
Sharper Concentration Inequalities for Multi-Graph Dependent Variables

Xiao Shao¹ Guoqiang Wu¹

Abstract

In multi-task learning (MTL) with each task involving graph-dependent data, generalization results of existing theoretical analyses yield a sub-optimal risk bound of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, where n is the number of training samples. This is attributed to the lack of a foundational sharper concentration inequality for multi-graph dependent random variables. To fill this gap, this paper proposes a new corresponding Bennett inequality, enabling the derivation of a sharper risk bound of $O(\frac{\log n}{n})$. Specifically, building on the proposed Bennett inequality, we propose a new corresponding Talagrand inequality for the empirical process and further develop an analytical framework of the local Rademacher complexity to enhance theoretical generalization analyses in MTL with multi-graph dependent data. Finally, we apply the theoretical advancements to applications such as Macro-AUC Optimization, demonstrating the superiority of our theoretical results over previous work, which is also corroborated by experimental results.

1. Introduction

As a crucial task within machine learning, Multi-Task Learning (MTL) (Caruana, 1997; Zhang & Yang, 2021), has recently attracted significant attention in various fields, including natural language processing (Liu et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2024) and computer vision (Wong et al., 2023).

Theoretically, most studies have made significant progress in generalization analyses within the context of MTL under the assumption that the data of each task is independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.). For example, Baxter (1995); Maurer (2006a); Maurer et al. (2016) analyzed the generalization bounds by utilizing the Rademacher Complexity (RC) (Bartlett & Mendelson, 2002) and Covering Number (CN) (Zhang, 2002), resulting in a risk bound of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, where n is the number of training samples. To achieve tighter bounds, Yousefi et al. (2018); Watkins et al. (2023) employed the Local Rademacher Complexity (LRC) in their analyses, which can produce a better result of $O(\frac{\log n}{n})$.

However, in practical learning scenarios of MTL, there are some non-i.i.d. situations, particularly when the data for each task exhibits a graph-dependent structure (Wu et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2023), referred to as *multi-graph dependence*, which is the focus of this paper. (See related work of other dependent structure cases in Appendix I). Recently, Wu et al. (2023) (Appendix A therein) have conducted generalization analyses of MTL with the multi-graph dependent data, resulting in a risk bound of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. Nevertheless, this result is comparatively weaker than that achieved under the i.i.d. scenario. Naturally, a question then arises:

- Q1: *can we obtain a better risk bound than $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ in MTL with the multi-graph dependent data?*

From a technical standpoint, answering the above question is quite challenging, as it necessitates revisiting the foundational tools of risk bounds in learning theory (Vapnik, 1999; Shalev-Shwartz & Ben-David, 2014; Mohri et al., 2018), specifically the concentration inequality (Boucheron et al., 2013), in the context of graph-dependent random variables. For single-task learning, Janson (2004); Usunier et al. (2005); Zhang et al. (2019); Ralaivola & Amini (2015) proposed the versions of the Hoeffding, McDiarmid, and Bennett inequalities for different function forms of the (single) graph-dependent random variables (Zhang & Amini, 2024), respectively. In contrast, for MTL, Wu et al. (2023) proposed a McDiarmid-type concentration inequality for multi-graph dependent variables. Then, a natural fundamental question arises:

- Q2: *can we obtain a new Bennett concentration inequality for the multi-graph dependent random variables?*

This paper provides an affirmative answer to the above question (Q2) and subsequently addresses the question Q1 affirmatively. See the next subsection for details.

1.1. Contributions and Organizations

Contributions. Firstly, we propose a new Bennett concentration inequality (i.e., Theorem 1) for multi-graph dependent variables, which can cover the result of single-graph

dependent variables (Ralaivola & Amini, 2015) as a special case. Notably, a specific case of the Bennett inequality we propose (i.e., Theorem 5 in Appendix C.1) can encompass the one in (Bartlett et al., 2005) under the i.i.d. case, while (Ralaivola & Amini, 2015) cannot.

Secondly, building on this new Bennett inequality, we propose the new corresponding Talagrand inequalities for the empirical process (see Theorem 2 in Section 3.2, and Corollary 4 in Appendix C.2) and further develop a new analytical framework of LRC for theoretical generalization analyses in MTL with multi-graph dependent data.

Finally, we apply the theoretical advances to the analysis of Macro-AUC Optimization, and other applications (see Section 4 and Appendix F). Notably, for Macro-AUC Optimization, we can obtain a sharper risk bound of $O(\frac{\log n}{n})$ than the one of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ provided by Wu et al. (2023), indicating the superiority of our theory results, which is also verified by experimental results (see Appendix G).

Organizational structure. Section 2 clarifies the problem setup that this study aims to address; subsequently, Section 3 presents the main theoretical results, including new concentration inequalities and key findings on risk bounds, which are essential to understand the following content. Then, Section 4 provides specific application cases, including the generalization analysis of Macro-AUC Optimization. Detailed contents can be found in Appendix A ~ I.

1.2. Related Work

Concentration inequalities. The development of concentration inequalities (Boucheron et al., 2013) is paramount in both statistical learning (Cherkassky, 1997) and probability theory (Rényi, 2007). A methodology analogous to the Hoeffding inequality was introduced to address the summation of graph-dependent random variables (Janson, 2004). Building upon this foundational work, Usunier et al. (2005) and Ralaivola & Amini (2015) proposed new concentration inequalities that not only extended the results of (Janson, 2004) but also broadened their applicability. Furthermore, Zhang (2022) provided additional proofs that further reinforced the theoretical framework surrounding these inequalities.

Generalization. In the realm of multi-task learning (MTL) generalization bounds, research has leveraged tools such as Rademacher Complexity (RC) (Maurer, 2006b;a; Kakade et al., 2012), Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension (Baxter, 2000b), and Covering Numbers (CN) (Baxter, 2000a; Maurer et al., 2016) to establish convergence results of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. Furthermore, Local Rademacher complexity (LRC) (Yousefi et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2023) has been applied, achieving a generalization bound of $O(\frac{1}{n})$ under optimal conditions, albeit primarily in independent

and identically distributed (i.i.d.) settings. Motivated by the work of Janson (2004); Ralaivola & Amini (2015); Wu et al. (2023), this paper introduces a new concentration inequality tailored for multi-graph dependent variables, thereby yielding a risk bound with several significant theoretical implications. In particular, when applied to Macro-AUC Optimization, the proposed concentration inequality exhibits a convergence rate of $O(\frac{1}{n})$ (see Appendix I for additional related work).

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we will clarify several notations, outline the problem setting of MTL, and introduce essential notions of empirical risk and expected risk. These concepts will serve for the analysis presented in the following sections.

2.1. Notations

Let boldfaced lowercase letters (e.g., \mathbf{a}) denote vectors, while uppercase letters (e.g., \mathbf{A}) represent matrices. For a matrix \mathbf{B} , denote the i -th row by \mathbf{b}_i , the j -th column by \mathbf{b}^j , and the element at position (i, j) as b_{ij} . Similarly, for a vector \mathbf{c} , c_i denotes its i -th component, and the p -norm is represented as $\|\cdot\|_p$. The notation $[M]$ defines the set $\{1, \dots, M\}$, with $|\cdot|$ indicating the size or cardinality of a set. Π_N denotes a set, which satisfies $\Pi_N := \{(p_1, \dots, p_N) : \sum_{i \in [N]} p_i = 1 \text{ and } p_i \geq 0, \forall i\}$. For a set $A = \{a, b, c\}$, the notation $\mathbf{x}_A := (\mathbf{x}_a, \mathbf{x}_b, \mathbf{x}_c)$ is employed, and thus $\mathbf{x}_{[N]} := (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$. The notation $\mathbf{x}_{[N]}^{\setminus i} := (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ represents the vector that omits the i -th element, with a similar format applied to the matrix $\mathbf{X}_A, \mathbf{X}_A^{\setminus i}$. The symbols \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{E} are used to denote probability and expectation, respectively, exemplified by expressions such as $\mathbb{P}(x \geq \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathbb{E}(x)$. $f_g = f \circ g$ represents the composite of two functions. The variance $\text{var}(f) = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x})^2] - (\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x})])^2$ for a random variable \mathbf{x} .

2.2. Problem Setting

Here, we introduce the learning setup of multi-task learning (MTL) with multi-graph dependent data. Given a training dataset $S = \{(\mathbf{x}, y)\}_{i=1}^m$ that is organized into K blocks (or tasks), such that $S = (S_1, \dots, S_K)$. Each block $S_k = \{(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki})\}_{i=1}^{m_k}$ is drawn from a distribution D_k (for $k \in [K]$) over the domain $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and is associated with a dependency graph G_k , which will be explained in subsection 2.3, with $\sum_{k \in [K]} m_k = m$. Let a hypothesis be $h := (h_1, \dots, h_K)$, where each individual mapping $h_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ corresponds to a particular task $k \in [K]$. Denote $\mathcal{H} := \{h\}$ as the hypothesis space. For each $k \in [K]$, $\mathcal{H}_k := \{h_k \mid h_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\}$, and denote a loss function as $L : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, define its empirical

risk on dataset S as

$$\widehat{R}_S(h) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{i=1}^{m_k} L(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, h_k), \quad (1)$$

and the expected risk as $R(h) = \mathbb{E}_S [\widehat{R}_S(h)]$.

The objective is to learn a mapping function (or hypothesis) that minimizes the expected risk as much as possible.

2.3. Dependency Graph

To characterize the dependency structure of random variables, we need to introduce some background about dependency graphs (Janson, 2004), which will aid in deriving and understanding the concentration inequalities discussed later.

Definition 1 (Dependency graph, Definition 4 in Ralaivola & Amini (2015)). *A series of random variables $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=1}^N$ over \mathcal{X} , can be associated with a corresponding dependency graph $G = (V, E)$ that illustrates the dependencies between the variables. Then, the graph G satisfies the following:*

- (1) $V = [N]$;
- (2) an edge $(j, k) \in E$ exists if and only if the random variables \mathbf{x}_j and \mathbf{x}_k are dependent.

Definition 1 clarifies the relationship between the construction of dependency graphs and the input variables. For a dependency graph $G = (V, E)$, we can get its fractional independent vertex cover $\{(I_j, \omega_j)\}_j$ and the fractional chromatic number $\chi_f(G)$, where $I_j \subseteq V$ and $\omega_j \in [0, 1]$ (see Definition 6 in Appendix A.2 for details). This method of modeling the dependence structure of variables proves to be effective for the new concentration inequalities introduced in this work (see related work in Appendix I).

Since we deal not only with the sum of dependent random variables but also with more complex functions of dependent variables, we need to introduce the definition of the fractionally colorable function for the following analysis.

Definition 2 (Fractionally colorable function, Definition 5 in Ralaivola & Amini (2015)). *Given a series of random variables $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$ with its dependency graph $G = (V, E)$. A function $f : \mathcal{X}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a fractionally colorable function w.r.t. the graph G if there exists a decomposition $\mathcal{D}_G(f) = \{(f_j, I_j, \omega_j)\}_{j \in [J]}$, satisfying:*

- (1) the set $\{(I_j, \omega_j)\}_{j \in [J]}$ constitutes a fractional independent vertex cover of the graph G (see details in Definition 6 in Appendix A.2);
- (2) the function f can be decomposed as $f(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j \in [J]} \omega_j f_j(\mathbf{x}_{I_j})$, where $f_j : \mathcal{X}^{|I_j|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\forall j \in [J]$.

Using Definition 2, we can further decompose the function of single graph-dependent random variables into a

weighted sum of functions of independent random variables, facilitating the theoretical analysis. Besides, we extend the above definition to the following version for the function of multi-graph dependent random variables, which serves for analyzing MTL in the context of multi-graph dependent data.

Definition 3 (Multi-fractionally sub-additive function). *Given m random variables $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K)$ with K blocks, where for each $k \in [K]$, random variables \mathbf{X}_k is associated with a dependency graph $G_k = ([m_k], E_k)$, and $\sum_{k \in [K]} m_k = m$. A function $f : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is multi-fractionally sub-additive w.r.t. $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^K$ if it can be expressed as $f(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{k \in [K]} f_k(\mathbf{X}_k)$, where each $f_k : \mathcal{X}^{m_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is fractionally colorable w.r.t. G_k with a decomposition $\mathcal{D}_{G_k}(f_k) = \{(f_{kj}, I_{kj}, \omega_{kj})\}_{j \in [J_k]}$, where J_k denotes the number of independent subsets I associated with the k -th block partition of G_k , and each f_{kj} is sub-additive (see the detailed definition in Appendix A.1).*

This definition plays an important role in subsequent analyses involving multi-graph dependent data.

3. Main Results

In this section, building on previous work (Janson, 2004; Ralaivola & Amini, 2015; Zhang & Amini, 2024), we establish a new Bennett-type inequality and employ it to conduct a theoretical analysis of the risk bounds for MTL with multi-graph dependent variables. (See Figure 1 in Appendix B for a proof structure of the main results).

Consider m random variables $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K)$ with K blocks, where for each $k \in [K]$, random variables \mathbf{X}_k is associated with a dependency graph $G_k = ([m_k], E_k)$, and $\sum_{k \in [K]} m_k = m$. Besides, a function $f : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is multi-fractionally sub-additive w.r.t. $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^K$ with the corresponding decomposition $\mathcal{D}_{G_k}(f_k) = \{(f_{kj}, I_{kj}, \omega_{kj})\}_{j \in [J_k]}$ for each $k \in [K]$ (see Definition 3).

For simplified writing, we provide the following expression for each $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= f(\mathbf{X}), \quad Z_k = f_k(\mathbf{X}_k), \\ Z_{kj} &= f_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{I_{kj}}), \quad Z_{kj}^i = f_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{I_{kj} \setminus \{i\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The following three important functions are provided for the proof and analysis presented in this paper:

$$G(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(Z - E[Z]))], \quad (3)$$

$$\psi(x) = \exp(-x) + x - 1, \quad (4)$$

$$\varphi(x) = (1+x) \log(1+x) - x. \quad (5)$$

Then, we introduce the following to streamline our analysis:

$$P_m(L_h) = \widehat{R}_S(h), \quad P(L_h) = R(h).$$

If g is an arbitrary function about the dependent variables \mathbf{X} , $P_m(g)$ and $P(g)$ can be defined as follows, respectively,

$$P_m(g) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} g(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad (6)$$

$$P(g) = \mathbb{E}[P_m(g)].$$

3.1. Some Assumptions

To address the dependence relationships among variable functions, we adopt a graph-dependent approach. Following the methodology outlined in [Ralaivola & Amini \(2015\)](#), we introduce the following assumptions about the function f to facilitate our analysis:

Assumption 1. *Suppose f is multi-fractionally sub-additive w.r.t. $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^K$ (see Definition 3), then for every f_k has a decomposition $\mathcal{D}_{G_k}(f_k) = \{(f_{kj}, I_{kj}, \omega_{kj})\}_{j \in [J_k]}$. Besides, assume every $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) for every $\mathbf{x}_{I_{kji}}$, where $i \in I_{kj}$, there exists a $\sigma(\mathbf{x}_{I_{kji}})$ -measurable random variable Y_{kji} associated with it. Moreover, Y_{kji} satisfies the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{kji} \leq Z_{kj} - Z_{kj}^{\setminus i} \leq 1) = 1,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}_{kji}[Y_{kji}] \geq 0) = 1,$$

where \mathbb{E}_{kji} represents the expectation relative to the σ -algebra formed by $(\mathbf{x}_{I_{kji}^{\setminus i}})$;

- (2) for every $\mathbf{x}_{I_{kj}}$, there exists constraint values b_{kj} , $\sigma_{kj}^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying $\mathbb{P}(Y_{kji} \leq b_{kj}) = 1$, and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_{kj}^2 \geq \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \mathbb{E}_{kji}[Y_{kji}^2]\right) = 1;$$

- (3) let $v_{kj} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 + b_{kj})\mathbb{E}[Z_{kj}] + \sigma_{kj}^2$, and $v_{kj} \in \mathbb{R}$.

