

# On the Dichotomy Between Privacy and Traceability in $\ell_p$ Stochastic Convex Optimization

Sasha Voitovych\*    Mahdi Haghifam†    Idan Attias‡    Gintare Karolina Dziugaite§  
Roi Livni¶    Daniel M. Roy||

## Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the necessity of memorization in stochastic convex optimization (SCO) under  $\ell_p$  geometries. Informally, we say a learning algorithm memorizes  $m$  samples (or is  $m$ -traceable) if, by analyzing its output, it is possible to identify at least  $m$  of its training samples. Our main results uncover a fundamental tradeoff between traceability and excess risk in SCO. For every  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we establish the existence of a risk threshold below which any sample-efficient learner must memorize a *constant fraction* of its sample. For  $p \in [1, 2]$ , this threshold coincides with best risk of differentially private (DP) algorithms, i.e., above this threshold, there are algorithms that do not memorize even a single sample. This establishes a sharp dichotomy between privacy and traceability for  $p \in [1, 2]$ . For  $p \in (2, \infty)$ , this threshold instead gives novel lower bounds for DP learning, partially closing an open problem in this setup. En route of proving these results, we introduce a complexity notion we term *trace value* of a problem, which unifies privacy lower bounds and traceability results, and prove a sparse variant of the fingerprinting lemma.

## 1 Introduction

In machine learning (ML), the goal of learning is to extract useful patterns from training data in order to produce a model that performs well on unseen data. While there are settings (such as private machine learning) where one attempts to minimize the information the learned model retains about its training data, it is now widely accepted that, in some scenarios, certain forms of memorization are compatible with learning. The quintessential example of a learner that memorizes its training data is the 1-nearest neighbor algorithm [CH67]. Among modern ML methodologies, there are many examples of the so-called *benign overfitting* phenomenon [ZBHRV21; BLLT20; BMR21], demonstrating that memorization can coexist with learning, and may even be necessary [Fel20].

This work asks: *to what extent is memorization necessary for learning?* Prior work [DSSUV15; Fel20; FZ20; BBFST21; CDK22] has studied this question in various settings and under different notions of memorization. Our aim is to understand memorization in the simplest settings. We do

---

Sasha Voitovych and Mahdi Haghifam are equal-contribution authors.

\*Institute for Data, Systems, and Society, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

†Khoury College of Computer Sciences, Northeastern University.

‡University of Illinois at Chicago and Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago.

§Google DeepMind

¶Department of Electrical Engineering, Tel Aviv University.

||Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto and Vector Institute.

so by revisiting the fundamental setting of *Stochastic Convex Optimization* (SCO) [SSSS09]. We adopt a notion of memorization known as traceability (membership inference) [DSSUV15; SSSS17; CCNSTT22; ADHLR24]. Informally, we say a learning algorithm is  $m$ -traceable (i.e., memorizes  $m$  samples) if there is a *tracer* that, using the output of the learning algorithm, can distinguish at least  $m$  samples in the training set from those freshly drawn from the distribution. SCO is an ideal testbed for this problem: (1) as in modern machine learning practices, first-order methods are known to achieve optimal sample-complexity rates in this setting [Fel16; HRS16; AKL21], and (2) within this framework, we can design provable methods that mitigate memorization, such as differentially private algorithms [CMS11; BST14; BFTG19]. By examining the connection between learning and traceability in SCO, we gain valuable insights into the interplay between privacy, memorization, and generalization.

Our main result uncovers a fundamental *dichotomy* in the behavior of traceability in SCO for various geometries. We show that there exists a risk threshold: below this threshold, every sample-efficient algorithm requires memorization of a constant fraction of the training set, while above this threshold, there exist algorithms that can avoid memorization of even a single example.


In more detail, an SCO problem is defined by a parameter space  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , a data space  $\mathcal{Z}$  and a loss function  $f: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is convex in its first argument. In this problem, a learner receives a finite sample from  $\mathcal{Z}$  drawn i.i.d. from an unknown data distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . The goal of the learner is to find an approximate minimizer of the population risk  $F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(\theta, Z)]$ . For an SCO problem to be learnable, one often assumes that the loss function  $f$  is *Lipschitz* and the *diameter* of the space  $\Theta$  is bounded. These bounds govern the behavior of learnability, but they can be measured in different geometries. A canonical class of geometries is induced by the  $\ell_p$  norms, in which case we assume that  $\Theta$  has bounded  $\ell_p$ -diameter and  $f(\cdot, z)$  is  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz, for a fixed  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .

Following previous works [DSSUV15; ADHLR24], we formalize memorization as follows. Let  $n$  denote the number of training samples and  $\mathcal{A}_n: \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \Theta$  be a (possibly randomized) learning algorithm that takes as input a dataset of size  $n$ ,  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ , and outputs a parameter  $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$ . Then, a *tracer*  $\mathcal{T}$  is a function that takes as input the parameter  $\hat{\theta}$  and a data point  $Z$ , and outputs a binary decision, IN or OUT, indicating whether it believes  $Z$  was in the training set used by  $\mathcal{A}_n$ . We interpret  $\mathcal{T}$  as a *hypothesis test* distinguishing between samples generated independently of  $S_n$  (null, or OUT) and samples coming from  $S_n$  (alternative, or IN). Formally, for some fixed  $\xi \in (0, 1)$  and  $m \leq n$ , if we sample  $Z_{\text{OUT}} \sim \mathcal{D}$  independently of  $S_n$  and sample  $Z_{\text{IN}} \sim \text{unif}(S_n)$ , we require  $\mathcal{T}$  to satisfy

$$\Pr[\mathcal{T}(\hat{\theta}, Z_{\text{OUT}}) = \text{IN}] \leq \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[\mathcal{T}(\hat{\theta}, Z_{\text{IN}}) = \text{IN}] \geq \frac{m}{n},$$

where the probability is over the randomness of  $S_n$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , and  $Z_{\text{OUT}}$  or  $Z_{\text{IN}}$ . The first condition above can be interpreted as a *false-positive rate* of  $\mathcal{T}$  under the null (OUT), and the second can be interpreted as a *power* of  $\mathcal{T}$  under the alternative (IN). Equivalently,  $m$  is the expected number of samples in the training set  $S_n$  that the tracer can distinguish, i.e., for which  $\mathcal{T}$  outputs IN. Then, we say  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable if there exist a tracer  $\mathcal{T}$  with these properties. (See Definitions 2.3 and 2.4.)

A notable setting when an algorithm is not traceable is when  $\mathcal{A}_n$  satisfies differential privacy (DP) [DMNS06]. DP intuitively guarantees that even an adversary that knows all but one point in the training set cannot reliably identify the remaining point. DP is a strong notion, and learners often pay a high excess risk to satisfy it. However, precisely because DP is stringent, it is unclear what information a learner *actually* leaks if it cannot satisfy DP. For instance, it is unclear whether, in the



**Figure 1:** The various regimes for the excess risk and the main question of this paper.

absence of DP, memorization needs to occur. This makes traceability, a weaker notion, a suitable framework to study memorization in the absence of DP. More formally, let  $\mathfrak{P}$  be a family of SCO problems  $\mathcal{P}$  (e.g.,  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz problems), and consider the minimax statistical and DP excess risks

$$\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathfrak{P}, n) = \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \min_{\mathcal{A}_n} \max_{\mathcal{D}} \{ \mathbb{E}[F_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n(S_n))] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \} \quad \text{and} \quad (1)$$

$$\alpha_{\text{DP}}(\mathfrak{P}, n) = \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \min_{(\varepsilon, \delta)\text{-DP-}\mathcal{A}_n} \max_{\mathcal{D}} \{ \mathbb{E}[F_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n(S_n))] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \}, \quad (2)$$

where we set  $\varepsilon = 0.1, \delta = 1/n^2$  for concreteness. Note that achieving an excess risk less than  $\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathfrak{P}, n)$  on all  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{P}$  is not possible, and there are non-traceable algorithms (DP algorithms) achieving risks  $\alpha \geq \alpha_{\text{DP}}(\mathfrak{P}, n)$ .<sup>1</sup> The current paper then revolves around the following fundamental questions, which is shown in Figure 1, toward a general understanding of memorization in SCO:

*Do algorithms with excess risk  $\alpha \in (\alpha_{\text{stat}}, \alpha_{\text{DP}})$  need to memorize their training data? If so, how many samples need to be memorized in this excess risk regime?*

## 1.1 Contributions

### 1.1.1 Tradeoff between Excess Risk and Traceability

In this paper, we establish a tradeoff between traceability and excess risk for algorithms in the context of SCO in general geometries. We give informal statements of our main results below, and give a summary in Table 1.

