
Uncertainty quantification by block bootstrap for differentially private stochastic gradient descent

Holger Dette

Chair of Stochastics
Ruhr University Bochum
Germany, Bochum

holger.dette@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Carina Graw

Chair of Stochastics
Ruhr University Bochum
Germany, Bochum

carina.graw@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Abstract

Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) is a widely used tool in machine learning. In the context of Differential Privacy (DP), SGD has been well studied in the last years in which the focus is mainly on convergence rates and privacy guarantees. While in the non private case, uncertainty quantification (UQ) for SGD by bootstrap has been addressed by several authors, these procedures cannot be transferred to differential privacy due to multiple queries to the private data. In this paper, we propose a novel block bootstrap for SGD under local differential privacy that is computationally tractable and does not require an adjustment of the privacy budget. The method can be easily implemented and is applicable to a broad class of estimation problems. We prove the validity of our approach and illustrate its finite sample properties by means of a simulation study. As a by-product, the new method also provides a simple alternative numerical tool for UQ for non-private SGD.

1 Introduction

In times where data is collected almost everywhere and anytime, privacy is an important issue that has to be addressed in any data analysis. In the past, successful de-anonymisation attacks have been performed (see, for example, Narayanan and Shmatikov, 2006; Gambs et al., 2014; Eshun and Palmieri, 2022) leaking private, possible sensitive data of individuals. Differential Privacy (DP) is a framework that has been introduced by Dwork et al. (2006) to protect an individuals data against such attacks while still learning something about the population. Nowadays, Differential Privacy has become a state-of-the-art framework which has been implemented by the US Census and large companies like Apple, Microsoft and Google (see Ding et al., 2017; Abowd, 2018).

The key idea of Differential Privacy is to randomize the data or a data dependent statistic. This additional randomness guarantees that the exchange of one individual merely changes the distribution of the randomized output. In the last decade, numerous differentially private algorithms have been developed, see for example Wang et al. (2020); Xiong et al. (2020); Yang et al. (2023) and the references therein. In many cases differentially private algorithms are based on already known and well studied procedures such as empirical risk minimisation, where either the objective function (objective perturbation) or the minimizer of that function (output perturbation) is privatized, or statistical testing, where the statistic is privatized, see for example Chaudhuri et al. (2011); Vu and Slavkovic (2009). Two different concepts of differential privacy are distinguished in the literature: the first one, called (global) *Differential Privacy* (DP) assumes the presence of a trusted curator, who maintains and performs computations on the data and ensures that a published statistic satisfies a certain privacy guarantee. The second one, which is considered in this paper, does not make this assumption and is called *local Differential Privacy* (LDP). Here it is required that the data is collected in a privacy preserving way.

Besides privacy there is a second issue which has to be addressed in the analysis of massive data,

namely the problem of computational complexity. A common and widely used tool when dealing with large-scale and complex optimization problems in big data analysis is *Stochastic Gradient Descent* (SGD), which is already introduced in the early work of Robbins and Monro (1951). This procedure computes data based, iteratively and in an online fashion an estimate of the minimizer

$$\theta_* = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} L(\theta) \quad (1)$$

of a function L . The convergence properties of adaptive algorithms, such as SGD, towards θ_* are well studied, see for example the monograph Benveniste et al. (1990) and the references therein. Mertikopoulos et al. (2020) investigate SGD in case of non convex functions and show convergence to a local minimizer.

There also exists a large amount of work on statistical inference based on SGD estimation starting with the seminal papers of Ruppert (1988) and Polyak and Juditsky (1992), who establish asymptotic normality of the averaged SGD estimator for convex functions. The covariance matrix of the asymptotic distribution has a sandwich form, say $G^{-1}SG^{-1}$, and Chen et al. (2020) propose two different approaches to estimate this matrix. An online version for one of these methods is proposed in Zhu et al. (2021), while Yu et al. (2021) generalize these results for SGD with constant stepsize and non convex loss functions. Recent literature on UQ for SDG includes Su and Zhu (2018), who propose iterative sample splitting of the path of SGD, Li et al. (2018), who consider SGD with constant stepsize splitting the whole path into segments, and Chee et al. (2023), who construct a simple confidence interval for the last iterate of SGD.

Song et al. (2013) investigate SGD under DP and demonstrate that mini-batch SGD has a much better accuracy than estimators obtained with batch size 1. However, mini-batch SGD with a batch size larger than 1 only guarantees global DP and therefore requires the presence of a trusted curator. Among other approaches for empirical risk minimization, Bassily et al. (2014) derive a utility bound in terms of the excess risk for an (ϵ, δ) -DP SGD and Avella-Medina et al. (2023) investigate statistical inference for noisy gradient descent under Gaussian DP.

On the other hand, statistical inference for SGD under LDP is far less explored. Duchi et al. (2018) show the minimax optimality of the LDP SGD median but do not provide confidence intervals for inference. The method of Chen et al. (2020) is not always applicable (for example, for quantiles) and requires an additional private estimate of the matrix G in the asymptotic covariance matrix of the SDG estimate. Recently, Liu et al. (2023) propose a self-normalizing approach to obtain distribution free locally differentially private confidence intervals for quantiles. However, this method is tailored to a specific model and it is well known that the nice property of distribution free inference by self-normalization comes with the price of a loss in statistical efficiency (see Dette and Gösmann, 2020, for an example in the context of testing).

A natural alternative is the application of bootstrap, and bootstrap for SGD in the non-private case has been studied by Fang et al. (2018); Zhong et al. (2023). These authors propose a multiplier approach where SGD is executed B times multiplying the updates by non-negative random variables. However, to ensure ϵ -LDP, the privacy budget must be split over all B bootstrap versions, leading to large noise levels and high inaccuracy of the resulting estimators. There is also ongoing research on parametric Bootstrap under DP, (see Ferrando et al., 2022; Fu et al., 2023; Wang and Awan, 2023) who assume that the parameter of interest characterizes the distribution of the data, which is not necessarily the case for SGD. Finally we mention Wang et al. (2022), who introduce a bootstrap procedure under Gaussian DP, where each bootstrap estimator is privately computed on a random subset.

Our Contribution: In this paper we propose a computational tractable method for statistical inference using SGD under LDP. Our approach provides a universally applicable and statistically valid method for uncertainty quantification for SDG and LDP-SGD. It is based on an application of the block bootstrap to the mean of the iterates obtained by SGD. The (multiplier) block bootstrap is a common principle in time series analysis (see Lahiri, 2003). However, in contrast to this field, where the dependencies in the sequence of observations are quickly decreasing with an increasing lag, the statistical analysis of such an approach for SGD is very challenging. More precisely, SGD produces a sequence of highly dependent iterates, which makes the application of classical concepts from time series analysis such as mixing (see Bradley, 2005) or physical dependence (see Wu, 2005) impossible. Instead, we use a different technique and show the consistency of the proposed multiplier block bootstrap for the LDP-SGD under appropriate conditions on the block length and the learning rate. As a by-product our results also provide a new method of UQ for SGD and for mini-batch SGD in the non-private case.

Notations: $\|\cdot\|$ denotes a norm on \mathbb{R}^d if not further specified. \xrightarrow{d} denotes weak convergence and $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$ denotes convergence in probability.

2 Preliminaries and Background

Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD). Define $L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, X)]$, where X is a \mathbb{X} -valued random variable and $\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a loss function. We consider the optimization problem (1). If L is differentiable and convex, then this minimization problem is equivalent to solving

$$R(\theta) := \nabla L(\theta) = 0,$$

where $R = \nabla L$ is the gradient of L . SGD computes an estimator $\bar{\theta}$ for θ_* using noisy observations $g(X_i, \cdot)$ of the gradient $R(\cdot)$ in an iterative way. Note that g does not need to be differentiable with respect to θ . The iterations of SGD are defined by

$$\theta_i = \theta_{i-1} - \eta_i g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}) = \theta_{i-1} - \eta_i (R(\theta_{i-1}) + \xi_i) \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_i = ci^{-\gamma}$ with parameters $c > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0.5, 1)$ is the learning rate and the quantity $\xi_i = g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}) - R(\theta_{i-1})$ is called *measurement error* in the i th iteration (note that we do not reflect the dependence on θ_{i-1} and X_i in the definition of ξ_i). The estimator of θ_* is finally obtained as the average of the iterates, that is

$$\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i. \quad (3)$$

Note that the first representation in (2) can be directly used for implementation, while the second is helpful for proving probabilistic properties of SGD. For example Polyak and Juditsky (1992) show that, under appropriate conditions, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta} - \theta_*)$ is asymptotically normal distributed where the covariance matrix Σ of the limit distribution depends on the optimization problem and the variance of the measurement errors ξ_i .

The use of only one observation $g(X_i, \theta_{i-1})$ in SGD yields a relatively large measurement error in each iteration which might result in inaccurate estimation of the gradient $R(\theta_{i-1})$. Therefore, several authors have proposed a variant of SGD, called mini-batch SGD, where $s \geq 1$ observations $g(X_{i_1}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}), \dots, g(X_{i_s}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1})$ are used for the update. An estimator for $R(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1})$ is then given by the mean of this observations, yielding the recursion

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - \eta_i \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s g(X_{i_j}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}) = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - \eta_i (R(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}) + \tilde{\xi}_i) \quad (4)$$

where the measurement error is given by $\tilde{\xi}_i = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s g(X_{i_j}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}) - R(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1})$, see for example Cotter et al. (2011); Khirirat et al. (2017).

Differential Privacy (DP). The idea of differential privacy is that one individual should not change the outcome of an algorithm largely, i.e. changing one data point should not alter the result too much. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ be a measurable space. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathbb{X}^n$ will be called a data base containing n data points. Two data bases $x, x' \in \mathbb{X}^n$ are called *neighbouring* if they only differ in one data point and are called *disjoint* if all data points are different. How much a single data point is allowed to change the outcome is captured in a privacy parameter ϵ . Let $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space. A randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ maps $x \in \mathbb{X}^n$ onto a random variable $\mathcal{A}(x)$ with values in \mathbb{Y} . Here we will consider either subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the Borel sets or finite sets equipped with their power set.