This assumption plays a role in the proof of the concentration inequality presented in the following subsection. To achieve a tighter excess risk bound for MTL, we introduce the following mild assumptions regarding the loss function, which are essential for our theoretical analysis.

Assumption 2. *Suppose a loss function L satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) for every distribution D , there exists $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$, satisfying $\mathbb{E}(L_{h^*}) = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}(L_h)$, where $L_h = L \circ h$;
- (2) L is μ -Lipschitz continuous, i.e., $\forall k \in [K]$, $i \in [m_k]$, $|L(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, h'_k) - L(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, h''_k)| \leq \mu |h'_k(\mathbf{x}_{ki}) - h''_k(\mathbf{x}_{ki})|$, where $h'_k, h''_k \in \mathcal{H}_k$;

Notably, in contrast to h^* in the following discussion, \hat{h} satisfies $\mathbb{E}_m(L_{\hat{h}}) = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_m(L_h)$, where \mathbb{E}_m denotes the empirical average. Intuitively, \hat{h} represents the hypothesis that achieves the minimal empirical error, which can be obtained by real learning algorithms based on the Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) rule in practice.

3.2. Concentration Inequality of Multi-graph Dependent Variables

Building on the prior work ([Ralaivola & Amini, 2015](#)), we propose a new Bennett-type inequality tailored for the analysis of multiple graph-dependent variables. This new inequality not only extends the existing framework but also seamlessly incorporates scenarios involving single-graph dependence, thereby broadening its applicability.

Theorem 1 (A new Bennett's inequality for multi-graph dependent variables, proof in Appendix E.2.1). *Assume Z is defined as Eq.(2), and can be described as $Z = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} Z_{kj}$. Suppose Assumption 1 is holds, and for each $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$, $b_{kj} = b$ is holds. Then,*

- (1) for every $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{W} \varphi\left(\frac{tW}{Uv}\right)\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)\right), \quad (7)$$

where φ is defined in Eq.(5), $v = (1+b)\mathbb{E}[Z] + \sigma^2$, $W = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k) = \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k$, and $U = \sum_{k \in [K]} U_k$;

- (2) for every $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + \sqrt{2cvt} + \frac{2ct}{3}) \leq e^{-t}, \quad (8)$$

where $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$.

Remark. *Technically, Eq. (8) is due to the employing of various common shrinking techniques, i.e., $\varphi(x) \geq \frac{x^2}{2 + \frac{2x}{3}}$.¹ This is a more general Bennett inequality, encompassing the results presented in [Ralaivola & Amini \(2015\)](#) when $K = 1$. Especially, if $\omega_{kj} = 1$ for $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$, then a special Bennett's inequality can be obtained (see detailed in Theorem 5 of Appendix C.1).*

Next, leveraging the above theorem, we derive a new Talagrand-type inequality for the empirical process. This inequality serves as a key tool for establishing LRC bounds and, consequently, improving the risk bounds for MTL in the context of multi-graph dependent data.

¹Note that, using the existing literature ([Yousefi et al., 2018](#); [Watkins et al., 2023](#)), we can only derive a constant of $\frac{2}{3}$ instead of $\frac{1}{3}$ (owing to the original literature ([Bousquet, 2002](#)) does not provide detailed steps to prove this), but this does not affect the order of bounds.

Theorem 2 (A new corresponding Talagrand’s inequality for empirical process, proof in Appendix E.1). *Let a function class $\mathcal{F} = \{f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K)\}$, where each $f_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and assume that all functions f_k are measurable, square-integrable, and fulfill the conditions $\mathbb{E}[f_k(\mathbf{x}_{kj})] = 0$ for all $k \in [K]$ and $j \in [m_k]$. Furthermore, we require that $\|f_k\|_\infty \leq 1$, i.e., $\sup_{\mathbf{x}} |f_k(\mathbf{x})| \leq 1$. Define Z as follows:*

$$Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

Furthermore, for each $k \in [K]$ and $j \in [J_k]$, let σ_{kj} represent a positive real value such that $\sigma_{kj}^2 \geq \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}[f^2(\mathbf{x}_i)]$. Then, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)\right), \quad (9)$$

where $v = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sigma_{kj}^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[Z]$. Also, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$Z \leq \mathbb{E}[Z] + \sqrt{2cvt} + \frac{2ct}{3}, \quad (10)$$

where $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$.

In contrast to previous work (Wu et al., 2023; Watkins et al., 2023), the above theorem serves as an important component in our analysis of the risk bound and enables us to derive valuable insights and conclusions.

3.3. Risk Bounds for MTL with Multi-graph Dependent Data

The previously proposed Talagrand inequality will be applied in conjunction with the LRC technique to analyze the risk bounds of MTL under non-i.i.d. conditions. First, we give the following function class considered within this subsection:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f : (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K) \mid f_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \forall k \in [K]\}. \quad (11)$$

Then, we define the LFRC of the function class \mathcal{F} as follows.

Definition 4 (Local fractional Rademacher complexity (LFRC)). *Assuming \mathcal{F} is defined in Eq. (11).² For a fixed r , the LFRC of \mathcal{F} can be defined as*

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r) = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim D_{[K]}^m} [\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{F}, r)], \quad (12)$$

where $S \sim D_{[K]}^m$ denotes $S_1 \sim D_1^{m_1}, S_2 \sim D_2^{m_2}, \dots, S_K \sim D_K^{m_K}$ for simplicity. Additionally, the empirical LFRC $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{F}, r)$ can be defined as

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{F}, r)$$

²Note that, the function class can cover the widely-used hypothesis space and loss space.

$$= \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_\zeta \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \text{var}(f) \leq r} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_l f_k(\mathbf{x}_i) \right], \quad (13)$$

where $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_m)$ is a sequence of independent Rademacher variables: $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_l = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta_l = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Notably, this definition is different from the i.i.d. case (Bartlett et al., 2005), as the variable ω_{kj} addresses the treatment of dependent variables. Besides, it is distinct from the non-i.i.d. definition of Rademacher Complexity (RC) (Wu et al., 2023), incorporating additional information about variance.

Then, based on the definition of FLRC and the Talagrand inequality, we can derive the first risk bound for multi-graph dependent variables.

Theorem 3 (A bound of multi-graph dependent variables with small variance, proof in Appendix E.2.3). *Assume the function class \mathcal{F} is defined in Eq. (11). Then for every $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (Pf - P_m f) \\ & \leq \inf_{\alpha > 0} \left(2(1 + \alpha) \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r) + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the same results hold for the quantity $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (P_m f - Pf)$. For every $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (P_m f - Pf) \\ & \leq \inf_{\alpha > 0} \left(2(1 + \alpha) \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r) + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $P_m(f)$ and $P(f)$ are defined in Eq. (6). Additionally, $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r)$ is defined in Eq.(12).

Remark. *We can analyze the tightness of our results: when $K = 1$, our result is one more constant $\frac{5^2}{4^2}$, which cannot cover the i.i.d. case. But if we use Theorem 5 (see Appendix C.1), our result can cover i.i.d. case. This theorem shows the maximum difference between the empirical and the expected value, which is associated with FLRC and the small variance of the class. This theorem is the main basis of the following theoretical results.*

However, the function class in Theorem 3 lacks true locality due to the arbitrariness of the parameter r . This limitation restricts its practical applicability. To address this issue, we introduce the concept of a sub-root function (see Appendix A.3), which enables us to derive an improved and more practically useful bound.

Theorem 4 (An improved bound of multi-graph dependent variables with sub-root function, proof in Appendix E.2.4).

Assume that there are some functional $T : \mathcal{F}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and some constant B , for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $T(f_k) \in [\text{var}(f_k), B\mathbb{E}f_k]$. If a sub-root function Φ and its fixed point r^* satisfy:³

$$\forall r \geq r^*, \Phi(r) \geq B\mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, T(f_k) \leq r\}. \quad (14)$$

Then for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $M > 1$ and $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$, the following holds:

$$Pf \leq \frac{M}{M-1}P_m f + \frac{c_1 M}{B}r^* + (c_2 B M + 22)\frac{ct}{K}, \quad (15)$$

$$P_m f \leq \frac{M}{M-1}Pf + \frac{c_1 M}{B}r^* + (c_2 B M + 22)\frac{ct}{K}, \quad (16)$$

where $c_1 = 704$, $c_2 = 26$, and $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in K} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}$.

Remark. We can notice that c is approximately of $O(\frac{1}{m})$ in Eq.(14). The subsequent analysis of the fixed point complexity facilitates the practical application of inequalities. Additionally, if $K = 1$, $\chi_f(G_k) = 1$, our bound has a consistency $\frac{5^2}{4^2}$ compared to Bartlett et al. (2005). However, if we use Theorem 5 (see Appendix C.1) to create a similar bound, we can cover its result.

Furthermore, based on Theorem 4, we can analyze the excess risk bound of MTL in the non-i.i.d. case.

Corollary 1 (An excess risk bound of μ -Lipschitz loss function, proof in Appendix E.1). Assume that the loss function satisfies Assumption 2, and there exists a sub-root function Φ and its fixed point r^* , satisfying

$$\forall r \geq r^*, \Phi(r) \geq B\mu\mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mu^2\mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\}.$$

Then for every $t > 0$ and $r \geq \Phi(r)$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq \frac{c_1}{B}r + (c_2 B + 22)\frac{ct}{K}, \quad (17)$$

where $c_1 = 704$, $c_2 = 26$ and $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in K} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}$.

Remark. This corollary provides the risk bound for MTL when dealing with multi-graph dependent random variables. Moreover, it achieves a more refined bound by incorporating additional conditions (Assumption 2) that are easily satisfied by the loss function.

From inequality (17), it is evident that the convergence rate of the risk bound is intrinsically linked to the complexity associated with the parameter r . Furthermore, the relationship between r and FLRC is clearly established. Since the classical significance and theoretical importance of kernel hypothesis spaces, we will proceed to analyze the risk bound of MTL specifically under the kernel hypothesis space framework. To begin with, we propose the following proposition.

³Note that, here the content in $\{\}$ of $\mathcal{R}\{\}$ means adding some conditions to the function class (e.g., $T(f_k) \leq r$).

Proposition 1 (The upper bound of FLRC in kernel hypothesis, proof in Appendix E.2.5). Define $\kappa : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a Positive Definite Symmetric (PDS) kernel and let its induced reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) be \mathbb{H} . Assume for every $k \in [K]$, $f_k = \theta_k^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_k)$, where $\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a$ is a weight vector, and $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$. For every $r > 0$, the FLRC of function class \mathcal{F} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \left(\frac{2\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \min\{r, M_a^2 \lambda_{kl}\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where for every $k \in [K]$, the eigenvalues $(\lambda_{kl})_{l=1}^{\infty}$ are arranged in a nonincreasing order, which satisfies $\kappa_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{kl} \varphi_{kl}(\mathbf{x})^T \varphi_{kl}(\mathbf{x}')$.

Moreover, if for every $k \in [K]$, $\lambda_{k1} \geq \frac{1}{m_k M_a^2}$. Then for every $r \geq \frac{1}{m}$ and $m = \sum_{k \in [K]} m_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} \\ & \geq c \sum_{k \in [K]} \left(\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \min\{r, M_a^2 \lambda_{kl}\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where c is a constant.

Remark. This proposition provides both upper and lower bounds for $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r)$. The upper bound is relatively tight, while the lower bound is more approximate. Nevertheless, these results can still give a rough indication of the complexity bounds of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r)$.

Naturally, with Proposition 1, we can obtain a specific excess risk bound in the kernel space.

Corollary 2 (An excess risk bound of loss space in kernel hypothesis, proof in Appendix E.2.6). Assume that $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$, and loss function L satisfies Assumption 2. Besides, C is a constant about B, μ , and C' is a constant about $\chi_f(G)$. Then for all $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq C_{B, \mu} \left(r^* + C'_{\chi_f(G)} \frac{t}{K} \right), \quad (18)$$

where

$$r^* \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \min_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} \left(\frac{d_k \chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l > d_k} \lambda_{kl}} \right). \quad (19)$$

Remark. We observe that if we take $d_k = 0$ for every $k \in [K]$, where $d = (d_1, \dots, d_K)$, then r^* is at most of order $O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{m}})$, while it can be of order $O(\frac{\log(m)}{m})$ if the eigenvalues decay exponentially quickly.

Furthermore, the linear hypothesis space can be viewed as a special case of the kernel hypothesis space. We have conducted a detailed analysis of this scenario, yielding conclusions that align closely with those derived for the kernel

case (see Proposition 3 and Corollary 6 in Appendix D.2). Additionally, for other hypothesis spaces, such as Neural Networks (NNs), we provide a comprehensive discussion in Section 5.

4. Applications

In this section, we apply previous theoretical results to Macro-AUC Optimization (Lu et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024) and other applications (details in Appendix F).

4.1. Macro-AUC Optimization

4.1.1. PROBLEM SETUP

Following (Wu et al., 2023) (Appendix B.1.1 therein), we can transform the Macro-AUC Optimization in multi-label learning into MTL with multi-graph dependent data. This requires constructing a multi-task dataset S from the original dataset $\tilde{S} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i = \{\tilde{y}_{ik}\}_{k=1}^K$. Each label is treated as an individual task, leading to $S = \{S_k\}_{k=1}^K$, with $S_k = \{(\mathbf{x}_{kj}, y_{kj})\}_{j=1}^{m_k}$. For each label (or task) $k \in [K]$, each instance \mathbf{x}_{kj} ($j \in [m_k]$) is formed from positive and negative samples, $y_{kj} = 1$, and the total number of instances is $m_k = n_k^+ n_k^- = n^2 \tau_k (1 - \tau_k)$, where $\tau_k = \frac{\min\{n_k^+, n_k^-\}}{n}$ is the imbalance level factor, and n_k^+ and n_k^- are the number of positive and negative samples for the label k , respectively. Our goal is to learn the best hypothesis $h = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_K) \in \mathcal{H}$ from a finite training set to maximize the Macro-AUC metric. From previous results in bipartite ranking (Ralaivola & Amini, 2015), we can note that

$$\forall k \in [K], \chi_f(G_k) = \max\{|n^+|, |n^-|\} = (1 - \tau_k)n.$$

4.1.2. THEORETICAL RESULTS

Leveraging the theoretical results and techniques developed in Section 3, we derive several key theoretical insights, which are detailed in Appendix F.1.1. In the following, we present bounds associated with the Macro-AUC Optimization under the kernel hypothesis space and conduct a comprehensive analysis of the convergence rates of these bounds in the context of bipartite ranking.

