
TOWARDS THE GENERALIZATION OF MULTI-VIEW LEARNING: AN INFORMATION-THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Wen Wen, Tieliang Gong*, Yuxin Dong, Weizhan Zhang
School of Computer Science of Technology
Xi'an Jiaotong University
{wen190329, adidasgt1, yxdong9805}@gmail.com
zhangwzh@xjtu.edu.cn

Shujian Yu
Department of Artificial Intelligence
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
yusj9011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Multiview learning has drawn widespread attention for its efficacy in leveraging cross-view consensus and complementarity information to achieve a comprehensive representation of data. While multi-view learning has undergone vigorous development and achieved remarkable success, the theoretical understanding of its generalization behavior remains elusive. This paper aims to bridge this gap by developing information-theoretic generalization bounds for multi-view learning, with a particular focus on multi-view reconstruction and classification tasks. Our bounds underscore the importance of capturing both consensus and complementary information from multiple different views to achieve maximally disentangled representations. These results also indicate that applying the multi-view information bottleneck regularizer is beneficial for satisfactory generalization performance. Additionally, we derive novel data-dependent bounds under both leave-one-out and supersample settings, yielding computational tractable and tighter bounds. In the interpolating regime, we further establish the fast-rate bound for multi-view learning, exhibiting a faster convergence rate compared to conventional square-root bounds. Numerical results indicate a strong correlation between the true generalization gap and the derived bounds across various learning scenarios.

1 Introduction

In most scientific data analysis scenarios, data collected from diverse domains and different sensors exhibit heterogeneous properties while preserving underlying connections. For example, (1) a piece of text can express the same semantics and sentiment in multiple different languages; (2) the user's interest can be reflected in the text posted, images uploaded, and videos viewed; (3) animals perceive potential dangers in their surroundings through various senses such as sight, hearing, and smell. All of these reflect different perspectives of the data, collectively referred to as multi-view data. Extracting consensus and complementarity information from multiple views to achieve a comprehensive representation of multi-view data, has stimulated research interest across various fields and led to the development of multi-view learning Hamdi et al. (2021); Fan et al. (2022); Fu et al. (2022); Hong et al. (2023).

While various methodologies have emerged in multi-view learning, predominantly encompassing canonical correlation analysis (CCA)-based approaches Gao et al. (2020); Chen et al. (2022); Shu et al. (2022) and engineering-driven techniques Xu et al. (2021); Bai et al. (2023), these methods suffer from a critical limitation. Specifically, their emphasis on maximizing cross-view consensus information often comes at the expense of view-specific, task-relevant information, thereby potentially compromising downstream performance Liang et al. (2024). Recent significant efforts have been dedicated to leveraging diverse information-theoretic techniques to precisely capture both view-common and view-unique components from multiple views Wang et al. (2019); Federici et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2023); Cui et al. (2024); Zhang et al. (2024), thereby yielding maximally disentangled representation and improving generalization ability. For instance, Kleinman et al. (2024) and Zhang et al. (2024) introduce the notion of Gács-Körner common information (Gács et al., 1973) and utilize total correlation between consensus and complementarity information to extract mutually independent cross-view common and unique components. The works of Federici et al. (2020) and Cui

*Corresponding to: Tieliang Gong

Table 1: Theoretical supports for diverse multi-view learning approaches based on information theory.

Learning Task	Reference	Information-theoretic Tool	Information Measure	Generalization Analysis
Multi-view Reconstruction	Kleinman et al. (2024)	Mutual Information	$\max \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^2 I(X^{(j)}; C)$	Theorem 4.4
	Zhang et al. (2024)	GK Common information Total Correlation	$H(C) - TC(C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)})$	Theorem 4.1
Multi-view Classification	Wang et al. (2019)		$I(\bar{Y}; \bar{Z}) - I(\bar{X}; \bar{Z})$	
	Federici et al. (2020)	Multi-view IB	$I(X; Z Y) + I(Y; Z)$	Theorems 4.7-4.16
	Wang et al. (2023)		$I(X; Y) + I(X; Y Z)$	

et al. (2024) generalizes the information bottleneck (IB) approach Tishby et al. (1999) to multi-view learning, achieving a favorable trade-off between prediction performance and complexity in learning compact multi-view representation. Despite empirical success, the generalization properties of multi-view learning, particularly regarding consensus and complementarity information across views, still remain poorly understood.

This work provides a comprehensive information-theoretic generalization analysis for multi-view learning by establishing high-probability generalization bounds. Our results offer theoretical explanations for the effectiveness of existing multi-view learning methods in achieving sufficiently compact representations and excellent generalization performance, as enumerated in Table 1. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- We establish information-theoretic bounds for multi-view learning from the perspective of both reconstruction and classification tasks. Our bounds, expressed in terms of information measures that integrate both view-common and view-unique components, demonstrate that extracting consensus and complementarity information across multiple views within an information-theoretic framework facilitates the maximally disentangled representations and leads to smaller generalization errors. Furthermore, the derived bounds justify the effectiveness of the multi-view information bottleneck regularizer in balancing representation capabilities and generalization performance.
- We develop novel data-dependent bounds by employing one-dimensional variables in both leave-one-out and supersample settings, facilitating the attainment of computational feasibility. Additionally, we derive the fast-rate bound for multi-view learning by leveraging the weighted generalization error, improving the scaling rate from $1/\sqrt{nm}$ to $1/nm$ under the interpolating regime, where n and m denote the number of multi-view samples and the number of views, respectively.
- Empirical observations on both synthetic and real-world datasets validate the close agreement between the true generalization error and the derived bounds, indicating the effectiveness of our results in capturing the generalization of multi-view learning.

2 Related work

Multi-view Learning with Information Theory. Recently, multi-view learning methods driven by information theory have achieved remarkable success in various application areas Oord et al. (2018); Wang et al. (2019); Federici et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2023). Oord et al. (2018) propose a universal unsupervised learning approach based on mutual information to learn compact representations from high-dimensional multi-view data. Wang et al. (2019) propose a deep multi-view information bottleneck framework to disentangle complex dependencies across different views and extract cross-view common and unique information. Recent significant advancements have been made by Federici et al. (2020) and Wang et al. (2023), who develop information bottleneck approaches for multi-view learning under unsupervised and self-supervised settings. Their methods effectively capture compact representations by retaining sufficient information from all views while removing superfluous information from individual views. To obtain maximally disentangled representations, Kleinman et al. (2024) generalize the Gács-Körner common information Gács et al. (1973) to the stochastic functions, efficiently inferring the common and unique components of the cross-representation via parameterized optimization. Zhang et al. (2024) introduce the multi-view Gács-Körner common information and propose novel multi-view learning framework capable of precisely extracting common and unique features from multiple views, achieving smaller reconstruction error and improving performance on downstream classification tasks. Despite the superior performance, there is a lack of theoretical understanding of the generalization behavior of multi-view learning.

Information-Theoretic Generalization Analysis. Information theory has become a powerful tool for depicting and analyzing the generalization properties of learning algorithms in recent years (Xu & Raginsky, 2017; Steinke & Zakynthinou, 2020; Wang & Mao, 2023; Dong et al., 2024b). Xu & Raginsky (2017) initially provide an information-theoretic understanding of the generalization ability by relating the generalization error to the input-output mutual information, implying the balance between the data fit and the generalization. This framework has been subsequently enhanced and expanded through diverse approaches, such as the random subsets Bu et al. (2020); Dong et al. (2024b), conditional information measures Steinke & Zakynthinou (2020), gradient variance analysis Negrea et al. (2019); Wang & Mao (2023), etc. Along the lines of previous work, significant effort has recently been devoted to revealing the relationship between information bottlenecks and generalization (Shwartz-Ziv et al., 2019; Saxe et al., 2019; Federici et al., 2020; Tezuka & Namekawa, 2021). Shwartz-Ziv et al. (2019) provide an analytic bound on the mutual information between representation compression. However, their bounds do not explain the success of the information bottleneck principle and are invalid for data-dependent algorithms Hafez-Kolahi et al. (2020). While Hafez-Kolahi et al. (2020) move towards this by proving an input compression bound, this is still far from being a valid sample complexity bound. Kawaguchi et al. (2023) establish the information-theoretic bounds for representation learning through mutual information, demonstrating that optimizing the information bottleneck is an effective way to control generalization errors. Remarkably, their derived bounds only apply to the case of a single-view data as input. While the aforementioned work bears its own limitations, it still provides valuable insights for analyzing the generalization of multi-view learning.

3 Preliminaries

We denote random variables and their specific realizations by capital letters and lower-case letters, respectively. Denote by $H(X) = \mathbb{E}_{p(X)}[-\log p(X)]$ the Shannon’s entropy of random variable X and $H_\alpha(X) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \int_{\mathcal{X}} p^\alpha(X) dX$ the Rényi’s α -order entropy of X , where the limit case $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ recovers Shannon’s entropy. The conditional entropy of random variable X given Y is denoted by $H(X|Y)$. Let $I(X; Z)$ be the mutual information between random variables X and Z . The mutual information $I(X; Z)$ can also be expressed by $I(X; Z) = \mathbb{E}_{p(X)}[KL(p(Z|X)||p(Z))]$, where KL denotes Kullback Leibler divergence. The corresponding conditional mutual information given Y is denoted by $I(X; Z|Y)$. For simplicity, we write X_y to denote X conditional on $Y = y$. We define the multivariate mutual information, known as total correlation, $TC(X_1, \dots, X_n) = KL(p(X_1, \dots, X_n) || \prod_{i=1}^n p(X_i))$, where $p(X_i)$ is the marginal distributions of the components of X . We use \circ to represent the composition of functions.

Multiview Learning. Multi-view learning aims to leverage the consensus and complementarity information extracted from multiple views to improve performance. Let multi-view data X comprise m different views, denoted as $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(m)}) \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, where \mathcal{X} is the feature space and each view $X^{(j)}$ is the d -dimensional feature vector. Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ represent the hypothesis space of representation functions. Given the hypothesis function $\phi^{(j)} = \{(\phi_c^{(j)}, \phi_u^{(j)})\} : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ of the j -th view, the extracted view-common and view-unique features of single views $X^{(j)}$, denoted C and $U^{(j)}$, can be expressed by

$$(C, U^{(j)}) := (\phi_c^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), \phi_u^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) = \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}).$$

To precisely quantify common information across different views, extensive work (Salehifar et al., 2021; Tsur et al., 2024) has introduced the concept of Gács-Körner common information between two views Gács et al. (1973):

Definition 3.1. Gács et al. (1973) Let $X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)})$ be a two-view data. Given deterministic functions g_1 and g_2 , the Gács-Körner common information is defined by

$$C_{GK}(X) := \max_C H(C), \tag{1}$$

subjected to $C = g_1(X^{(1)}) = g_2(X^{(2)})$.

