# Stochastic Approximation Approaches to Group Distributionally Robust Optimization and Beyond

Lijun Zhang

Haomin Bai

# Peng Zhao

ZHANGLJ@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

BAIHM@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

ZHAOP@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China

#### Tianbao Yang

TIANBAO-YANG@TAMU.EDU

ZHOUZH@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

#### Zhi-Hua Zhou

National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China

# Abstract

This paper investigates group distributionally robust optimization (GDRO) with the goal of learning a model that performs well over m different distributions. First, we formulate GDRO as a stochastic convex-concave saddle-point problem, which is then solved by stochastic mirror descent (SMD) with m samples in each iteration, and attain a nearly optimal sample complexity. To reduce the number of samples required in each round from m to 1, we cast GDRO as a two-player game, where one player conducts SMD and the other executes an online algorithm for non-oblivious multi-armed bandits, maintaining the same sample complexity. Next, we extend GDRO to address scenarios involving imbalanced data and heterogeneous distributions. In the first scenario, we introduce a weighted variant of GDRO, enabling *distribution-dependent* convergence rates that rely on the number of samples from each distribution. We design two strategies to meet the sample budget: one integrates non-uniform sampling into SMD, and the other employs the stochastic mirrorprox algorithm with mini-batches, both of which deliver faster rates for distributions with more samples. In the second scenario, we propose to optimize the average top-k risk instead of the maximum risk, thereby mitigating the impact of outlier distributions. Similar to the case of vanilla GDRO, we develop two stochastic approaches: one uses m samples per iteration via SMD, and the other consumes k samples per iteration through an online algorithm for non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits.

Keywords: Group distributionally robust optimization (GDRO), Stochastic convexconcave saddle-point problem, Non-oblivious online learning, Bandits, Average top-k risk

#### 1 Introduction

In the classical statistical machine learning, our goal is to minimize the risk with respect to a fixed distribution  $\mathcal{P}_0$  (Vapnik, 2000), i.e.,

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ R_0(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_0} \left[ \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \right] \right\},\tag{1}$$

where  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$  is a sample drawn from  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{W}$  denotes a hypothesis class, and  $\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})$  is a loss measuring the prediction error of model  $\mathbf{w}$  on  $\mathbf{z}$ . During the past decades, various algorithms

©2024 Lijun Zhang, Haomin Bai, Peng Zhao, Tianbao Yang and Zhi-Hua Zhou. License: CC-BY 4.0, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

have been developed to optimize (1), and can be grouped in two categories: sample average approximation (SAA) and stochastic approximation (SA) (Kushner and Yin, 2003). In SAA, we minimize an empirical risk defined as the average loss over a set of samples drawn from  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , and in SA, we directly solve the original problem by using stochastic observations of the objective  $R_0(\cdot)$ .

However, a model trained on a single distribution may lack robustness in the sense that (i) it could suffer high error on minority subpopulations, though the average loss is small; (ii) its performance could degenerate dramatically when tested on a different distribution. Distributionally robust optimization (DRO) provides a principled way to address those limitations by minimizing the worst-case risk in a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  (Ben-Tal et al., 2013). Recently, it has attracted great interest in optimization (Shapiro, 2017), statistics (Duchi and Namkoong, 2021), operations research (Duchi et al., 2021), and machine learning (Hu et al., 2018; Curi et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2021; Agarwal and Zhang, 2022). In this paper, we consider an emerging class of DRO problems, named as Group DRO (GDRO) which optimizes the maximum risk

$$\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i} \left[ \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \right] \right\}$$
(2)

over a finite number of distributions (Oren et al., 2019; Sagawa et al., 2020). Mathematically, GDRO can be formulated as a minimax stochastic problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\max_{i\in[m]} \{R_i(\mathbf{w})\}\tag{3}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$  denote *m* distributions. A motivating example is federated learning, where a centralized model is deployed at multiple clients, each of which faces a (possibly) different data distribution (Mohri et al., 2019).

Supposing that samples can be drawn from all distributions freely, we develop efficient SA approaches for (3), in favor of their light computations over SAA methods. As elaborated by Nemirovski et al. (2009, § 3.2), we can cast (3) as a stochastic convex-concave saddle-point problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m} \left\{\phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w})\right\}$$
(4)

where  $\Delta_m = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^m | \mathbf{q} \ge \mathbf{0}, \sum_{i=1}^m q_i = 1\}$  is the (m-1)-dimensional simplex, and then solve (4) by their mirror descent stochastic approximation method, namely stochastic mirror descent (SMD). In fact, several recent studies have adopted this (or similar) strategy to optimize (4). But, unfortunately, we found that existing results are unsatisfactory because they either deliver a loose sample complexity (Sagawa et al., 2020), suffer subtle dependency issues in their analysis (Haghtalab et al., 2022; Soma et al., 2022), or hold only in expectation (Carmon and Hausler, 2022).

As a starting point, we first provide a routine application of SMD to (4), and discuss the theoretical guarantee. In each iteration, we draw 1 sample from every distribution to construct unbiased estimators of  $R_i(\cdot)$  and its gradient, and then update both **w** and **q** by SMD. The proposed method achieves an  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/T})$  convergence rate in expectation and with high probability, where T is the total number of iterations. As a result, we obtain an  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity for finding an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution of (4), which matches the  $\Omega(m/\epsilon^2)$  lower bound (Soma et al., 2022, Theorem 5) up to a logarithmic factor, and tighter than the  $O(m^2(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  bound of Sagawa et al. (2020) by an m factor. While being straightforward, this result seems *new* for GDRO. Additionally, we note that the aforementioned method requires setting the number of iterations T in advance, which could be inconvenient in practice. To avoid this limitation, we further propose an *anytime* algorithm by using time-varying step sizes, and obtain an  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{(\log m)/t})^1$  convergence rate at each iteration t.

Then, we proceed to reduce the number of samples used in each iteration from m to 1. We remark that a naive uniform sampling over m distributions does not work well, and yields a higher sample complexity (Sagawa et al., 2020). As an alternative, we borrow techniques from online learning with stochastic observations, and explicitly tackle the *non-oblivious* nature of the online process, which distinguishes our method from that of Soma et al. (2022). Specifically, we use SMD to update  $\mathbf{w}$ , and Exp3-IX, a powerful algorithm for nonoblivious multi-armed bandits (MAB) (Neu, 2015), with stochastic rewards to update  $\mathbf{q}$ . In this way, our algorithm only needs 1 sample in each round and attains an  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/T})$ convergence rate, implying the same  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity. Similarly, we also put forward an anytime variant, achieving an  $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{m(\log m)/t})$  convergence rate.

Subsequently, we extend GDRO to address two specific scenarios, as illustrated below.

#### 1.1 Extension to Imbalanced Data

In the first extention, we investigate a more practical and challenging scenario in which there are different budgets of samples that can be drawn from each distribution, a natural phenomenon encountered in learning with imbalanced data (Amodei et al., 2016). Let  $n_i$  be the sample budget of the *i*-th distribution, and without loss of generality, we assume that  $n_1 \ge n_2 \ge \cdots \ge n_m$ . Now, the goal is not to attain the optimal sample complexity, but to reduce the risk on all distributions as much as possible, under the budget constraint. To achieve this goal, we propose a novel formulation of weighted GDRO, which weights each risk  $R_i(\cdot)$  in (4) by a scale factor  $p_i$ . For GDRO with different budgets, we develop two SA approaches based on non-uniform sampling and mini-batches, respectively.

In each iteration of the first approach, we draw 1 sample from every  $\mathcal{P}_i$  with probability  $n_i/n_1$ , and then construct stochastic gradients to perform mirror descent. Consequently, the budget will be satisfied in expectation after  $n_1$  rounds, and our algorithm can be regarded as SMD for an instance of weighted GDRO. With the help of scale factors, we demonstrate the proposed algorithm enjoys distribution-dependent convergence in the sense that it converges faster for distributions with more samples. In particular, the excess risk on distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$  reduces at an  $O(\sqrt{n_1 \log m/n_i})$  rate, and for  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , it becomes  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_1})$ , which almost matches the optimal  $O(\sqrt{1/n_1})$  rate of learning from a single distribution with  $n_1$  samples.

On the other hand, for distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$  with budget  $n_i < n_1$ , the above  $O(\sqrt{n_1 \log m}/n_i)$ rate is worse than the  $O(\sqrt{1/n_i})$  rate obtained by learning from  $\mathcal{P}_i$  alone. In shape contrast with this limitation, our second approach yields nearly optimal convergence rates for *multiple* distributions across a large range of budgets. To meet the budget constraint, it runs for  $\bar{n} \leq n_m$  rounds, and in each iteration, draws a mini-batch of  $n_i/\bar{n}$  samples from every dis-

<sup>1.</sup> We use the  $\widetilde{O}$  notation to hide constant factors as well as polylogarithmic factors in t.

tribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . As a result, (i) the budget constraint is satisfied *exactly*; (ii) for distributions with a larger budget, the associated risk function can be estimated more accurately, making the variance of the stochastic gradient smaller. To benefit from the small variance, we leverage stochastic mirror-prox algorithm (Juditsky et al., 2011), instead of SMD, to update solutions, and again make use of the weighted GDRO formulation to obtain distributionwise convergence rates. Theoretical analysis shows that the excess risk converges at an  $O((\frac{1}{n_m} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}})\log m)$  rate for each  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Thus, we obtain a nearly optimal  $O((\log m)/\sqrt{n_i})$ rate for distributions  $\mathcal{P}_i$  with  $n_i \leq n_m^2$ , and an  $O((\log m)/n_m)$  rate otherwise. Note that the latter rate is as expected since the algorithm only updates  $O(n_m)$  times.

#### **1.2** Extension to Heterogeneous Distributions

In the second extension, we delve into another scenario where distributions exhibit heterogeneity, indicating significant variations in their risks (Li et al., 2019). The widely acknowledged sensitivity of the max operation to outliers implies that GDRO could be dominated by a single outlier distribution, while neglecting others (Shalev-Shwartz and Wexler, 2016). Inspired by the average top-k loss for supervised learning (Fan et al., 2017), we modify our objective from the maximum risk  $\mathcal{L}_{max}(\mathbf{w})$  in GDRO to the average top-k risk:

$$\mathcal{L}_{k}(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) \right\}$$
(5)

where  $\mathcal{B}_{m,k}$  is the set of subsets of [m] with size k, i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}_{m,k} = \{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [m] | |\mathcal{I}| = k\}$ . This modification aims to reduce the impact of outliers in heterogeneous distributions while still including GDRO as a special case.

We refer to the minimization of  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$  as average top-k risk optimization (AT<sub>k</sub>RO), and develop two stochastic algorithms. Similar to GDRO, AT<sub>k</sub>RO can be formulated as a stochastic convex-concave saddle-point problem, akin to (4), with the only difference being that the domain of  $\mathbf{q}$  is the capped simplex instead of the standard simplex. Therefore, we can employ SMD to update  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , which uses m samples in each round. Theoretical analysis demonstrates that this approach achieves an  $O(\sqrt{(\log(m/k))/T})$  convergence rate, implying an  $O((m \log(m/k))/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity. Furthermore, to circumvent the limitation of predefining the total number of iterations T, we introduce an anytime version that attains an  $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{(\log(m/k))/t})$  convergence rate.

Following the second approach for GDRO, we reduce the number of samples required in each round from m to k by casting  $AT_kRO$  as a two-player game. In each round, we use the Dependent Rounding (DepRound) algorithm (Gandhi et al., 2006) to select k distributions based on the current value of  $\mathbf{q}$ , and then draw 1 sample from each selected distribution. Then, we construct unbiased stochastic gradients for  $\mathbf{w}$ , and apply SMD for updates. Since the domain of  $\mathbf{q}$  is the capped simplex, we model the online problem for  $\mathbf{q}$  as an instance of non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits, and extend Exp3-IX to develop its update rule. We prove that our algorithm achieves an  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/(kT)})$  convergence rate, yielding an  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity. Similarly, we have also designed an anytime approach, which uses 1 sample per round and achieves an  $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{m(\log m)/t})$  rate. This paper extends our previous conference version (Zhang et al., 2023) by developing anytime algorithms, investigating a new scenario, and conducting more experiments, as detailed below.

- First, we adapt the two SA algorithms for GDRO to operate in an anytime manner. In the conference paper, our algorithms for GDRO required predefining the total number of iterations T to set step sizes. By adopting time-varying step sizes, we design anytime algorithms and provide the corresponding theoretical analysis.
- Second, we explore the scenario of heterogeneous distributions, which involves outlier distributions with significantly high risks. To mitigate the impact of these outliers, we propose to solve the  $AT_kRO$  problem and develop two algorithms: one employs SMD with m samples per round, achieving a sample complexity of  $O((m \log(m/k))/\epsilon^2)$ ; the other combines SMD with an algorithm for non-oblivious combinatorial semibandits, achieving a sample complexity of  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  and using k samples in each iteration. Furthermore, we have also extended these two algorithms into anytime versions.
- Last, we construct a heterogeneous data set and perform experiments to verify the advantages of  $AT_kRO$ . Additionally, we compare the performance of the anytime algorithms with their non-anytime counterparts, demonstrating the benefits of the anytime capability.

# 2 Related Work

Distributionally robust optimization (DRO) stems from the pioneering work of Scarf (1958), and has gained a lot of interest with the advancement of robust optimization (Ben-Tal et al., 2009, 2015). It has been successfully applied to a variety of machine learning tasks, including adversarial training (Sinha et al., 2018), algorithmic fairness (Hashimoto et al., 2018), class imbalance (Xu et al., 2020), long-tail learning (Samuel and Chechik, 2021), label shift (Zhang et al., 2021), etc.

In general, DRO is formulated to reflect our uncertainty about the target distribution. To ensure good performance under distribution perturbations, it minimizes the risk w.r.t. the worst distribution in an uncertainty set, i.e.,

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \sup_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_0)} \left\{ \mathrm{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}} \left[ \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \right] \right\}$$
(6)

where  $S(\mathcal{P}_0)$  denotes a set of probability distributions around  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . In the literature, there mainly exist three ways to construct  $S(\mathcal{P}_0)$ : (i) enforcing moment constraints (Delage and Ye, 2010), (ii) defining a neighborhood around  $\mathcal{P}_0$  by a distance function such as the *f*-divergence (Ben-Tal et al., 2013), the Wasserstein distance (Kuhn et al., 2019), and the Sinkhorn distance (Wang et al., 2021), and (iii) hypothesis testing of goodness-of-fit (Bertsimas et al., 2018).

By drawing a set of samples from  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , we can also define an empirical DRO problem, which can be regarded as an SAA approach for solving (6). When the uncertainty set is defined in terms of the Cressie-Read family of *f*-divergences, Duchi and Namkoong (2021) have studied finite sample and asymptotic properties of the empirical solution. Besides, it has been proved that empirical DRO can also benefit the risk minimization problem in (1). Namkoong and Duchi (2017) show that empirical DRO with the  $\chi^2$ -divergence has the effect of variance regularization, leading to better generalization w.r.t. distribution  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . Later, Duchi et al. (2021) demonstrate similar behaviors for the *f*-divergence constrained neighborhood, and provide one- and two-sided confidence intervals for the minimum risk in (1). Based on the Wasserstein distance, Esfahani and Kuhn (2018) establish an upper confidence bound on the risk of the empirical solution.

Since (6) is more complex than (1), considerable research efforts were devoted to develop efficient algorithms for DRO and its empirical version. For  $\mathcal{P}_0$  with finite support, Ben-Tal et al. (2013, Corollary 3) have demonstrated that (6) with *f*-divergences is equivalent to a convex optimization problem, provided that the loss  $\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})$  is convex in  $\mathbf{w}$ . Actually, this conclusion is true even when  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is continuous (Shapiro, 2017, § 3.2). Under mild assumptions, Esfahani and Kuhn (2018) show that DRO problems over Wasserstein balls can be reformulated as finite convex programs—in some cases even as linear programs. Besides the constrained formulation in (6), there also exists a penalized (or regularized) form of DRO (Sinha et al., 2018), which makes the optimization problem more tractable. In the past years, a series of SA methods have been proposed for empirical DRO with convex losses (Namkoong and Duchi, 2016), and DRO with convex loss (Levy et al., 2020) and non-convex losses (Jin et al., 2021; Qi et al., 2021; Rafique et al., 2022).

The main focus of this paper is the GDRO problem in (3)/(4), instead of the traditional DRO in (6). Sagawa et al. (2020) have applied SMD (Nemirovski et al., 2009) to (4), but only obtain a sub-optimal sample complexity of  $O(m^2(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ , because of the large variance in their gradients. In the sequel, Haghtalab et al. (2022) and Soma et al. (2022) have tried to improve the sample complexity by reusing samples and applying techniques from MAB respectively, but their analysis suffers dependency issues. Carmon and Hausler (2022, Proposition 2) successfully established an  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity by combining SMD and gradient clipping, but their result holds only in expectation. To deal with heterogeneous noise in different distributions, Agarwal and Zhang (2022) propose a variant of GDRO named as minimax regret optimization (MRO), which replaces the risk  $R_i(\mathbf{w})$  with "excess risk"  $R_i(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_i(\mathbf{w})$ . More generally, calibration terms can be introduced to prevent any single distribution from dominating the maximum (Słowik and Bottou, 2022). Efficient optimization of MRO has been investigated by Zhang et al. (2024).

In the context of federated learning, Mohri et al. (2019) have analyzed the generalization error of empricial GDRO when the number of samples from different distributions could be different. However, their convergence rate is unsatisfactory as it depends on the smallest number of samples and is distribution-independent. Finally, we note that GDRO has a similar spirit with collaborative PAC learning (Blum et al., 2017; Nguyen and Zakynthinou, 2018; Rothblum and Yona, 2021) in the sense that both aim to find a single model that performs well on multiple distributions.

# 3 SA Approaches to GDRO

In this section, we present two efficient SA approaches for GDRO, which achieve the same sample complexity but use a different number of samples in each round (m versus 1).

#### 3.1 Preliminaries

First, we state the general setup of mirror descent (Nemirovski et al., 2009). We equip the domain  $\mathcal{W}$  with a distance-generating function  $\nu_w(\cdot)$ , which is 1-strongly convex with respect to certain norm  $\|\cdot\|_w$ . We define the Bregman distance associated with  $\nu_w(\cdot)$  as

$$B_w(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \nu_w(\mathbf{u}) - \left[\nu_w(\mathbf{v}) + \langle \nabla \nu_w(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle\right].$$

For the simplex  $\Delta_m$ , we choose the negative entropy (neg-entropy) function  $\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \ln q_i$ , which is 1-strongly convex with respect to the vector  $\ell_1$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , as the distancegenerating function. Similarly,  $B_q(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the Bregman distance associated with  $\nu_q(\cdot)$ .

Then, we introduce the standard assumptions about the domain, and the loss function.

**Assumption 1** The domain  $\mathcal{W}$  is convex and its diameter measured by  $\nu_w(\cdot)$  is bounded by D, i.e.,

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) \le D^2.$$
(7)

For  $\Delta_m$ , it is easy to verify that its diameter measured by the neg-entropy function is bounded by  $\sqrt{\ln m}$ .

Assumption 2 For all  $i \in [m]$ , the risk function  $R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i}[\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})]$  is convex.

To simplify presentations, we assume the loss belongs to [0,1], and its gradient is also bounded.

**Assumption 3** For all  $i \in [m]$ , we have

$$0 \le \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \le 1, \ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \ \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i.$$
(8)

**Assumption 4** For all  $i \in [m]$ , we have

$$\|\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \le G, \ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \ \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i$$
(9)

where  $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$  is the dual norm of  $\|\cdot\|_{w}$ .

Note that it is possible to relax the bounded assumptions in (8) and (9) to light tail conditions such as the sub-Gaussian Property (Vershynin, 2018).

Last, we discuss the performance measure. To analyze the convergence property, we measure the quality of an approximate solution  $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$  to (4) by the error

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$$
(10)

which directly controls the optimality of  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$  to the original problem (3), since

$$\max_{i\in[m]} R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \max_{i\in[m]} R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m} \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m} \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w})$$

$$\leq \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m} \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{q}_i R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}).$$
(11)

#### 3.2 Stochastic Mirror Descent for GDRO

To apply SMD, the key is to construct stochastic gradients of the function  $\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})$  in (4). We first present its true gradients with respect to  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ :

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}), \text{ and } \nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) = [R_1(\mathbf{w}),\ldots,R_m(\mathbf{w})]^{\top}.$$

In each round t, denote by  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  the current solutions. We draw one sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , and define stochastic gradients as

$$\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{t,i} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}), \text{ and } \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = [\ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(1)}), \dots, \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(m)})]^\top.$$
(12)

Obviously, they are unbiased estimators of the true gradients:

$$\mathbf{E}_{t-1}[\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)] = \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \text{ and } \mathbf{E}_{t-1}[\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)] = \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$$

where  $E_{t-1}[\cdot]$  represents the expectation conditioned on the randomness until round t-1. It is worth mentioning that the construction of  $\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  can be further simplified to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})$$
(13)

where  $i_t \in [m]$  is drawn randomly according to the probability  $\mathbf{q}_t$ .