**Tracing when  $p \in (1, 2]$ .** For the case  $p \in (1, 2]$ , we show that every learner that obtains logarithmically better error than  $\alpha_{\text{DP}}$  must memorize its samples, and provide essentially the best possible lower bound on the number of samples memorized. In more detail, we show that there exists an  $\ell_p$ -SCO problem such that, if an algorithm that achieves risk

$$\alpha \lesssim \frac{\alpha_{\text{DP}}}{\log^2(n)},$$

then  $\Omega(1/\alpha^2)$  of its sample points are traceable (see Theorem 2.5 for the exact statement). This result uncovers a fundamental dichotomy between traceability and privacy in  $\ell_p$ -SCO. It is known that  $p \in (1, 2]$ ,  $\Theta(1/\alpha^2)$  is precisely the sample complexity (that is, the minimal number of samples a learner requires to achieve excess risk of  $\alpha$ ) of learning  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz problems [AWBR09]. Thus, any sample-efficient learner that obtains logarithmically better error than  $\alpha_{\text{DP}}$  must memorize a *constant fraction* of its sample. Note that  $\Omega(1/\alpha^2)$  is essentially the best possible lower bound on recall, as there are algorithms that learn using  $O(1/\alpha^2)$  samples. Hence, this result shows that

<sup>1</sup>In the rest of the paper, we drop  $\mathfrak{P}$  and  $n$ , since we implicitly assume that  $\mathfrak{P}$  denotes the class of SCO problems such that the loss function is Lipschitz wrt  $\ell_p$  norm and the parameter space is a subset of unit  $\ell_p$  ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (See Definition 2.2). Moreover,  $n$  always denotes the number of samples available to the learner.

a phase transition occurs: for  $\alpha \geq \alpha_{\text{DP}}$ , there are algorithms that are not 1-traceable, and for  $\alpha \lesssim \alpha_{\text{DP}}/\log^2(n)$ , every algorithm is  $\Omega(1/\alpha^2)$ -traceable. ( $\alpha_{\text{DP}}$  in this regime is known due to results in [BFTG19; AFKT21; BGN21].)

**Tracing when  $p = 1$ .** The above result also applies to  $p = 1$ . However, note that, for  $p = 1$ , the sample complexity of learning is  $\Theta(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  [AWBR09], i.e., the above result only shows  $1/\log(d)$  fraction of the sample can be traced in this setting. We derive a tighter version of the above result for  $p = 1$ , which intuitively shows that slightly more accurate learners in  $\ell_1$ -SCO must still memorize a constant fraction of their sample. Specifically, we show that for  $p = 1$  there exists an SCO problem such that, if an algorithm achieves risk

$$\alpha \lesssim \frac{\alpha_{\text{DP}}}{d^{0.01} \log^2(n)},$$

then  $\Omega(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  of its samples can be traced (see Theorem 2.6). The choice of the constant 0.01 is arbitrary.

**Tracing when  $p \in (2, \infty)$ .** The situation becomes more complex for  $2 < p < \infty$ , since determining the optimal excess risk of DP learning in this setting is an open problem [BFTG19; ABGMU22; LLL24]. Nevertheless, in this setting, we show an existence of a risk threshold below which any sample-efficient learner must again memorize a constant fraction of its samples. In more detail, Theorem 2.7 uncovers that, for

$$\alpha \lesssim \frac{\underline{\alpha}_{\text{DP}}}{\log(n)},$$

where  $\underline{\alpha}_{\text{DP}}$  is set as

$$\underline{\alpha}_{\text{DP}} = \Theta\left(\frac{d}{n^2}\right)^{1/p},$$

we can construct an SCO problem such that, if a learner achieves a risk of  $\alpha$ , then  $\Omega(1/\alpha^p)$  of its samples are traceable. Note that, in the regime  $\varepsilon \in \Theta(1)$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{stat}} \ll \alpha_{\text{DP}}$  only when  $d \in \Omega(n)$ ; in this regime, the sample complexity of learning for  $p > 2$  is precisely  $\Theta(1/\alpha^p)$ , i.e., the number of traced out samples is again on the order of the sample complexity.

Note that  $\underline{\alpha}_{\text{DP}}$  need not be the optimal DP risk in this setting. Nevertheless, this quantity can be shown to be a *lower bound* on the optimal DP risk (in the regime  $\varepsilon \in \Theta(1)$ ). We extend this result to other regimes of  $\varepsilon$ , and another important contribution of our work is proving such DP lower bounds.

### 1.1.2 Tighter Lower Bounds for $\ell_p$ DP-SCO for $p > 2$

Our proof techniques have implications for the sample complexity of DP-SCO. We provide an improved lower bound on DP-SCO under  $\ell_p$  geometries for  $p > 2$  in the high dimensional regime, i.e.,  $d \geq \varepsilon n$ , which is arguably the most interesting regime as it is more relevant for the modern ML applications. Specifically, we show, in Theorem 2.9, that for all  $\varepsilon < 1$  and small  $\delta$  we can construct a problem such that for every  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP algorithm,  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , there exists a data distribution such that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ F_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\theta}) \right] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \gtrsim \left( \frac{d}{n^2 \varepsilon^2} \right)^{1/p}.$$

In particular, the above implies that when  $d \geq \varepsilon n$ , the error due to privacy dominates the statistical error. This result improves upon all previous best bounds in the literature when  $d \geq \varepsilon n$  [ABGMU22;

$p$	Recall	Range of $\alpha$	Sample complexity	Minimax DP rate	Refs.
1	$\frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2}$	$\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}}, \frac{d^{0.49}}{n\sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}}\right)$	$\frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}$	Thm. 2.6
(1, 2]	$\frac{1}{\alpha^2}$	$\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}, \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}}\right)$	$\frac{1}{\alpha^2}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}$	Thm. 2.5
$[2, \infty)$	$\frac{1}{\alpha^p}$	$\left(\min\left\{\frac{1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\}, \left(\frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)}\right)^{1/p}\right)$	$\frac{1}{\alpha^p} \dagger$	Open	Thm. 2.7

**Table 1:** Summary of traceability results. All results are stated up to constants. The sample complexity bounds are implied by Theorem A.1. Minimax DP rates are known due to [BFTG19; BGN21; AFKT21; GLLST23] and are displayed up to log factors and with  $\delta = 1/n^2$ . (†) Although, in general, the sample complexity in this setting is a minimum of two terms, within the stated range of  $\alpha$ , the term  $1/\alpha^p$  dominates.

LLL24]. In particular, Theorem 3.1 of [LLL24] gives a lower bound  $\sqrt{d/n^2\varepsilon^2}$ , which is weaker than our lower bound for any  $p > 2$ . Corollary 4 of [ABGMU22] gives a lower bound  $\min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{\varepsilon n}\right\}$  which is weaker than our lower bound for  $d \geq \varepsilon n$ .

### 1.1.3 DP and traceability in PAC Learning

Our results for SCO imply that any algorithm with an excess risk smaller than what is possible with DP is traceable with a recall that scales with the sample complexity. A natural question is whether the same phenomenon holds true for other learning setups. Consider PAC classification. We show that, for every class with VC dimension bounded by  $d_{\text{vc}}$ , recall of any tracer is in  $O(d_{\text{vc}} \log^2(n))$ , i.e., it is at most a small fraction of the training sample provided  $n \gg d_{\text{vc}}$ . Many of these classes are not privately learnable, specifically, those with infinite Littlestone dimension [BNSV15; ALMM19; BLM20], e.g., the class of thresholds. In other words, the sharp dichotomy between privacy and traceability does not hold in PAC classification. We also point out that for the class of thresholds, we can remove the  $\log^2(n)$  factor from the recall upper bound. See Appendix G for a formal statement and further discussion.

## 1.2 Related Work

In this section, we discuss the prior work and put this paper in the context of existing results.

**Necessity of memorization in learning.** Our work is most similar in spirit to the works of Dwork, Smith, T. Steinke, Ullman, and Vadhan [DSSUV15] and Attias, Dziugaite, Haghifam, Livni, and D. M. Roy [ADHLR24]. In [DSSUV15], the authors studied the traceability of algorithms for mean estimation in  $\ell_\infty$  norm. In particular, they demonstrated that, in the accuracy regime where DP learning is impossible, every algorithm is traceable with large recall. More recently, [ADHLR24] showed that a similar conclusion holds for learners in SCO in  $\ell_2$  geometry. Our work builds on top of these results on a number of fronts. Our first novelty is a generic traceability theory (outlined in Section 3) that allows to seamlessly convert fingerprinting lemmas into traceability results and DP lower bounds. Another key difference is the structure of hard problems and the novelty of fingerprinting lemma. First, in our fingerprinting lemmas, the parameters of the priors in our constructions necessarily need to *scale* with the risk level, in order to show that the number of

memorized samples is the same as sample complexity. We emphasize that this scaling is indeed necessary to achieve an optimal result. For example, in the context of SCO in  $\ell_2$  geometry, one could hope to use the fingerprinting lemma with *uniform prior* from [DSSUV15] along with the reduction in [BST14, Sec. 5.1]; however, it would only yield a recall of  $\Omega(1/\alpha)$  samples, while the sample complexity is  $\Theta(1/\alpha^2)$ . Second,  $\ell_p$ -SCO with  $p > 2$  is distinct in the sense that the hardest problems have a sparse structure (see [AWBR09]). It is different from the usual constructions for mean estimation and  $\ell_2$ -SCO for which a “hypercube-like” construction suffices. These differences necessitate new techniques, leading us to devise novel constructions and a new fingerprinting lemma specifically suited to sparse data vectors, which can be of independent interest.