Definition 2.1. Let $\epsilon > 0$. A randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ is ϵ -differentially private (dp) if for all neighbouring $x, x' \in \mathbb{X}^n$ and all sets $S \in \mathcal{Y}$

$$P(\mathcal{A}(x) \in S) \leq e^\epsilon P(\mathcal{A}(x') \in S). \quad (5)$$

\mathcal{A} is also called a ϵ -dp mechanism and is said to preserve DP. If \mathcal{A} is restricted to $n = 1$, i.e. x and x' contain only one data point, and (5) holds, \mathcal{A} is ϵ -local differentially private (ldp).

In this paper we work under the constraints of local differential privacy (LDP).

The following result is well known (see, for example Dwork and Roth, 2014).

Theorem 2.1.

- (1) Post processing: Let $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ be an ϵ -dp mechanism and $f : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a measurable function. Then $f \circ \mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -dp.
- (2) Sequential composition: Let $\mathcal{A}_i : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ be ϵ_i -dp mechanisms. Then $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}^k$ that maps $x \mapsto (\mathcal{A}_1(x), \dots, \mathcal{A}_k(x))$ is $\sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_i$ -dp.
- (3) Parallel composition: Let $\mathcal{A}_i : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ be ϵ_i -dp mechanisms and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{X}^n$ be disjoint. Then $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{X}^{n \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}^k$ that maps $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \mapsto (\mathcal{A}_1(x_1), \dots, \mathcal{A}_k(x_k))$ is $\max \epsilon_i$ -dp.

Two well known privacy mechanism are the following:

Example 2.1 (Laplace Mechanism). Let $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Its sensitivity is defined as $\Delta(f) = \sup_{x, x' \in \mathbb{X}} \|f(x) - f(x')\|$. Assume that $\Delta(f) < \infty$ and let $L \sim \text{Lap}(0, \Delta(f)/\epsilon)$, where $\text{Lap}(0, b)$ denotes a centered Laplace distribution with density

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{2b} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|}{b}\right).$$

Then the randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{Lap} : x \mapsto f(x) + L$ is ϵ -dp.

Example 2.2 (Randomized Response). Let $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a function. Denote $p = \frac{e^\epsilon}{e^\epsilon + 1}$ and define for $x \in \mathbb{X}$ a random variable $\mathcal{A}_{RR}(x)$ on $\{0, 1\}$ with conditional distribution given x as

$$\mathcal{A}_{RR}(x) \sim \begin{cases} B(p) & , f(x) = 1 \\ B(1-p) & , f(x) = 0 \end{cases},$$

where $B(p)$ denotes a Bernoulli distribution with success probability p . Then $\mathcal{A}_{RR}(x)$ is ϵ -dp.

Local Differential Private Stochastic Gradient Descent (LDP-SGD). By Theorem 2.1 it follows that SGD is ϵ -ldp if the noisy observations $g(X_i, \theta_{i-1})$ in (2) are computed in a way that preserves ϵ -LDP. Let \mathcal{A} be such an ϵ -ldp mechanism for computing g . The LDP-SGD updates are then given by

$$\theta_i^{LDP} = \theta_{i-1}^{LDP} - \eta_i \mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP})) = \theta_{i-1}^{LDP} - \eta_i (R(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP}) + \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}) \quad (6)$$

where

$$\xi_i^{SGD} = g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}) - R(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP}) \quad (7)$$

captures the error due to measurement and

$$\xi_i^{LDP} = \mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP})) - g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}) \quad (8)$$

captures the *error due to privacy*. Analog to (3), the final ldp SDG estimate is defined by

$$\bar{\theta}^{LDP} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^{LDP}. \quad (9)$$

Remark 2.1. Song et al. (2013) also investigate mini-batch SGD under DP, where each iteration is updated as in (4) and demonstrated that mini-batch SGD with batchsize 5 achieves higher accuracy than batchsize 1. Their procedure then reads

$$\tilde{\theta}_i^{DP} = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP} - \eta_i \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s g(X_{i_j}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP}) + \frac{L_i}{s} \right) = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP} - \eta_i (R(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP}) + \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{DP}),$$

where $L_i \sim \text{Lap}(0, \Delta(g)/\epsilon)$, $\xi_i^{SGD} = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s g(X_{i_j}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP}) - R(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{DP})$ and $\xi_i^{DP} = L_i/s$. Therefore, all results presented in this paper for the LDP-SGD also hold for the DP mini-batch SGD proposed by Song et al. (2013). However, this mini-batch SGD guarantees DP, not LDP. To obtain an ldp mini-batch SGD, one would need to privatize each data, leading to the following iteration:

$$\tilde{\theta}_i^{LDP} = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{LDP} - \eta_i \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s (g(X_{i_j}, \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^{LDP}) + L_{i_j}),$$

where $L_{i_1}, \dots, L_{i_s} \sim \text{Lap}(0, \Delta(g)\epsilon)$ are independent random variables. Our results are applicable for ldp mini batch SGD as well.

Remark 2.2. Note that the deconvolution approach used in Wang et al. (2022) for the construction of a DP bootstrap procedure is not applicable for SGD, because it requires an additive relation of the form $U = V + W$ between a DP-private and a non-private estimator U and V , where the distribution of W is known. For example, if the gradient is linear, that is $R(\theta) = G\theta$ for a matrix G , and SGD and LDP-SGD are started with the same initial value θ_0 , we obtain by standard calculations the representation

$$\bar{\theta}^{LDP} = \bar{\theta} + Z_n$$

where $Z_n = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \xi_j^{LDP} \prod_{k=j+1}^i (1 - G\eta_k)$. However, although the distribution of the random variables ξ_j^{LDP} is known, the distribution of Z_n is not easily accessible and additionally depends on the unknown matrix G , which makes the application of deconvolution principles not possible.

Algorithm 1 Local Differentially Private Stochastic Gradient Descent (LDP-SGD)

Input: X_1, \dots, X_n , noisy gradient $g(\cdot, \cdot)$, θ_0 , learning rate $\eta_i = ci^{-\gamma}$ with parameters $c > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0.5, 1)$, ϵ -ldp mechanism \mathcal{A}
Output: $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}, \bar{\theta}^{LDP}$
 $\hat{\theta}^{LDP} \leftarrow 0$
for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
 $\theta_i^{LDP} \leftarrow \theta_{i-1}^{LDP} + ci^{-\gamma} \mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}))$
 $\bar{\theta}^{LDP} \leftarrow \frac{i-1}{i} \bar{\theta}^{LDP} + \frac{1}{i} \theta_i^{LDP}$
end for

Block Bootstrap. Bootstrap is a widely used procedure to estimate a distribution of an estimator $\hat{\theta} = \theta(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ calculated from data X_1, \dots, X_n (see Efron and Tibshirani, 1994). In the simplest case X_1^*, \dots, X_n^* are drawn with replacement from X_1, \dots, X_n and used to calculate $\hat{\theta}^* = \theta(X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*)$. This procedure is repeated several times to obtain an approximation of the distribution $\hat{\theta}$. While it provides a valid approximation in many (but not in all) cases if X_1, \dots, X_n are independent identically distributed, the bootstrap approximation is not correct in the case of dependent data. A common approach to address this problem is the multiplier bootstrap which is tailored to estimators with a linear structure (Lahiri, 2003). For illustration of the principle, we consider the empirical mean $\hat{\theta} = \bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Under suitable assumptions the central limit theorem for stationary sequences shows that for large sample size n the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)$ can be approximated by a normal distribution, say $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, with expectation 0 and variance σ^2 , where $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X_1]$ and σ^2 depends in a complicated manner on the dependence structure of the data. The multiplier block bootstrap mimics this distribution by partitioning the sample into m blocks of length l , say $\{X_{(i-1)l+1}, \dots, X_{il}\}$. For each block one calculates the mean $\bar{X}_{(i)} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} X_j$ which is then multiplied with a random weight ϵ_i with mean 0 and variance 1 to obtain the estimate $\bar{X}_n^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i \bar{X}_{(i)}$ where $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{l} \rfloor$. If the dependencies between X_i and X_j become sufficiently small for increasing $|i - j|$, it can be shown that the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n^* - \bar{X}_n)$ is a reasonable approximation of the distribution $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)$ (for large n). Typical conditions on the dependence structure of the data guaranteeing these approximations are formulated in terms of mixing or physical dependence coefficients (see Bradley, 2005; Wu, 2005). We will not give details here, because none of these techniques will be applicable for proving the validity of the multiplier block bootstrap developed in the following section.

3 Multiplier Block Bootstrap for LDP-SGD

In this section, we will develop a multiplier block bootstrap approach to obtain the distribution of the LDP-SGD estimate $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$ defined in (9) by resampling. We also prove that this method is statistically valid in the sense that the bootstrap distribution converges weakly (conditional on the data) to the limit distribution of the estimate $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$, which is derived first.

Our first result is a direct consequence of Theorem 2 in Polyak and Juditsky (1992) which can be applied to LDP-SGD.

Theorem 3.1. *If Assumption A.1 in the supplement holds, then the LDP-SGD estimate $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$ in (9) satisfies*

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta}^{LDP} - \theta_*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma), \quad (10)$$

where the matrix Σ is given by $\Sigma = G^{-1}SG^{-1}$. Here S is the asymptotic variance of the errors $\xi_i = \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}$ and G is a linear approximation of $R(\theta)$ (see Assumption A.1 in the supplement for more details).

Remark 3.1.

(a) Assumption A.1 requires the sequence of errors $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ to be a martingale difference process with respect to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. This assumption is satisfied, if $\{\xi_i^{SGD}\}_{i \geq 1}$ and $\{\xi_i^{LDP}\}_{i \geq 1}$ are martingale difference processes with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. Note that the condition $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^{LDP} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$ is implied by $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(g(X, \theta)) | X] = g(X, \theta)$, which is satisfied for the Laplace mechanism and Randomized Response can be adjusted to fulfill this requirement.

