

Oral presentation - 23 November 2023
Jérémy Bettinger & Simon Viel

Concentration inequalities for martingales



**Université
de Rennes**



École nationale
de la statistique
et de l'analyse
de l'information

Under the direction of Bernard Delyon & Adrien Saumard
ENSAI, Rennes.

Summary

Hoeffding's inequality

Freedman's inequality

An application to matrices

Hoeffding's Inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding)

Let $(X_k)_{k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket}$ be independent random variables such that :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{R} \quad a_k \leq X_k \leq b_k \text{ a.s.}$$

If $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$ and $x \geq 0$, then we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_n - \mathbb{E}(S_n)| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2}\right).$$

Hoeffding's Inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding)

Let $(X_k)_{k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket}$ be independent random variables such that :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{R} \quad a_k \leq X_k \leq b_k \text{ a.s.}$$

If $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$ and $x \geq 0$, then we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_n - \mathbb{E}(S_n)| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2}\right).$$

- ▶ Our objective here is to generalise Hoeffding's inequality by replacing S_n by any square-integrable martingale without assuming that the increments are independent.

Azuma-Hoeffding Inequality

Theorem (Azuma-Hoeffding)

Let $(M_k)_{k \in \llbracket 0; n \rrbracket}$ be a martingale with finite variance such that $M_0 = 0$ and :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{R} \quad a_k \leq \Delta M_k := M_k - M_{k-1} \leq b_k \text{ a.s.}$$

If $x \geq 0$, then we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_n| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2}\right).$$

Demonstration - Azuma Hoeffding

By definition, $M_n = M_{n-1} + \Delta M_n$.

Demonstration - Azuma Hoeffding

By definition, $M_n = M_{n-1} + \Delta M_n$.

Let $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})\mathbb{E}(\exp(t\Delta M_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})].\end{aligned}$$

Demonstration - Azuma Hoeffding

By definition, $M_n = M_{n-1} + \Delta M_n$.

Let $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})\mathbb{E}(\exp(t\Delta M_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})].\end{aligned}$$

Technical Lemma

Let X a be real-valued centered variable such that $a \leq X \leq b$ a.s.

Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tX)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b-a)^2}{8}\right).$$

Technical Lemma

Let X be a real-valued centered variable such that $a \leq X \leq b$ a.s.
Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tX)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b-a)^2}{8}\right).$$

Technical Lemma

Let X be a real-valued centered variable such that $a \leq X \leq b$ a.s.
Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tX)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b-a)^2}{8}\right).$$

We apply this lemma to the conditional expectation of $X = \Delta M_n$ which is bounded by hypothesis and centered by the martingale property : $\mathbb{E}(\Delta M_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = 0$.

Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(t\Delta M_n) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right).$$

Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(t\Delta M_n) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right).$$

The previous equality

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})\mathbb{E}(\exp(t\Delta M_n) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})]$$

thus becomes

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})] \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right).$$

By iterating the relation

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})] \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right),$$

By iterating the relation

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})] \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right),$$

we obtain :

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_0)] \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right)$$

where $v_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2$.

By iterating the relation

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_{n-1})] \exp\left(\frac{t^2(b_n - a_n)^2}{8}\right),$$

we obtain :

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_0)] \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right)$$

where $v_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2$.

Since $M_0 = 0$, we have :

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

Using Markov inequality, we obtain for all $t, x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp(-tx) \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n))$$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

Using Markov inequality, we obtain for all $t, x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp(-tx) \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n))$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(-tx + \frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

Using Markov inequality, we obtain for all $t, x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp(-tx) \mathbb{E}(\exp(tM_n))$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(-tx + \frac{t^2 v_n}{8}\right).$$

We optimize in t the right bound with $t = 4x/v_n$.

