

Learning Decision-Focused Uncertainty Sets in Robust Optimization

Irina Wang, Bart Van Parys, and Bartolomeo Stellato

June 16, 2026

Abstract

We propose a data-driven technique to automatically learn tractable contextual uncertainty sets in robust optimization, for a family of problems with both objective and constraint uncertainty. Our method reshapes the uncertainty sets by optimizing for both worst-case and average-case performance while guaranteeing constraint satisfaction via a conditional-value-at-risk constraint. We solve the resultant constrained learning problem using a stochastic augmented Lagrangian method that relies on differentiating the solutions of the robust optimization problems with respect to the parameters of the uncertainty set. Due to the nonsmooth and nonconvex nature of the augmented Lagrangian function, we apply the nonsmooth conservative implicit function theorem to establish convergence to a critical point, which is a feasible solution of the constrained learning problem under mild assumptions. Using empirical process theory, we show both marginal and conditional finite-sample probabilistic guarantees of constraint satisfaction for the resulting solutions. Numerical experiments show that our method outperforms traditional approaches in robust and distributionally robust optimization in terms of out-of-sample performance and constraint satisfaction guarantees.

1 Introduction

Over the past years, [robust optimization \(RO\)](#) has become a widely adopted efficient tool for decision-making under uncertainty. A robust approach first defines an uncertainty set where the uncertain vector lives, and subsequently hedges its decision against any worst-case realization in this set ([Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2008](#); [Ben-Tal et al., 2009](#); [Bertsimas et al., 2011](#); [Bertsimas and den Hertog, 2022](#)). To attain proper solution quality and practical robustness, the choice of uncertainty set is paramount.

Traditionally, uncertainty sets are shaped and sized to guarantee they contain an appropriately large fraction of the probability mass of the unknown distribution generating the samples (*i.e.*, high coverage). The main appeal of this approach is that the uncertainty set is independent of the subsequent optimization problem considered, and guarantees the worst-case performance regardless of the problem. In this vein, many approaches to designing uncertainty sets assume structural information of the underlying distributions, and rely on these a priori assumptions to build guarantees of constraint satisfaction ([Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2000](#); [Bertsimas et al., 2011](#); [Bandi and Bertsimas, 2012](#)). In particular, a large amount of existing literature studies how to bound the probability of constraint violation based on the size and shape of the uncertainty sets ([Li et al., 2012](#); [Guzman et al., 2017](#)), where the aforementioned structural information is exploited, but the

optimization problem itself is not leveraged. Even in recent data-driven RO, whether by approximating a high-probability-region using quantile estimation (Hong et al., 2021), or by learning a contextual uncertainty set known to contain with high probability the realized uncertainty (Mesaoui et al., 2022), significant attention has been given to the probability distribution generating the data and less so to the quality of the resulting decisions. In distributionally robust optimization (DRO) as well, the constructed ambiguity set of distributions has historically been required to contain the true data-generating distribution with a certain level of confidence (Mohajerin Esfahani and Kuhn, 2018).

Unfortunately, decoupling the uncertainty set construction from the subsequent optimization problem may lead to overly conservative decisions (Roos and den Hertog, 2020; Gao and Kleywegt, 2023). In DRO with Wasserstein ambiguity sets, the two-step approach suffers from the *curse of dimensionality* as their radius must scale with the dimension of the uncertainty (Weed and Bach, 2019). On the other hand, one can overcome the curse of dimensionality by exploiting Lipschitz conditions on the objective function of the subsequent optimization problem when designing the ambiguity set (Gao, 2023). The situation in DRO with f -divergence ambiguity sets is even more striking. For instance, Kullback-Leibler ambiguity sets around an empirical distribution can structurally not contain any continuous distribution however large its radius is chosen. Consequently, if the data-generating distribution is continuous, a two-step approach is not possible here. Nevertheless, the Kullback-Leibler can be shaped to ensure that the solution has optimal statistical properties when one is willing to exploit the fact that the subsequent optimization problem has a continuous loss function (Van Parys et al., 2021). In both cases, significant reduction in conservatism can be achieved by designing the uncertainty set not only based on the distributions generating the data, but also by exploiting structural properties of the subsequent optimization problem.

The drive for even better performance in RO, then, leads us to methods of constructing uncertainty sets that deviate from the decoupled approach, and explicitly take into account the optimization problem. This idea has been around for multiple years; as stated by Ben-Tal et al. (2009), the requirement of containing a high probability mass is only a sufficient (and often restrictive and not needed) condition to guarantee high probability of constraint satisfaction. In this vein, researchers have turned to constructing uncertainty sets that target directly the probability of constraint violation, and which may have low coverage (Bertsimas and Sim, 2004; Bertsimas et al., 2021; Calafiore and Campi, 2005).

However, while these works take into account the constraints of the optimization problem, and reduce conservatism compared to the decoupled approaches, they either do not optimize over uncertainty-set parameters to find the best one in terms of the *performance of the resulting decisions*, or only do so in a limited capacity, *i.e.*, with very few tunable parameters.

In fact, the performance of the RO problem may be judged on criteria that differ across applications, which may be optimized by different parameterizations of the uncertainty sets. Traditionally, the goal of RO uncertainty sets is to provide solutions that perform well with respect to the true worst-case realizations. However, in practical applications, the decision-maker would prefer solutions that perform well in typical cases, not only in the worst-case. Recently, a line of work in Pareto efficiency in RO (Iancu and Trichakis, 2014; Bertsimas et al., 2024; Adelhütte et al., 2023) identifies solutions that perform well not only in the worst case, but for all scenarios in the uncertainty set. Extending these ideas, we propose to construct uncertainty sets in a decision-focused manner, such that the resultant robust solutions perform well not only in terms of constraint satisfaction, but

also in *both* worst-case and average-case performance.

1.1 Our contributions

In this work, we propose an end-to-end approach to calibrate uncertainty sets for a family of contextual optimization problems, optimizing over a performance metric for the specific problem family. This is a common scenario in many applications, including inventory management, where we solve similar optimization problems with varying prices and factors driving demand (*i.e.*, context parameters), while satisfying the uncertain demand with high probability. We construct the uncertainty set, which maps from contexts to context-based regions of uncertainty, by learning its contextual shape and size parameters. By directly taking into account the quality of the **RO** solutions through the performance metric, the learned set is *decision-focused* and eliminates the unnecessary conservatism common in existing data-driven **RO** methods. Our specific contributions are as follows:

- We control the trade-off between performance and robustness by constructing a constrained learning problem for the uncertainty set parameters. We minimize the expectation of a performance metric, which incorporates both worst-case and average-case performance, over the family of parametric **RO** problems while ensuring an appropriate probability level of constraint satisfaction. The latter is enforced as a constraint on the conditional-value-at-risk (**CVaR**) of the problem family’s uncertain constraints.
- We present the learning problem as a constrained bi-level problem, where the inner level is represented by the family of parametric **RO** problems. The outer level performance metric and **CVaR** constraint rely on the solutions of the inner level problems.
- We develop a stochastic augmented Lagrangian algorithm to solve the constrained learning problem, which requires differentiating through the inner level solutions as well as the **CVaR** constraint. Due to the potentially nonsmooth, nonconvex, and thus nondifferentiable nature of the problem, we show *path-differentiability* of the Lagrangian, and apply nonsmooth implicit differentiation. We show convergence to a critical point under step-size and boundedness conditions, and establish the critical point as a feasible solution of the constrained learning problem under mild assumptions.
- Using empirical process theory, we give both marginal and conditional finite sample probabilistic guarantees of constraint satisfaction for the resulting solution.
- We benchmark our method on examples in portfolio optimization and multi-stage inventory management, outperforming data-driven robust and distributionally robust approaches in terms of out-of-sample performance and probabilistic guarantees. The code is available at https://github.com/stellatogrp/cvxro_experiments.

1.2 Related work

Data-driven robust optimization. Data-driven robust optimization has gained wide popularity, by constructing uncertainty sets through data-driven approximations of the unknown data-generating distribution. Using approaches such as quantile estimation (Hong et al., 2021), bounding the type- ∞ Wasserstein distance (Bertsimas et al., 2022), constructing intersections of multiple

single-measure-based ambiguity sets (Tanoumand et al., 2023), and applying deep learning clustering techniques (Goerigk and Kurtz, 2023), significant attention has been given to modeling the distribution. In fact, the majority of these methods rely on a two-step procedure which separates the construction of the uncertainty set from the resulting robust optimization problem, and often enforces a high coverage requirement on the selected uncertainty sets. As noted by Ben-Tal et al. (2009), however, this requirement may be unnecessary. Recently, Gupta (2019) proves that while convex problems require DRO ambiguity sets with high coverage to guarantee constraint satisfaction, traditional DRO ambiguity sets for concave problems are significantly larger than the asymptotically optimal sets. To reduce conservatism, Bertsimas et al. (2018) use hypothesis testing to pair a priori assumptions on the distribution with different statistical tests, and obtain various uncertain-constraint-dependent uncertainty sets with different shapes, computational properties, and modeling power. These sets are non coverage-based, and offer improved performance for the targeted constraints. Similarly, Van Parys et al. (2021) use a DRO approach with constraints on out-of-sample disappointment to find least conservative cost-estimators and optimizers for stochastic optimization problems. We go one step further, and construct parametric uncertainty sets to optimize *target performance metrics* for particular *families of contextual RO problems*. To this end, we turn to ideas in differentiable optimization. Recent developments in differentiable convex optimization have enabled a popular *end-to-end* approach of training a predictive model to minimize loss on a downstream optimization task (Donti et al., 2017; Demirović et al., 2019; Wilder et al., 2019a,b; Cameron et al., 2022; Elmachtoub and Grigas, 2022), for which we also point to the surveys by Kotary et al. (2021) and Mandi et al. (2024). Our approach adapts this idea, training instead the shape of the uncertainty set on its performance on parametric RO problems. In a work with a similar goal, Schuurmans and Patrinos (2023) construct DRO ambiguity sets which constrain only the worst-case distribution along the direction in which the expected cost of an approximate solution increases most rapidly. Our work, however, considers a broader class of optimization problems and uncertainty sets, and can directly tackle joint chance constraints using hyperparameter tuning.

Contextual optimization. Bertsimas and Kallus (2020) introduce a framework for prescriptive analytics that uses contextual information to directly prescribe optimal decisions, bypassing the intermediate step of estimating unknown parameters. Building on this, end-to-end approaches have been shown to improve performance over traditional *two-stage* approaches, where the prediction model is trained separately from the downstream optimization problem. The *Smart Predict, then Optimize* (SPO+) framework (Elmachtoub and Grigas, 2022) designs a convex surrogate task loss that differentiates through a downstream linear program with respect to the predicted cost vector, directly aligning the prediction model with the optimization objective rather than a generic prediction error. Similarly, Wilder et al. (2019a) propose a task-loss approach for combinatorial optimization, obtaining gradients by differentiating through a continuous relaxation of the combinatorial problem. Both approaches share the key idea of differentiating through the optimization solution with respect to learned parameters, which is the same mechanism our method relies on. However, these works focus on learning the cost or constraint parameters of a deterministic optimization problem given contextual features, while we instead learn the shape of the uncertainty set in a RO problem. Closer to our setting, Costa and Iyengar (2023) propose an end-to-end distributionally robust approach for portfolio construction, where they integrate a prediction layer that predicts asset returns with data on financial features and historical returns, and use these predictions in a decision layer that solves the robust optimization problem. In a similar way, Chenreddy

and Delage (2024) propose an end-to-end training algorithm to produce contextual uncertainty sets that achieve a certain conditional coverage, for robust problems with an uncertain objective. They construct penalty functions for the achieved objective value and the conditional coverage of the uncertainty set, and train the set predictors via gradient descent. After the initial versions of their work and our work were made public, another work emerged that considers an uncertain objective, and calibrates performance guarantees through conformal prediction (Yeh et al., 2025). We, however, allow for not only an uncertain objective, but also for any number of uncertain constraints, and formulate our problem as a *constrained* optimization problem. We do not enforce coverage constraints, which may introduce unnecessary conservatism, and instead constrain the **CVaR** of the constraint violations. We also optimize over the average-case performance in addition to the worst-case performance, which results in less conservative decisions when the uncertainty realization is not worst-case. In addition, we provide convergence and finite sample probabilistic guarantees. As pointed out in the recent survey by Sadana et al. (2023), current work in the end-to-end framework seldom focuses on uncertainty in the downstream optimization problem, especially in the constraints. Our approach thus aims to fill this gap.

Pareto efficiency in RO. The concept of Pareto efficiency in **RO** was introduced by Iancu and Trichakis (2014) for linear **RO** problems, where they identify solutions that yield worst-case optimal performance and which are not dominated by any other such solutions in non-worst-case scenarios. The concept has since been extended to general linear **RO** problems in Euclidean spaces (Adelhütte et al., 2023), and to linear Adaptive Robust Optimization problems (Bertsimas et al., 2024). The focus of this line of work is to find Pareto-dominating solutions among a set of **RO** solutions for a fixed uncertainty set. Tangentially, while not aimed directly at finding Pareto optimal solutions, the robust satisficing framework of Long et al. (2023) is also demonstrated to improve the Pareto efficiency compared to classic **RO**, by searching among a *different set of solutions*. In our work, while also not directly searching for Pareto optimal solutions, we optimize a decision-dependent contextual uncertainty set so that the unique **RO** solution implied by the uncertainty set may perform better both in the worst-case and on average.

Differentiable convex optimization. There has been extensive work on embedding differentiable optimization problems as layers within deep learning architectures (Amos and Kolter, 2017). Agrawal et al. (2019a) propose an approach to differentiating through disciplined convex programs, and implement their methodology in cvxpy. Specifically, they implement differentiable layers for disciplined convex programs in PyTorch and TensorFlow 2.0, in the package cvxpylayers. They convert the convex programs into conic programs, then implicitly differentiate the residual map of the homogeneous self-dual embedding associated with the conic program. These developments have fueled the recent advances in end-to-end approaches, and are also the tool of choice in this work for differentiating through the inner level **RO** solutions.

Nonsmooth implicit differentiation. Traditional techniques in differentiable convex optimization rely on the implicit function theorem, which requires derivatives to exist almost everywhere. Recently, a nonsmooth variant has been established, using conservative Jacobians, provided that a nonsmooth form of the classical invertibility condition is fulfilled (Bolte et al., 2021). As a key ingredient, definable and locally Lipschitz continuous functions are shown to admit conservative Jacobians, which follow the chain rule, and are thus compatible with backpropagation techniques

in stochastic gradient descent (Davis et al., 2018; Bolte et al., 2021). These techniques can be used to prove convergence to stationary points for nonsmooth problems.

Risk measures. Value at risk (**VaR**) and conditional value at risk (**CVaR**) are common risk measures for quantifying costs encountered in the tails of distributions. A **VaR** $_{\eta}$ constraint is a chance constraint that measures the maximum cost incurred with respect to a given confidence level η , but while intuitive, the function is often intractable, and does not quantify costs beyond the found threshold value. Conditional value at risk, on the other hand, measures the *expected* cost given that the cost exceeds **VaR**, and, as the tightest convex approximation of **VaR**, is known to have a tractable formulation (Uryasev and Rockafellar, 2001; Rockafellar and Uryasev, 2002). Since its development, **CVaR** optimization has been a common method for controlling risk in portfolio optimization and option hedging problems, and has also been explored in risk-constrained Markov decision problems, where the risk is presented as a constraint on the **CVaR** of the cumulative cost (Chow et al., 2015). In fact, **CVaR** is a *coherent risk metric* (Artzner et al., 1999), which satisfies certain axioms that give it value beyond approximating the **VaR** (Sarykalin et al., 2014). The use of **CVaR** constraints to substitute chance constraints has also been explored in reliability engineering, where the **CVaR** constraint has been given a different name: buffered failure probability (Rockafellar and Royset, 2010). In our work, we constrain risk, which in **RO** is the probability of constraint violation, by constraining the **CVaR** of the uncertain constraint functions.

1.3 Layout of the paper

In Section 2, we introduce the notion of the decision-focused set with a motivating example. In Section 3, we describe the data-driven algorithm and prove its convergence, and in Section 4, provide probabilistic guarantees. In Section 5, we discuss hyperparameter tuning, and in Section 6, present various numerical examples. For completeness, we give example convex reformulations of robust optimization problems for common uncertainty sets, with our shaped parameters, in the appendices.

