

---

# Generalization Error Bounds on Deep Learning with Markov Datasets

---

Lan V. Truong\*  
Department of Engineering  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, CB2 1PZ  
lt407@cam.ac.uk

## Abstract

In this paper, we derive upper bounds on generalization errors for deep neural networks with Markov datasets. These bounds are developed based on Koltchinskii and Panchenko’s approach for bounding the generalization error of combined classifiers with i.i.d. datasets. The development of new symmetrization inequalities in high-dimensional probability for Markov chains is a key element in our extension, where the spectral gap of the infinitesimal generator of the Markov chain plays a key parameter in these inequalities. We also propose a simple method to convert these bounds and other similar ones in traditional deep learning and machine learning to Bayesian counterparts for both i.i.d. and Markov datasets. Extensions to  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chains such as AR and ARMA models and mixtures of several Markov data services are given.

## 1 Introduction

In statistical learning theory, understanding generalization for neural networks is among the most challenging tasks. The standard approach to this problem was developed in seminar papers by Vapnik [1], and it is based on bounding the difference between the generalization error and the training error. These bounds are expressed in terms of the so called VC-dimension of the class. However, these bounds are very loose when the VC-dimension of the class can be very large, or even infinite. In 1998, several authors [2, 3] suggested another class of upper bounds on generalization error that are expressed in terms of the empirical distribution of the margin of the predictor (the classifier). Later, Koltchinskii and Panchenko [4] proposed new probabilistic upper bounds on generalization error of the combination of many complex classifiers such as deep neural networks. These bounds were developed based on the general results of the theory of Gaussian, Rademacher, and empirical processes in terms of general functions of the margins, satisfying a Lipschitz condition. They improved previously known bounds on generalization error of convex combination of classifiers.

In the context of supervised classification, PAC-Bayesian bounds have proved to be the tightest [5–7]. Several recent works have focused on gradient descent based PAC-Bayesian algorithms, aiming to minimise a generalisation bound for stochastic classifiers [8–10]. Most of these studies use a surrogate loss to avoid dealing with the zero-gradient of the misclassification loss. Several authors used other methods to estimate of the misclassification error with a non-zero gradient by proposing new training algorithms to evaluate the optimal output distribution in PAC-Bayesian bounds analytically [11–13]. Recently, there have been some interesting works which use information-theoretic approach to find PAC-bounds on generalization errors for machine learning [14, 15] and deep learning [16].

---

\*Use footnote for providing further information about author (webpage, alternative address)—*not* for acknowledging funding agencies.

All of the above-mentioned bounds are derived based on the assumption that the dataset is generated by an i.i.d. process with unknown distribution. However, in many applications in machine learning such as speech, handwriting, gesture recognition, and bio-informatics, the samples of data are usually correlated. In this work, we develop some upper bounds on generalization errors for deep neural networks with Markov or hidden Markov datasets. Our bounds are derived based on the same approach as Koltchinskii and Panchenko [4]. To deal with the Markov structure of the datasets, we need to develop some new techniques in this work. The development of new symmetrization inequalities in high-dimensional probability for Markov chains is a key element in our extension, where the pseudo spectral gap of the infinitesimal generator of the Markov chain plays as a key parameter in these inequalities. Furthermore, we also apply our results to  $m$ -order Markov chains such as AR and ARMA models and mixtures of Markov chains.

Finally, a simple method to convert all our bounds for traditional deep learning to counterparts for Bayesian deep learning is given. Our method can be applied to convert other similar bounds for i.i.d. datasets in the research literature as well. Bayesian deep learning has been recently introduced by Wilson and Izmailov [17]. The key distinguishable property of a Bayesian approach is marginalization, rather than using a single setting of weights in (traditional) deep learning. Bayesian marginalization can particularly improve the accuracy and calibration of modern deep neural networks, which are typically underspecified by the data, and can represent many compelling but different solutions.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Mathematical Backgrounds

Let a Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on a state space  $\mathcal{S}$  with transition kernel  $Q(x, dy)$  and the initial state  $X_1 \sim \nu$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a Polish space in  $\mathbb{R}$ . In this paper, we consider the Markov chains which are irreducible and recurrent, so the existence of a stationary distribution  $\pi$  is guaranteed. An irreducible and recurrent Markov chain on an infinite state-space is called Harris chain [18]. A Markov chain is called *reversible* if the following detailed balance condition is satisfied:

$$\pi(dx)Q(x, dy) = \pi(dy)Q(y, dx), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (1)$$

Let  $L_2(\pi)$  be the Hilbert space of complex valued measurable functions on  $\mathcal{S}$  that are square integrable w.r.t.  $\pi$ . We endow  $L_2(\pi)$  with inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle := \int fg^* d\pi$ , and norm  $\|f\|_{2,\pi} := \langle f, f \rangle_\pi^{1/2}$ . Let  $E_\pi$  be the associated averaging operator defined by  $(E_\pi)(x, y) = \pi(y), \forall x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ , and

$$\lambda = \|Q - E_\pi\|_{L_2(\pi) \rightarrow L_2(\pi)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\|B\|_{L_2(\pi) \rightarrow L_2(\pi)} = \max_{v: \|v\|_{2,\pi}=1} \|Bv\|_{2,\pi}$ .  $Q$  can be viewed as a linear operator (infinitesimal generator) on  $L_2(\pi)$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{Q}$ , defined as  $(\mathbf{Q}f)(x) := \mathbb{E}_{Q(x, \cdot)}(f)$ , and the reversibility is equivalent to the self-adjointness of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The operator  $\mathbf{Q}$  acts on measures on the left, creating a measure  $\mu\mathbf{Q}$ , that is, for every measurable subset  $A$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mu\mathbf{Q}(A) := \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} Q(x, A)\mu(dx)$ . For a Markov chain with stationary distribution  $\pi$ , we define the *spectrum* of the chain as

$$\mathcal{S}_2 := \{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : (\xi\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \text{ is not invertible on } L_2(\pi)\}. \quad (3)$$

It is known that  $\lambda = 1 - \gamma^*$  [19], where

$$\gamma^* := \begin{cases} 1 - \sup\{|\xi| : \xi \in \mathcal{S}_2, \xi \neq 1\}, & \text{if eigenvalue 1 has multiplicity 1,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is the *the absolute spectral gap* of the Markov chain. The absolute spectral gap can be bounded by the mixing time  $t_{\text{mix}}$  of the Markov chain by the following expression:

$$\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^*} - 1\right) \log 2 \leq t_{\text{mix}} \leq \frac{\log(4/\pi_*)}{\gamma^*}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi_* = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_x$  is the *minimum stationary probability*, which is positive if  $Q^k > 0$  (entry-wise positive) for some  $k \geq 1$ . See [20] for more detailed discussions. In [20, 21], the authors provided algorithms to estimate  $t_{\text{mix}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{ps}}$  from a single trajectory.

By  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S})$  denote the set of real-valued signed measures on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))$  where  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$  is the set of all Borel subsets in  $\mathcal{S}^2$ . Assume that  $\nu \ll \pi$ . Define

$$\mathcal{M}_2 := \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}) : \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \right\|_2 < \infty \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is the standard  $L_2$  norm in the Hilbert space of complex valued measurable functions on  $\mathcal{S}$ . We also assume that

$$c := \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \right\|_\infty < \infty. \quad (6)$$

For  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  being an i.i.d. sequence, which is a special case of Markov chain, or an arbitrary homogeneous Markov chain with  $X_1 \sim \pi$ , it holds that  $c = 1$ .

## 2.2 Problem settings

In this paper, we consider a uniformly bounded class of functions:

$$\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\} \quad (7)$$

such that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq M \quad (8)$$

for some finite constant  $M$ . Define the following probability measure

$$P(A) := \int_A \pi(x) dx, \quad (9)$$

for any measurable set  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ . In addition, let  $P_n$  be the empirical measure based on the sample  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ , i.e.,

$$P_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}, \quad (10)$$

We also denote  $Pf := \int_{\mathcal{S}} f dP$  and  $P_n f := \int_{\mathcal{S}} f dP_n$ . Then, we have

$$Pf = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x) \pi(x) dx, \quad (11)$$

and

$$P_n f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i). \quad (12)$$

On the Banach space of uniformly bounded functions  $\mathcal{F}$ , define an infinity norm:  $\|Y\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |Y(f)|$ . Let

$$G_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right], \quad (13)$$

where  $\{g_i\}$  is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal variables, independent of  $\{X_i\}$ . We will call  $n \mapsto G_n(\mathcal{F})$  the Gaussian complexity function of the class  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Similarly, we define

$$R_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right], \quad (14)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The set function  $\mu : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued signed measure if  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and for pairwise disjoint  $A_1, A_2, \dots$  with  $A_k \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , one has  $\mu(\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty A_k) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \mu(A_k)$ .

where  $\{\varepsilon_i\}$  is a sequence of i.i.d. Rademacher (taking values  $+1$  and  $-1$  with probability  $1/2$  each) random variables, independent of  $\{X_i\}$ . We will call  $n \mapsto R_n(\mathcal{F})$  the Rademacher complexity function of the class  $\mathcal{F}$ .

For real applications in machine learning, we can assume that feature vectors are generated by a Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with stochastic matrix  $Q$ , and  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is the corresponding sequence of labels such as in text and speech services. Furthermore,  $Q$  is irreducible and recurrent on some finite set  $\mathcal{S}$ . An i.i.d. sequence of feature vectors can be considered as a special Markov chain where  $Q(x, x')$  only depends on  $x'$ . In the supervised learning, the sequence of labels  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  can be considered as being generated by a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), where the emission probability  $P_{Y_n|X_n}(y|x) = g(x, y)$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $g: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . It is easy to see that  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a Markov chain with the transition probability

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_{n+1}Y_{n+1}|X_nY_n}(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}|x_n, y_n) \\ = Q(x_n, x_{n+1})g(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Let  $\tilde{Q}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) := Q(x_1, x_2)g(x_2, y_2)$  for all  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ , which is the transition probability of the Markov chain  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Then, it is not hard to see that  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is irreducible and recurrent on  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ , so it has a stationary distribution, say  $\tilde{\pi}$ . The associated following probability measure is defined as

$$P(A) := \int_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\pi}(x, y) dx dy, \quad (16)$$

and the empirical distribution  $P_n$  based on the observations  $\{(X_k, Y_k)\}_{k=1}^n$  is

$$P_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{X_k, Y_k}. \quad (17)$$

### 2.3 Contributions

In this paper, we aim to develop a set of novel upper bounds on *the generalization errors* for deep neural networks with Markov dataset. More specially, our target is to find a relationship between  $Pf$  and  $P_n f$  which holds for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  in terms of Gaussian and Rademacher complexities. Our main contributions include:

- We develop general bounds on generalization errors for machine learning (and deep learning) on Markov datasets.
- Since the dataset is non-i.i.d., the standard symmetrization inequalities in high-dimensional probability can not be applied. In this work, we extend some symmetrization inequalities for i.i.d. random processes to Markov ones.
- We propose a new method to convert all the bounds for machine learning (and deep learning) models to Bayesian settings.
- Extensions to  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chains such as AR and ARMA models and mixtures of several Markov services are given.

## 3 Main Results

### 3.1 Probabilistic Bounds for General Function Classes

In this section, we develop probabilistic bounds for general function classes in terms of Gaussian and Rademacher complexities.

First, we prove the following key lemma, which is an extension of the symmetrization inequality for i.i.d. sequences (for example, [22]) to a new version for Markov sequences  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and the initial distribution  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_2$ :

**Lemma 1.** For all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , define

$$A_n := \sqrt{\frac{2M}{n(1-\lambda)} + \frac{64M^2}{n^2(1-\lambda)^2} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_2}. \quad (18)$$

Then, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] - A_n - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] + A_n, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (19)$$

The proof of this lemma can be found in Appendix A. Compared with the i.i.d. case, the symmetrization inequality for Markov chain in Lemma 1 are different in two perspectives: (1) The expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$  is now is under the joint distributions of Markov chain and Rademacher random variables and (2) The term  $A_n$  appears in both lower and upper bounds to compensate for the difference between the initial distribution  $\nu$  and the stationary distribution  $\pi$  of the Markov chain<sup>3</sup>. If  $X_1 \sim \pi$  (or  $\nu = \pi$ ), the term  $A_n$  is unnecessary in (19). See our detailed proof for this fact.

By applying Lemma 1, the following theorem can be proved (cf. Appendix B).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\varphi$  is a non-increasing function such that  $\varphi(x) \geq \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{8L(\varphi)}{\delta} R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2L(\varphi)\sqrt{2\pi}}{\delta} G_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (18) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

Since  $A_n = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ , Theorem 2 shows that with high probability, the generalization error can be bounded by Rademacher or Gaussian complexity functions plus an  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  term, where  $n$  is the training set length. This fact also happens in i.i.d. case [4]. However, because the dependency among samples in Markov chain, the constant in  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  term is larger than the i.i.d. case.

### 3.2 Bounding the generalization error in deep neural networks

In this section, we consider the same example as [4, Section 6]. However, we assume that feature vectors in the dataset are generated by a Markov chain instead of an i.i.d. process. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the class of all uniformly bounded functions  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .  $\mathcal{H}$  is called the class of *base functions*. Denote by  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  the class of measurable functions  $\tilde{f} : S \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is the alphabet of labels.  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  is introduced for real machine learning applications where we need to work with a new Markov chain generated from both feature vectors and their labels  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  instead of the feature-based Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . See Subsection 2.2 for detailed discussions. For binary classification,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \{\tilde{f} : f \in \mathcal{H}\}$ , where  $\tilde{f}(x, y) = yf(x)$ .

Consider a feed-forward neural network with  $V$  layers of neurons

$$V = \{v_i\} \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^l V_j \quad (22)$$

where  $V_l = \{v_o\}$ . The neurons  $v_i$  and  $v_o$  are called the input and the output neurons, respectively. To define the network, we will assign the labels to the neurons in the following way. Each of the base neurons is labelled by a function from the base class  $\mathcal{H}$ . Each neuron of the  $j$ -th layer  $V_j$ , where  $j \geq 1$ , is labelled by a vector  $w := (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n$  is the number of inputs of the neuron. Here,  $w$  will be called the vector of weights of the neuron.

<sup>3</sup>This difference causes a burn-in time [23] which is the time between the initial and first time that the Markov chain is stationary.

Given a Borel function  $\sigma$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[-1, 1]$  (for example, sigmoid function) and a vector  $w := (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $n = |\mathcal{S}| + 1$ , let

$$N_{\sigma, w} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, N_{\sigma, w}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) := \sigma\left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_j u_j\right). \quad (23)$$

Let  $\sigma_j : j \geq 1$  be functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[-1, 1]$ , satisfying the Lipschitz conditions

$$|\sigma_j(u) - \sigma_j(v)| \leq L_j |u - v|, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (24)$$

The neural network works can be formed as the following. The input neuron inputs an instance  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . A base neuron computes the value of the base function on this instance and outputs the value through its output edges. A neuron in the  $j$ -th layer ( $j \geq 1$ ) computes and outputs through its output edges the value  $N_{\sigma_j, w}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$  (where  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$  are the values of the inputs of the neuron). The network outputs the value  $f(x)$  (of a function  $f$  it computes) through the output edge.

