

Optimal Non-Asymptotic Lower Bound on the Minimax Regret of Learning with Expert Advice

Francesco Orabona
francesco@orabona.com

David Pal
dpal@yahoo-inc.com

Yahoo Labs
New York, NY, USA

November 9, 2015

Abstract

We prove non-asymptotic lower bounds on the expectation of the maximum of d independent Gaussian variables and the expectation of the maximum of d independent symmetric random walks. Both lower bounds recover the optimal leading constant in the limit. A simple application of the lower bound for random walks is an (asymptotically optimal) non-asymptotic lower bound on the minimax regret of online learning with expert advice.

1 Introduction

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d be i.i.d. Gaussian random variables $N(0, \sigma^2)$. It is easy to prove that (see Appendix A)

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \right] \leq \sigma \sqrt{2 \ln d} \quad \text{for any } d \geq 1. \quad (1)$$

It is also well known that

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E} [\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i]}{\sigma \sqrt{2 \ln d}} = 1. \quad (2)$$

In section 2, we prove a non-asymptotic $\Omega(\sigma \sqrt{\log d})$ lower bound on $\mathbf{E} [\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i]$. The leading term of the lower bound is asymptotically $\sqrt{2 \ln d}$. In other words, the lower bound implies (2).

Discrete analog of a Gaussian random variable is the symmetric random walk. Recall that a random walk $Z^{(n)}$ of length n is a sum $Z^{(n)} = Y_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_n$ of n i.i.d. Rademacher variables, which have probability distribution $\Pr[Y_i = +1] = \Pr[Y_i = -1] = 1/2$. We consider d independent symmetric random walks $Z_1^{(n)}, Z_2^{(n)}, \dots, Z_d^{(n)}$ of length n . Analogously to (1), it is easy to prove that (see Appendix A)

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right] \leq \sqrt{2n \ln d} \quad \text{for any } n \geq 0 \text{ and any } d \geq 1. \quad (3)$$

Note that σ^2 in (1) is replaced by $\text{Var}(Z_i^{(n)}) = n$. By central limit theorem $\frac{Z_i^{(n)}}{\sqrt{n}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ converges in distribution to $N(0, 1)$. From this fact, it is possible to prove the analog of (2),

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right]}{\sqrt{2n \ln d}} = 1. \quad (4)$$

We prove a non-asymptotic $\Omega(\sqrt{n \log d})$ lower bound on $\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right]$. Same as for the Gaussian case, the leading term of the lower bound is asymptotically $\sqrt{2n \ln d}$ matching (4).

In section 4, we show a simple application of the lower bound on $\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right]$ to the problem of learning with expert advice. This problem was extensively studied in the online learning literature; see [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006]. Our bound is optimal in the sense that for large d and large n it recovers the right leading constant.

2 Maximum of Gaussians

Crucial step towards lower bounding $\mathbf{E} [\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i]$ is a good lower bound on the tail $\Pr[X_i \geq x]$ of a single Gaussian. The standard way of deriving such bounds is via bounds on the so-called Mill's ratio. Mill's ratio of a random variable X with density function $f(x)$ is the ratio $\frac{\Pr[X > x]}{f(x)}$.¹ It clear that a lower bound on the Mill's ratio yields a lower bound on the tail $\Pr[X > x]$.

Without loss of generality it suffices to lower bound the Mill's ratio of $N(0, 1)$, since Mill's ratio of $N(0, \sigma^2)$ can be obtained by rescaling. Recall that probability density of $N(0, 1)$ is $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2}$ and its cumulative distribution function is $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} dt$. The Mill's ratio for $N(0, 1)$ can be expressed as $\frac{1-\Phi(x)}{\phi(x)}$. A lower bound on Mill's ratio of $N(0, 1)$ was proved by Boyd [1959].

Lemma 1 (Mill's ratio for standard Gaussian [Boyd, 1959]). *For any $x \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)} = \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \int_x^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt \geq \frac{\pi}{(\pi - 1)x + \sqrt{x^2 + 2\pi}} \geq \frac{\pi}{\pi x + \sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

The second inequality in Lemma 1 is our simplification of Boyd's bound. It follows by setting $a = \sqrt{2\pi}$ and $b = x$. By a simple algebra it is equivalent to the inequality $a + b \geq \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$ which holds for any $a, b \geq 0$.

