

An Information-Theoretic Framework for Supervised Learning

Hong Jun Jeon

*Department of Computer Science
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

HJJEON@STANFORD.EDU

Benjamin Van Roy

*Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

BVR@STANFORD.EDU

Abstract

Each year, deep learning demonstrates new and improved empirical results with deeper and wider neural networks. Meanwhile, with existing theoretical frameworks, it is difficult to analyze networks deeper than two layers without resorting to counting parameters or encountering sample complexity bounds that are exponential in depth. Perhaps it may be fruitful to try to analyze modern machine learning under a different lens. In this paper, we propose a novel information-theoretic framework with its own notions of regret and sample complexity for analyzing the data requirements of machine learning. With our framework, we first work through some classical examples such as scalar estimation and linear regression to build intuition and introduce general techniques. Then, we use the framework to study the sample complexity of learning from data generated by deep sign neural networks, deep ReLU neural networks, and deep networks that are infinitely wide but have a bounded sum of weights. For sign neural networks, we recover sample-complexity bounds that follow from VC-dimension based arguments. For the latter two neural network environments, we establish new results that suggest that the sample complexity of learning under these data generating processes is at most linear and quadratic, respectively, in network depth.

Keywords: information theory, rate-distortion theory, neural networks

1. Introduction

The refrain “success is guaranteed” espoused by some deep learning researchers suggests that, given a large data set, a sufficiently large neural network trained via stochastic gradient descent will deliver a useful model. Perhaps this statement is not intended to be taken literally, as it is easy to generate data in a manner for which *no algorithm* can accomplish this by learning from any reasonable number of samples. Yet, neural networks *have* successfully addressed many complex data sets. This begs the question: “for what data generating processes can neural networks succeed?”

Perhaps this refrain stems from the *empirical* phenomena of this era. In modern machine learning, the apparent capabilities of empirical methods have rapidly outpaced what is soundly understood theoretically. Modern neural network architectures have scaled immensely in both parameter count and depth. GPT3 for example has 175 billion parameters and 96 decoder blocks, each with many layers within. Yet, contrary to traditional statistical analyses, these deep neural networks with gargantuan parameter counts are able to

generalize well and produce useful models. This gap between what has been shown theoretically versus empirically makes it quite enticing to develop a coherent framework that could potentially explain this phenomenon.

In parametric statistics, the number of parameters typically drives sample complexity. In the realm of classical statistics, problems such as linear regression, this analysis based on parameter count can produce sharp results that mirror what is observed in practice. Naturally, researchers have made efforts to extend these techniques to try and understand deep learning.

However, these existing results break down when trying to explain learning under models that are simultaneously very deep (many layers) and wide (many hidden units per layer). Classical results such as those of Haussler (1992) and Bartlett et al. (1998) can potentially handle the deep but narrow case. These results bound the sample complexity of a learning a neural network function in terms of the number of parameters and the depth. More recently, Harvey et al. (2017) established a general result that suggests that for neural networks with piecewise-linear activation units, the sample complexity grows linearly in the product of parameter count and depth. However, when we consider neural networks with arbitrary width, these bounds become vacuous. This is unnerving as in practice, wider neural networks have been observed to generalize *better* (Neyshabur et al., 2014).

As an alternative to parameter count methods, researchers have produced sample complexity bounds that depend on the product of norms of realized weight matrices. In these networks, while the layers may be arbitrarily wide, the complexity is instead constrained by bounded weight matrix norms. Bartlett et al. (2017) and Neyshabur et al. (2018), for example, establish sample complexity bounds that scale with the product of spectral norms. Neyshabur et al. (2015) and Golowich et al. (2018) establish similar bounds that instead scale in the product of Frobenius norms. While this line of work provides sample complexity bounds that are *width*-independent, they pay for it via an exponential dependence on *depth*, which is also inconsistent with empirical results.

A large line of work has tried to ameliorate this exponential depth dependence via so-called *data-dependent* quantities (Dziugaite and Roy, 2017; Arora et al., 2018; Nagarajan and Kolter, 2018; Wei and Ma, 2019). Among these, the most relevant to our work is Wei and Ma (2019), which bounds sample complexity as a function of depth and statistics of trained neural network weights. While difficult to interpret due to dependence on complicated data-dependent statistics, their bound suggests a nonic dependence on depth. Arora et al. (2018) also utilize concepts of compression in their analysis, which we generalize and expand upon. While they establish a sample complexity bound that suggests quadratic dependence on depth, further dependence may be hidden in data-dependent terms. These data-dependent bounds are touted for their flexibility as one can derive expected error bounds by simply integrating out the aleatoric uncertainty in the data. However, such a procedure does not allow one to derive the bounds that we show in this paper.

We suspect that the looseness of these results in comparison to empirical findings are due to a worst-case analysis framework. In this paper, we study an average-case notion of regret and sample complexity that is motivated by information theory. Our information-theoretic framework generalizes that developed by Haussler et al. (1994), which provided a basis for understanding the relationship between prediction error and information. In a similar vein, Russo and Zou (2019) introduced tools that establish general relationships

between mutual information and error. Using these results, [Xu and Raginsky \(2017\)](#) established upper bounds on the generalization error of learning algorithms with countably infinite hypothesis spaces. We extend these results in several directions to enable analysis of data generating processes related to deep learning. For example, the results of [Haussler et al. \(1994\)](#) do not address noisy observations, and all three aforementioned papers do not accommodate continuous parameter spaces, let alone nonparametric data generating processes. A distinction of our work is that it builds on rate-distortion theory to address these limitations. While [Nokleby et al. \(2016\)](#) also use rate-distortion theory to study Bayes risk, these results are again limited to parametric classification and only offer lower bounds. The rate-distortion function that we study is equivalent to one defined by the *information bottleneck* ([Tishby et al., 2000](#)). However, instead of using it as a basis for *optimization methods* as do [Shwartz-Ziv and Tishby \(2017\)](#), we develop tools to study *sample complexity* and arrive at concrete and novel results.

In this paper, we consider contexts in which an agent learns from an iid sequence of data pairs. We consider a suite of data generating processes ranging from classical examples to those for which deep neural networks may be suited. For each data generating process, we quantify the number of samples required to arrive at a useful model. These analyses rely on general and elegant information-theoretic results that we introduce. We establish tight upper and lower bounds for the average regret and sample complexity that depend on the rate-distortion function. With these information-theoretic tools, we analyze three deep neural network data generating processes and quantify the number of samples required to arrive at a useful model. **We establish novel sample complexity bounds for ReLU neural network data generating processes that are roughly linear in the parameter count** (as opposed to linear in the product of parameter count and depth as established in ([Harvey et al., 2017](#))). **For a multilayer process with arbitrary width but bounded sum of weights, we establish sample complexity bounds with only a quadratic depth dependence** as opposed to exponential ([Bartlett et al., 2017](#)) or high-order polynomial ([Wei and Ma, 2019](#)) dependence. **We view this approach to bounding sample complexity of multilayer data generating processes, as well as our foundational information-theoretic tools, to be the primary contributions of this paper.** Beyond this paper, we expect future results to build on this framework. In particular, its generality and conceptual simplicity positions it to address problems beyond supervised learning, such as reinforcement learning ([Sutton and Barto, 2018](#)) and learning with side information ([Jonschkowski et al., 2015](#)). Indeed, information theory has already influenced thought on these topics ([Lu et al., 2021](#)), and our results should provide tools to develop further understanding.

2. Prediction and Error

Consider an environment which, when presented with an input, responds with an output. In the standard framing of supervised learning, an agent learns from input-output data pairs to predict the output corresponding to any future input. Accuracy of the agent’s prediction depends on information the agent has acquired about the environment. In this section, we introduce mathematical formalisms for reasoning about environments and predictions. We formalize a notion of error that is equivalent to the incremental information that a

new data pair provides about the environment. With this notion of error, we establish the notions of regret and sample complexity that we will study in this work. While to many these ideas may seem unconventional, we provide connections between our formalism and existing hallmarks of machine learning.

2.1 Environment

We denote input and output spaces by \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . While our concepts and results extend to more general spaces, for the purpose of this paper, we restrict attention to cases where \mathcal{X} is a finite-dimensional real-valued vector space and \mathcal{Y} is also a finite-dimensional real-valued vector space (regression) or finite (classification). As illustrated in Figure 1, an environment \mathcal{E} prescribes to each input X and a conditional probability measure $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|X)$ of the output Y .




Figure 1: Presented with an input, an environment responds with an output.

In order to model the agent’s uncertainty about the environment, we treat \mathcal{E} as a random variable. Before gathering any data, the agent’s beliefs about the environment are represented by the prior distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \in \cdot)$. The agent’s beliefs evolve as it conditions this distribution on observations.

2.2 Data Generating Process

We consider a stochastic process that generates a sequence $((X_t, Y_{t+1}) : t = 0, \dots, T - 1)$ of data pairs. We refer to each X_t as an *input* and each Y_{t+1} as an *output*. We define these and all other random variables we will consider with respect to a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

Elements of the sequence $(X_t : t = 0, \dots, T - 1)$ are independent and identically distributed. Denote the history of data generated through time t by $H_t = (X_0, Y_1, \dots, X_{t-1}, Y_t, X_t)$. Each output is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, H_t) = \mathcal{E}(\cdot | X_t)$. Here, \mathcal{E} (the environment) is a random function that specifies a conditional output distribution $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x)$ for each input x . As aforementioned, initial uncertainty about \mathcal{E} is expressed by the prior distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \in \cdot)$. Note that, conditioned on \mathcal{E} , the sequence $((X_t, Y_{t+1}) : t = 0, \dots, T - 1)$ is iid.

2.3 Prediction

We consider an agent that predict the next response Y_{t+1} given the history H_t . Rather than a point estimate, the agent provides as its prediction a probability distribution P_t over possible responses. We characterize the agent in terms of a function π for which $P_t = \pi(H_t)$.

It will be useful to introduce some notation for referring to particular predictions. We will generally use P_t as a dummy variable – that is a generic prediction whose definition depends on context. We denote the prediction conditioned on the environment, which could

only be produced by a prescient agent, by

$$P_t^* = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, X_t) = \mathcal{E}(\cdot | X_t).$$

We will refer to this as the *target distribution* as it represents what an agent aims to learn. Finally, we use \hat{P}_t to denote the posterior-predictive conditioned on H_t , which will turn out to be optimal for the objective we will define next.

$$\hat{P}_t = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | H_t).$$

2.4 Error

We assess the error of a prediction P_t in terms of the KL-divergence relative to P_t^* :

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) = \int P_t^*(dy) \ln \frac{dP_t^*}{dP_t}(y).$$

This quantifies mismatch between the prediction P_t and target distribution P_t^* . As the following examples illustrate, this generalizes notions of error, like mean-squared error and cross-entropy loss, that are commonly used in the machine learning literature.

2.5 Connections to Cross-Entropy Loss

We establish that in the classification setting, our notion of error is equivalent to cross-entropy loss up to translations.

Example 1. (cross-entropy loss) *Suppose the set \mathcal{Y} of responses is finite. Then,*

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* \| P) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P^*(y) \ln \frac{P^*(y)}{P(y)} = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P^*(y) \ln P^*(y) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P^*(y) \ln P(y).$$

The first term does not depend on P , so minimizing KL-divergence is equivalent to minimizing the final term,

$$- \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P^*(y) \ln P(y) = -\mathbb{E}[\ln(P(Y_{t+1})) | \mathcal{E}, P, X],$$

which is exactly the expected cross-entropy loss of P , as is commonly used to assess classifiers.

2.6 Connections to Mean-Squared Error

In the regression setting we first establish a direct link between KL-divergence and mean-squared error for the case in which P_t^* and P_t are Gaussian.

