Lecture 04: Concentration Inequalities III

Nikola Zlatanov

Innopolis University

Advanced Statistics

13-th of Feb to 20-th of Feb, 2023



Motivation

- Recall that the bound on the tail of normalized sum of Gaussian RVs decays with rate which at least with $e^{-t^2/2}$.
- Recall that the bound on the tail of the sum of symmetric Bernoulli decays with rate which at least with $e^{-t^2/2}$, using Hoeffding's inequality.
- Recall that the bound on the tail of the sum of bounded RVs decays with rate which at least with e^{-ct^2} , using Hoeffding's inequality.
- Now the question is: Is this all? Are there any other RVs whose tail of the normalized sum decays also exponentially with t^2 ?
- More precisely: What is the biggest class of distributions for i.i.d. X_i 's such that the following bound holds

$$\Pr\left\{ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{X_i - E[X_i]}{\sigma} \right| \ge t \right\} \le c_1 e^{-c_2 t^2}, \text{ for } t \ge 0$$
 (1)

• Well, if (1) holds in general for $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$, then it holds also for n = 1, in which case we obtain

$$\Pr\left\{ \left| \frac{X_1 - E[X_1]}{\sigma} \right| \ge t \right\} \le c_1 e^{-c_2 t^2}, \text{ for } t \ge 0$$
 (2)

- Hence, each term in the sum in (1) must themselves satisfy (2).
- \bullet The RV X that satisfies (2) is called a sub-Gaussian RV.
- The term sub-Gaussian intuitively means that the tail of X behaves like a Gaussian tail, up to some constants.
- ullet Note, X is not Gaussian, only its tail behaves like a Gaussian tail, up to some constants.

• Note that instead of (2), I can investigate can $\Pr\{|X_1 - E[X_1]| \ge t\}$ since this only changes the constants

$$\Pr\{|X_1 - E[X_1]| \ge t\} = \Pr\{|X_1 - E[X_1]| \ge \sigma \hat{t}\}$$

$$= \Pr\left\{\frac{|X_1 - E[X_1]|}{\sigma} \ge \hat{t}\right\}$$

$$\le c_1 e^{-c_2 \hat{t}^2} = c_1 e^{-\frac{c_2}{\sigma^2} t^2} = c_1 e^{-\hat{c}_2 t^2}$$
(3)

- In addition, for all sub-Gaussian RVs, without loss of generality we can assume E[X] = 0.
- This is only for simplicity of notations, as not to drag the terms $X_i E[X_i]$ in the equations, since always X with E[X] = 0 can be obtained from RV \hat{X} with $E[\hat{X}] \neq 0$ using $X = \hat{X} E[\hat{X}]$.

- Thm (Sub-Gaussian Lemma): For any sub-Gaussian RV X, the following statements are equivalent:
 - 1. Tails: there $\exists c_1 > 0$, such that the following holds

$$\Pr\{|X| \ge t\} \le 2e^{-t^2/c_1^2}, \text{ for } t \ge 1$$
(4)

2. Moments: there $\exists c_2 > 0$, such that the following holds

$$(E[|X|^p])^{1/p} \le c_2 \sqrt{p} \tag{5}$$

3. There $\exists c_3$, such that the following holds

$$E[e^{X^2/c_3^2}] \le 2 \tag{6}$$

4. MGF: there $\exists c_4$, such that the following holds

$$E[e^{\lambda X}] \le e^{\lambda^2 c_4^2} \tag{7}$$



- The sub-Gaussian lemma says that if X satisfies anyone of the properties (4) to (7), then it satisfies all properties (4) to (7).
- Note, sub-Gaussian RVs can have better tails than the Gaussian tail, but cannot have worse tails than the Gaussian tail, up to some constants.
- To prove the sub-Gaussian properties, we will use the following: Lemma (Integral Identity): \forall non-negative RVs X, the following holds

$$E[X] = \int_0^\infty \Pr\{X \ge t\} dt \tag{8}$$

Proof: Let $\mathbf{1}(b) = 1$ if b = True and $\mathbf{1}(b) = 0$ if b = False. Then, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$x = \int_0^x dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}(t \le x)dt \tag{9}$$

Now in (9), we substitute x with an RV X and take expectations from both sides, to obtain

$$\begin{split} E[X] &= E\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}(t \le x)dt\right] = \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}(t \le x)dt\right] f_X(x)dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}(t \le x)f_X(x)dx\right]dt = \int_0^\infty E\left[\mathbf{1}(t \le X)\right]dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left(1 \times \Pr\{t \ge X\} + 0 \times \Pr\{t < X\}\right)dt = \int_0^\infty \Pr\{X \ge t\}dt \end{split}$$

