

Lecture 08: Chernoff and Hoeffding Bound + Hypergeometric Distribution

Recall I

- Last lecture we were deriving the Chernoff Bound
- Let \mathbb{X} be a Bernoulli distribution with mean p . That is \mathbb{X} is a random variable over the sample space $\{0, 1\}$ such that the probability $\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{X} = 1] = p$ and $\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{X} = 0] = (1 - p)$.
- Let $(\mathbb{X}^{(1)}, \mathbb{X}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbb{X}^{(n)})$ be n independent and identical samples of the random variable \mathbb{X}
- Our object of study is the random variable

$$S_{n,p} := \mathbb{X}^{(1)} + \dots + \mathbb{X}^{(n)}$$

This random variable is over the sample space $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and we have $\mathbb{P}[S_{n,p} = i] = \binom{n}{i} p^i (1 - p)^{n-i}$. This distribution is also referred to as the binomial distribution $B_{n,p}$.

- The expected value of $\mathbb{S}_{n,p}$ is $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{S}_{n,p}] = np$ by linearity of expectation
- We are interested in finding whether it is possible for the random variable $\mathbb{S}_{n,p}$ to deviate far from the expected value or not.
- Chernoff bound states that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{S}_{n,p} \geq n(p+t)] \leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p))$$

That is, the Chernoff bound states that the probability of exceeding the mean by nt , for constant t , is exponentially small in n

Recall III

- Let us now recall the steps that were involved in deriving the Chernoff Bound
- The first observation was that, for any $h > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n,p} \geq n(p + t)] = \mathbb{P} \left[\exp(hS_{n,p}) \geq \exp(hn(p + t)) \right]$$

The goal is to consider “all moments of the random variable $S_{n,p}$ suitably weighted.” The identity is a result of the fact that $\exp(h \cdot)$ is a monotonically increasing function for positive h .

- Then, we applied Markov to obtain the upper bound

$$\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\exp(hS_{n,p}) \right]}{\exp(hn(p + t))}$$

We emphasize that this is the only place we shall apply an inequality. The tightness of the final bound is solely dependent on the tightness of this inequality!

- Next, we observe that the expectation

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(hS_{n,p})] = \mathbb{E} [\exp(h\mathbb{X}^{(1)})] \cdots \mathbb{E} [\exp(h\mathbb{X}^{(n)})] = \left(\mathbb{E} [\exp(h\mathbb{X})] \right)^n$$

The first equality relies on the fact that the random variables $\mathbb{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{X}^{(n)}$ are independent. The final equality relies on the fact that the random variables $\mathbb{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{X}^{(n)}$ are identical to \mathbb{X} . Based on this observation, the upper-bound evaluates to the following

$$= \left(\frac{(1-p) + p \exp(h)}{\exp(h(p+t))} \right)^n$$

Recall V

- This bound holds for all positive h . We choose $h = h^*$ that minimizes the quantity $\left(\frac{(1-p)+p\exp(h)}{\exp(h(p+t))}\right)$. By basic calculus, we obtain

$$\exp(h^*) = \frac{(1-p)(p+t)}{p(1-p-t)}$$

- Substituting this value of $h = h^*$ in the upper-bound, we get

$$= \left(\left(\frac{p+t}{p} \right)^{p+t} \left(\frac{1-p-t}{1-p} \right)^{1-p-t} \right)^{-n} = \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p))$$

- This completes the proof that

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n,p} \geq n(p+t)] \leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p))$$

- This bound is still not easy to work. We shall derive bounds that are easier to calculate

- **Problem 1.** Suppose we are given a coin that outputs heads with probability p , and outputs tails with probability $(1 - p)$. Can we estimate p accurately?
- Our algorithm is the following. We toss the coin n times and count the number of heads \tilde{n} . Then, we output $\tilde{p} = \frac{\tilde{n}}{n}$ as an estimate of the quantity p .
- What is the probability that we are accurate? Chernoff bound states that

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n,p} \geq n(p + \varepsilon)] \leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p + \varepsilon, p))$$

So, the probability that $\tilde{p} \geq p + \varepsilon$ is

$$\leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p + \varepsilon, p))$$

- **Problem 2.** Suppose we have a randomized algorithm that correctly decides whether $x \in L$ or not, for some language L , with probability 0.75. Can we construct another algorithm that correctly decides whether $x \in L$ or not with probability $1 - 2^{-k}$, for any $k \geq 2$?
- Hint: Run the algorithm a large number of times and take a majority of the outcome. Use Chernoff bound to analyze the algorithm.

Goal of today's Lecture I

- We will obtain a more “easy-to-evaluate” upper-bound for Chernoff Bound
- We shall generalize the Chernoff bound in two orthogonal directions to obtain two different bounds
 - Concentration of the Hypergeometric Distribution, and
 - Hoeffding Bound

Goal of today's Lecture II

- **Hypergeometric Distribution.** Let us establish a new way to interpreting the random variables $(\mathbb{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{X}^{(n)})$. Suppose we have a box of N balls. Among them pN are red and $(1 - p)N$ are blue. The random variable $\mathbb{X}^{(1)}$ is a the random variable corresponding to the experiment of drawing a random ball from this box and checking whether the balls is red or not. Then, we replace the ball back in the box. Now, the random variable $\mathbb{X}^{(2)}$ corresponds to the drawing a random balls from the box and checking whether it is red or not. And, so on...
- In the hypergeometric distribution, we have $N \geq n$ and we perform the same experiment as above except that we do not replace the balls back into the bin!