Then, we use SMD to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$ :

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_w \langle \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_t) \right\},\tag{14}$$

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta_q \langle -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right\}$$
(15)

where  $\eta_w > 0$  and  $\eta_q > 0$  are two step sizes that will be determined later. The updating rule of  $\mathbf{w}_t$  depends on the choice of the distance-generating function  $\nu_w(\cdot)$ . For example, if  $\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$ , (14) becomes stochastic gradient descent (SGD), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{W}} \big[ \mathbf{w}_t - \eta_w \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) \big]$$

where  $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}[\cdot]$  denotes the Euclidean projection onto the nearest point in  $\mathcal{W}$ . Since  $B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t)$  is defined in terms of the neg-entropy, (15) is equivalent to

$$q_{t+1,i} = \frac{q_{t,i} \exp\left(\eta_q \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)})\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^m q_{t,j} \exp\left(\eta_q \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(j)})\right)}, \ \forall i \in [m]$$
(16)

*/*···

which is the Hedge algorithm (Freund and Schapire, 1997) applied to a maximization problem. In the beginning, we set  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}_m$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_m$  is the *m*-dimensional vector consisting of 1's. In the last step, we return the averaged iterates  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$  as final solutions. The complete procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Based on the theoretical guarantee of SMD for stochastic convex-concave optimization (Nemirovski et al., 2009,  $\S$  3.1), we have the following theorem for Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Stochastic Mirror Descent for GDRO

**Input**: step size  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ 

- 1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- 2: for t = 1 to T do

3: For each  $i \in [m]$ , draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ 

- 4: Construct the stochastic gradients defined in (12)
- 5: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (14) and (15), respectively
- 6: **end for**
- 7: return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$

**Theorem 1** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = D^2 \sqrt{\frac{8}{5T(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}}$  and  $\eta_q = (\ln m) \sqrt{\frac{8}{5T(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}}$  in Algorithm 1, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2\sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{T}}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \le \left(8 + 2\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{T}}.$$

**Remark 1** Theorem 1 shows that Algorithm 1 achieves an  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/T})$  convergence rate. Since it consumes *m* samples per iteration, the sample complexity is  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ , which nearly matches the  $\Omega(m/\epsilon^2)$  lower bound (Soma et al., 2022, Theorem 5).

**Comparisons with Sagawa et al. (2020)** Given the fact that the number of samples used in each round of Algorithm 1 is m, it is natural to ask whether it can be reduced to a small constant. Indeed, the stochastic algorithm of Sagawa et al. (2020) only requires 1 sample per iteration, but suffers a large sample complexity. In each round t, they first generate a random index  $i_t \in [m]$  uniformly, and draw 1 sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}$  from  $\mathcal{P}_{i_t}$ . The stochastic gradients are constructed as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = q_{t,i_t} m \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}), \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{g}}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = [0, \dots, m\ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}), \dots, 0]^\top$$
(17)

where  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  is a vector with  $m\ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})$  in position  $i_t$  and 0 elsewhere. Then, the two stochastic gradients are used to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$ , in the same way as (14) and (15). However, it only attains a slow convergence rate:  $O(m\sqrt{(\log m)/T})$ , leading to an  $O(m^2(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity, which is higher than that of Algorithm 1 by a factor of m. The slow convergence is due to the fact that the optimization error depends on the dual norm of the stochastic gradients in (17), which blows up by a factor of m, compared with the gradients in (12).

**Comparisons with Haghtalab et al. (2022)** To reduce the number of samples required in each round, Haghtalab et al. (2022) propose to reuse samples for multiple iterations. To approximate  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ , they construct the stochastic gradient  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  in the same way as (13), which needs 1 sample. To approximate  $\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ , they draw *m* samples  $\mathbf{z}_{\tau}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{\tau}^{(m)}$ , one from each distribution, at round  $\tau = mk + 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and reuse them for m iterations to construct the following gradient:

$$\mathbf{g}_{q}'(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) = [\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{\tau}^{(1)}),\ldots,\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{\tau}^{(m)})]^{\top}, \ t = \tau,\ldots,\tau+m-1.$$
(18)

Then, they treat  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  and  $\mathbf{g}'_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  as stochastic gradients, and update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  by SMD. In this way, their algorithm uses 2 samples on average in each iteration. However, the gradient in (18) is no longer an unbiased estimator of the true gradient  $\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  at rounds  $t = \tau + 2, \ldots, \tau + m - 1$ , making their analysis ungrounded. To see this, from the updating rule of SMD, we know that  $\mathbf{w}_{\tau+2}$  depends on  $\mathbf{q}_{\tau+1}$ , which in turn depends on the m samples drawn at round  $\tau$ , and thus

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\ell(\mathbf{w}_{\tau+2}; \mathbf{z}_{\tau}^{(i)})\right] \neq R_i(\mathbf{w}_{\tau+2}), \ i = 1, \dots, m$$

#### 3.2.1 ANYTIME EXTENSIONS

The step sizes  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$  in Theorem 1 depend on the total number of iterations T, which complicates practical implementation as it requires setting T beforehand. Additionally, the theorem only offers theoretical guarantees for the final solution. To avoid these limitations, we propose an anytime extension of Algorithm 1 by employing time-varying step sizes. We note that there is a long-standing history of designing anytime algorithms in optimization and related areas (Zilberstein, 1996; Horsch and Poole, 1998; Cutkosky, 2019).

Specifically, we replace the fixed step sizes  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$  in (14) and (15) with time-varying step sizes (Nemirovski et al., 2009)

$$\eta_t^w = D^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{t(D^2 G^2 + \ln m)}}, \text{ and } \eta_t^q = (\ln m) \sqrt{\frac{2}{t(D^2 G^2 + \ln m)}},$$
 (19)

respectively. To enable anytime capability, we maintain the weighted averages of the iterates:

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t} = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{w} \mathbf{w}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{w}} = \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \eta_{j}^{w}\right) \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t-1} + \eta_{t}^{w} \mathbf{w}_{t}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{w}},$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t} = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{q} \mathbf{q}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{q}} = \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \eta_{j}^{q}\right) \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t-1} + \eta_{t}^{q} \mathbf{q}_{t}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{q}}$$
(20)

which can be returned as solutions whenever required, and provide the following theoretical guarantee for the solution  $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$  at each round t.

**Theorem 2** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting step sizes as (19) in Algorithm 1, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t})\right] \leq \frac{\sqrt{D^{2}G^{2} + \ln m}}{\sqrt{2}\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)} \left(5 + 3\ln t\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log m}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right), \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}.$$
 (21)

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \le \frac{\sqrt{D^2 G^2 + \ln m}}{\sqrt{2} \left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)} \left(9 + 11 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} + 7 \ln t + 3 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \ln t\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log m} \log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Remark 2** The convergence rate of the anytime extension is slower by a factor of  $O(\log t)$  compared to Algorithm 1 with fixed step sizes. However, the modified algorithm possesses the anytime characteristic, indicating it is capable of returning a solution at any round.

#### 3.3 Non-oblivious Online Learning for GDRO

In this section, we explore methods to reduce the number of samples used in each iteration from m to 1. As shown in (13), we can use 1 sample to construct a stochastic gradient for  $\mathbf{w}_t$  with small norm, since  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)\|_{w,*} \leq G$  under Assumption 4. Thus, it is relatively easy to control the error related to  $\mathbf{w}_t$ . However, we do not have such guarantees for the stochastic gradient of  $\mathbf{q}_t$ . Recall that the infinity norm of  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  in (17) is upper bounded by m. The reason is that we insist on the unbiasedness of the stochastic gradient, which leads to a large variance. To control the variance, Carmon and Hausler (2022) have applied gradient clipping to  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ , and established an  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity that holds in expectation. Different from their approach, we borrow techniques from online learning to balance the bias and the variance.

In the studies of convex-concave saddle-point problems, it is now well-known that they can be solved by playing two online learning algorithms against each other (Freund and Schapire, 1999; Rakhlin and Sridharan, 2013; Syrgkanis et al., 2015; Roux et al., 2021). This transformation allows us to exploit no-regret algorithms developed in online learning to bound the optimization error. To solve problem (4), we ask the 1st player to minimize a sequence of convex functions

$$\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{1,i} R_i(\mathbf{w}), \quad \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_2) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{2,i} R_i(\mathbf{w}), \quad \cdots, \quad \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_T) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{T,i} R_i(\mathbf{w}) \quad (22)$$

under the constraint  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , and the 2nd player to maximize a sequence of linear functions

$$\phi(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w}_1), \quad \phi(\mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w}_2), \quad \cdots, \quad \phi(\mathbf{w}_T, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w}_T) \quad (23)$$

subject to the constraint  $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ . We highlight that there exists an important difference between our stochastic convex-concave problem and its deterministic counterpart. Here, the two players cannot directly observe the loss function, and can only approximate  $R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_i}[\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z})]$  by drawing samples from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . The stochastic setting makes the problem more challenging, and in particular, we need to take care of the *non-oblivious* nature of the learning process. Here, "non-oblivious" refers to the fact that the online functions depend on the past decisions of the players.

Next, we discuss the online algorithms that will be used by the two players. As shown in Section 3.2, the 1st player can easily obtain a stochastic gradient with small norm by using 1 sample. So, we model the problem faced by the 1st player as "non-oblivious online convex optimization (OCO) with stochastic gradients", and still use SMD to update its solution. In each round t, with 1 sample drawn from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , the 2nd player can estimate the value of  $R_i(\mathbf{w}_t)$ which is the coefficient of  $q_i$ . Since the 2nd player is maximizing a linear function over the simplex, the problem can be modeled as "non-oblivious multi-armed bandits (MAB) with stochastic rewards". And fortunately, we have powerful online algorithms for nonoblivious MAB (Auer et al., 2002; Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020), whose regret has a

Algorithm 2 Non-oblivious Online Learning for GDRO Input: step size  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ , and IX coefficient  $\gamma$ 1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 2: for t = 1 to T do 2: Generate  $i_t \in [m]$  according to  $\mathbf{q}_t$ , and draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_{i_t}$ 3: Construct the stochastic gradient in (13) and the IX loss estimator in (25) 4: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (24) and (26), respectively 5: end for 6: return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$ 

sublinear dependence on m. In this paper, we choose the Exp3-IX algorithm (Neu, 2015), and generalize its theoretical guarantee to stochastic rewards. In contrast, if we apply SMD with  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  in (17), the regret scales at least linearly with m.

The complete procedure is presented in Algorithm 2, and we explain key steps below. In each round t, we generate an index  $i_t \in [m]$  from the probability distribution  $\mathbf{q}_t$ , and then draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}$  from the distribution  $\mathcal{P}_{i_t}$ . With the stochastic gradient in (13), we use SMD to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$ :

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_w \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_t) \right\}.$$
(24)

Then, we reuse the sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}$  to update  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to Exp3-IX, which first constructs the Implicit-eXploration (IX) loss estimator (Kocák et al., 2014):

$$\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \frac{1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})}{q_{t,i} + \gamma} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i], \ \forall i \in [m]$$

$$(25)$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is the IX coefficient and  $\mathbb{I}[A]$  equals to 1 when the event A is true and 0 otherwise, and then performs a mirror descent update:

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta_q \langle \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right\}.$$
(26)

Compared with (15), the only difference is that the stochastic gradient  $-\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  is now replaced with the IX loss estimator  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$ . However, it is not an instance of SMD, because  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$ is no longer an unbiased stochastic gradient. The main advantage of  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$  is that it reduces the variance of the gradient estimator by sacrificing a little bit of unbiasedness, which turns out to be crucial for a high probability guarantee, and thus can deal with non-oblivious adversaries. Since we still use the entropy regularizer in (26), it also enjoys an explicit form that is similar to (16).

We present the theoretical guarantee of Algorithm 2. To this end, we first bound the regret of the 1st player. In the analysis, we address the non-obliviousness by the "ghost iterate" technique of Nemirovski et al. (2009).

**Theorem 3** Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = \frac{2D}{G\sqrt{5T}}$ , we have

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_t)\right] \le 2DG\sqrt{5T}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_t) \le DG\sqrt{T} \left(2\sqrt{5} + 8\sqrt{\ln\frac{1}{\delta}}\right).$$

By extending Exp3-IX to stochastic rewards, we have the following bound for the 2nd player.

**Theorem 4** Under Assumption 3, and setting  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{mT}}$  and the IX coefficient  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$ , we have

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m}\sum_{t=1}^T\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^T\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}_t)\right] \le 3\sqrt{mT\ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 3\left(\sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 1\right)$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m}\sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) \le 3\sqrt{mT\ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 1\right)\ln\frac{3}{\delta}.$$

Combining the above two theorems directly leads to the following optimization error bound.

**Theorem 5** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = \frac{2D}{G\sqrt{5T}}$ ,  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{mT}}$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$  in Algorithm 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2DG\sqrt{\frac{5}{T}} + 3\sqrt{\frac{m\ln m}{T}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + 3\left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{T\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + \frac{1}{T}\right)$$
(27)

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \leq DG\sqrt{\frac{1}{T}} \left(2\sqrt{5} + 8\sqrt{\ln\frac{2}{\delta}}\right) + 3\sqrt{\frac{m\ln m}{T}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{T\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + \frac{1}{T}\right)\ln\frac{6}{\delta}.$$
<sup>(28)</sup>

**Remark 3** The above theorem shows that with 1 sample per iteration, Algorithm 2 is able to achieve an  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/T})$  convergence rate, thus maintaining the  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ sample complexity. It is worth mentioning that one may attempt to reduce the log *m* factor by employing mirror descent with the Tsallis entropy  $(\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{q_i})$  for the 2nd player (Audibert and Bubeck, 2010, Theorem 13). However, even in the standard MAB problem, such an improvement only happens in the oblivious setting, and is conjectured to be impossible in the non-oblivious case (Audibert and Bubeck, 2010, Remark 14). **Comparisons with Soma et al. (2022)** In a recent work, Soma et al. (2022) have deployed online algorithms to optimize  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , but did not consider the non-oblivious property. As a result, their theoretical guarantees, which build upon the analysis for oblivious online learning (Orabona, 2019), cannot justify the optimality of their algorithm for (4). Specifically, their results imply that for any *fixed*  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  that are independent from  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$  (Soma et al., 2022, Theorem 3),

$$E\left[\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{T}}\right).$$
(29)

However, (29) cannot be used to bound  $\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$  in (10), because of the dependency issue. To be more clear, we have

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) - \phi(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \overline{\mathbf{q}})$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \phi(\overline{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q})$  depend on  $\overline{\mathbf{q}}$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{w}}$ , respectively.

**Remark 4** After we pointed out the dependence issue of reusing samples, Haghtalab et al. (2023) modified their method by incorporating bandit algorithms to optimize  $\mathbf{q}$ . From our understanding, the idea of applying bandits to GDRO was *firstly* proposed by Soma et al. (2022), and subsequently refined by us.

#### 3.3.1 ANYTIME EXTENSIONS

Similar to Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 also requires the prior specification of the total number of iterations T, as the values of  $\eta_w$  in SMD, as well as  $\eta_q$  and  $\gamma$  in Exp3-IX, are dependent on T. Following the extension in Section 3.2.1, we can also adapt Algorithm 2 to be anytime by employing time-varying parameters in SMD and Exp3-IX. Specifically, in the *t*-th round, we replace  $\eta_w$  in (24),  $\eta_q$  in (26), and  $\gamma$  in (25) with

$$\eta_t^w = \frac{D}{G\sqrt{t}}, \ \eta_t^q = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{mt}}, \ \text{and} \ \gamma_t = \frac{\eta_t^q}{2}$$
(30)

respectively, and output  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t$  in (20) as the current solution.

Compared to the original Algorithm 2, our modifications are relatively minor. However, the theoretical analysis differs significantly. The reason is because the optimization error of  $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$  is governed by the *weighted average regret* of the two players, rather than the standard regret. That is,

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t})$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w}\right)^{-1} \left(\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j})\right]\right)}_{:=O_{1}} (31)$$

$$+ \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q}\right)^{-1} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j})\right]\right)}_{:=O_{2}} .$$

For the 1st player, we extend the analysis of SMD in Theorem 3, and obtain the results below for bounding  $O_1$ .

**Theorem 6** Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, and using  $\eta_t^w$  in (30) for the 1st player, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[O_1] \le \frac{DG}{\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(\frac{9}{4} + \frac{5}{4}\ln t\right), \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$O_1 \le \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t+1} - 1} \left(\frac{17}{4} + \frac{13}{4}\ln t + 2\ln\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

While Neu (2015) have analyzed the regret of Exp3-IX with time-varying step sizes, our focus is on the weighted average regret  $O_2$ . To achieve this, we conduct a different analysis to bound  $O_2$ , and establish the following theoretical guarantee.

**Theorem 7** Under Assumption 3, and using  $\eta_t^q$  and  $\gamma_t$  in (30) for the 2nd player, we have

$$E[O_2] \le \frac{1}{2(\sqrt{t+1}-1)} \left( (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + 6\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right), \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$O_2 \le \frac{1}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left( (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + \left(2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}}\right)\ln\frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

By directly integrating the above two theorems, we derive the following theorem for the optimization error at each round.

**Theorem 8** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting parameters as (30) in Algorithm 2, we have

$$E\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t},\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t})\right] \leq \frac{(3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + 6\sqrt{m/\ln m} + 4\sqrt{(1+\ln t)/2} + DG\left(5+3\ln t\right)}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)}$$

$$=O\left(\frac{\sqrt{m\log m}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right), \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}.$$
(32)

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) \leq \frac{(3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + \left(2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}}\right)\ln\frac{6}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} + DG\left(9+7\ln t + 4\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \quad (33)$$
$$= O\left(\frac{\sqrt{m\log m}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Remark 5** Similar to the conclusion in Section 3.2.1, the convergence rate in the above theorem is  $O(\log t)$  times slower than that in Theorem 5.

# 4 Weighted GDRO for Imbalanced Data

When designing SA approaches for GDRO, it is common to assume that the algorithms are free to draw samples from every distribution (Sagawa et al., 2020), as we do in Section 3. However, this assumption may not hold in practice. For example, data collection costs can vary widely among distributions (Radivojac et al., 2004), and data collected from various channels can have different throughputs (Zhou, 2024). In this section, we investigate the scenario where the number of samples can be drawn from each distribution could be different. Denote by  $n_i$  the number of samples that can be drawn from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_m$ . Note that we have a straightforward **Baseline** which just runs Algorithm 1 for  $n_m$  iterations, and the optimization error  $\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_m}).$ 

#### 4.1 Stochastic Mirror Descent with Non-uniform Sampling

To meet the budget, we propose to incorporate non-uniform sampling into SMD. Before getting into technical details, we first explain the main idea of using non-uniform sampling. One way is to draw 1 sample from every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$  with probability  $p_i = n_i/n_1$  in each iteration. Then, after  $n_1$  iterations, the *expected* number of samples drawn from  $\mathcal{P}_i$  will be  $n_1 p_i = n_i$ , and thus the budget is satisfied in expectation.

Specifically, in each round t, we first generate a set of Bernoulli random variables  $\{b_t^{(1)}, \ldots, b_t^{(m)}\}$  with  $\Pr[b_t^{(i)} = 1] = p_i$  to determine whether to sample from each distribution. If  $b_t^{(i)} = 1$ , we draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . The question then becomes how to construct stochastic gradients from these samples. Let  $\mathcal{C}_t = \{i | b_t^{(i)} = 1\}$  be the indices of selected distributions. If we stick to the original problem in (4), then the stochastic gradients should be constructed in the following way

$$\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) = \sum_{i \in C_{t}} \frac{q_{t,i}}{p_{i}} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}; \mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)}), \text{ and } [\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})]_{i} = \begin{cases} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}; \mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})/p_{i}, & i \in \mathcal{C}_{t} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(34)

to ensure unbiasedness. Then, they can be used by SMD to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$ . To analyze the optimization error, we need to bound the norm of stochastic gradients in (34). To this end, we have  $\|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)\|_{w,*} \leq Gn_1/n_m$  and  $\|\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)_i\|_{\infty} \leq n_1/n_m$ . Following the arguments of Theorem 1, we can prove that the error  $\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_1} \cdot n_1/n_m) = O(\sqrt{n_1 \log m}/n_m)$ , which is even larger than the  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_m})$  error of the Baseline.

In the following, we demonstrate that a simple twist of the above procedure can still yield meaningful results that are complementary to the Baseline. We observe that the large norm of the stochastic gradients in (34) is caused by the inverse probability  $1/p_i$ . A natural idea is to ignore  $1/p_i$ , and define the following stochastic gradients:

$$\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = \sum_{i \in C_t} q_{t,i} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}), \text{ and } [\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)]_i = \begin{cases} \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}), & i \in \mathcal{C}_t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(35)

#### Algorithm 3 Stochastic Mirror Descent for Weighted GDRO

**Input**: step size  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ 

- 1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- 2: for t = 1 to  $n_1$  do
- 3: For each  $i \in [m]$ , generate a Bernoulli random variable  $b_t^{(i)}$  with  $\Pr[b_t^{(i)} = 1] = p_i$ , and if  $b_t^{(i)} = 1$ , draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$
- 4: Construct the stochastic gradients defined in (35)
- 5: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (14) and (15), respectively
- 6: end for
- 7: return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{t=1}^{n_1} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{t=1}^{n_1} \mathbf{q}_t$

In this way, they are no longer stochastic gradients of (4), but can be treated as stochastic gradients of a weighted GDRO problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m} \left\{\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i p_i R_i(\mathbf{w})\right\}$$
(36)

where each risk  $R_i(\cdot)$  is scaled by a factor  $p_i$ . Based on the gradients in (35), we still use (14) and (15) to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$ . We summarize the complete procedure in Algorithm 3.