Q.E.D. (Integral Identity)

• Proof of sub-Gaussian Lemma Property 2 using Property 1. Assume Property 1 holds, then:

$$E[|X|^{p}] = \int_{0}^{\infty} \Pr\{|X|^{p} \ge t\} dt \stackrel{(a)}{=} \int_{0}^{\infty} \Pr\{|X|^{p} \ge s^{p}\} p s^{p-1} ds$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\le} 2p \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-s^{2}/c_{1}^{2}} s^{p-1} ds \stackrel{(c)}{=} 2p \times \frac{1}{2} c_{1}^{p} \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1\right)! = c_{1}^{p} p \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1\right)!$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\le} c_{1}^{p} p \left(\frac{p}{2}\right)^{p/2 - 1} = c_{1}^{p} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{p/2 - 1} p p^{p/2 - 1} = 2 \left(\frac{c_{1}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{p} p^{p/2}, \quad (10)$$

where (a) is due to variable change $s^p = t$ leading to $dt = ps^{p-1}ds$, (b) is due to Property 1, (c) is due to $\int_0^\infty e^{-s^2/c_1^2} s^{p-1} ds = \frac{1}{2} c_1^p \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1\right)!, \text{ and } (d) \text{ is since factorial is } p/2 - 1 \text{ times multiplication of } p/2. \text{ Finally,}$

$$E[|X|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \le \left(2\left(\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^p p^{p/2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{2^{1/p}c_1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{p} = c_2\sqrt{p},$$
 where $c_2 = 2^{1/p}c_1/\sqrt{2}$.

• Proof of sub-Gaussian Lemma Property 3 using Property 2:

$$\begin{split} E\left[e^{X^2/c_3^2}\right] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} E\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{X^{2k}}{c_3^{2k}k!}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{E[X^{2k}]}{c_3^{2k}k!} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_2^{2k}(2k)^k}{c_3^{2k}k!} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_2^{2k}(2k)^k}{c_3^{2k}(k/e)^k} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_2^{2k}(2)^k}{c_3^{2k}(1/e)^k} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2ec_2^2}{c_3^2}\right)^k \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2ec_2^2}{c_3^2}} \stackrel{(e)}{=} 2, \end{split}$$

where (a) is from the Taylor series expansion of e^x , given by $e^x = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x^k/k!$, (b) is from (10), (c) is from Sterling's bound $k! \ge k^k/(e^k)$, (d) holds for some $c_3 > c_2\sqrt{2e}$, where we use the identity $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x^k = 1/(1-x)$ for 0 < x < 1, and (e) holds if $c_3 = 2c_2\sqrt{e}$.

• Proof of sub-Gaussian Lemma Property 4 using Property 3: Note that $(ax - b\lambda)^2 \ge 0$ always holds. Expanding, we obtain $a^2x^2 - 2abx\lambda + b^2\lambda^2 \ge 0$ always hold, or equivalently $2abx\lambda \le a^2x^2 + b^2\lambda^2$, which is equivalent to

$$x\lambda \le \frac{\alpha}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2\alpha}\lambda^2,\tag{11}$$

where $\alpha = a/b$.

We can now prove our inequality for $|\lambda| > \sqrt{\ln(2)}$ as

$$\begin{split} E[e^{\lambda X}] &\overset{(a)}{\leq} E[e^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}\lambda^2}e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}X^2}] = e^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}\lambda^2}E[e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}X^2}] \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} 2e^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}\lambda^2} \overset{(c)}{\leq} e^{\lambda^2c_4^2}, \text{ if } |\lambda| > \sqrt{\ln(2)} \end{split}$$

where (a) is due to (11),(b) is due to Property 3 when $\alpha \leq e/(2c_2^2)$ and (c) holds if $|\lambda| > \sqrt{\ln(2)}$ and by setting $c_4^2 = 1 + 1/(2\alpha) \geq 1 + e/c_2^2$.



- Proof of sub-Gaussian Lemma Property 4 using Property 3 when $|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{\ln(2)}$?
- If someone can provide me with such proof, I give 5pts!