Example 2. (gaussian mean-squared error) *Fix $\mu \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$. Let $\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, X_t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Consider a point prediction $\hat{\mu}_t$ that is determined by H_t and a distributional prediction $P_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}_t, \sigma^2)$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(\mu - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t]}{2\sigma^2} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t] - \mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \mu)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t]}{2\sigma^2}.$$

Hence, KL-divergence grows monotonically the squared error $\mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t]$. However, while the minimal squared error $\mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \mu)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t] = \sigma^2$ that is attainable with full knowledge of the environment remains positive, the minimal KL-divergence, which is delivered by $P_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, is zero.

Now consider a distributional prediction $P_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\sigma}_t^2)$, based on a variance estimate $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 \neq \sigma^2$. Then,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(\mu - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 | \mathcal{E}, H_t]}{2\hat{\sigma}_t^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} - 1 - \ln \frac{\sigma^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \right).$$

Consider optimizing the choice of $\hat{\sigma}_t^2$ given H_t :

$$\min_{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) | H_t].$$

The minimum is attained by

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \underbrace{\sigma^2}_{\text{aleatoric}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(\mu - \mathbb{E}[\mu | H_t])^2 | H_t]}_{\text{epistemic}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[\mu | H_t] - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 | H_t]}_{\text{bias}},$$

which differs from σ^2 . While σ^2 characterizes aleatoric uncertainty, the incremental variance $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 - \sigma^2$ accounts for epistemic uncertainty and bias.

Now, for P_t^* and P_t that are not Gaussian, we have the following upper bound:

Lemma 1. For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, if $\hat{\mu}_t = \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} y dP_t(y)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t)] \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \hat{\mu}_t)^2]}{\sigma^2} \right).$$

Therefore, decreasing the mean squared error will always decrease the expected KL-divergence. A corresponding lower bound holds for data generating processes for which Y_{t+1} satisfies a certain subgaussian condition:

Lemma 2. For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $\hat{\mu}_t = \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} y dP_t(y)$. If $P_t(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot)$ is δ_t^2 -subgaussian conditioned on H_t w.p 1, then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t)] \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Y_{t+1} - \hat{\mu}_t)^2]}{\delta_t^2}$$

Therefore, for data generating processes that obey these subgaussian conditions, we have both upper and lower bounds for expected KL divergence in terms of mean-squared error.

3. Regret and Sample Complexity

We assess an agent's performance over duration T in terms of the expected cumulative error

$$\mathcal{R}_\pi(T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) \right].$$

The focus of this paper is on understanding how well an *optimal* agent can perform, given particular data generating processes. We will use *regret* to refer to the optimal performance defined below.

Definition 3. (optimal regret) For all $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the *optimal regret* is

$$\mathcal{R}(T) := \inf_{\pi} \mathcal{R}_{\pi}(T).$$

With this notation, the error incurred by an optimal uninformed prediction is given by $\mathcal{R}(1)$. We will also consider sample complexity, which we take to be the duration required to attain expected average error within some threshold $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Definition 4. (sample complexity) For all $\epsilon \geq 0$, the *sample complexity* is

$$T_{\epsilon} := \min \left\{ T : \frac{\mathcal{R}(T)}{T} \leq \epsilon \right\}.$$

3.1 Optimal Predictions

We focus in this paper on how well an *optimal* agent performs, rather than on how to design practical agents that economize on memory and computation. Recall that an agent is characterized by a function π , which generates predictions $P_t = \pi(H_t, Z_t)$, where Z_t represents algorithmic randomness. The following result establishes that the conditional distribution $\hat{P}_t = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | H_t)$ offers an optimal prediction.

Theorem 5. (optimal prediction) For all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t] = \inf_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) | H_t],$$

where $P_t = \pi(H_t, Z_t)$.

Proof Let $\hat{P}_t = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | H_t)$. By Gibbs' inequality,

$$\inf_{P_t} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\hat{P}_t \| P_t) = \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\hat{P}_t \| \hat{P}_t) = 0.$$

Let $P_t^* = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, X_t)$. Then, for all P_t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{dP_t^*}{dP_t}(Y_{t+1}) \middle| \mathcal{E}, H_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\ln dP_t^*(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] - \mathbb{E} [\ln dP_t(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\ln dP_t^*(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] - \mathbb{E} [\ln d\hat{P}_t(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} [\ln d\hat{P}_t(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] - \mathbb{E} [\ln dP_t(Y_{t+1}) | \mathcal{E}, H_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{dP_t^*}{d\hat{P}_t}(Y_{t+1}) \middle| \mathcal{E}, H_t \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{d\hat{P}_t}{dP_t}(Y_{t+1}) \middle| \mathcal{E}, H_t \right] \\ &= \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) + \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{d\hat{P}_t}{dP_t}(Y_{t+1}) \middle| \mathcal{E}, H_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) | H_t] &= \inf_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) + \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{d\hat{P}_t}{dP_t}(Y_{t+1}) \middle| \mathcal{E}, H_t \right] \middle| H_t \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t] + \inf_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\hat{P}_t \| P_t) | H_t] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\hat{P}_t \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t].
 \end{aligned}$$

■

In the remainder of the paper we will study an agent that generates optimal predictions $P_t = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | H_t)$, as illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: We consider an agent that, given a history H_t , generates an optimal prediction $P_t = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | H_t)$.

3.2 An Aside on Misspecified/Suboptimal Predictions

Before we begin our analysis on the performance of *optimal* agents, we provide the following corollary which precisely addresses the performance shortfall incurred by a *suboptimal* agent whether that be due to model misspecification or computational constraints.

Corollary 6. (misspecified/suboptimal prediction) For all $t \geq 0$ and $P_t = \pi(H_t, Z_t)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t) | H_t] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t) | H_t] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\hat{P}_t \| P_t) | H_t].$$

This result establishes that the shortfall that the suboptimal predictor P_t experiences is exactly equal to the expected KL-divergence between P_t and the optimal posterior predictive \hat{P}_t .

4. Information

As tools for analysis of prediction error and sample complexity, we will define concepts for quantifying uncertainty and the information gained from observations. The entropy $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ of the environment quantifies the agent's initial degree of uncertainty in terms of the information required to identify \mathcal{E} . We will measure information in units of *nats*, each of which is equivalent to $1/\ln 2$ bits. For example, if \mathcal{E} occupies a countable range Θ then $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}) = -\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} = \theta) \ln \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} = \theta)$. Uncertainty at time t can be expressed in terms

of the conditional entropy $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}|H_t)$, which is the number of remaining nats after observing H_t . The mutual information $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_t) = \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}) - \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}|H_t)$ quantifies the information about \mathcal{E} gained from H_t .

4.1 Learning from Errors

Each data pair (X_t, Y_{t+1}) provides $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; (X_t, Y_{t+1})|H_{t-1}, Y_t)$ nats of new information about the environment. By the chain rule of mutual information, this is the sum

$$\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; (X_t, Y_{t+1})|H_{t-1}, Y_t) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; X_t|H_{t-1}, Y_t) + \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1}|H_t)$$

of the information gained from X_t and Y_{t+1} . The former term $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; X_t|H_{t-1}, Y_t)$ is equal to zero because X_t is independent from both \mathcal{E} and (H_{t-1}, Y_t) . The latter term $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1}|H_t)$ can be thought of as the level of surprise experienced by the agent upon observing Y_{t+1} . Surprise is associated with prediction error, and the following result formalizes the equivalence between error and information gain.

Lemma 7. (expected prediction error equals information gain) *For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \|\hat{P}_t)] = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1}|H_t),$$

and $\mathcal{R}(t) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_t)$.

Proof It is well known that the mutual information $\mathbb{I}(A; B)$ between random variables A and B can be expressed in terms of the expected KL-divergence $\mathbb{I}(A; B) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(A \in \cdot|B) \|\mathbb{P}(A \in \cdot))]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E}|H_t) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot|\mathcal{E}, H_t) \|\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot|H_t))] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot|\mathcal{E}, X_t) \|\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot|H_t))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \|\hat{P}_t)], \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $Y_{t+1} \perp H_t | (\mathcal{E}, X_t)$. We then have

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \|\hat{P}_t) \right] = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E}|H_t) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_T),$$

where the final equality follows from the chain rule of mutual information. ■

The agent's ability to predict tends to improve as it learns from experience. This is formalized by the following result, which establishes that expected prediction errors are monotonically nonincreasing.

Lemma 8. (expected prediction error is monotonically nonincreasing) *For all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \|\hat{P}_t)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_{t+1}^* \|\hat{P}_{t+1})].$$

Proof We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_{t+1}^* \|\hat{P}_{t+1})] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+2} | H_{t+1}) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | H_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | \mathcal{E}, H_{t+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | H_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | \mathcal{E}, H_{t-1}, Y_t, X_{t+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | H_{t-1}, Y_t, X_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+2} | \mathcal{E}, H_{t-1}, Y_t, X_{t+1}) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+2} | H_{t-1}, Y_t, X_{t+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1} | H_{t-1}, Y_t, X_t) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1} | H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \|\hat{P}_t)],
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 7, (b) follows since $Y_{t+2} \perp (X_t, Y_{t+1}) | (\mathcal{E}, X_{t+1})$, (c) follows from the fact that conditioning reduces differential entropy, (d) follows from the fact that (X_t, Y_{t+1}) and (X_{t+1}, Y_{t+2}) are independent and identically distributed conditioned on (H_{t-1}, Y_t) , and (e) follows from the equivalence between mutual information and expected KL-divergence. \blacksquare

5. General Regret and Sample Complexity Bounds

We will characterize fundamental limits of performance by establishing bounds on the error and sample complexity attained by an optimal agent. These bounds are very general, applying to *any* data generating process. The results bound error and sample complexity in terms of rate-distortion. As such, for any particular data generating process, bounds can be produced by characterizing the associated rate-distortion function. In subsequent sections, we will consider particular data generating processes to which we will specialize the bounds by characterizing associated rate-distortion functions.

5.1 Bound Regret and Sample Complexity via Entropy

In this section we will establish the core link between discrete entropy and our notions of regret and sample complexity. We begin with the following core result

Theorem 9. (regret and mutual information) *For all $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathbb{I}(H_T; \mathcal{E})$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}(T) &= \inf_{\pi} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| P_t)] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t^* \| \hat{P}_t)] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{I}(H_T; \mathcal{E}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Theorem 5, (b) follows from Lemma 7 and (c) follows from the chain-rule of mutual information. ■

The following upper bounds on regret and sample complexity are an almost direct result of this theorem:

Theorem 10. For all $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\mathcal{R}(T) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}); \quad T_{\epsilon} \leq \left\lceil \frac{\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})}{\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon} \right\rceil$$

Proof We begin by showing the regret bound:

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathbb{I}(H_T; \mathcal{E}) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}).$$

The sample complexity bound follows as a result:

$$\left\lceil \frac{\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})}{\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon} \right\rceil \geq \left\lceil \frac{\mathcal{R}(T)}{\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon} \right\rceil = T_{\epsilon}.$$

This establishes that the maximum total error we can incur is $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$. This is intuitive as if we have incurred $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ error, this means we have learned all $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ bits of information that exist pertaining to \mathcal{E} and so all future predictions should produce 0 additional error. ■

While this is a nice result for understanding simple problems for which the realizations of \mathcal{E} are restricted to a countable set, \mathcal{E} will be a continuous random variable in the majority of interesting learning problems. When \mathcal{E} is a continuous random variable, $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ will almost always be ∞ , resulting in vacuous regret and sample complexity bounds.

However, this vacuousness is often due to the inherent looseness of the bound $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_T) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$, i.e., it is not that the regret $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is truly ∞ but rather that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ is an overly lofty upper bound. In fact, it is often the case that $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_T)$ is actually finite and tractable. Another shortcoming is that these entropy-based bounds do not provide any insight about lower bounds on $\mathcal{R}(T)$ and T_{ϵ} . In the following section, we introduce *rate-distortion theory* a set of information-theoretic tools which will allow us to address both the vacuous upper bounds and the absence of lower bounds.

