

Upper Tail Estimates with Combinatorial Proofs

Jan Hażła* Thomas Holenstein*

December 6, 2024

Abstract

We study generalisations of a simple, combinatorial proof of a Chernoff bound similar to the one by Impagliazzo and Kabanets (RANDOM, 2010).

In particular, we prove a randomized version of the hitting property of expander random walks and apply it to obtain a concentration bound for expander random walks which is essentially optimal for small deviations and a large number of steps. At the same time, we present a simpler proof that still yields a “right” bound settling a question asked by Impagliazzo and Kabanets.

Next, we obtain a simple upper tail bound for polynomials with input variables in $[0, 1]$ which are not necessarily independent, but obey a certain condition inspired by Impagliazzo and Kabanets. The resulting bound is used by Holenstein and Sinha (FOCS, 2012) in the proof of a lower bound for the number of calls in a black-box construction of a pseudorandom generator from a one-way function.

We then show that the same technique yields the upper tail bound for the number of copies of a fixed graph in an Erdős–Rényi random graph, matching the one given by Janson, Oleszkiewicz, and Ruciński (Israel J. Math, 2002).

1 Introduction

Concentration bounds are inequalities that estimate the probability of a random variable assuming a value that is far from its expectation. They have a multitude of applications all across the mathematics and theoretical computer science. See, e.g., textbooks [AB09] and [DP09] for uses in complexity theory and randomised algorithms.

A typical setting is when this variable is a function $f(x)$ of n simpler random variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ that possess a certain degree of independence and we try to bound said probability with a function decaying exponentially with n (or, maybe, n^ϵ for some $\epsilon > 0$).

The canonical examples are Chernoff-Hoeffding bounds [Che52, Hoe63] for the sum of n independent random variables in $[0, 1]$ and Azuma’s inequality [Azu67] for martingales.

*ETH Zürich, Department of Computer Science, Zurich, Switzerland. E-mail: {jan.hazla,thomas.holenstein}@inf.ethz.ch

The standard technique to prove Chernoff bounds is due to Bernstein [Ber24]. The idea is to bound $E[e^{tf(x)}]$ for some appropriately chosen t , and then to apply Markov's inequality.

Recently, Impagliazzo and Kabanets [IK10] gave a different, combinatorial proof of the Chernoff bound, arguing that its simplicity and nature provide additional insight into understanding concentration. What is more, their proof is constructive in a certain sense (see [IK10] for details).

The proof given by Impagliazzo and Kabanets is related to previous published results: in [SSS95], Schmidt, Siegel and Srinivasan give a Chernoff bound which is applicable in case the random variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are only m -wise independent for some large enough m . It turns out that the expressions which appear in their computations have close counterparts in the proof in [IK10], but they still bound $E[e^{tf(x)}]$, and it seems to us that the approach in [IK10] makes the concepts clearer and the calculations shorter.

Another work related to [IK10] is due to Janson, Oleszkiewicz and Ruciński [JOR02], who give an upper tail bound (i.e., a one-sided concentration bound) for the number of subgraphs in an Erdős-Rényi random graph $G_{n,p}$. The proof given in [JOR02] bears much relationship to the proof given in [IK10]. We elaborate on that in Section 1.3.

Finally, there is a connection to an argument used by Rao to prove a concentration bound for parallel repetition of two-prover games [Rao08]. As we will see, one of the ideas in the proof given in [IK10] is to consider a subset of the variables (x_1, \dots, x_n) . Rao also does this, with a somewhat different purpose.

In the following we present our contributions and an overview of the paper.

1.1 A simple proof of a Chernoff Bound

Throughout the paper we focus on bounding expressions of the form $\Pr[f(x) \geq \mu(1 + \epsilon)]$. We call such bounds “(multiplicative) upper tail bounds”.

We start by presenting a short proof of a Chernoff bound in, arguably, the most basic setting.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be i.i.d. over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $\Pr[x_i = 1] = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \frac{n}{2}(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon^2 n}{6} \right).$$

Proof. Let $m := \lceil \frac{\epsilon n}{3} \rceil$. Since for each $M \subseteq [n]$ with $|M| < m$ it holds that $\Pr_{x_i, i} [x_i = 1 \mid \forall j \in M : x_j = 1] \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})$, we have $E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^m \right] \leq \left(\frac{n}{2} \right)^m (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})^m$. By Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^m \geq \left(\frac{n}{2} \right)^m (1 + \epsilon)^m \right] \leq \left(\frac{1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon^2 n}{6} \right).$$

□

The above is the simplest proof of the most basic Chernoff bound we know of, and we believe that it is worthwhile to state it explicitly. It can be obtained by adapting the proof given in [IK10] for the given setting, although a direct adaptation yields a slightly different (and probably a bit longer) argument. Alternatively, it can be seen as an instantiation of the proof given in [JOR02] in case one is interested in counting the number of copies of K_2 (i.e., the number of edges) in a random graph $G_{n,p}$, after rather many simplifications that can be done for this very special case. Finally, it is a straightforward instantiation of our later proof given in Section 2.

1.2 Growth boundedness

The central notion in our proofs is *growth boundedness*, which, for distributions over $\{0, 1\}^n$, can be stated as follows:

Definition 1.2. *Let $\delta \geq -1$ and $m \in [n]$. A distribution P_x over $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $\mu := \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} [x_i = 1]$ is (δ, m) -growth bounded if*

$$\Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} \left[\forall j \in [m] : x_{i_j} = 1 \right] \leq \mu^m (1 + \delta)^m .$$

We generalise this definition later to the case where the x_i are in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (Definition 2.1).

We prove that having (δ, m) -growth boundedness for $\delta < \epsilon$ is sufficient to show that the probability of having more than $\mu(1 + \epsilon)$ fraction of ones is exponentially small in m . For example, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *Let P_x be an $(\frac{\epsilon}{3}, m)$ -growth bounded distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $\mu := \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} [x_i = 1]$, $\mu > 0$, $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon m}{2} \right) .$$

We note that the growth boundedness is a very weak restriction on a distribution. For example, it is satisfied by m -wise independent distributions.

The proof of this theorem is inspired by [IK10]. In fact, our main contribution here is to observe that the growth boundedness suffices to prove concentration bounds, and the proof then follows roughly the lines of the corresponding proofs in [IK10].

1.3 Connection of [IK10] and [JOR02]

The basic idea of the proof in [IK10] is to consider $\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]$, where M is a subset of $[n]$ obtained by choosing each element independently with some probability q . Then, this is compared with $\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{E}]$, where \mathcal{E} is the event that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon)$. In fact, we have

$$\Pr_x[\mathcal{E}] \leq \frac{\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]}{\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{E}]}.$$

It is possible to show that for $m := \mathbb{E}[|M|] \ll n$ we have $\Pr_M[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{E}] \gtrsim \mu^m(1 + \epsilon)^m$. To see the intuition of this, simply note that this probability roughly equals the probability of only selecting red balls when one chooses with repetition m times out of n balls, at least $\mu n(1 + \epsilon)$ of which are red.¹ Thus,

$$\Pr_x[\mathcal{E}] \lesssim \frac{\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]}{\mu^m(1 + \epsilon)^m}. \quad (1)$$

Now note that this last argument only uses the probability over M , and so is independent of the distribution of x . Thus, for any distribution on which we can give a good upper bound on $\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]$, the technique of [IK10] gives a concentration result.

The argument we use is very similar, but we pick M as an m -tuple whose elements are picked independently with repetition. However, then we also have

$$n^m \Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}_{x,M}[(x_1 + \dots + x_n)^m].$$

By Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}] = \Pr[(x_1 + \dots + x_n)^m \geq (\mu n(1 + \epsilon))^m] \leq \frac{\Pr_{x,M}[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]}{\mu^m(1 + \epsilon)^m},$$

which is almost the same as (1).

The view in (1) is the one adopted by [IK10]. Bounding the m -th moment and using Markov is the view adopted in [JOR02]. The above argument shows that these views are closely related, and one can argue that the connection is given by growth boundedness.

1.4 Growth boundedness without repetition

One can make a similar argument also for different ways of choosing M than in [IK10] or in the growth boundedness definition. In particular, in the proof of the expander random walk bound we find it convenient to choose M as a uniform subset of $[n]$ of size m .

This leads to the following definition (copied from Section 2.1):

¹The difference to the actual random experiment is that we do not keep each ball with probability m/n but instead choose exactly m times.

Definition 2.5. Let $\delta \geq -1$ and $m \in [n]$. We say that a distribution P_x over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $\mu := \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ i \leftarrow [n]}}[x_i = 1]$ is (δ, m) -growth bounded without repetition if

$$\Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[n]}{m}}} \left[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \right] \leq \mu^m (1 + \delta)^m .$$

In Section 2.1 we present a proof of an analogue of Theorem 1.3 for growth boundedness without repetition.

