

Robust Estimation under the Wasserstein Distance

Sloan Nietert*, Rachel Cummings† and Ziv Goldfeld*

September 25, 2024

Abstract

We study the problem of robust distribution estimation under the Wasserstein distance, a popular discrepancy measure between probability distributions rooted in optimal transport (OT) theory. Given n samples from an unknown distribution μ , of which εn are adversarially corrupted, we seek an estimate for μ with minimal Wasserstein error. To address this task, we draw upon two frameworks from OT and robust statistics: partial OT (POT) and minimum distance estimation (MDE). We prove new structural properties for POT and use them to show that MDE under a partial Wasserstein distance achieves the minimax-optimal robust estimation risk in many settings. Along the way, we derive a novel dual form for POT that adds a sup-norm penalty to the classic Kantorovich dual for standard OT. Since the popular Wasserstein generative adversarial network (WGAN) framework implements Wasserstein MDE via Kantorovich duality, our penalized dual enables large-scale generative modeling with contaminated datasets via an elementary modification to WGAN. Numerical experiments demonstrating the efficacy of our approach in mitigating the impact of adversarial corruptions are provided.

1 Introduction

Given i.i.d. samples X_1, \dots, X_n from an unknown probability measure μ , the empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ is a simple and ubiquitous estimator for μ . However, real-world data is often subject to measurement errors, model misspecification, and even malicious outliers. In this work, we seek to recover μ from corrupted samples $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$ under the strong ε -contamination model, namely, where an ε -fraction of the clean samples may be arbitrarily modified. This model is equivalently described by the total variation (TV) constraint $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, where $\tilde{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\tilde{X}_i}$ is empirical measure of the corrupted data. Working within a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) , we measure the quality of an estimate ν for μ using OT. Specifically, we use the p -Wasserstein distance $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$, defined via

A preliminary version of this work appeared at AISTATS 2022 under the title “Outlier-Robust Optimal Transport: Duality, Structure, and Statistical Analysis.” The current text presents new results for robust distribution estimation and a more general duality theorem, among other refinements.

*Cornell University

†Columbia University

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) := \left(\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} d(x, y)^p d\pi(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \|d\|_{L^p(\pi)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of couplings for μ and ν . This is a natural choice for non-parametric distribution estimation, since W_p metrizes the weak topology and tolerates support mismatch (Boissard et al., 2015; Fournier and Guillin, 2015; Singh and Póczos, 2018; Lei, 2020). Unfortunately, due to the strict marginal constraints in (1), OT values can be arbitrarily perturbed via small TV perturbations of the input measures; in particular, $W_p(\mu, (1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\delta_x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $d(x, x_0) \rightarrow \infty$, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

1.1 Our Contributions

To address the sensitivity of W_p to outliers, we consider the POT problem

$$W_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)} \|d\|_{L^p(\pi)}, \quad \Pi_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) := \left\{ \pi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2) \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi(\cdot \times \mathcal{X}) \leq \mu, \pi(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot) \leq \nu \\ \pi(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) = 1 - \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where the inequalities are understood setwise.¹ Equipped with this robust Wasserstein distance,² we employ minimum distance estimation (MDE) under W_p^ε , seeking an estimator $T(\tilde{\mu}_n)$ such that

$$T(\tilde{\mu}_n) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} W_p^\varepsilon(\nu, \tilde{\mu}_n),$$

where \mathcal{G} is a distribution family known to contain μ (generally encoding tail bounds). We prove that this procedure achieves the minimax optimal estimation error under W_p in the population limit, i.e., as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the finite-sample setting, our bounds are shown to be optimal up to the sub-optimality of $\hat{\mu}_n$ for distribution learning without corruptions, and this gap is negligible for the main distribution families considered.³

Our analysis hinges on several new results for POT, which may be of independent interest. This includes an approximate triangle inequality and the following equivalent primal formulation,

$$W_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\mu': \|\mu' - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon} W_p(\mu', \nu), \quad (3)$$

directly connecting W_p^ε to the robust estimation task at hand. Moreover, this reformulation enables deriving a penalized dual problem which, when $p = 1$, simplifies to (see Theorem 1 for the general case):

$$W_1^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\varphi: \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\varphi] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[\varphi] - 2\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_\infty.$$

¹Setwise inequalities between measures reduce to pointwise inequalities between densities when they exist.

²Despite calling W_p^ε a distance, note that it is no longer a proper metric, e.g., $W_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = 0$ for $\mu \neq \nu$ so long as $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$.

³In an independent manuscript (submitted after the conference version of this work was published and concurrently with the extended version), Ma et al. (2023) explore MDE under the robust Wasserstein distance of Mukherjee et al. (2021). Their approach leads to a distinct dual, with a sup-norm constraint compared to our sup-norm penalty, and they show convergence of their finite-sample MDE towards MDE w.r.t. the population distribution. However, they do not provide robust estimation guarantees for their estimator under the Wasserstein distance, which is the focus of this work.

When $\varepsilon = 0$, this recovers the classic Kantorovich W_1 dual that underlies the popular WGAN approach to generative modeling (Arjovsky et al., 2017). In particular, WGAN is a min-max implementation of MDE under W_1 that features the Kantorovich dual objective. By adding our simple ℓ_∞ penalty, we arrive at a practical implementation of MDE under W_1^ε which enables robust generative modeling. We provide numerical experiments on image data highlighting the potency of the proposed approach for mitigating the effect of outliers in generative modeling from contaminated data. Comparisons to the robust WGANs from Balaji et al. (2020) and Staerman et al. (2021) are also provided, demonstrating the superiority of our method.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 opens with a discussion of preliminaries, followed by a summary of our structural results for POT in Section 3. Section 4 provides robust estimation guarantees for MDE under W_p^ε , as well as for W_p^ε itself as an estimate of W_p . Section 5 applies our duality theory to build a robust WGAN and provides empirical results stemming from this approach, as well as comparisons to competing methods.

1.2 Related Work

Balaji et al. (2020) define a robust OT problem mirroring (3) but with general f -divergences instead TV, primarily focusing on the χ^2 divergence. They arrive at a more complex dual form (derived by invoking standard Kantorovich duality on the Wasserstein distance inside the infimum) that requires optimization over a significantly larger domain. In Mukherjee et al. (2021), robustness w.r.t. the TV distance is integrated via a regularization term in the objective. This leads to a simple modified primal problem but the corresponding dual requires optimizing over two potentials, even when $p = 1$. Additionally, Le et al. (2021) and Nath (2020) consider robustness via Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence and integral probability metric regularization terms, respectively. The former focuses on Sinkhorn-based algorithms, while the latter introduces a dual form that is distinct from ours and less compatible with existing duality-based OT computational methods. Staerman et al. (2021) present a median-of-means adaptation of the dual Kantorovich problem to tackle robust estimation when the contamination fraction ε vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The robust OT literature is intimately related to unbalanced OT theory, which addresses transport problems between measures of different mass (Piccoli and Rossi, 2014; Chizat et al., 2018a; Liero et al., 2018; Schmitzer and Wirth, 2019; Hanin, 1992). These formulations are reminiscent of the problem (3) but with regularizers added to the objective (KL being the most studied) rather than incorporated as constraints. Sinkhorn-based primal algorithms (Chizat et al., 2018b) are the standard approach to computation, and these have been extended to large-scale machine learning via minibatch methods (Fratras et al., 2021). Sonthalia and Gilbert (2020) explore a distinct version of unbalanced OT derived via dual regularization, but the regularized dual involves two potentials even when $p = 1$. Unbalanced OT is sometimes called relaxed or semi-relaxed OT, depending on whether one or both marginal constraints are relaxed (Blondel et al., 2018; Fukunaga and Kasai, 2022). The former work (Blondel et al., 2018) features a regularized dual, but the regularizer penalizes violations of the standard Kantorovich dual constraint, which is not relaxed in our approach.

The POT problem (2) itself has also been previously studied. Caffarelli and McCann (2010) consider a different parameterization of the problem, arriving at a distinct dual. In

particular, even when $p = 1$, their dual involves two potential functions. Their work reduces the POT problem to an OT problem with an augmented cost, as discussed in Section 2.1. Figalli (2010) restricts attention to quadratic costs with no discussion of duality. Álvarez-Esteban et al. (2011) find sufficient conditions for the optimal partial coupling to be unique and induced by a deterministic transport map. Del Barrio and Matrán (2013) study statistical convergence rates under POT, generally finding them to be comparable to standard OT. More recently, Chapel et al. (2020) applied POT to positive-unlabeled learning, but dual-based algorithms were not considered.

There is a long history of learning in the presence of corruptions, dating back to the robust statistics community in the 1960s (Huber, 1964). Over the years, many robust and sample-efficient estimators have been designed, particularly for mean and scale parameters; see, e.g., Ronchetti and Huber (2009) for a comprehensive survey and Donoho and Liu (1988) for an influential population-limit approach based on MDE. In the theoretical computer science community, much work has focused on achieving optimal rates for robust mean and moment estimation with computationally efficient estimators (Cheng et al., 2019; Diakonikolas and Kane, 2019). Recent statistics work, building off of Donoho and Liu (1988), has developed a unified framework for robust estimation based on MDE, which generally achieves optimal population-limit and near-optimal finite-sample guarantees for tasks including mean and covariance estimation (Zhu et al., 2022). Their analysis employs a quantity dubbed “generalized resilience” which is also essential to our work (once adapted to the OT setting). Our MDE approach follows their “weaken-the-distance” principle for robust statistics, but with a distinct notion of “weakening” that lends itself better to OT. Zhu et al. (2022) also consider robust estimation where perturbations are bounded under W_1 instead of $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$, but they do not consider a W_1 objective. In follow-up work by a subset of the authors (Nietert et al., 2024), spectral methods from Diakonikolas et al. (2016) are adapted to obtain a computationally efficient and minimax optimal procedure for estimation under W_1 when μ has bounded covariance, under a stronger adversarial model. However, this approach does not translate to the WGAN setting motivating our work.

2 Preliminaries

Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, and denote the diameter of a set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ by $\text{diam}(A) := \sup_{x, y \in A} d(x, y)$. Write $\text{Lip}_1(\mathcal{X})$ for the family of real 1-Lipschitz functions on \mathcal{X} . Take $C_b(\mathcal{X})$ as the set of continuous, bounded real functions on \mathcal{X} , and let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of signed Radon measures on \mathcal{X} equipped with the TV norm $\|\mu\|_{TV} := \frac{1}{2}|\mu|(\mathcal{X})$. Let $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ denote the space of finite, positive Radon measures on \mathcal{X} . For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, we consider the standard $L^p(\mu)$ space with norm $\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} = (\int |f|^p d\mu)^{1/p}$ and write $\mu \leq \nu$ when $\mu(B) \leq \nu(B)$ for every Borel set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Denote the shared mass of μ and ν by $\mu \wedge \nu := \mu - (\nu - \mu)^-$, where $\kappa = \kappa^+ - \kappa^-$ is the Jordan decomposition of $\kappa \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$, and write $\mu \vee \nu := \mu + \nu - \mu \wedge \nu$. For $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$, define $\mu|_A = \mu(\cdot \cap A)$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ denote the space of probability measures on \mathcal{X} , and take $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X}) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \int d(x, x_0)^p d\mu(x) < \infty \text{ for some } x_0 \in \mathcal{X}\}$ to be those with bounded p th moment. Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, let $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ denote the set of their couplings, i.e., $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ such that $\pi(B \times \mathcal{X}) = \mu(B)$ and $\pi(\mathcal{X} \times B) = \nu(B)$, for every Borel set B . When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, we write the

covariance matrix for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ as $\Sigma_\mu := \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^\top]$ where $X \sim \mu$. We also use $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X)]$ to denote the expectation of the random variable $f(X)$ when $X \sim \mu$ and write $f_\# \mu$ for the probability law of $f(X)$. We write $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$, $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$, and use $\lesssim, \gtrsim, \asymp$ to denote inequalities/equality up to absolute constants. We sometimes write $a = O(b)$ and $b = \Omega(a)$ for $a \lesssim b$.

2.1 (Partial) Optimal Transport

For a lower semi-continuous cost function $c : \mathcal{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *optimal transport cost* between $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ with $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \nu(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c \, d\pi, \quad (4)$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu) := \{\pi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2) : \pi(\cdot \times \mathcal{X}) = \mu, \pi(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot) = \nu\}$. For $p \in [1, \infty)$, the p -Wasserstein distance $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ as defined in (1) coincides with $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu)^{1/p}$ for the cost $c(x, y) := \mathbf{d}(x, y)^p$. Some basic properties of \mathbf{W}_p are (see, e.g., Villani, 2003; Santambrogio, 2015): (i) the inf is attained in the definition of \mathbf{W}_p , i.e., there exists a coupling $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ such that $\mathbf{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^p d\pi^*(x, y)$; (ii) \mathbf{W}_p is a metric on $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$; and (iii) convergence in \mathbf{W}_p is equivalent to weak convergence plus convergence of p th moments: $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ and $\int |x|^p d\mu_n(x) \rightarrow \int |x|^p d\mu(x)$.

Wasserstein distances adhere to a dual formulation, which we summarize below. For a function $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ and symmetric cost function $c : \mathcal{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the c -transform of φ is

$$\varphi^c(y) := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [c(x, y) - \varphi(x)], \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

A function $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$, not identically $-\infty$, is called c -concave if $\varphi = \psi^c$ for some function $\psi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$. For the \mathbf{W}_1 cost $c(x, y) = \mathbf{d}(x, y)$, this occurs if and only if $\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathcal{X})$. With this notation, the following duality holds (Villani, 2003, Theorem 1.3),

$$\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\substack{\varphi, \psi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y) \, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu \right] = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu \right], \quad (5)$$

and one may restrict the right-hand supremum to c -concave φ .

We define the partial OT cost $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$ as the solution to (4) when the set of feasible couplings $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is replaced with the set of partial couplings $\Pi_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$, as defined in (2). We recover \mathbf{W}_p^ε by taking $c = \mathbf{d}^p$. Computation for POT is generally addressed via the following characterization of POT as an instance of standard OT over an augmented space.

Proposition 1 (POT as augmented standard OT, Caffarelli and McCann, 2010). *Let $\bar{x} \notin \mathcal{X}$ be a dummy point, define the disjoint union $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \sqcup \{\bar{x}\}$, and suppose that the cost c is non-negative. Define the augmented cost function $\bar{c} : \bar{\mathcal{X}}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by*

$$\bar{c}(x, y) = \begin{cases} c(x, y), & x, y \in \mathcal{X} \\ 0, & x \in \mathcal{X}, y = \bar{x} \text{ or } y \in \mathcal{X}, x = \bar{x} \\ \infty. & x = y = \bar{x} \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \text{OT}_{\bar{c}}(\mu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}}, \nu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}})$.

One may thus compute W_p^ε by applying methods for standard OT to this augmented space, e.g., linear programming for an exact solution or Sinkhorn methods for an approximate solution (see [Peyré and Cuturi \(2019\)](#) for a thorough discussion of computational OT). In these cases, $\bar{c}(\bar{x}, \bar{x})$ can be taken to be a sufficiently large but finite constant.

2.2 Minimum Distance Estimation

Given a distribution family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and a statistical distance $D : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, we define the minimum distance functional $T_{[\mathcal{G}, D]} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ by the relation

$$T_{[\mathcal{G}, D]}(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} D(\mu, \nu),$$

choosing the representative arbitrarily and assuming no issues with existence. More generally, for any $\delta > 0$, we set $T_{[\mathcal{G}, D]}^\delta(\mu)$ to any distribution $\kappa \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $D(\mu, \kappa) \leq \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} D(\mu, \nu) + \delta$. One can view such ν as a δ -approximate projection of μ onto the family \mathcal{G} under D . We recall next how MDE can be applied in the contexts of OT and robust statistics.

WGAN as MDE under W_1 . A remarkable application of OT to machine learning is generative modeling via the WGAN framework, which can be understood as MDE under W_1 . Given a distribution family \mathcal{G} and the n -sample empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$ of an unknown distribution μ , the W_1 minimum distance estimate for μ given $\hat{\mu}_n$ is

$$T_{[\mathcal{G}, W_1]}(\hat{\mu}_n) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} W_1(\hat{\mu}_n, \nu) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \operatorname{Lip}_1(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \, d(\hat{\mu}_n - \nu).$$

In practice, \mathcal{G} is realized as the pushforward of a simple reference distribution (e.g., standard normal or uniform on a ball) through a parameterized family of neural networks. The resulting estimate is called a generative model, since a minimizing parameter allows one to generate high quality samples from a distribution close to μ , given that \mathcal{G} is a sufficiently rich family. The min-max objective for this problem lends itself well to implementation via alternating gradient-based optimization, and the resulting WGAN framework has supported breakthrough work in generative modeling ([Arjovsky et al., 2017](#); [Gulrajani et al., 2017](#); [Tolstikhin et al., 2018](#)). MDE under the Wasserstein metric has also been of general interest in the statistics community due to its generalization guarantees and lack of parametric assumptions ([Bassetti et al., 2006](#); [Bernton et al., 2017](#); [Boissard et al., 2015](#)).

Robust statistics and MDE under $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$. In robust statistics, one seeks to estimate some property of a distribution μ from contaminated data, generally under the requirement that $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$ for some class $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ encoding distributional assumptions. A common approach for quantifying the error is using a statistical distance $D : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. In the population-limit version of such tasks, sampling issues are ignored, and we suppose that one observes a contaminated distribution $\tilde{\mu}$ such that $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{TV} \leq \varepsilon$. The information-theoretic complexity of robust estimation in this setting is characterized by the *modulus of continuity*

$$m_D(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{TV}, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G} \\ \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq \varepsilon}} D(\mu, \nu),$$

and the associated guarantees are achieved via MDE under the TV norm. This is summarized in the following lemma due to [Donoho and Liu \(1988\)](#).