We omit the optimization error of Algorithm 3 for (36), since it has exactly the same form as Theorem 1. What we are really interested in is the theoretical guarantee of its solution on multiple distributions. To this end, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 9** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = D^2 \sqrt{\frac{8}{5n_1(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}}$  and  $\eta_q = (\ln m) \sqrt{\frac{8}{5n_1(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}}$  in Algorithm 3, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \frac{n_1}{n_i} p_{\varphi}^* \le \frac{1}{p_i} \mu(\delta) \sqrt{\frac{10(D^2 G^2 + \ln m)}{n_1}} = \mu(\delta) \frac{\sqrt{10(D^2 G^2 + \ln m)n_1}}{n_i}, \ \forall i \in [m]$$

where  $p_{\varphi}^*$  is the optimal value of (36) and  $\mu(\delta) = 8 + 2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$ .

**Remark 6** While the value of  $p_{\varphi}^*$  is generally unknown, it can be regard as a small constant when there exists one model that attains small risks on all distributions. We see that Algorithm 3 exhibits a *distribution-dependent* convergence behavior: the larger the number of samples  $n_i$ , the smaller the target risk  $n_1 p_{\varphi}^*/n_i$ , and the faster the convergence rate  $O(\sqrt{n_1 \log m}/n_i)$ . Note that its rate is always better than the  $O(\sqrt{n_1 \log m}/n_m)$  rate of SMD with (34) as gradients. Furthermore, it converges faster than the Baseline when  $n_i \geq \sqrt{n_1 n_m}$ . In particular, for distribution  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , Algorithm 3 attains an  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_1})$  rate, which almost matches the optimal  $O(\sqrt{1/n_1})$  rate of learning from a single distribution. Finally, we would like to emphasize that a similar idea of introducing "scale factors" has been used by Juditsky et al. (2011, § 4.3.1) for stochastic semidefinite feasibility problems and Agarwal and Zhang (2022) for empirical MRO.

#### 4.2 Stochastic Mirror-Prox Algorithm with Mini-batches

In Algorithm 3, distributions with more samples take their advantage by appearing more frequently in the stochastic gradients. In this section, we propose a different way, which lets them reduce the variance in the elements of stochastic gradients by mini-batches (Roux et al., 2008).

The basic idea is as follows. We run our algorithm for a small number of iterations  $\bar{n}$  that is no larger than  $n_m$ . Then, in each iteration, we draw a mini-batch of  $n_i/\bar{n}$  samples from every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . For  $\mathcal{P}_i$  with more samples, we can estimate the associated risk  $R_i(\cdot)$  and its gradient more accurately, i.e., with a smaller variance. However, to make this idea work, we need to tackle two obstacles: (i) the performance of the SA algorithm should depend on the variance of gradients instead of the norm, and for this reason SMD is unsuitable; (ii) even some elements of the stochastic gradient have small variances, the entire gradient may still have a large variance. To address the first challenge, we resort to a more advanced SA approach—stochastic mirror-prox algorithm (SMPA), whose convergence rate depends on the variance (Juditsky et al., 2011). To overcome the second challenge, we again introduce scale factors into the optimization problem and the stochastic gradients. And in this way, we can ensure faster convergence rates for distributions with more samples.

In SMPA, we need to maintain two sets of solutions:  $(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  and  $(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)$ . In each round t, we first draw  $n_i/n_m$  samples from every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i,j)}$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, n_i/n_m$ . Then, we use them to construct stochastic gradients at  $(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)$  of a weighted GDRO problem (36), where the value of  $p_i$  will be determined later. Specifically, we define

$$\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}',\mathbf{q}_{t}') = \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t,i}' p_{i} \left( \frac{n_{m}}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}/n_{m}} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}';\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i,j)}) \right),$$
  
$$\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t}',\mathbf{q}_{t}') = \left[ p_{1} \frac{n_{m}}{n_{1}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{1}/n_{m}} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}';\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(1,j)}), p_{2} \frac{n_{m}}{n_{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{2}/n_{m}} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}';\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(2,j)}), \dots, p_{m} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t}';\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(m)}) \right]^{\top}.$$
(37)

Let's take the stochastic gradient  $\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)$ , whose variance will be measured in terms of  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ , as an example to explain the intuition of inserting  $p_i$ . Define  $u_i = \frac{n_m}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \ell(\mathbf{w}'_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i,j)})$ . With a larger mini-batch size  $n_i/n_m$ ,  $u_i$  will approximate  $R_i(\mathbf{w}'_t)$  more accurately, and thus have a smaller variance. Then, it allows us to insert a larger value of  $p_i$ , without affecting the variance of  $\|\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)\|_{\infty}$ , since  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  is insensitive to perturbations of small elements. Similar to the case in Theorem 9, the convergence rate of  $R_i(\cdot)$  depends on  $1/p_i$ , and becomes faster if  $p_i$  is larger.

Based on (37), we use SMD to update  $(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)$ , and denote the solution by  $(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1})$ :

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_w \langle \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'_t \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}'_t) \right\},\tag{38}$$

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta_q \langle -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'_t) \right\}.$$
(39)

Algorithm 4 Stochastic Mirror-Prox Algorithm for Weighted GDRO

**Input**: step size  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ 

1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}'_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}'_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 

2: for t = 1 to  $n_m/2$  do

3: For each  $i \in [m]$ , draw  $n_i/n_m$  samples  $\{\mathbf{z}_t^{(i,j)} | j = 1, \ldots, n_i/n_m\}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ 

- 4: Construct the stochastic gradients defined in (37)
- 5: Calculate  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_{t+1}$  according to (38) and (39), respectively
- 6: For each  $i \in [m]$ , draw  $n_i/n_m$  samples  $\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_t^{(i,j)} | j = 1, \dots, n_i/n_m\}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$
- 7: Construct the stochastic gradients defined in (40)
- 8: Calculate  $\mathbf{w}'_{t+1}$  and  $\mathbf{q}'_{t+1}$  according to (41) and (42), respectively
- 9: end for

10: return 
$$\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{2}{n_m} \sum_{t=2}^{1+n_m/2} \mathbf{w}_t$$
 and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{2}{n_m} \sum_{t=2}^{1+n_m/2} \mathbf{q}_t$ 

Next, we draw another  $n_i/n_m$  samples from each distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , denoted by  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_t^{(i,j)}$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, n_i/n_m$ , to construct stochastic gradients at  $(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1})$ :

$$\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t+1,i} p_{i} \left( \frac{n_{m}}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}/n_{m}} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}; \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t}^{(i,j)}) \right),$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1}) = \left[ p_{1} \frac{n_{m}}{n_{1}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{1}/n_{m}} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}; \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t}^{(1,j)}), \dots, p_{m} \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}; \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t}^{(m)}) \right]^{\top}.$$
(40)

Then, we use them to update  $(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)$  again, and denote the result by  $(\mathbf{w}'_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}'_{t+1})$ :

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1}' = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_w \langle \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1}), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_t' \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_t') \right\},\tag{41}$$

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1}' = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta_q \langle -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t' \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t') \right\}.$$
(42)

To meet the budget constraints, we repeat the above process for  $n_m/2$  iterations. Finally, we return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{2}{n_m} \sum_{t=2}^{1+n_m/2} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{2}{n_m} \sum_{t=2}^{1+n_m/2} \mathbf{q}_t$  as solutions. The complete procedure is summarized in Algorithm 4.

To analysis the performance of Algorithm 4, we further assume the risk function  $R_i(\cdot)$  is smooth, and the dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$  satisfies a regularity condition.

Assumption 5 All the risk functions are L-smooth, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}')\|_{w,*} \le L \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_w, \ \forall \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}, i \in [m].$$
(43)

Note that even in the studies of stochastic convex optimization (SCO), smoothness is necessary to obtain a variance-based convergence rate (Lan, 2012).

**Assumption 6** The dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$  is  $\kappa$ -regular for some small constant  $\kappa \geq 1$ .

The regularity condition is used when analyzing the effect of mini-batches on stochastic gradients. For a formal definition, please refer to Juditsky and Nemirovski (2008). Assumption 6 is satisfied by most of papular norms considered in the literature, such as the vector  $\ell_p$ -norm and the infinity norm.

Then, we have the following theorem for Algorithm 4.

Theorem 10 Define

$$p_{\max} = \max_{i \in [m]} p_i, \quad \omega_{\max} = \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{p_i^2 n_m}{n_i},$$

$$\widetilde{L} = 2\sqrt{2}p_{\max}(D^2 L + D^2 G \sqrt{\ln m}), \text{ and } \sigma^2 = 2c\omega_{\max}(\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m)$$
(44)

where c > 0 is an absolute constant. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, and setting

$$\eta_w = 2D^2 \min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}\widetilde{L}}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{7\sigma^2 n_m}}\right), \text{ and } \eta_q = 2\min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}\widetilde{L}}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{7\sigma^2 n_m}}\right)\ln m$$

in Algorithm 4, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \frac{1}{p_i} p_{\varphi}^* = \frac{1}{p_i} \left( \frac{7\widetilde{L}}{n_m} + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_m}} \left( 14\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + 7\sqrt{3\log\frac{2}{\delta}} + \frac{14}{n_m}\log\frac{2}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

where  $p_{\varphi}^*$  is the optimal value of (36). Furthermore, by setting  $p_i$  as

$$p_i = \frac{1/\sqrt{n_m} + 1}{1/\sqrt{n_m} + \sqrt{n_m/n_i}},\tag{45}$$

with high probability, we have

$$R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \frac{1}{p_i} p_{\varphi}^* = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n_m} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}}\right)\sqrt{\kappa + \ln^2 m}\right).$$

**Remark 7** Compared with Algorithm 3, Algorithm 4 has two advantages: (i) the budget constraint is satisfied exactly; (ii) we obtain a faster  $O((\log m)/\sqrt{n_i})$  rate for all distributions  $\mathcal{P}_i$  such that  $n_i \leq n_m^2$ , which is much better than the  $O(\sqrt{n_1 \ln m}/n_i)$  rate of Algorithm 3, and the  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_m})$  rate of the Baseline. For distributions with a larger budget, i.e.,  $n_i > n_m^2$ , it maintains a fast  $O((\log m)/n_m)$  rate. Since it only updates  $n_m$  times, and the best we can expect is the  $O(1/n_m)$  rate of deterministic settings (Nemirovski, 2004). So, there is a performance limit for mini-batch based methods, and after that increasing the batch-size cannot reduce the rate, which consists with the usage of mini-batches in SCO (Cotter et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2013).

**Remark 8** To further improve the convergence rate, we can design a hybrid algorithm that combines non-uniform sampling and mini-batches. Specifically, we run our algorithm for  $\bar{n} \in [n_m, n_1]$  rounds, and for distributions with  $n_i \geq \bar{n}$ , we use mini-batches to reduce the variance, and for distributions with  $n_i < \bar{n}$ , we use random sampling to satisfy the budget constraint.

# 5 $AT_k RO$ for Heterogeneous Distributions

GDRO is effective in dealing with homogeneous distributions, where the risks of all distributions are roughly of the same order. However, its effectiveness diminishes when confronted



Figure 1: Graphical illustrations of Example 1.

with heterogeneous distributions. This stems from the sensitivity of the max operator to outlier distributions with significantly high risks, causing it to focus solely on outliers and overlook others (Shalev-Shwartz and Wexler, 2016). To address this issue, research in robust supervised learning has introduced the approach of minimizing the average of the k largest individual losses (Fan et al., 2017; Curi et al., 2020). Inspired by these studies, we propose to optimize the average top-k risk  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$  in (5), which can mitigate the influence of outliers.

### 5.1 Preliminaries

By replacing  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w})$  in (2) with  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$ , we obtain the average top-k risk optimization (AT<sub>k</sub>RO) problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\max_{\mathcal{I}\in\mathcal{B}_{m,k}}\left\{\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}R_i(\mathbf{w})\right\}$$
(46)

which reduces to GDRO when k = 1. Before introducing specific optimization algorithms, we present an example to illustrate the difference between GDRO and AT<sub>k</sub>RO.

**Example 1** We define the hypothesis space as  $\mathcal{W} = [0, 1]$  and the Bernoulli distribution as  $\text{Ber}(\mu, 1)$ , which outputs 1 with probability  $\mu$  and 0 with probability  $1 - \mu$ . Then, we consider 16 distributions:  $\text{Ber}(\mu_i, 1)$  where  $\mu_i$  is sequentially set to 0.5, 0.86, 0.87, ..., 0.99, 1. The loss function is defined as  $\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{z})^2$  for a random sample  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}$  drawn from these distributions. We denote the solutions of GDRO and  $AT_5RO$  by  $\mathbf{w}_G^*$  and  $\mathbf{w}_A^*$ , respectively. It is easy to show that  $\mathbf{w}_G^* = 0.5$  and  $\mathbf{w}_A^* = 0.8$ , as detailed in Appendix B.

To visualize the results, in Fig. 1 we plot a portion of the risk functions, the objectives of GDRO and AT<sub>5</sub>RO, as well as their respective solutions. From Fig. 1(a), it is evident that distribution  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is significantly different from the other 15 distributions, indicating it could be an outlier. Fig. 1(b) demonstrates that GDRO primarily focuses on  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , yielding the solution  $\mathbf{w}_G^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_1(\mathbf{w}) = 0.5$ . Although its solution performs well on  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , it underperforms on the other 15 distributions. Note that a slight increase in  $\mathbf{w}_G^*$  leads to a noticeable reduction in  $R_2, \ldots, R_{16}$ , with the cost of a minor increase in  $R_1$ . AT<sub>5</sub>RO offers a relatively balanced solution  $\mathbf{w}_A^* = 0.8$  by considering the top-5 high-risk distributions. Specifically, the average risk of  $\mathbf{w}_A^*$  on distributions  $\mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{16}$  is 0.168 lower than that of  $\mathbf{w}_G^*$ , with a 0.09 increase in the risk on  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . Therefore, AT<sub>5</sub>RO effectively mitigates the influence of the outlier distribution  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , showing superior robustness compared to GDRO.

Similar to the case of GDRO, (46) can be cast as a stochastic convex-concave saddlepoint problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\left\{\phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w})\right\}$$
(47)

where

$$\mathcal{S}_{m,k} = \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid 0 \le q_i \le \frac{1}{k}, \sum_{i=1}^m q_i = 1 \right\}$$

is the capped simplex which can be viewed as the slice of the hyper-cube  $[0, 1/k]^m$  cut by a hyper-plane  $\mathbf{q}^{\top} \mathbf{1} = 1$ . The difference between (4) and (47) lies in the domain of  $\mathbf{q}$ , which is  $\Delta_m$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  respectively.

Note that a similar convex-concave optimization problem has been studied by Curi et al. (2020) and Roux et al. (2021). However, their works investigate the deterministic setting, whereas our paper considers a stochastic problem. Consequently, their algorithms are not applicable here, necessitating the design of efficient stochastic approaches for (47). By replacing  $\Delta_m$  in (10) with  $S_{m,k}$ , we obtain the performance measure of an approximate solution ( $\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}$ ) to (47), i.e.,

$$\epsilon'_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$$
(48)

which also controls the optimality of  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$  to (46) by replacing  $\Delta_m$  with  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  in (11).

#### 5.2 Stochastic Mirror Descent for $AT_kRO$

Following the procedure in Section 3.2, we also use SMD to optimize (47), with the only difference being the update rule for  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Since the objectives of (47) and (4) are identical, the stochastic gradients  $\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ and  $\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  in (12) also serve as unbiased estimators of true gradients  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  and  $\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ , respectively. In the *t*-th round, we reuse (14) to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$ , and modify the update of  $\mathbf{q}_t$  as

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \left\{ \eta_q \langle -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right\}.$$
(49)

Because the domain is no longer the simplex  $\Delta_m$ , the explicit form in (16) does not apply to (49). In the following lemma, we demonstrate that (49) can be reduced to a neg-entropy Bregman projection problem onto the capped simplex (Si Salem et al., 2023).

Lemma 11 Consider a mirror descent defined as

$$\mathbf{q} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \left\{ \eta \langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_0 \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_0) \right\}$$
(50)

where  $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{q}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $B_q(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the Bregman distance defined in terms of the neg-entropy. Then, (50) is equivalent to  $\mathbf{q} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} B_q(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}})$  where  $\hat{q}_i = q_{0,i} e^{-\eta g_i}$ . Algorithm 5 Stochastic Mirror Descent for  $AT_k RO$ Input: step size  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ 

1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 2: for t = 1 to T do 3: For each  $i \in [m]$ , draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ 4: Construct the stochastic gradients defined in (12) 5: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (14) and (51), respectively 6: end for

7: return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$ 

By Lemma 11, we can leverage existing algorithms for neg-entropy Bregman projections onto the capped simplex to compute

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} B_q(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_t), \text{ where } \hat{q}_{t,i} = q_{t,i} e^{\eta_q \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)})}.$$
(51)

In particular, we choose Algorithm 2 of Si Salem et al. (2023), summarized in Appendix C.1, whose time complexity is  $O(m + k \ln k)$ .

We present the entire procedure in Algorithm 5, and have the following theorem.

**Theorem 12** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = D^2 \sqrt{\frac{8}{5T(D^2G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k})}}$  and  $\eta_q = (\ln \frac{m}{k}) \sqrt{\frac{8}{5T(D^2G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k})}}$  in Algorithm 5, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2\sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln\frac{m}{k})}{T}}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \le \left(8 + 2\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln\frac{m}{k})}{T}}$$

**Remark 9** The above theorem indicates that Algorithm 5 attains an  $O(\sqrt{(\log(m/k))/T})$  convergence rate. Since it requires *m* samples in each iteration, the sample complexity is  $O((m \log(m/k))/\epsilon^2)$ .

#### 5.2.1 ANYTIME EXTENSIONS

As discussed in Section 3.2.1, we can adapt Algorithm 5 for anytime use by employing time-varying step sizes. In the t-th round, we use step sizes

$$\eta_t^w = D^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{t(D^2 G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k})}}, \text{ and } \eta_t^q = (\ln \frac{m}{k}) \sqrt{\frac{2}{t(D^2 G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k})}}$$
(52)

in (14) and (49)/(51) to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$ , respectively. When required, we return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t$  in (20) as outputs.

Similar to Theorem 2, we have the following theoretical guarantee for  $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$ .

**Theorem 13** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting step sizes as (52) in Algorithm 5, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)\right] \le \frac{\sqrt{D^2 G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k}}}{\sqrt{2}\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)} \left(5 + 3\ln t\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log \frac{m}{k}}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right), \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \le \frac{\sqrt{D^2 G^2 + \ln \frac{m}{k}}}{\sqrt{2} \left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)} \left(9 + 11 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} + 7 \ln t + 3 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \ln t\right) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log \frac{m}{k}} \log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Remark 10** Similar to previous cases, the convergence rate of the anytime extension is slower by a factor of  $O(\log t)$ .

#### 5.3 Non-oblivious Online Learning for $AT_k RO$

Building on the two-player game in Section 3.3, we can leverage online learning techniques to reduce the number of samples used in each round from m to k.

The 1st player faces the same problem, specifically minimizing the sequence of convex functions in (22) under the constraint  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ . Therefore, it can still be framed as "nonoblivious OCO with stochastic gradients" and solved using SMD. In contrast, the 2nd player tackles a different challenge: maximizing the sequence of linear functions in (23), constrained by  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  rather than  $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ . Because the domain is the capped simplex, it is natural to ask the 2nd player to select the k highest-risk options from m distributions, reflecting the combinatorial nature of the problem. After drawing one sample from each selected distribution, the 2nd player observes k stochastic rewards, which fits into a semi-bandit structure. This leads to modeling the 2nd player's problem as "non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits with stochastic rewards". For the 2nd player, we can certainly apply existing algorithms designed for non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits (Audibert et al., 2014; Neu and Bartók, 2016; Vural et al., 2019). Here, to maintain consistency with Algorithm 2, we will extend the Exp3-IX algorithm to address this scenario.

In the following, we elaborate on the details and modifications compared to Algorithm 2. To select k distributions from m in each round, we require a sampling algorithm that, given the value of k and a probability vector  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ , can generate a set  $\mathcal{I}$  such that

$$|\mathcal{I}| = k, \text{ and } \Pr[i \in \mathcal{I}] = kp_i, \forall i \in [m].$$
(53)

For this purpose, we can use the DepRound algorithm (Gandhi et al., 2006), which satisfies the above requirement and has O(m) time and space complexities. A detailed description of its procedure is provided in Appendix C.2. We note that DepRound has been used by many combinatorial semi-bandit algorithms (Uchiya et al., 2010; Vural et al., 2019; Roux et al., 2021). In each round t, we first invoke the DepRound algorithm with  $(k, \mathbf{q}_t)$  as inputs to generate a set  $\mathcal{I}_t$  containing the indices of k selected distributions. For each  $i \in \mathcal{I}_t$ , we then draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from the corresponding distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . **Algorithm 6** Non-oblivious Online Learning for  $AT_k RO$ 

**Input**: step sizes  $\eta_w$  and  $\eta_q$ , and IX coefficient  $\gamma$ 

- 1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- 2: for t = 1 to T do
- 3: Generate  $\mathcal{I}_t = \text{DepRound}(k, \mathbf{q}_t)$
- 4: For each  $i \in \mathcal{I}_t$ , draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$
- 5: Construct the stochastic gradient in (54) and the modified IX loss estimator in (55)
- 6: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (24) and (57), respectively
- 7: end for
- 8: return  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$

Next, the 1st player constructs the stochastic gradient as shown below:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)})$$
(54)

which can be easily verified, based on (53), as an unbiased estimator of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ . Then, we update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  by applying the mirror descent (24) with  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  in (54). For the 2nd player, we modify the IX loss estimator for the combinatorial semi-bandit setting:

$$\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \frac{1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)})}{kq_{t,i} + \gamma} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t], \ \forall i \in [m]$$
(55)

and then update  $\mathbf{q}_t$  by mirror descent

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \left\{ \eta_q \langle \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right\}.$$
(56)

Compared with (25), (55) incorporates two key changes. First, we replace  $\mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$  with  $\mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t]$  to utilize all the k observed losses  $\{\ell(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}) | i \in \mathcal{I}_t\}$ . Second, since  $\Pr[i \in \mathcal{I}_t] = kq_{t,i}$ , the denominator of  $\tilde{s}_{t,i}$  is adjusted accordingly. By Lemma 11, we can similarly transform (56) into a neg-entropy Bregman projection problem:

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} B_q(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_t), \text{ where } \hat{q}_{t,i} = q_{t,i} e^{-\eta_q \tilde{s}_{t,i}}$$
(57)

which can be solved by Algorithm 2 of Si Salem et al. (2023). The complete procedure is presented in Algorithm 6.