Corollary 3 (Kernel case excess risk bound of Macro-AUC, proof in Appendix E.1). *Assume that for every k , $\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a$, and the loss function L satisfies Assumption 2. Besides, C is a constant about B and μ . Then, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq C_{B,\mu}(r^* + \frac{C'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K}}{K} \frac{t}{n}), \quad (20)$$

where

$$r^* \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \min_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} \left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{d_k}{K \tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K \tau_k} \sum_{l > d_k} \lambda_{kl}} \right). \quad (21)$$

Intuitively, to fairly compare the bounds, we use some techniques (Mohri et al., 2018) to obtain the excess risk bound of Wu et al. (2023), i.e., $P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.

By Eq.(20) and Eq.(21), we can notice that $P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) = O(r^*) + O(\frac{1}{K n})$, where $r^* = O(\frac{1}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_l \lambda_l})$. So the risk bound depends on $O(r^*)$, especially the tail sum of kernel eigenvalues, i.e., $\sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K \tau_k} \sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}}$, where $d'_k = \operatorname{argmin}_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} (\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{d_k}{K \tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K \tau_k} \sum_{l > d_k} \lambda_{kl}})$ and $d'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we can get

$$\sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K \tau_k} \sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}}.$$

(See Proposition 5 in Appendix F.1 for detailed proofs). In the following, we discuss the sample complexity of r^* .

- (1) When for each $k \in [K]$, $d'_k = 0$, we can obtain $r^* = O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})$. Specifically, in this case, $r^* \leq M \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}}$, where $M = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}}$, and thus $r^* = O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})$. Therefore, the convergence rate is the same as that of Global RC, which is the worst case for our risk bound.
- (2) When for some k , $d'_k \neq 0$, and the rank of kernel matrix $\operatorname{Rank}(\kappa_k) < \infty$, we can obtain $r^* = O(\frac{1}{n})$. Specifically, we can obtain $d'_k < \infty$ and $\sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl} = 0$, thus $r^* \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{d'_k}{K \tau_k}$. Furthermore, $r^* \leq M^2 \frac{d_*}{n}$, where $d_* = \max(d'_1, d'_2, \dots, d'_K)$ (proof details in Proposition 6, Appendix F.1). Thus, the convergence rate of r^* is $O(\frac{d_*}{n})$. There are many kernels of finite rank, such as the linear Kernel, we can take $d_* = a$, where a is a constant (see details in Appendix F.1.1).
- (3) When for every $k \in [K]$, $\{\lambda_{kl}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ has the property of exponential decay, i.e., $\sum_{l > d'_k} \lambda_{kl} = O(e^{-d'_k})$ (e.g., the Gaussian Kernel), we can obtain $r^* = O(\frac{\log n}{n})$. Specifically, in this case, $r^* \leq M^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} + M_a M \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l \in d'_k} \lambda_{kl}} \leq \frac{M^2 \log n}{n} + M_a M \frac{\sqrt{C}}{n}$, where C is constant. Then, we can take $d_* = \log n$, and thus we can obtain $r^* = O(\frac{\log n}{n})$.

Remark. *We can analyze the superiority of our risk bound: in terms of the order of sample size n , the analysis above indicates that our worst-case convergence rate is $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$,*

which is consistent with the findings in [Wu et al. \(2023\)](#). However, under typical conditions, our rate can reach $O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$, indicating an improvement over their results.

In addition, similar results and analyses are obtained regarding linear hypothesis spaces (see [Appendix F.1](#)). Moreover, we provide experimental validation of the linear hypothesis (see [Appendix G](#)), supporting our results’ superiority.

4.2. Other Applications

It can be observed that the Macro-AUC optimization problem in Multi-Class Learning (MCL) ([Yang et al., 2021](#)) is a special case of the aforementioned applications. Our focus remains on the same mapping function h , so the theoretical results mentioned above still hold in multi-class learning. Moreover, another related application is Area Under the Uplift Curve (AUUC) - Maximization ([Betlei et al., 2021](#)), which has a conversion relationship with Macro-AUC Optimization. We provide a detailed analysis of this application and present main results there (see details in [Appendix F.2](#)).

5. Discussion

In the following, we discuss the limitations of our work and our vision for future work (see others in [Appendix H](#)).

The tightness and generality of Bennett’s inequality.

The Bennett inequality ([Theorem 1, 5](#)) we propose is tight and general. Especially, in [Theorem 1](#), our Bennett inequality is for multi-graph dependent variables. In particular, the result of [Ralaivola & Amini \(2015\)](#) for the (single) graph-dependent case is a special instance of our inequality (i.e., $K = 1$). In addition, in [Theorem 6 \(Appendix C.3\)](#), we complement [Theorem 1](#) by providing the two-sided constraint of the Bennett inequality, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(|Z - \mathbb{E}Z| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)\right)$. This helps explain the tightness of our bound to some extent, as the coefficients are the same. Besides, [Bartlett et al. \(2005\)](#) (i.i.d.) is also a special case of ours; however, our result does not encompass its conclusion, though there is a constant (i.e., $\frac{4}{5}$).

To address these scenarios, we provide a specific Bennett inequality (i.e., $\omega = 1$, detailed in [Appendix C.1](#)), which includes [Bartlett et al. \(2005\)](#). However, due to the coarser scaling in its derivation, this inequality may not be optimal, particularly when $K \neq 1$, resulting in relatively loose outcomes. Our rigorous calculations indicate that this result is only somewhat close to [Theorem 1](#), which remains tighter.

Thus, we need to employ scaling or function approximation techniques to optimize the Bennett inequality for non-i.i.d. variables, enhancing its generality and tightness, especially in case $w = 1$ to ensure continuity of the inequality.

The tightness of our risk bound. Our risk bound is rel-

atively tight on the order of sample size n . Especially, regarding the upper bound for MTL, we obtained a bound of $O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$ in terms of the sample size n . Furthermore, we computed the upper and lower bounds (see in [Proposition 1 \(see Section 3.3\)](#), [3 \(see Appendix D.2\)](#)) for FLRC, which indicates that our bounds are relatively tight and the experimental results corroborate our theoretical findings (see [Appendix G](#) for details). However, for the lower bound, we only provided a somewhat vague estimate and did not conduct a detailed investigation or discussion about the constant c , suggesting that there is still room for improvement in our boundary values. Moreover, in deriving the generalization bounds, we repeatedly utilize the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and other coarse scalings, which resulted in bounds that are not sufficiently tight. These limitations highlight areas for further research in future work.

Other hypothesis space. For Neural Networks (NN), similar theoretical results may be achieved, but non-trivial. Especially, in i.i.d. case, some papers have utilized classical methods such as CN ([Marion, 2023](#)) and RC ([Xiao et al., 2024](#)) to analyze the generalization bound of NN and obtain the best convergence result of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$. However, based on our proposed new method, this generalization bound is expected to be theoretically improved. Nevertheless, the study still faces numerous challenges ([Allen-Zhu et al., 2018](#)), including some optimization problems that are non-convex and have significant overparameterization phenomena. Additionally, to facilitate analysis, research ([Daniely & Granot, 2019](#)) typically assumes explicit regularization using p-norm, whereas, in practical neural network applications, regularization is often implicit, which may lead to a deviation between the assumed constraints ([Golowich et al., 2018](#)) and the actual application, thereby making the generalization analysis bound appear even broader. Furthermore, the application of the LRC technique in the analysis of generalization bound in the i.i.d. case has not yet been completed. Despite the presence of these difficulties, We believe that our proposed new concentration inequality will have a positive impact on the generalization analysis of neural networks, and can be extended to other theoretical analysis fields, providing more possibilities for future research work.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we provide a new Bennett inequality specifically designed for multi-graph dependent variables. This newly proposed inequality provides a fresh theoretical basis for the study of MTL problems. Furthermore, a tighter excess risk bound was achieved, with a convergence rate of $O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$. Additionally, we explore several concrete application scenarios and analyze their convergence bounds to demonstrate the efficacy and potential impact of the pro-

posed inequality in practical problems.

Impact Statement

This paper presents a theoretical study on Multi-Task learning (MTL), aimed at providing theoretical support and guidance for algorithms, to facilitate their development. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., and Liang, Y. Learning and generalization in overparameterized neural networks, going beyond two layers. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- Ando, R. K., Zhang, T., and Bartlett, P. A framework for learning predictive structures from multiple tasks and unlabeled data. *Journal of machine learning research*, 6 (11):1817—1853, 2005.
- Bartlett, P. L. and Mendelson, S. Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.
- Bartlett, P. L., Bousquet, O., and Mendelson, S. Local rademacher complexities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33 (4):1497–1537, 2005.
- Baxter, J. Learning internal representations. In *Proceedings of the eighth annual conference on Computational learning theory - COLT '95*, pp. 311–320. ACM Press, 1995.
- Baxter, J. A model of inductive bias learning. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 12(1):149–198, 2000a.
- Baxter, J. A model of inductive bias learning. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 12(1):149–198, 2000b.
- Ben-David, S. and Borbely, R. S. A notion of task relatedness yielding provable multiple-task learning guarantees. *Machine learning*, 73:273–287, 2008.
- Betlei, A., Diemert, E., and Amini, M.-R. Uplift modeling with generalization guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 55—65, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Bhagat, S., Cormode, G., and Muthukrishnan, S. Node classification in social networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1101.3291, 2011.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Bousquet, O. A bennett concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 334(6):495–500, 2002.
- Bousquet, O. Concentration inequalities for sub-additive functions using the entropy method. In *Stochastic inequalities and applications*, pp. 213–247. Springer, 2003.
- Caruana, R. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28:41–75, 1997.
- Chen, S., Zhang, Y., and Yang, Q. Multi-task learning in natural language processing: An overview. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(12):1–32, 2024.
- Cherkassky, V. The nature of statistical learning theory. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 8 6:1564, 1997.
- Combes, R. An extension of mcdiarmid’s inequality. In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 79–84. IEEE, 2024.
- Crammer, K. and Mansour, Y. Learning multiple tasks using shared hypotheses. In Pereira, F., Burges, C., Bottou, L., and Weinberger, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012.
- Daniely, A. and Granot, E. Generalization bounds for neural networks via approximate description length. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d’Alché-Buc, F., Fox, E., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- de la Peña, V. and Giné, E. *Decoupling: From Dependence to Independence*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1nd edition, 1999.
- Golowich, N., Rakhlin, A., and Shamir, O. Size-independent sample complexity of neural networks. In Bubeck, S., Perchet, V., and Rigollet, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, pp. 297–299. PMLR, 2018.
- Ibragimov, I. A. Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 7(4): 349–382, 1962.
- Janson, S. Normal convergence by higher semiinvariants with applications to sums of dependent random variables and random graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 16(1): 305–312, 1988.
- Janson, S. Large deviations for sums of partly dependent random variables. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 24(3): 234–248, 2004.

- Juba, B. Estimating relatedness via data compression. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 441–448, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Kakade, S. M., Shalev-Shwartz, S., and Tewari, A. Regularization techniques for learning with matrices. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):1865–1890, 2012.
- Kontorovich, L. *Measure concentration of strongly mixing processes with applications*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2007.
- Lampert, C. H., Ralaivola, L., and Zimin, A. Dependency-dependent bounds for sums of dependent random variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01404*, 2018.
- Li, M., Qiu, J., and Shi, W. Macro-auc-driven active learning strategy for multi-label classification enhancement. In *2024 IEEE 7th International Conference on Multimedia Information Processing and Retrieval (MIPR)*, pp. 280–286, 2024.
- Liu, X., He, P., Chen, W., and Gao, J. Multi-task deep neural networks for natural language understanding. In Korhonen, A., Traum, D., and Márquez, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 4487–4496, Florence, Italy, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lu, L., Ren, P., Tang, X., Yang, M., Yuan, M., Yu, W., Huang, J., Zhou, E., Lu, L., He, Q., et al. Ai-model for identifying pathologic myopia based on deep learning algorithms of myopic maculopathy classification and “plus” lesion detection in fundus images. *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology*, 9:719262, 2021.
- Marion, P. Generalization bounds for neural ordinary differential equations and deep residual networks. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 48918–48938. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- Maurer, A. Bounds for linear multi-task learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:117–139, 2006a.
- Maurer, A. The rademacher complexity of linear transformation classes. In *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pp. 65–78. Springer, 2006b.
- Maurer, A., Pontil, M., and Romera-Paredes, B. The benefit of multitask representation learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(81):1–32, 2016.
- McDiarmid, C. On the method of bounded differences. surveys in combinatorics, 1989 (norwich, 1989), 148–188. *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, 141, 1989.
- Mohri, M., Rostamizadeh, A., and Talwalkar, A. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. The MIT Press, 2nd edition, 2018.
- Pentina, A. and Ben-David, S. Multi-task and lifelong learning of kernels. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory: 26th International Conference, ALT 2015, Banff, AB, Canada, October 4-6, 2015, Proceedings 26*, pp. 194–208. Springer, 2015.
- Pontil, M. and Maurer, A. Excess risk bounds for multitask learning with trace norm regularization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 55–76. PMLR, 2013.
- Qi, L., Yang, H., Shi, Y., and Geng, X. Multimatch: Multi-task learning for semi-supervised domain generalization. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, 20(6):1–21, 2024.
- Ralaivola, L. and Amini, M.-R. Entropy-based concentration inequalities for dependent variables. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2436–2444. PMLR, 2015.
- Rényi, A. *Probability theory*. Courier Corporation, 2007.
- Rosenblatt, M. A central limit theorem and a strong mixing condition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 42(1):43–47, 1956.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Ben-David, S. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- Steinwart, I. and Christmann, A. Fast learning from non-i.i.d. observations. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1768–1776, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2009. Curran Associates Inc.
- Surry, P. D. and Radcliffe, N. J. Quality measures for uplift models. *submitted to KDD2011*, 2011.
- Tanoue, Y. Concentration inequality of sums of dependent subexponential random variables and application to bounds for value-at-risk. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 53(9):3123–3142, 2024.
- Tufféry, S. *Data mining and statistics for decision making*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- Usunier, N., Amini, M. R., and Gallinari, P. Generalization error bounds for classifiers trained with interdependent data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 18, 2005.
- Vapnik, V. N. An overview of statistical learning theory. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 10(5):988–999, 1999.

