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### 5.1 Basic Inequalities

We present several fundamental inequalities used in probability theory.
(1) Markov's Inequality: For a non-negative random variable $X$, the probability that $X$ is at least $t$ is bounded by the expected value of $X$ over $t$ :

$$
P(X \geq t) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{t}, \quad \text { for } X \geq 0
$$

Proof. The expected value of $X$ is:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X]=\int_{0}^{\infty} x \cdot p(x) d x
$$

This can be split as:

$$
\int_{0}^{t} x \cdot p(x) d x+\int_{t}^{\infty} x \cdot p(x) d x
$$

Since $x \geq t$ for the second integral, we have:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \int_{t}^{\infty} t \cdot p(x) d x=t \cdot P(X \geq t)
$$

(2) Chebyshev's Inequality: For a random variable $X$ with mean $\mu$ and variance $\operatorname{Var}(X)$, the probability that the deviation of $X$ from $\mu$ is at least $t$ is bounded by the variance over $t^{2}$ :

$$
P(|X-\mu| \geq t) \leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}(X)}{t^{2}}
$$

Proof. Apply Markov's inequality to the non-negative random variable $|X-\mu|^{2}$, we have

$$
L H S=P\left(|X-\mu|^{2} \geq t^{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{t^{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[|X-\mu|^{2}\right]=R H S
$$

(3) Chernoff Bound: The Chernoff bound combines the moment generating function with Markov's inequality to provide an exponential bound on the tail probabilities.

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(X-\mu \geq t)=P(\exp (\lambda(X-\mu)) \geq \exp (\lambda t)), \quad \forall \lambda>0 \\
\leq \exp (-\lambda t) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\exp (\lambda(X-\mu))], \quad \lambda \in[-b, b]
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $\phi(\lambda) \equiv \mathbb{E}[\exp (\lambda(X-\mu))]$, this leads to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P(X-\mu \geq t) \leq \exp (-\lambda t) \cdot \phi(\lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in[0, b] \\
& \quad \Longrightarrow P(X-\mu \geq t) \leq \inf _{\lambda \in[0, b]} \exp (-\lambda t) \cdot \phi(\lambda)
\end{aligned}
$$

### 5.2 Subgaussian

### 5.2.1 Definition

A random variable $X$, subject to $\mathbb{E}[\exp (\lambda(X-\mu))] \leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^{2} \sigma^{2}}{2}\right)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.
(1) Subgaussian with Chernoff bound.

$$
P(X-\mu \geq t) \leq \inf _{\lambda>0} \exp (-\lambda t) \Phi(\lambda) \leq \inf _{\lambda>0} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \sigma^{2} \lambda^{2}-\lambda t\right) .
$$

where $\lambda=\frac{t}{\sigma^{2}}$, then we have

$$
P(X-\mu \geq t) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right) .
$$

If $X$ is subgaussian, then $-X$ is also subgaussian.

$$
P(-X-(-\mu) \geq t)=\mathbb{P}(X-\mu \leq-t) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right) .
$$

Therefore,

$$
P(|X-\mu| \geq t) \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)
$$

(2) Any bounded random variable is subgaussian.

Proof. Let $X \in[a, b]$ almost surely. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\exp (\lambda(X-\mu))] & =\mathbb{E}_{X} \exp \left(\lambda\left(X-\mathbb{E}\left[X^{\prime}\right]\right)\right), \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{X} \mathbb{E}_{X}^{\prime} \exp \left(\lambda\left(X-X^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{X} \mathbb{E}_{X}^{\prime}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \exp \left(\lambda\left(X-X^{\prime}\right) \cdot \epsilon\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$\epsilon$ is a Rademacher random variable, meaning $\epsilon=\left\{1\right.$ with probability $\frac{1}{2},-1$ with probability $\left.\frac{1}{2}\right\}$, thus we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \exp \left(\lambda \cdot\left(X-X^{\prime}\right) \cdot \epsilon\right) & =\frac{1}{2} \exp \left(\lambda \cdot\left(X-X^{\prime}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2} \exp \left(\lambda \cdot\left(X^{\prime}-X\right)\right) \\
& \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \lambda^{2} \cdot\left(X-X^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\exp (\lambda(X-\mu))] & \leq \mathbb{E}_{X} \mathbb{E}_{X}^{\prime} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \lambda^{2}\left(X-X^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \lambda^{2}(b-a)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $X$ is subgaussian with $\sigma^{2}=(b-a)^{2}$.
(3) Additivity of Subgaussian.