5.2 The Rate-Distortion Function

An *environment proxy* is a random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ that provides information about the environment \mathcal{E} but no additional information pertaining to inputs or outputs. In other words, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \perp (X, Y) | \mathcal{E}$. We will denote the set of environment proxies by $\tilde{\Theta}$. While an infinite amount of information must be acquired to identify the environment when $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E}) = \infty$, there can be a proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ with $\mathbb{H}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) < \infty$ that enables accurate predictions. The minimal expected error attainable based on the proxy is achieved by a prediction $\tilde{P} = \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_t)$. This results in expected error $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})]$.

We will establish that the expected error $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})]$ equals the information gained, beyond that supplied by the proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$, about the environment \mathcal{E} from observing Y . This is intuitive: more is learned from Y if knowledge of \mathcal{E} enables a better prediction of Y than does $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$. We quantify this information gain in terms of the difference $\mathbb{H}(Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) - \mathbb{H}(Y | \mathcal{E}, X)$ between the uncertainty conditioned on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ and that conditioned on \mathcal{E} . This is equal to the mutual information $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) = \mathbb{H}(Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) - \mathbb{H}(Y | \mathcal{E}, X)$. The following result equates this with expected error.

Lemma 11. (proxy error equals information gain) *For all $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})] = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X).$$

Proof It is well known that the mutual information $\mathbb{I}(A; B)$ between random variables A and B can be expressed in terms of the expected KL-divergence $\mathbb{I}(A; B) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(A \in \cdot | B) || \mathbb{P}(A \in \cdot))]$. We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) || \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, X) || \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the fact that $(X, Y) \perp \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}$. ■

Intuitively, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})]$ (or $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X)$) is a measure of the *distortion* incurred in our estimate of Y from knowing only $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ as opposed to the true \mathcal{E} . For example, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ may be a quantization or lossy compression of \mathcal{E} and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})]$ is measuring how inaccurate our prediction of Y is under this compression $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$.

Now we consider the following ϵ -optimal set:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon = \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta} : \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* || \tilde{P})] \leq \epsilon \right\}.$$

$\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ denotes the set of proxies that produce predictions that incur a *distortion* of no more than ϵ .

With the *distortion* component of *rate-distortion* covered, it suffices now to discuss the *rate*. The *rate* is the mutual information $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$, which quantifies the amount of information about the environment conveyed by proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$. For example, a finer quantization would result in a higher rate since $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ would capture \mathcal{E} up to more bits of precision. However, in turn one may expect that with this higher rate, the *distortion* incurred by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ should be *lower*. A higher fidelity compression should produce less distortion. The *rate-distortion function* formalizes this trade-off mathematically:

Definition 12. (rate-distortion function) For all $\epsilon \geq 0$, The *rate-distortion function* for environment \mathcal{E} w.r.t distortion function $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P^* \|\tilde{P})]$ is

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) := \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}).$$

The rate-distortion function characterizes the minimal amount of information that a proxy must convey in order to be an element of $\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$. Intuitively, this can be thought of as the amount of information about the environment required to make ϵ -accurate predictions. Even when $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{E})$ is infinite and ϵ is small, $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ can be manageable. As we will see in the following section, both the regret and sample complexity of learning scales with $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$.

5.3 Bound Regret and Sample Complexity via Rate-Distortion

With rate-distortion in place, we will tighten the bounds of Theorem 10. These bounds are very general, applying to *any* data generating process. The results upper and lower bound error and sample complexity in terms of rate-distortion as opposed to entropy. As such, for any particular data generating process, bounds can be produced by characterizing the associated rate-distortion function. In subsequent sections, we will consider particular data generating processes to which we will specialize the bounds by characterizing associated rate-distortion functions.

The following result brackets the cumulative error of optimal predictions.

Theorem 13. (rate-distortion regret bounds) For all $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \min\{\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}), \epsilon T\} \leq \mathcal{R}(T) \leq \inf_{\epsilon \geq 0} (\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) + \epsilon T).$$

Proof We begin by establishing the upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}(T) &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_T^* \| \hat{P}_t) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | H_t) \\
 &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | H_t) + \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | H_t) + \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \mathbb{I}(H_T; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \mathbb{I}(H_T; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(f)}{\leq} \mathbb{I}(H_T; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) + \epsilon T \\
 &\stackrel{(g)}{\leq} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) + \epsilon T
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 7, (b) follows from the chain rule of mutual information, (c) follows from the chain rule of mutual information, (d) follows from the facts that $\mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, H_t) \leq \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_t)$ and $\mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \mathcal{E}, H_t) = \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \mathcal{E}, X_t)$, (e) holds for any $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$, and (f) follows from the data processing inequality. Since the above inequality holds for all $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$, the result follows.

Next, we establish the lower bound. Fix $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = (\tilde{H}_{T-2}, \tilde{Y}_{T-1})$ be independent from but distributed identically with (H_{T-2}, Y_{T-1}) , conditioned on \mathcal{E} . In other words, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \perp (H_{T-2}, Y_{T-1}) | \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{P}((H_{T-2}, Y_{T-1}) \in \cdot | \mathcal{E})$. This implies that $\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{E}, \tilde{H}_{T-2}, \tilde{Y}_{T-1}, X_{T-1}, Y_T) \in \cdot) = \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{E}, H_{T-2}, Y_{T-1}, X_{T-1}, Y_T) \in \cdot)$, and therefore, $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_T | H_{T-1}) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_T | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_{T-1})$.

Fix $\epsilon \geq 0$. If $\mathcal{R}(T) < \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ then $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \notin \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}(T) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; H_T) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_{t+1} | H_t) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_T | H_{T-1}) T \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; Y_T | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_{T-1}) T \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_{T-1}^* \| \tilde{P}_{T-1})] T \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{>} \epsilon T,
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 7, (b) follows from the chain rule of mutual information, (c) follows from Lemma 8, (d) follows from Lemma 11, and (e) follows from the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \notin \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}(T) \geq \min\{\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}), \epsilon T\}.$$

Since this holds for any $\epsilon \geq 0$, the result follows. \blacksquare

This upper bound is intuitive. Knowledge of a proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ enables an agent to limit prediction error to ϵ per timestep. Getting to that level of prediction error requires $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ nats, and therefore, that much cumulative error. Hence, $\mathcal{R}(T) \leq \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) + \epsilon T$.

To motivate the lower bound, note that an agent requires $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ nats to attain per timestep error within ϵ . Obtaining those nats requires cumulative error at least $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$. So prior to obtaining that many nats, the agent *must* incur at least ϵ error per timestep, hence the ϵT term in the minimum. Meanwhile, if at time T , the agent is able to produce predictions with error less than ϵ it means that it has already accumulated at least $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ nats of information about \mathcal{E} (error).

Sample complexity bounds follow almost immediately from Theorem 13.

Theorem 14. (rate-distortion sample complexity bounds) *For all $\epsilon \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})}{\epsilon} \leq T_\epsilon \leq \inf_{\delta \in [0, \epsilon]} \left\lceil \frac{\mathbb{H}_{\epsilon-\delta}(\mathcal{E})}{\delta} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{2\mathbb{H}_{\epsilon/2}(\mathcal{E})}{\epsilon} \right\rceil.$$

Proof We begin by showing the upper bound. Fix $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $\delta \in [0, \epsilon]$. Let

$$T = \left\lceil \frac{\mathbb{H}_{\epsilon-\delta}(\mathcal{E})}{\delta} \right\rceil,$$

so that $\mathbb{H}_{\epsilon-\delta}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \delta T$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}(T) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{H}_{\epsilon-\delta}(\mathcal{E}) + (\epsilon - \delta)T \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta T + (\epsilon - \delta)T \\
 &= \epsilon T,
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the upper bound of Theorem 13 and (b) follows from our choice of T . Since $T_\epsilon = \min\{T : \mathcal{R}(T) \leq \epsilon T\}$, it follows that $T \geq T_\epsilon$. Since the above holds for arbitrary $\delta \in [0, \epsilon]$, the result follows.

We now show the lower bound. Fix $\epsilon \geq 0$. By the definition of T_ϵ , we have

$$\mathcal{R}(T_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon T_\epsilon.$$

In the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 13, we show that for all $\epsilon \geq 0$, $\mathcal{R}(T) < \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \implies \mathcal{R}(T) > \epsilon T$. Therefore, using the contrapositive and the above definition of T_ϵ , we have that $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mathcal{R}(T_\epsilon)$ and therefore

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mathcal{R}(T_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon T_\epsilon.$$

The result follows. ■

6. Regret and Sample Complexity Bounds for Classical Examples

We now demonstrate our machinery on some classical problems: scalar estimation and linear regression. While the results in these settings are not novel, we hope that they provide the reader with some intuition for the techniques that can be used to bound the rate-distortion function.

6.1 Scalar Estimation

We begin with scalar estimation, a problem for which for all t , the range of X_t is a singleton and the environment is identified by a deterministic scalar $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$ and a random scalar θ , with $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|X_t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$. Note that for each t , the output Y_{t+1} is independent of the input X_t and can be interpreted as a scalar signal θ perturbed by noise: $Y_{t+1} = \theta + W_{t+1}$ for a random variable $W_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ that is independent from θ .

In this section we will use \mathbf{h} to denote differential entropy. Before proceeding to the main results, we will state a well known result about the maximum differential entropy of a random vector with a given covariance matrix.

Lemma 15. (maximum differential entropy) *For all random vectors $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ with covariance K ,*

$$\mathbf{h}(X) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2\pi e)^d |K| \right),$$

with equality iff $Pr(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, K)$ for some $\mu \in \mathfrak{R}^d$.

Proof Follows from Theorems 8.6.3 and 8.6.5 of [Cover and Thomas \(2006\)](#). ■

We will cite this result extensively throughout the paper.

Recall that $\mathcal{R}(1) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_0^* || P_0)]$, where $P_0 = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \in \cdot | X_0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} \in \cdot | X_t)$ for all t . For our scalar estimation context, $\mathcal{R}(1)$ satisfies the following bounds:

Lemma 16. For all $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$ and real-valued random variables θ with variance 1, if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$ then

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)}}{\sigma^2 2\pi e} \right) \leq \mathcal{R}(1) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right).$$

Proof Note that

$$\mathcal{R}(1) = \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \theta | X_t) = \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \theta) = \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \theta) = \mathbf{h}(\theta + W_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}).$$

We first establish the lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(1) &= \mathbf{h}(\theta + W_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)} + e^{2\mathbf{h}(W_{t+1})} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e \sigma^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)}}{\sigma^2 2\pi e} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the entropy power inequality. We next establish the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(1) &= \mathbf{h}(\theta + W_{t+1}) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e (1 + \sigma^2)) - \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e \sigma^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from lemma 15. ■

The upper and lower bounds suggest that $\mathcal{R}(1)$ shrinks as the variance of the noise σ^2 increases. This may initially seem counterintuitive, but consider a situation in which $\sigma^2 \rightarrow 0$. In this case, $Y_t = \theta$ so $\mathbb{I}(Y_t; \theta) = \mathbb{H}(\theta) = \infty$ for continuous random variable θ . Meanwhile, if $\sigma^2 \rightarrow \infty$, then $Y_t = W_t$ and so $\mathbb{I}(Y_t; \theta) = \mathbb{I}(W_t; \theta) = 0$ since $W_t \perp \theta$. $\mathcal{R}(1)$ is larger for smaller σ^2 because with less noise, Y_t conveys more about θ .

An interesting case is when $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. In this setting, we have that the lower bound is:

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{e^{\ln(2\pi e)}}{\sigma^2 2\pi e} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right).$$

So for θ distributed Gaussian, $\mathcal{R}(1) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)$ because the upper and lower bounds match.

We now establish an upper bound on the *rate-distortion function* that holds for all real-valued random variables θ with variance 1.

