

369 A Proof of Theorem 1

370 **Theorem.** Under S1, S2, H1, H2. For any $K_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$, let K be an independent discrete r.v. drawn
 371 uniformly from $\{0, \dots, K_{\max} - 1\}$ and define the following quantity:

$$\Delta_{(K_{\max})} := 2nL\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(K_{\max})}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K_{\max})})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \frac{4LC_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}},$$

372 Then we have following non-asymptotic bounds:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|^2] \leq \frac{\Delta_{(K_{\max})}}{K_{\max}}, \quad \mathbb{E}[g_{-}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})] \leq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{(K_{\max})}}{K_{\max}}} + \frac{C_{\text{gr}}}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} M_{(k)}^{-1/2}.$$

373 **Proof** We begin by recalling the definition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^k(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

374 Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^{k+1})}, \{z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^{k+1})}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^{k+1})}}) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}})). \end{aligned}$$

375 Furthermore, we recall that

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}), \quad \hat{\mathcal{e}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

376 Due to S2, we have

$$\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{e}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq 2L\hat{\mathcal{e}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}). \quad (18)$$

377 To prove the first bound in (16), using the optimality of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}})) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

378 Let \mathcal{F}_k be the filtration of random variables up to iteration k , i.e., $\{i_{\ell-1}, \{z_{i_{\ell-1},m}^{(\ell-1)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\ell-1)}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell=1}^k$.

379 We observe that the conditional expectation evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{i_k} [\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) | \mathcal{F}_k, i_k] | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &= \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) + \mathbb{E}_{i_k} [\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{M_{(k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}} r_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, z_{i_k,m}^{(k)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) | \mathcal{F}_k, i_k] | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) + \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}}, \end{aligned}$$

380 where the last inequality is due to H2. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k,m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}}) | \mathcal{F}_k] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}).$$

381 Taking the conditional expectations on both sides of (19) and re-arranging terms give:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \leq n\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) | \mathcal{F}_k] + \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}} \quad (20)$$

382 Proceeding from (20), we observe the following lower bound for the left hand side

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) + \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2 \\
& = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} r_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}, z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \right\}}_{:= -\delta^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})} + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

383 where (a) is due to $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = 0$ [cf. S1], (b) is due to (18) and we have defined the summation in
384 the last equality as $-\delta^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})$. Substituting the above into (20) yields

$$\frac{\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2}{2L} \leq n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) | \mathcal{F}_k] + \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}} + \delta^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \quad (21)$$

385 Observe the following upper bound on the total expectations:

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}}\right],$$

386 which is due to H2. It yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2] \leq 2nL \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)})] + \frac{2LC_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{2LC_r}{\sqrt{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}}\right]$$

387 Finally, for any $K_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$, we let K be a discrete r.v. that is uniformly drawn from $\{0, 1, \dots, K_{\max} -$
388 $1\}$. Using H2 and taking total expectations lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|^2] &= \frac{1}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{2nL \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(K_{\max})}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K_{\max})})]}{K_{\max}} + \frac{2LC_r}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}}\right] \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

389 For all $i \in [1, n]$, the index i is selected with a probability equal to $\frac{1}{n}$ when conditioned indepen-
390 dently on the past. We observe:

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{(\tau_i^k)}^{-1/2}] = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{j-1} M_{(k-j)}^{-1/2} \quad (23)$$

391 Taking the sum yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \mathbb{E}[M_{(\tau_i^k)}^{-1/2}] &= \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{j-1} M_{(k-j)}^{-1/2} = \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-(l+1)} M_{(l)}^{-1/2} \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{K_{\max}-1} M_{(l)}^{-1/2} \sum_{k=l+1}^{K_{\max}-1} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-(l+1)} \leq \sum_{l=0}^{K_{\max}-1} M_{(l)}^{-1/2} \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

392 where the last inequality is due to upper bounding the geometric series. Plugging this back into (22)
393 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|^2] &= \frac{1}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{2nL \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(K_{\max})}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K_{\max})})]}{K_{\max}} + \frac{1}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \frac{4LC_r}{\sqrt{M_{(k)}}} = \frac{\Delta_{(K_{\max})}}{K_{\max}}.
\end{aligned}$$

