Lecture 6: Concentration Inequalities -Introduction to Martingales

John Sylvester Nicolás Rivera Luca Zanetti Thomas Sauerwald



Lent 2019

More Chernoff Bounds

Conditional Expectation



Remember the Chernoff Bounds from the previous lecture..

Chernoff Bounds: upper tails Suppose X_1, \ldots, X_n are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter p_i . Let $X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n$ and $\mu = \mathbf{E}[X] = \sum p_i$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{P}[X \ge (1+\delta)\mu] \le \left[\frac{e^{\delta}}{(1+\delta)^{(1+\delta)}}\right]^{\mu}$$

and for $t > \mu$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathbf{X} \geq t] \leq \mathbf{e}^{-\mu} \left(\frac{\mathbf{e}\mu}{t}\right)^t,$$



.. and the lower tails ..

— Chernoff Bounds: Lower Tails —

Suppose X_1, \ldots, X_n are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter p_i . Let $X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n$ and $\mu = \mathbf{E}[X] = \sum p_i$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{P}[X \leq (1-\delta)\mu] \leq \left[rac{oldsymbol{e}^{-\delta}}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}}
ight]^{\mu}.$$

and for any $t < \mu$

$$\mathbf{P}[X \leq t] \leq e^{-\mu} \left(\frac{e\mu}{t}\right)^t.$$







- Most of the time we will use Chernoff Bounds for sum of independent Bernoulli random variables
- but not always
- it does not hurt to know how to derive similar bounds for other random variables

Remember the key steps:

- Chernoff Bound recipe —
- 1. Let $\lambda > 0$, then

$$\mathsf{P}[X \ge (1+\delta)\mu] \le e^{-\lambda(1+\delta)\mu} \mathsf{E}\Big[e^{\lambda X}\Big]$$

- 2. Compute an upper bound for $\mathbf{E}[e^{\lambda X}]$
- 3. Optimise the value of $\lambda > 0$.



Exercise:

• Let X be a Poisson random variable of mean μ . Prove that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\,\boldsymbol{e}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\boldsymbol{X}}\,\right] = \boldsymbol{e}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\left(\boldsymbol{e}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}-1\right)}$$

and deduce that for $t \geq \mu$

$$\mathbf{P}[X \ge t] \le e^{-\mu} \left(rac{e\lambda}{t}
ight)^t$$
 and $\mathbf{P}[X \ge (1+\delta)\mu] \le e^{-\delta^2\mu}$,

and the corresponding lower tails.

• Let X be a Normal random variable of mean μ and variance σ^2 . Prove that

$$\mathsf{E}\!\left[\,\boldsymbol{e}^{\lambda X}\,\right] = \boldsymbol{e}^{\mu\lambda + \sigma^2\lambda^2/2},$$

and deduce that for $t > \mu$

$$\mathbf{P}[X \ge t] \le e^{-(t-\mu)^2/2}.$$



- Beside sums of independent Bernoulli Random variables, sums of independent and bounded random variables is very important in applications.
- Unfortunately the distribution of the X_i will be unknown or very hard to compute, thus it will be very hard to compute the moment-generating function of X_i.

• Hoeffding's Lemma helps us here sider $X' = X - \mathbf{E}[X]$ Hoeffding's Extension Lemma Let X be a random variable with mean 0 such that $a \le X \le b$, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. $\mathbf{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \le \exp\left(\frac{(b-a)^2\lambda^2}{\lambda}\right)$

$$\mathsf{E}\Big[e^{\lambda X}\Big] \leq \exp\left(\frac{(b-a)^2\lambda^2}{8}\right)$$



Chernoff-Hoeffding Bounds

Chernoff-Hoeffding's Bounds — Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be independent random variable with mean μ_i such that $a_i \le X_i \le b_i$. Let $X = X_1 + ... + X_n$, and let $\mu = \mathbf{E}[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i$. Then for any t > 0

$$\mathbf{P}[X \ge \mu + t] \le \exp\left[\frac{-2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right]$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}[X \le \mu - t] \le \exp\left[\frac{-2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right]$$

Proof:

• Let
$$X'_i = X_i - \mu_i$$
 and $X' = X'_1 + \dots, X'_n$, then $\mathbf{P}[X \ge \mu + t] = \mathbf{P}[X' \ge t]$

•
$$\mathbf{P}[X' \ge t] \le e^{-\lambda t} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{\lambda X'_i} \right] \le \exp \left[-\lambda t + \frac{\lambda^2}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (b_i - a_i)^2 \right]$$

• Choose
$$\lambda = \frac{4t}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (b_i - a_i)^2}$$
 to get the result.

This is not magic! you just need to optimise on $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$



Hoeffding's Extension Lemma

Let X be a random variable with mean 0 such that $a \leq X \leq b$, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\mathsf{E}\Big[e^{\lambda X}\Big] \leq \exp\left(\frac{(b-a)^2\lambda^2}{8}\right)$$

Proof (for $\lambda \geq 0$):

• $f(x) = e^{\lambda x}$ is a convex function.