Corollary 2 (Lower Bound on Gaussian Tail). *Let $X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $x \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\Pr[X \geq x] \geq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{x}{\sigma} + 2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X \geq x] &= \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{x}{\sigma}}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \frac{\pi}{\pi \frac{x}{\sigma} + \sqrt{2\pi}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}).$$

□

Equipped with the lower bound on the tail, we prove a lower bound on the maximum of Gaussians.

Theorem 3 (Lower Bound on Maximum of Independent Gaussians). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d be independent Gaussian random variables $N(0, \sigma^2)$. For any $d \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \right] \geq \sigma \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35}\right) \right) \left(\sqrt{2 \ln d - 2 \ln \ln d} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sigma \quad (5)$$

$$\geq 0.13\sigma\sqrt{\ln d} - 0.7\sigma. \quad (6)$$

¹Mill's ratio has applications in economics. A simple is problem where Mill's ratio shows up is the problem of setting optimal price for a product. Given a distribution prices that customers are willing to pay, the goal is to choose the price that brings the most revenue.

Proof. Let A be the event that at least one of the X_i is greater than $C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d}$ where $C = C(d) = \sqrt{2 - \frac{2\ln \ln d}{\ln d}}$. We denote by \bar{A} the complement of this event. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid \bar{A} \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} [X_1 \mid \bar{A}] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} [X_1 \mid X_1 \leq C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d}] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E}[X_1 \mid X_1 \leq 0] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] - \sigma\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d} \cdot \Pr[A] - \sigma\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}(1 - \Pr[A]) \\
&= \sigma \left(C\sqrt{\ln d} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right) \Pr[A] - \sigma\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where we used that $\mathbf{E}[X_1 \mid X_1 \leq 0] = \frac{1}{\Pr[X_1 \leq 0]} \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{x}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) = -\sigma\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$.

It remains to lower bound $\Pr[A]$, which we do as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[A] &= 1 - \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&= 1 - \left(\Pr [X_1 \leq C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d}] \right)^d \\
&= 1 - \left(1 - \Pr [X_1 > C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d}] \right)^d \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-d \cdot \Pr [X_1 \geq C\sigma\sqrt{\ln d}] \right) \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-d \exp \left(-\frac{C^2 \ln d}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}C\sqrt{\ln d} + 2} \right) \\
&= 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{d^{1-\frac{C^2}{2}}}{C\sqrt{2\pi \ln d} + 2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where in the first inequality we used the elementary inequality $1 - x \leq \exp(-x)$ valid for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since $C = \sqrt{2 - \frac{2\ln \ln d}{\ln d}}$ we have $d^{1-\frac{C^2}{2}} = \ln d$. Substituting this into (8), we get

$$\Pr[A] \geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\ln d}{C\sqrt{2\pi \ln d} + 2} \right) = 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{C\sqrt{2\pi} + 2} \right). \tag{9}$$

The function $C(d)$ is decreasing on the interval $[1, e^e]$, increasing on $[e^e, \infty)$, and $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} C(d) = \sqrt{2}$. From these properties we can deduce that $C(d) \leq \max\{C(2), \sqrt{2}\} \leq 1.75$ for any $d \in [2, \infty)$. Therefore, $C\sqrt{2\pi} + 2 \leq 6.35$ and hence

$$\Pr[A] \geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35} \right). \tag{10}$$

Inequalities (7) and (10) together imply bound (5). Bound (6) is obtained from (5) by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35} \right) \right) \left(\sqrt{2 \ln d - 2 \ln \ln d} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sigma \\
&= \sigma \left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35} \right) \right) \sqrt{2 \ln d - 2 \ln \ln d} - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35} \right) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sigma \\
&\geq 0.1227 \cdot \sigma \sqrt{2 \ln d - 2 \ln \ln d} - 0.7 \sigma \\
&= 0.1227 \cdot \sigma \sqrt{\ln d} \cdot C(d) - 0.7 \sigma
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{6.35} \right) \leq 0.8773$ for any $d \geq 2$. Since $C(d)$ has minimum at $d = e^e$, it follows that $C(d) \geq C(e^e) = \sqrt{2 - \frac{2}{e}} \geq 1.1243$ for any $d \geq 2$. \square