A parallel line of work investigated memorization using the notion of *label memorization* in supervised setups. As per this definition, a learner is said to memorize its training samples if it “overfits” at these points. Feldman [Fel20] showed that, in some classification tasks, if the underlying distribution is *long-tailed*, then a learner is forced to memorize many training labels. Cheng, Duchi, and Kuditipudi [CDK22] showed this phenomenon also occurs in the setting of linear regression. While this framework is suitable to study memorization in supervised tasks, the notion of “labels” in SCO in not well-defined and thus calls for alternative definitions.

Another line of work studied memorization through the lens of information theoretic measures. Brown, Bun, Feldman, Smith, and Talwar [BBFST21] used *input-output mutual information* (IOMI) as a memorization metric and showed that IOMI can scale linearly with the training sample’s entropy, indicating that a constant fraction of bits is memorized. In the context of SCO in  $\ell_2$  geometry, lower bounds on IOMI have been studied in [HRTSMK23; Liv24]. Specifically [Liv24] demonstrated that, for every accurate algorithm, its IOMI must scale with dimension  $d$ . Our approach to the study of memorization is conceptually different since we focus on the number of *samples* memorized as opposed to the number of *bits*. Nevertheless, it can be shown using Lemma G.3 and [HNKRD20, Thm. 2.1] that the recall *lower bounds* IOMI of an algorithm (provided that FPR  $\xi$  is small enough, e.g.,  $\xi = 1/n^2$ ). However, because of the Lipschitzness of loss functions in  $\ell_p$ -SCO, we can use discretization of  $\Theta$  and design algorithms with IOMI that is significantly smaller than the entropy of the training set, thus, memorization in the sense of [BBFST21] does not arise here.

**Membership inference.** Membership inference is an important practical problem [HSRDTMP-SNC08; SSSS17; CCNSTT22]. In these works, the focus is on devising strategies for the tracer in modern machine learning settings, particularly neural networks. Our work takes a more fundamental perspective, aiming to determine whether membership inference is inherently unavoidable or simply a byproduct of specific training algorithms. An interesting aspect of our results is that, for  $1 < p \leq 2$ , the optimal strategy for tracing depends *only* on the loss function, which is in line with empirical studies [SDSOJ19].

**Private Stochastic Convex Optimization.** DP-SCO has been extensively studied in  $\ell_2$  geometry (see, for instance, [CMS11; BST14; BFTG19; FKT20]). For  $\ell_p$  with  $p \in [1, 2)$ , the optimal DP excess risk was established in [AFKT21; BGN21]. The best known upper bounds for DP-SCO in  $\ell_p$  geometry for  $p > 2$  are due to [BGN21; GLLST23]. In this setting, there is a long-standing gap between upper and lower bounds, and the best known lower bounds are due to [ABGMU22; LLL24], which our paper improves on.

**Fingerprinting Lemmas and DP Lower Bounds.** Fingerprinting codes were introduced by [BS98]. The work [Ull13] was first to relate them to lower bounds on differential privacy, and they were used extensively afterwards [BUV14; DSSUV15; BSU17; SU17; KLSU18; CWZ23; KMS22; PTU24]. Intuitively, fingerprinting lemmas formalize the intuition that the output of an accurate algorithm must be correlated with its training set [DSSUV15; Ste16; BSU17; SU17; KLSU18; CWZ23; KMS22; PTU24]. To put our *sparse fingerprinting lemma* into the context of prior work, it can be seen to generalize the results of [SU17] to sparse sets. Another “sparse fingerprinting lemma” in the literature is given by [CWZ23] to address DP lower bounds in the sparse generalized linear model. Besides visual and naming similarities, our results are distinct. Indeed, sparsity enters the lemmas in different forms: in [CWZ23] the *mean vector* is sparse (and data is dense), and in our case, the mean is dense and the *data vectors* are sparse. The proof techniques also differ substantially.

## 2 Problem Setup and Main Results

We begin by a preliminary overview of the standard setup of SCO [SSSS09]. An SCO problem is characterized via a triple  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{Z}, \Theta, f)$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the data space,  $\Theta$  is the parameter space, which must be convex, and  $f: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function such that  $f(\cdot, z)$  is convex for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . We will assume  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $d$  is reserved to denote the dimension of the parameter space.

In SCO, data points are drawn from an underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{Z}$ , unknown to the learner. The objective of the learner is to minimize the *expected risk* based on observed samples. More formally, assuming  $\mathcal{Z}$  is equipped with an implicit  $\sigma$ -algebra, let  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  denote the set of probability measures over  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Then, a learning algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n: \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\Theta)$  receives a sample  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  of  $n$  data points from  $\mathcal{Z}^n$  and returns a (perhaps randomized) output in  $\Theta$ . Then, for  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$ , expected risk is defined as  $F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(Z, \theta)]$ . An  $\alpha$ -learner is defined to be a learner whose expected *excess risk* is bounded by  $\alpha$ . A formal definition is given below.

**Definition 2.1** ( $\alpha$ -learner). Fix  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and SCO problem  $(\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$ . We say  $\mathcal{A}_n: \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\Theta)$  is an  $\alpha$ -learner for  $(\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$  iff for every  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} [F_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\theta})] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \leq \alpha.$$

In our work, we focus on learning *Lipschitz-bounded* families of problems, which are defined below. For every  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , let  $\mathcal{B}_p(r) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\theta\|_p \leq r\}$  be the unit ball in  $\ell_p$  norm.

**Definition 2.2** (Lipschitz-bounded problems). Fix  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , and let  $d < \infty$  be a natural number. We let  $\mathcal{L}_p^d$  denote the set of all  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded SCO problems in  $d$  dimensions. Namely,  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f) \in \mathcal{L}_p^d$  iff (i)  $\Theta \subset \mathcal{B}_p(1)$ , and (ii) for every  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$  and  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we have  $|f(z, \theta_1) - f(z, \theta_2)| \leq \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_p$ .

### 2.1 Tracing

The key notion we study here is *tracing*, and we next introduce our framework for traceability. The form of tracers discussed in the introduction takes as input the output of an algorithm and a data point and outputs a binary decision: IN or OUT. In the remainder of the paper, we consider families of tracers that output a real-valued *score* (instead of a binary value) that intuitively corresponds to the likelihood of the event that the learner saw a data point during training. The binary decisions (IN or OUT) will then be obtained by thresholding the value of the score. Drawing parallels with hypothesis testing, this is similar to thresholding the log-likelihood ratio to obtain optimal binary tests in the Neymann–Pearson lemma. Below, we give the most general definition of a tracer.

**Definition 2.3** (Tracer). Fix data space  $\mathcal{Z}$  and parameter space  $\Theta$ . A tracer’s strategy is a tuple of  $\mathcal{T} = (\phi, \mathcal{D})$  where  $\phi : \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$ .

In the next definition, we define the traceability of learning algorithms using the tracers in Definition 2.3.

**Definition 2.4** ( $(\xi, m)$ -traceability). Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ , and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say a learning algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable if there exists a tracer  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that, if  $(Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes(n+1)}$  and  $\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ , we have

- (i) False-positive rate (FPR):  $\Pr(\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_0) \geq \lambda) \leq \xi$ ,
- (ii) Recall:  $\mathbb{E}[|\{i \in [n] : \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \geq \lambda\}|] \geq m$ .

## 2.2 Main Results

### 2.2.1 Traceability of $\alpha$ -Learners

In this section, we discuss our traceability results for accurate learners in  $\ell_p$  geometries. First, we will state a result that applies to  $p \in [1, 2)$ , and then present its slight refinement for  $p = 1$ . We will then present our result for  $p \geq 2$ . See Appendices E.1 to E.3 for proofs.