We denote by  $\mathcal{N}_l$  the set of such networks. We call  $\mathcal{N}_l$  the class of feed-forward neural networks with base  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $l$  layers of neurons (and with sigmoid  $\sigma_j$ ). Let  $\mathcal{N}_\infty := \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \mathcal{N}_j$ . Define  $\mathcal{H}_0 := \mathcal{H}$ , and then recursively

$$\mathcal{H}_j := \left\{ N_{\sigma_j, w}(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) : n \geq 0, h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{j-1}, w \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \cup \mathcal{H}_{j-1}. \quad (25)$$

Denote  $\mathcal{H}_\infty := \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \mathcal{H}_j$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  includes all the functions computable by feed-forward neural networks with base  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Let  $\{b_j\}$  be a sequence of positive numbers. We also define recursively classes of functions computable by feed-forward neural networks with restrictions on the weights of neurons:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_j(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j) := & \left\{ N_{\sigma_j, w}(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) : n \geq 0, \right. \\ & \left. h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{j-1}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{j-1}), w \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|w\|_1 \leq b_j \right\} \cup \mathcal{H}_{j-1}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{j-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $\|w\|_1$  denotes the 1-norm of the vector  $w$ .

Clearly,

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty = \bigcup \left\{ \mathcal{H}_j(b_1, \dots, b_j) : b_1, \dots, b_j < +\infty \right\}. \quad (27)$$

Let  $\varphi$  be a function such that  $\varphi(x) \geq I_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi$  satisfies the Lipschitz condition with constant  $L(\varphi)$ . Then, the following is a direct application of Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** For any  $t \geq 0$  and for all  $l \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l) : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \prod_{j=1}^l (2L_j b_j + 1) G_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (18) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

**Remark 4.**  $P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\}$  represents the probability of mis-classification in the deep neural network.

*Proof.* Let

$$\mathcal{H}'_l := \mathcal{H}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l). \quad (29)$$

As the proof of [4, Theorem 13], it holds that

$$G_n(\mathcal{H}'_l) \leq \prod_{j=1}^l (2L_j b_j + 1) G_n(\mathcal{H}). \quad (30)$$

Hence, (28) is a direct application of Theorem 2 and (30).  $\square$

Now, given a neural network  $f \in \mathcal{N}_\infty$ , let

$$l(f) := \min\{j \geq 1 : f \in \mathcal{N}_j\}. \quad (31)$$

For any number  $k$  such that  $1 \leq k \leq l(f)$ , let  $V_k(f)$  be the set of all neurons of layer  $k$  in the neural network which is represented by  $f$ . Denote

$$W_k(f) := \max_{m \in V_k(f)} \|w^{(m)}\|_1 \vee b_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, l(f), \quad (32)$$

and let

$$\Lambda(f) := \prod_{k=1}^{l(f)} (4L_k W_k(f) + 1), \quad (33)$$

$$\Gamma_\alpha(f) := \sum_{k=1}^{l(f)} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2} \log(2 + \log_2 W_k(f))}, \quad (34)$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is the number such that  $\zeta(\alpha) < 3/2$ ,  $\zeta$  being the Riemann zeta-function:

$$\zeta(\alpha) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-\alpha}. \quad (35)$$

Then, by using Theorem 3 with  $b_k \rightarrow \infty$  and the same arguments as [4, Proof of Theorem 14], we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 5.** *For any  $t \geq 0$  and for all  $l \geq 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}_\infty : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0,1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \Lambda(f) G_n(\mathcal{H}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \Gamma_\alpha(f) + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \\ \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \left[ 3 - 2\zeta\left(\frac{\alpha(1-\lambda)}{128e}\right) \right]^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (18) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

It follows, in particular, in the example of the voting methods of combining classifiers [2], from Theorem 3, we achieve the following PAC-bound:

$$P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{\delta \in (0,1]} \left[ P_n\{\tilde{f} \leq \delta\} + \frac{8C}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{V(\mathcal{H})}{n}} + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t_\alpha + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \quad (37)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \alpha$  (PAC- Bayes bound), where  $V(\mathcal{H})$  is the VC-dimension of the class  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $C$  is some positive constant and  $t_\alpha$  is chosen such that  $\frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t_\alpha^2) = \alpha$ .

### 3.3 Generalization Error Bounds on Bayesian Deep Learning

For Bayesian machine learning and deep learning,  $\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space of the Markov chain and  $\mathcal{W}$  is the domain of (random) coefficients. We assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  are Polish spaces on  $\mathbb{R}$ , which include both discrete sets and  $\mathbb{R}$ . For example, in binary classification,  $f(X, W) = \text{sgn}(W^T X + b)$  where the feature  $X$  and the coefficient  $W$  are random vectors with specific prior distributions. In practice, the distribution of  $W$  is known which depends on our design method, and the distribution of  $X$  is unknown. For example,  $W$  is assumed to be Gaussian in Bayesian deep neural networks [17].

Since all the bounds on Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 hold for any function  $f$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  at each fixed vector  $W = w$ , hence, they can be directly applied to Bayesian settings where  $W$  is random. However, these bounds are not expected to be tight enough since we don't use the prior distribution of  $W$  when deriving them.

In the following, we use another approach to derive new (and tighter) bounds for Bayesian deep learning and machine learning from all the bounds in Subsections 3.1 and 3.2. For illustration purposes, we only derive a new bound. Other bounds can be derived in a similar fashion. We assume that  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n$  are i.i.d. random variables as in [17].

Let

$$\tilde{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i, W_i}, \quad (38)$$

and define a new probability measure  $\tilde{P}$  on  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W}$  such that

$$\tilde{P}(A) := \int_A \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dx dw, \quad (39)$$

for all (Borel) set  $A$  on  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W}$ . Here,  $\tilde{\pi}$  is the stationary distribution of the irreducible Markov process  $\{(X_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with stochastic matrix

$$\tilde{Q} := \{Q(x, w)P_W(w)\}_{x \in \mathcal{S}, w \in \mathcal{W}}. \quad (40)$$

In addition, define two new (averaging) linear functionals:

$$\hat{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{W}} \delta_{X_i, w} dP_W(w), \quad (41)$$

and

$$\hat{P} := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{W}} \delta_{x, w} \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dP_W(w) dP(x), \quad (42)$$

such that

$$\hat{P}_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{W}} f(X_i, w) dP_W(w), \quad (43)$$

and

$$\hat{P}(f) := \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{W}} f(x, w) \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dP_W(w) dP(x). \quad (44)$$

In practice, the prior distribution of  $W$  is known, so we can estimate  $\hat{P}_n(f)$  based on the training set  $\{(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}$ , which is a Markov chain on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  (cf. Section 2.2). The following result can be proved.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\tilde{E}_\pi$  be the associated averaging operator associated with the Markov chain  $\tilde{Q}$  defined in Subsection 2.1 and  $\varphi_k$  be a sequence of function such that  $\varphi_k(x) \geq I_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$ . For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \hat{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k > 0} \left[ \hat{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k) R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \hat{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k > 0} \left[ \hat{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + \sqrt{2\pi} L(\varphi_k) G_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where  $\lambda := \|\tilde{Q} - \tilde{E}_\pi\|_{L_2(\pi) \rightarrow L_2(\pi)}$  and  $A_n$  is defined in (18) and  $c$  is defined in (6).



*Proof.* Let  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n$  be an  $n$  samples of  $W \sim P_W$  on  $\mathcal{W}$  (or samples of some set of random coefficients). For simplicity, we assume that  $\{W_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is an i.i.d. sequence. Then, it is obvious that  $\{(X_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  forms a Markov chain with probability transition probability

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{Q}(x_n, w_n; x_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x_{n+1}, W_{n+1} = w_{n+1} | X_n = x_n, W_n = w_n) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

$$= Q(x_n, x_{n+1})P_W(w_{n+1}). \quad (48)$$

From Theorem 6, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ \tilde{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

This means that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right)$ , it holds that

$$\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{k>0} \left[ \tilde{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right]. \quad (50)$$

From (50), it holds that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right)$ ,

$$\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{k>0} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n \right]. \quad (51)$$

From (51), with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right)$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_W[\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\}] & \leq \mathbb{E}_W \left[ \inf_{k>0} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n \right] \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\leq \inf_{k>0} \mathbb{E}_W \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \quad (53)$$

$$= \inf_{k>0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_W[\varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i))] + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right). \quad (54)$$

From (54), we obtain (45). Similarly, we can achieve (46).  $\square$

## 4 Extension to High-order Markov Chains

In this section, we show that all the results in the previous sections can be extended to any homogeneous Markov sequence of arbitrary order. The main idea in deriving bounds for  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chains such as Autoregressive (AR) and Autoregressive Moving-Average (ARMA) models is to convert these Markov chains to equivalent 1-order homogeneous Markov chains and use our previous bounds for the new Markov chains. See Section C for more detailed discussions. We also present a method to extend our results to a mixture of  $m$  independent Markov services in this section.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we derive upper bounds on generalization errors for machine learning and deep neural networks based on a new assumption that the dataset has Markov or hidden Markov structure. We

also propose a new method to convert all these bounds to Bayesian deep learning and machine learning. Extension to  $m$ -order Markov chains and a mixture of Markov chains are also given. An interesting future research topic is to develop some new algorithms to evaluate performance of these bounds on real Markov datasets.

## References

- [1] V. N. Vapnik. *Statistical Learning Theory*. Wiley, New York, 1998.
- [2] Peter Bartlett, Yoav Freund, Wee Sun Lee, and Robert E. Schapire. Boosting the margin: a new explanation for the effectiveness of voting methods. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(5):1651 – 1686, 1998.
- [3] Peter Bartlett and John Shawe-Taylor. *Generalization Performance of Support Vector Machines and Other Pattern Classifiers*, page 43–54. MIT Press, 1999.
- [4] V. Koltchinskii and D. Panchenko. Empirical Margin Distributions and Bounding the Generalization Error of Combined Classifiers. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(1):1 – 50, 2002.
- [5] J. Langford and J. Shawe-Taylor. PAC-Bayes and Margins. In *Advances of Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2003.
- [6] D. A. McAllester. Pac-bayesian stochastic model selection. *Machine Learning*, 51, 2004.
- [7] E. Parrado-Hernández A. Ambroladze and J. ShaweTaylor. Tighter PAC-Bayes bounds. In *NIPS*, 2007.
- [8] G. K. Dziugaite and D. M. Roy. Computing nonvacuous generalization bounds for deep (stochastic) neural networks with many more parameters than training data. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, 2017.
- [9] M. Austern R. P. Adams W. Zhou, V. Veitch and P. Orbanz. Non-vacuous generalization bounds at the imagenet scale: a PAC-Bayesian compression approach. In *The International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [10] F. Biggs and B. Guedj. Differentiable PAC-Bayes objectives with partially aggregated neural networks. *Entropy*, 23, 2021.
- [11] A. McAllester. Some PAC-Bayesian theorems. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 1998.
- [12] Eugenio Clerico, George Deligiannidis, and Arnaud Doucet. Wide stochastic networks: Gaussian limit and PACBayesian training. *Arxiv: 2106.09798*, 2021.
- [13] Eugenio Clerico, George Deligiannidis, and Arnaud Doucet. Conditional Gaussian PAC-Bayes. *Arxiv: 2110.1188*, 2021.
- [14] A. Xu and M. Raginsky. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. In *Advances of Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2017.
- [15] Amedeo Roberto Esposito, Michael Gastpar, and Ibrahim Issa. Generalization error bounds via Rényi-f-divergences and maximal leakage. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(8):4986–5004, 2021.
- [16] D. Jakubovitz, R. Giryes, and M. R. D. Rodrigues. Generalization Error in Deep Learning. *Arxiv: 1808.01174*, 30, 2018.
- [17] A. G. Wilson and P. Izmailov. Bayesian deep learning and a probabilistic perspective of model construction. In *Proc. 37th ICML*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2020.
- [18] Pekka Tuominen and Richard L. Tweedie. Markov Chains with Continuous Components. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s3-38(1):89–114, 01 1979.
- [19] Daniel Paulin. Concentration inequalities for Markov chains by Marton couplings and spectral methods. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20(79):1 – 32, 2015.

- [20] G. Wolfer and A. Kontorovich. Estimating the mixing time of ergodic markov chains. In *32nd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 2019.
- [21] R. Combes and M. Touati. Computationally efficient estimation of the spectral gap of a markov chain. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 3:1 – 21, 2019.
- [22] A. W. Van Der Vaart and Wellner. *Weak convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer, New York, 1996.
- [23] D. Rudolf. Explicit error bounds for Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Arxiv: 1108.3201*, 2011.
- [24] H. Royden and P. Fitzpatrick. *Real Analysis*. Pearson, 4th edition, 2010.
- [25] Pascal Lezaud. Chernoff and Berry-Esséen inequalities for Markov processes. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics, EDP Sciences*, 5:183–201, 2001.
- [26] Shravas Rao. A Hoeffding inequality for Markov chains. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 24(none):1 – 11, 2019.
- [27] J. Fan, B. Jiang, and Q. Sun. Hoeffding’s Inequality for General Markov Chains and Its Applications to Statistical Learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Research*, 22:1–35, May 2021.
- [28] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces*. Springer, New York., 1991.
- [29] A. W. Van Der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer, New York., 1996.
- [30] P. Billingsley. *Probability and Measure*. Wiley-Interscience, 3rd edition, 1995.
- [31] I. Kontoyiannis, L. A. Lastras-Montaño, and S. P. Meyn. Relative entropy and exponential deviation bounds for general Markov chains. In *Proc. of Intl. Symp. on Inform. Th.*, 2005.

## A Main Results

### A.1 Probabilistic Bounds for General Function Classes

In this section, we develop probabilistic bounds for general function classes in terms of Gaussian and Rademacher complexities. First, we prove the following key lemma, which is an extension of the symmetrization inequality for i.i.d. sequences (for example, [22]) to a new version for Markov sequences  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and the initial distribution  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_2$ :

**Lemma 7.** For all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , define

$$A_n := \sqrt{\frac{2M}{n(1-\lambda)} + \frac{64M^2}{n^2(1-\lambda)^2} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_2}. \quad (55)$$

Then, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] - A_n - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] + A_n, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (56)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

Next, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 8.** Consider a countable family of Lipschitz function  $\Phi = \{\varphi_k : k \geq 1\}$ , where  $\varphi_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x) \leq \varphi_k(x)$  for all  $k$ . For each  $\varphi \in \Phi$ , denote by  $L(\varphi)$  its Lipschitz constant. Then, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ P_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log k} \right) + A_n \right]\right) \\ & \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ P_n \varphi_k(f) + \sqrt{2\pi} L(\varphi_k) G_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log k} \right) + A_n \right]\right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

**Theorem 9.** Let  $\varphi$  is a non-increasing function such that  $\varphi(x) \geq \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{8L(\varphi)}{\delta} R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right]\right) \\ & \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2L(\varphi)\sqrt{2\pi}}{\delta} G_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right]\right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (18) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* See Appendix C.  $\square$

In the next statements, we use Rademacher complexities, but Gaussian complexities can be used similarly. Now, assume that  $\varphi$  is a function from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\varphi(x) \leq I_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi$  satisfies the Lipschitz with constant  $L(\varphi)$ . Then, the following theorems can be proved by using similar arguments as the proof of Theorem 9.