2 The optimization problem

Consider a contextual stochastic optimization setting with context parameter $x \in \mathbf{R}^p$ and uncertain parameter $u \in \mathbf{R}^m$. The context parameter x represents information available when we make our decisions (*e.g.*, market factors for portfolio optimization, the supplier’s price for inventory problems), while the uncertain parameter u is not known (*e.g.*, future returns in portfolio optimization), but may be affected by the context parameter. We set $\mathbf{P}_x$ as the distribution of x with domain $\mathcal{D}_x \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$, $\mathbf{P}_u$ as the distribution of u with domain $\mathcal{D}_u \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$, and $\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}$ as their joint distribution, all of which are unknown. Importantly, since x may affect u , u and x can be correlated. We therefore denote by $\mathbf{P}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}$ the conditional distribution of u for a context $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{D}_x$.

2.1 The conditional formulation

For any context $\bar{x}$, the decision-maker, who has some uncertain objective function $f(z, u, \bar{x})$, would like to ensure that their decision $z(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{R}^n$ performs well in both the average-case and the worst-case, where we use the following *value at risk* formulation to describe the η -quantile worst-case.

That is, for some risk parameter $\eta \in [0, 1]$:

$$\mathbf{VaR}(f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}), \eta|\bar{x}) = \inf\{\Gamma \mid \mathbf{P}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}(f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) \leq \Gamma) \geq 1 - \eta\} \leq 0.$$

The decision-maker would then consider minimizing the aggregate objective,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}(\gamma f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x})) + \mathbf{VaR}(f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}), \eta|\bar{x}), \quad (1)$$

where the first term describes the average-case, the second term describes the worst-case, and γ controls their tradeoff. This dual objective is inspired by the developments on Pareto-optimal solutions by [Iancu and Trichakis \(2014\)](#), who identify solutions for **RO** problems that perform well not only in the worst-case, but also dominate all other solutions in the typical-case.

Ideally, the problem for any context $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{D}_x$ can then be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z(\bar{x})}{\text{minimize}} && \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}(\Phi_\gamma(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x})) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{VaR}(g(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}), \eta|\bar{x}) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the functions Φ_γ and g are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\gamma(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) &= \gamma f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) + t(z(\bar{x})) \\ g(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) &= \max_{l=1, \dots, L} g_l(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}), \quad \text{where} \quad g_1(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) = f(z(\bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) - t(z(\bar{x})). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

By augmenting $z(\bar{x})$ with an epigraph variable represented by $t(z(\bar{x}))$, the objective function reformulates (1) such that the **VaR** is moved into the constraint. The function $g : \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the uncertain constraint that the decision-maker would like to constrain below 0 with high probability (that is, with probability $1 - \eta$, as implied by the value at risk). As given in (3), we assume g to be the maximum of L functions, each of which is concave in u and convex in both z and x . The concavity assumption is standard for methods in **RO**, and our given form encompasses a wide variety of functions that can be approximated by pointwise maximums. This structure also allows us to express any finite number of uncertain constraints as a single joint constraint, such that the violation probability is considered holistically. By the epigraph reformulation, the function $f - t$ is contained in g as g_1 , one of the L constituent functions.

The conditional formulation given in (2) is powerful, as the constraint controls the risk for *each context*. However, while the conditional guarantee is desirable, in real-life settings the conditional distribution may be difficult to estimate ([Angelopoulos and Bates, 2023](#)). The associated performance guarantees require stringent assumptions, which additionally depend on the approximation technique applied. While we do provide performance guarantees for this setting (see Section 4.2), for the sake of simplicity, in the following we focus on the *joint formulation*,

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z(\cdot)}{\text{minimize}} && \mathbf{E}_{(u,x)}(\Phi_\gamma(z(x), u, x)) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{VaR}(g(z, u, x), \eta) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

which can be interpreted as (2) with an additional expectation taken over x in both the objective and the constraints. Instead of optimizing for a particular context, we want to find a mapping $z(\cdot)$ that performs well *across all contexts*. Such a mapping would then be applicable for any context within the problem family. In the following, we describe our proposed mapping.

2.2 The joint formulation and the bi-level problem

In (4), we are interested in finding the best mapping $z(\cdot)$ from context parameters x to decisions z . To this end, we define the parametric set-valued mapping given by $x \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\theta, x)$, where $\mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$ is a convex contextual uncertainty set that depends on the *set parameter* $\theta \in \mathbf{R}^q$. For example, θ can represent the mapping between x and the center, size, and shape of $\mathcal{U}(\theta, x)$. We then define the mapping $z(\cdot)$ as the solution to the **RO** problem

$$\begin{aligned} z(\theta, x) \in \quad & \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad t(z) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & g(z, u, x) \leq 0 \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In this manner, we would like to find the optimal parameter θ by solving the bi-level optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{minimize}} \quad & \mathbf{E}_{(u,x)}(\Phi_\gamma(z(\theta, x), u, x)) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{VaR}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x), \eta) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the inner level problems, which become constraints of the outer level problem (6), are represented by (5), for all $x \in \mathcal{D}_x$. Problem (5) guarantees that, for θ and any given x , the solution $z(\theta, x)$ satisfies the constraint for any value of the uncertain parameter u in $\mathcal{U}(\theta, x)$. The outer level problem (6) then selects θ in a *decision-focused* manner, such that the solutions $z(\theta, x)$ perform well in terms of the performance metric and satisfy the **VaR** constraint across the problem class.

Unfortunately, the value at risk function often leads to intractable formulations (Uryasev and Rockafellar, 2001), so our problem cannot be solved directly. To get a tractable approximation, we adopt the *conditional value at risk* (Uryasev and Rockafellar, 2001; Rockafellar and Uryasev, 2002), defined as

$$\mathbf{CVaR}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x), \eta) = \inf_{\alpha} \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{E}_{(u,x)}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x) - \alpha)_+}{\eta} + \alpha \right\},$$

where $(a)_+ = \max\{a, 0\}$. It is well known (Uryasev and Rockafellar, 2001) that, for any $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$, the relationship between these probabilistic guarantees of constraint satisfaction is

$$\mathbf{CVaR}(g(z, u, x), \eta) \leq 0 \implies \mathbf{VaR}(g(z, u, x), \eta) \leq 0 \iff \mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}(g(z, u, x) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

Therefore, if the solution $z(\theta, x)$ of (5) satisfies $\mathbf{CVaR}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x), \eta) \leq 0$, we have the desired probabilistic guarantee in (6). In fact, as the **CVaR** constraint is stronger than the **VaR** constraint, ensuring its satisfaction might result in more desirable solutions, especially when, on top of the *threshold* worst-case value, the decision-maker is concerned with the *magnitude* of all the worst-case values beyond the threshold (Sarykalin et al., 2014). Furthermore, this formulation should not favor neglecting certain contexts x (such that they suffer constraint violations of a significant magnitude) in exchange for better performance for other contexts, since that would result in a high **CVaR**.

2.3 Data-driven approximation

As the distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}$ is unknown, we are unable to obtain the true expectation in (6). We do, however, assume access to historical data. Suppose we are given a pair of *training* datasets $W^N = (U^N, X^N) = \{(u^i, x^i)\}_{i=1}^N \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{(u,x)}$, consisting of a set of N independent samples of the uncertain parameter u and context parameter x , governed by $\mathbf{P}^N$, their joint distribution. As

the true probabilistic guarantee in (6) cannot be obtained, we instead target the the following *finite-sample probabilistic guarantee*

$$\mathbf{P}^N (\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \eta) \geq 1 - \beta, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is the target confidence level across draws of the dataset W^N . In other words, for any dataset W^N drawn from the true distribution, the learned θ satisfies the chance constraint $\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}(g(z(\theta, x), u, x) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \eta$ with confidence β . To obtain such a guarantee, we first must ensure the convergence of a data-driven version of (6). To this end, we define a constraint on the sampled **CVaR**,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{CVaR}}(\theta) = \inf_{\alpha} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{(g(z(\theta, x^i), u^i, x^i) - \alpha)_+}{\eta} + \alpha \right) \leq \kappa, \quad (8)$$

and require this condition to hold for feasible θ . The parameter $\kappa < 0$ is a threshold margin that we compute the value of later in Section 4, Theorem 4.1, to ensure the finite sample guarantee (7). We can then formulate the stochastic objective and constraint functions as follows,

$$F(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi_{\gamma}(z(\theta, x^i), u^i, x^i) \quad \text{and} \quad H(\alpha, \theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((g(z(\theta, x^i), u^i, x^i) - \alpha)_+ / \eta + \alpha - \kappa)_+,$$

evaluated over the dataset W^N . We use these approximations to define the sampled version of (6) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\alpha, \theta}{\text{minimize}} && F(\theta) \\ & \text{subject to} && H(\alpha, \theta) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the constraint H corresponds to the **CVaR** constraint where α is also a minimization variable. When the functions f and g are convex in z , optimizing over α as well has no impact on the optimal solution (Sarykalin et al., 2008). With this formulation, we thus tune α and the set parameter θ to improve the quality of the solutions $z(\theta, x^i)$ of the inner **RO** problem (5), measured by the performance on the outer level problem.

Solving the stochastic problem (9) is challenging because of the nonconvex bi-level structure introduced by the inner **RO** problem (5). While it may be possible to directly reformulate it as a single-level problem, this would involve several bilinear constraints over the entire training dataset, which can be difficult even in the simplest case of ℓ_1 -norm uncertainty sets; see Appendix F. We address these challenges in the following section, by introducing a stochastic first-order method to address problem (9) with tractable iterations. For the high-level architecture, see Figure 1.




Figure 1: Our high-level procedure. The evaluation metric is the augmented Lagrangian function defined in Section 3.1, and is derived from the sampled problem (9).

We give in Appendix A examples of parameterized uncertainty sets and the corresponding convex reformulations of (5), which we use to solve for $z(\theta, x^i)$. In the motivating example below, we give a parameterization of an ellipsoidal uncertainty set, where the trainable parameters are $\theta = (W_A, W_b, h_A, h_b, \rho)$. Learning θ using (9) thus equates to learning a feasible and ideally optimal set-valued mapping from context parameters to a region of uncertainty realizations.

2.4 Motivating example

We demonstrate through a motivating toy example the average-case gains we could obtain through a decision-focused uncertainty set, even when the worst-case objective value cannot be further improved. We consider a 2-product newsvendor problem where each day, the vendor orders $z \in \mathbf{R}^2$ products at price $k \in \mathbf{R}^2$, and we allow fractional values for simplicity. The products are sold at price $p \in \mathbf{R}^2$, until either the demand $u \in \mathbf{R}^2$ or inventory z is exhausted. The objective function to minimize is the sum of the ordering cost minus the revenue, $f(z, u, k, p) = k^T z - p^T \min\{z, u\} = k^T z + \max(-p_1 z_1 - p_2 z_2, -p_1 z_1 - p_2 u_2, -p_1 u_1 - p_2 z_2, -p_1 u_1 - p_2 u_2)$. Using the epigraph form, we obtain the RO problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && t \\ & \text{subject to} && f(z, u, k, p) \leq t \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, k, p) \\ & && z \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We parametrize the problem (10) with context parameters $x = (k, p)$, the buying and selling prices of the products, and would like to construct uncertainty sets without knowing the distributions of x and u .

Problem setup. We consider 20 unique sets of contexts, each repeated 100 times, to generate 2000 total data-samples. Each unique $k = (4, 5) + \delta_1$ and $p = k + \max\{0, \delta_2\}$, with δ_1, δ_2 normal random variables with mean 0 and variance 3. The uncertain parameter u is distributed as a contextual normal distribution, with parameters $\mu = (3, 4) - 0.1p - 0.2k$, $\Sigma = I$, where the mean depends on the context. In other words, the demands of the products are inversely related to their prices. Overall, we generate 2000 uncertainty-context pairs (u_i, x_i) . We split the 2000 samples into 600 training data-points, 400 validation data-points, and 1000 testing data-points.

Methods. For this toy example, we compare our method against a mean-variance uncertainty set and a contextual mean-variance uncertainty set; we delay a more comprehensive comparison against other baselines to the numerical examples in Section 6. We have access to three independent datasets: a training set, a validation set, and a testing set, detailed in the problem setup.

For each method, we determine the shape of the uncertainty set using the training set, tune the radius of the uncertainty set for at most a 10% probability of constraint violation (the probability that the in-sample objective underestimates the out-of-sample cost) on the validation dataset, and record the corresponding test-set values for the probability of constraint violation, 10% worst-case objective, and average objective. We repeat the data generation for u and the uncertainty set training and selection for 10 runs of the experiment, and report the averaged values. The probability of constraint violation is measured as $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{(u,x)}(f(z(\theta, x), u, x) \leq t(\theta, x))$, where $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{(u,x)}$ is the empirical distribution over the considered dataset. The worst-case and average-case objectives are likewise computed using the uncertain objective function $f(\cdot)$ over the considered datasets, for

instance, the 10% worst-case objective is computed as the 90-th percentile of the test-set objective values. Below, we describe the methods in greater detail.

- Mean-Variance (MV) uncertainty set. Standard methods in RO methods construct uncertainty sets based on the empirical mean $\hat{\mu}$ and covariance $\hat{\Sigma}$ of the training-set uncertainty U^N , and can be expressed in the ellipsoidal form

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta) = \{u = \hat{\mu} + \hat{\Sigma}^{1/2}v \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \rho\} = \{b^{\text{mv}} + A^{\text{mv}}v \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \rho\}, \quad (11)$$

where $\theta = (A^{\text{mv}}, b^{\text{mv}}, \rho)$. The radius ρ , which represents the size of the uncertainty set, is tuned using the validation-set uncertainty U^{valid} .

- Contextual Mean-Variance (CMV) uncertainty set. Consider now a contextual version of (11) inspired by [Messoudi et al. \(2022\)](#), *i.e.*, $\mathcal{U}(\theta, x) = \{u = b^{\text{cmv}}(x) + A^{\text{cmv}}(x)v \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \rho\}$, where $b^{\text{cmv}}(x)$ is a linear mapping of the context x to the contextual mean of the uncertainty, and $A^{\text{cmv}}(x)$ is based on the covariance matrix of the k uncertainty realizations associated with the k nearest neighbors of x , *i.e.*,

$$A^{\text{cmv}}(x) = \hat{\Sigma}_k^{1/2}(x), \quad b^{\text{cmv}}(x) = W_b x + h_b. \quad (12)$$

Specifically, we compute W_b, h_b as the solution to the ordinary least-squares problem

$$W_b, h_b = \text{argmin} \|X^N W_b^T + \mathbf{1}_N h_b^T - U^N\|_F^2,$$

where we use the training dataset (U^N, X^N) . To compute $\hat{\Sigma}_k^{1/2}(x)$, for each context x , we find the $k = \lceil N/10 \rceil$ realizations in X^N that are closest (in the Euclidean distance) to x , and take the square root of the covariance matrix of the k corresponding realizations in U^N . The parameters of the uncertainty set then become $\theta = (W_b, h_b, \hat{\Sigma}_k^{1/2}(\cdot), \rho)$, where ρ is tuned using the validation dataset.

- Decision-focused (LRO) uncertainty set. Consider now a reshaped ellipsoidal set

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta) = \{u = b^{\text{lro}}(x) + A^{\text{lro}}(x)v \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \rho\},$$

where both $A^{\text{lro}}(x)$ and $b^{\text{lro}}(x)$ are linear mappings of the context x , *i.e.*,

$$A^{\text{lro}}(x) = W_A x + h_A, \quad b^{\text{lro}}(x) = W_b x + h_b, \quad (13)$$

where $W_A \in \mathbf{R}^{m,m,p}$, $h_A \in \mathbf{R}^{m,p}$, $W_b \in \mathbf{R}^{m,p}$, $h_b \in \mathbf{R}^m$. Note that the mappings for A^{lro} are tensors. The parameters of the uncertainty set are $\theta = (W_A, W_b, h_A, h_b, \rho)$, the first four of which are selected using our end-to-end framework on the training dataset, and the radius is tuned using the validation dataset.

Comparison. In Table 1, we compare the three uncertainty sets, with an average taken over the 10 independent runs. We note that while the 10% worst-case values are all 0 (for all methods, the radius can always be tuned to obtain a particular worst-case guarantee), the average-case objective for the learned decision-focused uncertainty set (LRO) outperforms the other two methods, signifying that we attain less conservative - but still robust - solutions. In fact, we note that the

	LRO	MV	CMV
$\hat{\eta}$	0.0995	0.094	0.0997
10% worst-case obj.	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
avg-case obj.	-1.98 ± 0.08	-1.52 ± 0.08	-1.83 ± 0.04

Table 1: Out-of-sample values for the three methods, across 10 repetitions. Values shown as mean $\pm$ half-IQR, where half-IQR = $(Q_{.75} - Q_{.25})/2$.

worst average-case objective for LRO in the given (0.25,0.75) quantile range still outperforms the best average-case objective for the other methods. In the next sections, we introduce an automatic technique to find these contextual decision-focused sets. In the larger numerical examples in Section 6, we further demonstrate the ability of the method to outperform baseline methods in both worst-case and average-case performance.

