

Structured Prediction: From Gaussian Perturbations to Linear-Time Principled Algorithms

Jean Honorio, jhonorio@purdue.edu

Computer Science Dept., Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

Tommi Jaakkola, tommi@csail.mit.edu

CSAIL, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

Abstract

Margin-based structured prediction commonly uses a maximum loss over all possible structured outputs [1, 4, 13]. In natural language processing, recent work [14, 15] has proposed the use of the maximum loss over random structured outputs sampled independently from some proposal distribution. This method is linear-time in the number of random structured outputs and trivially parallelizable. We study this family of loss functions in the PAC-Bayes framework under Gaussian perturbations [11]. Under some technical conditions and up to statistical accuracy, we show that this family of loss functions produces a tighter upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion than commonly used methods. Thus, using the maximum loss over random structured outputs is a principled way of learning the parameter of structured prediction models, and of performing approximate inference on test data. Besides explaining the experimental success of [14, 15], our theoretical results show that more general techniques are possible.

1 Introduction

Structured prediction has been shown to be useful in many diverse domains. Application areas include natural language processing (e.g., named entity recognition, part-of-speech tagging, dependency parsing), computer vision (e.g., image segmentation, multiple object tracking), speech (e.g., text-to-speech mapping) and computational biology (e.g., protein structure prediction).

In dependency parsing, for instance, the observed input is a sentence and the desired structured output is a parse tree for the given sentence.

In general, structured prediction can be viewed as a kind of decoding. A *decoder* is a machine for predicting the structured output y given the observed input x . Such a decoder, depends on a parameter w . Given a fixed w , the task performed by the decoder is called *inference*. In this paper, we focus on the problem of learning the parameter w . As a consequence, we also obtain a result for the problem of performing approximate inference on test data. Next, we introduce the problem and our main contributions.

We assume a distribution D on pairs (x, y) where $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is the observed input and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the latent structured output, i.e., $(x, y) \sim D$. We also assume that we have a training set S of n i.i.d. samples drawn from the distribution D , i.e., $S \sim D^n$, and thus $|S| = n$.

We let $\mathcal{Y}(x) \neq \emptyset$ denote the countable set of feasible *decodings* of x . In general, $|\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ is exponential with respect to the input size.

We assume a fixed mapping ϕ from pairs to feature vectors, i.e., for any pair (x, y) we have the feature vector $\phi(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$. For a parameter $w \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$, we consider linear decoders of the form:

$$f_w(x) \equiv \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} \phi(x, y) \cdot w \quad (1)$$

In practice, very few cases of the above general *inference* problem are tractable, while most are NP-hard and also hard to approximate within a fixed factor. (We defer the details in theory of computation to Section 5.)

We also introduce the *distortion* function $d: \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The value $d(y, y')$ measures the amount of difference between two structured outputs y and y' . Disregarding the computational and statistical aspects, the ultimate goal is to set the parameter w in order to minimize the decoder distortion. That is:

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim D} [d(y, f_w(x))] \quad (2)$$

Computationally speaking, the above procedure is inefficient since $d(y, f_w(x))$ is a discontinuous function with respect to w and thus, it is in general an exponential-time optimization problem. Statistically speaking, the problem in eq.(2) requires access to the data distribution D and thus, in general it would require an infinite amount of data. In practice, we only have access to a small amount of training data.

Additionally, eq.(2) would potentially favor parameters w with low distortion, but that could be in a neighborhood of parameters with high distortion. In order to avoid this issue, we could optimize a more “robust” objective under Gaussian perturbations. More formally, let $\alpha > 0$ and let $Q(w)$ be a unit-variance Gaussian distribution centered at $w\alpha$ of parameters $w' \in \mathcal{W}$. The Gibbs decoder distortion of the perturbation distribution $Q(w)$ and data distribution D , is defined as:

$$L(Q(w), D) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim D} \left[\mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [d(y, f_{w'}(x))] \right] \quad (3)$$

The minimization of the Gibbs decoder distortion can be expressed as:

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} L(Q(w), D)$$

The focus of our analysis will be to propose upper bounds of the Gibbs decoder distortion, with good computational and statistical properties. That is, we will propose upper bounds that can be computed in polynomial-time, and that require a small amount of training data.

For our analysis, we follow the same set of assumptions as in [11]. We define the margin $m(x, y, y', w)$ as the amount by which y is preferable to y' under the parameter w . More formally:

$$m(x, y, y', w) \equiv \phi(x, y) \cdot w - \phi(x, y') \cdot w$$

Let $c(p, x, y)$ be a nonnegative integer that gives the number of times that the part $p \in \mathcal{P}$ appears in the pair (x, y) . For a part $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we define the feature p as follows:

$$\phi_p(x, y) \equiv c(p, x, y)$$

We let $\mathcal{P}(x) \neq \emptyset$ denote the set of $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that there exists $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ with $c(p, x, y) > 0$. We define the Hamming distance H as follows:

$$H(x, y, y') \equiv \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(x)} |c(p, x, y) - c(p, x, y')|$$

The commonly applied margin-based approach to learning w uses the maximum loss over all possible structured outputs [1, 4, 13]. That is:¹

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} d(y, \hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(H(x, y, \hat{y}) - m(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0) + \lambda \|w\|_2^2 \quad (4)$$

In Section 2, we reproduce the results in [11] and show that the above objective is related to an upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion in eq.(3). Note that evaluating the objective function in eq.(4) is as hard as the inference problem in eq.(1), since both perform maximization over the set $\mathcal{Y}(x)$.

Our main contributions are presented in Sections 3 and 4. Inspired by recent work in natural language processing [14, 15], we show a tighter upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion in eq.(3), which is related to the following objective:¹

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{\hat{y} \in T(w, x)} d(y, \hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(H(x, y, \hat{y}) - m(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0) + \lambda \|w\|_2^2 \quad (5)$$

where $T(w, x)$ is a set of random structured outputs sampled i.i.d. from some proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. Note that evaluating the objective function in eq.(5) is linear-time in the number of random structured outputs in $T(w, x)$.

2 From PAC-Bayes to Maximum Loss Over All Possible Structured Outputs

In this section, we show the relationship between PAC-Bayes bounds and the commonly used maximum loss over all possible structured outputs.

As reported in [11], by using the PAC-Bayes framework under Gaussian perturbations, we show that the commonly used maximum loss over all possible structured outputs is an upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion up to statistical accuracy ($\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n/n})$ for n training samples).

¹ For computational convenience, the *convex* hinge loss $\max(0, 1 + z)$ is used in practice instead of the *discontinuous* 0/1 loss $\mathbb{1}(z \geq 0)$.

Theorem 1 ([11]). *Assume that there exists a finite integer value ℓ such that $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. With probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ over the choice of n training samples, simultaneously for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and unit-variance Gaussian perturbation distributions $Q(w)$ centered at $w\sqrt{2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2)}$, we have:*

$$L(Q(w), D) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} d(y, \hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(H(x, y, \hat{y}) - m(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0) \\ + \frac{\|w\|_2^2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\|w\|_2^2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2) + \log(2n/\delta)}{2(n-1)}}$$

(See Appendix A for detailed proofs.)