**Theorem 2.5.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, for all  $p \in [1, 2)$ , if  $d, n, \xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \alpha \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)}}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}, \quad (3)$$

*then there exist an  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m \in \Omega(\alpha^{-2})$ .*

Note that the upper bound on  $\alpha$  in Equation (3) is precisely the optimal DP excess risk for  $\varepsilon \in \Theta(1)$  and  $p \in [1, 2]$  [AFKT21; BGN21], and the lower bound is precisely the optimal non-private risk (except  $p = 1$ ; see Theorem A.1). Moreover, for  $p \in (1, 2]$ , the lower bound on  $m$ , i.e., the number of memorized samples, *exactly* matches the sample complexity of  $\ell_p$ -SCO problems. For  $p = 1$ , this bound is less than the sample complexity by a factor of  $\log(d)$ . (See Corollary A.3 for an overview of known rates for the sample complexity of SCO.) Thus, our result uncovers a dichotomy for  $p \in [1, 2]$ : every algorithm with excess risk *better* than the optimal DP excess risk is traceable with a recall that scales with the sample complexity.

As mentioned above, for  $p = 1$ , the lower bound on recall in Theorem 2.5 is less than sample complexity by a factor of  $\log(d)$ . This prompts us to establish the following refinement for  $p = 1$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, if  $d$  is large enough and  $n, \xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} \leq \alpha \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \frac{d^{0.49}}{n \sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}}, \frac{1}{8} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

*there exists an  $\ell_1$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m \in \Omega(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$ .*



Note that the upper bound in Equation (4) is slightly stronger than in Equation (3); however, the lower bound on recall now matches the sample complexity of learning in  $\ell_1$  geometry. We now present a result for  $p > 2$ .

**Theorem 2.7.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, for all  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , if  $d$ ,  $n$ ,  $\xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$\frac{1}{6} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{d^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq \alpha \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \left( \frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)} \right)^{1/p}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

*then there exist an  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with*

$$m \in \Omega \left( \frac{1}{(6\alpha)^p} \right).$$

For  $p \in (2, \infty)$ , our results have a different implication, showing that all sufficiently accurate learners need to memorize a number of samples on the order of the sample complexity. However, in this case, the upper bound in Equation (5) need not be the optimal DP error. Instead, it provides a *lower bound* on the optimal DP error, as we will see shortly (Theorem 2.9). We note that  $p = \infty$  is excluded from the range above, because  $\alpha_{\text{DP}} \in O(\alpha_{\text{stat}})$  in  $\ell_\infty$  [BGN21]. As mentioned in the introduction, the question of traceability is vacuous unless  $\alpha_{\text{stat}}$  and  $\alpha_{\text{DP}}$  are sufficiently far apart.

*Remark 2.8.* We make a brief remark on the lower bounds in Equations (3) to (5). Note that these lower bounds precisely correspond to minimax excess risk of learning  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded classes for appropriate values of  $p$  (see Theorem A.1). Also, in the proofs of these theorems, the problems we consider are *the hardest* problems to learn within each respective class (see Theorems F.2 and F.4). Thus, for each of these problems, if there exists an  $\alpha$ -learner, then  $\alpha$  automatically satisfies the lower bound in Equations (3) to (5) (up to constants). I.e., the question of traceability is vacuous whenever this lower bound is not satisfied.  $\triangleleft$

### 2.2.2 Improved DP-SCO Lower Bound for $p > 2$

While our focus has been on tracing, we have developed several technical tools that are of independent interest. As our next theorem shows, using the notion of trace value, which we further develop in subsequent sections, we show improved lower bounds for DP-SCO in  $\ell_p$  geometries for  $p > 2$ . The proof can be found in Appendix E.4.

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$  be arbitrary. Then, there exist a universal constant  $c > 0$  and a problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, \ell) \in \mathcal{L}_p^d$  such that any  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP learner of  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $\delta \leq c/n$  satisfies,*

$$\alpha \geq c \cdot \min \left\{ \left( \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2 n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{\varepsilon n}, 1 \right\}.$$

## 3 Technical Overview

Our proofs rely on introducing two key technical elements that allow us to generalize tracing techniques to general  $\ell_p$  setups. The first element is a novel complexity notion which we term *the (subgaussian) trace value* of a problem. Surprisingly, as we show in the proof of Theorem 2.9, we can use the trace value not only to prove traceability results, but also to establish DP sample complexity lower bounds, and, even to recover *non-private* sample complexity lower bounds.

The subgaussian trace value is defined by narrowing down the general family of tracers and additionally requiring that the tracer  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  induces a subgaussian process over the set  $\Theta$  (which we formalize shortly). To provide intuition behind this requirement, the subgaussianity assumption on the tracer let us argue that (i) if  $\hat{\theta}$  was not trained on  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$ , then  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z)$  will be small with high probability, and, (ii)  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2$  is bounded with high probability. As per Definition 2.4, condition (i) ensures a small FPR of a tracer, and condition (ii) is useful for the following technical reason. It allows us to argue that, if the trace value is large on average over the training set, it implies the existence of a threshold  $\lambda$  such that  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z) \geq \lambda$  for many  $Z \in S_n$ , and thus establishing recall.

Our second technical contribution concerns techniques for lower bounding the trace value, which we accomplish through several novel *fingerprinting lemmas*. Previous works used the standard fingerprinting lemma, where the learner observes points on a hypercube, to lower bound DP and traceability in  $\ell_2$  geometry. However, when moving to general  $\ell_p$  geometries, this setup no longer captures the hardest settings to learn. For instance, for  $p > 2$ , canonical instances of hard problems involve data drawn from sparse sets [AWBR09]. We thus prove new fingerprinting lemmas that enable us to leverage our framework in such settings. These fingerprinting lemmas are then applied to carefully constructed instances of hard problems, and we show that every accurate learner of these problems is traceable. In the remainder of this section, we provide a formal definition of trace value, subgaussian processes, and state our new fingerprinting lemmas. Then, we show the notion of trace value lets us reason about tracing, DP, and (even) non-private sample complexity lower bounds.

### 3.1 General framework: subgaussian trace value

We next describe more formally the framework of subgaussian tracers. For a random variable  $X$ , the subgaussian norm of  $X$  is the quantity  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} := \inf\{t: \mathbb{E}[\exp(X^2/t^2)] \leq 2\}$  [Ver18]. We use the following definition of a subgaussian process:

**Definition 3.1** (Subgaussian process). We call an indexed collection of random variables  $\{X_\theta\}$  a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t a metric space  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$  if for every  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ , we have

$$\|X_\theta - X_{\theta'}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma \|\theta - \theta'\|, \quad \|X_\theta\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma \text{diam}_{\|\cdot\|}(\Theta).$$

For origin symmetric convex body  $\Theta$ , let  $\|\cdot\|_\Theta$  denote the Minkowski norm w.r.t.  $\Theta$ , that is  $\|x\|_\Theta := \inf\{\lambda > 0: x \in \lambda\Theta\}$ . If  $\Theta$  is not convex or not origin symmetric, we let  $\|\cdot\|_\Theta$  be the Minkowski norm w.r.t. convex hull of  $(\Theta \cup -\Theta)$ . Note that  $\|\cdot\|_\Theta$  is the minimal norm to contain  $\Theta$  in its unit ball. Then, a subgaussian process naturally leads to a definition of a subgaussian tracer as follows.

**Definition 3.2** (Subgaussian tracer). Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  to be a constant, and let  $\Theta$  be a convex body. We let  $\mathfrak{T}_\kappa$  be the class of subgaussian tracers at scale  $\kappa > 0$ , that is, a tracer  $(\phi, \mathcal{D}) \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa$  iff

- (i)  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  where  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$  is a 1-subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$ .
- (ii)  $|\phi(\theta, z)| \leq \kappa$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .
- (iii)  $\phi(\cdot, z)$  is convex for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

We make a note in passing that the convexity condition is necessary only for  $\ell_1$ -proofs.

**Definition 3.3** (Subgaussian trace value). Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{T}_\kappa$  be as in Definition 3.2. Then, we define the subgaussian trace value (or trace value in short) of problem  $\mathcal{P}$  by

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) = \inf_{\alpha\text{-learner } \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{\mathcal{T} = (\phi, \mathcal{D}) \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right].$$

where the inf is taken over all  $\mathcal{A}_n$  that achieve excess risk  $\leq \alpha$  on  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $n$  samples.

**Traceability via trace value.** The trace value characterizes the average score the pair  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  assigns to the data points in the training set. However, the definition of recall in Definition 2.3 requires characterizing the *number* of samples in the training set that takes a large value. The former can be converted into the latter, provided the sum of squared scores of samples is not too large. A formal statement, which is a consequence of Paley–Zygmund inequality, can be found in Lemma A.11. In the next lemma, we show how to control the sum of squares of the  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i)$  using the subgaussian assumption we made on  $\phi$ . The main machinery used for proving the lemma is Dudley’s entropy integral to control the supremum of a subgaussian process.