So

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We have shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We can obtain the following inequality in the same way by replacing M_n by $-M_n$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq -x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We have shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We can obtain the following inequality in the same way by replacing M_n by $-M_n$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq -x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We can conclude for all $x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_n| \geq x) = \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) + \mathbb{P}(M_n \leq -x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right)$$

We have shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We can obtain the following inequality in the same way by replacing M_n by $-M_n$:

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq -x) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right).$$

We can conclude for all $x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_n| \geq x) = \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq x) + \mathbb{P}(M_n \leq -x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{v_n}\right)$$

hence the desired inequality

$$\forall x \geq 0 \quad \mathbb{P}(|M_n| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2x^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2}\right).$$



Bennett's Inequality

Theorem (Bennett)

Let $(X_k)_{k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket}$ be independent random variables centered and square integrable such that :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists b > 0 \quad X_k \leq b \text{ a.s.}$$

Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \in [0; b]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\text{Var}(S_n) + bx/3)}\right).$$

Bennett's Inequality

Theorem (Bennett)

Let $(X_k)_{k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket}$ be independent random variables centered and square integrable such that :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists b > 0 \quad X_k \leq b \text{ a.s.}$$

Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \in [0; b]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\text{Var}(S_n) + bx/3)}\right).$$

- ▶ We obtain Poissonian tails that have the advantage of taking the variance into account.

Bennett's Inequality

Theorem (Bennett)

Let $(X_k)_{k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket}$ be independent random variables centered and square integrable such that :

$$\forall k \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket, \exists b > 0 \quad X_k \leq b \text{ a.s.}$$

Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \in [0; b]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq x) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\text{Var}(S_n) + bx/3)}\right).$$

- ▶ We obtain Poissonian tails that have the advantage of taking the variance into account.
- ▶ Our objective here is to generalise Bennett's inequality by replacing S_n by any square-integrable martingale without assuming that the increments are independent.

Freedman's Inequality

Theorem (Freedman(1975))

Let $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a square integrable martingale starting from 0 such that the increments $\Delta M_k = M_k - M_{k-1}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ are as bounded from above by $b \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \in [0; b]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq nx, \langle M \rangle_n \leq ny) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{nx^2}{2(y + bx/3)}\right).$$

Freedman's Inequality

Theorem (Freedman(1975))

Let $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a square integrable martingale starting from 0 such that the increments $\Delta M_k = M_k - M_{k-1}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ are as bounded from above by $b \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \in [0; b]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq nx, \langle M \rangle_n \leq ny) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{nx^2}{2(y + bx/3)}\right).$$

Since the upper bound is homogeneous in b , in the demonstration we will assume that $b = 1$, that is $\Delta M_k \leq 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, almost surely.

Demonstration : the case of S_n

In order to guide our demonstration for the martingale case, we first have to understand what happens in the case of the sum of independent variables.

Demonstration : the case of S_n

In order to guide our demonstration for the martingale case, we first have to understand what happens in the case of the sum of independent variables.

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent centered variables with finite variance and let $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$, we compute the Cramér transform of S_n . By independence of X_1, \dots, X_n , we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) = \ln(\mathbb{E}[\exp(tS_n)]) = \sum_{k=1}^n \ln(\mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)]).$$

Demonstration : the case of S_n

In order to guide our demonstration for the martingale case, we first have to understand what happens in the case of the sum of independent variables.

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent centered variables with finite variance and let $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$, we compute the Cramér transform of S_n . By independence of X_1, \dots, X_n , we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) = \ln(\mathbb{E}[\exp(tS_n)]) = \sum_{k=1}^n \ln(\mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)]).$$

Thus, using the concavity of the logarithm yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)] \right).$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)] \right).$$

Let X be a random variable with distribution $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n P_{X_k}$.
By the construction of X , $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX)]$.

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)] \right).$$

Let X be a random variable with distribution $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n P_{X_k}$.
By the construction of X , $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX_k)] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX)]$.

Lemma

Suppose that $X \leq 1$ as, $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = v = \text{Var}(S_n)/n$.
Let $\tilde{\zeta} \sim \frac{v}{1+v} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{1+v} \delta_{-v}$ be a centered Bernoulli random variable with variance v , then almost surely

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(tX)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(t\tilde{\zeta})] = \frac{v}{1+v} e^t + \frac{1}{1+v} e^{-vt}.$$

We obtain the upper bound for the Cramér transform

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq nL_v(t) \text{ where } L_v(t) = \ln(ve^t + e^{-vt}) - \ln(1 + v).$$

We obtain the upper bound for the Cramér transform $\mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq nL_v(t)$ where $L_v(t) = \ln(v e^t + e^{-vt}) - \ln(1+v)$.

