

Convergence of Statistical Estimators via Mutual Information Bounds

EL Mahdi Khrifch & Pierre Alquier
ESSEC Business School

December 25, 2024

Abstract

Recent advances in statistical learning theory have revealed profound connections between mutual information (MI) bounds, PAC-Bayesian theory, and Bayesian nonparametrics.

This work introduces a novel mutual information bound for statistical models. The derived bound has wide-ranging applications in statistical inference. It yields improved contraction rates for fractional posteriors in Bayesian nonparametrics. It can also be used to study a wide range of estimation methods, such as variational inference or Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE). By bridging these diverse areas, this work advances our understanding of the fundamental limits of statistical inference and the role of information in learning from data. We hope that these results will not only clarify connections between statistical inference and information theory but also help to develop a new toolbox to study a wide range of estimators.

Contents

1	Introduction and Motivation	2
1.1	Mutual Information Bounds in Machine Learning	2
1.2	Bayesian Nonparametrics and Posterior Contraction	2
1.3	Our Contributions	3
2	Notations and Preliminaries	3
3	Main Results	5
4	Examples	7
4.1	Gaussian Model	8
4.2	Exponential Family	9
4.3	Smooth models	10
4.4	Dimension Assumption	11
4.5	Application to the MLE	12
5	PAC Bayes, Mutual Information and Proofs	12
5.1	PAC-Bayes bounds	13
5.2	Mutual Information and proof of Theorem 1	14
5.3	Localized PAC-Bayes bounds and proofs of Theorems 2 and 3	15
5.4	Other proofs	19

1 Introduction and Motivation

1.1 Mutual Information Bounds in Machine Learning

Mutual information (MI) bounds have emerged as a powerful tool for analyzing generalization and learning in machine learning applications. This approach provides an information-theoretic perspective on the generalization capabilities of learning algorithms.

The use of information-theoretic approaches in machine learning goes back to Rissanen’s Minimum Description Length (MDL) principle [Rissanen, 1978], see Grünwald [2007] for a more recent view on the topic. A related approach is PAC-Bayes bounds [McAllester, 1999b,a]. These bounds were initially developed as Bayesian-inspired generalization bounds in machine learning, but the connection to information theory was highlighted in subsequent works by Zhang [2006] and Catoni [2007]. The Kullback-Leibler divergence terms in the PAC-Bayes bound can be interpreted in terms of length of the description of a model, and more generally as a complexity measure. In particular, Catoni [2007] proved that an optimal prior choice in the PAC-Bayes bound makes the Kullback-Leibler divergence term equal to the mutual information between the sample and the parameter. This fact, rediscovered independently by Russo and Zou [2016] under the name “mutual information bound”, has received considerable attention in the past years [Xu and Raginsky, 2017, Negrea et al., 2019, Lugosi and Neu, 2022].

In parallel, it became clear that PAC-Bayes bounds can be used to analyze various kinds of machine learning algorithms, including empirical risk minimization [Catoni and Giulini, 2017] as well as various kinds of robust estimators [Catoni, 2012], generalized posteriors and their variational approximations [Alquier et al., 2016]. We refer the reader to [Alquier, 2024] for a recent overview on PAC-Bayes, and to [Hellström et al., 2023] for a global presentation of all information bounds.

PAC-Bayes bounds were also recently used to analyze estimators in a more statistical context where the objective is inference on parameters: Bhattacharya et al. [2019] analyzed Bayesian fractional posteriors with related tools, this was extended to variational approximations by Alquier and Ridgway [2020] and to (non-tempered) posteriors [Yang et al., 2020, Zhang and Gao, 2020], see also Cherief-Abdellatif [2019], Ohm and Lin [2024] for results on model selection. Since mutual information bounds in machine learning are optimized PAC-Bayes bounds, a natural question arises: Can we similarly optimize these statistical bounds to achieve tighter results? In this paper, we prove a mutual information version of the PAC-Bayes bounds of Bhattacharya et al. [2019] and Alquier and Ridgway [2020]. We show that it can be used to prove convergence rates for tempered posteriors, variational approximations, and the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE). When applied to Bayesian-style estimators, this result leads to improved rates when compared to Bhattacharya et al. [2019], Alquier and Ridgway [2020], Yang et al. [2020], Zhang and Gao [2020]. Thus, our bound extends beyond the existing literature on MI bounds, providing new tools to study a wide range of statistical methods.

1.2 Bayesian Nonparametrics and Posterior Contraction

The study of frequentist properties of Bayesian procedures, particularly in nonparametric settings, has been a topic of significant interest in recent years. Two major approaches to this problem have emerged: the analysis of posterior concentration rates in the Bayesian nonparametric literature and the PAC-Bayesian framework from statistical learning theory. While these approaches have largely developed independently, recent work suggests that bridging the gap between them can lead to powerful new insights and improved theoretical guarantees.

The study of posterior concentration rates has a rich history in Bayesian nonparametrics. Seminal work by Ghosal et al. [2000] and Shen and Wasserman [2001] established general conditions for posterior consistency and convergence rates. These results were later extended to more general settings by Ghosal and Van Der Vaart [2007] and Van Der Vaart and van Zanten [2008]. A comprehensive overview of these developments can be found in Rousseau [2016], Ghosal and Van der Vaart [2017] and Castillo [2024].

Concurrently, the PAC-Bayesian approach, introduced by McAllester [1999a], has proven to be a versatile tool for deriving generalization bounds in statistical learning. This approach has recently gained traction within the Bayesian community, offering a new perspective on the analysis of Bayesian methods.

Some progress has been made in connecting PAC-Bayesian theory and Bayesian nonparametrics. Notably, Grünwald and Mehta [2018] provided a unified analysis of excess risk bounds for general loss functions, bridging the gap between empirical risk minimization and generalized Bayesian approaches. Additionally, Bhattacharya et al. [2019], Alquier and Ridgway [2020], Banerjee and Montufar [2021] used PAC-Bayesian techniques to prove the contraction of tempered posteriors under essentially only a prior mass condition.

1.3 Our Contributions

We derive a new MI bound tailored for statistical estimation. This bound provides guarantees in terms of statistical inference, rather than on the generalization risk as in Russo and Zou [2016], Xu and Raginsky [2017]. From a technical perspective, we obtain this bound by applying the localization technique of Catoni [2007] to the PAC-Bayes bounds of Bhattacharya et al. [2019], Alquier and Ridgway [2020].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our notation and state our MI bound in its most general form: Theorem 1. In Section 3, we specify this bound in various settings. Under specific assumptions on the statistical model, we derive convergence rates for tempered posteriors and for variational inference. Our rates are tighter than those in Bhattacharya et al. [2019], Alquier and Ridgway [2020], Yang et al. [2020], Zhang and Gao [2020], as we eliminate suboptimal logarithmic terms. Finally, in Section 4, we work through concrete examples: we verify our assumptions in classical models and illustrate an application of Theorem 1 to prove the convergence of the MLE.

All proofs are provided in Section 5, where we also clarify the connection between our MI bound and PAC-Bayes bounds.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Consider a collection of n i.i.d. random variables $(X_1, \dots, X_n) =: \mathcal{S}$ in a measured sample space $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X}, P)$. Let $\{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ be a statistical model, that is, a collection of probability distributions on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X})$ indexed by a parameter set Θ . Let \mathcal{M}_1^+ be the set of probability measures on Θ equipped with a suitable σ -algebra \mathcal{B} .

In this work, we assume that the model is well-specified, i.e., there exists a true parameter $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ such that $P_{\theta_0} = P$.

We assume that the model is dominated: all the P_θ 's have a density p_θ with respect to a specified measure μ (for example, the Lebesgue measure or the counting measure). Let $\mathcal{L}_n(\theta)$ denote the likelihood function, and

$r_n(\theta, \theta_0)$ the negative log-likelihood ratio. That is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_n(\theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n p_\theta(X_i) \\ r_n(\theta, \theta_0) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{p_{\theta_0}(X_i)}{p_\theta(X_i)},\end{aligned}$$

with the convention $\log(p_{\theta_0}(X_i)/0) = +\infty$.

