

A Note on High-Probability Analysis of Algorithms with Exponential, Sub-Gaussian, and General Light Tails

Amit Attia*

Tomer Koren†

Abstract

This short note describes a simple technique for analyzing probabilistic algorithms that rely on a light-tailed (but not necessarily bounded) source of randomization. We show that the analysis of such an algorithm can be reduced, in a black-box manner and with only a small loss in logarithmic factors, to an analysis of a simpler variant of the same algorithm that uses bounded random variables and often easier to analyze. This approach simultaneously applies to any light-tailed randomization, including exponential, sub-Gaussian, and more general fast-decaying distributions, without needing to appeal to specialized concentration inequalities. Analyses of a generalized Azuma inequality and stochastic optimization with general light-tailed noise are provided to illustrate the technique.

1 Setup and Main Theorem

We are interested in analyzing randomized algorithms that internally use light-tailed (yet not necessarily bounded) randomization. Formally, we will treat a randomized algorithm as a *deterministic* meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ that has access to a *sampling oracle* \mathcal{O} , with which it interacts for a total of n rounds. A sampling oracle \mathcal{O} is a function that maps a query $x \in \mathcal{X}$ from a given query space \mathcal{X} to a random vector (RV); namely, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ it returns a sample of an RV $\mathcal{O}(x)$ whose probability law may be determined by the query x . In each round $i = 1, \dots, n$, the algorithm \mathcal{A} may issue a query $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, which in itself might be an RV that depends on the oracle's responses from previous rounds, after which the oracle returns the random vector $\mathcal{O}(x_i)$ to the algorithm.

In this manuscript we are interested in sampling oracles whose outputs are bounded or light-tailed random vectors; in the following definition and throughout the manuscript, $\|\cdot\|$ is an arbitrary norm over vectors.

Definition 1 (light-tailed RV / sampling oracle). A random vector Z is:

- (i) **B -bounded** for $B > 0$, if

$$\Pr(\|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]\| \leq B) = 1;$$

- (ii) **(γ, σ, c) -tailed** for $\gamma, \sigma, c > 0$, if

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \quad \Pr(\|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]\| \geq t) \leq c \cdot \exp(-(t/\sigma)^\gamma).$$

Analogously, a sampling oracle \mathcal{O} is:

- (i) **B -bounded**, for a given function $B : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, if for any query $x \in \mathcal{X}$ the random vector $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is $B(x)$ -bounded; i.e.,

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X} : \quad \Pr(\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]\| \leq B(x)) = 1.$$

- (ii) **(γ, σ, c) -tailed**, for given functions $\gamma, \sigma, c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, if for any query $x \in \mathcal{X}$ the random vector $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is $(c(x), \sigma(x), \gamma(x))$ -tailed; i.e.,

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, t \geq 0 : \quad \Pr(\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]\| \geq t) \leq c(x) \cdot \exp(-(t/\sigma(x))^{\gamma(x)}).$$

*Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University; amitattia@mail.tau.ac.il.

†Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University, and Google Research Tel Aviv; tkoren@tauex.tau.ac.il.

The definition of (γ, σ, c) -tailed random vector is similar to that of a sub-Weibull random variable (Vladimirova et al., 2020). Note that sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential oracles, where

$$\Pr(\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]\| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/\sigma^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]\| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t/\sigma)$$

respectively, for $\sigma > 0$, are special cases of tailed oracles.

The following is the main result of this manuscript.

Theorem 1. *Given an algorithm \mathcal{A} , number of rounds n and a (γ, σ, c) -tailed sampling oracle \mathcal{O} , there exists a B -bounded sampling oracle $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with*

$$B(x) = 4\sigma(x) \left(\max \left\{ \log \frac{2c(x)n}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma(x)} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma(x)} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (1)$$

such that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x)]$ for all queries $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the outputs of the algorithms $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n)$ are identical.

In words, Theorem 1 implies that for analyzing an algorithm that internally uses samples of light-tailed RVs, it is sufficient to analyze a simpler version of the algorithm that uses bounded RVs (with the bound given in Eq. (1)), and the conclusion of this analysis will equally apply to the original version of the algorithm since their outputs are identical (w.h.p.). While the bound stated in Eq. (1) is in general tight (we discuss this below), a typical application of the theorem often comes at the cost of additional logarithmic factors in n and $1/\delta$, since the magnitude of the bound B (when treating γ, σ and c as constants) is polylog(n/δ). We give a few concrete examples of how the theorem is applied in the section below, deferring its proof to Section 3.