**Lemma 3.4.** Fix  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a subset of a unit ball in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $\phi: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  be such that, as  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . Then, there exists a universal constant  $C > 0$ , such that

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} \leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \sqrt{d} + t \right) \right] \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-t^2), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

In the next theorem, we show that Lemma 3.4 implies that if, the trace value is large, it means that for *many* in-sample data points  $Z_i$ , the value of  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i)$  is large, which allows the tracer to reliably identify  $Z_i$  as part of the training set. Additionally, for a fresh sample  $Z_0 \sim \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_0)$  will be small with high probability, once again due to the subgaussian assumption.

**Theorem 3.5.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$ . Let  $T = \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, for some constant  $c > 0$ , every  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with

$$\xi = \exp(-cT^2), \quad m = c \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n + d} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n + d)} \right].$$

**Privacy lower bounds via trace value.** In the next theorem, we show that the notion of trace value directly lower bounds the best privacy parameters achievable by a DP algorithm. The proof can be found in Appendix B.3.

**Theorem 3.6.** There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$ , such that the following holds. Fix  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $T = \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of problem  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, for any  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , we have  $\exp(\varepsilon) - 1 \geq c(T - 2\delta\kappa)$ .

**Connection to non-private sample complexity.** Remarkably, the trace value can also be used to lower bound the sample complexity of non-private learning. Naively, if every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable, it implies a lower bound of  $m$  on the sample complexity. However, in Theorems 2.5 to 2.7, we begin by assuming that  $\alpha \geq \alpha_{\text{stat}}$  for the respective class of problems, i.e., any argument using Theorems 2.5 to 2.7 to lower bound sample complexity would be cyclical.

Surprisingly, if we directly use *trace value*, we can recover optimal sample complexity bounds for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and all regimes of  $(d, \alpha)$ , thus unifying traceability with private and non-private sample complexity lower bounds. While we detail the argument formally in Appendix F, we consider here a helpful example of  $\ell_2$  geometry. First, it can be shown that we always have

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) \lesssim \sqrt{d/n}$$

for arbitrary problem  $\mathcal{P}$  (see Proposition F.1). Also, we will later show that, for any  $\alpha > 0$ , there exist an  $\ell_2$  problem  $\mathcal{P}$  with

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) \gtrsim \sqrt{d}/n\alpha$$

(see Theorem 3.10). Combining the two inequalities and solving for  $n$ , we obtain  $n \gtrsim 1/\alpha^2$ , which is optimal.

### 3.2 Fingerprinting lemmas

By introducing the notion of trace value, we have reduced the problems of traceability and privacy lower bounds to the question of lower bounding the trace value. Now, we discuss the techniques to lower bound trace value. The proofs can be found in Appendix C.

**Sparse fingerprinting lemma.** For  $\ell_2$  geometry, one can lower bound trace value using the classical fingerprinting lemma in [DSSUV15]. (See [BFTG19; ADHLR24]). Intuitively, fingerprinting lemmas show that the correlation of the output of any algorithm to the unknown mean can be tightly related to the correlation to samples. While this strategy leads to traceability results in  $\ell_2$  geometry, examples of hard problems for  $\ell_p$  geometry with  $p > 2$  are those with *sparse* sets  $\mathcal{Z}$  (e.g., as in [AWBR09]). This motivates us to prove the following *sparse fingerprinting lemma*, which is another important contribution of our work. For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\text{supp}(x)$  be the set of its non-zero coordinates and denote  $\|x\|_0 = |\text{supp}(x)|$ . First, we define a family of distributions over sparse sets  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

**Definition 3.7** (Sparse distributions family). Fix  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \in [d]$  and  $\mu \in [-k/d, k/d]^d$ . Consider the mixture distribution on

$$\mathcal{Z}_k = \{z \in \{0, \pm 1\}^d : \|z\|_0 = k\}$$

given by, for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ ,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}(z) = \mathbb{E}_{J \sim \text{unif}\left(\binom{[d]}{k}\right)} [P_{\mu, k, J}(z)],$$

where

$$P_{\mu, k, J}(z) = \mathbb{1}(\text{supp}(z) = J) \cdot \prod_{j \in J} \left( \frac{1 + (d/k) \cdot \mu^j z^j}{2} \right).$$

Note that, in particular,  $\mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}} [Z] = \mu$ . Intuitively, one can think of *sampling* from  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}$  using the following procedure: (i) sample the support coordinates  $J \sim \text{unif}\left(\binom{[d]}{k}\right)$ , (ii) for each  $j \in J$ , sample  $Z^j$  from  $\{\pm 1\}$  with mean  $\frac{d}{k}\mu^j$  independently, (iii) for each  $j \notin J$ , set  $Z^j = 0$ .

With this distribution family at hand, we may state the sparse fingerprinting lemma. For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a subset  $R \subseteq [d]$  of coordinates, we use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$  to denote the inner product  $\langle x, y \rangle_R := \sum_{i \in R} x_i y_i$ . Also, for  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ , let  $\mathbf{s}\text{-beta}_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\alpha, \beta)$  be the *symmetric* beta-distribution, i.e., beta distribution with parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  scaled and shifted to have support  $[-\gamma, \gamma]$  (see Definition A.13).

**Lemma 3.8** (Sparse fingerprinting). *Fix  $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $k \in [d]$ . For each  $\mu \in [-k/d, k/d]^d$ , let  $\mathcal{Z}_k$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}$  be as in Definition 3.7. Let  $\pi = \mathbf{s}\text{-beta}_{[-k/d, k/d]}(\beta, \beta)^{\otimes d}$  be a prior and set*

$$\phi_\mu(\theta, Z) := \left\langle \theta, \left( Z - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right) \right\rangle_{\text{supp}(Z)}.$$

Then, for every learning algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with sample  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_\mu(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] = \frac{2\beta d}{k} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left\langle \mu, \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)}[\hat{\theta}] \right\rangle.$$

The key novelty of this lemma is that it provides a way to study the correlation between a learner's output and training samples on sparse sets  $\mathcal{Z}_k$ . An important and distinctive feature of this result is that the right-hand side scales by a factor of  $d/k$ , highlighting the fact that sparse problems correspond to greater trace values. Intuitively, this stems from the fact that each coordinate is *seen* fewer times by the learning algorithm, meaning it must retain more information from each training sample in order to learn accurately. Additionally, we note that for the special case  $k = d$ , the result precisely recovers the fingerprinting lemma with  $\beta$ -priors from [SU17].

**Fingerprinting for  $\ell_1$  setup.** Additionally, to prove Theorem 2.6, we will need the following fingerprinting lemma. It can be seen as a generalization of beta-fingerprinting lemma in [SU17] using the scaling matrix technique of [KLSU18; ADHLR24].

**Lemma 3.9** (Fingerprinting lemma with a scaling matrix). *Fix  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \{\pm 1\}^d$  and let  $\beta > 0$  be arbitrary. Consider arbitrary  $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ . For every  $\mu \in [-\gamma, \gamma]^d$ , let  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  be the product distribution on  $\mathcal{Z}$  with mean  $\mu$ , i.e., for every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = \prod_{k=1}^d \left( \frac{1 + z^k \mu^k}{2} \right)$$

let  $\Lambda_\mu$  be a diagonal matrix of size  $d$  where the  $i$ -th diagonal element is given by

$$\Lambda_\mu^{ii} = \frac{1 - (\mu^i/\gamma)^2}{1 - (\mu^i)^2},$$

and let  $\phi_\mu(\theta, z) = \langle \theta, \Lambda_\mu(z - \mu) \rangle$ . Let  $\pi = \mathbf{s}\text{-beta}_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\beta, \beta)^{\otimes d}$  be a prior. Then, for any algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \sum_{Z \in S_n} \phi_\mu(\hat{\theta}, Z) = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left\langle \mu, \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)}[\hat{\theta}] \right\rangle.$$

This fingerprinting lemma is handy for the following reason. To ensure the problem is hard to learn, entries of  $\mu$  typically need to inversely scale with  $\alpha$ . To achieve this, one can select small  $\gamma$  in the above to shrink the beta-prior to a smaller scale, while simultaneously having the freedom to set  $\beta$  to any value. In particular, this allows us to choose  $\beta \in \Theta(\log(d))$  in the proof of Theorem 2.6 to leverage the anti-concentration result of [SU17, Prop. 5].

### 3.3 Final steps: bounding the trace value for hard problems

Finally, we go over the construction of hard problems. To illustrate the difficulty of problem constructions, we give an example of a problem that requires many samples to learn but nevertheless is not traceable. Specifically, we consider learning over  $\ell_1$  ball with linear loss. Let

$$\Theta = \mathcal{B}_1(1), \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{\pm 1\}^d, \quad f(\theta, Z) = -\langle \theta, Z \rangle. \quad (6)$$

Consider a difficult set of distributions  $\{\mathcal{D}_i\}_{i=1}^d$  where  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is a product distribution on  $\mathcal{Z}$  and has mean  $\alpha$  on coordinate  $i$  and mean zero on all other coordinates. It can be shown this problem requires  $\Theta(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  samples to learn up to an accuracy of  $\alpha/3$ , and ERM is an optimal learner. However, after seeing  $\Theta(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , the ERM takes the value  $\hat{\theta} = e_i$  w.h.p., which is also the *population* risk minimizer. In other words, it becomes impossible to trace out any specific samples on which  $\hat{\theta}$  was trained. Intuitively, since ERM can only take  $2d$  values (at the vertices of an  $\ell_1$ -ball), it does not carry sufficient information about the training sample.