Let $X_{i}$ be subgaussian, i.e. $X_{i} \sim \operatorname{SubG}\left(\sigma_{i}^{2}\right)$, then $\sum X_{i}$ is also subgaussian given $X_{i}$ 's are independent, and $\sum X_{i} \sim \operatorname{SubG}\left(\sum \sigma_{i}^{2}\right)$.
We can further derive the Hoeffding bound:

$$
P\left(\sum\left(X_{i}-\mu\right) \geq t\right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \sum \sigma_{i}^{2}}\right) .
$$

(4) If we know $P(|X|>t)$, then we can have:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[|X|^{k}\right]=\int_{0}^{\infty} P\left(|X|^{k}>t\right) d t \leq \int_{0}^{\infty} 2 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2 / k}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right) d t
$$

by using the bound for $P(|X|>t)$ :

$$
P(|X|>t) \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)
$$

We can get:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[|X|^{k}\right] \approx\left(2 \sigma^{2}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \cdot k \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(\sigma^{k}\right)
$$

5.2.2 $\quad f(X)-\mathbb{E} f(X)$

Let $f(X) \equiv f\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$, if $f$ has a bounded difference, $f(X)-\mathbb{E} f(X)$ will be subgaussian.
(1) Doob construction. Construct a martingale with $f(X)$ and $X_{1: n}$.

$$
Y_{k}=\mathbb{E}\left[f(X) \mid F_{k}\right], \quad \mathcal{F}_{k}=\sigma\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{k}\right)
$$

Definition of martingale:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[Y_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right]=Y_{k}
$$

Which can be derived as follows:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[Y_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f(X) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k+1}\right] \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right] \quad \text { Tower property } \mathbb{E}\left[f(X) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right] \equiv Y_{k}
$$

Let

$$
D_{k}=Y_{k}-Y_{k-1}
$$

then

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[D_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[Y_{k+1}-Y_{k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right]=0
$$

finally,

$$
Y_{n}-Y_{0}=f(X)-\mathbb{E}[f(X)]=\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_{k}
$$

(2) Azuma-Hoeffding. For $D_{k} \in\left[a_{k}, b_{k}\right], \sum_{k=1}^{n} D_{k}$ is subG.

Proof.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n} \cdot D_{k}\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} D_{k}\right) \cdot \exp \left(\lambda D_{n} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)\right]\right]\right.
$$

and we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n} \cdot D_{k}\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} D_{K}\right)\right] \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda D_{n}\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\right.
$$

since $D_{k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ bdd is subG, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda D_{k}\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^{2}\left(b_{k}-a_{k}\right)^{2}}{8}\right)
$$

then

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n} \cdot D_{k}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(\lambda \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} D_{K}\right)\right] \cdot \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^{2}\left(b_{k}-a_{k}\right)^{2}}{8}\right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^{2}}{8} \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(b_{k}-a_{k}\right)^{2}\right)\right.
$$

thus $\sum D_{k}$ is subG with $\sigma^{2}=\frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(b_{k}-a_{k}\right)^{2}$.
(3) Bounded Difference Inequality.

$$
\forall x, x_{k}^{\prime}
$$

if

$$
\left|f(\mathbf{x})-f\left(\mathbf{x}_{k}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leq L_{k}
$$

Here

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k}^{\prime}= \begin{cases}x_{k}^{\prime}, & \text { if } x_{k}=x_{k}^{\prime} \\ x_{j}, & \text { if } x_{k} \neq x_{k}^{\prime}\end{cases}
$$

Define $\sum D_{k}=f(\mathbf{x})-\mathbb{E} f(\mathbf{x})$, we have $\sum D_{k}$ is subG.

