

Todo list

■	Improve quality of presentation in order to merge this part with more cultivated sections of the thesis.	6
■	What solutions were offered to deal with confounding? Start from propensity scores.	7
■	Formulate improved version with Bernstein.	8
■	Formulate better transition to weights with estimated propensity score. . . .	8
■	Elaborate on assumptions. For example (iii) [vdvW13, §2.7.1] [vdV00, §19.9]	9
■	Streamline analysis of second term.	10
■	Streamline analysis of third term.	11
■	Continue section with rates for right outcome model and then both models right. Do the rates improve?	11
■	Introduce concept of semiparametric efficiency. For the semiparametric efficiency bound of propensity score weighting, [Hah98] is a good reference. General introduction to semiparametric models see [vdV00, §25].	12
■	Elaborate on assumptions. Give as a counterexample	
	$f(x) := (1 + \delta_{x \geq 0})(x^2 + x \cdot \lambda)$	
	13
■	Consider Non-negativity constraints only for $f(x) = x \log x$. Incorporating Non-negativity constraint for general f is complicated or impossible. Maybe find counterexample.	14
■	Continue with paraphrase of [WZ19, page 20]	16
■	Give explanation why simple estimates are insufficient. See notes.	19
■	Solve editorial issue with ball.	21
■	Order results to give pretty proof.	23
■	Simplify proof with properties of relative interiors.	25
■	Add comment on nomenclature. What is Legendre transformation in this context?	26
■	Include lemma on convex conjugates of indicator functions. This should be straightforward.	26

Streamline example. Provide explanaiton in the end. Confer [Roc70, bottom p.337]	26
Find right moment to introduce nomenclature for optimization problem. See also end of Tseng Bertsekas chapter.	28
Insert lemma in chapter 1.	29
Generalize also to take equality constraints. Write in unconstrained form to derive dual.	30
Read and understand proof (p.270)	31
Read and understand proof (p.80)	31
Provide details. See notes.	32
Apply to estimate [CGT12, above (A.4)] to get intrinsic dimension version of Rosenthal-Pinelis inequality.	41

Robust Weighting and Matching Techniques for Causal Inference in Observational Studies with Continuous Treatment

Universität Stuttgart



Universität Stuttgart

Ioan Scheffel

January 17, 2023

Contents

1	Balancing Weights	5
1.1	Double Robustness	5
1.1.1	Learning Rates of the weighted mean	5
1.2	Error Decompositions	12
1.3	Application of Convex Optimization	13
1.4	Application of Matrix Concentration Inequalities	16
2	Convex Analysis	21
2.1	A Convex Analysis Primer	21
2.2	Conjugate Calculus and Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem	26
2.3	Tseng Bertsekas	30
3	Random Matrix Inequalities	35
3.1	A Matrix Analysis Primer	35
3.2	Matrix Khintchin Inequality and Applications	36
3.3	Generalized Inequalities by Hermitian Dilation	38
3.4	Intrinsic Dimension	40
4	Empirical Processes	43
4.1	A Primer on Empirical Processes	43
5	Simple yet useful Calculations	45

1 Balancing Weights

1.1 Double Robustness

By double robustness we mean the property of an estimator that it is consistent if either one of treatment or outcome model is well specified. The augmented weighting estimator was designed to have exactly this property. Surprisingly, the weighted mean estimator in the balancing weights approach of [WZ19] retains this feature despite its simplicity [ZP17]. In the following we explore double robustness in the weighted mean estimator from the perspective of learning rates. We will adopt a similar notion of learning rates as in [SC08]. To the best of our knowledge this approach is new. Indeed, the existing literature is mostly concerned with consistency and treats learning rates somewhat superficially.

1.1.1 Learning Rates of the weighted mean

What is the speed of convergence in the weak law of large numbers? The next statement gives a clear-cut answer: The arithmetic mean of independent, identically distributed, square-integrable random variables learns with rate $n^{-1/2}$. Furthermore, using Bienaymé's formula and Chebyshev's inequality, the statement is easy to prove (cf. [Kle20, Theorem 5.14]).

Theorem. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. square-integrable random variables with $V := \text{Var}[X_1] < \infty$. Then, for any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbf{E}[X_i]) \right| \leq \sqrt{V} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \geq 1 - \tau. \quad (1.1)$$

Reflection. Bernsteins's inequality yields better confidence. ♠

Theorem 1.1. (Bernstein's inequality) *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space, $B > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ be real numbers, and $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Furthermore, let $X_1, \dots, X_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be independent random variables satisfying $\mathbf{E}[X_i] = 0$, $\|X_i\|_\infty \leq B$ and*

1 Balancing Weights

$\mathbf{E}[X_i^2] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(e/\tau)}{n}} + \frac{2B \log(e/\tau)}{3n} \right] \geq 1 - \tau, \quad \tau > 0.$$

Proof. Confer [SC08, Theorem 6.12] for the one-sided version. The two-sided version, as stated in the above theorem, is an easy consequence. We omit the details. \square

$$\sqrt{2}(\sigma \vee B) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \log(e/\tau)$$

Improve quality of presentation in order to merge this part with more cultivated sections of the thesis.

Deriving learning rates in this way, we call for *observed outcomes* of the treated matching *marginal potential outcomes* under treatment, that is,

$$Y(1) | T = 1 \sim \mathbf{P}_{Y(1)}. \quad (1.2)$$

In practice, virtually every scenario violates this assumption. Compare the health of an otherwise thriving smoker with that of an asthmatic nonsmoker. Or the dropout rates of study programs with and without compulsory entrance examinations. Indeed, any unbalanced external influence on both treatment and outcome ruins the above assessment. We speak of a **confounded** scenario, and the unbalanced external influence is called a **confounder**. When regarding the health risks of smoking, indicators of asthma, such as frequent cough or shortness of breath, are confounders. We emphasize that they are so, not merely by being signs of bad health, but because asthmatics are also less likely to smoke.

Let us take a moment to understand the word “to confound”.

Theorem 1.2. (Work in progress) *The verb to confound has nuances of meaning [zot]*

to throw (a person) into confusion

in this case the Statistician or whoever wishes to inform his decisions on the basis of data.

refute

A change of effect when stratifying is a strong refutation.

to put to shame

To embarrass some on who used invalid analysis as an argument in a public debate.

damn

to fail to discern differences between : mix up

*Maybe in the sense of conflate: see causal effects where there are non.
 to increase the confusion of
 after a change of effect. what should be trusted?
 baffle, frustrate
 yield to this and stop asking causal questions.
 archaic : to bring to ruin
 ruin the analysis, assesment.
 obsolete : consume, waste
 waste the effort of conducting the analysis.*

Short, confounding is nasty.

Encouraging practitioners to address confounding in their investigations, the statistical literature coins the term *Simpson's paradox*. It relates to surprising changes of effect in subclasses of the data (cf. [Wag82] for a brief discussion of Simpson's paradox and some real world examples). Use non-probabilistic frameworks, such as causal framework. Despite widespread acceptance, their use in empirical data analysis is still subject to debate [Pea09, §6].

What solutions were offered to deal with confounding? Start from propensity scores.

Statisticians have wrestled with this issue for nearly a century.

In experimental studies we usually specify treatment assignment as opposed to merely observing a unit receiving treatment.

The next statement makes use of the propensity score.

Theorem. *Consider the weighted mean estimator with weights*

$$w_i = \frac{1}{n} \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i)}. \quad (1.3)$$

Denote $V := \mathbf{E}[(Y(1))^2 / \pi(X)] - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]^2$. Assume that weak unconfoundedness holds. Then, for any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)] \right| \leq \sqrt{V} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \geq 1 - \tau. \quad (1.4)$$

Proof. We want to reinforce coherent use of the weak law of large numbers. To this end, we verify

$$\begin{aligned} n \mathbf{E}[w(T, X) Y(T)] &= \mathbf{E}[Y(1)], \\ n^2 \mathbf{Var}[w(T, X) Y(T)] &= \mathbf{E}[(Y(1))^2 / \pi(X)] - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

1 Balancing Weights

Essentially, the random weight $w(T, X)$ acts on $Y(T)$ through $T / \pi(X)$. It does so by inducing independence of observed outcome $Y(T)$ and treatment T . This requires that weak unconfoundedness holds, i.e.,

$$(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp T \mid X. \quad (1.5)$$

To showcase the details we added an n and n^2 factor in the above display. The calculations go as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} n \mathbf{E}[w(T, X) Y(T)] &= \mathbf{E}[Y(T) \cdot (T / \pi(X))] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Y(1) / \pi(X) \mid T = 1] \cdot \mathbf{P}[T = 1] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{E}[Y(1) \mid X = x, T = 1] \cdot (\mathbf{P}[T = 1] / \pi(x)) \mathbf{P}_{X|T}(dx \mid 1) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} [Y(1) \mid X = x] \mathbf{P}_X(dx) = \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

The first equality holds because of the definition of the weights. The second, third and last equality stem from $T \in \{0, 1\}$, and the law of total expectation, applied with T and X . The fourth equality is justified by the assumption of weak unconfoundedness. The density transformation is due to Bayes's Theorem. With slight modifications in the above argument, it follows

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left(Y(T) \cdot (T / \pi(X)) \right)^2 \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[(Y(1))^2 / \pi(X) \right]. \quad (1.7)$$

We omit the details. Invoking the weak law of large numbers finishes the proof. \square

Formulate improved version with Bernstein.

Formulate better transition to weights with estimated propensity score.

We started by asking an easy question, so it is time for a more challenging one: How do we proceed in deriving learning rates if the propensity score is unknown. How do we generally procede? [what has been done in the past. Why are some methods obsolete] A naive answer would be: We hope to select a proper model and try to estimate the propensity score. Stunningly, a lot of practitioners still settle for obsolete methods when it comes to propensity score analysis.