3 Maximum of Random Walks

The general strategy for proving a lower bound on $\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right]$ is the same as in the previous section. The main task it to lower bound the tail $\Pr[Z^{(n)} \geq x]$ of a symmetric random walk $Z^{(n)}$ of length n . Note that

$$B_n = \frac{Z^{(n)} + n}{2}$$

is a Binomial random variable $B(n, \frac{1}{2})$. We follow the same approach used in Orabona [2013]. First we lower bound the tail $\Pr[B_n \geq k]$ with McKay [1989, Theorem 2].

Lemma 4 (Bound on Binomial Tail). *Let n, k be integers satisfying $n \geq 1$ and $\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq n$. Define $x = \frac{2k-n}{\sqrt{n}}$. Then, $B_n \sim B(n, \frac{1}{2})$ satisfies*

$$\Pr[B_n \geq k] \geq \sqrt{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} 2^{-n} \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)}.$$

We lower bound the binomial coefficient $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$ using Stirling's approximation of the factorial. The lower bound on the binomial coefficient will be expressed in terms of Kullback-Leibler divergence between two Bernoulli distributions, Bernoulli(p) and Bernoulli(q). Abusing notation somewhat, we write the divergence as

$$D(p||q) = p \ln \left(\frac{p}{q} \right) + (1-p) \ln \left(\frac{1-p}{1-q} \right).$$

The result is the following lower bound on the tail of Binomial.

Theorem 5 (Bound on Binomial Tail). *Let n, k be integers satisfying $n \geq 1$ and $\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq n$. Define $x = \frac{2k-n}{\sqrt{n}}$. Then, $B_n \sim B(n, \frac{1}{2})$ satisfies*

$$\Pr[B_n \geq k] \geq \frac{\exp(-nD(\frac{k}{n}||\frac{1}{2}))}{\exp(\frac{1}{6})\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)}.$$

Proof. Lemma 4 implies that

$$\Pr[B_n \geq k] \geq \sqrt{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} 2^{-n} \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)}$$

Since $k \geq 1$, we can write the binomial coefficient as

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{k}$$

We bound the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$ by using Stirling's formula for the factorial. We use explicit upper and lower bounds due to Robbins [1955] valid for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n < n! < \exp\left(\frac{1}{12}\right) \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n.$$

Using the Stirling's approximation, for any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{k} &= \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} \\ &> \frac{\sqrt{2\pi n} n^n e^{-n}}{\sqrt{2\pi k} k^k e^{-k} e^{1/12} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi(n-k)} (n-k)^{n-k} e^{-(n-k)} e^{1/12}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{n-k} \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k \sqrt{\frac{n}{k(n-k)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \sqrt{2\pi}} 2^n \exp\left(-n \cdot D\left(\frac{k}{n} \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \sqrt{\frac{n}{k(n-k)}} \end{aligned}$$

where in the equality we used the definition of $D(p||q)$. Combining all the inequalities, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[B_n \geq 2k - n] &\geq \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \sqrt{2\pi}} 2^n \exp\left(-n \cdot D\left(\frac{k}{n} \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \sqrt{\frac{n}{k(n-k)}} 2^{-n} \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-n \cdot D\left(\frac{k}{n} \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n-k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-n \cdot D\left(\frac{k}{n} \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)} \end{aligned}$$

for $\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq n-1$. For $k = n$, we verify the statement of the theorem by direct substitution. The left hand side is $\Pr[B^{(n)} \geq n] = 2^{-n}$. Since $e^{-nD(1||\frac{1}{2})} = 2^{-n}$ and $x = \sqrt{n} \geq 1$, it's easy to see that the right hand side is smaller than 2^{-n} . \square

For $k = n/2 + xn$, the divergence $D\left(\frac{k}{n} \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right) = D\left(\frac{1}{2} + x \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)$ can be approximated by $2x^2$. We define the function $\psi : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\psi(x) = \frac{D\left(\frac{1}{2} + x \parallel \frac{1}{2}\right)}{2x^2}.$$

It is the ratio of the divergence and the approximation. The function $\psi(x)$ satisfies the following properties:

- $\psi(x) = \psi(-x)$
- $\psi(x)$ is decreasing on $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$ and increasing on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$
- minimum value is $\psi(0) = 1$
- maximum value is $\psi(\frac{1}{2}) = \psi(-\frac{1}{2}) = 2 \ln(2) \leq 1.3863$

Using the definition of $\psi(x)$ and Theorem 5, we have the following Corollary.