- Volkonskii, V. A. and Rozanov, Y. A. Some limit theorems for random functions. i. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 4(2):178–197, 1959.
- Watkins, A., Ullah, E., Nguyen-Tang, T., and Arora, R. Optimistic rates for multi-task representation learning. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2207–2251. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- Wong, A., Wu, Y., Abbasi, S., Nair, S., Chen, Y., and Shafiee, M. J. Fast graspnext: A fast self-attention neural network architecture for multi-task learning in computer vision tasks for robotic grasping on the edge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 2293–2297, 2023.
- Wu, G., Li, C., and Yin, Y. Towards understanding generalization of macro-auc in multi-label learning. In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 37540–37570. PMLR, 2023.
- Wu, Z., Zhan, M., Zhang, H., Luo, Q., and Tang, K. Mt-gcn: A multi-task approach for node classification and link prediction in graph data. *Information Processing & Management*, 59(3):102902, 2022.
- Xiao, J., Sun, R., Long, Q., and Su, W. Bridging the gap: Rademacher complexity in robust and standard generalization. In Agrawal, S. and Roth, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 5074–5075. PMLR, 2024.
- Yang, Z., Xu, Q., Bao, S., Cao, X., and Huang, Q. Learning with multiclass auc: Theory and algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44:7747–7763, 2021.
- Yousefi, N., Lei, Y., Kloft, M., Mollaghasemi, M., and Anagnostopoulos, G. C. Local rademacher complexity-based learning guarantees for multi-task learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):1385–1431, 2018.
- Zhang, R.-R. When janson meets mcdiarmid: Bounded difference inequalities under graph-dependence. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 181:109272, 2022.
- Zhang, R.-R. and Amini, M.-R. Generalization bounds for learning under graph-dependence: A survey. *Machine Learning*, 113(7):3929–3959, 2024.
- Zhang, R. R., Liu, X., Wang, Y., and Wang, L. Mcdiarmid-type inequalities for graph-dependent variables and stability bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Zhang, T. Covering number bounds of certain regularized linear function classes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2(Mar):527–550, 2002.
- Zhang, Y. Multi-task learning and algorithmic stability. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 3181—3187. AAAI Press, 2015.
- Zhang, Y. and Yang, Q. A survey on multi-task learning. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 34(12):5586–5609, 2021.

Contents of Appendix

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| A | Background Knowledge | 14 |
| A.1 | Additional material on sub-additive functions | 14 |
| A.2 | Additional knowledge related to the graph theory | 14 |
| A.3 | Material on sub-root function | 14 |
| B | A big picture of the main results | 14 |
| C | Additional Concentration Inequalities | 14 |
| C.1 | A Special Bennett’s Inequality | 14 |
| C.2 | A Special Talagrand-type Inequality | 16 |
| C.3 | Supplement to Bennett Inequality | 16 |
| D | Theoretical Results for MTL with Multi-graph Dependent Data | 17 |
| D.1 | Supplemental definition and proposition | 17 |
| D.2 | Supplemental risk bounds | 17 |
| E | Proofs | 18 |
| E.1 | Proof Sketches | 18 |
| E.2 | Proof Details | 19 |
| E.2.1 | Proof of Theorem 1 | 19 |
| E.2.2 | Proof of Theorem 5 | 21 |
| E.2.3 | Proof of Theorem 3 | 22 |
| E.2.4 | Proof of Theorem 4 | 22 |
| E.2.5 | Proof of Proposition 1 | 24 |
| E.2.6 | Proof of Corollary 2 | 26 |
| E.2.7 | Proof of Proposition 3 | 26 |
| E.2.8 | Proof of Corollary 6 | 27 |
| F | Other Applications | 28 |
| F.1 | Macro-AUC -Optimization in MTL | 28 |
| F.1.1 | Some generalization analysis of linear hypothesis | 29 |
| F.2 | Area Under the Uplift Curve (AUUC) - Maximization | 30 |
| F.2.1 | Problem setting | 30 |
| F.2.2 | Some theory results | 30 |
| G | Experiment Results | 31 |
| H | Supplementary Discussion | 32 |

A. Background Knowledge

In this section, we will introduce some preliminary knowledge, including concepts related to handling dependent variables and basic graph theory.

A.1. Additional material on sub-additive functions

Definition 5 (Sub-additive functions, Definition 1.1 in [Bousquet \(2003\)](#)). *Given a function $f : \mathcal{X}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it is sub-additive when the following holds: there exists N functions, i.e., f_1, \dots, f_N , where $f_i : \mathcal{X}^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in [N]$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^N (f(\mathbf{X}) - f_i(\mathbf{X}^{\setminus i})) \leq f(\mathbf{X})$, where the definition of $\mathbf{X}^{\setminus i}$ can be seen in Section 2, i.e., $\mathbf{X}^{\setminus i} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$.*

A.2. Additional knowledge related to the graph theory

Definition 6 (Fractional independent vertex cover, and fractional chromatic number ([Zhang & Amini, 2024](#))). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, where V and E represent the set of vertices and the set of edges of the graph G , respectively. Then, there exists a set $\{(I_j, \omega_j)\}_j$, where $I_j \subseteq V$ and $\omega_j \in [0, 1]$, which is a fractional independent vertex cover of G , if satisfying the following:*

- (1) *each vertex is painted thoroughly, ensuring there are no overlaps or omissions, i.e., $\forall v \in V, \sum_{j:v \in I_j} \omega_j = 1$;*
- (2) *every I_j is an independent set of vertices, which means that no two vertices in I_j are connected.*

Define the fractional chromatic number $\chi_f(G) = \min_I \sum_j \omega_j$, which is the minimum value among all fractional independent vertex covers of G .

A.3. Material on sub-root function

Definition 7 (Sub-root function, Definition 3.1 in [Bartlett et al. \(2005\)](#)). *A function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be sub-root if it is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and for every $r > 0$, the mapping function $r \mapsto \frac{\Phi(r)}{\sqrt{r}}$ is nonincreasing. We will only focus on nontrivial sub-root functions, meaning those that are not the constant function $\Phi \equiv 0$.*

Lemma 1 (The property of sub-root function, Lemma 3.2 in [Bartlett et al. \(2005\)](#)). *If a function $\Psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a nontrivial sub-root function, then it is continuous throughout the interval $[0, \infty)$, and the equation $\Phi(r) = r$ has a solitary positive solution r^* , which is called fixed point. Furthermore, for every positive value of r , it follows that $r \geq \Phi(r) \iff r^* \leq r$.*

B. A big picture of the main results

In this section, we present a diagrammatic framework outlining the proofs of the main theorems and corollaries, providing a concise overview of the content in Sections C ~ F. This will facilitate an understanding of the primary theoretical outcomes of this paper and their relationship to previous results.

C. Additional Concentration Inequalities

This section serves as a supplement to Section 3, discussing specific cases of the new Bennett inequality proposed in this paper, as well as some direct applications, such as the Talagrand inequality.

C.1. A Special Bennett's Inequality

Theorem 5 (A new refined Bennett's inequality for a special case of multi-graph dependent variables, proof in Appendix E.2.2). *$Z = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} Z_{kj}$ (see details in Eq. (2), Section 3). Suppose Assumption 1 is holds, and for every $k \in [K], j \in [J_k], b_{kj} = b, \omega_{kj} = 1$. Then*

- (1) *for every $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + t) \leq \exp\left(-v\varphi\left(\frac{t}{v \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)}\right)\right), \quad (22)$$




Figure 1. The proof structure diagram of the main results. The blue node denotes previous results (or assumptions) and others are our contributions.

where $v = (1 + b)\mathbb{E}[Z] + \sigma^2$, $W = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k) = \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k$, and $\omega_k = |J_k|$, $U = \sum_{k \in [K]}$. Additionally, φ can be seen in Eq.(5), i.e., $\varphi(x) = (1 + x) \log(1 + x) - x$;

(2) for every $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + c\sqrt{2vt} + \frac{2ct}{3}) \leq e^{-t}, \quad (23)$$

where $c = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$ (details in Appendix E.2).

Remark. This theorem serves as a complement to Theorem 1 and represents a specific instance of the Bennett inequality, applicable to i.i.d random variables. A detailed analysis and discussion of its implications will follow.

Discussion: then we discuss the above inequality in two cases, and in contrast to the i.i.d. case (Bartlett et al., 2005; Yousefi et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2023) and the single graph (Ralaivola & Amini, 2015).

(1) in the i.i.d. case, $\chi_f(G_k) = \chi_f(G) = 1$, we take $K = 1$ to contrast to single-graph, the result in the single-graph case is

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-\frac{v}{\chi_f(G)} \varphi(\frac{4t}{5v})} = e^{-v\varphi(\frac{4t}{5v})},$$

while our result is

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-v\varphi(\frac{t}{v \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)})} = e^{-v\varphi(\frac{t}{v})}.$$

For a fixed t , we observe that the smaller $\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t)$ this term, the better. Since $\varphi(\frac{t}{v}) > \varphi(\frac{4t}{5v})$, $e^{-v\varphi(\frac{t}{v})} < e^{-v\varphi(\frac{4t}{5v})}$, our bound is tighter, and Bennett's inequality in prior work can be viewed as a special case.

(2) in the graph-dependent case, $\chi_f(G) \neq 1$, we also take $K = 1$ to contrast to the single-graph. In this case, $\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k) = \chi_f(G) \geq 2$, the result in [Ralaivola & Amini \(2015\)](#) is

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-\frac{v}{\chi_f(G)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)},$$

while our result is

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-v\varphi\left(\frac{t}{v\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)}\right)} = e^{-v\varphi\left(\frac{t}{v\chi_f(G)}\right)}.$$

Denote $\clubsuit_1 = -\frac{v}{\chi_f(G)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)$, and $\clubsuit_2 = -v\varphi\left(\frac{t}{v\chi_f(G)}\right)$, $c_1 = \frac{1}{\chi_f(G)}$, $c_2 = \frac{4}{5}$, $x = \frac{t}{v}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \clubsuit_1 - \clubsuit_2 &= v\varphi(c_1x) - c_1v\varphi(c_2x) = v(\varphi(c_1x) - c_1\varphi(c_2x)) \\ &= (1 + c_1x) \log(1 + c_1x) - c_1(1 + c_2x) \log(1 + c_2x) - (c_1 - c_1c_2)x. \end{aligned}$$

We can notice that as $\chi_f(G)$ increases, $\clubsuit_1 - \clubsuit_2$ becomes smaller and smaller, i.e., $\clubsuit_1 - \clubsuit_2 \approx 0$. Thus our result in [Theorem 5](#) is equivalent to the result in [Ralaivola & Amini \(2015\)](#).

Similar to [Theorem 2](#), we can derive the special Talagrand-type inequality from [Theorem 5](#).

C.2. A Special Talagrand-type Inequality

Corollary 4 (A new refined Talagrand-type inequality for empirical process with a special case of multi-graph dependent variables, proof in [Appendix E.1](#)). *Denote \mathbf{X} as some random variables, which are divided in the same way as the [Section 2](#), i.e., $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K)$. For every $k \in [K]$, $\mathbf{X}_k = (\mathbf{x}_{k1}, \mathbf{x}_{k2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{km_k})$, with $m = \sum_{k \in [K]} m_k$. Assume that each \mathbf{X}_k is linked to a dependence graph G_k , where $\{(I_{kj}, \omega_{kj})\}_{j \in [J_k]}$ constitutes a fractional independent vertex cover of G_k , and define $\chi_f(G_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj}$.*

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f, f = (f_1, \dots, f_K)\}$, where each $f_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, and assume that all functions f_k are measurable, squareintegrable, and fulfill the conditions $\mathbb{E}[f_k(\mathbf{x}_{kj})] = 0$, $\omega_{kj} = 1$ for all $k \in [K]$ and $j \in [m_k]$. Additionally, we require that $\|f_k\|_\infty \leq 1$. Define Z as follows:

$$Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

Moreover, for every $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$, donate a positive real value σ_{kj} , satisfying $\sigma_{kj}^2 \geq \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}[f^2(\mathbf{x}_i)]$. Then, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + t) \leq \exp\left(-v\varphi\left(\frac{t}{vW}\right)\right), \quad (24)$$

where $v = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \sigma_{kj}^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[Z]$, $W = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$, and the definition of other variables in [Theorem 5](#). Also, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$Z \leq \mathbb{E}[Z] + c\sqrt{2vt} + \frac{2ct}{3}, \quad (25)$$

where $c = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$.

Remark. This result is specific to [Theorem 2](#) and represents an inequality directly derived from [Theorem 5](#). It can be used to further develop the form of LRC and applies to the generalized boundary analysis of MTL, encompassing the case of i.i.d. (detail information and in [E.1](#)).

C.3. Supplement to Bennett Inequality

Theorem 6 (The lower bound of Bennett's inequality for a special case of multi-graph dependent variables). *Given $Z = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} Z_{kj}$ (see details in [Eq.\(2\)](#), [Section 3](#)). Suppose [Assumption 1](#) is holds, and for every $k \in [K]$, $j \in [J_k]$, $b_{kj} = b$, $\omega_{kj} = 1$. Then for all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \leq \mathbb{E}[Z] - t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{W} \varphi\left(\frac{tW}{Uv}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)\right), \quad (26)$$

where φ is defined as above, i.e., $\varphi(x) = (1+x)\log(1+x) - x$. Owing to the fact $x \geq 0$, $\varphi(x) \geq \frac{x^2}{2+\frac{2x}{3}}$, we can get

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \leq \mathbb{E}[Z] - \sqrt{2cvt} - \frac{2ct}{3}) \leq e^{-t}, \quad (27)$$

where $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$. The definition of v , W , U can be seen in Theorem 1.

Remark. This theorem supplements the Bennett inequality and can be used to analyze the lower bounds of the generalization bounds discussed later. Furthermore, this theorem can be combined with the results of Theorem 1, then $\mathbb{P}(|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi(\frac{4t}{5v}))$. The equivalence of the upper and lower bounds implies that the bound obtained is relatively tight. However, the result does not cover the i.i.d. case. This indicates that the result is not optimal and that there is still a gap $\frac{5}{4}$ to be bridged.

Proof. We can define some constants as Theorem 1, then

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \leq -t) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[Z] - Z \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\lambda(\mathbb{E}[Z]-Z)} \geq e^{\lambda t}) \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda(\mathbb{E}[Z]-Z)}) \cdot e^{-\lambda t},$$

$\textcircled{1}$ is owing to the fact, i.e., $\forall a > 0$, $\mathbb{P}[x > a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{a}$. The result can then be obtained using the same technique as in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

D. Theoretical Results for MTL with Multi-graph Dependent Data

In this section, we will provide some results on the generalization bounds of MTL in the case of graph-dependent case, to supplement the content of Section 3 in the main text.