(b) If ξ_i^{LDP} and ξ_i^{SGD} are independent given \mathcal{F}_{i-1} and their respective covariance matrices converge in probability to S_{LDP} and S_{SGD} , then it holds that $S = S_{SGD} + S_{LDP}$.

In principle ldp statistical inference based on the statistic $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$ can be made using the asymptotic distribution in Theorem 3.1 with an ldp estimator of the covariance matrix Σ in (10). For this purpose the matrices G and S have to be estimated in an ldp way. While S can be estimated directly from the ldp observations $\mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}))$ in (6) by

$$\bar{S}^{LDP} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP})) (\mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^{LDP})))^T,$$

the matrix G has to be estimated separately. Therefore, the privacy budget has to be split on the estimation of G and on the iterations of SGD. As a consequence this approach leads to high inaccuracies since all components need to be estimated in a ldp way. Furthermore, common estimates of G are based on the derivative of g (with respect to θ), and therefore g needs to be differentiable. This excludes important examples such as quantile regression. Additionally, the computation of the inverse of G can become computationally costly in high dimensions.

As an alternative we will develop a multiplier block bootstrap, which avoids these problems. Before we explain our approach in detail we note that the bootstrap method proposed in Fang et al. (2018) for non private SGD is not applicable in the present context. These authors replace the recursion in (2) by $\theta_i^* = \theta_{i-1}^* - \eta_i w_i g(X_i, \theta_{i-1}^*)$ where w_1, \dots, w_n are independent identically distributed non-negative random variables with $Var(w_i) = 1 = \mathbb{E}[w_i]$. By applying SGD in this way B times they calculate SGD estimates $\bar{\theta}^{*(1)}, \dots, \bar{\theta}^{*(B)}$, which are used to estimate the distribution of $\bar{\theta}$. However, for the implementation of this approach under LDP the privacy budget ϵ must be split onto these B versions. In other words, for the calculation of each bootstrap replication $\bar{\theta}^{*(b)}$ there is only a privacy budget of ϵ/B left, resulting in highly inaccurate estimators.

To address these problems we propose to apply the multiplier block bootstrap principle to the iterations $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}$ of LDP-SGD in order to mimic the strong dependencies in this data. To be precise let $l = l(n)$ be the block length and $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{l} \rfloor$ the number of blocks. Let $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ be bounded, real-valued, independent and identically distributed random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0$ and equal to $Var(\epsilon_i) = 1$. For the given iterates $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}$ by LDP-SGD in (6) we calculate a bootstrap analog of $\bar{\theta}^{LDP} - \theta_*$ as

$$\bar{\theta}^* = \frac{1}{ml} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \sum_{b=(j-1)l+1}^{jl} (\theta_b^{LDP} - \bar{\theta}^{LDP}), \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$ is the LDP-SGD estimate defined in (9). We will show below that under appropriate assumptions the distribution of $\bar{\theta}^*$ is a reasonable approximation of the distribution of $\bar{\theta}^{LDP} - \theta_*$. In practice this distribution can be obtained by generating B samples of the form (11). Details are given in Algorithm 2, where the multiplier block bootstrap is used to construct an α -quantile for the distribution of $\bar{\theta}^{LDP} - \theta_*$, say q_α . With these quantiles we obtain an $(1 - 2\alpha)$ confidence interval for θ_* as

$$\hat{C} = [\bar{\theta}^{LDP} + q_\alpha, \bar{\theta}^{LDP} + q_{1-\alpha}]. \quad (12)$$

Algorithm 2 Block Bootstrap for Stochastic Gradient Descent

Input: $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n, B, l, \alpha \in (0, 1)$

Output: an α -quantile of the distribution of $\bar{\theta}^{LDP} - \theta_*$

Set $\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i$ and $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{l} \rfloor$

for $i = 1 \dots B$ **do**

Draw $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ independent and identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0$ and $Var(\epsilon_i) = 1$

$\bar{\theta}^{*(i)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{ml} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \sum_{b=(j-1)l+1}^{jl} (\theta_b - \bar{\theta})$

end for

$q_\alpha \leftarrow$ empirical α quantile of $\{\bar{\theta}^{*(1)}, \dots, \bar{\theta}^{*(B)}\}$

Theorem 3.2. *Let Assumptions A.1 and A.2 in the supplement be satisfied. Let $l = l(n)$ and $m = m(n)$ such that $l, m \rightarrow \infty$ and $m^\gamma l^{\gamma-1} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ in (11) be independent identical distributed random variables independent of $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}$ with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_1] = 0$ and $Var(\epsilon_1) = 1$. Further assume that there exists a constant C such that $|\epsilon_i| \leq C$ a.s.. Then, conditionally on $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}$,*

$$\sqrt{n} \bar{\theta}^* \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$$

in probability with $\Sigma = G^{-1} S G^{-1}$. Here S is the asymptotic variance of the errors $\xi_i = \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}$ and G is a linear approximation of $R(\theta)$ (see Assumption A.1 in the supplement for more details).

Remark 3.2.

(a) If we chose $l = \lfloor n^\beta \rfloor$ (which yields $m = \lfloor n^{1-\beta} \rfloor$), l and m satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 if $\gamma < \beta$. The parameter β determines the number of blocks used in the multiplier bootstrap. On the one hand we would like to have as many blocks as possible since we expect better results if more samples are available. This would suggest to choose β close to γ . On the other hand, β also determines the block-length l , which needs to be large enough to capture the underlying strong dependence structure of the iterates of LDP-SGD. This suggests to choose β close to one.

(b) If the blocks have been calculated, the run time of the block bootstrap is of order $O(Bmd)$, which is dominated by the run time $O(nd)$ of (LDP-)SGD, as long as $B = o(l)$.

4 Simulation

We will consider LDP-SGD for the estimation of a quantile and of the parameters in a quantile regression model. We investigate these models because here the gradient is not differentiable and the plug-in estimator from Chen et al. (2020) can not be used. In each scenario, we consider samples of size $n = 10^6, 10^7, 10^8$ and privacy parameter $\epsilon = 1$. The stepsize of the SGD is chosen as $\eta_i = i^{-0.51}$. The 90% confidence intervals (12) for the quantities of interest are computed by $B = 500$ bootstrap replications. The block length is chosen as $l = \lfloor n^\beta \rfloor$, where $\beta = 0.75$. The distribution of multiplier is chosen as $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Unif}(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$. The empirical coverage probability and average length of the interval \hat{C} are estimated by 500 simulation runs. All simulations are run in R (R Core Team, 2023) and executed on an internal cluster with an AMD EPYC 7763 64-Core processor under Ubuntu 22.04.4.

Quantiles: Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent and identically distributed \mathbb{R} valued random variables with distribution function F_X and density p_X . Denote by x_τ the τ -th quantile of X_1 i.e. $F_X(x_\tau) = \tau$. We assume that $p_X(x) > 0$ in a neighborhood of x_τ , then x_τ is the (unique) root of the equation $R(\theta) = -\tau + F_X(\theta)$. The noisy gradient is given by $g(X_i, \theta) = -\tau + \mathbb{I}\{X_i \leq \theta\}$, which can be privatized using Randomized Response, that is

$$\mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta)) = -\tau + \frac{\mathcal{A}_{RR}(\mathbb{I}\{X_i \leq \theta\})}{2p - 1} - \frac{1 - p}{2p - 1},$$

where \mathcal{A}_{RR} is defined in Example 2.2 and $p = \frac{e^\epsilon}{1+e^\epsilon}$. Note that the re-scaling ensures that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(g(X_i, \theta)) | X_i] = g(X_i, \theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. The measurement error and the error due to pri-

vacy in (7) and (8) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_i^{SGD} &= \mathbb{I}\{X_i \leq \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}\} - F_X(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP}), \\ \xi_i^{LDP} &= \frac{\mathcal{A}_{RR}(\mathbb{I}\{X_i \leq \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}\})}{2p-1} - \frac{1-p}{2p-1} - \mathbb{I}\{X_i \leq \theta_{i-1}^{LDP}\},\end{aligned}$$

respectively, which define indeed martingale difference processes with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, where $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_i^{LDP})$ and $\sigma(Y)$ denotes the sigma algebra generated by the random variable Y . The assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 can be verified with $\Sigma = (S_{SGD} + S_{LDP})/(p_X(x_\tau))^2$ where

$$S_{SGD} = F_X(x_\tau)(1 - F_X(x_\tau)) = \tau(1 - \tau), \quad S_{LDP} = \frac{e^\epsilon}{e^\epsilon - 1}.$$

In Table 1 we display the simulated coverage probabilities and length of the confidence intervals for the 50% and 90% quantile of a standard normal distribution calculated by block bootstrap (BB). We also compare our approach with the batch mean (BM) introduced in Chen et al. (2020) and the self normalisation (SN) approach suggested in Liu et al. (2023). We observe that BB and BM behave very similar with respect to the empirical coverage and the length of the computed confidence intervals while the confidence intervals obtained by SN are slightly larger.

In Figure 1 we display the trajectory of the upper and lower boundaries of a 90% confidence interval for the 50% quantile of a standard normal distribution for the BB, BM and SN approach. Again, we observe that the confidence intervals obtained by BB and BM are quite similar and the confidence intervals obtained by SN are wider.




Figure 1: Trajectory of the LDP-SGD estimate $\bar{\theta}_n^{LDP}$ (av. SGD) and the upper and lower boundaries of confidence intervals obtained by block bootstrap (BB), batch mean (BM) and self normalisation (SN) of the 50% quantile of a standard normal distribution. The left and right panel correspond to different sample sizes, left: $n = 10 - 200000$; right: $n = 200000 - 1000000$.

Table 1: Empirical coverage and length of a 90% confidence interval for the 50% and 90% quantile of a standard normal distribution. The confidence intervals are obtained by LDP-SGD with self normalization (SN), batch mean (BM) and the block bootstrap (BB) proposed in this paper. The numbers in brackets are the standard errors.