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $\varphi$  is a nonincreasing function such that  $\varphi(x) \leq \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} < \sup_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{8L(\varphi)}{\delta} R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \quad (61)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} < \sup_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} G_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n \right] + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \quad (62)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

By combining Theorem 9 and Theorem 10, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 11.** *Let*

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{F}; \delta) := \frac{8}{\delta} R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 2M \sqrt{\frac{128e}{n(1-\lambda)} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} + 4M \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 \gamma_{ps}}{8(1+1/\gamma_{ps}) + 20t/\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (63)$$

Then, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : |P_n\{f \leq 0\} - P\{f \leq 0\}| > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left( P_n\{|f| \leq \delta\} + \Delta_n(\mathcal{F}; \delta) + \frac{4Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \quad (64)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : |P_n\{f \leq 0\} - P\{f \leq 0\}| > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left( P\{|f| \leq \delta\} + \Delta_n(\mathcal{F}; \delta) + \frac{4Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \quad (65)$$

where  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* Equation (64) is drawn by setting  $\varphi(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \leq 0\} + (1-x)\mathbf{1}\{0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  in Theorem 9. Equation (65) is drawn by setting  $\varphi(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \leq -1\} - x\mathbf{1}\{-1 \leq x \leq 0\}$ .  $\square$

## A.2 Conditions on Random Entropies and $\gamma$ -Margins

As [4], given a metric space  $(T, d)$ , we denote by  $H_d(T; \varepsilon)$  the  $\varepsilon$ -entropy of  $T$  with respect to  $d$ , that is

$$H_d(T; \varepsilon) := \log N_d(T; \varepsilon), \quad (66)$$

where  $N_d(T; \varepsilon)$  is the minimal number of balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  covering  $T$ . Let  $d_{P_n, 2}$  denote the metric of the space  $L_2(\mathcal{S}; dP_n)$ :

$$d_{P_n, 2}(f, g) := (P_n|f - g|^2)^{1/2}. \quad (67)$$

For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , define

$$\delta_n(\gamma; f) := \sup \left\{ \delta \in (0, 1) : \delta^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} P(f \leq \delta) \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{4}} \right\} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) := \sup \left\{ \delta \in (0, 1) : \delta^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} P_n(f \leq \delta) \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{4}} \right\}. \quad (69)$$

We call  $\delta_n(\gamma; f)$  and  $\hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f)$ , respectively, the  $\gamma$ -margin and empirical  $\gamma$ -margin of  $f$ .

**Theorem 12.** Suppose that for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$  and some constant  $D > 0$ ,

$$H_{d_{F_n}, 2}(\mathcal{F}; u) \leq Du^{-\alpha}, \quad u > 0 \quad a.s., \quad (70)$$

Then, for any  $\gamma \geq \frac{2\alpha}{2+\alpha}$ , there exists some constants  $\zeta, \nu > 0$  such that when  $n$  is large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \forall f \in \mathcal{F} : \zeta^{-1} \hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) \leq \delta_n(\gamma; f) \leq \zeta \hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) \right] \geq 1 - \nu \log_2 \log_2 n \exp \left\{ -n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} / 2 \right\}. \quad (71)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix D for a detailed proof.  $\square$

### A.3 Convergence rates of empirical margin distributions

First, we prove the following lemmas.

**Lemma 13.** For any class  $\mathcal{F}$  of bounded measurable functions from  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right)$ , the following holds:

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \leq \frac{4t}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n. \quad (72)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

**Remark 14.** By setting  $t = \sqrt{2 \log n}$ , (72) shows that  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The uniform boundedness of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a necessary condition for this fact to be hold. For  $\mathcal{F}$  being unbounded, [4, Remark in p.29] shows an example where  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \not\rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix E.  $\square$

Now, for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , define

$$F_f(y) := P\{f \leq y\}, \quad F_{n,f} := P_n\{f \leq y\}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (73)$$

Let  $L$  denote the Lévy distance between the distributions in  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$L(F, G) := \inf \{ \delta > 0 : F(t) \leq G(t + \delta) + \delta, \quad G(t) \leq F(t + \delta) + \delta, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \}. \quad (74)$$

**Lemma 15.** Let  $M > 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a class of measurable functions from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $[-M, M]$ . Let  $\varphi$  be equal to 1 for  $x \leq 0$ , 0 for  $x \geq 1$  and linear between them. Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi := \left\{ \varphi \circ \left( \frac{f - y}{\delta} \right) - 1 : f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad y \in [-M, M] \right\} \quad (75)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . Recall the definition of  $A_n$  in (55). Then, for all  $t > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ , the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \geq \delta + \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq 2c \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right). \quad (76)$$

Especially, for all  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \geq 3 \left( \mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} + A_n + \frac{2tM}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \\ \leq 2c \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* See Appendix F. □

In what follows, for a function  $f$  from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $M > 0$ , we denote by  $f_M$  the function that is equal to  $f$  if  $|f| \leq M$ , is equal to  $M$  if  $f > M$  and is equal to  $-M$  if  $f < -M$ . We set

$$\mathcal{F}_M := \{f_M : f \in \mathcal{F}\}. \quad (78)$$

As always, a function  $F$  from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $[0, \infty)$  is called an envelope of  $\mathcal{F}$  iff  $|f(x)| \leq F(x)$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ .

We write  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{GC}(\mathbb{P})$  iff  $\mathcal{F}$  is a Glivenko-Cantelli class with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$  (i.e.,  $\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  a.s.). We write  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{BCLT}(\mathbb{P})$  and say that  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfies the Bounded Central Limit Theorem for  $\mathbb{P}$  iff

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] = O(n^{-1/2}). \quad (79)$$

Based on Lemma and Lemma 15, we prove the following theorems.

**Theorem 16.** *Suppose that*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P\{|f| \geq M\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad M \rightarrow \infty. \quad (80)$$

*Then, the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{F}_M \in \text{GC}(\mathbb{P})$  for all  $M > 0$   
and
- (ii)  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$

*Proof.* See Appendix G. □

Next, the following theorems hold.

**Theorem 17.** [4, Theorem 7] *The following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{GC}(\mathbb{P})$  for all  $M > 0$   
and
- (ii) *there exists a  $\mathbb{P}$ -integrable envelope for the class  $\mathcal{F}^{(c)} = \{f - Pf : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$  and  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \rightarrow 0 \quad n \rightarrow \infty$  and*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (81)$$

Now, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 18.** *Suppose that the class  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniformly bounded. If  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{BCLT}(\mathbb{P})$ , then*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) = O_P\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/4}\right) \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (82)$$

*Moreover, for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$  and for some  $D > 0$*

$$H_{d_{P_n, 2}}(\mathcal{F}; u) \leq Du^{-\alpha} \log n, \quad u > 0, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (83)$$

*then*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) = O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2+\alpha}} \log n\right) \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (84)$$

*Proof.* Appendix H. □

#### A.4 Bounding the generalization error of convex combinations of classifiers

We start with an application of the inequalities in Subsection A.1 to bounding the generalization error in general classification problems. Assume that the labels take values in a finite set  $\mathcal{Y}$  with  $|\mathcal{Y}| = K$ . Consider a class  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  of functions from  $\tilde{S} := \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ . A function  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  predicts a label  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  for an example  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  iff

$$f(x, y) > \max_{y' \neq y} f(x, y'). \quad (85)$$

In practice,  $f(x, y)$  can be set equal to  $P(y|x)$ , so  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  can be assumed to be uniformly bounded. The margin of a labelled example  $(x, y)$  is defined as

$$m_{f,y}(x) := f(x, y) - \max_{y' \neq y} f(x, y'), \quad (86)$$

so  $f$  mis-classifies the label example  $(x, y)$  iff  $m_f(x, y) \leq 0$ . Let

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ f(\cdot, y) : y \in \mathcal{Y}, f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \right\}. \quad (87)$$

Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is uniformly bounded, so  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniformly bounded.

Then, we can show the following theorem.

**Theorem 19.** *For all  $t > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{m_{f,y} \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0,1]} \left[ P_n\{m_f \leq \delta\} + \frac{8}{\delta} K(2K-1)R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1} + A_n} \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6). Furthermore,

$$P\{m_{f,y} \leq 0\} := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(x) P(m_f \leq 0), \quad (89)$$

and

$$P_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{m_{f,y}(X_n) \leq 0\} \quad (90)$$

is the empirical distribution of the Markov process  $\{m_{f,y}(X_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  given  $f$  and  $y$ .

*Proof.* First, we need to bound the Rademacher's complexity for the class of functions  $\{m_f : f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}\}$ . Observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j m_f(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right]. \quad (91)$$

By [4, Proof of Theorem 11], we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j m_f(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right] \leq K(2K-1)R_n(\mathcal{F}), \quad (92)$$

where  $R_n(\mathcal{F})$  is the Rademacher complexity function of the class  $\mathcal{F}$  defined in (14). Now, assume that this class of function is uniformly bounded as in practice. Hence, by Theorem 9 for  $\varphi$  that is equal to 1 on  $(-\infty, 0]$ , is equal to 0 on  $[1, +\infty)$  and is linear in between, we obtain (88).  $\square$

In the following, we assume that features are generated by a Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with stochastic matrix  $Q$ , and  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is the corresponding sequence of labels. In the supervised learning, this sequence of labels can be considered as generated by a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), where the



emission probability  $P_{Y_n|X_n}(y|x) = g(x, y)$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Then, we can show that  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a Markov chain with the transition probability

$$P_{X_{n+1}Y_{n+1}|X_nY_n}(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}|x_n, y_n) = P_{X_{n+1}|X_n, Y_n}(x_{n+1}|x_n, y_n)P_{Y_{n+1}|X_{n+1}, X_n, Y_n}(y_{n+1}|x_{n+1}, x_n, y_n) \quad (93)$$

$$= P_{X_{n+1}|X_n}(x_{n+1}|x_n)P_{Y_{n+1}|X_{n+1}}(y_{n+1}|x_{n+1}) \quad (94)$$

$$= Q(x_n, x_{n+1})g(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}). \quad (95)$$

Assume that this Markov chain  $Q$  is irreducible and recurrent on some finite set  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\tilde{Q}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) := Q(x_1, x_2)g(x_2, y_2)$  for all  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ , which is the transition probability of the Markov chain  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Then, it is not hard to show that  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is irreducible and recurrent on  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ , so it has a stationary distribution, say  $\tilde{\pi}$ .

Define the following probability measure

$$P(A) := \int_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\pi}(x, y) dx dy. \quad (96)$$

and  $P_n$  be the empirical distribution based on the observations  $\{(X_k, Y_k)\}_{k=1}^n$ , i.e.,

$$P_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{X_k, Y_k}. \quad (97)$$

For simplicity, we assume that the set of labels is  $\{-1, 1\}$ , so that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{S} \times \{-1, 1\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \{\tilde{f} : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , where  $\tilde{f}(x, y) = yf(x)$ . For linear classification,  $\mathcal{F} := \{\text{sgn}(\beta^T x + \gamma) : \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , for example. Then, by [4], it is not hard to show that

$$R_n(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) = R_n(\mathcal{F}). \quad (98)$$

Furthermore, some results in Subsection A.1 can give useful bounds for boosting or other method of combining the classifiers. Given a class  $\mathcal{H}$  of measurable functions from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ . The closed convex hull of  $\mathcal{H}$ , denoted by  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{H})$ , is the set of all point-wise limits of convex combinations of functions from  $\mathcal{H}$ . It is not hard to see that

$$R_n(\mathcal{F}) = R_n(\mathcal{H}), \quad (99)$$

hence, by applying Theorem 9, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 20.** *Let  $\varphi$  is a nonincreasing function such that  $\varphi(x) \geq \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{8L(\varphi)}{\delta} R_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

As in [4], in the voting methods of combining classifiers, a classifier produced at each iteration is a convex combination  $\tilde{f}$  of simple base classifiers from the class  $\mathcal{H}$ . In addition, the Rademacher complexity can be bounded above by

$$R_n(\mathcal{H}) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{V(\mathcal{H})}{n}} \quad (101)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ , where  $V(\mathcal{H})$  is the VC-dimension of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\varphi$  be equal to 1 on  $(-\infty, 0]$ , is equal to 0 on  $[1, +\infty)$  and is linear in between. By setting  $t_\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{64e}{1-\lambda} \ln\left(\frac{\pi^2 c}{3\alpha}\right)}$ , from Theorem 20, with probability at least  $1 - \alpha$ , it holds that

$$P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n\{\tilde{f} \leq \delta\} + \frac{8C}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{V(\mathcal{H})}{n}} + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t_\alpha + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right], \quad (102)$$

which extends the result of Bartlett et al. [2] to Markov dataset (PAC-bound).

## A.5 Bounding the generalization error in neural network learning

In this section, we consider the same example as [4, Section 6]. However, we assume that feature vectors in this dataset is generated by a Markov chain instead of an i.i.d. process. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a class of measurable functions from  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (base functions). Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  be the set of function  $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The introduction of  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  is to deal with the new Markov chain  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  which is generated by both feature vectors and their labels instead of the feature-based Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . See Subsection 2.2 for detailed discussions.

Consider a feed-forward neural network where the the set  $V$  of all the neurons is divided into layers

$$V = \{v_i\} \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^l V_j \quad (103)$$

where  $V_l = \{v_o\}$ . The neurons  $v_i$  and  $v_o$  are called the input and the output neurons, respectively. To define the network, we will assign the labels to the neurons in the following way. Each of the base neurons is labelled by a function from the base class  $\mathcal{H}$ . Each neuron of the  $j$ -th layer  $V_j$ , where  $j \geq 1$ , is labelled by a vector  $w := (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n$  is the number of inputs of the neuron. Here,  $w$  will be called the vector of weights of the neuron.

Given a Borel function  $\sigma$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[-1, 1]$  (for example, sigmoid function) and a vector  $w := (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let

$$N_{\sigma, w} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad N_{\sigma, w}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) := \sigma\left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_j u_j\right). \quad (104)$$

For  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\|w\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |w_i|. \quad (105)$$

Let  $\sigma_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  be functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[-1, 1]$ , satisfying the Lipschitz conditions

$$|\sigma_j(u) - \sigma_j(v)| \leq L_j |u - v|, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (106)$$

The network works the following way. The input neuron inputs an instance  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . A base neuron computes the value of the base function on this instance and outputs the value through its output edges. A neuron in the  $j$ -th layer ( $j \geq 1$ ) computes and outputs through its output edges the value  $N_{\sigma_j, w}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$  (where  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$  are the values of the inputs of the neuron). The network outputs the value  $f(x)$  (of a function  $f$  it computes) through the output edge.

