

# Best lower bound on the probability of a binomial exceeding its expectation

Iosif Pinelis

*Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Michigan Technological University  
Houghton, Michigan 49931, USA  
E-mail: ipinelis@mtu.edu*

---

## Abstract

Let  $X$  be a random variable distributed according to the binomial distribution with parameters  $n$  and  $p$ . It is shown that  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) \geq 1/4$  if  $1 > p \geq c/n$ , where  $c := \ln(4/3)$ , the best possible constant factor.

*Keywords:* binomial distribution, probability inequalities, exact bounds  
*2010 MSC:* 60E15, 62E15

---

## 1. Summary and discussion

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $X = X_{n,p}$  be a random variable (r.v.) with the binomial distribution with parameters  $n$  and  $p$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) \geq 1/4 \tag{1}$$

*if*

$$1 > p \geq c/n, \tag{2}$$

*where*

$$c := \ln(4/3) = 0.28768\dots \tag{3}$$

*Under condition (2), the equality in (1) is attained only if  $n = 2$  and  $p = 1/2$ . The constant factor  $c$  in (2) is the best possible.*

Complementing Theorem 1 is the following simple proposition.

**Proposition 2.** *If  $c/n \geq p \geq 0$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = 1 - (1-p)^n \geq \max(1, bn)p$ , where  $b := (1 - e^{-c})/c = 0.86901\dots$*

A very short proof of Theorem 1 will be given in Section 2. This proof is based on a monotonicity result due to Anderson and Samuels [2], which in turn follows from a more general result due to Hoeffding [7].

A bit longer proof of Theorem 1, which may still be of interest, is relegated to the appendix. This second proof is based on a version of the Berry–Esseen bound, which takes care of the main case when  $np \geq 2$  and  $n(1-p) \geq 2$ , that is, when  $2 \leq \mathbf{E}X \leq n-2$ . The remaining cases are rather easy to deal with, since all the values of  $X$  are in the set  $\{0, \dots, n\}$ .

Previously it was shown [5] that, for  $X$  as in Theorem 1, one has

$$\mathbf{P}(X \geq \mathbf{E}X) > 1/4 \tag{4}$$

if

$$p > 1/n. \tag{5}$$

Theorem 1 improves the result of [5] in two ways at once:

- (i) The (optimal) constant factor  $c = 0.28768\dots$  in (2) is better than the corresponding constant factor 1 in (5). (Concerning the strictness of the inequality  $\mathbf{P}(X \geq \mathbf{E}X) > 1/4$  in (4), here one may recall that the inequality  $\mathbf{P}(X > \mathbf{E}X) \geq 1/4$  in (1) is strict unless  $n = 2$  and  $p = 1/2$  – in which latter case condition (5) fails to hold.)
- (ii) Instead of the probability  $\mathbf{P}(X \geq \mathbf{E}X)$  in (4), we have the (possibly) smaller probability  $\mathbf{P}(X > \mathbf{E}X)$  in (1).

Improvement (i) and the optimality of the constant factor  $c$  are illustrated in Figure 1, showing the graphs

- $\{(p, \mathbf{P}(X_{n,p} > np)) : 1/n \leq p < 1\}$  (solid)
- $\{(p, \mathbf{P}(X_{n,p} > np)) : c/n < p \leq 1/n\}$  (dashed, black)
- $\{(p, \mathbf{P}(X_{n,p} > np)) : 0 < p \leq c/n\}$  (dashed, gray)

for  $n = 5$ . This figure is similar to [5, Figure 2], where the graphs over the interval  $(c/n, 1/n]$  were dashed, too.




Figure 1: Graphs of  $\mathbf{P}(X > \mathbf{E}X)$ .

However, concerning improvement (i), one should note that the case when  $c \leq np < 1$  – considered in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1 – is comparatively simple. As for improvement (ii), inequality (1) follows from its

non-strict counterpart  $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathbb{E} X) \geq 1/4$  upon noting that  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E} X) = \mathbb{P}(X_{n,p} > np)$  is right-continuous in  $p$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E} X) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathbb{E} X) \geq 1/4$  if  $np$  is not an integer.

So, the main distinction of the present note from [5] is perhaps that each of the two proofs of Theorem 1 given here appears to be significantly simpler than the proof in [5].

As noted in [5], inequality (4) was used several times in the machine learning literature, including [4, 14, 13], to bound the probability of the so-called relative deviation of frequencies from the corresponding probabilities for certain classes of events. Such results have applications to the so-called probably-approximately-correct (PAC) models of machine learning; concerning PAC models, see e.g. [12, 6, 8, 1].

In [3], the non-strict version,  $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathbb{E} X) \geq 1/4$ , of inequality (1) was obtained, but only for large enough  $n$  and  $p \geq 2/n$ .