We now compute the Fenchel-Legendre derivative of L_v and we eventually find $L_v^*(x) = \frac{x+v}{1+v} \ln(1 + \frac{x}{v}) + \frac{1-x}{1+v} \ln(1-x)$ that can be lower-bounded by $\frac{x^2}{2(v+x/3)}$.

We obtain the upper bound for the Cramér transform $\mathcal{L}_{S_n}(t) \leq nL_v(t)$ where $L_v(t) = \ln(ve^t + e^{-vt}) - \ln(1+v)$.

We now compute the Fenchel-Legendre derivative of L_v and we eventually find $L_v^*(x) = \frac{x+v}{1+v} \ln(1 + \frac{x}{v}) + \frac{1-x}{1+v} \ln(1-x)$ that can be lower-bounded by $\frac{x^2}{2(v+x/3)}$.

Using Cramér's inequality finally leads to Bennett's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq nx) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{nx^2}{2(v + bx/3)}\right).$$



Demonstration : adaptation to the martingale case

Similarly to what we have seen for the sum of independent variables, we introduce $L_\nu : t \mapsto \ln(\nu e^t + e^{-\nu t}) - \ln(1 + \nu)$

Demonstration : adaptation to the martingale case

Similarly to what we have seen for the sum of independent variables, we introduce $L_v : t \mapsto \ln(ve^t + e^{-vt}) - \ln(1 + v)$ and the random variable $W_n(t) = \exp(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t))$ where

$$V_k = \langle V \rangle_k - \langle V \rangle_{k-1} = \mathbb{E}[(M_k - M_{k-1})^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}].$$

Demonstration : adaptation to the martingale case

Similarly to what we have seen for the sum of independent variables, we introduce $L_v : t \mapsto \ln(ve^t + e^{-vt}) - \ln(1 + v)$ and the random variable $W_n(t) = \exp(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t))$ where

$$V_k = \langle V \rangle_k - \langle V \rangle_{k-1} = \mathbb{E}[(M_k - M_{k-1})^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}].$$

The same technical lemma than previously ensures that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(t\zeta)]$ with ζ a centered Bernoulli variable with variance V_k conditionnally to \mathcal{F}_{k-1} .

We obtain $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \exp(L_{V_k}(t))$ almost surely.

We obtain $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \exp(L_{V_k}(t))$ almost surely.

Recall that $W_n(t) = \exp(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t))$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_n(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] &= W_{n-1}(t)\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \exp(-L_{V_n}(t)) \\ &\leq W_{n-1}(t).\end{aligned}$$

We obtain $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \exp(L_{V_k}(t))$ almost surely.

Recall that $W_n(t) = \exp(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t))$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_n(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] &= W_{n-1}(t)\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta M_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \exp(-L_{V_n}(t)) \\ &\leq W_{n-1}(t).\end{aligned}$$

It means that $(W_n(t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a supermartingale starting from 1 and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}[W_n(t)] \leq 1$.

End of the demonstration

Let A_n denote the event $(M_n \geq nx, \langle M \rangle_n \leq ny)$.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, using Markov's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_n - tnx)\mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}].$$

End of the demonstration

Let A_n denote the event $(M_n \geq nx, \langle M \rangle_n \leq ny)$.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, using Markov's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_n - tnx)\mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}].$$

So,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t) - tnx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny} \right]$$

End of the demonstration

Let A_n denote the event $(M_n \geq nx, \langle M \rangle_n \leq ny)$.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, using Markov's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tM_n - tnx)\mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}].$$

So,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t) - tnx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny} \right]$$

Since the function $v \mapsto L_v(t)$ is concave and non-decreasing, we have $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t) \leq L_{\langle M \rangle_n/n}(t) \leq L_y(t)$ on the event A_n .