Corollary 6. *Let $n \geq 1$ be a positive integer and let $t \in [1, \frac{n}{2} + 1]$ be a real number. Then $B_n \sim B(n, \frac{1}{2})$ satisfies*

$$\Pr\left[B_n \geq \frac{1}{2}n + t - 1\right] \geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{6}\right) \exp\left(-2\psi\left(\frac{t}{n}\right) \frac{t^2}{n}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{2t}{\sqrt{n}} + 2}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 5 and Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr \left[Z \geq \frac{1}{2}n + t - 1 \right] &= \Pr \left[Z \geq \left\lceil \frac{1}{2}n + t - 1 \right\rceil \right] \\
&\geq \frac{\exp \left(-nD \left(\frac{\lceil \frac{1}{2}n + t - 1 \rceil}{n} \middle\| \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)}{\exp \left(\frac{1}{6} \right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{\pi}{\pi \frac{2^{\lceil \frac{1}{2}n + t - 1 \rceil - n}}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{2\pi}} \\
&\geq \frac{\exp \left(-nD \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}n + t}{n} \middle\| \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)}{\exp \left(\frac{1}{6} \right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{\pi}{\pi \frac{2^{\frac{1}{2}n + t} - n}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{2\pi}} \\
&= \frac{\exp \left(-nD \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{t}{n} \middle\| \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)}{\exp \left(\frac{1}{6} \right) \sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{\pi}{\pi \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{2\pi}} \\
&= \exp \left(-\frac{1}{6} \right) \exp \left(-2\psi \left(\frac{t}{n} \right) \frac{t^2}{n} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} + 2}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7 (Lower Bound on Maximum of Independent Symmetric Random Walks). *Let $Z_1^{(n)}, Z_2^{(n)}, \dots, Z_d^{(n)}$ be d independent symmetric random walks of length n . If $2 \leq d \leq \exp(\frac{n}{3})$ and $n \geq 7$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right] &\geq \frac{1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{3.1\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)}{\sqrt{\psi \left(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)}} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{2 \ln d - 2 \ln \ln d} - 1 \right) - \sqrt{n} \\
&\geq 0.09\sqrt{n \ln d} - 2\sqrt{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define the event A equal to the case that at least one of the $Z_i^{(n)}$ is greater or equal to $C\sqrt{n \ln d} - 2$ where $C = C(d, n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\psi \left(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)}} \sqrt{2 - \frac{2 \ln \ln d}{\ln d}}$.

We upper and lower bound $C(d, n)$. Denote by $f(d) = \sqrt{2 - \frac{2 \ln \ln d}{\ln d}}$ and notice that $C(d, n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\psi \left(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)}} f(d)$.

It suffices to bound $f(d)$ and $\psi \left(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)$. We already know that $1 \leq \psi(x) \leq 2 \ln(2)$ for all $x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ for $d \leq \exp(n/3)$. The function $f(d)$ is decreasing on $(1, e^e]$, increasing on $[e^e, \infty)$, and $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} f(d) = \sqrt{2}$. It has unique minimum at e^e . Therefore, $f(d) \geq f(e^e) = \sqrt{2 - \frac{2}{e}} \geq 1.12$ for all $d \in (1, \infty)$. Similarly, from unimodality of $f(d)$ we have that $f(d) \leq \max\{\sqrt{2}, f(2)\} = f(2) \leq 1.6$ for all $d \in [2, \infty)$. From this we can conclude that if $n \geq \ln d > 0$,

$$0.95 \leq \frac{f(e^e)}{\sqrt{2 \ln 2}} \leq C(d, n) \leq f(2) \leq 1.6. \quad (11)$$