In [11, Lemma 13], it was shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathbb{E} X) \geq \min(p, 1/4) \tag{6}$$

for

$$p \in (0, 1/2]. \tag{7}$$

This was used to prove a part of [11, Proposition 8]. To state that result, we need to reproduce several definitions from [11]. Let  $(X, Y)$  be a random vector in  $\mathfrak{X} \times \{-1, 1\}$ , where  $\mathfrak{X}$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A classifier is a Borel-measurable map from  $\mathfrak{X}$  to  $\{-1, 1\}$ . For any classifier  $h$ , consider the two types of error probabilities,

$$R^-(h) := \mathbb{P}(h(X) \geq 0 | Y = -1) \quad \text{and} \quad R^+(h) := \mathbb{P}(h(X) < 0 | Y = 1),$$

and also the empirical counterpart

$$\hat{R}^-(h) := \frac{1}{n^-} \sum_{i=1}^{n^-} \mathbf{1}(h(X_i^-) \geq 0)$$

of  $R^-(h)$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_{n^-}$  is a (training) iid sample from the conditional distribution of  $X$  given  $Y = -1$ , and  $\mathbf{1}(A)$  denotes the indicator of an assertion  $A$  (so that  $\mathbf{1}(A) = 1$  if  $A$  is true and  $\mathbf{1}(A) = 0$  if  $A$  is false).

The mentioned result in [11] is as follows: there exist classifiers  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  and a probability distribution for  $(X, Y)$  such that, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$  and any r.v.  $\Lambda$  with values in  $[0, 1]$  such that for the random ‘‘pseudo-classifier’’  $h_\Lambda := \Lambda h_1 + (1 - \Lambda) h_2$  we have  $\hat{R}^-(h_\Lambda) < \alpha$ , the event that the ‘‘excess type II risk’’

$$R^+(h_\Lambda) - \min_{\lambda \in [0, 1]: R^+(h_\lambda)} R^+(h_\lambda)$$

is  $\geq \alpha$  occurs with a probability  $P \geq \min(\alpha, 1/4)$ .

Using inequality (1) with condition (2) – instead of inequality (6) with condition (7), we can replace the conditions  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$  and  $P \geq \min(\alpha, 1/4)$  in

the cited result in [11] by the respective conditions  $\alpha \in [c/n, 1]$  and  $P \geq 1/4$ , which will constitute a substantial improvement, in the case when  $\alpha \geq c/n$ . For the simpler case of  $\alpha \in (0, c/n]$ , an improvement over the result in [11] can be similarly obtained using Proposition 2.

## 2. Proofs

Here and in what follows,

$$q := 1 - p. \quad (8)$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* If  $n = 1$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = \mathbb{P}(X > p) = \mathbb{P}(X = 1) = p = np \geq c > 1/4,$$

so that (1) holds, with the strict inequality.

Fix now any natural  $n \geq 2$ . Consider first the case when  $c \leq np < 1$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}(X > np) = 1 - q^n \geq 1 - q^{c/p} = 1 - \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1-p)}{p}} > 1 - \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{4}, \quad (9)$$

so that  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) > \frac{1}{4}$ . Moreover, if  $c = \ln \frac{4}{3}$  is replaced here by any  $c_1 \in (0, c)$ , and if  $p = c_1/n$  with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) = 1 - q^n = 1 - (1 - c_1/n)^n \rightarrow 1 - e^{-c_1} < 1 - e^{-c} = 1/4$ .

Therefore, the constant factor  $c$  in (2) cannot be improved and, moreover, without loss of generality (wlog)

$$np \geq 1. \quad (10)$$

So,

$$m := m_n := \lfloor np \rfloor + 1 \in [2, n]. \quad (11)$$

Introduce also

$$p_j := p_{n,j} := (m_n - 1)/j = (m - 1)/j \quad (12)$$

for  $j \in \{m, \dots, n\}$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = \mathbb{P}(X_{n,p} > np) = \mathbb{P}(X_{n,p} \geq m) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_{n,p_n} \geq m). \quad (13)$$