1.5 Random walks on expanders

For an introduction to expander graphs, see [HLW06] or [Vad12, Chapter 4]. In short, a λ -expander is a d -regular undirected graph G with the second largest (in terms of absolute value) eigenvalue of the transition matrix at most λ .

We consider a random walk on λ -expander starting in a uniform random vertex. It is a very useful fact in many applications that such a random walk behaves in certain respects very similarly to a random walk on the complete graph.

In particular, the so called hitting property [AKS87, Kah95] states that the probability that an ℓ -step random walk on a λ -expander G stays completely inside a set $W \subseteq V := V(G)$ with $\mu := |W|/|V|$ is at most $(\mu + \lambda)^\ell$. A more general version [AFWZ95] states that for each $M \subseteq [\ell]$ the probability that a random walk stays inside W in all steps from M is at most $(\mu + 2\lambda)^{|M|}$.

One of our results, which may be of independent interest, can be considered as a randomized version of the hitting property. Namely, we show that, given $\epsilon > 0$, for a relatively small *random* subset $M \subseteq [\ell]$ of size m the probability that a random walk on a λ -expander stays inside W in all steps from M is at most $(\mu(1 + \epsilon))^m$:

Theorem 3.6. Let G be a λ -expander with a distribution P_r over V^ℓ representing an $(\ell - 1)$ -step random walk $r = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$ (with v_1 being a uniform starting vertex) and $W \subseteq V$ with $\mu := |W|/|V|$. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $m \leq \min(1, \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2})\ell$. Then,

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}}} \left[\forall i \in M : v_i \in W \right] \leq (\mu(1 + \epsilon))^m .$$

The proof is a combination of a coupling argument and standard linear-algebraic techniques. More specifically, for a fixed $M = \{s_1 < \dots < s_m\}$ and $d_i := s_i - s_{i-1}$ we can show by known methods that

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow P_r} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] \leq \prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \lambda^{d_i}) .$$

For a typical M we hope that most of the d_i will be large enough to make the contribution of λ^{d_i} negligible. We show that by coupling the d_i with i.i.d. random variables e_i such that $e_i \leq d_i$ and bounding the (simpler to work with) expression

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \lambda^{e_i})\right] = \prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \mathbb{E}[\lambda^{e_i}]) .$$

Another important property of random walks on expander graphs is the Chernoff bound estimating the probability that the number of times a random walk visits W is far from its expectation. The first Chernoff bound for expander random walks was given by Gillman [Gil98] and the problem was treated further in [Kah97, Lez98, Hea08].

Impagliazzo and Kabanets [IK10] apply their technique to obtain a bound for random walks on expander graphs, but in case of deviations smaller than λ they lose a factor of $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ in the exponent. They then ask if their technique can be modified to avoid this loss.

We answer this question affirmatively: using Theorem 3.6 we immediately obtain a bound that matches the known ones and does not suffer from the additional $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ factor while preserving the simplicity of the proof.

Theorem 3.10. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.6 with $\mu > 0$. Define \mathbb{P}_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1 \iff v_i \in W$ and let $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{4}{5}]$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{(1 - \lambda)\epsilon^2 \mu \ell}{18} \right) .$$

Furthermore, by a more careful computation and using a tighter version of Theorem 3.6 we arrive at a bound with a better exponent when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

Theorem 3.14. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.6 with $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Define \mathbb{P}_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1 \iff v_i \in W$ and let $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. Then, there exists c_μ that depends only on μ such that*

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{1 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell}{2} + c_\mu \cdot \epsilon^3 \ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \ell \right) .$$

Using a result by Kahalé [Kah97], we can show that the result is optimal in the following sense: let G be an expander graph such that a random walk on G chooses a self-loop with probability $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and a uniform random vertex with probability $1 - \lambda$ (such G is a λ -expander) and let $W \subseteq V(G)$ have measure $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Then:

Theorem 3.17. *There exist $\epsilon_{\lambda, \mu} > 0$ and $c_{\lambda, \mu} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\lambda, \mu})$ and ℓ big enough (where “big enough” depends on λ, μ and ϵ), we have*

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1 + \epsilon) \right] \geq \exp \left(- \frac{1 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell}{2} - c_{\lambda, \mu} \cdot \epsilon^3 \ell \right) .$$

1.5.1 Comparison to the expander random walk bound by Kahalé

The previous results which are most closely related to Theorems 3.14 and 3.17 are due to Kahalé [Kah97]. He defines $\alpha := \min_{x \geq 1} f(x)$ for

$$f(x) := x \left(\frac{(\lambda + \mu - \lambda\mu)x - \lambda}{x^2 - (1 - \mu + \lambda\mu)x} \right)^{(1+\epsilon)\mu} \quad (2)$$

and proves that for the expander which has “least concentration” we have

$$\alpha^{\ell(1+\eta(\ell))} \leq \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \right] \leq c_{\lambda,\mu,\epsilon} \cdot \alpha^{\ell}, \quad (3)$$

where $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and $c_{\lambda,\mu,\epsilon}$ is a constant depending only on λ , μ , and ϵ (see Theorems 3.1 and 5.1 in [Kah97]).

Our proof of Theorem 3.17 consists in showing that

$$\alpha \geq \exp \left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} - O(\epsilon^3) \right) \quad (4)$$

and combining this with the left hand side inequality in (3).

Since the right hand side inequality in (3) holds for an arbitrary expander graph, one can also provide an alternative proof of Theorem 3.14 (to be precise, the resulting theorem would differ in the lower order terms). For this, one combines the upper bound in (3) with $\alpha \leq f(1 + \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \epsilon)$, and estimates the Taylor expansion of the resulting expression.² We believe that the proof we provide in Section 3 is simpler overall.

Besides proving (3), Kahalé also gives an upper bound on α : in [Kah97, Theorem 4.1] he shows

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq \exp \left(-(1-\lambda)\mu \left(\sqrt{(1+\epsilon)(1-\mu)} - \sqrt{1-(1+\epsilon)\mu} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-(1-\lambda) \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + O(\epsilon^3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This falls short of our bound by a factor of $2/(1+\lambda)$ in the exponent.

1.6 Polynomial concentration

In certain applications it is desired to bound the concentration not only of the sum, but rather of a (low-degree) polynomial of some random variables.

In the case when (informally) the polynomial is such that the change in its value is bounded when the value of a single input variable is changed the Azuma’s inequality can be applied to bound concentration.

²This was realized by the authors only with hindsight.

If this is not so, one can use techniques that were invented by Kim and Vu [KV00] and developed in a body of work that followed (in particular [Vu02, SS12]). In the special case of a multilinear low-degree polynomial $p(v)$ and an independent distribution of input variables \mathbb{P}_v , their concentration bound can be expressed, very roughly speaking, as a function of $\frac{E_0}{E'}$, where E_0 is the expectation of $p(v)$ and $E' = \max_{K \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{E}[\partial_K p(v)]$.

We obtain a bound in similar spirit, but aim for simplicity and intuitiveness of the proof rather than tightness or full generality. Nevertheless, our bound works for arbitrary polynomials with positive coefficients over input random variables in $[0, 1]$ and is tight in the case of *elementary symmetric polynomials* $e_k(v) := \sum_{|S|=k} \prod_{i \in S} v_i$.

Most importantly, as opposed to prior results, our bound does not require the input variables to be independent, but rather *almost independent* in a certain sense:

Definition 1.4. Let \mathbb{P}_v be a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$, $\delta \geq 0$ and $m \in [\ell]$. \mathbb{P}_v is (δ, m) -almost independent if for each $M \subseteq [\ell]$ with $|M| \leq m$

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} [\forall i \in M : v_i = 1] \leq (1 + \delta)^m \prod_{i \in M} \Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} [v_i = 1].$$

Again, we generalise this definition later to the case where the v_i are in $[0, 1]$ (Definition 4.1).

The concept of almost independence is used in [HS12] in the proof of the black-box lower bound for the number of calls in a construction of a pseudorandom generator from a one-way function and we are not aware of another bound that would be applicable in the setting that arises there.

Let us state two versions of our polynomial concentration bound. For simplicity we focus on distributions over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ and multilinear polynomials, with more general statements in Section 4.

Let \mathbb{P}_v be a (δ, km) -almost independent distribution. Let $p(v)$ be a multilinear polynomial of degree k with positive coefficients. Our way to deal with dependencies in \mathbb{P}_v is to state the bound in terms of \mathbb{P}_v^* which is the distribution of independent variables with the same marginals as \mathbb{P}_v (i.e., each v_i^* has the same distribution as v_i).