We first will give a generic construction that gives a lower bound on the trace value for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , and then present a refinement for  $p = 1$ .

**Generic construction.** As mentioned above, to obtain optimal results for  $p > 2$ , problems constructed need to be sparse, and the main subtlety in our constructions is choosing the sparsity parameter. For some  $k \in [d]$  to be chosen later, consider the following  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz problem  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$ .

$$\Theta = \mathcal{B}_\infty(d^{-1/p}), \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \{0, \pm 1\}^d : \|z\|_0 = k\}, \quad f(\theta, z) = -k^{-1/q} \langle \theta, z \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Here, the parameter space  $\Theta$  is the largest  $\ell_\infty$  ball inscribed into the unit  $\ell_p$  ball, and  $q$  is the Hölder conjugate of  $p$ , i.e.,  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . The next step is to show that  $\alpha$ -learners for the above problem must be correlated with the mean of the unknown data distribution. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a distribution with mean  $\mu$ , and suppose  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is an  $\alpha$ -learner for Equation (7). Then, we can show

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \langle \mu, \hat{\theta} \rangle \right] \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \langle \mu, \theta \rangle - k^{1/q} \cdot \alpha = d^{-1/p} \|\mu\|_1 - k^{1/q} \alpha.$$

Now, we apply the sparse fingerprinting lemma (Lemma 3.8). A key step is choosing the scale  $\beta \geq 1$  of the beta-prior. On the one hand,  $\beta$  should be small enough to guarantee  $\mathbb{E} d^{-1/p} \|\mu\|_1 > k^{1/q} \alpha$ , so that the above lower bound is non-vacuous. On the other hand, taking  $\beta$  too small decreases the sample complexity of learning the problem, thus, disallowing the desired level of recall. The optimal choice is  $\beta \propto \alpha^{-2} \cdot (k/d)^{1/p}$ , as long as this quantity is  $\geq 1$ . This choice yields

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \gtrsim \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha},$$

where  $\kappa \in \Theta(1)$ , and, for some universal constant  $c > 0$ , we let

$$\phi(\theta, Z) := \frac{cd^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \left\langle \theta, \left( Z - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right) \right\rangle_{\text{supp}(Z)}.$$

Note that the  $d^{1/p}/\sqrt{k}$  scaling ensures  $\phi$  induces a 1-subgaussian process. Finally, it remains to choose a suitable value for  $k$ , for each pair  $(p, \alpha)$ . Recall the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  from Equation (7).

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be the family of problems described in Equation (7). There exist universal constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that, for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1/6]$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following trace value lower bounds hold for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\kappa \leq c_1 \sqrt{d}$ :*

(i) *For  $p \leq 2$  and  $k = d$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha}.$$

(ii) *For  $p \geq 2$  and  $k = (6\alpha)^p d \vee 1$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \left[ \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n(6\alpha)^{p/2}} \wedge \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \right].$$

Using the reduction Theorem 3.5, the above establishes Theorems 2.5 and 2.7.

**Refinement for  $p = 1$ .** While the above construction also yields a traceability result for  $p = 1$ , it is suboptimal for the following simple reason: for  $k = d$ , the problem in Equation (7) only requires  $\Theta(1/\alpha^2)$  samples to learn, thus, it is impossible to trace out  $\Omega(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  samples. On the other hand, the problem in Equation (6) requires  $\Theta(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$  samples to learn but is not traceable. The intuition we follow here is to modify the construction in Equation (7) to make  $\Theta$  “look” more like an  $\ell_1$ -ball to drive up the sample complexity while still avoiding the counterexample with an ERM learner from the beginning of the section. In particular, we consider the following  $\ell_1$ -problem,

$$\Theta = \mathcal{B}_1(1) \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(1/s), \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{\pm 1\}^d, \quad f(\theta, z) = -\langle z, \theta \rangle, \quad (8)$$

for a suitably chosen  $s \in [d]$ . Note that, if we choose  $s \gg 1$ ,  $\Theta$  above is a polytope with much more vertices ( $2^s \binom{d}{s}$ ) than an  $\ell_1$  ball ( $2d$ ), which would intuitively force a learner like an ERM to reveal more information about the training sample. On a technical level, selecting large  $s$  improves the subgaussian constant of a tracer; however, selecting  $s$  that is too large shrinks the diameter of the set, and thus, the problem becomes easier to learn. We must trade off these two aspects, and carefully set the value of  $s$ . As it turns out, the optimal choice is  $s \propto d^{1-c}$  for any small  $c > 0$  in order to establish Theorem 2.6. The remainder of the proof is rather technical and hence is deferred to Appendix E.2.

### 3.4 Open problem: dichotomy for $p > 2$ .

We conclude the technical section by stating an intriguing open problem. We conjecture Theorem 2.9 is tight, and the dichotomy between traceability and SCO also holds for  $p > 2$ . In particular, we conjecture that the optimal DP-SCO excess risk for  $\ell_p$  with  $p > 2$  scales as

$$\min \left\{ \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}, \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)^{1/p} \right\} + \min \left\{ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\varepsilon}, \left( \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2 n^2} \right)^{1/p} \right\},$$

ignoring  $\log(1/\delta)$  factors. If the conjecture is true, we have a complete understanding of traceability in SCO. If it is false, it reveals that there is something fundamentally different about settings with  $p > 2$ , which would also significantly enrich our understanding of DP-SCO.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Mufan Li and Ziyi Liu for their comments on the drafts of this work.

## Funding

This work was completed while Sasha Voitovych was a student at the University of Toronto and supported by an Undergraduate Student Research Award from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. Mahdi Haghifam is supported by a Khoury College of Computer Sciences Distinguished Postdoctoral Fellowship. Idan Attias is supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant ECCS-2217023, through the Institute for Data, Econometrics, Algorithms, and Learning (IDEAL). Roi Livni is supported by a Google fellowship, a Vatat grant and the research has been funded, in parts, by an ERC grant (FoG - 101116258). Daniel M. Roy is supported by the funding through NSERC Discovery Grant and Canada CIFAR AI Chair at the Vector Institute.

## References

- [AWBR09] A. Agarwal, M. J. Wainwright, P. Bartlett, and P. Ravikumar. “Information-theoretic lower bounds on the oracle complexity of convex optimization”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 22 (2009).
- [ALMM19] N. Alon, R. Livni, M. Malliaris, and S. Moran. “Private PAC learning implies finite Littlestone dimension”. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2019, pp. 852–860.
- [AKL21] I. Amir, T. Koren, and R. Livni. “SGD generalizes better than GD (and regularization doesn’t help)”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 63–92.
- [ABGMU22] R. Arora, R. Bassily, C. Guzmán, M. Menart, and E. Ullah. “Differentially private generalized linear models revisited”. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), pp. 22505–22517.
- [AFKT21] H. Asi, V. Feldman, T. Koren, and K. Talwar. “Private stochastic convex optimization: Optimal rates in l1 geometry”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 393–403.
- [ADHLR24] I. Attias, G. K. Dziugaite, M. Haghifam, R. Livni, and D. M. Roy. “Information Complexity of Stochastic Convex Optimization: Applications to Generalization and Memorization”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09327* (2024).
- [BLLT20] P. L. Bartlett, P. M. Long, G. Lugosi, and A. Tsigler. “Benign overfitting in linear regression”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117.48 (2020), pp. 30063–30070.
- [BMR21] P. L. Bartlett, A. Montanari, and A. Rakhlin. “Deep learning: a statistical viewpoint”. *Acta numerica* 30 (2021), pp. 87–201.
- [BFTG19] R. Bassily, V. Feldman, K. Talwar, and A. Guha Thakurta. “Private stochastic convex optimization with optimal rates”. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [BGN21] R. Bassily, C. Guzmán, and A. Nandi. “Non-Euclidean differentially private stochastic convex optimization”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 474–499.
- [BST14] R. Bassily, A. Smith, and A. Thakurta. “Private empirical risk minimization: Efficient algorithms and tight error bounds”. In: *2014 IEEE 55th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*. IEEE. 2014, pp. 464–473.



