

Concentration of Measure: Markov's, Chebyshev's and Hoeffding's Inequalities

Mohammad Sadegh Talebi
Department of Computer Science

(Partially based on Yevgeny Seldin's Slides)



Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Recap: Independent Random Variables
- 3 Markov's Inequality
- 4 Chebyshev's Inequality
- 5 Hoeffding's Inequality



Motivation: Supervised Learning

- A finite hypothesis class \mathcal{H}
- A sample $S = ((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n))$, with elements **independently** drawn from a fixed (but unknown) distribution.
- $\ell(h(X), Y)$ is the loss of $h \in \mathcal{H}$ on (X, Y)
- $L(h) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(h(X), Y)]$ is unknown.
- Empirical loss of h :

$$\hat{L}(h, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(h(X_i), Y_i)$$

- $\hat{L}(h, S)$ is an **unbiased estimator** of $L(h)$: $\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}(h, S)] = L(h)$



Motivation: Supervised Learning

- A finite hypothesis class \mathcal{H}
- A sample $S = ((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n))$, with elements **independently** drawn from a fixed (but unknown) distribution.
- $\ell(h(X), Y)$ is the loss of $h \in \mathcal{H}$ on (X, Y)
- $L(h) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(h(X), Y)]$ is unknown.
- Empirical loss of h :

$$\hat{L}(h, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(h(X_i), Y_i)$$

- $\hat{L}(h, S)$ is an **unbiased estimator** of $L(h)$: $\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}(h, S)] = L(h)$

What can be said about $L(h)$?



Motivation: Bernoulli Trials

Assume a certain treatment is successful with probability p , and failing otherwise.

- p is unknown, but is fixed for all subject patients.
- Let X_1, \dots, X_n be the realized outcomes on n patients.
- Sample mean:

$$\hat{p}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

- $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}_n] = p$



Motivation: Bernoulli Trials

Assume a certain treatment is successful with probability p , and failing otherwise.

- p is unknown, but is fixed for all subject patients.
- Let X_1, \dots, X_n be the realized outcomes on n patients.
- Sample mean:

$$\hat{p}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

- $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}_n] = p$

How close is \hat{p}_n to p for a given n ?



Motivation: Bernoulli Trials

Assume a certain treatment is successful with probability p , and failing otherwise.

- p is unknown, but is fixed for all subject patients.
- Let X_1, \dots, X_n be the realized outcomes on n patients.
- Sample mean:

$$\hat{p}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

- $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}_n] = p$

How close is \hat{p}_n to p for a given n ?

How much patients do we need to try so that \hat{p}_n is not farther than p by some ε ?



Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Recap: Independent Random Variables
- 3 Markov's Inequality
- 4 Chebyshev's Inequality
- 5 Hoeffding's Inequality



Recap: Independence

Independence

- Two events A and B are **independent** if $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$



Recap: Independence

Independence

- Two events A and B are **independent** if $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$
- Two random variables (r.v.'s) X and Y are independent if

$$F_{X,Y}(x,y) = F_X(x)F_Y(y) \quad \forall x,y$$



Recap: Independence

Independence

- Two events A and B are **independent** if $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$
- Two random variables (r.v.'s) X and Y are independent if

$$F_{X,Y}(x,y) = F_X(x)F_Y(y) \quad \forall x,y$$

- X and Y are independent $\implies \mathbb{E}[XY] = \mathbb{E}[X]\mathbb{E}[Y]$.
- A collection of r.v.'s X_1, \dots, X_n are independent if every pair in the collection is independent.
- If X_1, \dots, X_n are independent and have identical distribution (i.e., $F_{X_1} = \dots = F_{X_n}$), then they are called **independent identically distributed (i.i.d.)** r.v.'s.



Recap: Asymptotic Convergence Results

Consider i.i.d. r.v.'s X_1, \dots, X_n , with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mu$ and $\text{Var}(X_1) = \sigma^2 < \infty$.