Next, we consider the event that we have a consistent estimator of the propensity score and the distribution of the covariate vector X , along with that of the outcome Y , has compact support. The next assumptions reduce the technical task to a minimum.

Assumptions. *Let the following hold.*

- (i) There exists $C_Y \geq 1$ such that $|Y(1)| \leq C_Y$ almost surely.
- (ii) There exists $C_\pi > 0$ such that $C_\pi < \pi(X)$ almost surely.
- (iii) There exists a function class \mathcal{F} with unit ball $B_{\mathcal{F}} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ such that $\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, B_{\mathcal{F}}, L_2(\mathbf{P})) \leq C_{\mathcal{F}}(1/\varepsilon)^{1/k}$ for some $k > 1/2$ and some constant $C_{\mathcal{F}} \geq 1$.
- (iv) The random function f_w defined by $f_w(T, X, Y) := \left(n w(X) - \frac{1}{\pi(X)}\right) T Y$ satisfies $f_w \in \mathcal{F}$ almost surely.
- (v) There exist a learning rate (r_n) , confidence constants (γ_τ) and uniform constant $C_w \geq 1$ such that for all $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds $\mathbf{P} \left[\left\| w(X) - \frac{1}{\pi(X)} \right\|_\infty \leq C_w c_\tau \varepsilon_n \right] \geq 1 - \tau$
- (vi) There exists $\alpha > 1$ such that $\varepsilon_n \cdot c_{n^{-\alpha}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_n \cdot c_{n^{-\alpha}} \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Elaborate on assumptions. For example (iii) [vdvW13, §2.7.1] [vdV00, §19.9]

Theorem. Let the assumptions. Then the weighted mean learns with rate (ε_n) defined by

$$\varepsilon_n := \inf \{ t \in (0, 1] : r_n \cdot \gamma_{t/n} \leq t \} \wedge 1 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, it has confidence constants (c_τ) given by

$$c_\tau = \gamma_\tau / \tau \tag{1.8}$$

and uniform constant

$$C_{\mathbf{P}} = \max \left\{ \sqrt{C_{\mathcal{F}}} C_w, C_Y C_w, \frac{C_Y}{C_\pi} \right\} \tag{1.9}$$

Proof. We consider the following error decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i Y_i - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i)} (Y_i - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]) + \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \left(w_i - \frac{1}{n \pi(X_i)} \right) Y_i \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i)} (Y_i - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{G}_n f_w \\ & \quad - \mathbf{E}[f_w(T, X, Y)]. \end{aligned}$$

1 Balancing Weights

We already bounded the first term. To bound the remaining terms we will use the learning rates of w . To this end, we employ maximal inequalities for empirical processes to bound the second term. We bound the third term by the law of total expectation and balancing learning rates and confidence.

2nd term

Denote $\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau} := (C_Y C_w \gamma_\tau r_n) \cdot B_{\mathcal{F}} =: \delta_{n,\tau} \cdot B_{\mathcal{F}}$. It holds by maximal inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}^* \left[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}} \right] &\leq \int_0^{\delta_{n,\tau}} \sqrt{\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon/\delta_{n,\tau}, B_{\mathcal{F}}, L_2(\mathbf{P}))} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_0^{\delta_{n,\tau}} \left(\frac{\delta_{n,\tau}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1/(2k)} d\varepsilon = \delta_{n,\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

For $t > 0$, Markov's inequality gives

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}}^* \geq t \right] \leq \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}}^* \right] \leq \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}^* \left[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}} \right] \leq \frac{\delta_{n,\tau}}{t}, \quad (1.10)$$

and consequently

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}}^* \leq \frac{1}{\tau} C_Y C_w \gamma_\tau r_n \right] \geq 1 - \tau \quad (1.11)$$

Next, note that

$$\|f_w\|_\infty \leq C_Y \left\| nw - \frac{1}{\pi(X)} \right\| \leq C_Y C_w \gamma_\tau r_n \quad (1.12)$$

with probability greater than $1 - \tau$. Thus $f_w \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}$ with probability greater than $1 - \tau$. It follows

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\mathbb{G}_n f_w \leq \frac{1}{\tau} C_Y C_w \gamma_\tau r_n \right] \geq 1 - 2\tau. \quad (1.13)$$

Streamline analysis of second term.

3rd term

We localize with regards to $f_w \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\tau}$. We require the weights to be smaller than 1, such that we always have $\|nw - \frac{1}{\pi}\| \leq n + \frac{1}{C_\pi}$.

$$\mathbf{E}[f_w] \leq C_Y C_w \gamma_\tau r_n (1 - \tau) + C_Y \left(n + \frac{1}{C_\pi} \right) \tau \quad (1.14)$$

$$\leq C_Y \left(C_w \gamma_\tau r_n + \left(n + \frac{1}{C_\pi} \right) \tau \right). \quad (1.15)$$

If we choose $\tau = \varepsilon_n$ we get

$$\mathbf{E}[f_w] \leq C_Y \left(C_w + 1 + \frac{1}{C_\pi} \right) \varepsilon_n. \quad (1.16)$$

Selecting the worst instance of learning rate, confidence and uniform constant concludes the proof.

Streamline analysis of third term.

□

Reflection. Why did we use empirical process theory instead of conventional concentration inequalities? The weights w are random, so f_w is random as well.

Best is $\gamma_\tau = 1$, when we recover the learning rate of the estimator, that is, (r_n) . The confidence γ_τ/τ is substandard. Improvements may involve Bernstein like concentration for empirical processes (cf. [vdvW13, Section 2.14.2]) ♠

Continue section with rates for right outcome model and then both models right.
Do the rates improve?

Next we need to assume that the weights and outcome are independent given treatment and covariates, that is,

$$Y(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp w \mid X, T. \quad (1.17)$$

Also the bias of the outcome regression has to be bounded by the weights. We get the following error decomposition

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n n w_i T_i (Y_i - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)|X_i]) + (\mathbf{E}[Y(1)|X_i] - \mathbf{E}[Y(1)]) \quad (1.18)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i w_i - 1/n) (\mathbf{E}[Y(1)|X_i] - B(X_i)\lambda) \quad (1.19)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i - 1/n) B(X_i)\lambda \quad (1.20)$$

The expectation of summand in the first term is zero. Hence the convergence by wlln or more refined methods. The second term goes to 0 by the consistency of the outcome regression. The third term is bounded by the weights.

$$\mathbf{E}[T w \cdot (Y(T) - \mathbf{E}[Y(1) | X])] = \mathbf{E}[T \cdot \mathbf{E}[w | T, X] \cdot \mathbf{E}[Y(T) - Y(1) | T, X]] = 0$$

The first equality stems from the conditional independence assumptions. The resulting term vanishes because the difference $Y(T) - Y(1)$ does so after conditioning on $T = 1$.

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i w_i - 1/n) (\mathbf{E}[Y(1)|X_i] - B(X_i) \lambda) \right| \leq 2 \max_{i=1, \dots, n} |\mathbf{E}[Y(1)|X_i] - B(X_i) \lambda| \quad (1.21)$$

$$\leq 2 \text{ learning rate triple of regression} \quad (1.22)$$

with probability greater than $1 - \tau$. Note, that the weights sum to 1. Assume $|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i w_i - 1/n) B_k(X_i)| \leq \delta_k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and the deltas go to zero with some rate. The by Cauchy-Schwarz it follows

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i w_i - 1/n) B(X_i) \cdot \lambda \right| \leq |\langle (\delta_k), \lambda \rangle| \leq \text{rate of deltas} \cdot \|\lambda\| \quad (1.23)$$

So we assume $\lambda \in \Theta$, where the parameter space Θ is compact or grows moderately with K .

Introduce concept of semiparametric efficiency. For the semiparametric efficiency bound of propensity score weighting, [Hah98] is a good reference. General introduction to semiparametric models see [vdV00, §25].

Takeaways Each error decomposition furnishes information about the asymptotic properties of the weighted mean. We always get consistency, but learning rates may differ. Obtaining good confidence depends on employing more refined concentration inequalities like Bernstein's inequality. If both treatment and outcome model are well specified we reach the semiparametric efficiency bound of weighting with the true inverse propensity score.

1.2 Error Decompositions

In this section we extend the weighting scheme to estimating the marginal distribution of the outcome. We extend the error decomposition in [WZ19, page 27]

The following decomposition is flexible in Φ . We get different causal estimands $\mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y(1))]$, for example, the population average of $Y(1)$ for $\Phi(Y) = Y$, that is, $\mathbf{E}[Y(1)]$. Likewise we get the distribution function of $Y(1)$ at t for $\Phi(Y) = \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, t]}(Y)$, that is, $\mathbf{P}[Y(1) \leq t]$.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i \Phi(Y_i) - \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y(1))] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i + R_0 + R_1 + R_2, \quad (1.24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &:= \frac{T_i}{\pi_i} (\Phi(Y_i) - \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y_i(1))|X_i]) + (\mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y_i(1))|X_i] - \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y(1))]) \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ R_0 &:= \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \left(w_i - \frac{1}{n\pi_i} \right) (\Phi(Y_i) - \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y_i(1))|X_i]), \\ R_1 &:= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_i w_i - \frac{1}{n} \right) (\mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y_i(1))|X_i] - B(X_i)^\top \lambda), \\ R_2 &:= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(T_i w_i - \frac{1}{n} \right) B(X_i)^\top \lambda \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^K. \end{aligned}$$

We can even view $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i$ as an empirical process $\mathbb{G}_n f$ indexed over

$$f_\Phi(T, X, Y) = \frac{T}{\pi(X)} (\Phi(Y) - \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y)|X]) + \mathbf{E}[\Phi(Y)|X]. \quad (1.25)$$

If $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\Phi : \Phi \in \text{some set}\}$ is \mathbf{P} -Donsker, the empirical process converges to a tight gaussian process. Then the functional delta Method is applicable.