• Proof of sub-Gaussian Lemma Property 1 using Property 4:

$$\Pr\{X \ge t\} = \Pr\left\{e^{\lambda X} \ge e^{\lambda t}\right\} \stackrel{(a)}{\le} \frac{E[e^{\lambda X}]}{e^{\lambda t}} \stackrel{(b)}{\le} \frac{e^{\lambda^2 c_4^2}}{e^{\lambda t}} = e^{\lambda^2 c_4^2 - \lambda t}$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} e^{\frac{t^2 c_4^2}{4} - \frac{t^2}{2}} \stackrel{(d)}{=} e^{-t^2/c_1^2},$$

where (a) is due to Markov, (b) is due to Property 4, (c) is by setting $\lambda = t/2$, and (d) is by setting $c_1^2 = 2/(2 - c_4^2)$, for $c_4^2 < 2$. Now, it is also easy to obtain from above that

$$\Pr\{-X \ge t\} \le e^{-t^2/c_1^2},$$

also holds. Combining the talls of $\Pr\{X \geq t\}$ and $\Pr\{-X \geq t\}$, we obtain

$$\Pr\{|X| \ge t\} \le 2e^{-t^2/c_1^2},$$

Q.E.D

- We now can prove the following theorem
- Thm: If X_i , for i = 1, 2, ..., n, are independent sub-Gaussian, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ is also sub-Gaussian.
- Proof: We need to prove one of the four Properties, since they are all equivalent. Let's prove Property 4, i.e., that there $\exists \hat{c}_4$ (given by $\hat{c}_4^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n c_{4,i}^2$, for i=1,2...,n such that

$$E\left[e^{\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}}\right] \le e^{\lambda^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{4,i}^{2}} \le e^{\lambda^{2} n \max_{i} c_{4,i}^{2}} \tag{12}$$

Let's start

$$E\left[e^{\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}}\right] = E\left[\prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{\lambda X_{i}}\right] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \prod_{i=1}^{n} E[e^{\lambda X_{i}}] \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{\lambda^{2} c_{4,i}^{2}}$$
$$= e^{\lambda^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{4,i}^{2}} \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} e^{\lambda^{2} n \max_{i} c_{4,i}^{2}}$$

where (a) comes from independence, (b) comes from Property 4 for each X_i , and (c) comes from $\sum_{i=1}^n c_{4,i}^2 \le n \max_i c_{4,i}^2$

- Now, since we proved that if X_i , for i = 1, 2, ..., n are independent sub-Gaussian, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ is also sub-Gaussian, we can state Property 1 for $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ as the following theorem
- Thm (General Hoeffding's inequality): If X_i , for i = 1, 2, ..., n are independent sub-Gaussian, then the following holds

$$\Pr\left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \right| \ge t \right\} \le 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{1,i}^2}} \le 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{n \max_{i} c_{1,i}^2}}$$
(13)

- Proof: Since $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ are sub-Gaussian, Property 1 holds, from which (13) follows.
- Note that (13) is the Hoeffding's inequality but now it is more general since it holds for all sub-Gaussian RVs and now it is derived using a different method than before.



- Examples of Sub-Gaussian
 - Gaussian
 - $\circ\,$ Any discrete or continuous distribution bounded on a finite interval.



- Although sub-Gaussian cover a wide range of distributions, there are many other important distributions that do not belong to the sub-Gaussian class of distributions.
- For example: The Poisson distribution, the Exponential distribution, etc.
- That is why we need another class of distributions.
- The class of distribution that we will investigate now, is the class of sub-exponential distributions.
- Sub-exponential distributions are especially useful when: If X is sub-Gaussian, in which case X^2 is sub-exponential. To see this, let $Y = X^2$, and let X be sub-Gaussian. Let's check the tail of Y

$$\Pr\{Y > t\} = \Pr\{X^2 > t\} = \Pr\{|X| > \sqrt{t}\} \le 2e^{-t/c},$$

where c > 0 is some constant. Hence, the tail of Y is not sub-Gaussian, thereby Y is not a sub-Gaussian RV.

- \bullet Sub-exponential Lemma: For any sub-exponential RV X, the following statements are equivalent:
 - 1. Tails: There $\exists k_1 > 0$, such that the following holds

$$\Pr\{|X| \ge t\} \le 2e^{-t/k_1}, \text{ for } t \ge 1$$
 (14)

2. Moments: There $\exists k_2$, such that the following holds

$$(E[|X|^p])^{1/p} \le k_2 p \tag{15}$$

3. There $\exists k_3$, such that the following holds

$$E[e^{|X|/k_3}] \le 2 \tag{16}$$

4. MGF: There $\exists k_4$, for X with E[X] = 0, such that the following holds

$$E[e^{\lambda X}] \le e^{\lambda^2 k_4^2}$$
, but only for $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{k_4}$, (17)

otherwise, for $|\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{k_A}$, $E[e^{\lambda X}] = \infty$.