- Sample mean:

$$\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

- \bar{X}_n is an **unbiased** estimate of μ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_n] = \mu$$

- By the Central Limit Theorem (CLT), \bar{X}_n **asymptotically** converges to μ **in distribution**:

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{distribution}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$



Recap: Asymptotic Convergence Results

Consider i.i.d. r.v.'s X_1, \dots, X_n , with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mu$ and $\text{Var}(X_1) = \sigma^2 < \infty$.

- Sample mean:

$$\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

- \bar{X}_n is an **unbiased** estimate of μ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_n] = \mu$$

- By the Central Limit Theorem (CLT), \bar{X}_n **asymptotically** converges to μ **in distribution**:

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{distribution}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

- By the Strong Law of Large Numbers (SLLN), \bar{X}_n **asymptotically** converges to μ **almost surely**:

$$\bar{X}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{almost surely}} \mu$$



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

- How close is \overline{X}_n to μ when n is *finite* (and not necessarily large)?



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

- How close is \bar{X}_n to μ when n is *finite* (and not necessarily large)?
- How many samples n do we need so that \bar{X}_n does not exceed μ by no more than a specified ε ?



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

- How close is \bar{X}_n to μ when n is *finite* (and not necessarily large)?
- How many samples n do we need so that \bar{X}_n does not exceed μ by no more than a specified ε ?
- Can we derive a *data-dependent* rule to stop collecting samples for to reach a given accuracy?



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

- How close is \bar{X}_n to μ when n is *finite* (and not necessarily large)?
- How many samples n do we need so that \bar{X}_n does not exceed μ by no more than a specified ε ?
- Can we derive a *data-dependent* rule to stop collecting samples for to reach a given accuracy?

Concentration inequalities (or tail inequalities) are tools from probability to study the deviation of a r.v. from its mean *non-asymptotically* (i.e., for *finite* n).



What About Non-asymptotic Regime?

CLT and SLLN provide nice results but asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

- How close is \bar{X}_n to μ when n is *finite* (and not necessarily large)?
- How many samples n do we need so that \bar{X}_n does not exceed μ by no more than a specified ε ?
- Can we derive a *data-dependent* rule to stop collecting samples for to reach a given accuracy?

Concentration inequalities (or tail inequalities) are tools from probability to study the deviation of a r.v. from its mean *non-asymptotically* (i.e., for *finite* n).

Most often, concentration inequalities provide upper bounds on

$$\mathbb{P}\left(f(X_1, \dots, X_n) > \varepsilon\right)$$



for a finite set of *(conditionally) independent* r.v.'s X_1, \dots, X_n .

Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Recap: Independent Random Variables
- 3 Markov's Inequality**
- 4 Chebyshev's Inequality
- 5 Hoeffding's Inequality



Markov's Inequality

Theorem (Markov's Inequality)

Suppose X is a non-negative r.v. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{\varepsilon}$$



Markov's Inequality

Theorem (Markov's Inequality)

Suppose X is a non-negative r.v. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{\varepsilon}$$

Proof. Define $Y = \mathbb{I}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} 1 & X \geq \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$



Markov's Inequality

Theorem (Markov's Inequality)

Suppose X is a non-negative r.v. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{\varepsilon}$$

Proof. Define $Y = \mathbb{I}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} 1 & X \geq \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$. Y is a Bernoulli r.v. and $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = \mathbb{E}[Y] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X}{\varepsilon}\right]$$



Markov's Inequality: Examples

- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha \mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ valid for $X \geq 0$.



Markov's Inequality: Examples

- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha \mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ valid for $X \geq 0$.
- $X \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.