394 This concludes our proof for the first inequality in (16).

395 To prove the second inequality of (16), we define the shorthand notations $g^{(k)} := g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})$, $g_-^{(k)} :=$
 396 $-\min\{0, g^{(k)}\}$, $g_+^{(k)} := \max\{0, g^{(k)}\}$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(k)} &= \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \frac{\mathcal{L}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|} \\ &= \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\{ \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)})}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|} - \frac{\langle \nabla \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) | \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} \rangle}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|} \right\} \\ &\geq -\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\| + \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)})}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|} \end{aligned}$$

397 where the last inequality is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and we have defined
 398 $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{d}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)})$ as the directional derivative of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)})$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ along the direction \boldsymbol{d} . Moreover,
 399 for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \\ &= \underbrace{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)'}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)'}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})}_{\geq 0} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}) - \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} r'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}, z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

400 where the inequality is due to the optimality of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}$ and the convexity of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ [cf. H1]. Denoting
 401 a scaled version of the above term as:

$$\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} r'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}, z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \right\}}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|}.$$

402 We have

$$g^{(k)} \geq -\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\| + \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} (-\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\| - \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|. \quad (25)$$

403 Since $g^{(k)} = g_+^{(k)} - g_-^{(k)}$ and $g_+^{(k)} g_-^{(k)} = 0$, this implies

$$g_-^{(k)} \leq \|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\| + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|. \quad (26)$$

404 Consider the above inequality when $k = K$, i.e., the random index, and taking total expectations on
 405 both sides gives

$$\mathbb{E}[g_-^{(K)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|] + \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \epsilon^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$$

406 We note that

$$\left(\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|] \right)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \widehat{e}^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)})\|^2] \leq \frac{\Delta(K_{\max})}{K_{\max}},$$

407 where the first inequality is due to the convexity of $(\cdot)^2$ and the Jensen's inequality, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \epsilon^{(K)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \frac{1}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{C_{\text{gr}}}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n M_{(\tau_i^k)}^{-1/2}\right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{C_{\text{gr}}}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} M_{(k)}^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

408 where (a) is due to H2 and (b) is due to (24). This implies

$$\mathbb{E}[g_-^{(K)}] \leq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(K_{\max})}{K_{\max}}} + \frac{C_{\text{gr}}}{K_{\max}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_{\max}-1} M_{(k)}^{-1/2},$$

409 and concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

B Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem. Under S1, S2, H1, H2. In addition, assume that $\{M_{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a non-decreasing sequence of integers which satisfies $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_{(k)}^{-1/2} < \infty$. Then:

1. the negative part of the stationarity measure converges almost surely to zero, i.e., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_{-}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = 0$ a.s..
2. the objective value $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})$ converges almost surely to a finite number $\underline{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = \underline{\mathcal{L}}$ a.s..

Proof We apply the following auxiliary lemma which proof can be found in Appendix C for the readability of the current proof:

Lemma 1. Let $(V_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a non negative sequence of random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[V_0] < \infty$. Let $(X_k)_{k \geq 0}$ a non negative sequence of random variables and $(E_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence of random variables such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|E_k|] < \infty$. If for any $k \geq 1$:

$$V_k \leq V_{k-1} - X_{k-1} + E_{k-1} \quad (27)$$

then:

(i) for all $k \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[V_k] < \infty$ and the sequence $(V_k)_{k \geq 0}$ converges a.s. to a finite limit V_{∞} .

(ii) the sequence $(\mathbb{E}[V_k])_{k \geq 0}$ converges and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[V_k] = \mathbb{E}[V_{\infty}]$.

(iii) the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_k$ converges almost surely and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_k] < \infty$.

We proceed from (19) by re-arranging terms and observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \\ &\quad - (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)})) + (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}})) \end{aligned}$$

Our idea is to apply Lemma 1. Under S1, the finite sum of surrogate functions $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, defined in (15), is lower bounded by a constant $c_k > -\infty$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. To this end, we observe that

$$V_k := \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \inf_{k \geq 0} c_k \geq 0 \quad (28)$$

is a non-negative random variable.

Secondly, under H1, the following random variable is non-negative

$$X_k := \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Thirdly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &= -(\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k+1)})) + (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}})). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Note that from the definitions (28), (29), (30), we have $V_{k+1} \leq V_k - X_k + E_k$ for any $k \geq 1$.