Theorem 17. (scalar estimation rate-distortion upper bound) For all $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_+$, $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)]$, and random variables $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}$ with variance 1, if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{2\pi e}{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)}} \cdot \frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \right).$$

Proof Fix $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}, \epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2})]$, and consider a proxy $\tilde{\theta} = \theta + V$ where $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2)$ for $\delta^2 = \frac{\sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)}{1 - \sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)}$ and $V \perp \theta$. Note that $\delta^2 \geq 0$ for all $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2})]$. We begin by upper bounding the rate of such a proxy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(\theta; \tilde{\theta}) &= \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}|\theta) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(V) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e(\delta^2 + 1)) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\delta^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2(e^{2\mathcal{R}\epsilon} - 1)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) lemma 15.

Now, we upper bound the distortion of the proxy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(Y; \theta|\tilde{\theta}, X) &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1}|\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1}|\theta) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1} + \theta|\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}\left(W_{t+1} + \left(\theta - \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2}\tilde{\theta}\right) \middle| \tilde{\theta}\right) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}\left(W_{t+1} + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{1 + \delta^2}\theta + \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2}V\right) \middle| \tilde{\theta}\right) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{h}\left(W_{t+1} + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{1 + \delta^2}\theta + \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2}V\right)\right) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(2\pi e\left(\sigma^2 + \frac{\delta^4}{(1 + \delta^2)^2} + \frac{\delta^2}{(1 + \delta^2)^2}\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\sigma^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^2}{(1 + \delta^2)\sigma^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln(e^{2\epsilon}) \\ &= \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from lemma 15.

It follows from our characterizations of rate and distortion that $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ and the rate-distortion function is upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) &\leq \mathbb{I}(\theta; \tilde{\theta}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{2\pi e}{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)}} \frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon} - 1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the lower bound of Lemma 16. ■

We now study the special case where $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. In this case, we will see that Theorem 17 is met with *equality*. We show this by proving a matching lower bound. Note that while we study the case in which θ is distributed standard Gaussian, the results trivially extend to the cases in which θ is distributed Gaussian with arbitrary mean and variance.

Theorem 18. (scalar estimation gaussian rate-distortion lower bound) *For all $\sigma^2, \epsilon \in \mathfrak{R}_+$, if $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1}.$$

Proof Fix $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \mathcal{E}|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_t) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1}|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X_t) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\theta + W_{t+1}|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\theta + W_{t+1}|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\sigma^2) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(e^{2\mathbf{h}(W_{t+1})} + e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}})} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\sigma^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}})}}{2\pi e\sigma^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ and (b) follows from the conditional entropy power inequality. Rearranging the resulting inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbf{h}(\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\sigma^2 (e^{2\epsilon} - 1)). \quad (1)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) &= \mathbf{h}(\theta) - \mathbf{h}(\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi e\sigma^2 (e^{2\epsilon} - 1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2 (e^{2\epsilon} - 1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is an arbitrary element of $\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$, the result follows:

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) = \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \right).$$




Figure 3: The rate-distortion function for scalar estimation under various values of noise variance σ^2 .

■

For θ distributed Gaussian, Theorems 17 and 18 establish matching upper and lower bounds. To succinctly present the rate-distortion results of this section, we provide the following corollary.

Corollary 19. (scalar estimation rate-distortion function) *For all $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2})$, and random variables $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}$ with variance 1, if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{2\pi e}{e^{2\mathfrak{h}(\theta)}} \cdot \frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \right).$$

Further, if $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{e^{2\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1}.$$

Figure 3 plots the rate-distortion function established by corollary 19 for the case of $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and noise variance $\sigma^2 = 0.1$. As is to be expected, the rate monotonically decreases in the distortion. Further, as the rate grows unbounded as the distortion vanishes.

For scalar estimation with Gaussian θ , $\mathcal{R}(1) = \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2})$. Note that $1/\sigma^2$ represents a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). For any given level of distortion ϵ , the rate $H_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ characterized by corollary 19 increases with the SNR. This is intuitive. With zero SNR, Y is unpredictable and knowledge of θ is not helpful, as reflected by the fact that $\mathcal{R} = 0$. On the other hand, when the SNR is asymptotically large, knowledge of θ enables perfect prediction of Y , which is infinitely better than what can be offered by an uninformed agent.

6.2 Linear Regression

Let us next consider linear regression, where the environment \mathcal{E} is identified by a vector $\theta \in \mathfrak{R}^d$ with iid components each with unit variance. Predictors and responses are generated according to random vector X with $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ and $Y = \theta^\top X + W$ where W is a random variable with $\mathbb{P}(W \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ for some $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, and $W \perp \theta$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top x, \sigma^2)$. Note that the results and techniques developed in this section certainly extend to input distributions that are not Gaussian with slight modifications. We study the Gaussian case since it is a canonical example and often simplifies analysis. We first establish an analogue to the maximum differential entropy result of lemma 15 that applies to random vectors with a fixed *sum of* variances.

Lemma 20. *For all real-valued random vectors $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ where $\kappa = \text{trace}(\text{cov}[X])$,*

$$\mathbf{h}(X) \leq \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \frac{\kappa}{d} \right),$$

with equality iff $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \frac{\kappa}{d} I_d)$ for some $\mu \in \mathfrak{R}^d$.

Proof Let K be the covariance matrix of X . Next, let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ denote the eigenvalues of K . Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}(X) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2\pi e)^d |K| \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2\pi e)^d \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2\pi e)^d \left(\frac{\kappa}{d} \right)^d \right) \\ &= \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \frac{\kappa}{d} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from lemma 15 and (b) follows from the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = \kappa$ and the fact that the product is maximized when all the λ_i are equal. The equality result follows from applying lemma 15 to a random vector with covariance $K = \frac{\kappa}{d} I_d$. \blacksquare

We next establish upper and lower bounds for nominal regret $\mathcal{R}(1)$.

Lemma 21. *For all $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ s.t. $d \geq 2$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, and random vectors $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ with iid components, each with variance 1, if $\mathbb{P}(X_0 \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}^d$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top x, \sigma^2)$, then*

$$\frac{1}{6} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d}}{2\pi e} \right) \leq \mathcal{R}(1) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \right).$$

Proof We begin by proving the lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \theta | X_t) &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | X_t) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \theta, X_t) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1} + \theta^\top X_t | X_t) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^d e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta_i X_{t,i} | X=X)} \right) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e \sigma^2) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d} |X_{t,i}|^2}{2\pi e \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
 &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|X_t\|_2^2 \geq d)}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d}}{2\pi e} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{1}{6} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \frac{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d}}{2\pi e} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the entropy power inequality and $\theta_i, X_{t,i}$ denote the i th component of θ and X_t respectively, (b) follows from the fact that for a constant a , $\mathbf{h}(a\theta) = \mathbf{h}(\theta) + \ln(|a|)$, and (c) follows from the fact that for $d \geq 2$, $\mathbb{P}(\|X_t\|_2^2 \geq d) \geq \frac{1}{3}$ for $\|X_t\|_2^2$ distributed χ_d^2 .

We next prove the upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}(1) &= \mathbb{I}(Y_{t+1}; \theta | X_t) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | X_t) - \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | \theta, X_t) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(Y_{t+1} | X_t) - \mathbf{h}(W_{t+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e (\sigma^2 + \|X_t\|_2^2)) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e \sigma^2) \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\|X_t\|_2^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|X_t\|_2^2]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from lemma 15 and (b) follows from Jensen's inequality. ■

Just as in scalar estimation, the upper and lower bounds suggest that $\mathcal{R}(1)$ vanishes as the variance σ^2 of the noise increases because with less noise, Y conveys more about θ . The bounds also suggest that $\mathcal{R}(1)$ grows with d , which is intuitive since θ encodes more information when d is larger.

In the case where $\mathbb{P}(\theta \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, the lower bound becomes:

$$\frac{1}{6} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2} \right),$$

which closely resembles the upper bound.

We now derive an upper bound for the rate-distortion function in the linear regression setting.

Theorem 22. (linear regression rate-distortion upper bound) *For all $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ s.t. $d \geq 2$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_+$, $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2})]$, and random vectors $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ with iid components, each with variance 1, if for all t , $\mathbb{P}(X_t \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}^d$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top x, \sigma^2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{e^{\delta \mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \frac{2\pi e}{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d}} \right).$$

Proof Fix $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$. Let the proxy $\tilde{\theta} = \theta + V$, where $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2 I_d)$ for $\delta^2 = \frac{\sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)}{d - \sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)}$ and $V \perp \theta$. Note that $\delta^2 \geq 0$ for all $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \frac{d}{\sigma^2})]$. We first upper bound the rate of such proxy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(\theta; \tilde{\theta}) &= \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}|\theta) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\tilde{\theta}) - \mathbf{h}(V) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{d}{2} \ln(2\pi e(\delta^2 + 1)) - \frac{1}{2} \ln((2\pi e\delta^2)) \\ &= \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{d}{\sigma^2(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 20.

Now, we upper bound the distortion of such proxy:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(Y; \theta | \tilde{\theta}, X) &= \mathbf{h}(Y | \tilde{\theta}, X) - \mathbf{h}(Y | \theta, X) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(W + \theta^\top X | \tilde{\theta}, X) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}\left(W + \left(\theta - \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2} \tilde{\theta}\right)^\top X | \tilde{\theta}, X\right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}\left(W + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{1 + \delta^2} \theta + \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2} V\right)^\top X | \tilde{\theta}, X\right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &\leq \mathbf{h}\left(W + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{1 + \delta^2} \theta + \frac{1}{1 + \delta^2} V\right)^\top X | X\right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \left(\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\delta^4}{(1 + \delta^2)^2} + \frac{\delta^2}{(1 + \delta^2)^2} \right) \|X\|_2^2 \right) \right) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \ln (2\pi e \sigma^2) \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\delta^2 \|X\|_2^2}{(1 + \delta^2) \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{d \delta^2}{(1 + \delta^2) \sigma^2} \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \ln (e^{2\epsilon}) \\
 &= \epsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from lemma 15 and (b) follows from Jensen's inequality.

Therefore, $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ and the rate-distortion function is upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) &\leq \mathbb{I}(\theta; \tilde{\theta}) \\
 &\leq \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{d}{\sigma^2 (e^{2\epsilon} - 1)} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{e^{6\mathcal{R}(1)} - 1}{e^{2\epsilon} - 1} \frac{2\pi e}{e^{2\mathbf{h}(\theta)/d}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the lower bound from Lemma 21. ■

The following results assume that $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ consists of iid 1-subgaussian and symmetric elements. Under this assumption, we can establish both upper *and lower* bounds on the rate-distortion function for linear regression. While this analysis trivially extends to the case in which θ has arbitrary mean (and is symmetric about that mean) and independent (but not necessarily identically distributed) components, for simplicity of notation, we study the zero-mean iid case.

We establish a lower bound by first finding a suitable lower bound for the distortion function. For subgaussian random vectors, the following lemma allows us to lower bound the expected KL-divergence distortion by a multiple of the mean squared error. We provide the proof for Lemma 23 and related lemmas in Appendix A.

Lemma 23. For all $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, if $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ consists of iid components each of which are 1-subgaussian and symmetric, $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{I}(Y; \theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X).$$

With this result in place, we now provide a lower bound for the rate-distortion function.

Theorem 24. (subgaussian linear regression rate-distortion lower bound) For all $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ s.t. $d > 2$, $\sigma^2 \geq 0$ and $\epsilon \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2(4d + \sigma^2)}\right]$, if $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ consists of iid components that are each 1-subgaussian and symmetric, $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \geq \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{d}{2(4d + \sigma^2)\epsilon} \right).$$

Proof Fix $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and a proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{I}(Y; \theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|X\|_2^2}{2(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ and (b) follows from Lemma 23. As a result, we have that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$ implies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2 \right] &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)} \right]} \epsilon \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[8\|X\|_2^2 + 2\sigma^2 \right] \epsilon \\ &= 2(4d + \sigma^2)\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Jensen's inequality.