τ		10^6	10^7	10^8	
0.5	BB	cover:	0.880 (0.015)	0.886 (0.014)	0.886 (0.014)
		length:	0.0085 (5.2×10^{-5})	0.0027 (1.2×10^{-5})	0.0009 (3.1×10^{-6})
	BM	cover:	0.884 (0.014)	0.898 (0.014)	0.896 (0.014)
		length:	0.0086 (5.2×10^{-5})	0.0027 (1.1×10^{-5})	0.0009 (2.9×10^{-6})
	SN	cover:	0.914 (0.013)	0.898 (0.014)	0.886 (0.014)
		length:	0.0106 (1.9×10^{-4})	0.0034 (6×10^{-5})	0.0011 (2.1×10^{-5})
0.9	BB	cover:	0.828 (0.017)	0.856 (0.016)	0.848 (0.016)
		length:	0.0175 (1.1×10^{-4})	0.0057 (2.7×10^{-5})	0.0018 (6.4×10^{-6})
	BM	cover:	0.830 (0.017)	0.868 (0.015)	0.840 (0.016)
		length:	0.0179 (1.1×10^{-4})	0.0058 (2.5×10^{-5})	0.0018 (5.8×10^{-6})
	SN	cover:	0.862 (0.015)	0.880 (0.015)	0.878 (0.015)
		length:	0.0235 (4.5×10^{-4})	0.0076 (1.4×10^{-4})	0.0024 (4.3×10^{-5})

Quantile Regression: Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be iid random vectors where $Z_i = (X_i, y_i)$, $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\Sigma_X = \mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^T]$ and $y_i = X_i^T \beta_\tau + \varepsilon_i$ where ε_i is independent of X_i with distribution function

F_ε . We further assume that F_ε has a density in a neighbourhood of 0, say p_ε , with $p_\varepsilon(0) > 0$, that $F_\varepsilon(0) = \tau$ and that there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that $|X_i| \leq m$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. If $Q_{y|X}(\tau)$ is the conditional quantile of y given X , it follows that $Q_{y|X}(\tau) = X^T \beta_\tau$ and $R(\beta_\tau) = 0$, where

$$R(\beta) = -\tau \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{y - X^T \beta < 0\}X]$$

which can be linearly approximated by $G = \Sigma_X p_\varepsilon(0)$, since a Taylor expansion at β_τ yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{y - X^T \beta < 0\}|X] = \tau + p_\varepsilon(0)X^T(\beta - \beta_\tau) + O(\|\beta - \beta_\tau\|^2).$$

The noisy observations are given by $g(Z_j, \beta) = (-\tau + \mathbb{I}\{y_j - X_j^T \beta \leq 0\})X_j$ and can be privatized by the Laplace mechanism (see Example 2.1)

$$\mathcal{A}_{Lap}(g(Z_j, \beta)) = g(Z_j, \beta) + \mathbf{L}_j,$$

where $\mathbf{L}_j = (L_1, \dots, L_d)^T$ is a vector of independent and identical distributed Laplacian random variables, i.e. $L_i \sim \text{Lap}(0, 2 \max(\tau, 1 - \tau)md/\varepsilon)$.

The measurement error and the error due to privacy in (7) and (8) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i^{SGD} &= -\tau(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X]) + \mathbb{I}\{y_i - X_i \beta_{i-1}^{LDP} < 0\}X_i - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{y - X \beta_{i-1}^{LDP} < 0\}X] \\ \xi_i^{LDP} &= (L_1, \dots, L_d)^T, \end{aligned}$$

which are indeed martingale difference processes with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, where $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\beta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \beta_i^{LDP})$. The assumptions from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 can be verified with $\Sigma = \Sigma_X^{-1}(S_{SGD} + S_{LDP})\Sigma_X^{-1}/p_\varepsilon(0)^2$ and

$$S_{SGD} = \tau(1 - \tau)\Sigma_X, \quad S_{LDP} = 2 \frac{4 \max\{\tau^2, (1-\tau)^2\}m^2 d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{I}_{d \times d}.$$

We compare the confidence intervals obtained by BB and BM where $X = (1, X_1, X_2, X_3)$, (X_1, X_2, X_3) follows a truncated standard normal distribution on the cube $[-1, 1]^3$ and ε_i is normal distributed with variance 1. For the generation of the truncated normal and the Laplace distribution we used the package of Botev and Belzile (2021) and Wu et al. (2023), respectively. The simulation results are displayed in Table 2. We observe that for $n = 10^6$ BB yields too small and BM yields too large coverage probabilities, while the lengths of the confidence intervals from BB are smaller. If $n = 10^7$ and $n = 10^8$ the coverage probabilities from BB and BM are increasing and decreasing respectively.

Table 2: Empirical coverage and length of a 90% confidence interval for the parameters of quantile regression with $\beta_\tau = (0, 0, 1, -1)$ where $\tau = 0.5$. The confidence intervals are obtained by batch mean (BM) and the block bootstrap (BB) proposed in this paper. The numbers in brackets are the standard errors.

			10^6	10^7	10^8
BB	β_0	cover:	0.860 (0.016)	0.882 (0.014)	0.904 (0.013)
		length:	0.07 (1.2×10^{-3})	0.016 (1.2×10^{-4})	0.005 (1.7×10^{-5})
	β_1	cover:	0.862 (0.015)	0.868 (0.015)	0.880 (0.015)
		length:	0.228 (6.3×10^{-3})	0.055 (4.8×10^{-4})	0.016 (6.2×10^{-5})
	β_2	cover:	0.850 (0.016)	0.870 (0.015)	0.882 (0.014)
		length:	0.241 (5.6×10^{-3})	0.054 (5.3×10^{-4})	0.016 (6.9×10^{-5})
β_3	cover:	0.844 (0.016)	0.866 (0.015)	0.890 (0.014)	
length:	0.243 (5.6×10^{-3})	0.054 (8.0×10^{-4})	0.016 (6.7×10^{-5})		
BM	β_0	cover:	0.952 (0.01)	0.932 (0.011)	0.918 (0.012)
		length:	0.103 (2.4×10^{-3})	0.02 (3.6×10^{-4})	0.005 (2.1×10^{-5})
	β_1	cover:	0.938 (0.012)	0.928 (0.012)	0.896 (0.014)
		length:	0.315 (9.4×10^{-3})	0.076 (1.5×10^{-3})	0.017 (1.3×10^{-4})
	β_2	cover:	0.948 (0.01)	0.926 (0.012)	0.902 (0.013)
		length:	0.335 (8.4×10^{-3})	0.073 (1.7×10^{-3})	0.017 (2.0×10^{-4})
β_3	cover:	0.928 (0.012)	0.928 (0.012)	0.898 (0.014)	
length:	0.339 (8.5×10^{-3})	0.073 (2.3×10^{-3})	0.017 (1.5×10^{-4})		

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC 2092 CASA - 390781972.

References

- Abowd, J. M. (2018). The us census bureau adopts differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 2867–2867.
- Avella-Medina, M., Bradshaw, C., and Loh, P.-L. (2023). Differentially private inference via noisy optimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(5):2067–2092.
- Bassily, R., Smith, A., and Thakurta, A. (2014). Private empirical risk minimization: Efficient algorithms and tight error bounds. In *2014 IEEE 55th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 464–473. IEEE.
- Benveniste, A., Métivier, M., and Priouret, P. (1990). *Adaptive algorithms and stochastic approximations*, volume 22. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Botev, Z. and Belzile, L. (2021). *TruncatedNormal: Truncated Multivariate Normal and Student Distributions*. R package version 2.2.2.
- Bradley, R. C. (2005). Basic Properties of Strong Mixing Conditions. A Survey and Some Open Questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2(none):107 – 144.
- Chaudhuri, K., Monteleoni, C., and Sarwate, A. D. (2011). Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(3).
- Chee, J., Kim, H., and Toulis, P. (2023). “plus/minus the learning rate”: Easy and scalable statistical inference with sgd. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2285–2309. PMLR.
- Chen, X., Lee, J. D., Tong, X. T., and Zhang, Y. (2020). Statistical inference for model parameters in stochastic gradient descent. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(1):251–273.
- Chung, K. L. (1954). On a stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 463–483.
- Cotter, A., Shamir, O., Srebro, N., and Sridharan, K. (2011). Better mini-batch algorithms via accelerated gradient methods. In Shawe-Taylor, J., Zemel, R., Bartlett, P., Pereira, F., and Weinberger, K., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Dette, H. and Gösmann, J. (2020). A likelihood ratio approach to sequential change point detection for a general class of parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(531):1361–1377.
- Ding, B., Kulkarni, J., and Yekhanin, S. (2017). Collecting telemetry data privately. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I., and Wainwright, M. J. (2018). Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):182–201.
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K., and Smith, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*, pages 265–284. Springer.
- Dwork, C. and Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407.
- Efron, B. and Tibshirani, R. (1994). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs on Statistics & Applied Probability. Taylor & Francis.