If $n \geq 7$ and $2 \leq d \leq \exp(n/3)$ this implies that

$$1 < \frac{C\sqrt{n \ln d}}{2} < \frac{n}{2} + 1. \quad (12)$$

Recalling the definition of event A , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid \bar{A} \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid \bar{A} \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid \bar{A} \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid Z_1^{(n)} < C\sqrt{n \ln d} - 2 \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \mid A \right] \cdot \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0 \right] \cdot \Pr[\bar{A}] \quad (\text{by (12)}) \\
&\geq (C\sqrt{n \ln d} - 2) \Pr[A] + \mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0 \right] (1 - \Pr[A]).
\end{aligned}$$

We lower bound $\mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0 \right]$. Using the fact that distribution of $Z_1^{(n)}$ is symmetric and has zero mean,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[Z_1^{(n)} \mid Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0 \right] &= \sum_{k=-n}^0 k \cdot \Pr[Z_1^{(n)} = k \mid Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0] \\
&= \frac{1}{\Pr[Z_1^{(n)} \leq 0]} \sum_{k=-n}^0 k \cdot \Pr[Z_1^{(n)} = k] \\
&\geq 2 \sum_{k=-n}^0 k \cdot \Pr[Z_1^{(n)} = k] \quad (\text{by symmetry of } Z_1^{(n)}) \\
&= - \sum_{k=-n}^n |k| \cdot \Pr[Z_1^{(n)} = k] \quad (\text{again, by symmetry of } Z_1^{(n)}) \\
&= - \mathbf{E}[|Z_1^{(n)}|] \\
&= - \mathbf{E} \left[\sqrt{(Z_1^{(n)})^2} \right] \\
&\geq - \sqrt{\mathbf{E} \left[(Z_1^{(n)})^2 \right]} \quad (\text{by concavity of } \sqrt{\cdot}) \\
&= - \sqrt{\text{Var} \left(Z_1^{(n)} \right)} \\
&= - \sqrt{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us focus on $\Pr[A]$. Note that $B_n = \frac{Z_1 + n}{2}$ is a binomial random variable with distribution $B(n, \frac{1}{2})$. Similar

to the proof of Theorem 3, we can lower bound $\Pr[A]$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[A] &= 1 - \Pr[\bar{A}] \\
&= 1 - \left(\Pr \left[Z_1^{(n)} < C\sqrt{n \ln d} - 2 \right] \right)^d \\
&= 1 - \left(\Pr \left[B_n < \frac{n}{2} + \frac{C\sqrt{n \ln d}}{2} - 1 \right] \right)^d \\
&= 1 - \left(1 - \Pr \left[B_n \geq \frac{C\sqrt{n \ln d}}{2} + \frac{n}{2} - 1 \right] \right)^d \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-d \cdot \Pr \left[B_n \geq \frac{C\sqrt{n \ln d}}{2} + \frac{n}{2} - 1 \right] \right) && \text{(since } 1 - x \leq e^{-x} \text{)} \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{6}) d^{1 - \frac{C^2}{2} \psi(\frac{C\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}})}}{C\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\ln d} + 2} \right) && \text{(by Corollary 6 and (12))} \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{6}) d^{1 - \frac{C^2}{2} \psi(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}})}}{1.6\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\ln d} + 2} \right) && \text{(by (11)).}
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the fact that $C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\psi(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}})}} \sqrt{2 - \frac{2 \ln \ln d}{\ln d}}$ implies that $d^{1 - \frac{C^2}{2} \psi(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}})} = \ln d$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[A] &\geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{6}) d^{1 - \frac{C^2}{2} \psi(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}})}}{1.6\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\ln d} + 2} \right) \\
&= 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{6}) \ln d}{1.6\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\ln d} + 2} \right) \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{6}) \sqrt{\ln d}}{2.6\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) \\
&\geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{3.1\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that $\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\ln d} > 2$ for $d \geq 2$. Putting all together, we have the stated bound. \square