A plethora of applications of the delta method to estimates of the distribution function are to be found in [vdV00] and [vdvW13]. This includes Quantile estimation [vdV00, §21] [vdvW13, §3.9.21/24], survival analysis via Nelson-Aalen and Kaplan-Meier estimator [vdvW13, §3.9.19/31], Wilcoxon Test [vdvW13, §3.9.4.1], and much more. Maybe Booststrapping from the weighted distribution is also sensible .

1.3 Application of Convex Optimization

Assumption 1.1. Assume that the map $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ has the following properties.

- (i) f is strictly convex.
- (ii) f is lower-semicontinuous and continuously differentiable on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(f))$.
- (iii) The derivative of f on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(f))$ is a diffeomorphism.
- (iv) The Legendre transformation f^* of f is finite.
- (v) The function $x \mapsto xt - f(x)$ takes its supremum on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(f))$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Assumption (i),(ii) and (iv) are from [TB91]. See corresponding section in the thesis. Assumption (iii) and (v) is needed to get a meaningful analytic expression for the weights after establishing the properties pointed out in [TB91].

Elaborate on assumptions. Give as a counterexample

$$f(x) := (1 + \delta_{x \geq 0})(x^2 + x \cdot \lambda)$$

We consider the following optimization problem.

Consider Non-negativity constraints only for $f(x) = x \log x$. Incorporating Non-negativity constraint for general f is complicated or impossible. Maybe find counterexample.

Problem 1.1.

$$\underset{w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n T_i f(w_i)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} w_i T_i &\geq 0, & i &= 1, \dots, n, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i &= 1 \\ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i B_k(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(X_i) \right| &\leq \delta_k, & k &= 1, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.3. *Under Assumption, the dual of the above Problem is the unconstrained optimization problem*

$$\underset{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^K}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n nT_i f^*(\langle B(X_i), \lambda \rangle) - \langle B(X_i), \lambda \rangle + \langle \delta, |\lambda| \rangle,$$

where $t \mapsto f^*(t) = t(f')^{-1}(t) - f((f')^{-1}(t))$ is the Legendre transformation of f , $B(X_i) = [B_1(X_i), \dots, B_K(X_i)]^\top$ denotes the K basis functions of the covariates of unit $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $|\lambda| = [|\lambda_1|, \dots, |\lambda_K|]^\top$, where $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value of a real-valued scalar. Moreover, if λ^\dagger is an optimal solution then

$$w_i^* = (f')^{-1}(\langle B(X_i), \lambda^\dagger \rangle), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

are the unique optimal solutions to (P).

Proof. We prove the following Lemma at the end of the section.

Lemma 1.1. *The dual of the optimization problem is*

$$\underset{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{2K}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n nT_i f^*(\langle Q_{\bullet,i}, \lambda \rangle) - \langle Q_{\bullet,i}, \lambda \rangle + \langle d, \lambda \rangle$$

subject to

$$\lambda_k \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \{1, \dots, K\},$$

where

$$Q := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) \\ -\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) := [B(X_1), \dots, B(X_n)], \quad \text{and} \quad d := \begin{bmatrix} 0_n \\ \delta \\ \delta \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. *Lemma* We write the optimization problem in the form of [TB91].

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{i=1}^n T_i f(w_i) \\
 & w_i T_i \geq 0, && i = 1, \dots, n, \\
 & \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i = 1 \\
 & \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i B_k(X_i) \geq -\delta_k + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(X_i) && k = 1, \dots, K \\
 & -\sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i B_k(X_i) \geq -\delta_k - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(X_i) && k = 1, \dots, K
 \end{aligned}$$

Next we write

$$\mathbf{Q} := \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}[T_1, \dots, T_n] \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) \\ -\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}) := [T_1 B(X_1), \dots, T_n B(X_n)], \quad \text{and} \quad d := \begin{bmatrix} 0_n \\ -\delta + \overline{B(\mathbf{X})} \\ -\delta - \overline{B(\mathbf{X})} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\overline{B(\mathbf{X})} := [\overline{B_1(\mathbf{X})}, \dots, \overline{B_K(\mathbf{X})}]^\top$ and $\overline{B_k(\mathbf{X})} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(X_i)$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{i=1}^n T_i f(w_i) \\
 & 1_n \cdot w = 0 \\
 & \mathbf{Q}w \geq d
 \end{aligned}$$

The convex conjugate is

$$\sum_{T_i=1} T_i f^*(\lambda_i) + \sum_{T_i=0} \delta_{\{0\}}(\lambda_i).$$

Since $\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet i} = 0_n$ if $T_i = 0$ we get the desired representation. Note that the equality constraint vanishes automatically. \square

Continue with paraphrase of [WZ19, page 20]

\square

1.4 Application of Matrix Concentration Inequalities

We extend the analysis to covariates with unbounded support. To the best of our knowledge this has not been done in this setting. Indeed, [WZ19, Assumption 1] only allows for covariates with bounded support. Our idea is to apply Matrix Moment Inequalities instead of Bernstein's inequality. We learned from this possibility from [Tro15, (6.1.6)]

Analysis of $\mathbf{E}[\max_{i \leq n} \|A_i\|^2]$

We start from the premise that the fourth moment of the random quantities $B_k(X_i)$ and $1/\pi_i$ is uniformly bounded in k and i .

Assumptions. (i) *There exists a constant $C_B \geq 1$ such that*

$$\mathbf{E}[B_k(X_i)^4] \leq C_B \quad \text{for all } (k, i) \in \{1, \dots, K\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

(ii) *There exists a constant $C_\pi \geq 1$ such that*

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\pi_i}\right)^4\right] \leq C_\pi \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Note, that these assumptions allow for covariate distributions with unbounded support. The coming example ought to reinforce this observation.

Example. Let us assume a logistic regression model for the propensity score. Then there exist coefficients $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\vartheta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ (N is the number of covariates and ϑ_0 is the intercept of the model) such that

$$1/\pi(X) = 1 + \exp(\vartheta_0 + \langle \vartheta, X \rangle), \quad (1.26)$$

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\pi(X)}\right)^4\right] = \sum_{j=1}^4 \binom{4}{j} e^{j\vartheta_0} M_X(j\vartheta), \quad (1.27)$$

where M_X is the moment-generating function of the random vector X (we assume it exists.). While the quantity in (1.26) may be unbounded when X has unbounded support, that in (1.27) remains bounded for moderate decay rates of the underlying distribution.

The multivariate normal distribution with location parameter $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{M}_N$ has moment-generating function

$$M_{N(\mu, \Sigma)}(t) = \exp\left(\langle t, \mu \rangle + \frac{\langle t, \Sigma t \rangle}{2}\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

In particular, the expression in (1.27) is finite if X follows a multivariate normal distribution.

Likewise we give a negative example. Let $N = 1$ and $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$, that is, only one exponentially distributed covariate is taken into account. The moment-generating function is then confined to take arguments $t < \lambda$, and thus (1.27) becomes pointless if $4\vartheta \geq \lambda$. \diamond

1 Balancing Weights

Next, we recall the entity we want to examin.

$$A_i = \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{T_i}{\pi_i} \right) B(X_i) \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we get the bound

$$\left| 1 - \frac{T_i}{\pi_i} \right| \leq \left(1 \vee \frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \right) \leq 1 + \frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} = \frac{1}{\pi_i}. \quad (1.28)$$

Let $i^* \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the index where $\|A_i\|$ attains its maximum.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{i \leq n} \|A_i\|^2 \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\|A_{i^*}\|^2 \right] \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{\|B(X_{i^*})\|}{\pi_{i^*}} \right)^2 \right] / n^2 \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\pi_{i^*}} \right)^4 \right]^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{E} \left[\|B(X_{i^*})\|^4 \right]^{1/2} / n^2 \\ &\leq K / n^2 \cdot \sqrt{C_\pi C_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.29)$$

The first inequality comes from the bound (1.28). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality provides the second inequality. In the last step we use the assumptions made at the start of the section. Paying the price of an extra n factor, the maximal inequality (1.29) yields a bound of the sum, that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\|A_i\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{K}{n} \sqrt{C_\pi C_B}$$

Assumption 1.2. .

Assumption 1.3. .

Remark 1.1. *With Assumption we also get a bound on the fourth moment of $\|B(X_i)\|$. Indeed, by the convexity of $x \mapsto x^2$, the monotonicity and linearity of the expectation it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\|B(X_i)\|^4] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K B_k^2(X_i) \right)^2 \right] = K^2 \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} B_k^2(X_i) \right)^2 \right] \leq K^2 \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} B_k^4(X_i) \right] \\ &= K \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} [B_k^4(X_i)] \leq K^2 C_B \end{aligned}$$

◇

Analysis of $v(\mathbf{S})$

We use the fact that $\|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2}$. It holds

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[A_i A_i^\top] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^2 B(X_i) B(X_i)^\top \right] = \frac{1}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^2 B_k(X_i) B_l(X_i) \right] \right)_{1 \leq k, l \leq K}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[A_i A_i^\top] \right\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[A_i A_i^\top] \right\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^2 B_k(X_i) B_l(X_i) \right] \right)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{E}[B_k(X_i)^4]^{\frac{1}{4}} \mathbf{E}[B_l(X_i)^4]^{\frac{1}{4}} \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{K}{n} \right)^2 C_\pi C_B \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[A_i^\top A_i] \right\|_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[A_i^\top A_i] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^2 \|B(X_i)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} \right)^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \|B(X_i)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{K}{n} \sqrt{C_\pi C_B} \end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$v(\mathbf{S}) \leq \frac{K}{n} \sqrt{C_\pi C_B}$$

Thus we can apply Theorem 3.3 to get

$$\mathbf{E}[\|\mathbf{S}\|_2] \leq \sqrt{2e \frac{K}{n} \sqrt{C_\pi C_B} \log(K+1)} + 4e \frac{\sqrt{K}}{n} \sqrt[4]{C_\pi C_B} \log(K+1) \leq 14C_\pi C_B \sqrt{\frac{K \log(K+1)}{n}}$$

Give explanation why simple estimates are insufficient. See notes.