Under H2, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})|] \leq C_r M_{(k)}^{-1/2}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}, \{z_{i_k, m}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}})\right|\right] \leq C_r \mathbb{E}\left[M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}^{-1/2}\right]$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})|\right] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n C_r \mathbb{E}\left[M_{(\tau_i^k)}^{-1/2}\right]$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[|E_k|] \leq \frac{C_r}{n} \left(M_{(k)}^{-1/2} + \mathbb{E}\left[M_{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}^{-1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \{M_{(\tau_i^k)}^{-1/2} + M_{(\tau_{i+1}^k)}^{-1/2}\}\right] \right)$$

Using (24) and the assumption on the sequence $\{M_{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|E_k|] < \frac{C_r}{n} (2 + 2n) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_{(k)}^{-1/2} < \infty.$$

Therefore, the conclusions in Lemma 1 hold. Precisely, we have $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_k < \infty$ and

$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_k] < \infty$ almost surely. Note that this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_k] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\tau_{i_k}^k)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \geq 0$, the above implies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (31)$$

and subsequently applying (18), we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\| = 0$ almost surely. Finally, it follows from (18) and (26) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_-^{(k)} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{2L} \sqrt{\widehat{e}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})} + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = 0, \quad (32)$$

where the last equality holds almost surely due to the fact that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |\epsilon^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|] < \infty$. This concludes the asymptotic convergence of the MISSO method.

Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})$ converges almost surely. As a consequence of Lemma 1, it is clear that $\{V_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ converges almost surely and so is $\{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})\}_{k \geq 0}$, i.e., we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = \underline{\mathcal{L}}$. Applying (31) implies that

$$\underline{\mathcal{L}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)})$ converges almost surely to $\underline{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

C Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma. Let $(V_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a non negative sequence of random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[V_0] < \infty$. Let $(X_k)_{k \geq 0}$ a non negative sequence of random variables and $(E_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence of random variables such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|E_k|] < \infty$. If for any $k \geq 1$:

$$V_k \leq V_{k-1} - X_{k-1} + E_{k-1}$$

then:

(i) for all $k \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[V_k] < \infty$ and the sequence $(V_k)_{k \geq 0}$ converges a.s. to a finite limit V_{∞} .

(ii) the sequence $(\mathbb{E}[V_k])_{k \geq 0}$ converges and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[V_k] = \mathbb{E}[V_{\infty}]$.

(iii) the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_k$ converges almost surely and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_k] < \infty$.

457 **Proof** We first show that for all $k \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[V_k] < \infty$. Note indeed that:

$$0 \leq V_k \leq V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^k X_j + \sum_{j=1}^k E_j \leq V_0 + \sum_{j=1}^k E_j \quad (33)$$

458 showing that $\mathbb{E}[V_k] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_0] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^k E_j\right] < \infty$.

459 Since $0 \leq X_k \leq V_{k-1} - V_k + E_k$ we also obtain for all $k \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[X_k] < \infty$. Moreover, since
 460 $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |E_j|\right] < \infty$, the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j$ converges a.s. We may therefore define:

$$W_k = V_k + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} E_j \quad (34)$$

461 Note that $\mathbb{E}[|W_k|] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_k] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} |E_j|\right] < \infty$. For all $k \geq 1$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} W_k &\leq V_{k-1} - X_k + \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} E_j \leq W_{k-1} - X_k \leq W_{k-1} \\ \mathbb{E}[W_k] &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[X_k] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

462 Hence the sequences $(W_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and $(\mathbb{E}[W_k])_{k \geq 0}$ are non increasing. Since for all $k \geq 0$, $W_k \geq$
 463 $-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |E_j| > -\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[W_k] \geq -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|E_j|] > -\infty$, the (random) sequence $(W_k)_{k \geq 0}$
 464 converges a.s. to a limit W_{∞} and the (deterministic) sequence $(\mathbb{E}[W_k])_{k \geq 0}$ converges to a limit w_{∞} .
 465 Since $|W_k| \leq V_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |E_j|$, the Fatou lemma implies that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} |W_k|] = \mathbb{E}[|W_{\infty}|] \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|W_k|] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_0] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|E_j|] < \infty \quad (36)$$

466 showing that the random variable W_{∞} is integrable.