For the 1st player, Theorem 3 remains applicable because the only change in the proof of Theorem 3 is that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)\|_{w,*}^2 = \|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_t}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)})\|_{w,*}^2 \leq G^2$ , which does not alter the conclusion. For the 2nd player, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 14** Under Assumption 3, and setting  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{k \ln m}{mT}}$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q})-\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\right] \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}+\frac{2m}{k}+2\sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}+3\sqrt{\frac{mT\ln m}{k}}+\frac{m\ln m}{k}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$$
$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \frac{m}{k} + \sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}\right) \ln \frac{2}{\delta} + 3\sqrt{\frac{mT\ln m}{k}} + \frac{m\ln m}{k}$$

Based on Theorems 3 and 14, we directly obtain the optimization error of Algorithm 6 as follows.

**Theorem 15** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and setting  $\eta_w = \frac{2D}{G\sqrt{5T}}$ ,  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{k \ln m}{mT}}$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$  in Algorithm 6, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2DG\sqrt{\frac{5}{T}} + 3\sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{m}{kT\ln m}} + 3\sqrt{\frac{m\ln m}{kT}} + \frac{m(2+\ln m)}{kT}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{split} \epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}},\bar{\mathbf{q}}) \leq & DG\sqrt{\frac{1}{T}}\left(2\sqrt{5} + 8\sqrt{\ln\frac{2}{\delta}}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2T}} + \frac{m}{kT} + \sqrt{\frac{m}{kT\ln m}}\right)\ln\frac{4}{\delta} \\ & + 3\sqrt{\frac{m\ln m}{kT}} + \frac{m\ln m}{kT}. \end{split}$$

**Remark 11** Theorem 15 demonstrates that Algorithm 6 obtains an  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/(kT)})$  convergence rate. Since it consumes k samples per iteration, the sample complexity is  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ , slightly higher than that of Algorithm 5.

#### 5.3.1 ANYTIME EXTENSIONS

Based on the discussion in Section 3.3.1, it is natural to adopt time-varying parameters to make Algorithm 6 anytime. However, during the theoretical analysis, we encountered a technical obstacle. In the original paper of Exp3-IX, there are two concentration results concerning the IX loss estimator (25): one for fixed parameters and the other for time-varying parameters, i.e., Corollary 1 and Lemma 1 of Neu (2015) respectively. In Section 5.3, we successfully extended their Corollary 1 to combinatorial semi-bandits, resulting in Theorem 14. However, we are unable to extend their Lemma 1 to combinatorial semibandits,<sup>2</sup> and therefore cannot provide theoretical guarantees for Algorithm 6 when using time-varying parameters. Additionally, we have not found any algorithms in the literature that utilize time-varying parameters in non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits.

To circumvent the aforementioned challenge, we present an anytime algorithm for  $AT_kRO$ from a different perspective. The key observation is that we are not dealing with a true bandit problem but are instead exploiting bandit techniques to solve (47). During the execution

<sup>2.</sup> In combinatorial semi-bandits, there are k non-zero  $\{\tilde{s}_{t,i}|i \in \mathcal{I}_t\}$  in each round t. Consequently, we need to handle k non-zero  $\{\bar{\xi}_{t,i}|i \in \mathcal{I}_t\}$  in (140), which renders the original analysis invalid, and it remains unclear how to resolve this issue.

Algorithm 7 Non-oblivious Online Learning for  $AT_kRO$  with Anytime Capability

1: Initialize  $\mathbf{w}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_1 = [1/m, \dots, 1/m]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 

2: for t = 1 to T do

2: Generate  $i_t \in [m]$  according to  $\mathbf{q}_t$ , and draw a sample  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)}$  from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_{i_t}$ 

- 3: Construct the stochastic gradient in (13) and the IX loss estimator in (59)
- 4: Update  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (58) and (60), respectively
- 5: end for

of our algorithm, the 2nd player is not necessarily required to select k distinct arms. It is perfectly fine to select just 1 arm, as long as we can bound the regret in terms of the linear functions in (23), subject to the constraint  $\mathbf{q} \in S_{m,k}$ . To this end, we propose to modify the anytime extension of Algorithm 2 described in Section 3.3.1.

In the following, we describe the key steps. Recall the three time-varying parameters  $\eta_t^w$ ,  $\eta_t^q$  and  $\gamma_t$  in (30). In each round, we use SMD in (24) with a time-varying step size to update  $\mathbf{w}_t$ :

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_t^w \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_t) \right\}$$
(58)

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  is defined in (13). Similarly, we use a time-varying parameter to define the IX loss estimator

$$\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \frac{1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})}{q_{t,i} + \gamma_t} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i], \ \forall i \in [m].$$

$$(59)$$

The only change required is to adjust the domain in the mirror descent (26) to  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ :

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \left\{ \eta_t^q \langle \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_t \rangle + B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right\}$$
(60)

which can also be reduced to a neg-entropy Bregman projection problem. If demanded, we will return  $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$  in (20) as the current solution. We summarize the complete procedure in Algorithm 7.

Following the proof of Theorem 8, we establish the following theoretical guarantee regarding the optimization error.

**Theorem 16** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, for Algorithm 7 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)\right] \leq \frac{(3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + 6\sqrt{m/\ln m} + 4\sqrt{(1+\ln t)/2} + DG\left(5+3\ln t\right)}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)}$$
$$= O\left(\frac{\sqrt{m\log m}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right), \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \\ \leq & \frac{(3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + \left(2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}}\right)\ln\frac{6}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} + DG\left(9+7\ln t + 4\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \\ = & O\left(\frac{\sqrt{m\log m}\log t}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

**Remark 12** Note that the upper bounds in this theorem are exactly the same as in Theorem 8. Since Algorithm 7 uses only 1 sample per iteration, it is not surprising that its convergence rate is slower than Algorithm 6 by a factor of  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{k})$ .

#### 6 Analysis

In this section, we present proofs of main theorems, and defer the analysis of supporting lemmas to Appendix A.

# 6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof is based on Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 of Nemirovski et al. (2009). To apply them, we show that their preconditions are satisfied under our assumptions.

Although two instances of SMD are invoked to update  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  separately, they can be merged as 1 instance by concatenating  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  as a single variable  $[\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}] \in \mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m$ , and redefine the norm and the distance-generating function (Nemirovski et al., 2009, § 3.1). Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the space that  $\mathcal{W}$  lies in. We equip the Cartesian product  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  with the following norm and dual norm:

$$\left\| [\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}] \right\| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2D^2}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_w^2 + \frac{1}{2\ln m} \|\mathbf{q}\|_1^2, \text{ and } \left\| [\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}] \right\|_* = \sqrt{2D^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{w,*}^2 + 2\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\infty}^2 \ln m}.$$
 (61)

We use the notation  $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}]$ , and equip the set  $\mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m$  with the distance-generating function

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}) = \nu([\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}]) = \frac{1}{2D^2} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\ln m} \nu_q(\mathbf{q}).$$
(62)

It is easy to verify that  $\nu(\mathbf{x})$  is 1-strongly convex w.r.t. the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $B(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the Bregman distance associated with  $\nu(\cdot)$ :

$$B(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \nu(\mathbf{x}) - \left[\nu(\mathbf{x}') + \langle \nabla \nu(\mathbf{x}'), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' \rangle \right]$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{2D^2} \left( \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \left[ \nu_w(\mathbf{w}') + \langle \nabla \nu_w(\mathbf{w}'), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' \rangle \right] \right)$$
  
$$+ \frac{1}{2\ln m} \left( \nu_q(\mathbf{q}) - \left[ \nu_q(\mathbf{q}') + \langle \nabla \nu_q(\mathbf{q}'), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}' \rangle \right] \right)$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{2D^2} B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') + \frac{1}{2\ln m} B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}')$$
  
(63)

where  $\mathbf{x}' = [\mathbf{w}'; \mathbf{q}'].$ 

Then, we consider the following version of SMD for updating  $\mathbf{x}_t$ :

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta \left\langle [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)], \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\rangle + B(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t) \right\}$$
(64)

where  $\eta > 0$  is the step size. In the beginning, we set  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m} \nu(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{w}_1; \mathbf{q}_1]$ . From the decomposition of the Bregman distance in (63), we observe that (64) is equivalent to (14) and (15) by setting

$$\eta_w = 2\eta D^2$$
, and  $\eta_q = 2\eta \ln m$ .

# GROUP DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST OPTIMIZATION AND BEYOND

Next, we show that the stochastic gradients are well-bounded. Under our assumptions, we have

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t,i} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})\right\|_{w,*} \le \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t,i} \left\|\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})\right\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(9)}{\le} \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t,i}G = G,$$
$$\|\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{\infty} = \left\|[\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(1)}),\ldots,\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(m)})]^{\top}\right\|_{\infty} \stackrel{(8)}{\le} 1.$$

As a result, the concatenated gradients used in (64) is also bounded in term of the dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_*$ :

$$\left\| \left[ \mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}); -\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) \right] \right\|_{*} = \sqrt{2D^{2} \|\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*}^{2} + 2\|\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{\infty}^{2} \ln m}$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\sqrt{2D^{2}G^{2} + 2\ln m}}_{:=M}.$$
(65)

Now, we are ready to state our theoretical guarantees. By setting

$$\eta = \frac{2}{M\sqrt{5T}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{5T(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}},$$

(3.13) of Nemirovski et al. (2009) implies that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2M\sqrt{\frac{5}{T}} = 2\sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{T}}.$$

Furthermore, from Proposition 3.2 of Nemirovski et al. (2009), we have, for any  $\Omega > 1$ 

$$\Pr\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \ge (8+2\Omega)M\sqrt{\frac{5}{T}} = (8+2\Omega)\sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{T}}\right] \le 2\exp(-\Omega).$$

We complete the proof by setting  $\delta = 2 \exp(-\Omega)$ .

# 6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

In a manner similar to the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 6.1, we combine the updates for  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{q}_t$  into a unified expression:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m} \left\{ \eta_t \left\langle [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)], \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\rangle + B(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t) \right\}$$

where the step size  $\eta_t$  satisfying

$$\eta_t^w = 2\eta_t D^2$$
, and  $\eta_t^q = 2\eta_t \ln m$ .

Then, from (3.11) of Nemirovski et al. (2009), we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t})\right] \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{t}\right)^{-1} \left(2 + \frac{5}{2}M^{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{t}^{2}\right) \\
 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right)^{-1} \left(2M + \frac{5M}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{j}\right)$$
(66)

where we set  $\eta_t = \frac{1}{M\sqrt{t}}$ , and M is defined in (65). Combining (66) with the following inequalities

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{j} \le 1 + \int_{1}^{t} \frac{1}{x} dx = 1 + \ln x |_{1}^{t} = 1 + \ln t$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \ge \int_{1}^{t+1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{x} |_{1}^{t+1} = 2(\sqrt{t+1}-1)$$
(67)

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t})\right] \leq \frac{M}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(5+3\ln t\right).$$

Next, we focus on the high-probability bound. Although Proposition 3.2 of Nemirovski et al. (2009) provides a high-probability bound only for a fixed step size, its proof actually supports time-varying step sizes. By setting  $\Theta = 2\sqrt{\Omega}$  in their analysis, we have

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) > 2 + \frac{5}{2} (1+\Omega) M^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{2} + 8\sqrt{2\Omega} M \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{2}}\right] \le 2 \exp(-\Omega) \quad (68)$$

for any  $\Omega > 0$ . Substituting  $\eta_t = \frac{1}{M\sqrt{t}}$  into (68), we have

$$2 \exp(-\Omega)$$

$$\geq \Pr\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) > M\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right)^{-1} \left(2 + \frac{5}{2}(1+\Omega)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right) + 8\sqrt{2\Omega\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right)}\right)\right]$$

$$\stackrel{(67)}{\geq} \Pr\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) > \frac{M}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(2 + \frac{5}{2}(1+\Omega)(1+\ln t) + 8\sqrt{2\Omega(1+\ln t)}\right)\right]$$

$$\geq \Pr\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) > \frac{M}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(2 + \frac{5}{2}(1+\Omega)(1+\ln t) + 4\left(2\Omega+1+\ln t\right)\right)\right]$$

$$\geq \Pr\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) > \frac{M}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(9 + 11\Omega + 7\ln t + 3\Omega\ln t\right)\right].$$

We complete the proof by setting  $\delta = 2 \exp(-\Omega)$ .

#### 6.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Our goal is to analyze SMD for non-oblivious OCO with stochastic gradients. In the literature, we did not find a convenient reference for it. A very close one is the Lemma 3.2 of Flaxman et al. (2005), which bounds the expected regret of SGD for non-oblivious OCO. But it is insufficient for our purpose, so we provide our proof by following the analysis of SMD for stochastic convex-concave optimization (Nemirovski et al., 2009, § 3). Notice that we cannot use the theoretical guarantee of SMD for SCO (Nemirovski et al., 2009, § 2.3), because the objective function is fixed in SCO.

# GROUP DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST OPTIMIZATION AND BEYOND

From the standard analysis of mirror descent, e.g., Lemma 2.1 of Nemirovski et al. (2009), we have

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w} \rangle \le \frac{B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_t) - B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{t+1})}{\eta_w} + \frac{\eta_w}{2} \| \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) \|_{w,*}^2.$$
(69)

Summing the above inequality over t = 1, ..., T, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \frac{B_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{1})}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{\eta_{w}}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*}^{2}$$

$$\stackrel{(9),(13)}{\leq} \frac{B_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{1})}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{\eta_{w}TG^{2}}{2} \leq \frac{D^{2}}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{\eta_{w}TG^{2}}{2}$$
(70)

where the last step is due to (Nemirovski et al., 2009, (2.42))

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} B_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{w}_1) \le \max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) \stackrel{(i)}{\le} D^2.$$
(71)

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[ \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_t) \right] \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w} \rangle + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$
$$\stackrel{(70)}{\leq} \frac{D^2}{\eta_w} + \frac{\eta_w T G^2}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w} \rangle.$$

Maximizing each side over  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , we arrive at

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) - \phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{t})\right] = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{t})$$

$$\leq \frac{D^{2}}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{\eta_{w}TG^{2}}{2} + \max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{w} \rangle}_{:=F(\mathbf{w})} \right\}.$$
(72)

Next, we bound the last term in (72), i.e.,  $\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} F(\mathbf{w})$ . Because  $E_{t-1}[\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)] = \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ ,  $F(\mathbf{w})$  is the sum of a martingale difference sequence for any *fixed*  $\mathbf{w}$ . However, it is not true for  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} F(\mathbf{w})$ , because  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  depends on the randomness of the algorithm. Thus, we cannot directly apply techniques for martingales to bounding  $\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} F(\mathbf{w})$ . This is the place where the analysis differs from that of SCO.

To handle the above challenge, we introduce a virtual sequence of variables to decouple the dependency (Nemirovski et al., 2009, proof of Lemma 3.1). Imagine there is an online algorithm which performs SMD by using  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$  as the gradient:

$$\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_w \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}_t \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_t) \right\}$$
(73)

where  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{w}_1$ . By repeating the derivation of (70), we can show that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{v}_{t} - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$

$$\leq \frac{B_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{1})}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{\eta_{w}}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*}^{2} \leq \frac{D^{2}}{\eta_{w}} + 2\eta_{w}TG^{2}$$
(74)

where in the last inequality, we make use of (71) and

$$\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} \leq \|\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*}$$

$$\leq E_{t-1}[\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*}] + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} \leq 2G.$$
(75)

Then, we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{w} \rangle \right\}$$

$$= \max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{v}_{t} - \mathbf{w} \rangle \right\}$$

$$+ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{v}_{t} \rangle$$

$$\stackrel{(74)}{\leq} \frac{D^{2}}{\eta_{w}} + 2\eta_{w}TG^{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \underbrace{\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{v}_{t} \rangle}{:= V_{t}}.$$
(76)

From the updating rule of  $\mathbf{v}_t$  in (73), we know that  $\mathbf{v}_t$  is independent from  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}_t)$  –  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ , and thus  $V_1, \ldots, V_T$  is a martingale difference sequence.

Substituting (76) into (72), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_t) \le \frac{2D^2}{\eta_w} + \frac{5\eta_w T G^2}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} V_t.$$
(77)

Taking expectation over both sides, we have

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{t})\right] \leq \frac{2D^{2}}{\eta_{w}} + \frac{5\eta_{w}TG^{2}}{2} = 2DG\sqrt{5T}$$

where we set  $\eta_w = \frac{2D}{G\sqrt{5T}}$ . To establish high probability bounds, we make use of the Hoeffding-Azuma inequality for martingales stated below (Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006).

**Lemma 17** Let  $V_1, V_2, \ldots$  be a martingale difference sequence with respect to some sequence  $X_1, X_2, \ldots$  such that  $V_i \in [A_i, A_i + c_i]$  for some random variable  $A_i$ , measurable with respect to  $X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1}$  and a positive constant  $c_i$ . If  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i$ , then for any t > 0,

$$\Pr[S_n > t] \le \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2}\right).$$

To apply the above lemma, we need to show that  $V_t$  is bounded. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}), \mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{v}_{t} \rangle| \\ \leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} \|\mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{v}_{t}\|_{w} \\ \stackrel{(75)}{\leq} 2G \|\mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{v}_{t}\|_{w} \leq 2G \left(\|\mathbf{w}_{t} - \mathbf{w}_{1}\|_{w} + \|\mathbf{v}_{t} - \mathbf{w}_{1}\|_{w}\right) \\ \leq 2G \left(\sqrt{2B_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{w}_{1})} + \sqrt{2B_{w}(\mathbf{v}_{t}, \mathbf{w}_{1})}\right) \stackrel{(71)}{\leq} 4\sqrt{2}DG. \end{aligned}$$

$$(78)$$

From Lemma 17, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} V_t \le 8DG \sqrt{T \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$
(79)

We complete the proof by substituting (79) into (77).

#### 6.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Since we can only observe  $\ell(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})$  instead of  $R_{i_t}(\mathbf{w}_t)$ , the theoretical guarantee of Exp3-IX (Neu, 2015) cannot be directly applied to Algorithm 2. To address this challenge, we generalize the regret analysis of Exp3-IX to stochastic rewards.

By the definition of  $\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})$  in (4) and the property of linear optimization over the simplex, we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) = \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{t})\right) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{t,i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{t})$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T}R_{j^{*}}(\mathbf{w}_{t}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{t,i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{t}) = \sum_{t=1}^{T}E_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_{j^{*}}}[\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z})] - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{t,i}E_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_{i}}[\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z})] \quad (80)$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{t,i}s_{t,i} - \sum_{t=1}^{T}s_{t,j^{*}} = \sum_{t=1}^{T}\langle\mathbf{q}_{t},\mathbf{s}_{t}\rangle - \sum_{t=1}^{T}s_{t,j^{*}}$$

where  $j^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t=1}^T R_j(\mathbf{w}_t)$  and the vector  $\mathbf{s}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is defined as

$$s_{t,i} = 1 - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i}[\ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z})] \stackrel{(8)}{\in} [0, 1], \ \forall i \in [m].$$
(81)

To facilitate the analysis, we introduce a vector  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with

$$\hat{s}_{t,i} = 1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}) \stackrel{(8)}{\in} [0, 1], \ \forall i \in [m]$$
(82)

where  $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$  denotes a random sample drawn from the *i*-th distribution. Note that  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_t$  is only used for *analysis*, with the purpose of handling the stochastic rewards. In the algorithm, only  $\hat{s}_{t,i_t} = 1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i_t)})$  is observed in the *t*-th iteration.

Following the proof of Theorem 1 of Neu (2015), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t \rangle - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \tilde{s}_{t,j^*} \le \frac{\ln m}{\eta_q} + \frac{\eta_q}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i}$$
(83)

which makes use of the property of online mirror descent with local norms (Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012). From (5) of Neu (2015), we have

$$\langle \mathbf{q}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{t,i} \tilde{s}_{t,i} = \hat{s}_{t,it} - \gamma \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{t,i}.$$
(84)

Combining (83) and (84), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{s}_{t,i_t} \le \sum_{t=1}^{T} \tilde{s}_{t,j^*} + \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i} + \frac{\ln m}{\eta_q}.$$
(85)

From (80), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) = \sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{s}_{t,it} - \sum_{t=1}^{T}s_{t,j*} + \sum_{t=1}^{T}\langle\mathbf{q}_{t},\mathbf{s}_{t}\rangle - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{s}_{t,it}$$

$$\stackrel{(85)}{\leq}\sum_{\substack{t=1\\ \cdots=A}}^{T}\left(\tilde{s}_{t,j*} - s_{t,j*}\right) + \underbrace{\left(\frac{\eta_{q}}{2} + \gamma\right)\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\tilde{s}_{t,i}}_{::=B} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\langle\mathbf{q}_{t},\mathbf{s}_{t}\rangle - \hat{s}_{t,it}\right)}_{::=C} + \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q}}.$$

$$(86)$$

We proceed to bound the above three terms A, B and C respectively.