Since the above condition is an implication that holds for arbitrary $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$, minimizing the rate $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ over the set of proxies that satisfy $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2 \right] \leq 2(4d + \sigma^2)\epsilon$ will provide a lower bound. However, this is simply the rate-distortion problem for a multivariate source under squared error distortion which is a well known lower bound (Theorem 10.3.3 of (Cover and Thomas, 2006)). The lower bound follows as a result. \blacksquare

Now, these results suggest the following sample complexity bounds for linear regression:

Theorem 25. For all $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ s.t. $d > 2$, $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, $\epsilon \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2(4d + \sigma^2)}\right]$, and random vectors $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ consisting of iid components that are each 1-subgaussian and symmetric, if for all t , $\mathbb{P}(X_t \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}^d$, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top x, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\frac{d}{2\epsilon} \ln \left(\frac{d}{2(4d + \sigma^2)\epsilon} \right) \leq T_\epsilon \leq \frac{d}{\epsilon} \ln \left(\frac{d}{\sigma^2\epsilon} \right)$$




Figure 4: We plot the rate-distortion upper bound from Theorem 22 for $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ and $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$ as a function of the dimension d for various levels of distortion ϵ . The plots suggest that $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) = \tilde{O}(d)$ and that rate increases as the distortion decreases. Note that since the y-axis is in log scale, the graph also suggests that the rate-distortion function has a logarithmic dependence on $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$.

Proof The result follows from Theorems 22, 24, and 14. ■

7. Deep Neural Network Environments

In this section, we will focus on characterizing the rate-distortion function, and hence the sample complexity, of different deep neural network environments. As seen in the previous section, for the analysis of rate-distortion, it suffices to restrict attention to a representative input-output pair rather than a sequence, i.e., the distortion depends on one representative input-output pair and not the sequence $((X_t, Y_{t+1}) : t \in \mathbb{Z}_+)$. We will denote this representative pair by (X, Y) . The input X is distributed $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, while the conditional distribution of the output is $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{E}, X) = \mathcal{E}(\cdot | X)$.

For environments we consider in this section, X takes values in \mathfrak{R}^d and Y take values in \mathfrak{R} , and $Y = f(X) + W$ for a random function f and random variable $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$. We assume X , f , and W are independent. The environment is produced by composing K independent and identically distributed random functions: $f = f_K \circ \dots \circ f_1$. In this sense, the environment is multilayer, with each k th layer represented by a function f_k . We denote

inputs and outputs of these functions by $U_0 = X$ and $U_k = f_k(U_{k-1})$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Hence, $Y = U_K + W$. Figure 5 illustrates the structure of such an environment.




Figure 5: A multilayer environment.

Our analysis will relate the rate-distortion function $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E})$ of the multilayer environment to that of K single-layer environments. Each such single-layer environment, which we denote by \mathcal{E}_k , takes the form $\mathcal{E}_k(\cdot|u) \sim \mathcal{N}(f_k(u), \sigma^2 I_d)$. In other words, conditioned on \mathcal{E}_k and the input U_{k-1} , the output of \mathcal{E}_k is distributed according to $U_k + W$.

To frame our results, we define a class of proxies that decompose independently across layers. Recall that an *environment proxy* of an environment \mathcal{E} is a random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ for which $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \perp H_\infty | \mathcal{E}$. Similarly, an *environment proxy* of \mathcal{E}_k is a random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ for which $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \perp H_\infty | \mathcal{E}_k$. This definition allows for dependence between the proxies across layers even though we have assumed environments to be iid across layers. To restrict attention to independent single-layer proxies, we define a *multilayer proxy* to be a tuple $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_K)$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \perp (\mathcal{E}_{-k}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{-k}, H_\infty) | \mathcal{E}_k$, where \mathcal{E}_{-k} and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{-k}$ denote tuples of single-layer environments and proxies, with the k th omitted.

7.1 Prototypical Multilayer Environments

In this section, we will provide 3 prototypical multilayer environments. We will eventually study the sample complexity of these environments. We will see that the high-level strategies for analyzing each prototypical environment will be very similar though the lower-level techniques required to prove analogous results will vary. We hope that these examples give the reader a wide enough breadth of techniques to analyze their own interesting multilayer environments.

7.1.1 PROTOTYPICAL ENVIRONMENT 1: (DEEP SIGN NETWORK)

Prototypical Environment 1 is a fully-connected feed-forward neural network with sign activation functions (refer to Figure 6). Let

$$U_1 = f_1(U_0) = \text{sign}(A^{(1)}U_0 + b^{(1)}),$$




Figure 6: Prototypical Environment 1

where $A^{(1)} \in \mathfrak{R}^{N \times d}$, $b^{(1)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$ both with independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{d}$. For $k \in \{2, \dots, K-1\}$, let

$$U_k = f_k(U_{k-1}) = \text{sign}(A^{(k)}U_{k-1} + b^{(k)}),$$

where $A^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{R}^{N \times N}$, $b^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$, both with independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$. For the final layer, let

$$U_K = f_K(U_{K-1}) = A^{(K)\top}U_{K-1},$$

where $A^{(K)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$ with independent elements, each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$. In this environment, \mathcal{E}_k is identified by $(A^{(k)}, b^{(k)})$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ and \mathcal{E}_K is identified by $A^{(K)}$. We will refer to this environment as the *deep sign network*.




Figure 7: Prototypical Environment 2

7.1.2 PROTOTYPICAL ENVIRONMENT 2: (DEEP RELU NETWORK)

Prototypical Environment 1 mirrors the architecture of fully-connected feed-forward neural networks (refer to Figure 7). Let

$$U_1 = f_1(U_0) = \text{ReLU}(A^{(1)}U_0 + b^{(1)}),$$

where $A^{(1)} \in \mathfrak{R}^{N \times d}$, $b^{(1)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$ both with independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{d}$. For $k \in \{2, \dots, K-1\}$, let

$$U_k = f_k(U_{k-1}) = \text{ReLU}(A^{(k)}U_{k-1} + b^{(k)}),$$

where $A^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{R}^{N \times N}$, $b^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$, both with independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$. For the final layer, let

$$U_K = f_K(U_{K-1}) = A^{(K)\top}U_{K-1},$$

where $A^{(K)} \in \mathfrak{R}^N$ with independent elements, each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$. In this environment, \mathcal{E}_k is identified by $(A^{(k)}, b^{(k)})$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ and \mathcal{E}_K is identified by $A^{(K)}$. We will refer to this environment as the *deep ReLU network*.




Figure 8: Prototypical Environment 3

7.1.3 PROTOTYPICAL ENVIRONMENT 3: (DEEP NONPARAMETRIC NETWORK)

Prototypical Environment 3 considers a deep neural network with potentially infinitely many weights (refer to Figure 8). For $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let

$$U_k = f_k(U_{k-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n^{(k)} g_n^{(k)}(U_{k-1}),$$

where $\alpha^{(k)} = (\alpha_1^{(k)}, \dots, \alpha_N^{(k)}) \sim \text{Dir}(N, [1, \dots, 1])$. For $k \in \{2, \dots, K-1\}$, the deterministic basis functions $g_n^{(k)}$ are maps from $\mathfrak{R}^M \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^M$. ($g_n^{(1)} : n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) are maps from $\mathfrak{R}^d \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^M$ and ($g_n^{(K)} : n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) are maps from $\mathfrak{R}^M \mapsto \mathfrak{R}$. For regularity, we will assume that for all n and k , the basis functions satisfy $\mathbb{E}[g_n^{(k)}(U_{k-1})^2] = 1$ and that

$$L = \sup_{x,y} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|f^{(k)}(x) - f^{(k)}(y)\|_2^2}{\|x - y\|_2^2} \middle| x = x, y = y \right] \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

The expectation here is taken over the randomness in the function $f^{(k)}$, i.e., the randomness in $\alpha^{(k)}$. L can be thought of as an expected squared Lipschitz constant of $f^{(k)}$. Note that this condition is also met when $f^{(k)}$ is a layer from the deep ReLU network. The set of

random functions for which $L \leq 1$ is much broader than say 1-Lipschitz functions because of both the square and the expectation. For example, $f(x) = Ax$ is $\|A\|_2$ -Lipschitz but if say $\text{cov}[A] = I_n$, then $L = 1$.

\mathcal{E}_k is identified by $\alpha^{(k)}$. We will refer to this environment ($\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$) as the *deep nonparametric network*. For intractably large N , f_k is effectively nonparametric. In this regime, parameter count becomes a vacuous description of the data generating process's complexity. However, the complexity is still controlled by the fact that $\alpha_n \geq 0$ and $\sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n = 1$ due to the Dirichlet prior. We will establish rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds that are actually *independent* of N and M .

7.2 Rate Distortion Bounds for Single-Layer Environments

In this section, we will provide rate-distortion bounds for a single-layer version of each of our 3 prototypical environments. These bounds will eventually be useful for analyzing the rate-distortion function for *multilayer* environments.

We begin with a rate-distortion bound for a single-layer sign neural network environment. A proof of this result can be found in Appendix B.1

Theorem 26. (single-layer sign neural network rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\epsilon \in \left[0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt[4]{(N+1)N^4}\right)$, if \mathcal{E}_k is identified by (A, b) where $A : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ s.t. each row $A_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, $b : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ is distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$, and $Y = \text{sign}(AX + b)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(\frac{N}{\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

For the sign feed-forward neural network, we notice that the single-layer rate-distortion bound is quadratic in N or equivalently, linear in the parameter count.

We show an analogous rate-distortion bound for single-layer ReLU neural network environments. The proof may be found in Appendix B.2

Theorem 27. (single-layer relu neural network rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if \mathcal{E}_k is identified by (A, b) where $A : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, $b : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ both consist of independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$, $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ is a random vector with covariance I_N , and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{ReLU}(AX + b), \sigma^2 I_N)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(\frac{N}{2\sigma^2\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

Finally, we show the rate-distortion bound for the single-layer nonparametric neural network environments. The proof may be found in Appendix B.3

Theorem 28. (single-layer nonparametric rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, M \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if \mathcal{E} is identified by α where $\alpha \sim \text{Dir}(N, [1, \dots, 1])$ and*

$$f(X) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n g_n(X),$$

for deterministic basis functions (g_1, \dots, g_N) mapping $\mathfrak{R}^M \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^M$ that satisfy $\mathbb{E}[g_n(X)^2] = 1$ for random vector $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^N$, and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(f(X), \sigma^2 I_M)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2\epsilon}.$$

Note that the rate-distortion bound here is actually independent of both N and M . The rate-distortion function is able to capture the fact that while the function f can have arbitrarily many parameters N , the simplex constraint $\alpha \sim \text{Dir}(N, [1, \dots, 1])$ fundamentally limits its complexity.

7.3 From Single to Multilayer Environments




Figure 9: The error incurred by a multilayer proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}$ measures the difference between true output Y and the prediction \tilde{Y} (shown in red box). This difference is the result of error that builds up through layers of the environment (denoted by red dotted outline).

We are now interested in analyzing the *depth* dependence of the rate-distortion and sample complexity of these environments. For *multilayer* environments, it quickly becomes clear that error is more cumbersome to reason about. Figure 9 depicts the error incurred by using a multilayer proxy $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ to approximate multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$. Evidently, it seems tricky to reason about the error propagation through the layers of the environment. Many traditional lines of analysis struggle on this front and result in sample complexity bounds that are exponential in the depth of the network [Bartlett et al. \(2017\)](#), [Golowich et al. \(2018\)](#). The techniques in these papers consider a worst-case reasoning under which an ϵ error between the first outputs U_1 and \tilde{U}_1 may blow up to a $\lambda^K \epsilon$ error when passed through remaining layers of the network (where λ is a spectral radius).

It would be much simpler to instead independently analyze the incremental error incurred at each stage of the network. Figure 10 depicts this. We consider that at each layer, we know the true input U_{k-1} and simply measure the immediate error incurred at the output U_k as opposed to the error incurred at the final output of the network Y .




Figure 10: A much easier system to analyze is one in which we measure the incremental error at each stage of the multilayer environment. If each layer incurs an error of $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$, the total error incurred will be ϵ . Note that the inputs to each layer are correctly specified in this system. We show that in many cases, analyzing the error of this system upper bounds the error of the system in Figure 9.