We denote by  $\mathcal{N}_l$  the set of such networks. We call  $\mathcal{N}_l$  the class of feed-forward neural networks with base  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $l$  layers of neurons (and with sigmoid  $\sigma_j$ ). Let  $\mathcal{N}_{\infty} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}_j$ . Define  $\mathcal{H}_0 := \mathcal{H}$ , and then recursively

$$\mathcal{H}_j := \left\{ N_{\sigma_j, w}(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) : n \geq 0, h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{j-1}, w \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \cup \mathcal{H}_{j-1}. \quad (107)$$

Denote  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_j$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  includes all the functions computable by feed-forward neural networks with base  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Let  $\{b_j\}$  be a sequence of positive numbers. We also define recursively classes of functions computable by feed-forward neural networks with restrictions on the weights of neurons:

$$\mathcal{H}_j(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j) \quad (108)$$

$$:= \left\{ N_{\sigma_j, w}(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) : n \geq 0, h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{j-1}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{j-1}), w \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|w\|_1 \leq b_j \right\} \\ \bigcup \mathcal{H}_{j-1}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{j-1}). \quad (109)$$

Clearly,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\infty} = \bigcup \left\{ \mathcal{H}_j(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j) : b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j < +\infty \right\}. \quad (110)$$

As in the previous section, let  $\varphi$  be a function such that  $\varphi(x) \geq I_{(-\infty, 0]}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi$  satisfies the Lipschitz condition with constant  $L(\varphi)$ . Then, the following is a direct application of Theorem 9.

**Theorem 21.** For any  $t \geq 0$  and for all  $l \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l) : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\}\right) \\ & > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \prod_{j=1}^l (2L_j b_j + 1) G_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* Let

$$\mathcal{H}'_l := \mathcal{H}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l). \quad (112)$$

As the proof of [4, Theorem 13], it holds that

$$G_n(\mathcal{H}'_l) := \mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}'_l} \leq \prod_{j=1}^l (2L_j b_j + 1) G_n(\mathcal{H}). \quad (113)$$

Hence, (111) is a direct application of Theorem 9 and (113).  $\square$

Now, given a neural network  $f \in \mathcal{N}_\infty$ , let

$$l(f) := \min\{j \geq 1 : f \in \mathcal{N}_j\}. \quad (114)$$

For a number  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq l(f)$ , let  $V_k(f)$  denote the set of all neurons of layer  $k$  in the graph representing  $f$ . Denote

$$W_k(f) := \max_{m \in V_k(f)} \|w^{(m)}\|_1 \vee b_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, l(f), \quad (115)$$

and let

$$\Lambda(f) := \prod_{k=1}^{l(f)} (4L_k W_k(f) + 1), \quad (116)$$

$$\Gamma_\alpha(f) := \sum_{k=1}^{l(f)} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2} \log(2 + \log_2 W_k(f))}, \quad (117)$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is the number such that  $\zeta(\alpha) < 3/2$ ,  $\zeta$  being the Riemann zeta-function:

$$\zeta(\alpha) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-\alpha}. \quad (118)$$

Then, by using the same arguments as [4, Proof of Theorem 14], we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 22.** For any  $t \geq 0$  and for all  $l \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}_\infty : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\}\right) > \inf_{\delta \in (0, 1]} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \Lambda(f) G_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \Gamma_\alpha(f) + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \left[ 3 - 2\zeta\left(\frac{\alpha(1-\lambda)}{128e}\right) \right]^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

where  $A_n$  is defined in (55) and  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* By replacing  $t$  by  $t + \sum_{j=1}^l \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2} \log(k_j + 1)}$  and using the same arguments as [4, Proof of Theorem 14], we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}_\infty : P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\}\right) \\ & > \inf_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left[ P_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \Lambda(f) G_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sum_{j=1}^l \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2} \log(k_j + 1)} + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \cdots \sum_{k_l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\pi^2}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} \left(t + \sum_{j=1}^l \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2} \log(k_j + 1)}\right)^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

$$\leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \left[ 3 - 2\zeta\left(\frac{\alpha(1-\lambda)}{128e}\right) \right]^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \quad (121)$$

where the last equation is followed by using some algebraic manipulations.  $\square$

It follows, in particular, in the example of the voting methods of combining classifiers [2], from the PAC-bound in (102), we achieve the following bound

$$P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left[ P_n\{\tilde{f} \leq \delta\} + \frac{8C}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{V(\mathcal{H})}{n}} + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t_\alpha + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \quad (122)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \alpha$  (PAC-Bayes bound).

## B Generalization Bounds on Bayesian Deep Learning

For Bayesian machine learning and deep learning,  $\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space of the Markov chain and  $\mathcal{W}$  is the domain of (random) coefficients. We assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  are Polish spaces on  $\mathbb{R}$ , which include both discrete sets and  $\mathbb{R}$ . For example, in linear regression,  $f(X, W) = \text{sgn}(W^T X + b)$  where the feature  $X$  and the coefficient  $W$  are random vectors with specific prior distributions. In practice, the distribution of  $W$  is known which depends on our design method, and the distribution of  $X$  is unknown. For example,  $W$  is assumed to be Gaussian in Bayesian deep neural networks [17].

Since all the bounds on Section A hold for any function in  $\mathcal{F}$  for each fixed vector  $W = w$ , hence, it is obvious that these upper bounds can be directly applied to Bayesian deep learning and machine learning where  $W$  is random. However, these bounds are not expected to be tight enough for Bayesian settings since we don't use the prior distribution of  $W$  when deriving them.

In the following, we use another approach to derive new (tighter) bounds for Bayesian deep learning and machine learning from all the bounds in Section A. For the purpose of illustration, we derive one new bound, and other bounds can be derived in a similar fashion.

Define

$$\tilde{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i, W_i}, \quad (123)$$

and a new probability measure  $\tilde{P}$ :

$$\tilde{P}(A) := \int_A \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dx dw, \quad (124)$$

where  $A$  is a (Borel) measurable set on  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W}$  and  $\tilde{\pi}$  is the stationary distribution of the irreducible Markov process  $\{(X_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  with stochastic matrix

$$\tilde{Q} := \{Q(x, w) P_W(w)\}_{x \in \mathcal{S}, w \in \mathcal{W}}. \quad (125)$$

Define new (averaging) linear functionals:

$$\hat{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{W}} \delta_{X_i, w} dP_W(w), \quad (126)$$

such that

$$\hat{P}_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{W}} f(X_i, w) dP_W(w), \quad (127)$$

and

$$\hat{P} := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{W}} \delta_{x, w} \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dP_W(w) dP(x), \quad (128)$$

such that

$$\hat{P}(f) := \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{W}} f(x, w) \tilde{\pi}(x, w) dP_W(w) dP(x). \quad (129)$$

In practice, since the prior distribution of  $W$  is known, we can estimate  $\hat{P}_n(f)$  based on the training set, which is  $\{(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}$ , by considering  $X_n$  as  $(X_n, Y_n)$  as mention in Section A. Note that  $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  forms a Markov chain if  $\{Y_n\}$  are i.i.d. and  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Markov chain. See Subsection 2.2 for detailed discussions.

**Theorem 23.** *Let  $\tilde{E}_\pi$  be the associated averaging operator associated with the Markov chain  $\tilde{Q}$  defined in Subsection 2.1. For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \hat{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ \hat{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k) R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \hat{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ \hat{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + \sqrt{2\pi} L(\varphi_k) G_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

where  $\lambda := \|\tilde{Q} - \tilde{E}_\pi\|_{L_2(\pi) \rightarrow L_2(\pi)}$ ,  $A_n$  is defined in (55), and  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* Let  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n$  be an  $n$  samples of  $W \sim P_W$  on  $\mathcal{W}$  (or samples of some set of random coefficients). For simplicity, we assume that  $\{W_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is an i.i.d. sequence. Then, it is obvious that  $\{(X_n, W_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  forms a Markov chain with probability transition probability

$$\tilde{Q}(x_n, w_n; x_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} = x_{n+1}, W_{n+1} = w_{n+1} | X_n = x_n, W_n = w_n) \quad (132)$$

$$= Q(x_n, x_{n+1}) P_W(w_{n+1}). \quad (133)$$

It follows by Theorem 8, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ \tilde{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k) R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

This means that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right)$ , it holds that

$$\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{k>0} \left[ \tilde{P}_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k) R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right]. \quad (135)$$

From (135), it holds that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right)$ ,

$$\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\} \leq \inf_{k>0} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n \right]. \quad (136)$$

From (136), with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right)$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_W[\tilde{P}\{f \leq 0\}] &\leq \mathbb{E}_W \left[ \inf_{k>0} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) + A_n \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \inf_{k>0} \mathbb{E}_W \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i)) + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{k>0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_W[\varphi_k(f(X_i, W_i))] + 4L(\varphi_k)R_n(\mathcal{F}) \\ &\quad + A_n + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

From (139), we obtain (130). Similarly, we can achieve (131).  $\square$

By using the same arguments, we obtain similar versions for Bayesian Deep Learning from changing all the results in Section A by replacing  $P$  by  $\hat{P}$  and  $P_n$  by  $\hat{P}_n$ . For example, the following PAC-bound in (102) can be converted to the following PAC-Bayesian counterpart:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{H}_\infty : \hat{P}\{\tilde{f}_S \leq 0\} > \inf_{\delta \in (0,1]} \left[ \hat{P}_n \varphi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}_S}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}L(\varphi)}{\delta} \Lambda(f_S)G_n(\mathcal{H}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \Gamma_\alpha(f_S) + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

$$\leq \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \left[ 3 - 2\zeta\left(\frac{\alpha(1-\lambda)}{128e}\right) \right]^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right). \quad (141)$$

## C Extension to High-Order Markov Chains

In this section, we extend our results in previous sections to  $m$ -order Markov chains and a mixture of  $m$  independent Markov services.

### C.1 Extend to $m$ -order Markov chain

In this subsection, we extend our results in previous sections to  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chain. The main idea is to convert  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chains to 1-order homogeneous Markov chain and use our results in previous sections to bound the generalization error.

We start with the following simple example.

**Example 24.** [ $m$ -order moving average process without noise] Consider the following  $m$ -order Markov chain

$$X_k = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k-i}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (142)$$

Let  $Y_k := [X_{k+m-1}, X_{k+m-2}, \dots, X_k]^T$ . Then, from (142), we obtain

$$Y_{k+1} = \mathbf{G}Y_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \quad (143)$$

where

$$\mathbf{G} := \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{m-1} & a_m \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (144)$$

It is clear that  $\{\mathbf{Y}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is an order-1 Markov chain. Hence, instead of directly working with the  $m$ -order Markov chain  $\{\mathbf{X}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , we can find an upper bound for the Markov chain  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

To derive generalization error bounds for the Markov chain  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , we can use the following arguments. For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $(x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{k+m-1})$ , by setting  $\tilde{f}(x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{k+m-1}) = f(x_k)$  where  $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{f(X_i) \leq 0\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{f}(Y_i) \leq 0\}. \quad (145)$$

Hence, by applying all the results for 1-order Markov chain  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , we obtain corresponding upper bounds for the sequence of  $m$ -order Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

This approach can be extended to more general  $m$ -order Markov chain  $X_k = g(X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m})$  where  $g : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . More specifically, for any tuple  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in \mathcal{S}^m$ , observe that

$$dg = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} dx_1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_2} dx_2 + \cdots + \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_m} dx_m. \quad (146)$$

Hence, if  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} = \alpha_i$  for some constant  $\alpha_i$  and for each  $i \in [m]$ , from (146), we have

$$g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = g(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m) + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \nu_i, \quad (147)$$

where  $\nu_i$ 's are constants. One specific example where the function  $g : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies this property is  $g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \cdots + a_m x_m$ , where  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m$  are constants as in Example 24.

Now, by choosing  $u = g(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m) + (\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \nu_i) / (1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \nu_i)$ , from (147), we have

$$g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) + u = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i (x_i + u). \quad (148)$$

By setting  $Y_k = [X_{k+m-1} + u \quad X_{k+m-2} + u \quad \cdots \quad X_k + u]^T$ , from (148), we have:

$$Y_{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{m-1} & a_m \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Y_k. \quad (149)$$

In a more general setting, if  $X_k = g(X_{k-1}, \dots, X_{k-m}, V_k)$  for some random variable  $V_k$  which is independent of  $\{X_{k-i}\}_{i=1}^m$  such as the Autoregressive model (AR), where

$$X_k = c + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k-i} + V_k, \quad (150)$$

we can use the following conversion procedure. First, by using Taylor's approximation (to the first-order), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, \xi) &\approx g(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \Big|_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0)} (x_i - c_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial g}{\partial v} \Big|_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0)} (\xi - \xi_0) \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

for some good choice of  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0) \in \mathcal{S}^m \times \mathcal{V}$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the alphabet of  $V_k$ . Using the above trick with  $Y_k = [X_{k+m-1} + u \quad X_{k+m-2} + u \quad \dots \quad X_k + u]^T$ ,  $a_i = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \Big|_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0)}$ , we can replace the recursion  $X_k = g(X_{k-1}, \dots, X_{k-m}, V_k)$  by the following equivalent recursion:

$$Y_{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{m-1} & a_m \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Y_k + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial g}{\partial v} \Big|_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m, \xi_0)} V_k \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (152)$$

Since  $V_k$  is independent of  $\{X_{k+m-i}\}_{i=2}^{m+1}$  or  $Y_k$ , (152) models a new 1-order Markov chain  $\{Y_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ . Then, by using the the same arguments to obtain (145), we can derive bounds on generalization error for this model.

For a general  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chain, it holds that

$$P_{X_k | X_{k-1}=x_1, X_{k-2}=x_2, \dots, X_{k-m}=x_m} \sim T_{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)} \quad (153)$$

for all  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in \mathcal{S}^m$ , where  $T_{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)}$  is a random variable which depends only on  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$  and does not depend on  $k$ . Hence, we can represent the

$$X_k = \tilde{g}(X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m}, T_{(X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m})}), \quad (154)$$

where  $T_{(X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m})} = f(\varepsilon_k, V_k, V_{k-1}, \dots, V_{k-q}, X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m})$ . Here,  $\varepsilon_k$  represents new noise at time  $k$  which is independent of the past. Hence, in a general  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chain, we can represent the  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chain by the following recursion:

$$X_k = g(X_{k-1}, X_{k-2}, \dots, X_{k-m}, \varepsilon_k, V_k, V_{k-1}, \dots, V_{k-q}), \quad (155)$$

where  $\varepsilon_k$  represents new noise at time  $k$  and  $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . By using Taylor expansion to the first order, we can approximate the Markov chain in (155) by an Autoregressive Moving-Average Model (ARMA( $m, q$ )) model as following:

$$X_k = c + \varepsilon_k + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i \varepsilon_{k-i}, \quad (156)$$

where  $c$  and  $a_i$ 's are constants, and  $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are i. i. d. Gaussian random variables  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . For this model, let

$$V_k := \varepsilon_k + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i \varepsilon_{k-i}, \quad (157)$$

and

$$Y_k := \begin{pmatrix} X_{k+m-1} + u \\ X_{k+m-2} + u \\ \vdots \\ X_k + u \\ V_{k+m-1} \\ V_{k+m-2} \\ \vdots \\ V_{k+m-q} \\ V_{k+m-q-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (158)$$

where

$$u := \frac{c}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i}. \quad (159)$$

Let  $V_k := \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Observe that

$$V_{k+m} = \varepsilon_{k+m} + V_{k+m-1}. \quad (160)$$



On the other hand, we have

$$X_{k+m} = c + \varepsilon_{k+m} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k+m-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i \varepsilon_{k+m-i} \quad (161)$$

$$= c + \varepsilon_{k+m} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k+m-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i (V_{k+m-i} - V_{k+m-1-i}) \quad (162)$$

$$= c + \varepsilon_{k+m} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_{k+m-i} + \theta_1 V_{k+m-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i) V_{k+m-1-i} - \theta_q V_{k+m-q-1}. \quad (163)$$

Then, we have

$$Y_{k+1} = \mathbf{G}Y_k + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{k+m} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \varepsilon_{k+m} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (164)$$

where

$$\mathbf{G} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{11} & \mathbf{G}_{12} \\ \mathbf{G}_{21} & \mathbf{G}_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (165)$$

Here,

$$\mathbf{G}_{11} := \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{m-1} & a_m \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{m \times q+1}, \quad (166)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{12} := \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 & \theta_2 - \theta_1 & \cdots & \theta_q - \theta_{q-1} & -\theta_q \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{m \times q+1}, \quad (167)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{21} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{q+1 \times m}, \quad (168)$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{22} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{q+1 \times q+1}. \quad (169)$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{k+m}$  is independent of  $Y_k$ , (164) models a 1-order Markov chain. Hence, we can use the above arguments to derive new generalization error bounds for the  $m$ -order homogeneous Markov chain where ARMA model is a special case.