467 In the sequel, set $U_k \triangleq W_0 - W_k$. By construction we have for all $k \geq 0$, $U_k \geq 0$, $U_k \leq U_{k+1}$ and
 468 $\mathbb{E}[U_k] \leq \mathbb{E}[|W_0|] + \mathbb{E}[|W_k|] < \infty$ and by the monotone convergence theorem, we get:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[U_k] = \mathbb{E}[\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} U_k] \quad (37)$$

469 Finally, we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[U_k] = \mathbb{E}[W_0] - w_{\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} U_k] = \mathbb{E}[W_0] - \mathbb{E}[W_{\infty}] \quad (38)$$

470 showing that $\mathbb{E}[W_{\infty}] = w_{\infty}$ and concluding the proof of (ii). Moreover, using (35) we have that
 471 $W_k \leq W_{k-1} - X_k$ which yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} X_j &\leq W_0 - W_{\infty} < \infty \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_j] &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_0] - w_{\infty} < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

472 which concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

473 D Details about the Numerical Experiments

474 D.1 Binary Logistic Regression on the Traumabase

475 D.1.1 Traumabase quantitative variables

476 The list of the 16 quantitative variables we use in our experiments are as follows — *age, weight,*
 477 *height, BMI (Body Mass Index), the Glasgow Coma Scale, the Glasgow Coma Scale motor com-*
 478 *ponent, the minimum systolic blood pressure, the minimum diastolic blood pressure, the maximum*
 479 *number of heart rate (or pulse) per unit time (usually a minute), the systolic blood pressure at ar-*
 480 *rival of ambulance, the diastolic blood pressure at arrival of ambulance, the heart rate at arrival*
 481 *of ambulance, the capillary Hemoglobin concentration, the oxygen saturation, the fluid expansion*
 482 *colloids, the fluid expansion cristalloids, the pulse pressure for the minimum value of diastolic and*
 483 *systolic blood pressure, the pulse pressure at arrival of ambulance.*

484 D.1.2 Metropolis Hastings algorithm

485 During the simulation step of the MISSO method, the sampling from the target distribution
 486 $\pi(z_{i,\text{mis}}; \theta) := p(z_{i,\text{mis}} | z_{i,\text{obs}}, y_i; \theta)$ is performed using a Metropolis Hastings (MH) algorithm
 487 [Meyn and Tweedie, 2012] with proposal distribution $q(z_{i,\text{mis}}; \delta) := p(z_{i,\text{mis}} | z_{i,\text{obs}}; \delta)$ where
 488 $\theta = (\beta, \Omega)$ and $\delta = (\xi, \Sigma)$. The parameters of the Gaussian conditional distribution of $z_{i,\text{mis}} | z_{i,\text{obs}}$
 489 read:

$$\begin{aligned}\xi &= \beta_{\text{mis}} + \Omega_{\text{mis},\text{obs}} \Omega_{\text{obs},\text{obs}}^{-1} (z_{i,\text{obs}} - \beta_{\text{obs}}) , \\ \Sigma &= \Omega_{\text{mis},\text{mis}} + \Omega_{\text{mis},\text{obs}} \Omega_{\text{obs},\text{obs}}^{-1} \Omega_{\text{obs},\text{mis}}\end{aligned}$$

490 where we have used the Schur Complement of $\Omega_{\text{obs},\text{obs}}$ in Ω and noted β_{mis} (resp. β_{obs}) the missing
 491 (resp. observed) elements of β . The MH algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 MH algorithm

```

1: Input: initialization  $z_{i,\text{mis},0} \sim q(z_{i,\text{mis}}; \delta)$ 
2: for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  do
3:   Sample  $z_{i,\text{mis},m} \sim q(z_{i,\text{mis}}; \delta)$ 
4:   Sample  $u \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ 
5:   Calculate the ratio  $r = \frac{\pi(z_{i,\text{mis},m}; \theta) / q(z_{i,\text{mis},m}; \delta)}{\pi(z_{i,\text{mis},m-1}; \theta) / q(z_{i,\text{mis},m-1}; \delta)}$ 
6:   if  $u < r$  then
7:     Accept  $z_{i,\text{mis},m}$ 
8:   else
9:      $z_{i,\text{mis},m} \leftarrow z_{i,\text{mis},m-1}$ 
10:  end if
11: end for
12: Output:  $z_{i,\text{mis},M}$ 

```

492 D.1.3 MISSO Update

493 **Choice of surrogate function for MISO:** We recall the MISO deterministic surrogate defined in
 494 (7):

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i(\theta; \bar{\theta}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \log(p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) / f_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \theta)) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_i) .$$

495 where $\theta = (\delta, \beta, \Omega)$ and $\bar{\theta} = (\bar{\delta}, \bar{\beta}, \bar{\Omega})$. We adapt it to our missing covariates problem and decom-
 496 pose the the surrogate function defined above into an observed and a missing part.