We express the concentration in terms of

$$\mu_i^* := \max_{\substack{K \subseteq [\ell] \\ |K|=i}} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v^*} [\partial_K p(v)].$$

Theorem 1.5. Let the setting be as above and $\epsilon > 0$. Then,

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} \left[p(v) \geq \mu_0^* (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \left(\frac{(1 + \delta)^k \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*} \right)}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m.$$

Theorem 1.6. *Let the setting be as above but with P_v independent (i.e., $P_v = P_v^*$), $\mu' := \max_{i \in [k]} \mu_i^*$ and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[p(v) \geq \mu_0^*(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon}{6k} \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon \mu_0^*}{\mu'} \right)^{1/k} \right).$$

A simple example of how one can use our theorems is provided in Section 4.1.

Even though, following [KV00], our bound is expressed in terms of the μ_i^* , the proof uses a different technique without obvious similarity to existing work. To give an outline, let us consider the case of independent $v_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and a multilinear polynomial $p(v)$ with all non-zero coefficients equal to 1.

We can think of $p(v)$ as a sum of binary random variables (corresponding to the monomials) x_1, \dots, x_n with $\mathbb{E}_{i \leftarrow [n]} [x_i] = \frac{\mu_0^*}{n}$. Fix $(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in [n]^m$ and let M be the set of all indices j such that v_j influences at least one of x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m} (note that $|M| \leq km$).

We write $p(v) = \sum_{K \subseteq M: |K| \leq k} p_K(v)$, where $p_K(v)$ consists exactly of those monomials whose variables intersected with M are exactly K . Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[p_K(v) \mid \forall i \in M : v_i = 1 \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[\partial_K p(v) \right].$$

To get growth boundedness for x_1, \dots, x_n , we bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{v \leftarrow P_v \\ i_{m+1} \leftarrow [n]}} \left[x_{i_{m+1}} = 1 \mid \forall j \in [m] : x_{i_j} = 1 \right] &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[p(v) \mid \forall i \in M : v_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{K \subseteq M: |K| \leq k} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[\partial_K p(v) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\mu_0^*}{n} \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is an application of our growth boundedness framework.

1.7 Counting subgraphs in random graphs

In the proof of the polynomial concentration bound we consider values μ_i^* which are maxima of expectations of $\partial_K p(v)$ over sets K of size i . Each such value yields a contribution³ of $(km)^i \mu_i^*$ (proportional to the number of partial derivatives of this type in the subset of input variables of size km) and the “quality” of a concentration bound depends, roughly, on the maximum such contribution.

In principle, nothing prevents us from considering a different, possibly finer, division of partial derivatives into a constant number of classes, each with its own contribution.

³Think of a constant k and a family of polynomials with m going to infinity.

In particular, it is an obvious fact that the number of occurrences of a fixed subgraph H in a random Erdős–Rényi graph (for some of the work on the problem see [JR02, JOR02, JR11]) can be expressed in terms of a multilinear polynomial. In this setting we may divide the partial derivatives into classes corresponding to the subgraphs of H . Interestingly, this yields an upper tail bound proof that is basically isomorphic to the famous one by Janson, Oleszkiewicz and Ruciński [JOR02].

Our result holds in the setting of almost-independent distributions, readily applicable, for example, to $\mathbf{G}_{n,m}$ random graphs (of course the proof of [JOR02] also generalises to those settings).

Notation For a natural number n , let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For a finite set A , by $a \leftarrow A$ we mean a uniform random choice of an element from A . As usual, by $\binom{n}{k}$ we denote $\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (n-i)}{k!}$ for $n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

2 A Chernoff Bound

Definition 2.1. Let $\delta \geq -1$ and $m \in [n]$. A distribution \mathbb{P}_x over $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\mu := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x \\ i \leftarrow [n]}} [x_i]$ is (δ, m) -growth bounded if

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^m \right] \leq (\mu n)^m (1 + \delta)^m .$$

Equivalently, \mathbb{P}_x is (δ, m) -growth bounded if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^m x_{i_j} \right] \leq \mu^m (1 + \delta)^m .$$

In the context of [IK10] and [JOR02] we find it instructive to give two proofs of the concentration bound for growth bounded distributions, one of them restricted to distributions over $\{0, 1\}^n$.

Theorem 2.2. Let \mathbb{P}_x be a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\mu := \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x \\ i \leftarrow [n]}} [x_i = 1]$, $\mu > 0$, $\epsilon > -1$. If \mathbb{P}_x is (δ, m) -growth bounded, then

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \left(\frac{1 + \delta}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m .$$

Proof. First note that since \mathbb{P}_x is over a binary domain, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m x_{i_i} \right] = \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} [\forall j \in [m] : x_{i_j} = 1] .$$

We set $q := \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon)\right]$, and see that⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^m(1 + \delta)^m &\geq \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} [\forall j \in [m] : x_{i_j} = 1] \\ &\geq q \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} [\forall j \in [m] : x_{i_j} = 1 \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon)] \\ &\geq q \mu^m (1 + \epsilon)^m . \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.3. *Let P_x be a distribution over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, $\mu := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ i \leftarrow [n]}}[x_i]$, $\mu > 0$, $\epsilon > -1$. If P_x is (δ, m) -growth bounded, then*

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \left(\frac{1 + \delta}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m .$$

Proof. By Markov's inequality and the growth boundedness of P_x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] &= \Pr \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^m \geq (\mu n)^m (1 + \epsilon)^m \right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1 + \delta}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m . \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.4. *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and P_x be an $(\frac{\epsilon}{3}, m)$ -growth bounded distribution over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\mu := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ i \leftarrow [n]}}[x_i]$, $\mu > 0$.*

1. *If $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$:*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon m}{2} \right) . \quad (5)$$

2. *If $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}$:*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \left(\frac{4}{5} \right)^m . \quad (6)$$

3. *If $\epsilon \geq 3$:*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2^{-m} . \quad (7)$$

⁴Clearly, $q = 0$ is not a problem.

Proof. (5) follows because $\frac{1+\epsilon/3}{1+\epsilon} \leq \exp(-\frac{\epsilon}{2})$ for $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, (6) since $\frac{1+\epsilon/3}{1+\epsilon} \leq \frac{4}{5}$ for $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and (7) due to $\frac{1+\epsilon/3}{1+\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\epsilon \geq 3$. \square

For example, suppose that x_1, \dots, x_n are i.i.d. over $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\Pr[x_i = 1] = \mu > 0$, and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, P_x is $(\frac{\epsilon}{3}, \lceil \frac{\epsilon \mu n}{3} \rceil)$ -growth bounded and

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp(-\epsilon^2 \mu n / 6).$$

2.1 Growth boundedness without repetition

We restrict ourselves to a setting that will be useful in the expander random walk bound.

Definition 2.5. Let $\delta \geq -1$ and $m \in [n]$. We say that a distribution P_x over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $\mu := \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} [x_i = 1]$ is (δ, m) -growth bounded without repetition if

$$\Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[n]}{m}}} \left[\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \right] \leq \mu^m (1 + \delta)^m.$$

Theorem 2.6. Let P_x be a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\mu := \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} [x_i = 1]$, $\mu > 0$, $\epsilon > -1$. Assume P_x is (δ, m) -growth bounded without repetition for some $m \leq \mu(1 + \epsilon)n$ and let $c := \frac{m}{\mu \epsilon n}$. Then,

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \left(\frac{1 + \delta}{1 + (1 - c)\epsilon} \right)^m$$

Proof. Set $q := \Pr[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon)]$ and compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^m (1 + \delta)^m &\geq \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[n]}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : x_i = 1] \\ &\geq q \Pr_{\substack{x \leftarrow P_x \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[n]}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n(1 + \epsilon)] \\ &\geq q \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{\mu n(1 + \epsilon) - i}{n - i} \\ &\geq q \mu^m (1 + (1 - c)\epsilon)^m. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Corollary 2.7. Let $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{4}{5}]$ and \mathbb{P}_x be a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$ that is $(\frac{\epsilon}{3}, m)$ -growth bounded without repetition for some $m \leq \frac{\epsilon \mu n}{6}$ with $\mu := \Pr_{x \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_x} [x_i = 1]$, $\mu > 0$. Then,

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \mu n (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon m}{3} \right).$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 2.6 and note that $\frac{1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}}{1 + \frac{\delta \epsilon}{6}} \leq \exp \left(- \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right)$ for $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{4}{5}]$. \square

3 Random Walks on Expanders

We consider d -regular undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| = n$. Parallel edges and self-loops are allowed. Let $A_G = (a_{u,v})_{u,v \in V}$ be the *transition matrix* of G , i.e., $a_{u,v}$ is the probability of moving to v when randomly choosing a uniform edge incident to u . Let $1 = \lambda_1 \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n| \geq 0$ be the eigenvalues of A_G and $\lambda(G) = |\lambda_2|$. We call G a λ -expander if $\lambda(G) \leq \lambda$.