Mathematically, the error incurred by the full system from using proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}$ can be expressed as $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_{K:1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, X)$. By the chain rule, we have that

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_{K:1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, X) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X). \quad (3)$$

Therefore, the error incurred from layer k can be expressed as $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X)$. This is cumbersome as we are not given the true input U_{k-1} but rather an approximation from input X and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}$. Furthermore, we are measuring the error in the *final* output Y as opposed to the *immediate* output U_k . It would be much more simple to analyze something like the following:

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}), \quad (4)$$

where W is independent 0-mean gaussian noise with variance σ^2 in each dimension. This sum is much easier to work with because the k th term only depends on $\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}$, and U_k . There is no inter-layer dependence.

The key insight is that in our prototypical environments (and many others), something *akin* to the following will hold:

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}). \quad (5)$$

As a result, the cumbersome sum 3 will be *upper bounded* by the nice sum 4.

The condition in inequality 5 involves two parts:

1. $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$

- Conditioning on the true input U_{k-1} provides more information about \mathcal{E}_k than conditioning on an approximation $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}, X)$.

$$2. \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) \leq \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$$

- The immediate output $U_k + W$ provides more information about \mathcal{E}_k than the final output Y does.

1) holds for all proxies of the form $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_K)$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i \perp \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j$ for $i \neq j$. We prove this result explicitly in Lemma 29. It is rather intuitive that the pristine data pair (U_{k-1}, Y) would provide more information about \mathcal{E}_k than $(U_0, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}, Y)$ would. We expect some information to be lost through the noisy reconstruction of U_{k-1} from $U_0, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}$.

2) will not hold exactly for our environments. $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1})$ will not always be $\leq \mathbb{I}(U_k + W, \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_k, U_{k-1})$. For our sign neural network, the data processing inequality gives the following adequate upper bound:

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) \leq \mathbb{I}(U_k, \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_k, U_{k-1}),$$

which we show in Lemma 30.

However, for the relu and nonparametric deep networks, a slightly modified result can be show. In these two environments, $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1})$ will be \leq a very natural upper bound of $\mathbb{I}(U_k + W, \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_k, U_{k-1})$, which we detail in Lemma 31. Intuitively $U_k + W$ will provide more information about \mathcal{E}_k than Y so long as in expectation, the layers f_{k+1}, \dots, f_K don't amplify the scale of the output. If they were to amplify the scale, then the signal to noise ratio of Y would look more favorable than that of $U_k + W$, leading to potentially more information. This is precisely why in equation 2, we make the assumption that $L \leq 1$ where again,

$$L = \sup_{x,y} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|f^{(k)}(x) - f^{(k)}(y)\|_2^2}{\|x - y\|_2^2} \middle| x = x, y = y \right].$$

We will begin by addressing 1), The following result holds across all three (and many other) multilayer environments. It states that more information about \mathcal{E}_k is acquired when conditioning on the true input U_{k-1} (as in Figure 10) as opposed to an approximation that depends on X and proxies $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}$.

Lemma 29. (more is learned with the true input) *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}$ be a multilayer proxy. Then, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$,*

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}).$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}, X, Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) - \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}, X | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{j-1:1}, X, Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) + \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1}, X | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, Y) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) + \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \mathcal{E}_{k-1:1}, X | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, Y) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \mathcal{E}_{k-1:1}, X, Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{k-1:1}, X) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; Y | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{E}_k \perp \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1} | (X, Y, \mathcal{E}_{k-1:1})$ and the data processing inequality, (b) follows from the fact that $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \mathcal{E}_{k-1:1}, X | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) = 0$, and (c) follows from the fact that $Y \perp (\mathcal{E}_{k-1:1}, X) | U_{k-1}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 29 states that we learn more information about \mathcal{E}_k when we are given the true input U_{k-1} than when we are given $(X, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k-1:1})$ and have to infer U_{k-1} . This is intuitive as we should be able to recover more about \mathcal{E}_k when we observe its input exactly.

To prove 2), that the immediate output U_k provides more information about \mathcal{E}_k than does Y , slightly different analysis techniques will be necessary across the different environments. In essence, we expect a result like 2) to hold as a result of the data-processing inequality. No amount of post-processing of U_k into (Y) can increase the amount of available information conveyed about \mathcal{E}_k .

We begin with the most simple result which holds for prototypical environment 1 (sign neural networks).

Lemma 30. (deep sign network data processing inequality) *For all $d, N, K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, and $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, if multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is the sign neural network with input $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ and output $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(U_K, \sigma^2)$, then for any proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$,*

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) \leq \mathbb{I}(U_k; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}).$$

Proof The result follows from the fact that $\mathcal{E}_k \perp Y | (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_k)$ and the data processing inequality. \blacksquare

prototypical environment 1 is special in the fact that outputs U_k for $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ take values in a finite set $\{0, 1\}^N$. As a result, we can directly apply the data processing inequality without adding any noise to U_k . For prototypical environments 2 and 3, for which U_k take values in $\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^N$ respectively, we cannot directly apply the data processing inequality here. This is because $\mathbb{I}(U_k; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) = \infty$ in this case because observing a noiseless sample conveys infinitely many bits about \mathcal{E}_k .

For the deep relu network and deep nonparametric networks, we have the following analogous result:

Lemma 31. For all $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $(N_0, N_1, \dots, N_K) \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}^{K+1}$, and $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, if $N_K = 1$, and multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ consists of single-layer environments \mathcal{E}_k that each identify a random function $f^{(k)}$ from $\mathfrak{R}^{N_{k-1}} \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^{N_k}$ for which

$$L^{(k)} = \sup_{x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^{N_{k-1}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|f^{(k)}(x) - f^{(k)}(y)\|_2^2}{\|x - y\|_2^2} \middle| x = x, y = y \right] \leq 1,$$

and

$$U_k = \begin{cases} X & k = 0 \\ f^{(k)}(U_{k-1}) & 1 \leq k \leq K \end{cases}$$

with $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(U_K, \sigma^2)$, then for any proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$,

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\|U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]\|_2^2 \right]}{\sigma^2} \right)$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) &= \mathbf{h}(Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) - \mathbf{h}(Y | \mathcal{E}_K : k, U_{k-1}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(Y | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1}) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\ &= \mathbf{h} \left(Y - (f_K \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})(\mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]) | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, U_{k-1} \right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\ &\leq \mathbf{h} \left(Y - (f_K \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})(\mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]) \right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{V} \left[U_K - (f_K \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})(\mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]) \right]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(U_K - (f_K \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})(\mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]))^2 \right]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=k+1}^K L^{(i)} \left\| U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}] \right\|^2 \right]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}] \right\|^2 \right]}{\sigma^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

■

The rate distortion bounds in Theorems 26, 27, and 28 are actually evaluated with $\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]\|_2^2]}{\sigma^2} \right)$ as the distortion. This is possible because for continuous

Y , the above expression is always an upper bound for $\mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$ based on principles of maximum differential entropy. This will allow us to bound the rate-distortion function for each multilayer environment with respect to the aforementioned single-layer rate distortion bounds. We provide these results in the following subsection.

7.4 Sample Complexity Bounds for Multilayer Environments

With the results established in the subsection 7.3, we can now present the main rate-distortion and sample-complexity results for our 3 multilayer environments.

We first present rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds for the deep sign network.

Theorem 32. (deep sign network rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds)

For all $d, N, K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is the deep sign network with input $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $\text{cov}[X] = I_d$ and output $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(U_K, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(KN^2 + dN), \quad T_\epsilon = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{KN^2 + dN}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof By Lemma 30 and Theorem 41, for $d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) = \mathbb{I}(U_k; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$, we have that

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d),$$

where $\mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d)$ denotes the rate-distortion function for random variable \mathcal{E}_k under distortion function $d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d) \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^{K-1} \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d) + \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_1, d) + \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_K, d) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathcal{O}\left((K-2)N^2 \ln\left(\frac{NK}{\epsilon}\right) + dN \ln\left(\frac{dK}{\epsilon}\right) + N \ln\left(\frac{K}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(KN^2 \ln\left(\frac{NK}{\epsilon}\right) + dN \ln\left(\frac{dK}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(KN^2 + dN), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Theorem 41 and (b) follows from Theorem 26, The sample complexity result follows from Theorem 14. ■

This result agrees with the classical VC-dimension based sample complexity bounds of (Baum and Haussler, 1988) that state that the VC-dimension for scalar-output sign neural networks are $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{W}|}{\epsilon} \log \frac{|\mathcal{N}|}{\epsilon}\right)$ where \mathcal{W} denotes the set of neural network weights (in our case $|\mathcal{W}| = KN^2$) and \mathcal{N} the set of neural network nodes (in our case $|\mathcal{N}| = NK$).

Next, we have the rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds for deep ReLU networks.

Theorem 33. (deep relu network rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds)

For all $d, N, K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is the deep ReLU network with input $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $\text{cov}[X] = I_d$ and output $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(U_K, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) = \tilde{O}(KN^2 + dN), \quad T_\epsilon = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{KN^2 + dN}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof By Lemma 31 and Theorem 41, for

$$d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]\|_2^2]}{\sigma^2} \right),$$

we have that

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d),$$

where $\mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d)$ denotes the rate-distortion function for random variable \mathcal{E}_k under distortion function $d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)$. Furthermore, distortion used in the proof of Theorem 27 is exactly $d(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\epsilon, d}(\mathcal{E}_k, d) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathcal{O} \left((K-2)N^2 \ln \left(\frac{NK}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \right) + dN \ln \left(\frac{dK}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \right) + N \ln \left(\frac{NK}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \right) \right) \\ &= \tilde{O}(KN^2 + dN). \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Theorem 27. The sample complexity result follows from applying Theorem 14. \blacksquare

These sample complexity bounds show that in order to incur ϵ error, the optimal posterior predictive will need at most $\mathcal{O}(KN^2 \ln(\frac{NK}{\epsilon}))$ samples on average. This improves upon the prior results of (Bartlett et al., 1998; Harvey et al., 2017) which prescribe an $\tilde{O}(K^2N^2)$ dependence.

Finally, we have the rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds for deep nonparametric networks.

Theorem 34. (deep nonparametric network rate-distortion and sample complexity bounds)

For all $d, N, M, K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if multilayer environment $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is the deep nonparametric network with input $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ and output $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(U_K, \sigma^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) \leq \frac{K^2}{2\sigma^2\epsilon}, \quad T_\epsilon \leq 2 \left(\frac{K}{\sigma\epsilon} \right)^2.$$

Proof By Lemma 31 and Theorem 41, for

$$d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|U_k - \mathbb{E}[U_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}]\|_2^2]}{\sigma^2} \right),$$

we have that

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d),$$

where $\mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d)$ denotes the rate-distortion function for random variable \mathcal{E}_k under distortion function $d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)$. Furthermore, distortion used in the proof of Theorem 28 is exactly $d(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\epsilon, d}(\mathcal{E}_k, d) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{K}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{K^2}{2\sigma^2\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Theorem 28. The sample complexity result follows from applying Theorem 14. \blacksquare

We see that the sample complexity is independent of the input dimension or the hidden layer width (N) and the dependence on depth is only quadratic.

8. Closing Remarks

We have introduced a novel and elegant information-theoretic framework for analyzing the sample complexity of data generating processes. We demonstrate its usefulness by proving two new theoretical results that suggests that it is possible to learn efficiently from data generated by deep and nonparametric functions.

Beyond the scope of this paper, we believe that the flexibility and simplicity of our framework will allow for the analysis of machine learning systems such as semi-supervised learning, multitask learning, bandits and reinforcement learning. We also believe that many of the nuances of empirical deep learning such as batch-normalization, pooling, and structured input distributions can be analyzed through the average-case nature of information theory and powerful tools such as the data processing inequality.