497 **Surrogate function decomposition** We adapt it to our missing covariates problem and decompose
 498 the term depending on θ , while $\bar{\theta}$ is fixed, in two following parts leading to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i(\theta; \bar{\theta}) &= - \int_{\mathbf{Z}} \log f_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \theta) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}}) \\
 &= - \int_{\mathbf{Z}} \log [p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \beta, \Omega)] p_i(z_i, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}}) \\
 &= - \underbrace{\int_{\mathbf{Z}} \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) p_i(z_i, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}})}_{=\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\delta, \bar{\theta})} - \underbrace{\int_{\mathbf{Z}} \log p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \beta, \Omega) p_i(z_i, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}})}_{=\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta})}
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

499 The mean β and the covariance Ω of the latent structure can be estimated minimizing the sum of
 500 MISSO surrogates $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta}, \{z_m\}_{m=1}^M)$, defined as MC approximation of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta})$, for all
 501 $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, in closed-form expression.

502 We thus keep the surrogate $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta})$ as it is, and consider the following quadratic approximation
 503 of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\delta, \bar{\theta})$ to estimate the vector of logistic parameters δ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\bar{\delta}, \bar{\theta}) &- \int_{\mathbf{Z}} \nabla \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) \big|_{\delta=\bar{\delta}} p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}}) (\delta - \bar{\delta}) \\
 &- (\delta - \bar{\delta})/2 \int_{\mathbf{Z}} \nabla^2 \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}}) (\delta - \bar{\delta})^\top
 \end{aligned}$$

504 Recall that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nabla \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) &= z_i (y_i - S(\delta^\top z_i)) \\
 \nabla^2 \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) &= -z_i z_i^\top \dot{S}(\delta^\top z_i)
 \end{aligned}$$

505 where $\dot{S}(u)$ is the derivative of $S(u)$. Note that $\dot{S}(u) \leq 1/4$ and since, for all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, the $p \times p$
 506 matrix $z_i z_i^\top$ is semi-definite positive we can assume:

507 **L1.** For all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exist, for all $z_i \in \mathbf{Z}$, a positive definite matrix $H_i(z_i) :=$
 508 $\frac{1}{4}(z_i z_i^\top + \epsilon I_d)$ such that for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $-z_i z_i^\top \dot{S}(\delta^\top z_i) \leq H_i(z_i)$.

509 Then, we use, for all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, the following surrogate function to estimate δ :

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\delta, \bar{\theta}) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\bar{\delta}, \bar{\theta}) - D_i^\top (\delta - \bar{\delta}) + \frac{1}{2} (\delta - \bar{\delta}) H_i (\delta - \bar{\delta})^\top \tag{41}$$

510 where:

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_i &= \int_{\mathbf{Z}} \nabla \log p_i(y_i | z_{i,\text{mis}}, z_{i,\text{obs}}, \delta) \big|_{\delta=\bar{\delta}} p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}}) \\
 H_i &= \int_{\mathbf{Z}} H_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}) p_i(z_{i,\text{mis}}, \bar{\theta}) \mu_i(dz_{i,\text{mis}})
 \end{aligned}$$

511 Finally, at iteration k , the total surrogate is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\theta, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M(\tau_i^k)}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M(\tau_i^k)}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{D}_i^{(\tau_i^k)} (\delta - \delta^{(\tau_i^k)}) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\delta - \delta^{(\tau_i^k)}) \left\{ \tilde{H}_i^{(\tau_i^k)} \right\} (\delta - \delta^{(\tau_i^k)})^\top
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

512 where for all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D}_i^{(\tau_i^k)} &= \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)} \left(y_i - S(\left(\delta^{(\tau_i^k)} \right)^\top z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)}) \right) \\ \tilde{H}_i^{(\tau_i^k)} &= \frac{1}{4M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)} (z_{i,m}^{(\tau_i^k)})^\top\end{aligned}$$

513 Minimizing the total surrogate (42) boils down to performing a quasi-Newton step. It is perhaps sen-
514 sible to apply some diagonal loading which is perfectly compatible with the surrogate interpretation
515 we just gave.