## C.2 Mixture of $m$ Services

In this section, we consider the case that  $Y_k = \sum_{l=1}^m \alpha_l X_k^{(l)}$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $\{X_k^{(l)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  are independent Markov chains on  $\mathcal{S}$  with stationary distribution for all  $l \in [m]$ . This setting usually happens in practice, for example, video is a mixture of voice, image, and text, where each service can be modelled as a high-order Markov chain and the order of the Markov chain depends on the type of service.

Let

$$Z_k := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 X_k^{(1)} + \alpha_2 X_k^{(2)} + \dots + \alpha_m X_k^{(m)} \\ \alpha_2 X_k^{(2)} + \dots + \alpha_m X_k^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_m X_k^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_k \\ \alpha_2 X_k^{(2)} + \dots + \alpha_m X_k^{(m)} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_m X_k^{(m)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (170)$$

Then, it holds that

$$Z_k = \mathbf{G} X_k \quad (171)$$

where

$$\mathbf{G} := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_{m-1} & \alpha_m \\ 0 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_{m-1} & \alpha_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \alpha_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad (172)$$

and

$$X_k := \begin{pmatrix} X_k^{(1)} \\ X_k^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ X_k^{(m)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (173)$$

It is obvious that  $\mathbf{G}$  is non-singular since  $\det(\mathbf{G}) = \prod_{l=1}^m \alpha_l \neq 0$ . Therefore, for fixed pair  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}^m \times \mathcal{S}^m$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{k+1} = y | Z_k = x) = \mathbb{P}(X_{k+1} = \mathbf{G}^{-1}y | X_k = \mathbf{G}^{-1}x). \quad (174)$$

Now, assume that  $\mathbf{G}^{-1}x = (\beta_x^{(1)}, \beta_x^{(2)}, \dots, \beta_x^{(m)})$  and  $\mathbf{G}^{-1}y = (\beta_y^{(1)}, \beta_y^{(2)}, \dots, \beta_y^{(m)})$ . Then, from (173) and (174), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{k+1} = y | Z_k = x) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{l=1}^m \{X_{k+1}^{(l)} = \beta_y^{(l)}\} \middle| \bigcap_{l=1}^m \{X_k^{(l)} = \beta_x^{(l)}\}\right) \quad (175)$$

$$= \prod_{l=1}^m \mathbb{P}(X_{k+1}^{(l)} = \beta_y^{(l)} | X_k^{(l)} = \beta_x^{(l)}) \quad (176)$$

$$= \prod_{l=1}^m Q_l(\beta_x^{(l)}, \beta_y^{(l)}), \quad (177)$$

where  $Q_l$  is the transition probability of the Markov chain  $l$ . It follows that  $\{Z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  is a 1-order Markov chain. It is easy to see that  $\{Z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  has stationary distribution if all the Markov chains  $\{X_k^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^m$  have stationary distributions.

Now, as Subsection C.1, to derive generalization error bounds for the Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , we can use the following arguments. For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and by setting  $\tilde{f}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) := f(z_1)$  where  $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we obtain  $\tilde{f}(GX_k) = f(Y_k)$  and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{f(Y_i) \leq 0\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{f}(GX_i) \leq 0\}. \quad (178)$$

Hence, by applying all the results for 1-order Markov chain  $\{Z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  where  $Z_n = \mathbf{G}X_n$ , we obtain corresponding upper bounds for the sequence of  $m$ -order Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

There are many ways to choose the function  $\tilde{f}$ . For example, we can choose

$$\tilde{f}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) := \frac{f(z_1) + f(z_2 + z_m) + f(z_3 + z_{m-1}) + \dots}{L} \quad (179)$$

where  $L$  is the number of terms in this sum. Then, it is obvious that

$$f(Y_k) = \tilde{f}(\alpha_1 X_k^{(1)} + \alpha_2 X_k^{(2)} + \dots + \alpha_m X_k^{(m)}, \alpha_2 X_k^{(2)} + \dots + \alpha_m X_k^{(m)}, \dots, \alpha_m X_k^{(m)}) \quad (180)$$

$$= \tilde{f}(\mathbf{G}X_k). \quad (181)$$

However, the generalization error bound depends on  $P\{\tilde{f} \leq 0\} = P\{f \leq 0\}$ , which only depends on the stationary distribution of the Markov chain  $\{Z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and the function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence, the choice of the 1-order Markov chain  $\{Z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  plays the key role on the tightness of the bound, not the choice of the function  $\tilde{f}$ .

## A Proof of Lemma 7

Before going to prove Lemma 7, we observe the following interesting fact.

**Lemma 25.** *Let  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be an arbitrary process on a Polish space  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a independent copy (replica) of  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  a class of uniformly bounded functions from  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\epsilon := (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n)$  be a vector of i.i.d. Rademacher's random variables. Then, the following holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right| \right] \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right| \right]. \quad (182)$$

In addition, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right] \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right]. \quad (183)$$

**Remark 26.** *Our lemma generalizes a similar fact for i.i.d. processes. In the case that  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is an i.i.d. random process, (182) holds with equality since  $P_{X_n, Y_n}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$  is invariant under permutation. However, for the Markov case, this fact does not hold in general. Hence, in the following, we provide a new proof for (182), which works for any process  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  by making use of the properties of Rademacher's process.*

*Proof.* Let  $g(x, y) := f(x) - f(y)$  and  $\mathcal{G} := \{g : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : g(x, y) := f(x) - f(y) \text{ for some } f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Then, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right| \right] \right] = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] \right]. \quad (184)$$

Observe that  $g(X_i, Y_i) = -g(Y_i, X_i)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .

For all  $j \in [n]$ , denote by

$$\mathcal{N}_j := [n] \setminus \{j\}, \quad (185)$$

and

$$\epsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j} := \{\epsilon_i : i \in \mathcal{N}_j\}. \quad (186)$$

Now, for each  $j \in [n]$ , observe that  $\varepsilon_j$  is independent of  $X_1^n, Y_1^n, \varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^n, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) - g(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_j, X_j) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (188)$$

where (188) follows from  $g(X_j, Y_j) = -g(Y_j, X_j)$ .

Now, by setting  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i := -\varepsilon_i$  for all  $i \in n$ . Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_j, X_j) \right| \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \tilde{\varepsilon}_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_j, X_j) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (189)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_j, X_j) \right| \right] \quad (190)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right], \quad (191)$$

where (189) follows from  $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_i : i \in \mathcal{N}_j)$  has the same distribution as  $(\varepsilon_i : i \in \mathcal{N}_j)$ , (190) follows from  $g(X_i, Y_i) = -g(Y_i, X_i)$  and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i = -\varepsilon_i$ , and (191) follows from  $g(X_i, Y_i) = -g(Y_i, X_i)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .

From (188) and (191), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^n, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{N}_j}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_j, Y_j) \right| \right] \quad \forall j \in [n]. \quad (192)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^n, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (193)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) - g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right], \quad (195)$$

where (193) follows from setting  $j = n$  in (192), and (195) follows from  $g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) = -g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})$ .

Now, for any fixed tuple  $(x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-1}) \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1} \times \mathcal{S}^{n-1} \times \{-1, 1\}^{n-1}$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_n, Y_n | X_1^{n-1}, Y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_n, y_n | x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) \\ = P_{X_n | X_1^{n-1}}(x_n | x_1^{n-1}) P_{Y_n | Y_1^{n-1}}(y_n | y_1^{n-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

$$= P_{Y_n | Y_1^{n-1}}(x_n | x_1^{n-1}) P_{X_n | X_1^{n-1}}(y_n | y_1^{n-1}) \quad (197)$$

$$= P_{Y_n, X_n | Y_1^{n-1}, X_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_n, y_n | x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}). \quad (198)$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_1^{n-1}, Y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) \\ = P_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(\varepsilon_1^{n-2}) P_{X_1^{n-1}}(x_1^{n-1}) P_{Y_1^{n-1}}(y_1^{n-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (199)$$

$$= P_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(\varepsilon_1^{n-2}) P_{Y_1^{n-1}}(x_1^{n-1}) P_{X_1^{n-1}}(y_1^{n-1}) \quad (200)$$

$$= P_{Y_1^{n-1}, X_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}). \quad (201)$$

Hence, from (198) and (201), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_1^n, Y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^n, y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) \\ = P_{X_1^{n-1}, Y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) P_{X_n, Y_n | X_1^{n-1}, Y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_n, y_n | x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) \end{aligned} \quad (202)$$

$$= P_{Y_1^{n-1}, X_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) P_{Y_n, X_n | Y_1^{n-1}, X_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_n, y_n | x_1^{n-1}, y_1^{n-1}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}) \quad (203)$$

$$= P_{Y_1^n, X_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^n, y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}). \quad (204)$$

Now, from (204), we also have

$$P_{X_1^n, Y_1^n}(x_1^n, y_1^n) = P_{Y_1^n, X_1^n}(x_1^n, y_1^n). \quad (205)$$

It follows from (205) that

$$P_{X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) = \sum_{x_1^{n-2}, y_1^{n-2}, x_n, y_n} P_{X_1^n, Y_1^n}(x_1^n, y_1^n) \quad (206)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1^{n-2}, y_1^{n-2}, x_n, y_n} P_{Y_1^n, X_1^n}(x_1^n, y_1^n) \quad (207)$$

$$= P_{Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}). \quad (208)$$

Hence, from (204) and (208), we have

$$P_{X_n, Y_n, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2} | X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}}(x_n, y_n, x_1^{n-2}, y_1^{n-2}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2} | x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) \quad (209)$$

$$= \frac{P_{X_1^n, Y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^n, y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2})}{P_{X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})} \quad (210)$$

$$= \frac{P_{Y_1^n, X_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2}}(x_1^n, y_1^n, \varepsilon_1^{n-2})}{P_{Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})} \quad (211)$$

$$= P_{X_n, Y_n, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2} | X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}}(y_n, x_n, y_1^{n-2}, x_1^{n-2}, \varepsilon_1^{n-2} | y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}). \quad (212)$$

From (212), for each fixed  $(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \middle| X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, Y_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \middle| X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, Y_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + g(Y_n, X_n) \right| \middle| Y_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, X_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right] \tag{213}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \middle| Y_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, X_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right] \tag{214}
\end{aligned}$$

where (213) follows from (212), and (214) follows from the fact that  $g(x, y) = -g(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ .

From (214) and (208), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right]. \tag{215}
\end{aligned}$$

From (195) and (215), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^n, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right| \right]. \tag{216}
\end{aligned}$$

By using induction, we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^n, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right] = \mathbb{E}_{X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) \right| \right], \tag{217}$$

or equation (182) holds.

Next, we prove (183). For any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \right] \tag{218} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_n, X_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \quad (219)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_n, X_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \quad (220)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_n, X_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \quad (221)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \quad (222)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right], \quad (223)$$

where (220) follows from  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i = -\varepsilon_i$ , (221) follows from the fact that  $\varepsilon_1^{n-1}$  and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1^{n-1}$  have the same distribution, (222) follows from  $g(X_i, Y_i) = -g(Y_i, X_i)$ .

Now, observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-1}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) - g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \quad (224)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right| \right] \right], \quad (225)$$

where (225) follows from  $g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) = -g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})$ .

Now, for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , and each fixed pair  $(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{S}^2$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) \right. \\ \left. + g(X_n, Y_n) \leq t \mid X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, Y_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right] \\ = \mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) \right. \\ \left. + g(X_n, Y_n) \leq t \mid X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, Y_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^{n-2}, Y_1^{n-2}, X_n, Y_n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + g(Y_n, X_n) \leq t \mid Y_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, X_{n-1} = y_{n-1} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{226}$$

where (226) follows from (212). Hence, by taking expectation over  $(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})$ , from (226) and (208), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \leq t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}, X_1^n, Y_1^n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(Y_n, X_n) \leq t \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{227}$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . From (227),  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n)$  has the same distribution as  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(Y_n, X_n)$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon^{n-2}, \mathbf{X}} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon^{n-2}, \mathbf{X}} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(Y_i, X_i) + g(Y_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) + g(Y_n, X_n) \right] \right] \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{228}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon^{n-2}, \mathbf{X}} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right] \right], \tag{229}$$

where (229) follows from  $g(X_i, Y_i) = -g(Y_i, X_i)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .

From (225) and (229), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right] \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon_1^{n-2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \varepsilon_i g(X_i, Y_i) + g(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) + g(X_n, Y_n) \right] \right] \right] \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{230}$$

By using induction, we finally get (183).  $\square$

Now, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be an irreducible Markov process with the stationary distribution  $\pi$  on some Polish space  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be an independent replica of  $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  and  $\mathbf{Y} := (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} := (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$  be a vector of Rademacher's random variables. Then, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a class of uniformly bounded functions  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] - \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}}, \tag{231}$$

where  $M := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty$ .