Hoeffding's Extension Lemma -

Let X be a random variable with mean 0 such that $a \leq X \leq b$, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\mathsf{E}\Big[\, e^{\lambda X}\,\Big] \leq \exp\left(rac{(b-a)^2\lambda^2}{8}
ight)$$

Proof (for $\lambda \geq 0$):

- 1. $f(x) = e^{\lambda x}$ is a convex function.
- 2. As $a \le X \le b$, we consider the points $(a, e^{\lambda a})$ and $(b, e^{\lambda b})$
- 3. The straight line between those points is always above the graph of $e^{\lambda x}$ 4. i.e. X = x

$$e^{\lambda X} \leq rac{b-X}{b-a}e^{\lambda a} + rac{X-a}{b-a}e^{\lambda b}$$

5. Then

$$\mathsf{E}\Big[\,e^{\lambda X}\,\Big] \leq rac{be^{\lambda a}}{b-a} - rac{ae^{\lambda b}}{b-a}$$



1. $f(x) = e^{\lambda x}$ is a convex function.

- 2. As $a \le X \le b$, we consider the points $(a, e^{\lambda a})$ and $(b, e^{\lambda b})$
- 3. The straight line between those points is always above the graph of $e^{\lambda x}$ 4. i.e.

$$e^{\lambda X} \leq rac{b-X}{b-a}e^{\lambda a} + rac{X-a}{b-a}e^{\lambda b}$$

5. Then

$$\mathsf{E}\Big[e^{\lambda X}\Big] \leq \frac{be^{\lambda a}}{b-a} - \frac{ae^{\lambda b}}{b-a}$$

6. Consider

$$\phi(\lambda) = \log\left(rac{b e^{\lambda a}}{b-a} - rac{a e^{\lambda b}}{b-a}
ight)$$

and check that (Exercise)

$$\phi(t) = \int_0^t \phi'(x) dx \le \int_0^t x(b-a)^2 / 4 dx \le t^2 (b-a)^2 / 8$$

9. replace $t = \lambda$ for non-negative λ .



8.

- There are several version of Chernoff-style Bounds that work for sum of independent random variables.
- The proof of all of them usually follows the same recipe
- Some bounds include more information about the random variables, e.g. the variance
- the limit is the amount of information we have about the random variables and our ability to manipulate/bound quantities.



Can we prove concentration of other type of random variables? Yes.. but

- There is no general tool to prove concentration beyond the basic recipe
- but in general it is very hard to compute moment generating functions
- It is worth trying to transform the problem into the setting of sum of independent random variable
- If everything fails.. There are a few other families of random variables for which proving concentration is doable One of them are the so-called Martingales



More Chernoff Bounds

Conditional Expectation



Before talking about martingales, we need to review **conditional expectation**.

- Given two events *A* and *B* with $\mathbf{P}[A] > 0$ we define $\mathbf{P}[B|A] = \mathbf{P}[B \cap A] / \mathbf{P}[A]$.
- if $\mathbf{P}[A] = 0$, the usual convention is that $\mathbf{P}[B|A] = 0$.
- Given a discrete random variable *Y*, we define its conditional expectation with respect to the event *A* by

$$\mathsf{E}[Y|A] = \sum_{b} b\mathsf{P}[Y = b|A]$$

 a particular case is when the event A = {X = a} where X is another discrete random variable. In such a case we define the function f(a) by

$$f(a)=\mathbf{E}[Y|X=a],$$

• We define the conditional expectation $\mathbf{E}[Y|X]$, as the random variable that takes the value $\mathbf{E}[Y|X = a]$ then X = a, i.e. f(X).



- The conditional expectation of *Y* w.r.t a event *A*, **E**[*Y*|*A*] is a deterministic number .
- The conditional expectation of Y w.r.t a random variable X, $\mathbf{E}[Y|X]$ is a random variable.
- X can be a random vector (X_1, \ldots, X_N) in the definition of **E**[Y|X].
- There is a definition of conditional expectation with respect to general random variables¹, but most of the results in the discrete setting extend to the continuous setting.
- The conditional expectation **E**[*Y*|*X*] is always a function of *X*.
- Behind conditional expectation there is the notion of information². The standard notion of expectation is like 'the best estimate of a random variable given no information of it', while the conditional expectation given X is like 'the best estimate of a random variable given the information of X'

²Measure theory, again



¹such a definition require the understanding of Measure theory

Conditional Expectation: two dices

Suppose we independently roll two standard 6-sided dice. Let X_1 and X_2 the observed number in the first and second dice respectively. We compute a few conditional expectations.