We recall the definitions of the α -Rényi divergence \mathcal{D}_α , for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, KL . Given two probability distributions P and Q defined on the same measurable space, and μ a reference measure such that both P and Q are absolutely continuous with respect to μ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P\|Q) &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\int \left(\frac{dP}{d\mu}(x) \right)^\alpha \left(\frac{dQ}{d\mu}(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} \mu(dx) \right), \\ KL(P\|Q) &= \int \log \left(\frac{dP}{dQ}(x) \right) P(dx)\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that $KL(P\|Q) = +\infty$ if P is not absolutely continuous with respect to Q . It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P\|Q)$ does not depend on the choice of the reference measure μ .

Definition 1. Let U and V be two random variables, $P_{U,V}$ the joint distribution of U and V , and P_U the marginal distribution of U and P_V the marginal distribution of V . The mutual information (MI) between U and V is defined as:

$$\mathcal{I}(U, V) := KL(P_{U,V} \| P_U \otimes P_V).$$

We now present our main result, which establishes a mutual information bound for any randomized procedure, that is, any probability distribution $\hat{\rho}$ learned from the data, where $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}(\mathcal{S})$. Examples of such procedures include the posterior, tempered posteriors, and variational approximations. By analogy with the Bayesian framework, we will sometimes call $\hat{\rho}$ a (generalized) posterior. To clarify the notation in this setting, consider that $V = \mathcal{S} = (X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim P^{\otimes n}$ and $U = \theta$ is sampled conditionally on the data: $U|V \sim \hat{\rho}$. This describes a joint distribution on the data and the parameter: $P_{U,V}$, and thus a mutual information $\mathcal{I}(U, V) = \mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})$.

Theorem 1. Given a generalized posterior $\hat{\rho}$, we have, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] - \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right| \right] \leq \frac{\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})}{n(1-\alpha)}. \quad (2.1)$$

This theorem is proven in Section 5.

Intuitively, it is natural to sample from generalized posteriors $\hat{\rho}$ concentrated on θ with a large likelihood, that is, for which $r_n(\theta, \theta_0)$ is small. We expect this to make $\theta \sim \hat{\rho}$ close to θ_0 . Theorem 1 states that this is provably the case, in the sense that $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})$ will be small, provided that $\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})/n$ also remains small.

We will see in Section 3 that generalized Bayesian methods such as fractional posteriors and their variational approximations can be tuned to ensure that $\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})/n$ is small. In this case, we will derive tight rates of convergence from Theorem 1. We emphasize the generality of Theorem 1: in this form, there are no regularity assumptions on the densities p_θ (even though such assumptions can be useful to make the bound tight). Moreover,

there is no restriction on $\hat{\rho}$. While the bound will give tight results when applied to Bayesian methods, it can also be used to prove convergence of the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE). This is not entirely straightforward: one might be tempted to take $\hat{\rho}$ as the Dirac mass on the MLE, but this will often cause $\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})$ to be infinite. However, by taking $\hat{\rho}$ with support on a small neighborhood of the MLE instead (a technique developed by [Catoni \[2004\]](#) for PAC-Bayes bounds), we can analyze the MLE.

For completeness, we recall the definition of the MLE:

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}_n(\theta) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} r_n(\theta, \theta_0)$$

when this argmin exists and is unique. Let π be a prior distribution on (Θ, \mathcal{B}) . The fractional posterior for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is defined as:

$$\pi_{n,\alpha}(\theta) := \frac{e^{-\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0)} \pi(\theta)}{\mathbb{E}_\pi[e^{-\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0)}]} \propto \mathcal{L}_n^\alpha(\theta) \pi(\theta),$$

note that it reduces to the standard posterior when $\alpha = 1$. For $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_1^+$, we define the variational approximation:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha} = \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{KL(\rho \parallel \pi)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right].$$

Note that when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}_1^+$, we have $\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha} = \pi_{n,\alpha}$. In practice, variational approximations are useful when \mathcal{F} leads to feasible algorithms; see [Bishop \[2006\]](#) for an introduction.

Many other methods could be analyzed with this theorem. For example, the original MI bound was applied by [Neu et al. \[2021\]](#) to analyze the output of finite steps of stochastic gradient descent on the empirical risk. A similar approach could be used with our bound to analyze stochastic optimization algorithms on the log-likelihood.

In the next section, we formulate assumptions on the model (and the prior π) that will lead to explicit rates of convergence for the fractional posteriors and their variational approximations. Notably, in this setting, [Theorem 1](#) leads to better rates than the bounds in [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier et al. \[2016\]](#) as it eliminates the extra $\log(n)$ factor. The MLE will be discussed later, in [Section 4](#).

3 Main Results

Our results rely on two sets of assumptions. [Assumptions 2, 3 and 4](#) are assumptions on the model complexity. Similar assumptions appear in [Catoni \[2007\]](#), [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier et al. \[2016\]](#). While these assumptions alone could yield the same rates as in these works, an additional assumption on the model, [Assumption 1](#), allows us to obtain improved rates from [Theorem 1](#).

Assumption 1. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a $c(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$\forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad KL(P_{\theta_0} \parallel P_\theta) \leq c(\alpha) \mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \parallel P_{\theta_0}). \quad (3.1)$$

To understand this property, we recall the following fact from [\[van Erven and Harremoës, 2010\]](#): for any $\alpha < 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(p \parallel q) \leq KL(p \parallel q).$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(p\|q) \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow 1^-} KL(p\|q).$$

Thus, Assumption 1 establishes that the Rényi divergence and the KL divergence are equivalent on our statistical model. Similar assumptions have appeared in various forms in the literature. Notably, Grünwald and Mehta [2018, Lemma 13] relates the KL divergence to the Hellinger distance. A similar result was previously established by Wong and Shen [1995, Theorem 5], allowing one to bound KL divergence in terms of Hellinger distance. It is worth noting that the Hellinger distance $H(P, Q)$ is also related to the Rényi divergence, specifically for $\alpha = 1/2$:

$$H^2(P, Q) = 2 \left(1 - \exp(-\mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P\|Q))\right) \leq \mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P\|Q). \quad (3.2)$$

Models where $H^2(P, Q)$ is locally equivalent to KL have been extensively studied in asymptotic statistics theory. We examine several examples of models satisfying Assumption 1 in Section 4.

Assumption 2. For $\beta > 0$, we define the following localized prior:

$$\pi_{-\beta}(d\theta) = \frac{e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_\theta)} \pi(d\theta)}{Z_\beta}$$

where

$$Z_\beta = \int e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_\theta)} \pi(d\theta).$$

For any $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, we assume that there is a $\kappa_\pi \in (0, 1]$ and a $d_\pi > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta^{\kappa_\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_\theta)] = d_\pi.$$

When $\kappa_\pi = 1$, Assumption 1 is a standard assumption for obtaining parametric rates of convergence, with d_π interpreted as a notion of model complexity or dimension [Catoni, 2007]. Similar assumptions are discussed by Baraud [2024], Alquier [2024]. The case $\kappa_\pi < 1$ leads to nonparametric rates. We provide numerous examples where this assumption holds in Section 4. In particular, Lemma 6 below justifies the interpretation of d_π as a dimension.

While Assumptions 1 and 2 suffice to prove the convergence of the tempered posterior in expectation, stronger contraction results require a stronger version of Assumption 2: Assumption 3.

Assumption 3. Define

$$\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\log \frac{P_{\theta_0}(X_1)}{p_\theta(X_1)} \right)^2 \right].$$

For any $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, we assume that there is $\kappa_\pi \in (0, 1]$, $d_\pi > 0$ and $d'_\pi > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta^{\kappa_\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_\theta)] = d_\pi \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta^{\kappa_\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)] \leq d'_\pi.$$

We need a slightly different assumption to study the variational approximation $\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}$, following Alquier and Ridgway [2020]. Assumption 4 extends Assumption 2 to this setting.

Assumption 4. For any $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, we assume that there exist $\kappa_\pi \in (0, 1]$ and $d_\pi > 0$ such that, for any $\beta > 0$, there exists a $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_\beta)}{n} \leq \frac{d_\pi}{\beta^{\kappa_\pi}}.$$

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have the following bound for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta < n(1 - \alpha)/c(\alpha)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n, \alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \frac{c(\alpha)\alpha n - \beta c(\alpha)}{n(1 - \alpha) - \beta c(\alpha)} \frac{d_\pi}{\beta^{\kappa_\pi}}.$$

Moreover, if Assumption 4 holds,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n, \alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \frac{c(\alpha)\alpha n - \beta c(\alpha)}{n(1 - \alpha) - \beta c(\alpha)} \frac{d_\pi}{\beta^{\kappa_\pi}}.$$

In particular, for $\beta = n(1 - \alpha)/(2c(\alpha))$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n, \alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \alpha \left(\frac{2c(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} \right)^{1 + \kappa_\pi} \frac{d_\pi}{n^{\kappa_\pi}}.$$

Remark 1. When $\kappa_\pi = 1$, which holds in many examples below, we obtain rates in $1/n$. In contrast, the results of [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier and Ridgway \[2020\]](#) yield rates in $\log(n)/n$.