2 Convex Analysis

In our application we want to analyse a convex optimization problem by its dual problem. In particular we want to obtain primal optimal solutions from dual solutions. To accomplish the task we need technical tools from convex analysis, mainly conjugate calculus and some KKT related results.

Our starting point is the support function intersection rule [MMN22, Theorem 4.23]. We give the details in the case of finite dimensions and refer for the rest of the proof to the book. The conjugate sum rule is applied to give first conjugate sum and then chain rule, which are vital to calculating convex conjugates. The proofs are omitted, since the book is thorough enough. The well known Fenchel-Rockafellar Duality theorem is a corollary of conjugate sum and chain rule. It gives general conditions under which dual and primal values coincide. The material we present is very well known, so we claim no originality. We paraphrase the approach of [MMN22] to Duality. As an introduction, we recommend this recently published book together with the classical reference [Roc70].

We finish the chapter with ideas from [TB91]. They provide the high-level ideas to obtain for strictly convex functions a dual relationship between optimal solutions. We will deliver the details that are omitted in the paper.

2.1 A Convex Analysis Primer

Excursively, we present some well known definitions and facts from convex analysis. For details, see, e.g., [MMN22].

A subset $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is called **convex set**, if for all $x, y \in C$ and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we have $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in C$. The Cartesian product of convex sets is convex. The intersection of a collection of convex sets is also convex.

Given (not necessary convex) sets $\Omega, \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, define the **set addition** and **multiplication** by a real scalar as $\Omega_1 + \Omega_2 := \{x_1 + x_2 : x_1 \in \Omega_1, x_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ and $\lambda\Omega := \{\lambda x : x \in \Omega\}$. For convex sets the addition and multiplication by a real scalar are convex.

Throughout this section, we shall denote by $B := \{x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)^{1/2} \leq 1\}$

Solve editorial issue with ball.

the **Euclidian unit ball** in \mathbb{R}^n . This is a closed convex set. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the **ball with radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and center a** is given by $\{a + x \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon\} = a + \varepsilon B$. For any set Ω in \mathbb{R}^n , the set of points x whose distance from Ω does not exceed ε is $\Omega + \varepsilon B$. The **closure** $\text{cl}(\Omega)$ and **interior** $\text{int}(\Omega)$ of Ω can therefore be expressed by $\text{cl}(\Omega) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \Omega + \varepsilon B$ and $\text{int}(\Omega) = \{x \in \Omega : \text{there exists } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that } x + \varepsilon B \subseteq \Omega\}$.

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is called **affine set**, if $\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y \in A$ for all $x, y \in A$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. The **affine hull** $\text{aff}(\Omega)$ of a set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the smallest affine set that includes Ω . A mapping $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is called **affine mapping** if there exist a linear mapping $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $A(x) = L(x) + b$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The image and inverse image/preimage of convex sets under affine mappings are also convex.

Because the notion of interior is not precise enough for our purposes we define the relative interior which is the interior relative to the affine hull. This concept is motivated by the fact that a line segment embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 does have a natural interior in \mathbb{R} which is not a true interior in \mathbb{R}^2 . The relative interior of C is defined as the interior which results when C is regarded as a subset of its affine hull.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We define the **relative interior** of Ω by

$$\text{ri}(\Omega) := \{x \in \Omega : \text{there exists } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that } (x + \varepsilon B) \cap \text{aff}(\Omega) \subset \Omega\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Next we collect some useful properties of relative interiors.

Proposition 2.1. Let C be a non-empty convex set in \mathbb{R}^n . Then we get the representation

- (i) $\text{ri}(C) = \{z \in C : \text{for all } x \in C \text{ there exists } t > 0 \text{ such that } z + t(z - x) \in C\}$.
- (ii) $\text{ri}(C) \neq \emptyset$ if $C \neq \emptyset$.
- (iii) $\text{cl}(C)$ and $\text{ri}(C)$ are convex sets.
- (iv) $\text{cl}(\text{ri}(C)) = \text{cl}(C)$ and $\text{ri}(\text{cl}(C)) = \text{ri}(C)$.
- (v) Suppose $\bigcap_{i \in I} C_i \neq \emptyset$ for a finite index set I . Then $\text{ri}(\bigcap_{i \in I} C_i) = \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{ri}(C_i)$.
- (vi) Let $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a linear mapping. Then $\text{ri}(L(C)) = L(\text{ri}(C))$. If additionally it holds $L^{-1}(\text{ri}(C)) \neq \emptyset$ we have $\text{ri}(L^{-1}(C)) = L^{-1}(\text{ri}(C))$.
- (vii) $\text{ri}(C_1 \times C_2) = \text{ri}(C_1) \times \text{ri}(C_2)$.
- (viii) $\text{ri}(C_1) \cap \text{ri}(C_2) = \emptyset$ if and only if $0 \notin \text{ri}(C_1 - C_2)$.

Order results to give pretty proof.

Proof. (i) [Roc70, Theorem 6.4]

(ii) [Roc70, Theorem 6.2]

(iii) [Roc70, Theorem 6.2]

(iv) [Roc70, Theorem 6.3]

(v) [Roc70, Theorem 6.5]

(vi) [Roc70, Theorem 6.6-6.7]

(vii) Let $(z_1, z_2) \in \text{ri}(C_1 \times C_2)$. Then for all $(x_1, x_2) \in C_1 \times C_2$ there exists $t > 0$ such that

$$z_i + t(z_i - x_i) \in C_i \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (2.2)$$

This proves \subseteq . Suppose $z_1 \in \text{ri}(C_1)$ and $z_2 \in \text{ri}(C_2)$. Let $(x_1, x_2) \in C_1 \times C_2$ with If $t_1 = t_2$ everything is clear. W.l.o.g. assume $t_1 < t_2$. Define $\theta := \frac{t_1}{t_2} \in (0, 1)$. By the convexity of C_2 it follows

$$z_2 + t_1(z_2 - x_2) = \theta(z_2 + t_2(z_2 - x_2)) + (1 - \theta)z_2 \in C_2. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus $(z_1, z_2) \in \text{ri}(C_1 \times C_2)$. This proves \supseteq and equality.

(viii) [MMN22, Theorem 2.92]

□

We proceed with convex separation results which are vital to the subsequent developments.

Definition 2.2. Let C_1 and C_2 be two non-empty convex sets in \mathbb{R}^n . A hyperplane H is said to **separate** C_1 and C_2 if C_1 is contained in one of the closed half-spaces associated with H and C_2 lies in the opposite closed half-space. It is said to **separate** C_1 and C_2 **properly** if C_1 and C_2 are not both actually contained in H itself.

Theorem 2.1. Let C_1 and C_2 be two non-empty convex sets in \mathbb{R}^n . There exists a hyperplane separating C_1 and C_2 properly if and only if there exists a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in C_2} \langle x, b \rangle \leq \inf_{x \in C_1} \langle x, b \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x \in C_2} \langle x, b \rangle < \sup_{x \in C_1} \langle x, b \rangle. \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. [Roc70, Theorem 11.1]

□

Theorem 2.2. (Convex separation in finite dimension) *Let C_1 and C_2 be two non-empty convex sets in \mathbb{R}^n . Then C_1 and C_2 can be properly separated if and only if $\text{ri}(C_1) \cap \text{ri}(C_2) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. [Roc70, Theorem 11.3] □

Definition 2.3. *Given a nonempty subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ the **support function** $\sigma_\Omega : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ of Ω is defined by*

$$\sigma_\Omega(x^*) := \sup_{x \in \Omega} \langle x^*, x \rangle \quad \text{for } x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.5)$$

Definition 2.4. *Given functions $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ the **infimal convolution** of these functions is defined as*

$$(f_1 \square \dots \square f_m)(x) := \inf_{\substack{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \sum_{i=1}^m x_i = x}} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x_i) \quad (2.6)$$

The next result establishes a connection between the support function of the intersection of two convex sets and the infimal convolution of the support functions of the sets taken by themselves. The proof translates the geometric concept of convex separation to the world of convex functions.

Theorem 2.3. *Let C_1 and C_2 be two non-empty convex sets in \mathbb{R}^n with $\text{ri}(C_1) \cap \text{ri}(C_2) \neq \emptyset$. Then the support function of the intersection $C_1 \cap C_2$ is represented as*

$$(\sigma_{C_1 \cap C_2})(x^*) = (\sigma_{C_1} \square \sigma_{C_2})(x^*) \quad \text{for all } x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.7)$$

Furthermore, for any $x^ \in \text{dom}(\sigma_{C_1 \cap C_2})$ there exist dual elements $x_1^*, x_2^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x^* = x_1^* + x_2^*$. and*

$$(\sigma_{C_1 \cap C_2})(x^*) = \sigma_{C_1}(x_1^*) + \sigma_{C_2}(x_2^*). \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. [MMN22, Theorem 4.23] We want to use results on convex separation. To make the geometric property of convex separation fruitful to our purpose we consider two special sets. We will verify that these sets meet the requirements for convex separation, i.e., that they are convex and the intersection of their relative interiors is empty. The rest of the proof is as in the cited reference at the beginning of the proof. To this end, consider the sets

$$\Theta_1 := C_1 \times [0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_2 := \{(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \in C_2 \text{ and } \lambda \leq \langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Simplify proof with properties of relative interiors.