Proposition 2 (Robustness of MDE, [Donoho and Liu, 1988](#)). *Fix $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, let $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, and take any $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Then, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\|\nu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, including the minimum distance estimate $\mathsf{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}(\tilde{\mu})$, we have*

$$\mathsf{D}(\nu, \mu) \leq \mathfrak{m}_{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}, 2\varepsilon). \quad (6)$$

The MDE solution satisfies $\|\mathsf{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}(\tilde{\mu}) - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$ because $\|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, while inequality (6) holds by the definition of the modulus since $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\tilde{\mu} - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2\varepsilon$. In typical cases of interest, it is easy to show that no procedure can obtain estimation error substantially less than $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}, \varepsilon)$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, so this characterization is essentially tight.

Generalized resilience. Our robustness analysis for OT distances relies on the notion of (generalized) resilience, which was originally proposed for robust mean estimation ([Steinhardt et al., 2018](#); [Zhu et al., 2022](#)). Specifically, given a statistical distance $\mathsf{D} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, we say that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is (ρ, ε) -resilient w.r.t. D if $\mathsf{D}(\mu, \nu) \leq \rho$ for all distributions ν with $\nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu$. Resilience is a primary sufficient condition for robust estimation, since it implies immediate bounds on the relevant modulus of continuity.

Lemma 1 (Bounded modulus under resilience, [Zhu et al., 2022](#)). *Let $\mathsf{D} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfy the triangle inequality, and write \mathcal{G} for the family distributions which are $(\rho, 2\varepsilon)$ -resilient w.r.t. D . Then we have*

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\mathsf{D}}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}, \varepsilon) \leq 2\rho.$$

Example 1 (Robust mean estimation). *In robust mean estimation, the error is quantified via $\mathsf{D}_{\text{mean}}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[X] - \mathbb{E}_{\nu}[X]\|$, i.e., we seek an estimate for the mean of an unknown distribution under the ℓ_2 norm. A distribution μ is (ρ, ε) -resilient w.r.t. D_{mean} if $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[X] - \mathbb{E}_{\nu}[X]\| \leq \rho$ for all distributions $\nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu$. For example, if μ has variance σ , one can show that μ is $(O(\sigma\sqrt{\varepsilon}), 2\varepsilon)$ -resilient in mean; thus its mean can be recovered under TV ε -corruptions up to error $O(\sigma\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. The MDE procedure achieving this risk bound in the population-limit is closely related to efficient finite-sample algorithms based on iterative filtering and spectral reweighing ([Diakonikolas et al., 2016](#); [Hopkins et al., 2020](#)).*

3 Structure of POT

Our approach to robust estimation builds upon the robust Wasserstein distance W_p^ε , defined by a POT problem where a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -fraction of mass is transported. Here, we establish several important properties and equivalences for POT, which may be of independent interest. Throughout, we fix a cost c of the form $c(x, y) = h(d(x, y))$, where $h : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is continuous and strictly increasing with $h(0) = 0$. In particular, this captures the p -Wasserstein cost $c = \mathsf{d}^p$. Proofs for this section are deferred to Section 6.1.

To begin, we provide three alternative reformulations of OT_c^ε , which was originally defined in Section 2.1 as a minimization problem over partial couplings. These reformulations more




Figure 1: Visualization of Proposition 3. The gridded light blue and green regions each have mass ε , respectively, and are removed to obtain optimal μ_- and ν_- for W_1^ε . No mass need be removed from the dark region designating $\mu \wedge \nu$.

evidently connect POT to outlier robustness, and each of them will be used throughout our theory. After stating the result, we discuss and interpret each representation.

Proposition 3 (Equivalent reformulations). *For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \min_{\substack{\mu_-, \nu_- \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu \\ \mu_-(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_-(\mathcal{X}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon}} \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-) = \min_{\substack{\mu_+, \nu_+ \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_+ \geq \mu, \nu_+ \geq \nu \\ \mu_+(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_+(\mathcal{X}) \leq 1 + \varepsilon}} \text{OT}_c(\mu_+, \nu_+) = \min_{\substack{\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \|\mu' - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu).$$

For the first reformulation, there are minimizers $\mu_- \leq \mu$ and $\nu_- \leq \nu$ such that $\mu_-, \nu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$. For the second, there are maximizers $\mu_+ \geq \mu$ and $\nu_+ \geq \nu$ such that $\mu_+, \nu_+ \leq \mu \vee \nu$.

The first formulation measures OT_c^ε as the smallest transport cost that can be attained by omitting an ε -fraction of mass from each of μ and ν ; the removed mass can be interpreted as the identified outliers. The existence of minimizers bounded from below by $\mu \wedge \nu$, depicted in Fig. 1, was previously known for W_1^ε and W_2^ε (see, e.g., Figalli, 2010), but our result requires a more general argument. The second equality shows that OT_c^ε can be equivalently formulated in terms of mass addition, which is key to several of our proofs. This result relies on the geometric symmetry of the POT problem; instead of removing mass from one measure, we may equivalently add it to the other. The third TV formulation follows since a TV perturbation can be split into separate mass addition and mass removal steps.

We now establish basic structural properties of OT_c^ε , identifying extreme values, noting its monotonicity in the robustness radius, and establishing an approximate triangle inequality.

Proposition 4 (Basic properties). *For $\mu, \nu, \kappa \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in [0, 1]$, we have*

1. Monotonicity in the robustness parameter: *if $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 < \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}$, then*

$$0 < \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) \leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon_2}{1 - \varepsilon_1} \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu) < \infty,$$

with $\text{OT}_c^0(\mu, \nu) = \text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu)$ and $\text{OT}_c^{\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}}(\mu, \nu) = 0$;

2. Approximate triangle inequality: *recalling that $c(x, y) = h(d(x, y))$, if h and $\log \circ h \circ \exp$ are convex and $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq 1$, then*

$$h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu)) \leq h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa)) + h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu)).$$

In particular, $W_p^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) \leq W_p^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa) + W_p^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu)$.

The monotonicity statement is a simple observation, while the proof of the second claim combines Proposition 3 and standard triangle inequalities for OT and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$.

Although computation for POT is well-understood via a reduction to standard OT (see Proposition 1), this reduction uses a non-standard cost function, inhibiting some dual-based OT applications like WGAN. Fortunately, we prove that OT_c^ε admits a Kantorovich-type dual in terms of the base cost c . This result is key to our experiments in Section 5.




Figure 2: Optimal potentials: (left) 1D densities plotted with their optimal potential for the W_1^ϵ dual problem; (right) contour plots for optimal dual potentials to W_1 and W_1^ϵ between 2D Gaussian mixtures. Observe how optimal potentials for the robust dual are flat over outlier mass.

Theorem 1 (Dual form). *For $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OT}_c^\epsilon(\mu, \nu) &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu - 2\epsilon \|\varphi\|_\infty \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu - \epsilon \left(\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) - \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and the suprema are achieved by $\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\varphi = (\varphi^c)^c$. If $\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ maximizes (7) and $\mu_-, \nu_- \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ are minimizers for the mass removal reformulation in Proposition 3, then $\text{spt}(\mu - \mu_-) \subseteq \text{argmax}(\varphi)$ and $\text{spt}(\nu - \nu_-) \subseteq \text{argmin}(\varphi)$.

This new formulation differs from the classic dual (5) by a sup-norm penalty on the potential function, its lack of moment requirements on μ and ν , and the existence of continuous, bounded maximizers. Recall that when $c = \mathbf{d}$, $\varphi = (\varphi^c)^c$ exactly when φ is 1-Lipschitz, with $\varphi^c = -\varphi$. Moreover, the extremal level sets of any maximizing dual potential encode the location of mass removed in the primal problem, as depicted in Fig. 2.

Proof sketch. The “ \geq ” direction of (7) is straightforward to derive. Starting from the mass addition formulation of OT_c^ϵ (see Proposition 3), we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OT}_c^\epsilon(\mu, \nu) &= \inf_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \beta(\mathcal{X}) \leq \epsilon}} \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d(\mu + \alpha) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d(\nu + \beta) \\ &\geq \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \inf_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \beta(\mathcal{X}) \leq \epsilon}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d(\mu + \alpha) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d(\nu + \beta) \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu - \epsilon \left(\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) - \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By subtracting a constant from φ , we can ensure that the final term takes its desired form of $2\|\varphi\|_\infty$ without modifying the objective value. For compact \mathcal{X} , one can argue via Sion’s minimax theorem that the inequality above is actually an equality; for general \mathcal{X} , however, the situation is more subtle. Fortunately, we can sidestep any functional analysis by applying standard Kantorovich duality to the augmented problem from Proposition 1. The full proof

in Section 6.1.3 proceeds with a careful analysis of \bar{c} -concave functions under the augmented cost \bar{c} to match our penalized objective. Existence of maximizers follows by a compactness and semi-continuity argument under an appropriate weak topology. \square

Remark 1 (TV as a dual norm). Recall that $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ is the dual norm corresponding to the Banach space of measurable functions on \mathcal{X} equipped with $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$. An inspection of the proof of Theorem 1 reveals that our penalty scales with $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ precisely for this reason.

Lastly, we describe an alternative dual form which ties robust OT to loss trimming—a popular practical tool for robustifying estimation algorithms when μ and ν have finite support (Shen and Sanghavi, 2019).

Proposition 5 (Loss trimming dual). *If $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ are uniform distributions over n points each and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ is a multiple of $1/n$, then*

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \left(\min_{\substack{S \subseteq \text{spt}(\mu) \\ |S|=(1-\varepsilon)n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in S} \varphi(x) + \min_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{spt}(\nu) \\ |T|=(1-\varepsilon)n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{y \in T} \varphi^c(y) \right).$$

The inner minimization problems above clip out the εn fraction of samples whose potential evaluations are largest. This is similar to how standard loss trimming clips out a fraction of samples that contribute most to the considered training loss.

4 Robust Estimation under W_p

We now formalize the problem of robust distribution estimation under W_p . Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. samples from an unknown distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and write $\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ for their empirical measure. Under the strong ε -contamination model, an adversary observes these samples and produces corrupted samples $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$ with empirical measure $\tilde{\mu}_n$, such that the contamination fraction is at most ε , i.e., $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{X}_i \neq X_i\} \leq \varepsilon$. We seek an estimate $\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ for μ that minimizes the p -Wasserstein error $W_p(\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu)$.

Error and risk. Formally, this corruption process may be any measurable transformation of the clean samples and an independent (but otherwise arbitrary) source of randomness. Write $\mathcal{M}_n^{\text{adv}}(\mu, \varepsilon)$ for the family of all joint distributions $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ of corrupted data $\{\tilde{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ that can be obtained this way. Note that the modified samples, of which there are at most εn , may be highly correlated. Fixing any estimator \mathbb{T} that depends only on the corrupted data (and possibly independent randomness), we define its n -sample *robust estimation risk* by

$$R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}, \mu, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n \in \mathcal{M}_n^{\text{adv}}(\mu, \varepsilon)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n} [W_p(\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu)].$$

By definition, the error incurred by \mathbb{T} under ε -contamination is bounded by $R_{p,n}$ in expectation. No estimator can obtain finite error for all distributions, so we often require that μ belongs to a family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ encoding distributional assumptions. In this setting, we define the worst-case risk over \mathcal{G} and the corresponding *minimax risk*, respectively, by

$$R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}, \mu, \varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \inf_{\mathbb{T}} R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon).$$




Figure 3: Visual depiction of MDE under W_p^ε and its analysis. Solid lines represent statistical distance bounds given by the problem formulation, and dotted lines represent bounds deduced by our choice of estimator and the approximate triangle inequality for W_p^ε . We abbreviate $\delta_n = W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)$.

The estimator. To solve this robust estimation task, we perform MDE using W_p^ε , projecting $\tilde{\mu}_n$ onto the clean family \mathcal{G} under the robust distance. That is, we consider the estimator⁴

$$\mathsf{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}(\tilde{\mu}_n) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \nu),$$

as illustrated in Figure 3. To study the performance of MDE, we begin by analyzing a population-limit version of the problem where measures are observed directly rather than via sampling. In Section 4.1, we introduce a resilience-type condition which characterizes population-limit minimax risk for a variety of standard distribution classes, and we show that this risk is attained by MDE under W_p^ε . In Section 4.2, we return to the finite-sample regime and prove that MDE under W_p^ε still achieves near-optimal risk bounds. Finally, in Section 4.3, we consider W_p^ε as a stand-alone estimator for W_p and quantify its performance. Proofs for this section are deferred to Section 6.2.

Remark 2 (One-sided robust distance). A natural alternative to $W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \nu)$ above is the one-sided robust distance $W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n \| \nu) := \inf_{\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \tilde{\mu}_n} W_p(\mu', \nu)$. This variant seems well-suited to the additive ε -corruption model, i.e., when $\tilde{\mu}_n \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_n$. Nevertheless, we show in Appendix A that MDE under the one-sided distance achieves matching guarantees to those proved in this section, even under strong ε -contamination. It also admits a slightly simpler dual form, which we employ for the generative modeling experiments in Section 5. Presently, we stick to the symmetric robust distance since its analysis is cleaner.

4.1 Population-Limit Guarantees and Resilience

Before analyzing finite-sample risk, we characterize a baseline risk that is unavoidable even with unlimited samples. Formally, given μ that belongs to a clean family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we consider the task of estimating μ under W_p from a contaminated distribution $\tilde{\mu}$ with $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Given a map $\mathsf{T} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we define its *population-limit robust estimation error* as

$$R_{p,\infty}(\mathsf{T}, \mu, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon} W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\mu}), \mu).$$

As before, the minimax risk is $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \inf_{\mathsf{T}} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} R_{p,\infty}(\mathsf{T}, \mu, \varepsilon)$, and MDE corresponds to the estimator $\mathsf{T} = \mathsf{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}$. In this regime, however, the procedure simplifies considerably;

⁴As mentioned before, existence and representative selection are inconsequential; approximate minimizers will suffice.

since $\inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \nu) \leq W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \mu) = 0$, the minimum distance estimate satisfies $W_p^\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}), \tilde{\mu}) = 0$, or equivalently $\|\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}) - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Consequently, Lemma 1 implies that this estimator matches the performance of MDE under the TV norm, i.e., $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$, which recovers the standard approach to population-limit robust statistics outlined in Section 2.

To quantify the risk, we first note that if \mathcal{G} is unrestricted, $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ may be unbounded. Therefore, we next introduce a natural distributional assumption under which accurate estimation is possible. The definition essentially instantiates generalized resilience (Zhu et al., 2022) to our setting.

Definition 1 (Resilience w.r.t. W_p). Let $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$ and $\rho \geq 0$. A distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is called (ρ, ε) -resilient w.r.t. W_p if $W_p(\mu, \mu') \leq \rho$ for all $\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu$. Write $\mathcal{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon)$ for the family of all such distributions.

That is, μ belongs to $\mathcal{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon)$ if deleting an ε -fraction of mass from μ and renormalizing (equivalently, conditioning on an event with probability $1 - \varepsilon$) leads to change at most ρ in W_p . In particular, this implies that μ has finite p th moments; otherwise, such change could be infinite. Lemma 1 then gives the following.

Proposition 6 (Bounded risk under resilience). Let $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 2\varepsilon)$. Then $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \leq 2\rho$, and this risk is achieved by the estimators $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$.

While resilience w.r.t. W_p is a high-level condition, we can precisely quantify it for many families of interest. Moreover, the resulting upper risk bounds from Proposition 6 are often tight. In particular, for $\sigma \geq 0$ and $q \geq 1$, we consider the class $\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$ of distributions $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbb{E}_\mu[d(X, x_0)^q] \leq \sigma^q$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, i.e., those with centered absolute q th moments bounded by σ . When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, we further consider the following standard families of sub-Gaussian distributions and those with a bounded covariance matrix, namely:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp(|\langle \theta, X - \mathbb{E}_\mu[X] \rangle|^2 / \sigma^2) \right] \leq 2 \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \right\}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \Sigma_\mu \preceq \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_d \right\}.$$

We now state tight population-limit minimax risk bounds for these concrete classes.

Theorem 2 (Population-limit minimax risk). For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$,⁵ we have

$$R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \asymp \begin{cases} \sigma \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma) \text{ for } q \geq p \text{ and } \exists x, y \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, y) = \sigma \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{q}} \\ \sigma \sqrt{d + p + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) \\ \sigma \sqrt{d} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d, p \leq 2, \text{ and } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) \end{cases}$$

and these risks are achieved by the estimators $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$.

For the upper bounds, we show in Section 6.2.1 that resilience w.r.t. W_p is implied by mean resilience of the p th power of the metric d and then apply Proposition 6. This yields the risk bound for $\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$ and further implies the two latter bounds by observing that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)}(\sqrt{d + p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)})$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2(\sqrt{d}\sigma)$. For lower bounds, we use that $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \geq W_p(\alpha, \beta)/2$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\|\alpha - \beta\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Indeed, even if one knows

⁵The stated risk bounds hold for any ε bounded away from $1/2$, with inverse dependence on $1 - 2\varepsilon$.

that $\mu \in \{\alpha, \beta\} \subset \mathcal{G}$, there is no way to distinguish between these cases if $\tilde{\mu} = \alpha$. The best one can do in this case is to estimate their Wasserstein barycenter, achieving error $W_p(\alpha, \beta)/2$. When $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$, for example, consider $\mu = \delta_x, \nu = (1 - \varepsilon)\delta_x + \varepsilon\delta_y$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{d}(X, x)^q] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathbf{d}(X, x)^q] = \varepsilon \mathbf{d}(x, y)^q$, and $W_p(\mu, \nu) = \varepsilon^{1/p} \mathbf{d}(x, y)$. By selecting $\mathbf{d}(x, y) = \sigma \varepsilon^{-1/q}$, the maximal distance for which $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$, we obtain the tight lower bound of $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \varepsilon) \gtrsim W_p(\mu, \nu) = \sigma \varepsilon^{1/p-1/q}$. Lower bounds for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$ follow by considering appropriate Gaussian mixtures.

Remark 3 (Comparison to mean resilience). When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, the corresponding rates for mean resilience and population-limit minimax risk for robust mean estimation under the sub-Gaussian and bounded covariance classes are $O(\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)})$ and $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, respectively (see, e.g., [Steinhardt et al., 2018](#)). These match our bounds for W_1 up to \sqrt{d} dependence, which we interpret as reflecting the high-dimensional structure of the Wasserstein metric. In follow-up work, [Nietert et al. \(2022\)](#) showed that mean resilience coincides with resilience under max-sliced W_1 , which measures W_1 between 1-dimensional projections of the data.