516 The logistic parameters are estimated as follows:

$$\delta^{(k)} = \arg \min_{\delta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\delta, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}})$$

517 where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\delta, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}})$ is the MC approximation of the MISO surrogate defined in
518 (41) and which leads to the following quasi-Newton step:

$$\delta^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta^{(\tau_i^k)} - (\tilde{H}^{(k)})^{-1} \tilde{D}^{(k)}$$

519 with $\tilde{D}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{D}_i^{(\tau_i^k)}$ and $\tilde{H}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{H}_i^{(\tau_i^k)}$.

520 **MISSO updates:** At the k -th iteration, and after the initialization, for all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, of the latent
521 variables $(z_i^{(0)})$, the MISSO algorithm consists in picking an index i_k uniformly on $\llbracket n \rrbracket$, complet-
522 ing the observations by sampling a Monte Carlo batch $\{z_{i_k, \text{mis}, m}^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(k)}}$ of missing values from the
523 conditional distribution $p(z_{i_k, \text{mis}} | z_{i_k, \text{obs}}, y_{i_k}; \theta^{(k-1)})$ using an MCMC sampler and computing the
524 estimated parameters as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta^{(k)} &= \arg \min_{\beta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega^{(k)}, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} z_{i,m}^{(k)} \\ \Omega^{(k)} &= \arg \min_{\Omega \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta^{(k)}, \Omega, \theta^{(\tau_i^k)}, \{z_{i,m}\}_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_{(\tau_i^k)}} w_{i,m}^{(k)} \\ \delta^{(k)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta^{(\tau_i^k)} - (\tilde{H}^{(k)})^{-1} \tilde{D}^{(k)}.\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$

525 where $z_{i,m}^{(k)} = (z_{i, \text{mis}, m}^{(k)}, z_{i, \text{obs}})$ is composed of a simulated and an observed part, $\tilde{D}^{(k)} =$
526 $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{D}_i^{(\tau_i^k)}$, $\tilde{H}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{H}_i^{(\tau_i^k)}$ and $w_{i,m}^{(k)} = z_{i,m}^{(k)} (z_{i,m}^{(k)})^\top - \beta^{(k)} (\beta^{(k)})^\top$. Be-
527 sides, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta}, \{z_m\}_{m=1}^M)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta}, \{z_m\}_{m=1}^M)$ are defined as MC approximation of
528 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta})$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(2)}(\beta, \Omega, \bar{\theta})$, for all $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ as components of the surrogate function (40).

529 D.2 Incremental Variational Inference

530 D.2.1 Bayesian LeNet-5 Architecture

531 We describe in Table 1 the architecture of the Convolutional Neural Network introduced in [LeCun
532 et al., 1998] and trained on MNIST:

layer type	width	stride	padding	input shape	nonlinearity
convolution (5×5)	6	1	0	$1 \times 32 \times 32$	ReLU
max-pooling (2×2)		2	0	$6 \times 28 \times 28$	
convolution (5×5)	6	1	0	$1 \times 14 \times 14$	ReLU
max-pooling (2×2)		2	0	$16 \times 10 \times 10$	
fully-connected	120			400	ReLU
fully-connected	84			120	ReLU
fully-connected	10			84	

Table 1: LeNet-5 architecture

533 D.2.2 Bayesian ResNet-18 Architecture

534 We describe in Table 2 the architecture of the Resnet-18 we train on CIFAR-10:

layer type	Output Size	ResNet-18	nonlinearity
conv1	$112 \times 112 \times 64$	$7 \times 7, 64$, stride 2	ReLU
conv2x	$56 \times 56 \times 64$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 \times 3, 64 \\ 3 \times 3, 64 \end{pmatrix} \times 2$	ReLU
conv3x	$28 \times 28 \times 128$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 \times 3, 128 \\ 3 \times 3, 128 \end{pmatrix} \times 2$	ReLU
conv4x	$14 \times 14 \times 256$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 \times 3, 256 \\ 3 \times 3, 256 \end{pmatrix} \times 2$	ReLU
conv5x	$7 \times 7 \times 512$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 \times 3, 512 \\ 3 \times 3, 512 \end{pmatrix} \times 2$	ReLU
average pool	$1 \times 1 \times 512$	7×7 average pool	ReLU
fully connected	1000	512×1000 fully connections	
softmax	1000		