Clearly, Θ_1 is convex by the convexity of C_1 . To see that Θ_2 is convex consider the affine function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(x, \lambda) \mapsto \alpha - \langle x^*, x \rangle - \lambda$. From the definitions of φ and Θ_2 we get the identity

$$\Theta_2 = (C_2 \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \varphi^{-1}(-\infty, 0].$$

Thus, by the convexity of the sets C_2 and $\varphi^{-1}(-\infty, 0]$ it follows the convexity of Θ_2 . Next we show that the relative interiors of Θ_1 and Θ_2 do not intersect, i.e., $\text{ri } \Theta_1 \cap \text{ri } \Theta_2 = \emptyset$. First note that

$$\text{ri}(\Theta_1) = \text{ri}(C_1) \times \text{ri}([0, \infty)) \subseteq \text{ri}(C_1) \times (0, \infty). \quad (2.10)$$

Indeed, if $0 \in \text{ri}([0, \infty))$ then there exists $t > 0$ such that $-tx \geq 0$ for some $x > 0$. A contradiction. Furthermore

$$\text{ri}(\Theta_2) \subseteq \{(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \in \text{ri}(C_2) \text{ and } \lambda < \langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha\}. \quad (2.11)$$

To see this, assume there is $(x, \lambda) \in \text{ri}(\Theta_2)$ with $\lambda = \langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha$. Then for some $(y, \mu) \in \Theta_2$ with $\mu < \langle x^*, y \rangle - \alpha$ there exists $t > 0$ such that $(x, \lambda) + t((x, \lambda) - (y, \mu)) \in \Theta_2$. It follows

$$0 \leq (1+t)(\langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha - \lambda) + t(\mu - \langle x^*, y \rangle + \alpha) < 0, \quad (2.12)$$

a contradiction. The first inequality is due to $(x, \lambda) + t((x, \lambda) - (y, \mu)) \in \Theta_2$ and the second inequality due to $\mu < \langle x^*, y \rangle - \alpha$ and $\lambda = \langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha$. But then $\text{ri}(\Theta_1) \cap \text{ri}(\Theta_2) = \emptyset$. Indeed, suppose that there exists $(x, \lambda) \in \text{ri}(\Theta_1) \cap \text{ri}(\Theta_2)$. Then it holds $\langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha \leq 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ since $x \in \text{ri}(C_1) \cap \text{ri}(C_2) \subseteq C_1 \cap C_2$. On the other hand

$$0 < \lambda < \langle x^*, x \rangle - \alpha \leq 0, \quad (2.13)$$

a contradiction.

Thus, convex separation is applicable. Confer [MMN22, Theorem 4.23] about the rest of the proof. \square

Takeaways The support function intersection rule connects the geometric property of convex separation to an identity of support functions. This result is central to the analysis of convex conjugates.

2.2 Conjugate Calculus and Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem

The goal of this section is to establish the tools to calculate convex conjugates. We cite the conjugate sum and chain rule without proof. After some examples, we cite the Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem.

Definition 2.5. (Convex conjugate) *Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the **convex conjugate** $f^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ of f is defined as*

$$f^*(x^*) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x^*)^T x - f(x) \quad (2.14)$$

Add comment on nomenclature. What is Legendre transformation in this context?

Note that f in Definition 2.5 does not have to be convex. On the other hand, the convex conjugate is always convex:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a proper function. Then its convex conjugate $f^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is convex.*

Proof. [MMN22, Proposition 4.2] □

Theorem 2.4. (Conjugate Chain Rule) *Let $A : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a linear map (matrix) and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ a proper convex function. If $\text{Im}(A) \cap \text{ri}(\text{dom}(g)) \neq \emptyset$ it follows*

$$(g \circ A)^*(x^*) = \inf_{y^* \in (A^*)^{-1}(x^*)} g^*(y^*). \quad (2.15)$$

Furthermore, for any $x^ \in \text{dom}(g \circ A)^*$ there exists $y^* \in (A^*)^{-1}(x^*)$ such that $(g \circ A)^*(x^*) = g^*(y^*)$.*

Proof. [MMN22, Proposition 4.28] □

Theorem 2.5. *Let $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be proper convex functions and $\text{ri}(\text{dom}(f)) \cap \text{ri}(\text{dom}(g)) \neq \emptyset$. Then we have the conjugate sum rule*

$$(f + g)^*(x^*) = (f^* \square g^*)(x^*) \quad (2.16)$$

for all $x^ \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, the infimum in $(f^* \square g^*)(x^*)$ is attained, i.e., for any $x^* \in \text{dom}(f + g)^*$ there exists vectors x_1^*, x_2^* for which*

$$(f + g)^*(x^*) = f^*(x_1^*) + g^*(x_2^*), \quad x^* = x_1^* + x_2^*. \quad (2.17)$$

Include lemma on convex conjugates of indicator functions. This should be straightforward.

Streamline example. Provide explanation in the end. Confer [Roc70, bottom p.337]

Example. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a proper convex function, that is, $\text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$ and f is convex. In steps we apply the conjugate chain and sum rule, together with mathematical induction, to prove the conjugate relationship

$$\begin{aligned} S_{f,n} : \mathbb{R}^n &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, & (x_1, \dots, x_n) &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i), \\ S_{f,n}^* : \mathbb{R}^n &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, & (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n f^*(x_i^*). \end{aligned}$$

This relationship is very natural and the ensuing calculations serve to confirm our intuition.

First, we work in the projections on the coordinates. For the i -th coordinate, where $i = 1, \dots, n$, this is

$$p_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto x_i. \quad (2.18)$$

All projections p_i are linear function with matrix representation e_i^\top , where e_i is i -the coordinate vector. The adjoint of p_i is therefore

$$p_i^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \mapsto e_i \cdot x. \quad (2.19)$$

For the inverse image of the adjoint of p_i it holds

$$(p_i^*)^{-1} \{(x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)\} = \begin{cases} \{x_i^*\}, & \text{if } x_j^* = 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i, \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

Throughout this example we use the asterisk character $*$ somewhat inconsistently. Note that f^* is the convex conjugate of the function f and p_i^* is the adjoint linear function of the projection on the i -th coordinate. Likewise, we denote dual variables, that is, the arguments of convex conjugates, as x^* .

Next, we employ the conjugate chain rule to establish the conjugate relationship

$$\begin{aligned} f_i : \mathbb{R}^n &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, & (x_1, \dots, x_n) &\mapsto x_i \mapsto f(x_i), \\ f_i^* : \mathbb{R}^n &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, & (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) &\mapsto \begin{cases} f^*(x_i^*), & \text{if } x_j^* = 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note, that $f_i = (f \circ p_i)$ and $f_i^* = (f \circ p_i)^*$. Since $\text{Im } p_i = \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$, it holds $\text{Im } p_i \cap \text{ri}(\text{dom } f) \neq \emptyset$. Then f and p_i conform with the demands of the conjugate chain rule. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^*(x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) &= (f \circ p_i)^*(x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) = \inf \{f^*(y) \mid y \in (p_i^*)^{-1} \{(x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)\}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} f^*(x_i^*), & \text{if } x_j^* = 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i, \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

2 Convex Analysis

where we keep to the convention $\inf \emptyset = \infty$.

Next, note that for $n = 1$ we arrive at the result. Thus, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds $(S_{f,n})^* = S_{f,n}^*$. In order to apply the conjugate sum rule to $S_{f,n}$ and f_{n+1} we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } f_i &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x_i \in \text{dom } f\} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n+1, \\ \bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} \text{dom } f_i &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x_i \in \text{dom } f \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n+1\} \neq \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ri}(\text{dom } S_{f,n}) \cap \text{ri}(\text{dom } f_{n+1}) \\ = \text{ri}(\text{dom } S_{f,n} \cap \text{dom } f_{n+1}) = \text{ri}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} \text{dom } f_i\right) \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

By the conjugate sum rule it follows

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{f,n+1})^*(x_1^*, \dots, x_{n+1}^*) &= (S_{f,n} + f_{n+1})^*(x_1^*, \dots, x_{n+1}^*) = ((S_{f,n})^* \square f_{n+1}^*)(x_1^*, \dots, x_{n+1}^*) \\ &= (f_1^* \square \dots \square f_{n+1}^*)(x_1^*, \dots, x_{n+1}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} f_i^*(x_i^*) = S_{f,n+1}^*(x_1^*, \dots, x_{n+1}^*). \end{aligned}$$

◇

Find right moment to introduce nomenclature for optimization problem. See also end of Tseng Bertsekas chapter.

Given proper convex functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we define the primal minimization problem as follows:

Problem 2.1. (Primal) *Given proper convex functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ we define the **primal optimization problem** to be*

$$\underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) + g(Ax)$$

Remark 2.1. *Problem 2.1 appears in the unconstrained form. We can impose constraints by controlling for the domains of f and g . To incorporate linear constraints $Ax \leq 0$ or more general constraints $x \in \Omega$, where Ω is a convex set, we can choose*

$$g(x) = \delta_{\Omega}(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega \\ \infty & \text{if } x \notin \Omega \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

where $x \notin \Omega$ leads to $f(x) + g(x) = \infty$ and the optimization problem (if feasible) will exclude x from the solutions. ◇

2.2 Conjugate Calculus and Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem

Problem 2.2. (Dual) Consider the same setting as in Problem 2.1. Using the convex conjugates of f, g and the transpose of A we define the **dual problem** of Problem 2.1 to be

$$\underset{y^* \in \mathbb{R}^m}{\text{maximize}} \quad -f^*(A^\top y^*) - g^*(y^*).$$

Proposition 2.3. Consider the optimization problem 2.1 and its dual 2.2, where the functions f and g are not assumed to be convex. Define the **optimal values** of these problems by

$$\hat{p} := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) + g(Ax) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{d} := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} -f^*(A^\top y) - g^*(y).$$

Then we have the relationship $\hat{d} \leq \hat{p}$.