Remark 2. The proof of Theorem 2 appears in Section 5. While it can be derived as a corollary of Theorem 1, we follow a slightly different approach in Section 5: we begin with PAC-Bayes bounds in expectation based on [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier and Ridgway \[2020\]](#) and demonstrate that optimization with respect to the prior leads to Theorem 1. The ‘‘optimal’’ prior, however, does not yield very explicit bounds. Catoni’s localized priors [[Catoni, 2007](#)] were developed as approximations of the optimal priors and provide more explicit rates as shown in Theorem 2.

We also state a variant that holds with large probability rather than in expectation.

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions (1,2,3), we have, for any $\alpha, \delta, \eta \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta = n(1 - \alpha)/(2c(\alpha))$, with probability at least $1 - \delta - \eta$ on the sample \mathcal{S} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n, \alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \alpha \left(\frac{2c(\alpha)}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{1 + \kappa_\pi} \frac{d_\pi + d'_\pi}{n^{\kappa_\pi}} + \frac{2c(\alpha) \left[\frac{1}{\eta} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right]}{n(1 - \alpha)}.$$

4 Examples

In this section, we consider various examples of statistical models. We discuss the validity of Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 (or its variants), and apply Theorem 2.

4.1 Gaussian Model

Gaussian mean estimation

Consider the case where the model is a d dimensional Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\theta, v^2 I)$ with known covariance matrix $v^2 I$ and unknown mean θ , and a Gaussian prior on $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\pi(\theta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{\frac{d}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^T \Sigma^{-1} \theta}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (4.1)$$

$$P_\theta(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} v^d} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-\theta)^T (x-\theta)}{2v^2}\right). \quad (4.2)$$

Lemma 1. *When the model is given by (4.2),*

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = \frac{1}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2v^2} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}).$$

In other words, Assumption 1 is satisfied with $c(\alpha) = 1/\alpha$.

Lemma 2. *When the model and the prior are given by (4.1) and (4.2),*

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] = \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \left\| \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d \right)^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \theta_0 \right\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \text{Tr} \left[\left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d \right)^{-1} \right].$$

In particular, when $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I_d$,

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] = \frac{\frac{\beta}{v^2} \|\theta_0\|^2}{2\sigma^4 \left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)^2} + \frac{\frac{\beta}{v^2} d}{2 \left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)} \leq \frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2}$$

and thus Assumption 2 is satisfied with $\kappa_\pi = 1$ and $d_\pi = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2}$.

Plugging Lemmas 1 and 2 into Theorem 2, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1. *In the Gaussian model given by (4.1) and (4.2) and $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_S \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \frac{2d + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{2\sigma^2}}{\alpha(1-\alpha)^2 n}.$$

In other words,

$$\mathbb{E}_S \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n,\alpha}} (\|\theta - \theta_0\|^2) \leq \frac{v^2 \left(4d + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{\sigma^2} \right)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)^2 n}.$$

Of course, in this case, the fractional posterior has an explicit form, and we can directly derive the expected risk. However, we believe this simple example effectively illustrates an application of Theorem 2. Moreover, even in such a simple model, the results of [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier et al. \[2016\]](#) would yield rates in $\log(n)/n$ rather than $1/n$.

We can also verify Assumption 3 in this setting.

Lemma 3. In the Gaussian model given by (4.1) and (4.2) and $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$, Assumption 3 holds with $\kappa_\pi = 1$, $d_\pi = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2}$ and $d'_\pi = \frac{1+4v^2}{v^2}d_\pi$.

Gaussian sequence model

We now examine the Gaussian sequence model. While this model can be viewed as a variant of the previous one and remains simple, it usefully illustrates how Theorem 2 can lead to nonparametric rates.

Following the notation of Castillo [2024]: let $X_{i,j} = \theta_j + \varepsilon_{i,j}$ where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots$, the $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and

$$\theta_0 \in S_b(L) = \left\{ \theta : \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{2b} \theta_\ell^2 \leq L \right\}$$

for some $L, b > 0$. While this is infinite dimensional, we can truncate for $i \geq n$. That is, we consider p_θ as the density of $\mathcal{N}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), 1) = \mathcal{N}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), v^2)$ with $v = 1$. Using Lemma 1, we immediately obtain Assumption 1 with $c(\alpha) = 1/\alpha$.

Lemma 4. Let $\pi = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ with Σ a diagonal matrix, and let σ_i denote its diagonal elements. Put $\sigma_i = i^{-1-2b}$ [Castillo, 2024]. Then

$$\sup_{\beta} \beta^{\frac{2b}{1+2b}} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \left(\frac{3L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4b} \right).$$

In other words, Assumption 2 is satisfied with $d_\pi = \frac{3L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4b}$ and $\kappa_\pi = \frac{2b}{1+2b}$.

Corollary 2. In the Gaussian sequence model $p_\theta = \mathcal{N}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), 1)$ with $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots) \in S_b(L)$ and π as in Lemma 4,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \alpha \left(\frac{2c(\alpha)}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1+\frac{2b}{2b+1}} \frac{\frac{3L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4b}}{n^{\frac{2b}{2b+1}}}.$$

4.2 Exponential Family

We now turn to more general statistical models. Assumption 1 can be verified in a wide class of models in the exponential family.

Definition 2. We say that $(P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta)$ is an exponential family with respect to a measure μ on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X})$ if there exist measurable functions $h : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $T : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that:

$$p_\theta(x) = \frac{dP_\theta}{d\mu}(x) = \exp(h(x) + \langle T(x), \theta \rangle - \psi(\theta)),$$

where $\psi(\theta) = \log \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \exp(h(x) + \langle T(x), \theta \rangle) \mu(dx) \right)$ is the partition function.

Lemma 5. In the case $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and μ is the Lebesgue measure, assume that ψ is m -strongly convex and that its gradient is Lipschitz with constant L . Define the condition number of ψ as $\kappa = \frac{L}{m}$. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{\alpha} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})$$

and thus Assumption 1 is satisfied with $c(\alpha) = \kappa/\alpha$.

Next, we provide examples of exponential families for which Assumption 1 holds.

Example 4 (Poisson Distribution). Consider the Poisson distribution with probability mass function $\frac{\lambda^x}{x!}e^{-\lambda}$. The canonical decomposition yields $\theta = \log \lambda$ and $T(x) = x$. The partition function is given by:

$$\psi(\theta) = \lambda = e^\theta.$$

It can be shown that for any compact set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that the partition function is m -strongly convex with Lipschitz gradient with constant L . Thus, Assumption 1 is satisfied for the Poisson distribution when the parameter set Θ is compact.

Example 5 (Bernoulli Distribution). Consider the Bernoulli distribution with probability mass function $p^x(1-p)^{1-x}$. The canonical decomposition yields $\theta = \log\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)$ and $T(x) = x$. The partition function is given by:

$$\psi(\theta) = \log(1 + e^\theta).$$

Let us consider the second derivative of the partition function:

$$\psi''(\theta) = \frac{e^\theta}{(1 + e^\theta)^2}.$$

It can be shown that ψ has Lipschitz gradient with constant $L = \frac{1}{4}$, and for any compact set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that the partition function is m -strongly convex. Thus, Assumption 1 is satisfied for the Bernoulli distribution on compact sets.

A discussion of Assumption 2 in these two examples will be included in Subsection 4.4.

4.3 Smooth models

The relationships between Fisher information and various divergences are deeply connected to Le Cam’s quadratic mean differentiability (QMD)[Le Cam, 2012], a fundamental concept in asymptotic statistics. Following Polyanskiy and Wu [2025, Section 7.11], we present calculations that verify Assumption 1 holds in a local neighborhood of θ_0 . These calculations build upon previous results on the local behavior of the Hellinger distance [Baraud et al., 2017] and KL divergence [Van der Vaart, 2000, Ch. 7.1], unified under the f -divergence framework introduced by Csiszár [1967]. We begin with the following assumption.