3 Learning the uncertainty set parameterization

In this section, we detail the procedure to solve the sampled problem (9), and prove its convergence either to a feasible solution, or to a stationary point of constraint violation.

3.1 The stochastic augmented Lagrangian algorithm

We begin by defining the optimality conditions for problem (9). Since the problem is nonsmooth and nonconvex due to the bi-level structure (see Appendix F), we search for feasible stationary points instead of globally optimal points. We make use of the following augmented Lagrangian function

$$L(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu) = F(\theta) + \lambda H(\alpha, \theta) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|H(\alpha, \theta)\|^2, \quad (14)$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier in $\mathbf{R}$, and μ is the penalty parameter in $\mathbf{R}$. As this is the augmented Lagrangian formulation of (9), the function L is evaluated over the entire dataset W^N . We also denote the estimated augmented Lagrangian over a subset (batch) of data $B \subseteq W^N$ as $\hat{L}$. We then define the following stationary and ϵ -stationary points.

Definition 3.1 (Stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian). *Given λ and μ , a point $(\alpha, \theta) \in \mathbf{R}^{q+1}$ is called a stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian function (14) if $0 \in J_L(\alpha, \theta)$, where $J_L(\alpha, \theta)$ denotes the conservative Jacobian (Definition 3.3) of L in the variables (α, θ) .*

Definition 3.2 (ϵ -stationary point). *Given $\epsilon > 0$, a point $(\alpha, \theta) \in \mathbf{R}^{q+1}$ is called an ϵ -stationary point of (9) if there is a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ such that*

$$\|H(\alpha, \theta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{dist}(0, J_F(\theta) + \lambda J_H(\alpha, \theta)) \leq \epsilon, \quad (15)$$

where $J_F(\theta)$ is the conservative Jacobian of the objective function F in the variable θ , $J_H(\alpha, \theta)$ denotes the conservative Jacobian of the constraint function in variables (α, θ) , and the distance between a vector z and set $\mathcal{Z}$ is defined as $\text{dist}(z, \mathcal{Z}) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{Z}} \|z - y\|_2$.

These definitions rely on conservative Jacobians, which are a generalized form of Jacobians for functions that are almost everywhere differentiable (Bolte and Pauwels, 2019), and are suitable for our case due to the nonsmooth nature of our problem. In the following section, we detail the assumptions required for the existence of these conservative Jacobians. Below, in Algorithms 1 and 2, we give our proposed stochastic augmented Lagrangian approach to find an ϵ -stationary point for the sampled problem (9). Later, in Section 3.1.2 on the convergence analysis, for $k \rightarrow \infty$, we prove the convergence of θ to either a feasible solution satisfying condition (8), or to a stationary point of the constraint violation function $(1/2)\|H(\alpha, \theta)\|^2$.

Algorithm 1 Safeguarded stochastic augmented Lagrangian algorithm to solve (9)

```

1: given  $\theta^0 = (A^{\text{init}}, b^{\text{init}})$ ,  $\alpha^0, \lambda^0, \mu^0, \epsilon \geq 0, \kappa, \sigma > 1, \tau < 1, \eta \in (0, 1), H_{\text{best}} = \infty$ 
2: for  $k = 1, \dots, k_{\text{max}}$  do
3:    $(\alpha^k, \theta^k) \leftarrow \text{minimize } L(\alpha, \theta, \lambda^{k-1}, \mu^{k-1}) \text{ over } (\alpha, \theta) \text{ via Algorithm 2}$ 
4:   if  $\|H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$  then
5:     return  $\theta^k$  ▷  $\epsilon$ -stationary point found
6:   else if  $\|H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)\|_2 \leq \tau \|H_{\text{best}}\|_2$  then
7:      $\lambda^k \leftarrow \Pi_{[\lambda^{\min}, \lambda^{\max}]}(\lambda^{k-1} + \mu^{k-1}(H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)))$  ▷ update Lagrange multipliers
8:      $H_{\text{best}} \leftarrow \|H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)\|_2$ 
9:      $\mu^k \leftarrow \mu^{k-1}$ 
10:  else
11:     $\mu^k \leftarrow \sigma \mu^{k-1}$  ▷ update penalty
12:     $\lambda^k \leftarrow \lambda^{k-1}$ 
13: return  $\theta^{k_{\text{max}}}$ 

```

Algorithm 2 Stochastic gradient descent for the inner loop

```

1: given  $\theta^0, \alpha^0, \lambda, \mu, \{\delta^t\}_{t \in \mathbf{N}}, W^N$ 
2: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{max}}$  do
3:   sample data  $W^t = (U^t, X^t) \subseteq W^N$ 
4:    $z^t(\theta^{t-1}, x) \leftarrow \text{solve inner RO problem (5) for all } x \in X^t$ 
5:    $J_{\hat{L}} \leftarrow J_{\hat{L}}(\alpha^{t-1}, \theta^{t-1})$  ▷ compute Jacobian of  $\hat{L}$  over  $W^t$ 
6:    $\alpha^t \leftarrow \alpha^{t-1} - \delta^t v_{\alpha}^t$ , with  $v_{\alpha}^t \in J_{\hat{L}}(\alpha)$ 
7:    $\theta^t \leftarrow \theta^{t-1} - \delta^t v_{\theta}^t$ , with  $v_{\theta}^t \in J_{\hat{L}}(\theta)$ 
8: return  $(\alpha^t, \theta^t)$ 

```

3.1.1 Path differentiability and conservative Jacobians

In order to apply Algorithms 1 and 2, we need to establish the existence of J_L and $J_{\hat{L}}$, the conservative Jacobians of the augmented Lagrangian functions L and $\hat{L}$. The conservative Jacobian is defined as follows.

Definition 3.3 (Conservative Jacobian (Bolte et al., 2021)). *Given a locally Lipschitz continuous function $F : \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$, we call $J_F : \mathbf{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbf{R}^{n \times m}$ its conservative Jacobian if J_F has a closed*

graph, is locally bounded, and is nonempty with

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(\gamma(t)) \in J_F(\gamma(t))\dot{\gamma}(t) \quad \text{a.e.},$$

for any absolutely continuous curve γ in $\mathbf{R}^n$. A locally Lipschitz function F that admits a conservative Jacobian J_F is called *path differentiable*.

Notably, locally Lipschitz functions that are *definable* are path differentiable (Bolte et al., 2021). To obtain the conservative Jacobians J_L and $J_{\bar{L}}$, we then require the following assumptions.

Assumption 3.1 (Definability). *All functions f and g_l in the robust optimization problem (5) are definable in z (van den Dries and Miller, 1999; Coste, 2000; Bolte et al., 2021).*

Assumption 3.2 (Local Lipschitzness). *All functions f and g_l in the robust optimization problem (5) are locally Lipschitz in z . A function ℓ is locally Lipschitz if, for each point z on its domain, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of z such that ℓ is Lipschitz on $\mathcal{V}$.*

The class of definable functions is very wide and includes semi-algebraic functions: functions whose graphs can be described by a finite number of polynomial equalities and inequalities. This includes polynomials, the Euclidean norm, max and mins of finitely many polynomials, as well as piecewise polynomial functions, which incorporate a large number of functions we would expect to use in stochastic optimization problems. Functions such as e^z or $-\log(z)$ are also definable, whereas $\sin(z)$ is not, as it has an infinite and discrete zero set. For a more detailed overview, see the works by Bolte and Pauwels (2019) and Bolte et al. (2021). For a foundational work, see van den Dries and Miller (1999).

Assuming the definability of the objective and constraint functions, it follows that F and H , and subsequently L , as compositions of definable pieces, are definable in the variables (z, α) (Bolte et al., 2021). The same follows for the local Lipschitzness condition, which is preserved under composition.

By the chain rule for path differentiable functions, L is then path differentiable in θ if $z(\theta, x)$ is itself path differentiable. We observe that $z(\theta, x)$ is the solution map of the inner robust problem (5), which admits a convex conic reformulation; we give this reformulation in Appendix B. Path differentiability of the solution map then requires the following conditions, which ensure the uniqueness of the optimal primal-dual solution pair for any input (θ, x) .

Assumption 3.3 (Uniqueness and nondegeneracy). *The convex conic reformulation (25) of the robust optimization problem (5) has a unique and nondegenerate primal solution (z^*, s^*) , where s is a slack variable in the primal cone $\mathcal{K}$.*

Note that primal uniqueness can be ensured by adding a small quadratic penalty, i.e., $\varepsilon\|z\|^2$, to the problem objective, and primal nondegeneracy holds generically for linear conic programs, i.e., for all problem data (G, h, c) of (25) except on a measure zero set (Dür et al., 2017, Theorem 10). Nondegeneracy implies Slater’s condition (Dür et al., 2017, Theorem 6), and together with primal optimality, implies the existence and uniqueness of the dual optimal solution (Alizadeh et al., 1997, Theorem 7).

Since we have established the existence of a unique primal-dual optimal pair, we can make use of the results of Agrawal et al. (2019b) and Bolte et al. (2021), which enable us to find conservative Jacobians of optimal solutions for conic problems by differentiating through the KKT optimality conditions. We state the theorem below, with the proof delayed to Appendix C.

Theorem 3.1 (Path differentiability of the RO solution). *Suppose Assumption 3.3 holds. Let $z(\theta, x)$ be the unique solution, for a given input pair (θ, x) , to the convex conic reformulation (25) of the inner optimization problem (5). This solution is path differentiable with nonempty conservative Jacobian $J_z(\theta) \neq \emptyset$.*

By application of the chain rule, we can then establish the existence of the conservative Jacobians of the augmented Lagrangian function L . The specific forms of the conservative Jacobians established in Proposition 3.1 are given in Appendix D.

Proposition 3.1 (Conservative Jacobians of the augmented Lagrangian (14)). *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 to 3.3 hold, and for each given input pair (θ, x) , the solution $z(\theta, x)$ of the optimization problem (5) is path differentiable with conservative Jacobian $J_z(\theta)$. Then, the Lagrangian function $L(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu)$, from equation (14), and its batched version $\hat{L}(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu)$, are path differentiable with conservative Jacobians $J_L(\alpha, \theta)$ and $J_{\hat{L}}(\alpha, \theta)$.*

3.1.2 Convergence analysis

To show convergence of the augmented Lagrangian algorithm, given in Algorithm 1, we require the convergence of the inner loop, Algorithm 2. The convergence of Algorithm 2 relies on the path-differentiability of the Lagrangian function, as well as the boundedness of the iterates and the Lagrangian multiplier λ .

Assumption 3.4 (Boundedness). *There exists a constant $\alpha^{\max} > 0$ and compact set $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \subset \mathbf{R}$, such that for $\alpha^0 \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, $\|\alpha^t\| \leq \alpha^{\max}$ almost surely. Similarly, there exist constants $\theta^{\max}, z^{\max}, x^{\max} > 0$, compact sets $\mathcal{D}_\theta \subset \mathbf{R}^q$, $\mathcal{D}_x \subset \mathbf{R}^p$, $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, such that for $\theta^0 \in \mathcal{D}_\theta$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_x$, we have $\|\theta^t\| \leq \theta^{\max}$, $\|x\| \leq x^{\max}$, and $z(\theta^t, x) \in \mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid \|z\| \leq z^{\max}\}$ almost surely. In addition, the optimal Lagrangian multiplier $\lambda^* \in [\lambda^{\min}, \lambda^{\max}]$.*

Lastly, we require that the step sizes are nonnegative, square summable, but not summable.

Assumption 3.5 (Step sizes). *The step sizes $\{\delta^t\}_{t \in \mathbf{N}}$ are chosen such that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t = \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} (\delta^t)^2 < \infty, \quad \delta^t = o(1/\log(t)).$$

Under these assumptions, by Theorem 6.2 of Davis et al. (2018) and Theorem 3 of Bolte et al. (2021), the sequence $\{\alpha^t, \theta^t\}$ in Algorithm 2 converges to a stationary point of the Lagrangian function (14) with arbitrary λ and μ . We note that μ^k in Algorithm 1 is potentially unbounded, in which case it does not converge. The stationary point (α^k, θ^k) of the augmented Lagrangian function for any λ^k and μ^k is, therefore, not guaranteed to be a feasible solution of the CVaR-constrained problem (9). However, with the use of the safeguards $[\lambda^{\min}, \lambda^{\max}]$, we can guarantee that the limit point of the augmented Lagrangian algorithm is at least a stationary point of constraint violation (Birgin and Martinez, 2009, Theorem 6.3). More specifically, below we show that the algorithm finds a feasible point of condition (8) under mild assumptions, and otherwise converges to a stationary point of the constraint violation function $(1/2)\|H(\alpha, \theta)\|^2$. The proof is delayed to Appendix E.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 to 3.5 hold. If the sequence of penalty parameters $\{\mu^k\}$ is bounded, then the sequence of updates $\{\theta^k\}$ in Algorithm 1 converges almost surely to a feasible point, θ^* , of the $\widehat{\text{CVaR}}$ condition (8) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Otherwise, $\{\alpha^k, \theta^k\}$ converges to a stationary point of the constraint violation function $(1/2)\|H(\alpha, \theta)\|^2$.*

Note that a feasible point θ^* of the $\widehat{\text{CVaR}}$ condition (8) also implies a feasible point of the constrained problem (9). In practice, with a finite number of iterations $k_{\max}$ and some $\epsilon > 0$, we obtain an ϵ -stationary solution of (9) satisfying condition (15). The feasibility is then ensured through tuning the radius ρ while fixing the other parameters of θ . In fact, even when we converge to a stationary point of infeasibility, increasing the radius ρ can often restore feasibility.

4 Probabilistic guarantees of constraint satisfaction

In the previous section, we have given a solution method to obtain a feasible solution of the sampled problem (9), which does not exactly correspond to the probabilistic guarantees of constraint satisfaction (7). In this section, we thus establish this guarantee. We prove two results: one with respect to the joint distribution, as given in (7), and another with respect to the conditional distribution, for the setting introduced in Section 2.1.

4.1 Guarantees with respect to the joint distribution

To arrive at our desired guarantees, where the inner probability is with respect to the unknown joint distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}$, we need to analyze the generalization behavior of the robust solutions on out-of-sample data. In addition to Assumption 3.4, we need a boundedness assumption on the function from the CVaR definition.

Assumption 4.1. *The function $(g(z(\theta, x), u, x) - \alpha)_+ / \eta + \alpha$ maps to values in $(-c^{\min}, c^{\max})$, where $0 \leq c^{\min}, c^{\max} < \infty$, for all θ, α, u, x in its support.*

Under Assumption 4.1, we then let $C = c^{\min} + c^{\max}$ and define the normalized function

$$\psi_w(u, x) = \frac{1}{C} \left(c^{\min} + \frac{(g(z(\theta, x), u, x) - \alpha)_+}{\eta} + \alpha \right), \quad (16)$$

where $w = (\theta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbf{R}^{q+1}$. Note that when Assumption 3.4 holds, we have $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{D}_\theta \times \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ being a compact set. The function ψ_w then maps to values in $(0, 1)$, and we consider the entire function class

$$\Psi = \{\psi_w\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}},$$

which we use to acquire the finite sample probabilistic guarantee in Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.1 (Finite sample probabilistic guarantee). *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 to 4.1 hold. For the function class Ψ defined above, suppose the following condition on the covering number N^{cov} holds with constants V and K , relative to the $L_2(Q)$ norm $\|\psi\|_{Q,2} = (\int |\psi|^2 dQ)^{1/2}$ with probability measure Q ,*

$$\sup_Q N^{\text{cov}}(\delta, \Psi, L_2(Q)) \leq \left(\frac{K}{\delta} \right)^V, \quad (17)$$

for every $0 < \delta < K$. Then, when Algorithm 1 converges to an ϵ -stationary point of (9), given as θ^* , we have the finite sample probabilistic guarantee

$$\mathbf{P}^N (\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}(g(z(\theta^*), x), u, x) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \eta) \geq 1 - \beta, \quad (18)$$

where $\beta = (D\sqrt{N}C\tau/\sqrt{V})^V \exp(-2NC^2\tau^2)$, D is a constant that depends only on K , and $\tau \leq -(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon)/C$.