1. $\mathbf{E}[X_1 + X_2 | X_1] = 3.5 + X_1$. Why? Because if $X_1 = a$ then

$$E[X_{1} + X_{2}|X_{1} = a] = \sum_{b=1}^{12} bP[X_{1} + X_{2} = b|X_{1} = a]$$

$$= \sum_{b=1}^{12} bP[X_{1} + X_{2} = b, X_{1} = a] /P[X_{1} = a]$$

$$= \sum_{b=1}^{12} bP[X_{2} = b - a, X_{1} = a] /P[X_{1} = a]$$

$$X_{1} \text{ indep } X_{2} = \sum_{b=1}^{12} bP[X_{2} = b - a]$$

$$= \sum_{c=1}^{6} (c + a)P[X_{2} = c]$$

$$= 3.5 + a$$



- 1. $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[Y|X]] = \mathbf{E}[Y].$
- 2. $\mathbf{E}[1|X] = 1$
- 3. Linearity :
 - For any constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{E}[cY|X] = c\mathbf{E}[Y|X]$
 - $\mathbf{E}[Y + Z|X] = \mathbf{E}[Y|X] + \mathbf{E}[Z|X]$
- 4. If X is independent of Y, then $\mathbf{E}[Y|X] = \mathbf{E}[Y]$.
- 5. if Y is a function of X^3 , i.e. Y = f(X), then $\mathbf{E}[YZ|X] = Y\mathbf{E}[Z|X]$. Particularly, $\mathbf{E}[X|X] = X$
- 6. Tower Property:
 - $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X|(Z, Y)]|Y] = \mathbf{E}[X|Y].$
- 7. Jensen Inequality:

• if *f* is a convex real function, then $f(\mathbf{E}[X|Y]) \leq \mathbf{E}[f(X)|Y]$.

By using this properties, everything becomes a bit easier, e.g., our two dices example

$$\mathbf{E}[X_1 + X_2 | X_1] \stackrel{\text{p3}}{=} \mathbf{E}[X_1 | X_1] + \mathbf{E}[X_2 | X_1] \stackrel{\text{p5,p4}}{=} X_1 + \mathbf{E}[X_2] = X_1 + 3.5$$

³measurable function



Exercise: Prove the properties

1.
$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[Y|X]] = \mathbf{E}[Y].$$
Proof: e.g.

$$\sum_{x} \mathbf{E}[Y|X = x] \mathbf{P}[X = x] = \sum_{x} \sum_{y} y \mathbf{P}[Y = y|X = x] \mathbf{P}[X = x]$$

$$= \sum_{x} \sum_{y} y \mathbf{P}[Y = y, X = x]$$

$$= \sum_{y} y \mathbf{P}[Y = y]$$



Example: Expectation of a Geometric Random Variable

Suppose $X_1, X_2, ...,$ are an infinite sequence of independent Bernoulli (coins) random variables of parameter p, i.e. **P**[$X_i = 1$] = p. Define

 $G = \min\{k \ge 1 : X_k = 1\}$, which is the number of coins we have to observe until we get a head.

G has geometric distribution of parameter *p*. Indeed $\mathbf{P}[G = k] = p(1 - p)^{k-1}$.

The expectation of G is given by the formula

$$\mathbf{E}[G] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k p (1-p)^{k-1}$$

Let say that we forgot how to compute that type of sums...



We can compute $\mathbf{E}[G]$ by other means.

- $\mathbf{E}[G] \stackrel{\mathbf{p}_1}{=} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[G|X_1]]$
- $G = X_1 + (1 X_1)(1 + G')$ where G' is the number of coins we need to wait to see a head after the first coin.
- $\mathbf{E}[X_1 + (1 X_1)(1 + G')|X_1] \stackrel{\rho_{3,\rho_5}}{=} X_1 + (1 X_1)\mathbf{E}[1 + G'|X_1]$
- *G'* has geometric distribution of parameter *p* and it is independent of *X*₁. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}\big[\mathbf{1}+G'|X_1\big] \stackrel{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{4}}{=} \mathbf{E}\big[\mathbf{1}+G'\big] = \mathbf{1}+\mathbf{E}[G]$$

Solve

$$E[G] = p + (1 - p)(1 + E[G])$$



Suppose we have *n* bins but a random number of balls, say *M*. Suppose *M* has finite expectation. What is the expected number of balls in the first bin?.

- 1. Recall balls are assigned to bins uniformly at random and independent of everything
- 2. Let $X_i = 1$ if the ball *i* falls in bin 1
- 3. The total number of balls in bin 1 is $\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_i$ (recall *M* is a random variable, and *M* is independent of X_i)



4.
$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_{i}\right] \stackrel{p_{1}}{=} \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_{i} \middle| M\right]\right]$$
5.
$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_{i} \middle| M\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} X_{i} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \middle| M\right] \stackrel{p_{3}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}\left[X_{i} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \middle| M\right]$$
6.
$$\mathbf{E}\left[X_{i} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \middle| M\right] \stackrel{p_{5}}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \mathbf{E}\left[X_{i} \middle| M\right] \stackrel{p_{4}}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \mathbf{E}[X_{i}] = \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}} \cdot (1/n)$$
7. Replacing 6 in 5:
$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_{i} \middle| M\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1/n) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{i \le M\}}$$
8. replacing 7 into 4:
$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{M} X_{i}\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1/n) \cdot \mathbf{P}[i \le M] = {}^{5}(1/n) \cdot \mathbf{E}[M]$$

⁵See Q2 of the Homework Assessment



 $^{^{\}rm 4}$ Technically linearity works for a finite sum, but in most cases it can be done for infinite case. We need measure theory to justify that