Definition 3.1 quantifies the maximum amount of information retained in common parts between two views through the entropy $H(C)$ of the variable C . This measurement has been expanded in (Zhang et al., 2024) from two views to m different views ($m \geq 2$). It is noteworthy that such a common information measure typically encounters computational infeasibility when dealing with high-dimensional data. To address this issue, we introduce a universal measure of common information among multiple views:

Definition 3.2. Let $X = \{X^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ be a multi-view data with m views. Given stochastic functions f_1, \dots, f_m , the multi-view common information is defined by

$$\tilde{C}_{GK}(X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(m)}) := \max_C I(X^{(j)}; C) \quad j \in [m],$$

subjected to $C = f_1(X^{(1)}) = \dots = f_m(X^{(m)})$.

It can be easily proven that for arbitrary $i, j \in [m]$, $I(X^{(i)}; C) = I(X^{(j)}; C)$, thereby leading to an equivalent formula of Definition 3.2: $\max_C \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} I(X^{(j)}; C) = \max_C I(X^{(j)}; C)$. If functions f_1, \dots, f_m are deterministic, where $H(C|X^{(j)}) = 0$ and $I(X^{(j)}; C) = H(C)$, the measure defined above would degenerate into the multi-view Gács-Körner common information. In contrast, Definition 3.2 not only applies broadly to various multi-view learning methods but also circumvents the infeasibility of computing the Gács-Körner common information on high-dimensional data Kleinman et al. (2024).

Building upon the above definitions and exploiting multi-view representation function $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$, one could learn a disentangled representation Z from the multi-view data $X = \{X^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$, expressed by

$$Z := (C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)}) = \phi(X).$$

Generalization Error. The generalization error serves as an effective indication of the generalization capability of hypothesis functions, defined as the difference between the population risk and the empirical risk. In this paper, we aim to analyze the generalization of multi-view learning by establishing information-theoretic generalization error bounds. In particular, we focus on the generalization error of the output hypothesis for both multi-view reconstruction and classification tasks, which evaluates the invariance of the learned representation to the original data and its sufficiency for class prediction.

Assume that we have n labeled multi-view samples, denoted as $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, i.i.d. drawn from a probability distribution over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{Y} denotes the class label space, each $x_i = (x_i^{(1)}, \dots, x_i^{(m)})$ consists of m views and \mathcal{Y} , and y_i denotes its corresponding label. Given a loss function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ and a decoding function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$, the empirical risk of the hypothesis $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ for multi-view reconstruction is defined by

$$\widehat{L}_{rec} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{\text{avg}}(x_i; \psi, \phi),$$

where $\ell_{\text{avg}}(x_i; \psi, \phi) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})$ represents the average of the sum of the loss between each single view $x_i^{(j)}$ and its reconstructed view $\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)})$ for i -th multi-view sample x_i . The empirical risk \widehat{L}_{rec} measures the quality of the learning hypothesis ϕ for capturing latent multi-view representations to precisely reconstruct the original multi-view data. The corresponding population risk is defined by

$$L_{rec} := \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}}[\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)],$$

which evaluates the generalization ability of ϕ on unseen multi-view data X . We define the generalization error for multi-view reconstruction by

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{rec} = L_{rec} - \widehat{L}_{rec}.$$

For classification tasks, let the decoding function $\hat{\psi} : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. Given the loss function $\hat{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, the empirical risk of $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ for the class prediction is defined by

$$\widehat{L}_{cls} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi),$$

where $\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i)$ represents the average of the sum of the loss between the predicted label $\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)})$ of each single view and its true label y_i for multi-view data x_i . Similarly, the population risk is defined by

$$L_{cls} := \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}[\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)].$$

The corresponding generalization error for the multi-view classification is defined by

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} = L_{cls} - \widehat{L}_{cls}.$$

Additionally, let $R_x = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)$ and $R_{x,y} = \sup_{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$ represent the maximum attainable losses, and $R_x^s = \sup_{i \in [n]} \ell_{\text{avg}}(x_i; \psi, \phi)$ and $R_{x,y}^s = \sup_{i \in [n]} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$ represent the maximum samplewise losses.

Drawing on the significant advancements made in Steinke & Zakynthinou (2020); Harutyunyan et al. (2021); Rammal et al. (2022), which establish computationally tractable bounds under various sampling regimes, we extend these methodologies to multi-view learning scenarios:

Leave-One-Out (LOO) Setting. The LOO setting is introduced by Rammal et al. (2022) for generalization analysis. Let $\tilde{S}_l = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ be a dataset of $n+1$ i.i.d. samples. We denote $U \sim \text{Unif}([n+1])$ as a uniform random variable for selecting the single test sample from \tilde{S}_l . Then, the training and test datasets are constructed as $\tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^l = \tilde{S}_l \setminus (x_U, y_U)$ and $\tilde{S}_{\text{test}}^l = \{(x_U, y_U)\}$. The generalization ability of the hypothesis ϕ is measured by the LOO validation error $\Delta_{\text{loo}} = \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq U} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$.

Supersample Setting. The supersample setting is initially explored by Steinke & Zakynthinou (2020) for generalization analysis. Let $\tilde{S}_s = \{(x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}), (x_{i,1}, y_{i,1})\}_{i=1}^n$ be the supersample dataset consisting of $2 \times n$ i.i.d. samples. The random variable $\tilde{U} = \{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \text{Unif}(\{0, 1\}^n)$ is used to split training and test samples. The training and test datasets are then constructed as $\tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s = \{(x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,\tilde{U}_i})\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\tilde{S}_{\text{test}}^s = \{(x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i})\}_{i=1}^n$, respectively. The generalization ability of ϕ is measured by $\Delta_{\text{sup}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,\tilde{U}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$.

Presumption. Following the previous work Kawaguchi et al. (2023), we focus on hypothesis spaces with finite cardinality. This allows for finite information measures, thereby yielding non-vacuous and non-trivial generalization guarantees. It is noteworthy that such a constraint is natural for digital computers and has been widely used in information-theoretic generalization analysis Xu & Raginsky (2017); Kawaguchi et al. (2023).

4 Information-theoretic Bounds for Multi-view Learning

In this section, we develop the high-probability generalization bounds of representation functions for multi-view reconstruction and classification tasks through the novel usage of the typical subset. We separately analyze the generalization properties of deterministic and stochastic representation functions, thereby providing generalization guarantees for various multi-view learning paradigms Wang et al. (2023); Kleinman et al. (2024); Zhang et al. (2024). Additionally, we develop novel data-dependent bounds for multi-view learning under the LOO and supersample settings, and the fast-rate bound in the interpolating regime. Please refer to the Appendix for complete proofs.

4.1 Generalization Bounds for Multi-view Reconstruction

We start with deterministic the representation function $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$, and establish the following generalization bound via information measures incorporating view-common and view-unique information:

Theorem 4.1. *For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{\text{rec}} \leq \mathcal{K}_1 \sqrt{\frac{H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}) + \mathcal{K}_2}{nm}} + \frac{\mathcal{K}_3}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

where $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \mathcal{K}_3$ are constants of order $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, specifically defined in Appendix D.4.

Remark 4.2. Theorem 4.1 characterizes the generalization behavior of deterministic multi-view representation functions through the entropy $H(C)$ of the view-common component and $\sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)})$ of the view-unique components. It elucidates how maximally disentangled representation, captured from both common and unique information across multiple views, facilitates excellent generalization performance, as evidenced by recent studies Zhang et al. (2024); Kleinman et al. (2024). Concretely, an ideal representation can be obtained through optimizing two quantities: maximizing $H(C)$ to capture the Gács-Körner common information (as defined in Definition 3.1), while minimizing $H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)})$ such that $H(Z) = H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)})$, leading to statistically independent common and unique components satisfying $\text{TC}(C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)}) = 0$. Therefore, this could yield a sufficiently decoupled representation $Z_* = (C_*, U_*^{(1)}, \dots, U_*^{(m)})$, while achieving smaller generalization error for multi-view reconstruction.

Remark 4.3. The derived bound exhibits a convergence rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\sqrt{nm})$ with respect to the number n of multi-view samples and the number m of views. In particular, when setting $m = 1$, Theorem 4.1 yields the generalization bound of single-view learning, tightening the existing bounds in Shwartz-Ziv et al. (2019); Hafez-Kolahi et al. (2020) by replacing $2^{H(Z)}$ with $H(Z)$ (i.e., $H(C, U^{(1)})$).

In the following, we connect the generalization error to the mutual information between each view and the common and unique components, as well as to the Rényi's entropy of the representation function:

Theorem 4.4. For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{rec} \leq \frac{\mathcal{K}_{3,\phi} + \mathcal{K}_1 \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}}}{\sqrt{nm}} + \mathcal{K}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m (I(X^{(j)}; C) + I(X^{(j)}; U^{(j)})) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi)}{nm}}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}$ are constants of order $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$, and $\mathcal{K}_{3,\phi} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + 1})$, specifically defined in Appendix D.5.

Remark 4.5. Theorem 4.4 generalizes the theoretical understanding of stochastic multi-view representations, including Theorem 4.1 as a special case. A key distinction between them lies in the information theoretical characterization: independent cross-view common and unique information can be captured by maximizing the mutual information $I(X^{(j)}; C)$ in Definition 3.2, while simultaneously minimizing $I(X^{(j)}; C) + I(X^{(j)}; U)$ for all $j \in [m]$. This approach not only reduces the computational complexity associated with the Gács-Körner common information on high-dimensional data, but also flexibly adapts to a variety of learning models. Additionally, the upper bound in Theorem 4.4 includes an extra Rényi's entropy term $H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) \approx I(\phi; S)$, quantifying the information of the representation function ϕ retained from the multi-view training data S , where ϕ is typically used at test time as opposed to training time and $H(\phi|S) = 0$. This provides a novel insight beyond Theorem 4.1: a trade-off between the data fit and the generalization needs to account for achieving both the representation capability and the generalization ability. If the learning hypothesis ϕ is deterministic, by $\sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y) \leq I(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n; Y)$ (Lemma A.10 in Dong et al. (2024a)), we have $H(\phi) = 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C) \leq I(X; C) = H(C)$, $I(X^{(j)}; U^{(j)}) = H(U^{(j)})$, and Theorem 4.4 can recover the upper bound in Theorem 4.1

Remark 4.6. Theorem 4.4 scales $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\sqrt{nm})$ in the number of multi-view samples and views, providing tighter bounds in terms of mutual information compared to single-view learning. Let $I(X; Z)$ denote the mutual information of single-view learning, we similarly prove that $I(X; Z) \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; Z^{(j)}) \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C^{(j)}) + I(X^{(j)}; U^{(j)})$, which demonstrates the benefits of learning from multiple views over a single view Shwartz-Ziv et al. (2019); Hafez-Kolahi et al. (2020).