- Eshun, S. N. and Palmieri, P. (2022). Two de-anonymization attacks on real-world location data based on a hidden markov model. In *2022 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*, pages 01–09. IEEE.
- Fang, Y., Xu, J., and Yang, L. (2018). Online bootstrap confidence intervals for the stochastic gradient descent estimator. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):3053–3073.
- Ferrando, C., Wang, S., and Sheldon, D. (2022). Parametric bootstrap for differentially private confidence intervals. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1598–1618. PMLR.
- Fu, X., Xiang, Y., and Guo, X. (2023). Differentially private confidence interval for extrema of parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02892*.
- Gambis, S., Killijian, M.-O., and del Prado Cortez, M. N. (2014). De-anonymization attack on geolocated data. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 80(8):1597–1614.
- Khairat, S., Feyzmahdavian, H. R., and Johansson, M. (2017). Mini-batch gradient descent: Faster convergence under data sparsity. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2880–2887.
- Lahiri, S. (2003). *Resampling methods for dependent data*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Li, T., Liu, L., Kyrillidis, A., and Caramanis, C. (2018). Statistical inference using sgd. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32.
- Liu, Y., Hu, Q., Ding, L., and Kong, L. (2023). Online local differential private quantile inference via self-normalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 21698–21714. PMLR.
- Mertikopoulos, P., Hallak, N., Kavis, A., and Cevher, V. (2020). On the almost sure convergence of stochastic gradient descent in non-convex problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1117–1128.
- Narayanan, A. and Shmatikov, V. (2006). How to break anonymity of the netflix prize dataset. *arXiv preprint cs/0610105*.
- Polyak, B. T. and Juditsky, A. B. (1992). Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 30(4):838–855.
- R Core Team (2023). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Robbins, H. and Monro, S. (1951). A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407.
- Ruppert, D. (1988). Efficient estimations from a slowly convergent robbins-monro process. Technical report, Cornell University Operations Research and Industrial Engineering.
- Song, S., Chaudhuri, K., and Sarwate, A. D. (2013). Stochastic gradient descent with differentially private updates. In *2013 IEEE global conference on signal and information processing*, pages 245–248. IEEE.
- Su, W. J. and Zhu, Y. (2018). Uncertainty quantification for online learning and stochastic approximation via hierarchical incremental gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04876*.
- Vu, D. and Slavkovic, A. (2009). Differential privacy for clinical trial data: Preliminary evaluations. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*, pages 138–143. IEEE.
- Wang, T., Zhang, X., Feng, J., and Yang, X. (2020). A comprehensive survey on local differential privacy toward data statistics and analysis. *Sensors*, 20(24):7030.
- Wang, Z. and Awan, J. (2023). Debiased parametric bootstrap inference on privatized data. *TPDP 2023 - Theory and Practice of Differential Privacy*.

- Wang, Z., Cheng, G., and Awan, J. (2022). Differentially private bootstrap: New privacy analysis and inference strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06140*.
- Wu, H., Godfrey, A. J. R., Govindaraju, K., and Pirikahu, S. (2023). *ExtDist: Extending the Range of Functions for Probability Distributions*. R package version 0.7-2.
- Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(40):14150–14154.
- Xiong, X., Liu, S., Li, D., Cai, Z., and Niu, X. (2020). A comprehensive survey on local differential privacy. *Security and Communication Networks*, 2020:1–29.
- Yang, M., Guo, T., Zhu, T., Tjuawinata, I., Zhao, J., and Lam, K.-Y. (2023). Local differential privacy and its applications: A comprehensive survey. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*, page 103827.
- Yu, L., Balasubramanian, K., Volgushev, S., and Erdogdu, M. A. (2021). An analysis of constant step size sgd in the non-convex regime: Asymptotic normality and bias. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4234–4248.
- Zhong, Y., Kuffner, T., and Lahiri, S. (2023). Online bootstrap inference with nonconvex stochastic gradient descent estimator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02205*.
- Zhu, W., Chen, X., and Wu, W. B. (2021). Online covariance matrix estimation in stochastic gradient descent. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–30.

A Technical assumptions

The theoretical results of this paper, in particular the consistency of the multiplier block bootstrap, are proved under the following assumptions.

Assumption A.1. Denote $\xi_i = \xi_i^{LDP} + \xi_i^{SGD}$. Assume that the following conditions hold:

- (1) There exists a differentiable function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with gradient ∇V such that for some constants $\lambda > 0, c' > 0, L' > 0, \varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} V(\theta) &\geq c' \|\theta\|^2 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \|\nabla V(\theta) - \nabla V(\theta')\| &\leq L' \|\theta - \theta'\| \quad \text{for all } \theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \nabla V(\theta - \theta_*)^T R(\theta) &> 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \neq \theta_* \\ \nabla V(\theta - \theta_*)^T R(\theta) &\geq \lambda V(\theta - \theta_*) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } \|\theta - \theta_*\| \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

- (2) There exist positive definite matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and constants $K_1 < \infty, \varepsilon > 0, 0 < \lambda \leq 1$ such that for all $\|\theta - \theta_*\| \leq \varepsilon$

$$\|R(\theta) - G(\theta - \theta_*)\| \leq K_1 \|\theta - \theta_*\|^{1+\lambda}. \quad (13)$$

- (3) $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a martingale-difference process with respect to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$, and for a constant $K_2 > 0$ it holds that for all $i \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\xi_i\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] + \|R(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP})\|^2 \leq K_2(1 + \|\theta_{i-1}^{LDP}\|^2).$$

- (4) For the errors $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, there exists a decomposition of the form $\xi_i = \xi_i(0) + \zeta_i(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP})$, a positive definite matrix S and a function $\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is continuous at the origin, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_i(0) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] &= 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\xi_i(0)\xi_i(0)^T | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] &= S \quad \text{in probability} \\ \lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \sup_i \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_i(0)\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\|\xi_i(0)\| > C) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] &= 0 \quad \text{in probability} \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_i(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP})\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] &\leq \delta(\|\theta_{i-1}^{LDP}\|) \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

- (5) The learning rates are given by $\eta_i = ci^{-\gamma}$ with $c > 0$ and $0.5 < \gamma < 1$.

Assumption A.2. Denote $\xi_i = \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}$ and assume that $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a martingale difference process with respect to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. Assume that the following holds:

- (1) There exists a function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_i \xi_i^T | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = S + s(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP} - \theta_*) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the matrix in Assumption A.1, and $\sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[s(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP} - \theta_*)^2])} \leq s_1 \sqrt{\eta_i}$ for a constant $s_1 > 0$.

- (2) There exists a constant $K < \infty$ such that $\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[(\xi_i \xi_i^T)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) \leq K$ a.s..

- (3) There exists a constant ρ with $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \sum_{j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \xi_j \right|^3 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \rho$.

- (4) The sequence $\{\xi_i \xi_i^T\}_{i \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable.

- (5) The learning rates are given by $\eta_j = cj^{-\gamma}$ and there exists a constant $b_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b_0^\gamma \geq 2\lambda(G)c$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{b_0} \lambda(G)^2 \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^{b_0} (1 - \lambda(G)\eta_k)^2 \geq \lambda(G)\eta_{b_0}/2 \quad (14)$$

for every eigenvalue $\lambda(G)$ of the matrix G in (13).

Remark A.1. In many cases, $\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[s(\theta_i^{LDP} - \theta_*)]^2)$ is approximately proportional to $\mathbb{E}[\|\theta_i - \theta_*\|_2]^2$ (which follows by a Taylor expansion) and the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}[\|\theta_i - \theta_*\|_2]$ is well studied, see for example Chung (1954) and Chen et al. (2020). If the sequence $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is bounded, Assumption A.2 (2)-(4) are satisfied.

Condition (14) is the base case of a proof by induction and can be numerically verified for different choices of the parameters c and γ in the learning rate.

B Proofs of the results in Section 3

We will denote $\xi_i := \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}$ in this section. Furthermore, we omit the superscript "LDP" of θ^{LDP} for improved readability. In other words, we write θ_i for θ_i^{LDP} and $\bar{\theta}$ for $\bar{\theta}^{LDP}$. Moreover, for the sake of simplicity, we assume that $n = ml$.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

This follows from Theorem 2 in Polyak and Juditsky (1992) by observing that $\xi_i = \xi_i^{SGD} + \xi_i^{LDP}$ satisfies the assumptions stated in this reference.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We first prove the statement in the case where the gradient $R(\theta)$ is assumed to be linear. After that, Theorem 3.2 is derived by showing that bootstrap LDP-SGD in the non linear case is asymptotically approximated by a linearized version of bootstrap LDP-SGD. The following result is shown in Section B.3.

Theorem B.1. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.2 hold and that $R(\theta) = G(\theta - \theta_*)$ for a positive definite matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Then, conditionally on $\theta_1^{LDP}, \dots, \theta_n^{LDP}$*

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{\theta}^* \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$$

in probability, where $\Sigma = G^{-1}SG^{-1}$.

From Theorem B.1 we conclude that Theorem 3.2 holds. To be precise, let $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the matrix in the linear approximation of the gradient $R(\theta)$ in (13), let $\{\xi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be the martingale difference process capturing the error due to measurement and privacy as in (6) and let $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the matrix in Assumption A.1 (4). Next we define a sequence of iterates θ_i^1 of LDP-SGD for a loss function with $R(\theta) = G(\theta - \theta_*)$, that is, $\theta_0^1 = \theta_0$ and for $i \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_i^1 &= \theta_{i-1}^1 - \eta_i(G(\theta_{i-1}^1 - \theta_*) + \xi_i) \\ \bar{\theta}_n^1 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^1. \end{aligned}$$

We denote the bootstrap analogue defined as in (11) for this sequence by $\bar{\theta}^{1,*}$, that is

$$\bar{\theta}^{1,*} = \frac{1}{ml} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \sum_{b=(j-1)l+1}^{jl} (\theta_b^1 - \bar{\theta}_n^1).$$

By Theorem B.1 it follows conditionally on $\theta_1^1, \dots, \theta_n^1$,

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{\theta}^{1,*} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, G^{-1}SG^{-1})$$

in probability. Since there is a bijection from $\theta_1^1, \dots, \theta_n^1$ to ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n and from $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ to ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n , the corresponding sigma algebras coincide and therefore, conditionally on $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$,

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{\theta}^{1,*} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, G^{-1}SG^{-1})$$

in probability. The assertion of Theorem 3.2 is now a consequence of

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta}^* - \bar{\theta}^{1,*}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