We start with a coupling argument which is a crucial ingredient of our proof of the randomized hitting property. Then we show a simplified version of the randomized hitting lemma and the concentration bound (which highlights our main ideas and is already an improvement over [IK10]) and later proceed to the optimized version which leads to improved exponent in the concentration bound.

3.1 Coupling argument

By $M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}$ we mean a uniform random choice of M among all subsets of $[\ell]$ of size m .

Let $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \leq \ell$ be given. We consider a distribution $\mathbb{D}_{m,\ell}$ defined by the following process:

- Pick uniformly $M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}$ and let $M := \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ with $x_1 < \dots < x_m$.
- Let $d_1 := x_1$ and $d_i := x_i - x_{i-1}$ for $i > 1$.

A bijection shows that $d = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$ is distributed uniformly on the $\binom{\ell}{m}$ m -tuples which satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^m d_i \leq \ell$ and $d_i > 0$. We will now couple $\mathbb{D}_{m,\ell}$ with independent random variables.

The following two claims are proven by indicating a straightforward bijection:

Claim 3.1. Conditioned on $d_1 = k$ (with $k + m - 1 \leq \ell$), $d' = (d_2, \dots, d_m)$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{D}_{m-1, \ell-k}$.

Claim 3.2. Conditioned on $d_1 > k$ (with $k + m \leq \ell$), $d' = (d_2, \dots, d_m, d_1 - k)$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{D}_{m, \ell-k}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $1 \leq m^* \leq m \leq \ell$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\ell}{m+m^*}$ and $\frac{m}{\ell-\alpha m^*} \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}$ be given. Then, there exists a distribution over $(d_1, \dots, d_m, e_1, \dots, e_{m^*})$ such that:*

- $e_i \leq d_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m^*$.
- (d_1, \dots, d_m) are distributed according to $D_{m,\ell}$.
- (e_1, \dots, e_{m^*}) are i.i.d. with e_i in \mathbb{Z}_+ and $\Pr[e_i = k] = \beta$ for $k \leq \alpha$.

Proof. Induction on m^* .

First, pick d_1 and e_1 together with properties as stated. This is possible since, by union bound, $\Pr[d_1 \leq k] \leq \frac{km}{\ell}$ and, furthermore, $\frac{m}{\ell} \leq \frac{m}{\ell-\alpha m^*} \leq \beta$ and $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor \beta \leq \alpha \beta \leq 1$.

If $d_1 \leq \alpha$, pick $(d_2, \dots, d_m, e_2, \dots, e_{m^*})$ from $D_{m-1, \ell-d_1}$ using the inductive assumption, Claim 3.1, $\alpha(m+m^*-2) \leq \ell-d_1$ and $\frac{m-1}{(\ell-d_1)-\alpha(m^*-1)} \leq \frac{m}{\ell-\alpha m^*}$.

If $d_1 > \alpha$, discard it and pick $(d_2, \dots, d_m, d_1 - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor, e_2, \dots, e_{m^*})$ from $D_{m, \ell - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor}$ using the inductive assumption, Claim 3.2, $\alpha(m+m^*-1) \leq \ell - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ and $\frac{m}{(\ell - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor) - \alpha(m^*-1)} \leq \frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m^*}$. Note that $e_1 \leq d_1$ still holds. \square

Setting $m := m^*$ and $\beta := \frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m}$ we get as a corollary:

Theorem 3.4. *Let $0 < m \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\ell}{2m}$. There exists a distribution over $(d_1, \dots, d_m, e_1, \dots, e_m)$ such that:*

- $e_i \leq d_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$.
- (d_1, \dots, d_m) are distributed according to $D_{m,\ell}$.
- (e_1, \dots, e_m) are i.i.d. with e_i in \mathbb{Z}_+ and $\Pr[e_i = k] = \frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m}$ for $k \leq \alpha$.

For a simplified bound we set $\alpha := \frac{\ell}{2m}$:

Corollary 3.5. *Let $0 < m \leq \ell$. There exists a distribution over $(d_1, \dots, d_m, e_1, \dots, e_m)$ such that:*

- $e_i \leq d_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$.
- (d_1, \dots, d_m) are distributed according to $D_{m,\ell}$.
- (e_1, \dots, e_m) are i.i.d. with e_i in \mathbb{Z}_+ and $\Pr[e_i = k] \leq \frac{2m}{\ell}$ for every k .

3.2 Simplified bound

Theorem 3.6. *Let G be a λ -expander with a distribution P_r over V^ℓ representing an $(\ell - 1)$ -step random walk $r = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$ (with v_1 being a uniform starting vertex) and $W \subseteq V$ with $\mu := |W|/|V|$. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $m \leq \min(1, \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\epsilon\mu}{2})\ell$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] \leq (\mu(1 + \epsilon))^m .$$

Proof. Pick $M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}$ letting $M := \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ with $s_1 < \dots < s_m$. Define random variables (d_1, \dots, d_m) as $d_i := s_i - s_{i-1}$ (assuming $d_0 = 0$).

Lemma 3.7.

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] \leq \mathbb{E}_{M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \lambda^{d_i}) \right] .$$

Proof. Let $v := (\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n})$ be the vector of the uniform distribution on V and let P_W be a diagonal $n \times n$ matrix with $(P_W)_{uu} = 1$ if $u \in W$ and $(P_W)_{uu} = 0$ otherwise. Note that $P_W^2 = P_W$.

Recall that A_G is the transition matrix of G . Let us denote the spectral norm of a matrix with $\|\cdot\|$. We bound the probability of a random walk staying in W on indices of M using a standard technique. In particular, we use (for the proof see [Vad12, Claim 4.21]):

Claim 3.8.

$$\|P_W A_G^k P_W\| \leq \mu + (1 - \mu)\lambda^k .$$

First of all, by induction (and noting that $v A_G = v$):

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] = \mathbb{E}_{M \leftarrow \binom{[\ell]}{m}} \left[|v P_W \prod_{i=2}^m A_G^{d_i} P_W|_1 \right] .$$

For a fixed M we estimate:

$$|v P_W \prod_{i=2}^m A_G^{d_i} P_W|_1 \leq \sqrt{\mu n} \cdot \|v P_W \prod_{i=2}^m A_G^{d_i} P_W\| \tag{8}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mu n} \cdot \|v P_W\| \prod_{i=2}^m \|P_W A_G^{d_i} P_W\| \tag{9}$$

$$= \mu \prod_{i=2}^m \|P_W A_G^{d_i} P_W\| \tag{10}$$

$$\leq \prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \lambda^{d_i}) , \tag{11}$$

where (8) is due to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (note there are at most μn non-zero coordinates in the final vector), (9) follows from $\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$, (10) from $\|vP_W\| = \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{n}}$ and (11) from Claim 3.8. \square

The hope is that (d_1, \dots, d_m) behave “almost” like the i.i.d. uniform random variables. This is indeed true, and by Corollary 3.5 we get (e_1, \dots, e_m) such that $e_i \leq d_i$ and e_i are i.i.d. with e_i in $[\lceil \frac{\ell}{2m} \rceil]$ and $\Pr[e_i = k] \leq \frac{2m}{\ell}$ for each k .

Putting this fact together with Lemma 3.7:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \lambda^{e_i}) \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + \mathbb{E}[\lambda^{e_i}]) \\ &\leq \left(\mu + \frac{2m}{\ell} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^m \leq \mu^m (1 + \epsilon)^m. \end{aligned}$$

\square

An immediate corollary of Theorem 3.6 is:

Corollary 3.9. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.6. Define P_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1 \iff v_i \in W$. Then, P_x is $(\epsilon, \min(\ell, \lfloor \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\epsilon \mu \ell}{2} \rfloor))$ -growth bounded without repetition.*

Combining Corollary 3.9 with Corollary 2.7 (setting $m := \lfloor \frac{(1-\lambda)\epsilon\mu\ell}{6} \rfloor$) we get:

Theorem 3.10. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.6 with $\mu > 0$. Define P_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1 \iff v_i \in W$ and let $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{4}{5}]$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow P_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu \ell (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{(1-\lambda)\epsilon^2 \mu \ell}{18} \right).$$

We can also rephrase Theorem 3.10 for a direct comparison with [IK10, Theorem 3.8] (noting that it avoids the $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ factor):

Theorem 3.11. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.10 but with $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{4\mu}{5}$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow P_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \ell(\mu + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{(1-\lambda)\epsilon^2 \ell}{18\mu} \right).$$

3.3 Improving the constant

Theorem 3.12. *Let G be a λ -expander with a distribution P_r over V^ℓ representing an $(\ell - 1)$ -step random walk $r = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$ (with v_1 being a uniform starting vertex) and $W \subseteq V$ with $\mu := |W|/|V|$. Let $m \in [\ell]$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\ell}{2m}$. Then,*

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] \leq \left(\mu + (1 - \mu) \left(\frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m} \frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} + \lambda^\alpha \right) \right)^m.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.6 we pick $M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}$ and show:

Lemma 3.13.

$$\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] \leq \mathbb{E}_{M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + (1 - \mu) \lambda^{d_i}) \right].$$

Proof. Exactly the same as for Lemma 3.7, only we do not ignore the $(1 - \mu)$ factor in Claim 3.8. \square

By Theorem 3.4 we can couple (d_1, \dots, d_m) with i.i.d (e_1, \dots, e_m) with $e_i \leq d_i$, $e_i \in [\lfloor \alpha \rfloor + 1]$ and $\Pr[e_i = k] = \frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m}$ for $k \leq \alpha$.