• Proof: By using the same methods as per the sub-Gaussian. DIY



- Examples of Sub-exponential RVs
 - Any sub-Gaussian since its tail is $e^{-t^2} < e^{-t}$
 - Any sub-Gaussian RV squared
 - Exponential distribution: $f_X(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda}e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}, x \geq 0.$
 - Poisson distribution. The tail decays with $e^{-t \ln(t)} < e^{-t}$
- How about the tail of the sum of sub-exponentials $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$, where X_i , $\forall i$ are sub-exponential RVs? Does its tail also decay with e^{-t} ? Maybe it decays slower, or faster?
- Here, we have a surprise, given by the theorem on the following page.

• Thm (Bernstein's Inequality): The tail of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$, where X_i , $\forall i$ are sub-exponential RVs with $E[X_i] = 0$, satisfies

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}\right| \geq t\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{t^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{4,i}^{2}}, \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}}\right\}\right)$$

$$\leq 2 \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{t^{2}}{n \max_{i} k_{4,i}^{2}}, \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}}\right\}\right)$$

$$= \begin{cases} 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}^{2}} \frac{t^{2}}{n}\right) & \text{if } n > \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}}\\ 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}^{2}} t\right) & \text{if } n < \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}}, \end{cases}$$
(18)

where the $k_{4,i}$'s are positive constants.

• Proof (via MGF):

$$\Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i} \geq t\right\} = \Pr\left\{e^{\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}} \geq e^{\lambda t}\right\} \leq \frac{E\left[e^{\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}}\right]}{e^{\lambda t}}$$

$$= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} E\left[e^{\lambda X_{i}}\right]}{e^{\lambda t}} \leq \frac{e^{\lambda^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{4,i}^{2}}}{e^{\lambda t}} = e^{\lambda^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{4,i}^{2} - \lambda t}$$
(19)

We now need to maximize the right-hand side w.r.t. λ , however, λ is constrained to $|\lambda| \leq \min_{i} \frac{1}{k_{4,i}} = \frac{1}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}}$. Doing constrained optimization leads to the optimal choice of λ , given by

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ \frac{t}{2\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{4,i}^{2}}, \frac{1}{\max_{i} k_{4,i}} \right\}$$
 (20)

Substituting (20) into (19), we obtained the one sided Bernstein's Inequality as

$$\Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i} \geq t\right\} \leq \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{t^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{1,i}^{2}}, \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{1,i}}\right\}\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{t^{2}}{n \max_{i} k_{1,i}^{2}}, \frac{t}{\max_{i} k_{1,i}}\right\}\right) \tag{21}$$

Following, the same procedure for deriving $\Pr \{-\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \geq t\}$, we again reach (21). Therefore, $\Pr \{|\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i| \geq t\}$ is simply two times (21). Q.E.D.



- What is very important in the Bernstein's Inequality, given by (18), is that
 - For $n < \frac{t}{\max\limits_{i} k_{4,i}}$, the tail of the sub-exponential sum goes towards zero exponentially with t
 - For $n > \frac{t}{\max k_{4,i}}$, the tail of the sub-exponential sum goes towards zero exponentially with t^2 , which is identical to the rate of the decay of the sub-Gaussian sum.

- Let X be n-dimensional vector given by $X = [X_1, X_2, ..., X_n]$.
- ullet The Euclidean norm of a random vector X is given by

$$||X||_2 = \sqrt{XX^T} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2},$$
 (22)

where $(\cdot)^T$ denotes the transpose operation.

- Note that, for a vector X, its norm, $||X||_2$ represents the length of the vector X, or equivalently its magnitude.
- The concentration inequalities that we have studied so far will allow us to study lengths of random vectors with independent components relatively easy.
- The Thin Shell Phenomenon of Sub-Gaussian Vectors will provide us with new insight on how we should visualize the lengths (i.e., norms) of high-dimensional sub-Gaussian vectors.

Lengths of Gaussian vectors:

- Let $X = [X_1, X_2, ..., X_n]$ be a Gaussian vector comprised of elements X_i that are i.i.d. zero-mean unit-variance Gaussian RVs. Then the length/magnitude of this vector is given by (22).
- Now let's compare the lengths of X for the case when the dimension n is n = 1 to the case when n is very high.
 - a) When n=1

b) When n is very high

• Thm (Thin Shell): If the vector $\mathbf{X} = [X_1, X_2, ..., X_n]$ is comprised of elements that are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian RVs with $E[X_i^2] = 1$, then

$$\Pr\left\{ \left(||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \le (1-\delta)\sqrt{n} \right) \bigcup \left(||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \ge (1+\delta)\sqrt{n} \right) \right\} \\
\le 2 \exp\left(-n\frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k} \min\left\{ \frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k}, 1 \right\} \right) \tag{23}$$

for some constants k > 0 and $0 \le \delta \le 1$.