Proof. By the definition of the function class Ψ and Assumptions 3.4 and 4.1, we can apply Theorem 2.14.9 by van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) to get

$$\mathbf{P}^N \left(\sup_{\psi_w \in \Psi} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_w(u^i, x^i) - \mathbf{E}_{(u,x)}[\psi_w(u, x)] \right\| \leq \tau \right) \geq 1 - \left(\frac{D\sqrt{N}C\tau}{\sqrt{V}} \right)^V \exp(-2NC^2\tau^2).$$

By the convergence of Algorithm 1 to an ϵ -stationary point of (9), we have that the empirical **CVaR** will be close to κ . Given equation (16), this means that at $w^* = (\theta^*, \alpha^k)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{w^*}(u^i, x^i) \leq (1/C)(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon).$$

Therefore, as $\psi_{w^*} \in \Psi$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}^N (\mathbf{E}_{(u,x)}[\psi_{w^*}(u, x)] \leq (1/C)(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon) + \tau) \geq 1 - \beta,$$

where $\beta = (D\sqrt{N}C\tau/\sqrt{V})^V \exp(-2NC^2\tau^2)$. If κ is set such that $\kappa \leq -C\tau - \epsilon - c^{\min}$, we then have

$$\mathbf{P}^N (\mathbf{CVaR}(g(z(\theta^*), x), u, x), \eta) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \beta,$$

which implies (18). ■

This probabilistic guarantee holds for our data-driven solutions $z(\theta^*, x)$. We note that the covering number requirement holds when Ψ is a class of Lipschitz functions, which is implied when the constraint function g is Lipschitz in z , and z is uniformly Lipschitz in θ over $\mathcal{D}_\theta$. For instance, when g is affine or a maximum of affine functions in variable z , which is a common scenario in many optimization problems (and is the case for our numerical experiments in Section 6), it is Lipschitz in z for all $(u, x) \in \mathcal{D}_{(u,x)}$, i.e.,

$$|g(z, u, x) - g(z', u, x)| \leq \bar{L} \|z - z'\|_2 \quad \forall z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}, (u, x) \in \mathcal{D}_{(u,x)},$$

with some Lipschitz constant $\bar{L}$. Under Assumption 3.3, $z(\theta, x)$ is path differentiable and therefore locally Lipschitz in θ . Since $\mathcal{D}_\theta$ and $\mathcal{D}_x$ are both compact by Assumption 3.4, local Lipschitzness implies the existence of a uniform constant L_z such that

$$|z(\theta, x) - z(\theta', x)| \leq L_z \|\theta - \theta'\|_2 \quad \forall \theta, \theta' \in \mathcal{D}_\theta, x \in \mathcal{D}_x.$$

It follows that g is Lipschitz in θ with constant $\bar{L}L_z$, and $\psi_w \in \Psi$ is Lipschitz in $w = (\theta, \alpha)$ with Lipschitz constant $L \leq (1/C)((\bar{L}L_z + 1)/\eta + 1)$. We can now derive the following covering number condition.

Covering number for L -Lipschitz functions. When ψ_w is L -Lipschitz in w for all u and x , we can apply standard bounds on the covering number of Lipschitz losses ([van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#); [Pollard, 1890](#); [Namkoong and Duchi, 2017](#)). In this case, the covering number condition (17) reduces to

$$\sup_Q N^{\text{cov}}(\delta, \Psi, L_2(Q)) \leq N(\delta/L, \mathcal{Z}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \left(1 + \frac{(\theta^{\max} + \alpha^{\max})L}{\delta}\right)^{q+1} \leq \left(\frac{K}{\delta}\right)^{q+1},$$

for every $0 < \delta < K$, where $K = \delta + (\theta^{\max} + \alpha^{\max})L$. Then, the confidence parameter can be chosen as $\beta = (D\sqrt{N}C\tau/\sqrt{q+1})^{q+1} \exp(-2NC^2\tau^2)$.

4.2 Guarantees with respect to the conditional distribution

To establish performance guarantees with respect to the conditional distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}$ instead of the joint distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(u,x)}$, we now consider the optimization problem (2), for which an approximated sampled formulation (alternative for (9)) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\alpha, \theta}{\text{minimize}} && \tilde{F}(\theta, \bar{x}) \\ & \text{subject to} && \tilde{H}(\alpha, \theta, \bar{x}) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where

$$\tilde{F}(\theta, \bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) \Phi_{\gamma}(z(\theta, x^i), u^i, x^i)$$

and

$$\tilde{H}(\alpha, \theta, \bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) ((g(z(\theta, x^i), u^i, x^i) - \alpha)_+ / \eta + \alpha - \kappa)_+.$$

The weights $w(\bar{x}, x^i)$ are constructed such that $\sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) = 1$ and $w(\bar{x}, x^i) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and is a measure of the proximity of the data-point x^i to $\bar{x}$. With this construction, the conditional distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}$ is approximated as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{(u|x=\bar{x})} = \sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) \delta_{u^i}.$$

As discussed by [Bertsimas and Kallus \(2020\)](#), the weights could be constructed using k -nearest-neighbors (k NN), kernel methods, nonnegative local linear methods, trees, or random forests. Here, we focus on the k NN setting, and note that the remaining methods could similarly be applied, albeit with different assumptions.

In the k NN setting, we choose the weights

$$w(\bar{x}, x^i) = \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{1}\{x^i \text{ is a } k\text{NN of } \bar{x}\},$$

where ties are broken randomly, and the nearest-neighbors are decided using the Euclidean distance in $\mathbf{R}^p$. In their work, [Bertsimas and Kallus \(2020\)](#) derive asymptotic guarantees for their constructed contextual prescriptors. We, however, require a finite-sample guarantee analogous to (18) for a particular context $\bar{x}$. We therefore require the following assumptions:

Assumption 4.2 (Regular marginal density). *The distribution $\mathbf{P}_x$ of the context variable x admits a density μ_x with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and μ_x is continuous at $\bar{x}$ with $\mu_x(\bar{x}) > 0$. Moreover, there exists a radius $R > 0$ such that for all $r \in [0, R]$, $\int_{B(\bar{x}, r)} \mu_x(x) dx \geq \mu_x(\bar{x}) V_p r^p$, where $B(\bar{x}, r) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^p \mid \|x - \bar{x}\|_2 < r\}$ is the open ball of radius r centered at $\bar{x}$, and V_p is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbf{R}^p$.*

Assumption 4.3 (Hölder continuous conditional expectation). *There exist constants $L > 0$ and $s > 0$ such that for all $w = (\theta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{W}$ and all $\bar{x}, \bar{x}' \in \mathcal{D}_x$:*

$$|\mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}[\psi_w(u, \bar{x})] - \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x}')}[\psi_w(u, \bar{x}')]| \leq L \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\|_2^s.$$

Intuitively, the density assumption ensures that the conditional distribution at $\bar{x}$ is meaningful and that the local mass of the ball around $\bar{x}$ is well-behaved, while the continuity assumption ensures that borrowing information from neighboring contexts introduces only a controlled amount of bias. We can then derive the following finite-sample guarantee for the conditional distribution. Note that compared with the joint distribution, this bound includes an additional bias term, which arises from the approximation of the conditional distribution.

Theorem 4.2 (Conditional finite sample guarantee). *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 to 4.3 hold. For the function class Ψ defined in Section 4, suppose the covering number condition (17) holds with constants V and K . Suppose also that Algorithm 1, adjusted for the conditional sampled problem (19) with k NN weights, converges to an ϵ -stationary point θ^* for a particular context $\bar{x}$. We then have the conditional finite sample probabilistic guarantee for the given $\bar{x}$:*

$$\mathbf{P}^N (\mathbf{P}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}(g(z(\theta^*, \bar{x}), u, \bar{x}) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \eta) \geq 1 - \beta_{\text{cond}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\beta_{\text{cond}} = \beta_{\text{var}} + \beta_{\text{bias}}$. The variance term is

$$\beta_{\text{var}} = \left(\frac{D\sqrt{k}C\tau_{\text{var}}}{\sqrt{V}} \right)^V \exp(-2kC^2\tau_{\text{var}}^2),$$

with D a constant depending only on K , and $\tau_{\text{var}} \leq -(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon)/C - \tau_{\text{bias}}$. The value τ_{bias} is chosen as $\tau_{\text{bias}} = Lr^s$ for an $r \in \left[(k/f_x(\bar{x})V_p N)^{1/p}, R \right]$, and the corresponding bias probability is

$$\beta_{\text{bias}} = \exp(-f_x(\bar{x})V_p r^p N) \left(\frac{e f_x(\bar{x})V_p r^p N}{k} \right)^k.$$

Proof. We decompose the error between the k NN-weighted empirical estimate and the true conditional expectation as

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) \psi_w(u^i, x^i) - \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}[\psi_w(u, \bar{x})] = S_{\text{var}} + S_{\text{bias}},$$

where

$$S_{\text{var}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in k\text{NN}(\bar{x})} (\psi_w(u^i, x^i) - \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=x^i)}[\psi_w(u, x^i)])$$

is the variance term, with $k\text{NN}(\bar{x})$ the set of indices of the k nearest neighbors of $\bar{x}$, and

$$S_{\text{bias}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in k\text{NN}(\bar{x})} \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=x^i)}[\psi_w(u, x^i)] - \mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}[\psi_w(u, \bar{x})]$$

is the bias term. We begin with bounding the variance term, as it follows the logic of the bound from Theorem 4.1, only with k samples instead of N .

Variance bound. By Assumptions 3.4, 4.1 and the normalization step in equation (16), the variance term S_{var} is an average of k conditionally independent random variables, each bounded in $(0, 1)$. Applying Theorem 2.14.9 by [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) with the k nearest-neighbor samples in place of the full dataset, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^N \left(\sup_{\psi_w \in \Psi} |S_{\text{var}}| \leq \tau_{\text{var}} \right) \geq 1 - \left(\frac{D\sqrt{k} C \tau_{\text{var}}}{\sqrt{V}} \right)^V \exp(-2kC^2 \tau_{\text{var}}^2) = 1 - \beta_{\text{var}}.$$

Bias bound. By Assumption 4.3, the bias term satisfies

$$\sup_{\psi_w \in \Psi} |S_{\text{bias}}| \leq L r_k(\bar{x})^s,$$

where $r_k(\bar{x}) = \max_{i \in k\text{NN}(\bar{x})} \|x^i - \bar{x}\|_2$ is the k NN radius. Under Assumption 4.2, $\mathbf{P}_x$ satisfies the full dimension condition (Definition 3) of [Singh and Póczos \(2016\)](#) with dimension p and locality radius R . For any $r \in \left[(k/f_x(\bar{x}) V_p N)^{1/p}, R \right]$, Lemma 6 of [Singh and Póczos \(2016\)](#) therefore gives

$$\mathbf{P}^N(r_k(\bar{x}) > r) \leq \exp(-f_x(\bar{x}) V_p r^p N) \left(\frac{e f_x(\bar{x}) V_p r^p N}{k} \right)^k = \beta_{\text{bias}}.$$

It follows that $\sup_{\psi_w \in \Psi} |S_{\text{bias}}| \leq L r^s = \tau_{\text{bias}}$ with probability $1 - \beta_{\text{bias}}$.

Combining the bounds. By the convergence of Algorithm 1 to an ϵ -stationary point of (19), analogously to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have at $w^* = (\theta^*, \alpha^k)$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w(\bar{x}, x^i) \psi_{w^*}(u^i, x^i) \leq (1/C)(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon).$$

By a union bound over the variance and bias events, with probability at least $1 - \beta_{\text{var}} - \beta_{\text{bias}}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(u|x=\bar{x})}[\psi_{w^*}(u, \bar{x})] \leq (1/C)(c^{\min} + \kappa + \epsilon) + \tau_{\text{var}} + \tau_{\text{bias}}.$$

Setting κ such that $\kappa \leq -C(\tau_{\text{var}} + \tau_{\text{bias}}) - \epsilon - c^{\min}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^N(\mathbf{CVaR}(g(z(\theta^*, \bar{x}), u, \bar{x}), \eta) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \beta_{\text{cond}},$$

which implies (20). ■

We note that due to the bias term, and due to the use of k instead of N in the variance term, this result adds additional conservatism to the probabilistic guarantee compared to that of Theorem 4.1.

5 Hyperparameter tuning

As our learning problem is stochastic, nonsmooth, and nonconvex, our feasible solution is not guaranteed to be a locally or globally optimal solution. Furthermore, as the theoretical guarantees are often conservative, they often require a very large number of samples N . In practice, we thus tune for a target guarantee using a validation dataset; to obtain the best solutions, we employ hyperparameter tuning to select among various feasible solutions. As opposed to traditional methods with limited hyperparameters (*e.g.*, only radius), our flexibility allows for the possibility of improved solutions.

As given in Algorithm 1, we have multiple tunable parameters; see Table 2 below, where we list suggested default values. We prioritize grid-searching over the most impactful hyperparameters, such as the radius ρ , augmented Lagrangian initializations λ^0 and μ^0 , the risk η , and the objective multiplier γ . The suggested ranges for these parameters are also given below. For the other parameters, while the given default values may not be optimal, they work consistently well for our numerical experiments, and so are unchanged.

ρ	α^0	λ^0	μ^0	γ	κ	σ	τ	$k_{\max}$	$t_{\max}$	η	$ B $
[0.00001, 5]	0	[0.1, 2]	[0.1, 2]	[0, 0.5]	-0.01	1.005	0.95	15	20	(0, 0.3]	200

Table 2: Default hyperparameter values and suggested ranges for the training algorithm 1.

Note that, to limit the training cost in practice, we limit the number of inner iterations $t_{\max}$ and outer iterations $k_{\max}$, as the per-iteration gains on the validation dataset are diminishing. For the step sizes δ^t given in Algorithm 2, we employ an incrementally decreasing schedule, where we multiply the step size by some value $\hat{\delta}$ every $\hat{k}$ steps. We use the default values $\hat{k} = 50$ and $\hat{\delta} = 0.7$, and an initial step size $\delta^0 = 0.001$.

For the uncertainty set initialization, we pre-train a contextual mean-variance linear mapping for $\theta^0 = (W_A^0, h_A^0, W_b^0, h_b^0)$, as introduced in (13). We use least-squares on the stacked vectors of the training data (U^N, X^N) to learn (W_b^0, h_b^0) , and similarly use least-squares on the 10%-nearest-neighbor covariance matrices to learn (W_A^0, h_A^0) , *i.e.*, minimize $\|W_b^0 X^N + h_b^0 - U^N\|^2$, and minimize $\|W_A^0 X^N + h_A^0 - \hat{\Sigma}^{1/2}(X^N)\|^2$.

Among the solutions obtained from the hyperparameter combinations, we use a validation dataset to select the one with the best performance.

6 Examples

We run the following experiments on the Princeton Institute for Computational Science and Engineering (PICSciE) facility with 20 parallel 2.4 GHz Skylake cores. We solve the inner optimization problems (5) with the Clarabel optimizer with default settings. The learning procedure relies on the Python package cvxpylayers (Agrawal et al., 2019a), and the code to replicate the experiments (along with the baselines) can be accessed at

https://github.com/stellatogr/cvxro_experiments

We compare our method with the following baselines. To accommodate non-contextual methods, we restrict ourselves to discrete contexts, so the problems can be solved separately in each context.

While we can also use clustering to restrict the number of representative contexts (for problems where the context does not appear in the formulation), here we use the exact contexts for a better comparison. For all experiments, we split the data into three components: training, validation, and testing. For all methods, we tune hyperparameters based on the performance on the validation dataset, for a validation probability of constraint violation below 10%, and for the best (lowest) 90 percentile validation value (out-of-sample objective value on the validation dataset) among all sets that satisfies the criteria. We report the corresponding test-set values. Below, we detail the tuning procedures for each method.

- **Learning for decision-focused RO (LRO) (our method)**. We apply the training method given in Section 3.1 on the training data, for an ellipsoidal uncertainty set with $p = 2$, and hyperparameter values from Table 2. We use the validation dataset to select the hyperparameter combination that has a probability of constraint violation below 10% and the lowest 90 percentile objective value.
- **Mean-Variance RO (MV)**. We perform mean-variance RO, where the shape of the uncertainty set is determined by the empirical mean and variance of the training data (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2000). We use grid search over the set size ρ on the validation set to select the ρ that gives a constraint violation below 10% and the lowest 90 percentile objective value.
- **Contextual Mean-Variance RO (CMV)**. We perform contextual mean-variance RO on the training data, as described in Section 2.4, and use grid search over the set size ρ on the validation data, as described above.
- **Wasserstein DRO (W)**. We perform Wasserstein-1 DRO (Mohajerin Esfahani and Kuhn, 2018), where the uncertainty set is constructed around individual data-points from the training set, regardless of the context. We again perform grid search over the set size ρ on the validation data, as described above.
- **Wasserstein DRO with separate contexts (CW)**. We perform Wasserstein-1 DRO for each context, where the uncertainty set is constructed around individual data-points from the training set for the particular context. For each context, we grid search over the set size ρ on the validation data. We average the final result across all contexts.
- **End-to-End Conditional RO (ECRO)**. We implement the end-to-end approach given by Chenreddy and Delage (2024), where a contextual neural-network is trained on the training data. We use grid search over $\eta \in [0.05, 0.3]$ and $\gamma \in [0.1, 0.9]$, which controls their objective CVaR and a conditional coverage objective, with 6 values in each interval. We choose the combination with the best performance on the validation data, as described above. For other hyperparameters, we use the values given in their work.
- **Linear-Convex Ordering RO with separate contexts (CLCX)**. We implement the LCX uncertainty set given by (Bertsimas et al., 2018, Section 7), which is a custom constraint-based uncertainty set built using hypothesis testing. We use the hyperparameters $\alpha = \epsilon = 0.1$, as given in their numerical experiments. We repeat the procedure for each context in the training data, and average the results across all contexts.