The proof of the above is based on the PAC-Bayes theorem and well-known Gaussian concentration inequalities. As it is customary in generalization results, a *deterministic* expectation with respect to the data distribution D is upper-bounded by a *stochastic* quantity with respect to the training set S . This takes into account the statistical aspects of the problem.

Note that the upper bound uses maximization with respect to $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ and that in general, $|\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ is exponential with respect to the input size. Thus, the computational aspects of the problem have not been fully addressed yet. In the next section, we solve this issue by introducing randomness.

3 From PAC-Bayes to Maximum Loss Over Random Structured Outputs

In this section, we analyze the relationship between PAC-Bayes bounds and the maximum loss over random structured outputs sampled independently from some proposal distribution.

Instead of using maximization with respect to $\mathcal{Y}(x)$, we will perform maximization with respect to a set $T(w, x)$ of random structured outputs sampled i.i.d. from some proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. In order for this approach to be computationally appealing, $|T(w, x)|$ should be polynomial, even when $|\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ is exponential with respect to the input size. The following assumption will allow us to accomplish this. (We show examples that fulfill this assumption in Section 4.)

Assumption A (Approximability). *The proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ fulfills the following approximability condition. There exists a value $\beta \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)} [d(y, y') = 1 \wedge H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] \geq 1 - \beta$$

or alternatively,

$$d(y, y') = 0 \vee H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) < 0 \text{ for all } y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$$

Regarding the statistical aspects, note that randomness does not only stem from data but also from our sampling procedure. That is, in Theorem 1, randomness only stems from the training set S . We now need to produce generalization results that hold for all the sets $T(w, x)$ of random structured outputs. In addition, the uniform convergence of Theorem 1 holds for all parameters w . We now need to produce a generalization result that also holds for all possible proposal distributions $R(w, x)$. Therefore, we need a method for upper-bounding the number of possible proposal distributions $R(w, x)$. The following assumption will allow us to upper-bound this number. (We show examples that fulfill this assumption in Section 4.)

Assumption B (Linearly inducible ordering). *The proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ depends solely on the linear ordering induced by the parameter $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and the mapping $\phi(x, \cdot)$. More formally, let $r(x) \equiv |\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ and thus $\mathcal{Y}(x) \equiv \{y_1 \dots y_{r(x)}\}$. Let $\pi(x) = (\pi_1 \dots \pi_{r(x)})$ be a permutation of $\{1 \dots r(x)\}$ such that $\phi(x, y_{\pi_1}) \cdot w < \dots < \phi(x, y_{\pi_{r(x)}}) \cdot w$. The proposal distribution fulfills $R(\pi(x), x) \equiv R(w, x)$.*

The above assumption states that two proposal distributions $R(w, x)$ and $R(w', x)$ are the same provided that for the same permutation $\pi(x)$ we have $\phi(x, y_{\pi_1}) \cdot w < \dots < \phi(x, y_{\pi_{r(x)}}) \cdot w$ and $\phi(x, y_{\pi_1}) \cdot w' < \dots < \phi(x, y_{\pi_{r(x)}}) \cdot w'$. Geometrically speaking, for a fixed x we first project the feature vectors $\phi(x, y)$ of all the structured outputs $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ onto the lines w and w' . Let $\pi(x)$ and $\pi'(x)$ be the resulting ordering of the structured outputs after projecting them onto w and w' respectively. Two proposal distributions $R(w, x)$ and $R(w', x)$ are the same provided that $\pi(x) = \pi'(x)$. That is, the specific values of $\phi(x, y) \cdot w$ and $\phi(x, y) \cdot w'$ are irrelevant.

In what follows, by using the PAC-Bayes framework under Gaussian perturbations, we show that the maximum loss over random structured outputs sampled independently from some proposal distribution provides an upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion up to statistical accuracy ($\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \sqrt{n})$ for n training samples).

Theorem 2. *Assume that there exist finite integer values ℓ and r such that $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$ and $|\mathcal{Y}(x)| \leq r$ for all $(x, y) \in S$. Assume that the proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills Assumption A with value β , and Assumption B. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the choice of both n training samples and n sets of random structured outputs, simultaneously for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$, unit-variance Gaussian perturbation distributions $Q(w)$ centered at $w \sqrt{2 \log(2n\ell / \|w\|_2^2)}$, and for sets of random structured outputs $T(w, x)$ sampled i.i.d. from the proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ for each*

training sample $(x, y) \in S$, such that $|T(w, x)| = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \log n / \log(1/\beta) \rceil$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
L(Q(w), D) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \max_{\hat{y} \in T(w,x)} d(y, \hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(H(x, y, \hat{y}) - m(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0) \\
&+ \frac{\|w\|_2^2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\|w\|_2^2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2) + \log(2n/\delta)}{2(n-1)}} \\
&+ \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} + \frac{1}{\log(1/\beta)} \sqrt{\frac{\log((\frac{n \log n}{2 \log(1/\beta)} + 1)\ell) \log^3 n}{2n}} \\
&+ 3\sqrt{\frac{2\ell \log(nr) + \log(4/\delta)}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

(See Appendix A for detailed proofs.)

The proof of the above is based on Theorem 1 as a starting point. In order to account for the computational aspect of requiring sets $T(w, x)$ of polynomial size, we use Assumption A for bounding a *deterministic* expectation. In order to account for the statistical aspects, we use Assumption B and Rademacher complexity arguments for bounding a *stochastic* quantity for all sets $T(w, x)$ of random structured outputs and all possible proposal distributions $R(w, x)$.

Approximate Inference on Test Data. Note that the upper bound in Theorem 2 holds simultaneously for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Therefore, our result implies that after learning the optimal parameter $\hat{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ in eq.(5) from *training* data, we can use the proposal distribution $R(\hat{w}, x)$ for approximate inference on *test* data. In this case, Theorem 2 can be additionally invoked for a *test* set S' , also with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Thus, under the same setting as of Theorem 2, the Gibbs decoder distortion is upper-bounded with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ over the choice of S and S' .

Necessity of the Approximability Assumption. Next, we argue for the necessity of Assumption A. Note that β is independent of x in Assumption A. As a counterexample, we will construct a case where $\beta(x) = 1 - 1/|\mathcal{Y}(x)|$. Thus, unlike Assumption A, β will depend on x in our counterexample. First, assume that only one element $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills the condition $d(y, \hat{y}) = 1 \wedge H(x, y, \hat{y}) - m(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0$. Furthermore, let $R(w, x) = R(x)$ be a uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. We have:

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w,x)} [d(y, y') = 1 \wedge H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}(x)|} = 1 - \beta(x)$$

In terms of Theorem 2, we would require $|T(w, x)| = \mathcal{O}(1/\log(1/\beta(x))) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}(x)|)$ random structured outputs. Thus, we would not produce a computationally tractable upper bound when $|\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ is exponential with respect to the input size.

4 Examples

In this section, we provide several examples that fulfill the two main assumptions of our theoretical result.

Table 1: Constant β of the approximability Assumption A for different problems. The results shown here follow from applying the decomposition Claim ii to the results in Claims iii to viii. While the results here pertain to uniform proposal distributions $R(x)$, by the change of measure Claim i, we can add a total variation distance to any of the entries in this table in order to obtain results for a general proposal distribution.