To bound term A, we need the following concentration result concerning the IX loss estimates (Neu, 2015, Lemma 1), which we further generalize to the setting with stochastic rewards.

**Lemma 18** Let  $\xi_{t,i} \in [0,1]$  for all  $t \in [T]$  and  $i \in [m]$ , and  $\tilde{\xi}_{t,i}$  be its IX-estimator defined as  $\tilde{\xi}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{p_{t,i}+\gamma_t} \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$ , where  $\hat{\xi}_{t,i} \in [0,1]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\xi}_{t,i}] = \xi_{t,i}$ , and the index  $i_t$  is sampled from [m]according to the distribution  $\mathbf{p}_t \in \Delta_m$ . Let  $\{\gamma_t\}_{t=1}^T$  be a fixed non-increasing sequence with  $\gamma_t \geq 0$  and let  $\alpha_{t,i}$  be non-negative  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable random variables satisfying  $\alpha_{t,i} \leq 2\gamma_t$ for all  $t \in [T]$  and  $i \in [m]$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{t,i} (\tilde{\xi}_{t,i} - \xi_{t,i}) \le \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$
(87)

Furthermore, when  $\gamma_t = \gamma \ge 0$  for all  $t \in [T]$ , the following holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\tilde{\xi}_{t,i} - \xi_{t,i}) \le \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}$$
(88)

simultaneously for all  $i \in [m]$ .

Notice that our construction of  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$  in (25) satisfies that  $\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{s}_{t,i}}{q_{t,i}+\gamma}\mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$  and  $i_t$  is drawn from [m] according to  $\mathbf{q}_t \in \Delta_m$  as well as  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{s}_{t,i}] = s_{t,i}$ , which meets the conditions required by Lemma 18. As a result, according to (88), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\tilde{s}_{t,j} - s_{t,j}) \le \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}$$

for all  $j \in [m]$  (including  $j^*$ ) with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

To bound term B, we can directly use Lemma 1 of Neu (2015), because our setting  $\frac{\eta_q}{2} = \gamma$  satisfies its requirement. Thus, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{t,j} \le \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{s}_{t,j} + \ln\frac{1}{\delta} \stackrel{(82)}{\le} \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) mT + \ln\frac{1}{\delta}.$$

We now consider term C in (86). Let  $V_t = \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{s}_t \rangle - \hat{s}_{t,i_t}$ . Then, it is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{E}_{t-1}[V_t] = 0$ . So, the process  $\{V_t\}_{t=1}^T$  forms a martingale difference sequence and it also satisfies  $|V_t| \leq 1$  for all t. Hence, we can apply Lemma 17 and have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{s}_t \rangle - \hat{s}_{t,i_t} \right) \le \sqrt{2T \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \le \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left( 1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right),$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

Combining the three upper bounds for the terms A, B and C, and further taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ 

$$\max_{q \in \Delta_m} \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$$
  
$$\leq \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{3m}{\delta} + \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) mT + \ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{3}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\ln m}{\eta_q}$$
  
$$= 2\sqrt{mT \ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}} \cdot \ln \frac{3m}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{3}{\delta}$$
  
$$= 3\sqrt{mT \ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{3}{\delta},$$

where the third line holds because of our parameter settings  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$  and  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{mT}}$ .

To obtain the expected regret upper bound based on high probability guarantee, we use the formula as follows (Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012, § 3.2).

**Lemma 19** For any real-valued random variable X,

$$\operatorname{E}[X] \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\delta} \operatorname{Pr}\left[X > \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right] \,\mathrm{d}\delta.$$

By setting

$$X = \left(\sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + 1\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\max_{q \in \Delta_m} \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - 3\sqrt{mT \ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}\right),$$

we derive  $E[X] \leq 3$  by Lemma 19, which implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{q\in\Delta_m}\sum_{t=1}^T\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q})-\sum_{t=1}^T\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}_t)\right] \le 3\sqrt{mT\ln m}+\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}+3\left(\sqrt{\frac{mT}{\ln m}}+\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}+1\right).$$

# 6.5 Proof of Theorem 5

By Jensen's inequality and the outputs  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{q}_t$ , we have

$$\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{T} \left( \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{T} \left( \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) \right) + \frac{1}{T} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) \right)$$
(89)

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \leq \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\right)\right] \\
 + \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t}) - \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{t})\right)\right].$$
(90)

We obtain (28) by substituting the high probability bounds in Theorems 3 and 4 into (89), and taking the union bound. Similarly, we obtain (27) by substituting the expectation bounds in Theorems 3 and 4 into (90).

### 6.6 Proof of Theorem 6

The proof of Theorem 6 closely follows that of Theorem 3, with the difference being the use of a time-varying step size  $\eta_t^w$ .

Similar to (69), by Lemma 2.1 of Nemirovski et al. (2009), we have

$$\eta_j^w \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle \le B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_j) - B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{j+1}) + \frac{(\eta_j^w)^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*}^2.$$
(91)

Summing (91) over  $j = 1, \dots, t$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{w}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq B_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{1}) + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{(\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}}{2} \| \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) \|_{w,*}^{2}$$

$$\overset{(9),(13),(71)}{\leq} D^{2} + \frac{G^{2}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}.$$
(92)

By Jensen's inequality, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \left[ \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{w}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{w}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{w}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$
$$\stackrel{(92)}{\leq} D^{2} + \frac{G^{2}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{w})^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{w}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle.$$

Maximizing both sides over  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , we obtain

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{w}\left[\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)-\phi\left(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)\right]$$

$$\leq D^{2}+\frac{G^{2}}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t}(\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}+\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\left\{\underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{w}\langle\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j})-\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}),\mathbf{w}_{j}-\mathbf{w}\rangle}_{:=F_{t}(\mathbf{w})}\right\}.$$
(93)

To handle the last term in (93), we also construct a virtual sequence of variable:

$$\mathbf{v}_{j+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \eta_j^w \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}_j \rangle + B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_j) \right\},$$
(94)

where  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{w}_1$ . The difference between (94) and (73) lies in the use of the time-varying step size  $\eta_j^w$  in (94). By repeating the derivation of (92), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}), \mathbf{v}_{j} - \mathbf{w} \rangle$$

$$\leq B_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{1}) + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{(\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}}{2} \| \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) \|_{w,*}^{2} \overset{(71),(75)}{\leq} D^{2} + 2G^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{w})^{2} \tag{95}$$

Then, we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} F_t(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^w \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle \right\} + \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^w \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{v}_j \rangle$$

$$\overset{(95)}{\leq} D^2 + 2G^2 \sum_{j=1}^t (\eta_j^w)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^t \underbrace{\eta_j^w \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{v}_j \rangle}_{:=W_j}.$$
(96)

Combining (93) and (96), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{w}\left[\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)-\phi\left(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)\right] \leq 2D^{2}+\frac{5G^{2}}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t}(\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{t}W_{j}.$$
(97)

Following the same arguments in the proof of Theorem 3, we know that  $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^t$  is a martingale difference sequence. Taking expectation over both sides of (97), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{w}\left[\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)-\phi\left(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)\right]\right] \leq 2D^{2}+\frac{5G^{2}}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t}(\eta_{j}^{w})^{2}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[O_1] \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^w\right)^{-1} \left[2D^2 + \frac{5G^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\eta_j^w)^2\right]$$

$$\stackrel{(30)}{=} \left(\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right)^{-1} \left[2DG + \frac{5DG}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{j}\right] \stackrel{(67)}{\leq} \frac{DG}{\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(\frac{9}{4} + \frac{5}{4}\ln t\right).$$

Then, we proceed to establish the high probability bound. From (78), we have  $|W_j| \le 4\sqrt{2}\eta_j^w DG$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . By Lemma 17, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} W_t \le 8DG \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_j^w)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$
(98)

Substituting (98) into (97), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{w} \left[ \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}\right) - \phi\left(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j}\right) \right] \leq 2D^{2} + \frac{5G^{2}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{w})^{2} + 8DG \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{w})^{2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$
 (99)

Thus,

$$O_{1} \stackrel{(99),(30)}{\leq} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}\right)^{-1} \left[2DG + \frac{5DG}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{j} + 8DG \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{j}\right) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}\right]$$
$$\stackrel{(67)}{\leq} \frac{DG}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left(2 + \frac{5}{2}(1+\ln t) + 8\sqrt{(1+\ln t)\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}\right]$$
$$\leq \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t+1}-1} \left(\frac{17}{4} + \frac{13}{4}\ln t + 2\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$$

where in the last step we use the fact that  $2\sqrt{(1+\ln t)\ln(1/\delta)} \le 1+\ln t+\ln(1/\delta)$ .

# 6.7 Proof of Theorem 7

We will modify the proof of Theorem 4 to bound the weighted average regret  $O_2$ . Similar to (80), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right) \\
= \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{j})\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{j,i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{j}) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}R_{k_{t}^{*}}(\mathbf{w}_{j})-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{j,i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{j}) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{j,i}s_{j,i}-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}s_{j,k_{t}^{*}}=\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\langle\mathbf{q}_{j},\mathbf{s}_{j}\rangle-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}s_{j,k_{t}^{*}}$$
(100)

where  $k_t^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q R_i(\mathbf{w}_j)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is defined in (81). By using the property of online mirror descent with local norms (Bubeck and Cesa-

By using the property of online mirror descent with local norms (Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012, Theorem 5.5; Orabona, 2019, § 6.5 and § 6.6), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \langle \mathbf{q}_{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{j} \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \tilde{s}_{j,k_{t}^{*}} \leq \ln m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{j,i} \tilde{s}_{j,i}^{2}$$

$$\leq \ln m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i}$$
(101)

where the last step follows from the fact that  $q_{j,i}\tilde{s}_{j,i} \leq 1$ . We rewrite (84) as

$$\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} \tilde{s}_{j,i} = \hat{s}_{j,i_t} - \gamma_j \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i}$$
(102)

where  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is defined in (82). Then, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \hat{s}_{j,i_{t}} \stackrel{(102)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \langle \mathbf{q}_{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{j} \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i}$$

$$\stackrel{(101)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \tilde{s}_{j,k_{t}^{*}} + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left( \frac{(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}{2} + \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i} + \ln m.$$
(103)

Based on (100), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_m}\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_j,\mathbf{q}\right) - \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_j,\mathbf{q}_j\right)$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \mathbf{s}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \hat{s}_{j,i_j} + \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \hat{s}_{j,i_j} - \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q s_{j,k_t^*}$$

$$\stackrel{(103)}{\leq} \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left( \tilde{s}_{j,k_{t}^{*}} - s_{j,k_{t}^{*}} \right)}_{:=A_{t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \left( \frac{(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}{2} + \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i}}_{:=B_{t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left( \langle \mathbf{q}_{j}, \mathbf{s}_{j} \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,i_{j}} \right)}_{:=C_{t}} + \ln m.$$

$$(104)$$

Next, we bound three terms  $A_t$ ,  $B_t$  and  $C_t$ , respectively.

For term  $A_t$ , recall that we set  $\eta_t^q = 2\gamma_t$  in (30). In Section 6.4, we have verified that our constructions of  $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_t$  satisfy the requirement of Lemma 18. Then, by setting  $\alpha_{t,i} = \eta_t^q \mathbb{I}[i = k] \leq 2\gamma_t$  in (87), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \left( \tilde{s}_{j,k} - s_{j,k} \right) \le \ln \frac{1}{\delta}$$

for each  $k \in [m]$ . Taking the union bound, we conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ 

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_j^q \left( \tilde{s}_{j,k_t^*} - s_{j,k_t^*} \right) \le \ln \frac{m}{\delta}.$$
 (105)

For term  $B_t$ , we apply Lemma 1 of Neu (2015) with  $\alpha_{t,i} = \frac{(\eta_t^q)^2}{2} + \gamma_t \eta_t^q = (\eta_t^q)^2$ . It is easy to very that  $\eta_t^q \in [0, 1]$ , and thus  $\alpha_{t,i} \leq \eta_t^q = 2\gamma_t$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \left( \frac{(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}{2} + \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left( \frac{(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}{2} + \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{s}_{j,i} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}$$

$$\leq m \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$
(106)

To bound term  $C_t$ , we define a martingale difference sequence  $W_j = \eta_j^q(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \mathbf{s}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,i_j})$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Then, it can be shown that  $|W_j| \leq \eta_j^q$  for all j. Applying Lemma 17, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left( \langle \mathbf{q}_{j}, \mathbf{s}_{j} \rangle - \hat{s}_{j, i_{j}} \right) \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}} \left( 1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$
(107)

Substituting (105), (106) and (107) into (104), and taking the union bound, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\Delta_{m}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)$$

$$\leq 2\ln m+m\sum_{j=1}^{t}(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}+2\ln\frac{3}{\delta}+\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t}(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}\left(1+\ln\frac{3}{\delta}\right).$$
(108)

Thus,

$$\begin{array}{l}
O_{2} \\
\stackrel{(108),(30)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-1} \left( 2\ln m + (\ln m) \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{j} + 2\ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{2m}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1}{t} \left( 1 + \ln \frac{3}{\delta} \right) \right) \\
\stackrel{(67)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left( (3 + \ln t) \sqrt{m\ln m} + \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right).
\end{array}$$

To obtain the expected upper bound of  $O_2$ , we define

$$X = \left( \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right)^{-1} \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \cdot \left( 2\left(\sqrt{t+1} - 1\right)O_2 - (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} - \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right) \right) \right)$$

By Lemma 19, we have  $E[X] \leq 3$ , which implies

$$E[O_2] \le \frac{1}{2(\sqrt{t+1}-1)} \left( (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + 6\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right).$$

# 6.8 Proof of Theorem 8

According to (30), we can rewrite  $\eta_t^w = c_w \eta_t$  and  $\eta_t^q = c_q \eta_t$  with  $c_w = D/G$ ,  $c_q = \sqrt{(\ln m)/m}$  and  $\eta_t = \sqrt{1/t}$ . Then, we decompose the optimization error in the *t*-th round using the convexity-concavity of  $\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) &= \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) \\ \stackrel{(20)}{=} \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \phi\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{w} \mathbf{w}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{w}}, \mathbf{q}\right) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}, \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{q} \mathbf{q}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{q}}\right) \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \phi\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j} \mathbf{w}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}}, \mathbf{q}\right) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}, \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j} \mathbf{q}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}}\right) \\ &\leq \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}\right) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j}\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}\right)^{-1} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j})\right]\right) \\ &+ \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}\right)^{-1} \left(\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j})\right]\right) \\ &= O_{1} + O_{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  are defined in (31). And thus

$$\mathbf{E}[\epsilon_{\phi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)] \le \mathbf{E}[O_1] + \mathbf{E}[O_2].$$
(110)

We derive (33) by substituting the high probability bounds in Theorems 6 and 7 into (131) and taking the union bound. Moreover, we obtain (32) by substituting the expectation bounds in Theorems 6 and 7 into (110).

#### 6.9 Proof of Theorem 9

For the stochastic gradients in (35), their norm can be upper bounded in the same way as (12). That is,

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{w,*} = \left\|\sum_{i\in C_{t}} q_{t,i}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})\right\|_{w,*} \le \sum_{i\in C_{t}} q_{t,i} \left\|\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})\right\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(9)}{\le} \sum_{i\in C_{t}} q_{t,i}G = G,$$
$$\|\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\|_{\infty} = \max_{i\in C_{t}} |\ell(\mathbf{w}_{t};\mathbf{z}_{t}^{(i)})| \stackrel{(8)}{\le} 1.$$

So, with exactly the same analysis as Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})\right] \le 2\sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{n_1}}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \le \left(8 + 2\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{\frac{10(D^2G^2 + \ln m)}{n_1}}.$$
(111)

Next, we discuss how to bound the risk of  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$  on every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , i.e.,  $R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}})$ . Following the derivation in (11), we know

$$\max_{i \in [m]} p_i R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{i \in [m]} p_i R_i(\mathbf{w}) \le \epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}).$$

Thus, for every distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ,  $R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}})$  can be bounded in the following way:

$$R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) \le \frac{1}{p_i} \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{i \in [m]} p_i R_i(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{p_i} \epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}).$$

Taking the high probability bound in (111) as an example, we have with probability at  $1-\delta$ 

$$R_{i}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) \leq \frac{1}{p_{i}} \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \max_{i\in[m]} p_{i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{p_{i}} \left(8 + 2\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{\frac{10(D^{2}G^{2} + \ln m)}{n_{1}}} = \frac{n_{1}}{n_{i}} \min_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}} \max_{i\in[m]} p_{i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) + \left(8 + 2\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \frac{\sqrt{10(D^{2}G^{2} + \ln m)n_{1}}}{n_{i}}.$$
(112)

#### 6.10 Proof of Theorem 10

We first provide some simple facts that will be used later. From Assumption 3, we immediately know that each risk function  $R_i(\cdot)$  also belongs to [0, 1]. As a result, the difference between each risk function and its estimator is well-bounded, i.e., for all  $i \in [m]$ ,

$$-1 \le R_i(\mathbf{w}) - \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \le 1, \ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \ \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i.$$
(113)

From Assumption 4, we can prove that each risk function  $R_i(\cdot)$  is G-Lipschitz continuous. To see this, we have

$$\|\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\|_{w,*} = \|\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_i}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \le \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim\mathcal{P}_i}\|\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(9)}{\le} G, \ \forall \mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}, i\in[m].$$
(114)

As a result, we have

$$R_i(\mathbf{w}) - R_i(w') \le G \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_w, \ \forall \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}, i \in [m].$$
(115)

Furthermore, the difference between the gradient of  $R_i(\cdot)$  and its estimator is also wellbounded, i.e., for all  $i \in [m]$ ,

$$\|\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \le \|\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\|_{w,*} + \|\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(9), (114)}{\le} 2G, \ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i.$$
(116)

Recall the definition of the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_*$  for the space  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  in (61), and the distance-generating function  $\nu(\cdot)$  in (62). Following the arguments in Section 6.1, the two updating rules in (38) and (39) can be merged as

$$[\mathbf{w}_{t+1};\mathbf{q}_{t+1}] = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{W}\times\Delta_m} \left\{ \eta \left\langle [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t',\mathbf{q}_t'); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_t',\mathbf{q}_t')], \mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{w}_t';\mathbf{q}_t'] \right\rangle + B(\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{w}_t';\mathbf{q}_t']) \right\}$$

where  $\eta_w = 2\eta D^2$  and  $\eta_q = 2\eta \ln m$ . Similarly, (41) and (42) are equivalent to

$$[\mathbf{w}_{t+1}';\mathbf{q}_{t+1}'] = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{W}\times\Delta_m} \Big\{ \eta \big\langle [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_{t+1},\mathbf{q}_{t+1}); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_{t+1},\mathbf{q}_{t+1})], \mathbf{x}-[\mathbf{w}_t';\mathbf{q}_t'] \big\rangle + B(\mathbf{x},[\mathbf{w}_t';\mathbf{q}_t']) \Big\}.$$

Let  $F([\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}])$  be the monotone operator associated with the weighted GDRO problem in (36), i.e.,

$$F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) = \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}); -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\right] = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i p_i \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}); -\left[p_1 R_1(\mathbf{w}), \dots, p_m R_m(\mathbf{w})\right]^{\top}\right].$$

From our constructions of stochastic gradients in (37) and (40), we clearly have

$$E_{t-1} \left\{ [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}'_t, \mathbf{q}'_t)] \right\} = F([\mathbf{w}'_t; \mathbf{q}'_t]), \\ E_{t-1} \left\{ [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1}); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}, \mathbf{q}_{t+1})] \right\} = F([\mathbf{w}_{t+1}; \mathbf{q}_{t+1}]).$$

Thus, Algorithm 4 is indeed an instance of SMPA (Juditsky et al., 2011, Algorithm 1), and we can use their Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 to bound the optimization error.

Before applying their results, we show that all the preconditions are satisfied. The parameter  $\Omega$  defined in (16) of Juditsky et al. (2011) can be upper bounded by

$$\Omega = \sqrt{2 \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W} \times \Delta_m} B(\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{w}_1'; \mathbf{q}_1'])} \stackrel{(63)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{1}{D^2} \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} B_w(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_1') + \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \frac{1}{\ln m} B_q(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_1')} \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{W}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{D^2} \left(\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})\right)} + \frac{1}{\ln m} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \nu_q(\mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \nu_q(\mathbf{q})\right)} \stackrel{(7)}{=} \sqrt{2}.$$
(117)

Next, we need to demonstrate that  $F([\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{q}])$  is continuous.

**Lemma 20** For the monotone operator  $F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}])$ , we have

$$\|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - F([\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}'])\|_* \le \widetilde{L} \|[\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}']\|$$

where  $\widetilde{L}$  is defined in (44).

We proceed to show the variance of the stochastic gradients satisfies the light tail condition. To this end, we introduce the stochastic oracle used in Algorithm 4:

$$\mathbf{g}([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) = [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}); -\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})]$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i} p_{i} \left( \frac{n_{m}}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}/n_{m}} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) \right),$$
$$\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) = \left[ p_{1} \frac{n_{m}}{n_{1}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{1}/n_{m}} \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(1,j)}), \dots, p_{m} \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(m)}) \right]^{\mathsf{T}}$$

and  $\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}$  is the *j*-th sample drawn from distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . The following lemma shows that the variance is indeed sub-Gaussian.

**Lemma 21** For the stochastic oracle  $\mathbf{g}([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}])$ , we have

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{\|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - \mathbf{g}([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}])\|_{*}^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}\right)\right] \leq 2$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is defined in (44).