D.1. Supplemental definition and proposition

Definition 8 (The FLRC of the loss space). Define $\mathcal{H} = \{h = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_K) | h_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}, k \in [K]\}$ as the hypothesis space, $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}\}$, and $L : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $L \in [0, M_c]$. According to Definition 4, the empirical FLRC of loss space is defined as

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_S(L \circ \mathcal{H}) = \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_\zeta \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}, \text{var}(h) \leq r} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i L(x_i, y_i, h_k) \right].$$

Furthermore, the FLRC of $L \circ \mathcal{H}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_m(L \circ \mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim D_{[K]}^m} [\mathcal{R}_S(L \circ \mathcal{H})].$$

Proposition 2. For every $r > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S, S'} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{K m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} (f_k(\mathbf{x}'_i) - f_k(\mathbf{x}_i)) \leq 2\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r). \quad (28)$$

we can prove this inequality due to the property of the Rademacher Complexity and the symmetry.

D.2. Supplemental risk bounds

Corollary 5 (An excess risk bound of learning multiple tasks with graph-dependent examples, proof in Appendix E.1). Let \hat{h} and h^* denote the prediction functions, which correspond to the minimum empirical loss and the minimum expected loss, respectively. Assume a bounded loss function $L \in [0, M_c]$. Assume:

a sub-root function Φ and its fixed point r^* satisfied the following:

$$\forall r \geq r^*, \Phi(r) \geq M_c \mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(L_h - L_{h^*})^2 \leq r\}.$$

Then for every $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq \frac{c_1}{M_c} r^* + (c_2 M_c + 22) \frac{ct}{K}, \quad (29)$$

where $c_1 = 704$, $c_2 = 26$, and $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in K} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}$.

This corollary gives the risk bound of a general bounded loss function, which can be improved if some properties of the loss function and the hypothesis class are taken into account.

Proposition 3 (The upper bound of FLRC in linear hypothesis, proof in Appendix E.2.7). *Assume that $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq M_b^2$, $M_b > 0$. The function class $\mathcal{F} = \{f, f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K), f_k = \theta_k^T \mathbf{x}_k, \|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a\}$. For every $r > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{2\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \min\left\{\frac{r}{M_b^2}, M_a^2 \tilde{\lambda}_l^2\right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where singular values $(\tilde{\lambda}_l)_{l=1}^{\infty}$ in a nonincreasing order, and $\Theta = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l$, where Θ is a weight matrix.

Moreover, if $\tilde{\lambda}_1^2 \geq \frac{1}{m M_a^2}$, then for every $r \geq \frac{M_b^2}{m}$, $m = \sum_{k \in [K]} m_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} \\ & \geq c \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \min\left\{\frac{r}{M_b^2}, M_a^2 \tilde{\lambda}_l^2\right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where c is a constant. The above gives the lower bound for linear space.

Remark. A more refined upper bound for the FLRC within linear hypothesis spaces is presented here. Furthermore, the relationship between this upper bound and the fixed point r^* is examined to facilitate a detailed analysis of the complexity associated with the generalization bound.

Corollary 6 (An excess risk bound of loss space in linear hypothesis, proof in Appendix E.2.8). *Assume that $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq M_b^2$, $M_b > 0$, $\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a$, and loss function L satisfies Assumption 2, C is a constant about B, μ , and C' is a constant about $\chi_f(G)$. Then for all $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq C_{B, \mu} (r^* + C'_{\chi_f(G)} \frac{t}{K}), \quad (30)$$

where

$$r^* \leq \min_{d \geq 0} \left(\frac{d}{M_b^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l > d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right), \quad (31)$$

where d is the division of singular values of matrix Θ , and $P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*})$ can be seen in Theorem 1.

E. Proofs

In this section, we will give detailed proofs of some major theorems and corollaries, as well as some simple proof techniques for corollaries, so that readers can understand and sort out the main results.

E.1. Proof Sketches

This section outlines the main ideas and techniques used in the proofs of several theorems and corollaries.

(1) Proof of Theorem 2, we can use Theorem 6.1 in (Bousquet, 2003) and Theorem 1 to get the following:

- $Y_{kjl} \leq Z_{kj} - Z_{kj}^{\setminus \{l\}} \leq 1$, these inequalities are owing to

$$\sum_{i \in I_{kj} \setminus \{l\}} f_l^{kj}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i \in I_{kj} \setminus \{l\}} f(\mathbf{x}_i), Y_{kjl} = f_l^{kj}(\mathbf{x}_l),$$

$$Y_{kjl} \leq Z_{kj} - Z_{kj}^{\setminus \{l\}} \leq f_{kj}^*(\mathbf{x}_l) \leq 1, \mathbb{E}_{kjl}[Y_{kjl}] = 0.$$

- $\sigma_{kj}^2 \geq \sum_{l \in I_{kj}} \mathbb{E}_{I_{kj}}[Y_{kjl}^2]$, because

$$\sum_{l \in I_{kj}} \mathbb{E}_{I_{kj}}[Y_{kjl}^2] = \sum_{l \in I_{kj}} \mathbb{E}_{I_{kj}}[f_l^{kj^2}(\mathbf{x}_l)] \leq \sum_{l \in I_{kj}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}[f^2 \mathbf{x}_l].$$

(2) Proof of Corollary 4, similar to above, we can use Theorem 5 and Theorem 6.1 in Bousquet (2003) to get the results, and we can observe $b = 1$.

(3) Proof of Corollary 5, let $g = L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}$, $T(g) = \mathbb{E}g^2$ and we notice $g \in [-M_c, M_c]$, then $\text{var}(g) = \mathbb{E}g^2 - (\mathbb{E}g)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}g^2$, i.e., $\text{var}(g) \leq T(g)$, $T(g) = \mathbb{E}g^2 \leq M_c \mathbb{E}g$, then we can use Theorem 4 to g , and since $P_m g \leq 0$, we can omit the term $\frac{M}{M-1} P_m g$.

(4) Proof of Corollary 1, according to Assumption 2, then $\mathbb{E}(L_h - L_{h^*})^2 \leq \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2$, let $T(L_h - L_{h^*}) = \mathbb{E}(L_h - L_{h^*})^2 \leq B\mu^2 \mathbb{E}(L_h - L_{h^*})$, and we know $\mu \mathcal{R}\{h, \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\} \geq \mathcal{R}\{L_h - L_{h^*}, \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\}$. And we notice $P_m(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq 0$, then use Theorem 4 to get the results.

(5) Proof of Theorem 7, we can use Theorem 3 and the value of $m_k, \chi_f(G_k)$, i.e., $m_k = n^2 \tau_k (1 - \tau_k)$, $\chi_f(G_k) = (1 - \tau_k)n$, to obtain the results.

(6) Proof of Corollary 7, we can prove the corollary by using Theorem 7 and Theorem 4, the value of $m_k, \chi_f(G_k)$, that is, $m_k = n^2 \tau_k (1 - \tau_k)$, $\chi_f(G_k) = (1 - \tau_k)n$.

(7) Proof of Corollary 3, we can use Corollary 7 and Proposition 1 (the upper bound of r^*), 2 (the risk bound in the kernel hypothesis) to get the results and use the value of $m_k, \chi_f(G_k)$, i.e., $m_k = n^2 \tau_k (1 - \tau_k)$, $\chi_f(G_k) = (1 - \tau_k)n$. Also, if we use one kernel matrix, we can get $r^* \leq \min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} d + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d} \lambda_l} \right)$.

(8) Proof of Corollary 8, we can use Corollary 7 and Proposition 3 (the upper bound of r^*), 6 (the risk bound in linear hypothesis), and use the value of $m_k, \chi_f(G_k)$, i.e., $m_k = n^2 \tau_k (1 - \tau_k)$, $\chi_f(G_k) = (1 - \tau_k)n$.

E.2. Proof Details

This section provides a detailed explanation of the proof procedures for several key theorems and lemmas, aiming to facilitate understanding of their underlying reasoning.

E.2.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Here we give the proof of **Theorem 1 (A new Bennett's inequality for multi-graph dependent variables)**, and review $Z = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} Z_{kj}$, where $Z_{kj} = f_{kj}(x_{I_{kj}})$.

Proof. Define some constants as follows:

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sigma_{kj}^2, v = (1 + b) \mathbb{E}[Z] + \sigma^2, c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k), \chi_f(G_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj},$$

$$p_k = \frac{U_k}{U}, q_{kj} = \frac{\omega_{kj} \max(1, \overbrace{v^{\frac{1}{2}} W^{\frac{1}{2}} v^{-\frac{1}{2}}})}{U_k}, U = \sum_{k \in [K]} U_k, U_k = \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \max(1, \Delta),$$

$$W = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k) = \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k, \sigma_k^2 = \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sigma_{kj}^2, \omega_k = \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj}, v_k = \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} v_{kj} = (1 + b) \mathbb{E}[Z_k] + \sigma_k^2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) &= \mathbb{P}(e^{\lambda(Z - \mathbb{E}Z)} \geq e^{\lambda t}) \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda(Z - \mathbb{E}Z)})}_{e^{G(\lambda)}} \cdot e^{-\lambda t}. \\
 G(\lambda) &= \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda(Z - \mathbb{E}Z)}) \\
 &= \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \frac{1}{p_k} (Z_k - \mathbb{E}X_k [Z_k])}) \\
 &= \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \frac{1}{p_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} q_{kj} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{q_{kj}} (Z_{kj} - \mathbb{E}X_{I_{kj}} [Z_{kj}])}) \\
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \log \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \sum_{j \in [J_k]} q_{kj} \mathbb{E}(e^{\frac{\lambda \omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}} (Z_{kj} - \mathbb{E}[Z_{kj}])}), \\
 G_{kj}(\lambda) &= \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda (Z_{kj} - \mathbb{E}Z_{kj})}), \\
 G(\lambda) &\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} \log \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \sum_{j \in [J_k]} q_{kj} (e^{G_{kj}(\frac{\lambda \omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}})}) \\
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\leq} \log \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \sum_{j \in [J_k]} q_{kj} (e^{v_{kj} \psi(-\frac{\lambda \omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}})}).
 \end{aligned}$$

① is due to the Markov Inequality, i.e., $\mathbb{P}[x > a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[x]}{a}$, and we define $e^{G(\lambda)} = \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda(Z - \mathbb{E}Z)})$. ② is due to the Jensen inequality, and ③ is due to the assumption 1, the last inequality ④ is due to Theorem 1 (Bousquet, 2002; 2003), i.e., $G(\lambda) \leq \psi(-\lambda)v$. We can observe that $v_{kj} \psi(-\frac{\lambda \omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}}) \leq \frac{v}{W} \psi(-\lambda U)$ (proof in Lemma 2),

then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{\frac{v}{W} \psi(-\lambda U) - \lambda t}, \quad (32)$$

we solve the minimum optimization problem with respect to λ , for $\lambda = \frac{\ln(1 + \frac{tW}{vU})}{U}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-\frac{v}{W} \varphi(\frac{tW}{vU})}. \quad (33)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_k &= \sum_{j \in [J_k]} w_{kj} \max(1, \Delta) \\
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} w_{kj} (1 + \frac{v_{kj} W}{4v}) = w_k + \frac{v_k W}{4v}, \\
 U &= \sum_{k \in [K]} U_k = \sum_{k \in [K]} (w_k + \frac{v_k W}{4v}) = W + \frac{W}{4} = \frac{5}{4} W,
 \end{aligned}$$

① is according to the fact that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq 1 + \frac{x^2}{4}$, i.e., $\max(1, \Delta) \leq 1 + \frac{v_{kj} W}{4v}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] + t) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{W} \varphi\left(\frac{tW}{Uv}\right)\right) \\
 &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{v}{\sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)} \varphi\left(\frac{4t}{5v}\right)\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \geq 0$, $\varphi(x) \geq \frac{x^2}{2 + \frac{2x}{3}}$, inequality ((8)) is deduced. \square

Lemma 2. If we define p_k, q_{kj} as Theorem 1, then we can get $v_{kj} \psi(-\frac{\lambda \omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}}) \leq \frac{v}{W} \psi(-\lambda U)$.

Proof. • $\Delta \leq 1$, then

$$q_{kj} = \frac{\omega_{kj}}{U_k}, v \geq v_{kj}W,$$

then

$$v_{kj}\psi\left(-\frac{\lambda\omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}}\right) = v_{kj}\psi(-\lambda U) \leq \frac{v}{W}\psi(-\lambda U);$$

• $\Delta > 1$, then

$$q_{kj} = \frac{\omega_{kj}v_{kj}^{\frac{1}{2}}W^{\frac{1}{2}}v^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{U_k}, v < v_{kj}W,$$

then

$$v_{kj}\psi\left(-\frac{\lambda\omega_{kj}}{p_k q_{kj}}\right) = v_{kj}\psi\left(-\lambda U \frac{v^{\frac{1}{2}}}{v_{kj}^{\frac{1}{2}}W^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \leq \frac{v}{W}\psi(-\lambda U).$$

□

E.2.2. PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Here we give the proof of **Theorem 5 (A new refined Bennett's inequality for a special case of multi-graph dependent variables)**.

Proof. Because of $\omega_{kj} = 1$, we can get $\omega_k = |J_k| \in [1, m_k]$, every \mathbf{x}_{kj} in only one independent set. Then we can define p_k, q_{kj} and some constants as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sigma_{kj}^2, v = (1+b)\mathbb{E}[Z] + \sigma^2, p_k = \frac{U_k}{U}, U = \sum_{k \in [K]} U_k, \\ c &= \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k), \chi_f(G_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj}, q_{kj} = \frac{1}{U_k}, U_k = \sum_{j \in [J_k]} = \omega_k. \end{aligned}$$

Review the proof of the Theorem 1, we can get:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{(\log \sum_{k \in [K]} p_k \sum_{j \in [J_k]} q_{kj} (v_{kj} \psi(-\frac{\lambda}{p_k q_{kj}})) - \lambda t)}, \quad (34)$$

then

$$v_{kj}\psi\left(-\frac{\lambda}{p_k q_{kj}}\right) = v_{kj}\psi(-\lambda U) \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} v\psi(-\lambda U),$$

the inequality $\textcircled{1}$ is due to every $v_{kj} \geq 0$, $v = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} v_{kj} \geq v_{kj}$. Then the inequality (34) can be written as the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{v\psi(-\lambda U) - \lambda t}.$$

We solve the minimum optimization problem with respect to λ , for $\lambda = \frac{\ln(1 + \frac{t}{vU})}{U}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(Z - \mathbb{E}Z \geq t) \leq e^{-v\varphi(\frac{t}{vU})}.$$

Since $U = \sum_{k \in [K]} U_k = \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k = W$, and we noticed $W = \sum_{k \in [K]} \chi_f(G_k)$. Finally, we can get the one part in Theorem 5, and the second part in Theorem 5 is due to the fact $x \geq 0$, $\varphi(x) \geq \frac{x^2}{2 + \frac{x}{3}}$. □

E.2.3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Here we give the proof of **Theorem 3 (A risk bound of multi-graph dependent variables with small variance)**.