*Proof.* Given  $\epsilon = \varepsilon$ , let  $A_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i)$  and  $B_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i)$ . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|A_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)| = \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon < 0\}] \quad (232)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[|B_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(A_\varepsilon)|\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}] \quad (233)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}[(A_\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon))\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}(A_\varepsilon) - B_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}] \quad (234)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] \\ + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(A_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[|B_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}] \quad (235)$$

$$= (\mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[|B_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}]) \\ - (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(A_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}]) \quad (236)$$

$$= (\mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon|\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon < 0\}]) \\ - (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(B_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{A_\varepsilon \geq 0\}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(A_\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}\{B_\varepsilon < 0\}]) \quad (237)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[|A_\varepsilon|] - \mathbb{E}[B_\varepsilon]\mathbb{P}(A_\varepsilon \geq 0) + \mathbb{E}[A_\varepsilon]\mathbb{P}(B_\varepsilon < 0), \quad (238)$$

where (233) and (237) follow from the identically distributions between  $A_\varepsilon$  and  $B_\varepsilon$ , and (234) follows from  $|b - a| \geq b - a$  for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Now, observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon [\mathbb{E}[A_\epsilon]\mathbb{P}(B_\epsilon < 0) - \mathbb{E}[B_\epsilon]\mathbb{P}(A_\epsilon \geq 0)] \\ = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon [\mathbb{E}[A_\epsilon]\mathbb{P}(B_\epsilon < 0)] - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon [\mathbb{E}[B_\epsilon]\mathbb{P}(A_\epsilon \geq 0)] \quad (239)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) < 0 \right) \right] \\ - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{X} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \quad (240)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \left( 1 - \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right) \right) \right] \\ - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{X} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \quad (241)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \right] - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \right) \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \\ - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \right) \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{X} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \quad (242)$$

$$= -\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \right) \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \\ - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \right) \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{X} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \quad (243)$$

$$= -2\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \right) \mathbb{P}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right) \right] \quad (244)$$

$$= -2\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right\} \right], \quad (245)$$

where (243) follows from

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{X} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right] \right] = 0, \quad (246)$$

(244) follow  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  have the same distribution given  $\epsilon = \epsilon$ .

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right| \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right\} \right] \tag{247}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \geq 0 \right)} \tag{248}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right)^2 \right]} \tag{249}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right)^2 \right]} \tag{250}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right)^2 \right]} \tag{251}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n f^2(X_i) \right) \right]} \tag{252}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{nM^2} \tag{253}$$

$$\leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}}, \tag{254}$$

where (251) follows from Tonelli's theorem [24].

From (245) and (254), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \geq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right| \right] - \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{255}$$

□

Next, recall the following result which was developed base on the spectral method [25]:

**Lemma 28.** [23, Theorems 3.41] *Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be a stationary Markov chain on some Polish space with  $L_2$  spectral gap  $\lambda$  defined in (2) and the initial distribution  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_2$ . Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and define*

$$S_{n, n_0}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_{j+n_0}) \tag{256}$$

for all  $n_0 \geq 0$ . Then, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| S_{n, n_0}(f) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f(X)] \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{2M}{n(1-\lambda)} + \frac{64M^2}{n^2(1-\lambda)^2} \lambda^{n_0} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_2. \tag{257}$$

Now, we return to the proof of Lemma 7.

*Proof of Lemma 7.* For each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \int_S \pi(x) f(x) dx \\
& = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] - \int_S \pi(x) f(x) dx. \tag{258}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] - \int_S \pi(x) f(x) dx \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| S_{n,0}(f) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f(X)] \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (259)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| S_{n,0}(f) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f(X)] \right|^2 \right]} \quad (260)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{2M}{n(1-\lambda)} + \frac{64M^2}{n^2(1-\lambda)^2} \left\| \frac{dv}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_2} \quad (261)$$

$$= A_n, \quad (262)$$

where (262) follows from Lemma 28 with  $n_0 = 0$ .

By using  $|a + b| \leq |a| + |b|$ , from (258) and (262), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] \right| \right] + A_n. \end{aligned} \quad (263)$$

On the other hand, let  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n$  is a replica of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] \right| \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(Y_i)] \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (264)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - f(Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \quad (265)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - f(Y_i) \right| \right] \right]. \quad (266)$$

Now, by Lemma 25 and the triangle inequality for infinity norm, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - f(Y_i) \right| \right] = \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] \quad (267)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(X_i)) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(Y_i)) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] \quad (268)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}], \quad (269)$$

where (269) follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is a replica of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

From (263) and (269), we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] + A_n. \quad (270)$$

Now, by the definition of sup, there exists  $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f^*(X_i) - f^*(Y_i)) \right] \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right] - \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (271)$$

On the other hand, from (258), for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \pi(x) f(x) dx \right| \\ & \geq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] \right| - \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \pi(x) f(x) dx \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (272)$$

Furthermore, from (265), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)] \right| \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - f(Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (273)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f^*(X_i) - f^*(Y_i) \right] \right| \right] \quad (274)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f^*(X_i) - f^*(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right] \quad (275)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(X_i) - f(Y_i)) \right] \right| \right] - \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (276)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right| \right] - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (277)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} [\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (278)$$

where (275) follows from (183) in Lemma 25, (276) follows from (271), and (277) follows from Lemma 27.

From (272), (278), and (262), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \pi(x) f(x) dx \right| \right] \geq \mathbb{E} [\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] - A_n - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (279)$$

□

## B Proof of Theorem 8

First, recall the following Hoeffding's inequality for Markov chains.

**Lemma 29.** [26]<sup>4</sup> Let  $\{Y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a stationary Markov chain with state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , transition matrix  $Q$ , stationary probability measure  $\pi$  and  $Y_1 \sim \nu$ , and averaging operator  $E_{\pi}$ . Let  $\lambda = \|Q - E_{\pi}\|_{L_2(\pi) \rightarrow L_2(\pi)}$  and let  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  so that  $\mathbb{E}[f_n(Y_n)] = 0$  for all  $n$  and  $f_n(x) \leq a_n$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  and all  $n$ . Recall the definition of the constant  $c$  in (6). Then for  $u \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu} \left[ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(Y_i) \right| \geq u \left( \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \leq 2c \exp(-u^2(1-\lambda)/(64e)). \quad (280)$$

The proof is based on [4]. First, we prove (57). Without loss of generality, we can assume that each  $\varphi \in \Phi$  takes its values in  $[0, 1]$  (otherwise, it can be redefined as  $\varphi \wedge 1$ ). Then, it is clear that  $\varphi(x) = 1$  for  $x \leq 0$ . Hence, for each fixed  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we obtain

$$P\{f \leq 0\} \leq P\varphi(f) \quad (281)$$

$$\leq P_n\varphi(f) + \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{\varphi}}, \quad (282)$$

<sup>4</sup>In the original statement, the probability event in the RHS of (430) is with  $Y_1 \sim \pi$ . However, it is easy to obtain (280) when  $Y_1 \sim \nu$  by using the change of measure. A similar change of measure is appeared in [27, Appendix C].

where

$$\mathcal{G}_\varphi := \{\varphi \cdot f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}. \quad (283)$$

For any  $t > 0$ , by Lemma 29 with  $f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_n = f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} \geq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}] + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{t^2(1-\lambda)}{64e}\right). \quad (284)$$

Hence, with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp\left(-\frac{t^2(1-\lambda)}{64e}\right)$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$

$$P\{f \leq 0\} \leq P_n \varphi(f) + \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}] + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (285)$$

Now, by Lemma 7 with  $M = 1$  and  $V_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\text{Var}_\pi(f)) \leq M^2 = 1$  and  $t = \log n$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}\right)\right] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}] + A_n \quad (286)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}\right] + A_n. \quad (287)$$

Since  $(\varphi-1)/L(\varphi)$  is contractive and  $\varphi(0)-1 = 0$ , by using the Rademacher comparison inequality [28], we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} \leq 2L(\varphi) \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \quad (288)$$

$$= 2L(\varphi) R_n(\mathcal{F}). \quad (289)$$

From (284), (285), (287), and (289), with probability  $1 - 2c \exp\left(-\frac{t^2(1-\lambda)}{64e}\right)$ , we have for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$P\{f \leq 0\} \leq P_n \varphi(f) + 4L(\varphi) R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n. \quad (290)$$

Now, we use (290) with  $\varphi = \varphi_k$  and  $t$  is replaced by  $t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log k}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P\{f \leq 0\} > \inf_{k>0} \left[ P_n \varphi_k(f) + 4L(\varphi_k) R_n(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log k} \right) + A_n \right] \right) \\ \leq 2c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} \left( t + \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log k} \right)^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (291)$$

$$\leq 2c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right) \quad (292)$$

$$= \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2\right), \quad (293)$$

where (293) follows from

$$\frac{\pi^2}{6} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-2}. \quad (294)$$

Next, we prove (58). By the equivalence of Rademacher and Gaussian complexity [29], we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}. \quad (295)$$

Hence, from (287) and (295), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi}\right)\right] \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \mathbb{E}\left\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i}\right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} + A_n. \quad (296)$$

Now, define Gaussian processes

$$Z_1(f, \sigma) := \sigma n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\varphi \circ f)(X_i), \quad (297)$$

and

$$Z_2(f, \sigma) := L(\varphi) n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i f(X_i) + \sigma g, \quad (298)$$

where  $\sigma = \pm 1$  and  $g$  is standard normal independent of the sequence  $\{g_i\}$ . Let  $\mathbb{E}_g$  be the expectation on the probability space  $(\Omega_g, \Sigma_g, \mathbb{P}_g)$  on which the sequence  $\{g_i\}$  and  $g$  are defined, then by [4, 28], we have

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left[ \sup\{Z_1(f, \sigma) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \sigma = \pm 1\} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \sup\{Z_2(f, \sigma) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \sigma = \pm 1\} \right]. \quad (299)$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left\| n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} = \mathbb{E}_g \left[ n^{-1/2} \sup_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i h(X_i) \right] \quad (300)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \sup\{Z_1(f, \sigma) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \sigma = \pm 1\} \right], \quad (301)$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi := \{\varphi(f), -\varphi(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , and similarly

$$L(\varphi) \mathbb{E}_g \left\| n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \sigma_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbb{E}|g| \geq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \sup\{Z_2(f, \sigma) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \sigma = \pm 1\} \right]. \quad (302)$$

From (299), (301), and (302), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \sigma_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} \leq L(\varphi) \mathbb{E}_g \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} + n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}|g|. \quad (303)$$

By combining (296) and (303), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_\varphi} \right) \right] \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \left( L(\varphi) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}|g| \right) + A_n. \quad (304)$$

Hence, from (285), (296), and (304), we finally obtain (58).

## C Proof of Theorem 9

We can assume, without loss of generality, that the range of  $\varphi$  is  $[0, 1]$  (otherwise, we can replace  $\varphi$  by  $\varphi \wedge 1$ ). Let  $\delta_k = 2^{-k}$  for all  $k \geq 0$ . In addition, set  $\Phi = \{\varphi_k : k \geq 1\}$ , where

$$\varphi_k(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x/\delta_k), & x \geq 0, \\ \varphi(x/\delta_{k-1}), & x < 0. \end{cases} \quad (305)$$

Now, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , there exists  $k$  such that  $\delta \in (\delta_k, \delta_{k-1}]$ . Hence, if  $f(X_i) \geq 0$ , it holds that  $f(X_i)/\delta_k \geq f(X_i)/\delta$ , so we have

$$\varphi_k(f(X_i)) = \varphi \left( \frac{f(X_i)}{\delta_k} \right) \quad (306)$$

$$\leq \varphi \left( \frac{f(X_i)}{\delta} \right), \quad (307)$$

where (307) follows from the fact that  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is non-increasing.

On the other hand, if  $f(X_i) < 0$ , then  $f(X_i)/\delta_{k-1} \geq f(X_i)/\delta$ . Hence, we have

$$\varphi_k(f(X_i)) = \varphi\left(\frac{f(X_i)}{\delta_{k-1}}\right) \quad (308)$$

$$\leq \varphi\left(\frac{f(X_i)}{\delta}\right), \quad (309)$$

where (307) follows from the fact that  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is non-increasing.

From (307) and (309), we have

$$P_n \varphi_k(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_k(f(X_i)) \quad (310)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi\left(\frac{f(X_i)}{\delta}\right) \quad (311)$$

$$= P_n \varphi\left(\frac{f}{\delta}\right). \quad (312)$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\frac{1}{\delta_k} \leq \frac{2}{\delta}, \quad (313)$$

and

$$\log k = \log \log_2 \frac{1}{\delta_k} \leq \log \log_2 2\delta^{-1}. \quad (314)$$

Furthermore, observe that

$$L(\varphi_k) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{d\varphi_k(x)}{dx} \right| \quad (315)$$

$$= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{d\varphi(x/\delta_k)}{dx} \right| \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\} + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{d\varphi(x/\delta_{k-1})}{dx} \right| \mathbf{1}\{x < 0\} \quad (316)$$

$$\leq \frac{L(\varphi)}{\min\{\delta_k, \delta_{k-1}\}} \quad (317)$$

$$= \frac{L(\varphi)}{\delta_k} \quad (318)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{\delta} L(\varphi). \quad (319)$$

By combining the above facts and using Theorem 8, we obtain (59) and (60).

## D Proof of Theorem 12

For  $k \geq 0$ , let  $\varphi_k$  be a continuous function from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\varphi_k(u) = 1$  for  $u \leq \delta_{k, \frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $\varphi_k(u) = 0$  for  $u \geq \delta_k$ , and linear  $\delta_{k, \frac{1}{2}} \leq u \leq \delta_k$ . For  $k \geq 1$  let  $\varphi'_k$  be a continuous function from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\varphi'_k(u) = 1$  for  $u \leq \delta_k$ ,  $\varphi'_k(u) = 0$  for  $u \geq \delta_{k-1, \frac{1}{2}}$ , and linear for  $\delta_k \leq u \leq \delta_{k-1, \frac{1}{2}}$ .

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Define recursively

$$r_0 := 1, \quad r_{k+1} = C\sqrt{r_k\varepsilon} \wedge 1, \quad \gamma_k := \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{r_k}} \quad (320)$$

some sufficiently large constant  $C > 1$ , and set

$$\delta_0 := \delta, \quad (321)$$

$$\delta_k := \delta(1 - \gamma_0 - \cdots - \gamma_{k-1}), \quad (322)$$

$$\delta_{k, \frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{2}(\delta_k + \delta_{k+1}), \quad k \geq 1. \quad (323)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\varepsilon < C^{-4}$  and therefore,  $r_{k+1} < r_k$  and  $\delta_k \in (\delta/2, \delta]$ ,  $k \leq \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1}$ . To begin with, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 30.** Define  $\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{F}$ , and further recursively

$$\mathcal{F}_{k+1} := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{F}_k : P\{f \leq \delta_{k, \frac{1}{2}}\} \leq \frac{r_{k+1}}{2} \right\}. \quad (324)$$

For all  $k \geq 1$ , define

$$\mathcal{G}_k := \{\varphi_k \circ f : f \in \mathcal{F}_k\}, \quad k \geq 0 \quad (325)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}'_k := \{\varphi'_k \circ f : f \in \mathcal{F}_k\}, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (326)$$

Assume that

$$E^{(k)} := \left\{ \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} \leq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon \right\} \\ \cap \left\{ \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} \leq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon \right\}, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (327)$$

and

$$E_N := \bigcap_{k=1}^N E^{(k)}, \quad N \geq 1. \quad (328)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \leq 4N \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2}\right). \quad (329)$$

*Proof.* The proof is based on [4, Proof of Theorem 5] with some changes in concentration inequalities.

