

Lecture #2: concentration inequalities

Hoeffding lemma: For X a random

variable s.t. $X \in [a, b]$ a.s., then $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[e^{s(X - \mathbb{E}[X])}] = \ln \mathbb{E}[e^{sx}] - s\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \frac{s^2(b-a)^2}{8}$$

Proof:

define for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ $\psi(\delta) = \ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}]$.

Note that $\mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}] = \int e^{\delta x} dP(x)$ can be differentiated

under the integral:
for any compact I , $\forall s \in I, x \in [a, b], x \in I^n \leq e^{\max_{I^n} |\delta|} \max_{I^n} \max(|x|, |b|) \max(|a|, |b|)$

$$\text{so: } \psi'(\delta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X e^{\delta X}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}]}$$

$$\text{Similarly: } \psi''(\delta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X^2 e^{\delta X}] \mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}] - \mathbb{E}[X e^{\delta X}]^2}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}]^2}$$

$$= \text{Var}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$$

under the probability Q defined as:

$$\frac{dQ}{dP}(w) = \frac{e^{sX(w)}}{\mathbb{E}_P[e^sX]}$$

$$\text{So } \psi''(s) = \inf_{\mu \in [0,1]} \left[\mathbb{E}_Q[(X-\mu)^2] \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\left(X - \frac{a+b}{2} \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{(a-b)^2}{4},$$

ψ is C^2 , so that Taylor expansion yields for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $c_s \in [0,s]$:

$$\psi(s) = \psi(0) + s \psi'(0) + \frac{s^2}{2} \psi''(c_s)$$

$$\leq 0 + s \mathbb{E}[X] + \frac{s^2}{2}$$

□

Hoeffding lemma (conditional version)

X r.v. such that $X \in [a,b]$ a.s. Then for all σ -algebra \mathcal{G} and $s \in \mathbb{R}$: $\ln \mathbb{E}[e^{s(X-\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}])} | \mathcal{G}] \leq \frac{s^2}{8}(b-a)^2$

we could work with a similar (but adapted) proof → see exercise session #1

Let's prove it in the less elegant, but original way.

Proof

Let $Y = X - \mathbb{E}[X|g] \in [A, B]$

where

$$A = a - \mathbb{E}[X|g]$$

$$B = b - \mathbb{E}[X|g]$$

are both measurable

and $B-A = b-a > 0$

$$Y = \frac{B-Y}{B-A} A + \frac{Y-A}{B-A} B$$

since $y \mapsto e^y$ is convex: $e^Y \leq \frac{B-Y}{B-A} e^{xA} + \frac{Y-A}{B-A} e^{xB}$

Taking $\mathbb{E}[Y|g]$ using $\mathbb{E}[Y|g] = 0$ and A, B g -measurable

$$\mathbb{E}[e^Y|g] \leq \frac{B}{B-A} e^{xA} - A e^{xB}$$

Now by a function study (eg the proof of unconditional Hoeffding bound):

$\forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}, \forall p \in [0, 1], \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\ln(p e^{su} + (1-p)e^{sv}) \leq s(pu + (1-p)v) + \frac{s^2}{8} (v-u)^2$$

In particular:

$$B > 0 \\ A \leq 0$$

$$\frac{B}{B-A} e^{xA} - \frac{A}{B-A} e^{xB} \leq \exp\left(s\left(\frac{BA}{B-A} - \frac{AB}{B-A}\right) + \frac{s^2}{8}(B-A)^2\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\frac{\delta^2}{8}(b-a)^2\right)$$

Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Y} | g] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\delta^2}{8}(b-a)^2\right) \quad \square$$

Hoeffding-Azuma inequality

Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a filtration and let $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be a sequence of adapted random variables (i.e. $\forall t \geq 1, X_t$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable), that are bounded

$\forall t, a_t \leq X_t \leq b_t$ a.s. when $a_t, b_t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t - \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2}\right)$$

Note: Hoeffding's inequality is the special case when all X_t are independent and $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_{t-1})$, so that $\mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mathbb{E}[X_t]$

Proof

Denote the martingale $S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T X_t - \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$

Markov inequality yields for any $\eta > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(S_T > \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\eta S_T} > e^{\eta \varepsilon}) \leq e^{-\eta \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^{\eta S_T}]$$

We show by induction that $\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_T}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{8} \sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2\right)$

- For $T=1$, conditional Hoeffding's lemma gives:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_1} | F_0] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{8} \sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2\right)$$

The same goes for $\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_1}]$.