4 Learning with Expert Advice

Learning with Expert Advice is an online problem where in each round t an algorithm chooses (possibly randomly) an action $I_t \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and then it receives losses of the actions $\ell_{t,1}, \ell_{t,2}, \dots, \ell_{t,d} \in [0, 1]$. This repeats for n rounds. The goal of the algorithm is to have a small cumulative loss $\sum_{t=1}^n \ell_{t, I_t}$ of actions it has chosen. The difference between the algorithm's loss and the loss of best fixed action in hind-sight is called *regret*. Formally,

$$\text{Regret}^{(d)}(n) = \sum_{t=1}^n \ell_{t, I_t} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell_{t, i} .$$

There are algorithms that given the number of rounds n as an input achieve regret no more than $\sqrt{\frac{n}{2} \ln d}$ for any sequence of losses.

Theorem 8. Let $n \geq 7$ and $2 \leq d \leq \exp(\frac{n}{3})$. For any algorithm for learning with expert advice there exists a sequence of losses $\ell_{t,i} \in \{0, 1\}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, $1 \leq t \leq n$, such that

$$\text{Regret}^{(d)}(n) \geq \frac{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{\ln d}}{3.1\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)}{\sqrt{\psi\left(\frac{1.6\sqrt{\ln d}}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \left(\sqrt{2 \ln d} - 2 \ln \ln d - 1\right) - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}.$$

Proof. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.7 in [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006] we only need to show that

$$\text{Regret}^{(d)}(n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} Z_i^{(n)} \right]$$

where $Z_1^{(n)}, Z_2^{(n)}, \dots, Z_d^{(n)}$ are independent symmetric random walks of length n . The theorem follows from Theorem 7. \square

The theorem proves a non-asymptotic lower bounds, while at the same time recovering the optimal constant of the asymptotic one in Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi [2006].

References

- A. V. Boyd. Inequalities for Mill's ratio. *Reports of Statistical Application Research (Union of Japanese Scientists and Engineers)*, 6:44–46, 1959.
- N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- B. D. McKay. On Littlewood's estimate for the binomial distribution. *Advanced Applied Probability*, 21:475–478, 1989.
- F. Orabona. Dimension-free exponentiated gradient. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 1806–1814. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- H. Robbins. A remark on Stirling's formula. *American Mathematical Monthly*, pages 26–29, 1955.

A Upper Bounds

We say that a random variable X is σ^2 -sub-Gaussian (for some $\sigma \geq 0$) if

$$\mathbf{E} [e^{sX}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2}\right) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (13)$$

It is straightforward to verify that $X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ is σ^2 -sub-Gaussian. Indeed, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} [e^{sX}] &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) e^{sx} dx \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{s^2\sigma^2}{2}\right) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - s\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{s^2\sigma^2}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that a Rademacher random variable Y (with distribution $\Pr[Y = +1] = \Pr[Y = -1] = \frac{1}{2}$) is 1-sub-Gaussian. Indeed, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{E} [e^{sY}] = \frac{e^s + e^{-s}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{k!} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{s^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^{2k}}{(2k)!} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^{2k}}{k! 2^k} = \exp\left(\frac{s^2}{2}\right).$$

If Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n are independent σ -sub-Gaussian random variables, then $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ is $(n\sigma^2)$ -sub-Gaussian. This follows from

$$\mathbf{E} \left[e^{s \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i} \right] = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} [e^{sY_i}].$$

This property proves that the symmetric random walk $Z^{(n)}$ of length n is n -sub-Gaussian.

The upper bounds (1) and (3) follow directly from sub-Gaussianity of the variables involved and the following lemma.

Lemma 9 (Maximum of sub-Gaussian random variables). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d be (possibly dependent) σ^2 -sub-Gaussian condition random variables. Then,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \right] \leq \sigma \sqrt{2 \ln d}.$$

Proof. For any $s > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_i \right] &= \frac{1}{s} \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \ln e^{sX_i} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{s} \ln \mathbf{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} e^{sX_i} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{s} \ln \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d e^{sX_i} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{s} \ln \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{E} [e^{sX_i}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{s} \ln \left(d \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{\ln d}{s} + \frac{\sigma^2 s}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $s = \frac{\sqrt{2 \ln d}}{\sigma}$ finishes the proof. □