Based on (117), Lemma 20, and Lemma 21, we can apply the theoretical guarantee of SMPA. Recall that the total number of iterations is  $n_m/2$  in Algorithm 4. From Corollary 1 of Juditsky et al. (2011), by setting

$$\eta = \min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}\tilde{L}}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{7\sigma^2 n_m}}\right)$$

we have

$$\Pr\left[\epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \ge \frac{7\widetilde{L}}{n_m} + 14\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2}{3n_m}} + 7\Lambda\sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_m}}\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{\Lambda^2}{3}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{\Lambda n_m}{2}\right)$$

for all  $\Lambda > 0$ . Choosing  $\Lambda$  such that  $\exp(-\Lambda^2/3) \leq \delta/2$  and  $\exp(-\Lambda n_m/2) \leq \delta/2$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ 

$$\epsilon_{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) \le \frac{7\widetilde{L}}{n_m} + 14\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2}{3n_m}} + 7\left(\sqrt{3\log\frac{2}{\delta}} + \frac{2}{n_m}\log\frac{2}{\delta}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_m}}.$$

Following the derivation of (112), we have

$$R_{i}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \frac{1}{p_{i}} \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{i \in [m]} p_{i}R_{i}(\mathbf{w})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p_{i}} \left( \frac{7\tilde{L}}{n_{m}} + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^{2}}{n_{m}}} \left( 14\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + 7\sqrt{3\log\frac{2}{\delta}} + \frac{14}{n_{m}}\log\frac{2}{\delta} \right) \right).$$
(118)

Inspired by Juditsky et al. (2011, § 4.3.1), we use the value of  $p_i$  in (45) to simplify (118). It is easy to verify that

$$\frac{p_{\max}}{p_i} = \frac{1/\sqrt{n_m} + \sqrt{n_m/n_i}}{1/\sqrt{n_m} + \sqrt{n_m/n_1}} \le \left(1 + \frac{n_m}{\sqrt{n_i}}\right),$$

$$\frac{1}{p_i} \frac{\widetilde{L}}{n_m} = O\left(\frac{p_{\max}}{p_i} \frac{\sqrt{\ln m}}{n_m}\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n_m} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}}\right)\sqrt{\ln m}\right),$$

$$p_i \le \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_m}} + 1\right)\sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n_m}}, \quad \omega_{\max} = \max_{i\in[m]} \frac{p_i^2 n_m}{n_i} \le \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_m}} + 1\right)^2,$$

$$\frac{1}{p_i}\sqrt{\omega_{\max}} = \frac{1/\sqrt{n_m} + \sqrt{n_m/n_i}}{1/\sqrt{n_m} + 1}\sqrt{\omega_{\max}} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_m}} + \sqrt{\frac{n_m}{n_i}},$$

$$\frac{1}{p_i}\sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_m}} = O\left(\frac{1}{p_i}\sqrt{\frac{\omega_{\max}(\kappa + \ln^2 m)}{n_m}}\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n_m} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}}\right)\sqrt{\kappa + \ln^2 m}\right).$$
(119)
(120)

Substituting (119) and (120) into (118), we have

$$R_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \frac{1}{p_i} \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{i \in [m]} p_i R_i(\mathbf{w}) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n_m} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_i}}\right)\sqrt{\kappa + \ln^2 m}\right)$$

#### 6.11 Proof of Theorem 12

The proof of Theorem 12 is almost identical to that of Theorem 1 in Section 6.1, with the only difference being the replacement of the simplex  $\Delta_m$  with the capped simplex  $S_{m,k}$ .

To obtain specific convergence rates, we need to analyze the diameter of  $S_{m,k}$  measured by the neg-entropy function. First, it is easy to verify that  $\frac{1}{m}\mathbf{1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{q}\in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\nu_q(\mathbf{q})$  and  $\min_{\mathbf{q}\in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = -\ln m$ . Note that  $\nu_q(\mathbf{q})$  is convex in  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ , indicating that the maximum value is attained at the extreme points of  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ , i.e., the vectors in  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  that cannot be expressed as a convex combination of other vectors in  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  (Roux et al., 2021, Section 4). Specifically, such vectors comprise k elements equal to 1 and the remaining m - k elements equal to 0. Thus,  $\max_{\mathbf{q}\in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = -\ln k$ . In summary, we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = -\ln k + \ln m = \ln \frac{m}{k}.$$

Then, we replace the diameter of the domain of **q** from  $\ln m$  to  $\ln \frac{m}{k}$  in Section 6.1, and obtain Theorem 12.

# 6.12 Proof of Theorem 13

In anytime extensions, the difference between Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 5 also lies in the domain of **q**. Thus, we can follow the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 6.2, where we only need to replace the simplex  $\Delta_m$  with the capped simplex  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ . From Section 6.11, we know that the diameter of  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  is upper bounded by  $\ln \frac{m}{k}$ . Therefore, we redefine  $M = \sqrt{2D^2G^2 + 2\ln \frac{m}{k}}$ , which leads to Theorem 13.

# 6.13 Proof of Theorem 14

Recall the definition of  $s_{t,i}$  and  $\hat{s}_{t,i}$  in (81) and (82) of Section 6.4. Following the analysis of (80), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t,\mathbf{q}_t) = \sum_{t=1}^{T}\langle\mathbf{q}_t,\mathbf{s}_t\rangle - \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^*}\sum_{t=1}^{T}s_{t,i}$$
(121)

where  $\mathcal{I}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T R_i(\mathbf{w}_t) \right]$ . From the new construction of the IX loss estimator (55), we have

$$q_{t,i}\tilde{s}_{t,i} \le \frac{q_{t,i}}{kq_{t,i} + \gamma} \le \frac{1}{k}, \ \forall i \in [m].$$

$$(122)$$

Similar to the derivation of (83) and (101), we make use the property of online mirror descent with local norms and proceed with the following steps:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \mathbf{q}_{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{t} \rangle - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{*}} \tilde{s}_{t,i} \leq \frac{\ln \frac{m}{k}}{\eta_{q}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\eta_{q}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{t,i} \tilde{s}_{t,i}^{2}$$

$$\stackrel{(122)}{\leq} \frac{\ln \frac{m}{k}}{\eta_{q}} + \frac{\eta_{q}}{2k} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i}$$
(123)

where in the first step we make use the fact that the diameter of  $S_{m,k}$  is upper bounded by  $\ln \frac{m}{k}$ . Moreover, (84) becomes

$$\langle \mathbf{q}_{t}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{t} \rangle \stackrel{(55),(82)}{=} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{m} kq_{t,i} \frac{\hat{s}_{t,i}}{kq_{t,i} + \gamma} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma}{kq_{t,i} + \gamma} \right) \hat{s}_{t,i} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}} \hat{s}_{t,i} - \frac{\gamma}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i}.$$

$$(124)$$

Combining (123) and (124), we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t} \hat{s}_{t,i} \le \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*} \tilde{s}_{t,i} + \frac{\ln \frac{m}{k}}{\eta_q} + \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2k} + \frac{\gamma}{k}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i}.$$
(125)

From (121), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t}, \mathbf{q}_{t})$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \langle \mathbf{q}_{t}, \mathbf{s}_{t} \rangle - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}} \hat{s}_{t,i} + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}} \hat{s}_{t,i} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{*}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} s_{t,i}$$

$$\stackrel{(125)}{\leq} \underbrace{\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{*}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\tilde{s}_{t,i} - s_{t,i})}_{:=A} + \underbrace{\underbrace{\left(\frac{\eta_{q}}{2k} + \frac{\gamma}{k}\right)}_{:=B} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i}}_{:=B} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\langle \mathbf{q}_{t}, \mathbf{s}_{t} \rangle - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}} \hat{s}_{t,i}\right)}_{:=C} + \frac{\ln \frac{m}{k}}{\eta_{q}}.$$

$$(126)$$

Next, we sequentially bound the above three items A, B, and C.

To bound A, we extend Corollary 1 of Neu (2015) to the modified IX loss estimator (55).

**Lemma 22** Let  $\xi_{t,i} \in [0,1]$  for all  $t \in [T]$  and  $i \in [m]$ , and  $\tilde{\xi}_{t,i}$  be its IX-estimator defined as  $\tilde{\xi}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{kp_{t,i}+\gamma} \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t]$ , where  $\gamma \ge 0$ ,  $\hat{\xi}_{t,i} \in [0,1]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\xi}_{t,i}] = \xi_{t,i}$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_t \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ , and  $\mathcal{I}_t$  is sampled by DepRound $(k, \mathbf{p}_t)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \tilde{\xi}_{t,i} - \xi_{t,i} \right) \le \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}$$
(127)

simultaneously hold for all  $i \in [m]$ .

Compared to Lemma 18, Lemma 22 only covers the case where a fixed  $\gamma$  is used.

It is easy to verify that the construction of  $\tilde{s}_{t,i}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_t$  satisfy the conditions outlined in Lemma 22. Therefore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \tilde{s}_{t,i} - s_{t,i} \right) \le \max_{i \in [m]} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \tilde{s}_{t,i} - s_{t,i} \right) \stackrel{(127)}{\le} \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}.$$
(128)

At the same time, we can also deliver an upper bound for B. From (127), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{t,i} \le \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^m s_{t,i} + \frac{m}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta} \le mT + \frac{m}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}.$$

implying

$$\left(\frac{\eta_q}{2k} + \frac{\gamma}{k}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{t,i} \le \frac{m}{k} \left(\frac{\eta_q}{2} + \gamma\right) \left(T + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}\right).$$
(129)

As for term C, we denote  $V_t = \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{s}_t \rangle - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t} \hat{s}_{t,i}$ . Since

$$\mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_t}\hat{s}_{t,i}\right] = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr[i\in\mathcal{I}_t]s_{t,i} \stackrel{(53)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{t,i}s_{t,i}$$

we know that  $\{V_t\}_{t=1}^T$  is a martingale difference sequence. Furthermore, under Assumption 3 and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ , we have  $|V_t| \leq 1$  for all t. By Lemma 17, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{s}_t \rangle - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t} \hat{s}_{t,i} \right) \le \sqrt{2T \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \le \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left( 1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$
(130)

Substituting (128), (129) and (130) into (126), and taking the union bound,<sup>3</sup> with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}) &- \sum_{t=1}^{T} \phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t}) \\ \leq &\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left(1+\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) + \frac{m}{k} \left(\frac{\eta_{q}}{2}+\gamma\right) \left(T+\frac{1}{2\gamma}\ln\frac{2m}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\ln\frac{2m}{\delta} + \frac{\ln\frac{m}{k}}{\eta_{q}} \\ = &\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left(1+\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) + \frac{m}{k}\eta_{q}T + \frac{m}{k}\ln\frac{2m}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\eta_{q}}\ln m + \frac{1}{\eta_{q}} \left(\ln\frac{2}{\delta}+\ln\frac{m}{k}\right) \\ = &\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} \left(1+\ln\frac{2}{\delta}\right) + 2\sqrt{\frac{m}{k}T\ln m} + \frac{m}{k}\ln\frac{2m}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}\ln\frac{2m}{\delta k} \\ \leq &\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}+\frac{m}{k}+\sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}\right)\ln\frac{2}{\delta} + 3\sqrt{\frac{m}{k}T\ln m} + \frac{m}{k}\ln m. \end{aligned}$$

where we set  $\gamma = \frac{\eta_q}{2}$  in the 3rd line and  $\eta_q = \sqrt{\frac{k \ln m}{mT}}$  in the 4th line. To get the expected regret bound, we define

$$X = \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} + \frac{m}{k} + \sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) - \sqrt{\frac{T}{2}} - 3\sqrt{\frac{m}{k}T\ln m} - \frac{m}{k}\ln m\right),$$

and Lemma 19 implies that  $E[X] \leq 2$ . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q})-\sum_{t=1}^{T}\phi(\mathbf{w}_{t},\mathbf{q}_{t})\right] \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{T}{2}}+\frac{2m}{k}+2\sqrt{\frac{mT}{k\ln m}}+3\sqrt{\frac{mT\ln m}{k}}+\frac{m\ln m}{k}$$

# 6.14 Proof of Theorem 15

The proof is almost identical to that of Theorem 5. We just need to replace  $\Delta_m$  with  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  in (89) and (90), and then substitute the conclusions of Theorems 3 and 14.

<sup>3.</sup> Because (128) and (129) depend on the same random event, we can avoid one invocation of the union bound.

# 6.15 Proof of Theorem 16

Similar to the proof of Theorem 8 in Section 6.8, we decompose the optimization error in the *t*-th round as

$$\epsilon_{\phi}'(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{t}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_{t}) \stackrel{(20)}{=} \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{w} \mathbf{w}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{w}}, \mathbf{q} \right) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi \left( \mathbf{w}, \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{\eta_{j}^{q} \mathbf{q}_{j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \eta_{k}^{q}} \right)$$

$$\leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \right)^{-1} \left( \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \left[ \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) \right] \right)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \right)^{-1} \left( \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j} \left[ \phi(\mathbf{w}_{j}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_{j}) \right] \right)$$

$$= O_{1} + O_{2}',$$
(131)

where  $O_1$  is defined in (31) and

$$O_2' = \left(\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q\right)^{-1} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \left[\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}) - \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\right]\right).$$

Note that the 1st player is identical to the one in Section 3.3.1, so we can directly use Theorem 6 to bound  $O_1$ . For the 2nd player, due to the difference in the domain, we need to reanalyze and have proven the same upper bounds for  $O'_2$  as in Theorem 7.

**Theorem 23** Under Assumption 3, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[O_2'] \le \frac{1}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left( (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + 6\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right), \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$O_2' \le \frac{1}{2\left(\sqrt{t+1}-1\right)} \left( (3+\ln t)\sqrt{m\ln m} + \left(2\sqrt{\frac{m}{\ln m}} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}}\right)\ln\frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1+\ln t}{2}} \right)$$

for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

By combining Theorems 6 and 23, we obtain Theorem 16 and the upper bounds are exactly the same as those in Theorem 8.

# 6.16 Proof of Theorem 23

We need to specifically adjust the proof of Theorem 7 in Section 6.7 based on the fact that the domain is the capped simplex  $S_{m,k}$ .

First, we modify (100) as

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}\langle\mathbf{q}_{j},\mathbf{s}_{j}\rangle-\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{t}^{*}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t}\eta_{j}^{q}s_{j,i}\right)$$
(132)

where  $\mathcal{I}_{t}^{*} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} R_{i}(\mathbf{w}_{j}) \right]$ . Based on the property of online mirror descent with local norms and the fact that the diameter of  $\mathcal{S}_{m,k}$  is upper bounded by  $\ln \frac{m}{k}$ , (101) becomes

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \langle \mathbf{q}_{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{j} \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left( \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t}^{*}} \tilde{s}_{j,i} \right) \leq \ln \frac{m}{k} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i}.$$
 (133)

By using (133) in the derivation of (103), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_j^q \hat{s}_{j,i_t} \le \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_j^q \left( \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t^*} \tilde{s}_{j,i} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left( \frac{(\eta_j^q)^2}{2} + \gamma_j \eta_j^q \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i} + \ln \frac{m}{k}.$$
 (134)

From (132), we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}\right) - \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \langle \mathbf{q}_{j},\mathbf{s}_{j} \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \hat{s}_{j,ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \hat{s}_{j,ij} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{t}^{*}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} s_{j,i}\right) \\
\stackrel{(134)}{\leq} \underbrace{\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{t}^{*}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left(\tilde{s}_{j,i} - s_{j,i}\right)}_{:=A_{t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \left(\frac{(\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}}{2} + \gamma_{j} \eta_{j}^{q}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{s}_{j,i}}_{:=B_{t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \left(\langle\mathbf{q}_{j}, \mathbf{s}_{j} \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,ij}\right)}_{:=C_{t}} + \ln \frac{m}{k}.$$
(135)

Next, we bound three terms  $A_t$ ,  $B_t$  and  $C_t$ , respectively.

Note that (105) in Section 6.7 holds for any possible value of  $k_t^* \in [m]$ . As a result, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t^*} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \big( \tilde{s}_{j,i} - s_{j,i} \big) \le \max_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^q \big( \tilde{s}_{j,i} - s_{j,i} \big) \le \ln \frac{m}{\delta}.$$
(136)

To bound  $B_t$  and  $C_t$ , we can directly use the inequalities in (106) and (107). Substituting (136), (106) and (107) into (135), and taking the union bound, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}\right) - \sum_{j=1}^{t} \eta_{j}^{q} \phi\left(\mathbf{w}_{j},\mathbf{q}_{j}\right)$$

$$\leq \ln \frac{m}{k} + \ln m + m \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} + 2\ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{3}{\delta}\right) \qquad (137)$$

$$\leq 2\ln m + m \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2} + 2\ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{t} (\eta_{j}^{q})^{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{3}{\delta}\right).$$

Note that the final bound in (137) is exactly the same as that in (108), and therefore we can reach the same conclusion as Theorem 7.

# 7 Experiments

Algorithms	Notation	Highlights
Alg. 1 of Sagawa et al. (2020)	$\mathrm{SMD}(1)$	SMD with 1 sample per round
Alg. 1	$\mathrm{SMD}(m)$	SMD with $m$ samples per round
Anytime extension of Alg. 1	$\mathrm{SMD}(m)_{\mathrm{a}}$	$\mathrm{SMD}(m)$ with time-varying step sizes
Alg. 2	Online(1)	Online learning method with 1 sample per round
Anytime extension of Alg. 2	$Online(1)_a$	Online(1) with time-varying step sizes
Alg. 3	$\mathrm{SMD}_\mathrm{r}$	SMD with random sampling
Alg. 4	$\mathrm{SMPA}_{\mathrm{m}}$	SMPA with mini-batches
Alg. 5	$\mathrm{AT}_k\mathrm{RO}(m)$	$SMD(m)$ for $AT_kRO$
Anytime extension of Alg. 5	$\mathrm{AT}_k\mathrm{RO}(m)_\mathrm{a}$	$\mathrm{SMD}(m)$ with time-varying step sizes for $\mathrm{AT}_k\mathrm{RO}$
Alg. 6	$\mathrm{AT}_k\mathrm{RO}(k)$	Online learning method with $k$ samples per round for $\mathrm{AT}_k\mathrm{RO}$
Alg. 7	$AT_k RO(1)_a$	Anytime online method with 1 sample per round for $AT_k RO$

We present experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms.

Table 1: Notation for Algorithms.

# 7.1 Data Sets and Experimental Settings

Following the setup in previous work (Namkoong and Duchi, 2016; Soma et al., 2022), we use both synthetic and real-world data sets.

First, we create a synthetic data set with m = 20 groups, each associated with a true classifier  $\mathbf{w}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{1000}$ . The set  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^*\}_{i \in [m]}$  is constructed as follows: we start with an arbitrary vector  $\mathbf{w}_0$  on the unit sphere; then, we randomly choose m points on a sphere of radius d centered at  $\mathbf{w}_0$ ; these points are projected onto the unit sphere to form  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^*\}_{i \in [m]}$ . For distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , the sample  $(\mathbf{x}, y)$  is generated by sampling  $\mathbf{x}$  from the standard normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$  and setting  $y = \operatorname{sign}(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_i^*)$  with probability 0.9, or to its inverse with probability 0.1. We set d = 0.5 in this data set.

To simulate heterogeneous distributions, we specifically construct another synthetic data set, which contains m = 20 distributions. The classifiers  $\mathbf{w}_i^*$ s are generated in the same way as described above. For a sample  $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ , the distribution  $\mathcal{P}_i$  outputs  $y = \operatorname{sign}(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_i^*)$ with probability  $p_i$  and  $y = -\operatorname{sign}(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_i^*)$  with probability  $1 - p_i$ . We choose  $\mathcal{P}_1$  as the outlier distribution and set  $p_1 = 0.6$ , while the remaining  $p_i$  values are uniformly chosen from the range 0.85 to 0.95. Additionally, we set d = 0.2 to ensure that  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^*\}_{i \in [m]}$  are close, emphasizing that the heterogeneity is primarily due to noise.



Figure 2: Balanced settings: maximum risk versus the number of iterations.



Figure 3: Balanced settings: maximum risk versus the number of samples.

We also use the Adult data set (Becker and Kohavi, 1996), which includes attributes such as age, gender, race, and educational background of 48,842 individuals. The objective is to determine whether an individual's income exceeds 50,000 USD or not. We set up m = 6 groups based on the race and gender attributes, where each group represents a combination of {black, white, others} with {female, male}.

We set  $\ell(\cdot; \cdot)$  to be the logistic loss and utilize different methods to train a linear model. Table 1 lists the notation for the algorithms referenced in this section. When we need to estimate the risk  $R_i(\cdot)$ , we draw a substantial number of samples from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , and use the empirical average to approximate the expectation.

#### 7.2 GDRO on Balanced Data

For experiments on the first synthetic data set, we will generate the random sample on the fly, according to the protocol in Section 7.1. For those on the Adult data set, we will randomly select samples from each group with replacement. In other words,  $\mathcal{P}_i$  is defined as the empirical distribution over the data in the *i*-th group.

In the experiments, we compare SMD(1) with our algorithms SMD(m) and Online(1). Fig. 2 plots the maximum risk  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w})$ , with respect to the number of iterations. We observe that SMD(m) is faster than Online(1), which in turn outperforms SMD(1). This



Figure 4: Imbalanced settings with the synthetic data set: individual risk versus the number of iterations.

observation is consistent with our theories, since their convergence rates are  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/T})$ ,  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/T})$ , and  $O(m\sqrt{(\log m)/T})$ , respectively. Next, we plot  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w})$  against the number of samples consumed by each algorithm in Fig. 3. As can be seen, the curves of SMD(m) and Online(1) are very close, indicating that they share the same sample complexity, i.e.,  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ . On the other hand, SMD(1) needs more samples to reach a target precision, which aligns with its higher sample complexity, i.e.,  $O(m^2(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ .

#### 7.3 Weighted GDRO on Imbalanced Data

For experiments on the first synthetic data set, we set the sample size for each group i as  $n_i = 1000 \times (21 - i)$ . For those on the Adult data set, we first select 364 samples randomly from each group, reserving them for later use in estimating the risk of each group. Then, we visit the remaining samples in each group *once* to simulate the imbalanced setting, where the numbers of samples in 6 groups are 26656, 11519, 1780, 1720, 999, and 364. In this way,  $\mathcal{P}_i$  corresponds to the (unknown) underlying distribution from which the samples in the *i*-th group are drawn.

On imbalanced data, we will compare  $\text{SMD}_r$  and  $\text{SMPA}_m$  with the baseline SMD(m), and examine how the risk on each individual distribution decreases with respect to the number of iterations. Recall that the total number of iterations of  $\text{SMD}_r$ ,  $\text{SMPA}_m$  and SMD(m) are  $n_1 n_m/2$ , and  $n_m$ , respectively. We present the experimental results on the synthetic and the Adult data sets in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, respectively. First, we observe that our  $\text{SMPA}_m$  is faster than both  $\text{SMD}_r$  and SMD(m) across all distributions, and finally attains the lowest risk in most cases. This behavior aligns with our Theorem 10, which



Figure 5: Imbalanced settings with the Adult data set: individual risk versus the number of iterations.

reveals that SMPA<sub>m</sub> achieves a nearly optimal rate of  $O((\log m)/\sqrt{n_i})$  for all distributions  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , after  $n_m/2$  iterations. We also note that on distribution  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , the distribution with the most samples, although SMD<sub>r</sub> converges slowly, its final risk is the lowest, as illustrated in Fig. 4(a) and Fig. 5(a). This phenomenon is again in accordance with our Theorem 9, which shows that the risk of SMD<sub>r</sub> on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  reduces at a nearly optimal  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_1})$  rate, after  $n_1$  iterations. From Fig. 4(f) and Fig. 5(f), we can see that the final risk of SMD(m) on the last distribution  $\mathcal{P}_m$  matches that of SMPA<sub>m</sub>. This outcome is anticipated, as they exhibit similar convergence rates of  $O(\sqrt{(\log m)/n_m})$  and  $O((\log m)/\sqrt{n_m})$ , respectively.

#### 7.4 $AT_k RO$ on Heterogeneous Distributions

For experiments on heterogeneous distributions, we use the second synthetic data set described in Section 7.1. We first compare our two algorithms  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(m)$  and  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(k)$ , where k = 3, and plot the changes of the average top-k risk  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$  in Fig. 6. From Theorems 12 and 15, we know that their convergence rates are  $O(\sqrt{(\log(m/k))/T})$  and  $O(\sqrt{m(\log m)/(kT)})$ , respectively, and their sample complexities are  $O((m \log(m/k))/\epsilon^2)$ and  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ , respectively. Fig. 6(a) indicates that  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(m)$  indeed converges faster than  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(k)$ , and Fig. 6(b) shows that  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(m)$  requires slightly fewer samples than  $\operatorname{AT}_k\operatorname{RO}(k)$ .

Additionally, to demonstrate the advantages of  $AT_kRO$ , we examine the performance of directly applying the SMD(m) algorithm, which is designed for GDRO, to the synthetic data set. Fig. 7 presents the changes in risk across a subset of distributions for SMD(m),  $AT_kRO(m)$ , and  $AT_kRO(k)$ . We observe that SMD(m) concentrates entirely on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and



(a)  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$  versus the number of iterations

(b)  $\mathcal{L}_k(\mathbf{w})$  versus the number of samples

Figure 6: Heterogeneous settings with the synthetic data set.



Figure 7: Heterogeneous settings with the synthetic data set: individual risk versus the number of iterations.

achieves the lowest final risk on the outlier distribution  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , approximately 0.061 lower than  $\operatorname{AT}_k \operatorname{RO}(m)$  and 0.056 lower than  $\operatorname{AT}_k \operatorname{RO}(k)$ . However, for the remaining 19 distributions  $\{\mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{20}\}$ , the risk of  $\operatorname{SMD}(m)$  is approximately 0.12 higher on average than those of the other two algorithms. Therefore, we conclude that  $\operatorname{AT}_k \operatorname{RO}$  can mitigate the impact of the outlier distribution and deliver a more balanced model in heterogeneous distributions compared to GDRO.



Figure 8: The performance of different methods versus the number of iterations. Blue dashed lines indicate the predetermined T for non-anytime algorithms.

# 7.5 Anytime Capability

To demonstrate the benefits of the anytime capability, we compare SMD(m) and Online(1) with their anytime extensions  $\text{SMD}(m)_a$  and  $\text{Online}(1)_a$  on the Adult data set under balanced settings, and  $\text{AT}_k \text{RO}(m)$  and  $\text{AT}_k \text{RO}(k)$  with  $\text{AT}_k \text{RO}(m)_a$  and  $\text{AT}_k \text{RO}(1)_a$  on the second synthetic data set, where k = 3.

We assign a preset value of T = 2000 for SMD(m) and Online(1), and T = 50000 for  $AT_k RO(m)$  and  $AT_k RO(k)$ . When the actual number of iterations exceeds the preset number T, we continue running the four algorithms with the initial parameters. As illustrated in Fig. 8, non-anytime algorithms initially reduce the objective (the maximum risk or the average top-k risk) more rapidly than anytime algorithms before reaching the predetermined T, where they achieve minimal values. However, as the number of iterations increases, their curves plateau or even increase due to sub-optimal parameters. In contrast, the anytime extensions, with time-varying step sizes, consistently reduce their targets over time, eventually falling below the risk attained by the corresponding non-anytime algorithms.

# 8 Conclusion

For the GDRO problem, we develop two SA approaches based on SMD and non-oblivious MAB, which consume m and 1 sample per round, respectively, and both achieve a nearly optimal sample complexity of  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$ . Then, we consider two special scenarios: imbalanced data and heterogeneous distributions. In the first scenario, we formulate a weighted GDRO problem and propose two methods by incorporating non-uniform sampling into SMD and using mini-batches with SMPA, respectively. These methods yield distribution-dependent convergence rates, and in particular, the latter one attains nearly optimal rates for multiple distributions simultaneously. In the second scenario, we formulate an AT<sub>k</sub>RO problem and propose two algorithms: one using SMD with m samples per round, obtaining an  $O(m(\log(m/k))/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity, and the other combining SMD with non-oblivious combinatorial semi-bandits, using k samples per round and achieving an  $O(m(\log m)/\epsilon^2)$  sample complexity. For both GDRO and AT<sub>k</sub>RO, we have also developed SA algorithms with anytime capabilities.

# Appendix A. Supporting Lemmas

#### A.1 Proof of Lemma 11

We first define  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$  as

$$\nabla \nu_q \left( \hat{\mathbf{q}} \right) = \nabla \nu_q (\mathbf{q}_0) - \eta \mathbf{g}. \tag{138}$$

Then, we have

$$\underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} B_{q}(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}) = \underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \nu_{q}(\mathbf{q}) - \nu_{q}\left(\hat{\mathbf{q}}\right) - \left\langle \nabla\nu_{q}\left(\hat{\mathbf{q}}\right), \mathbf{q} - \hat{\mathbf{q}}\right\rangle \right\}$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \nu_{q}(\mathbf{q}) - \left\langle \nabla\nu_{q}\left(\hat{\mathbf{q}}\right), \mathbf{q}\right\rangle \right\} \stackrel{(138)}{=} \underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \nu_{q}(\mathbf{q}) - \left\langle \nabla\nu_{q}(\mathbf{q}_{0}) - \eta \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{q}\right\rangle \right\}$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{S}_{m,k}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \eta \left\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{0} \right\rangle + B_{c}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}_{0}) \right\} = (50).$$

Recall that  $B_q(\cdot, \cdot)$  is defined in terms of the neg-entropy, i.e.,  $\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \ln q_i$ , we have  $[\nabla \nu_q(\mathbf{q})]_i = 1 + \ln q_i$ . Therefore, the *i*-th component of  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$  can be computed as

$$\hat{q}_i = \exp\left([\nabla \nu_q(\mathbf{q}_0)]_i - \eta g_i - 1\right) = \exp\left(\ln q_{0,i} - \eta g_i\right) = q_{0,i}e^{-\eta g_i}.$$

# A.2 Proof of Lemma 18

The proof follows the argument of Neu (2015, Proof of Lemma 1), and we generalize it to the setting with stochastic rewards. First, observe that for any  $i \in [m]$  and  $t \in [T]$ ,

$$\tilde{\xi}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{p_{t,i} + \gamma_t} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] 
\leq \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{p_{t,i} + \gamma_t \hat{\xi}_{t,i}} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \qquad (\hat{\xi}_{t,i} \in [0,1]) 
= \frac{1}{2\gamma_t} \frac{2\gamma_t \cdot \hat{\xi}_{t,i}/p_{t,i}}{1 + \gamma_t \cdot \hat{\xi}_{t,i}/p_{t,i}} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] 
\leq \frac{1}{\beta_t} \log\left(1 + \beta_t \bar{\xi}_{t,i}\right) \qquad (139)$$

where the last step is due to the inequality  $\frac{z}{1+z/2} \leq \log(1+z)$  for  $z \geq 0$  and we introduce the notations  $\beta_t = 2\gamma_t$  and  $\bar{\xi}_{t,i} = (\hat{\xi}_{t,i}/p_{t,i}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$  to simplify the presentation. Define the notation  $\tilde{\lambda}_t = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{t,i} \tilde{\xi}_{t,i}$  and  $\lambda_t = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{t,i} \xi_{t,i}$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\exp(\tilde{\lambda}_{t})\right] &= \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{t,i} \tilde{\xi}_{t,i}\right)\right] \\ &\stackrel{(139)}{\leq} \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\alpha_{t,i}}{\beta_{t}} \log\left(1 + \beta_{t} \bar{\xi}_{t,i}\right)\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \log\left(1 + \alpha_{t,i} \bar{\xi}_{t,i}\right)\right)\right] \qquad (\frac{\alpha_{t,i}}{\beta_{t}} \leq 1 \text{ by assumption}) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\Pi_{i=1}^{m}(1 + \alpha_{t,i} \bar{\xi}_{t,i})\right] = \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{t,i} \bar{\xi}_{t,i}\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$=1+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\alpha_{t,i}\xi_{t,i}\leq \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\alpha_{t,i}\xi_{t,i}\right)=\exp(\lambda_t)$$
(140)

where the second inequality is by the inequality  $x \log(1+y) \leq \log(1+xy)$  that holds for all  $y \geq -1$  and  $x \in [0,1]$ , the equality  $\mathbb{E}_{t-1} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^m (1+\alpha_{t,i}\bar{\xi}_{t,i}) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \left[ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{t,i}\bar{\xi}_{t,i} \right]$ follows from the fact that  $\bar{\xi}_{t,i} \cdot \bar{\xi}_{t,j} = 0$  holds whenever  $i \neq j$ , and the last line is due to  $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\bar{\xi}_{t,i}] = \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[(\hat{\xi}_{t,i}/p_{t,i}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_t=i]] = \xi_{t,i}$  and the inequality  $1+z \leq e^z$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ .

As a result, from (140) we conclude that the process  $Z_t = \exp\left(\sum_{s=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_s - \lambda_s)\right)$  is a supermartingale. Indeed,  $E_{t-1}[Z_t] = E_{t-1}[\exp\left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (\tilde{\lambda}_s - \lambda_s)\right) \cdot \exp(\tilde{\lambda}_t - \lambda_t)] \leq Z_{t-1}$ . Thus, we have  $E[Z_T] \leq E[Z_{T-1} \leq \ldots \leq E[Z_0] = 1$ . By Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\tilde{\lambda}_t - \lambda_t) > \epsilon\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\tilde{\lambda}_t - \lambda_t)\right)\right] \cdot \exp(-\epsilon) \le \exp(-\epsilon)$$

holds for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . By setting  $\exp(-\epsilon) = \delta$  and solving the value, we complete the proof for (87). And the inequality (88) for the scenario  $\gamma_t = \gamma$  can be immediately obtained by setting  $\alpha_{t,i} = 2\gamma \cdot \mathbb{I}[i = j]$  and taking the union bound over all  $j \in [m]$ .

# A.3 Proof of Lemma 20

From the definition of norms in (61), we have

$$\begin{split} \|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - F([\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}'])\|_{*}^{2} \\ &= \left\| \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}'); \\ \left[ p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}) \right]^{\top} \right] \right\|_{*}^{2} \\ &= 2D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &+ 2 \left\| \left[ p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}) \right]^{\top} \right\|_{\infty}^{2} \ln m \\ &= 2D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &+ 2 \left\| \left[ p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{1}R_{1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}') - p_{m}R_{m}(\mathbf{w}) \right]^{\top} \right\|_{\infty}^{2} \ln m \\ &\leq 4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &= 4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &= 4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &= 4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}'p_{i}\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*}^{2} \\ &= B \end{aligned}$$

To bound term A, we have

$$4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i} p_{i} \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' p_{i} \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|_{w,*}^{2}$$

$$\leq 4D^{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} |q_{i} - q_{i}'| \|p_{i} \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w})\|_{w,*} \right)^{2} \stackrel{(114)}{\leq} 4D^{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} |q_{i} - q_{i}'| p_{i} G \right)^{2} \leq 4D^{2} G^{2} p_{\max}^{2} \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'\|_{1}^{2}.$$

where  $p_{\text{max}}$  is defined in (44). To bound *B*, we have

$$4D^{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' p_{i} \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' p_{i} \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*}^{2}$$
  
$$\leq 4D^{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' p_{i} \left\| \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w}') \right\|_{w,*} \right)^{2} \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} 4D^{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' p_{i} L \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_{w} \right)^{2}$$
  
$$\leq 4D^{2} L^{2} p_{\max}^{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_{w}^{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i}' \right)^{2} = 4D^{2} L^{2} p_{\max}^{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_{w}^{2}.$$

To bound C, we have

$$2 \max_{i \in [m]} |p_i[R_i(\mathbf{w}) - R_i(\mathbf{w}')]|^2 \ln m$$

$$\stackrel{(115)}{\leq} 2 \max_{i \in [m]} |p_iG||\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'||_w|^2 \ln m \leq 2G^2 p_{\max}^2 ||\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'||_w^2 \ln m.$$

Putting everything together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - F([\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}'])\|_{*}^{2} &\leq (4D^{2}L^{2} + 2G^{2}\ln m)p_{\max}^{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_{w}^{2} + 4D^{2}G^{2}p_{\max}^{2} \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'\|_{1}^{2} \\ &\leq p_{\max}^{2}(8D^{4}L^{2} + 8D^{2}G^{2}\ln m) \left(\frac{1}{2D^{2}}\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_{w}^{2} + \frac{1}{2\ln m}\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'\|_{1}^{2}\right) \\ &= p_{\max}^{2}(8D^{4}L^{2} + 8D^{2}G^{2}\ln m) \|[\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}']\|^{2} \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - F([\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}'])\|_* &\leq p_{\max}\sqrt{8D^4L^2 + 8D^2G^2\ln m} \|[\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}']\| \\ &\leq \widetilde{L} \|[\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{w}';\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}']\| \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widetilde{L}$  is defined in (44).

# A.4 Proof of Lemma 21

The light tail condition, required by Juditsky et al. (2011), is essentially the sub-Gaussian condition. To this end, we introduce the following sub-gaussian properties (Vershynin, 2018, Proposition 2.5.2).

**Proposition 1 (Sub-gaussian properties)** Let X be a random variable. Then the following properties are equivalent; the parameters  $K_i > 0$  appearing in these properties differ from each other by at most an absolute constant factor.

(i) The tails of X satisfy

$$\Pr[|X| \ge t] \le 2\exp(-t^2/K_1^2), \ \forall t \ge 0$$

(ii) The moments of X satisfy

$$||X||_{L_p} = (\mathbf{E}|X|^p)^{1/p} \le K_2\sqrt{p}, \ \forall p \ge 1.$$

(iii) The moment generating function (MGF) of  $X^2$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(\lambda^2 X^2)\right] \leq \exp(K_3^2 \lambda^2), \ \forall \lambda \ such \ that \ |\lambda| \leq 1/K_3.$$

 $\mathbf{E}[\exp(\lambda^2 X^2)] \leq \exp(K_3^2 \lambda^2), \ \forall \lambda \ subsetemation structure for the MGF of X^2 is bounded at some point, namely$ 

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\exp(X^2/K_4^2)\right] \le 2.$$

From the above proposition, we observe that the exact value of those constant  $K_1, \ldots, K_5$  is not important, and it is very tedious to calculate them. So, in the following, we only focus on the order of those constants. To simplify presentations, we use c to denote an absolute constant that is independent of all the essential parameters, and its value may change from line to line.

Since

$$||F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - \mathbf{g}([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}])||_*^2$$
  
=2D<sup>2</sup>  $||\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})||_{w,*}^2 + 2||\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})||_{\infty}^2 \ln m,$ 

we proceed to analyze the behavior of  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2$  and  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2$  $\mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) \|_{\infty}^2$ . To this end, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 24 We have

$$E\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{c\kappa G^{2}\omega_{\max}}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})-\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^{2}\right)\right] \leq 2, \\
 E\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{c\omega_{\max}\ln m}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})-\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^{2}\right)\right] \leq 2$$
(141)

where  $\omega_{\text{max}}$  is defined in (44) and c > 0 is an absolute constant.

From Lemma 24, we have

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{2c\kappa D^2 G^2 \omega_{\max} + 2c\omega_{\max}\ln^2 m} \|F([\mathbf{w};\mathbf{q}]) - \mathbf{g}([\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}])\|_*^2\right)\right] \\ = & \operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{2D^2}{2c\kappa D^2 G^2 \omega_{\max} + 2c\omega_{\max}\ln^2 m} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2\right) \\ & + \frac{2\ln m}{2c\kappa D^2 G^2 \omega_{\max} + 2c\omega_{\max}\ln^2 m} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^2\right)\right] \\ = & \operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{\kappa D^2 G^2}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2}{c\kappa G^2 \omega_{\max}} + \frac{\ln^2 m}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^2}{c\omega_{\max}\ln m}\right)\right] \end{split}$$

$$\leq \frac{\kappa D^2 G^2}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} \mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \varphi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2}{c \kappa G^2 \omega_{\max}} \right) \right] \\ + \frac{\ln^2 m}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} \mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \varphi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^2}{c \omega_{\max} \ln m} \right) \right] \\ \leq \frac{\kappa D^2 G^2}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} 2 + \frac{\ln^2 m}{\kappa D^2 G^2 + \ln^2 m} 2 = 2$$

where the first inequality follows from Jensen's inequality.

# A.5 Proof of Lemma 22

The proof is built upon that of Corollary 1 of Neu (2015). Let  $\beta = 2\gamma$  and  $\xi'_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{kp_{t,i}}\mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t]$ . First, we have

$$\hat{\xi}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{kp_{t,i} + \gamma} \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t] \\
\leq \frac{\hat{\xi}_{t,i}}{kp_{t,i} + \gamma\hat{\xi}_{t,i}} \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t] = \frac{1}{2\gamma} \cdot \frac{2\gamma\hat{\xi}_{t,i}/kp_{t,i}}{1 + \gamma\hat{\xi}_{t,i}/kp_{t,i}} \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t] \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \cdot \log\left(1 + \beta\xi'_{t,i}\right)$$
(142)

where the first inequality follows from  $\hat{\xi}_{t,i} \in [0,1]$  and last inequality from the elementary inequality  $\frac{z}{1+z/2} \leq \log(1+z)$  that holds for all  $z \geq 0$ . Second, from the property of DepRound, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{t-1}[\xi_{t,i}'] = \mathbf{E}_{t-1} \left[ \frac{\xi_{t,i}}{kp_{t,i}} \mathbb{I}[i \in \mathcal{I}_t] \right] \stackrel{(53)}{=} \xi_{t,i}.$$
(143)

Then, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[\exp(\beta\tilde{\xi}_{t,i})\right] \stackrel{(142)}{\leq} \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\left[1+\beta\xi'_{t,i}\right] \stackrel{(143)}{=} 1+\beta\xi_{t,i} \leq \exp(\beta\xi_{t,i}).$$

Then, by repeating the subsequent analysis from Corollary 1 of Neu (2015), we can derive this lemma.

# A.6 Proof of Lemma 24

To analyze  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^2$ , we first consider the approximation error caused by samples from  $\mathcal{P}_i$ :

$$\left\|\frac{n_m}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)})-\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\right\|_{w,*}=\left\|\frac{n_m}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m}\left[\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)})-\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\right]\right\|_{w,*}.$$

Under the regularity condition of  $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$  in Assumption 6, we have, for any  $\gamma \ge 0$ ,

$$\left\|\frac{n_m}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \left[\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) - \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\right]\right\|_{w,*} \ge 2G(\sqrt{2\kappa} + \sqrt{2\gamma})\sqrt{\frac{n_m}{n_i}} \le \exp(-\gamma^2/2) \quad (144)$$

which is a directly consequence of the concentration inequality of vector norms (Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2008, Theorem 2.1.(iii)) and (116). Then, we introduce the following lemma to simplify (144).