By a simple induction argument we have either  $C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \geq 1$  and  $r_k = 1$ , or  $C\sqrt{\varepsilon} < 1$  and in this case

$$r_k = C^{1+2^{-1}+\dots+2^{-(k-1)}} \varepsilon^{2^{-1}+\dots+2^{-(k-1)}} \quad (330)$$

$$= C^{2(1-2^{-k})} \varepsilon^{1-2^{-k}} \quad (331)$$

$$= (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2(1-2^{-k})}. \quad (332)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $C\sqrt{\varepsilon} < 1$ . Observe that

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \gamma_i = C^{-1} \left[ C\sqrt{\varepsilon} + (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-1}} + \dots + (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}} \right] \quad (333)$$

$$= C^{-1} \left[ (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}} + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^2 + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^{2^2} \dots + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^{2^k} \right] \quad (334)$$

$$\leq C^{-1} \left[ (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}} + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^2 + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^3 \dots + ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^k \right], \quad (335)$$

$$\leq C^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ((C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^i, \quad (336)$$

$$\leq C^{-1} (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}} (1 - (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2^{-k}})^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (337)$$

for  $\varepsilon \leq C^{-4}$ ,  $C > 2(2^{\frac{1}{4}} - 1)^{-1}$  and  $k \leq \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1}$ , where (335) follows from  $i \leq 2^i$  for all  $i \geq 0$  and  $C\sqrt{\varepsilon} < 1$ . Hence, for small enough  $\varepsilon$  (note that our choice of  $\varepsilon \leq C^{-4}$  implies  $C\sqrt{\varepsilon} < 1$ ), we have

$$\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_k \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (338)$$



Therefore, for all  $k \geq 1$ , we get  $\delta_k \in (\delta/2, \delta)$ . Note also that below our choice of  $k$  will be such that the restriction  $k \leq \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1}$  for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  will always be fulfilled.

From the definitions of (325) and (326), for  $k \geq 1$ , we have

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k} P g^2 \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} P \{f \leq \delta_k\} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} P \{f \leq \delta_{k-1, \frac{1}{2}}\} \leq \frac{r_k}{2} \leq r_k, \quad (339)$$

and

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_k} P g^2 \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} P \{f \leq \delta_{k-1, \frac{1}{2}}\} \leq \frac{r_k}{2} \leq r_k. \quad (340)$$

Since  $r_0 = 1$ , it is easy to see that (339) and (340) trivially holds at  $k = 0$ .

Now, by the union bound, from (327), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[(E^{(k)})^c] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} > \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} > \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (341)$$

In addition, by Lemma 29 with  $f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_n = f \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $a_n = 1$ , for any  $u \geq 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} \geq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{u^2(1-\lambda)}{64e}\right). \quad (342)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} \geq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{u^2(1-\lambda)}{64e}\right). \quad (343)$$

By replacing  $u = K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon n} + K_3\varepsilon$  to (342) and (343) for  $K_2 > 0$  and  $K_3 > 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left\{\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} \geq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon\right\} \\ &\leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{n(1-\lambda)}{64e}(K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon)^2\right) \end{aligned} \quad (344)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left\{\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} \geq \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon\right\} \\ &\leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{n(1-\lambda)}{64e}(K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon)^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (345)$$

Now, since  $0 < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq 1$ , by (332), we have

$$r_{k-1} = (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2(1-2^{-(k-1)})} \geq C^2\varepsilon. \quad (346)$$

Hence, from (341), (344), (345), and (346), that

$$\mathbb{P}[(E^{(k)})^c] \leq 4c \exp\left(-\frac{n(1-\lambda)}{64e}(K_2\sqrt{r_{k-1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon)^2\right) \quad (347)$$

$$\leq 4c \exp\left(-\frac{n(1-\lambda)}{64e}(K_2C + K_3)^2\varepsilon^2\right) \quad (348)$$

$$\leq 4c \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2}\right), \quad \forall k \geq 1 \quad (349)$$

if we choose  $K_2$  and  $K_3$  such that

$$\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}\right)(K_2C + K_3) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (350)$$

Then, by the union bound and (349), we have

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \leq 4cN \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2}\right). \quad (351)$$

□

**Lemma 31.** Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \alpha < 2$  such that

$$\varepsilon \geq \left( \frac{1}{n\delta^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \vee A_n \quad (352)$$

for all large enough  $n$ , and let  $N$  be a positive integer which satisfies

$$N \leq \frac{1}{c} \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad r_N \geq \varepsilon, \quad (353)$$

where  $c$  is defined in (6). Denote by  $\mathcal{L} := \{ \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \{ f \leq \delta \} \leq \varepsilon \}$ . Then, the following properties hold on the event  $E_N \cap \mathcal{L}$ :

$$\bullet \text{ (i) } \forall f \in \mathcal{L} \quad P_n \{ f \leq \delta \} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}_N$$

and

$$\bullet \text{ (ii) } \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} P_n \{ f \leq \delta_k \} \leq r_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N.$$

*Proof.* We will use induction with respect to  $N$ . For  $N = 0$ , the statement is obvious. Suppose it holds for some  $N \geq 0$ , such that  $N + 1$  still satisfies condition (353) of the lemma. Then, on the event  $E_N \cap \mathcal{L}$  we have

$$\text{(i)} \quad \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} P_n \{ f \leq \delta_k \} \leq r_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N \quad (354)$$

and

$$\text{(ii)} \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \quad P_n \{ f \leq \delta \} \leq \varepsilon \quad \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}_N. \quad (355)$$

Suppose now that  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is such that  $P_n \{ f \leq \delta \} \leq \varepsilon$ . By the induction assumptions, on the event  $E_N$  defined in (328), we have  $f \in \mathcal{F}_N$ . Because of this, we obtain on the event  $E_{N+1}$

$$P \{ f \leq \delta_{N, \frac{1}{2}} \} = P_n \{ f \leq \delta_{N, \frac{1}{2}} \} + (P - P_n) \{ f \leq \delta_{N, \frac{1}{2}} \} \quad (356)$$

$$\leq P_n \{ f \leq \delta_N \} + (P - P_n) \{ f \leq \delta_{N, \frac{1}{2}} \} \quad (357)$$

$$\leq P_n \{ f \leq \delta_N \} + (P - P_n)(\varphi_N(f)) \quad (358)$$

$$\leq P_n \{ f \leq \delta_N \} + \|P - P_n\|_{\mathcal{G}_N} \quad (359)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon + \mathbb{E} \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N} + K_2 \sqrt{r_N \varepsilon} + K_3 \varepsilon. \quad (360)$$

For the class  $\mathcal{G}_N$ , define

$$\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N) := \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{G}_N}, \quad (361)$$

where  $\varepsilon_i$  is a sequence of i.i.d. Rademacher random variables. By Lemma 7 with  $t = \sqrt{\log n}$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N} \right) \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} [\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{G}_N}] + A_n \quad (362)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E} [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)] + A_n. \quad (363)$$

From (363), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N} \right) \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)] + A_n \end{aligned} \quad (364)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{E_N\} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)]] + 2\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{E_N^c\} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)]] + A_n. \quad (365)$$

Next, by the well-known entropy inequalities for subgaussian process [29], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)] & \leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_n} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2 \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_n} P_n g^2)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n, 2}}^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}_N; u) du \end{aligned} \quad (366)$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ .

By the induction assumption, on the event  $E_N \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_N} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right| \leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right|^2} \quad (367)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_N} \sqrt{P_n g^2} \quad (368)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_N} \sqrt{P_n \{f \leq \delta_N\}} \quad (369)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} \quad (370)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon, \quad (371)$$

where (370) follows from  $\inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_N} P_n \{f \leq \delta_N\} \leq \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_N} P_n \{f \leq \delta\} \leq P_n \{f \leq \delta\} \leq \varepsilon$  by the induction assumption with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_N$ .

We also have on the event  $E_N \cap \mathcal{L}$ , by (339), it holds that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_N} P_n g^2 \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_N} P_n \{f \leq \delta_N\} \leq r_N. \quad (372)$$

The Lipschitz norm of  $\varphi_{k-1}$  and  $\varphi'_k$  is bounded by

$$L = 2(\delta_{k-1} - \delta_k)^{-1} = 2\delta^{-1}\gamma_{k-1}^{-1} = \frac{2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{r_{k-1}}{\varepsilon}} \quad (373)$$

which implies the following bound on the distance:

$$d_{P_n, 2}^2(\varphi_N \circ f; \varphi_N \circ g) = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n |\varphi_N(f(X_j)) - \varphi_N(g(X_j))|^2 \quad (374)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{r_N}{\varepsilon}} \right)^2 d_{P_n, 2}^2(f, g). \quad (375)$$

Therefore, on the event  $\mathcal{E}_N \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2 \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_N} P_n g^2)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n, 2}}^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}_N; u) du \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2r_N)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n, 2}}^{1/2}\left(\mathcal{F}; \frac{\delta \sqrt{\varepsilon} u}{2\sqrt{r_N}}\right) du \end{aligned} \quad (376)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \left( \frac{r_N}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\alpha/4} \frac{r_N^{1/2 - \alpha/4}}{\sqrt{n} \delta^{\alpha/2}} \quad (377)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \frac{r_N^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^{\alpha/4}} \varepsilon^{\frac{2+\alpha}{4}} \quad (378)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \sqrt{r_N \varepsilon}, \quad (379)$$

where (379) follows from the condition (352), which implies that

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/2} \delta^{\alpha/2}} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{2+\alpha}{4}}. \quad (380)$$

From (366) and (379), we obtain that on the event  $E_N \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon [\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)] \leq \left[ \varepsilon + c \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \right] \sqrt{r_N \varepsilon}. \quad (381)$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)] \leq 1. \quad (382)$$

Hence, by combining with (381) and (382), from (365), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N})] = 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)]] + 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N^c\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}_N)]] + A_n \quad (383)$$

$$\leq 2\left[\varepsilon + c\left(\frac{2^{\alpha/2}\sqrt{D}}{1-\alpha/2}\right)\right]\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon} + 8N \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2}\right) + A_n. \quad (384)$$

Now, by the condition (352), it holds that

$$\varepsilon \geq A_n, \quad (385)$$

and

$$8cN \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2}\right) \leq \frac{8cN}{n} \quad (386)$$

$$\leq \frac{8 \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1}}{n} \quad (387)$$

$$\leq \frac{8 \log_2 \log_2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{2 \log n}}}{n} \quad (388)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \quad (389)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon, \quad (390)$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large, where (386) and (388) follows from  $\varepsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}}$ , (387) follows from (353), and (389) holds for  $n$  sufficiently large.

From (384), (385), and (390), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N})] \leq 2\left[\varepsilon + c\left(\frac{2^{\alpha/2}\sqrt{D}}{1-\alpha/2}\right)\right]\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon} + 2\varepsilon. \quad (391)$$

In addition, we have

$$r_N = (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{2(1-2^{-N})} \geq C^2\varepsilon, \quad (392)$$

or

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{r_N}{C^2}. \quad (393)$$

Hence, from (391) and (393), we conclude that with some constant  $\tilde{c} > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_N})] \leq \tilde{c}\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon}. \quad (394)$$

From (360) and (394), on the event  $E_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$ , we have

$$P\{f \leq \delta_{N, \frac{1}{2}}\} \leq \varepsilon + \tilde{c}\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon} + K_2\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon \quad (395)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}C\sqrt{r_N\varepsilon} \quad (396)$$

$$= r_{N+1}/2, \quad (397)$$

by a proper choice of the constant  $C > 0$ , where (397) follows from (393).

This means that  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}$  and the induction step for (i) is proved. Now, we prove (ii). We have on the event  $E_{N+1}$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} P_n\{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} P\{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} (P_n - P)\{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} \quad (398)$$

$$\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} P\{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} + \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} \quad (399)$$

$$\leq r_{N+1}/2 + \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} + K_2\sqrt{r_{N+1}\varepsilon} + K_3\varepsilon. \quad (400)$$

By Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N^c\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + A_n \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N^c\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (401)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{E_N^c\}\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})]] + \varepsilon, \quad (402)$$

where (402) follows from the condition (352).

As above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\hat{R}_n(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1})] &\leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2 \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} P_n g^2)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n,2}}^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1}; u) du. \end{aligned} \quad (403)$$

Since we already proved (i), it implies that on the event  $E_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right| \leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j g(X_j) \right|^2} \quad (404)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} \sqrt{P_n g^2} \quad (405)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} \sqrt{P_n \{f \leq \delta_{N,1/2}\}} \quad (406)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (407)$$

By the induction assumption, we also have on the event  $E_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} P_n g^2 \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_N} P_n \{f \leq \delta_{N,1/2}\} \leq r_N. \quad (408)$$

The bound for the Lipschitz norm of  $\varphi'_k$  gives the following bound on the distance

$$d_{P_n,2}^2(\varphi'_{N+1} \circ f; \varphi'_{N+1} \circ g) = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n |\varphi'_{N+1} \circ f(X_j) - \varphi'_{N+1} \circ g(X_j)|^2 \quad (409)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{r_N}{\varepsilon}} \right)^2 d_{P_n,2}^2(f, g). \quad (410)$$

Therefore, on the event  $E_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$ , we get quite similarly to (379),

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2 \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{N+1}} P_n g^2)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n,2}}^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}'_{N+1}; u) du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{(2r_N)^{1/2}} H_{d_{P_n,2}}^{1/2} \left( \mathcal{F}; \frac{\delta \sqrt{\varepsilon} u}{2\sqrt{r_N}} \right) du \end{aligned} \quad (411)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \left( \frac{r_N}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\alpha/4} \frac{r_N^{1/2 - \frac{\alpha}{4}}}{\sqrt{n} \delta^{\alpha/2}} \quad (412)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{D}}{1 - \alpha/2} \right) \sqrt{r_N \varepsilon}. \quad (413)$$

□

We collect all bounds to see that on the event  $\mathcal{E}_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} P_n \{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} \leq \frac{r_{N+1}}{2} + c\sqrt{r_N \varepsilon} \quad (414)$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ .

Therefore, it follows that with a proper choice of constant  $C > 0$  in the recurrence relationship defining the sequence  $\{r_k\}$ , we have on the event  $E_{N+1} \cap \mathcal{L}$

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{N+1}} P_n \{f \leq \delta_{N+1}\} \leq C\sqrt{r_N \varepsilon} = r_{N+1}, \quad (415)$$

which proves the induction step for (ii) and, therefore, the lemma is proved. Finally, using Lemma 32 and the same arguments as [4, Proof of Theorem 5], we can prove Theorem 12.

**Lemma 32.** *Suppose that for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$  and for some  $D > 0$  such that the condition (70) holds. Then for any constant  $\xi > C^2$ , for all  $\delta \geq 0$  and*

$$\varepsilon \geq \left( \frac{1}{n\delta^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \vee A_n, \quad (416)$$

and for all large enough  $n$ , the following:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P_n \{f \leq \delta\} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad P \left\{ f \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} \geq \xi \varepsilon \right] \leq 4c \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2} \right\} \quad (417)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P \{f \leq \delta\} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad P_n \left\{ f \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} \geq \xi \varepsilon \right] \leq 4c \log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2} \right\}, \quad (418)$$

where  $c$  is defined in (6).