- Assume it holds for $T \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_{T+1}}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_{T+1}} | F_T]]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma S_T} e^{\gamma(X_{T+1} - \mathbb{E}[X_{T+1} | F_T])} | F_T\right]\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_T} \mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma(X_{T+1} - \mathbb{E}[X_{T+1} | F_T])} | F_T]]$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_T}] e^{\frac{\gamma^2}{8} (b_{T+1} - a_{T+1})^2}$$

↑ Conditional Hoeffding Lemma

$$\leq e^{\frac{\gamma^2}{8} \sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2} e^{\frac{\gamma^2}{8} (b_{T+1} - a_{T+1})^2}$$

↑ induction hypothesis

So previous Markov inequality becomes

$$\Pr(S_T > \varepsilon) \leq e^{-\gamma\varepsilon} + e^{\frac{\gamma^2}{8} \sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2}$$

This holds for any $\gamma > 0$. Taking $\gamma = \frac{4\epsilon}{\sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2}$ minimises the right term so that

$$P(S_T > \epsilon) \leq e^{-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t)^2}}$$

□

Hoeffding (-Azuma) inequality is very useful in stochastic bandits problems (next lectures).

Yet all the above inequalities hold for bounded random variables.

Can we have similar versions with unbounded variables?

Definition (sub-Gaussian variables)

A r.v. $X \in \mathbb{R}$ is τ -sub-Gaussian if $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}[e^{z(X - \mathbb{E}[X])}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau^2 z^2}{2}\right)$

i.e. if it satisfies Hoeffding's lemma!

Examples:

if $X \in [a, b]$ a.s., then it is $\frac{(b-a)^2}{4}$ sub-Gaussian

if $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, it is τ sub-Gaussian.

Indeed, assume $\mu=0, \sigma=1$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\delta X}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2} + \delta x} dx$$

$$= \frac{e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\delta)^2} dx = e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2}} \quad \square$$

The general case μ, σ is the same by rescaling argument.

Hoeffding's inequality holds for T sub-Gaussian random variables:

Hoeffding inequality (sub-Gaussian version)

Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be independent random variables, where each X_t is τ_t sub-Gaussian. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$:

$$P\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t - \mathbb{E}[X_t] \geq \epsilon\right) \leq e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2}}$$

- Same proof as in the bounded case.
- Hoeffding-Azuma can be extended to the sub-Gaussian case, when carefully handling the assumptions.

see exam session #1 for a sub-Gaussian Hoeffding-Azuma inequality

Bernstein Inequality

Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a filtration and let $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be a sequence of adapted random variables (i.e. $\forall t \geq 1, X_t$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable), that are bounded $\forall t, 0 \leq X_t \leq 1$ a.s. and $\text{Var}(X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \tau_t^2$, where $a_t, b_t, \tau_t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t - \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-\epsilon^2}{2\sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2 + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon}\right)$$

Comparison with Hoeffding-Azuma: $\exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{T}\right)$ (with $a_t = 0, b_t = 1$)

With only $0 \leq X_t \leq 1$, we can only guarantee $\text{Var}(X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \frac{1}{4}$,

in which case Hoeffding-Azuma is better (no additional ϵ term below)

But if $\tau_t^2 \ll \frac{1}{4}$, Bernstein can be much better.

\rightarrow this is for example useful when $X_t \sim \text{Ber}(p_t)$ with a small (or large) p_t .