Proof. Using Azuma-Hoeffding inequality to show $D_{k}$ is bounded:
Let

$$
\begin{gathered}
D_{k}=Y_{k}-Y_{k-1} \\
A_{k}=\inf _{x} \mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{1 \sim k-1}, \mathbf{X}_{k}=x\right]-Y_{k-1} \\
B_{k}=\sup _{x} \mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{1 \sim k-1}, \mathbf{X}_{k}=x\right]-Y_{k-1}
\end{gathered}
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
A_{k} \leq D_{k} \leq B_{k} \\
\left.\left.B_{k}-A_{k} \leq \sup _{x, y} \mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{X})_{1 \sim k-1}, x, \mathbf{X}_{k+1 \sim n}\right)\right]-\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{X})_{1 \sim k-1}, y, \mathbf{X}_{k+1 \sim n}\right)\right] \leq \sup _{x, y} L_{k}=L_{k}
\end{gathered}
$$

So that $D_{k}$ is bdd.
By Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we have $\sum D_{k}$ is subG, which completes the proof.
(4) Rademacher complexity: the complexity of a vector collection $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$
\left\{\left[\begin{array}{c}
c f\left(x_{1}\right) \\
\vdots \\
\left.f\left(x_{n}\right)\right]
\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{c}
c f^{\prime}\left(X_{1}\right) \\
\vdots \\
f^{\prime}\left(X_{n}\right)
\end{array}\right], \ldots\right\}, \text { where } f \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \text { all the models. }
$$

Assume that $\varepsilon$ is a Rademacher vector, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} Z(\mathcal{A})=\mathbb{E} \sup _{a \in \mathcal{A}}\langle a, \varepsilon\rangle
$$

Define $\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon^{\prime k}$ as the $k$-th element of $\varepsilon^{\prime k} \neq \varepsilon_{k}$ and $f(\varepsilon)$ as $Z(\mathcal{A})$, we have $f(\varepsilon)-f\left(\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right)$ has bounded difference.

Proof. Since

$$
f\left(\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right)=\sup _{a \in \mathcal{A}}\left\langle a, \varepsilon^{\prime k}\right\rangle \geq\left\langle a, \varepsilon^{\prime k}\right\rangle, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}
$$

Which can be transferred to:

$$
\langle a, \varepsilon\rangle-f\left(\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right) \leq\left\langle a, \varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right\rangle, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}
$$

And we have

$$
\sup _{a}\langle a, \varepsilon\rangle-f\left(\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right) \leq \sup _{a}\left\langle a, \varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right\rangle
$$

So, finally, we have

$$
f(\varepsilon)-f\left(\varepsilon^{\prime k}\right) \leq \sup _{a} 2 \cdot\left|a_{k}\right|=: L_{k}
$$

which completes the proof.
(5) Maximal Inequality: (worst case won't happen w.h.p.)

$$
\frac{1}{n} \sum z_{i} \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow \text { w.h.p }\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum z_{i}\right| \leq t
$$

Given $X_{i \sim N}$ not i.i.d. but $\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{i} X_{i}\right]$ is sub-G $\left(\delta^{2}\right)$
(1) $\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{i} X_{i}\right]=\frac{1}{s} \mathbb{E}\left[\log \left(\exp \left(s \cdot \max _{i} X_{i}\right)\right)\right], \quad \forall s>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq \frac{1}{s} \log \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp \left(s \cdot \max _{i} X_{i}\right)\right]\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{s} \log \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{i} \exp \left(s \cdot X_{i}\right)\right]\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{s} \log \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i} \exp \left(s \cdot X_{i}\right)\right]\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{s} \log \left(\sum_{i} \exp \left(\frac{\delta^{2} s^{2}}{2}\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{s} \log N+\frac{\delta^{2}}{2} S, \quad \forall s>0 \\
\Rightarrow L H S & \leq \inf _{s>0} R H S=\delta \cdot \sqrt{2 \log N}
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) $\quad \mathbf{P}\left(\max _{i} X_{i}>t\right)=\mathbf{P}\left(\bigcup_{i}\left(X_{i}>t\right)\right)$

$$
\leq \sum_{i} \mathbf{P}\left(X_{i}>t\right)=N \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \delta^{2}}\right)
$$

$$
\Rightarrow N \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \delta^{2}}\right) \leq \varepsilon \Rightarrow t=O\left(\delta \cdot \sqrt{\log \frac{N}{\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

(3) $\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{i}\left|X_{i}\right|\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{i \in[N]} \max \left\{X_{i},-X_{i}\right\}\right] \leq \delta \cdot \sqrt{2 \log (2 N)}$.

$$
\text { (4) } \mathbf{P}\left(\max _{i}\left|X_{i}\right|>t\right) \leq 2 N \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 \delta^{2}}\right)
$$

(6) HW: Proof Thm 1.9. of Chapter 1.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\max _{\Theta \in \mathcal{B}_{2}} \Theta X\right] \leq 4 \delta \sqrt{d}
$$