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P_n \{f \leq \delta\} \leq \varepsilon \wedge P \{f \leq \delta/2\} \geq \xi \varepsilon \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \left\{ \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : \{P_n \{f \leq \delta\} \leq \varepsilon\} \wedge \{P \{f \leq \delta/2\} \geq \xi \varepsilon\} \right\} \cap E_N \right] + \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \end{aligned} \quad (419)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \left\{ \exists f \in \mathcal{F}_N \wedge \{P \{f \leq \delta/2\} \geq \xi \varepsilon\} \right\} \cap E_N \right] + \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \quad (420)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \left\{ \exists f \in \mathcal{F}_N \wedge \{P \{f \leq \delta_N\} \geq \xi \varepsilon\} \right\} \cap E_N \right] + \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \quad (421)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \left\{ \exists f \in \mathcal{F}_N \wedge \{P \{f \leq \delta_N\} > r_N\} \right\} \cap E_N \right] + \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \quad (422)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] \quad (423)$$

$$\leq 4cN \exp \left( -\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2} \right) \quad (424)$$

$$\leq 4c(\log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1}) \exp \left( -\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2} \right), \quad (425)$$

where (420) follows from (i) in Lemma 31, (422) follows from  $r_N \leq (C\sqrt{\varepsilon})^2 < \xi \varepsilon$  for some constant  $\xi > C^2$ , and (423) follows from (ii) in Lemma 31, and (425) follows from the condition (353) in Lemma 31, which holds for  $n$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

Now, we return to prove Theorem 12.

*Proof of Theorem 12.* Consider sequences  $\delta_j := 2^{-j\frac{2}{\gamma}}$ , and

$$\varepsilon_j := \left( \frac{1}{n\delta_j^{\alpha'}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2+\alpha'}}, \quad j \geq 0, \quad (426)$$

where

$$\alpha' := \frac{2\gamma}{2-\gamma} \geq \alpha. \quad (427)$$

By Lemma 32, the condition (70) implies that there exists  $\xi > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \exists j \geq 0 \quad \exists f \in \mathcal{F} : P_n\{f \leq \delta_j\} \wedge P\{f \leq \delta_j/2\} \geq \xi \varepsilon_j \right] \\ \leq 4c \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\log_2 \log_2 \varepsilon_j^{-1}) \exp \left( -\frac{n\varepsilon_j^2}{2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (428)$$

$$\leq 4v' \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\log_2 \log_2 n) \sum_{j \geq 0} \exp \left[ -\frac{n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{2} 2^{2j} \right] \quad (429)$$

$$\leq v \log_2 \log_2 n \exp \left[ -\frac{n^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{2} \right] \quad (430)$$

for some  $v, v' > 0$ . Now, if for some  $j \geq 1$ , we have

$$\hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) \in (\delta_j, \delta_{j-1}], \quad (431)$$

then by the definition of  $\hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f)$  in (69), we have

$$P_n\{f \leq \delta_j\} \leq P_n\{f \leq \hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f)\} \quad (432)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\delta_j^{-\gamma} n^{-1+\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \quad (433)$$

$$= \varepsilon_j. \quad (434)$$

Suppose that for some  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , the inequality  $\zeta^{-1} \hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) \leq \delta_n(\gamma; f)$  fails, which leads to

$$\delta_n(\gamma; f) < \zeta^{-1} \hat{\delta}_n(\gamma; f) \quad (435)$$

$$\leq \frac{\delta_{j-1}}{\zeta}. \quad (436)$$

Then, if  $\zeta > 2^{1+\frac{2}{\gamma}}$ , from the definition of  $\delta_n(\gamma; f)$  in (68), it holds that

$$P\{f \leq \delta_j/2\} \geq P\left\{f \leq \frac{\delta_{j-1}}{\zeta}\right\} \quad (437)$$

$$\geq \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta_{j-1}}{\zeta}\right)^{-\gamma} n^{-1+\gamma/2}} \quad (438)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} 2^{2j} \zeta^\gamma n^{-1+\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \quad (439)$$

$$= \varepsilon_j \sqrt{\frac{\zeta^\gamma}{2}} \quad (440)$$

$$> \xi \varepsilon_j \quad (441)$$

by choosing  $\zeta$  sufficiently large, where  $\xi$  is defined in Lemma 32. Hence, (430) guarantees that  $\square$

## E Proof of Lemma 13

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{1}\{f(X_i) \leq y\} - \mathbb{P}(f(X_i) \leq y)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(f(X_i) \leq y) - P(f \leq y). \end{aligned} \quad (442)$$

Now, let

$$f_n(x) := \mathbf{1}\{f(x) \leq y\} - \mathbb{P}(f(X_n) \leq y), \quad (443)$$

for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . It is clear that

$$\|f_n\|_\infty \leq 1. \quad (444)$$

Now, by Lemma 29, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(X_i)\right| \geq \frac{2t}{\sqrt{n}}\right] \leq 2c \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right). \quad (445)$$

On the other hand, for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , let

$$\tilde{f}_y(x) := \mathbf{1}\{f(x) \leq y\}. \quad (446)$$

It is clear that  $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{f}_y\|_\infty = 1$ . Hence, by (262), for any  $t > 0$ , it holds that

$$\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(f(X_i) \leq y) - P(f \leq y)\right| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}_y(X_i)] - \sum_x \pi(x) \tilde{f}_y(x)\right| \quad (447)$$

$$\leq \frac{4t}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n. \quad (448)$$

From (442), (445), and (448), we have

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \leq A_n + \frac{4t}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (449)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e}t^2\right)$ .  $\square$

## F Proof of Lemma 15

Let  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $\varphi(x)$  be equal to 1 for  $x \leq 0$ , 0 for  $x \geq 1$  and linear in between. Observe that

$$F_f(y) = P\{f \leq y\} \quad (450)$$

$$\leq P\varphi\left(\frac{f-y}{\delta}\right) \quad (451)$$

$$\leq P_n\varphi\left(\frac{f-y}{\delta}\right) + \|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \quad (452)$$

$$\leq F_{n,f}(y + \delta) + \|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}, \quad (453)$$

and

$$F_{n,f}(y) \leq P_n\{f \leq y\} \quad (454)$$

$$\leq P_n\varphi\left(\frac{f-y}{\delta}\right) \quad (455)$$

$$\leq P\varphi\left(\frac{f-y}{\delta}\right) + \|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \quad (456)$$

$$\leq F_f(y + \delta) + \|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}, \quad (457)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi := \left\{ \varphi \circ \left( \frac{f-y}{\delta} \right) - 1 : f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad y \in [-M, M] \right\}. \quad (458)$$

Furthermore, since  $\varphi$  is 1-Lipschitz, it is easy to show the following fact:

$$-\left[\varphi\left(\frac{f(X_i) - y}{\delta}\right) - 1\right] = \left|\varphi\left(\frac{f(X_i) - y}{\delta}\right) - 1\right| \leq \frac{f(X_i) + M}{\delta} \quad (459)$$



for all  $i \in [n]$ .

Now, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left[ \varphi \left( \frac{f(X_i) - y}{\delta} \right) - 1 \right] \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left( \frac{f(X_i) + M}{\delta} \right) \right| \quad (460)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(X_i) \right| + \frac{M}{n\delta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \right|. \quad (461)$$

It follows from (461) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{n\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \right| \right] \quad (462)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{n\delta} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \right)^2 \right]} \quad (463)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{\delta\sqrt{n}}. \quad (464)$$

Now, from Lemma 29, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \geq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \leq 2c \exp \left( -\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2 \right). \quad (465)$$

From (465), with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e))$ , it holds that

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \leq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + \frac{2tM}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (466)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 7, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + A_n. \quad (467)$$

From (466) and (467), with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e))$ , it holds that

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi} \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (468)$$

From (453), (457), and (468), with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e))$ , we have

$$L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \leq \delta + 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (469)$$

Furthermore, by choosing

$$\delta := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (470)$$

from (464), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varphi}] \leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (471)$$

Hence, (468) and (471), with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e))$ , we obtain

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \leq 3 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (472)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e))$ .

## G Proof of Theorem 16

Fix  $M > 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_M \in \text{GC}(\mathbb{P})$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}_M}] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (473)$$

which, by Lemma 7 with  $t = \sqrt{\log n}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}_M}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}_M}] - A_n - \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (474)$$

By taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , from (474), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}_M}] \rightarrow 0, \quad (475)$$

or

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} \right] \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (476)$$

Furthermore, with  $t = \log n$ , by Lemma 15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \geq 3 \left( \mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} + A_n + \frac{2M \log n}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \\ \leq 2c \exp \left( -(\log n)^2 (1 - \lambda) / (64e) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (477)$$

It follows from (477) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \geq 3 \left( \mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} + A_n + \frac{2M \log n}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \\ \leq 2c \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp \left( -(\log n)^2 (1 - \lambda) / (64e) \right) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (478)$$

Hence, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma [30],  $A_n \rightarrow 0$ , and (476), we obtain

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (479)$$

Since  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f_M}, F_{f_M}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f)$ , from (479), we have

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f_M}, F_{f_M}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (480)$$

Now, by [4], the following facts about Levy's distance holds:

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f_M}) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P\{|f| \geq M\} \quad (481)$$

and

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_{n,f_M}) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n\{|f| \geq M\}. \quad (482)$$

Now, by the condition (80), we have

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P\{|f| \geq M\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (483)$$

so

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f_M}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad M \rightarrow \infty. \quad (484)$$

To prove that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_{n,f_M}) = 0, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (485)$$

it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n\{|f| \geq M\} = 0, \quad a.s. \quad (486)$$

To this end, consider the function  $\varphi$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $[0, 1]$  that is equal to 0 for  $|u| \leq M - 1$ , is equal to 1 for  $|u| > M$  and is linear in between. We have

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n\{|f| \geq M\} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} P_n\{|f| \geq M\} \quad (487)$$

$$\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} P_n \varphi(|f|) \quad (488)$$

$$\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} P \varphi(|f|) + \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \quad (489)$$

$$\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} P\{|f| \geq M - 1\} + \|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}}, \quad (490)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\varphi \circ f : f \in \mathcal{F}_M\}. \quad (491)$$

Then, by using the same arguments to obtain (468), with probability at least  $1 - 2c \exp(-t^2(1 - \lambda)/(64e))$ , it holds that

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{G}}] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (492)$$

Then, by setting  $t = \log n$  and using the Borel-Cantelli's lemma [30], the following holds almost surely:

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{G}}] + A_n + \frac{2M \log n}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (493)$$

Now, since  $\varphi \circ f \in \mathcal{F}_M$ , by (476), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{G}}] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (494)$$

From (493) and (494), we obtain

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s.. \quad (495)$$

Hence, we obtain (ii) from (i), the condition (80), and (495).

To prove that (ii) implies (i), we use the following bound [31]

$$\left| \int_{-M}^M td(F - G)(t) \right| \leq cL(F, G), \quad (496)$$

which holds with some constant  $c = c(M)$  for any two distribution functions on  $[-M, M]$ . This bound implies that

$$\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P_n f - P f| \quad (497)$$

$$\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} \left| \int_{-M}^M td(F_{n,f} - F_f)(t) \right| + M \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P(|f| \geq M) - P_n(|f| \geq M)| \quad (498)$$

$$\leq c \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) + M \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P(|f| \geq M) - P_n(|f| \geq M)| \quad (499)$$

$$\leq c \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) + M \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P(|f| \geq M) - P_n(|f| \geq M)|. \quad (500)$$

Now, by Lemma 13, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\pi^2 c}{3} \exp(-\frac{1-\lambda}{64e} t^2)$ , the following holds:

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \leq \frac{4t}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n. \quad (501)$$

By setting  $t = \log n$  and using the Borel-Cantelli's lemma, from (501), we obtain

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_M} |P_n(f \leq y) - P(f \leq y)| \rightarrow 0, \quad a.s.. \quad (502)$$

Finally, from (501), (502), and (ii), we obtain (i). This concludes our proof of Theorem 16.

## H Proof of Theorem 18

The proof is based on [4, Proof of Theorem 9]. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniformly bounded, we can choose  $M > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_M = \mathcal{F}$ . To prove the first statement, note that  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{BCLT}(\mathbb{P})$  means that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] = O(n^{-1/2}). \quad (503)$$

Now, from Lemma 7, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] - A_n - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (504)$$

for all  $t > 0$ . By applying (504), it easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right] = \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \quad (505)$$

$$\leq \frac{2M}{\sqrt{n}} + A_n + \mathbb{E}[\|P_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \quad (506)$$

$$\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (507)$$

since  $A_n = O(1/\sqrt{n})$  by (55).

Now, from Lemma 15, for  $t = \sqrt{2 \log n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \geq 3 \left( \mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} + A_n + \frac{2M\sqrt{2 \log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \\ \leq 2c \exp(-2(1-\lambda)/(64e) \log n). \end{aligned} \quad (508)$$

From (507) and (508), it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{-1/4} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) \geq D \right\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (509)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some constant  $D$ , or

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_{n,f}, F_f) = O_P \left( \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/4} \right). \quad (510)$$

Now, recall

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi} := \left\{ \varphi \circ \left( \frac{f-y}{\delta} \right) - 1 : f \in \mathcal{F}, y \in [-M, M] \right\}. \quad (511)$$

To prove the second statement, we use the following fact [4, p.29]:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} [\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi}}] \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{n}} \left[ \int_0^{\sqrt{2}} H_{d_{P_n, 2}}^{1/2}(\mathcal{F}; \delta u) du + \sqrt{\log \frac{4M}{\delta}} + 1 \right] \quad (512)$$

for some constant  $d$ , which, under the condition (83), satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} [\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi}}] \leq d \left[ \frac{1}{\delta^{\alpha/2}} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{4M}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \right]. \quad (513)$$

Now, by Lemma 15, it holds for all  $t > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \geq \delta + \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi}}] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e)). \quad (514)$$

Since  $\mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \delta_{X_i} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi}} = \mathbb{E}[\|P_n^0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\varphi}}] \leq d \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \delta^{-\alpha/2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{4M}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \right]$ , from (514), for all  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \geq \delta + d \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \delta^{-\alpha/2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{4M}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \right] + A_n + \frac{2Mt}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \\ \leq 2c \exp(-t^2(1-\lambda)/(64e)). \end{aligned} \quad (515)$$

Now, by choosing  $t = \sqrt{\frac{128e}{1-\lambda} \log n} > \sqrt{2 \log n}$  and  $\delta = \frac{c \log n}{n^{\frac{1}{2+\alpha}}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \geq \frac{\nu \log n}{n^{\frac{1}{2+\alpha}}} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{n^2} \quad (516)$$

for some constant  $\nu$  and for  $n \geq N_0$  for some finite  $N_0$  big enough.

From (516), we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) \geq \frac{\nu \log n}{n^{\frac{1}{2+\alpha}}} \right\} \leq N_0 + \sum_{n=N_0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n^2} < \infty. \quad (517)$$

Hence, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma [30], it holds that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(F_f, F_{f,n}) = O_P \left( n^{-\frac{1}{2+\alpha}} \log n \right), \quad a.s. \quad (518)$$

This concludes our proof of Theorem 18.