Remark 4 (Unknown contamination fraction). If ε is unknown, $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$ can still be applied. Alternatively, one may take $\hat{\varepsilon} = \min\{\tau \in [0, 1] : \exists \nu \in \mathcal{G} \text{ s.t. } \|\nu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \tau\}$ (ensuring $\hat{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon$) and employ $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^{\hat{\varepsilon}}]}$. By construction, the returned $\nu = \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu})$ satisfies $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|\nu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2\varepsilon$ and thus achieves the risk bounds of [Theorem 2](#).

4.2 Finite-Sample Guarantees

We now return to the finite-sample setting. The following result provides a general lower bound and a resilience-based upper bound for minimax risk via MDE. Recall that $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}$ returns any distribution which solves the W_p^ε MDE problem over \mathcal{G} up to additive error δ .

Theorem 3 (Finite-sample minimax risk). *For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have*

$$R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \gtrsim R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon/4) + R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, 0).$$

For $\mu \in \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 2\varepsilon)$, the risk of the minimum distance estimator $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}^\delta$ is bounded as

$$R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, W_p^\varepsilon]}^\delta, \mu, \varepsilon) \lesssim \rho + \delta + \mathbb{E}[W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)].$$

Consequently, taking $\delta = 0$, we have $R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \lesssim \rho + \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$.

The lower bound formalizes the intuitive notion that finite-sample robust estimation is harder than both population-limit robust estimation and finite-sample standard estimation. The upper bound shows that the risk bound of [Proposition 6](#) translates to the finite-sample setting up to empirical approximation error. For the distribution families considered in [Theorem 2](#), these risk bounds match up to the gap between $R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, 0)$ and $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$, i.e., up to the sub-optimality of plug-in estimation under W_p . Under mild conditions given below, both of these quantities scale at rate $n^{-1/d}$.⁶

⁶Under the further assumption of smooth densities, the plug-in estimator is known to give a suboptimal rate ([Niles-Weed and Berthet, 2022](#)); optimization for this regime is beyond the scope of this work.

Corollary 1 (Concrete finite-sample risk bounds). *Let $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$, $q > p$, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ for $d > 2p$, and $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)\}$. If $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$, further suppose that $d > (1/p - 1/q)^{-1}$, while if $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$, assume that $p < 2$ and $d > (1/p - 1/2)^{-1}$. Then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending only on p, q , and d such that*

$$R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) + C_1 \sigma n^{-\frac{1}{d}} \lesssim R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \lesssim R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) + C_2 \sigma n^{-\frac{1}{d}},$$

and the upper risk bound is achieved by the minimum distance estimator $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon]}$.

We view the upper bound of Theorem 3 as a primary contribution of this work. It has two merits which are essential for meaningful practical guarantees. First, we only need to perform approximate MDE, as slack of δ in optimization only worsens our final bound by $O(\delta)$. Second, the empirical approximation term depends only on the clean measure μ and can be controlled even under heavy-tailed contamination. If μ has upper p -Wasserstein dimension d_\star in the sense of Weed and Bach (2019) then the $n^{-1/d}$ rate of Corollary 1 can be improved to n^{-1/d_\star} . We sketch the theorem proof, deferring full details to Section 6.2.2.

Proof sketch of Theorem 3. Our proof follows the “weaken the distance” approach to robust statistics formalized in Zhu et al. (2022). We observe that analysis of MDE under the TV distance, as applied to obtain population-limit upper risk bounds, fails in the finite-sample setting because $\|\hat{\mu}_n - \mu\|_{\text{TV}}$ may be large.⁷ In particular, $\tilde{\mu}_n$ cannot be viewed as a small TV perturbation of μ , even though $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. On the other hand, by Proposition 4, we can bound $\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \mu) \leq \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)$, which is small with high probability; this motivates our choice of approximate MDE under $\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon$. In order to quantify its performance, we bound the relevant modulus of continuity.

Lemma 2 ($\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon$ modulus of continuity). *For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon) \\ \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \leq \lambda}} \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \lesssim \lambda + \rho.$$

Now, to prove the upper bound, fix $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$ with empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$, and consider any distribution $\tilde{\mu}_n$ with $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Then, for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon]}^\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p^{2\varepsilon}(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) &\leq \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \tilde{\mu}_n) + \mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) && \text{(Proposition 4)} \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \tilde{\mu}_n) + \delta && \text{(MDE guarantee and } \mu \in \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \hat{\mu}_n) + 2\mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + \delta. && \text{(Proposition 4)} \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + \delta. && (\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

Writing $\lambda_n = 2\mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + \delta$, Lemma 2 gives that

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) \leq \sup_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G} \\ \mathcal{W}_p^{2\varepsilon}(\alpha, \beta) \leq \lambda_n}} \mathcal{W}_p(\alpha, \beta) \lesssim \lambda_n + \rho,$$

and so $R_{p,n}(\mathbb{T}, \mu, \varepsilon) \lesssim \rho + \delta + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$, as desired.

⁷E.g., if μ has a Lebesgue density then $\|\hat{\mu}_n - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} = 1$, for all n .

For the lower bound, we trivially have that $R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, 0) \leq R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ since $\mathcal{M}_n^{\text{adv}}(\mu, 0) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n^{\text{adv}}(\mu, \varepsilon)$ for all μ , i.e., the adversary may opt to corrupt no samples. Moreover, in Section 6.2.2, we prove that $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon/4) \leq 8R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ by transforming any estimator for the n -sample problem into an estimator for the population-limit problem with similar guarantees under slightly less contamination. To do so, we leverage the fact that a population-limit estimator has access to unlimited i.i.d. samples from the contaminated distribution and can use these to simulate many copies of an n -sample estimator. \square

Remark 5 (Exploiting low-dimensional structure). If μ is supported on a (possibly unknown) k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^d , one can substitute MDE over a class \mathcal{G} with MDE over the projected family $\mathcal{G}_k = \{U_{\sharp}\nu : U \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}, UU^{\top} = I_k, \nu \in \mathcal{G}\}$. For the families in Theorem 2, each occurrence of d in the population-limit risk bounds can then be improved to k . Similarly, the $n^{-1/d}$ rate in the finite-sample risk bounds can be improved to $n^{-1/k}$. If μ admits no such structure, one may still enjoy such improved bounds if willing to relax the W_p estimation guarantee to a weaker guarantee under the k -dimensional max-sliced Wasserstein distance $\overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}, UU^{\top} = I_k} W_p(U_{\sharp}\mu, U_{\sharp}\nu)$. See Appendix B for further details.

Remark 6 (Comparison to MDE under TV). Although $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}}$ may be large for all n , MDE under the TV norm still provides strong robust estimation guarantees in the finite-sample regime via a slight modification to the analysis. For example, if $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$ for $q > p$, then the empirical distribution $\hat{\mu}_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_q(20\sigma)$ with probability at least 0.95 by Markov's inequality. Hence, our population-limit risk bound for the class $\mathcal{G}_q(20\sigma)$ implies that the minimum distance estimator $\mathsf{T} = \mathsf{T}_{[\mathcal{G}_q(20\sigma), \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$ satisfies the near-optimal guarantee

$$W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu) \leq W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \hat{\mu}_n) + W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) \lesssim \sigma \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} + \mathbb{E}[W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$$

with probability at least 0.9. Our population limit risks for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma)$ followed from the inclusions $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2(\sigma\sqrt{d})$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)}(O(\sqrt{d + p + \log(1/\varepsilon)}\sigma))$, so the approach above translates to these settings as well, matching the guarantees of Corollary 1. However, MDE under TV lacks the connections of W_p^ε to the theory (POT) and practice (WGAN) of OT in modern machine learning, which is a key motivation for our approach.

4.3 W_p^ε as a Robust Estimator for W_p

Finally, we take a detour from MDE and examine robust estimation of the distance $W_p(\mu, \nu)$ itself given ε -corrupted samples from μ and ν . Formally, this is no harder than the previously considered task of robust distribution estimation under W_p , since the triangle inequality gives $|W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mathsf{T}(\tilde{\nu}_n)) - W_p(\mu, \nu)| \leq W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu) + W_p(\mathsf{T}(\tilde{\nu}_n), \nu)$. Moreover, a simple modulus of continuity argument reveals that the minimax population-limit risk for this task (restricting μ and ν to some clean family \mathcal{G}) coincides with that of the initial problem. While MDE thus solves the problem of *robust distance estimation*, we next explore a simple alternative approach: compute $W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ and output it as the estimate of $W_p(\mu, \nu)$. We now provide guarantees for this natural procedure.

Theorem 4 (Finite-sample robust estimation of W_p). *Let $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/3$ and write $\tau = 1 - (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{1/p} \in [3\varepsilon/p, 3\varepsilon]$. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$ have empirical measures $\hat{\mu}_n$ and $\hat{\nu}_n$, respectively. For any $\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}}, \|\tilde{\nu}_n - \hat{\nu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$|\mathbf{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)| \leq 2\rho + \tau\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) + \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathbf{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n).$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon \leq 0.33$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}$ for $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)\}$, $q \geq p$, then ρ can be replaced with $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ in the bound above.

Thus, for large sample sizes, the \mathbf{W}_p^ε estimate suffers from additive estimation error $O(\rho)$ and multiplicative estimation error $O(\tau)$, matching the resilience-based guarantees of MDE when $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ is sufficiently small. The proof is a straightforward application of techniques from previous sections. We note that the upper bound of $1/3$ on ε , i.e., the breakdown point of the \mathbf{W}_p^ε estimator, cannot be improved. Indeed, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, the proof includes a construction of $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}$ such that $\|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}}, \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1/3$ but $\mathbf{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) = 0$.

If $\varepsilon = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we can recover $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ exactly in the limit.

Corollary 2 (Asymptotic consistency). *Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathcal{X})$ for $q > p$, and consider any contaminated versions $\{\tilde{\mu}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty, \{\tilde{\nu}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \vee \|\tilde{\nu}_n - \hat{\nu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$. Then, for any sequence $\{\tau_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq [0, 1]$ such that $\varepsilon_n = o(\tau_n)$ and $\tau_n \rightarrow 0$, we have $\mathbf{W}_p^{\tau_n}(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$.*

Remark 7 (Comparison to median-of-means estimator). This consistency result is reminiscent of that presented by [Staerman et al. \(2021\)](#) for a median-of-means (MoM) estimator. They produce a robust estimate for \mathbf{W}_1 by partitioning the contaminated samples into blocks and replacing each mean appearing in the dual form of \mathbf{W}_1 with a median of block means, where the number of blocks depends on the contamination fraction. Our estimator improves upon the MoM approach in two important respects. First, our guarantees hold even when the support of μ and ν is unbounded. Second, their MoM guarantees do not account for the setting of [Theorem 4](#) when $\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon$ is a fixed constant.

[Theorem 4](#) reveals that $\mathbf{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ is a good estimate when the true distance $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ is small. In particular, for ε bounded away from $1/3$ and n sufficiently large, $\mathbf{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \asymp \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \pm \rho$. This guarantee lends itself well to the tasks of robust two-sample testing and independence testing under \mathbf{W}_p . In the first case, one receives ε -corrupted samples $\{\tilde{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\tilde{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from μ and ν , respectively, and seeks to distinguish between the null and alternative hypotheses:

$$H_0 : \mu = \nu \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) > \lambda.$$

In the second, one receives ε -corrupted samples $\{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and seeks to determine whether the joint distribution $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^2)$ of clean samples with marginals κ_1, κ_2 satisfies $\kappa = \kappa_1 \otimes \kappa_2$ or $\mathbf{W}_p(\kappa, \kappa_1 \otimes \kappa_2) > \lambda$, for the metric $\bar{\mathbf{d}}((x, y), (x', y')) := \mathbf{d}(x, x') \vee \mathbf{d}(y, y')$ on the product space. Below, empirical measures of all sample sizes are defined via a single infinite sequence of samples, i.e., $X_1, X_2, \dots \sim \mu$ are i.i.d. and $\hat{\mu}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ is the empirical measure of the first n samples, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 7 (Applications to robust two-sample and independence testing). *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/4]$ and fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$. Then, for $\lambda = 45\rho$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) > 3\rho\} = \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) > \lambda\} \quad \text{almost surely (a.s.)}$$

under both the null and alternative hypotheses for robust two-sample testing. Similarly, for independence testing, if $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\kappa}_n, \tilde{\kappa}_{1,n} \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_{2,n}) > 3\rho\} = \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{W}_p(\kappa, \kappa_1 \otimes \kappa_2) > \lambda\} \quad a.s.$$

under the null and alternative, where $\tilde{\kappa}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_{1,n}, \tilde{\kappa}_{2,n}$ are its marginals.

5 Experiments

To demonstrate the practical utility of our robust OT framework, we implement a neural network (NN) based approximation for the $\mathcal{W}_1^\varepsilon$ minimum distance estimator by adapting the WGAN. Applications to generative modeling with contaminated data are then presented.

5.1 The Wasserstein GAN

Recall that WGAN seeks to approximate a data distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the pushforward of a simple distribution ν_0 through a parameterized map $g_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\theta \in \Theta$. Employing the \mathcal{W}_1 objective, [Arjovsky et al. \(2017\)](#) coined the following MDE problem as WGAN:

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, (g_\theta)_\# \nu_0) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \, d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \circ g_\theta \, d\nu_0.$$

In practice, the function class $\text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is approximated by a parameterized NN family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\phi\}_{\phi \in \Phi}$ and the min-max problem is tackled via alternating stochastic gradient descent-ascent. Namely, given a mini-batch of i.i.d. samples $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mu$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim \nu_0$, we update iterates θ_t and ϕ_t according to the respective gradients of the objective

$$h(\theta, \phi) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\phi(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\phi(g_\theta(Y_i)).$$

There are many challenges to effectively implementing and analyzing this approach. For example, enforcing the Lipschitz constraint is non-trivial and is often performed softly by adding a certain gradient penalty to h ([Gulrajani et al., 2017](#)). Moreover, if the NNs involved are poly-sized, computational hardness results suggest that we must have $\mathcal{W}_1(\mu, (g_{\theta_\star})_\# \nu_0) \gg 1$ in the worst case, even when $\theta_\star = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \max_{\phi \in \Phi} h(\theta, \phi)$ is an exact min-max solution ([Chen et al., 2022](#)). Finally, in the absence of significant structural assumptions on μ , any estimate $\hat{\nu}$ for μ based on n samples must incur worst-case error $\mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \hat{\nu}) \gtrsim n^{-1/d}$ ([Niles-Weed and Berthet, 2022](#)). This rate is vacuous for $d \gtrsim \log(n)$ and appears in the standard analysis of Wasserstein MDE, even when the distribution class $\mathcal{G} := \{(g_\theta)_\# \nu_0\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is well-behaved and contains μ . Nevertheless, WGAN has enjoyed enormous practical success, and we therefore seek to translate its performance to our setting with corrupted data.

5.2 Robustifying WGAN

Consider the Huber contamination model, where the learner observes contaminated samples from a mixture $\tilde{\mu} = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\alpha$, for some undesirable data source α . To address this,

we replace W_1 above with its robust proxy W_1^ε . As discussed in Remark 2, it is slightly more natural to employ the one-sided variant $W_1^\varepsilon(\alpha||\beta) := \inf_{\alpha' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\alpha} W_1(\alpha', \beta)$ under Huber contamination. Opting for this approach, an adaptation of Theorem 1 to the one-sided W_1^ε case (see Appendix A) yields the robust MDE problem:

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} W_1^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu} || (g_\theta)_\# \nu_0) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi d\tilde{\mu} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \circ g_\theta d\nu_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x). \quad (9)$$

For the corresponding NN approximation, we update iterates θ_t and λ_t according to the respective (sub)gradients of the modified objective

$$h^\varepsilon(\theta, \lambda) := \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\lambda(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\lambda(g_\theta(Y_i)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \max_{i=1, \dots, n} f_\lambda(X_i).$$

Any implementation of WGAN can easily be adapted to support this robustified objective; for example, our PyTorch adjustment takes the following one-line form:

```
score = f_data.mean() - f_gen.mean() # old
score = f_data.mean()/(1-eps) - f_gen.mean() - eps*f_data.max()/(1-eps) # new
```

Due to the non-convex and non-smooth nature of the h^ε , formal optimization guarantees seem challenging to obtain. Nevertheless, the next subsection demonstrates strong empirical performance of the resulting robust WGAN.

5.3 Generative Modeling with Contaminated Datasets

We examine outlier-robust generative modeling using the modification suggested above. The experiments were performed on a cluster machine equipped with a NVIDIA Tesla V100. Code for these results is available at <https://github.com/sbnietert/robust-OT>, and full experimental details are provided in Appendix D.

First, we trained two WGAN with gradient penalty (WGAN-GP) models (Gulrajani et al., 2017) on a contaminated dataset with 80% MNIST data and 20% uniform random noise. Both models used a standard selection of hyperparameters but one of them was adjusted to compute gradient updates according to the robust objective with $\varepsilon = 0.25$. In Fig. 4 (top), we display generated samples produced by both networks after processing 125k contaminated batches of 64 images. The effect of outliers is clearly mitigated by training with the robustified objective.

We also applied our robustification technique to more sophisticated generative models which incorporate additional regularization on top of WGAN. In particular, we trained two off-the-shelf StyleGAN 2 models (Karras et al., 2020) using contaminated data—this time, 80% CelebA-HQ face photos and 20% MNIST data—with one tweaked to perform gradient updates according to the robust objective with $\varepsilon = 0.25$. We present generated samples in Fig. 4 (bottom). Again, the modified objective enables learning a model that is largely outlier-free despite being trained on corrupted data.

Finally, we compared our robust WGAN approach with existing techniques of Balaji et al. (2020) and Staerman et al. (2021).⁸ Using the publicly available code for these papers, we trained robust WGANs with default options for 100k batches of 128 images, using 95%

⁸Unfortunately, the WGAN described in Mukherjee et al. (2021) does not appear to scale to high-dimensional image data, and hence no comparison is presented.