Proof. We can define some variables, $V^+ = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (Pf - P_m f)$, $\mathcal{F}_r = \{f, f \in \mathcal{F}, \text{var}(f) \leq r\}$, and $f = \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i)$. then

$$\begin{aligned} V^+ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} (Pf - P_m f) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}'_r} \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f(\mathbf{x}'_i) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}'_r} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f(\mathbf{x}'_i) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}'_r} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} (f(\mathbf{x}'_i) - f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which has differences bounded by $\frac{1}{Km_k}$ in the sense of the Z in Theorem 2, then with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$V^+ \leq \mathbb{E}V^+ + \frac{1}{K} \sqrt{2cvt} + \frac{2ct}{3K}, \quad (35)$$

where $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}$ and $v = \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sigma_{kj}^2 + 2K\mathbb{E}V^+ \leq Kr + 2K\mathbb{E}V^+$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} V^+ &\leq \mathbb{E}V^+ + \sqrt{\frac{2c(r + 2\mathbb{E}V^+)t}{K}} + \frac{2ct}{3K} \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}V^+ + \sqrt{\frac{4c\mathbb{E}V^+t}{K}} + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \frac{2ct}{3K} \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} (1 + \alpha)\mathbb{E}V^+ + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K} \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} 2(1 + \alpha)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, r) + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ is due to the fact $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$, i.e., $\sqrt{\frac{2c(r+2\mathbb{E}V^+)t}{K}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{4c\mathbb{E}V^+t}{K}} + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}}$, and $\textcircled{2}$ is due to the fact $\forall \alpha > 0, 2\sqrt{ab} \leq \frac{a}{\alpha} + \alpha b$, and we can combine similar items. $\textcircled{3}$ is due to the proposition 2. \square

E.2.4. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

Here we give the proof of **Theorem 4 (An improved bound of multi-graph dependent variables with sub-root function)**.

Proof. We can define $\mathcal{G}_r = \{g = (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_K), g_k = \frac{r}{w(f)} f, f \in \mathcal{F}_k\}$, $\mathcal{F}(x, y) := \{f \in \mathcal{F}, T(f) \in [x, y]\}$, where $w(f) = \min\{r\lambda^a, a \in \mathbb{N}, r\lambda^a \geq T(f), f \in \mathcal{F}_k\}$, $V_r^+ = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_r} (Pg - P_m g)$. We can notice $\frac{r}{w(f)} \in [0, 1]$, then for each $g \in \mathcal{G}_r, \|g\|_\infty \leq 1$, and we found $\text{var}(g) \leq r$. Because

- $T(f) \leq r$, then

$$a = 0, w(f) = 1, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}_r, g = f, \text{var}(g) = \text{var}(f) \leq r;$$

- $T(f) > r$, then

$$g = \frac{f}{\lambda^a}, T(f) \in (r\lambda^{a-1}, r\lambda^a], \text{var}(g) = \frac{\text{var}(f)}{\lambda^{2a}} \leq r.$$

Then we can apply Theorem 3 for \mathcal{G}_r , for all $x > 0$, with probability $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$V_r^+ \leq 2(1 + \alpha)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_r) + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\frac{ct}{K}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_r) = \frac{1}{K} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta} \underbrace{\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_r, \text{var}(g) \leq r} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i g(x_i)}_{\diamond} \right].$$

Let $T(f) \leq Bb$, define a_0 to be the smallest integer that $r\lambda^{a_0+1} \geq Bb$ and partition $\mathcal{F}(0, Bb)$, i.e., $\mathcal{F}(0, r) + \mathcal{F}(r\lambda^0, r\lambda^1) + \mathcal{F}(r\lambda^1, r\lambda^2), \dots, \mathcal{F}(r\lambda^{a_0}, r\lambda^{a_0+1})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond &\leq \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_r, T(f) \in [0, r]} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i g_k(x_i) + \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_r, T(f) \in [r, Bb]} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i g_k(x_i) \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(0, r)} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i f_k(x_i) + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(r, Bb)} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \frac{r}{w(f_k)} f_k(x_i) \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(0, r)} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i f_k(x_i) + \sum_{j=0}^{a_0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(r\lambda^j, r\lambda^{j+1})} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \frac{r}{r\lambda^j} f_k(x_i) \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(0, r)} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i f_k(x_i) + \sum_{j=0}^{a_0} \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(r\lambda^j, r\lambda^{j+1})} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i f_k(x_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since the property in Lemma 7, i.e., $\forall \gamma \geq 1, \Phi(\gamma r) \leq \sqrt{\gamma} \Phi(r)$, then we can get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_r) &\leq \mathcal{R}\mathcal{F}(0, r) + \sum_{j=0}^{a_0} \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \mathcal{R}\mathcal{F}(r\lambda^j, r\lambda^{j+1}) \leq \frac{\Phi(r)}{B} + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^{a_0} \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \Phi(r\lambda^{j+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{\Phi(r)}{B} + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^{a_0} \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \lambda^{\frac{j+1}{2}} \Phi(r) = \frac{\Phi(r)}{B} \left[1 + \sqrt{\lambda} \sum_{j=0}^{a_0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^j}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

then taking $\lambda = 4$, we can get:

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_r) \leq \frac{5\Phi(r)}{B}.$$

Since the property in Lemma 7 and Lemma 1, i.e., $\Phi(r^*) = r^*$, and $\frac{\Phi(r)}{\sqrt{r}}$ is nonincreasing, thus

$$\begin{aligned} V_r^+ &\leq 2(1 + \alpha) \frac{5\Phi(r)}{B} + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K} \\ &\leq \frac{10(1 + \alpha)}{B} \sqrt{rr^*} + \sqrt{\frac{2crt}{K}} + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K}. \end{aligned}$$

Then let $A = \frac{10(1+\alpha)}{B} \sqrt{r^*} + \sqrt{\frac{2ct}{K}}$, $C = \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{ct}{K}$, thus

$$V_r^+ \leq A\sqrt{r} + C.$$

Then we can apply lemma 3.8 in Bartlett et al. (2005), i.e., if $V_r^+ \leq \frac{r}{\lambda BM}$, then $Pf \leq \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \frac{r}{\lambda BM}$, where $\lambda = 4$, and use a technique, i.e., $\forall \beta > 0, \sqrt{ab} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\beta a + \frac{b}{\beta})$, then

$$Pf \leq \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \lambda BMA^2 + 2C$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \lambda B M \left(\frac{100(1+\alpha)^2 r^*}{B^2} + \frac{20(1+\alpha)}{B} \sqrt{\frac{2c r^* t}{K}} + \frac{2ct}{K} \right) + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \frac{2ct}{K}, \\
 &\leq \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \lambda B M \left[\frac{100(1+\alpha)^2 r^*}{B^2} + \frac{20(1+\alpha)}{B} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{5r^*}{B} + \frac{2cBt}{5K} \right) \right) + \frac{2ct}{K} \right] + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \frac{2ct}{K},
 \end{aligned}$$

let $\alpha = \frac{1}{10}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 P f &= \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \lambda B M \left(\frac{121r^*}{B^2} + \frac{22}{B} \left(\frac{cBt}{5K} + \frac{5r^*}{2B} \right) + \frac{2ct}{K} \right) + \frac{32}{3} \frac{2ct}{K} \\
 &= \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \frac{(121+55)\lambda M}{B} r^* + \left(\frac{32\lambda B M}{5} + \frac{64}{3} \right) \frac{ct}{K} \\
 &\leq \frac{M}{M-1} P_m f + \frac{704M}{B} r^* + (26BM + 22) \frac{ct}{K},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $c = \frac{25^2}{16^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}$. Let $c_1 = 704$, $c_2 = 26$, then we can get inequality (15). In the same way, we can define $V_r^- = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_r} (P_m g - P g)$, and then get inequality (16). \square

E.2.5. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Here we give the proof of **Proposition 1 (The upper bound of FLRC in kernel hypothesis)**.

Proof. We can observe that $\mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E} f_k^2 \leq r\} = \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}(\|f_k\|_2) \leq \sqrt{r}\} \leq \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}(\|f_k\|_1) \leq \sqrt{r}\}$. Donote $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}_{2,1})$, $\mathcal{F}_{2,1} = \{f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k), k \in [K], \mathbb{E}(\|f_k\|_1) \leq \sqrt{r}\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{k2,1} \{f_k : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \Theta^T \phi(\mathbf{x}), \|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M a, \mathbb{E}(\|f\|_1) \leq \sqrt{r}\}$. Then we fix $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_K), d_k \in \mathbb{N}, d_k \in [0, m_k]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i < \theta_k, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) > \\
 &= \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{\chi_f(G_k)} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i < \theta_k, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) > \\
 &= \sum_{k \in [K]} < \theta_k, \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{\chi_f(G_k)} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) > \\
 &\leq \sum_{k \in [K]} < \theta_k, \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k) > \\
 &= \sum_{k \in [K]} [< \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sqrt{\lambda_{kl}} < \theta_k, \varphi_{kl} > \varphi_{kl}, \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{kl}}} < \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} > \varphi_{kl} > \\
 &\quad + < \theta_k, \sum_{l>d_k} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} >, \varphi_{kl} >] \\
 &\leq \sum_{k \in [K]} [< \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sqrt{\lambda_{kl}} < \theta_k, \varphi_{kl} > \varphi_{kl}, \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{kl}}} < \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} > \varphi_{kl} > \\
 &\quad + < \theta_k, \sum_{l>d_k} \frac{1}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} >, \varphi_{kl} >].
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\diamond = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i < \theta_k, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) >$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\diamond) \leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{ \left(\sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \lambda_{kl} < \theta_k, \varphi_{kl} >^2 \right) \left(\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{\lambda_{kl}} \mathbb{E} [< \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} >^2] \right) }$$

$$+ \|\theta_k\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d_k} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} \rangle^2]},$$

since $\sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \lambda_{kl} < \theta_k$, $\varphi_l \rangle^2 \leq r$, $\mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_{kl} \rangle^2] = \lambda_{kl}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\diamond) \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{r d_k \chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k}} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d_k} \lambda_{kl}}.$$

So $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathcal{F}_{2,1} \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \min_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} \sqrt{\frac{r d_k \chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k}} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d_k} \lambda_{kl}}$. \square

Proposition 4 (The upper bound of FLRC in kernel hypothesis with special case). *Assume for each $k \in [K]$, $\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a$. For all $r > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E} f^2 \leq r\} \leq \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{2 \chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \min\{r, M_a^2 \lambda_l\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (36)$$

where eigenvalues $(\lambda_l)_{l=1}^{\infty}$ are in a nonincreasing order, and satisfy $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda_l \varphi_l(\mathbf{x})^T \varphi_l(\mathbf{x}')$. In this theorem, we consider the data for all tasks to share a kernel matrix, which is used more commonly in practical applications.

Proof. We can use a similar method (eigenvalue decomposition) to the Proposition 1, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \langle \theta_k, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \rangle \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \left[\sum_{l=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_l} \langle \theta_k, \varphi_l \rangle, \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_l}} \langle \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle \right] \\ & + \langle \theta_k, \sum_{l>d} \frac{1}{K m_k} \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\square = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in J_k} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \langle \theta_k, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \rangle$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\square) & \leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l \langle \theta_k, \varphi_l \rangle^2 \right) \left(\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2] \right)} \\ & + \|\theta_k\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2]} \\ & \leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l \langle \theta_k, \varphi_l \rangle^2} \cdot \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2] \right)} \\ & + M_a \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2]} \\ & \leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l \langle \theta_k, \varphi_l \rangle^2} \cdot \sqrt{K} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \left(\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2] \right)} \\ & + M_a \sqrt{K} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d} \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l \rangle^2]} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l < \theta_k, \varphi_l >^2} \cdot \sqrt{\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \right) \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}[< \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l >^2] \right)} \\
 &+ M_a \sqrt{\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \right) \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l>d} \mathbb{E}[< \zeta_k \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \varphi_l >^2] \right)} \\
 &\leq \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l < \theta_k, \varphi_l >^2} \cdot \sqrt{\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}[< \phi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_l >^2] \right)} \\
 &+ M_a \sqrt{\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \right) \left(\sum_{l>d} \mathbb{E}[< \phi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_l >^2] \right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^d \lambda_l < \theta_k, \varphi_l >^2} \leq \sqrt{r}$, $\mathbb{E}[< \phi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_l >^2] = \lambda_l$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\diamond) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} r d} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l>d} \lambda_l},$$

so $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} r d} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l>d} \lambda_l}$. \square

E.2.6. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

Here we give the proof of **Corollary 2 (A risk bound of FLRC in kernel hypothesis)**.

Proof. We can notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\} &= \mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} = \mathcal{R}\{h - h^*, h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} \\
 &\leq \mathcal{R}\{h - g, h, g \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - g)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} = 2\mathcal{R}\{h, h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}h^2 \leq \frac{r}{4\mu^2}\},
 \end{aligned}$$

since the property in Lemma 1, i.e., the fixed point r^* satisfied $r^* = \Psi(r^*)$, Then we can use the Corollary 1 and the Theorem 1 to get the results. According to the Theorem 1,

$$r^* \leq C \left[\sum_{k \in [K]} \min_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu} \sqrt{r d_k \chi_f(G_k)} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d_k} \lambda_{kl}} \right) \right],$$

where C is a constant about B, μ . Also, if we share a kernel matrix, we can use Theorem 4, then

$$r^* \leq C \left[\min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} r d} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l>d} \lambda_l} \right) \right],$$

In this case, we can observe that the fixed point r^* satisfies,

$$r^* \leq \min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} d + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l>d} \lambda_l} \right).$$

\square

E.2.7. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

Here we give the proof of **Proposition 3 (The upper bound of FLRC in linear hypothesis)**.

Proof. Similarly, we can get $\mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} = \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}(\|f\|_2^2) \leq r\} = \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}^T \Theta \Theta^T \mathbf{x}] \leq r\} = \mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}[\|\Theta \Theta^T\|] \leq \frac{\sqrt{r}}{M_b}\}$. Then we denote the above as $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}_{2,2})$, and consider the SVD composition of Θ , i.e., $\Theta = \sum_{l=1} u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l$, where $\{\tilde{\lambda}_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ are the singular values of Θ and are sorted in a nonincreasing order. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \langle \Theta_k, \mathbf{x}_i \rangle = \sum_{k \in [K]} \langle \theta_k, \frac{1}{K m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \mathbf{x}_i \rangle \\ & \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} \sum_{k \in [K]} \langle \Theta_k, \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} \rangle \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \left[\left\| \sum_{l=1}^d u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\| \cdot \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^{-1} \right\| + \|\theta_k\|_2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{l>d} \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \right\| \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $\textcircled{1}$ due to denote the $\mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} = \frac{1}{K m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \mathbf{x}_i$. Let $\diamond = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} \zeta_i \langle \theta_k, \mathbf{x}_i \rangle$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\diamond) & \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a} \sum_{k \in [K]} \left[\left\| \sum_{l=1}^d u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\| \cdot \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^{-1} \right\| + \|\theta_k\|_2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{l>d} \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \right\| \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\| \cdot \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^{-1} \right\| + M_a \cdot \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{l>d} \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \right\| \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\| \cdot \mathbb{E}[\sqrt{K} \cdot \left\| \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^{-1} \right\|] + M_a \cdot \mathbb{E}[\sqrt{K} \cdot \left\| \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l>d} \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \right\|]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{k \in [K]} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^d u_l v_l^T \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{r}}{M_a}$, $\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{k\zeta} u_l u_l^T \right\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} d}$, then $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \frac{1}{M_b} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{rd \chi_f(G_k)}{m_k}} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2}$, thus

$$\mathcal{R}\{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq r\} \leq \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{2\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l=1}^\infty \min\left\{ \frac{r}{M_b^2}, M_a^2 \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 \right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

E.2.8. PROOF OF COROLLARY 6

Here we give the proof of **Corollary 6 (An excess risk bound of loss space in linear hypothesis)**.