4.2 Generalization Bounds for Multi-view Classification Tasks

We further investigate the generalization properties of the representation function for classification tasks. The following theorem provides the generalization bound of deterministic representation functions, illustrating the crucial role of the multi-view information bottleneck regularizer for controlling the generalization error.

Theorem 4.7. For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2}{nm}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_3}{\sqrt{nm}}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|})$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2, \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_3$ are constants of order $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, specifically defined in Appendix E.4.

Remark 4.8. Theorem 4.7 establishes an upper bound on the generalization error in terms of the conditional mutual information $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ between single views $X^{(j)}$ and its representations $(C, U^{(j)})$, conditioned on the label Y . It is noteworthy that $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ could serve as an information bottleneck regularizer to achieve the compressed representation and reduce the generalization error, which has been empirically proven to be successful in recent studies Federici et al. (2020); Lee et al. (2021). In theory, the spirit of the information bottleneck is to regularize $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)})$ while the maximizing $I(C, U^{(j)}; Y)$. By $I(X; Z) = I(X; Z|Y) + I(Z; Y)$ (Eq. (2) in Federici et al. (2020)), it is obvious that regularizing $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ instead of $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)})$ is a more intuitive and direct way to learn sufficient compact and highly label-relevant representations. Furthermore, $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ can be reduced to zero, leading to a tighter upper bound.

Remark 4.9. Notably, Theorem 4.7 yields a more rigorous upper bound than that of single-view learning Kawaguchi et al. (2023), demonstrating the advantages of learning representations from multiple views. Let $I(X; Z|Y)$ denote the conditional mutual information of single-view learning. Analogous to the analysis of Remark 4.6, it is evident that $I(X; Z|Y) \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; Z^{(j)}|Y) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$. When setting $m = 1$, Theorem 4.7 recover the bound of single-view learning, exhibiting comparable convergence order of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\sqrt{n})$ to Kawaguchi et al. (2023). In contrast to previous work, our bound provides clear interpretation in terms of decomposing random variables into unique and common components.

Remark 4.10. Compared to Theorems 4.1 and 4.4, Theorem 4.7 inherently depends on the label space \mathcal{Y} , implying a trade-off associated with its space complexity. On the one hand, the bound scales as $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|})$ in the cardinality of \mathcal{Y} , potentially leading to trivial bounds when $|\mathcal{Y}|$ is large. Theorem 4.4 is preferred for obtaining meaningful generalization

guarantees, since each view is a more desirable supervisory signal than the label in this setting. On the other hand, when $I(X^{(j)}; Y)$ is large, implying that each single view contains highly label-relevant information, it is advisable to apply Theorem 4.7 for tighter upper bounds.

By extending the analysis to stochastic representation functions, we derive the following upper bound that reconciles the information bottleneck regularizer $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ with the Rényi entropy $H_{1-\lambda}(\phi)$ of the representation function ϕ :

Theorem 4.11. *For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$:*

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{3,\phi}}{\sqrt{nm}} + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{2,\lambda}}{nm}},$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|})$, $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{2,\lambda} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{3,\phi} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + 1})$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, specifically defined in Appendix E.5.

Remark 4.12. Theorem 4.11 provides additional insights beyond Theorem 4.7 by capturing a novel relationship between the amount of information in the representation learned from multi-view inputs, i.e., $I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ and the information retained by the representation function from the training data, i.e., $H_{1-\lambda}(\phi)$. It is noteworthy that $H_{1-\lambda}(\phi)$ monotonically decreases as λ decreases, implying a trade-off between the Rényi's $(1 - \lambda)$ -order entropy of representation functions ϕ and the scaling rate of generalization. As a special case of Theorem 4.11 with $m = 1$, this enables us to tighten the existing bounds of single-view learning Kawaguchi et al. (2023) by applying a smaller λ . Moreover, the inherent robustness of Rényi entropy contributes to enhancing the robustness of learned representations Hanel et al. (2009); Lee & Shin (2022).

4.3 Data-dependent Generalization Bounds

The following theorems present novel sample complexity bounds by bounding the validation error under both the LOO and supersample settings:

Theorem 4.13. *If $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, for any $\delta > 0$ and all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\Delta_{\text{loo}} \leq \mathcal{K}_1^u \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + I(\phi; U) + \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^u},$$

where $\mathcal{K}_1^u, \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^u$ are constants of order $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$, specifically defined in Appendix F.1.

Theorem 4.14. *If $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, for any $\delta > 0$, and all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\Delta_{\text{sup}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{K}_1^{\tilde{u}} \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^{\tilde{u}}}}{\sqrt{nm}} + \mathcal{K}_1^{\tilde{u}} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + I(\phi; \tilde{U})}{nm}},$$

where $\mathcal{K}_1^{\tilde{u}}, \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^{\tilde{u}}$ are constants of order $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, specifically defined in Appendix F.2.

Remark 4.15. Notably, the upper bound of Theorem 4.14 scales proportionally with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\sqrt{nm})$ in the supersample setting, whereas Theorem 4.13 does not, as only one sample is chosen to evaluate the test loss each time under the LOO setting. Nevertheless, both Theorems 4.13 and 4.14 can improve upon existing results by exploiting one-dimensional random variables (U or \tilde{U}), achieving computational tractable and tighter bounds. Concretely, it can be proven that $I(\phi; \tilde{U})$ is strictly smaller than $H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) \approx I(\phi; S)$. By applying data-processing inequality on the Markov chain: $U \rightarrow \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s \rightarrow \phi$ conditioned on \tilde{S}_s , we have $I(\phi; \tilde{U}|\tilde{S}_s) \leq I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s|\tilde{S}_s)$. We further utilize the independence between \tilde{U} and \tilde{S}_s and obtain $I(\phi; \tilde{U}) \leq I(\phi; \tilde{U}) + I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{S}_s|\phi) = I(\phi; \tilde{U}|\tilde{S}_s) + I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{S}_s) = I(\phi; \tilde{U}|\tilde{S}_s)$. Similarly, the conditional independence between \tilde{S}_s and ϕ given $\tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s$ indicates that $I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s|\tilde{S}_s) \leq I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s|\tilde{S}_s) + I(\phi; \tilde{S}_s) = I(\phi; \tilde{S}_s|\tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s) + I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s) = I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s)$. Since the training process $\tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s \mapsto \phi$ is deterministic, the randomness of ϕ is mainly induced by the variable \tilde{U} , which implies that $H(\phi|\tilde{U}) \approx 0$. With these in mind, we obtain that

$$I(\phi; \tilde{U}) \leq I(\phi; \tilde{U}|\tilde{S}_s) \leq I(\phi; \tilde{S}_{\text{train}}^s|\tilde{S}_s) \leq I(\phi; S).$$

Therefore, the mutual information $I(\phi; \tilde{U})$ serves as a more stringent estimate of $I(\phi; S)$, thereby tightening the upper bounds. The above analysis can be similarly applied to $I(\phi; U)$. It is worth noting that the supersample validation error can approximate the generalization error when the training dataset is sufficiently large, as $\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\text{sup}} = \overline{\text{gen}}_{cls}$. In this case, Theorem 4.14 achieves a substantial improvement over Theorem 4.11.




Figure 1: Pearson correlation analysis between the generalization error and information measures in the derived bounds for a five-layer MLP trained on synthetic Gaussian datasets. (a),(b): The correlations of $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)})$ and $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ with the generalization error for both reconstruction and classification. (c): Comparison of Pearson correlation coefficients for different factors and the generalization error.




Figure 2: Comparison of the generalization bounds for classification tasks on real-world datasets with different optimizers. (a) CNN model trained with binary MNIST using Adam, (b), (c): pretrained ResNet-50 model fine-tuned on CIFAR-10 using SGD and SGLD, respectively.

4.4 Fast-rate Generalization Bound

We further develop the fast-rate bound in the context of multi-view classification by leveraging the weighted generalization error: $L_{cls} - (1 + \xi)\widehat{L}_{cls}$, where ξ is a predefined positive constant. This framework facilitates the attainment of a faster convergence rate of $1/nm$ instead of the conventional $1/\sqrt{nm}$.

Theorem 4.16. For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in (0, \log 2)$, $\xi \geq \frac{\log(2 - e^{2\beta R_{x,y}^s})}{2\beta R_{x,y}^s} - 1$, and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, we have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \xi \widehat{L}_{cls} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \widehat{\mathcal{K}}}{nm\beta},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ is given in Appendix G. In the interpolating setting, i.e., $\widehat{L}_{cls} = 0$, we further have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \widehat{\mathcal{K}}}{nm\beta}.$$

Remark 4.17. In the interpolating regime, where the empirical risk approaches zero, the weighted generalization error simplifies to the unweighted generalization error, leading to the bound scaling of $1/nm$. This characteristic renders the derived fast-rate bounds especially useful when the training error is small or even zero. In particular, Theorem 4.16 with $m = 1$ enhances the generalization bounds of single-view learning Shwartz-Ziv et al. (2019); Hafez-Kolahi et al. (2020); Kawaguchi et al. (2023) by achieving a faster scaling rate of $1/n$ as opposed to $1/\sqrt{n}$.

5 Numerical Results

In this section, we empirically compare the derived generalization bounds for downstream classification tasks and the upper bounds of single-view learning Kawaguchi et al. (2023). Our empirical evaluation consists of two parts: firstly, we investigate the effectiveness of learning from multiple views versus a single view by comparing the upper bounds on synthetic Gaussian datasets, which follows the same settings as Kawaguchi et al. (2023). Secondly, we evaluate the tightness between the derived upper bounds and the generalization error by employing complex neural networks on real-world image classification datasets (ResNet-50 He et al. (2016) on CIFAR-10 dataset Krizhevsky et al. (2009) and four-layer CNN on MNIST dataset Deng (2012)), which follows the deep learning settings as in Harutyunyan et al. (2021); Wang & Mao (2023). In experiments, we regard all data of each category in the adopted dataset as a multi-view sample, with each data representing a distinct view of the multi-view data. We utilize the binary loss to quantify the empirical and population risks.