Assumption 5. *For all $x \in \mathbf{X}$, the function $\theta \mapsto \log p_\theta(x)$ is three times differentiable in a neighborhood of θ_0 , and we can exchange differentiation and integration with respect to p_{θ_0} up to the third derivative.*

Under this assumption, we can define the Fisher information and its derivative.

Definition 3. *The Fisher information at θ is defined as:*

$$I(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{p_\theta} \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(X) \right)^2 \right]$$

Its derivative is:

$$I'(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{p_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial^3}{\partial \theta^3} \log p_\theta(X) \right]$$

We now present a theorem relating various divergences using the Fisher information with explicit remainder terms:

Theorem 6. *Under Assumption 5, for all θ in a neighborhood of θ_0 , we have:*

$$H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) = \frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_H(\theta) \quad (4.3)$$

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = \frac{1}{2}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_K(\theta) \quad (4.4)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) = \frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_R(\theta) \quad (4.5)$$

and the remainder terms are:

$$R_H(\theta) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt, \quad (4.6)$$

$$R_K(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt, \quad (4.7)$$

$$R_R(\theta) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt + O((\theta - \theta_0)^4). \quad (4.8)$$

Corollary 3. *If there exist constants m , M , and L such that $0 < m \leq I(\theta) \leq M < \infty$ and $|I'(\theta)| \leq L$ for all θ in a neighborhood of θ_0 , then for θ in this neighborhood:*

$$\frac{m}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \leq H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) \leq \frac{M}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{L}{12}|\theta - \theta_0|^3 \quad (4.9)$$

$$\frac{m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \leq KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) \leq \frac{M}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{L}{6}|\theta - \theta_0|^3 \quad (4.10)$$

$$\frac{m}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \leq \mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) \leq \frac{M}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{L}{12}|\theta - \theta_0|^3 + C(\theta - \theta_0)^4 \quad (4.11)$$

where C is a constant depending on m , M , and L .

Thus, if the model is smooth enough, then Assumption 1 is satisfied, at least in neighborhoods of θ_0 .

4.4 Dimension Assumption

We start by a lemma that explains why we refer to d_π as a dimension.

Lemma 6. *Assume that Θ satisfies Assumption 2 uniformly, in other words, for any θ_0 ,*

$$\sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta^{\kappa_\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] = d_\pi$$

where κ_π and d_π do not depend on θ_0 . Define a new statistical model $\Theta_p := \Theta^p$ that parametrizes product distributions: for any $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta_p$, $P_\theta := P_{\theta_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{\theta_p}$. Then, for any $\theta_0 \in \Theta_p$

$$\sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta^{\kappa_\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] = d_\pi p.$$

We omit the proof that is a direct application of the following fact: for $\theta_0 = (\theta_{0,1}, \dots, \theta_{0,p}) \in \Theta_p$ and $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta_p$, $KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^p KL(P_{\theta_{0,i}} \| P_{\theta_i})$.

We now verify that under suitable conditions on the KL divergence, Assumption 2 holds for one-dimensional compact models as the ones considered in Examples 4 and 5 above. Thanks to Lemma 6, this can be extended to multidimensional examples. Motivated by the discussion in the exponential family, we consider models where the KL divergence satisfies

$$\frac{m}{2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \leq KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta}) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \quad (4.12)$$

for some $0 < m < L < +\infty$.

Lemma 7. *When the prior is uniform on $\Theta = (-M, M)$ and $\theta_0 \in (-M, M)$, under the assumption that (4.12) holds, with $\kappa = L/m$,*

$$\sup_{\beta} \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \leq \frac{\kappa^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2},$$

and thus Assumption 2 is satisfied with $\kappa_{\pi} = 1$ and $d_{\pi} = \kappa^{3/2}/2$.

4.5 Application to the MLE

The previous subsections provided many examples where $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0}) \geq m \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2$ for some constant $m > 0$. In this setting, and under additional smoothness assumptions on the likelihood, we can use Theorem 1 to study the MLE. Specifically, we will assume that $r_n(\theta, \theta_0)/n$ is Lipschitz with respect to θ .

Corollary 4. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Assume Θ is a compact set in \mathbb{R}^d . Assume there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0}) \leq m \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2$. Assume moreover that, almost surely with respect to the sample, $\theta \mapsto r_n(\theta, \theta_0)/n$ is L -Lipschitz. Let $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, \varepsilon)$ denote the minimal number of balls of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ (with respect to the Euclidean norm) required to cover Θ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{n} \left[\frac{2\alpha L + 2 \log \mathcal{N}(\Theta, 1/n)}{m(1-\alpha)} + \frac{1}{n} \right]. \quad (4.13)$$

While the analysis of the MLE is not novel, the novelty here lies in obtaining this result as a corollary of Theorem 1. This demonstrates that Theorem 1 extends beyond the analysis of Bayesian estimators.

As Θ is a compact set in \mathbb{R}^d , we expect $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, \varepsilon) = \mathcal{O}((1/\varepsilon)^d)$. Thus, in this case, Corollary 4 gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{2d \log(n)}{nm(1-\alpha)} \right).$$

We observe that, compared to the Bayesian estimators, we lose a $\log(n)$ term. Whether this $\log(n)$ term can be eliminated in a general setting while still using a MI bound remains, to our knowledge, an open question.

5 PAC Bayes, Mutual Information and Proofs

In this section, we provide the proof of all the theorems. We try to organize the proofs by introducing the theory step by step. We start by providing a brief overview of the PAC-Bayes bounds of [Bhattacharya et al. \[2019\]](#), [Alquier and Ridgway \[2020\]](#), and provide variants in expectation: Subsection 5.1. In a second time, using these

results, we prove Theorem 1 (Subsection 5.2). We then prove all the results of Section 3, including Theorem 2, in Subsection 5.3. While all these results could be obtained as consequences of Theorem 1, we derive them from a localized version of the PAC-Bayes bound, following a technique developed by Catoni [2007].

Finally, Subsection 5.4, we gathered all the proofs of the results in Section 4.

5.1 PAC-Bayes bounds

Let us provide a first PAC-Bayes bounds in expectation (aka MAC-Bayes bound) for the fractional posterior. In this form, this bound is due to Alquier and Ridgway [2020], but note that the authors obtained it as a variant of a result of Bhattacharya et al. [2019], using the same proof technique. We remind the proof for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 7 (Theorem 2.6 in Alquier and Ridgway [2020]). *Given a data-dependent prior $\hat{\rho}$ and observations drawn from a true model P_{θ_0} equipped with a density P_{θ_0} we have the following bound, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [KL(\hat{\rho} \| \pi)]$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $\theta \in \Theta$, it is easy to see that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\exp(-\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0))] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{p_{\theta}(X_i)}{p_{\theta_0}(X_i)} \right)^{\alpha} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\left(\frac{p_{\theta}(X_1)}{p_{\theta_0}(X_1)} \right)^{\alpha} \right]^n = \exp(-n(1-\alpha) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0})).$$

This can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\exp(-\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0) + n(1-\alpha) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0}))] = 1.$$

Integrating w.r.t to $\hat{\rho}$ and using Fuibini's theorem, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\exp(-\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0) + n(1-\alpha) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0}))]] = 1.$$

The crux of the proof is to use the use of the following lemma:

Lemma 8. *For any probability π on Θ and any measurable function h s.t $\int e^h \pi < \infty$:*

$$\log \left(\int e^h \pi \right) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_1} \left[\int h \rho - KL(\rho \| \pi) \right],$$

with the convention $\infty - \infty = \infty$. Moreover, when h is bounded from above on the support of π , the supremum is attained at :

$$\pi_h(d\theta) = \frac{e^{h(\theta)} \pi(d\theta)}{\int e^{h(\theta)} \pi(d\theta)}.$$

Using the above lemma, for the function $h(\theta) = -\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0) + n(1-\alpha) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0})$, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\exp \left[\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_1} \left[\int h \rho - KL(\rho \| \pi) \right] \right] \right] = 1.$$

Using Jensen's inequality, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_1} \left[\int h\rho - KL(\rho\|\pi) \right] \right] \leq 0.$$

In particular, for any data dependent prior $\hat{\rho}$, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\int h\hat{\rho} - KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi) \right] \leq 0.$$

Using the definition of h , we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\int -\alpha r_n(\theta, \theta_0) + n(1 - \alpha) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0}) \hat{\rho}(d\theta) - KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi) \right] \leq 0.$$

Rearranging the terms, we have that:

$$n(1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] \leq \alpha \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi)].$$

Dividing by $n(1 - \alpha)$, we get the desired result. □

Consider the special case where $\hat{\rho} = \pi_{n,\alpha}$, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 5. *Fix $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_1^+$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have the following bound:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_{\theta})] + \frac{KL(\rho\|\pi)}{n(1 - \alpha)} \right].$$

The bounds of Corollary 5 yields bounds of order $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d_{\pi} \log(n)}{n}\right)$, under Assumption 2 as shown in [Alquier and Ridgway \[2020\]](#). The above bound holds for any prior π , and can be optimized by optimizing the prior π . In particular, one can optimize the prior π using Mutual Information (MI) bounds.