Notably omitted from this paper is any analysis of practical learning algorithms. We have assumed perfect Bayesian inference, while in practice, particular neural network architectures are used together with stochastic gradient descent. Whether practical algorithms of this sort can achieve sample complexity bounds similar to what we have established for our multilayer environments remains an interesting subject for future research. Our discussion of suboptimal algorithms and misspecification in section 3.2 provide some starting points for such a pursuit. Additionally, the exciting advances in uncertainty quantification for neural networks from Osband et al. (2021) may provide a practical algorithm that can be analyzed under our framework.

References

- Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Behnam Neyshabur, and Yi Zhang. Stronger generalization bounds for deep nets via a compression approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 254–263. PMLR, 2018.
- Peter Bartlett, Dylan Foster, and Matus Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30:6241–6250, 2017.
- Peter L Bartlett, Vitaly Maiorov, and Ron Meir. Almost linear vc-dimension bounds for piecewise polynomial networks. *Neural computation*, 10(8):2159–2173, 1998.
- Eric Baum and David Haussler. What size net gives valid generalization? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 1, 1988.
- Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory (Wiley Series in Telecommunications and Signal Processing)*. Wiley-Interscience, USA, 2006. ISBN 0471241954.
- Gintare Karolina Dziugaite and Daniel M Roy. Computing nonvacuous generalization bounds for deep (stochastic) neural networks with many more parameters than training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.11008*, 2017.
- Noah Golowich, Alexander Rakhlin, and Ohad Shamir. Size-independent sample complexity of neural networks. In Sébastien Bubeck, Vianney Perchet, and Philippe Rigollet, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 297–299. PMLR, 06–09 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v75/golowich18a.html>.
- Nick Harvey, Christopher Liaw, and Abbas Mehrabian. Nearly-tight VC-dimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. In Satyen Kale and Ohad Shamir, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 65 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1064–1068. PMLR, 07–10 Jul 2017. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v65/harvey17a.html>.
- David Haussler. Decision theoretic generalizations of the pac model for neural net and other learning applications. *Information and Computation*, 100(1):78–150, 1992. ISSN 0890-5401. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(92\)90010-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(92)90010-D). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/089054019290010D>.
- David Haussler, Michael Kearns, and Robert E Schapire. Bounds on the sample complexity of Bayesian learning using information theory and the VC dimension. *Machine learning*, 14(1):83–113, 1994.
- Rico Jonschkowski, Sebastian Höfer, and Oliver Brock. Patterns for learning with side information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06429*, 2015.

- Xiuyuan Lu, Benjamin Van Roy, Vikranth Dwaracherla, Morteza Ibrahimi, Ian Osband, and Zheng Wen. Reinforcement learning, bit by bit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04047*, 2021.
- Vaishnavh Nagarajan and Zico Kolter. Deterministic PAC-Bayesian generalization bounds for deep networks via generalizing noise-resilience. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. In search of the real inductive bias: On the role of implicit regularization in deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6614*, 2014.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. Norm-based capacity control in neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1376–1401. PMLR, 2015.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, and Nathan Srebro. A PAC-Bayesian approach to spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Matthew Norkleby, Ahmad Beirami, and Robert Calderbank. Rate-distortion bounds on bayes risk in supervised learning. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2099–2103, 2016. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.2016.7541669.
- Ian Osband, Zheng Wen, Mohammad Asghari, Morteza Ibrahimi, Xiyuan Lu, and Benjamin Van Roy. Epistemic neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.08924*, 2021.
- Daniel Russo and James Zou. How much does your data exploration overfit? controlling bias via information usage. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(1):302–323, 2019.
- Ravid Shwartz-Ziv and Naftali Tishby. Opening the black box of deep neural networks via information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00810*, 2017.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Naftali Tishby, Fernando C Pereira, and William Bialek. The information bottleneck method. *arXiv preprint physics/0004057*, 2000.
- Colin Wei and Tengyu Ma. Data-dependent sample complexity of deep neural networks via lipschitz augmentation. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/0e79548081b4bd0df3c77c5ba2c23289-Paper.pdf>.
- Aolin Xu and Maxim Raginsky. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07809*, 2017.

Appendix A. Proofs of linear regression rate-distortion lower bounds

We now introduce a lemma relating expected KL divergence to mean-squared error, a distortion measure that is prevalent in the literature. This relation will allow us to derive a lower bound for the rate-distortion function in the Gaussian linear regression setting.

Lemma 35. *For all $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, if $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ has iid components that are each ν^2 -subgaussian and symmetric, $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X, \sigma^2)$, then for all proxies $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}$, $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is $4\nu^2\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2$ -subgaussian conditioned on X .*

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X])} \middle| X \right] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\theta, X])} \middle| X \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(\mathbb{E}[Y|\theta, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X])} \middle| X \right] \\
 &= e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda((\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\theta}])^\top X)} \middle| X \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda(\theta^\top X)} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda(\theta^\top X)} \middle| \tilde{\theta}, X \right] \middle| X \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda(\theta^\top X)} \middle| \tilde{\theta}, X]^2 \middle| X \right] \\
 &\leq e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [e^{-2\lambda(\theta^\top X)} \middle| \tilde{\theta}, X] \middle| X \right] \\
 &= e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-2\lambda(\theta^\top X)} \middle| X \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{=} e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}} e^{2\lambda^2 \nu^2 \|X\|_2^2} \\
 &= e^{\frac{\lambda^2 (\sigma^2 + 4\nu^2 \|X\|_2^2)}{2}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\theta, X] = W$ which is independent from $\mathbb{E}[Y|\theta, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$, (b) follows from the fact that $\theta^\top X$ is symmetric conditioned on X and Jensen's inequality, (c) follows from $e^{\theta^\top X} = \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta^\top X} | \theta, \tilde{\theta}, X]$, and (d) follows from the fact that the components of θ are ν^2 -subgaussian. \blacksquare

Lemma 36. *If $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is ν^2 -subgaussian conditional on X , then for all $\alpha > 1$, $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is $\alpha\nu^2$ -subgaussian conditional on $(\tilde{\theta}, X)$.*

Proof Assume that for some $\alpha > 1$, there exists an event \mathcal{S} s.t. $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}) > 0$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$ implies that $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is not $\alpha\nu^2$ -subgaussian conditional on $(\tilde{\theta}, X)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X])} \middle| X \right] &\geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X])} \middle| \tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}, X \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{>} e^{\ln \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S})} \cdot e^{\frac{\alpha \lambda^2 \nu^2}{2}} \\
 &= e^{\frac{\lambda^2 (\alpha \nu^2 + \frac{2}{\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}))}{2}} \\
 &= e^{\frac{\lambda^2 (\nu^2 + (\alpha - 1)\nu^2 + \frac{2}{\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}))}{2}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds for all λ s.t. $|\lambda| \geq |\lambda^*|$ for some λ^* . Such λ^* exists because of the fact that $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$ implies that $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is not $\alpha\nu^2$ -subgaussian conditioned on $(\tilde{\theta}, X)$. As a result, for λ such that $\lambda^2 > \max\left\{\frac{2\ln\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S})}{(1-\alpha)\nu^2}, \lambda_*^2\right\}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X])} | X\right] > e^{\frac{\lambda^2\nu^2}{2}},$$

which is a contradiction since $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is ν^2 -subgaussian conditional on X . Therefore the assumption that there exists $\alpha > 1$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ s.t. is not $\alpha\nu^2$ -subgaussian conditional on $(X, \tilde{\theta})$ cannot be true. The result follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 37. *If $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$ is ν^2 -subgaussian conditioned on $(\tilde{\theta}, X)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\mathbb{E}[Y|\theta, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]\right)^2}{2\nu^2}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, X) \| \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\theta}, X))\right].$$

Proof We begin by stating a variational form of the KL-divergence. For all probability distributions P and Q over \mathfrak{R} such that P is absolutely continuous with respect to Q ,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(P \| Q) = \sup_{g: \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}} \left(\int_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} g(y) P(dy) - \ln \int_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} e^{g(y)} Q(dy) \right),$$

where the supremum is taken over measurable functions for which $\int_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} g(y) P(dy)$ is well-defined and $\int_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} e^{g(y)} Q(dy)$ is finite.

Let $P = \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, X_t)$, $Q = \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\theta}, X)$, and $Z = Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\theta}, X]$. Then, for arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, applying the variational form of KL-divergence with $g(Y) = \lambda Z$ gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, X) \| \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\theta}, X)) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, \tilde{\theta}, X) \| \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\theta}, X)) \\ &\geq \lambda \mathbb{E}\left[Z | \theta, \tilde{\theta}, X\right] - \ln \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda Z} | \tilde{\theta}, X\right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \lambda \left(\mathbb{E}[Y | \theta, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y | \tilde{\theta}, X] \right) - \frac{\lambda^2 \nu^2}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from $Y \perp \tilde{\theta} | (\theta, X)$ and (b) follows from Z being ν^2 -subgaussian conditioned on $(\tilde{\theta}, X)$. Since the above holds for arbitrary λ , maximizing the RHS w.r.t λ give us:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, X) \| \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\theta}, X)) \geq \frac{\left(\mathbb{E}[Y | \theta, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y | \tilde{\theta}, X]\right)^2}{2\nu^2}.$$

The result follows from taking an expectation on both sides. \blacksquare

We now provide the proof of Lemma 23 from the main text.

Lemma 23. *For all $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, if $\theta : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^d$ consists of iid components each of which are 1-subgaussian and symmetric, $\mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and if $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X, \sigma^2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)}\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2\right] \leq \mathbb{I}(Y; \theta|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X).$$

Proof $\theta^\top X$ is $\|X\|_2^2$ -subgaussian conditioned on X and by Lemma 35, $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X] \mid \|X\|_2^2$ is $4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2$ -subgaussian. Lemma 36 then states that $Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X]$ is $\alpha(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)$ -subgaussian conditioned on $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X)$ for all $\alpha > 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{d}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \theta, X) \| \mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X)) \right] &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left((\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}])^\top X \right)^2 \right]}{2\alpha(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2(4\|X\|_2^2 + \sigma^2)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta - \mathbb{E}[\theta | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}]\|_2^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 37 and (b) follows from the fact that $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. \blacksquare

Appendix B. Proofs of single-layer rate-distortion bounds

B.1 Proof of single-layer Sign Neural Network Results

Lemma 38. (error bounds on predicting layer outputs) *For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, if a is distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$, $Y = \text{sign}(a^\top X)$, and $\tilde{a} = a + V$ where $V \perp a$ and $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \epsilon^2 I_N)$, then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(Y \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{a}^\top X) | X \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N}{N + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}}}.$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{\theta}^\top X) | X) &= \int_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \mathbb{P}(\text{sign}(\bar{a}^\top X) \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{a}^\top X)) d\mathbb{P}(a = \bar{a}) \\ &= \int_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(|V^\top X| > |\bar{a}^\top X|) d\mathbb{P}(a = \bar{a}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \int_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{(\bar{a}^\top X)^2}{2\epsilon^2\|X\|_2^2}} d\mathbb{P}(a = \bar{a}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{\sqrt{M^N}}{2\sqrt{(2\pi)^N}} \int_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{(\bar{a}^\top X)^2}{2\epsilon^2\|X\|_2^2}} e^{-\frac{M\bar{a}^\top \bar{a}}{2}} d\lambda(\bar{a}) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{M^N}}{2\sqrt{(2\pi)^N}} \int_{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{\bar{a}^\top (XX^\top + M\epsilon^2\|X\|_2^2 I_d) \bar{a}}{2\epsilon^2\|X\|_2^2}} d\lambda(\bar{a}) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{\sqrt{M^N}}{2\sqrt{(2\pi)^N}} \sqrt{(2\pi)^N \frac{1}{|MI_N + \frac{XX^\top}{\epsilon^2\|X\|_2^2}|}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N}{N + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}}} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $V^\top X$ is $\epsilon^2 \|X\|_2^2$ -subgaussian conditional on X , (b) follows from the fact that $a \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, and (c) follows from an evaluation of the Gaussian integral. \blacksquare

With this result, we will establish a rate-distortion bound for a single layer sign neural network.