CIFAR-10 training images with 5% uniform random noise. In Fig. 5 and Table 1, the control WGAN is that of Balaji et al. (2020) without its robustification weights enabled. Our robust WGAN is implemented by adding the objective modification with $\varepsilon = 0.07$ to this control. Fig. 5 presents random samples of generated images from the four WGANs, while Table 1 displays Frechet inception distance (FID) scores (Heusel et al., 2017) over the course of training (lower scores correlate with high quality images). Our method performs favorably without tuning, but more detailed empirical study is needed to separate the impact of various hyperparameters. In particular, the poor relative performance of Staerman et al. (2021) is likely due in part to its distinct architecture. We note that despite using the code provided by Balaji et al. (2020) with the hyperparameters specified in their appendix, the FID scores we observed were lower than those presented in their paper.

Remark 8 (Gaps between theory and practice). Suppose optimistically that our robust WGAN implementation could find an exact minimizer for (9). Even then, the theory from Section 4 is insufficient to fully justify strong performance for distribution estimation if the family of generated distributions, $\mathcal{G} = \{(g_\theta)_\# \nu_0\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$, is sufficiently expressive. Indeed, if \mathcal{G} contains both the clean and corrupted population measures, i.e., $\tilde{\mu} = (g_{\tilde{\theta}})_\# \nu_0$ and $\mu = (g_{\theta_*})_\# \nu_0$ for some $\tilde{\theta}, \theta_* \in \Theta$, then both $\tilde{\theta}$ and θ_* minimize (9). Our formal risk bounds in Section 4 sidestep this issue by assuming that the distributions in \mathcal{G} satisfy Wasserstein resilience bounds. However, we make no effort to explicitly control the complexity of \mathcal{G} in our experiments. Thus, a satisfactory explanation for our strong empirical performance seems to require a white-box examination of the optimization procedure and its implicit biases. We defer a formal explanation of this phenomenon for future work.




Figure 4: (top): samples generated by robustified (left) and standard (right) WGAN-GP after training on corrupted MNIST dataset. (bottom): samples generated by robustified (left) and standard (right) StyleGAN 2 after training on corrupted CelebA-HQ dataset (left).



Figure 5: Samples generated by various robust WGANs after 100k batches of training.

Batch	Robust WGAN Method			
	Ours	Balaji et al. (2020)	Staerman et al. (2021)	Control (Balaji et al., 2020)
20k	38.61	60.92	58.19	59.19
60k	22.08	35.49	49.64	39.08
100k	18.87	30.44	40.81	31.40

Table 1: FID scores between uncontaminated CIFAR-10 image dataset and datasets generated by various robust WGANs during training (lower scores are better).

6 Proofs

We now provide proofs for the main results of this work.

6.1 Proofs for Section 3

We start by reviewing some relevant facts regarding OT, couplings, and c -transforms. Recall that the cost c is of the form $c(x, y) = h(d(x, y))$, where $h : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is continuous and strictly increasing with $h(0) = 0$. Further, we write $\lambda\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) : \mu(\mathcal{X}) = \lambda\}$ for $\lambda \geq 0$, and, for $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, write $\varphi_{\min} := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x)$ and $\varphi_{\max} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x)$.

Fact 1. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{OT}_c(\mu - \mu \wedge \nu, \nu - \mu \wedge \nu)$.

Proof. For any $\pi \in \Pi(\mu - \mu \wedge \nu, \nu - \mu \wedge \nu)$, the joint distribution $\pi' = (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#}(\mu \wedge \nu) + \pi$ is a coupling of μ and ν with $\int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi' = \int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi$. Hence, $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu) \leq \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu - \mu \wedge \nu, \nu - \mu \wedge \nu)} \int c d\pi = \text{OT}_c(\mu - \mu \wedge \nu, \nu - \mu \wedge \nu)$. \square

Fact 2. For $\mu_1, \mu_2, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ such that $(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(\mathcal{X}) = \nu(\mathcal{X})$, any joint measure $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu)$ can be decomposed as $\pi = \pi_{\mu_1, \nu} + \pi_{\mu_2, \nu}$ for $\pi_{\mu_1, \nu}, \pi_{\mu_2, \nu} \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2)$ such that $\mu_1(S) = \pi_{\mu_1, \nu}(S \times \mathcal{X})$ and $\mu_2(A) = \pi_{\mu_2, \nu}(S \times \mathcal{X})$ for all measurable $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

Proof. Write $\pi(y|x)$ for any regular conditional probability measure such that $\pi(S \times T) = \int_A \pi(T|x) d(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(x)$ for measurable $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Then $\pi_{\mu_1, \nu}, \pi_{\mu_2, \nu} \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2)$ defined by

$$\pi_{\mu_1, \nu}(S \times T) := \int_S \pi(T|x) d\mu_1(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{\mu_2, \nu}(S \times T) := \int_S \pi(T|x) d\mu_2(x)$$

sum to π , with $\pi_{\mu_1, \nu}(S \times \mathcal{X}) = \int_S \pi(\mathcal{X}|x) d\mu_1(x) = \mu_1(S)$ and $\pi_{\mu_2, \nu}(S \times \mathcal{X}) = \mu_2(S)$. \square

Fact 3. *If $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, then $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = 1 - \max_{0 \leq \alpha \leq \mu \wedge \nu} \alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \min_{\beta \geq \mu \vee \nu} \beta(\mathcal{X}) - 1$.*

Proof. If $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \varepsilon$, then $(\mu \wedge \nu)(\mathcal{X}) = 1 - \varepsilon$. Thus, one can take $\alpha = \mu \wedge \nu$ to bound the second expression by ε . If the second expression is at most ε , i.e., there is $\alpha \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\alpha \leq \mu \wedge \nu$, then one can take $\beta = \mu + \nu - \alpha$ to show the third expression is at most ε . Finally, if the third expression is at most ε , i.e., there exists $\beta \in (1 + \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mu \leq \beta$ and $\nu \leq \beta$, then $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|\mu - \beta\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\beta - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma 3. *For $\alpha, \beta_+ \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{X}) \leq \beta_+(\mathcal{X})$, we have*

$$\min_{\substack{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \beta \leq \beta_+ \\ \beta(\mathcal{X}) = \alpha(\mathcal{X})}} \text{OT}_c(\alpha, \beta) = \min_{\substack{\alpha_+ \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}) \\ \alpha \leq \alpha_+ \\ \alpha_+(\mathcal{X}) = \beta_+(\mathcal{X})}} \text{OT}_c(\alpha_+, \beta_+).$$

Proof. For the “ \leq ” direction, fix α_+ feasible for the right minimum, and let $\pi_+ \in \Pi(\alpha_+, \beta_+)$ be an optimal coupling for the $\text{OT}_c(\alpha_+, \beta_+)$ problem. By Fact 2, we can decompose $\pi_+ = \pi + \kappa$ for $\pi, \kappa \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2)$ such that α is the left marginal of π . Then, taking $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ to be the right marginal of π , β is clearly feasible for the left infimum. Moreover, we bound

$$\text{OT}_c(\alpha, \beta) \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi_+ = \text{OT}_c(\alpha_+, \beta_+).$$

Thus, taking an infimum over α_+ gives the “ \leq ” inequality.

For the “ \geq ” direction, let β be feasible for the left infimum, and take $\pi \in \Pi(\alpha, \beta)$ to be an optimal coupling for the $\text{OT}_c(\alpha, \beta)$ problem. Set $\alpha_+ = \alpha + (\beta_+ - \beta)$ and let $\pi_+ = \pi + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#}(\beta_+ - \beta)$. By design, $\pi_+ \in \Pi(\alpha_+, \beta_+)$, and so

$$\text{OT}_c(\alpha_+, \beta_+) \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi_+ = \int_{\mathcal{X}} c d\pi = \text{OT}_c(\alpha, \beta).$$

Taking an infimum over β gives the “ \geq ” inequality. Existence of a minimizer for the left minimum follows by a standard compactness argument, and our explicit construction above carries this to the right minimum as well. \square

Lemma 4. *For all bounded $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $\varphi^c \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ with $\varphi_{\min}^c = -\varphi_{\max}$, $\varphi^c \leq -\varphi$, and $\varphi^{cc} \geq \varphi$. In particular, $\|\varphi^c\|_{\infty} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty}$.*

Proof. To start, we compute $\varphi_{\min}^c = \inf_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} c(x, y) - \varphi(x) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} -\varphi(x) = -\varphi_{\max}$, using that $c \geq 0$ with $c(x, x) = 0$. Moreover, for each $y \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$\varphi^c(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} c(x, y) - \varphi(x) \leq c(y, y) - \varphi(y) = -\varphi(y).$$

In particular, we have $\|\varphi^c\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$. Further, for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we bound

$$\varphi^{cc}(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{X}} c(x, y) + \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x') - c(x', y) \geq \inf_{y \in \mathcal{X}} c(x, y) + \varphi(x) - c(x, y) = \varphi(x),$$

as desired. It remains to show continuity of φ^c . Fixing $y \in \mathcal{X}$, we may restrict the infimum defining $\varphi^c(y)$ to those $x \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $c(x, y) - \varphi(x) \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$ and thus $\mathbf{d}(x, y) \leq h^{-1}(2\|\varphi\|_\infty) =: R$. Now take any sequence $\{y\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $y_n \rightarrow y$. Since $\mathbf{d}(y, y_n) \leq 1$ for sufficiently large n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\varphi^c(y) - \varphi^c(y_n)| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \inf_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y) \leq R}} [\mathbf{d}(x, y)^p - \varphi(x)] - \inf_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y_n) \leq R}} [\mathbf{d}(x, y_n)^p - \varphi(x)] \right| \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \inf_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y) \leq R+1}} [\mathbf{d}(x, y)^p - \varphi(x)] - \inf_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y_n) \leq R+1}} [\mathbf{d}(x, y_n)^p - \varphi(x)] \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y) \leq R+1}} |\mathbf{d}(x, y)^p - \mathbf{d}(x, y_n)^p| \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{d}(x, y) \leq R+1}} p(R+2)^{p-1} |\mathbf{d}(x, y) - \mathbf{d}(x, y_n)| \\ &\leq p(R+2)^{p-1} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(y, y_n) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, φ^c is also continuous. \square

6.1.1 Proof of Proposition 3

We prove a slightly strengthened result.

Lemma 5. *For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \min_{(\mu', \nu') \in A} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu')$, where A is any of the following families:*

$$\begin{aligned} A_-^1 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_-, \nu_-) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu \\ \mu_-(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_-(\mathcal{X}) = 1 - \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, & A_-^2 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_-, \nu_-) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu \\ \mu_-(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_-(\mathcal{X}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, & A_-^3 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_-, \nu_-) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu \\ \mu_-, \nu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu \end{array} \right\}, \\ A_+^1 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_+, \nu_+) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_+ \geq \mu, \nu_+ \geq \nu \\ \mu_+(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_+(\mathcal{X}) = 1 + \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, & A_+^2 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_+, \nu_+) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_+ \geq \mu, \nu_+ \geq \nu \\ \mu_+(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_+(\mathcal{X}) \leq 1 + \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, & A_+^3 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu_+, \nu_+) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})^2 : \\ \mu_+ \leq \mu, \nu_+ \leq \nu \\ \mu_+, \nu_+ \leq \mu \vee \nu \end{array} \right\}, \\ A_{\text{TV}}^1 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu', \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \times \{\nu\} \\ \|\mu' - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}, & A_{\text{TV}}^2 &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\mu, \nu') \in \{\mu\} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \\ \|\nu' - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Throughout, we abbreviate $W = \text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$, $W_\pm^i = \inf_{(\mu', \nu') \in A_\pm^i} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu')$ for type $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $W_{\text{TV}}^i = \inf_{(\mu', \nu') \in A_{\text{TV}}^i} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu')$ for type $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Clearly, $W = W_-^1$, since the marginals of $\pi \in \Pi_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$ are in bijection with $(\mu_-, \nu_-) \in A_-^1$. Moreover, both infima are achieved by a standard argument. Indeed, $\Pi_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$ is compact under the topology of weak convergence of measures, and $\pi \mapsto \int c \, d\pi$ is continuous w.r.t. this topology.

Inequality/equality constraints: To see that $W_-^1 = W_-^2$, note that any $(\mu_-, \nu_-) \in A_-^2$ with mass $\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_-(\mathcal{X}) = m > 1 - \varepsilon$ can be scaled down by a factor of $(1 - \varepsilon)/m$ to have mass exactly $1 - \varepsilon$, retaining feasibility while only decreasing the objective $\text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-)$. Further, any minimizer for W_-^1 is still a feasible minimizer for W_-^2 .

Similarly, if $(\mu_+, \nu_+) \in A_+^2$ with $\mu_+(\mathcal{X}) = \nu_+(\mathcal{X}) = m < 1 + \varepsilon$, then, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mu_+ + (1 + \varepsilon - m)\delta_{x_0}$ and $\nu_+ + (1 + \varepsilon - m)\delta_{x_0}$ have mass exactly $1 + \varepsilon$, are still feasible, and can only have a smaller objective (see Fact 1). Thus, $W_+^1 = W_+^2$. If W_+^1 admits a minimizer (to be shown), it is still a feasible minimizer for W_+^2 .

Mass removal/addition equivalence: We next show that $W_-^1 = W_{\text{TV}}^1$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{\mu_-, \nu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu}} \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-) &= \min_{\substack{\mu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), \mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \mu_- \leq \mu'}} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu) && \text{(Lemma 3)} \\ &= \min_{\substack{\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \|\mu' - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu). && \text{(Fact 3)} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, any minimizer for W_-^1 corresponds to a feasible minimizer for W_{TV}^1 . We similarly prove that $W_+^1 = W_{\text{TV}}^1$, equating

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \|\mu' - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu) &= \min_{\substack{\mu_+ \in (1+\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), \mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu \leq \mu_+, \mu' \leq \mu_+}} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu) && \text{(Fact 3)} \\ &= \min_{\substack{\mu_+, \nu_+ \in (1+\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu \leq \mu_+, \nu \leq \nu_+}} \text{OT}_c(\mu_+, \nu_+). && \text{(Lemma 3)} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, any minimizer for W_{TV}^1 corresponds to a minimizer for W_+^1 . Finally, we clearly have $W_{\text{TV}}^1 = W_{\text{TV}}^2$ (and existence of minimizers for the latter) by symmetry.

Lower envelope: We turn to the structure of minimizers, focusing on mass removal. Fixing $(\mu_-, \nu_-) \in A_-^2$ optimal for W_-^2 , we seek to prove that one can find a modified pair (μ'_-, ν'_-) further satisfying $\mu'_-, \nu'_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$ and $\text{OT}_c(\mu'_-, \nu'_-) \leq \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-)$, implying that $W_-^2 = W_-^3$.

Fixing base measure $\lambda := \mu + \nu$, write $f_\kappa = d\kappa/d\lambda$ for the Radon–Nikodym derivative of $\kappa \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ w.r.t. λ . Write $\alpha := (\mu \wedge \nu - \mu_-)_+$ for the piece of mass which violates $\mu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$. Next, by adding $(f_\mu - f_{\mu_-}) \wedge (f_\nu - f_{\nu_-})$ to both f_{μ_-} and f_{ν_-} , we can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha = (\mu \wedge \nu - \mu_-)_+$. Indeed, this transformation maintains feasibility and can only decrease the transport cost (see Fact 1). Moreover, it ensures $f_\nu(x) = f_{\nu_-}(x)$ whenever $f_{\mu_-}(x) < f_\mu(x)$, and so $f_\alpha = (f_\mu \wedge f_\nu - f_{\mu_-})_+ = (f_\mu \wedge f_{\nu_-} - f_{\mu_-})_+$.

Next, take $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_-, \nu_-)$ to be an optimal coupling for $\text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-)$, and write $\pi(x|y)$ for a regular conditional probability measure such that $\pi(S \times T) = \int_T \pi(S|y) d\nu_-(y)$ for all measurable $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Define $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$ by $\beta(\cdot) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \pi(\cdot|y) d\alpha(y)$. Since $\alpha \leq \nu_-$, we have $\beta \leq \mu_-$. Now, take $\mu'_- := \mu_- - \beta + \alpha \leq \mu$ and define $\pi' \in \Pi(\mu'_-, \nu_-)$ by

$$\pi'(S \times T) := \int_T \pi(S|y) d(\nu_- - \alpha)(y) + \alpha(S \cap T)$$

for measurable $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Then, $(\mu', \nu_-) \in A_-^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu_-) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c \, d\pi' \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c(x, y) \, d\pi(x|y) \, d(\nu_- - \alpha)(y) \\ &= \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-) - \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c(x, y) \, d\pi(x|y) \, d\alpha(y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $c(x, y)$ only vanishes if $x = y$, this contradicts optimality of μ_- unless $\pi(\cdot|y) = \delta_y$ for α -almost all $y \in \mathcal{X}$. In this case, we have

$$\mu_-(\text{spt}(\alpha)) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \pi(\text{spt}(\alpha)|y) \, d\nu_-(y) \geq \int_{\text{spt}(\alpha)} \pi(\text{spt}(\alpha)|y) \, d\nu_-(y) = \nu_-(\text{spt}(\alpha)).$$

By our initial assumption, however, $f_\nu(x) = f_{\nu_-}(x)$ for λ -almost all $x \in \text{spt}(\alpha)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_-(\text{spt}(\alpha)) &= \nu(\text{spt}(\alpha)) \\ &\geq (\mu \wedge \nu)(\text{spt}(\alpha)) \\ &= (\mu \wedge \nu - \mu_-)(\text{spt}(\alpha)) + \mu_-(\text{spt}(\alpha)) \\ &= \alpha(\mathcal{X}) + \mu_-(\text{spt}(\alpha)). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts optimality unless $\alpha(\mathcal{X}) = 0$, in which case $\mu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$. A symmetric argument allows us to assume $\nu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$.