- [Bat08] N. Batir. “Inequalities for the gamma function”. *Archiv der Mathematik* 91.6 (2008), pp. 554–563.
- [BS98] D. Boneh and J. Shaw. “Collusion-secure fingerprinting for digital data”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 44.5 (1998), pp. 1897–1905.
- [BHMZ20] O. Bousquet, S. Hanneke, S. Moran, and N. Zhivotovskiy. “Proper learning, Helly number, and an optimal SVM bound”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 582–609.
- [BBFST21] G. Brown, M. Bun, V. Feldman, A. Smith, and K. Talwar. “When is memorization of irrelevant training data necessary for high-accuracy learning?” In: *Proceedings of the 53rd annual ACM SIGACT symposium on theory of computing*. 2021, pp. 123–132.
- [BLM20] M. Bun, R. Livni, and S. Moran. “An equivalence between private classification and online prediction”. In: *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE. 2020, pp. 389–402.
- [BNSV15] M. Bun, K. Nissim, U. Stemmer, and S. Vadhan. “Differentially private release and learning of threshold functions”. In: *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE. 2015, pp. 634–649.
- [BSU17] M. Bun, T. Steinke, and J. Ullman. “Make up your mind: The price of online queries in differential privacy”. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*. SIAM. 2017, pp. 1306–1325.
- [BUV14] M. Bun, J. Ullman, and S. Vadhan. “Fingerprinting codes and the price of approximate differential privacy”. In: *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2014, pp. 1–10.
- [CWZ23] T. T. Cai, Y. Wang, and L. Zhang. “Score attack: A lower bound technique for optimal differentially private learning”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07152* (2023).
- [CCNSTT22] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis, and F. Tramer. “Membership inference attacks from first principles”. In: *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE. 2022, pp. 1897–1914.
- [CMS11] K. Chaudhuri, C. Monteleoni, and A. D. Sarwate. “Differentially private empirical risk minimization.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12.3 (2011).
- [CDK22] C. Cheng, J. Duchi, and R. Kuditipudi. “Memorize to generalize: on the necessity of interpolation in high dimensional linear regression”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 5528–5560.
- [CH67] T. Cover and P. Hart. “Nearest neighbor pattern classification”. *IEEE transactions on information theory* 13.1 (1967), pp. 21–27.
- [DMNS06] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith. “Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis”. In: *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*. Springer. 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [DSSUV15] C. Dwork, A. Smith, T. Steinke, J. Ullman, and S. Vadhan. “Robust traceability from trace amounts”. In: *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE. 2015, pp. 650–669.

- [Fel16] V. Feldman. “Generalization of ERM in Stochastic Convex Optimization: The Dimension Strikes Back”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett. Vol. 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- [Fel20] V. Feldman. “Does learning require memorization? a short tale about a long tail”. In: *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2020, pp. 954–959.
- [FKT20] V. Feldman, T. Koren, and K. Talwar. “Private stochastic convex optimization: optimal rates in linear time”. In: *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2020, pp. 439–449.
- [FS17] V. Feldman and T. Steinke. “Generalization for adaptively-chosen estimators via stable median”. In: *Conference on learning theory*. PMLR. 2017, pp. 728–757.
- [FZ20] V. Feldman and C. Zhang. “What neural networks memorize and why: Discovering the long tail via influence estimation”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 2881–2891.
- [GLLST23] S. Gopi, Y. T. Lee, D. Liu, R. Shen, and K. Tian. “Private convex optimization in general norms”. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. SIAM. 2023, pp. 5068–5089.
- [HDMR21] M. Haghifam, G. K. Dziugaite, S. Moran, and D. Roy. “Towards a unified information-theoretic framework for generalization”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 26370–26381.
- [HNKRD20] M. Haghifam, J. Negrea, A. Khisti, D. M. Roy, and G. K. Dziugaite. “Sharpened generalization bounds based on conditional mutual information and an application to noisy, iterative algorithms”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 9925–9935.
- [HRTSMK23] M. Haghifam, B. Rodríguez-Gálvez, R. Thobaben, M. Skoglund, D. M. Roy, and G. Karolina Dziugaite. “Limitations of Information-Theoretic Generalization Bounds for Gradient Descent Methods in Stochastic Convex Optimization”. In: *Proceedings of The 34th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*. Vol. 201. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2023, pp. 663–706.
- [HRS16] M. Hardt, B. Recht, and Y. Singer. “Train faster, generalize better: Stability of stochastic gradient descent”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2016, pp. 1225–1234.
- [HSRDTMPSNC08] N. Homer, S. Szelinger, M. Redman, D. Duggan, W. Tembe, J. Muehling, J. V. Pearson, D. A. Stephan, S. F. Nelson, and D. W. Craig. “Resolving individuals contributing trace amounts of DNA to highly complex mixtures using high-density SNP genotyping microarrays”. *PLoS genetics* 4.8 (2008), e1000167.
- [KOV17] P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath. “The Composition Theorem for Differential Privacy”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 63.6 (2017), pp. 4037–4049.

- [KLSU18] G. Kamath, J. Li, V. Singhal, and J. Ullman. “Privately Learning High-Dimensional Distributions”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.00216* (2018).
- [KLSU19] G. Kamath, J. Li, V. Singhal, and J. Ullman. “Privately learning high-dimensional distributions”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2019, pp. 1853–1902.
- [KMS22] G. Kamath, A. Mouzakis, and V. Singhal. “New lower bounds for private estimation and a generalized fingerprinting lemma”. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), pp. 24405–24418.
- [LLL24] Y. T. Lee, D. Liu, and Z. Lu. *The Power of Sampling: Dimension-free Risk Bounds in Private ERM*. 2024. arXiv: [2105.13637](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.13637) [cs.LG].
- [LW86] N. Littlestone and M. Warmuth. “Relating data compression and learnability” (1986).
- [Liv24] R. Livni. “Information theoretic lower bounds for information theoretic upper bounds”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [MY16] S. Moran and A. Yehudayoff. “Sample compression schemes for VC classes”. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 63.3 (2016), pp. 1–10.
- [NY83] A. S. Nemirovskij and D. B. Yudin. “Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization” (1983).
- [PTU24] N. Peter, E. Tsfadia, and J. Ullman. “Smooth lower bounds for differentially private algorithms via padding-and-permuting fingerprinting codes”. In: *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2024, pp. 4207–4239.
- [SDSOJ19] A. Sablayrolles, M. Douze, C. Schmid, Y. Ollivier, and H. Jégou. “White-box vs black-box: Bayes optimal strategies for membership inference”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2019, pp. 5558–5567.
- [SSSS09] S. Shalev-Shwartz, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, and K. Sridharan. “Stochastic Convex Optimization.” In: *COLT*. Vol. 2. 4. 2009, p. 5.
- [SSSS17] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov. “Membership inference attacks against machine learning models”. In: *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 3–18.
- [ST10] K. Sridharan and A. Tewari. “Convex Games in Banach Spaces”. In: *COLT*. 2010, pp. 1–13.
- [SU17] T. Steinke and J. Ullman. “Tight lower bounds for differentially private selection”. In: *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 552–563.
- [SZ20] T. Steinke and L. Zakyntinou. “Reasoning about generalization via conditional mutual information”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 3437–3452.
- [Ste16] T. A. Steinke. “Upper and lower bounds for privacy and adaptivity in algorithmic data analysis”. PhD thesis. 2016.
- [Ull13] J. Ullman. “Answering  $n \{2+ o(1)\}$  counting queries with differential privacy is hard”. In: *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2013, pp. 361–370.

- [Ver18] R. Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. Vol. 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [Wai19] M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*. Vol. 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [ZBHRV21] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals. “Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization”. *Communications of the ACM* 64.3 (2021), pp. 107–115.

# Appendix Contents

<b>A</b>	<b>Additional preliminaries</b>	<b>22</b>
A.1	Background on SCO . . . . .	22
A.2	Differential Privacy . . . . .	23
A.3	Concentration inequalities . . . . .	23
A.4	Beta distributions . . . . .	25
<b>B</b>	<b>Proofs from Section 3.1</b>	<b>26</b>
B.1	Proof of Lemma 3.4 . . . . .	26
B.2	Proof of Theorem 3.5 . . . . .	28
B.3	Proof of Theorem 3.6 . . . . .	30
<b>C</b>	<b>Proofs of fingerprinting lemmas (Section 3.2)</b>	<b>31</b>
C.1	Proof of Lemma 3.8 . . . . .	31
C.2	Proof of Lemma 3.9 . . . . .	32
<b>D</b>	<b>Hard problem constructions and proofs of trace value lower bounds</b>	<b>35</b>
D.1	Proofs for $\ell_p$ -geometries (Theorem 3.10) . . . . .	35
D.2	Proofs for $\ell_1$ -geometry . . . . .	38
<b>E</b>	<b>Proofs of the main results (Section 2.2)</b>	<b>41</b>
E.1	Proof of Theorem 2.5 . . . . .	41
E.2	Proof of Theorem 2.6 . . . . .	42
E.3	Proof of Theorem 2.7 . . . . .	43
E.4	Proof of Theorem 2.9 . . . . .	44
<b>F</b>	<b>Connection between trace value and non-private sample complexity</b>	<b>45</b>
F.1	Lower bounds for $p \in (1, \infty)$ . . . . .	45
F.2	Lower bounds for $p = 1$ . . . . .	48
<b>G</b>	<b>Traceability of VC classes (Section 1.1.3)</b>	<b>51</b>

## A Additional preliminaries

### A.1 Background on SCO

The next proposition summarizes the known minimax rates for learning SCO problems in general geometries. A proof can be found in [NY83; AWBR09; ST10].