2 Examples

Theorem 1 can be used to extend existing results such as measure concentration bounds and analyses of stochastic approximation algorithms, that are often proven under bounded noise assumptions, to support (γ, σ, c) -tailed noise. Below we provide three such examples: Azuma’s inequality, convergence of stochastic gradient descent, and bounding the maximum of sub-Gaussian random variables.

2.1 Azuma’s Inequality

The first example that comes to mind is an extension of Azuma’s inequality that allows for general light tails. We will work out this example here mainly for illustration of the basic technique: in actual applications (such as the one in the subsequent section, being perhaps more representative), one can simply apply our main theorem to the analyzed algorithm as a “black box” rather than using it to analyze a particular martingale involved in the analysis.

Following is a standard formulation of Azuma’s inequality (see e.g., Dubhashi and Panconesi, 2009; Boucheron et al., 2013).

Theorem 2 (Azuma’s Inequality). *Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be a martingale difference sequence (MDS) and suppose there is a constant B such that $|Z_i| \leq B$ for all $0 \leq i < n$ almost surely. Then*

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq B \sqrt{2n \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \leq \delta,$$

Using Theorem 1, we can easily extend Azuma’s inequality to (γ, σ, c) -tailed random variables:

Theorem 3 (Azuma’s Inequality for light-tailed RVs). *Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be an MDS and suppose there are constants $\gamma, \sigma, c > 0$ such that, deterministically,¹*

$$\forall 0 \leq i < n, t \geq 0 : \quad \Pr(|Z_i| \geq t \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}) \leq c \cdot \exp(-(t/\sigma)^\gamma).$$

Then

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq \sigma \sqrt{32n \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left(\max \left\{ \log \frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma} \right) \leq 2\delta.$$

¹To avoid nuisances emerging from zero-probability events, we assume here that the condition holds deterministically, for any realization of the RVs Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} ; namely, that Z_i is (γ, σ, c) -tailed given any possible history of the martingale.

We can compare this result to a direct proof of Azuma’s inequality with sub-Gaussian increments, which can be found e.g. in Theorem 2 of [Shamir \(2011\)](#). Their bound is of order $\sigma\sqrt{n\log(1/\delta)}$ whereas our result, which is obtained in a black-box manner and applies more generally to any (γ, σ, c) -tailed differences, suffers an additional $\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}$ factor in the sub-Gaussian case.

Proof. Let $\gamma, \sigma, c > 0$ be given and fixed. To obtain the result we simply need to rephrase Azuma’s inequality in the setup of Theorem 1. To do so, imagine an artificial algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ that interacts with a sampling oracle \mathcal{O} , that given any possible prefix of the martingale $z_{1:i-1}$, generates the next element in the sequence. Namely, given any realization $z_{1:i-1}$ of the RVs $Z_{1:i-1}$, the oracle call $\mathcal{O}(z_{1:i-1})$ samples z_i from the conditional distribution of Z_t given $Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1}$ (and returns 0 if $z_{1:i-1}$ is not a possible realization of the history). Given the responses Z_1, \dots, Z_n of the oracle after n interactions with the algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$, the algorithm returns “True” if the following condition holds (and “False” otherwise):

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq \sigma\sqrt{32n\log\frac{1}{\delta}} \left(\max\left\{ \log\frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma}.$$

Let us analyze this algorithm using Theorem 1. Note that the oracle \mathcal{O} is (γ, σ, c) -tailed by construction, and so we can use the theorem to obtain that there exists a B -bounded oracle $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with

$$B = 4\sigma \left(\max\left\{ \log\frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma},$$

such that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(z_{0:i-1})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(z_{0:i-1})] = 0$ for all queries $z_{0:i-1}$ (by the martingale property for realizable queries and the definition of \mathcal{O} that returns 0 if $z_{0:i-1}$ is not a possible realization). Thus, denoting the responses of the oracle $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ (received by the algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n)$) by $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n$, we have, for all i ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i \mid \tilde{Z}_{0:i-1}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{Z}_{0:i-1}) \mid \tilde{Z}_{0:i-1}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(\tilde{Z}_{0:i-1}) \mid \tilde{Z}_{0:i-1}] = 0.$$