Upper envelope: Take $(\mu_-, \nu_-) \in A_-^3$ optimal for W_-^3 , and define $\mu_+ := \mu + \nu - \nu_-$ and $\nu_+ := \nu + \mu - \mu_-$. By construction, $\mu_+ = \mu \vee \nu + \mu \wedge \nu - \nu_- \leq \mu \vee \nu$, and, similarly $\nu_+ \leq \mu \vee \nu$. Thus, $(\mu_+, \nu_+) \in A_+^3$. Moreover, these are obtained by adding shared mass $(\mu - \mu_-) + (\nu - \nu_-)$ to the original measures, so their transport cost cannot increase (see Fact 1). Thus, $\text{OT}_c(\mu_+, \nu_+) \leq \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-) = W_-^3 = W_+^2 \leq W_+^3$. Consequently, μ_+ and ν_+ are optimal for the W_+^3 problem, and $W_+^3 = W$. \square

6.1.2 Proof of Proposition 4

We start with Claim 1. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 < \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}$ as in the proposition statement. Since \mathcal{X} is a Polish space, μ and ν are tight; in particular, there is a compact set $K \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mu(K), \nu(K) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_1$. Letting $\mu' = \frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{\mu(K)}\mu|_K$ and $\nu' = \frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{\nu(K)}\nu|_K$, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{OT}_c(\mu', \nu') \leq h(\text{diam}(K)) < \infty.$$

Now, fix any minimizers $\mu_-, \nu_- \in (1 - \varepsilon_1)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ for the mass removal formulation of $\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu)$. Letting $\mu'_- = \frac{1-\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_1}\mu_-$ and $\nu'_- = \frac{1-\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_1}\nu_-$, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{OT}_c(\mu'_-, \nu'_-) = \frac{1-\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_1} \text{OT}_c(\mu_-, \nu_-) = \frac{1-\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_1} \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu).$$

Next, we note that $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_2$ if and only if there exists $\kappa \in (1 - \varepsilon_2)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with $\kappa \leq \mu$ and $\kappa \leq \nu$, which occurs if and only if $\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) = 0$. Finally, $\text{OT}_c^0(\mu, \nu)$ trivially coincides with $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu)$ since $\Pi_0(\mu, \nu) = \Pi(\mu, \nu)$.

For Claim 2, we first note that our condition on h implies a triangle inequality for OT.

Lemma 6 (OT triangle inequality). *If h and $\log \circ h \circ \exp$ are convex, then*

$$h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu)) \leq h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\mu, \kappa)) + h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\kappa, \nu)).$$

Proof. We employ the standard proof for W_p (see, e.g., Theorem 7.3 of Villani, 2003) but employ a generalized version of Minkowski's inequality. Taking $\pi_{12} \in \Pi(\mu, \kappa)$ optimal for $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \kappa)$ and $\pi_{23} \in \Pi(\kappa, \nu)$ optimal for $\text{OT}_c(\kappa, \nu)$, the gluing lemma (see, e.g., Lemma 7.6 of Villani, 2003), guarantees that there exists $\pi_{123} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^3)$ whose marginal w.r.t. its first two coordinates is π_{12} and w.r.t. its last two coordinates is π_{23} . We then bound

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu)) &\leq h^{-1}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} h(d(x, z)) \, d\pi_{123}(x, y, z)\right) \\ &\leq h^{-1}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} h(d(x, y) + d(y, z)) \, d\pi_{123}(x, y, z)\right) \\ &\leq h^{-1}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} h(d(x, y)) \, d\pi_{123}(x, y, z)\right) + h^{-1}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} h(d(y, z)) \, d\pi_{123}(x, y, z)\right) \\ &= h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\mu, \kappa)) + h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\kappa, \nu)), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows by the generalized Minkowski's inequality due to Mulholland (see Theorem 1 of Mulholland, 1949). \square

We can now prove the claim. Define $W_1 := \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa)$ and $W_2 := \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu)$. By Proposition 3, there exist $\kappa', \kappa'' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\text{OT}_c(\mu, \kappa') \leq W_1$, $\|\kappa - \kappa'\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_1$, $\text{OT}_c(\nu, \kappa'') \leq W_2$, and $\|\kappa - \kappa''\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_2$. By the TV triangle inequality, we further have $\|\kappa' - \kappa''\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$. Thus, $\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \kappa'') \leq W_1$, and so, by Lemma 5, there exists $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|\mu - \gamma\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$ and $\text{OT}_c(\gamma, \kappa'') \leq W_1$. By Lemma 6, we have $h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c(\gamma, \nu)) \leq h^{-1}(W_1) + h^{-1}(W_2)$. Applying Lemma 5 once more, we obtain

$$h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu)) \leq h^{-1}(W_1) + h^{-1}(W_2) = h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa)) + h^{-1}(\text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu)),$$

as desired. \square

6.1.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Strong duality: We first prove a strong duality result, a bit more general than that in the theorem statement. For distributions $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, a measure on the product space $\pi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X}^2)$, $\varphi, \psi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\pi) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c \, d\pi, \\ \Pi_+^\varepsilon &:= \{\pi \in (1 + \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^2) : \pi_1 \geq \mu, \pi_2 \geq \nu\}, \\ J^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu + \varepsilon(\varphi_{\min} + \psi_{\min}), \\ J_c^\varepsilon(\varphi) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - 2\varepsilon\|\varphi\|_\infty, \\ \mathcal{F}_c &:= \{(\varphi, \psi) \in C_b(\mathcal{X})^2 : \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y), \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and write $\varphi^{cc} := (\varphi^c)^c$. The result below recovers strong duality for Theorem 1 when $c = d^p$.

Lemma 7. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_+^\varepsilon} l_c(\pi) = \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} J^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} J_c^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}): \varphi = \varphi^{cc}} J_c^\varepsilon(\varphi).$$

Proof. The first equality follows from Lemma 5. It is straightforward to prove the third and fourth equalities and the “ \geq ” direction of the second equality. Indeed, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_+^\varepsilon} l_c(\pi) &= \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in (1+\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \geq \mu, \nu' \geq \nu}} \text{OT}_c(\mu, \nu) \\ &= \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in (1+\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \geq \mu, \nu' \geq \nu}} \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu' + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi d\nu' \\ &\geq \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in (1+\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \geq \mu, \nu' \geq \nu}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu' + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi d\nu' \\ &= \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} J^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows by standard Kantorovich duality. Substituting $\phi \leftarrow \varphi^c$ can only increase the objective while preserving feasibility, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} J^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) &= \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi d\nu + \varepsilon\varphi_{\min} + \varepsilon\phi_{\min} \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu + \varepsilon\varphi_{\min} + \varepsilon\varphi_{\min}^c \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu - \varepsilon(\varphi_{\max} - \varphi_{\min}) \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c d\nu - \varepsilon 2\|\varphi\|_\infty \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} J_c^\varepsilon(\varphi), \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses that $\varphi_{\min}^c = -\varphi_{\max}$ (see Lemma 4). The fourth step uses the substitution $\varphi \leftarrow \varphi - \varphi_{\min} - (\varphi_{\max} - \varphi_{\min})/2$, which doesn't change the objective, preserves feasibility, and ensures that $\varphi_{\max} - \varphi_{\min} = 2\|\varphi\|_\infty$. Finally, we may restrict to $\varphi = \varphi^{cc}$ since this preserves feasibility and can only increase the objective (see Lemma 4).

It suffices now to show that $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \leq \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} J^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. We start from the augmented primal form for OT_c^ε given in Proposition 1, defined over the augmented space $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \sqcup \{\bar{x}\}$ with augmented cost \bar{c} . In particular, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \text{OT}_{\bar{c}}^\varepsilon(\mu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}}, \nu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}}) = \sup_{\bar{\varphi} \in C_b(\bar{\mathcal{X}})} \int_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}} \bar{\varphi} d(\mu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}}) + \int_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}} \bar{\varphi} d(\nu + \varepsilon\delta_{\bar{x}}),$$

where the last equality follows by standard Kantorovich duality for the augmented problem⁹. Note that each $\bar{\varphi} \in C_b(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$ can be decomposed into a pair $(\varphi, a) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathbb{R}$, where $a = \bar{\varphi}(\bar{x})$.

⁹The augmented space $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ is a Polish space over which \bar{c} is lower-semicontinuous, so strong duality holds.

Using this notation, we compute

$$\bar{\varphi}^{\bar{c}}(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{c}(x, y) - \bar{\varphi}(x) = \begin{cases} \varphi^c(y) \wedge (-a), & y \in \mathcal{X} \\ -\varphi_{\max}, & y = \bar{x} \end{cases}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ a \in \mathbb{R}}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \varepsilon a + \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\varphi^c \wedge (-a)) \, d\nu - \varepsilon \varphi_{\max}. \quad (10)$$

We now consider substituting φ with $\varphi' = \varphi \vee (a \wedge \varphi_{\max})$ within the objective. This can only increase the first integral and does not effect the second term. Moreover, computing

$$(\varphi')^c(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} c(x, y) - (\varphi(x) \vee (a \wedge \varphi_{\max})) = \varphi^c(y) \wedge (-a \vee -\varphi_{\max}),$$

we see that $(\varphi')^c \wedge (-a) = \varphi^c \wedge (-a)$, so the third term in (10) is unchanged. Finally, we compute $\varphi'_{\max} = \varphi_{\max} \vee (a \wedge \varphi_{\max}) = \varphi_{\max}$, so the last term of (10) is also unchanged. In the case that $\varphi_{\max} \leq a$, we have that $\varphi' = \varphi \vee \varphi_{\max} = \varphi_{\max}$ is constant. Otherwise, we have $\varphi' = \varphi \vee a \geq a$. Restricting to the constant case, we bound

$$\sup_{\varphi, a \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi + \varepsilon a + (-\varphi) \wedge (-a) - \varepsilon \varphi = 0.$$

For the other case, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ a \in \mathbb{R}: \varphi \geq a}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \varepsilon a + \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\varphi^c \wedge (-a)) \, d\nu - \varepsilon \varphi_{\max} \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ a \in \mathbb{R}: \varphi \geq a}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \varepsilon a + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - \varepsilon \varphi_{\max} \\ & = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - \varepsilon(\varphi_{\max} - \varphi_{\min}). \end{aligned}$$

By plugging in $\varphi \equiv 0$, we see that this quantity is always non-negative, and so the previous bound does not come into play. All together, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \leq \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - \varepsilon(\varphi_{\max} - \varphi_{\min}) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \mathbf{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi),$$

as desired. □

Existence of maximizers: Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ denote any probability distribution with $\text{spt}(\lambda) = \mathcal{X}$ (such λ always exists because \mathcal{X} is separable). To start, we prove that strong duality still holds if the infima defining \mathbf{J}^ε are relaxed to essential infima w.r.t. $\kappa := \mu + \nu + \lambda$ and if the dual potentials are uniformly bounded by $R := \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon/2}(\mu, \nu)/\varepsilon$. The selection of $\kappa \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathcal{X})$

is somewhat arbitrary; we only use that μ and ν are absolutely continuous w.r.t. κ and that $\text{spt}(\kappa) = \mathcal{X}$. Formally, for $\varphi, \psi \in L^1(\kappa)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu + \varepsilon(\text{ess inf}_\kappa \varphi + \text{ess inf}_\kappa \psi), \\ \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c &:= \left\{ (\varphi, \psi) \in L^\infty(\kappa) \times L^\infty(\kappa) : \begin{array}{l} \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y), \kappa \otimes \kappa \text{ a.e.} \\ \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\kappa)}, \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\kappa)} \leq R \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $R < \infty$ by Proposition 4 since $\varepsilon > 0$. We then have the following.

Lemma 8. *For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c} \bar{J}_\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7, we have

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} J_c^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - 2\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_\infty.$$

Since this quantity is non-negative, we can restrict to potentials $\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ for which the objective is non-negative. For such φ , we have

$$\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_\infty \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu - \varepsilon \|\varphi\|_\infty \leq \text{OT}_c^{\varepsilon/2}(\mu, \nu),$$

and so $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq R$. Since $\|\varphi^c\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$ (see Lemma 4), we have $(\varphi, \varphi^c) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$, and so $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \leq \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c} \bar{J}_\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi)$.

For the opposite inequality, fix $(\varphi, \psi) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ and $\pi \in \Pi_+^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$ with marginals $\mu' = \pi(\cdot \times \mathcal{X})$ and $\nu' = \pi(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot)$ satisfying $\mu', \nu' \leq \mu + \nu$. This ensures that π is absolutely continuous w.r.t. κ , and so $\varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)$ π -almost everywhere. We thus compute

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu + \varepsilon(\text{ess inf}_\kappa \varphi + \text{ess inf}_\kappa \psi) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu' + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu' \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} [\varphi(x) + \psi(y)] \, d\pi(x, y) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} c \, d\pi = I_c(\pi), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses that $\mu + \nu$ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. κ and the second uses that $\varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)$ π -almost everywhere. Combining this with Lemma 5, we conclude by bounding

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\substack{\pi \in \Pi_+^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \\ \pi(\cdot \times \mathcal{X}), \pi(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot) \leq \mu + \nu}} I_c(\pi) \geq \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c} \bar{J}_\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi). \quad \square$$

To show that the supremum is achieved, we will prove that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ is compact and that \bar{J}_ε is upper-semicontinuous with respect to an appropriate topology. In what follows, we consider $L^2(\kappa) \times L^2(\kappa)$ as a Banach space under the norm $\|(\varphi, \psi)\| := \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\kappa)} \vee \|\psi\|_{L^2(\kappa)}$ and write $C_0(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq C_b(\mathcal{X})$ for the space of continuous functions with compact support.

Lemma 9. *Viewed as a subset of $L^2(\kappa) \times L^2(\kappa)$, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ is weakly compact.*

Proof. Since $L^2(\kappa)$ is reflexive, so is the space $L^2(\kappa) \times L^2(\kappa)$. Thus, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ is weakly compact if and only if it is closed and bounded under this norm. Boundedness is trivial, since $\|(\varphi, \psi)\| \leq R < \infty$ for all $(\varphi, \psi) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$. Moreover, by the density of $C_0(\mathcal{X})$ in $L^1(\kappa)$, we have that $\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\kappa)} \leq R$ if and only if $\int \varphi f \, d\kappa \leq R$ for all $f \in C_0(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|f\|_{L^1(\kappa)} \leq 1$. Since the map $\varphi \mapsto \int \varphi f \, d\kappa$ is weakly continuous for all such f , the intersection of these constraints defines a weakly closed set. To see that the final constraint preserves closedness, take feasible $\{(\varphi_n, \psi_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converging to some $(\varphi, \psi) \in L^2(\kappa) \times L^2(\kappa)$. Since the countable union of null sets is a null set, there exists $N \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $\varphi_n(x) + \psi_n(y) \leq c(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus N$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, fixing $y_0 \in \mathcal{X} \setminus N$ and $f \in C_0(\mathcal{X})$ with $f \geq 0$, we have

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} (c(x, y_0) - \varphi_n(x) - \psi_n(y_0)) f(x) \, d\kappa(x) \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{X}} (c(x, y) - \varphi(x) - \psi(y_0)) f(x) \, d\kappa(x)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Taking an infimum over f gives that $\varphi(x) + \psi(y_0) \leq c(x, y)$ for κ -almost all x . A symmetric argument shows that for fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X} \setminus N$, the inequality holds for κ -almost all y . Combining, we have the inequality for κ -almost all x and y , as desired. \square

Lemma 10. *The objective \bar{J}^ε is weakly upper-semicontinuous over $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$.*

Proof. Let $\{(\varphi_n, \psi_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ converge weakly to some $(\varphi, \psi) \in L^2(\kappa) \times L^2(\kappa)$. Thus, $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi_n \, d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi_n \frac{d\mu}{d\kappa} \, d\kappa \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu$, since $\frac{d\mu}{d\kappa}$ is bounded and measurable, belonging to $L^2(\kappa)$. The same argument gives $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi_n \, d\mu \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\mu$. Mirroring the proof of Lemma 9, we use the density of $C_0(\mathcal{X})$ in $L^1(\kappa)$ to bound

$$\text{ess inf}_\kappa(\varphi) = \inf_{\substack{f \in C_0(\mathcal{X}) \\ f \geq 0, \|f\|_{L^1(\kappa)} \leq 1}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi f \, d\kappa = \inf_{\substack{f \in C_0(\mathcal{X}) \\ f \geq 0, \|f\|_{L^1(\kappa)} \leq 1}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi_n f \, d\kappa \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ess inf}_\kappa(\varphi_n).$$

The same argument gives $\text{ess inf}_\kappa(\psi) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ess inf}_\kappa(\psi_n)$. Combining the above we have $\bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi_n, \psi_n)$, as desired. \square

Combining Lemmas 9 and 10, we find there exists $(\varphi_0, \psi_0) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_c$ such that $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi_0, \psi_0)$. By modifying φ_0 on a set of κ -measure 0 (leaving the dual objective unchanged), we may assume that $\|\varphi_0\|_\infty = \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\kappa)}$, and thus Lemma 4 implies that φ_0^c and φ_0^{cc} are continuous and bounded. As before, taking c -transforms to obtain $(\varphi_0^{cc}, \varphi_0^c)$ maintains dual feasibility and the objective value, so this pair is still maximizing. Finally, since these two potentials are continuous and $\text{spt}(\kappa) = \mathcal{X}$, we can substitute \bar{J}^ε with J^ε . That is, we have $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \bar{J}^\varepsilon(\varphi_0^{cc}, \varphi_0^c) = J^\varepsilon(\varphi_0^{cc}, \varphi_0^c) = \sup_{(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{F}_c} J^\varepsilon(\varphi, \psi)$, as desired.

Structure of maximizers: Take $\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ maximizing (7). Fix any $\mu_- = \mu - \alpha$ and $\nu_- = \nu - \beta$ optimal for the mass removal formulation of $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \varepsilon\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfy $\alpha \leq \mu$ and $\beta \leq \nu$. Of course, $\mu + \beta$ and $\nu + \alpha$ are then optimal for the mass addition

formulation of $\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$. By strong duality, $\mu + \beta, \nu + \alpha$ and φ, φ^c must be a minimax equilibrium, and so

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\beta + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\alpha \quad (11)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu + \varepsilon\varphi_{\min} - \varepsilon\varphi_{\max}. \quad (12)$$

By Lemma 4, $\varphi_{\min}^c = -\varphi_{\max}$ (and minimizers of φ^c correspond to maximizers of φ), and so (11) is strictly less than (12) unless $\text{spt}(\beta) \subseteq \text{argmin}(\varphi)$ and $\text{spt}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{argmax}(\varphi)$.