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_n) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t)\right) \exp\left(nL_Y(t) - tn\chi\right) \mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_n(t)] \exp(nL_Y(t) - tn\chi).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_n) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t)\right) \exp\left(nL_Y(t) - tn x\right) \mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_n(t)] \exp(nL_Y(t) - tn x).\end{aligned}$$

In the end, we find that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \exp(-nL_Y^*(x)).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_n) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(tM_n - \sum_{k=1}^n L_{V_k}(t)\right) \exp\left(nL_y(t) - tnx\right) \mathbb{1}_{\langle M \rangle_n \leq ny}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_n(t)] \exp(nL_y(t) - tnx).\end{aligned}$$

In the end, we find that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq \exp(-nL_y^*(x)).$$

Since we have already computed the Legendre-Fenchel derivative of L_y , the proof is complete. □

An application to matrices

Theorem

Let $p < n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $A \in M_{p,n}(\mathbb{R})$ with coefficients bounded by $b > 0$.
Let π be a uniform distributed random variable on the set of one-to-one maps from $\llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$ and let $S = \sum_{i=1}^p A[i, \pi(i)]$.

Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4(\theta v + 2xb/3)}\right)$$

where

- ▶ $v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^n A[i, j]^2$
- ▶ $\theta = -\alpha - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \ln(1 - \alpha)$
- ▶ $\alpha = p/n$.

We set, for all $i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i))$ and $M_i = \mathbb{E}[S \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[S]$. Then $(M_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket}$ is a martingale.

We set, for all $i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i))$ and $M_i = \mathbb{E}[S \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[S]$. Then $(M_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket}$ is a martingale.

But given \mathcal{F}_i , $\pi|_{\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket}$ is uniformly distributed on the set of one-to-one maps from $\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket 1; n \rrbracket \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$.

We set, for all $i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i))$ and $M_i = \mathbb{E}[S \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[S]$. Then $(M_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket}$ is a martingale.

But given \mathcal{F}_i , $\pi_{\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket}$ is uniformly distributed on the set of one-to-one maps from $\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket 1; n \rrbracket \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$.

Thus by defining $m_i(k, \cdot) = \mathbb{E}[A[k, \pi(i+1)] \mid \mathcal{F}_i]$, we obtain

$$m_i(k, \cdot) = \frac{1}{n-i} \sum_{j \notin \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}} A[k, j]$$

We set, for all $i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i))$ and $M_i = \mathbb{E}[S \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[S]$. Then $(M_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket}$ is a martingale.

But given \mathcal{F}_i , $\pi_{\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket}$ is uniformly distributed on the set of one-to-one maps from $\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket 1; n \rrbracket \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$.

Thus by defining $m_i(k, :) = \mathbb{E}[A[k, \pi(i+1)] \mid \mathcal{F}_i]$, we obtain $m_i(k, :) = \frac{1}{n-i} \sum_{j \notin \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}} A[k, j]$ which in turn gives

$$\Delta M_i = A[i, \pi(i)] - m_{i-1}(i, :) + \sum_{k=i+1}^p [m_i(k, :) - m_{i-1}(k, :)].$$

We set, for all $i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket$, $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i))$ and $M_i = \mathbb{E}[S \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[S]$. Then $(M_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1; p \rrbracket}$ is a martingale.

But given \mathcal{F}_i , $\pi_{\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket}$ is uniformly distributed on the set of one-to-one maps from $\llbracket i+1; p \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket 1; n \rrbracket \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$.

Thus by defining $m_i(k, :) = \mathbb{E}[A[k, \pi(i+1)] \mid \mathcal{F}_i]$, we obtain $m_i(k, :) = \frac{1}{n-i} \sum_{j \notin \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}} A[k, j]$ which in turn gives

$$\Delta M_i = A[i, \pi(i)] - m_{i-1}(i, :) + \sum_{k=i+1}^p [m_i(k, :) - m_{i-1}(k, :)].$$

We eventually find that $|\Delta M_i| \leq 4b$ as since

$$m_i(k, :) - m_{i-1}(k, :) = \frac{1}{n-i} (m_{i-1}(k, :) - A[k, \pi(i)]).$$

Applying Freedman's inequality to both M and $-M$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_p| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\|\langle M \rangle_p\|_\infty + 4bx/3)}\right).$$