	$\ w\ _\infty \leq 1$	$1 < \ w\ _\infty \leq \mathcal{O}(\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$
Any type of structured output, $d(y, y') = 1$ ($y \neq y'$)	1/2	$\max\left(1/2, e^{\mathcal{O}(-(1-1/\gamma)^2)}\right)$
Directed spanning trees of v nodes, d returns the number of different edges	$\frac{v-2}{v-1}$	$\max\left(\frac{v-2}{v-1}, e^{\mathcal{O}(-(1-1/\gamma)^2)}\right)$
Directed acyclic graphs of v nodes and k parents per node, d returns the number of different edges	$\frac{k^2+2k+2}{k^2+3k+2}$	$\max\left(\frac{k^2+2k+2}{k^2+3k+2}, e^{\mathcal{O}(-(1-1/\gamma)^2)}\right)$
Sets of k elements, d returns the number of different elements	1/2	$\max\left(1/2, e^{\mathcal{O}(-(1-1/\gamma)^2)}\right)$

Examples for the Approximability Assumption. In what follows, we present some examples that fulfill our Assumption A.

For simplicity of analysis, most proofs in this part will assume a uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. In the following claim, we argue that we can perform a change of measure between different proposal distributions. Thus, allowing us to focus on uniform proposals afterwards.

Claim i (Change of measure). *Let $R(w, x)$ and $R'(w, x)$ two proposal distributions, both with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. Assume that the proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ fulfills Assumption A with value β_1 . Let $r_{w,x}(\cdot)$ and $r'_{w,x}(\cdot)$ be the probability mass functions of $R(w, x)$ and $R'(w, x)$ respectively. Assume that the total variation distance between $R(w, x)$ and $R'(w, x)$ is bounded as follows for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} TV(R(w, x) \| R'(w, x)) &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} |r_{w,x}(y) - r'_{w,x}(y)| \\ &\leq \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

The proposal distribution $R'(w, x)$ fulfills Assumption A with $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2$ provided that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \in [0, 1)$.

Next, we show that in order to analyze examples that fulfill Assumption A, we can focus on analyzing the expression involving the distortion function d , and independently, we can also focus on analyzing the expression involving the Hamming distance H and the margin m .

Claim ii (Decomposition). *Let $R(w, x)$ be a proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. Assume that there exist values $\beta_1 \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta_2 \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)} [d(y, y') = 1] &\geq 1 - \beta_1 \\ \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)} [H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] &\geq 1 - \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

The proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ fulfills Assumption A with $\beta = \max(\beta_1, \beta_2)$.

First, we focus on analyzing the expression involving the distortion function d in Assumption A. We start with a claim for any type of structured output, but for a distortion function d that returns zero if and only if two structures are exactly the same.

Claim iii. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be an arbitrary countable set of feasible decodings of x , such that $|\mathcal{Y}(x)| \geq 2$ for all $(x, y) \in S$. Let $d(y, y') = 1 (y \neq y')$. The uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills for all $(x, y) \in S$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [d(y, y') = 1] \geq 1 - 1/2$$

The following claim pertains to directed spanning trees and for a distortion function d that returns the number of different edges.

Claim iv. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be the set of directed spanning trees of v nodes. Let $A(y)$ be the adjacency matrix of $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Let $d(y, y') = \frac{1}{v-1} \sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}|$. The uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills for all $(x, y) \in S$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [d(y, y') = 1] \geq 1 - \frac{v-2}{v-1}$$

The next result is for directed acyclic graphs and for a distortion function d that returns the number of different edges.

Claim v. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be the set of directed acyclic graphs of v nodes and k parents per node, such that $2 \leq k \leq v-2$. Let $A(y)$ be the adjacency matrix of $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Let $d(y, y') = \frac{2}{k(2v-k-1)} \sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}|$. The uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills for all $(x, y) \in S$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [d(y, y') = 1] \geq 1 - \frac{k^2 + 2k + 2}{k^2 + 3k + 2}$$

The final example is for cardinality-constrained sets and for a distortion function d that returns the number of different elements.

Claim vi. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be the set of sets of k elements chosen from v possible elements, such that $k \leq v/2$. Let $d(y, y') = \frac{1}{k} (|y - y'| + |y' - y|)$. The uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills for all $(x, y) \in S$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [d(y, y') = 1] \geq 1 - 1/2$$

We now focus on analyzing the expression involving the Hamming distance H and the margin m in Assumption A. We start with a claim that pertains to $\|w\|_\infty \leq 1$.

Claim vii. *Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be an arbitrary countable set of feasible decodings of x . Let $\phi(x, y)$ be an arbitrary feature vector for the pair (x, y) . Let $\mathcal{W} = \{w \mid \|w\|_\infty \in (0, 1]\}$. The uniform proposal distribution $R(w, x) = R(x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ fulfills for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] = 1$$

The next result is for $\|w\|_\infty > 1$. We also assume a suitable data-dependent upper bound of $\|w\|_\infty$.

Claim viii. *For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$, define:*

$$u(z) = \begin{cases} z/\|z\|_1 & \text{if } z \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } z = 0 \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ be an arbitrary countable set of feasible decodings of x . Let $\phi(x, y)$ be an arbitrary feature vector for the pair (x, y) . Let $R(w, x) = R(x)$ be a uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \left\{ w \mid \|w\|_\infty \in \left(1, \gamma \frac{\mathbb{E}_{y' \sim R(x)} [\|u(\phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y'))\|_1]}{\|\mathbb{E}_{y' \sim R(x)} [u(\phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y'))]\|_1} \right) \right\}$ for all $(x, y) \in S$, and for a fixed value $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. We have that for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)} [H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] \geq 1 \\ & - \exp \left(\frac{-(1 - 1/\gamma)^2}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim R(x)} [u(\phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y'))] \right\|_1^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

We finish by compiling the above results. Table 1 shows the constant β of the Assumption A for different problems. The results shown in the table follow from applying the decomposition Claim ii to the results in Claims iii to viii.

Examples for the Linearly Inducible Ordering Assumption. In what follows, we present some examples that fulfill our Assumption B.

Next, we present the algorithm proposed in [14, 15] for dependency parsing in natural language processing. Here, x is a sentence of v words and $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is the set of directed spanning trees of v nodes.

Algorithm 1 Procedure for sampling a directed spanning tree $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ from a greedy local proposal distribution $R(w, x)$

Input: parameter $w \in \mathcal{W}$, sentence $x \in \mathcal{X}$
 Draw uniformly at random a directed spanning tree $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$
repeat
 $s \leftarrow$ post-order traversal of \hat{y}
 for each node t in the list s **do**
 for each node u before t in the list s **do**
 $y \leftarrow$ change the parent of node t to u in \hat{y}
 if $\phi(x, y) \cdot w > \phi(x, \hat{y}) \cdot w$ **then**
 $\hat{y} \leftarrow y$
 end if
 end for
end for
until no refinement in last iteration
Output: directed spanning tree $y' \leftarrow \hat{y}$

The above algorithm has the following property:

Claim ix. *Algorithm 1 fulfills Assumption B.*

Note that Algorithm 1 proposed in [14, 15] uses the fact that we can perform local changes to a directed spanning tree in a computationally efficient manner. That is, changing parents of nodes in a post-order traversal will produce directed spanning trees. We can extend the above algorithm to any type of data structure where we can perform computationally efficient local changes. For instance, we can easily extend the method for directed acyclic graphs (traversed in post-order as well) and for sets with up to some prespecified number of elements.