Proof. [MMN22, Proposition 4.62] □

Theorem 2.6. Let $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be proper convex functions and $0 \in \text{ri}(\text{dom}(g) - A(\text{dom}(f)))$. Then the optimal values of (2.1) and (2.2) are equal, i.e.

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{f(x) + g(Ax)\} = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{-f^*(A^\top y) - g^*(-y)\}. \quad (2.22)$$

Proof. [MMN22, Theorem 4.63] □

Insert lemma in chapter 1.

Lemma 2.1. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be convex. Then for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $C > 0$

$$\inf_{\|\Delta\|=C} f(y + \Delta) - f(y) \geq 0 \quad \implies \quad \exists y^* \in \mathbb{R}^n : y^* \text{ is global minimum of } f \text{ and } \|y^* - y\| \leq C. \quad (2.23)$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C} := \{\|\Delta\| \leq C\}$ is convex f has a local minimum in $y + \mathcal{C} := \{y + \Delta \mid \|\Delta\| \leq C\}$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $y^* \in y + \mathcal{C}$ is a local minimum, but not a global minimum and the left-hand side of (2.23) is true. Then it holds

$$f(x) < f(y^*) \quad \text{for some } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus y + \mathcal{C}. \quad (2.24)$$

Furthermore since $y + \mathcal{C}$ is compact and contains y^* , the line segment $\mathcal{L}[y^*, x]$ contains a point on the boundary of $y + \mathcal{C}$, i.e.

$$\theta x + (1 - \theta)y^* = y + \Delta_x \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \Delta_x \text{ with } \|\Delta_x\| = C. \quad (2.25)$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} f(y^*) &\leq f(y) \leq f(y + \Delta_x) = f(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y^*) \\ &\leq \theta f(x) + (1 - \theta)f(y^*) < f(y^*), \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus every local minimum of f in $y + \mathcal{C}$ is also a global minimum. The first inequality is due to y^* being a local minimum of f in $y + \mathcal{C}$, the second inequality is due to the left-hand side of (2.23) being true, the equality is due to (2.25), the third inequality is due to the convexity of f and the strict inequality is due to (2.24). \square

Takeaways Conjugate sum and chain rule are direct consequences of the support function intersection rule. They are powerful tools, that allow us to compute convex conjugates of difficult expressions as well as proving the Fenchel-Rockafellar Duality theorem.

2.3 Tseng Bertsekas

We present the relevant parts of the paper [BT03].

Consider the following optimization problem

$$\underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^m}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\mathbf{A}x \geq b, \tag{2.27}$$

$$\mathbf{B}x = 0. \tag{2.28}$$

Where $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, \mathbf{A} is a given $n \times m$ matrix, and b is a vector in \mathbb{R}^n .

Generalize also to take equality constraints. Write in unconstrained form to derive dual.

Assumption 2.1. Assume that the map $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ has the following properties.

- (i) f is strictly convex.
- (ii) f is lower-semicontinuous and continuous $\text{dom}(f)$.
- (iii) The convex conjugate f^* of f is finite.

The dual optimization problem associated with (P) is

$$\underset{p \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{maximize}} \quad q(p)$$

subject to the constraints

$$p \geq 0, \quad (2.29)$$

where $q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the concave function given by

$$q(p) := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} f(x) + \langle p, b - \mathbf{A}x \rangle = \langle p, b \rangle - f^*(\mathbf{A}^\top p). \quad (2.30)$$

The dual problem (D) is a concave program with simple nonnegativity constraints. Furthermore, strong duality holds for (P) and (D), i.e., the optimal value of (P) equals the optimal value of (D).

Since f^* is real-valued and f is strictly convex, f^* and q are continuously differentiable.

Theorem 2.7. [Roc70, Theorem 26.3] *A closed proper convex function is (essentially) strictly convex if and only if its conjugate is essentially smooth.*

Read and understand proof (p.270)

We will denote the gradient of q at p by $d(p)$ and its i th coordinate by $d_i(p)$. Since q is continuously differentiable, $d_i(p)$ is continuous, and since q is concave, $d_i(p)$ is nonincreasing in p_i .

By differentiating and by using the chain rule, we obtain the dual cost gradient

$$d(p) = b - \mathbf{A}x, \quad \text{where } x := \nabla f^*(\mathbf{A}^\top p) = \operatorname{argsup}_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m} \langle p, \mathbf{A}\xi \rangle - f(\xi). \quad (2.31)$$

The last equality follows from Danskin's Theorem and [Roc70, Theorem 23.5]

Read and understand proof (p.80)

Proposition 2.4. (Danskin's Theorem [BT03, page 649]) *Let $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a non-empty set, and let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $\phi(\cdot, z) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, viewed as a function of its first argument, is convex for each $z \in Z$. Then the function*

$$f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \sup_{z \in Z} \phi(x, z) \quad (2.32)$$

is convex and has directional derivative given by

$$f'(x; y) = \sup_{z \in Z(x)} \phi'(x, z; y), \quad (2.33)$$

2 Convex Analysis

where $\phi'(x, z; y)$ is the directional derivative of the function $\phi(\cdot, z)$ at x in the direction y , and

$$Z(x) := \left\{ \bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \phi(x, \bar{z}) = \sup_{z \in Z} \phi(x, z) \right\}. \quad (2.34)$$

In particular, if $Z(x)$ consists of a unique point \bar{z} and $\phi(\cdot, \bar{z})$ is differentiable at x , and $\nabla f(x) = \nabla_x \phi(x, \bar{z})$, where $\nabla_x \phi(x, \bar{z})$ is the vector with coordinates $(\partial \phi / \partial x_i)(x, \bar{z})$

Note that x is the unique vector satisfying

$$\mathbf{A}p \in \partial f(x). \quad (2.35)$$

From the optimality conditions for (D) it follows that a dual vector is an optimal solution of (D) if and only if

$$p = [p + d(p)]^+, \quad (2.36)$$

where $[\cdot]^+$ is the projection onto the positive orthant, i.e., $[y]^+ = [0 \vee y_1, \dots, 0 \vee y_n]^T$.

Provide details. See notes.

Given an optimal dual solution p , we may obtain an optimal primal solution from the equation $x = \nabla f^*(\mathbf{A}^\top p)$. To see this, note that

$$\mathbf{A}x \geq b \quad \text{and} \quad p_i = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \text{ such that } \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij}x_j > b_i. \quad (2.37)$$

We can show that p and x satisfy the KKT conditions and thus x is an optimal solution to (P).

n

Definition 2.6. [Roc70, §28] By an **ordinary convex program** (P) we mean an optimization problem of the following form

$$\underset{x \in C}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_0(x)$$

subject to the constraints

$$f_1(x) \leq 0, \dots, f_r(x) \leq 0, \quad f_{r+1}(x) = 0, \dots, f_m(x) = 0, \quad (2.38)$$

where $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a non-empty convex set, f_i is a finite convex function on C for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and f_i is an affine function on C for $i \in \{r+1, \dots, m\}$.

Definition 2.7. We define $[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to be a **Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) vector** for (P), if

- (i) $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.
- (ii) The infimum of the proper convex function $f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i f_i$ is finite and equal to the optimal value in (P) .

Theorem 2.8. (Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions) *Let (P) be an ordinary convex program, $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\bar{\alpha}$ is a KKT vector for (P) and \bar{z} is an optimal solution to (P) if and only if \bar{z} and the components α_i of $\bar{\alpha}$ satisfy the following conditions.*

- (i) $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $f_i(\bar{z}) \leq 0$, and $\alpha_i f_i(\bar{z}) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.
- (ii) $f_i(\bar{z}) = 0$ for $i \in \{r+1, \dots, m\}$.
- (iii) $0_n \in [\partial f_0(\bar{z}) + \sum_{\alpha_i \neq 0} \alpha_i \partial f_i(\bar{z})]$.

Proof. [Roc70, Theorem 28.3] □

Takeaways Employing the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions, we derive a dual relationship between optimal solutions for strictly convex functions.

3 Random Matrix Inequalities

In our application we want to bound moments of vector-valued random variables. For this we choose the theory of random matrix inequalities which lately received a lot of attention. In particular an approach via the method of exchangeable pairs [MJC⁺14] has been fruitful in simplifying the proofs of long standing results such as the matrix Khintchin inequality. The paper offers a comprehensive introduction to this method.

We will cite the matrix Khintchin inequality and inequalities for moments of matrices that follow from it [CGT12]. As a novelty, we will apply intrinsic dimension results and Hermitian Dilation from [Tro15] to matrix moments inequalities. Even though it is straightforward, to the best of our knowledge the calculations have not been carried out in any publication so far.

3.1 A Matrix Analysis Primer

The **trace** of a square matrix, denoted by tr , is the sum of its diagonal entries, i.e. $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = \sum_{j=1}^d b_{jj}$ for $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{M}_d$. The trace is unitarily invariant, i.e. $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^*)$ for all $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{M}_d$ for all unitary $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{M}_d$. In particular, the existence of an eigenvalue value decomposition shows that the trace of a Hermitian matrix equals the sum of its eigenvalues. Let $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is an interval. Consider a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{H}_d$ whose eigenvalues are contained in I . We define the matrix $f(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{H}_d$ using an eigenvalue decomposition of \mathbf{A} :

$$f(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} f(\lambda_1) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & f(\lambda_d) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^* \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_d \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^* = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet,i} \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet,i}^*. \quad (3.1)$$

The definition of $f(\mathbf{A})$ does not depend on which eigenvalue decomposition we choose. Any matrix function that arises in this fashion is called a **standard matrix function**.