In other words, $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n$ is an MDS with differences bounded by B , to which we can apply the standard version of Azuma’s inequality (Theorem 2) and obtain

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n) = \text{“True”}] = \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Z}_i \geq B\sqrt{2n\log\frac{1}{\delta}} \right] \leq \delta.$$

On the other hand, we also know that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the outputs of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n)$ are the same. Thus,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n) = \text{“True”}] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n) = \text{“True”}] + \delta.$$

Combining the two inequalities, we conclude that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq \sigma\sqrt{32n\log\frac{1}{\delta}} \left(\max\left\{ \log\frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma} \right] = \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n) = \text{“True”}] \leq 2\delta. \quad \square$$

2.2 Stochastic first-order optimization

Another scenario where analysis with light-tailed noise is common is in stochastic optimization. As a canonical example, consider a problem where we wish to (approximately) find a minimizer of a convex and differentiable function $f(x)$, with access only to unbiased stochastic gradients, that is, to a randomized gradient oracle $\mathcal{O}(x)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \nabla f(x)$ for all x in the domain. Common light-tailed assumptions on the gradient oracle include:

- (i) B -bounded gradient oracle, for a fixed $B > 0$;
- (ii) Sub-Gaussian gradient oracle, i.e., $(2, \sigma, 2)$ -tailed for some constant $\sigma > 0$;
- (iii) A more general bounded gradient oracle with “affine variance” ([Faw et al., 2022](#); [Attia and Koren, 2023](#)), i.e., B -bounded with $B(x) = \sqrt{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_1^2 \|\nabla f(x)\|^2}$ for some $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 > 1$, or a sub-Gaussian variant where the gradient oracle is $(2, \sigma, 2)$ -tailed with

$$\sigma(x) = \sqrt{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_1^2 \|\nabla f(x)\|^2}.$$

Naturally, the simplest assumption to handle is bounded noise. Below we provide a standard convergence result for SGD with bounded noise and a corollary derived using Theorem 1 to extend the oracle assumption to (γ, σ, c) -tailed oracles.

All following definitions use the Euclidean norm, denoted $\|\cdot\|_2$. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex set with diameter D ,² and let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex, differentiable and G -Lipschitz function that admits a minimizer $x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. Given an initial point $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and a stepsize parameter $\eta > 0$, the update step of (projected) stochastic gradient descent is $x_{i+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i - \eta g_i)$ where g_i is a stochastic gradient at x_i and $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y) = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x - y\|_2$ is the Euclidean projection to \mathcal{X} . The convergence result is as follows (proof is in Appendix B).

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{O}(x)$ be a B -bounded gradient oracle of f , i.e., such that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \nabla f(x)$ and $\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq B$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, for some $B > 0$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the iterates of n -steps SGD with stepsize*

$$\eta = \frac{D}{\sqrt{2(G^2 + B^2)n}}.$$

Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds for $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ that

$$f(\bar{x}) - f^* \leq 2D\sqrt{\frac{G^2 + B^2}{n}} + DB\sqrt{\frac{2\log(1/\delta)}{n}}.$$

As the gradient oracle of Theorem 4 is B -bounded, Theorem 1 can be directly applied (note that since the new oracle preserves the same expectation, it is also an unbiased gradient oracle) and we immediately obtain the following by replacing B with $\tilde{B} = 4\sigma(\max\{\log \frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma}\})^{1/\gamma}$:

Corollary 5. *Assume that $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is a (γ, σ, c) -tailed gradient oracle of f , namely $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \nabla f(x)$ and*

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X} : \quad \Pr(\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \geq t) \leq c \cdot \exp(-(t/\sigma)^\gamma).$$

Let $\tilde{B} = 4\sigma(\max\{\log \frac{2cn}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma}\})^{1/\gamma}$ and let x_1, \dots, x_n be the iterations of SGD with stepsize

$$\eta = \frac{D}{\sqrt{2(G^2 + \tilde{B}^2)n}}.$$

Then for any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ it holds for $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ that

$$f(\bar{x}) - f^* \leq D\tilde{B}\sqrt{\frac{2\log(1/\delta)}{n}} + 2D\sqrt{\frac{G^2 + \tilde{B}^2}{n}} = O\left(\frac{DG}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{D\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\log \frac{n}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right),$$

where the asymptotic notation treats γ and c as constants.