We also state the variant in probability.

Theorem 8 (Theorem 2.1 in [Alquier and Ridgway \[2020\]](#)). *Given a data-dependent prior $\hat{\rho}$ and observations drawn from a true model P_{θ_0} equipped with a density P_{θ_0} we have the following bound, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, with probability a least $1 - \delta$ over the sample \mathcal{S} ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1 - \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n(1 - \alpha)}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1 - \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{KL(\rho\|\pi) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n(1 - \alpha)} \right].$$

5.2 Mutual Information and proof of Theorem 1

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1, based on ideas from page 51 in [Catoni \[2007\]](#).

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider the result of Theorem 7, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] - \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \leq \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi)].$$

Let $\hat{\rho}$ be any data dependent prior, that is absolutely continuous w.r.t to π . Catoni [2007] defines $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]$ the probability measure defined by:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]}{d\pi}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{d\hat{\rho}}{d\pi}(\theta) \right].$$

Direct calculations show that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [KL(\hat{\rho}\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}])] + KL(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]\|\pi) = \mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S}) + KL(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]\|\pi).$$

Using the above equality, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] - \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \leq \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)}(\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S}) + KL(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]\|\pi)).$$

So the choice to replace π by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\hat{\rho}]$ is motivated by the fact that it minimizes the right-hand side of the above inequality. This leads ends the proof. \square

In other words, MI bounds can be seen as KL bounds optimized with respect to the prior. Note that MI bound cannot be computed in practice, thus the above bound is not directly computable. However, one can settle for a suboptimal prior π , said to be localized [Catoni, 2007, Alquier, 2024] by selecting a prior $\pi_{-\beta\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}}$ that is an approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\pi_{n,\alpha}]$.

5.3 Localized PAC-Bayes bounds and proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

The localization approach of Catoni in our context can be motivated by considering the localized prior, and then to upper bound $KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi_{-\beta\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}})$ via empirical bounds. The following theorem provides a bound on the localized prior under Assumption 1:

Theorem 9. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_1^+$, define the following posterior:*

$$\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha} = \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\rho}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{KL(\rho\|\pi)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right],$$

and the localized prior defined as in Assumption 2. If Assumption 1 is satisfied, then we have the following bound, for any $\beta < n(1-\alpha)/c(\alpha)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}}[KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_{\theta})] \leq \frac{c(\alpha)n}{n(1-\alpha) - \beta c(\alpha)} \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\rho}[KL(P_{\theta_0}\|P_{\theta})] + \frac{KL(\rho\|\pi_{-\beta})}{n} \right].$$

Proof. Consider the bound given in Theorem 7, for the choice of $\pi = \pi_{-\beta}$, and for any $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}\|P_{\theta_0})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[KL(\hat{\rho}\|\pi_{-\beta})].$$

Now consider the following decomposition:

$$KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi_{-\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} \left[\log \frac{\hat{\rho}(\theta)}{\pi_{-\beta}(\theta)} \right] \quad (5.1)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} \left[\log \frac{\hat{\rho}(\theta)}{\pi(\theta)} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} \left[\log \frac{\pi(\theta)}{\pi_{-\beta}(\theta)} \right] \quad (5.2)$$

$$= KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} \left[\log \frac{\pi(\theta)}{\pi_{-\beta}(\theta)} \right] \quad (5.3)$$

$$= KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} \left[\log \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}]}{e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}} \right) \right] \quad (5.4)$$

$$= KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})] + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}]. \quad (5.5)$$

Using the above decomposition, and using Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}||P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})] + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}] \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \beta c(\alpha) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}||P_{\theta_0})] + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}] \right], \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}||P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)]] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[KL(\hat{\rho}||\pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}||P_{\theta_0})] \leq \\ & \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \left[KL(\rho||\pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}] \right] \right], \end{aligned}$$

using Fubini and inverting the inf and the expectation w.r.t to \mathcal{S} , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta}||P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \left[KL(\rho||\pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0}||P_{\theta})}] \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the decomposition of equation 5.5, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta})] - \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we have that:

$$\left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\frac{\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n}}{1-\alpha}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta})}{n(1-\alpha)} \right].$$

Using Assumption 1 again,

$$\left(\frac{1}{c(\alpha)} - \frac{\beta}{n(1-\alpha)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\frac{\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n}}{1-\alpha}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta})}{n(1-\alpha)} \right].$$

We can divide both sides by $1/c(\alpha) - \beta/[n(1-\alpha)]$ on the condition that this quantity is > 0 . \square

Let us investigate the above bound. First, we note that when $\beta = 0$, we recover the bound of Corollary 5. Thus, Theorem 9 generalizes the bound of Corollary 5.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Apply Theorem 9. If Assumption 2 is satisfied, and if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}_1^+$ (in this case, $\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha} = \pi_{n,\alpha}$), we can take $\rho = \pi_{-\beta} \in \mathcal{F}$ and we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \leq \frac{c(\alpha)\alpha n - \beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha) - \beta c(\alpha)} \frac{d_{\pi}}{\beta \kappa^{\pi}}.$$

If Assumption 4 is satisfied instead, take the ρ of the assumption to get a similar upper bound. \square

Let us now state a version of Theorem 9 that holds with large probability.

Theorem 10. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\delta, \eta \in (0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_1^+$. If Assumption 1 is satisfied, then we have, for any $\beta < n(1-\alpha)/c(\alpha)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta - \eta$ on the sample \mathcal{S} ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \\ & \leq \frac{c(\alpha)n}{n(1-\alpha) - \beta c(\alpha)} \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] + \alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{n\eta}} + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta}) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider the bound given in Theorem 8, for the choice of $\pi = \pi_{-\beta}$, and for any $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$, with probability

at least $1 - \delta$ over \mathcal{S} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{KL(\hat{\rho} \| \pi_{-\beta}) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n(1-\alpha)}.$$

Using the decomposition from the previous proof, and using Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \left[KL(\hat{\rho} \| \pi) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \log \mathbb{E}_\pi[e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)}] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \left[KL(\hat{\rho} \| \pi) + \beta c(\alpha) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] + \log \mathbb{E}_\pi[e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)}] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right], \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}}[r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \left[KL(\hat{\rho} \| \pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)} \right] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \left[KL(\rho \| \pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)} \right] \right] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We use Markov inequality, and Fubini,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0) - nKL(P_{\theta_0} \| p_\theta)] \geq t] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n^2(\theta, \theta_0)]}{t^2} = \frac{n \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{t^2}$$

and thus, with probability at least $1 - \eta$ on the sample, \mathcal{S}

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0) - nKL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \leq \sqrt{n \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{\eta}}.$$

Thus, with probability at least $1 - \delta - \eta$ on \mathcal{S} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}}[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{n\eta}} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \left[KL(\rho \| \pi) + \log \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)} \right] \right] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the decomposition of equation 5.5, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{n\eta}} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta})] - \beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{\beta c(\alpha)}{n(1-\alpha)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\frac{\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n}}{1-\alpha} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{n\eta}} + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta}) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n(1-\alpha)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 1 again,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{c(\alpha)} - \frac{\beta}{n(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \tilde{\rho}_{n,\alpha}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] \\ & \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\left(\frac{\alpha - \frac{\beta}{n}}{1-\alpha} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)] + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)]}{n\eta}} + \frac{KL(\rho \| \pi_{-\beta}) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{n(1-\alpha)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We can divide both sides by $1/c(\alpha) - \beta/[n(1-\alpha)]$ on the condition that this quantity is > 0 . \square