Markov's Inequality: Examples

- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha \mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ valid for $X \geq 0$.
- $X \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.
- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(e^X \geq e^\varepsilon) \leq e^{-\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^X]$



Markov's Inequality: Examples

- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha \mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ valid for $X \geq 0$.
- $X \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.
- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(e^X \geq e^\varepsilon) \leq e^{-\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^X]$
- For X_1, \dots, X_n i.i.d. with mean μ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu - \bar{X}_n > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1 - \mu}{\varepsilon + 1 - \mu} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon + 1}$$



Markov's Inequality: Examples

- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha \mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ valid for $X \geq 0$.
- $X \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.
- $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(e^X \geq e^\varepsilon) \leq e^{-\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^X]$
- For X_1, \dots, X_n i.i.d. with mean μ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu - \bar{X}_n > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1 - \mu}{\varepsilon + 1 - \mu} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon + 1}$$

Theorem (Markov's Inequality)

Suppose X is a non-negative r.v. and f is a monotonically increasing function. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(X)]}{f(\varepsilon)}$$



Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Recap: Independent Random Variables
- 3 Markov's Inequality
- 4 Chebyshev's Inequality**
- 5 Hoeffding's Inequality



Chebyshev's Inequality

Theorem (Chebyshev's Inequality)

For all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(X)}{\varepsilon^2}$$



Chebyshev's Inequality

Theorem (Chebyshev's Inequality)

For all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(X)}{\varepsilon^2}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]|^2 \geq \varepsilon^2) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]|^2]}{\varepsilon^2} && \text{(Markov's inequality)} \\ &= \frac{\text{Var}(X)}{\varepsilon^2}\end{aligned}$$



Chebyshev's Inequality: Examples

Example 1: A **fair** coin is tossed 20 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_{20} - \mu| \geq 0.2) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(\bar{X}_{20})}{0.2^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \text{Var}(X_1)}{0.04} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{4}}{0.04}$$



Chebyshev's Inequality: Examples

Example 1: A **fair** coin is tossed 20 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_{20} - \mu| \geq 0.2) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(\bar{X}_{20})}{0.2^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \text{Var}(X_1)}{0.04} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{4}}{0.04}$$

Example 2: A **fair** die is rolled 60 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes. Upper bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\sum_i X_i - 210| \geq 20)$$



Chebyshev's Inequality: Examples

Example 1: A **fair** coin is tossed 20 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_{20} - \mu| \geq 0.2) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(\bar{X}_{20})}{0.2^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \text{Var}(X_1)}{0.04} = \frac{\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{4}}{0.04}$$

Example 2: A **fair** die is rolled 60 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes. Upper bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\sum_i X_i - 210| \geq 20)$$

- $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \frac{7}{2}$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\sum_i X_i] = 210$.
- $\text{Var}(\sum_i X_i) = \frac{35}{12}$
- $\mathbb{P}(|\sum_i X_i - 210| \geq 20) \leq \frac{175}{20^2}$



Chebyshev's Inequality

Theorem (Chebyshev's Inequality for I.I.D. Variables)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. r.v.'s. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(X_1)}{\varepsilon^2}$$



Chebyshev's Inequality

Theorem (Chebyshev's Inequality for I.I.D. Variables)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. r.v.'s. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(X_1)}{\varepsilon^2}$$

Chebyshev's inequality provides a result that decays at a rate $\frac{1}{n}$.



Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Recap: Independent Random Variables
- 3 Markov's Inequality
- 4 Chebyshev's Inequality
- 5 Hoeffding's Inequality**



Hoeffding's Inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding's Inequality)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be *independent* r.v.'s with support $[0, 1]$. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \leq -\varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding's Inequality)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be *independent* r.v.'s with support $[0, 1]$. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \leq -\varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

- Using a union bound:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding's Inequality)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be *independent* r.v.'s with support $[0, 1]$. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \leq -\varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

- Using a union bound:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$

- Also, $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2e^{-2n\varepsilon^2}$
- If X_i 's are *i.i.d.* with mean μ : $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu\right| \leq \varepsilon\right) \geq 2e^{-2n\varepsilon^2}$.

Hoeffding's bound decays *exponentially* fast in n .