Next, we generalize Algorithm 1 to any type of structured output.

Algorithm 2 Procedure for sampling a structured output $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ from a greedy local proposal distribution $R(w, x)$

Input: parameter $w \in \mathcal{W}$, observed input $x \in \mathcal{X}$
 Draw uniformly at random a structured output $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$
repeat
 Make a local change to \hat{y} in order to increase $\phi(x, \hat{y}) \cdot w$
until no refinement in last iteration
Output: structured output $y' \leftarrow \hat{y}$

The above algorithm has the following property:

Claim x. *Algorithm 2 fulfills Assumption B.*

5 Discussion

In this section, we provide more details regarding the computational complexity of the inference problem. We also present a brief review of the previous work and provide ideas for extending our theoretical result.

Computational Complexity of the Inference Problem. Very few cases of the general *inference* problem in eq.(1) are tractable. For instance, if $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is the set of directed spanning trees, and w is a vector of edge weights (i.e., linear with respect to y), then eq.(1) is equivalent to the maximum directed spanning tree problem, which is polynomial-time. In general, the inference problem in eq.(1) is not only NP-hard but also hard to approximate. For instance, if $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is the set of directed acyclic graphs, and w is a vector of edge weights (i.e., linear with respect to y), then eq.(1) is equivalent to the maximum acyclic subgraph problem, which approximating within a factor better than $1/2$ is unique-games hard [8]. As an additional example, consider the case where $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is the set of sets with up to some prespecified number of elements (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is a cardinality constraint), and the objective $\phi(x, y) \cdot w$ is submodular with respect to y . In this case, eq.(1) cannot be approximated within a factor better than $1 - 1/e$ unless $P=NP$ [12].

These negative results made us to avoid interpreting the maximum loss over random structured outputs in eq.(5) as an approximate optimization algorithm for the maximum loss over all possible structured outputs in eq.(4).

Previous Work. Approximate inference was proposed in [9], with an adaptation of the proof techniques in [11]. More specifically, [9] performs maximization of the loss over a *superset* of feasible decodings of x , i.e., over $y \in \mathcal{Y}'(x) \supseteq \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Note that our upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion dominates the maximum loss over $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$, and the latter dominates the upper bound of [9]. One could potentially use a similar argument with respect to a *subset* of feasible decodings of x , i.e., with respect to $y \in \mathcal{Y}'(x) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Unfortunately, this approach does not obtain an upper bound of the Gibbs decoder distortion.

Tangential to our work, previous analyses have exclusively focused either on sample complexity or convergence. Sample complexity analyses include margin bounds [13] and Rademacher complexity [10]. Convergence have been analyzed for specific algorithms for the separable [5] and nonseparable [7] cases.

Concluding Remarks. The work of [14, 15] has shown extensive experimental evidence for part-of-speech tagging and dependency parsing in the context of natural language processing. While the experimental results in [14, 15] are with respect to Algorithm 1 and for sets $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ of directed spanning trees, here we provide additional examples as well as very general assumptions. Thus, we hope that our theoretical work will motivate experimental validation on many other real-world structured prediction problems.

There are several ways of extending this research. While we focused on Gaussian perturbations, it would be interesting to analyze other distributions from the computational as well as statistical viewpoints. We analyzed a general class of proposal distributions that depend on the induced linear orderings. Algorithms that make greedy local changes, traverse the set of feasible decodings in a constrained fashion, by following allowed moves defined by

some prespecified graph. The addition of these graph-theoretical constraints would enable obtaining tighter upper bounds.

A Detailed Proofs

In this section, we state the proofs of all the theorems and claims in our manuscript.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Here, we provide the proof of Theorem 1. First, we derive an intermediate lemma needed for the final proof.

Lemma 1 (Adapted² from Lemma 6 in [11]). *Assume that there exists a finite integer value ℓ such that $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$. Let $Q(w)$ be a unit-variance Gaussian distribution centered at αw for $\alpha = \sqrt{2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2)}$. Simultaneously for all $(x, y) \in S$, $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$, we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [H(x, y, f_{w'}(x)) - m(x, y, f_{w'}(x), w) < 0] \leq \frac{\|w\|^2}{n}$$

or equivalently:

$$\mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [H(x, y, f_{w'}(x)) - m(x, y, f_{w'}(x), w) \geq 0] \geq 1 - \frac{\|w\|^2}{n} \quad (6)$$

Proof. First, note that $w' - \alpha w$ is a zero-mean and unit-variance Gaussian random vector. By well-known Gaussian concentration inequalities, for any $p \in \mathcal{P}(x)$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [|w'_p - \alpha w_p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq 2e^{-\varepsilon^2/2}$$

By the union bound and setting $\varepsilon = \alpha = \sqrt{2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2)}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [(\exists p \in \cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)) |w'_p - \alpha w_p| \geq \alpha] &\leq 2|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)|e^{-\alpha^2/2} \\ &= |\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \frac{\|w\|^2}{\ell n} \\ &\leq \frac{\|w\|^2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently:

$$\mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [(\forall p \in \cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)) |w'_p - \alpha w_p| < \alpha] \geq 1 - \frac{\|w\|^2}{n}$$

² We make two small corrections to Lemma 6 of [11]. First, it is only stated for $y' = f_w(x)$ but it does not make use of the optimality of $f_w(x)$, thus, it holds for any $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Second, for the union bound over all $p \in \cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)$, we assume that $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$. Instead, Lemma 6 in [11] incorrectly assumes $|\mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and thus $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \sum_{(x,y) \in S} |\mathcal{P}(x)| \leq n\ell$.

The high-probability statement in eq.(6) can be written as:

$$y' = f_{w'}(x) \Rightarrow H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0$$

Next, we use proof by contradiction, i.e., we will assume:

$$y' = f_{w'}(x) \text{ and } H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) < 0$$

and arrive to a contradiction $y' \neq f_{w'}(x)$. From the above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} m(x, y, y', w') &= m(x, y, y', \alpha w + (w' - \alpha w)) \\ &= \alpha m(x, y, y', w) - (\phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y')) \cdot (\alpha w - w') \\ &> \alpha H(x, y, y') - (\phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y')) \cdot (\alpha w - w') \\ &= \alpha H(x, y, y') - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(x)} (c(p, x, y) - c(p, x, y'))(\alpha w_p - w'_p) \\ &\geq \alpha H(x, y, y') - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(x)} |c(p, x, y) - c(p, x, y')| |\alpha w_p - w'_p| \\ &\geq \alpha H(x, y, y') - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(x)} |c(p, x, y) - c(p, x, y')| \alpha \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $m(x, y, y', w') > 0$ if and only if $\phi(x, y) \cdot w > \phi(x, y') \cdot w$. Therefore $y' \neq f_{w'}(x)$ since it does not maximize $\phi(x, \cdot) \cdot w$ as defined in eq.(1). Thus, we prove our claim. \square

Next, we provide the final proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. Define the Gibbs decoder *empirical* distortion of the perturbation distribution $Q(w)$ and training set S as:

$$L(Q(w), S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in S} \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)} [d(y, f_{w'}(x))]$$