5.1 Synthetic Datasets

We train a 5-layer MLP network consisting of a variational encoder and a classifier on synthetic Gaussian datasets. We follow the experimental settings adopted in Kawaguchi et al. (2023), where 216 models are trained with varying model architectures, weight decay rates, random seeds, and dataset draws. To effectively evaluate the predictive power of different information measures on the generalization ability, we extend the method from previous work Galloway et al. (2023); Kawaguchi et al. (2023) to multi-view learning scenarios and apply Pearson correlation analysis. As shown in Figure 1, both $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)})$ and $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y)$ exhibit a greater degree of correlation with the generalization error in comparison to other metrics, encompassing the number of the weight parameters, the F-norm of the learning hypothesis, and information bottleneck regularizer $I(X; Z|Y)$ of single-view learning. This empirical observation underscores the superiority of information measures involving multiple views over single views in capturing generalization dynamics.

5.2 Real-world Datasets

To precisely quantify information-theoretic generalization bounds in deep learning on real-world datasets, we utilize the experimental configuration provided by Harutyunyan et al. (2021). Specifically, we train a 4-layer CNN on the binary MNIST dataset with digits 4 and 9 and fine-tune a pre-trained ResNet-50 model on the CIFAR-10 dataset. Figure 2 presents a comparison of the generalization error with the square-root bound and the fast-rate bound. This visualization result indicates that the derived upper bounds closely align with the trend of the generalization error, showing a decrease as the number of multi-view samples increases. Moreover, the fast-rate bound stands as the most stringent estimation of the generalization error among the comparisons, demonstrating its effectiveness with small training errors as elaborated in our analysis.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide a comprehensive information-theoretic generalization analysis for multi-view learning. Specifically, we establish high-probability generalization bounds for both multi-view reconstruction and multi-view classification tasks. Our results demonstrate that capturing consensus and complementarity information from multiple views within an information-theoretic framework facilitates compact and maximally disentangled representations. In addition, the derived bounds reveal the critical role of the multi-view information bottleneck regularizer in improving the generalization performance for downstream classification tasks. In the LOO and supersample settings, we further derive novel data-dependent generalization bounds, achieving computational tractability and tightening existing results. Furthermore, we provide the first fast-rate bounds for multi-view learning to the best of our knowledge, yielding a faster converge rate in terms of the number of multi-view samples and the number of views within multi-view data. Numerical results validate the effectiveness of the derived bounds in capturing the generalization dynamics of multi-view learning. In future work, we will design theory-driven multi-view learning algorithms valid for various tasks to achieve excellent representation power and generalization performance.

Impact Statement

This paper provides the information-theoretic generalization analysis for meta-learning with the goal of advancing the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Bai, R., Huang, R., Qin, Y., Chen, Y., and Lin, C. Hvae: A deep generative model via hierarchical variational auto-encoder for multi-view document modeling. *Information Sciences*, 623:40–55, 2023.
- Bu, Y., Zou, S., and Veeravalli, V. V. Tightening mutual information-based bounds on generalization error. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 1(1):121–130, 2020.
- Chen, L., Wang, K., Li, M., Wu, M., Pedrycz, W., and Hirota, K. K-means clustering-based kernel canonical correlation analysis for multimodal emotion recognition in human–robot interaction. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 70(1):1016–1024, 2022.
- Cui, C., Ren, Y., Pu, J., Li, J., Pu, X., Wu, T., Shi, Y., and He, L. A novel approach for effective multi-view clustering with information-theoretic perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Deng, L. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.
- Dong, Y., Gong, T., Chen, H., He, Z., Li, M., Song, S., and Li, C. Towards generalization beyond pointwise learning: A unified information-theoretic perspective. In *The Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024a.
- Dong, Y., Gong, T., Chen, H., Yu, S., and Li, C. Rethinking information-theoretic generalization: Loss entropy induced pac bounds. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b.
- Fan, G., Zhang, C., Wang, K., and Chen, J. Mv-han: A hybrid attentive networks based multi-view learning model for large-scale contents recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pp. 1–5, 2022.
- Federici, M., Dutta, A., Forré, P., Kushman, N., and Akata, Z. Learning robust representations via multi-view information bottleneck. In *Proceedings of 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, pp. 1–26, 2020.
- Fu, Q., Xu, Q., Ong, Y. S., and Tao, W. Geo-neus: Geometry-consistent neural implicit surfaces learning for multi-view reconstruction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3403–3416, 2022.
- Gács, P., Körner, J., et al. Common information is far less than mutual information. *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, 2:149–162, 1973.
- Galloway, A., Golubeva, A., Salem, M., Nica, M., Ioannou, Y., and Taylor, G. W. Bounding generalization error with input compression: An empirical study with infinite-width networks. *IEEE Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- Gao, Q., Lian, H., Wang, Q., and Sun, G. Cross-modal subspace clustering via deep canonical correlation analysis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 3938–3945, 2020.
- Hafez-Kolahi, H., Kasaei, S., and Soleymani-Baghshah, M. Sample complexity of classification with compressed input. *Neurocomputing*, 415:286–294, 2020.
- Hamdi, A., Giancola, S., and Ghanem, B. Mvtn: Multi-view transformation network for 3d shape recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- Hanel, R., Thurner, S., and Tsallis, C. On the robustness of q-expectation values and rényi entropy. *Europhysics Letters*, 85(2):20005, 2009.
- Harutyunyan, H., Raginsky, M., Ver Steeg, G., and Galstyan, A. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for black-box learning algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:24670–24682, 2021.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
- Hong, Y., Lin, C., Du, Y., Chen, Z., Tenenbaum, J. B., and Gan, C. 3d concept learning and reasoning from multi-view images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 9202–9212, 2023.
- Kawaguchi, K., Deng, Z., Luh, K., and Huang, J. Robustness implies generalization via data-dependent generalization bounds. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10866–10894. PMLR, 2022.
- Kawaguchi, K., Deng, Z., Ji, X., and Huang, J. How does information bottleneck help deep learning? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 16049–16096. PMLR, 2023.
- Kleinman, M., Achille, A., Soatto, S., and Kao, J. Gacs-korner common information variational autoencoder. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G., et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.

- Lee, K. and Shin, J. Rényi: Contrastive representation learning with skew rényi divergence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:6463–6477, 2022.
- Lee, K.-H., Arnab, A., Guadarrama, S., Canny, J., and Fischer, I. Compressive visual representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:19538–19552, 2021.
- Liang, P. P., Deng, Z., Ma, M. Q., Zou, J. Y., Morency, L.-P., and Salakhutdinov, R. Factorized contrastive learning: Going beyond multi-view redundancy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Negrea, J., Haghifam, M., Dziugaite, G. K., Khisti, A., and Roy, D. M. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for sgld via data-dependent estimates. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Oord, A. v. d., Li, Y., and Vinyals, O. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- Rammal, M. R., Achille, A., Golatkar, A., Diggavi, S., and Soatto, S. On leave-one-out conditional mutual information for generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10179–10190, 2022.
- Salehifar, M., Nanjundaswamy, T., and Rose, K. Quantizer design to exploit common information in layered and scalable coding. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:1787–1796, 2021.
- Saxe, A. M., Bansal, Y., Dapello, J., Advani, M., Kolchinsky, A., Tracey, B. D., and Cox, D. D. On the information bottleneck theory of deep learning. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2019(12):124020, 2019.
- Shu, H., Qu, Z., and Zhu, H. D-gcca: decomposition-based generalized canonical correlation analysis for multi-view high-dimensional data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(169):1–64, 2022.
- Shwartz-Ziv, R., Painsky, A., and Tishby, N. Representation compression and generalization in deep neural networks, 2019.
- Steinke, T. and Zakyntinou, L. Reasoning about generalization via conditional mutual information. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 3437–3452. PMLR, 2020.
- Tezuka, T. and Namekawa, S. Information bottleneck analysis by a conditional mutual information bound. *Entropy*, 23(8):974, 2021.
- Tishby, N., Pereira, F. C., and Bialek, W. The information bottleneck method. In *Proceedings of 37th Annual Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 368–377, 1999.
- Tsur, D., Permuter, H., and Goldfeld, Z. Several interpretations of max-sliced mutual information. In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2526–2531. IEEE, 2024.
- Wang, Q., Boudreau, C., Luo, Q., Tan, P.-N., and Zhou, J. Deep multi-view information bottleneck. In *Proceedings of the 2019 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pp. 37–45. SIAM, 2019.
- Wang, S., Li, C., Li, Y., Yuan, Y., and Wang, G. Self-supervised information bottleneck for deep multi-view subspace clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 32:1555–1567, 2023.
- Wang, Z. and Mao, Y. Tighter information-theoretic generalization bounds from supersamples. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- Watanabe, S. Information theoretical analysis of multivariate correlation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 4(1):66–82, 1960.
- Xu, A. and Raginsky, M. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Xu, J., Ren, Y., Tang, H., Pu, X., Zhu, X., Zeng, M., and He, L. Multi-vae: Learning disentangled view-common and view-peculiar visual representations for multi-view clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 9234–9243, 2021.
- Zhang, Q., Lu, M., Yu, S., Xin, J., and Chen, B. Discovering common information in multi-view data. *Information Fusion*, 108:102400, 2024.

A Notations

The main notations for proofs are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of main notations involved in this paper

Notations	Descriptions
\mathcal{X}	the feature space.
\mathcal{Y}	the label space.
Φ	the hypothesis space of functions mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$.
X	the multi-view data variable.
Y	the label variable.
X_y	the random variable X conditional on $Y = y$.
C	the common information across multiple views.
$U^{(j)}$	the unique information of the j -th view.
Z	the learned representation, denoted by $Z = (C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)})$.
x	the specific multi-view data consisting of m views, i.e., $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
y	the specific label.
s	the training dataset for unsupervised learning, defined by $s = \{x_i = (x_i^{(1)}, \dots, x_i^{(m)})\}_{i=1}^n$.
S	the training dataset of multi-view learning, defined by $\tilde{S} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$.
\tilde{S}_l	the dataset for leave-one-out setting, defined by $\tilde{S}_l = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$.
\tilde{S}_s	the dataset for supsample setting, defined by $\tilde{S}_s = \{(x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}), (x_{i,1}, y_{i,1})\}_{i=1}^n$.
U	the uniform random variable used to select the single test sample from \tilde{S}_l , $U \sim \text{Unif}([n+1])$.
\tilde{U}	the uniform random variable used to split training and test samples from \tilde{S}_s , $\tilde{U} = \{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \text{Unif}(\{0, 1\}^n)$.
$\phi^{(j)}$	the representation function for the j -th view $\phi^{(j)} =: \{(\phi_c^{(j)}, \phi_u^{(j)})\} : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$.
ϕ	the representation function of multi-view data, defined by $\phi =: \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$.
ψ	the decoder function for multi-view reconstruction mapping from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d .
$\hat{\psi}$	the decoder function for multi-view classification mapping from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} .
$\ell(\psi \circ \phi(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)})$	the loss function for single-view reconstruction, where $\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$.
$\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi(X^{(j)}), Y)$	the loss function for single-view classification, where $\hat{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$.
$\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)$	the average loss of multi-view reconstruction, defined by $\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)})$
$\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$	the average loss of multi-view classification, defined by $\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y)$
$\overline{\text{gen}}_{\text{rec}}$	the generalization error for multi-view reconstruction.
$\overline{\text{gen}}_{\text{cls}}$	the generalization error for multi-view classification.
Δ_{loo}	the validation error for leave-one-out (LOO) setting, $\Delta_{\text{loo}} = \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq U} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$.
Δ_{sup}	the validation error for supsample setting, $\Delta_{\text{sup}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,1-\tilde{u}_i}, y_{i,1-\tilde{u}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,\tilde{u}_i}, y_{i,\tilde{u}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$.
$R_x, R_{x,y}$	the maximum attainable losses, $R_x = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)$ and $R_{x,y} = \sup_{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$, respectively.
$R_x^s, R_{x,y}^s$	the maximum samplewise losses, $R_x^s = \sup_{i \in [n]} \ell_{\text{avg}}(x_i; \psi, \phi)$ and $R_{x,y}^s = \sup_{i \in [n]} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$.
$ \mathcal{Y} $	the cardinality of hypothesis space \mathcal{Y} .
e	the base of the natural logarithm.