Theorem 26. (single-layer sign neural network rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\epsilon \in \left[0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt[4]{(N+1)N^4}\right)$, if \mathcal{E}_k is identified by (A, b) where $A : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ s.t. each row $A_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, $b : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ is distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{N}I_N)$, $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$, and $Y = \text{sign}(AX + b)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(\frac{N}{\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

Proof We denote by A_i, b_i the i th row of A, b respectively. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k = (\tilde{A}, \tilde{b})$ where $\tilde{A} = A + V$ where $V \perp A$ and $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2 I_d)$ and likewise $\tilde{b} = b + Z$ where $Z \perp b$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2)$. $\delta^2 = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\epsilon}{N}\right)^{\frac{4}{9}} - 1}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) &= \mathbb{I}(A; \tilde{A}) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\tilde{A}) - \mathbf{h}(\tilde{A}|A) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\ &= \frac{N^2}{2} \ln\left(2\pi e \left(\delta^2 + \frac{1}{N}\right)\right) - \mathbf{h}(V) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\ &= \frac{N^2}{2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2}\right) + \frac{N}{2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(\frac{9(N+1)N^4}{4\epsilon^4} + 1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(N^2 \ln\left(\frac{N}{\epsilon}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now verify that our choice of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfies the distortion constraint:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, X) &= \mathbb{I}(Y; A, b | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) \\
 &= \mathbb{H}(Y | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) \\
 &= N \mathbb{H}(Y_i | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) \\
 &= N \mathbb{H}(Y_i | \tilde{A}_i, \tilde{b}_i, S_i, X) \\
 &= N \mathbb{H}(Y_i - \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X \tilde{b}_i) | \tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{b}_i, S_i, X) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} N \mathbb{H}(Y_i - \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X \tilde{b}_i) | X) \\
 &= N \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \{-2, 0, 2\}} \mathbb{P}(Y_i - \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) = j | X) \ln \mathbb{P}(Y_i - \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) = j | X) \right] \\
 &= -N \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(Y_i \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) | X) \ln \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_i \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) | X)}{2} \right) \right] \\
 &\quad - N \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(Y_i = \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) | X) \ln \left(\mathbb{P}(Y_i = \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) | X) \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[N \sqrt{3 \mathbb{P}(Y_i \neq \text{sign}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X) | X)} \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} N \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{N+1}{N+1+\frac{1}{\delta^2}} \right)^{1/4} \\
 &\leq \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that conditioning reduces entropy, (b) follows from the fact that $-x \ln \frac{x}{2} - (1-x) \ln(1-x) \leq \sqrt{3x}$ for $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and (c) follows from Lemma 38. \blacksquare

B.2 Proof of single-layer ReLU Neural Network Results

Theorem 27. (single-layer relu neural network rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if \mathcal{E}_k is identified by (A, b) where $A : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, b : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ both consist of independent elements each with variance $\frac{1}{N}$, $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ is a random vector with covariance I_N , and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{ReLU}(AX + b), \sigma^2 I_N)$, then*

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{O} \left(N^2 \ln \left(\frac{N}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \right) \right).$$

Proof We use A_i, b_i to denote the i th rows of A, b respectively. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k = (\tilde{A}, \tilde{b})$ where $\tilde{A} = A + V$ where $V \perp A$ and $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2 I_d)$ and likewise $\tilde{b} = b + Z$ where $Z \perp b$ and

$Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2)$. $\delta^2 = \frac{\sigma^2 \left(e^{\frac{2\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon}{N}} - 1 \right)}{N+1}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) &= \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &= \mathbb{I}(A; \tilde{A}) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\
 &\leq \mathbf{h}(\tilde{A}) - \mathbf{h}(\tilde{A}|A) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\
 &= \frac{N^2}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \left(\delta^2 + \frac{1}{N} \right) \right) - \mathbf{h}(V) + \mathbb{I}(b; \tilde{b}) \\
 &= \frac{N^2}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2} \right) + \frac{N}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2} \right) \\
 &\leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2} \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{O} \left(N^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{N\delta^2} \right) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{O} \left(N^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2 \left(e^{\frac{2\mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon}{N}} - 1 \right)} \right) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{O} \left(N^2 \ln \left(\frac{N}{2\sigma^2 \mathcal{R}(1)\epsilon} \right) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

We now verify that our choice of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfies the distortion constraint:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, X) &= \mathbb{I}(Y; A, b | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) \\
 &= \mathbf{h}(Y | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) - \mathbf{h}(Y | A, b, S, X) \\
 &= N \left(\mathbf{h}(Y_i | \tilde{A}, \tilde{b}, S, X) - \mathbf{h}(Y_i | A, b, S, X) \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} N \left(\mathbf{h}(Y_i | \tilde{A}_i, \tilde{b}_i, S_i, X) - \mathbf{h}(W_i) \right) \\
 &= N \left(\mathbf{h}(Y_i - \text{ReLU}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X + \tilde{b}_i) | \tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{b}_i, S_i, X) - \mathbf{h}(W_i) \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} N \left(\mathbf{h}(Y_i - \text{ReLU}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X + \tilde{b}_i) | X) - \mathbf{h}(W_i) \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[N \left(\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \left(\sigma^2 + \mathbb{V}[\text{ReLU}(A_i^\top X + b_i) - \text{ReLU}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X + \tilde{b}_i) | X] \right) \right) - \mathbf{h}(W_i) \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{N}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{V}[\text{ReLU}(A_i^\top X + b_i) - \text{ReLU}(\tilde{A}_i^\top X + \tilde{b}_i)]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \frac{N}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{V}[A_i^\top X + b_i - \tilde{A}_i^\top X + \tilde{b}_i]}{\sigma^2} \right) \\
 &= \frac{N}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{(N+1)\delta^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \\
 &= \epsilon \mathcal{R}(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where in (a), $W_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, (b) follows from the fact that conditioning reduces entropy, (c) follows from Lemma 15, (d) follows from Jensen's Inequality, and (e) follows from the fact that for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$, $(\text{ReLU}(x) - \text{ReLU}(y))^2 \leq (x - y)^2$. ■

B.3 Proofs of single-layer Nonparametric Neural Network Results

Theorem 28. (single-layer nonparametric rate-distortion bound) *For all $N, M \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if \mathcal{E} is identified by α where $\alpha \sim \text{Dir}(N, [1, \dots, 1])$ and*

$$f(X) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n g_n(X),$$

for deterministic basis functions (g_1, \dots, g_N) mapping $\mathfrak{R}^M \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^M$ that satisfy $\mathbb{E}[g_n(X)^2] = 1$ for random vector $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^M$, and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(f(X), \sigma^2 I_M)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2\epsilon}.$$

Proof Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = (h_1, \dots, h_C)$ for $C = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[f(X)^2]}{\sigma^2 M \left(e^{\frac{2\epsilon}{M}} - 1 \right)}$ and where for all $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$,

$$h_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \left\{ g_n \quad w.p \alpha_n \right\}.$$

The distortion of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(f(X) + W; \mathcal{E} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) &= \mathbf{h}(f(X) + W | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X) - \mathbf{h}(f(X) + W | \mathcal{E}, X) \\
 &= \mathbf{h} \left(f(X) - \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C h_i(X) + W \middle| \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X \right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{h} \left(f(X) - \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C h_i(X) + W \right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &\leq \frac{M}{2} \ln \left(2\pi e \left(\sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\left\| f(X) - \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C h_i(X) \right\|^2}{M} \right] \right) \right) - \mathbf{h}(W) \\
 &= \frac{M}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| f(X) - \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C h_i(X) \right\|^2 \right]}{\sigma^2 M} \right) \\
 &= \frac{M}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1+(C-1)\|f(X)\|^2}{C} - \|f(X)\|^2 \right]}{\sigma^2 M} \right) \\
 &= \frac{M}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-\|f(X)\|^2}{C} \right]}{\sigma^2 M} \right) \\
 &= \epsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 15.

We now upper bound the rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(\alpha; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) &= \mathbb{I}(\alpha; (h_1, \dots, h_C)) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C\mathbb{I}(\alpha; g_1) \\
 &= C(\mathbf{h}(\alpha) - \mathbf{h}(\alpha|g_1)) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} C\left(\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(1)^N}{\Gamma(N)}\right) - \ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(1)^{N-1}\Gamma(2)}{\Gamma(N+1)}\right) - \psi(N+2) + \psi(2)\right) \\
 &= C\left(\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(N+1)}{\Gamma(N)}\right) - \sum_{i=2}^N \frac{1}{i}\right) \\
 &\leq C(\ln(N) - (\ln(N+1) - 1)) \\
 &\leq C\left(1 + \ln\frac{N}{N+1}\right) \\
 &\leq C \\
 &= \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[f(X)^2]}{\sigma^2 M(e^{\frac{2}{M}\epsilon} - 1)} \\
 &\leq \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[f(X)^2]}{2\sigma^2\epsilon} \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2\epsilon},
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 8 and (b) follows from the differential entropy of a Dirichlet random variable and the fact that g_1 is categorical (hence $\alpha|g_1$ is also Dirichlet). The result follows. \blacksquare

Appendix C. Proofs of multilayer data processing inequalities

Lemma 39. *For all real-valued random variables X , $\mathbb{V}[\text{ReLU}(X)] \leq \mathbb{V}[X]$.*

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{V}[X] &= \mathbb{E}[X^2] - \mathbb{E}[X]^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}[\text{ReLU}(X)^2] - \mathbb{E}[X]^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}[\text{ReLU}(X)^2] - \mathbb{E}[\text{ReLU}(X)]^2 \\
 &= \mathbb{V}[\text{ReLU}(X)]
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $x^2 \geq \text{ReLU}(x)^2$ and (b) follows from the fact that for all $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\text{ReLU}(x) \geq x$. \blacksquare

Lemma 40. (multilayer distortion bound) For all $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, if $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is a multilayer environment and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}$ is a multilayer proxy for which

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}),$$

then

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_{K:1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, X) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}).$$

Proof We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_{K:1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, U_0) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, U_0) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, U_0) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}), \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(U_k + W; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the chain rule of mutual information, (b) follows from the fact that $(U_k + W) \perp \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:k+1} | (U_0, \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1})$, (c) follows from Lemma 29, and (d) follows the assumption of the lemma statement. \blacksquare

Lemma 40 demonstrates that for the multilayer processes that we consider in this paper, the distortion incurred by multilayer proxy $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}$ is upper bounded by the total distortion of each single-layer proxy conditioned on the true input.

Theorem 41. multilayer rate-distortion bound For all $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $\sigma^2, \epsilon \geq 0$, if $\mathcal{E}_{K:1}$ is a multilayer environment such that there exists a real-valued function d s.t. for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $\delta \geq 0$, there exist $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) \leq \delta,$$

where $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, then

$$\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}_{K:1}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d),$$

where $\mathbb{H}_\epsilon(\mathcal{E}, d)$ is the rate-distortion function for environment \mathcal{E} w.r.t distortion function d .

Proof Let

$$\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1} = \{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon : \tilde{\mathcal{E}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_K); \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i \perp \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j \wedge \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i \perp \mathcal{E}_j \text{ for } i \neq j\},$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}) &= \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \inf_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \in \tilde{\Theta}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}^{(k)}} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_k; \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{H}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}(\mathcal{E}_k, d)
 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1} \subset \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon$, (b) follows from the fact that for $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i \perp \mathcal{E}_j$ for $i \neq j$, and (c) follows from the fact that for $\tilde{\Theta}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}^{(k)} := \{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \in \tilde{\Theta} : d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{K}\}$, $\tilde{\Theta}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \tilde{\Theta}_{\frac{\epsilon}{K}}^{(K)} \subset \tilde{\Theta}_\epsilon^{K:1}$ since we assumed that $\mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \mathcal{E}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \leq d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1})$ for all k and so

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_{K:1} | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:1}, X) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{I}(Y; \mathcal{E}_k | \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{K:k+1}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{k:1}, X) \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K d(\mathcal{E}_k, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k, U_{k-1}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\epsilon}{K} \\
 &= \epsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

■