For a proof of this statement, we define

$$k_j = i\mathbb{I}\{(i-1)l + 1 \leq j \leq il\} \quad (15)$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta}^* - \bar{\theta}^{1,*}) &= \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} (\theta_i - \bar{\theta} - \theta_i^1 + \bar{\theta}^1) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} (\theta_i - \theta_i^1) + \sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta}^1 - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i - \sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second and third term converge to zero in probability, since $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i$ does and both $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta}^1 - \theta_*)$, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta} - \theta_*)$ converge weakly by Theorem 3.1. For a corresponding statement regarding the first term let I denote the d -dimensional identity matrix and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_i - \theta_i^1 &= \theta_{i-1} - \eta_i R(\theta_{i-1}) - \eta_i \xi_i - (\theta_{i-1}^1 - \eta_i G(\theta_{i-1}^1 - \theta_*) - \eta_i \xi_i) \\ &= (I - \eta_i G)(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_{i-1}^1) - \eta_i (R(\theta_{i-1}) - G(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_*)) \\ &= (I - \eta_i G) \left((I - \eta_{i-1} G)(\theta_{i-2} - \theta_{i-2}^1) - \eta_{i-1} (R(\theta_{i-2}) - G(\theta_{i-2} - \theta_*)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \eta_i (R(\theta_{i-1}) - G(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_*)) \right) \\ &= (I - \eta_i G)(I - \eta_{i-1} G)(\theta_{i-2} - \theta_{i-2}^1) \\ &\quad - (I - \eta_i G)\eta_{i-1} (R(\theta_{i-2}) - G(\theta_{i-2} - \theta_*)) - \eta_i (R(\theta_{i-1}) - G(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_*)) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &= \left(\prod_{k=1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) (\theta_0 - \theta_0^1) - \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) (R(\theta_{j-1}) - G(\theta_{j-1} - \theta_*)) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) (R(\theta_{j-1}) - G(\theta_{j-1} - \theta_*)), \end{aligned}$$

since $\theta_0 = \theta_0^1$. Therefore, since $\max |\epsilon_j| \leq C$ a.s. by assumption, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} (\theta_i - \theta_i^1) \right\| &= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) (R(\theta_{j-1}) - G(\theta_{j-1} - \theta_*)) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) (R(\theta_{j-1}) - G(\theta_{j-1} - \theta_*)) \right\| \\ &= \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left\| \left(\sum_{j=i}^n \prod_{k=i+1}^j (I - \eta_k G) \right) (R(\theta_{i-1}) - G(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_*)) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \|R(\theta_{i-1}) - G(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_*)\| \left\| \sum_{j=i}^n \prod_{k=i+1}^j (I - \eta_k G) \right\|_M, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_M$ denotes a matrix norm. Following the same arguments as in Polyak and Juditsky (1992), part 4 of the proof of Theorem 2, it follows that the last term converges in probability to zero.

B.3 Proof of Theorem B.1

The proof is a consequence of the following three Lemmas:

Lemma B.1. *The bootstrap estimate $\bar{\theta}^*$ in (11) can be represented as*

$$\bar{\theta}^* = \frac{1}{n\eta_1} \beta_1^n (\theta_0 - \theta_*) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1} \xi_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (\beta_j^n - \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1}) \xi_j - (\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j, \quad (16)$$

where the indices k_j are defined in (15) and the $d \times d$ matrices β_j^n are given by

$$\beta_j^n = \eta_j \sum_{i=j}^n \epsilon_{k_i} \prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G). \quad (17)$$

Lemma B.2. *Conditionally on ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n we have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1} \xi_j \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$$

in probability, where $\Sigma = G^{-1} S G^{-1}$.

Lemma B.3. *Let the assumptions from Theorem B.1 hold, β_j^n as in (17) and k_j as in (15). Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n (\beta_j^n - \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1}) \xi_j \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

By the same arguments of Part 1 in the proof of Theorem 1 in Polyak and Juditsky (1992) we obtain for the first term in (16) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}\eta_1}(\theta_0 - \theta_*) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ (note that by assumption ϵ_i are bounded a.s.). The fourth term is of order $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1/\sqrt{n})$ since $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j$ converges to zero in probability and $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\theta} - \theta_*)$ converges in distribution by Theorem 3.1. The third term in (16) is of order $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1/\sqrt{n})$ as well by Lemma B.3. Therefore

$$\sqrt{n}\bar{\theta}^* = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1} \xi_j + o_P(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$$

in probability, given $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ by Lemma B.2 (note that the sigma algebras generated by ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ coincide).

C Proofs of Lemma B.1 - Lemma B.3

C.1 Proof of Lemma B.1

Obviously,

$$\bar{\theta}^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b=(j-1)l+1}^{jl} (\theta_b - \theta_* + \theta_* - \bar{\theta}) = \frac{1}{ml} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \sum_{b=(j-1)l+1}^{jl} (\theta_b - \theta_*) - (\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j.$$

Now we use the following representation for i -th iterate

$$\theta_i - \theta_* = \prod_{j=1}^i (I - \eta_j G)(\theta_0 - \theta_*) - \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \xi_j \prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G)$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}^* &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} \left(\prod_{j=1}^i (I - \eta_j G)(\theta_0 - \theta_*) - \sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j \xi_j \prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) - (\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{k_i} \prod_{j=1}^i (I - \eta_j G)(\theta_0 - \theta_*) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \xi_j \left(\sum_{i=j}^n \epsilon_{k_i} \prod_{k=j+1}^i (I - \eta_k G) \right) - (\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j \\ &= (\theta_0 - \theta_*) \frac{1}{n\eta_1} \beta_1^n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1} \xi_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (\beta_j^n - \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1}) \xi_j - (\bar{\theta} - \theta_*) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \epsilon_j, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion of Lemma B.1.

C.2 Proof of Lemma B.2

We will give the proof for $d = 1$, the multivariate case follows by analog arguments. Define

$$Y_{n,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \sum_{j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \xi_j$$

and note that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{k_j} G^{-1} \xi_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i G^{-1} Y_{n,i}.$$

As, conditional on ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n , the random variables $\epsilon_1 Y_{n,1}, \dots, \epsilon_m Y_{n,m}$ are independent we obtain by the Berry Esseen theorem that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i G^{-1} Y_{n,i} \leq x \mid \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{x}{\sigma_n} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |G^{-1} Y_{n,i}|^3 \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^3]}{\sigma_n^3} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (G^{-1} Y_{n,i})^2 = G^{-1} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Y_{n,i}^2 G^{-1}$$

is the variance of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i G^{-1} Y_{n,i}$ conditional on ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n . Note that, by Assumption A.2 (1)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Y_{n,i}^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2] = S + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[s(\theta_{i-1}^{LDP} - \theta_*)] = S + o(1).$$

Moreover, as

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{n,i}^4] = \frac{1}{l^2} \sum_{j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \mathbb{E}[\xi_j^4] + \frac{1}{l^2} \sum_{k \neq j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \mathbb{E}[\xi_j \xi_k^3] + \frac{1}{l^2} \sum_{k \neq j=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \mathbb{E}[\xi_j^2 \xi_k^2]$$

it follows that the $E[Y_{n,i}^4]$ are uniformly bounded (note that that the fourth moment of ξ_i is bounded by assumption). Therefore, by Chebyshev's inequality, $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Y_{n,i}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} S$, which yields

$$\sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2 = G^{-1} S G^{-1}.$$

By assumption, $\mathbb{E}[|\epsilon_i|^3]$ is bounded (since $|\epsilon_i|$ is bounded almost surely) and $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |Y_{n,i}|^3$ converges in probability. Therefore, the right hand side of (18) is of order $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1/\sqrt{m})$ and the assertion of the Lemma follows.

C.3 Proof of Lemma B.3

We first derive an alternative representation for the expression in Lemma B.3. By interchanging the order of summation we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_i^n - \epsilon_{k_i} G^{-1}) \xi_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\eta_i \sum_{j=i}^n \epsilon_{k_j} \prod_{k=i+1}^j (I - \eta_k G) - \epsilon_{k_i} G^{-1} \right) \xi_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i G^{-1} V_i$$

where V_i are defined by

$$V_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \left(\sum_{j=1}^b G \eta_j \prod_{k=j+1}^b (I - \eta_k G) \xi_j - \xi_b \right).$$

With these notations the assertion of Lemma B.3 follows from the L_2 convergence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_i^n - \epsilon_{k_i} G^{-1}) \xi_i \right\|^2 \right] \leq \|G^{-1}\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i V_i \right\|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

The expression on the right hand side can be decomposed into different parts according to Lemma C.1.

Lemma C.1. Define $\Delta_i = \theta_i - \theta_*$, $\Sigma_i = E[s(\Delta_{i-1})]$, where $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the function in Assumption A.2, and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i \xi_i^T] = S + \Sigma_i$. It holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i V_i \right\|^2 \right] = \text{tr} \left(S \{ I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + N C_{l,m} \} \right) + \text{tr} \left(I^{rest} - R_{l,m}^{rest} - N_{l,m}^{rest} + N C_{l,m}^{rest} \right)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{l,m} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{j=1}^b K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j} \right\} \\ N_{l,m} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b K_{b,b'}^T + \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^b K_{b',b} \right\} \\ N C_{l,m} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \sum_{j=1}^{b'} K_{b',j}^T K_{b',j} + \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{b'} \sum_{j=1}^b K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j} \right\} \\ I^{rest} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i \\ R_{l,m}^{rest} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{j=1}^b \Sigma_j K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j} \\ N_{l,m}^{rest} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \Sigma_{b'} K_{b',b'}^T + \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^b \Sigma_b K_{b',b} \\ N C_{l,m}^{rest} &= \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{b'} \Sigma_j K_{b',j}^T K_{b',j} \right\} + \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{b'} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^b \Sigma_j K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and

$$K_{b,j} := \eta_j G \prod_{k=j+1}^b (I - \eta_k G). \quad (21)$$

In order to estimate the expressions in Lemma C.1 we now argue as follows. For the first term we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and obtain

$$\{tr(S\{I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}\})\}^2 \leq tr(S^2)tr(\{I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}\}^2).$$

Note that the matrix $I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}$ is symmetric as it is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G . Consequently, the second term converges to 0 if we can show that all eigenvalues of the matrix $I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}$ converge to zero, that is

$$\lambda(I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\lambda(A)$ denotes the eigenvalue of the matrix A . For this purpose we note again that the matrix is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G which implies that

$$\lambda(I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}) = 1 - \lambda(R_{l,m}) - \lambda(N_{l,m}) + \lambda(NC_{l,m})$$

and investigate the eigenvalues of the different matrices separately. In particular, we show in Section D the following results.