For each setting, we repeat the experiment 10 times, each with a new independent dataset, and evaluate the performance metrics in Table 3. For all methods with size tuning, we use 60 values

of ρ , and for our method, additionally grid over 6 values of η and 6 combinations of $(\lambda^0, \mu^0, \gamma)$ in the given ranges. Note that for all methods, the hyperparameter tuning is done separately for each repetition of the experiments.

Name	Description
$\hat{\eta}$	Test-set empirical probability of constraint violation
10% worst-case	Test-set 90 percentile objective value
average-case	Test-set average objective value
CVaR	Test-set 10% Conditional Value-at-Risk

Table 3: Performance metrics, averaged over 10 runs.

6.1 Portfolio optimization

Problem description. We consider the classic portfolio management problem, where we select a portfolio $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$ of stocks to maximize $u^T z$, where $u \in \mathbf{R}^n$ are the uncertain asset returns. We assume to have access to contextual data on the market factors $F \in \mathbf{R}^{(n,2)}$, which influences the returns covariance, as well as data $h \in \mathbf{R}^n$ that influences the mean of the returns. This translates to the [RO](#) problem with a Lipschitz uncertain constraint

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && t \\ & \text{subject to} && -u^T z \leq t \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\ & && \mathbf{1}^T z = 1, \quad z \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the contextual information $x = (h, F)$ does not appear in the problem objective or constraints.

Data. We consider the cases where $n = 10$ and $n = 30$ stocks. For this problem, the uncertainty size $m = n$. We generate 20 different contexts, where for each context we have $x^i = (h^i, F^i)$, with h^i sampled uniformly on $[0.5, 1]$ and the components of F^i sampled independently from $N(0, 1)$.

The contextual uncertain return u^i is sampled from a multivariate normal distribution $N(\mu^i(h^i), \Sigma^i(F^i))$, where $\mu^i(h^i) = 0.7\mu + 0.3h^i$, and $\Sigma^i(F^i) = 0.2F^i F^{iT}$. The nominal mean μ is sampled uniformly on $[0.5, 1]$. We consider the cases with $N = 2000$ and $N = 1000$ samples, with the same number of samples for each context. For both cases, we use 30% of the data for training, 20% for validation, and 50% for testing.

Results. In Tables 4 and 5, we compare the performance of all methods, and note that our method outperforms the others in all objective metrics. This means that not only do we do better in the 10% worst-case and average case, the total loss we incur in the 10% worst cases is also consistently lower. The second-best method is CMV, where we already identify a good mapping from the context to the uncertainty set. Our learning method initializes from this set, and moves to less conservative mappings. As shown, these improvements cannot be found with traditional size-tuning. The other contextual method, ECRO, also performs relatively well, but suffers from the conservative coverage requirement, which reduces $\hat{\eta}$ in exchange for worse out-of-sample performance.

The non-contextual MV and W uncertainty sets, which use all data-points regardless of the context, suffer from this generalization, as expected. However, such formulations are much more tractable than those of CLCX and CW, for which a separate problem must be solved for each context. These methods also did not perform as well as the contextual methods, perhaps due to the (relatively) limited number of data-points available for each context. Furthermore, these methods could only be employed because we restricted the number of contexts; if we had unique contexts, the contexts may also need to be treated as an uncertainty set, or clustered, and might introduce additional conservatism in compensation for the information loss.

We note that the above behavior trends are consistent across the 4 scenarios, and comparing scenarios, a larger uncertainty set size $m = n$ (which for this problem indicates a larger selection of stocks) allows for better overall solutions, as does a larger N . A larger n may increase the solving and training time for all problems, as it increases the complexity. A larger N , on the other hand, might not affect the training time, as long as the batch size is kept consistent.

$n = 10, N = 1000$				
method	$\hat{\eta}$	10% worst-case	average-case	CVaR
LRO	0.0100	-0.800 ± 0.003	-0.855 ± 0.004	-0.731 ± 0.016
MV	0.0324	-0.571 ± 0.014	-0.806 ± 0.010	-0.433 ± 0.023
CMV	0.0410	-0.757 ± 0.006	-0.809 ± 0.004	-0.690 ± 0.019
W	0.0120	-0.553 ± 0.017	-0.807 ± 0.014	-0.415 ± 0.029
CW	0.0034	-0.479 ± 0.014	-0.810 ± 0.004	-0.403 ± 0.020
ECRO	0.0006	-0.639 ± 0.024	-0.822 ± 0.007	-0.508 ± 0.046
LCX	0.0056	-0.425 ± 0.031	-0.820 ± 0.018	-0.291 ± 0.042
$n = 10, N = 2000$				
method	$\hat{\eta}$	10% worst-case	average-case	CVaR
LRO	0.0060	-0.814 ± 0.004	-0.861 ± 0.003	-0.752 ± 0.008
MV	0.0650	-0.573 ± 0.004	-0.810 ± 0.002	-0.436 ± 0.007
CMV	0.0587	-0.780 ± 0.001	-0.824 ± 0.002	-0.741 ± 0.006
W	0.0452	-0.551 ± 0.006	-0.810 ± 0.004	-0.403 ± 0.011
CW	0.0283	-0.621 ± 0.008	-0.828 ± 0.003	-0.550 ± 0.010
ECRO	0.0014	-0.656 ± 0.016	-0.816 ± 0.010	-0.530 ± 0.028
LCX	0.0013	-0.476 ± 0.006	-0.810 ± 0.004	-0.320 ± 0.014

Table 4: Portfolio optimization ($n = 10$) averaged across 10 runs. Values shown as mean $\pm$ half-IQR, where half-IQR = $(Q_{.75} - Q_{.25})/2$. The best value for each category is in bold.

$n = 30, N = 1000$				
method	$\hat{\eta}$	10% worst-case	average-case	CVaR
LRO	0.0090	-0.899 ± 0.002	-0.926 ± 0.004	-0.842 ± 0.028
MV	0.0786	-0.716 ± 0.007	-0.831 ± 0.009	-0.644 ± 0.011
CMV	0.0318	-0.864 ± 0.002	-0.894 ± 0.003	-0.839 ± 0.007
W	0.0638	-0.666 ± 0.005	-0.836 ± 0.005	-0.555 ± 0.013
CW	0.0090	-0.610 ± 0.008	-0.822 ± 0.005	-0.562 ± 0.016
ECRO	0	-0.758 ± 0.012	-0.854 ± 0.004	-0.673 ± 0.031
LCX	0.0007	-0.555 ± 0.017	-0.834 ± 0.010	-0.447 ± 0.023
$n = 30, N = 2000$				
method	$\hat{\eta}$	10% worst-case	average-case	CVaR
LRO	0.0003	-0.902 ± 0.002	-0.926 ± 0.001	-0.881 ± 0.006
MV	0.0832	-0.721 ± 0.005	-0.830 ± 0.008	-0.651 ± 0.004
CMV	0.0339	-0.871 ± 0.002	-0.897 ± 0.001	-0.861 ± 0.001
W	0.0899	-0.668 ± 0.005	-0.842 ± 0.004	-0.558 ± 0.005
CW	0.0283	-0.621 ± 0.008	-0.828 ± 0.003	-0.550 ± 0.010
ECRO	0	-0.773 ± 0.008	-0.857 ± 0.005	-0.697 ± 0.014
LCX	0.0001	-0.628 ± 0.003	-0.820 ± 0.008	-0.528 ± 0.011

Table 5: Portfolio optimization ($n = 30$) averaged across 10 runs. Values shown as mean $\pm$ half-IQR, where half-IQR = $(Q_{.75} - Q_{.25})/2$. The best value for each category is in bold.

6.2 Inventory management

Problem description. We consider a two-stage adjustable RO problem on inventory management (Iancu and Trichakis, 2014, Section 5.2.1). There exists a retail network consisting of a single warehouse and n different retail points, indexed by $i = 1, \dots, n$. For simplicity, only a single product is sold. There are a total of C units of the product available, and each retail point starts with 0 inventory and is capable of stocking at most c_i units. The transportation cost for distributing the items at the i th retail point is t_i currency units per unit of inventory, and the operating cost is h_i per unit. The revenue per unit is r_i , which we take as a context parameter, as these values are known but may be subject to minor changes across problem instances, *i.e.*, supplier price changes. Customer demand $u \in \mathbf{R}^n$ is uncertain, but we have access to contextual data on q market factors, $F \in \mathbf{R}^{(n,q)}$, which influences the demand covariance. The total contextual information is thus $x = (r, F)$. The decision variable is the stocking decisions for all retail points, denoted $s \in \mathbf{R}^n$. In addition, the problem involves a vector $w(u)$ of realized sales at each point, which is dependent on stocking decision s and the unknown factors u affecting the demand; we have $w_i(u) = \min\{s_i, u_i\}$ for each retail point. The manager makes stocking decisions to maximize worst-case profits, which is equivalent to minimizing worst-case loss, $-r^T w(u) + (t + h)^T s$, $\forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x)$. For each problem

instance, the [RO](#) formulation is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \tau \\
& \text{subject to} && -r^T w(u) + (t+h)^T s \leq \tau, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && w_i(u) \leq s_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && w_i(u) \leq u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && \mathbf{1}^T s = C, \quad 0 \leq s \leq c,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where variables $s \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $w \in \mathbf{R}^n$, and $\tau \in \mathbf{R}$. To get a tractable approximation, we replace the adjustable decision $w_i(u)$ with their affine adjustable robust counterparts $z_i^0 + v_i^T u$, where $z_i^0 \in \mathbf{R}$ and $v_i \in \mathbf{R}^f$ are auxiliary variables introduced as part of the linear decision rules ([Ben-Tal et al., 2009](#)). The new formulation is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \tau \\
& \text{subject to} && -r^T z^0 - r^T V u + (t+h)^T s \leq \tau, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && z_i^0 + v_i^T u \leq s_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && z_i^0 + v_i^T u \leq u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\theta, x) \\
& && \mathbf{1}^T s = C, \quad 0 \leq s \leq c,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $V = [v_1 \dots v_n]^T \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times f}$. We treat the $2n+1$ uncertain constraints as a single joint chance constraint represented as the maximum of concave functions, which remains Lipschitz.

Data. As in the work by [Iancu and Trichakis \(2014\)](#), we let $n = 10$. This is also the size of the uncertain parameter, *i.e.*, $m = n$. We consider the case where the number of market factors for the contextual information is $q = 4$. We set $C = 200$, and all other problem data are independently sampled from uniformly distributed random variables. Inventory capacities c are between 30 and 50. Transportation and operation costs are between 0.1 and 0.3, and sales revenues r are between 2 and 4. We consider 10 instances for r , perturbing each by random sample of a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.05. We also consider 10 instances for F , each drawn from a standard $N(0, 1)^{(n, q)}$ distribution. The contextual uncertain demand u^i is sampled from a multivariate normal distribution $N(\mu^i(r^i), \Sigma^i(F^i))$, where $\mu^i(r^i) = \mu - 0.1r^i$, and $\Sigma^i(F^i) = 0.3F^i F^{iT}$. The nominal demand μ is sampled uniformly on $[10, 20]$. We consider the case with $N = 1000$ samples, with 100 samples for each context. We use 30% of the data for training, 20% for validation, and 50% for testing.

Uncertainty sets. As this problem has $2n+1 = 21$ uncertain constraints, the ECRO uncertainty set, which works with uncertain objectives only, does not apply. In addition, the LCX uncertainty set would require a separate cutting-plane procedure for each uncertain constraint, and also for each context, so we opted to forgo it. For the non-contextual Wasserstein [DRO](#) method (W), we use the [mean robust optimization \(MRO\)](#) approximation, with the number of clusters $K = 30$, given by [Wang et al. \(2024\)](#), to obtain a more tractable formulation. For our training method, due to the higher complexity of the problem, we lower the batch size to 30, and the initial step size to 0.0005. We halve the step size every 20 steps. To adjust for the smaller step sizes, we increase the number of outer iterations to 25, bringing the total number of iterations to 500.

Results. In Table 6, we compare the performance of all methods, and note that our method again outperforms the others in the performance metrics. Our decision-focused manner of learning uncertainty sets identifies more effective regions of uncertainty, and therefore reduces the conservatism of the data-driven solutions.

$n = 10$		$N = 1000$		
Method	$\hat{\eta}$	Worst-case	Average-case	CVaR
LRO	0.0990	-403.79 ± 1.17	-406.75 ± 0.72	-403.64 ± 1.10
MV	0.1027	-385.38 ± 1.96	-393.67 ± 1.99	-385.38 ± 1.96
CMV	0.0962	-377.95 ± 3.77	-397.71 ± 0.96	-377.95 ± 3.77
W	0.0994	-376.06 ± 1.08	-383.44 ± 1.05	-375.47 ± 1.05
CW	0.0998	-388.94 ± 9.63	-396.21 ± 9.79	-387.97 ± 9.60

Table 6: Average inventory management performance over 10 runs. Values shown as mean $\pm$ half-IQR. The best value for each category is in bold.

7 Conclusion

We develop a data-driven method to learn the contextual shape of uncertainty sets in a decision-focused manner, *i.e.*, using the structure and the solution of the robust counterpart. By formulating the learning problem as a stochastic optimization problem with **CVaR** constraints, we can optimize over a weighted performance metric while enforcing desired probabilistic guarantees. We show convergence of our algorithm using nonsmooth implicit differentiation, and provide finite sample probabilistic guarantees on unseen data. Through numerical examples, we demonstrate the performance gain achieved by our method compared to traditional manual tuning methods, for both worst-case and average-case performance.

Several directions for future research remain. One is to extend the performance guarantees to relate to the true global optimal value, though this requires solving the exact formulation provided in Appendix F. Another one is, instead of treating the algorithm as a “black box”, to analyze the geometric properties of the uncertainty sets found in relation to the geometric properties of the optimization problem, and establish theoretical insights. This would add to the empirical demonstrations given in this work, and help inform the best choice for an uncertainty set parametrization for a given problem. We aim to explore these directions in future works.

8 Acknowledgments

Irina Wang and Bartolomeo Stellato are supported by the NSF CAREER Award ECCS 2239771. Irina Wang is also supported by the Princeton Wallace Memorial Fellowship. The simulations presented in this article were performed on computational resources managed and supported by Princeton Research Computing, a consortium of groups including the Princeton Institute for Computational Science and Engineering (PICSciE) and the Office of Information Technology’s High Performance Computing Center and Visualization Laboratory at Princeton University. We would

like to thank Jason Klusowski for the useful feedback and discussions on empirical process theory, and Cole Becker for his contributions to the original ideation of this work.