• Proof: Note that

$$\Pr\left\{ \left(||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \le (1-\delta)\sqrt{n} \right) \bigcup \left(||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \ge (1+\delta)\sqrt{n} \right) \right\}$$
$$= \Pr\left\{ ||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \le (1-\delta)\sqrt{n} \right\} + \Pr\left\{ ||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \ge (1+\delta)\sqrt{n} \right\}$$
(24)

since the events $||\mathbf{X}||_2 \leq (1 - \delta)$ and $||\mathbf{X}||_2 \geq (1 + \delta)\sqrt{n}$ are disjoint.

Hence, to prove the Thm, we need to separately derive $\Pr\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \geq (1+\delta)\sqrt{n}\}$ and $\Pr\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_2 \leq (1-\delta)\sqrt{n}\}$ and then sum them. This is done in the following pages.

Proof Continuation:

$$\Pr\left\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_{2} \geq (1+\delta)\sqrt{n}\right\} = \Pr\left\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_{2}^{2} \geq (1+\delta)^{2}n\right\}$$

$$= \Pr\left\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_{2}^{2} \geq n + 2\delta n + \delta^{2}n\right\} = \Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2} - n \geq n\delta(2+\delta)\right\}$$

$$= \Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{i}^{2} - 1) \geq n\delta(2+\delta)\right\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} \geq n\delta(2+\delta)\right\}$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \exp\left(-n\frac{\delta(2+\delta)}{k}\min\left\{\frac{\delta(2+\delta)}{k}, 1\right\}\right)$$

$$(25)$$

where (a) comes by making the substitution $Y_i = X_i^2 - 1$ and (b) follows by applying Bernstein's Inequality which is valid since Y_i is sub-exponential and $E[Y_i] = E[X_i^2] - 1 = 0$. Note that since Y_i 's are i.i.d., the constants $k_{4,i}$ in Bernstein's Inequality satisfy $k_{4,i} = k$, $\forall i$.

Proof Continuation: Using the same technique, we can derive

$$\Pr \left\{ ||\mathbf{X}||_{2} \leq (1 - \delta)\sqrt{n} \right\} = \Pr \left\{ ||\mathbf{X}||_{2}^{2} \leq (1 - \delta)^{2} n \right\}
= \Pr \left\{ ||\mathbf{X}||_{2}^{2} \leq n - 2\delta n + \delta^{2} n \right\} = \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2} - n \leq -n\delta(2 - \delta) \right\}
= \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{i}^{2} - 1) \leq -n\delta(2 - \delta) \right\} = \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - X_{i}^{2}) \geq n\delta(2 - \delta) \right\}
\stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} \geq n\delta(2 - \delta) \right\} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \exp \left(-n \frac{\delta(2 - \delta)}{k} \min \left\{ \frac{\delta(2 - \delta)}{k}, 1 \right\} \right)$$
(26)

where (a) comes by making the substitution $Y_i = 1 - X_i^2$ and (b) follows by applying Bernstein's Inequality which is valid since Y_i is sub-exponential and $E[Y_i] = E[X_i^2] - 1 = 0$.

Proof Continuation: Now, since

$$\delta(2-\delta) \le \delta(2+\delta) \tag{27}$$

for $0 \le \delta \le 1$, (25), can be upper bounded as

$$\Pr\left\{||\boldsymbol{X}||_{2} \geq (1+\delta)\sqrt{n}\right\} \leq \exp\left(-n\frac{\delta(2+\delta)}{k}\min\left\{\frac{\delta(2+\delta)}{k},1\right\}\right)$$
$$\leq \exp\left(-n\frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k}\min\left\{\frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k},1\right\}\right) (28)$$

Summing (28) and (26), we obtain (23). Q.E.D.

- What the Thin-Shell Thm tells us is that the length of X is very close to \sqrt{n} with very high probability.
- In other words, what the The Thin Shell Phenomenon tells us is that high-dimensional vectors, comprised of n sub-Gaussian RVs, live very close to the surface of an n-dimensional sphere with radius \sqrt{n} .
- Moreover, it tells us that is extremely unlikely for any high-dimensional vector, comprises of n sub-Gaussian RVs, to live above or bellow the surface of the sphere with radius \sqrt{n} . In fact, the probability that we will find such a vector living at a distance δ above or bellow the surface of an n-dimensional sphere is

$$2\exp\left(-n\frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k}\min\left\{\frac{\delta(2-\delta)}{k},1\right\}\right)\to 0$$
, as $n\to\infty$