Lemma C.2. *If $n = lm \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

$$\lambda(R_{l,m}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma C.3. *If $\frac{m^\gamma}{l^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_i = ci^{-\gamma}$ for $c > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0.5, 1)$, it holds that*

$$\lambda(N_{l,m}) \rightarrow 2.$$

Lemma C.4. *If $\frac{m^\gamma}{l^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\log(l)/m \rightarrow 0$, it holds that*

$$\lambda(NC_{l,m}) \rightarrow 1.$$

From these results we can conclude that

$$tr(S\{I - R_{l,m} - N_{l,m} + NC_{l,m}\}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (22)$$

In order to derive a similar result for the second term in Lemma C.1 we consider all four terms in the trace separately. Starting with I^{rest} we obtain by Assumption A.2 that

$$|tr(I^{rest})| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{tr(\Sigma_i^2)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\eta_i} \rightarrow 0.$$

Next we note, observing the definition of $R_{l,m}^{rest}$ that

$$|tr(R_{l,m}^{rest})| \leq \frac{1}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{j=1}^b \sqrt{tr(\Sigma_j^2)} tr(K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j}) \leq C tr(R_{l,m}),$$

since $\sqrt{tr(\Sigma_j^2)}$ can be bounded by a constant by Assumption A.2. By Lemma C.2 $tr(R_{l,m})$ converges to zero which implies that

$$tr(R_{l,m}^{rest}) \rightarrow 0.$$

The two remaining terms $tr(N_{l,m}^{rest})$ and $tr(NC_{l,m}^{rest})$ are considered in the following Lemma, which will be proved in Section D.

Lemma C.5. *Under Assumption A.2 it holds that*

$$tr(N_{l,m}^{rest}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (23)$$

and that

$$tr(NC_{l,m}^{rest}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (24)$$

Combining these arguments yield

$$tr(I^{rest} - R_{l,m}^{rest} - N_{l,m}^{rest} + NC_{l,m}^{rest}) \rightarrow 0$$

and the assertion of Lemma B.3 follows from Lemma C.1 and (22).

D Proofs of auxiliary results

D.1 Proof of Lemma C.1

Observing that the bootstrap multipliers ϵ_i are independent of ξ_j it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i V_i \right\|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2 V_i^T V_i] + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \neq j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_j \epsilon_i V_i^T V_j] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[V_i^T V_i]$$

since $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0$ and $Var(\epsilon_i) = 1$. With the notation

$$B_b := \sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j G \prod_{k=j+1}^b (I - \eta_k G) \xi_j - \xi_b = \sum_{j=1}^b K_{b,j} \xi_j - \xi_b,$$

we obtain the representation $V_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} B_b$ which yields

$$\mathbb{E}[V_i^T V_i] = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \mathbb{E}[B_b^T B_b] + \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b \neq b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \mathbb{E}[B_b^T B_{b'}]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[B_b^T B_b] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^b K_{b,j} \xi_j \right)^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^b K_{b,j} \xi_j \right) \right] - 2 \sum_{j=1}^b \mathbb{E}[\xi_b^T K_{b,j} \xi_j] + \mathbb{E}[\xi_b^T \xi_b] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^b \mathbb{E}[\xi_j^T K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j} \xi_j] - 2 \mathbb{E}[\xi_b^T K_{b,b} \xi_b] + \mathbb{E}[\xi_b^T \xi_b] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^b tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \xi_j^T] K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j}) - 2 tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_b \xi_b^T] K_{b,b}) + tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_b \xi_b^T]), \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^T A \xi_j] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^T A \xi_j | \mathcal{F}_{\max\{i,j\}-1}]] = 0$ for $i \neq j$. For $b \neq b'$ a similar calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[B_b^T B_{b'}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^b \xi_j K_{b,j} - \xi_b \right)^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b'} \xi_i K_{b',i} - \xi_{b'} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\min(b,b')} tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \xi_j^T] K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j}) - \mathbb{I}\{b < b'\} tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_b \xi_b^T] K_{b',b}) - \mathbb{I}\{b' < b\} tr(\mathbb{E}[\xi_{b'} \xi_{b'}^T] K_{b,b'}). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting $\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \xi_j^T] = S + \Sigma_j$ and noting that $K_{b,b} = \eta_b G$ it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_i^T V_i] &= \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^b tr((S + \Sigma_j) K_{b,j}^T K_{b,j}) - 2 tr((S + \Sigma_b) K_{b,b}) + tr(S + \Sigma_b) \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b \neq b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\min(b,b')} tr((S + \Sigma_j) K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j}) \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{l} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b \neq b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \left\{ \mathbb{I}\{b < b'\} tr((S + \Sigma_b) K_{b',b}) + \mathbb{I}\{b' < b\} tr((S + \Sigma_{b'}) K_{b,b}') \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The assertion of Lemma C.1 now follows by a straight forward calculation adding and subtracting the terms with $b = b'$ in the second and third sum.

D.2 Proof of Lemma C.2

As $R_{l,m}$ is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda(G) = 1$ (change the constant c in the definition of η_k) and obtain with the inequalities $1 + x \leq e^x$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i \geq c \int_1^{k+1} x^{-\gamma} dx$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(R_{l,m}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^i (1 - \eta_k)^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j^2 \exp \left(-2 \sum_{k=j+1}^i \eta_k \right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j^2 \exp \left(-2c \int_{j+1}^{i+1} x^{-\gamma} dx \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(-\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (i+1)^{1-\gamma} \right) \left[\sum_{j=1}^i \eta_j^2 \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (j+1)^{1-\gamma} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Fixing a constant $v \in (0.5, 1)$, the inner sum can be split at $\lfloor iv \rfloor$, i.e.

$$\lambda(R_{l,m}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(-\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (i+1)^{1-\gamma} \right) [F_i + L_i],$$

where $F_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor iv \rfloor} \eta_j^2 \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (j+1)^{1-\gamma} \right)$ and $L_i = \sum_{j=\lfloor iv \rfloor+1}^i \eta_j^2 \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (j+1)^{1-\gamma} \right)$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i &\leq \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (\lfloor iv \rfloor + 1)^{1-\gamma} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor iv \rfloor} \eta_j^2 \leq c^2 \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (\lfloor iv \rfloor + 1)^{1-\gamma} \right) \left(1 + \int_1^{\lfloor iv \rfloor} x^{-2\gamma} dx \right) \\ L_i &\leq \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} ((i+1)^{1-\gamma}) \right) \sum_{j=\lfloor iv \rfloor+1}^i \eta_j^2 \leq c^2 \exp \left(\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} ((i+1)^{1-\gamma}) \right) \int_{\lfloor iv \rfloor}^i x^{-2\gamma} dx \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(R_{l,m}) &\leq \frac{c^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(-\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (i+1)^{1-\gamma} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\lfloor iv \rfloor + 1}{i+1} \right)^{1-\gamma} \right) \right) \left(1 + \frac{1 - \lfloor iv \rfloor^{1-2\gamma}}{2\gamma-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{c^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i^{1-2\gamma} \frac{1}{2\gamma-1} \left(\left(\frac{i}{\lfloor iv \rfloor} \right)^{2\gamma-1} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $(\lfloor iv \rfloor + 1)/(i+1) \leq (v+1)/2$ and $\frac{i}{\lfloor iv \rfloor} \leq \frac{1}{v-1/2}$ for $i \geq 2$. Therefore and since $\lfloor iv \rfloor^{1-2\gamma} \geq 0$,

$$\lambda(R_{l,m}) \leq \frac{2\gamma c^2}{(2\gamma-1)n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(-\frac{2c}{1-\gamma} (i+1)^{1-\gamma} \left(1 - \left(\frac{v+1}{2} \right)^{1-\gamma} \right) \right) + \frac{\kappa c^2}{n(2\gamma-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n i^{1-2\gamma},$$

where $\kappa = \left(\frac{1}{v-1/2} \right)^{2\gamma-1} - 1 > 0$. Since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(-K(i+1)^{1-\gamma}) \rightarrow 0$ for $K > 0$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i^{1-2\gamma} \rightarrow 0$, the assertion of the lemma follows.

D.3 Proof of Lemma C.3

Without loss of generality we assume that $\lambda(G) = 1$ (changing the constant c in the learning rate). Because $N_{l,m}$ is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G it follows that

$$\lambda(N_{l,m}) = \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \left\{ \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right\}.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j \prod_{k=j+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) = 1 - \prod_{k=1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \quad (25)$$

which follows by a direct calculation using an induction argument. With this representation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \left\{ \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right\} &= \sum_{b'=1}^b \left\{ \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right\} - \sum_{b'=1}^{(i-1)l} \left\{ \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right\} \\ &= 1 - \prod_{k=1}^b (1 - \eta_k) - \left(1 - \prod_{k=1}^{(i-1)l} (1 - \eta_k) \right) \prod_{k=(i-1)l+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{k=(i-1)l+1}^b (1 - \eta_k). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is left to show that

$$A_n := \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \prod_{k=(i-1)l+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \rightarrow 0.$$

For $k \leq b \leq il$ use $(1 - \eta_k) \leq (1 - \eta_{il})$ which gives (using the definition $\eta_k = ck^{-\gamma}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \prod_{k=(i-1)l+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) &\leq \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} (1 - \eta_{il})^{b-(i-1)l} = (1 - \eta_{il}) \frac{1 - (1 - \eta_{il})^l}{\eta_{il}} \\ &= (i^\gamma l^\gamma - c) \frac{1 - (1 - ci^{-\gamma} l^{-\gamma})^l}{c} \leq \frac{1}{c} i^\gamma l^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

if l is sufficiently large. This gives

$$A_n \leq \frac{2}{lmc} \sum_{i=1}^m i^\gamma l^\gamma \leq \frac{2m^\gamma}{cl^{1-\gamma}},$$

which converges to zero since $\frac{m^\gamma}{l^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$, by assumption.