Proof. Similarly, we can prove the Corollary 6 likely the Corollary 2.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\} & = \mathcal{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} = \mathcal{R}\{h - h^*, h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} \\ & \leq \mathcal{R}\{h - g, h, g \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}(h - g)^2 \leq \frac{r}{\mu^2}\} = 2\mathcal{R}\{h, h \in \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E}h^2 \leq \frac{r}{4\mu^2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Owing to the property in Lemma 1, i.e., the fixed point r^* satisfies $r^* = \Psi(r^*)$, Then we can use the Corollary 1 and Proposition 3 to get the results. According to the Proposition 3,

$$r^* \leq C \left[\sum_{k \in [K]} \min_{0 \leq d_k \leq m_k} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{M_b} \sqrt{\frac{rd_k \chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k}} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{K m_k} \sum_{l>d_k} \tilde{\lambda}_{kl}^2} \right) \right],$$

where C is a constant about B, μ . If we use the second decomposition of Θ , then

$$r^* \leq C \left[\min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{M_b} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} rd} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l>d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right) \right].$$

Furthermore, r^* satisfies

$$r^* \leq \min_{0 \leq d \leq m} \left(\frac{d}{M_b^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} + M_a \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_f(G_k)}{m_k} \sum_{l > d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right). \quad (37)$$

□

F. Other Applications

This section provides further applications of Section 4, which includes detailed theoretical results for Macro-AUC Optimization and AUUC-maximization.

F.1. Macro-AUC -Optimization in MTL

Here, we provide additional information on the theoretical results of Macro-AUC Optimization presented in the main text.

Theorem 7 (The base theorem of Macro-AUC, proof in Appendix E.1). *Assume that the loss function $L : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is bounded by M_c , and $\mathcal{H}_{l,r} = \{h : h \in \mathcal{H}, \text{var}(L(h, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{kl})) \leq r\}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{kl} = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{kl}^+, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{kl}^-)$. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}_{l,r}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$P(L_h) - P_m(L_h) \leq 2(1 + \alpha)\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{l,r}) + \frac{5}{4} \sqrt{\frac{2rt}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} + \frac{5^2}{4^2} \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}\right) \frac{t}{n}},$$

where $P(L_h), P_m(L_h)$ can be obtained by Eq.(6), i.e., $P_m(L_h) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in [J_k]} \frac{\omega_{kj}}{m_k} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}} L(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, h_k)$ and $P_h = \mathbb{E}(P_m(L_h))$.

Remark. *This theorem is the basis and core of the derivation of subsequent boundaries, where we can derive more detailed generalization bounds.*

The sub-root function can subsequently be introduced to derive an improved risk bound for Macro-AUC, similar to Theorem 4, as well as a risk bound for the bounded loss function. This development facilitates the establishment of the risk bound (see Appendix F) for the loss function under Assumption 2. Following this, generalization bounds are presented for two types of hypothesis spaces: kernel and linear. A comprehensive discussion on the convergence of these bounds is also provided.

Corollary 7 (A risk bound of Macro-AUC, proof in Appendix E.1). *Assume that the loss function L satisfies Assumption 2, and \hat{h} satisfies $\mathbb{E}_m(L_{\hat{h}}) = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}(L_h)$. Assume:*

$$\Phi(r) \geq B\mu \mathbf{R}\{h \in \mathcal{H}, \mu^2 \mathbb{E}(h - h^*)^2 \leq r\},$$

then for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq \frac{c_1}{B} r^* + c_2 \frac{t}{K},$$

where $c_1 = 704$, $c_2 = (26B + 22)c$, $c = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}$. We can notice that c_2 is $O(\frac{1}{n})$.

Corollary 8 (Linear case excess risk bound of Macro-AUC, proof in Appendix E.1). *Assume that $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq M_b^2$, $M_b > 0$. The hypothesis $\mathcal{H} = \{h, h = (h_1, \dots, h_K), h_k = \theta_k^T \mathbf{x}_k, \|\theta_k\|_2 \leq M_a\}$. And the loss function L satisfies Assumption 2, C is a constant about B, μ . Then with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq C_{B,\mu} \left(r^* + \frac{C'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K}}{K} \frac{t}{n} \right), \quad (38)$$

where

$$r^* \leq \min_{d \geq 0} \left(\frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right), \quad (39)$$

where d is the division of singular values of matrix Θ .

Proposition 5.

$$\sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K\tau_k} \sum_{kl > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \sqrt{K} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{K\tau_k} \sum_{kl > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}} \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{kl > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}},$$

① is due to the Cauchy Schwartz inequality, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i y_i \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N y_i^2}$. Let $y_i = 1$, $N = K$, we can get the results. ② is due to the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i y_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$, and we merge some terms. Let $M = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}}$, then $\sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{K\tau_k} \sum_{kl > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}} \leq M \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{kl > d'_k} \lambda_{kl}}$.

Proposition 6.

$$r^* \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} M^2 \cdot \frac{1}{nK} \sum_{k \in [K]} d_k \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} M^2 \frac{d_*}{n},$$

where $M = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}}$ and $d_* = \max(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_K)$. ① is due to the fact $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i y_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$ and the value of M . ② is due to for every $k \in [K]$, $d_k \leq d_*$.

Some examples of the second case (see Section 4.1.2) for kernel case are as follows: the Polynomial Kernel, i.e., $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}' + c)^a$, whose rank is at most $a + 1$, then $d_* = a + 1$. Many combinatorial kernels are of finite rank, such as the combination of additive and multiplicative kernels, and can create finite-dimensional feature space in an abounded way. Moreover, although some kernels are infinite dimensional, within a certain error range, finite kernels can be approximated by truncation on finite data points, such as Laplacian Kernel, and Gaussian Kernel.

F.1.1. SOME GENERALIZATION ANALYSIS OF LINEAR HYPOTHESIS

Next, we will analyze in detail the convergence rate of the generalization boundary in linear space (Corollary 8).

With inequality (38), we can notice that $P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) = O(r^*) + O(\frac{1}{Kn})$, similarly, $r^* \in [O(\frac{1}{n}), O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})]$ in inequality (39).

Then we analyze r^* , i.e., $\frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d'}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d'} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2}$, by the value of d' , where $d' = \operatorname{argmin}_{d \geq 0} (\frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2})$, $d' \in \mathbb{N}$.

(1) $d' = 0$, in this case, then

$$r^* \leq M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > 0} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} M_a M \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l > 0} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right),$$

where $M = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}}$, thus we can get the inequality ①. And we can notice that $r^* = O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})$, which is the worst case scenario for the convergence of our generalization bounds. But we know that the generalization bound of GRC analysis is also $\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}$. This at least shows that our convergence rate is not worse than GRC.

(2) $r(\Theta)$ is finite, where $r(\Theta)$ refers to the rank of matrix Θ . then there exists $d' < \infty$ for $\sum_{l > 0} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 = 0$, then

$$r^* \leq \frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d'}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{M^2}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d'}{n},$$

where $d' = \operatorname{argmin}_{d > 0} \frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d}{n}$, ① is due to $M = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k}}$ (we donate). We can notice that $r^* = O(\frac{d'}{n})$. If $r(\Theta) \leq$, i.e., $d' \leq a$, then $r^* = O(\frac{a}{n})$, where a is a constant.

(3) The eigenvalues of the SVD decomposition of the Θ matrix decay exponentially. In this case, we have $\sum_{l > d'} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2 = O(e^{-d'})$. By setting the truncation threshold at $d' = \log n$, then

$$r^* \leq \left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d'} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{M^2}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} + M_a M \sqrt{\sum_{l>d'} \frac{C}{n^2}} \\ &= \frac{M^2}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} + M_a M \frac{\sqrt{C}}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant. ① is due to the known condition and some simple deflating method used earlier. Through the above analysis, we can see that $r^* = O(\frac{\log n}{n})$.

F.2. Area Under the Uplift Curve (AUUC) - Maximization

F.2.1. PROBLEM SETTING

Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ be a feature vector, and output $Y \in \{0, 1\}$. We need to introduce treatment variables $G = \{T, C\}$ that indicate whether ($g = T$) or ($g = C$) not each individual received treatment. Assume a dataset $(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, g_{ki})$ $i.i.d.$ $D_{\mathcal{X}, Y, G}; \mathcal{X} \perp G$. To simplify the representation of S , we use S^g to represent a subset of S , i.e., S^g can be S^T or S^C . Then we can describe the setting: given dataset $S = \{S^C, S^T\}$, where $S^g = \{S_1^g, S_2^g, \dots, S_K^g\}$. For each $k \in [K]$, $S_k^g = \{(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, g)\}_{i=1}^{m_k^g}$. Also for every $k \in [K]$, $m_k = m_k^C + m_k^T$, $\sum_{k \in [K]} m_k = \sum_{k \in [K]} m_k^C + \sum_{k \in [K]} m_k^T = n^C + n^T = N$. The goal is to learn a mapping function $h = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_K)$.

F.2.2. SOME THEORY RESULTS

Definition 9 (AUUC-max in multi-tasks learning). For $k \in [K]$, define $h_k(S_k^T, \frac{p}{100}m_k^T)$ and $h_k(S_k^C, \frac{p}{100}m_k^C)$ as the first p percentiles of S_k^T and S_k^C , respectively, when arranged according to the predictions of each h_k . Furthermore, for S^T and S^C , we have $h(S^g, \frac{p}{100}n^g) = \sum_{k \in [K]} h_k(S_k^g, \frac{p}{100}m_k^g)$. Then empirical AUUC of h on S can be defined as

$$\widehat{AUUC}(h, S) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \int_0^1 V(h_k, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{p=1}^{100} V(h_k, \frac{p}{100}),$$

where $V(h_k, \frac{p}{100})$ satisfies the following:

$$V(h_k, \frac{p}{100}) = \frac{1}{m_k^T} \sum_{i^T \in h_k(S_k^T, \frac{p}{100}m_k^T)} y_{ki^T} - \frac{1}{m_k^C} \sum_{i^C \in h_k(S_k^C, \frac{p}{100}m_k^C)} y_{ki^C}.$$

Moreover, the expected AUUC of h is $\mathbb{E}_S[\widehat{AUUC}(h, S)]$.

Since we use AUUC as the evaluation metric and bipartite ranking as the algorithm training data, we need to establish a relationship between them using the following proposition.

Proposition 7. (The relationship between AUUC-max and the bipartite ranking loss in multitask learning.) The definition of $\widehat{AUUC}(h, S)$ and AUUC in Definition 9. Then AUUC and ranking loss satisfied the following :

$$AUUC(h) \geq \Gamma^{T,C} - (\Lambda^T \mathbb{E}_{S^T}[\hat{R}(h, S^T)] + \Lambda^C \mathbb{E}_{S^C}[\hat{R}(h, \tilde{S}^C)]),$$

where $\Gamma = \mathbb{E}_S[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\bar{y}_k^T - \frac{1}{2}((\bar{y}_k^T)^2 + (\bar{y}_k^C)^2))]$, $\Lambda^g = \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{y}_k^g (1 - \bar{y}_k^g)$, $\bar{y}_k^g = \mathbb{E}[Y_k | G = g]$.

Proof. From Definition 9, we know the empirical AUUC of h , then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{AUUC}(h, S) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \int_0^1 V(h_k, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{①}}{=} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \int_0^1 (F_{h_k}^{S_k^T}(\mathbf{x}) - F_{h_k}^{S_k^C}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\int_0^1 F_{h_k}^{S_k^T}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^1 F_{h_k}^{S_k^C}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{②}}{=} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} (\bar{y}_k^T (1 - \bar{y}_k^T) \cdot AUC(h_k, S_k^T) + \frac{(\bar{y}_k^T)^2}{2} - \bar{y}_k^C (1 - \bar{y}_k^C) \cdot AUC(h_k, S_k^C) - \frac{(\bar{y}_k^C)^2}{2}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{③}}{=} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} (\bar{y}_k^T (1 - \bar{y}_k^T) \cdot AUC(h_k, S_k^T) + \frac{(\bar{y}_k^T)^2}{2} - \bar{y}_k^C (1 - \bar{y}_k^C) \cdot (1 - AUC(h_k, \tilde{S}_k^C)) - \frac{(\bar{y}_k^C)^2}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{=} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} (\bar{y}_k^T (1 - \bar{y}_k^T) \cdot (1 - \hat{R}_k(h_k, S_k^T)) + \frac{(\bar{y}_k^T)^2}{2} - \bar{y}_k^C (1 - \bar{y}_k^C) \cdot (1 - (1 - \hat{R}_k(h_k, \tilde{S}_k^C)) - \frac{(\bar{y}_k^C)^2}{2}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \underbrace{(\bar{y}_k^T - \frac{1}{2}((\bar{y}_k^T)^2 + (\bar{y}_k^C)^2))}_{\hat{\gamma}_k^{T,C}} - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \underbrace{(\bar{y}_k^T (1 - \bar{y}_k^T))}_{\lambda_k^T} \hat{R}_k(h_k, S_k^T) + \underbrace{\bar{y}_k^C (1 - \bar{y}_k^C)}_{\lambda_k^C} \hat{R}_k(h_k, \tilde{S}_k^C) \\
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\geq} \hat{\Gamma}^{T,C} - (\Lambda^T \hat{R}(h, S^T) + \Lambda^C \hat{R}(h, \tilde{S}^C)).
 \end{aligned}$$