A Uncertainty sets and general reformulations

We derive convex reformulations of (5) for a general class of constraints g and common uncertainty sets. We express u as an affine transformation of an uncertain parameter v , *i.e.*, $u = A(x)v + b(x)$, where $A(x) \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times \hat{m}}$, $\hat{m} \leq m$, and $b(x) \in \mathbf{R}^m$. The proofs are in Appendix G. For notational simplicity, we suppress the dependency of g on x here and for all following sections on reformulations. We consider two types of functions g : the maximum of concave functions (left), where each g_l is concave in u , and its special case, the maximum of affine functions (right), where $P_l(z)$ and $a_l(z)$ are convex functions in z :

$$g(z, u) = \max_{l=1, \dots, L} g_l(z, u), \quad g(z, u) = \max_{l=1, \dots, L} (P_l(z)u + a_l(z)).$$

Box and Ellipsoidal uncertainty. The ellipsoidal uncertainty set is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta, x) = \{u = A(x)v + b(x) \mid \|v\|_p \leq 1, \quad u \in S\},$$

where $A(x) \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times \hat{m}}$, $b(x) \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $p \in \mathbf{R}$, and S includes additional support information such as upper and lower bounds. We let p be the order of the norm, which is any integer value ≥ 1 , or equal to ∞ . In the latter case, this becomes the box uncertainty set. The trainable parameter $\theta = (A(\cdot), b(\cdot))$, the mapping from the context parameter to the reshaping matrices. Note that if $A = \rho I$, $b = 0$, and $S = \mathbf{R}^m$, this is equivalent to the traditional ellipsoidal uncertainty set $\{u \mid \|u\|_p \leq \rho\}$. For the maximum of concave constraint, we have the following reformulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b(x)^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \|A(x)^T(h_l + \omega_l)\|_q \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \end{aligned}$$

with auxiliary variables $\omega_l, h_l \in \mathbf{R}^m$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$, and $g^*(z, h)$ the conjugate function. This result follows from the theorem of infimal convolutions and composites for conjugate functions (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998), (Bauschke and Combettes, 2017). In the special (maximum of affine) case, we instead have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && a_l(z) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) + b(x)^T(P_l(z) - \omega_l) + \|A(x)^T(\omega_l - P_l(z))\|_q \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

Budget uncertainty. The budget uncertainty set requires both box and ellipsoidal constraints,

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{bud}}(\theta, x) = \{u = A(x)v + b(x) \mid \|v\|_\infty \leq \rho_1, \quad \|v\|_1 \leq \rho_2, \quad u \in S\},$$

where $\theta = (A(\cdot), b(\cdot), \rho_1, \rho_2)$. For the maximum of concave constraint, we have the following reformulation.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b(x)^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \rho_1 \|r_l - A(x)^T(h_l + \omega_l)\|_1 + \rho_2 \|r_l\|_\infty \leq 0, \\ & && l = 1, \dots, L, \end{aligned}$$

with $r_l \in \mathbf{R}^{\hat{m}}$, $\omega_l, h_l \in \mathbf{R}^m$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$ as auxiliary variables. The maximum of affine reformulation is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && a_l(z) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) + b(x)^T(P_l(z) - \omega_l) + \rho_1 \|r_l - A(x)^T(P_l(z) + \omega_l)\|_1 + \rho_2 \|r_l\|_\infty \leq 0, \\ & && l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Polyhedral uncertainty. The polyhedral uncertainty set is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta) = \{u = A(x)v + b(x) \mid Dv \leq d, \quad u \in S\},$$

where $\theta = (A(\cdot), b(\cdot), D, d)$. For the maximum of concave constraint, we have the following reformulation.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && [-g_l]^*(z, \omega_l) - b(x)^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) + \sigma_S(\gamma_l) \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\ & && A(x)^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) = -D^T h_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

with auxiliary variables $\gamma_l, \omega_l \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $h_l \in \mathbf{R}^r$, for $l = 1, \dots, L$. The maximum of affine reformulation is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && a_l(z) + d^T h_l + b(x)^T(P_l(z) - \gamma_l) \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\ & && A(x)^T(P_l(z) - \gamma_l) = D^T h_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\ & && h_l \geq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

Mean robust uncertainty. The Mean Robust Uncertainty (MRO) (Wang et al., 2024) set is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{mro}}(\theta) = \left\{ u = A(x)(v_{11}, \dots, v_{LK}) + b(x) \in S^{K \times L} \mid \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} \|v_{lk} - \bar{d}_k\|^p \leq \rho^p, \quad \alpha \in \Gamma \right\},$$

where $\Gamma = \{\alpha \mid \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} = w_k, \alpha_{lk} \geq 0 \forall k, l\}$. Here, we assume the constraint function g of the RO to be a maximum of L pieces, indexed by l . The support S of each component of u is assumed to be convex and closed. We assume A is square, with dimensions $\mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$, and we have $\theta = (A(\cdot), b(\cdot))$. This set depends on U^N , a dataset of N samples. We partition U_N into K disjoint subsets, with $\bar{d}_k$ the centroid of the k th subset. The weight we place upon each subset is w_k , and is equivalent to the proportion of points in the subset. We choose p to be an integer exponent, and ρ to be a positive radius. For the maximum of concave constraint, we have the following reformulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} && \lambda \rho^p + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k s_k \leq 0 \\ & && [-g_l]^*(x, h_{lk}) - b(x)^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) - (A(x)^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}))^T \bar{d}_k \\ & && \quad + \phi(q)\lambda \|A(x)^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk})/\lambda\|_*^q \leq s_k, \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\ & && \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

with auxiliary variables $s, h_{lk}, \omega_{lk} \in \mathbf{R}^m$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$. For the special case of the maximum of affine constraint, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && f(z) \\
& \text{subject to} && \lambda \rho^p + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k s_k \leq 0 \\
& && a_l(z) + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) - b(x)^T(\omega_{lk} - P_l(x)) - (A(x)^T(\omega_{lk} - P_l(z)))^T \bar{d}_k \\
& && \quad + \phi(r) \lambda \|A(x)^T(\omega_{lk} - P_l(z)) / \lambda\|_q^r \leq s_k, \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\
& && \lambda \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

B Linear transformation to cone programs in standard form

The convex optimization problems (5) can be transformed to the cone program (Agrawal et al., 2019a)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && c^T z \\
& \text{subject to} && Gz + s = h \\
& && s \in \mathcal{K},
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $z \in \mathbf{R}^{\bar{n}}$ is the primal variable, $s \in \mathbf{R}^{\bar{m}}$ is a slack variable, and the set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{\bar{m}}$ is a nonempty, closed, convex cone with dual cone $\mathcal{K}^* \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{\bar{m}}$. The dual problem is subsequently given as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && h^T r \\
& \text{subject to} && G^T r + c = 0 \\
& && r \in \mathcal{K}^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $r \in \mathbf{R}^{\bar{m}}$ is the dual variable. Assumption 3.3 ensures the uniqueness of the optimal primal-dual solution pair, which is needed to characterize the mapping $z(\theta, x)$ in Appendix C.

We also require the following property: so long as the constituent functions g_l of the constraint g from the robust problem (5) are concave in the uncertain parameters, and that these functions satisfy the (*disciplined parametrized program*) DPP rules proposed by Agrawal et al. (2019a), the cone program's data (G, h, c) can be expressed as a linear function (*i.e.*, tensor product) of the parameters θ and x (Agrawal et al., 2019a, Lemma 1). The DPP rules depend on well-known composition theorems for convex functions, and ensure that every function in the program is convex in the decision variables, or affine if representing equalities (Agrawal et al., 2019b; Bolte et al., 2021).

C Proof of conservative Jacobians for the robust optimization problem

To prove Theorem 3.1, we characterize the path-differentiability of the function $z(\theta, x)$ by solving the inner optimization problem and obtaining conservative Jacobians using the results of Agrawal et al. (2019b) and Bolte et al. (2021). The optimization problem (5) is first reformulated into a convex and tractable problem in conic form (25), as shown in Appendix B. The conic program's data, (G, h, c) , is parameterized by (θ, x) , through the mapping

$$(\theta, x) \rightarrow (G, h, c),$$

which is linear in θ and x for all uncertainty sets in Appendix A, given the disciplined parametrized program (DPP) requirement detailed in Appendix B (Agrawal et al., 2019a, Lemma 1), as well as the linear contextual mapping we defined in Section 5.

Given also the corresponding dual (26) with dual variable $r \in \mathbf{R}^m$, solving the conic program amounts to solving the homogeneous self-dual embedding (Ye et al., 1994) of the primal-dual problem. In the following, we define $N = \bar{n} + \bar{m} + 1$. The overall procedure is split into three steps: mapping the problem data (G, h, c) onto a skew symmetric matrix Q :

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G^T & c \\ -G & 0 & h \\ -c^T & -h^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{R}^{N \times N},$$

finding the solution $y = (u, v, w) \in \mathbf{R}^N$ to the homogeneous self-dual embedding, and mapping y onto the solution of the primal-dual pair (Agrawal et al., 2019b). We can express the chain of mappings as

$$(G, h, c) \rightarrow Q \rightarrow y \rightarrow (z, r, s).$$

To solve for $y = \nu(Q)$, shown as the mapping $Q \rightarrow y$, we define the normalized residual map (Busseti et al., 2019), given as

$$\mathcal{N}(y, Q) = ((Q - I)\Pi + I)(y/|w|),$$

where Π is the projection onto the convex cone $\mathcal{K}' = \mathbf{R}^{\bar{n}} \times \mathcal{K}^* \times \mathbf{R}_+$. For a given Q , $y = \nu(Q)$ is a solution to the homogeneous self-dual embedding if and only if $\mathcal{N}(y, Q) = 0$ and $w > 0$. Once this solution is obtained, the mapping $y \rightarrow (z, r, s)$ is given by the function $\phi(y) = (u, \Pi(v), \Pi(v) - v)/w$. We can now invoke Proposition 4 of the work by Bolte et al. (2021), together with the results from Agrawal et al. (2019b) to show that ν and ϕ are path-differentiable.

Proposition C.1. *Assume the functions Π and $\mathcal{N}$ are path differentiable, with conservative Jacobians J_Π and $J_\mathcal{N}$. Assume, for any Q constructed from the problem data (G, h, c) , $y = \nu(Q)$ is the unique solution to $\mathcal{N}(y, Q) = 0$. Furthermore, assume all matrices formed by the first N columns of $J_\mathcal{N}(y, Q)$ are invertible. Then, the functions ν and ϕ are path-differentiable, with conservative Jacobians*

$$J_\nu(Q) = \{-U^{-1}V \mid [U \ V] \in J_\mathcal{N}(y, Q)\}, \quad J_\phi(y) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & -z \\ 0 & J_\Pi(v) & -r \\ 0 & J_\Pi(v) - I & -s \end{bmatrix}.$$

We verify each assumption in turn. The assumption on Π holds, as the cones we consider (zero cones, free cones, nonnegative cones, and second-order cones) are subdifferentiable (Busseti et al., 2019; Kanzow et al., 2009). By Theorem 1 of the work by Bolte et al. (2021), which states that the Clarke Jacobian is a minimal conservative Jacobian, we conclude that the conic projections admit conservative Jacobians, and are thus path differentiable. It follows that $\mathcal{N}$, as a linear function of Π and Q , is also path-differentiable.

The uniqueness of $y = \nu(Q)$ holds from Assumption 3.3: primal nondegeneracy ensures a unique dual solution r^* (Alizadeh et al., 1997, Theorem 7), and together with (z^*, s^*) determined by primal uniqueness, gives a unique solution $y^* = (u^*, v^*, w^*) = (z^*, r^* - s^*, 1)$ to the homogeneous self-dual embedding.

The invertibility of U holds as $U = ((Q - I)J_\Pi(y) + I)/w$ (Agrawal et al., 2019b), which is nonsingular due to the PSD nature of the members of the set $J_\Pi(y)$ (see Busseti et al. (2019); Kanzow et al. (2009)) and the skew-symmetric nature of Q , so long as $(Q - I)J_\Pi(y)$ does not have eigenvalues of -1 .

Subsequently, by Clarke’s nonsmooth implicit function theorem (Clarke, 1990, Theorem 7.1.1), invertibility of U implies that ν is locally Lipschitz in Q . Note that the uniqueness of $y = \nu(Q)$ ensures that ν is a well-defined (single-valued) function. Since ν is also definable (as a composition of semi-algebraic maps), it follows that ν is path differentiable. Together with the path differentiability of $\mathcal{N}$, these results yield the conservative Jacobian $J_\nu(Q)$ as given in the proposition. Since ϕ is given as a composition of these functions, it is also path differentiable, with conservative Jacobian $J_\phi(y) = J_\phi(\nu(Q))$.

Next, as the linear mappings from θ to (G, h, c) and to Q preserve path differentiability, we can apply the chain rule to obtain

$$J_\phi(\theta) = J_\phi(y)J_\nu(Q)J_Q(G, h, c)J_{(G, h, c)}(\theta).$$

As $(z, r, s) = \phi(y)$, we can partition $J_\phi(\theta)$ as $(J_z(\theta), J_r(\theta), J_s(\theta))$ where the first component is the conservative Jacobian of interest. Therefore, we conclude that $z(\theta, x)$ is path differentiable, with nonempty conservative Jacobian $J_z(\theta)$.

Lastly, we note that when the matrix U is singular, we can still solve for the Jacobian using a least-squares approximation, as remarked in (Agrawal et al., 2019a, Appendix B). In fact, for large matrices, the least-squares approximation is the most efficient solution method for all problems.

D Conservative Jacobians for the augmented Lagrangian

We give the conservative Jacobians from Proposition 3.1. In this section, for simplicity, we denote the solution of the optimization problem (5), $z^i = z(\theta, x^i)$, and its conservative Jacobian, $J_{z^i}(\theta)$, for each input pair (θ, x^i) . For the Lagrangian function $\hat{L}(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu)$ over the batch $B = (U, X) \subseteq W^N$, where $|B|$ denotes the cardinality of the set, we have the following conservative Jacobians,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\hat{L}}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in B} J_{\Phi_\gamma}(z^i)J_{z^i}(\theta) + \frac{\lambda}{\eta|B|} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in B} M^i \mathbf{1}\{g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha\} J_g(z^i)J_{z^i}(\theta) \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu}{\eta|B|} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in B} M^i ((g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha)/\eta + \alpha - \kappa) \mathbf{1}\{g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha\} J_g(z^i)J_{z^i}(\theta), \\ J_{\hat{L}}(\alpha) &= \frac{\lambda}{|B|} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in B} M^i (1 - (1/\eta) \mathbf{1}\{g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha\}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu}{|B|} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in B} M^i (1 - (1/\eta) \mathbf{1}\{g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha\}) ((g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha)_+/\eta + \alpha - \kappa), \end{aligned}$$

where $M^i = \mathbf{1}\{(g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha)_+/\eta + \alpha - \kappa \geq 0\}$. For a condition A , we denote its indicator function $\mathbf{1}\{A\}$, taking the value 1 when true and 0 when false. When the Lagrangian function is defined over the entire dataset, we formulate the conservative Jacobian $J_L(\alpha, \theta)$ the same way as above, with $B = W^N$.

E Proof of convergence of the augmented Lagrangian algorithm

We prove Theorem 3.2, the convergence of the augmented Lagrangian algorithm to a stationary point. We separate the procedure into three steps. In the first step, we show for Algorithm 2 with fixed λ, μ , the convergence of $\{\alpha^t, \theta^t\}$ to a stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian function (14) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we note that by Theorem 1 of Bolte and Pauwels (2019), conservative Jacobians are gradients almost everywhere, so by Bolte et al. (2021), the iterates of the algorithm are a Clarke stochastic subgradient sequence almost surely. We thus use the Clarke differential (Clarke, 1975), $\partial^c f(z) := \text{conv}\{\lim_{z_i \rightarrow z} \nabla f(z_i) \mid z_i \in \text{dom}(\nabla f)\}$ to denote the subdifferentials in our analysis, instead of using $J_f(z)$. In the next two steps, we show for Algorithm 1, either the convergence of $\{\theta^k\}$ to a feasible point of condition (8), or the convergence of $\{\alpha^k, \theta^k\}$ to a stationary point of the constraint violation function.

Step 1: Convergence of (α, θ) . In this step, we consider the augmented Lagrangian function with fixed λ and μ . By Assumptions 3.4 and 3.5 on the boundedness and step sizes of the iterates, by the definability of the augmented Lagrangian function, and by the existence of its conservative Jacobians, we apply Theorem 3 of Bolte et al. (2021), on the convergence of SGD for path-differentiable functions. The projection onto the nonnegative orthant for s does not affect the convergence results, as proximal SGD with conservative Jacobians also converges, subject to the same assumptions (Davis et al., 2018, Theorem 6.2). Let $L(\alpha, \theta) = L(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu)$, as the suppressed variables are fixed, and let (α^*, θ^*) be a local minimum point of this function. By the aforementioned theorems, we can show that $V_{\lambda, \mu}(\alpha, \theta) := L(\alpha, \theta) - L(\alpha^*, \theta^*)$ is a Lyapunov function for the differential inclusion $(\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\theta}) \in -\partial^c L(\alpha, \theta)$. Specifically, there exist a ball of radius r around (α^*, θ^*) such that for $(\alpha, \theta) \in \mathbf{B}_{\alpha^*, \theta^*}(r)$, the Lyapunov function is locally positive definite. This function is decreasing along solutions strictly outside of the set of Clarke-critical points $\{(\alpha, \theta) \in \mathbf{R}^{p+1}, 0 \in \partial^c L(\alpha, \theta)\}$. Then, for almost all initializations $(\alpha^0, \theta^0) \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \times \mathcal{D}_\theta$, the objective $L(\alpha^t, \theta^t)$ converges almost surely and all stationary points $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\theta})$ of $\{\alpha^t, \theta^t\}$ are Clarke-critical in the sense that $0 \in \partial^c L(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\theta})$ (Bolte et al., 2021). We thus conclude that, with almost any initial point $(\alpha^0, \theta^0) \in \mathbf{B}_{\alpha^*, \theta^*}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\alpha \times \mathcal{D}_\theta$, the sequence $\{\alpha^t, \theta^t\}$ converges to a stationary point (α^*, θ^*) , satisfying $0 \in J_L(\alpha^*, \theta^*)$.