D.4 Proof of Lemma C.4

As in the proof of Lemma C.4 we assume without loss of generality that $\lambda(G) = 1$. Observing again that $NC_{l,m}$ is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G it follows that

$$\lambda(NC_{l,m}) = \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{b-1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{b'} \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^{b'} (1 - \eta_k)^2 \right\} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k).$$

We will show below that there exists a constant c' and a constant b_0 (which depends on the parameters of the learning rate) such that for all $b \geq b_0$

$$\sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^b (1 - \eta_k)^2 \leq \eta_b/2 + c'b^{-1} \quad (26)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^b (1 - \eta_k)^2 \geq \eta_b/2. \quad (27)$$

Recalling the definition of $N_{l,m}$ in (19) and using (26), (27) and Lemma C.3 it follows that

$$\lambda(NC_{l,m}) \leq \lambda(N_{l,m})/2 + c' \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{b-1} b'^{-1} \rightarrow 1, \quad (28)$$

$$\lambda(NC_{l,m}) \geq \lambda(N_{l,m})/2 \rightarrow 1$$

since the first term in (28) converges to 1 by Lemma C.4 while the second term vanishes asymptotically, which is a consequence of the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b b'^{-1} &= \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b=b'+1}^{il} b'^{-1} \\
&= \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} b'^{-1} (il - b') \\
&= \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m i \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{il} b'^{-1} - 2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{m} \sum_{b'=1}^l b'^{-1} + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m i \log \left(\frac{i}{i-1} \right) - 2 + o(1) \\
&\leq \frac{2 \log(l)}{m} + \frac{2}{m} \int_2^{m+1} x \log \left(\frac{x}{x-1} \right) dx - 2 + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

The right hand side converges to 0 since $\frac{\log(l)}{m} \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\frac{2}{m} \int_2^{m+1} x \log \left(\frac{x}{x-1} \right) dx \rightarrow 2.$$

Therefore it remains to prove the two inequalities (26) and (27).

Proof of (26). We will show this result by induction over b . Denote

$$B = B(c') = \max \left\{ \left(3 \frac{c^2}{4c' - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma-1}}, \left(3 \frac{2c'}{c(4c' - 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, \left(3 \frac{2cc'}{4c' - 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \right\}.$$

At first we argue that there exist constants $c' \geq 1$ and $b_0 \geq B$ such that (26) holds for $b = b_0$ (this particular choice of B is used in the induction step).

To see this note that, for $c' \geq 1$, $B(c')$ is bounded by a constant (depending on c and γ). Let b_0 be fixed and larger than this constant. In particular, the choice of b_0 does not depend on c' and $b_0 \geq B(c')$ for all $c' \geq 1$. Then, for c' sufficiently large, (26) holds for $b = b_0$ since the left-hand side is finite for b_0 fixed.

For the induction step we assume that (26) holds for some $b-1 \geq b_0$, then we have to show:

$$\sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^b (1 - \eta_k)^2 = \eta_b^2 + (1 - \eta_b)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{b-1} \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^{b-1} (1 - \eta_k)^2 \leq \eta_b/2 + c' \frac{1}{b}. \quad (29)$$

Since we assumed that (26) holds for $b-1$, (29) follows from

$$\eta_b^2 + (1 - \eta_b)^2 \left(\eta_{b-1}/2 + c' \frac{1}{b-1} \right) \leq \eta_b/2 + c' \frac{1}{b}$$

which is equivalent to (inserting the definition of η_b and multiplying by b^γ)

$$\left(\left(\frac{b}{b-1} \right)^\gamma - 1 \right) (-c^2 b^{-\gamma} + \frac{c}{2}) + \frac{1}{2} c^3 b^{-2\gamma} \left(\frac{b}{b-1} \right)^\alpha + \frac{c' c^2}{b-1} b^{-\gamma} + \frac{c' b^\gamma}{b(b-1)} \leq \frac{2cc'}{b-1}. \quad (30)$$

Since $\left(\frac{b}{b-1} \right)^\gamma \leq \frac{b}{b-1}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\left(\frac{b}{b-1} \right)^\gamma - 1 \right) (-c^2 b^{-\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} c) + \frac{1}{2} c^3 b^{-2\gamma} \left(\frac{b}{b-1} \right)^\alpha + \frac{c' c^2}{b-1} b^{-\gamma} + \frac{c' b^\gamma}{b(b-1)} \\
&\leq \frac{c}{2} \left(\frac{b}{b-1} - 1 \right) + \frac{c^3}{2(b-1)} b^{1-2\gamma} + \frac{c' c^2}{b-1} b^{-\gamma} + \frac{c' b^\gamma}{b(b-1)} \\
&= \frac{c + c^3 b^{1-2\gamma} + 2c' c^2 b^{-\gamma} + 2c' b^{\gamma-1}}{2(b-1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

So (30) and therefore (29) follows from

$$c^3 b^{1-2\gamma} + 2c' c^2 b^{-\gamma} + 2c' b^{\gamma-1} \leq 4cc' - c,$$

which is implied if the following three inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} c^3 b^{1-2\gamma} &\leq \frac{1}{3}c(4c' - 1) \\ 2c' c^2 b^{-\gamma} &\leq \frac{1}{3}c(4c' - 1) \\ 2c' b^{\gamma-1} &\leq \frac{1}{3}c(4c' - 1) \end{aligned}$$

which they do for $b \geq B$. \square

Proof of (27). We will show this result by induction over b . By Assumption A.2 there exists a constant $b_0 \geq (2c)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ such that (27) holds for a $b - 1 \geq b_0$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^b \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^b (1 - \eta_k)^2 = \eta_b^2 + (1 - \eta_b)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{b-1} \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^{b-1} (1 - \eta_k)^2 \geq \eta_b^2 + (1 - \eta_b)^2 \frac{\eta_{b-1}}{2}$$

by the induction hypothesis. Showing that this is larger than $\eta_b/2$ is equivalent to (inserting the definition of η_b , multiplying by $2b^{2\gamma}(b-1)^\gamma/c$)

$$2c((b-1)^\gamma - b^\gamma) + c^2 + b^{2\gamma} \geq (b-1)^\gamma b^\gamma.$$

Since $c^2 > 0$, this is implied by

$$2c \leq b^\gamma$$

(note that $(b-1)^\gamma - b^\gamma \leq 0$). By Assumption A.2 (5) we have $b^\gamma \geq b_0^\gamma \geq 2c$, which completes the proof of Lemma C.4. \square

D.5 Proof of Lemma C.5

We start by showing (23). Note that by definition of $N_{l,m}^{rest}$ (20)

$$tr(N_{l,m}^{rest}) = \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b tr(\Sigma_{b'} K_{b,b'})$$

where the matrix $K_{b,b'}$ is defined in (21) and Σ_b as in Lemma C.1. From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it follows that $|tr(\Sigma_{b'} K_{b,b'}^T)| \leq \sqrt{tr(\Sigma_{b'}^2) tr(K_{b,b'}^2)}$. By Assumption A.2, $\sqrt{tr(\Sigma_{b'}^2)}$ is (up to a constant) bounded by $\sqrt{\eta_{b'}}$. We will prove

$$B_n := \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=2}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \sqrt{\eta_{b'} \lambda(K_{b,b'}^2)} \rightarrow 0, \quad (31)$$

$$C_n := \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{b=1}^l \sum_{b'=1}^b \sqrt{\eta_{b'} \lambda(K_{b,b'}^2)} \rightarrow 0 \quad (32)$$

for every eigenvalue of $K_{b,b'}$ from which (23) follows.

To see (31), note again that $K_{b,b'}$ is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G and as in the proof of Lemma C.3 we assume without loss of generality that $\lambda(G) = 1$, which gives

$$\lambda(K_{b,b'}^2) = \eta_{b'}^2 \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k)^2.$$

If l is sufficiently large, $1 - \eta_k \geq 0$ for $k \geq b' \geq l$, and therefore

$$\sqrt{\lambda(K_{b,b'}^2)} = \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k).$$

By $\sqrt{\eta_{b'}} \leq \sqrt{\eta_{(i-1)l}}$ for $b' \geq (i-1)l$ and by applying (25), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_n &\leq \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=2}^m \sqrt{\eta_{(i-1)l}} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^b \left\{ \eta_{b'} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right\} \\
&= \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=2}^m \sqrt{\eta_{(i-1)l}} \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \left(1 - \prod_{k=(i-1)l+1}^b (1 - \eta_k) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \sqrt{\eta_{(i-1)l}} \\
&\leq 2l^{-\gamma/2}
\end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero.

(32) follows by similar arguments and noting that $(1 - \eta_k) < 0$ for only finitely many k .

To show the second assertion (24) in Lemma C.5, note that by the definition (20) of $NC_{l,m}^{rest}$ and same arguments as in the proof of (23), it follows that

$$tr(NC_{l,m}) \leq \frac{2}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{b-1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{b'} \sqrt{\eta_{b'} tr((K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j})^2)} \right\}$$

where $tr((K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j})^2) \leq d\lambda_{max}((K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j})^2)$. Noting $K_{b,j}$ is a polynomial of the symmetric matrix G and assuming without loss of generality that for the corresponding eigenvalue of G it holds $\lambda(G) = 1$ it follows

$$\sqrt{\lambda((K_{b,j}^T K_{b',j})^2)} = \eta_j^2 \prod_{k=j+1}^{b'} (1 - \eta_k)^2 \prod_{k=b'+1}^b |1 - \eta_k|.$$

Similar to (26) one can show by induction that (c being the constant in the learning rate)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{b'} \eta_j^2 \sqrt{\eta_j} \prod_{k=j+1}^{b'} (1 - \eta_k)^2 \leq c\eta_{b'} \sqrt{\eta_{b'}} + c'b'^{-1}.$$

This implies

$$tr(NC_{l,m}) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{lm} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{b=(i-1)l+1}^{il} \sum_{b'=(i-1)l+1}^{b-1} \eta_{b'} \sqrt{\eta_{b'}} \prod_{k=b'+1}^b |1 - \eta_k| + c'b'^{-1},$$

where the sum over the first term converges to zero by the same arguments used for the convergence of B_n and C_n and the sum over the second term converges to zero by the same arguments used in the proof of (26). Therefore (24) follows.