Lemma 25 Suppose we have

$$\Pr\left[X \ge \alpha + \gamma\right] \le \exp(-\gamma^2/2), \ \forall \gamma > 0$$

where X is nonnegative. Then, we have

$$\Pr\left[X \ge \gamma\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\gamma^2/\max(6\alpha^2, 8)\right), \ \forall \gamma > 0.$$

From (144) and Lemma 25, we have

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}G}\sqrt{\frac{n_i}{n_m}} \left\|\frac{n_m}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \left[\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) - \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\right]\right\|_{w,*} \ge \gamma\right]$$
  
$$\leq 2\exp\left(-\gamma^2/\max(6\kappa, 8)\right) \le 2\exp\left(-\gamma^2/(8\kappa)\right), \ \forall\gamma > 0$$

which satisfies the Proposition 1.(i). From the equivalence between Proposition 1.(i) and Proposition 1.(iv), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\left\|\frac{n_m}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m}\left[\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)})-\nabla R_i(\mathbf{w})\right]\right\|_{w,*}^2 \middle/ \frac{c\kappa G^2 n_m}{n_i}\right)\right] \le 2.$$

Inserting the scaling factor  $p_i$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\exp\left(\left\|p_{i}\frac{n_{m}}{n_{i}}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}/n_{m}}\left[\nabla\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)})-\nabla R_{i}(\mathbf{w})\right]\right\|_{w,*}^{2}\right/\frac{c\kappa G^{2}p_{i}^{2}n_{m}}{n_{i}}\right)\right] \leq 2.$$
(145)

To simplify the notation, we define

$$\mathbf{u}_i = p_i \frac{n_m}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \left[ \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) - \nabla R_i(\mathbf{w}) \right], \text{ and } \omega_{\max} = \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{p_i^2 n_m}{n_i}.$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$E\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{c\kappa G^{2}\omega_{\max}}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})-\mathbf{g}_{w}(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{w,*}^{2}\right)\right] \\
 = E\left[\exp\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}\mathbf{u}_{i}\right\|_{w,*}^{2} \middle/ \left[c\kappa G^{2}\omega_{\max}\right]\right)\right] \\
 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}E\left[\exp\left(\left\|\mathbf{u}_{i}\right\|_{w,*}^{2} \middle/ \left[c\kappa G^{2}\omega_{\max}\right]\right)\right] \stackrel{(145)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{m}q_{i}2 = 2.$$

where we use the fact that  $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$ ,  $(\cdot)^2$  and  $\exp(\cdot)$  are convex, and the last two functions are increasing in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ .

To analyze  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^2$ , we consider the approximation error related to  $\mathcal{P}_i$ :

$$\frac{n_m}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) - R_i(\mathbf{w}) \bigg| = \left| \frac{n_m}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i/n_m} \left[ \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}^{(i,j)}) - R_i(\mathbf{w}) \right] \right|.$$

Note that the absolute value  $|\cdot|$  is 1-regular (Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2008). Following (113) and the derivation of (145), we have

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(\left|p_{i}\frac{n_{m}}{n_{i}}\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}/n_{m}}\left[\ell(\mathbf{w};\mathbf{z}^{(i,j)})-R_{i}(\mathbf{w})\right]\right|^{2}/\frac{cp_{i}^{2}n_{m}}{n_{i}}\right)\right] \leq 2.$$
(146)

To prove that  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{g}_q(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^2$  is also sub-Gaussian, we need to analyze the effect of the infinity norm. To this end, we develop the following lemma.

Lemma 26 Suppose

$$\operatorname{E}\left[\exp\left(|X_j|^2/K_j^2\right)\right] \le 2, \ \forall j \in [m].$$
(147)

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\max_{j\in[m]}|X_j|^2 \middle/ \left[cK_{\max}^2\ln m\right]\right)\right] \le 2.$$

where c > 0 is an absolute constant, and  $K_{\max} = \max_{j \in [m]} K_j$ .

From (146) and Lemma 26, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{c\omega_{\max}\ln m}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\varphi(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})-\mathbf{g}_{q}(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{q})\|_{\infty}^{2}\right)\right] \leq 2.$$

#### A.7 Proof of Lemma 25

When  $\gamma \in [0, 2\alpha]$ , we have

$$\Pr[X \ge \gamma] \le 1 \le 2 \exp(-2/3) \le 2 \exp(-\gamma^2/6\alpha^2).$$

When  $\gamma \geq 2\alpha$ , we have

$$\Pr[X \ge \gamma] = \Pr[X \ge \alpha + \gamma - \alpha] \le \exp(-(\gamma - \alpha)^2/2) \le \exp(-\gamma^2/8)$$

where we use the fact  $\gamma - \alpha \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}$ . Thus, we always have

$$\Pr\left[X \ge \gamma\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\gamma^2/\max(6\alpha^2, 8)\right), \ \forall \gamma > 0.$$

# A.8 Proof of Lemma 26

From (147), and the equivalence between Proposition 1.(i) and Proposition 1.(iv), we have

$$\Pr\left[|X_j| \ge t\right] \le 2\exp\left(-t^2/cK_j^2\right), \ \forall t \ge 0, \forall j \in [m].$$

As a result,

$$\Pr\left[\max_{j\in[m]}|X_j| \ge t\right] = \Pr\left[\exists j, |X_j| \ge t\right] \le \sum_{j=1}^m \Pr\left[|X_j| \ge t\right] \le 2\sum_{j=1}^m \exp\left(-t^2/cK_j^2\right)$$
$$\le 2m \exp\left(-t^2/cK_{\max}^2\right) = \exp\left(-t^2/cK_{\max}^2 + \ln[2m]\right).$$

Choosing  $t = \sqrt{cK_{\max}^2(\ln[2m] + \gamma^2/2)}$ , we have

$$\Pr\left[\max_{j\in[m]}|X_j| \ge \sqrt{cK_{\max}^2(\ln[2m] + \gamma^2/2)}\right] \le \exp\left(-\gamma^2/2\right).$$

Thus

$$\Pr\left[\max_{j\in[m]} |X_j| \ge \sqrt{cK_{\max}^2} \left(\sqrt{\ln[2m]} + \gamma/\sqrt{2}\right)\right] \le \exp\left(-\gamma^2/2\right)$$
  
$$\Leftrightarrow \Pr\left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{cK_{\max}^2}} \max_{j\in[m]} |X_j| \ge \sqrt{2\ln[2m]} + \gamma\right] \le \exp\left(-\gamma^2/2\right).$$

By Lemma 25, we have

$$\Pr\left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{cK_{\max}^2}}\max_{j\in[m]}|X_j| \ge \gamma\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\gamma^2/\max\left(12\cdot\ln[2m],8\right)\right), \ \forall \gamma > 0.$$

From the equivalence between Proposition 1.(i) and Proposition 1.(iv), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\max_{j\in[m]}|X_j|^2 \middle/ \left[cK_{\max}^2\ln m\right]\right)\right] \le 2.$$

#### Appendix B. Details of Example 1

According to our constructions, the i-th risk function is given by

$$R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathrm{Ber}(\mu_i, 1)} \left[ (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{z})^2 \right] = \mathbf{w}^2 - 2\mu_i \mathbf{w} + \mu_i.$$

We first derive the objective of GDRO, i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w})$  in (2). When  $\mathbf{w} \in [0, 0.5]$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^2 - 2\mathbf{w} + 1$  with corresponding  $\mu_i = 1$ , and when  $\mathbf{w} \in [0.5, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^2 - \mathbf{w} + 0.5$  with corresponding  $\mu_i = 0.5$ . Then, it can be easily verified from Fig. 1(b) that  $\mathbf{w}_G^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{L}_{\max}(\mathbf{w}) = 0.5$ .

Then, we analyze the objective of AT<sub>5</sub>RO, i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_5(\mathbf{w})$  in (5). Denote  $\mathcal{I}^*(\mathbf{w}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{B}_{m,5}} \left\{ \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i(\mathbf{w}) \right\}$ . We discuss the following two situations:

- 1. When  $\mathbf{w} \in [0, 0.5]$ , we have  $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*(\mathbf{w})} = \{0.96, \cdots, 1\}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_5(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^2 1.96\mathbf{w} + 0.98$ . In this case, 0.5 attains the minimum objective  $\mathcal{L}_5(0.5) = 0.25$ ;
- 2. When  $\mathbf{w} \in (0.5, 1]$ , we have  $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^*(\mathbf{w})} = \{0.5, 0.86, \cdots, 0.89\}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_5(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^2 1.6\mathbf{w} + 0.8$ . In this case, 0.8 attains the minimum objective  $\mathcal{L}_5(0.8) = 0.16$ .

In summary,  $\mathbf{w}_A^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{L}_5(\mathbf{w}) = 0.8.$ 

# Appendix C. Supporting Algorithms

# C.1 Projection onto the Capped Simplex

Algorithm 8 Neg-entropy Bregman projection onto the capped simplex

**Input:** size k, and non-negative vector  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 1: if  $\max_{i \in [m]}(p_i) \le 1/k$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i = 1$  then 2: return p 3: end if 4: Partially sort **p** to **p**' s.t.  $p'_m \ge \cdots \ge p'_{m-k+1} \ge p'_i \ \forall i \in [m-k]$  and record mapping  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p}'$ . 5: Set  $p'_{m+1} = +\infty$ 6: **for** i = m to m - k + 1 **do** 7:  $c = \left(1 - \frac{m-i}{k}\right) / \left(\|\mathbf{p}'\|_1 - \sum_{j=i+1}^m p'_j\right)$ 8: **if**  $p'_i c < 1/k \le p'_{i+1}c$  **then** 9:  $p'_{j} = \begin{cases} 1/k & j \ge i+1\\ cp'_{i} & j \le i \end{cases}$ return  $\mathcal{M}^{-1}(\mathbf{p}')$ 10: end if 11: 12: end for 13: return  $1/k \cdot \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{0}_m]$ 

# C.2 Sampling Rule: DepRound

The original DepRound algorithm (Gandhi et al., 2006) takes an input vector  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  that satisfies  $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{1}$  and  $\mathbf{p}^\top \mathbf{1} = k$ . Here, we modify it to require  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$ .

# Algorithm 9 DepRound

Input: size k, and probability vector  $\mathbf{p} \in S_{m,k} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ 1:  $\mathbf{p} = k \cdot \mathbf{p}$ 2: while  $\exists i \in [m]$  s.t.  $p_i \in (0, 1)$  do 3: Choose any  $i, j \in [m]$  with  $i \neq j$  and  $p_i \in (0, 1), p_j \in (0, 1)$ 4: Set  $\alpha = \min\{1 - p_i, p_j\}$  and  $\beta = \min\{p_i, 1 - p_j\}$ 5: Update  $(p_i, p_j) = \begin{cases} (p_i + \alpha, p_j - \alpha) \text{ with probability } \frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \\ (p_i - \beta, p_j + \beta) \text{ with probability } \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta} \end{cases}$ 6: end while

7: return  $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in [n] \mid p_i = 1\}$ 

# References

- Alekh Agarwal and Tong Zhang. Minimax regret optimization for robust machine learning under distribution shift. In *Proceedings of 35th Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2704–2729, 2022.
- Dario Amodei, Sundaram Ananthanarayanan, Rishita Anubhai, and et al. Deep speech 2 : End-to-end speech recognition in english and mandarin. In Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 173–182, 2016.
- Jean-Yves Audibert and Sébastien Bubeck. Regret bounds and minimax policies under partial monitoring. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2785–2836, 2010.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Gábor Lugosi. Regret in online combinatorial optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):31–45, 2014.
- Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.
- Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20.
- Aharon Ben-Tal, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Arkadi Nemirovski. Robust Optimization. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Aharon Ben-Tal, Dick den Hertog, Anja De Waegenaere, Bertrand Melenberg, and Gijs Rennen. Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Management Science*, 59(2):341–357, 2013.
- Aharon Ben-Tal, Elad Hazan, Tomer Koren, and Shie Mannor. Oracle-based robust optimization via online learning. Operations Research, 63(3):628–638, 2015.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Vishal Gupta, and Nathan Kallus. Robust sample average approximation. Mathematical Programming, 171:217–282, 2018.
- Avrim Blum, Nika Haghtalab, Ariel D. Procaccia, and Mingda Qiao. Collaborative PAC learning. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30, pages 2389–2398, 2017.
- Sébastien Bubeck and Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 5(1):1–122, 2012.
- Yair Carmon and Danielle Hausler. Distributionally robust optimization via ball oracle acceleration. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35, pages 35866– 35879, 2022.
- Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi and Gábor Lugosi. Prediction, Learning, and Games. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Andrew Cotter, Ohad Shamir, Nati Srebro, and Karthik Sridharan. Better mini-batch algorithms via accelerated gradient methods. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24, pages 1647–1655, 2011.
- Sebastian Curi, Kfir Y. Levy, Stefanie Jegelka, and Andreas Krause. Adaptive sampling for stochastic risk-averse learning. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33, pages 1036–1047, 2020.
- Ashok Cutkosky. Anytime online-to-batch, optimism and acceleration. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1446–1454, 2019.
- Erick Delage and Yinyu Ye. Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research*, 58(3):595–612, 2010.
- John C. Duchi and Hongseok Namkoong. Learning models with uniform performance via distributionally robust optimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1378–1406, 2021.
- John C. Duchi, Peter W. Glynn, and Hongseok Namkoong. Statistics of robust optimization: A generalized empirical likelihood approach. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(3): 946–969, 2021.
- Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani and Daniel Kuhn. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171:115–166, 2018.
- Yanbo Fan, Siwei Lyu, Yiming Ying, and Baogang Hu. Learning with average top-k loss. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30, pages 497–505, 2017.
- Abraham D. Flaxman, Adam Tauman Kalai, and H. Brendan McMahan. Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: Gradient descent without a gradient. In *Proceedings* of the 16th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, pages 385–394, 2005.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139, 1997.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E. Schapire. Adaptive game playing using multiplicative weights. Games and Economic Behavior, 29(1):79–103, 1999.
- Rajiv Gandhi, Samir Khuller, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, and Aravind Srinivasan. Dependent rounding and its applications to approximation algorithms. *Journal of the ACM*, 53 (3):324–360, 2006.
- Nika Haghtalab, Michael I. Jordan, and Eric Zhao. On-demand sampling: Learning optimally from multiple distributions. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35, pages 406–419, 2022.
- Nika Haghtalab, Michael I. Jordan, and Eric Zhao. On-demand sampling: Learning optimally from multiple distributions. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2210.12529v2, 2023.

- Tatsunori Hashimoto, Megha Srivastava, Hongseok Namkoong, and Percy Liang. Fairness without demographics in repeated loss minimization. In Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 1929–1938, 2018.
- Michael C. Horsch and David Poole. An anytime algorithm for decision making under uncertainty. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 246–255, 1998.
- Weihua Hu, Gang Niu, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. Does distributionally robust supervised learning give robust classifiers? In Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 2029–2037, 2018.
- Jikai Jin, Bohang Zhang, Haiyang Wang, and Liwei Wang. Non-convex distributionally robust optimization: Non-asymptotic analysis. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34, pages 2771–2782, 2021.
- Anatoli Juditsky, Arkadi Nemirovski, and Claire Tauvel. Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm. *Stochastic Systems*, 1(1):17–58, 2011.
- Anatoli B. Juditsky and Arkadi S. Nemirovski. Large deviations of vector-valued martingales in 2-smooth normed spaces. ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:0809.0813, 2008.
- Tomás Kocák, Gergely Neu, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. Efficient learning by implicit exploration in bandit problems with side observations. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27, pages 613–621, 2014.
- Daniel Kuhn, Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani, Viet Anh Nguyen, and Soroosh Shafieezadeh-Abadeh. Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Theory and applications in machine learning. Operations Research & Management Science in the Age of Analytics, pages 130–166, 2019.
- Harold J. Kushner and G. George Yin. Stochastic Approximation and Recursive Algorithms and Applications. Springer, second edition, 2003.
- Guanghui Lan. An optimal method for stochastic composite optimization. Mathematical Programming, 133:365–397, 2012.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Daniel Levy, Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, and Aaron Sidford. Large-scale methods for distributionally robust optimization. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33, pages 8847–8860, 2020.
- Liping Li, Wei Xu, Tianyi Chen, Georgios B. Giannakis, and Qing Ling. RSA: Byzantinerobust stochastic aggregation methods for distributed learning from heterogeneous datasets. In *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1544–1551, 2019.

- Mehryar Mohri, Gary Sivek, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Agnostic federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4615–4625, 2019.
- Hongseok Namkoong and John C. Duchi. Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f-divergences. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29, pages 2216–2224, 2016.
- Hongseok Namkoong and John C. Duchi. Variance-based regularization with convex objectives. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30, pages 2971–2980, 2017.
- 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.
- Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence O(1/t) for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
- Gergely Neu. Explore no more: Improved high-probability regret bounds for non-stochastic bandits. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28, pages 3168–3176, 2015.
- Gergely Neu and Gábor Bartók. Importance weighting without importance weights: An efficient algorithm for combinatorial semi-bandits. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(154):1–21, 2016.
- Huy Lê Nguyen and Lydia Zakynthinou. Improved algorithms for collaborative PAC learning. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31, pages 7642–7650, 2018.
- Francesco Orabona. A modern introduction to online learning. ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1912.13213v6, 2019.
- Yonatan Oren, Shiori Sagawa, Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Distributionally robust language modeling. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, pages 4227–4237, 2019.
- Qi Qi, Zhishuai Guo, Yi Xu, Rong Jin, and Tianbao Yang. An online method for a class of distributionally robust optimization with non-convex objectives. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34, pages 10067–10080, 2021.
- Predrag Radivojac, Nitesh V. Chawla, A. Keith Dunker, and Zoran Obradovic. Classification and knowledge discovery in protein databases. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 37(4):224–239, 2004.
- Hassan Rafique, Mingrui Liu, Qihang Lin, and Tianbao Yang. Weakly-convex-concave min-max optimization: Provable algorithms and applications in machine learning. Optimization Methods and Software, 37(3):1087–1121, 2022.

- Sasha Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Optimization, learning, and games with predictable sequences. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26, pages 3066–3074, 2013.
- Guy N. Rothblum and Gal Yona. Multi-group agnostic PAC learnability. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9107–9115, 2021.
- Christophe Roux, Elias Wirth, Sebastian Pokutta, and Thomas Kerdreux. Efficient onlinebandit strategies for minimax learning problems. ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:2105.13939, 2021.
- Nicolas Le Roux, Pierre-Antoine Manzagol, and Yoshua Bengio. Topmoumoute online natural gradient algorithm. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20, pages 849–856, 2008.
- Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Dvir Samuel and Gal Chechik. Distributional robustness loss for long-tail learning. In Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 9475–9484, 2021.
- Herbert Scarf. A min-max solution of an inventory problem. Studies in the Mathematical Theory of Inventory and Production, pages 201–209, 1958.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Yonatan Wexler. Minimizing the maximal loss: How and why. In Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 793–801, 2016.
- Alexander Shapiro. Distributionally robust stochastic programming. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27(4):2258–2275, 2017.
- Tareq Si Salem, Giovanni Neglia, and Stratis Ioannidis. No-regret caching via online mirror descent. ACM Transactions on Modeling and Performance Evaluation of Computing Systems, 8(4), 2023.
- Aman Sinha, Hongseok Namkoong, and John Duchi. Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Agnieszka Słowik and Léon Bottou. On distributionally robust optimization and data rebalancing. In Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pages 1283–1297, 2022.
- Tasuku Soma, Khashayar Gatmiry, and Stefanie Jegelka. Optimal algorithms for group distributionally robust optimization and beyond. ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:2212.13669, 2022.
- Vasilis Syrgkanis, Alekh Agarwal, Haipeng Luo, and Robert E. Schapire. Fast convergence of regularized learning in games. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28, pages 2989–2997, 2015.

- Taishi Uchiya, Atsuyoshi Nakamura, and Mineichi Kudo. Algorithms for adversarial bandit problems with multiple plays. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 375–389, 2010.
- Vladimir N. Vapnik. The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory. Springer, second edition, 2000.
- Roman Vershynin. High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Nuri Mert Vural, Hakan Gokcesu, Kaan Gokcesu, and Suleyman S. Kozat. Minimax optimal algorithms for adversarial bandit problem with multiple plays. *IEEE Transactions on* Signal Processing, 67(16):4383–4398, 2019.
- Jie Wang, Rui Gao, and Yao Xie. Sinkhorn distributionally robust optimization. ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:2109.11926, 2021.
- Ziyu Xu, Chen Dan, Justin Khim, and Pradeep Ravikumar. Class-weighted classification: Trade-offs and robust approaches. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference* on Machine Learning, pages 10544–10554, 2020.
- Jingzhao Zhang, Aditya Krishna Menon, Andreas Veit, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Sanjiv Kumar, and Suvrit Sra. Coping with label shift via distributionally robust optimisation. In International Conference on Learning Representations, 2021.
- Lijun Zhang, Tianbao Yang, Rong Jin, and Xiaofei He.  $O(\log T)$  projections for stochastic optimization of smooth and strongly convex functions. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1121–1129, 2013.
- Lijun Zhang, Peng Zhao, Zhenhua Zhuang, Tianbao Yang, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Stochastic approximation approaches to group distributionally robust optimization. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37, pages 52490–52522, 2023.
- Lijun Zhang, Haomin Bai, Wei-Wei Tu, Ping Yang, and Yao Hu. Efficient stochastic approximation of minimax excess risk optimization. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 58599–58630, 2024.
- Zhi-Hua Zhou. Learnability with time-sharing computational resource concerns. National Science Review, nwae204, 2024.
- Shlomo Zilberstein. Using anytime algorithms in intelligent systems. AI Magazine, 17(3): 73–83, 1996.