• often used with ϵ scaling in T , while Hoeffding is used with ϵ scaling in \sqrt{T}

Proof: Similar to Hoeffding-Azuma proof, but using

Bernstein Lemma: Let X be a random variable in $[0, 1]$. Then for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X}]) \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[X] + (e^\gamma - \gamma - 1) \text{Var}(X)$$

Denote the martingale $S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T X_t - \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$

Let $\gamma > 0$.

$$P(S_T \geq \varepsilon) \leq e^{-\gamma \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_T}]$$

We can again show by induction $\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma S_T}] \leq e^{(\gamma + \gamma - 1) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2}$

so that

$$P(S_T \geq \varepsilon) \leq e^{\underbrace{(\gamma + \gamma - 1) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2}_{V} - \gamma \varepsilon} \quad \text{for any } \gamma > 0.$$

Minimizing the quantity $\underbrace{(\gamma + \gamma - 1) V - \gamma \varepsilon}_{f(\gamma)}$:

$$f'(\gamma) = 0, \quad V + \gamma = V + \varepsilon.$$

$$\gamma^* = \ln\left(\frac{V + \varepsilon}{V}\right)$$

$$\text{and } f(\gamma^*) = V + \varepsilon - (V + \varepsilon) \ln\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{V}\right) - V.$$

$$\text{so: } P(S_T \geq \varepsilon) \leq \exp\left(-h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t^2\right)$$

{ Bennett's inequality }

where $h(u) = (1+u) \ln(1+u) - u$.

J

Using $h(u) \geq \frac{u^2}{2 + \frac{2u}{3}}$ for $u \geq 0$

finally yields

see below

$$\Pr(S_T \geq \varepsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2 \sum_{r=1}^T r + \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon}\right) \quad \square.$$

Lemma

For $h(u) = (1+u) \ln(1+u) - u$

$$\forall u \geq 0, h(u) \geq \frac{u^2}{2 + \frac{2u}{3}}.$$

Proof, This is simply by comparison of the derivatives.
(omitted in class)

$$\text{Define } f(u) = h(u) - \frac{u^2}{2 + \frac{2}{3}u}.$$

$$f'(u) = \ln(1+u) + \frac{2u(2 + \frac{2}{3}u) - \frac{2}{3}u^2}{(2 + \frac{2}{3}u)^2}$$

$$= \ln(1+u) - \frac{4u + \frac{2}{3}u^2}{(2 + \frac{2}{3}u)^2},$$

$$f''(u) = \frac{1}{1+u} - \frac{(4+\frac{4}{3}u)(2+\frac{2}{3}u) - (4+\frac{4}{3}u)(4u+\frac{2}{3}u^2)}{(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^3}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1+u} - 2 \frac{2 + \frac{10}{3}u - \frac{2}{3}u^2}{(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1+u} - 2 \frac{2 + \frac{10}{3}u - \frac{2}{3}u^2}{(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^2}$$

$$= \frac{(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^2 - (1+u)(4 - \frac{10}{3}u - \frac{4}{3}u^2)}{(1+u)(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^2} = \frac{0 + (\frac{7}{3} + \frac{20}{3} - 4)u + (\frac{u}{9} + \frac{20}{9} + \frac{u}{3})u^2 + \frac{4}{3}u^3}{(1+u)(2+\frac{2}{3}u)^2}$$

$$\geq 0 \quad \text{for } u \geq 0$$

$$f(0) = 0$$

$$f'(0) = 0 \quad f \text{ convex on } \mathbb{R}_+$$

$$\text{so } f' \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+$$

$$f \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+ \quad \text{②.}$$

Let X be a centered random variable in \mathbb{R} . Show that $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 4 \Rightarrow 5$.

1. Laplace transform: for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{\eta X}]) \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \eta^2}{2}$;
2. Concentration: for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\max\{\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon), \mathbb{P}(X \leq -\varepsilon)\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$;
3. Moment condition: for any $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathbb{E}[X^{2q}] \leq 2q!(2\sigma^2)^q$;
4. Orlicz condition: $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{4\sigma^2})] \leq 4$;
5. Laplace transform: for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{\eta X}]) \leq \frac{20\sigma^2 \eta^2}{2}$.

1 sub-Gaussian variable

Prove Bernstein Lemma

Bernstein Lemma: Let X be a random variable in $[0, 1]$. Then for any $\gamma > 0$:

$$\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X}]) \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[X] + (\gamma^2 - \gamma - 1) \text{Var}(X)$$

Hint: Consider the function $\varphi: x \mapsto \frac{e^x - x - 1}{x^2}$, which is non-decreasing in \mathbb{R} .