Step 2: Convergence of λ . From step 1, we have a stationary point (α^k, θ^k) of the augmented Lagrangian function at iteration k of Algorithm 1, with fixed multiplier and penalty parameters λ^{k-1} and μ^{k-1} . Further properties of this stationary point depend on the convergence, or lack thereof, of the sequence $\{\lambda^k\}$. As the step size parameter of λ is the penalty μ , we consider the two cases, (a) where the sequence of penalty parameters $\{\mu^k\}$ is bounded, and (b) where $\{\mu^k\}$ is unbounded. We first analyze case (a). By lines 6-12 of Algorithm 1, we note that for $\{\mu^k\}$ to be bounded, the penalty parameter must remain constant from some iteration onwards. By the condition on line 6, with $\tau < 1$, this implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)\|_2 = 0$, which in turn implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu^k (H(\alpha^k, \theta^k)) = 0$. This sequence of updates for λ is geometric and summable, so the sequence $\{\lambda^k\}$ is bounded, with a convergent subsequence. Given the boundedness assumption on the true Lagrangian multiplier λ^* in Assumption 3.4, we conclude that the whole sequence converges, *i.e.*, $\{\lambda^k\} \rightarrow \lambda^*$. We now turn to case (b), where $\{\mu^k\}$ is unbounded. In this case, $\{\lambda^k\}$ may not converge. However, by the λ update rule in lines 7 of Algorithm 1, we note that while $\{\mu^k\} \rightarrow \infty$, $\{\lambda^k\}$ is bounded between $\lambda^{\min}$ and $\lambda^{\max}$, the safeguard values.

Step 3: convergence of the outer loop. We now show that either the sequence $\{\theta^k\}$ converges to a feasible point of the $\widehat{\text{CVaR}}$ condition, or $\{\alpha^k, \theta^k\}$ converges to a stationary point of the constraint violation function. We begin with the former. Suppose the sequence of penalty parameters $\{\mu^k\}$ is bounded, and converges to μ^* . Then, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, $\{\lambda^k\}$ converges to the stationary point λ^* . From step 1, we have that $\{\theta^t\}$ in the inner loop converges almost surely to $\theta^k = \theta^*(\lambda^{k-1}, \mu^{k-1})$ along each step of λ and μ 's convergence. In order to establish the convergence of $\{\theta^k\}$ in the outer loop to a stationary point $\theta^*(\lambda^*, \mu^*)$, a feasible point of the $\widehat{\text{CVaR}}$ condition (8), we must ensure that $\theta^*(\lambda, \mu)$ is well-behaved, by showing its continuity with respect to (λ, μ) .

Recall Assumption 3.3 on the uniqueness of the inner RO solutions $z(\theta, x)$, Assumption 3.4 on the compactness of the set $\mathcal{Z}$, and the convexity (and therefore continuity) of the objective and constraint functions f and g in x . Suppose these assumptions hold. By Theorem 4.2.1 of Bank et al. (1984), we establish the continuity of $L(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \mu)$ in θ , for $\theta \in \mathcal{D}_\theta$. As L is bilinear and therefore continuous in (λ, μ) , we obtain our desired stability results, *i.e.*, as $\{\lambda^k\}$ and $\{\mu^k\}$ converge to λ^* , μ^* , the optimal solution with respect to θ is continuous, and converges almost surely to the local minimizer θ^* . Note that $\{\alpha^k\}$ does not necessarily converge to a stationary point, as the minimum over α is not necessarily unique (Uryasev and Rockafellar, 2001, Theorem 2). However, by the convergence of the inner loop in step 1 and by the convergence condition of μ in step 2, as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in Algorithm 1, we have a point $(\alpha^k, \theta^*, \lambda^*, \mu^*)$ satisfying $0 \in J_L(\alpha^k, \theta^*)$ and $H(\alpha^k, \theta^*) = 0$. We can conclude that $\{\theta^k\}$ converges almost surely to a feasible point θ^* of the $\widehat{\text{CVaR}}$ condition, where the minimizer over α takes some value $\alpha^* \leq \alpha^k$.

On the other hand, suppose the sequence of penalty parameters $\{\mu^k\}$ is unbounded. By step 1, for any λ^k and μ^k , we have obtained a stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian function, satisfying $0 \in J_L(\alpha^k, \theta^k)$. Note that, with $\{\mu^k\}$ unbounded and $\{\lambda^k\}$ bounded, we observe $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k / \mu^k = 0$. Therefore, dividing both sides of the conservative Jacobian by μ^k and taking the limit, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\eta N} \sum_{x^i \in X^N} \mathbf{1} \left\{ (g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha^k)_+ / \eta + \alpha^k - \kappa \geq 0 \right\} \mathbf{1} \left\{ g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha^k \right\} \\ &\quad ((g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha^k)_+ / \eta + \alpha^k - \kappa) J_g(z^i) J_{z^i}(\theta^k), \\ 0 &\in \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{(u^i, x^i) \in W^N} \frac{1}{\eta N} \sum_{x^i \in X^N} \mathbf{1} \left\{ (g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha^k)_+ / \eta + \alpha^k - \kappa \geq 0 \right\} \\ &\quad \left(1 - (1/\eta) \mathbf{1} \left\{ g(z^i, u^i, x^i) \geq \alpha^k \right\} \right) ((g(z^i, u^i, x^i) - \alpha^k)_+ / \eta + \alpha^k - \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

These are the stationary conditions for the constraint violation function $V(\alpha, \theta) = (1/2) \|H(\alpha, \theta)\|^2$, *i.e.*, $0 \in J_V(\alpha^k, \theta^k)$. We thus converge to a stationary point of the constraint violation function, as desired.

F Direct reformulation for (9)

We can directly reformulate the bi-level problem into a single-level problem using the KKT conditions. At a fixed θ and for any context x_i , the inner level problem (5) with respect to the 1-norm uncertainty set with a polyhedral support $S = \{u \in \mathbf{R}^m \mid Cu \leq d\}$, that is,

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta, x) = \{u = A(x)v + b(x) \mid \|v\|_1 \leq \rho, u \in S\},$$

can be reformulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{z_i, \tau_i, v_{il}, \omega_{il}, \lambda_i}{\text{minimize}} && \tau_i \\
& \text{subject to} && [-g_l]^*(z_i, \tau_i, v_{il} - C^T \omega_{il}, x_i) + d^T \omega_{il} + b(x_i)^T v_{il} + \rho \lambda_{il} \leq 0 \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& && \|A(x_i)^T v_{il}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_i \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& && W z_i \leq h, \quad \omega_i \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we parametrized $\mathcal{Z} = \{z \mid Wz \leq h\}$. For conciseness, let us express, for all $l = 1, \dots, L, j = 1, \dots, m$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_{1,il} &= [-g_l]^*(z_i, \tau_i, v_{il} - C^T \omega_{il}, x_i) + d^T \omega_{il} + b(x_i)^T v_{il} + \rho \lambda_{il} \\
\tilde{g}_{2,ilj} &= (A(x_i)^T v_{il})_j - \lambda_i \\
\tilde{g}_{3,ilj} &= -(A(x_i)^T v_{il})_j - \lambda_i \\
\tilde{g}_{4,i} &= W z_i - h.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, in addition to the primal feasibility constraints, the KKT conditions of this problem include the following stationarity, dual feasibility, and complementary slackness constraints,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla_{(\tau_i, z_i, v_{il}, \omega_{il}, \lambda_i)} \left(\tau_i + \sum_j \delta_{1,il} \tilde{g}_{1,il} + \sum_{lj} \delta_{2,ilj} \tilde{g}_{2,ilj} + \sum_{lj} \delta_{3,ilj} \tilde{g}_{3,ilj} + \delta_{4,i}^T \tilde{g}_{4,i} \right) = 0 \\
& \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4 \geq 0 \\
& \sum_{l=1}^L \left(-\delta_{1,il} \tilde{g}_{1,il} - \sum_{j=1}^m (\delta_{2,ilj} \tilde{g}_{2,ilj} - \delta_{3,ilj} \tilde{g}_{3,ilj}) \right) - \delta_{4,i}^T \tilde{g}_{4,i} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{KKT}$$

where δ are the additional dual variables. We use this to formulate the single-level problem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\theta, \alpha, z, \tau, \omega, v, \delta}{\text{minimize}} && \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\gamma f(z_i, u_i, x_i) + \tau_i) \\
& \text{subject to} && [-g_l]^*(z_i, \tau_i, v_{il} - C^T \omega_{il}, x_i) + d^T \omega_{il} + b(x_i)^T v_{il} + \rho \lambda_{il} \leq 0 \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \\
& && \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (g(z_i, \tau_i, u_i, x_i) - \alpha)_+ / \eta + \alpha \leq \kappa \\
& && \|A(x_i)^T v_{il}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_i \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \\
& && W z_i \leq h, \quad \omega_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \\
& && \text{(KKT)}
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where KKT encodes the additional constraints from (KKT). This formulation includes bilinear terms $b(x_i)^T v_{il}$, $A(x_i)^T v_{il}$, and similar trilinear terms involving δ in the KKT constraints, and is thus intractable.

G General reformulation proofs

G.1 Conjugate of a general function

We first derive the conjugate of general functions, which can then be used in the upcoming reformulations.

Linear function. For a linear function $g(z, u) = (Pu + a)^T z$, we compute the conjugate as

$$[-g]^*(z, h) = \sup_u h^T u - (a + Pu)^T z = \begin{cases} a^T z & \text{if } h = -P^T z \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Sum of concave functions. For a general function $g(z, u) = \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(u, z)$, where each g_j is concave in u , by the theorem of infimal convolutions ([Rockafellar and Wets, 1998](#), Theorem 11.23(a), p. 493), we compute the conjugate as

$$[-g]^*(z, h) = \begin{cases} \inf_{h_j, \dots, h_J} & \sum_{j=1}^J [-g_j]^*(z, h_j) \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{j=1}^J h_j = h. \end{cases}$$

Maximum of concave functions. We also consider the maximum of concave functions,

$$g(z, u) = \max_{l=1, \dots, L} g_l(z, u).$$

In practice, these functions $g(z, u)$ are often affine functions. For all the reformulations below, we assume $g(z, u)$ to be of this maximum of concave form.

G.2 Box and Ellipsoidal reformulations

Rewriting the robust constraint as optimization problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{Av+b \in S} g(z, Av + b) \\ & \text{subject to } \|v\|_p \leq 1 \\ &= \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} g(z, Av + b) - \lambda \|v\|_p + \lambda \\ &= \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_l g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda \|v\|_p + \lambda \\ &= \max_l \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda \|v\|_p + \lambda \\ &= \max_l \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda \|v\|_p + \lambda \\ &= \inf_{\lambda_l \geq 0, \tau} \tau \\ & \text{subject to } \lambda_l + \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda_l \|v\|_p \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \end{aligned}$$

where $p = \infty$ for box uncertainty and $p \geq 1$ otherwise. We used the Lagrangian in the first equality, and decomposed $g(z, Av + b)$ into its constituents for the second equality. As l and λ are separable, in the third step we interchanged the inf and the max. Next, for each l , as the expression is convex in λ and concave in u , we used the Von Neumann-Fan minimax theorem to interchange the inf and the sup. We then express the max in epigraph form by introducing an auxiliary variable τ .

Now, if we define the function $c(v) = \|v\|_p$, then using the definition of conjugate functions, we have, for each l , the left-hand-side of the constraint equal to

$$\lambda_l + [-g_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_S(A \cdot + b) + \lambda_l c]^*(0).$$

We then borrow results from (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 11.23(a), p. 493), (Zhen et al., 2021, Lemma C.9), and (Bauschke and Combettes, 2017, Proposition 13.24) with regards to the inf-convolution of conjugate functions, the conjugate functions of norms, and the conjugate of linear compositions, to note

$$[-g_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_S(A \cdot + b) + \lambda_l c]^*(0) = \inf_{\omega_l, h_l, y_l} ([-g_l]^*(z, h_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) + \mathcal{I}_{\|y_l\|_q \leq \lambda_l} + \mathcal{I}_{A^T(h_l + \omega_l) = y_l}),$$

where $h_l \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $y_l \in \mathbf{R}^{\hat{m}}$, $\omega_l \in \mathbf{R}^m$, and q is the conjugate number of p . Substituting these back, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{z, \tau, h, \omega, y} \quad \tau \\ & \text{subject to} \quad [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \|y_l\|_q \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\ & \quad \quad \quad A^T(h_l + \omega_l) = y_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that this optimization problem upper bounds our original robust constraint, which we constrain to be nonpositive. Therefore, we only need $\tau \leq 0$. For the final step, we can now write the original minimization problem (5) in minimization form for both the objective and constraints, to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z, h, \omega}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(z) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \|A^T(h_l + \omega_l)\|_q \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

G.3 Budget reformulation

Rewriting the robust constraint as optimization problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{Az+b \in S} \quad g(z, Av + b) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \|v\|_\infty \leq \rho_1 \\ & \quad \quad \quad \|v\|_1 \leq \rho_2 \\ & = \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_l g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda_1 \|v\|_\infty + \lambda_1 \rho_1 - \lambda_2 \|v\|_1 + \lambda_2 \rho_2 \\ & = \max_l \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda_1 \|v\|_\infty + \lambda_1 \rho_1 - \lambda_2 \|v\|_1 + \lambda_2 \rho_2 \\ & = \max_l \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, v) - \lambda_1 \|v\|_\infty + \lambda_1 \rho_1 - \lambda_2 \|v\|_1 + \lambda_2 \rho_2, \end{aligned}$$

where we again used the Lagrangian, separated g into its constituents, and applied the minimax theorem. We now express the max in epigraph form,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda_l \geq 0, \tau} \quad \tau \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \lambda_{l1} \rho_1 + \lambda_{l2} \rho_2 + \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, Av + b) - \lambda_{l1} \|v\|_\infty - \lambda_{l2} \|v\|_1 \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

If we define the functions $c_1(v) = \|v\|_\infty$, $c_2(v) = \|v\|_1$, then using the definition of conjugate functions, we have for each l the left-hand-side of the constraint equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{l1}\rho_1 + \lambda_{l2}\rho_2 + [-g_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_S(A \cdot + b) + \lambda_{l1}c_1 + \lambda_{l2}c_2]^*(0) \\
&= \inf_{h_l, \omega_l, y_l} \lambda_{l1}\rho_1 + \lambda_{l2}\rho_2 + [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) + [\lambda_{l1}c_1 + \lambda_{l2}c_2]^*(-y_l) \\
& \quad + \mathcal{I}_{A^T(h_l + \omega_l) = y_l} \\
&= \inf_{h_l, \omega_l, y_l, r_l} \lambda_{l1}\rho_1 + \lambda_{l2}\rho_2 + [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) + \mathcal{I}_{\|r_l - y_l\|_1 \leq \lambda_{l1}} + \mathcal{I}_{\|r_l\|_\infty \leq \lambda_{l2}} \\
& \quad + \mathcal{I}_{A^T(h_l + \omega_l) = y_l}
\end{aligned}$$

We can express this as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{z, h_l, \omega_l, y_l, r_l, \tau} \tau \\
& \text{subject to} \quad [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \rho_1\|r_l - y_l\|_1 + \rho_2\|r_l\|_\infty \leq \tau, \\
& \quad \quad \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& \quad \quad \quad A^T(h_l + \omega_l) = y_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L.
\end{aligned}$$

We can then let $\tau = 0$ and substitute the new constraints in for the robust constraint in (5),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} \quad f(z) \\
& \text{subject to} \quad [-g_l]^*(z, h_l) + \sigma_S(\omega_l) - b^T(h_l + \omega_l) + \rho_1\|r_l - A^T(h_l + \omega_l)\|_1 + \rho_2\|r_l\|_\infty \leq 0, \\
& \quad \quad \quad l = 1, \dots, L.
\end{aligned}$$

G.4 Polyhedral reformulation

Rewriting the robust constraint as an optimization problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{Av+b \in S} g(z, Av+b) \\
& \text{subject to } Dv \leq d \\
& = \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{h \geq 0} g(z, Av+b) - (Dv)^T h + d^T h \\
& = \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{h \geq 0} \max_l g_l(z, Av+b) - (Dv)^T h + d^T h \\
& = \max_l \sup_{Av+b \in S} \inf_{h \geq 0} g_l(z, Av+b) - (Dv)^T h + d^T h \\
& = \max_l \inf_{h \geq 0} \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, Av+b) - (Dv)^T h + d^T h \\
& = \inf_{h \geq 0, \tau} \tau \\
& \quad \text{subject to } d^T h_l + \sup_{Av+b \in S} g_l(z, Av+b) - (Dv)^T h_l \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& = \inf_{h \geq 0, \omega, \tau, y, \gamma} \tau \\
& \quad \text{subject to } d^T h_l + [-g_l]^*(z, \omega_l) - b^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) + \sigma_S(\gamma_l) + \mathcal{I}_{D^T h_l = -y_l} \\
& \quad \quad \quad + \mathcal{I}_{A^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) = y_l} \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& = \inf_{h \geq 0, \omega, \tau, \gamma} \tau \\
& \quad \text{subject to } [-g_l]^*(z, \omega_l) - b^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) + \sigma_S(\gamma_l) \leq \tau, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& \quad \quad \quad A^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) = -D^T h_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L,
\end{aligned}$$

where we again used the Lagrangian, the Von Neumann-Fan minimax theorem, the infimal convolution of conjugates, and the conjugate of affine compositions. The final reformulation (5) is then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize } f(z) \\
& \text{subject to } [-g_l]^*(z, \omega_l) - b^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) + \sigma_S(\gamma_l) \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, L \\
& \quad \quad \quad A^T(\omega_l + \gamma_l) = -D^T h_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L.
\end{aligned}$$