The latter inequality, which follows from the (strict) stochastic monotonicity of  $X_{n,p}$  in  $p$  and the inequality  $p \geq p_n$ , is strict unless  $p = p_n$  (that is, unless  $np$  is an integer). Next, by part (i) of [10, Theorem 3] (which immediately follows from the second inequality in [2, Theorem 2.1], again by the stochastic monotonicity of  $X_{n,p}$  in  $p$ ), we have  $\mathbb{P}(X_{j+1,p_{j+1}} \geq m) > \mathbb{P}(X_{j,p_j} \geq m)$  for all  $j \in \{m, \dots, n-1\}$ . So,  $\mathbb{P}(X_{n,p_n} \geq m) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_{m,p_m} \geq m)$ , and this inequality is strict unless  $m = n$ . Also,  $\mathbb{P}(X_{m,p_m} \geq m) = (1 - 1/m)^m \geq (1 - 1/2)^2 = 1/4$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(X_{m,p_m} > m) > 1/4$  unless  $m = 2$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) > 1/4$  unless  $n = m = 2$  and  $np$  is an integer. Thus, in view of (10),  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) > 1/4$  unless  $n = 2$  and  $p = 1/2$ . That  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = 1/4$  if  $n = 2$  and  $p = 1/2$  is trivial. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* If  $c/n \geq p \geq 0$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = 1 - (1 - p)^n$ . Next,  $(1 - (1 - p)^n)/(np)$  is decreasing in  $p \in (0, 1]$ , so that for  $p \in (0, c/n]$  we have  $(1 - (1 - p)^n)/(np) \geq (1 - (1 - c/n)^n)/c \geq (1 - e^{-c})/c = b$ , so that  $1 - (1 - p)^n \geq bnp$ . The inequality  $1 - (1 - p)^n \geq p$  is obvious. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Alon, N., Hanneke, S., Holzman, R., Moran, S., 2021. A theory of PAC learnability of partial concept classes. [arXiv:2107.08444](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08444). [arXiv:2107.08444](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08444) [cs.LG].
- [2] Anderson, T.W., Samuels, S.M., 1967. Some inequalities among binomial and Poisson probabilities, in: Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif.. pp. 1–12. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bsm/1200512976>.
- [3] Andonova Jaeger, S., 2005. Generalization bounds and complexities based on sparsity and clustering for convex combinations of functions from random classes. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 6, 307–340.
- [4] Anthony, M., Shawe-Taylor, J., 1993. A result of Vapnik with applications. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 47, 207–217. doi:10.1016/0166-218X(93)90126-9.
- [5] Greenberg, S., Mohri, M., 2014. Tight lower bound on the probability of a binomial exceeding its expectation. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 86, 91–98. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2013.12.009>, doi:10.1016/j.spl.2013.12.009.
- [6] Haussler, D., 1992. Decision theoretic generalizations of the PAC model for neural net and other learning applications. *Inf. Comput.* 100, 78–150. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(92\)90010-D](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(92)90010-D), doi:10.1016/0890-5401(92)90010-D.
- [7] Hoeffding, W., 1956. On the distribution of the number of successes in independent trials. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 27, 713–721. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728178>, doi:10.1214/aoms/1177728178.
- [8] Kontorovich, A., Pinelis, I., 2019. Exact lower bounds for the agnostic probably-approximately-correct (PAC) machine learning model. *Ann. Statist.* 47, 2822–2854. doi:10.1214/18-AOS1766.
- [9] Korolev, V., Shevtsova, I., 2012. An improvement of the Berry-Esseen inequality with applications to Poisson and mixed Poisson random sums. *Scand. Actuar. J.* , 81–105doi:10.1080/03461238.2010.485370.
- [10] Pinelis, I., 2020. Monotonicity properties of the Poisson approximation to the binomial distribution. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 167, 108901, 7. doi:10.1016/j.spl.2020.108901.

- [11] Rigollet, P., Tong, X., 2011. Neyman-Pearson classification, convexity and stochastic constraints. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 12, 2831–2855.
- [12] Valiant, L.G., 1984. A theory of the learnable. *Commun. ACM* 27, 1134–1142.
- [13] Vapnik, V., 2006. Estimation of dependences based on empirical data. *Information Science and Statistics*, Springer, New York. Reprint of the 1982 edition, Afterword of 2006: Empirical inference science.
- [14] Vapnik, V.N., 1998. Statistical learning theory. *Adaptive and Learning Systems for Signal Processing, Communications, and Control*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

## Appendix

*Second proof of Theorem 1.* At least one of the following five cases must occur:

*Case 1:*  $np \geq 2$  and  $nq \geq 2$  (recall the convention  $q := 1 - p$  in (8)).

*Case 2:*  $c \leq np < 1$  and  $n \geq 1$ , where  $c$  is as in (3).

*Case 3:*  $1 \leq np < 2$  and  $n \geq 3$ .

*Case 4:*  $1 < nq \leq 2$  and  $n \geq 3$ .

*Case 5:*  $0 < nq \leq 1$  and  $n \geq 2$ .

In particular, note that the cases when either (i)  $n = 1$  or (ii)  $n = 2$  and  $p < 1/2$  are covered by Case 2, whereas the case when  $n = 2$  and  $p \geq 1/2$  is covered by Case 5.

Consider now each of the five listed cases.