Table 2: ResNet-18 architecture

535 D.2.3 Algorithms updates

536 First, we initialize the means $\mu_\ell^{(0)}$ for $\ell \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and variance estimates $\sigma^{(0)}$. At iteration k , minimizing
537 the sum of stochastic surrogates defined as in (6) and (13) yields the following MISSO update —
538 **step (i)** pick a function index i_k uniformly on $\llbracket n \rrbracket$; **step (ii)** sample a Monte Carlo batch $\{z_m^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M(k)}$
539 from $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$; and **step (iii)** update the parameters as

$$\mu_\ell^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\ell^{(\tau_i^k)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(k)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma^{(\tau_i^k)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i}^{(k)}, \quad (44)$$

540 where we define the following gradient terms for all $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k)} &= -\frac{1}{M(k)} \sum_{m=1}^{M(k)} \nabla_w \log p(y_i | x_i, w) \Big|_{w=t(\theta^{(k-1)}, z_m^{(k)})} + \nabla_{\mu_\ell} d(\theta^{(k-1)}), \\ \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i}^{(k)} &= -\frac{1}{M(k)} \sum_{m=1}^{M(k)} z_m^{(k)} \nabla_w \log p(y_i | x_i, w) \Big|_{w=t(\theta^{(k-1)}, z_m^{(k)})} + \nabla_{\sigma} d(\theta^{(k-1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

541 For all benchmark algorithms, we pick, at iteration k , a function index i_k uniformly on $\llbracket n \rrbracket$ and
542 sample a Monte Carlo batch $\{z_m^{(k)}\}_{m=1}^{M(k)}$ from the standard Gaussian distribution. The updates of the
543 parameters μ_ℓ for all $\ell \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and σ break down as follows:

544 **Monte Carlo SAG update:** Set

$$\mu_\ell^{(k)} = \mu_\ell^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(k)} = \sigma^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i}^{(k)},$$

545 where $\hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k)} = \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k-1)}$ and $\hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i}^{(k)} = \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i}^{(k-1)}$ for $i \neq i_k$ and are defined by (45) for $i = i_k$. The learning
 546 rate is set to $\gamma = 10^{-3}$.

547 **Bayes By Backprop update:** Set

$$\mu_\ell^{(k)} = \mu_\ell^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i_k}^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(k)} = \sigma^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i_k}^{(k)},$$

548 where the learning rate $\gamma = 10^{-3}$.

549 **Monte Carlo Momentum update:** Set

$$\mu_\ell^{(k)} = \mu_\ell^{(k-1)} + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(k)} = \sigma^{(k-1)} + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma^{(k)},$$

550 where

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\mu_\ell, i}^{(k)} = \alpha \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i_k}^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma^{(k)} = \alpha \hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i_k}^{(k)},$$

551 where α and γ , respectively the momentum and the learning rates, are set to 10^{-3} .

552 **Monte Carlo ADAM update:** Set

$$\mu_\ell^{(k)} = \mu_\ell^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} / (\sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)}} + \epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(k)} = \sigma^{(k-1)} - \frac{\gamma}{n} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_\sigma^{(k)} / (\sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{m}}_\sigma^{(k)}} + \epsilon),$$

553 where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} &= \mathbf{m}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k-1)} / (1 - \rho_1^k) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{m}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} = \rho_1 \mathbf{m}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k-1)} + (1 - \rho_1) \hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i_k}^{(k)}, \\ \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} &= \mathbf{v}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k-1)} / (1 - \rho_2^k) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{v}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k)} = \rho_2 \mathbf{v}_{\mu_\ell}^{(k-1)} + (1 - \rho_2) (\hat{\delta}_{\mu_\ell, i_k}^{(k)})^2 \end{aligned}$$

554 and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_\sigma^{(k)} &= \mathbf{m}_\sigma^{(k-1)} / (1 - \rho_1^k) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{m}_\sigma^{(k)} = \rho_1 \mathbf{m}_\sigma^{(k-1)} + (1 - \rho_1) \hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i_k}^{(k)}, \\ \hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma^{(k)} &= \mathbf{v}_\sigma^{(k-1)} / (1 - \rho_2^k) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{v}_\sigma^{(k)} = \rho_2 \mathbf{v}_\sigma^{(k-1)} + (1 - \rho_2) (\hat{\delta}_{\sigma, i_k}^{(k)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

555 The hyperparameters are set as follows: $\gamma = 10^{-3}$, $\rho_1 = 0.9$, $\rho_2 = 0.999$, $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$.