Remark 9 (Optimal perturbations). The above suggests taking the perturbations as $\alpha = \mu|_{\text{argmax}(\varphi)}$ and $\beta = \nu|_{\text{argmin}(\varphi)}$, but we cannot do so in general. Indeed, consider the case where μ and ν are uniform discrete measures on n points and ε is not a multiple of $1/n$. Issues with that approach also arise when μ and ν are both supported on $\text{argmax}(\varphi)$ and the optimal μ_- satisfies $\mu_- \geq \mu \wedge \nu$.

6.1.4 Proof of Proposition 5

Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. For this result, we will apply Sion's minimax theorem to the mass-removal formulation of OT_c^ε . Mirroring the proof of Theorem 1, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) &= \inf_{\substack{\mu_-, \nu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu, \nu_- \leq \nu}} \sup_{\substack{\varphi, \psi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu_- + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu_- \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\varphi, \psi \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \\ \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)}} \left(\inf_{\substack{\mu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu_- + \inf_{\substack{\nu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \nu_- \leq \nu}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \, d\nu_- \right) \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \left(\inf_{\substack{\mu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu_- \leq \mu}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu_- + \inf_{\substack{\nu_- \in (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \nu_- \leq \nu}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu_- \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that the infimum constraint set is convex and compact w.r.t. the topology of weak convergence, that the supremum constraint set is convex, and that the objective is bilinear and continuous in both arguments (with the function space equipped with the sup-norm). When μ and ν are uniform distributions over n points and ε is a multiple of $1/n$, this further simplifies to

$$\text{OT}_c^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \left(\min_{\substack{S \subseteq \text{spt}(\mu) \\ |S| = (1-\varepsilon)n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in S} \varphi(x) + \min_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{spt}(\nu) \\ |T| = (1-\varepsilon)n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{y \in T} \varphi^c(y) \right). \quad \square$$

6.2 Proofs for Section 4

In what follows, resilience of a random variable refers to resilience of its probability law. Mean resilience refers to taking $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_{\text{mean}}$.

6.2.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We begin by showing that resilience w.r.t. \mathbf{W}_p is implied by standard mean resilience of the p th power of the metric d .

Lemma 11. *Fix $X \sim \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbb{E}[d(X, x_0)^p] \leq \sigma^p$ for some $\sigma \geq 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Suppose further that $d(X, x_0)^p$ is (ρ, ε) -resilient in mean for some $\rho \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$. Then $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_p(2\rho^{1/p} + 2\varepsilon^{1/p}\sigma, \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ (noting that the result is trivial when $\varepsilon = 0$), and fix any $\nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu$. Writing $\mu = (1 - \varepsilon)\nu + \varepsilon\alpha$ for the appropriate $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and taking $\tau := \varepsilon \vee (1 - \varepsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) &= \mathbf{W}_p((1 - \varepsilon)\nu + \varepsilon\alpha, \nu) \\
&\leq \mathbf{W}_p(\varepsilon\alpha, \varepsilon\nu) && \text{(Fact 1)} \\
&= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}\mathbf{W}_p(\alpha, \nu) && \text{(homogeneity of } \mathbf{W}_p^p) \\
&\leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathbf{W}_p(\alpha, \delta_{x_0}) + \mathbf{W}_p(\delta_{x_0}, \nu)) && \text{(triangle inequality for } \mathbf{W}_p) \\
&= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\mathbb{E}_\alpha[d(Y, x_0)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbb{E}_\nu[d(Y, x_0)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) && \text{(definition of } \mathbf{W}_p) \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), \beta \leq \frac{1}{1-\tau}\mu} \mathbb{E}_\beta[d(Y, x_0)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, fix any $\beta \leq \frac{1}{1-\tau}\mu$ and write $\bar{\rho} := (1 \vee \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon})\rho$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\beta[d(Y, x_0)^p] &\leq |\mathbb{E}_\beta[d(Y, x_0)^p] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[d(X, x_0)^p]| + \mathbb{E}_\mu[d(X, x_0)^p] && \text{(triangle inequality)} \\
&\leq \bar{\rho} + \mathbb{E}_\mu[d(X, x_0)^p] && \text{(Lemma 10 of Steinhardt et al., 2018)} \\
&\leq \bar{\rho} + \sigma^p. && \text{(moment bound for } \mu)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the previous bound, we obtain

$$\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}(\bar{\rho} + \sigma^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}(\bar{\rho}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \sigma) \leq 2\rho^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}\sigma,$$

where the last step is by definition of $\bar{\rho}$. Thus, μ is $(2\rho^{1/p} + 2\varepsilon^{1/p}\sigma, \varepsilon)$ -resilient w.r.t. \mathbf{W}_p . \square

We now prove risk bounds for Theorem 2, beginning with the class $\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$ for $q \geq p$. If $X \sim \mu \in \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$, then there exists $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbb{E}\left[(d(x_0, X)^p)^{q/p}\right] = \mathbb{E}[d(x_0, X)^q] \leq \sigma^q = (\sigma^p)^{q/p}$. By Lemmas C.3 and E.2 of Zhu et al. (2022), $d(x_0, X)^p$ is thus $(O(\sigma^p \varepsilon^{1-p/q}), \varepsilon)$ -resilient in mean for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$. Noting that $\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_p(\sigma)$, Lemma 11 gives $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_p(O(\sigma \varepsilon^{1/p-1/q}), \varepsilon)$ for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$. Lemma 6 then implies the upper risk bound, while the lower bound was provided in the discussion following the theorem.

Next, we fix $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $X \sim \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such $\mathbb{E}[|\langle \theta, X - \mathbb{E}[X] \rangle|^q] \leq \sigma^q$ for some $q > p$ (capturing $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$ as a special case when $q = 2$). By Lemmas 5 of Nietert et al. (2022), we then have $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_q(O(\sqrt{1 + d/q}\sigma))$, implying the desired risk bound. For the lower bound, consider the pair of distributions $\mu = \delta_0$ and $\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)\delta_0 + \varepsilon\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/\varepsilon)$. By design, for $p < 2$, we have $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$ and $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, so $\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \sigma \varepsilon^{1/p-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\|Z\|^p]^{1/p} = \Omega(\sigma \sqrt{d} \varepsilon^{1/p-1/2})$, which yields a matching lower risk bound for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$.

Finally, let $X \sim \mu \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma)$. By Proposition 2.5.2 of [Vershynin \(2018\)](#), we have that $\mathbb{E}[|\langle \theta, X - \mathbb{E}[X] \rangle|^q]^{1/q} \lesssim \sqrt{q}\sigma$ for all $q \geq 1$. Taking $q = p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)$, we obtain $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)}(\sqrt{d + p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)})$, implying that $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \varepsilon)$ is bounded by

$$\sigma \sqrt{d + p \vee \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p \vee \log(1/\varepsilon)}} = \sigma \sqrt{d + p \vee \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)} \left(1 \wedge e\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{d + p + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$. For the lower bound, first consider the pair of distributions $\mu = \delta_0$ and $\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)\delta_0 + \varepsilon\delta_x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\| = \sigma\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$. By design, we have $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma)$ and $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, so $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \sigma\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\varepsilon^{1/p}$ serves as a lower bound. Similarly, the pair $\mu = \delta_0$ and $\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)\delta_0 + \varepsilon\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ gives a lower bound of $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \sigma\varepsilon^{1/p} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\|Z\|^p]^{1/p} = \Omega(\sigma\sqrt{d + p}\varepsilon^{1/p})$. Combining these two bounds gives the desired lower risk bound of $\Omega(\sigma\sqrt{d + p + \log(1/\varepsilon)}\varepsilon^{1/p})$. \square

6.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3

For the upper bound, it remains to prove Lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$, fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon)$, and take $\mu_-, \nu_- \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with $\mu_- \leq \mu$ and $\nu_- \leq \nu$ optimal for the mass-removal formulation of $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)$. Then,

$$\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathbb{W}_p\left(\mu, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu_-\right) + \mathbb{W}_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu_-, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\nu_-\right) + \mathbb{W}_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\nu_-, \nu\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) + 2\rho,$$

implying the lemma. \square

For the lower bound, it remains to prove that $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon/4) \leq 8R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$. To see this, take $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, fix any distribution $\tilde{\mu}$ with $\|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon/4$, and let \mathbb{T}_n be a minimax optimal n -sample estimator achieving $R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$. By the coupling formulation of the TV distance, there exists $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \tilde{\mu})$ such that $(X, \tilde{X}) \sim \pi$ satisfy $\mathbb{P}(X \neq \tilde{X}) \leq \varepsilon/4$. Consequently, the product distribution $\pi^{\otimes n}$ is a coupling of $\mathbb{P}_n := \mu^{\otimes n}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n := \tilde{\mu}^{\otimes n}$ such that the contamination fraction $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \neq \tilde{X}_i\}$ has expected value at most $\varepsilon/4$. By Markov's inequality, there exists an event E with $\pi^{\otimes n}(E) \geq 3/4$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \neq \tilde{X}_i\} \leq \varepsilon$ under π conditioned on E . Taking $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_n$ to be the right marginal of $\pi^{\otimes n}$ conditioned on E , we have $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_n \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{adv}}(\mu, \varepsilon)$ by construction, and so $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_n}[\mathbb{W}_p(\mathbb{T}_n(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu)] \leq R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$. Thus, by Markov's, $\mathbb{W}_p(\mathbb{T}_n(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu) \leq 4R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ with probability at least $3/4$ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}'_n$. Combining with the previous bound we have that $\mathbb{W}_p(\mathbb{T}_n(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu) \leq 4R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ with probability at least $3/4 \cdot 3/4 > 1/2$ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n$.

Now, set $\mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu})$ to be any $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathbb{W}_p(\mathbb{T}_n(\tilde{\mu}_n), \nu) \leq 4R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ with probability greater than $1/2$ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n$ (note that such ν can be chosen as a function only of $\tilde{\mu}$). By a union bound and the triangle inequality, $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu})) \leq 8R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ with positive probability under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n$. Since this inequality involves no random variables, it must hold unconditionally, thus bounding $R_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon/4) \leq 8R_{n,p}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$. \square

6.2.3 Proof of Corollary 1

Given Theorem 3 and Theorem 2, it remains to show that, for \mathcal{G} as in the corollary statement and $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{W}_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)] \leq C_{p,q,d} n^{-1/d} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{p,n}(\mathcal{G}, 0) \geq c_{p,q,d} n^{-1/d},$$

where dependence on q only appears for $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$. The upper bound follows by Theorem 3.1 of Lei (2020) with the substitution of q with $2p$ for $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma)$ and 2 for $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$. The lower bound follows by Theorem 1 of Niles-Weed and Berthet (2022) with smoothness parameter s taken as 0 (noting that their asymptotic notation hides dependence on the constants we specify here). \square

6.2.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Fix $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/3$ and $\tau = 1 - (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{1/p} \in [3\varepsilon/p, 3\varepsilon]$ as in the theorem statement. Take $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$ with empirical measures $\hat{\mu}_n$ and $\hat{\nu}_n$, respectively, and let $\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be such that $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}}, \|\tilde{\nu}_n - \hat{\nu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. To begin, we bound $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ from below. By Proposition 4, we have $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \geq \mathbb{W}_p^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) - \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) - \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n)$. Then, by resilience of μ and ν and Proposition 3, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_p^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) &= (1 - \tau) \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-3\varepsilon}\mu, \nu' \leq \frac{1}{1-3\varepsilon}\nu}} \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', \nu') \\ &\geq (1 - \tau)(\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) - 2\rho) \\ &\geq (1 - \tau)\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) - 2\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Combining, we obtain $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \geq (1 - \tau)\mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) - 2\rho - \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) - \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n)$.

For the upper bound, we note that by Lemma 5 there exist $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, $\|\tilde{\nu} - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, $\mathbb{W}_p(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu}_n) \leq \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n)$, and $\mathbb{W}_p(\tilde{\nu}, \hat{\nu}_n) \leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n)$. Hence, Proposition 4 gives that

$$\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \leq \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) + \mathbb{W}_p(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathbb{W}_p(\tilde{\nu}, \hat{\nu}_n) \leq \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) + \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n).$$

Defining the midpoint distributions $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{1 - \|\bar{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}}} \tilde{\mu} \wedge \mu$ and $\bar{\nu} = \frac{1}{1 - \|\bar{\nu} - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}} \tilde{\nu} \wedge \nu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) &= (1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\tilde{\mu}, \nu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\tilde{\nu}}} \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', \nu') \\ &< \mathbb{W}_p(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) + \mathbb{W}_p(\bar{\mu}, \mu) + \mathbb{W}_p(\bar{\nu}, \nu) \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) + 2\rho. \end{aligned}$$

All together, we obtain

$$\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) \leq \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) + 2\rho + \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n).$$

Combining the upper and lower bounds gives the theorem. \square

Remark 10 (Breakdown point). For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, take minimizers $\mu_- = \mu - \alpha$ and $\nu_- = \nu - \beta$ for the $W_p^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu)$ mass removal problem, where $\alpha, \beta \in 3\varepsilon\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfy $\alpha \leq \mu$ and $\beta \leq \nu$. Defining $\tilde{\mu} := \mu - \alpha/3 + \beta/3$ and $\tilde{\nu} := \nu - \beta/3 + \alpha/3$, we find that

$$W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) \leq W_p(\mu - 2\alpha/3 + \beta/3, \nu - 2\beta/3 + \alpha/3) \leq W_p(\mu - \alpha, \nu - \beta) = W_p^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu).$$

Since $\|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}}, \|\tilde{\nu} - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, we cannot obtain meaningful robust estimation guarantees when $\varepsilon \geq 1/3$ and $W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) = 0$.

6.2.5 Proof of Corollary 2

Since $\varepsilon_n = o(\tau_n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tau_n \geq \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Since $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathcal{X})$ for $q > p$, there exists $\sigma < \infty$ such that $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma)$, and $W_p(\mu, \nu) < \infty$. By the proof of Theorem 2, we then have $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_p(O(\sigma\varepsilon^{1/p-1/q}), \varepsilon)$ for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$. Thus, Theorem 4 gives that

$$|W_p^{\tau_n}(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - W_p(\mu, \nu)| \leq O(\sigma\tau_n^{1/p-1/q}) + 3\tau_n W_p(\mu, \nu) + W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + W_p(\hat{\nu}_n, \nu) \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

6.2.6 Proof of Proposition 7

By the proof of Theorem 4, we have, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$, that

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(\mu, \nu) &\geq W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - 2\rho - W_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) - W_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n) \\ W_p(\mu, \nu) &\leq (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{p}} (W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) + 2\rho + W_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + W_p(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n)) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1/4$, Theorem 7.12 of Villani (2003) gives

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - 2\rho \leq W_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 4W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) + 8\rho \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus, for the two-sample testing application, under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu = \nu$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) > 3\rho\} = 0$ a.s., and, under the alternative $H_1 : W_p(\mu, \nu) > 45\rho$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) > 3\rho\} = 1$ a.s.

For independence testing, we note that $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^2)$ is $(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$ -resilient w.r.t. W_p on the product space since both of its marginals lie in $\mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$, by our choice of $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$. Thus, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\kappa}_n, \tilde{\kappa}_{1,n} \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_{2,n}) > 3\rho\} = 0$ a.s., under the null, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{W_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\kappa}_n, \tilde{\kappa}_{1,n} \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_{2,n}) > 3\rho\} = 1$ a.s., under the alternative, as desired. □

7 Concluding Remarks

To perform robust distribution estimation under W_p , this paper introduced the outlier-robust Wasserstein distance W_p^ε , which measures proximity between probability distributions using POT. By applying MDE under this robust distance, we achieved minimax-optimal population-limit and near-optimal finite-sample risk guarantees. Our analysis relied on a new approximate triangle inequality for POT and an equivalence result between mass

addition and mass removal formulations of W_p^ε . These robust estimation guarantees were complemented by a comprehensive duality theory, mirroring the classical Kantorovich dual up to a regularization term scaling with the sup-norm of the dual potential. This gave rise to an elementary robustification technique for WGAN which enabled generative modeling experiments with contaminated image data. We also addressed the problem of estimating the Wasserstein distance itself based on contaminated data (as opposed to estimating a distribution under the distance), and showed that W_p^ε serves as a near-optimal and efficiently computable estimate. Moving forward, we hope that our framework of MDE under POT can find broader applications to both the theory and practice of robust statistics.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Benjamin Grimmer for helpful conversations surrounding minimax optimization, Jacob Steinhardt and Adam Sealfon for useful discussions on robust statistics, and Jason Gaitonde for advice on high-dimensional probability. S. Nietert was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant DGE-1650441. R. Cummings was supported in part by the NSF CAREER award under Grant CNS-1942772, a Mozilla Research Grant, and a JPMorgan Chase Faculty Research Award. Z. Goldfeld was supported in part by the NSF CAREER award under Grant CCF-2046018, an NSF Grant DMS-2210368, and the IBM Academic Award.

References

- P. C. Álvarez-Esteban, E. del Barrio, J. A. Cuesta-Albertos, and C. Matrán. Uniqueness and approximate computation of optimal incomplete transportation plans. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 47(2):358 – 375, 2011.
- M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017.
- Y. Balaji, R. Chellappa, and S. Feizi. Robust optimal transport with applications in generative modeling and domain adaptation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- F. Bassetti, A. Bodini, and E. Regazzini. On minimum Kantorovich distance estimators. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 76(12):1298–1302, 2006.
- E. Bayraktar and G. Guo. Strong equivalence between metrics of Wasserstein type. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 26:1–13, 2021.
- E. Bernton, P. E. Jacob, M. Gerber, and C. P. Robert. Inference in generative models using the Wasserstein distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.05146*, 1(8):9, 2017.
- M. Blondel, V. Seguy, and A. Rolet. Smooth and sparse optimal transport. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 880–889. PMLR, 2018.