B Additional Lemmas

Lemma B.1. (Watanabe, 1960) *Given a set of n stochastic variables $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$, where λ_i can take any different discrete values. The set λ of n variables is now divided into two subsets μ and ν respectively containing l and m variables, which satisfies $\mu \cup \nu = \lambda$, $\mu \cap \nu = \emptyset$, and $n = l + m$. Then, $H(\lambda) = H(\mu) + H(\nu) - TC(\lambda; \mu, \nu)$, where $TC(\lambda; \mu, \nu) = H(\mu) + H(\nu) - H(\lambda)$ represents information redundancy.*

Lemma B.2. (Kawaguchi et al., 2022) *Let the vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$ follows the multinomial distribution with parameters and $p = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$. Let $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k \geq 0$ be fixed such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i p_i \neq 0$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i \left(p_i - \frac{X_i}{m}\right) > \epsilon\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{m\epsilon^2}{\beta}\right),$$

where $\beta = 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{a}_i^2 p_i$.

C Proof Sketch

For clarity, we present a proof sketch for deriving information-theoretic generalization bounds established in this paper. Our proof involves the construction of typical subsets and the tricky usage of probability bounds, including the four steps:

Step 1. Construct the typical subset. we construct the typical subsets associated with the feature representation space and the learning hypothesis space, and prove their properties by leveraging a standard proof used in information theory and the McDiarmid's inequality.

Step 2. Decompose the generalization gap. We decompose into three terms (i.e., I + II + III in Lemma D.2), where the third term corresponds to the case of the extracted representation being in the typical set, while other two terms are for the case of the extracted representation being outside of the typical set.

Step 3. Bound each terms. We bound each term in the decomposition. To be specific, we derive an upper bound on the first term by invoking properties of the typical subset, while the other two terms are bounded by recasting the problem into that of multinomial distributions and applying the concentration inequality of multinomial distributions.

Step 4. Combine the upper bounds of each term, we then obtain the desirable bounds.

D Proof of Theorems 4.1&4.4 [Generalization Bound for Multi-view Reconstruction]

Let multi-view data $X = \{X^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ be generated with a hidden function θ by $X = \theta(Y, V)$, where Y is the randomly generated label, θ is some hidden deterministic function, and $V = \{V^{(j)} = (V_1^{(j)}, \dots, V_d^{(j)})\}_{j=1}^m \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ are i.i.d. nuisance variables. Denote the random variables for X and Z conditioned on $Y = y$ by X_y and Z_y . For any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, define the sensitivity c_ϕ^y of the representation function $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ w.r.t the nuisance variable $V_i^{(j)}$:

$$c_\phi^y = \sup_{j \in [m]} \sup_{v_1^{(j)}, \dots, \hat{v}_i^{(j)}, \dots, v_d^{(j)}} |\log(p_z(\phi^{(j)} \circ \theta_y(v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_i^{(j)}, \dots, v_d^{(j)}))) - \log(p_z(\phi^{(j)} \circ \theta_y(v_1^{(j)}, \dots, \hat{v}_i^{(j)}, \dots, v_d^{(j)})))|,$$

where $p_z(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z = z)$ and $\theta_y(v^{(j)}) = \theta(y, v^{(j)})$, and then define the global sensitivity of ϕ by

$$c_\phi = \mathbb{E}_Y [c_\phi^Y].$$

Let the set of all possible multi-view data and its representation by

$$\mathcal{Z}^x = \{\theta_y(v), \phi \circ \theta_y(v) : v \in \mathcal{V}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

For any $\gamma > 0$, we define the typical subset \mathcal{Z}_γ^x of \mathcal{Z}^x by

$$\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x = \left\{ x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}), z = (c, u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(m)}) \in \mathcal{Z}^x : -\log p_z(z) - H(Z) \leq c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

D.1 Properties of the Typical Subset

Lemma D.1. For any $\gamma > 0$ and all $j \in [m]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{n}},$$

and

$$|\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x| \leq \exp(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}).$$

Proof. Consider the function $f(y, v) = -\log p_z(h_y(v))$, where $h_y(v) = \phi \circ \theta_y(v)$. Let $p_y(y) = \mathbb{P}(Y = y)$, $p_v(v) = \mathbb{P}(V = v)$, and $h_y^{-1}(z) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : h_y(v) = z\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Y,V}[f(Y, V)] &= -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_y(y) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} p_v(v) \log p_z(h_y(v)) \\ &= -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_y(y) \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{v \in h_y^{-1}(z)} p_v(v) \log p_z(h_y(v)) \\ &= -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_y(y) \sum_{v \in h_y^{-1}(z)} p_v(v) \right) \log p_z(z) \\ &= -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_z(z) \log p_z(z) \\ &= H(Z). \end{aligned}$$

By applying McDiarmid's inequality on $f(V) = -\log p_z(Z)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(-\log p_z(Z) - H(Z) \leq \epsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{d(c_\phi)^2}\right).$$

Let $\delta = \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{d(c_\phi)^2}\right)$, we have

$$\epsilon = c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(1/\delta)}{2}}.$$

Combining with (2) and setting $\delta = \gamma/\sqrt{nm}$, having

$$\mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \leq \delta = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

and accordingly $\epsilon = c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}$. Further consider the size of the typical subset, for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log p_z(z) - H(Z) &\leq \epsilon \\ -H(Z) - \epsilon &\leq \log p_z(z) \\ \exp(-H(Z) - \epsilon) &\leq p_z(z). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$1 \geq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x} p_z(z) \geq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x} \exp(-H(Z) - \epsilon) = |\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x| \exp(-H(Z) - \epsilon).$$

We thus obtain

$$|\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x| \leq \exp(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}). \quad (3)$$

□

D.2 Decompose the Generalization Error

Recall the definition of the generalization error of the learning hypothesis ϕ for multi-view reconstruction:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{rec} = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}). \quad (4)$$

We define $T = |\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x|$, the elements of the typical subset \mathcal{Z}_γ^x by $\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x = \{(a_1^x, a_1^c, a_1^u), \dots, (a_T^x, a_T^c, a_T^u)\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \{i \in [n], j \in [m] : (x_i^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x\} \\ \mathcal{U}_k &= \{i \in [n], j \in [m] : x_i^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which are dependent on the training set S . By using the above notations, we decompose the generalization error as follows.

Lemma D.2. *The generalization error satisfies:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) = \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= \mathbb{P}\left(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x\right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})\right) \\ \text{II} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x\right) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm}\right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}), \\ \text{III} &= \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)\right) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm}\right) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{U}_T = [n] \cup [m]$. The population risk can be decomposed by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi) | (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] + \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X, Z \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi) | (X, Z) \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the empirical risk is decomposed by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) &= \frac{1}{nm} \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) + \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}_k} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) + \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}_k} \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x) \\ &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) + \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \sum_{k=1}^T \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Putting (6) and (7) back into (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\
 &\quad - \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) - \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \sum_{k=1}^T \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \right) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x).
 \end{aligned}$$

To simplify the notation, we denote the above decomposition as

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) = \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{I} &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \right) \\
 \text{II} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}), \\
 \text{III} &= \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \right) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

D.3 Bounding Each Term in Decompositions

Lemma D.3. *For any $\gamma > 0$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\text{I} \leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Proof. From Lemma D.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Since $\ell(\phi(x_i), x_i) \geq 0$ for any $i \in [n]$, we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{I} &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \right), \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\
 &\leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), X^{(j)}) | (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x] \\
 &\leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma D.4. For any $\gamma > 0$, and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds for all $\phi \in \Phi$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{II} &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \\
 \text{III} &\leq 2R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define $p_k = \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u))$, for $k \in [T]$, $p_{T+1} = \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x)$, $b_k = \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x)$ for $k \in [T+1]$, and

$$\text{III}_k = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(p_t - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_t|}{nm} \right) b_t - \left(p_k - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \right) b_k.$$

Applying Lemma B.2 with

$$\begin{aligned}
 k &= T+1, \quad X = (|\mathcal{U}_1|, \dots, |\mathcal{U}_T|, |\mathcal{U}|), \quad p = (p_1, \dots, p_{T+1}), \\
 m &= nm, \quad \bar{a}_k = 0, \quad \bar{a}_{T+1} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a}_t = b_t \quad \text{for any } t \neq k.
 \end{aligned}$$

When there exists $t \in [T] \setminus k$ such that $p_t b_t > 0$, we have $\sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \bar{a}_t p_t \neq 0$, which satisfies the precondition of Lemma B.2. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \in [T]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{III}_k > \epsilon) \geq \exp \left(- \frac{nm\epsilon^2}{2(\sum_{t=1}^T p_t b_t^2 - p_k b_k^2)} \right).$$

Setting $\delta = \exp \left(- \frac{nm\epsilon^2}{2(\sum_{t=1}^T p_t b_t^2 - p_k b_k^2)} \right)$ and solving ϵ , we can get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\text{III}_k > \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T p_t b_t^2 - p_k b_k^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \right) \leq \delta, \tag{9}$$

for any $k \in [T]$. Similarly, by setting $\bar{a}_{T+1} = 1$ and $\bar{a}_t = 0$ for any $t \in [T]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(p_{T+1} - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} > \epsilon \right) \leq \exp \left(- \frac{nm\epsilon^2}{2p_{T+1}} \right),$$

and further get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(p_{T+1} - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} > \sqrt{\frac{2p_{T+1} \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \right) \leq \delta. \tag{10}$$

Note that for $p_t a_t = 0$, $t \neq k$ or $p_{T+1} = 0$, then $\text{III}_k = 0$ or $p_{T+1} - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} = 0$, and (9) and (10) can be satisfied.