We can now prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Apply Theorem 10 to $\rho = \pi_{-\beta}$ and upper bound

$$\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_\rho \mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)}{n\eta}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}_\rho \mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0) + \frac{2}{n\eta}.$$

\square

5.4 Other proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. In order to calculate the α -divergence, we use the formulas in VanDerWerken and Schmidler [2013], Liese and Vajda [1987]. In our setting where the variance matrices are equal, they give

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) = \frac{\alpha}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2.$$

Moreover,

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = \frac{1}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2.$$

This shows that

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \leq \frac{\frac{1}{\alpha}}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta} \| P_{\theta_0}).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2. From the Proof of Lemma 1,

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2.$$

Our prior is $\pi = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for some positive definite matrix Σ . For any $\beta > 0$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{-\beta}(\theta) &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\theta' \Sigma^{-1} \theta}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\theta' \Sigma^{-1} \theta}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \|\theta\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{v^2} \langle \theta, \theta_0 \rangle\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\theta' \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right) \theta}{2} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} \langle \theta, \theta_0 \rangle\right) \\ &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{\theta' \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right) \theta}{2} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} \theta' \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right) \left[\left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right)^{-1} \theta_0\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that:

$$\pi_{-\beta}(\theta) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right)^{-1} \theta_0, \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right)^{-1}\right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] &= \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [\|\theta - \theta_0\|^2] \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \left\| \left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right)^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \theta_0 \right\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2v^2} \text{Tr} \left[\left(\Sigma^{-1} + \frac{\beta}{v^2} I_d\right)^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, when $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$,

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] = \frac{\frac{\beta}{v^2} \|\theta_0\|^2}{2\sigma^4 \left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^2} + \frac{\frac{\beta}{v^2} d}{2 \left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)} \leq \frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2}.$$

We finally check the last inequality in the lemma. In order to do so, check that the function $f(\beta) = \frac{\frac{\beta}{v^2}}{2\sigma^4 \left(\frac{\beta}{v^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^2}$ is maximized at $\beta_0 = \frac{v^2}{\sigma^2}$, and thus

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] \leq \frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2}.$$

Thus, Catoni's dimension assumption is satisfied. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\log^2 \frac{P_{\theta_0}(x)}{p_{\theta}(x)} &= \left(\frac{\|\theta - x\|^2 - \|\theta_0 - x\|^2}{2v^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\langle \theta - \theta_0, \theta + \theta_0 - 2x \rangle^2}{2v^4}\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0) = \frac{\|\theta - \theta_0\|^2(1 + 4v^2)}{2v^4}$$

and

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}}[\mathcal{V}(\theta, \theta_0)] = \frac{1 + 4v^2}{v^2} \left[\frac{d}{2} + \frac{\|\theta_0\|^2}{8\sigma^2} \right] = d'_{\pi}.$$

\square

Proof of Lemma 4. Lemma 2 gives

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] = \frac{\beta}{2} \left\| (\Sigma^{-1} + \beta I_n)^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \theta_0 \right\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \text{Tr} \left[(\Sigma^{-1} + \beta I_n)^{-1} \right].$$

We now use the diagonal form of Σ to get

$$\begin{aligned}\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\frac{\theta_{0,i}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)^2} + \frac{\beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} \leq \beta} \left\{ \frac{\frac{\theta_{0,i}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)^2} + \frac{\beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)} \right\} + \sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} > \beta} \left\{ \frac{\frac{\theta_{0,i}^2}{\sigma_i^2} \beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)^2} + \frac{\beta}{2(\frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \beta)} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} \leq \beta} \left\{ \frac{\theta_{0,i}^2}{\sigma_i^2 \beta} + \frac{1}{2} \right\} + \sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} > \beta} \left\{ \frac{\beta \theta_{0,i}^2}{2} + \frac{\beta \sigma_i}{2} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We now use explicitly $\sigma_i = i^{-1-2b}$. We have $1/\sigma_i \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow i^{1+2b} \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow i \leq \beta^{1/(1+2b)}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} \leq \beta} \frac{\theta_{0,i}^2}{\sigma_i^2 \beta} &= \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \beta^{1/(1+2b)}} \theta_{0,i}^2 i^{2(1+2b)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \beta^{1/(1+2b)}} \theta_{0,i}^2 i^{2b(2+2b)/(1+2b)} \\ &\leq \beta^{1/(1+2b)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_{0,i}^2 i^{2b} \\ &\leq L \beta^{1/(1+2b)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} \leq \beta} \frac{1}{2} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \beta^{1/(1+2b)}} \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta^{1/(1+2b)}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} > \beta} \frac{\beta \theta_{0,i}^2}{2} = \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{\beta^{1/(1+2b)} < i \leq n} \theta_{0,i}^2 \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i > \beta^{1/(1+2b)}} \frac{\theta_{0,i}^2 i^{2b}}{\beta^{2b/(1+2b)}} \leq \frac{L}{2} \beta^{1/(1+2b)}.$$

Finally, using a sum-integral comparison inequality,

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{\sigma_i} > \beta} \frac{\beta \sigma_i}{2} \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i > \beta^{1/(1+2b)}} \frac{1}{i^{1+2b}} \leq \frac{\beta}{4b} \frac{1}{\beta^{2b/(1+2b)}} = \frac{1}{4b} \beta^{1/(1+2b)}.$$

So we can conclude that

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \left(\frac{3L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4b} \right) \beta^{1/(1+2b)}.$$

In other words,

$$\sup_{\beta} \beta^{\frac{2b}{1+2b}} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \left(\frac{3L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4b} \right).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5. The α -divergence can be calculated for any member of the exponential family. Consider the case where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, and μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . In this case, we have that:

$$\psi(\theta) = \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(h(x) + \langle T(x), \theta \rangle) dx \right).$$

From [Nielsen and Nock, 2011], the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (\alpha \psi(\theta) + (1-\alpha) \psi(\theta_0) - \psi(\alpha \theta + (1-\alpha) \theta_0)), \\ KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) &= \psi(\theta_0) - \psi(\theta) - \langle \theta_0 - \theta, \nabla \psi(\theta) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

As ψ is m -strongly convex, we have that:

$$\psi(\alpha \theta + (1-\alpha) \theta_0) \leq \alpha \psi(\theta) + (1-\alpha) \psi(\theta_0) - \frac{m}{2} \alpha (1-\alpha) \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2.$$

This yields that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have that:

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) \geq \frac{m\alpha}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2.$$

Similarly, if ψ has a Lipschitz gradient with constant L , we have that:

$$\|\nabla \psi(\theta_0) - \nabla \psi(\theta)\| \leq L \|\theta_0 - \theta\|,$$

which implies

$$\psi(\theta_0) - \psi(\theta) - \langle \theta_0 - \theta, \nabla \psi(\theta) \rangle \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2.$$

This in turn yields:

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2.$$

We obtain finally:

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2 = \frac{m\kappa}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2 = \frac{m\frac{\kappa}{\alpha}}{2} \|\theta_0 - \theta\|^2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{\alpha} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6. We prove each part separately:

1. Squared Hellinger Distance:

First, we use the definition of the Hellinger Distance

$$H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) = 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{p_\theta p_{\theta_0}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Using Taylor expansion of $\sqrt{p_\theta}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} &= \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} + (\theta - \theta_0) \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right|_{\theta_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \theta_0)^2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right|_{\theta_0} + R_3(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

We calculate the first derivative

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right|_{\theta_0} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}} \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \quad (5.8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}} p_{\theta_0}(x) \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \quad (5.9)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0}. \quad (5.10)$$

For the second derivative,

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right|_{\theta_0} = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{p_\theta(x)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_\theta(x) \right) \right|_{\theta_0} \quad (5.11)$$

$$= \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right) \right|_{\theta_0} \quad (5.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left. \frac{1}{4\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_{\theta_0}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_{\theta_0}(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \\ &\quad + \left. \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_{\theta_0}(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \left[\left(\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_{\theta_0}(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 + \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_{\theta_0}(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \right]. \quad (5.14)$$