- E. Boissard, T. L. Gouic, and J.-M. Loubes. Distribution’s template estimate with Wasserstein metrics. *Bernoulli*, 21(2):740 – 759, 2015.
- N. Bonnotte. *Unidimensional and evolution methods for optimal transportation*. PhD thesis, Paris 11, 2013.
- L. A. Caffarelli and R. J. McCann. Free boundaries in optimal transport and Monge-Ampère obstacle problems. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 171(2):673–730, 2010.
- M. Cao. WGAN-GP. <https://github.com/caogang/wgan-gp>, 2017.
- L. Chapel, M. Z. Alaya, and G. Gasso. Partial optimal transport with applications on positive-unlabeled learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- S. Chen, J. Li, Y. Li, and R. Meka. Minimax optimality (probably) doesn’t imply distribution learning for GANs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- Y. Cheng, I. Diakonikolas, and R. Ge. High-dimensional robust mean estimation in nearly-linear time. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2019.
- L. Chizat, G. Peyré, B. Schmitzer, and F.-X. Vialard. Unbalanced optimal transport: dynamic and Kantorovich formulations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 274(11):3090–3123, 2018a.
- L. Chizat, G. Peyré, B. Schmitzer, and F.-X. Vialard. Scaling algorithms for unbalanced optimal transport problems. *Mathematics of Computation*, 87(314):2563–2609, 2018b.
- E. Del Barrio and C. Matrán. Rates of convergence for partial mass problems. *Probability Theory and related fields*, 155(3):521–542, 2013.
- I. Diakonikolas and D. M. Kane. Recent advances in algorithmic high-dimensional robust statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05911*, 2019.
- I. Diakonikolas, G. Kamath, D. M. Kane, J. Li, A. Moitra, and A. Stewart. Robust estimators in high dimensions without the computational intractability. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2016.
- D. L. Donoho and R. C. Liu. The ”Automatic” Robustness of Minimum Distance Functionals. *The Annals of Statistics*, 16(2):552 – 586, 1988.
- K. Fatras, T. Sejourne, R. Flamary, and N. Courty. Unbalanced minibatch optimal transport; applications to domain adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- A. Figalli. The optimal partial transport problem. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 195:533–560, 2010.
- N. Fournier and A. Guillin. On the rate of convergence in wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability theory and related fields*, 162(3):707–738, 2015.

- T. Fukunaga and H. Kasai. Block-coordinate Frank-Wolfe algorithm and convergence analysis for semi-relaxed optimal transport problem. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2022.
- I. Gulrajani, F. Ahmed, M. Arjovsky, V. Dumoulin, and A. C. Courville. Improved training of Wasserstein GANs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- L. G. Hanin. Kantorovich-Rubinstein norm and its application in the theory of Lipschitz spaces. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 115(2):345–352, 1992.
- M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter. GANs trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- R. Hogg, J. McKean, and A. Craig. *Introduction to Mathematical Statistics*. Pearson Education, 2005.
- S. B. Hopkins, J. Li, and F. Zhang. Robust and heavy-tailed mean estimation made simple, via regret minimization. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- P. J. Huber. Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73–101, 1964.
- T. Karras, T. Aila, S. Laine, and J. Lehtinen. Progressive growing of GANs for improved quality, stability, and variation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- T. Karras, S. Laine, M. Aittala, J. Hellsten, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila. Analyzing and improving the image quality of StyleGAN. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, University of Toronto, 2009.
- K. Le, H. Nguyen, Q. M. Nguyen, T. Pham, H. Bui, and N. Ho. On robust optimal transport: Computational complexity and barycenter computation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- J. Lei. Convergence and concentration of empirical measures under Wasserstein distance in unbounded functional spaces. *Bernoulli*, 26(1):767 – 798, 2020.
- M. Liero, A. Mielke, and G. Savaré. Optimal entropy-transport problems and a new Hellinger-Kantorovich distance between positive measures. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 211(3):969–1117, 2018.

- T. Lin, Z. Zheng, E. Chen, M. Cuturi, and M. I. Jordan. On projection robust optimal transport: Sample complexity and model misspecification. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2021.
- Y. Ma, H. Liu, D. La Vecchia, and M. Lerasle. Inference via robust optimal transportation: theory and methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.06297*, 2023.
- D. Mukherjee, A. Guha, J. Solomon, Y. Sun, and M. Yurochkin. Outlier-robust optimal transport. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- H. P. Mulholland. On generalizations of minkowski’s inequality in the form of a triangle inequality. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-51(1):294–307, 1949.
- K. Nadjahi, A. Durmus, U. Simsekli, and R. Badeau. Asymptotic guarantees for learning generative models with the sliced-Wasserstein distance. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019.
- K. Nadjahi, A. Durmus, L. Chizat, S. Kolouri, S. Shahrampour, and U. Simsekli. Statistical and topological properties of sliced probability divergences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- J. S. Nath. Unbalanced optimal transport using integral probability metric regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.05001*, 2020.
- S. Nietert, R. Sadhu, Z. Goldfeld, and K. Kato. Statistical, robustness, and computational guarantees for sliced Wasserstein distances. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- S. Nietert, Z. Goldfeld, and S. Shafiee. Robust distribution learning with local and global adversarial corruptions (extended abstract). In S. Agrawal and A. Roth, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2024.
- J. Niles-Weed and Q. Berthet. Minimax estimation of smooth densities in Wasserstein distance. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(3):1519–1540, 2022.
- J. Niles-Weed and P. Rigollet. Estimation of wasserstein distances in the spiked transport model. *Bernoulli*, 28(4):2663–2688, 2022.
- G. Peyré and M. Cuturi. Computational optimal transport. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- B. Piccoli and F. Rossi. Generalized Wasserstein distance and its application to transport equations with source. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 211(1):335–358, 2014.
- E. M. Ronchetti and P. J. Huber. *Robust Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2009.
- F. Santambrogio. *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians*, volume 87 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling.

- B. Schmitzer and B. Wirth. A framework for Wasserstein-1-type metrics. *Journal of Convex Analysis*, 26(2):353–396, 2019.
- Y. Shen and S. Sanghavi. Learning with bad training data via iterative trimmed loss minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- S. Singh and B. Póczos. Minimax distribution estimation in wasserstein distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08855*, 2018.
- R. Sonthalia and A. C. Gilbert. Dual regularized optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.03126*, 2020.
- G. Staerman, P. Laforgue, P. Mozharovskiy, and F. d’Alché-Buc. When OT meets MoM: robust estimation of Wasserstein distance. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2021.
- J. Steinhardt, M. Charikar, and G. Valiant. Resilience: A criterion for learning in the presence of arbitrary outliers. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS)*, volume 94, 2018.
- I. Tolstikhin, O. Bousquet, S. Gelly, and B. Schölkopf. Wasserstein auto-encoders. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- N. W. Varuna Jayasiri. labml.ai annotated paper implementations, 2020. URL <https://nn.labml.ai/>.
- R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- C. Villani. *Topics in Optimal Transportation*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2003.
- J. Weed and F. Bach. Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2620–2648, 2019.
- B. Zhu, J. Jiao, and J. Steinhardt. Generalized resilience and robust statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(4):2256 – 2283, 2022.

Appendix A Asymmetric Robust Distance

Define the asymmetric robust p -Wasserstein distance with robustness radii $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in [0, 1]$ by

$$\mathbb{W}_p^{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\substack{\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_1} \mu \\ \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), \nu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_2} \nu}} \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', \nu'),$$

so that $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)^{1/p} \mathbb{W}_p^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon}$ and $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu \parallel \nu) = \mathbb{W}_p^{\varepsilon, 0}(\mu, \nu)$. Our results for robust distribution estimation still hold for MDE under $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$ if we take care to pass the contaminated empirical measure as the left argument. This extension relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 12. Fix $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon)$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Then, for any $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|\tilde{\nu} - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, we have $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\nu} \parallel \mu) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1/p} (\mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \mu) + \rho)$.

Proof. Write $\nu' := \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\nu \wedge \tilde{\nu}(\mathcal{X})} \nu \wedge \tilde{\nu}$. By design, we have $\nu' \leq \nu$, $\nu' \leq \tilde{\nu}$, and $\nu'(\mathcal{X}) = 1 - \varepsilon$. By Lemma 3, there exists $\mu' \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with $\mu' \leq \mu$ such that $\mathbb{W}_p(\mu', \nu') \leq \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$. We then compute

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \varepsilon)^{1/p} \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\nu} \parallel \mu) &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu', (1 - \varepsilon)\mu) \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu', \mu') + \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', (1 - \varepsilon)\mu) \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \mu) + \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', (1 - \varepsilon)\mu) \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon)^{1/p} \rho \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p(\nu, \mu) + \rho. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Next, given any $\tilde{\mu}, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, it follows from definitions that $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}, \nu) \leq \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu} \parallel \nu)$, since the feasible set of input pairs for the two-sided problem is larger. Recall now the setup for the proof of Theorem 3. We have clean measure $\mu \in \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_p(\rho, 2\varepsilon)$, empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$, and ε -corrupted measure $\tilde{\mu}_n$. Taking \mathbb{T} as the δ -approximate minimum distance estimator over \mathcal{G} under $\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$, minding the order of arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_p^{2\varepsilon}(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) &\leq \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu, \tilde{\mu}_n) + \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) && \text{(Proposition 4)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu \parallel \tilde{\mu}_n) + \mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{W}_p^\varepsilon(\mu \parallel \tilde{\mu}_n) + \delta && \text{(MDE guarantee and } \mu \in \mathcal{G}) \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \rho + \delta, && \text{(Lemma 12)} \end{aligned}$$

At this point, the remainder of the proof goes through, and final bound still holds up to constant factors. Next, although the proof of Proposition 3 was given for the symmetric distance, an identical argument reveals that the following variant holds in general:

$$\mathbb{W}_p^{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{[(1 - \varepsilon_1)(1 - \varepsilon_2)]^{1/p}} \inf_{\substack{\mu' \geq (1 - \varepsilon_2)\mu, \nu' \geq (1 - \varepsilon_1)\nu \\ \mu'(\mathcal{X}) = \nu'(\mathcal{X}) = 1 - \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2}} \mathbb{W}_p(\mu', \nu').$$

We now translate Theorem 1 to the asymmetric case, following the same argument of the original proof to write $\mathbb{W}_p^{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu)^p$ as

$$\sup_{\varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})} \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi \, d\mu + \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi^c \, d\nu + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{1 - \varepsilon_2} \inf_x \varphi(x) + \frac{\varepsilon_1}{1 - \varepsilon_1} \sup_x \varphi(x).$$

Note that this matches the symmetric case when $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$ (up to a multiplicative factor of $(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}$) and matches the one-sided dual used in Section 5 when $\varepsilon_2 = 0$.

Appendix B Application to Sliced OT

Here, we extend the theory developed in the main paper to projection-robust and sliced OT. These variants of the classic Wasserstein distance are obtained by taking either an average

or maximum of W_p between lower-dimensional projections. Throughout, we fix $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Write $\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} : U^\top U = I_k\}$ for the Stiefel manifold of orthonormal k -frames in \mathbb{R}^d and $\sigma_k \in \mathcal{P}(\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for its Haar measure. For $U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mathbf{p}^U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ denote the corresponding projection mapping $\mathbf{p}^U(x) := U^\top x$. Also let $U_k := (I_k \ 0_{d-k, d-k})^\top \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the standard projection matrix onto \mathbb{R}^k . We then define the k -dimensional average-sliced Wasserstein distance between $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\underline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) := \left(\int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu)^p d\sigma_k(U) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and the k -dimensional max-sliced Wasserstein distance between them by

$$\overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu).$$

In the literature, ‘‘sliced OT’’ most typically refers to the setting where $k = 1$, while ‘‘projection-robust OT’’ refers to our max-sliced definition. Both variants are metrics over $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which generate the same topology as classic W_p (Bonnotte, 2013; Nadjahi et al., 2019; Bayraktar and Guo, 2021; Nadjahi et al., 2020). Despite the name, formal outlier-robustness guarantees for either sliced distance were not presented until our preliminary work (Nietert et al., 2022). We now expand on this work by extending W_p^ε to the sliced setting, starting with a unified framework for robust distribution estimation under sliced Wasserstein distances. Proofs are deferred to Section C.

Error and risk. Fix a statistical distance $D \in \{\underline{W}_{p,k}, \overline{W}_{p,k}\}$ and family of clean distributions $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Employing the strong ε -corruption model of Section 4, we seek an estimator T operating on contaminated samples which minimizes the worst-case n -sample risk

$$R_n(T, D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n \in \mathcal{M}_n^{\text{adv}}(\mu, \varepsilon)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n} [D(T(\tilde{\mu}_n), \mu)].$$

As before, we write $R_n(D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \inf_T R_n(T, D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ for the n -sample minimax risk.

The estimators. We next define robust proxies of the average- and max-sliced distances, respectively, as:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) &:= \left(\int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p^\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu)^p d\sigma_k(U) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) &:= \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p^\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu), \end{aligned}$$

substituting W_p^ε for W_p in their definitions. To solve the estimation tasks, we again perform MDE, considering the minimum distance estimates

$$\begin{aligned} T_{[\mathcal{G}, \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon]}(\tilde{\mu}_n) &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \nu) \\ T_{[\mathcal{G}, \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon]}(\tilde{\mu}_n) &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

B.1 Robust Estimation Guarantees for Sliced \mathbf{W}_p

We start by characterizing population-limit risk. For a distance $D \in \{\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}\}$, a clean family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and a map $T : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we again define

$$R_\infty(T, D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) := \sup_{\substack{\mu \in \mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} D(T(\tilde{\mu}), \mu),$$

with corresponding minimax risk $R_\infty(D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) = \inf_T R_{p,\infty}(T, D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$. We can obtain tight bounds for this quantity in terms of the previously considered minimax risks.

Theorem 5 (Population-limit minimax risk for sliced \mathbf{W}_p). *Fix $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$, $q > p$, and $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)\}$ (assuming in the last case that $p < 2$). Letting $\mathcal{G}_k := \{\mathbf{p}_{\#}^{U_k} \mu : \mu \in \mathcal{G}\}$ denote the orthogonal projection of \mathcal{G} onto \mathbb{R}^k , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} R_\infty(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) &\asymp \sqrt{1 \wedge \frac{k+p}{d}} R(\mathbf{W}_p, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon), \\ R_\infty(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) &\asymp R(\mathbf{W}_p, \mathcal{G}_k, \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and these risks are achieved by the estimators and $T_{[\mathcal{G}, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon]}$ and $T_{[\mathcal{G}, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon]}$, respectively (as well as by $T_{[\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}]}$ in both cases).

Specializing these bounds to each of the mentioned classes, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3 (Concrete population-limit risk bounds). *For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} R_p(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) &\asymp \begin{cases} \sigma \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma) \text{ for } q \geq p \\ \sigma \sqrt{k+p + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) \\ \sigma \sqrt{k} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } p < 2, \text{ and } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) \end{cases} \\ R_p(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) &\asymp \begin{cases} \sigma \sqrt{1 \wedge \frac{k+p}{d}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_q(\sigma) \text{ for } q \geq p \\ \sigma \sqrt{(1 \wedge \frac{k+p}{d})(d+p + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma) \\ \sigma \sqrt{k} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}}. & \text{if } p < 2, \text{ and } \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

That is, average-sliced risks are proportional to standard risks with a multiplier of $\sqrt{k/d}$ when $d \gg p$, and max-sliced risks are equal to standard risks in \mathbb{R}^k . This extends Theorem 2 of [Nietert et al. \(2022\)](#) to general k and a wider selection of clean families. Moreover, the proof is markedly simpler, connecting risks directly to those under classic \mathbf{W}_p . As before, our argument extends to a class of distributions with bounded Orlicz norm of a certain type, including those with bounded projected q th moments for $q > 2$. For the upper bounds, we show that the modulus of continuity characterizing $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$ risk equals that of the \mathbf{W}_p in \mathbb{R}^k , and that resilience w.r.t. $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$ is bounded by the same term appearing in the proof for \mathbf{W}_p up to a prefactor of $O(\sqrt{1 \wedge (k+p)/d})$. For the lower bounds, we are able to reuse examples constructed for Theorem 2.

We next provide near-tight risk bounds for the classes above in the finite-sample regime.

Theorem 6 (Finite-sample minimax risk for sliced \mathbf{W}_p). *Fix $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.49$, $q \geq p$, and $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)\}$ (assuming in the last case that $p < 2$). Then, for $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}^\varepsilon) \in \{(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon), (\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon)\}$, we have*

$$R_\infty(\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) + R_n(\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{G}, 0) \lesssim R_n(\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \lesssim R_\infty(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) + \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)],$$

and the upper bound is achieved by the minimum distance estimator $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{D}^\varepsilon]}$.

Remark 11 (Population-limit discrepancy for $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$). Ideally, the population-limit term in the upper bound would be adapted to \mathbf{D} rather than fixed to the larger max-sliced risk. However, the proof in Appendix C.2 relies on the max-sliced resilience of \mathcal{G} , and it is not clear whether $\mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon]}$ can achieve this lower risk in general. For specific families \mathcal{G} , we may have $R_\infty(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \asymp R_\infty(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$, in which case this gap is negligible. For example, when $p = 1$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)$, both risks are $\Theta(\sqrt{k\varepsilon})$.

For $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$, we match the population-limit risk up to empirical approximation error for the standard classes. In this case, the gap between the upper and lower bounds is simply the sub-optimality of plug-in estimation under $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$. For small k , we note that the empirical approximation error $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$ can be significantly smaller than that under \mathbf{W}_p (Lin et al., 2021; Niles-Weed and Rigollet, 2022) (see also Nietert et al., 2022, Section 3). Compared to the analogous results for $k = 1$ in Nietert et al. (2022), our results hold for all sample sizes n , and our proof is cleaner, following the approach of Theorem 3 via approximate triangle inequalities and appropriate modulus of continuity bounds. As was the case there, our argument also extends to approximate MDE.