By substituting (10) into II, we have that for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \left(\mathbb{P} \left(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x \right) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}), \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Similarly, by using (9), we have for any $\delta > 0$ and $k \in [T]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}_k &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_t^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_t^c, a_t^u)) b_t^2 - \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) b_k^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &\leq R_x \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_t^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_t^c, a_t^u)) - \mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = \psi(a_k^c, a_k^u))} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &= R_x \sqrt{\mathbb{P} \left((X, Z) \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x \cap (X^{(j)}, \phi(X^{(j)})) \neq (a_k^x, \psi(a_k^c, a_k^u)) \right)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &\leq R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking union bound over every $k \in [T]$, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds for all $k \in [T]$:

$$\text{III}_k \leq R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T/\delta)}{n}}. \quad (12)$$

Putting (12) back into III, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_k^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^c, a_k^u)) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k|}{nm} \right) \ell(\psi(a_k^c, a_k^u), a_k^x) \\ &= \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{k=1}^T \text{III}_k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{k=1}^T R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &= \frac{T}{T-1} R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case of $T = 1$, we prove that for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \left(\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_1^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_1^c, a_1^u)) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_1|}{nm} \right) \ell(\psi(a_1^c, a_1^u), a_1^x) \\ &\leq b_1 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)} = a_1^x, \phi(X^{(j)}) = (a_1^c, a_1^u))} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &\leq R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $T \geq 1$, the following inequality holds

$$\text{III} \leq 2R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (13)$$

Notice that the bounds (11) and (13) naturally hold for a deterministic ϕ . We now extend the results to the case of stochastic representation functions $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$. By taking union bounds with (11) and (13), we have for any

$\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds for all $\phi \in \Phi$:

$$\text{II} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{III} \leq 2R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (15)$$

From Lemma D.1, we know that

$$T = |\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x| \leq \exp(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}).$$

Substituting the above inequality into (15), we have

$$\text{III} \leq 2R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (16)$$

Taking union bounds over (14) and (16), we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\text{II} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}},$$

$$\text{III} \leq 2R_x \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.$$

□

In the following lemma, we present a general upper bound on the generalization error for the multi-view reconstruction task.

Lemma D.5. *For any $\gamma > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and all $\phi \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} + 2\sqrt{2}R_x \sqrt{\frac{H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Lemmas D.1 and D.4, we have for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} & \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & = \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)})}}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_x^s \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & = R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{III} \leq 2\sqrt{2}R_x \sqrt{\frac{\left(H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.$$

According to Lemma D.3, we obtain that

$$I \leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Combining the estimation of I, II, and III with Lemma D.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} + 2\sqrt{2}R_x \sqrt{\frac{H(Z) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Further, we have the following inequality holds:

$$H(Z) = H(C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)}) \leq H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}).$$

Combining this with the inequality (17), we complete the proof. \square

D.4 Completing the Proof of Theorem 4.1

Theorem 4.1 (Restate). For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{\text{rec}} \leq \mathcal{K}_1 \sqrt{\frac{H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}) + \mathcal{K}_2}{nm}} + \frac{\mathcal{K}_3}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1 &= 2\sqrt{2}R_x, \\ \mathcal{K}_2 &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2/\delta), \\ \mathcal{K}_3 &= \gamma R_x + R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{2 \log(2/\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For deterministic functions ϕ , we have $|\Phi| = 1$. Substituting $|\Phi| = 1$ into Lemma D.5, this completes the proof. \square

We proceed to prove the generalization bound of stochastic representation functions ϕ by calculating the size $|\Phi|$ of the hypothesis space Φ . We define $p_\phi(\check{\phi}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi = \check{\phi})$ and for any $\lambda > 0$

$$C_\lambda = \frac{1}{e^{\lambda H(\phi)}} \sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi} p_\phi^{1-\lambda}(\check{\phi}).$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, define the typical subset of Φ :

$$\Phi_\epsilon = \{\check{\phi} \in \Phi : -\log p_\phi(\check{\phi}) - H(\phi) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

The following lemma provides the properties of the typical subset Φ_ϵ :

Lemma D.6. For any $\lambda > 0$, if we take $\epsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log(C_\lambda/\delta)$, Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) \leq \delta,$$

and

$$|\Phi_\epsilon| \leq \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Proof. By the definition of Φ_ϵ and applying Markov's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(-\log p_\phi(\phi) \geq H(\phi) + \epsilon) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(-\lambda \log p_\phi(\phi) \geq \lambda H(\phi) + \lambda \epsilon) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(p_\phi^{-\lambda}(\phi) \geq \exp(\lambda H(\phi) + \lambda \epsilon)) \\
 &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_\phi[p_\phi^{-\lambda}(\phi)]}{\exp(\lambda H(\phi) + \lambda \epsilon)} \\
 &= \frac{\sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi} p_\phi^{-\lambda}(\check{\phi})}{\exp(\lambda H(\phi) + \lambda \epsilon)} = \frac{C_\lambda}{e^{\lambda \epsilon}} := \delta.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now compute the size of Φ_ϵ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\log p_\phi(\phi) - H(\phi) &\leq \epsilon \\
 -H(\phi) - \epsilon &\leq \log p_\phi(\phi) \\
 \exp(-H(\phi) - \epsilon) &\leq p_\phi(\phi),
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$1 \geq \mathbb{P}(\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon) \geq \sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi_\epsilon} p_\phi(\check{\phi}) \geq \sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi_\epsilon} \exp(-H(\phi) - \epsilon) = |\Phi_\epsilon| \exp(-H(\phi) - \epsilon).$$

By taking $C_\lambda/e^{\lambda \epsilon} = \delta$ and solving ϵ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_\epsilon| &\leq \exp\left(H(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{C_\lambda}{\delta}\right)\right) \\
 &= \exp\left(H(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{e^{\lambda H(\phi)}} \sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi} p_\phi^{1-\lambda}(\check{\phi})\right)\right) \\
 &= \exp\left(H(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \lambda H(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\sum_{\check{\phi} \in \Phi} p_\phi^{1-\lambda}(\check{\phi})\right)\right) \\
 &= \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

D.5 Completing the Proof of Theorem 4.4

Theorem 4.4 (Restate). For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{rec} \leq \mathcal{K}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C) + I(X^{(j)}; U^{(j)}) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}}{nm}} + \frac{\mathcal{K}_{3,\phi}}{\sqrt{nm}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{K}_1 &= 2\sqrt{2}R_x, \\
 \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda} &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + H(C|X) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}|X^{(j)}), \\
 \mathcal{K}_{3,\phi} &= \gamma R_x + \sqrt{2}R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Leveraging Lemma D.5, if $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, then for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\
 &\leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} + 2\sqrt{2}R_x \sqrt{\frac{H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

From Lemma D.6, we know that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) &\leq \delta, \\ |\Phi_\epsilon| &\leq \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{inequality (18) holds}) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon \cap \text{inequality (18) holds}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon) \mathbb{P}(\text{inequality (18) holds} | \phi \in \Phi_\epsilon) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon)(1 - \delta) \\ &\geq (1 - \delta)(1 - \delta) = 1 - 2\delta + \delta^2 \geq 1 - 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $\delta = \delta'/2$, we have for any $\delta' > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{inequality (18) holds}) \geq 1 - \delta'.$$

In other words, for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds for all $\phi \in \Phi$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{X}} [\ell_{\text{avg}}(X; \psi, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(\psi \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), x_i^{(j)}) \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma R_x}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_x^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} + 2\sqrt{2}R_x \sqrt{\frac{H(C) + \sum_{j=1}^m H(U^{(j)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(4|\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

According to the chain rule, we get that $H(U^{(j)}) = I(X^{(j)}; U^{(j)}) + H(U^{(j)}|X^{(j)})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H(C) &= I(X; C) + H(C|X) = I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m; C) + H(C|X) \\ &= I(X^{(1)}; C) + I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m; C|X^{(1)}) + H(C|X) \\ &= I(X^{(1)}; C) + I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m; C) + I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m; X^{(1)}|C) - I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m; X^{(1)}) + H(C|X) \\ &= I(X^{(1)}; Z) + I(\{X^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m; C) + H(C|X) \\ &= \dots \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C) + H(C|X). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the fourth equation is due to the fact that given the common information C , $X^{(j)}$ and $X^{(i)}$ are independent of each other for arbitrary $i \neq j$. Substituting (19) and (21) into (20), this completes the proof. \square

E Proof of Theorems 4.7&4.11 [Generalization Bound for Multi-view Classification]

Similarly, we define the set of all possible multi-view data and its representation for each class by

$$\mathcal{Z}_y^x = \{\theta_y(v), \phi \circ \theta_y(v) : v \in \mathcal{V}\}.$$

For any $\gamma > 0$, define the typical subset of \mathcal{Z}_y^x by

$$\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x = \left\{ x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}), z = (c, u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(m)}) \in \mathcal{Z}_y^x : -\log p_{z|y}(z) - H(Z_y) \leq c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right\}, \quad (22)$$

where $p_{z|y}(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z = z|Y = y) = \mathbb{P}(Z_y = z)$.

E.1 Properties of the Typical Subset

Lemma E.1. *For any $\gamma > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_y, Z_y \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

and

$$|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \leq \exp\left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}\right).$$

Proof. Consider the function $f_y(v) = -\log p_{z|y}(h_y(v))$, where $h_y(v) = \phi \circ \theta_y(v)$. Let $p_v(v) = \mathbb{P}(V = v)$ and $h_y^{-1}(z) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : h_y(v) = z\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_V[f_y(V)] &= -\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} p_v(v) \log p_{z|y}(h_y(v)) \\ &= -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_y^x} \sum_{v \in h_y^{-1}(z)} p_v(v) \log p_{z|y}(h_y(v)) \\ &= -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_y^x} \left(\sum_{v \in h_y^{-1}(z)} p_v(v) \right) \log p_{z|y}(z) \\ &= -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_y} p_{z|y}(z) \log p_{z|y}(z) \\ &= H(Z_y). \end{aligned}$$

By applying McDiarmid's inequality on $f(V) = -\log p_{z|y}(Z)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(-\log p_{z|y}(Z) - H(Z_y) \geq \epsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{d(c_\phi^y)^2}\right).$$

By taking $\delta = \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{d(c_\phi^y)^2}\right)$, we have

$$\epsilon = c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(1/\delta)}{2}}.$$

Combining with (22), we select $\delta = \gamma/\sqrt{nm}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X_y, Z_y \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \delta = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma D.1, we can prove that

$$|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \exp(-H(Z_y) - \epsilon) \leq 1,$$

which implies

$$|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \leq \exp\left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}\right).$$

□

E.2 Decompose the Generalization Error

Recall the definition of the generalization error of the learning hypothesis $\hat{\phi}$ for multi-view classification:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}[\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X,Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i). \quad (23)$$

We further define $T^y = |\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x|$, the elements of the typical subset as $\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x = \{(a_1^{x,y}, a_1^{c,y}, a_1^{u,y}), \dots, (a_T^{x,y}, a_T^{c,y}, a_T^{u,y})\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^y &= \{i \in [n], j \in [m] : x_i^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x, y_i = y\}, \\ \mathcal{U}_k^y &= \{i \in [n], j \in [m] : x_i^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y_i = y\}, \end{aligned}$$

which are dependent on the training set s . By using the above notations, we decompose the generalization error as follows.