Similarly, we can extend results with a more general (γ, σ, c) -tailed *affine* noise such as Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 of [Attia and Koren \(2023\)](#).

2.3 Bounding the maximum of random variables

Our final application is a toy example to demonstrate that the result of Theorem 1 is, in general, tight. In the two examples above, there was a (logarithmic) gap between the bounds obtained by an application of Theorem 1 and the bounds that could have been obtained by a direct analysis. However, in its full generality, the logarithmic overhead introduced by Theorem 1 cannot be improved, as we will now show.

Consider the problem of bounding the maximum of n sub-Gaussian random variables. We can formalize this using a $(2, \sigma, 2)$ -tailed sampling oracle for a suitable $\sigma > 0$, and an algorithm that calls the oracle n times (with a null query) and returns the maximum of the returned variables. Applying Theorem 1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the maximum of the variables is bounded by $4\sigma\sqrt{\log(4n/\delta)}$.

Let us now show that this bound obtained from Theorem 1 is tight. Consider the following PDF:

$$f(t) = \frac{|t|e^{-t^2/\sigma^2}}{\sigma^2},$$

²We intentionally overload notation here, since \mathcal{X} also serves as the space of queries in this example.

and let X be a random variable following the distribution f . A direct calculation yields that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\Pr(|X| \geq x) = e^{-x^2/\sigma^2}$; thus, X is σ -sub-Gaussian. Considering n i.i.d. random variables following the same distribution, X_1, \dots, X_n , we then have that

$$\Pr\left(\forall i \in [n] : |X_i| \leq \sigma\sqrt{\log \frac{n}{\delta}}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{n}\right)^n \leq e^{-\delta}.$$

Thus, the probability of the complementary event is lower bounded by:

$$\Pr\left(\exists i \in [n] : |X_i| > \sigma\sqrt{\log \frac{n}{\delta}}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-\delta} = 1 - \frac{1}{e^\delta} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{1+\delta} = \frac{\delta}{1+\delta} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

The probability lower bound indicates that the result obtain by Theorem 1 is tight up to constant factors. The fact can be attributed to the proof technique of Theorem 1, which bounds with high probability each of the random variables.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove our main theorem, we leverage the following key lemma which show that for any zero-mean and (γ, σ, c) -tailed random vector, there is a zero-mean and *bounded* random vector that is equal to the original random vector with high probability.

Lemma 1. *Let X be a zero-mean (γ, σ, c) -tailed RV and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Set $B = 4\sigma(\max\{\log \frac{2c}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma}\})^{1/\gamma}$. Then there exist a random variable \tilde{X} such that \tilde{X} is:*

- (i) *zero-mean:* $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}] = 0$;
- (ii) *equal to X w.h.p.:* $\Pr(\tilde{X} = X) \geq 1 - \delta$;
- (iii) *deterministically bounded:* $\|\tilde{X}\| \leq B$.

In Appendix A we show that the bound over $\|\tilde{X}\|$ is essentially tight when $c = \Theta(1)$ and $1/\gamma = O(\log(1/\delta))$, even when \tilde{X} is scalar. We prove Lemma 1 below, but first we show how it implies our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1. Define an oracle $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ as follows: for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x)$ be the random variable obtained by applying Lemma 1 to the zero-mean random vector $\mathcal{O}(x) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]$ and adding back the expected value $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]$. Hence, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is a B -bounded oracle, with $B(x)$ as defined in Eq. (1) and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)]$.

Consider the two algorithms $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n)$ obtained by independent interactions of \mathcal{A} with the two oracles \mathcal{O} and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, each over n steps. Let X_i and \tilde{X}_i be the queries of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}, n)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, n)$ at step i of the interactions, respectively (these are RVs that depend on the randomization before round i), and consider the events $E_k = \{\forall 1 \leq i \leq k : \tilde{X}_i = X_i \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{X}_i) = \mathcal{O}(X_i)\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. We are interested in lower bounding the probability of the event E_n , under which the outputs of the two algorithms are identical. Since each X_k (resp. \tilde{X}_k) is determined deterministically given the responses of \mathcal{O} (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$) to queries in rounds $1, \dots, k-1$, we have

$$\Pr(\neg E_n) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{X}_k) \neq \mathcal{O}(X_k) \mid E_{k-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{X}_k) \neq \mathcal{O}(\tilde{X}_k) \mid E_{k-1}).$$