In PAC-Bayes terminology, $Q(w)$ is the *posterior* distribution. Let the *prior* distribution P be the unit-variance zero-mean Gaussian distribution. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha > 0$. By well-known PAC-Bayes proof techniques, Lemma 4 in [11] shows that with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ over the choice of n training samples, simultaneously for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and unit-variance Gaussian posterior distributions $Q(w)$ centered at $w\alpha$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q(w), D) &\leq L(Q(w), S) + \sqrt{\frac{KL(Q(w)||P) + \log(2n/\delta)}{2(n-1)}} \\ &= L(Q(w), S) + \sqrt{\frac{\|w\|_2^2 \alpha^2 / 2 + \log(2n/\delta)}{2(n-1)}} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Thus, an upper bound of $L(Q(w), S)$ would lead to an upper bound of $L(Q(w), D)$. In order to upper-bound $L(Q(w), S)$, we can upper-bound each of its summands, i.e., we can

upper-bound $\mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x))]$ for each $(x, y) \in S$. Define the distribution $Q(w, x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ in the following form for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$:

$$\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim Q(w, x)}[y' = y] \equiv \mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[f_{w'}(x) = y] \quad (8)$$

For clarity of presentation, define:

$$u(x, y, y', w) \equiv H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w)$$

Let $u \equiv u(x, y, f_{w'}(x), w)$. Simultaneously for all $(x, y) \in S$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x))] &= \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u \geq 0) + d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u < 0)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u \geq 0) + \mathbf{1}(u < 0)] \end{aligned} \quad (9.a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u \geq 0)] + \mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[u < 0] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u \geq 0)] + \|w\|_2^2/n \end{aligned} \quad (9.b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[d(y, f_{w'}(x)) \mathbf{1}(u(x, y, f_{w'}(x), w) \geq 0)] + \|w\|_2^2/n \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim Q(w, x)}[d(y, y') \mathbf{1}(u(x, y, y', w) \geq 0)] + \|w\|_2^2/n \end{aligned} \quad (9.c)$$

$$\leq \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} d(y, \hat{y}) \mathbf{1}(u(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \geq 0) + \|w\|_2^2/n \quad (9.d)$$

where the step in eq.(9.a) holds since $d : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The step in eq.(9.b) follows from Lemma 1 which states that $\mathbb{P}_{w' \sim Q(w)}[u(x, y', f_{w'}(x), w) < 0] \leq \|w\|_2^2/n$ for $\alpha = \sqrt{2 \log(2n\ell/\|w\|_2^2)}$, simultaneously for all $(x, y) \in S$, $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$. By the definition in eq.(8), then the step in eq.(9.c) holds. Let $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be some arbitrary function, the step in eq.(9.d) uses the fact that $\mathbb{E}_y[g(y)] \leq \max_y g(y)$.

By eq.(7) and eq.(9.d), we prove our claim. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Note that sampling from the distribution $Q(w, x)$ as defined in eq.(8) is NP-hard in general, thus our plan is to upper-bound the expectation in eq.(9.c) by using the maximum over random structured outputs sampled independently from a proposal distribution $R(w, x)$ with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$.

Let $T(w, x)$ be a set of n' i.i.d. random structured outputs drawn from the proposal distribution $R(w, x)$, i.e., $T(w, x) \sim R(w, x)^{n'}$. Furthermore, let $\mathbb{T}(w)$ be the collection of the n sets $T(w, x)$ for all $(x, y) \in S$, i.e. $\mathbb{T}(w) \equiv \{T(w, x)\}_{(x, y) \in S}$ and thus $\mathbb{T}(w) \sim \{R(w, x)^{n'}\}_{(x, y) \in S}$. For clarity of presentation, define:

$$v(x, y, y', w) \equiv d(y, y') \mathbf{1}(H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0)$$

For sets $T(w, x)$ of sufficient size n' , our goal is to upper-bound eq.(9.c) in the following form for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in S} \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim Q(w, x)}[v(x, y, y', w)] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in S} \max_{\hat{y} \in T(w, x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w) + \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \sqrt{n})$$

Note that the above expression would produce a tighter upper bound than the maximum loss over all possible structured outputs since $\max_{\hat{y} \in T(w,x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \leq \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w)$. For analysis purposes, we decompose the latter equation into two quantities:

$$A(w, S) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \left(\mathbb{E}_{y' \sim Q(w,x)} [v(x, y, y', w)] - \mathbb{E}_{T(w,x) \sim R(w,x)^{n'}} \left[\max_{\hat{y} \in T(w,x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \right] \right) \quad (10)$$

$$B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \left(\mathbb{E}_{T(w,x) \sim R(w,x)^{n'}} \left[\max_{\hat{y} \in T(w,x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \right] - \max_{\hat{y} \in T(w,x)} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w) \right) \quad (11)$$

Thus, we will show that $A(w, S) \leq \sqrt{1/n}$ and $B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) \leq \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \sqrt{n})$ for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$, any training set S and all collections $\mathbb{T}(w)$, and therefore $A(w, S) + B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) \leq \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \sqrt{n})$. Note that while the value of $A(w, S)$ is deterministic, the value of $B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w))$ is stochastic given that $\mathbb{T}(w)$ is a collection of sampled random structured outputs.

Fix a specific $w \in \mathcal{W}$. If data is separable then $v(x, y, y', w) = 0$ for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$. This statement is equivalent to the second condition in Assumption A, i.e., $d(y, y') = 0 \vee H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) < 0$ for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)$. Thus, we have $A(w, S) = B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) = 0$ and we complete our proof for the separable case.³ In what follows, we focus on the nonseparable case.

Bounding the Deterministic Expectation $A(w, S)$. Here, we show that in eq.(10), $A(w, S) \leq \sqrt{1/n}$ for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and any training set S , provided that we use a sufficient number n' of random structured outputs sampled from the proposal distribution.

By well-known identities, we can rewrite:

$$A(w, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \int_0^1 \left(\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w,x)} [v(x, y, y', w) \leq z]^{n'} - \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim Q(w,x)} [v(x, y, y', w) \leq z] \right) dz \quad (12.a)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w,x)} [v(x, y, y', w) < 1]^{n'} \quad (12.b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w,x)} [d(y, y') < 1 \vee H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) < 0]^{n'}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \left(1 - \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w,x)} [d(y, y') = 1 \wedge H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] \right)^{n'} \quad (12.c)$$

$$\leq \beta^{n'} \quad (12.c)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{1/n} \quad (12.d)$$

³ The same result can be obtained for any subset of S for which the “separability” condition holds. Therefore, our analysis with the “nonseparability” condition can be seen as a worst case scenario.

where the step in eq.(12.a) holds since for two independent random variables $g, h \in [0, 1]$, we have $\mathbb{E}[g] = 1 - \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}[g \leq z] dz$ and $\mathbb{P}[\max(g, h) \leq z] = \mathbb{P}[g \leq z] \mathbb{P}[h \leq z]$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\max(g, h)] = 1 - \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}[g \leq z] \mathbb{P}[h \leq z] dz$. The step in eq.(12.b) follows since for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$, we have that $(\exists y' \in \mathcal{Y}(x)) v(x, y, y', w) = 1$ which is consequence of Assumption A. The step in eq.(12.c) follows from Assumption A. Finally, note that by setting $n' = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \log n / \log(1/\beta) \rceil$, the step in eq.(12.d) holds. Note that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} 1 / \log(1/\beta) = 0$, thus we consider $1 / \log(1/0) = 0$.