Lemma E.2. *The generalization error satisfies:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}[\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X,Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i) = \tilde{\text{I}} + \tilde{\text{II}} + \tilde{\text{III}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\text{I}} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \right) \\
 \tilde{\text{II}} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \\
 \tilde{\text{III}} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, X_i^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X_i^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y).
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We decompose the population risk as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi) | Y = y] \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi) | Y = y, (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X, Z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi) | Y = y, (X, Z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, X^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y). \tag{24}
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the empirical risk can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i) &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) + \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}_k^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) + \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}_k^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y) \\
 &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y). \tag{25}
 \end{aligned}$$

Putting (24) and (25) back into (23), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i) \\
 = & \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 & - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \\
 & + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) - \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \\
 & + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, X^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y) \\
 = & \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \right. \\
 & \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \right) \\
 & + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \\
 & + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, X_i^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X_i^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y),
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

E.3 Bounding Each Term in Decompositions

Lemma E.3. *For any $\gamma > 0$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\tilde{\text{I}} \leq \frac{\gamma R_{x,y}}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Additionally, if $\phi \in \Phi$, for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequalities holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\text{II}} & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \\
 \tilde{\text{III}} & \leq 2R_{x,y} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma E.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_y, Z_y \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

By applying the above inequality, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\Gamma} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \left(\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \right) \\
 &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, X^{(j)} \sim X} [\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}), Y) | Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi) | Y = y, (X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x] \\
 &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}} R_{x,y} = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}} R_{x,y}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Define $p_k^y = \mathbb{P}(Y = y, X^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}))$ for $k \in [T^y]$, $p_{T^y+1}^y = \mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)$, and $b_k^y = \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y)$ for $k \in [T^y + 1]$, we then have

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_k = \sum_{t=1}^{T^y} \left(p_t^y - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_t^y|}{nm} \right) b_t^y - \left(p_k^y - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \right) b_k^y.$$

Applying Lemma B.2 with

$$\begin{aligned}
 k &= T^y + 1, \quad X = (|\mathcal{U}_1^y|, \dots, |\mathcal{U}_{T^y}^y|, |\mathcal{U}^y|), \quad p = (p_1, \dots, p_{T^y+1}), \\
 m &= nm, \quad \bar{a}_k = 0, \quad \bar{a}_{T^y+1} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a}_i = b_i \quad \text{for any } i \neq k.
 \end{aligned}$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \in [T^y]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{\Pi}_k \geq \epsilon) \leq \exp \left(- \frac{nm\epsilon^2}{2(\sum_{t=1}^{T^y} p_t^y (b_t^y)^2 - p_k^y (b_k^y)^2)} \right). \quad (26)$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(p_{T^y+1}^y - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \exp \left(- \frac{nm\epsilon^2}{2p_{T^y+1}^y} \right). \quad (27)$$

Take δ as the right-hand side of (26) and (27) respectively, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\widetilde{\Pi}_k \geq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T^y} p_t^y (b_t^y)^2 - p_k^y (b_k^y)^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \right) \leq \delta \quad (28)$$

for any $k \in [T^y]$, and

$$\mathbb{P} \left(p_{T^y+1}^y - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2p_{T^y+1}^y \log(1/\delta)}{nm}} \right) \leq \delta. \quad (29)$$

Take union bounds (28), (29) over all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\phi \in \Phi$, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequalities hold for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\phi \in \Phi$:

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_k \leq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T^y} p_t^y (b_t^y)^2 - p_k^y (b_k^y)^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \quad (30)$$

for any $k \in [T]$, and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (31)$$

Substitute (31) into $\widetilde{\Pi}$ in Lemma E.2, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\Pi} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}^y|}{nm} \right) \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y) \\
 &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (32)
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by applying the inequality (30), we then have for any $\delta > 0$ and $k \in [T^y]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widetilde{\text{III}}_k &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T^y} p_t^y (b_t^y)^2 - p_k^y (b_k^y)^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &\leq R_{x,y} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T^y} p_t^y - p_k^y} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &= R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y \cap (X, Z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma} \cap (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \neq (a_k^{x,y}, a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &\leq R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all $k \in [T^y]$, for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\widetilde{\text{III}}_k \leq R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T^y |\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (33)$$

Putting (33) back into $\widetilde{\text{III}}$ in Lemma E.2, we have that for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widetilde{\text{III}} &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \left(\mathbb{P}(Y = y, X^{(j)} = a_k^{x,y}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) = (a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y})) - \frac{|\mathcal{U}_k^y|}{nm} \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(a_k^{c,y}, a_k^{u,y}), y) \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{1}{T^y - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} \widetilde{\text{III}}_k \\
 &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{1}{T^y - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{T^y} R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T^y |\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{T^y}{T^y - 1} R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T^y |\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &\leq 2 \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} R_{x,y} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(T^y |\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (34)
 \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma E.1, we get that

$$T^y = |\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \leq \exp \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right).$$

Combining the above with (34), we can get

$$\widetilde{\text{III}} \leq 2R_{x,y} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \quad (35)$$

Finally, taking the union bound over (32) and (35), we have that for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widetilde{\text{II}} &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y, X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \\
 \widetilde{\text{III}} &\leq 2R_{x,y} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

In the following lemma, we present the general upper bound for multi-view classification tasks.

Lemma E.4. For any $\gamma > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and all $\phi \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi}(\phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)})), y_i) \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma R_{x,y}}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_{x,y} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \quad + 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma E.1, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_y, Z_y \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Applying Lemma E.3 and using Jensen's inequality, we have that for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Pi} & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y, (X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)})) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(X^{(j)}, \phi^{(j)}(X^{(j)}) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x)} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \frac{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{U}^y} \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y)}{|\mathcal{U}^y|} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \leq R_{x,y} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Pi\!I} & \leq 2R_{x,y} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & \leq 2R_{x,y} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi^y \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right) + 2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ & = 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\frac{H(Z|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma E.2, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((X, Y); \hat{\psi}, \phi)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_i^{(j)}), y_i) = \tilde{\text{I}} + \tilde{\Pi} + \tilde{\Pi\!I} \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma R_{x,y}}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_{x,y} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}} + 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\frac{H(Z|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Further using the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(Z|Y) &= I(X^{(1)}; Z|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) = I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) \\
 &= I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}|Y) + I(X^{(1)}; \{U^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m |Y, C, U^{(1)}) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) \\
 &= I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}),
 \end{aligned}$$

Putting the above estimation back into (36), this completes the proof. \square

E.4 Completing the Proof of Theorem 4.7

Theorem 4.7 (Restate). For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2}{nm}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_3}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 &= 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y}\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|}, \\
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2 &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\mathcal{Y}|/\delta) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}), \\
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_3 &= \gamma R_{x,y} + R_{x,y}^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}|/\delta)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the function ϕ is deterministic and independent of the training data S , we have $|\Phi| = 1$. Combining this with Lemma E.4, this completes the proof. \square

E.5 Completing the Proof of Theorem 4.11

Theorem 4.11 (Restate). For any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$:

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{2,\lambda}}{nm}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{3,\phi}}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_1 &= 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y}\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|}, \\
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{2,\lambda} &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}), \\
 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{3,\phi} &= \gamma R_{x,y} + \sqrt{2}R_{x,y}^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{H_{1-\lambda}(\phi^s) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma E.4, if $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} &\leq \frac{\gamma R_{x,y}}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_{x,y}^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi_\epsilon|/\delta)}{nm}} \\
 &\quad + 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y}\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(2|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi_\epsilon|/\delta)}{nm}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Analyzing analogously to the proof of Theorem 4.4, we apply Lemma D.6 and obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) \leq \delta,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{inequality (37) holds}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon \cap \text{inequality (37) holds}) \geq 1 - 2\delta.$$

We select $\delta = \delta'/2$, and then for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} &\leq \frac{\gamma R_{x,y}}{\sqrt{nm}} + R_{x,y}^s \frac{\sqrt{\gamma|\mathcal{Y}|}}{(nm)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi_\epsilon|/\delta)}{nm}} \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{2}R_{x,y} \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)}) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log(4|\mathcal{Y}||\Phi_\epsilon|/\delta)}{nm}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Using Lemma D.6, we have

$$\log(4|\Phi_\epsilon||\mathcal{Y}|/\delta) = \log(|\Phi_\epsilon|) + \log(4|\mathcal{Y}|/\delta) \leq H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right). \quad (39)$$

Plugging (39) back into (38), this completes the proof. \square

F Proof of Theorems 4.13&4.14 [Data-dependent Generalization Bounds]

F.1 LOO Settings

Theorem 4.13 (Restate). If $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, for any $\delta > 0$ and all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\Delta_{\text{loo}} \leq \mathcal{K}_1^u \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + I(\phi; U) + \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^u},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1^u &= \sqrt{2}\sigma_u, \\ \mathcal{K}_{2,\lambda}^u &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) + H(\phi|U), \end{aligned}$$

by assuming that Δ_{loo} is σ_u -subgaussian w.r.t $\sigma_u \in [0, R_{x,y}^s]$.