To bound the conditional probabilities in the summation, observe that by the properties of the random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x)$ guaranteed by Lemma 1, we have that

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \Pr(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x) \neq \mathcal{O}(x)) \leq \delta/n,$$

thus, for all k ,

$$\Pr(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{X}_k) \neq \mathcal{O}(\tilde{X}_k) \mid E_{k-1}) \leq \delta/n.$$

Overall, we obtained $\Pr(\neg E_n) \leq \delta$, that is $\Pr(E_n) \geq 1 - \delta$ as required. \square

3.1 Proof of Lemma 1

For the proof of Lemma 1 we require the following technical result (proven later in the section).

Lemma 2. *Let $x, s > 0$ such that $x \geq 2(s-1)$. Then $\int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt \leq 2x^{s-1} e^{-x}$.*

Proof of Lemma 1. Denote $r = \sigma \left(\max\left\{ \log \frac{2c}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma}$; note that $\Pr(\|X\| > r) \leq \delta/2$. Define a random vector Z by rejection sampling X on the ball of radius r : if $\|X\| \leq r$, let $Z = X$; otherwise, continue resampling from the distribution of X and reject samples as long as their norm is larger than r ; let Z be the first accepted sample. To correct the bias of Z , let

$$\tilde{X} = \begin{cases} Z & \text{with prob. } 1 - \delta/2; \\ -\frac{2-\delta}{\delta} \mathbb{E}[Z] & \text{with prob. } \delta/2. \end{cases}$$

By construction, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}] = 0$. Also, $\Pr(\tilde{X} = X) \geq 1 - \delta$ due to a union bound of $\Pr(\tilde{X} = Z)$ and $\Pr(X = Z)$, each happens with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$.

We are left with bounding \tilde{X} . As $\|Z\| \leq r$ it remains to bound the correction term. For this, we first bound $\mathbb{E}[Z] = \mathbb{E}[X \mid \|X\| \leq r]$. By the law of total expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| \leq r\}] &= \Pr(\|X\| \leq r) \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| \leq r\} \mid \|X\| \leq r] + \Pr(\|X\| > r) \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| \leq r\} \mid \|X\| > r] \\ &= \Pr(\|X\| \leq r) \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| \leq r\} \mid \|X\| \leq r] \\ &= \Pr(\|X\| \leq r) \mathbb{E}[X \mid \|X\| \leq r]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[X \mid \|X\| \leq r] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| \leq r\}]}{\Pr(\|X\| \leq r)} = -\frac{\mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| > r\}]}{\Pr(\|X\| \leq r)}.$$

Thus, using the (γ, σ, c) -tail bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}[Z]\| &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|X\| \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| > r\}] && (\Pr(\|X\| \leq r) > 1/2) \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\infty \Pr(\|X\| \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| > r\} \geq x) dx && (\text{tail formula for expectations}) \\ &\leq 2r \Pr(\|X\| > r) + 2 \int_r^\infty \Pr(\|X\| \mathbf{1}\{\|X\| > r\} \geq x) dx && (\text{split integral at } r) \\ &\leq \delta r + 2 \int_r^\infty \Pr(\|X\| \geq x) dx && (\Pr(\|X\| > r) \leq \delta/2) \\ &\leq \delta r + 2c \int_r^\infty e^{-x^\gamma/\sigma^\gamma} dx. && (X \text{ is } (\gamma, \sigma, c)\text{-tailed}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $u(x) = x^\gamma/\sigma^\gamma$. Hence,

$$\int_r^\infty e^{-x^\gamma/\sigma^\gamma} dx = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \int_r^\infty u(x)^{1/\gamma-1} e^{-u(x)} u'(x) dx = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \int_{u(r)}^\infty u^{1/\gamma-1} e^{-u} du.$$

Using Lemma 2 (noting that $u(r) \geq \frac{2}{\gamma} > 2(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1)$),

$$\int_{u(r)}^\infty u^{1/\gamma-1} e^{-u} du \leq 2u(r)^{1/\gamma-1} e^{-u(r)}.$$

