Lecture 4 CS 59000 Reinfoxement Learning (RL) Agenda: - Markov Inequality - Hoesting Inequality - Bernstein Inequality - Martingale sequences - Maximal inequality - Azuma & Freedman Inequality This lecture is about ancontration inequalities. Theorem: [Markov' [neguality]. Consider a random variable X: S-> Rt on a probability space (S, F, P), then  $P(X > z) < \frac{E(X)}{5}$ E[X] = S X dP > Radon Nikodym = J x h (x) d n = J x h (x) d x

change of meyon

2)
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}}^{\infty} h(x) I(x \in x) dx + \int_{0}^{\infty} h(x) I(x \neq x) dx$$

$$= \int_{0}^{\infty} h(x) I(x \neq x)$$

Theorem [ Chebysher's Inequality]. Consider arandom variable X: SL > R on a protability space (SL, J, p) p For any K, (and E)0, me have: P(|X-E(X)|>E(|X-E(X)|) for any K, snich bland 1x-EX)1k is integrable. Example: K-2 > \langle \frac{1}{52} Van (X) Proof. Note that [X-EX] is a random variable on non-negline real. Using Markov inequality on [X-E&] K, we have P(X-E(X)| > ER) (E(X-E(X))) (E P( [X-E(X)] > ε K) = P( E=: Y ω: |X-E(X)|(ω)) ξ = 18 (E = : (w: |x-E(x)|(w)> E) 1X1K > E = Km: 1X1m F)

Proof by picture  $\in \left[\left|X-\epsilon[X]\right|^{k}\right] = \left|\left|X-\epsilon[X]\right|^{k}d\rho_{X}$ EK [K / |X- F(X) | K [X-EX] (X -EX) 2 (X -EX) 2 + ) EK I (X-E(X)(-E) dp = EK P(X-EX]/>E) Def. A random variable X on (R, F, IP) is sub-Gaussian if there is a possitive number R, such blub;  $E\left[e\left(X-E[X]\right)\right]\left\langle e^{-R\frac{\lambda^{2}}{2}}\right\rangle$ for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ (Nobe: For Gaustian equality) random variable, we get

An alternative proof of Markor inequality. Theorem statement: [Morkov Inequality]: Consider a random variable X: SL -> Rt on a probability space (s., F, IP), then for Eya,  $P(X > E) < \frac{E[X]}{\cdot}$ Proof:  $E(X) = \int_{\mathbf{n}} x \, dP = \int_{\mathbf{n}} X \, \mathbf{I}(X > \mathcal{E}) \, dP$ + SX I(X(E) SIP Note that the funtion I(X>E) is measurable. and E= Yw: I(x> E)=19 GF. Therefor, we have : E(X) = I X I(X>E) dp This term is non negative + Sex I(X(E) dip () > Sx I(X> E) dip  $\frac{y}{2} \Rightarrow z \int_{z} I(x > z) dP$ 

= E IP (E)= E IP(X) E) Then theorem statement follows. There was a question in the chart on how we can go from 10 to 2. In other words, what one the steps used inshowing

proof,  

$$\int_{X} I(X > E) dP$$

> ε ∫ I(x>ε) dp

The last inequality hold since  $\Sigma I(X)\Sigma$  is a simple function where  $\Sigma I(X)\Sigma$   $X I(X)\Sigma$  there on af the Candidate in the supremum.