For each $p \geq 1$ the **Schatten p -norm** is defined as $\|\mathbf{B}\|_p := (\text{tr}(|\mathbf{B}|^p))^{1/p}$ for $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{M}_d$. In this setting, $|\mathbf{B}| := (\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B})^{1/2}$. The **spectral norm** of an Hermitian matrix \mathbf{A} is defined by the relation $\|\mathbf{A}\| := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \vee (-\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}))$. For a general matrix \mathbf{B} , the

spectral norm is defined to be the largest singular value: $\|\mathbf{B}\| := \sigma_1(\mathbf{B})$. The Schatten p -norm dominates the spectral norm for all $p \geq 1$.

3.2 Matrix Khintchin Inequality and Applications

In this section we state the matrix Khintchin inequality and matrix moment inequalities as an applications. We provide the proof of auxiliary theorems which are cited without proof in [MJC⁺14]. They are needed to prove the matrix Khintchin inequality.

Proposition 3.1. (Generalized Klein inequality) *Let u_1, \dots, u_n and v_1, \dots, v_n be real-valued functions on an interval I of the real line. Suppose*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n u_k(a)v_k(b) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } a, b \in I. \quad (3.2)$$

Then

$$\overline{\text{tr}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n u_k(\mathbf{A})v_k(\mathbf{B}) \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{H}_d(I). \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. [Pet94, Proposition 3] Let $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i} \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i}^*$ and $\mathbf{B} = \sum_{j=1}^d \mu_j \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j} \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j}^*$ be the orthonormal decompositions of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} . Then

$$\overline{\text{tr}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n u_k(\mathbf{A})v_k(\mathbf{B}) \right) = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i,j=1}^d \overline{\text{tr}} (u_k(\lambda_i) \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i} \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i}^* v_k(\mu_j) \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j} \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j}^*) \quad (3.4)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j=1}^d \overline{\text{tr}} (\mathbf{P}_{\bullet i} \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i}^* \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j} \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j}^*) \sum_{k=1}^n u_k(\lambda_i) v_k(\mu_j) \geq 0 \quad (3.5)$$

by the hypothesis. To see that $\overline{\text{tr}} (\mathbf{P}_{\bullet i} \mathbf{P}_{\bullet i}^* \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j} \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet j}^*)$ is non-negative for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we apply a well known extension of von Neumann's trace inequality [Ruh70, Lemma 1], namely

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{Q}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d p_i q_{d-i+1} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{H}_d([0, \infty)), \quad (3.6)$$

where the eigenvalues $p_1 \geq \dots \geq p_d$ and $q_1 \geq \dots \geq q_d$ are sorted decreasingly. \square

Lemma 3.1. (Mean value trace inequality) *Let I be an interval of the real line. Suppose that $g : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a weakly increasing function and that $h : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function whose derivative h' is convex. Then for all matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{H}_d(I)$ it holds*

$$\overline{\text{tr}}[(g(\mathbf{A}) - g(\mathbf{B})) \cdot (h(\mathbf{A}) - h(\mathbf{B}))] \leq \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{tr}}[(g(\mathbf{A}) - g(\mathbf{B})) \cdot (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))]. \quad (3.7)$$

When h' is concave, the inequality is reversed. The same result holds for the standard trace.

Proof. [MJC⁺ 14, Lemma 3.4] Fix $a, b \in I$. Since g is weakly increasing, $(g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (a - b) \geq 0$. The fundamental theorem of calculus and the convexity of h' yield the estimate

$$(g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (h(a) - h(b)) = (g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (a - b) \int_0^1 h'(\tau a + (1 - \tau)b) d\tau \quad (3.8)$$

$$\leq (g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (a - b) \int_0^1 [\tau h'(a) + (1 - \tau)h'(b)] d\tau \quad (3.9)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} [(g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (a - b) \cdot (h'(a) + h'(b))]. \quad (3.10)$$

The inequality is reversed, if h' is concave. To apply the Kleins inequality we expand the terms. The RHS is

$$\begin{aligned} & (g(a) - g(b)) \cdot (a - b) \cdot (h'(a) + h'(b)) \\ &= [g(a) \cdot a \cdot h'(a)] + [g(a) \cdot a] \cdot h'(b) - b \cdot [h'(a) \cdot g(a)] - [b \cdot h'(b)] \cdot g(a) \\ &+ [\text{the same as above with } a \text{ and } b \text{ reversed }](a \rightleftharpoons b) \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Taking the trace yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}[g(\mathbf{A}) \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))] - \text{tr}[\mathbf{B} \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B})) \cdot g(\mathbf{A})] + (\mathbf{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathbf{B}) \\ &= \text{tr}[g(\mathbf{A}) \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))] - \text{tr}[g(\mathbf{A}) \cdot \mathbf{B} \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))] + (\mathbf{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathbf{B}) \\ &= \text{tr}[g(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))] + (\mathbf{A} \rightleftharpoons \mathbf{B}) \\ &= \text{tr}[(g(\mathbf{A}) - g(\mathbf{B})) \cdot (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cdot (h'(\mathbf{A}) + h'(\mathbf{B}))]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

On the LHS we have only products of two factors which commute under the trace operation. Thus we may use the same expression as in the scalar case without further calculations. The result follows immediately from the Klein inequality. \square

Theorem 3.1. (Matrix Khintchin) *Suppose that $p = 1$ or $p \geq 3/2$. Consider a finite sequence $(\mathbf{Y}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent, random, Hermitian matrices and a deterministic sequence $(\mathbf{A}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ for which*

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}_k] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Y}_k^2 \preceq \mathbf{A}_k^2 \quad \text{almost surely for all } k \geq 1. \quad (3.13)$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{Y}_k \right\|_{2p}^{2p} \right]^{1/(2p)} \leq \sqrt{p - \frac{1}{2}} \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathbf{A}_k^2 + \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}_k^2]) \right) \right\|_{2p}^{1/2}. \quad (3.14)$$

In particular, when $(\xi_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is an independent sequence of Rademacher random variables,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \xi_k \mathbf{A}_k \right\|_{2p}^{2p} \right]^{1/(2p)} \leq \sqrt{2p - 1} \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{A}_k^2 \right) \right\|_{2p}^{1/2}. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. [MJC⁺14, Corollary 7.3] □

Theorem 3.2. Assume $n \geq 3$

(i) Suppose that $p \geq 1$, and fix $r \geq p \vee 2 \log(n)$. Consider a finite sequence $(\mathbf{S}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent, random, positive-semidefinite matrices with dimension $n \times n$. Then

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{S}_k \right\|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \left[\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{S}_k] \right\|^{1/2} + 2\sqrt{er} \mathbf{E}[\max_{k \geq 1} \|\mathbf{S}_k\|^p]^{1/(2p)} \right]^2. \quad (3.16)$$

(ii) Suppose that $p \geq 2$, and fix $r \geq p \vee 2 \log(n)$. Consider a finite sequence $(\mathbf{Y}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent, symmetric, random, self-adjoint matrices with dimension $n \times n$. Then

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{Y}_k \right\|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \sqrt{er} \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Y}_k^2] \right) \right\|^{1/2} + 2er \mathbf{E}[\max_{k \geq 1} \|\mathbf{Y}_k\|^p]^{1/p}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. [CGT12, Theorem A.1] In the proof, they shift to the Schatten-norm in order to apply matrix Khintchin. Then they shift back to the spectral norm, loosing a dimensional factor. This factor can be improved using the intrinsic dimension lemma. □

3.3 Generalized Inequalities by Hermitian Dilation

For an introduction to Hermitian Dilation see [Tro15, §2.1.16]

Definition 3.1. (Hermitian Dilation) *The Hermitian dilation*

$$\mathfrak{H} : \mathbb{C}^{d_1 \times d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{d_1 \times d_2}$$

is a map from a general matrix to an Hermitian matrix defined by

$$\mathfrak{H}(B) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & B \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.18)$$

Properties:

$\|\mathbf{B}\| = \|\mathfrak{H}\mathbf{B}\|$ Linearity confer [Tro15, §7.7.3] for combination with intrinsic dimension argument.

Theorem 3.3. (Matrix Rosenthal-Pinelis) *Let $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_n$ be independent, random matrices with dimension $d_1 \times d_2$. Introduce the random matrix*

$$\mathbf{S} := \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{A}_k.$$

Let $v(\mathbf{S})$ be the matrix variance statistic of the sum:

$$v(\mathbf{S}) := \left\| \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^\top] \right\| \vee \left\| \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S}] \right\| = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}_k^\top] \right\| \vee \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{A}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k] \right\|. \quad (3.19)$$

Then

$$\left(\mathbf{E} \left[\|\mathbf{S}\|^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2ev(\mathbf{S}) \log(d_1 + d_2)} + 4e \left(\mathbf{E}[\max_{k \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}_k\|^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log(d_1 + d_2). \quad (3.20)$$

Remark 3.1. Since $\mathbf{E}[\|S\|] \leq \mathbf{E}[\|S\|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Theorem 3.3 also holds with $\mathbf{E}[\|S\|]$ on the left-hand side of (3.20). To obtain a tail bound we can employ the Markov inequality and Theorem 3.3:

$$\mathbf{P}[\|S\| \geq t]$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathbf{E}[\|S\|]}{t} \leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\sqrt{2ev(\mathbf{S}) \log(d_1 + d_2)} + 4e \left(\mathbf{E}[\max_{k \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}_k\|^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log(d_1 + d_2) \right) \quad \text{for } t > 0. \quad (3.21)$$

It might be possible to improve the \log term employing an intrinsic dimension argument.