Thus, as $u(r) \geq 2/\gamma$,

$$\int_r^\infty e^{-x^\gamma/\sigma^\gamma} dx \leq \frac{2\sigma u(r)^{1/\gamma-1} e^{-u(r)}}{\gamma} = \frac{2\sigma^\gamma r^{1-\gamma} e^{-u(r)}}{\gamma} \leq \frac{\delta r}{2c},$$

and $\|\mathbb{E}[Z]\| \leq 2\delta r$. We conclude that \tilde{X} is bounded (deterministically) in absolute value by

$$\max\left\{ r, \frac{2-\delta}{\delta} \|\mathbb{E}[Z]\| \right\} < 4\sigma \left(\max\left\{ \log \frac{2c}{\delta}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} \right)^{1/\gamma}.$$

□

3.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. If $s \leq 1$,

$$\int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt \leq x^{s-1} \int_x^\infty e^{-t} dt = x^{s-1} [-e^{-t}]_x^\infty = x^{s-1} e^{-x}.$$

Now we assume that $s > 1$. Defining $u(t) = t - x$,

$$\int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt = e^{-x} \int_0^\infty (u+x)^{s-1} e^{-u} du.$$

As $1 + a \leq e^a$ for all a , for $u > 0$,

$$(u+x)^{s-1} \leq x^{s-1} e^{u(s-1)/x}.$$

Thus, as $x \geq 2(s-1)$,

$$\int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt \leq e^{-x} x^{s-1} \int_0^\infty e^{u(s-1)/x-u} du = e^{-x} x^{s-1} \left[\frac{x e^{u(s-1)/x-u}}{s-1-x} \right]_0^\infty = \frac{x^s e^{-x}}{x+1-s} \leq 2x^{s-1} e^{-x}.$$

□

Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 101078075). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work received additional support from the Israel Science Foundation (ISF, grant number 2549/19), from the Len Blavatnik and the Blavatnik Family foundation, from the Adelis Foundation, and from the Prof. Amnon Shashua and Mrs. Anat Ramaty Shashua Foundation.

References

- A. Attia and T. Koren. SGD with adagrad stepsizes: Full adaptivity with high probability to unknown parameters, unbounded gradients and affine variance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08783*, 2023.
- S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities - A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- D. P. Dubhashi and A. Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- M. Faw, I. Tziotis, C. Caramanis, A. Mokhtari, S. Shakkottai, and R. Ward. The power of adaptivity in SGD: Self-tuning step sizes with unbounded gradients and affine variance. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 313–355. PMLR, 2022.
- Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- O. Shamir. A variant of Azuma's inequality for martingales with subgaussian tails. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.2392*, 2011.
- M. Vladimirova, S. Girard, H. Nguyen, and J. Arbel. Sub-Weibull distributions: Generalizing sub-Gaussian and sub-Exponential properties to heavier tailed distributions. *Stat*, 9(1):e318, 2020.

A Tightness of Lemma 1

The following lemma implies that Lemma 1 is tight when $c = \Theta(1)$ and $1/\gamma = O(\log(1/\delta))$.

Lemma 3. *There exist a (γ, σ, c) -tailed zero-mean random variable X with parameters $c = 1, \sigma$ and γ such that any random variable \tilde{X} with $\Pr(X = \tilde{X}) \geq 1 - \delta$ must satisfy*

$$\Pr\left(|\tilde{X}| < \sigma \log^{1/\gamma} \frac{1}{2\delta}\right) < 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. For $\sigma, \gamma > 0$, let

$$f(t) = \frac{\gamma |t|^{\gamma-1} e^{-|t|^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma}}{Z \sigma^\gamma}$$

where

$$Z = 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{\gamma |t|^{\gamma-1} e^{-|t|^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma}}{\sigma^\gamma} dt = 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{\gamma t^{\gamma-1} e^{-t^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma}}{\sigma^\gamma} dt = 2 \left[-e^{-t^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma} \right]_0^\infty = 2.$$

Hence, $f(t)$ is a PDF as

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty f(t) dt = 2 \int_0^\infty f(t) dt = \frac{2}{Z} \int_0^\infty \frac{\gamma |t|^{\gamma-1} e^{-|t|^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma}}{\sigma^\gamma} dt = 1.$$