Putting this together with Lemma 3.13:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : v_i \in W] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m (\mu + (1 - \mu) \lambda^{e_i}) \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\mu + (1 - \mu) \mathbb{E}[\lambda^{e_i}] \right) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\mu + (1 - \mu) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \alpha \rfloor + 1} \Pr[e_i = j] \lambda^j \right) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\mu + (1 - \mu) \left(\frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m} \frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} + \lambda^\alpha \right) \right)^m. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Theorem 3.14. *Let the setting be as in Theorem 3.6 with $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Define P_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1 \iff v_i \in W$ and let $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. Then, there exists c_μ that depends only on μ such that*

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow P_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu \ell (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{1 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell}{2} + c_\mu \cdot \epsilon^3 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \ell \right).$$

Proof. Set $m := \lfloor \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \epsilon \ell \rfloor$ and $\alpha := \max(1, \log_\lambda(\mu\epsilon^2))$ and assume that $\epsilon \leq \min(\frac{1}{3}, \mu, -\frac{1-\mu}{3\ln(\epsilon)})$. One can verify that $2m\alpha \leq \ell$ indeed holds (we use $-\frac{1-\lambda}{(1+\lambda)\ln(\lambda)} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1)$).

Applying Theorem 3.12:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : x_i = 1] &\leq \mu^m \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \frac{(1-\mu)}{\mu} \frac{m}{\ell - \alpha m} + \epsilon^2 \right)^m \\ &\leq \mu^m \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \frac{(1-\mu)}{\mu} \frac{m}{\ell} \left(1 + \frac{2\alpha m}{\ell} \right) + \epsilon^2 \right)^m \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\leq \mu^m \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \epsilon + \frac{3}{1-\mu} \epsilon^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \right)^m, \quad (13)$$

where in (12) we used $\frac{1}{1-\delta} \leq 1 + 2\delta$ for $\delta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Next, estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \mid \forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \right] &\geq \mu^m \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{\ell(1+\epsilon) - \frac{i}{\mu}}{\ell - i} \\ &= \mu^m \exp \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \ln \left(\frac{\ell(1+\epsilon) - \frac{i}{\mu}}{\ell - i} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \mu^m \exp \left(\int_0^m \ln \left(\frac{\ell(1+\epsilon) - \frac{x}{\mu}}{\ell - x} \right) dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Since we have

$$\Pr_{r \leftarrow P_r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \right] \leq \frac{\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} [\forall i \in M : x_i = 1]}{\Pr_{\substack{r \leftarrow P_r \\ M \leftarrow \binom{\ell}{m}}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \mid \forall i \in M : x_i = 1 \right]},$$

it is enough to lower bound the natural logarithm of the quotient of (14) and (13). We use

$\ln(1 + \delta) \geq \delta - \frac{\delta^2}{2}$ for $\delta \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln \left(\frac{\mu^m \exp \left(\int_0^m \ln \left(\frac{\ell(1+\epsilon) - \frac{x}{\mu}}{\ell - x} \right) dx \right)}{\mu^m \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \epsilon + \frac{3}{1-\mu} \epsilon^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right)^m} \right) &= \int_0^m \ln \left(\frac{\ell(1+\epsilon) - \frac{x}{\mu}}{\ell - x} \right) dx \\
&\quad - m \ln \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \epsilon + \frac{3}{1-\mu} \epsilon^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \\
&\geq \int_0^m \ln \left(1 + \epsilon - \frac{1-\mu}{\mu} \frac{x}{\ell} \right) dx \\
&\quad - m \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \epsilon + \frac{3}{1-\mu} \epsilon^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \\
&\geq \int_0^m \epsilon - \frac{(1-\mu)x}{\mu\ell} - \epsilon^2 dx \\
&\quad - m \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \epsilon + \frac{3}{1-\mu} \epsilon^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \\
&\geq \epsilon m - \frac{(1-\mu)m^2}{2\mu\ell} - \frac{\lambda\epsilon m}{1+\lambda} - \frac{4}{(1-\mu)^2} \epsilon^3 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \ell \\
&\geq \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell}{2} - \frac{4}{(1-\mu)^2} \epsilon^3 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \ell - \frac{1}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We remark that the proof gives $c_\mu \leq \frac{4}{(1-\mu)^2}$ for $\epsilon \leq \min(\frac{1}{3}, \mu, -\frac{1-\mu}{3 \ln(\epsilon)})$.

3.4 Optimality

We show that for a small ϵ and large ℓ our bound is optimal up to an $o(\epsilon^2)$ term in the exponent.

For this we construct the following example⁵: let $\lambda, \mu \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and let G be any regular graph such that its probability transition matrix $A_G = \lambda I_n + \frac{1-\lambda}{n} J_n$, where I_n is the identity matrix, J_n the all-ones matrix and $n = |V(G)|$. Let W be an arbitrary subset of $V(G)$ such that $|W| = \mu n$.

It is easy to see that $\lambda(G) = \lambda$. As previously, consider an ℓ -step random walk on G with a uniform starting vertex and define \mathbb{P}_x over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ as $x_i = 1$ if and only if the i -th step of the random walk is in W .

We prove that optimality follows from the following bound by Kahlé [Kah97, Theorem 5.1]:

⁵ A straightforward generalisation to arbitrary $\lambda, \mu \in (0, 1)$ is possible if we phrase the result in terms of Markov chains rather than discrete graphs.

Theorem 3.15 ([Kah97]). *Let $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1-\mu}{\mu})$. There exists a function $\eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depending on λ, μ and ϵ , such that $\eta(\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and*

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu \ell (1 + \epsilon) \right] \geq \alpha^{\ell(1+\eta(\ell))},$$

where $\alpha := \min_{x \geq 1} f(x)$ for

$$f(x) := x \left(\frac{(\lambda + \mu - \lambda\mu)x - \lambda}{x^2 - (1 - \mu + \lambda\mu)x} \right)^{(1+\epsilon)\mu}. \quad (15)$$

Note that for fixed λ, μ and ϵ the function $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and, therefore, $f(x)$ achieves its minimum on some $x_0 \in [1, \infty)$.

From now on we suppose that λ and μ are fixed and write f as $f_\epsilon(1+y)$ for $y \geq 0$ and, consequently, $x_0 = 1 + y_0$, where y_0 is a function of ϵ .

Setting $c := \frac{1}{\mu(1-\lambda)}$ and $r := (1 + \epsilon)\mu$ one can express f as

$$f_\epsilon(1+y) = (1+y)^{1-r} \left(\frac{1 + (1+c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right)^r.$$

We first prove the following lemma (recall that we consider λ and μ as fixed constants):

Lemma 3.16. $y_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0_+$.

Proof. First of all, write $f_\epsilon(1+y)$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} f_\epsilon(1+y) &= g(y) \cdot (h(y))^\epsilon \\ &= \left((1+y)^{1-\mu} \left(\frac{1 + (1+c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right)^\mu \right) \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1 + (1+c\lambda)y}{(1+y)(1+cy)} \right)^\mu \right)^\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

noting that neither g nor h depend on ϵ . Also note that $g(0) = 1$ and $h(y) \leq 1$ for $y \geq 0$. What is more, since, for every $\epsilon < \frac{1-\mu}{\mu}$, $g(y) \cdot (h(y))^\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some $y_{\lambda,\mu}$ such that $y_0 \leq y_{\lambda,\mu}$ if ϵ is smaller than, say, $\frac{1-\mu}{2\mu}$.

Next, observe that there exists $\alpha_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $h(y) \geq \alpha_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $y \in [0, y_{\lambda,\mu}]$. We claim that if we show $g(y) > 1$ for $y > 0$, we are done.

To see this, define

$$y_1 := \sup \left\{ y \in [0, y_{\lambda,\mu}] : g(y) \leq \alpha_{\lambda,\mu}^{-\epsilon} \right\}$$

and note that if $y > y_1$, then $f_\epsilon(1+y) > 1 = f(1)$ and, therefore, $y_0 \leq y_1$. But if $g(y) > 1$ for $y > 0$, then $y_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0_+$ (we used that $g(y)$ is continuous).