Bounding the Stochastic Quantity $B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w))$. Here, we show that in eq.(11), $B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) \leq \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \sqrt{n})$ for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$, any training set S and all collections $\mathbb{T}(w)$. For clarity of presentation, define:

$$g(x, y, T, w) \equiv \max_{\hat{y} \in T} v(x, y, \hat{y}, w)$$

Thus, we can rewrite:

$$B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x, y) \in S} \left(\mathbb{E}_{T(w, x) \sim R(w, x)^{n'}} [g(x, y, T(w, x), w)] - g(x, y, T(w, x), w) \right)$$

Let $r(x) \equiv |\mathcal{Y}(x)|$ and thus $\mathcal{Y}(x) \equiv \{y_1 \dots y_{r(x)}\}$. Let $\pi(x) = (\pi_1 \dots \pi_{r(x)})$ be a permutation of $\{1 \dots r(x)\}$ such that $\phi(x, y_{\pi_1}) \cdot w < \dots < \phi(x, y_{\pi_{r(x)}}) \cdot w$. Let Π be the collection of the n permutations $\pi(x)$ for all $(x, y) \in S$, i.e. $\Pi = \{\pi(x)\}_{(x, y) \in S}$. From Assumption B, we have that $R(\pi(x), x) \equiv R(w, x)$. Similarly, we rewrite $T(\pi(x), x) \equiv T(w, x)$ and $\mathbb{T}(\Pi) \equiv \mathbb{T}(w)$.

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{W}_{\Pi, S}$ be the set of all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ that induce Π on the training set S . For the parameter space \mathcal{W} , collection Π and training set S , define the function class $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W}, \Pi, S}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W}, \Pi, S} \equiv \{g(x, y, T, w) \mid w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Pi, S} \wedge (x, y) \in S\}$$

Note that since $|\mathcal{Y}(x)| \leq r$ for all $(x, y) \in S$, then $|\cup_{(x, y) \in S} \mathcal{Y}(x)| \leq \sum_{(x, y) \in S} |\mathcal{Y}(x)| \leq nr$. Note that each ordering of the nr structured outputs completely determines a collection Π and thus the collection of proposal distributions $R(w, x)$ for each $(x, y) \in S$. Note that since $|\cup_{(x, y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$, we need to consider $w, \phi(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$. From results in [2, 3, 6], we can conclude that there are at most $(nr)^{2\ell}$ linearly inducible orderings, or equivalently, there are at most $(nr)^{2\ell}$ collections Π .

Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. By Rademacher-based uniform convergence⁴ and by a union bound over all $(nr)^{2\ell}$ collections Π , with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ over the choice of n sets of random structured outputs, simultaneously for all parameters $w \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w)) \leq 2 \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}(\Pi)}(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W}, \Pi, S}) + 3 \sqrt{\frac{2\ell \log(nr) + \log(4/\delta)}{n}} \quad (13)$$

⁴ Note that for the analysis of $B(w, S, \mathbb{T}(w))$, the training set S is fixed and randomness stems from the collection $\mathbb{T}(w)$. Also, note that for applying McDiarmid's inequality, independence of each set $T(w, x)$ for all $(x, y) \in S$ is a sufficient condition, and identically distributed sets $T(w, x)$ are not necessary.

where $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}(\Pi)}(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W},\Pi,S})$ is the *empirical* Rademacher complexity of the function class $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W},\Pi,S}$ with respect to the collection $\mathbb{T}(\Pi)$ of the n sets $T(\pi(x),x)$ for all $(x,y) \in S$. For clarity, define:

$$\Delta_p(x,y,y') \equiv \begin{cases} c(p,x,y) - c(p,x,y') & \text{if } p \in \mathcal{P}(x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let σ be an n -dimensional vector of independent Rademacher random variables indexed by $(x,y) \in S$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}[\sigma_{(x,y)} = +1] = \mathbb{P}[\sigma_{(x,y)} = -1] = 1/2$. The empirical Rademacher complexity is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{T}(\Pi)}(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W},\Pi,S}) &\equiv \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{W},\Pi,S}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \sigma_{(x,y)} g(x,y,T(\pi(x),x),w) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Pi,S}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \sigma_{(x,y)} \max_{\hat{y} \in T(\pi(x),x)} d(y,\hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(H(x,y,\hat{y}) - m(x,y,\hat{y},w) \geq 0) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Pi,S}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S} \sigma_{(x,y)} \max_{\hat{y} \in T(\pi(x),x)} d(y,\hat{y}) \mathbb{1}(\|\Delta(x,y,\hat{y})\|_1 - \Delta(x,y,\hat{y}) \cdot w \geq 0) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \{1 \dots n\}} \sigma_i \max_{j \in \{1 \dots n'\}} d_{ij} \mathbb{1}(\|z_{ij}\|_1 - z_{ij} \cdot w \geq 0) \right) \right] \tag{14.a} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{(nn'+1)\ell} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \{1 \dots n\}} \sigma_i \max_{j \in \{1 \dots n'\}} d_{ij} \mathbb{1}(z_{ij} \cdot w \geq 0) \right) \right] \tag{14.b} \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \{1 \dots n'\}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{(nn'+1)\ell} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \{1 \dots n\}} \sigma_i d_{ij} \mathbb{1}(z_{ij} \cdot w \geq 0) \right) \right] \tag{14.c} \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \{1 \dots n'\}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{(nn'+1)\ell} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \{1 \dots n\}} \sigma_i \mathbb{1}(z_{ij} \cdot w \geq 0) \right) \right] \tag{14.d} \\ &\leq n' \sqrt{\frac{2 \log((nn'+1)\ell) \log n}{n}} \tag{14.e} \end{aligned}$$

where in the step in eq.(14.a), the terms σ_i , d_{ij} and z_{ij} correspond to $\sigma_{(x,y)}$, $d(y,\hat{y})$ and $\Delta(x,y,\hat{y})$ respectively. Thus, we assume that index i corresponds to the training sample $(x,y) \in S$, and that index j corresponds to the structured output $\hat{y} \in T(\pi(x),x)$. Note that since $|\cup_{(x,y) \in S} \mathcal{P}(x)| \leq \ell$, thus the step in eq.(14.a) considers $w, z_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell} \setminus \{0\}$ without loss of generality. The step in eq.(14.b) considers a larger function class, since we can always write $\|z_{ij}\|_1 = z_{ij} \cdot w'$ for some $w' \in \{-1, +1\}^{\ell}$. Note that $i \in \{1 \dots n\}$, $j \in \{1 \dots n'\}$ and $\|z_{ij}\|_0 \leq \ell$ for all i and j , thus we increased the dimensionality of the vector space, obtaining $w, z_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{(nn'+1)\ell} \setminus \{0\}$. The step in eq.(14.c) follows from the fact that for any two function classes \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{H} , we have that $\mathfrak{R}(\{\max(g,h) \mid g \in \mathfrak{G} \wedge h \in \mathfrak{H}\}) \leq \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{G}) + \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{H})$. The step in eq.(14.d) follows from the composition lemma and the fact that $d_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ for all i and j .