◇

3.4 Intrinsic Dimension

Definition. For a positive-semidefinite matrix \mathbf{S} , the *intrinsic dimension* is the quantity

$$\text{intdim } \mathbf{A} := \text{tr } \mathbf{A} / \|\mathbf{A}\|.$$

Lemma. (Intrinsic dimension) Let $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function with $\varphi(0) = 0$. For any positive-semidefinite matrix \mathbf{S} it holds

$$\text{tr } \varphi(\mathbf{S}) \leq \text{intdim } \mathbf{S} \cdot \varphi(\|\mathbf{S}\|).$$

Proof. [Tro15, Lemma 7.5.1] Since φ is convex on any interval $[0, L]$ with $L > 0$, and $\varphi(0) = 0$, it holds

$$\varphi(a) \leq (1 - a/L) \cdot \varphi(0) + a/L \cdot \varphi(L) = a/L \cdot \varphi(L) \quad \text{for all } a \in [0, L].$$

Since \mathbf{S} is positive-semidefinite, the eigenvalues of \mathbf{S} fall in the interval $[0, L]$, where $L = \|\mathbf{S}\|$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr } \varphi(\mathbf{S}) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi(\lambda_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i / \|\mathbf{S}\| \cdot \varphi(\|\mathbf{S}\|) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}) / \|\mathbf{S}\| \cdot \varphi(\|\mathbf{S}\|) = \text{intdim } \mathbf{S} \cdot \varphi(\|\mathbf{S}\|). \end{aligned}$$

□

The next example applies the preceding lemma to bound the p -Schatten-norm, when $p \geq 2$, by the spectral norm and the intrinsic dimension.

Example. Let $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ be any rectangular matrix and let $p \geq 2$. Then $\varphi(x) := |x|^p$ defines a convex function with $\varphi(0) = 0$. The intrinsic dimension lemma yields

$$\|\mathbf{B}\|_p^p = \text{tr } |\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}|^{p/2} \leq \text{intdim } \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B} \cdot \|\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}\|^{p/2} = \text{intdim } \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B} \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\|^p.$$

If, additionally, \mathbf{B} is self-adjoint and positive-semidefinite then it holds

$$\text{tr } \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B} = \text{tr } \mathbf{B}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \right)^2 = (\text{tr } \mathbf{B})^2,$$

and consequently

$$\|\mathbf{B}\|_p^p \leq (\text{intdim } \mathbf{B})^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\|^p.$$

◇

Apply to estimate [CGT12, above (A.4)] to get intrinsic dimension version of Rosenthal-Pinelis inequality.

Takeaways The notion of intrinsic dimension is useful when bounding convex functions of a positive-semidefinite matrix by its spectral norm. We saw how to derive bounds on the p -Schatten-norm when $p \geq 2$.

4 Empirical Processes

Classical references are [vdV00] and [vdvW13]. For maximal inequalities see [vdV00, §19] For Functional Delta-Method see [vdV00, §20] For an introduction to empirical processes and outer expectation see the beginning of [vdvW13].

4.1 A Primer on Empirical Processes

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space, (\mathcal{X}, Σ) a measurable space, and $X_1, \dots, X_n : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \Sigma)$ a sample of independent and identically-distributed random variables with probability distribution \mathbf{P}_X . Throughout this section we consider the **empirical measure** of this sample, that is, the discrete random measure

$$\mathbf{P}_n : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad C \mapsto \frac{1}{n} \# \{1 \leq i \leq n : X_i \in C\} . \quad (4.1)$$

A family \mathcal{F} of measurable functions $f : (\mathcal{X}, \Sigma) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ induces a stochastic process by

$$f \mapsto \mathbf{P}_n f , \quad (4.2)$$

where for a measure Q on (\mathcal{X}, Σ) we denote $Qf := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f Q(dx)$. In this way we define the \mathcal{F} -indexed **empirical process** \mathbb{G}_n by

$$f \mapsto \mathbb{G}_n f := \sqrt{n}(\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P})f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(X_i) - \mathbf{P}f) . \quad (4.3)$$

The purpose of this notation is to abstract the behaviour of \mathbb{G}_n ranging over \mathcal{F} . Conforming with this integral viewpoint, we define the (random) norm

$$\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{G}_n f| . \quad (4.4)$$

We stress that $\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ often ceases to be measurable, even in simple situations [vdvW13, page 3]. To deal with this, we introduce the notion of **outer expectation** \mathbf{E}^* , that is,

$$\mathbf{E}^*[T] := \inf \{ \mathbf{E}[U] \mid U \geq T, U : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P}) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})) \text{ measurable and } \mathbf{E}[U] < \infty \} . \quad (4.5)$$

In our application the technical difficulties halt at this point, because we only consider T with $\mathbf{E}^*[T] < \infty$. Then there exists a smallest measurable function T^* dominating T with $\mathbf{E}^*[T] = \mathbf{E}[T^*]$. Thus, we may assume T to be measurable in this regard.

In our application we need concentration inequalities for $\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. One easy way is to use maximal inequalities for the expectation together with Markov's inequality. There are also Bernstein-like inequalities for empirical processes.

5 Simple yet useful Calculations

Theorem 5.1. (Multivariate Taylor Theorem) *Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$. Then for all $x, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $\xi \in [0, 1]$ such that it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} f(x + \Delta) = f(x) &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} \Delta_i + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n \frac{\partial^2 f(x + \xi \Delta)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \Delta_i \Delta_j \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 f(x + \xi \Delta)}{\partial x_i^2} \Delta_i^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Corollary 5.1.1. *Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Then for all $a, x, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exist $\xi \in [0, 1]$ such that it holds*

$$f(a^T(x + \Delta)) - f(a^T x) = f'(a^T x) \Delta^T a + \frac{1}{2} f''(a^T(x + \xi \Delta)) \Delta^T A \Delta, \quad (5.2)$$

where $A := aa^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Proof. By the chain rule we have for all $a, x, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\xi \in [0, 1]$

$$\frac{\partial^2 f(a^T(x + \xi \Delta))}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = f''(a^T(x + \xi \Delta)) a_i a_j. \quad (5.3)$$

Since $A := aa^T$ is symmetric we have

$$\Delta^T A \Delta = 2 \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n a_i a_j \Delta_i \Delta_j + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \Delta_i^2. \quad (5.4)$$

Plugging (5.3) and (5.4) into (5.1) yields (5.2). \square

Proposition 5.1. *For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds*

$$|x + y| - |x| \geq -|y| \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. Checking all 6 combinations of $x + y, x, y$ being nonnegative or negative yields the result. \square

Notation Index

$\#A$ cardinality of the set A

$\mathbf{E}[X|Y]$ conditional expectation of the random variable X with respect to $\sigma(Y)$

$\mathbf{E}[X]$ expectation of the random variable X

$\mathbf{Var}[X]$ variance of the random variable X

$\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ extension of the real numbers

$\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$ convergence of distributions

\mathbf{P} generic probability measure

$\mathbf{P}_X = \mathbf{P} \circ X^{-1}$ distribution of the random variable X

\mathbb{R} set of real numbers

$x \vee y, x \wedge y, x^+, x^-$ maximum, minimum, positive part, negative part of real numbers

$X \sim \mu$ the random variable has distribution μ

Bibliography

- [BT03] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods. November 2003.
- [CGT12] Richard Y. Chen, Alex Gittens, and Joel A. Tropp. The Masked Sample Covariance Estimator: An Analysis via Matrix Concentration Inequalities, June 2012.
- [Hah98] Jinyong Hahn. On the Role of the Propensity Score in Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects. *Econometrica*, 66(2):315, March 1998.
- [Kle20] Achim Klenke. *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course*. Universitext. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
- [MJC⁺14] Lester Mackey, Michael I. Jordan, Richard Y. Chen, Brendan Farrell, and Joel A. Tropp. Matrix concentration inequalities via the method of exchangeable pairs. *The Annals of Probability*, 42(3), May 2014.
- [MMN22] Boris S. Mordukhovich and Nguyen Mau Nam. *Convex Analysis and Beyond: Volume I: Basic Theory*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2022.
- [Pea09] J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [Pet94] Dénes Petz. A survey of certain trace inequalities. *Banach Center Publications*, 30(1):287–298, 1994.
- [Roc70] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [Ruh70] Axel Ruhe. Perturbation bounds for means of eigenvalues and invariant subspaces. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 10(3):343–354, September 1970.
- [SC08] Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer Science & Business Media, September 2008.

Bibliography

- [TB91] Paul Tseng and Dimitri P. Bertsekas. Relaxation Methods for Problems with Strictly Convex Costs and Linear Constraints. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16(3):462–481, 1991.
- [Tro15] Joel A. Tropp. An Introduction to Matrix Concentration Inequalities, January 2015.
- [vdV00] A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, June 2000.
- [vdvW13] Aad van der vaart and Jon Wellner. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, March 2013.
- [Wag82] Clifford H. Wagner. Simpson’s Paradox in Real Life. *The American Statistician*, 36(1):46–48, 1982.
- [WZ19] Yixin Wang and José R. Zubizarreta. Minimal Dispersion Approximately Balancing Weights: Asymptotic Properties and Practical Considerations. *Biometrika*, page asz050, October 2019.
- [zot] Definition of CONFOUND. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/confound>.
- [ZP17] Qingyuan Zhao and Daniel Percival. Entropy balancing is doubly robust. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 5(1):20160010, September 2017.