To see that $g(y) > 1$ for $y > 0$, consider two cases. If $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (1+y)^{1-\mu} \left(\frac{1+(1+c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right)^\mu &= \left((1+y)^{\frac{1-\mu}{\mu}} \left(\frac{1+(1+c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right) \right)^\mu \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\left(1+\frac{1-\mu}{\mu}y\right)(1+(1+c\lambda)y)}{1+cy} \right)^\mu > 1, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where (16) follows by Bernoulli's inequality. On the other hand, if $\mu \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (1+y)^{1-\mu} \left(\frac{1+(1+c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right)^\mu &= \left((1+y) \left(1 - \frac{(c-1-c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right)^{\frac{\mu}{1-\mu}} \right)^{1-\mu} \\ &\geq \left((1+y) \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \frac{(c-1-c\lambda)y}{1+cy} \right) \right)^{1-\mu} \\ &= \left((1+y) \left(\frac{1+(c-1)y}{1+cy} \right) \right)^{1-\mu} > 1, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where again we used Bernoulli's inequality in (17). \square

Now we prove the optimality in our setting:

Theorem 3.17. *There exist $\epsilon_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ and $c_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\lambda,\mu})$ and ℓ big enough (where "big enough" depends on λ, μ and ϵ), we have*

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \right] \geq \exp \left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell}{2} - c_{\lambda,\mu} \cdot \epsilon^3 \ell \right).$$

Proof. Using $y - \frac{y^2}{2} \leq \ln(1+y) \leq y - \frac{y^2}{2} + \frac{y^3}{3}$ for $y \geq 0$ we estimate $-\ln(f_\epsilon(1+y))$ (with constant in the $O()$ notation depending on μ and λ):

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln(f_\epsilon(1+y)) &= -(1-r) \ln(1+y) + r \ln(1+cy) - r \ln(1+(1+c\lambda)y) \\ &\leq -(1-r) \left(y - \frac{y^2}{2} \right) + r \left(cy - \frac{c^2 y^2}{2} + \frac{c^3 y^3}{3} \right) - r \left((1+c\lambda)y - \frac{(1+c\lambda)^2 y^2}{2} \right) \\ &\leq (1-\mu c(c-2\lambda-c\lambda^2)) \frac{y^2}{2} + \epsilon y + O(\max(y^3, \epsilon^3)) \\ &= -\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \cdot \frac{1-\mu}{\mu} \cdot \frac{y^2}{2} + \epsilon y + O(\max(y^3, \epsilon^3)). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Setting $a := \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \cdot \frac{1-\mu}{\mu}$ simple calculations on the first two terms of (18) show that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R} : -\frac{ay^2}{2} + \epsilon y \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2a} \quad (19)$$

and

$$\forall y \geq \frac{4\epsilon}{a} : -\frac{ay^2}{2} + \epsilon y \leq -\frac{ay^2}{4}. \quad (20)$$

Due to Lemma 3.16, (18), and (20) we can assume that y_0 is small enough so that if $y_0 \geq \frac{4\epsilon}{a}$, then $-\ln(f(1+y_0)) \leq -\frac{ay_0^2}{4} + O(y_0^3) \leq 0$.

On the other hand, if $y_0 < \frac{4\epsilon}{a}$, then by (18) and (19) we have $-\ln(f(1+y_0)) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2a} + O(\epsilon^3)$. Therefore, for ϵ small enough we have

$$-\ln(f(1+y_0)) \leq \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + O(\epsilon^3), \quad (21)$$

where the $O()$ constant depends on μ and λ .

We conclude by applying Theorem 3.15 and (21):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_x} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \geq \mu\ell(1+\epsilon) \right] &\geq \exp(\ell \cdot (1+o(1)) \cdot \ln(f(1+y_0))) \\ &\geq \exp\left(-\ell \cdot \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \cdot \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + O(\epsilon^3) + o(1)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Polynomial Concentration

Let P_v be a distribution over $v = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell) \in [0, 1]^\ell$. Let multisets e_1, \dots, e_n with elements from $[\ell]$ be given. We define random variables x_1, \dots, x_n as $x_i = w_i \prod_{j \in e_i} v_j$ with $w_i \geq 0$ and then consider the polynomial $p(v) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$. We are interested in bounding the upper tail of $p(v)$.

The usual assumption is that the variables v_i are independent. However, we have applications in mind where the variables are only almost independent in a certain sense:

Definition 4.1. *Given a tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_s) \in [\ell]^s$ define (c_1, \dots, c_ℓ) as $c_j := |\{k \in [s] : i_k = j\}|$.*

Let $\delta \geq 0$ and $m \in [\ell]$. A distribution P_v over $[0, 1]^\ell$ is (δ, m) -almost independent if for all $(i_1, \dots, i_s) \in [\ell]^s$ with $s \leq m$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} \left[\prod_{j=1}^s v_{i_j} \right] \leq (1+\delta)^m \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow P_v} [v_j^{c_j}].$$

Note that an ℓ -wise independent distribution is $(0, \ell)$ -almost independent. Also worth noting is that for binary distributions the condition from Definition 4.1 reduces to

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v} [\forall i \in M : v_i = 1] \leq (1 + \delta)^m \prod_{i \in M} \Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v} [v_i = 1]$$

for all sets $M \subseteq [\ell]$ with $|M| \leq m$.

In order to get concentration bounds, certain quantities of $p(v)$ need to be small. For example, no pair $v_i v_j$ should occur in too many of the monomials. Kim and Vu [KV00] give convenient quantifications of these requirements. These quantifications are slightly more subtle here, since the underlying random variables need not be independent. We believe that a good way to deal with this is to first remove the dependence from the random variables, and then use similar concepts as Kim and Vu. Given a distribution \mathbf{P}_v on $[0, 1]^\ell$, let thus \mathbf{P}_v^* be the distribution with the same marginals as \mathbf{P}_v , but in which variables v_i are independent.

For $K \subseteq [\ell]$, let:

$$\Delta_K p(v) := \sum_{i \in [n]: \forall j \in K v_j \in e_i} x_i |_{v_j=1: j \in K}.$$

In other words, $\Delta_K p(v)$ consist of of monomials which contain at least one copy of each variable from K with variables from K set to 1 in those monomials. Note that in multilinear case this expression coincides with $\partial_K p(v)$.

Inspired by [KV00], we let $\mu := \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v} [p(v)]$ and $\mu_i^* := \max_{K \subseteq [\ell], |K|=i} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v^*} [\Delta_K p(v)]$. Note that $\mu_0^* = \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v^*} [p(v)]$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathbf{P}_v be a (δ, km) -almost independent distribution over $[0, 1]^\ell$. Let $p(v)$ be as above of degree at most k , i.e., $p(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ with $x_i = w_i \prod_{j \in e_i} v_j$, where $w_i \geq 0$ and the total cardinality of e_i is at most k .*

Then, if $\mu > 0$, for all $\epsilon > 0$ we have:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v} [p(v) \geq \mu_0^* (1 + \epsilon)] \leq \left(\frac{(1 + \delta)^k \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*}\right)}{1 + \epsilon} \right)^m.$$

Proof. Immediately from the following lemma and Theorem 2.3:

Lemma 4.3. *The random variables (x_1, \dots, x_n) are (δ', m) -growth bounded, where $1 + \delta' = (1 + \delta)^k \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*}\right) \frac{\mu_0^*}{\mu}$.*

Proof. For each $(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in [n]^m$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v} \left[\prod_{j=1}^m x_{i_j} \right] \leq (1 + \delta)^{km} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathbf{P}_v^*} \left[\prod_{j=1}^m x_{i_j} \right], \quad (22)$$

where we used that the v_i are (δ, km) -almost independent. Therefore it is enough to show

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^* \\ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \leftarrow [n]^m}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^m x_{i_j} \right] \leq \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*} \right)^m \left(\frac{\mu_0^*}{n} \right)^m. \quad (23)$$

We proceed by induction: $m = 0$ is self-evident. For $m > 0$ and fixed (i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}) we define a set⁶ $M := \cup_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{i_j}$, i.e., M consists of all v_i that influence $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m-1}})$.

For any $K \subseteq M$ with $|K| \leq k$ we let $p_K(v)$ be the sum over those monomials which have exactly intersection K with M , i.e.,

$$p_K(v) := \sum_{i: e_i \cap M = K} x_i.$$

Then, since $p(v) = \sum_{K: |K| \leq k} p_K(v)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^* \\ i_m \leftarrow [n]}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^m x_{i_j} \right] &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} \left[\left(\sum_{K: |K| \leq k} p_K(v) \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} x_{i_j} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{K: |K| \leq k} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} [p_K(v) | v_i = 1: i \in K] \right) \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} x_{i_j} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{K: |K| \leq k} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} [\Delta_K p(v)] \right) \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} x_{i_j} \right] \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^*}{\mu_0^*} \right) \frac{\mu_0^*}{n} \mathbb{E}_{v \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_v^*} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} x_{i_j} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The inductive argument follows by averaging over all (i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}) . \square

4.1 Discussion and tightness

The bound and the definition of (δ, m) -almost independence are motivated by application arising in lower bounding the sample complexity of a black-box construction of a pseudo-random generator from a one-way function. The details can be found in Section 6.4 in [HS12] (it is easy to see that Definition 21 in [HS12] implies almost independence from Definition 4.1).