The step in eq.(14.e) follows from well-known VC-dimension arguments and its connection to the empirical Rademacher complexity.

By eq.(7), eq.(9.c), eq.(12.d), eq.(13) and eq.(14.e), we prove our claim. \square

A.3 Proof of Claim i

Proof. For all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$, by definition of the total variation distance, we have for any event $\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w)$:

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)}[\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w)] - \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(w, x)}[\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w)] \right| \leq TV(R(w, x) \| R'(w, x))$$

Let the event $\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w) : d(y, y') = 1 \wedge H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0$. Since $R(w, x)$ fulfills Assumption A with value β_1 and since $TV(R(w, x) \| R'(w, x)) \leq \beta_2$, we have that for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(w, x)}[\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w)] &\geq \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)}[\mathcal{A}(x, y, y', w)] - TV(R(w, x) \| R'(w, x)) \\ &\geq 1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

which proves our claim. \square

A.4 Proof of Claim ii

Proof. Note that for all $(x, y) \in S$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)}[d(y, y') = 1 \wedge H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] \\ &\geq \min \left(\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)}[d(y, y') = 1], \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(w, x)}[H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] \right) \\ &\geq \min(1 - \beta_1, 1 - \beta_2) \\ &= 1 - \max(\beta_1, \beta_2) \end{aligned}$$

which proves our claim. \square

A.5 Proof of Claim iii

Proof. Since $d(y, y') = 1 (y \neq y')$ and since $R(x)$ is a uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}(x)|} \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} 1(d(y, \hat{y}) = 1) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}(x)|} \\ &\geq 1 - 1/2 \end{aligned} \tag{15.a}$$

where the step in eq.(15.a) follows since $|\mathcal{Y}(x)| \geq 2$. \square

A.6 Proof of Claim iv

Proof. Let $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3 \dots s_v)$ be the pre-order traversal of y . Let $s' = (s_2, s_1, s_3 \dots s_v)$ be a node ordering where we switched s_1 with s_2 . Let $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ be the set of directed spanning trees of v nodes with node ordering s' .⁵ Let $R'(x)$ be the uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$. Since $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ is the set of directed spanning trees of v nodes with a specific node ordering, then $|\mathcal{Y}'(x)| = \prod_{i=2}^v (i-1) = (v-1)!$. Moreover, since $d(y, y') = \frac{1}{v-1} \sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}|$ and since $R'(x)$ is a uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] &\geq \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(x)} \left[\sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}| = v-1 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(v-1)!} \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}'(x)} 1 \left(\sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(\hat{y})_{ij}| = v-1 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{(v-1)!} \prod_{i=3}^v (i-2) \tag{16.a} \\
&= 1 - \frac{v-2}{v-1}
\end{aligned}$$

where the step in eq.(16.a) follows from the fact that when choosing the parent for the node in position i in the ordering s' , we have one option less (i.e., that option that is in y). \square

A.7 Proof of Claim v

Proof. Let $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3 \dots s_v)$ be the pre-order traversal of y . Let $s' = (s_2, s_1, s_3 \dots s_v)$ be a node ordering where we switched s_1 with s_2 . Let $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ be the set of directed acyclic graphs of v nodes and k parents per node, and with node ordering s' .⁶ Let $R'(x)$ be the uniform proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$. Since $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ is the set of directed acyclic graphs of v nodes and k parents per node, and with a specific node ordering, then $|\mathcal{Y}'(x)| = \prod_{i=2}^{k+1} (i-1) \prod_{i=k+2}^v \binom{i-1}{k} = k! \prod_{i=k+2}^v \binom{i-1}{k}$. Moreover, since $d(y, y') = \frac{2}{k(2v-k-1)} \sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}|$ and since $R'(x)$ is a uniform proposal distribution

⁵ We use the node ordering s' in order to have trees in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ with all edges different from y . If we use the node ordering s instead, every tree in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ will contain the edge (s_2, s_1) , thus no tree in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ will have all edges different from y .

⁶ We use the node ordering s' in order to have graphs in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ with all edges different from y . If we use the node ordering s instead, every graph in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ will contain the edge (s_2, s_1) , thus no graph in $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$ will have all edges different from y .

with support on $\mathcal{Y}'(x)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] &\geq \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R'(x)} \left[\sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(y')_{ij}| = \frac{1}{2}k(2v - k - 1) \right] \\
&= \left(k! \prod_{i=k+2}^v \binom{i-1}{k} \right)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}'(x)} 1 \left(\sum_{ij} |A(y)_{ij} - A(\hat{y})_{ij}| = \frac{1}{2}k(2v - k - 1) \right) \\
&= \left(k! \prod_{i=k+2}^v \binom{i-1}{k} \right)^{-1} \prod_{i=3}^{k+1} (i-2) \prod_{i=k+2}^v \left(\binom{i-1}{k} - 1 \right) \tag{17.a} \\
&= \frac{1}{k} \frac{\binom{k+1}{k} - 1}{\binom{k+1}{k}} \prod_{i=k+3}^v \frac{\binom{i-1}{k} - 1}{\binom{i-1}{k}} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{k} \frac{\binom{k+1}{k} - 1}{\binom{k+1}{k}} \prod_{i=k+3}^v \frac{\binom{i-1}{2} - 1}{\binom{i-1}{2}} \tag{17.b} \\
&= \frac{kv}{(k^2 + 3k + 2)(v - 2)} \tag{17.c} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{k^2 + 2k + 2}{k^2 + 3k + 2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the step in eq.(17.a) follows from the fact that when choosing the k parents for the node in position i in the ordering s' , we have one option less (i.e., the option that is in y). The step in eq.(17.b) follows from the fact that the function $\frac{z-1}{z}$ is nondecreasing as well as $\binom{a}{2} \leq \binom{a}{k}$ for $a \geq k + 2$ and $k \geq 2$. The step in eq.(17.c) follows from the fact $v/(v - 2) \geq 1$ for $v > 2$. \square

A.8 Proof of Claim vi

Proof. Since $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is the set of sets of k elements chosen from v possible elements, then $|\mathcal{Y}(x)| = \binom{v}{k}$. Moreover, since $d(y, y') = \frac{1}{k}(|y - y'| + |y' - y|)$ and since $R(x)$ is a uniform

proposal distribution with support on $\mathcal{Y}(x)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[d(y, y') = 1] &= \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[|y - y'| + |y' - y| = k] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[|y - y'| + |y' - y| < k] \\
&= 1 - \binom{v}{k}^{-1} \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} \mathbb{1}(|y - \hat{y}| + |\hat{y} - y| < k) \\
&= 1 - \binom{v}{k}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{v-k}{i} \tag{18.a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq 1 - \binom{v}{k}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{(v-k)^i}{i!} \tag{18.b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \binom{v}{k}^{-1} \frac{e^{v-k} \int_{v-k}^{+\infty} t^{k-1} e^{-t} dt}{(k-1)!} \\
&= 1 - \binom{v}{\lfloor \alpha v \rfloor}^{-1} \frac{e^{v-\lfloor \alpha v \rfloor} \int_{v-\lfloor \alpha v \rfloor}^{+\infty} t^{\lfloor \alpha v \rfloor - 1} e^{-t} dt}{(\lfloor \alpha v \rfloor - 1)!} \tag{18.c}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq 1 - 1/2 \tag{18.d}$$

where the step in eq.(18.a) follows from the fact that for a fixed set y of k elements, if the set \hat{y} has $k - i$ common elements with y , then there are $\binom{v-k}{i}$ possible ways of choosing the remaining i non-common elements in y' from out of $v - k$ possible elements. The step in eq.(18.b) follows from well-known inequalities for the binomial coefficient. The step in eq.(18.c) follows from making $k = \lfloor \alpha v \rfloor$. The step in eq.(18.d) follows for any $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$. \square