- **Hoeffding Bound.** Instead of considering $(\mathbb{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbb{X}^{(n)})$ we consider independent random variables $(\mathbb{X}_1, \dots, \mathbb{X}_n)$ such that each \mathbb{X}_i is a distribution over the sample space $[a_i, b_i]$ and, overall, we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{X}_n] = np$.

Easy to Calculate Chernoff Bound I

- Our goal is to find an easy to evaluate upper bound of

$$\exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p))$$

- This goal is equivalent to finding an easy to evaluate lower-bound of

$$D_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p) = (p+t) \ln \frac{p+t}{p} + (1-p-t) \ln \frac{1-p-t}{1-p} =: g(t)$$

- We do this by using Taylor expansion of $g(t)$ around $t = 0$.
Let us start with this process.

Easy to Calculate Chernoff Bound II

- Note that $g(0) = 0$
- Let us differentiate and obtain $g^{(1)}(t)$

$$\begin{aligned}g^{(1)}(t) &= \ln \frac{p+t}{p} + 1 - \ln \frac{1-p-t}{1-p} - 1 \\ &= \ln \frac{p+t}{p} - \ln \frac{1-p-t}{1-p}\end{aligned}$$

- Note that $g^{(1)}(0) = 0$
- Let us differentiate once more and obtain $g^{(2)}(t)$

$$g^{(2)}(t) = \frac{1}{p+t} + \frac{1}{1-p-t}$$

- So, we get $g^{(2)}(0) = \frac{1}{p(1-p)}$. Okay, so we got something non-negative. We shall truncate at the next term in the Taylor's Expansion.

Easy to Calculate Chernoff Bound III

- Let us differentiate once more and obtain $g^{(3)}(t)$

$$g^{(3)}(t) = -\frac{1}{(p+t)^2} + \frac{1}{(1-p-t)^2}$$

Easy to Calculate Chernoff Bound IV

- We shall see a few bounds. Let us expand till 2-terms. There exists $c \in [0, t]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}g(t) &= g(0) + g^{(1)}(0)t + g^{(2)}(c)\frac{t^2}{2} \\ &= \frac{t^2}{2(p+c)(1-p-c)} \\ &\geq 2t^2, \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(by AM-GM Inequality)}\end{aligned}$$

- This bound is not sensitive to p . Let us get a bound sensitive to p . We consider 3-terms in the expansion now. For some $c \in [0, t]$, we have.

$$\begin{aligned}g(t) &= g(0) + g^{(1)}(0)t + g^{(2)}(0)\frac{t^2}{2} + g^{(3)}(c)\frac{t^2}{6} \\ &= \frac{t^2}{2p(1-p)} + g^{(3)}(c)\frac{t^2}{6}\end{aligned}$$

Easy to Calculate Chernoff Bound V

If $p \geq 1/2$, then we have $g^{(3)}(c) \geq 0$ and, consequently,

$$g(t) \geq \frac{t^2}{2p(1-p)}$$

- Let us summarize

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n,p} \geq n(p+t)] \leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p)) \leq \exp(-2nt^2)$$

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n,p} \geq n(p+t)] \leq \exp(-nD_{\text{KL}}(p+t, p)) \leq \exp\left(-n \frac{t^2}{2p(1-p)}\right)$$

when $p \geq 1/2$

Take a look at the graph at [desmos](#)

For a bound for all p , go one more term in the Taylor expansion.

Hypergeometric Distribution

- Recall the hypergeometric distribution. We are given N balls in a bin. There are pN red balls and $(1 - p)N$ blue balls. We sample n balls from the bin without replacement. Let the samples be $(\mathbb{X}_1, \dots, \mathbb{X}_n)$. We are interested in the probability that we see $n(p + t)$ red balls.
- Crucial Observation.** Pause just after time j (i.e., just after picking j balls).
 - If you have p red balls in $(\mathbb{X}_1, \dots, \mathbb{X}_j)$ then the probability that \mathbb{X}_{j+1} is a red ball is p .
 - If you have $< p$ red balls in $(\mathbb{X}_1, \dots, \mathbb{X}_j)$ then the probability that \mathbb{X}_{j+1} is a red ball is $> p$.
 - If you have $> p$ red balls in $(\mathbb{X}_1, \dots, \mathbb{X}_j)$ then the probability that \mathbb{X}_{j+1} is a red ball is $< p$.
- Conclusion.** The hypergeometric series pushes the “sum” towards the mean. So, it is more concentrated than the binomial distribution $B(n, p)$!
- Using coupling argument this intuition can be formalized.

- **First Change.** Let us assume that the mean of each X_i is 0. This assumption is justified because we can consider the random variable $Y_i = X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]$ instead. This simplification will make several of the mathematical expressions less cumbersome.

Now, given the assumption that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[S_{n,p}] = 0$ as well. So, we are interested in bounding the probability

$$\mathbb{P}[S_{n,p} \geq nt]$$

- **Second Change.** We have to upper-bound $\mathbb{E} [\exp(h\mathbb{X}_i)]$ given the fact that \mathbb{X}_i is over the sample space $[a_i, b_i]$ and $\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{X}_i] = 0$. How do we proceed further?
Let us use Hoeffding's Lemma

Lemma (Hoeffding's Lemma)

Let \mathbb{X}_i be a r.v. over the sample space $[a_i, b_i]$ with $\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{X}_i] = 0$.
Then, the following holds

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(h\mathbb{X}_i)] \leq \exp \left(\frac{h^2(b_i - a_i)^2}{8} \right)$$

- Then you should be able to complete the proof of Hoeffding Bound.

$$\mathbb{P} [S_{n_p} \geq n(p + t)] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{2t^2 n^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2} \right)$$