Substituting into the Hellinger distance formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) &= 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \left[1 + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{8}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{R_3(x)}{\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}} \right]. \tag{5.15}
\end{aligned}$$

We simplify under Assumption 5

$$\begin{aligned}
H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) &= 2 - 2 \left[1 + 0 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{8}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \int \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 dx \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{8}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \int \sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} dx \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int \frac{R_3(x)}{\sqrt{p_{\theta_0}(x)}} dx \right], \tag{5.16}
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) &= \frac{1}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} dx + R_H(\theta). \tag{5.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain

$$H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) = \frac{1}{4} I(\theta_0) (\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_H(\theta) \tag{5.18}$$

where:

$$I(\theta_0) = \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \Big|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 dx \tag{5.19}$$

$$R_H(\theta) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt. \tag{5.20}$$

2. KL Divergence:

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \log \frac{p_{\theta_0}(x)}{p_\theta(x)} dx. \tag{5.21}$$

Taylor expansion of $\log(p_\theta)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \log p_\theta(x) &= \log p_{\theta_0}(x) + (\theta - \theta_0) \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} + R_3(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Substituting into KL divergence formula:

$$\begin{aligned} KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) &= \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left[-(\theta - \theta_0) \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} - R_3(x) \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

We simplify under Assumption 5:

$$\begin{aligned} KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) &= -(\theta - \theta_0) \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} dx - \int p_{\theta_0}(x) R_3(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

thus

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = 0 + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2 I(\theta_0) + R_K(\theta). \quad (5.25)$$

Finally we obtain

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) = \frac{1}{2} I(\theta_0) (\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_K(\theta), \quad (5.26)$$

where:

$$I(\theta_0) = \int p_{\theta_0}(x) \left(\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\theta(x) \right|_{\theta_0} \right)^2 dx \quad (5.27)$$

$$R_K(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt. \quad (5.28)$$

3. Rényi Divergence:

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) = -2 \log(1 - H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0})/2) \quad (5.29)$$

We use a Taylor expansion of $\log(1 - x)$ around $x = 0$:

$$-2 \log(1 - x) = 2x + x^2 + O(x^3) \quad (5.30)$$

where $x = H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0})/2$. Then

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) = H^2(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) + \frac{1}{4}H^4(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0}) + O(H^6(P_\theta, P_{\theta_0})) \quad (5.31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left[\frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_H(\theta) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_H(\theta) \right]^2 + O((\theta - \theta_0)^6), \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) &= \frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_H(\theta) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{64}I(\theta_0)^2(\theta - \theta_0)^4 + O((\theta - \theta_0)^3). \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

Finally, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/2}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0}) = \frac{1}{4}I(\theta_0)(\theta - \theta_0)^2 + R_R(\theta) \quad (5.34)$$

where:

$$R_R(\theta) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt + O((\theta - \theta_0)^4). \quad (5.35)$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Corollary 3. The lower bounds follow directly from the non-negativity of the remainder terms and the lower bound on $I(\theta_0)$. For the upper bounds, we use:

$$\left| \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 I'(t) dt \right| \leq L \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} (\theta - t)^2 dt = \frac{L}{3} |\theta - \theta_0|^3.$$

For the Rényi divergence, we additionally bound the $O((\theta - \theta_0)^4)$ term using the bounds on $I(\theta)$ and $I'(\theta)$. □

Proof of Lemma 7. For the uniform prior on Θ , we have

$$\pi(d\theta) = \frac{1}{2M} \mathbf{1}_{[-M, M]}(d\theta). \quad (5.36)$$

By the L -Lipschitz property, we have that

$$KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \leq 2LM^2, \quad (5.37)$$

for any $\theta, \theta_0 \in [-M, M]$. Let us define

$$F(\beta) := \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_\theta)]. \quad (5.38)$$

Then we have $F(\beta) \leq 2LM^2$ for all $\beta \geq 0$. Thus, it suffices to study the behavior of $F(\beta)$ for large β .

To that end, we first write the localized prior:

$$\pi_{-\beta}(d\theta) = \frac{e^{-\beta KL(P_{\theta_0} \| P_{\theta})}}{Z_{\beta}} \cdot \frac{1}{2M} \mathbf{1}_{[-M, M]}(d\theta). \quad (5.39)$$

Using the assumption in (4.12), we obtain:

$$F(\beta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \pi_{-\beta}} [(\theta - \theta_0)^2] \quad (5.40)$$

$$= \frac{L}{2} \frac{\int_{-M}^M (\theta - \theta_0)^2 e^{-\frac{\beta m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta}{\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta}. \quad (5.41)$$

Applying integration by parts yields:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\beta) &\leq \frac{L}{2} \frac{\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta}{\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta} \left[-\frac{1}{\beta m} (\theta - \theta_0) e^{-\frac{\beta m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} \right]_{-M}^M \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{2\beta m} \frac{\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta}{\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.42)$$

The integrals can be expressed using the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the standard normal distribution Φ as follows:

$$\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\beta m}} \left[\Phi\left(\sqrt{\beta m}(M - \theta_0)\right) - \Phi\left(\sqrt{\beta m}(-M - \theta_0)\right) \right], \quad (5.43)$$

$$\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\beta L}} \left[\Phi\left(\sqrt{\beta L}(M - \theta_0)\right) - \Phi\left(\sqrt{\beta L}(-M - \theta_0)\right) \right]. \quad (5.44)$$

For $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and $\theta_0 \in (-M, M)$, we obtain:

$$\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta m}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta \sim \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\beta m}}, \quad (5.45)$$

$$\int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{\beta L}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^2} d\theta \sim \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\beta L}}. \quad (5.46)$$

Therefore:

$$F(\beta) \lesssim o\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right) + \frac{L}{2\beta m} \sqrt{\frac{L}{m}} \quad (5.47)$$

$$\leq \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2\beta} \quad (5.48)$$

for β large enough. More precisely, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \geq \beta_0$:

$$F(\beta) \leq \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2\beta}. \quad (5.49)$$

Combining our bounds, we have:

$$F(\beta) \leq \begin{cases} 2LM^2 & \text{for } 0 \leq \beta < \beta_0 \\ \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2\beta} & \text{for } \beta \geq \beta_0 \end{cases} \quad (5.50)$$

Now, for any $\beta \geq 0$:

$$\beta F(\beta) \leq \begin{cases} 2LM^2\beta & \text{for } 0 \leq \beta < \beta_0 \\ \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2} & \text{for } \beta \geq \beta_0 \end{cases} \quad (5.51)$$

Notice that $\beta \mapsto 2LM^2\beta$ is strictly increasing, while $\beta \mapsto \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2\beta}F(\beta) \leq \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2}$ is bounded. Moreover, by the asymptotic behavior we showed, we can choose β_0 such that:

$$\beta_0 = \min \left\{ \beta > 0 : F(\beta) \leq \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2\beta} \right\}. \quad (5.52)$$

With this choice of β_0 , we have:

$$\sup_{\beta \geq 0} \beta F(\beta) = \max \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_0} \beta F(\beta), \sup_{\beta \geq \beta_0} \beta F(\beta) \right\} \quad (5.53)$$

$$= \max \left\{ \beta_0 F(\beta_0), \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2} \right\} \quad (5.54)$$

$$= \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2}, \quad (5.55)$$

where the second equality follows from the monotonicity of $\beta F(\beta)$ on $[0, \beta_0]$ and our choice of β_0 , and the last equality holds by construction of β_0 . This verifies Assumption 2 with $\kappa_\pi = 1$ and $d_\pi = \frac{\kappa^{3/2}}{2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, put $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \varepsilon)$ for short and let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} \in \Theta$ be such that $\Theta \subset B(\theta_1, \varepsilon) \cup \dots \cup B(\theta_{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)$. We define

$$\pi = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} \delta_{\theta_i}$$

and $\hat{\rho} = \delta_{\theta_{\hat{i}}}$ where

$$\hat{i} = \arg \min_{1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} \|\theta_i - \hat{\theta}_n\|,$$

in other words, $\hat{\rho}$ is a Dirac mass on the closest parameter to the MLE among the $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}$. Theorem 1 states