For the rest of this section we focus on the case of independent v_i . Kim and Vu in [KV00] use the quantity $\mu' := \max_{i \in [k]} \mu_i^*$. We obtain a simpler version of Theorem 4.2 as follows:

⁶We “collapse” multisets to a set M in a natural way here. The same applies to the definition of $p_K(v)$.

Lemma 4.4.

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{km}{i} \mu_i^* \leq (km)^k \mu'$$

Proof. Since we can represent every subset of $[km]$ with $0 < s \leq k$ elements $i_1 < \dots < i_s$ with the k -tuple $(i_1, i_2 - i_1, \dots, i_s - i_{s-1}, km, \dots, km)$, the number of non-empty subsets of $[km]$ of size at most k is at most $(km)^k$. \square

Theorem 4.5. Let \mathbb{P}_v be a distribution of independent variables (i.e., $\mathbb{P}_v = \mathbb{P}_v^*$) over $[0, 1]^\ell$. Let $p(v)$ be as in Theorem 4.2 and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} \left[p(v) \geq \mu(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{6k} \left(\frac{\epsilon \mu}{\mu'} \right)^{1/k} \right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, Corollary 2.4.1 and Lemma 4.4 taking $m := \left\lfloor \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\epsilon \mu}{3\mu'} \right)^{1/k} \right\rfloor$ and noting that \mathbb{P}_v is $(0, \ell)$ -almost independent. \square

As a simple example, consider the polynomial that counts the triangles in Erdős–Rényi random graph $\mathbb{G}_{n, n^{-3/4}}$, i.e., $p(v) = \sum_{\{a,b,c\} \in \binom{[n]}{3}} v_{ab} v_{ac} v_{bc}$. We compute $\mu = \Theta(n^{3/4})$ and $\mu' = \Theta(1)$.

For $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{3}{16}]$, Theorem 4.5 gives:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} \left[p(v) \geq \mu(1 + n^{-\epsilon}) \right] \leq \exp(-\Omega(n^{1/4-4\epsilon/3})).$$

Better bounds are known, in particular we revisit the triangle counting in Section 5.

We conclude by showing that Theorem 4.2 is essentially tight for *elementary symmetric polynomials* $e_k(v) := \sum_{|S|=k} \prod_{i \in S} v_i$. For the upper bound we have:

Lemma 4.6. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and let \mathbb{P}_v be a distribution of i.i.d. random variables over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} [v_i = 1] = p > 0$.

There exists $c_k > 0$ (depending only on k) such that:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} \left[e_k(v) \geq p^k \binom{n}{k} (1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp(-c_k \epsilon^2 p \ell).$$

Proof. We have $\mu_i \leq (p\ell)^{k-i}$ for every i . What is more, there exists c'_k such that $\mu \geq c'_k (p\ell)^k$. Now apply Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 2.4.1 for $m := c''_k \epsilon p \ell$ (again observing that \mathbb{P}_v is $(0, \ell)$ -almost independent). \square

For the lower bound, we first state a well-known tightness of the Chernoff bound for independent coin tosses (for the proof see [You12] or, alternatively, Appendix B of [HR11]):

Lemma 4.7. Let $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and \mathbb{P}_v be a distribution of i.i.d. random variables over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v}[v_i = 1] = p \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, assume that $\epsilon^2 p \ell \geq 3$. Then:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \geq p\ell(1 + \epsilon) \right] \geq \exp(-9\epsilon^2 p \ell) .$$

Lemma 4.8. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and \mathbb{P}_v be a distribution of i.i.d. random variables over $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v}[v_i = 1] = p \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, assume that $\epsilon p \ell \geq k$ and $\epsilon^2 p \ell \geq \frac{3}{4}$. Then:

$$\Pr_{v \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_v} [e_k(v) \geq p^k \binom{\ell}{k} (1 + \epsilon)] \geq \exp(-36\epsilon^2 p \ell) .$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[e_k(v) \geq p^k \binom{\ell}{k} (1 + \epsilon) \right] &\geq \Pr \left[e_k(v) \geq \frac{(p\ell(1 + \epsilon))^k}{k!} \right] \\ &\geq \Pr \left[e_k(v) \geq \frac{(p\ell(1 + 2\epsilon) - k)^k}{k!} \right] \\ &\geq \Pr \left[e_k(v) \geq \binom{p\ell(1 + 2\epsilon)}{k} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \geq p\ell(1 + 2\epsilon) \right] \\ &\geq \exp(-36\epsilon^2 p \ell) , \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where (24) follows from Lemma 4.7. □

5 Counting Subgraphs in Random Graphs

We prove in our framework (a slight generalisation of) a result due to Janson, Oleszkiewicz, and Ruciński [JOR02].

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider some distribution \mathbb{P}_e over $e \in \{0, 1\}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ where we index the entries of e with $E := \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in [n], u \neq v\}$, that is the set of $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges of an n -vertex simple graph. Unsurprisingly, we interpret $e_{\{u, v\}} = 1$ as the existence of respective edge in the graph. Let⁷ p be such that for each $\{u, v\} \in E$ we have $\Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbb{P}_e}[e_{\{u, v\}} = 1] \leq p$.

Fix a simple graph $G = ([v_G], E_G)$ with v_G vertices and e_G edges. We would like to count the number of (not necessarily induced) isomorphic copies of G in a random graph induced by \mathbb{P}_e .

⁷One can modify our proof so that it works for heterogenous $p_{\{u, v\}}$, but it is more technical than interesting.

Assume w.l.o.g. that G does not have isolated vertices. We will only use graphs without isolated vertices in our proof and therefore from now on we identify a graph with the set of its edges.

We denote isomorphism of graphs by $G \sim H$. Then the number of copies of G in the graph induced by P_e can be expressed as a polynomial:

$$q(e) := \sum_{\substack{E' \subseteq E \\ E' \sim G}} x_{E'} := \sum_{\substack{E' \subseteq E \\ E' \sim G}} \prod_{\{u,v\} \in E'} e_{\{u,v\}},$$

where variables $x_{E'}$ can be thought of as a vector x distributed according to some P_x . The number of monomials in this sum is $\frac{1}{d} \prod_{i=0}^{v_G-1} (n-i)$, where d is the number of automorphisms of G , and the degree of each monomial is e_G .

Thus, we can apply the technique from Section 4. We will do it in a more careful fashion, though, in order to match the bound from [JOR02].

For a graph H let $N(n, m, H)$ be the largest number of copies of H which can be packed into n vertices and m edges. Following [JOR02], we set:

$$M_G^*(n, p) := \max \left\{ m \leq \binom{n}{2} : \forall H \subseteq E_G, H \neq \emptyset : N(n, m, H) \leq n^{v_H} p^{e_H} \right\}.$$

We need the following lemma with a proof in [JOR02, Lemma 2.1]:

Lemma 5.1. *For every H with $e_H > 0$ there is a constant C_H such that if $n \geq v_H$ and $0 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \binom{n}{2}$, then*

$$N(n, m_1, H) \leq C_H \frac{m_1}{m_2} N(n, m_2, H).$$

Given P_e , similarly as in Section 4, let $\mu := E_{e \leftarrow P_e}[q(e)]$ and $\mu^* := \frac{1}{d} p^{e_G} \prod_{i=0}^{v_G-1} (n-i)$. Note that μ^* is the expectation of $q(e)$ in the distribution where each edge appears independently with probability p (i.e., Erdős–Rényi model) and that $E_{e \leftarrow P_e^*}[q(e)] \leq \mu^*$, where P_e^* is the independent distribution with the same marginals as P_e .

Lemma 5.2. *Fix $\delta > 0$, as well as n , P_e and G . If m is such that*

$$\forall H \subseteq E_G, H \neq \emptyset : N(n, m, H) \leq \frac{1}{2^{e_G} v_G^{v_G}} \delta n^{v_H} p^{e_H},$$

and P_e is $(\delta', e_G m)$ -almost independent, then P_x is (δ'', m) -growth bounded, where $1 + \delta'' = (1 + \delta')^{e_G} (1 + \delta)^{\frac{\mu^}{\mu}}$.*

Proof. Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 in (22) and (23), we reduce the problem to showing that

$$E_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} [q(e)^m] \leq (\mu^*)^m (1 + \delta)^m.$$

The rest of our argument is very similar as in [JOR02], but we give it for completeness and appreciating the connection to the proof of Lemma 4.3.