Remark 12 (Average-sliced improvements). Note that for the average-sliced Wasserstein metric, there is a gap between the upper and lower bounds in Theorem 6. In particular, the upper bound does not coincide with the population risk as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It remains unclear whether the finite-sample risk bound for MDE under $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon$ (or an alternative robust distance) can be improved to $R_\infty(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) + \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$, so that the first term matches the population-limit risk from Theorem 5 and the second is the current empirical convergence term from Theorem 6. We remark that Proposition 2 in Nietert et al. (2022) bridges this gap for $k = 1$ via MDE under the TV norm, but the resulting bound contains a non-standard truncated empirical convergence term and only holds for sufficiently large sample sizes.

Next, we consider direct estimation of the sliced distances via their robust proxies.

Theorem 7 (Finite-sample robust estimation of sliced \mathbf{W}_p). *Let $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/3$, write $\tau = 1 - (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{1/p} \in [3\varepsilon/p, 3\varepsilon]$, and fix $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}^\varepsilon) \in \{(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon), (\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}^\varepsilon)\}$. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be $(\rho, 3\varepsilon)$ -resilient w.r.t. $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{p,k}$ with empirical measures $\hat{\mu}_n$ and $\hat{\nu}_n$, respectively. Then for any $\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}}, \|\tilde{\nu}_n - \hat{\nu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$|\mathbf{D}^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - \mathbf{D}(\mu, \nu)| \lesssim \rho + \tau \mathbf{D}(\mu, \nu) + \mathbf{D}(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \mathbf{D}(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n).$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon \leq 0.33$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}$ for $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{G}_q(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{subG}}(\sigma), \mathcal{G}_{\text{cov}}(\sigma)\}$, $q > p$, then ρ can be replaced with $R_\infty(\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ in the bound above.

As with Theorem 4, the W_p^ε estimate suffers from additive estimation error $O(\rho)$ and multiplicative estimation error $O(\tau)$, matching the resilience-based guarantees of MDE when $W_p(\mu, \nu)$ is sufficiently small and n is sufficiently large.

Remark 13 (Dual forms for robust sliced W_p). For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, plugging in the W_p^ε dual into the definitions of the robust sliced distances gives

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)^p &= \int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left(\sup_{f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^k)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f \, d\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f^c \, d\mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu - 2\varepsilon \|f\|_\infty \right) d\sigma_k(U) \\ \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu)^p &= \sup_{\substack{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^k)}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f \, d\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f^c \, d\mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu - 2\varepsilon \|f\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Appendix C Proofs for Appendix B

C.1 Proof of Theorem 5

We begin with some preliminary facts. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $x_{1:k} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ denote its first k components.

Fact 4 (Concentration of Gaussian norm). For $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\|Z\| - \sqrt{d}\right| > t\right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{8}}.$$

Lemma 13 (Moments of Gaussian norm). For $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and $q \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} = \frac{\sqrt{2} \Gamma(\frac{d+q}{2})^{\frac{1}{q}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})^{\frac{1}{q}}} \asymp \sqrt{d+q}.$$

Proof. For the first equality, we use that the expectation is the $(q/2)$ -th moment of a χ^2 random variable with d degrees of freedom (see, e.g., Section 3.3.1 of Hogg et al., 2005). By Stirling's approximation, we then have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \asymp \frac{\left(\frac{d+q}{2}\right)^{\frac{d+q-1}{2q}} e^{-\frac{d+q}{2q}}}{\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2q}} e^{-\frac{d}{2q}}} \asymp \left(\frac{d+q}{d}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2q}} \sqrt{d+q} \asymp \sqrt{d+q}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 14. For $X \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ and $q \geq 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\|X_{1:k}\|^q]^{1/q} \asymp \sqrt{1 \wedge \frac{k+q}{d}}$.

Proof. We start with the upper bound. Letting $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_d) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|X_{1:k}\|^q] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\|Z_{1:k}\|^q}{\|Z\|^q}\right] \\
&= \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\|Z_{1:k}\|^q}{\|Z\|^q} \geq t\right) dt && (\|Z_{1:k}\| \leq 1) \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\|Z_{1:k}\|^q \geq t \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}\right)^q\right) dt + \mathbb{P}\left(\|Z\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}\right) && (\text{union bound}) \\
&= 2^q d^{-\frac{q}{2}} \mathbb{E}[\|Z_{1:k}\|^q] + \mathbb{P}\left(\|Z\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2}\right) \\
&\leq 2^q d^{-\frac{q}{2}} \mathbb{E}[\|Z_{1:k}\|^q] + 2e^{-\frac{d}{32}}. && (\text{Fact 4})
\end{aligned}$$

Assume now that $d \geq 100q$ (otherwise, the desired upper bound is trivial). Applying Lemma 13 and noting that $\exp(-u/32) \leq u^{-1/2}$ for $u \geq 100$, we further obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X_{1:k}\|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{k+q}{d}} + e^{-\frac{d}{32q}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{k+q}{d}} + \sqrt{q/d} \asymp \sqrt{\frac{k+q}{d}},$$

matching the stated bound once we cap the quantity at 1. For the lower bound, we compute

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X_{1:k}\|^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \geq \mathbb{E}[X_1^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \asymp \sqrt{1 \wedge \frac{q}{d}},$$

where the final inequality follows by Lemma 6 of [Nietert et al. \(2022\)](#). This matches the stated bound when $k = O(1)$. For Z as above, Fact 4, gives that $\|Z\| > 2\sqrt{d}$ or $\|Z_{1:k}\| < \sqrt{k}/2$ with probability at most $2e^{-d/8} + 2e^{-k/32} \leq 4e^{-k/32}$. Hence, for $k \geq 100$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X_{1:k}\|^q] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\|Z_{1:k}\|^q}{\|Z\|^q}\right] \gtrsim \left(1 - 4e^{-\frac{k}{32}}\right) \left(\frac{k}{d}\right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \gtrsim \left(\frac{k}{d}\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}.$$

Combining the previous two inequalities shows that the upper bound is tight. \square

We now return to the proof of Theorem 5.

Risk bounds for $\overline{W}_{p,k}$: Fix $\varepsilon, q, \mathcal{G}$, and \mathcal{G}_k as in the theorem statement. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$ and any $U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, observe that $\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu \in \mathcal{G}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu - \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Moreover, this embedding is surjective, since \mathcal{G}_k embeds naturally into \mathcal{G} for all of the considered families. We have

$$\mathbf{m}_{\overline{W}_{p,k}}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}, \varepsilon) = \sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}, U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} \mathbf{W}_p(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu) = \sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G}_k \\ \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon}} \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{W}_p}(\mathcal{G}_k, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}, \varepsilon).$$

Consequently, $\overline{W}_{p,k}$ inherits the upper and lower risk bounds from Section 4 for \mathbf{W}_p in \mathbb{R}^k .

Risk bounds for $\underline{W}_{p,k}$: For the average-sliced distance, take $X \sim \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $U = (U_1, \dots, U_d)^\top \sim \sigma_k$ to be independent, and fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. We compute

$$\underline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \delta_{x_0})^p = \mathbb{E}[\underline{W}_p(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \delta_{x_0})^p] = \mathbb{E}[\|U^\top (X - x_0)\|^p] = \mathbb{E}[\|U_1\|^p] \underline{W}_p(\mu, \delta_{x_0})^p, \quad (13)$$

where the third equality follows by rotational symmetry.

Since the upper risk bounds in Section 4 all followed from Lemma 11, we now mimic that proof to bound generalized resilience w.r.t. $\underline{W}_{p,k}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and fix any $\nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu$. Writing $\mu = (1-\varepsilon)\nu + \varepsilon\alpha$ for the appropriate $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and taking $\tau := \varepsilon \vee (1-\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\underline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) \leq \underline{W}_{p,k}(\varepsilon\alpha, \varepsilon\nu) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}} \underline{W}_{p,k}(\alpha, \nu) \leq \mathbb{E}[\|U_1\|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}} (\underline{W}_p(\alpha, \delta_{x_0}) + \underline{W}_p(\delta_{x_0}, \nu)).$$

Here, the properties of $\underline{W}_{p,k}$ applied for the first four lines are inherited from \underline{W}_p . The final expression matches that in the proof of Lemma 11 up to the initial factor. Consequently, all of the risk bounds from Section 4 translate to the average-sliced setting up this factor.

For the lower bound, we observe that all of the lower risk bounds in Section 4 are of the form $\underline{W}_p(\delta_0, (1-\varepsilon)\delta_0 + \varepsilon\kappa) = \varepsilon^{1/p} \underline{W}_p(\delta_0, \kappa)$ for some $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Translating these to our setting, we obtain

$$\underline{W}_{p,k}(\delta_0, (1-\varepsilon)\delta_0 + \varepsilon\kappa) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}} \underline{W}_{p,k}(\delta_0, \kappa) = \mathbb{E}[\|U_1\|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}} \underline{W}_p(\delta_0, \kappa),$$

matching the previous bounds exactly up to the same prefactor appearing in the upper bounds. Noting that U_1 is equal in distribution to the first k components of a vector sampled uniformly at random from \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , an application of Lemma 14 completes the proof. \square

C.2 Proof of Theorem 6

Write $\underline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$ and $\overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$ for the families of distributions which are (ρ, ε) -resilient w.r.t. $\underline{W}_{p,k}$ and $\overline{W}_{p,k}$, respectively. We start with a simple characterization of $\overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$.

Lemma 15. *We have $\mu \in \overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$ if and only if $\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu \in \underline{W}_p(\rho, \varepsilon)$ for all $U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. Since suprema over fixed sets commute, we have

$$\sup_{\substack{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu}} \overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sup_{\substack{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \nu \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\mu}} \underline{W}_p(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu). \quad \square$$

Next, we translate the approximate triangle inequality to the sliced regime.

Lemma 16 (Approximate triangle inequality for sliced \underline{W}_p). *Let $\mu, \nu, \kappa \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $0 \leq \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \leq 1$. Then we have*

$$\underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) \leq \underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa) + \underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu) \text{ and } \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) \leq \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \kappa) + \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_2}(\kappa, \nu).$$

Proof. For the average-sliced distance, Proposition 4 and the $L^p(\sigma_k)$ triangle inequality give

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) &= \left(\int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p^{\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu)^p d\sigma_k(U) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} [W_p^{\varepsilon_1}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu) + W_p^{\varepsilon_2}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu)]^p d\sigma_k(U) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu) + \underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu).
\end{aligned}$$

For the max-sliced distance, we again apply Proposition 4 to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu) &= \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p^{\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu) \\
&\leq \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} [W_p^{\varepsilon_1}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu) + W_p^{\varepsilon_2}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu)] \\
&\leq \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_1}(\mu, \nu) + \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon_2}(\mu, \nu). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the appropriate modulus of continuity, mirroring Lemma 2.

Lemma 17 (Sliced W_p modulus of continuity). *For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.99$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon) \\ \underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) \leq \lambda}} \underline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) \lesssim \lambda + \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon) \\ \overline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) \leq \lambda}} \overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) \lesssim \lambda + \rho.$$

Note that the second suprema has μ and ν range over $\overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$ rather than $\underline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$. This leads to the sub-optimality of the average-sliced finite-sample risk bound we obtained for MDE under $\underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon}$. It is unavoidable with our current analysis due to our reliance on Lemma 15, which pertains only to max-sliced resilience.

Proof. For the average-sliced distance, fix $\mu, \nu \in \overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, \varepsilon)$, and, for any $U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mu_U, \nu_U \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ with $\mu_U \leq \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu$ and $\nu_U \leq \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu$ be minimizers for the $W_p^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu)$ problem. We then bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu)^p &= \int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu)^p d\sigma_k(U) \\
&\leq \int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left[W_p\left(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U\right) + W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U\right) + W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu\right) \right]^p d\sigma_k(U) \\
&\leq \int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left[W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U\right) + 2\rho \right]^p d\sigma_k(U) \quad (\text{Lemma 15}) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \int_{\text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} [W_p^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu) + 2\rho]^p d\sigma_k(U) \\
&\lesssim (\underline{W}_{p,k}^{\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) + 2\rho)^p. \quad (L^p(\sigma_k) \text{ triangle inequality})
\end{aligned}$$

For the max-sliced distance, let $\mu_U, \nu_U \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ with $\mu_U \leq \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \mu$ and $\nu_U \leq \mathbf{p}_{\#}^U \nu$ be

minimizers for the $W_p^\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu)$ problem, for any $U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We then bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) &= \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu) \\
&\leq \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p\left(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U\right) + W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U\right) + W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu\right) \\
&\leq \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p\left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mu_U, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \nu_U\right) + 2\rho \quad (\text{Lemma 15}) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) + 2\rho \\
&\lesssim \overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) + \rho.
\end{aligned}$$

Together, these two inequalities imply the lemma. \square

Finally, we replicate the proof of Theorem 3. For the lower bound, the exact same argument applies up to the substitution of W_p with $D \in \{\underline{W}_{p,k}, \overline{W}_{p,k}\}$. To prove the upper bound, let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{W}_{p,k}(\rho, 2\varepsilon)$, fix $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$ with empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_n$, and consider any distribution $\tilde{\mu}_n$ with $\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$. Then, for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{[\mathcal{G}, D^\varepsilon]}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{2\varepsilon}(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) &\leq D^\varepsilon(\mu, \tilde{\mu}_n) + D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) \quad (\text{Lemma 16}) \\
&\leq 2D^\varepsilon(\mu, \tilde{\mu}_n) + \delta \quad (\text{MDE guarantee and } \mu \in \mathcal{G}) \\
&\leq 2D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \hat{\mu}_n) + 2D(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + \delta. \quad (\text{Lemma 16}) \\
&\leq 2D(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu) + \delta. \quad (\|\tilde{\mu}_n - \hat{\mu}_n\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

Writing $\lambda_n = 20 \mathbb{E}[D(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)] + \delta$, Markov's inequality and Lemma 17 yield

$$D(\mu, \mathbb{T}(\tilde{\mu}_n)) \leq \sup_{\substack{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{G} \\ D^{2\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) \leq \lambda_n}} W_p(\mu, \nu) \lesssim \rho + \lambda_n$$

with probability at least 9/10. Thus, $R_{p,n}(D, \mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \lesssim \rho + \delta + \mathbb{E}[W_p(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu)]$, as desired. Plugging in the appropriate ρ for the families of interest gives the upper bounds of the theorem when $\delta = 0$ (we present the argument for $\delta > 0$ to emphasize that exact optimization is not necessary). \square

C.3 Proof of Theorem 7

The proof mimics that of Theorem 4. We assume a Huber contamination model, i.e., when $\tilde{\mu}_n = (1-\varepsilon)\hat{\mu}_n + \varepsilon\alpha$ and $\tilde{\nu}_n = (1-\varepsilon)\hat{\nu}_n + \varepsilon\beta$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ (the extension to the full setting is identical to that for Theorem 4). More concisely, we write the Huber condition as $\hat{\mu}_n \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\tilde{\mu}_n, \hat{\nu}_n \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\tilde{\nu}_n$. We now have

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) &= \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p^\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \tilde{\mu}_n, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \tilde{\nu}_n) \\
&= (1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mathbf{p}_\#^U \tilde{\mu}_n, \nu' \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \mathbf{p}_\#^U \tilde{\nu}_n}} W_p(\mu', \nu') \\
&< \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} W_p(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \hat{\mu}_n, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \hat{\nu}_n) \\
&= \overline{W}_{p,k}(\hat{\mu}_n, \hat{\nu}_n) \\
&\leq \overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) + \overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + \overline{W}_{p,k}(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n).
\end{aligned}$$

The same argument holds when $D = \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon$.

In the other direction, Lemma 16 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) &\leq D(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + D^\varepsilon(\hat{\mu}_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) + D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) + D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\nu}_n, \hat{\nu}_n) + D(\hat{\nu}_n, \nu) \\
&= D(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) + D(\hat{\nu}_n, \nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the resilience of μ and ν w.r.t. $\overline{W}_{p,k}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{W}_{p,k}^{3\varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) &= (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \inf_{\substack{\mu', \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \\ \mu' \leq \frac{1}{1-3\varepsilon} \mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \nu' \leq \frac{1}{1-3\varepsilon} \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu}} W_p(\mu', \nu') \\
&\geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{U \in \text{St}_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} [W_p(\mathbf{p}_\#^U \mu, \mathbf{p}_\#^U \nu) - 2\rho] \\
&= (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} (\overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) - 2\rho) \\
&\geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \overline{W}_{p,k}(\mu, \nu) - 2\rho.
\end{aligned}$$

The same argument holds when $D = \underline{W}_{p,k}^\varepsilon$. Combining the pieces, we obtain

$$|D^\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\nu}_n) - D(\mu, \nu)| \leq 2\rho + \tau D(\mu, \nu) + D(\mu, \hat{\mu}_n) + D(\nu, \hat{\nu}_n). \quad \square$$

Appendix D Full Experiment Details

Full code is available on GitHub at <https://github.com/sbniertert/robust-0T>. We stress that we never had to adjust hyper-parameters or loss computations from their defaults, only adding our robust objective modification and procedures to corrupt the original datasets (MNIST (Lecun et al., 1998), CelebA-HQ (Karras et al., 2018), and CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009)). The implementation of WGAN-GP used for the robust GAN experiments in the main text was based on a standard PyTorch implementation (Cao, 2017), as was that of StyleGAN 2 (Varuna Jayasiri, 2020). The images presented in Fig. 4 were generated without any manual filtering after a predetermined number of batches (125k, batch size 64, for WGAN-GP; 100k, batch size 32, for StyleGAN 2). Training for the WGAN-GP and StyleGAN 2 experiments took 5 hours and 20 hours of compute, respectively, on a cluster machine equipped with a NVIDIA Tesla V100 and 14 CPU cores.

For the comparison to Balaji et al. (2020) and Staerman et al. (2021), we used the 50k CIFAR-10 training set of 32×32 images contaminated with 2632 images of uniform random

noise. Each GAN was trained for 100k batches of 128 images, taking approximately 12 hours of compute on the same cluster machine. For the robust GAN of [Balaji et al. \(2020\)](#), we used their continuous weighting scheme, recommended robustness strength, and DCGAN architecture, along with hyperparameters suggested in their appendix.