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_\theta \| P_{\theta_0})] - \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \hat{\rho}} [r_n(\theta, \theta_0)] \right| \right] \leq \frac{\mathcal{I}(\theta, \mathcal{S})}{n(1-\alpha)},$$

and thus, in our setting, this gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_{\theta_{\hat{i}}} \| P_{\theta_0}) - \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} r_n(\theta_{\hat{i}}, \theta_0) \right] \leq \frac{\log \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}{n(1-\alpha)}$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\mathcal{D}_\alpha(P_{\theta_{\hat{i}}} \| P_{\theta_0})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)} r_n(\theta_{\hat{i}}, \theta_0) \right] + \frac{\log \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}{n(1-\alpha)}.$$

By the Lipschitz assumption,

$$\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}r_n(\theta_i, \theta_0) \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}r_n(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta_0) + L\|\theta_i - \hat{\theta}_n\| \leq \frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}r_n(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta_0) + L\varepsilon.$$

Moreover, by definition of $\hat{\theta}_n$, $r_n(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta_0) \leq r_n(\theta_0, \theta_0) = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta_i} \| P_{\theta_0})] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\alpha}{n(1-\alpha)}r_n(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta_0) \right] + \frac{L\varepsilon\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} + \frac{\log \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}}{n(1-\alpha)} \\ &\leq \frac{L\varepsilon\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} + \frac{\log \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}}{n(1-\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that

$$\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|^2 \leq 2\|\theta_i - \theta_0\|^2 + 2\|\theta_i - \hat{\theta}_n\|^2 \leq 2\|\theta_i - \theta_0\|^2 + 2\varepsilon^2$$

and as, by assumption, $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta_i} \| P_{\theta_0}) \geq m\|\theta_i - \theta_0\|^2$, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}(P_{\theta_i} \| P_{\theta_0}) \geq m \left(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|^2 - \varepsilon^2 \right).$$

Putting everything together gives:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon^2 + \frac{2L\varepsilon\alpha}{m(1-\alpha)} + \frac{2\log \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}}{nm(1-\alpha)}.$$

Take $\varepsilon = 1/n$ to end the proof. □

References

- Pierre Alquier. User-Friendly Introduction to PAC-Bayes bounds. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 17(2):174–303, 2024. doi: 10.1561/2200000100. [2](#), [6](#), [15](#)
- Pierre Alquier and James Ridgway. Concentration of tempered posteriors and of their variational approximations. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(3):1475–1497, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [7](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- Pierre Alquier, James Ridgway, and Nicolas Chopin. On the properties of variational approximations of Gibbs posteriors. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):8374–8414, 2016. [2](#), [5](#), [8](#)
- Pradeep K. Banerjee and Guido Montufar. Information Complexity and Generalization Bounds. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1709–1714. IEEE, 2021. doi: 10.1109/ISIT45174.2021.9517960. [3](#)
- Yannick Baraud. From robust tests to Bayes-like posterior distributions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 188(1):159–234, 2024. [6](#)
- Yannick Baraud, Lucien Birgé, and Mathieu Sart. A new method for estimation and model selection: ρ -estimation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 207(2):425–517, 2017. [10](#)
- Anirban Bhattacharya, Debdeep Pati, and Yun Yang. Bayesian Fractional Posteriors. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(1):39–66, 2019. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#)

- Christopher M. Bishop. Pattern recognition and machine learning. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 2:1122–1128, 2006. [5](#)
- Ismaël Castillo. Bayesian nonparametric statistics, St-Flour lecture notes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16422*, 2024. [3](#), [9](#)
- Olivier Catoni. *Statistical learning theory and stochastic optimization*. Saint-Flour Summer School on Probability Theory 2001 (Jean Picard ed.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, 2004. [5](#)
- Olivier Catoni. *PAC-Bayesian supervised classification: The thermodynamics of statistical learning*, volume 56 of *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes – Monograph Series*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, OH, 2007. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)
- Olivier Catoni. Challenging the empirical mean and empirical variance: a deviation study. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 48, pages 1148–1185, 2012. [2](#)
- Olivier Catoni and Ilaria Giulini. Dimension-free PAC-Bayesian bounds for matrices, vectors, and linear least squares regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.02747*, 2017. [2](#)
- Badr-Eddine Cherief-Abdellatif. Consistency of ELBO maximization for model selection. In Francisco Ruiz, Cheng Zhang, Dawen Liang, and Thang Bui, editors, *Proceedings of The 1st Symposium on Advances in Approximate Bayesian Inference*, volume 96 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11–31. PMLR, 02 Dec 2019. [2](#)
- Imre Csiszár. On information-type measure of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 2:299–318, 1967. [10](#)
- Subhashis Ghosal and Aad Van der Vaart. *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. [3](#)
- Subhashis Ghosal and Aad W Van Der Vaart. Convergence rates of posterior distributions for non-i.i.d. observations. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(1):192–223, 2007. [3](#)
- Subhashis Ghosal, Jayanta K. Ghosh, and Aad W. Van Der Vaart. Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, pages 500–531, 2000. [3](#)
- Peter D. Grünwald. *The minimum description length principle*. MIT press, 2007. [2](#)
- Peter D. Grünwald and Nishant A. Mehta. Fast rates for general unbounded loss functions: From ERM to generalized Bayes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):2317–2380, 2018. [3](#), [6](#)
- Fredrik Hellström, Giuseppe Durisi, Benjamin Guedj, and Maxim Raginsky. Generalization bounds: Perspectives from information theory and PAC-Bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04381*, 2023. [2](#)
- Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. [10](#)
- Friedrich Liese and Igor Vajda. *Convex Statistical Distances*. Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik. Teubner, 1987. [19](#)

- Gábor Lugosi and Gergely Neu. Generalization Bounds via Convex Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 3524–3546. PMLR, 2022. [2](#)
- David A. McAllester. PAC-Bayesian model averaging. *Machine Learning*, 37(3):355–363, 1999a. [2](#), [3](#)
- David A. McAllester. Some PAC-Bayesian theorems. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 230–234, 1999b. [2](#)
- Jeffrey Negrea, Mahdi Haghifam, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Ashish Khisti, and Daniel M Roy. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for SGLD via data-dependent estimates. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. [2](#)
- Gergely Neu, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Mahdi Haghifam, and Daniel M. Roy. Information-Theoretic Generalization Bounds for Stochastic Gradient Descent. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3526–3545. PMLR, 15–19 Aug 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v134/neu21a.html>. [5](#)
- Frank Nielsen and Richard Nock. On Rényi and Tsallis Entropies and Divergences for Exponential Families. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.3259*, 2011. [22](#)
- Ilsang Ohn and Lizhen Lin. Adaptive variational Bayes: Optimality, computation and applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 52(1):335–363, 2024. [2](#)
- Yury Polyanskiy and Yihong Wu. *Information Theory: From Coding to Learning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2025. [10](#)
- Jorma Rissanen. Modeling by shortest data description. *Automatica*, 14(5):465–471, 1978. [2](#)
- Judith Rousseau. On the frequentist properties of Bayesian nonparametric methods. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 3:211–231, 2016. [3](#)
- Daniel Russo and James Zou. Controlling bias in adaptive data analysis using information theory. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1232–1240, 2016. [2](#), [3](#)
- Xiaotong Shen and Larry Wasserman. Rates of convergence of posterior distributions. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 687–714, 2001. [3](#)
- Aad W. Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press, 2000. [10](#)
- Aad W. Van Der Vaart and J. Harry van Zanten. Rates of convergence for posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(1):28–59, 2008. [3](#)
- Tim van Erven and Peter Harremoës. Rényi divergence and majorization. In *2010 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 1335–1339. IEEE, 2010. [5](#)
- Douglas N. VanDerwerken and Scott C. Schmidler. Parallel Markov chain Monte Carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.7479*, 2013. [19](#)
- Wing Hung Wong and Xiaotong Shen. Probability inequalities for likelihood ratios and convergence rates of sieve MLEs. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(2):339–362, 1995. [6](#)

- Aolin Xu and Maxim Raginsky. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2524–2533, 2017. [2](#), [3](#)
- Yun Yang, Debdeep Pati, and Anirban Bhattacharya. α -variational inference with statistical guarantees. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):886–905, 2020. [2](#), [3](#)
- Fengshuo Zhang and Chao Gao. Convergence rates of variational posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(4): 2180–2207, 2020. [2](#), [3](#)
- Tong Zhang. Information-theoretic upper and lower bounds for statistical estimation. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52(4):1307–1321, 2006. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2005.864439. [2](#)