Applying Freedman's inequality to both M and $-M$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_p| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\|\langle M \rangle_p\|_\infty + 4bx/3)}\right).$$

We admit that $\langle M \rangle_p \leq 2\theta v$ almost surely where

$$v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^n A[i,j]^2 ; \quad \theta = -\alpha - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \ln(1-\alpha) ; \quad \alpha = \frac{p}{n}$$

giving the result. □

Applying Freedman's inequality to both M and $-M$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_p| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\|\langle M \rangle_p\|_\infty + 4bx/3)}\right).$$

We admit that $\langle M \rangle_p \leq 2\theta v$ almost surely where

$$v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^n A[i,j]^2 ; \quad \theta = -\alpha - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \ln(1-\alpha) ; \quad \alpha = \frac{p}{n}$$

giving the result. □

- ▶ We would like to have a similar result for square matrices.

Applying Freedman's inequality to both M and $-M$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_p| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\| \langle M \rangle_p \|_\infty + 4bx/3)}\right).$$

We admit that $\langle M \rangle_p \leq 2\theta v$ almost surely where

$$v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^n A[i,j]^2 ; \quad \theta = -\alpha - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \ln(1-\alpha) ; \quad \alpha = \frac{p}{n}$$

giving the result. □

- ▶ We would like to have a similar result for square matrices.
- ▶ Because the constant θ is not defined for $\alpha = 1$, that is $p = n$, we will decompose the matrix into two rectangular matrices and apply the previous result twice.

The square matrix version

Let $n \geq 2$, $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\pi \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ and $S = \sum_{i=1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$.
Set $v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A[i, j]^2$ and suppose that $|A[i, j]| \leq b$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$.

The square matrix version

Let $n \geq 2$, $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\pi \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ and $S = \sum_{i=1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$.
Set $v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A[i, j]^2$ and suppose that $|A[i, j]| \leq b$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$.

Now write a decomposition $S = P + Q$ with $P = \sum_{i=1}^p A[i, \pi(i)]$
and $Q = \sum_{i=p+1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$ where $p = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

The square matrix version

Let $n \geq 2$, $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\pi \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ and $S = \sum_{i=1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$.
Set $v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A[i, j]^2$ and suppose that $|A[i, j]| \leq b$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$.

Now write a decomposition $S = P + Q$ with $P = \sum_{i=1}^p A[i, \pi(i)]$
and $Q = \sum_{i=p+1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$ where $p = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(|P - \mathbb{E}[P]| \geq x/2) + \mathbb{P}(|Q - \mathbb{E}[Q]| \geq x/2).$$

The square matrix version

Let $n \geq 2$, $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\pi \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ and $S = \sum_{i=1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$.
Set $v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A[i, j]^2$ and suppose that $|A[i, j]| \leq b$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket$.

Now write a decomposition $S = P + Q$ with $P = \sum_{i=1}^p A[i, \pi(i)]$
and $Q = \sum_{i=p+1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$ where $p = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(|P - \mathbb{E}[P]| \geq x/2) + \mathbb{P}(|Q - \mathbb{E}[Q]| \geq x/2).$$

In the end, we get $\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq x) \leq 4 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{16(\theta v + xb/3)}\right)$
with the constant $\theta = \frac{5}{2} \ln(3) - \frac{2}{3}$. □

Remark

Defining $S = \sum_{i=1}^n A[i, \pi(i)]$, we have shown that :

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq x) \leq 4 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{16(\theta v + xb/3)}\right)$$

with the constant $\theta = \frac{5}{2} \ln(3) - \frac{2}{3}$.

Remark

When $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ are iid observations of a distribution P and $A[i, j] = f(x_i, y_j)$, this inequality may be used for a test of independence of the marginals of P .

Do you have any questions ?

References :

- [1] Bercu, Delyon and Rio, Concentration inequalities for sums and martingales (2015).
- [2] Chung and Lu, Concentration inequalities and martingale inequalities : a survey (2006).

Happy birthday Nolwenn !