G.5 Mean Robust Optimization reformulation

We adapt the proof from (Wang et al., 2024, Appendix A.3). To simplify notation, we define $c_k(v_{lk}) := \|v_{lk} - \bar{d}_k\|^p - \rho^p$. We also note that $u_{lk} = Av_{lk} + b$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{u_{11}, \dots, u_{LK} \in S, \alpha \in \Gamma} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} g_l(z, u_{lk}) \\
& \text{subject to } \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} c_k(v_{lk}) \leq 0 \\
& = \sup_{u_{11}, \dots, u_{LK} \in S, \alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} g_l(z, u_{lk}) - \lambda \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} c_k(v_{lk}) \\
& = \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{u_{11}, \dots, u_{LK} \in S} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} g_l(z, u_{lk}) - \lambda \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} c_k(v_{lk}).
\end{aligned}$$

We applied the Lagrangian in the first equality. Then, as the summation is over upper-semicontinuous functions $g_l(x, u_{lk})$ concave in u_{lk} , we applied the Von Neumann-Fan minimax theorem to interchange the inf and the sup. Next, we rewrite the formulation using an epigraph trick, and make a change of variables.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\quad \text{subject to} \quad \sup_{u_{11}, \dots, u_{LK} \in S} \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} (g_l(z, u_{lk}) - \lambda c_k(v_{lk})) \leq s_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\
&= \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\quad \text{subject to} \quad \sup_{\alpha_{11}u_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{LK}u_{LK} \in S'} \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} (g_l(z, (\alpha_{lk}u_{lk})/\alpha_{lk}) \\
&\quad \quad \quad - \lambda c_k((\alpha_{lk}v_{lk})/\alpha_{lk})) \leq s_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we rewrote $u_{lk} = (\alpha_{lk}u_{lk})/\alpha_{lk}$, $v_{lk} = (\alpha_{lk}v_{lk})/\alpha_{lk}$, and maximized over $\alpha_{lk}u_{lk} \in S'$, where S' is the support transformed by α_{lk} . See [Wang et al. \(2024\)](#) for details. Next, we make substitutions $h_{lk} = \alpha_{lk}u_{lk}$, $y_{lk} = \alpha_{lk}v_{lk}$, and define functions $g'_l(z, h_{lk}) = \alpha_{lk}g_l(z, h_{lk}/\alpha_{lk})$, $c'_k(y_{lk}) = \alpha_{lk}c_k(y_{lk}/\alpha_{lk})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\quad \text{subject to} \quad \sup_{h_{11}, \dots, h_{LK} \in S'} \sum_{l=1}^L g'_l(z, h_{lk}) - \lambda c'_k(y_{lk}) \leq s_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\
&= \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{l=1}^L [-g'_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_{S'}(A \cdot + b) + \lambda c'_k]^*(0) \leq s_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
\end{aligned}$$

For the new functions defined, we applied the definition of conjugate functions. Now, using the conjugate form $f^*(y) = \alpha g^*(y)$ of a right-scalar-multiplied function $f(z) = \alpha g(z/\alpha)$, we rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} [-g_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_S(A \cdot + b) + \lambda c_k]^*(0) \leq s_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that while the support of h_{lk} is S' , the support of h_{lk}/α_{lk} , which is the input of g_l , is still S . Now, again using properties of conjugate functions, we note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{lk} [(-g_l(z, A \cdot + b) + \chi_S(A \cdot + b) + \lambda c_k)]^*(0) &= \alpha_{lk} \inf_{\omega_{lk}, h_{lk}, y_{lk}} ([-g_l]^*(z, h_{lk}) - b^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{I}_{A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) = y_{lk}} + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) + [\lambda c_k]^*(-y_{lk}))
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$[\lambda c_k]^*(-y_{lk}) = -y_{lk}^T \bar{d}_k + \phi(q) \lambda \|y_{lk}/\lambda\|_*^q + \lambda \rho^p.$$

Substituting these back, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0, h_{lk}, \omega_{lk}, s_k} \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \\
&\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} ([-g_l]^*(z, h_{lk}) - b^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) \\
&\quad + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) - (A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}))^T \bar{d}_k + \phi(q) \lambda \|A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk})/\lambda\|_*^q + \lambda \rho^p) \leq s_k, \\
&\quad \quad \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad l = 1, \dots, L.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over α , noting that $\sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_{lk} = w_k$ for all k , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0, h_{lk}, \omega_{lk}, s_k} \quad & \lambda \rho^p + \sum_k^K w_k s_k \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [-g_l]^*(z, h_{lk}) - b^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) - (A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}))^T \bar{d}_k \\ & + \phi(q)\lambda \|A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk})/\lambda\|_*^q \leq s_k, \\ & l = 1, \dots, L, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

for which the final reformulation of (5) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & f(z) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \lambda \rho^p + \sum_k^K w_k s_k \leq 0 \\ & [-g_l]^*(z, h_{lk}) - b^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}) + \sigma_S(\omega_{lk}) - (A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk}))^T \bar{d}_k \\ & + \phi(q)\lambda \|A^T(h_{lk} + \omega_{lk})/\lambda\|_*^q \leq s_k, \\ & l = 1, \dots, L, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned}$$

References

- Adelhütte, D., Biefel, C., Kuchlbauer, M., and Rolfes, J. (2023). Pareto robust optimization on euclidean vector spaces. *Optimization Letters*, 17(3):771–788.
- Agrawal, A., Amos, B., Barratt, S., Boyd, S., Diamond, S., and Kolter, Z. (2019a). Differentiable convex optimization layers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Agrawal, A., Barratt, S., Boyd, S., Busseti, E., and Moursi, W. (2019b). Differentiating through a cone program. *Journal of Applied and Numerical Optimization*, 1(2):107–115.
- Alizadeh, F., Haeberly, J.-P. A., and Overton, M. L. (1997). Complementarity and nondegeneracy in semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 77(1):111–128.
- Amos, B. and Kolter, J. Z. (2017). Optnet: differentiable optimization as a layer in neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ICML’17, page 136–145. JMLR.org.
- Angelopoulos, A. N. and Bates, S. (2023). *Conformal Prediction: A Gentle Introduction*, volume 16. Now Publishers Inc., Hanover, MA, USA.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M., and Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9:203 – 228.
- Bandi, C. and Bertsimas, D. (2012). Tractable stochastic analysis in high dimensions via robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 134(1):23–70.
- Bank, B., Guddat, J., Klatte, D., Kummer, B., and Tammer, K. (1984). Non-linear parametric optimization. *SIAM Review*, 26(4):594–595.
- Bauschke, H. H. and Combettes, P. L. (2017). *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2nd edition.
- Ben-Tal, A., El Ghaoui, L., and Nemirovski, A. (2009). *Robust Optimization*. Princeton University Press.
- Ben-Tal, A. and Nemirovski, A. (2000). Robust solutions of Linear Programming problems contaminated with uncertain data. *Mathematical Programming*, 88(3):411–424.
- Ben-Tal, A. and Nemirovski, A. (2008). Selected topics in robust convex optimization. *Math. Program.*, 112:125–158.

- Bertsimas, D., Brown, D. B., and Caramanis, C. (2011). Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM Review*, 53(3):464–501.
- Bertsimas, D. and den Hertog, D. (2022). *Robust and Adaptive Optimization*. Dynamic Ideas.
- Bertsimas, D., den Hertog, D., and Pauphilet, J. (2021). Probabilistic Guarantees in Robust Optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2893–2920.
- Bertsimas, D., Gupta, V., and Kallus, N. (2018). Data-driven robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 167(2):235–292.
- Bertsimas, D. and Kallus, N. (2020). From predictive to prescriptive analytics. *Management Science*, 66(3):1025–1044.
- Bertsimas, D., Shtern, S., and Sturt, B. (2022). Technical note—two-stage sample robust optimization. *Operations Research*, 70(1):624–640.
- Bertsimas, D. and Sim, M. (2004). The Price of Robustness. *Operations Research*, 52(1):35–53.
- Bertsimas, D., ten Eikelder, S. C. M., den Hertog, D., and Trichakis, N. (2024). Pareto adaptive robust optimality via a fourier–motzkin elimination lens. *Mathematical Programming*, 205(1):485–538.
- Birgin, E. G. and Martinez, J. M. (2009). *Practical augmented Lagrangian methods* *Practical Augmented Lagrangian Methods*, pages 3013–3023. Springer US, Boston, MA.
- Bolte, J., Le, T., Pauwels, E., and Silveti-Falls, T. (2021). Nonsmooth implicit differentiation for machine-learning and optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 13537–13549.
- Bolte, J. and Pauwels, E. (2019). Conservative set valued fields, automatic differentiation, stochastic gradient method and deep learning. *Mathematical Programming*, 188.
- Busseti, E., Moursi, W., and Boyd, S. (2019). Solution refinement at regular points of conic problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 74(3):627–643.
- Calafiore, G. and Campi, M. C. (2005). Uncertain convex programs: randomized solutions and confidence levels. *Mathematical Programming*, 102(1):25–46.
- Cameron, C., Hartford, J., Lundy, T., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2022). The perils of learning before optimizing. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36:3708–3715.
- Chenreddy, A. and Delage, E. (2024). End-to-end conditional robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04670*.
- Chow, Y., Ghavamzadeh, M., Janson, L., and Pavone, M. (2015). Risk-constrained reinforcement learning with percentile risk criteria. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18.
- Clarke, F. H. (1975). Generalized gradients and applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 205:247–262.
- Clarke, F. H. (1990). *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. Classics in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia.
- Costa, G. and Iyengar, G. N. (2023). Distributionally robust end-to-end portfolio construction. *Quantitative Finance*, 23(10):1465–1482.
- Coste, M. (2000). *An Introduction to O-minimal Geometry*. Dottorato di ricerca in matematica / Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Matematica. Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- Davis, D., Drusvyatskiy, D., Kakade, S. M., and Lee, J. (2018). Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20:119–154.
- Demirović, E., Stuckey, P., Bailey, J., Chan, J., Leckie, C., Ramamohanarao, K., and Guns, T. (2019). An investigation into prediction + optimisation for the knapsack problem. In *Integration of Constraint Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Operations Research*, Lecture Notes in

- Computer Science, pages 241–257. Springer.
- Donti, P. L., Amos, B., and Kolter, J. Z. (2017). Task-based end-to-end model learning in stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’17, page 5490–5500, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Dür, M., Jargalsaikhan, B., and Still, G. (2017). Genericity results in linear conic programming: A tour d’horizon. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(1):77–94.
- Elmachtoub, A. N. and Grigas, P. (2022). Smart “predict, then optimize”. *Manage. Sci.*, 68(1):9–26.
- Gao, R. (2023). Finite-sample guarantees for wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Breaking the curse of dimensionality. *Operations Research*, 71(6):2291–2306.
- Gao, R. and Kleywegt, A. (2023). Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with wasserstein distance.
- Goerigk, M. and Kurtz, J. (2023). Data-driven robust optimization using deep neural networks. *Computers and Operations Research*, 151:106087.
- Gupta, V. (2019). Near-optimal bayesian ambiguity sets for distributionally robust optimization. *Management Science*, 65(9):4242–4260.
- Guzman, Y. A., Matthews, L. R., and Floudas, C. A. (2017). New a priori and a posteriori probabilistic bounds for robust counterpart optimization: Iii. exact and near-exact a posteriori expressions for known probability distributions. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 103:116–143.
- Hong, L. J., Huang, Z., and Lam, H. (2021). Learning-based robust optimization: Procedures and statistical guarantees. *Management Science*, 67(6):3447–3467.
- Iancu, D. A. and Trichakis, N. (2014). Pareto efficiency in robust optimization. *Management Science*, 60(1):130–147.
- Kanzow, C., Ferenczi, I., and Fukushima, M. (2009). On the local convergence of semismooth newton methods for linear and nonlinear second-order cone programs without strict complementarity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(1):297–320.
- Kotary, J., Fioretto, F., Van Hentenryck, P., and Wilder, B. (2021). End-to-end constrained optimization learning: A survey. *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4475–4482.
- Li, Z., Tang, Q., and Floudas, C. A. (2012). A comparative theoretical and computational study on robust counterpart optimization: Ii. probabilistic guarantees on constraint satisfaction. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 51(19):6769–6788.
- Long, D., Sim, M., and Zhou, M. (2023). Robust satisficing. *Operations Research*, 71(1):61–82.
- Mandi, J., Kotary, J., Berden, S., Mulamba, M., Bucarey, V., Guns, T., and Fioretto, F. (2024). Decision-focused learning: Foundations, state of the art, benchmark and future opportunities. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 80:1623–1701.
- Messoudi, S., Destercke, S., and Rousseau, S. (2022). Ellipsoidal conformal inference for multi-target regression. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Symposium on Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction with Applications*, volume 179 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 294–306. PMLR.
- Mohajerin Esfahani, P. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171:115–166.
- Namkoong, H. and Duchi, J. C. (2017). Variance-based regularization with convex objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Pollard, D. (1890). *Convergence of Stochastic Processes*. Springer New York, NY.
- Rockafellar, R. and Royset, J. (2010). On buffered failure probability in design and optimization of structures. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 95(5):499–510.
- Rockafellar, R. T. and Uryasev, S. (2002). Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of banking & finance*, 26(7):1443–1471.
- Rockafellar, R. T. and Wets, R. J. (1998). Variational analysis. *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*.
- Roos, E. and den Hertog, D. (2020). Reducing conservatism in robust optimization. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 32(4):1109–1127.
- Sadana, U., Chenreddy, A., Delage, E., Forel, A., Frejinger, E., and Vidal, T. (2023). A survey of contextual optimization methods for decision making under uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10374*.
- Sarykalin, S., Serraino, G., and Uryasev, S. (2008). *Value-at-Risk vs Conditional Value-at-Risk in Risk Management and Optimization*, chapter 13, pages 270–294. INFORMS.
- Sarykalin, S., Serraino, G., and Uryasev, S. (2014). *Value-at-Risk vs. Conditional Value-at-Risk in Risk Management and Optimization*, chapter Chapter 13, pages 270–294.
- Schuermans, M. and Patrinos, P. (2023). Distributionally robust optimization using cost-aware ambiguity sets. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, PP:1–1.
- Singh, S. and Póczos, B. (2016). Analysis of k -nearest neighbor distances with application to entropy estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.08578*.
- Tanoumand, N., Bodur, M., and Naoum-Sawaya, J. (2023). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization: Intersecting ambiguity sets, performance analysis and tractability. *Optimization Online*.
- Uryasev, S. and Rockafellar, R. T. (2001). Conditional value-at-risk: optimization approach. In *Stochastic optimization: algorithms and applications*, pages 411–435. Springer.
- van den Dries, L. and Miller, C. (1999). Geometric categories, o-minimal structures and control. In Vaandrager, F. W. and van Schuppen, J. H., editors, *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 4–4, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer New York, NY.
- Van Parys, B. P. G., Mohajerin Esfahani, P., and Kuhn, D. (2021). From data to decisions: Distributionally robust optimization is optimal. *Management Science*, 67(6):3387–3402.
- Wang, I., Becker, C., Van Parys, B., and Stellato, B. (2024). Mean robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming*.
- Weed, J. and Bach, F. (2019). Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2620 – 2648.
- Wilder, B., Dilkina, B., and Tambe, M. (2019a). Melding the data-decisions pipeline: Decision-focused learning for combinatorial optimization. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):1658–1665.
- Wilder, B., Ewing, E., Dilkina, B., and Tambe, M. (2019b). End to end learning and optimization on graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Ye, Y., Todd, M. J., and Mizuno, S. (1994). An $o(\sqrt{nl})$ -iteration homogeneous and self-dual linear programming algorithm. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 19(1):53–67.
- Yeh, C., Christianson, N., Wu, A., Wierman, A., and Yue, Y. (2025). End-to-end conformal

calibration for optimization under uncertainty. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
Zhen, J., Kuhn, D., and Wiesemann, W. (2021). A unified theory of robust and distributionally robust optimization via the primal-worst-equals-dual-best principle.