Hoeffding's Inequality: Alternative Form

If X_i 's are i.i.d. with mean μ : $\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \underbrace{e^{-2n\varepsilon^2}}_{=\delta}$

Solving $\delta = e^{-2n\varepsilon^2}$ yields $\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}$ Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu \geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \leq \delta$$

or alternatively:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta$$

For X_1, \dots, X_n i.i.d., it holds that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta$$



Hoeffding's Inequality: Proof

The proof of Hoeffding's inequality relies on the following lemma:

Lemma (Hoeffding's Lemma)

Let X be a r.v. supported on $[a, b]$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X - \mathbb{E}[X])}] \leq \frac{\lambda^2(b - a)^2}{8}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$$

For proof, see Yevgeny's lecture notes.



Hoeffding's Inequality: Proof

Proof of (i). Let $Z := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]$.



Hoeffding's Inequality: Proof

Proof of (i). Let $Z := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]$. For any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(e^{\lambda Z} \geq e^{\lambda \varepsilon}) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Z}] \quad (\text{Markov's inequality}) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i])}\right] \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])}] \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda^2/8}] = e^{-\lambda \varepsilon + \frac{n\lambda^2}{8}} \quad (\text{Hoeffding's lemma})\end{aligned}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality: Proof

Proof of (i). Let $Z := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]$. For any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(Z \geq \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(e^{\lambda Z} \geq e^{\lambda \varepsilon}) \\
 &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Z}] \quad (\text{Markov's inequality}) \\
 &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i])}\right] \\
 &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])}] \\
 &\leq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda^2/8}] = e^{-\lambda \varepsilon + \frac{n\lambda^2}{8}} \quad (\text{Hoeffding's lemma})
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \varepsilon) \leq \min_{\lambda > 0} e^{-\lambda \varepsilon + \frac{n\lambda^2}{8}}$. The best bound is attained at $\lambda = 4\varepsilon n^{-1}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \varepsilon) \leq e^{-2\varepsilon^2/n}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality: Generic Ranges

Theorem (Hoeffding's Inequality)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be *independent* r.v.'s such that $X_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ *almost surely*, that is $\mathbb{P}(X_i \in [a_i, b_i]) = 1$. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}}$$
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \leq -\varepsilon\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality: Examples

Example 1 (revisited): A **fair** coin is tossed 20 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes.

By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{20} \sum_{i=1}^{20} X_i - \frac{1}{2}\right| \geq 0.1\right) \leq 2e^{-2 \cdot 20 \cdot 0.1^2}$$



Hoeffding's Inequality: Examples

Example 1 (revisited): A **fair** coin is tossed 20 times. Let X_1, \dots, X_{20} be the realized outcomes.

By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{20} \sum_{i=1}^{20} X_i - \frac{1}{2}\right| \geq 0.1\right) \leq 2e^{-2 \cdot 20 \cdot 0.1^2}$$

Compare it to the result from Chebyshev's inequality.



Hoeffding's Inequality: Sub-Gaussian Case

Sub-Gaussian Random Variable

A r.v. X is said to be **R -sub-Gaussian** if

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X-\mathbb{E}[X])}] \leq \frac{\lambda^2 R^2}{2}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$$

- A r.v. with range $[a, b]$ is sub-Gaussian with $R = \frac{b-a}{2}$ (by Hoeffding's Lemma)
- A Gaussian r.v. is sub-Gaussian with $R = \sigma$.
- Intuitively, the tail of a sub-Gaussian r.v. decays at least as fast as that of a Gaussian.



Hoeffding's Inequality: Sub-Gaussian Case

Sub-Gaussian Random Variable

A r.v. X is said to be ***R*-sub-Gaussian** if

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X - \mathbb{E}[X])}] \leq \frac{\lambda^2 R^2}{2}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$$

- A r.v. with range $[a, b]$ is sub-Gaussian with $R = \frac{b-a}{2}$ (by Hoeffding's Lemma)
- A Gaussian r.v. is sub-Gaussian with $R = \sigma$.
- Intuitively, the tail of a sub-Gaussian r.v. decays at least as fast as that of a Gaussian.

Theorem (Hoeffding's Inequality: Sub-Gaussian Case)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. ***R*-sub-Gaussian** r.v.'s with mean μ . Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mu \leq R \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)}$$