$\textcircled{1}$ is due to [Betlei et al. \(2021\)](#); [Surry & Radcliffe \(2011\)](#), i.e., $F_{h_k}^{S_k^T}(\mathbf{x}), F_{h_k}^{S_k^C}(\mathbf{x})$ can be induced by h , and $V(h_k, \mathbf{x}) = F_{h_k}^{S_k^T}(x) - F_{h_k}^{S_k^C}(\mathbf{x})$. $\textcircled{2}$ is due to [Betlei et al. \(2021\)](#); [Tufféry \(2011\)](#), i.e., a relationship between $F_{h_k}^D, Gini(h, D)$ and AUC , where D represents a dataset. Then we can get $\int_0^1 F_{h_k}^D(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \bar{y}_D (1 - \bar{y}_D) \cdot AUC(h, D) + \frac{(\bar{y}_D)^2}{2}$, and then substitute it to $\textcircled{1}$. In $\textcircled{3}$, we revert labels in S_k^C for $\forall k \in [K]$, i.e., $\tilde{S}_k^C = \{\mathbf{x}_{ki}, 1 - y_{ki}, C\}_{i=1}^{m_k^C}$. Thus $AUC(h_k, S_k^C) = 1 - AUC(h_k, \tilde{S}_k^C)$ and substitute it to $\textcircled{2}$. Moreover, $\textcircled{4}$ is due to the relationship between AUC and empirical ranking risk, i.e., $AUC(h_k, D) = 1 - \hat{R}_k(h_k, D)$, where $\hat{R}_k(h_k, D) = \frac{1}{|D^+||D^-|} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, \mathbf{x}_{kj}) \in D^+ \times D^-} \mathbb{1}[h_k(\mathbf{x}_{ki}) \leq h_k(\mathbf{x}_{kj})]$. The last inequality $\textcircled{5}$ is due to $\sum_{i \in [n]} a_i b_i \leq \sum i \in [n] a_i \cdot \sum i \in [n] b_i$. Finally, we take expectations from both sides, then

$$AUUC(h) \geq \Gamma^{T,C} - (\Lambda^T \mathbb{E}_{S^T}[\hat{R}(h, S^T)] + \Lambda^C \mathbb{E}_{S^C}[\hat{R}(h, \tilde{S}^C)]).$$

□

Then we can define our empirical risk of h as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{R}_S &= \hat{R}_{S^T} + \hat{R}_{S^C}, \\
 \hat{R}_{S^g} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{m_k^g} \sum_{i=1}^{m_k^g} L(\mathbf{x}_{ki}, y_{ki}, g, h_k), g \in \{T, C\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The expected risk of h satisfies $R(h) = \mathbb{E}_S[\hat{h}]$. And according to the definition of FLRC in [Definition 4](#), we can define the empirical FLRC of S^g for $g \in \{T, C\}$ as

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{S^g}(\mathcal{H}, r) = \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_C \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}, \text{var}(h) \leq r} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{m_k^g} \sum_{j \in J_k^g} \omega_{kj} \sum_{i \in I_{kj}^g} \zeta_{ki} h_k(\mathbf{x}_{ki}) \right].$$

Theorem 8 (The base theorem of AUUC-max in multi-tasks learning). *For each $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-t}$,*

$$AUUC(h) \geq \Gamma^{T,C} - (\Lambda^T \hat{R}(L \circ h, S^T) + \Lambda^C \hat{R}(L \circ h, S^C)) - R_{S^T, S^C}(H, S^T, S^C) - \left[\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha^T} \right) c^T + \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{\alpha^C} \right) c^C \right] \frac{t}{K},$$

where $R_{S^T, S^C}(H, S^T, S^C)$ is related to the FLRC of S^T and S^C , i.e., $R_{S^T, S^C}(H, S^T, S^C) = 2(1 + \alpha^T) \mathcal{R}_{S^T}(\mathcal{H}, r) + \sqrt{\frac{2c^T r t}{K}} + 2(1 + \alpha^C) \mathcal{R}_{S^C}(\mathcal{H}, r) + \sqrt{\frac{2c^C r t}{K}}$. Additionally, $c^g = \frac{5^2}{4^2} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{\chi_{h, g}(G)}{m_k^g}$ for $g \in \{T, C\}$.

G. Experiment Results

Because our results differ from the form presented in [Wu et al. \(2023\)](#), the following derivation is needed for a more fair comparison.

h^* represents the minimum value of the expected risk, using techniques similar to [Mohri et al. \(2018\)](#), then for arbitrarily $\epsilon > 0$, there exists h_ϵ , such that $P(L_{h_\epsilon}) \leq P(L_{h^*}) + \epsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) &= P(L_{\hat{h}}) - P(L_{h_\epsilon}) + P(L_{h_\epsilon}) - P(L_{h^*}) \\
 &\leq P(L_{\hat{h}}) - P(L_{h_\epsilon}) + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 1. the mean upper bound values of different dataset

| DATA SET | BOUND (PA) | BOUND (PA) ¹ | SAMPLE SIZE | LABEL NUMBER |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| EMOTIONS | 2.479 | 17.473 | 593 | 6 |
| CAL500 | 101.142 | 22.852 | 502 | 174 |
| IMAGE | 1.406 | 53.281 | 2000 | 5 |
| SCENE | 13.829 | 24.985 | 2407 | 6 |
| YEAST | 4.404 | 5.406 | 2417 | 14 |
| COREL5K | 63.123 | 37.675 | 5000 | 374 |
| RCV1SUBSET1 | 13.658 | 38.779 | 6000 | 101 |
| BIBTEX | 4.155 | 33.758 | 7395 | 159 |
| DELICIOUS | 4.168 | 14.753 | 16105 | 983 |

¹ PA ALGORITHM ANALYZED USING RC IN (WU ET AL., 2023).

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= P(L_{\hat{h}}) - P_m(L_{\hat{h}}) + P_m(L_{\hat{h}}) - P(L_{h_\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
 &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} P(L_{\hat{h}}) - P_m(L_{\hat{h}}) + P_m(L_{h_\epsilon}) - P(L_{h_\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
 &\leq 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |P(L_h) - P_m(L_h)| + \epsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*})$ can be seen in Corollary 1. $\textcircled{1}$ is due to $P_m(L_{\hat{h}}) \leq P_m(L_{h_\epsilon})$. The two bounds we want to compare are as follows:

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq 704\mu r^* + \frac{75}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \cdot \frac{t}{n}, \quad (40)$$

$$P(L_{\hat{h}} - L_{h^*}) \leq 2 \left[\frac{4\mu M_b M_a}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\tau_k}} \right) + 3 \sqrt{\frac{\log 2 + t}{2n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \right) \right], \quad (41)$$

$$r^* \leq \min_{d \geq 0} \left(\frac{1}{M_b^2} \cdot \frac{d}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} + M_a \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{l > d} \tilde{\lambda}_l^2} \right),$$

thus we should calculate and compare the right-hand sides of Eq. (40) and Eq. (41). If the result of the former is smaller than that of the latter, we can approximately conclude that our bound is tighter.

We calculate the average value of the Macro-AUC generalization bound (see Table 1). The experimental results show that there is still a noticeable gap between this bound and the actual generalization error (with computed results exceeding 1). However, it can still inspire the development of algorithms with better performance. Moreover, in many datasets, such as Emotions and Image, the upper bound approaches 1. When the dataset size exceeds 10,000, our bound value on pa is smaller than that reported in Wu et al. (2023).

H. Supplementary Discussion

The optimization of the fixed point r^* . Our bounds are related to the complexity of r^* ; however, we followed the approach of other literature by setting it as a hyperparameter in our experiments, resulting in approximate results. This has created a gap between the experimental and theoretical results. Additionally, the computed risk bound from the experiments is not non-empty (i.e., greater than 1), which is also a limitation of our study. However, compared to Wu et al. (2023), our bounds are tighter in most datasets, and these theoretical results still provide valuable guidance for algorithm design.

Other applications. Some applications involve processing a large graph, such as when nodes in a social network need to be labeled with different labels. In this case, it is necessary to address classification problems that depend on multiple nodes (Bhagat et al., 2011), which will serve as an application of the theoretical results presented in this paper.

I. Additional Related Work

Concentration inequalities. Zhang & Amini (2024) delineates the evolution of concentration inequalities, continuously refining aspects such as universality, adaptability, and tightness. First, McDiarmid (1989) introduced the McDiarmid inequality, applicable to independent random variables, establishing a theoretical framework for analyzing generalization error; however, its limitation lies in its inability to address practical problems involving dependent variables. Subsequently, Janson (2004) proposed a concentration inequality tailored for partially dependent random variables, drawing from Hoeffding’s inequality, which primarily handles graph-dependent random variables, but is constrained to functions involving summation operations. To mitigate this limitation, Usunier et al. (2005) further extended the study of concentration inequalities by introducing a universal concentration inequality applicable to functions of random variables of any form, thereby providing broader theoretical support for subsequent research.

Building on this foundation, Ralaivola & Amini (2015) advanced the discourse by extending the Bennett inequality for application in LRC analysis, facilitating the exploration of generalization bounds, and maturing the application of concentration inequalities in datasets with complex dependency structures. Moreover, Lampert et al. (2018) considered weak dependence relationships and introduced a method to measure dependencies within unordered sets, presenting a concentration inequality applicable to any set of random variables, a contribution that significantly expands the applicability of concentration inequalities. Furthermore, Zhang et al. (2019) proposed a concentration inequality for Lipschitz continuous functions specifically addressing tree-structured dependency graphs and demonstrated that this inequality exceeds previous studies in terms of applicability and boundary tightness, illustrating the robust adaptability of concentration inequalities within complex data environments.

Furthermore, Zhang (2022) provided a comprehensive theoretical enhancement to Zhang et al. (2019) and discovered that the bounds for independent random variables were tighter than those established in Janson (2004). In addition, Combes (2024); Tanoue (2024) proposes new concentrated inequalities for parameter extension and data-dependent structures of concentrated inequalities. Inspired by the concentration inequalities related to graph dependencies, the work (Wu et al., 2023) proposed a concentration inequality aimed at addressing multi-label learning, subsequently deriving Rademacher complexity for analyzing generalization bounds. In light of these insights, we are inspired to build on the contributions of Usunier et al. (2005); Ralaivola & Amini (2015); Wu et al. (2023) by proposing a Bennett inequality based on graph dependencies, from which we aim to derive LRC, which is expected to yield improved risk bounds compared to work (Wu et al., 2023).

Multi-task generalization. In recent years, Multi-Task Learning (MTL) (Zhang & Yang, 2021) has garnered significant attention in both theoretical and applied domains, particularly in addressing challenges related to insufficient labeled data and inter-task information sharing. The theoretical analysis of MTL predominantly focuses on frameworks such as covering Numbers (CN), Rademacher Complexity (RC), and VC-dimension (VCd). For instance, Ando et al. (2005) proposed a framework that leverages the structural information inherent in MTL, achieving a convergence bound of $O(\frac{C}{\sqrt{n}})$ through a joint empirical risk minimization approach, where this bound is related to the number of tasks C . In contrast, the paper (Crammer & Mansour, 2012) utilized VCd to perform an in-depth analysis of shared hypotheses, generating a convergence bound of $O(\sqrt{\frac{K \log n}{n}})$, despite its somewhat limited exploration of data feature impacts.

In addition, Baxter (1995) modeled internal representation learning as a multi-task learning scenario and acquired a convergence bound of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ using CN. Subsequently, Baxter (2000a) integrated a bias learning model with MTL, employing VCd to derive a convergence bound of $O(\sqrt{\frac{C}{n}})$. Furthermore, Maurer’s previous work (2006a; 2006b) applied RC to analyze MTL within linear hypothesis spaces, resulting in respective convergence bounds of $O(\frac{B}{\sqrt{n}})$, indicating data-dependent convergence rates.

In exploring task-relatedness, Ben-David & Borbely (2008) introduced the concept of inter-task connections and analyzed generalization boundaries using VC dimension techniques, achieving $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ results. Notably, many of the aforementioned bounds exhibit a linear dependence on the number of tasks K , which may lead to relaxation or even failure when K significantly exceeds n . To address this, Juba (2006); Kakade et al. (2012) employed compression and regularization techniques, significantly tightening the convergence bounds to $O(\frac{C}{\sqrt{n}})$ and $O(\sqrt{\frac{\log \min(K,d)}{n}})$, respectively, where C is associated with the compression coefficient. Following the trajectory of regularization techniques, Pontil & Maurer (2013) used trace norm regularization to attain a convergence bound of $O(\min(\sqrt{\frac{C}{n}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log n K}{nK}}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{nK}})$.

Furthermore, studies (Pentina & Ben-David, 2015; Zhang, 2015; Maurer et al., 2016) have utilized CN, concentration inequalities, Gaussian averages, and other analyses to examine various algorithmic applications of MTL, achieving convergence rates of the order of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. To further enhance the convergence rates, Yousefi et al. (2018); Watkins et al. (2023) employed LRC (Bartlett et al., 2005) to analyze theoretical bounds, resulting in convergence rates of $O(\frac{1}{n^\alpha})$ ($0.5 < \alpha < 1$). Furthermore, Wu et al. (2023) proposed more comprehensive concentration inequalities, which, when combined with RC, analyzed the generalization bounds under non-independent and identically distributed (non-i.i.d.) conditions, producing a convergence behavior of $O(\frac{B}{\sqrt{n}})$ and highlighting the potential implications of this research in practical applications. Finally, to improve MTL efficacy, Qi et al. (2024) introduced the MultiMatch method, which significantly improved experimental outcomes by integrating MTL with high-quality pseudo-label generation, demonstrating a convergence boundary of $O(\frac{d}{\sqrt{n}})$. Therefore, following works (Yousefi et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023), we continue to explore this trajectory employing LRC in conjunction with Hoeffding’s inequality, aiming to derive tighter convergence bounds than those presented in Wu et al. (2023).

Approaches to dependent data. The research on methods for handling dependent random variables focuses mainly on three strategies: mixing models, decoupling, and graphical dependence. Rosenblatt (1956) introduce the simple boundary mixing conditions, which led to the establishment of the central limit theorem for dependent random variables, revealing that results under independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) conditions can encompass Hoeffding inequality. Subsequent work (Volkonskii & Rozanov, 1959; Ibragimov, 1962; Kontorovich, 2007; Steinwart & Christmann, 2009) further proposed extreme limit theorems that satisfy stronger mixing conditions, providing a wealth of theoretical results for the study of dependent random variables. The mixing coefficients within this approach allow for the quantitative characterization of the dependencies between data. However, this quantitative treatment is relatively complex and requires strong assumptions, which impose limitations on its practical applications. Furthermore, de la Peña & Giné (1999) proposed a decoupling approach, which transformed dependent random variables into combinations of independent random variables. This work explored extreme limit theorems related to U-processes and summative dependent variables, subsequently leading to the introduction of more general decoupling inequalities, thus paving new avenues for subsequent research. Despite the theoretical richness of the decoupling methods, there are still practical challenges associated with their application.

In contrast to mixing conditions, the graphical dependence offers a more straightforward and intuitive method to present the dependencies among data. Research conducted in Janson (2004) utilizing the method of graph coloring provided a qualitative perspective to understand the dependencies between random variables, significantly simplifying the description of these relationships and facilitating theoretical analysis and empirical validation. Furthermore, Janson (1988) analyzed the convergence of summative dependent variables using graphical constructions, further corroborating the efficacy of the graphical dependence approach. In recent years, related studies (Janson, 2004; Usunier et al., 2005; Ralaivola & Amini, 2015; Wu et al., 2023) have extensively employed graphical dependence methods to address dependent random variables, introducing various types of concentration inequalities and providing theoretical support for related algorithms. Consequently, we will also adopt the graph coloring method to analyze the generalization error of MTL in the context of dependent random variables.