*Case 1:* The version of the Berry–Esseen bound given in [9, Theorem 1] implies

$$\mathbb{P}(X > \mathbb{E}X) = \mathbb{P}(X > np) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon(n, p), \quad \text{where} \quad \varepsilon(n, p) := \frac{c_3}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \frac{\rho}{\sigma^3} + c_2 \right),$$

$$\rho = p^3q + q^3p, \quad \sigma = \sqrt{pq}, \quad c_3 := \frac{33477}{100000}, \quad c_2 = \frac{429}{1000}.$$

Note that  $p^3q/\sigma^3 = p^{3/2}(1-p)^{-1/2}$  is convex in  $p$  and, similarly,  $q^3p/\sigma^3$  is convex in  $p$ , so that  $\rho/\sigma^3$  and  $\varepsilon(n, p)$  are convex in  $p$ . Therefore and in view of the Case 1 conditions  $np \geq 2$  and  $nq \geq 2$ , we have  $\varepsilon(n, p) \leq \varepsilon(n, 2/n) = \varepsilon(n, 1 - 2/n) =: \varepsilon_*(n)$ , which is a simple algebraic function of  $n$ . For the derivative  $\varepsilon'_*(n)$  of  $\varepsilon_*(n)$  in  $n$ , we see that  $\varepsilon'_*(n)n^{5/2}(n-2)^{3/2}$  is a polynomial in  $(n-2)^{1/2}$ , of degree 5. Therefore, it is easy to see that  $\varepsilon_*(n)$  is decreasing in  $n \in [4, 6]$ , increasing in  $n \in [7, 89]$ , and decreasing in  $n \in [90, \infty)$ . Also, the conditions  $np \geq 2$  and  $nq \geq 2$  imply  $n = np + nq \geq 4$ . So, in Case 1,  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \max(\varepsilon_*(4), \varepsilon_*(89), \varepsilon_*(90)) > 0.25587 > 1/4$ .

*Case 2:* Then, by (9),  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) > \frac{1}{4}$ . Moreover, it was shown in the paragraph containing (9) that the constant factor  $c$  in (2) cannot be improved.

*Case 3:* Then

$$\mathbb{P}(X > np) = \mathbb{P}(X > 1) = 1 - q^n - nq^{n-1}p,$$

which is increasing in  $p$ , by the stochastic monotonicity of  $X_{n,p}$  in  $p$ . So, wlog  $p = 1/n$ , in which case  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) = f_3(n) := 1 - (2 - 1/n)(1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$ . The second derivative of  $\ln(1 - f_3(n))$  is  $1/((2n - 1)^2(n - 1)n) > 0$ , so that  $\ln(1 - f_3)$  is convex. Also,  $\ln(1 - f_3(n)) \rightarrow \ln(2/e)$ . Therefore,  $\ln(1 - f_3(n))$  is decreasing (in  $n \geq 3$ ) and  $f_3(n)$  is increasing, from  $f_3(3) = 7/27 > 1/4$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) > \frac{1}{4}$  in Case 3.

*Case 4:* Then  $n - 2 \leq np < n - 1$ ,  $p \geq 1 - 2/n$ , and

$$\mathbb{P}(X > np) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq n - 1) = f_1(p) := f_1(p, n) := p^n + np^{n-1}q,$$

and  $f_1(p)$  is increasing in  $p$ , by the stochastic monotonicity of  $X_{n,p}$  in  $p$ . Therefore, here wlog  $p = 1 - 2/n$ , and

$$\tilde{f}_1(n) := f_1(1 - 2/n, n) = \frac{3n - 2}{n - 2} (1 - 2/n)^n.$$

Letting

$$D\tilde{f}_1(n) := \tilde{f}'_1(n) \Big/ \frac{(1 - 2/n)^n (3n - 2)}{n - 2} = \ln(1 - 2/n) + \frac{6n - 8}{(n - 2)(3n - 2)},$$

we have

$$(D\tilde{f}_1)'(n) = -\frac{4(3n^2 - 4n + 4)}{(3n - 2)^2(n - 2)^2n} < 0.$$

So,  $D\tilde{f}_1$  is decreasing. Also,  $D\tilde{f}_1(\infty-) = 0$ . It follows that  $D\tilde{f}_1 > 0$  and hence  $\tilde{f}_1$  is increasing, from  $\tilde{f}_1(3) = \frac{7}{27} > \frac{1}{4}$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) > \frac{1}{4}$  in Case 4.

*Case 5:* Then  $n > np \geq n - 1$ ,  $p \geq 1 - 1/n$ , and hence

$$\mathbb{P}(X > np) = \mathbb{P}(X = n) = p^n \geq (1 - 1/n)^n,$$

and  $(1 - 1/n)^n$  is increasing in  $n \geq 2$ , from  $(1 - 1/2)^2 = 1/4$ . So,  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) > \frac{1}{4}$  in Case 5 – except when  $n = 2$  and  $p = 1/2$ , in which case  $\mathbb{P}(X > np) = \frac{1}{4}$ .

This completes the second proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$