A.9 Proof of Claim vii

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}[\cdot] \equiv \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] \equiv \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim R(x)}[\cdot]$. Let $\Delta(x, y, y') \equiv \phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y') \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Furthermore, let $z \equiv \Delta(x, y, y')$. By the generalized Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and since $\|w\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w &\geq \|z\|_1 - \|z\|_1 \|w\|_\infty \\
&\geq \|z\|_1 - \|z\|_1 \\
&\geq 0 \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] &= \mathbb{P}[\| \Delta(x, y, y') \|_1 - \Delta(x, y, y') \cdot w \geq 0] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w \geq 0] \\
&= 1 \tag{20.a}
\end{aligned}$$

where the step in eq.(20.a) follows from eq.(19). \square

A.10 Proof of Claim viii

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}[\cdot] \equiv \mathbb{P}_{y' \sim R(x)}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] \equiv \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim R(x)}[\cdot]$. Let $\Delta(x, y, y') \equiv \phi(x, y) - \phi(x, y') \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Furthermore, let:

$$z = \begin{cases} \Delta(x, y, y') / \|\Delta(x, y, y')\|_1 & \text{if } \Delta(x, y, y') \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \Delta(x, y, y') = 0 \end{cases}$$

Note that by construction $\|z\|_1 \leq 1$. Let $W = \gamma \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1]}{\|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1} > 1$. By the generalized Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and since $\|w\|_\infty \leq W$, for all vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $\|z\|_1 \leq 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_1 - z \cdot w &\geq \|z\|_1 - \|z\|_1 \|w\|_\infty \\ &\geq \|z\|_1 - \|z\|_1 W \\ &= \|z\|_1 (1 - W) \\ &\geq 1 - W \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the last step follows since $W > 1$. Similarly, by the generalized Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and since $\|w\|_\infty \leq W$, for all vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $\|z\|_1 \leq 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_1 - z \cdot w &\leq \|z\|_1 + \|z\|_1 \|w\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|z\|_1 + \|z\|_1 W \\ &\leq 1 + W \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Let $\mu \equiv \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w]$. By the generalized Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, since $\|w\|_\infty \leq W$, and since $W = \gamma \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1]}{\|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1] - \mathbb{E}[z] \cdot w \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1] - \|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1 \|w\|_\infty \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1] - \|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1 W \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1] (1 - \gamma) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1] > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, it is easy to verify that $\mu > 0$. By Hoeffding's inequality and by eq.(21) and eq.(22), we have for $\varepsilon = \mu > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w \leq 0] &= \mathbb{P}[\mu - (\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w) \geq \varepsilon] \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{-2\varepsilon^2}{(2W)^2}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{-\mu^2}{2W^2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{-\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1]^2 (1 - \gamma)^2}{2W^2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{24.a}$$

$$= \exp\left(\frac{-(1 - 1/\gamma)^2}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1^2\right) \tag{24.b}$$

where the step in eq.(24.a) follows from eq.(23). The step in eq.(24.b) follows since $W = \gamma \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_1]}{\|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1}$. Finally, note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[H(x, y, y') - m(x, y, y', w) \geq 0] &= \mathbb{P}[\|\Delta(x, y, y')\|_1 - \Delta(x, y, y') \cdot w \geq 0] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\|\Delta(x, y, y')\|_1 - \Delta(x, y, y') \cdot w < 0] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w < 0] \\
&\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}[\|z\|_1 - z \cdot w \leq 0] \\
&\geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-(1 - 1/\gamma)^2}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[z]\|_1^2\right) \tag{25.a}
\end{aligned}$$

where the step in eq.(25.a) follows from eq.(24.b). \square

A.11 Proof of Claim ix

Proof. Algorithm 1 depends solely on the linear ordering induced by the parameter w and the mapping $\phi(x, \cdot)$. That is, at any point in time, Algorithm 1 executes comparisons of the form $\phi(x, y) \cdot w > \phi(x, \hat{y}) \cdot w$ for any two structured outputs y and \hat{y} . \square

A.12 Proof of Claim x

Proof. Algorithm 2 depends solely on the linear ordering induced by the parameter w and the mapping $\phi(x, \cdot)$. That is, at any point in time, Algorithm 2 executes comparisons of the form $\phi(x, y) \cdot w > \phi(x, \hat{y}) \cdot w$ for any two structured outputs y and \hat{y} . \square

References

- [1] Y. Altun and T. Hofmann. Large margin methods for label sequence learning. *European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*, pages 145–152, 2003.
- [2] J. Bennett. Determination of the number of independent parameters of a score matrix from the examination of rank orders. *Psychometrika*, 21(4):383–393, 1956.
- [3] J. Bennett and W. Hays. Multidimensional unfolding: Determining the dimensionality of ranked preference data. *Psychometrika*, 25(1):27–43, 1960.
- [4] M. Collins. Parameter estimation for statistical parsing models: Theory and practice of distribution-free methods. In *New Developments in Parsing Technology*, volume 23, pages 19–55. Kluwer Academic, 2004.
- [5] M. Collins and B. Roark. Incremental parsing with the perceptron algorithm. *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 111–118, 2004.
- [6] T. Cover. The number of linearly inducible orderings of points in d -space. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 15(2):434–439, 1967.
- [7] K. Crammer, O. Dekel, J. Keshet, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and Y. Singer. Online passive-aggressive algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(Mar):551–585, 2006.

- [8] V. Guruswami, R. Manokaran, and P. Raghavendra. Beating the random ordering is hard: Inapproximability of maximum acyclic subgraph. *Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 573–582, 2008.
- [9] A. Kulesza and F. Pereira. Structured learning with approximate inference. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 20:785–792, 2007.
- [10] B. London, B. Huang, B. Taskar, and L. Getoor. Collective stability in structured prediction: Generalization from one example. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 828–836, 2013.
- [11] D. McAllester. Generalization bounds and consistency. In *Predicting Structured Data*, pages 247–261. MIT Press, 2007.
- [12] G. Nemhauser, L. Wolsey, and M. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I. *Mathematical Programming*, 14:265–294, 1978.
- [13] B. Taskar, C. Guestrin, and D. Koller. Max-margin Markov networks. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 16:25–32, 2003.
- [14] Y. Zhang, T. Lei, R. Barzilay, and T. Jaakkola. Greed is good if randomized: New inference for dependency parsing. *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1013–1024, 2014.
- [15] Y. Zhang, C. Li, R. Barzilay, and K. Darwish. Randomized greedy inference for joint segmentation, POS tagging and dependency parsing. *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 42–52, 2015.