Solutions

Solution: 1) \Rightarrow 2) is Hoeffding inequality for a single random variable.

For 2) \Rightarrow 3),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[X^{2q}] &= \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(X^{2q} > u) du \\
 &= \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(|X| > u^{\frac{1}{2q}}) du \\
 &\leq 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{u^{1/q}}{2\sigma^2}\right) du \\
 &= (2\sigma^2)^q 2q \int_0^{+\infty} \exp(-v) v^{q-1} dv & v = \frac{u^{1/q}}{2\sigma^2} \\
 &= (2\sigma^2)^q 2q \Gamma(q) \\
 &= 2(2\sigma^2)^q q!
 \end{aligned}$$

For 3) \Rightarrow 4), the monotone convergence theorem gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{4\sigma^2})] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{X^{2k}}{(2\sigma^2)^k k!} \frac{1}{2^k}\right] \leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = 4.$$

For 4) \Rightarrow 5), using the fact that X is centered, we have for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\exp(\eta X)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta X)^k}{k!}\right] \\
 &= 1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta X)^k}{k!}\right] \\
 &\leq 1 + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[X^2 \exp(|\eta X|)] \\
 &\leq 1 + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \exp(2\sigma^2\eta^2) \mathbb{E}[X^2 \exp(\frac{X^2}{8\sigma^2})] & \inf_a (\frac{\eta^2}{2a} + \frac{aX^2}{2}) = \eta|X|, a = \frac{1}{4\sigma^2} \\
 &\leq 1 + 2\sigma^2\eta^2 \exp(2\sigma^2\eta^2) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{4\sigma^2}\right)\right] & z \leq \exp(\frac{z}{2}) \\
 &\leq (1 + 8\sigma^2\eta^2) \exp(2\sigma^2\eta^2) \leq \exp\left(\frac{20\sigma^2\eta^2}{2}\right) & 1 + z \leq e^z.
 \end{aligned}$$

Bernstein

φ defined in \mathbb{R} by continuity.
 φ is non-decreasing, so: $\varphi(\gamma(X - \mathbb{E}[X])) \leq \varphi(\gamma)$ a.s.

$$\text{ie } e^{\gamma(X - \mathbb{E}[X])} - \gamma(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) - 1 \leq \gamma^2(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) \frac{e^\gamma - \gamma - 1}{\gamma}$$

$$\text{Taking E: } \mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X}] = e^{\gamma \mathbb{E}[X]} \leq 1 + \text{Var}(X)(e^\gamma - \gamma - 1)$$

$$\text{Taking ln: } \ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{\gamma X}]) \leq \ln(1 + \text{Var}(X)(e^\gamma - \gamma - 1)) + \gamma \mathbb{E}[X].$$

$$\ln(u+1) \leq u \leq \text{Var}(X)(e^\gamma - \gamma - 1) + \gamma \mathbb{E}[X].$$

In this exercise, we are trying to prove the conditional Hoeffding's lemma with a similar proof technique we used for the Hoeffding lemma (without conditioning). Consider a random variable X such that $X \in [a, b]$ almost surely and a σ -algebra \mathcal{G} . Define the function $\psi : s \mapsto \ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{sX}] \mid \mathcal{G})$.

- 1) Justify that ψ is twice continuously differentiable on \mathbb{R} and that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi'(s) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[X e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}]} \\ \psi''(s) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[X^2 e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}] \mathbb{E}[e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}] - (\mathbb{E}[X e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}])^2}{(\mathbb{E}[e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}])^2}.\end{aligned}$$

- 2) Show that we can define the probability distribution \mathbb{Q}_s as

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_s}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{e^{sX}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}]}$$

where $X \sim \mathbb{P}$.

- 3) Show that for any random variable Z , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[Z \frac{e^{sX}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{sX} \mid \mathcal{G}]} \mid \mathcal{G}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_s}[Z \mid \mathcal{G}].$$

- 4) Deduce that

$$\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{s(X-\mathbb{E}[X])}]) \leq \frac{s^2}{8}(b-a)^2.$$