Proof. Assume that $(X, Z) = (x, z)$ for some $(x, z) = \{(x_i, z_i) = (x_i, \phi(x_i))\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x$ and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{loo}} &= \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq U} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) \\ &= \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) + \frac{1}{n} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) \\ &= \frac{n+1}{n} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{n+1}{n} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) \\ &= \frac{n+1}{n} \left(\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to prove $\Delta_{\text{loo}} = 0$. When $\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_U, y_U); \hat{\psi}, \phi) = \sup_{i \in [n+1]} \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi)$ and $\hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_i, y_i); \hat{\psi}, \phi) = 0$ for any $i \neq U$, Δ_{loo} takes the maximum value $R_{x,y}^s$. Similarly, one can prove that $\Delta_{\text{loo}} \geq -R_{x,y}^s$. This implies that Δ_{loo} is $R_{x,y}^s$ -subgaussian. Assume that $(X, Z) = (x, z)$ and let Δ_{loo} be σ_u -subgaussian w.r.t U , where $\sigma_u \in [0, R_{x,y}^s]$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_U(\Delta_{\text{loo}} \geq \epsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\sigma_u^2}\right).$$

That is, for any $\delta > 0$ and $(x, z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x$, if $(X, Z) = (x, z)$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\Delta_{\text{loo}} \leq \sigma_u \sqrt{2 \log(1/\delta)}. \quad (40)$$

From Lemma D.1 and D.6, we know that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(X, Z \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}, \quad |\mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x| \leq \exp\left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}\right), \quad (41)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) \leq \delta, \quad |\Phi_\epsilon| \leq \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \quad (42)$$

Taking the union bound of (40) over all $(x, z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x$ and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds simultaneously if $(X, Z) = (x, z)$:

$$\Delta_{\text{loo}} \leq \sigma_u \sqrt{2 \log(|\Phi_\epsilon| |\mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x| / \delta)}. \quad (43)$$

Again, take the union bound over $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, (41), (42), and (43), then for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{loo}} &\leq \sigma_u \sqrt{2 \log(4 |\Phi_\epsilon| |\mathcal{Z}_{y, \gamma}^x| |\mathcal{Y}| / \delta)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \sigma_u \sqrt{H(Z_y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \sigma_u \sqrt{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \left(H(Z_y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) \right)} \\ &= \sqrt{2} \sigma_u \sqrt{H(Z|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Similarly, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} H(Z|Y) &= I(X^{(1)}; Z|Y) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) = I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(m)}|Y) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) \\ &= I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}|Y) + I(X^{(1)}; \{U^{(j)}\}_{j=2}^m | C, U^{(1)}, Y) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) \\ &= I(X^{(1)}; C, U^{(1)}|Y) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) \approx H(\phi) = I(\phi; U) + H(\phi|U) \quad (46)$$

Combining the inequalities (45), (46) with (44), we complete the proof. \square

F.2 Supersample Settings

Theorem 4.14 (Restate). For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $\delta > 0$, and all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\Delta_{\text{sup}} \leq \mathcal{K}_1^{\tilde{u}} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + I(\phi; \tilde{U}) + \mathcal{K}_{2, \lambda}^{\tilde{u}}}{nm}},$$

where $\Delta_{\psi, \phi}^{\tilde{u}, j} = \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1}^{(j)}), y_{i,1}) - \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,0}^{(j)}), y_{i,0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1^{\tilde{u}} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta_{\psi, \phi}^{\tilde{u}, j})^2}, \\ \mathcal{K}_{2, \lambda}^{\tilde{u}} &= c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y) + H(\phi|\tilde{U}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For some $(x_u, z_u) = \{(x_{i,0}, \phi(x_{i,0})), (x_{i,1}, \phi(x_{i,1}))\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x$, and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{sup}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_{\text{avg}}((x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}, y_{i,\tilde{U}_i}); \hat{\psi}, \phi) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\tilde{U}_i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m (-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} \Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j} = \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1}^{(j)}), y_{i,1}) - \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,0}^{(j)}), y_{i,0})$. Note that $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{U}_i} [(-1)^{\tilde{U}_i}] = 0$, by using McDiarmid's inequality with $f(\tilde{U}) = \Delta_{\text{sup}}$, we have for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{U}}(\Delta_{\text{sup}} \geq \epsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (2\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j}/nm)^2}\right).$$

Therefore, for any $\delta > 0$, $(x_u, z_u) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x$, and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\Delta_{\text{sup}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{nm}}.$$

According to Lemmas E.1 and D.6, we know that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}((X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}, \quad |\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \leq \exp\left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}\right), \quad (47)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) \leq \delta, \quad |\Phi_\epsilon| \leq \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \quad (48)$$

Taking union bounds over all $(x_u, z_u) \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x$ and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously

$$\Delta_{\text{sup}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| |\Phi_\epsilon| / \delta)}{nm}}. \quad (49)$$

Again, take the union bound over $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, (47), (48), and (49), we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{sup}} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4|\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| |\Phi_\epsilon| |\mathcal{Y}| / \delta)}{nm}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{H(Z_y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}}{nm}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \left(H(Z_y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} \right)}{nm}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n,m} (\Delta \hat{\ell}_{\psi,\phi}^{i,j})^2} \sqrt{\frac{H(Z|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}}{nm}}. \quad (50) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) \approx H(\phi) = I(\phi; \tilde{U}) + H(\phi|\tilde{U}). \quad (51)$$

Putting the inequality (45) and (51) back into (50), this completes the proof. \square

G Proof of Theorem 4.16 [Fast-rate Generalization Bound]

Theorem 4.16 (Restate). For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $\delta > 0$, $\beta \in (0, \log 2)$, and $\xi \geq \frac{\log(2 - e^{-2\beta R_{x,y}^s})}{2\beta R_{x,y}^s} - 1$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $\phi = \{\phi^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m \in \Phi$, we have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \xi \widehat{L}_{cls} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \widehat{\mathcal{K}}}{nm\beta},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) + \log(\frac{4|Y|}{\delta}) + H(Z|Y, X^{(1)})$. In the interpolating setting, i.e., $\widehat{L}_{cls} = 0$, we further have

$$\overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \widehat{\mathcal{K}}}{nm\beta}.$$

Proof. Assume that $(X, Z) = (x, z)$. For some $(x, z) = \{(x_{i,0}, \phi(x_{i,0})), (x_{i,1}, \phi(x_{i,1}))\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x$, and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \geq t\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{2}\right) \left(\widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\xi}{2} \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - \frac{\xi}{2} \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \geq t\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1}^{(j)}), y_{i,1}) - \xi \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1}^{(j)}), y_{i,1}) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(-(-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,0}^{(j)}), y_{i,0}) - \xi \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,0}^{(j)}), y_{i,0}) \right) \geq t\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{I \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sup_{I \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(-(-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-I}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-I}) \right\} \geq t\right) \\ &\leq \inf_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{I \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right\} \geq \gamma t\right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{I \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(-(-1)^{\bar{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \widehat{\ell}(\widehat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-I}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-I}) \right\} \geq (1 - \gamma)t\right). \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

For any $I \in \{0, 1\}$, $t > 0$, and $\beta > 0$, by using Markov's inequality, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \geq t \right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P} \left(\exp \left(\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right) \geq e^{2\beta nmt} \right) \\
 &\leq e^{-2\beta nmt} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{U}} \left[\exp \left(\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right) \right] \\
 &= e^{-2\beta nmt} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{U}} \prod_{i,j=1}^{n,m} \left[\exp \left(\beta \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right) \right] \\
 &= e^{-2\beta nmt} \prod_{i,j=1}^{n,m} \frac{e^{-2\beta(1+\xi)\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} + e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})}}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We intend to select the values of ξ and β , such that $e^{-2\beta(1+\xi)\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} + e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} \leq 2$ for any $i \in [n]$, $j \in [m]$, and $I \in \{0, 1\}$. Notice that $e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} \leq 2$ implies that $\beta \leq \frac{\log 2}{2\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} < 1$.

Furthermore, it is sufficient to select a large enough ξ that satisfies:

$$e^{-2\beta(1+\xi)\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} + e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} \leq 2.$$

Solving the above inequality yields $\xi \geq \frac{\log(2 - e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})})}{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} - 1$. It is easy to validate that this lower bound increases monotonically with the increase of $\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})$. Therefore, we choose the value of ξ by

$$\xi \geq \frac{\log(2 - e^{2\beta R_{x,y}^s})}{2\beta R_{x,y}^s} - 1,$$

such that $\frac{e^{-2\beta(1+\xi)\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})} + e^{2\beta\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I})}}{2} \leq 1$. For any $i \in [n]$, $j \in [m]$, and the following inequality can hold:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \geq t \right) \leq e^{-2\beta nmt}. \quad (53)$$

Taking the union bound of (53) over $I \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{I \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left((-1)^{\tilde{U}_i} (2 + \xi) - \xi \right) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,I}^{(j)}), y_{i,I}) \right\} \geq t \right) \leq 2e^{-2\beta nmt}. \quad (54)$$

Putting (54) back into (52), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\tilde{U}_i}) \right) \geq t \right) \\
 &\leq \inf_{\gamma \in (0,1)} 2e^{-2\beta\gamma nmt} + 2e^{-2\beta(1-\gamma)nmt} \\
 &= 2e^{-2\beta nmt} + 2e^{-2\beta nmt} = 4e^{-2\beta nmt}.
 \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

By taking δ as the RHS of the above inequality, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\tilde{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\tilde{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\tilde{U}_i}) \right) \leq \frac{\log(4/\delta)}{nm\beta}. \quad (56)$$

From Lemma D.1 and D.6, we know that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}((X, Z) \notin \mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{nm}}, \quad |\mathcal{Z}_{y,\gamma}^x| \leq \exp\left(H(Z_y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}}\right), \quad (57)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\phi \notin \Phi_\epsilon) \leq \delta, \quad |\Phi_\epsilon| \leq \exp\left(H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \quad (58)$$

Taking the union bound over every $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $(x, z) \in \mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x$ and $\phi \in \Phi_\epsilon$, we then have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \leq \frac{\log(4|\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x| |\Phi_\epsilon| |\mathcal{Y}| / \delta)}{nm\beta}. \quad (59)$$

By substituting (57) and (58) into the above inequality, we have for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\log(|\mathcal{Z}_\gamma^x|) + \log(|\Phi_\epsilon|) + \log(4|\mathcal{Y}|/\delta)}{nm\beta} \\ & \leq \frac{H(Z_y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)}{nm\beta} \\ & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \frac{H(Z_y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)}{nm\beta} \\ & \leq \frac{H(Z|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right)}{nm\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Putting (45) back into the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y)}{nm\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{gen}}_{cls} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,1-\bar{U}_i}) - (1 + \xi) \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) + \xi \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \right) \\ & \leq \xi \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\ell}(\hat{\psi} \circ \phi^{(j)}(x_{i,\bar{U}_i}^{(j)}), y_{i,\bar{U}_i}) \\ & \quad + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y)}{nm\beta} \\ & = \xi \widehat{L}_{cls} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m I(X^{(j)}; C, U^{(j)}|Y) + c_\phi \sqrt{\frac{d \log(\sqrt{nm}/\gamma)}{2}} + H_{1-\lambda}(\phi) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{4|\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}\right) + H(Z|X^{(1)}, Y)}{nm\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square