We proceed by induction on m , with $m = 0$ being a trivial case. For $m > 0$ fix a tuple $(x_{E'_1}, \dots, x_{E'_{m-1}})$, with $E' := \cup_{i=1}^{m-1} E'_i$.

For an $H \subseteq E_G$ we define:

$$q_H(e) := \sum_{\substack{E'' \subseteq E \\ E'' \sim G \\ (E'' \cap E') \sim H}} x_{E''} ,$$

that is $q_H(e)$ groups all those possible occurrences of G for which their intersection with E' is isomorphic to H . Clearly $q(e) \leq \sum_{H \subseteq E_G} q_H(e)$.

Define an event \mathcal{A} as $\forall \{u, v\} \in E' : e_{\{u, v\}} = 1$. We have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} \left[q(e) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} x_{E'_i} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} \left[\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} x_{E'_i} \right] \sum_{H \subseteq E_G} \mathbb{E}_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} \left[q_H(e) \mid \mathcal{A} \right] .$$

But for $H \neq \emptyset$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} \left[q_H(e) \mid \mathcal{A} \right] &= p^{e_G - e_H} \cdot \left| \{ E'' \subseteq E : E'' \sim G \wedge (E'' \cap E') \sim H \} \right| \\ &\leq p^{e_G - e_H} N(n, m, H) n^{v_G - v_H} \frac{v_G!}{d} \\ &\leq \frac{v_G!}{d 2^{e_G} v_G^{v_G}} \delta n^{v_G} p^{e_G} \leq \frac{\delta \mu^*}{2^{e_G}} , \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where (25) follows since each copy of G corresponding to a monomial in p_H can be recovered from its intersection with E' (isomorphic to H), its vertices outside E' and its isomorphism with G (where factor d accounts for the isomorphisms that result in the same graph). Summing over all H ,

$$\sum_{H \subseteq E_G} \mathbb{E}_{e \leftarrow P_e^*} \left[q_H(e) \mid \mathcal{A} \right] \leq \mu^* + \sum_{\substack{H \subseteq E_G \\ H \neq \emptyset}} \frac{\delta \mu^*}{2^{e_G}} \leq \mu^* (1 + \delta) .$$

Since the choice of $(x_{E'_m}, \dots, x_{E'_{m-1}})$ was arbitrary, the induction follows by averaging over all such choices. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Fix n , G , P_e , and $\delta > 0$. There exists $C_G > 0$ depending only on G such that If $\frac{C_G m}{\delta} \leq M_G^*(n, p)$ and P_e is $(\delta', e_G m)$ -almost independent, then P_x is (δ'', m) -growth bounded, where $1 + \delta'' = (1 + \delta')^{e_G} (1 + \delta) \frac{\mu^*}{\mu}$.*

Proof. From Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. \square

Theorem 5.4 ([JOR02]). *Fix G and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Let $\mathbf{G}_{n,p}$ be Erdős–Rényi distribution with $n \geq v_G$ and $p > 0$. There exists $c_G > 0$ depending only on G such that:*

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbf{G}_{n,p}} \left[q(e) \geq \mu(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp(-c_G \epsilon^2 M_G^*(n, p)) .$$

Proof. From Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 2.4.1 taking $m := c'_G \epsilon M_G^*(n, p)$ for appropriately small c'_G and noting that $\mathbf{G}_{n,p}$ is $(0, \binom{n}{2})$ -almost independent and $\mu^* = \mu$. \square

We can apply almost-independence to the distribution $\mathbf{G}_{n,m}$ of a uniform random graph on n vertices and m edges.

Theorem 5.5. *Fix G and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathbf{G}_{n,m}$ be uniform distribution on graphs with n vertices and m edges with $n \geq v_G$ and $m \geq \frac{9e_G^2}{\epsilon}$. Set $p := \frac{m}{n}$. There exists $c_G > 0$ depending only on G such that:*

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbf{G}_{n,m}} \left[q(e) \geq \mu(1 + \epsilon) \right] \leq \exp(-c_G \epsilon^2 M_G^*(n, p)) .$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{G}_{n,m}$ is also $(0, \binom{n}{2})$ -almost independent, the only issue is bounding $\frac{\mu^*}{\mu}$. Our constraints give:

$$\frac{\mu^*}{\mu} \leq \left(1 + \frac{e_G}{m - e_G} \right)^{e_G} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{8e_G} \right)^{e_G} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$$

($\exp(\epsilon) \leq 1 + 2\epsilon$ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$). With this bound in mind we apply Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 2.4.1 setting $m := c'_G \epsilon M_G^*(n, p)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbf{G}_{n,m}} \left[q(e) \geq \mu(1 + \epsilon) \right] &\leq \Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbf{G}_{n,m}} \left[q(e) \geq \mu^* \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{1 + \epsilon/4} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{e \leftarrow \mathbf{G}_{n,m}} \left[q(e) \geq \mu^* \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-c_G \epsilon^2 M_G^*(n, p)\right) . \end{aligned}$$

\square

References

- [AB09] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity - A Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [AFWZ95] Noga Alon, Uriel Feige, Avi Wigderson, and David Zuckerman. Derandomized graph products. *Computational Complexity*, 5(1):60–75, 1995.
- [AKS87] M. Ajtai, J. Komlos, and E. Szemerédi. Deterministic simulation in LOGSPACE. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '87*, pages 132–140, New York, NY, USA, 1987. ACM.
- [Azu67] Kazuoki Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 19:357–367, 1967.
- [Ber24] Sergei N. Bernstein. On a modification of Chebyshev’s inequality and of the error formula of Laplace. *Ann. Sci. Inst. Sav. Ukraine, Sect. Math.*, 1, 1924.
- [Che52] Herman Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(4):pp. 493–507, 1952.
- [DP09] Devdatt Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 2009.
- [Gil98] David Gillman. A Chernoff bound for random walks on expander graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(4):1203–1220, 1998.
- [Hea08] Alexander Healy. Randomness-efficient sampling within NC^1 . *Computational Complexity*, 17(1):3–37, 2008.
- [HLW06] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bulletin of the AMS*, 43(4):439–561, 2006.
- [Hoe63] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):pp. 13–30, 1963.
- [HR11] Thomas Holenstein and Renato Renner. On the randomness of independent experiments. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 57(4):1865–1871, 2011.
- [HS12] Thomas Holenstein and Makrand Sinha. Constructing a pseudorandom generator requires an almost linear number of calls. In *FOCS*, pages 698–707. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.

- [IK10] Russell Impagliazzo and Valentine Kabanets. Constructive proofs of concentration bounds. In Maria J. Serna, Ronen Shaltiel, Klaus Jansen, and José D. P. Rolim, editors, *APPROX-RANDOM*, volume 6302 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 617–631. Springer, 2010.
- [JOR02] Svante Janson, Krzysztof Oleszkiewicz, and Andrzej Ruciński. Upper tails for subgraph counts in random graphs. *ISRAEL J. MATH*, 2002.
- [JR02] Svante Janson and Andrzej Ruciński. The infamous upper tail. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 20(3):317–342, 2002.
- [JR11] Svante Janson and Andrzej Ruciński. Upper tails for counting objects in randomly induced subhypergraphs and rooted random graphs. *Arkiv för matematik*, 49(1):79–96, 2011.
- [Kah95] Nabil Kahalé. Eigenvalues and expansion of regular graphs. *J. ACM*, 42(5):1091–1106, September 1995.
- [Kah97] Nabil Kahalé. Large deviation bounds for Markov chains. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing*, 6(4):465–474, 1997.
- [KV00] Jeong Han Kim and Van H. Vu. Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications. *Combinatorica*, 20(3):417–434, 2000.
- [Lez98] Pascal Lezaud. Chernoff-type bound for finite Markov chains. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 8(3):849–867, 1998.
- [Rao08] Anup Rao. Parallel repetition in projection games and a concentration bound. In *In Proc. 40th STOC*, pages 1–10. ACM, 2008.
- [SS12] Warren Schudy and Maxim Sviridenko. Concentration and moment inequalities for polynomials of independent random variables. In Yuval Rabani, editor, *SODA*, pages 437–446. SIAM, 2012.
- [SSS95] Jeanette P. Schmidt, Alan Siegel, and Aravind Srinivasan. Chernoff-Hoeffding bounds for applications with limited independence. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 8(2):223–250, May 1995.
- [Vad12] Salil P. Vadhan. Pseudorandomness. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 7(1-3):1–336, 2012.
- [Vu02] V. H. Vu. Concentration of non-Lipschitz functions and applications. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 20(3):262–316, May 2002.
- [You12] Neal Young. Reverse chernoff bound. <http://cstheory.stackexchange.com/questions/14471/reverse-chernoff-bound>, November 2012.