Let X be a random variable following the distribution defined by $f(t)$. Hence, with $u(t) = -t$ and the property $f(t) = f(-t)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \int_{-\infty}^\infty t f(t) dt = \int_0^\infty t f(t) dt + \int_{-\infty}^0 u f(u) du = 0$$

and for $x \geq 0$,

$$\Pr(|X| \geq x) = 2 \int_x^\infty f(t) dt = \frac{2}{Z} \left[-e^{-t^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma} \right]_x^\infty = e^{-x^\gamma / \sigma^\gamma}.$$

Thus, X is a (γ, σ, c) -tailed zero-mean random vector and with probability 2δ , it holds $|X| \geq \sigma \log^{1/\gamma} \frac{1}{2\delta}$. Hence, under a union bound,

$$\Pr\left(|\tilde{X}| \geq \sigma \log^{1/\gamma} \frac{1}{2\delta}\right) \geq \Pr\left(|X| \geq \sigma \log^{1/\gamma} \frac{1}{2\delta}\right) - \delta \geq \delta. \quad \square$$

B Standard high-probability analysis of SGD

The section contains a standard convergence analysis of Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) for stochastic convex optimization assuming bounded noise. In section Section 2.2 we show how the standard result can be extended to (γ, σ, c) -tailed noise by an immediate application of Theorem 1. For completeness, we repeat the stochastic convex optimization setup described at Section 2.2, stating and providing the proof for the convergence result.

All following definitions use the Euclidean norm, denoted with $\|\cdot\|_2$. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex set with diameter D and $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex, differentiable and G -Lipschitz function which admits a minimizer $x^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. We assume access to f using a gradient oracle $\mathcal{O} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \nabla f(x)$. Given a starting point x_1 , the update step of (projected) SGD is $x_{i+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i - \eta g_i)$ where $\eta > 0$ is the step size parameter, g_i is a stochastic gradient at x_i and $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y) = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x - y\|_2$ is the Euclidean projection to \mathcal{X} . Following is the convergence result.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{O}(x)$ be a B -bounded gradient oracle of f , i.e., such that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{O}(x)] = \nabla f(x)$ and $\|\mathcal{O}(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq B$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, for some $B > 0$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the iterates of n -steps SGD with stepsize*

$$\eta = \frac{D}{\sqrt{2(G^2 + B^2)n}}.$$

Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds for $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ that

$$f(\bar{x}) - f^* \leq 2D \sqrt{\frac{G^2 + B^2}{n}} + DB \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{n}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4. A standard property of the Euclidean projection to convex sets is that for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\|y - x\|_2 \geq \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y) - x\|_2$ (e.g., [Nesterov, 2003](#)). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i - x^*\|_2^2 &= \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i - \eta g_i) - x^*\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|x_i - \eta g_i - x^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \|x_i - x^*\|_2^2 - 2\eta g_i \cdot (x_i - x^*) + \eta^2 \|g_i\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms,

$$g_i \cdot (x_i - x^*) \leq \frac{\|x_i - x^*\|_2^2 - \|x_{i+1} - x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2} \|g_i\|_2^2.$$

Summing for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n g_i \cdot (x_i - x^*) \leq \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g_i\|_2^2.$$

As $\|a + b\|_2^2 \leq 2\|a\|_2^2 + 2\|b\|_2^2$,

$$\|g_i\|_2^2 \leq 2\|\nabla f(x_i)\|_2^2 + 2\|g_i - \nabla f(x_i)\|_2^2 \leq 2G^2 + 2B^2.$$

Substituting η ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n g_i \cdot (x_i - x^*) \leq \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta} + \eta(G^2 + B^2)n \leq 2D\sqrt{(G^2 + B^2)n}.$$

Let $Z_i = (\nabla f(x_i) - g_i) \cdot (x_i - x^*)$. Thus, Z_1, \dots, Z_n is a martingale difference sequence with respect to g_1, \dots, g_n since $\mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid g_1, \dots, g_{i-1}] = 0$ and also note that $|Z_i| \leq DB$ with probability 1. Using Azuma's inequality (cf. [Theorem 2](#)), we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f(x_i) - g_i) \cdot (x_i - x^*) \leq DB \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

Thus, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f(x_i) \cdot (x_i - x^*) &\leq DB \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla g_i \cdot (x_i - x^*) \\ &\leq DB \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n}} + 2D \sqrt{\frac{G^2 + B^2}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

A standard application of convexity and Jensen's inequality on the LHS concludes the proof. \square