**Theorem A.1.** Fix  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n)$  be the minimax error rate of learning  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded problems, as defined in Equation (1). Then,

1. For  $p = 1$ , we have

$$\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} \right).$$

2. For  $1 < p \leq 2$ , we have

$$\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} \wedge \frac{1}{(p-1)\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

3. For  $2 \leq p < \infty$ , we have

$$\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} \wedge \frac{1}{n^{1/p}} \right)$$

4. For  $p = \infty$ , we have

$$\alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} \right).$$

*Remark A.2.* Notice that, in the overparameterized regime ( $d \geq n$ ), the minimax error for  $p \geq 2$  is  $\Theta\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/p}\right)$  which is dimension-independent. This shows that for  $d \geq n$ , in all geometries except  $p = \{1, \infty\}$ , the minimax error is dimension-free.  $\triangleleft$

This proposition implies the following corollary on the minimum number of samples required for  $\alpha$ -learners.

**Corollary A.3.** Fix  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . Let  $N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n)$  be the sample complexity of learning problems  $\mathcal{L}_p^d$  up to error  $\alpha$ , i.e.,

$$N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) = \min \left\{ n : \alpha_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \leq \alpha \right\}.$$

Then,

1. For  $p = 1$ , we have

$$N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2} \right).$$

2. For  $1 < p \leq 2$ , we have

$$N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2} \wedge \frac{1}{((p-1)\alpha)^2} \right).$$

3. For  $2 \leq p < \infty$ , we have

$$N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \frac{d^{1-2/p}}{\alpha^2} \wedge \frac{1}{\alpha^p} \right).$$

4. For  $p = 1$ , we have

$$N_{\text{stat}}(\mathcal{L}_p^d, n) \in \Theta \left( \frac{d}{\alpha^2} \right).$$

## A.2 Differential Privacy

**Definition A.4.** Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta \in [0, 1)$ . A randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{A}_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\Theta)$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP, iff, for every two neighboring datasets  $S_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$  and  $S'_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$  (that is,  $S_n, S'_n$  differ in one element), and for every measurable subset  $M \subseteq \Theta$ , it holds

$$\Pr_{\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)}(\hat{\theta} \in M) \leq e^\varepsilon \cdot \Pr_{\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S'_n)}(\hat{\theta} \in M) + \delta.$$

Algorithms that satisfy DP are not traceable in the sense of Definition 2.4 [KOV17]. The following simple proposition formalizes this observation.

**Proposition A.5.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP algorithm. Then, if  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable, it holds that

$$m \leq n \exp(\varepsilon)\xi + n\delta.$$

## A.3 Concentration inequalities

First, we collect lemmata on the subgaussian norm, introduced in Section 3.1, which we use to derive concentration inequalities. The following is Equation (2.14) in [Ver18], and shows that a bound on subgaussian norm immediately leads to concentration inequalities.

**Lemma A.6** (Subgaussian concentration). *There exists a universal constant  $C$  such that the following holds for every random variable  $X$  with  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$ : for every  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\Pr[|X| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{ct^2}{\|X\|_{\psi_2}^2}\right)$$

The subgaussian norm behaves nicely under the summation of independent random variables. The following is Proposition 2.6.1 in [Ver18].

**Lemma A.7** (Sum of subgaussian variables). *Let  $C > 0$  be a universal constant. Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be a collection of arbitrary independent real random variables. Then,*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_{\psi_2}^2.$$

Subgaussian norm also behaves nicely under mixtures. In particular, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition A.8** (Subgaussian mixtures). *Let  $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  be  $\sigma$ -subgaussian random variables, and let  $\pi$  be a distribution over the index set  $A$ . Then, a mixture of  $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  under  $\alpha \sim \pi$  is also  $\sigma$ -subgaussian.*

*Proof.* Let  $Y$  be such mixture. Then, for any  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(Y^2/t^2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}[\exp(X_\alpha^2/t^2)].$$

Plugging in  $t = \sigma$  into above, and using that  $\|X_\alpha\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$  for all  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(Y^2/\sigma^2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}[\exp(X_\alpha^2/t^2)] \leq 2,$$

i.e.,  $\|Y\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$ , as desired.  $\square$

It is well-known that bounded random variables are subgaussian (Equation (2.17) of [Ver18]).

**Proposition A.9.** *Suppose  $X$  is a random variable such that  $X \in [-b, b]$  almost surely. Then,*

$$\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq Cb,$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

We will heavily use the following result for the supremum of subgaussian processes (which follows from [Ver18, Theorem 8.1.6]). Let  $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)$  denote the covering number of  $\Theta$  in norm  $\|\cdot\|$  at scale  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Proposition A.10.** *Let  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  be a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t. a metric space  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$  as per Definition 3.1, and further assume that  $\Theta$  is contained in the unit ball of  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $t \geq 0$  be arbitrary. Then, with probability at least  $1 - 4\exp(-t^2)$*

$$\sup_{\theta} X_\theta \leq C\sigma \left[ \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right],$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ . Using Theorem 8.1.6 [Ver18], we obtain the following bound for the increment of the subgaussian process  $\{X_\theta\}$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta - X_{\theta_0}| \leq C\sigma \left( \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \right] \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t^2).$$

First, note that for  $\varepsilon \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon) = 1$ , since  $\Theta$  lies in the unit ball of  $\|\cdot\|$ . Thus,

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta - X_{\theta_0}| \leq C\sigma \left( \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \right] \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t^2). \quad (9)$$

Note that, by triangle inequality, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta - X_{\theta_0}| \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta| - X_{\theta_0}. \quad (10)$$

Since  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  satisfies Definition 3.1, we have

$$\|X_{\theta_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq 2\sigma.$$

From Lemma A.6, we then have

$$\Pr [|X_{\theta_0}| \leq c\sigma t] \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t^2),$$



for some constant  $c > 0$ . Combining this with Equation (10) and taking a union bound with Equation (9), we get

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta| \leq C' \sigma \left( \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \right] \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-t^2),$$

for some absolute constant  $C' > 0$ . □

The following lemma is an anti-concentration inequality based on Paley–Zygmund inequality. It shows that if the sum of variables is large, one can conclude that many of them are large given an appropriate control over their sum of squares. It is given as Lemma A.4 in [ADHLR24], and it is also similar to Lemma 25 in [DSSUV15].

**Lemma A.11.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $A_1 := \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i$  and  $A_2 := \sum_{i \in [n]} (a_i)^2$ . Then, for every  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $|\{i \in [n] : a_i \geq \beta/n\}| \geq \frac{(\max\{A_1 - \beta, 0\})^2}{A_2}$ .*

#### A.4 Beta distributions

Next definitions are the versions of beta distributions that we use in this paper. Recall that, classically, beta distribution is supported on  $[0, 1]$ . However, in our results, it is convenient to consider the rescaled and centered variants.

**Definition A.12.** Fix  $\beta > 0$ . A (symmetric) beta distribution denoted by **s-beta**  $(\beta, \beta)$  is a continuous distribution, such that, if  $X \sim \mathbf{s}\text{-beta}(\beta, \beta)$ , then, for every  $a \in [-1, 1]$ , we have

$$\Pr(X \leq a) = \int_{-1}^a \frac{(1 - x^2)^{\beta-1}}{B(\beta)} dx,$$

where  $B(\beta) = 2^{2\beta-1} \Gamma(\beta)^2 / \Gamma(2\beta)$ .

**Definition A.13.** Fix  $\beta > 0$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ . We define rescaled (symmetric) beta distribution, denoted by **s-beta** $_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\beta, \beta)$ , where for  $a \in [-\gamma, \gamma]$ , its distribution is given by

$$\Pr(X \leq a) = \frac{1}{\gamma B(\beta)} \int_{-\gamma}^a \left( 1 - \left( \frac{x}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta-1} dx,$$

where  $B(\beta) = 2^{2\beta-1} \Gamma(\beta)^2 / \Gamma(2\beta)$ .

We have the following result on the first moment of the beta distribution.

**Lemma A.14.** *Fix  $\beta > 0$ . Let  $X \sim \mathbf{s}\text{-beta}(\beta, \beta)$  where  $\beta \geq 1$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}|X| \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\beta}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $B(\beta) = 2^{2\beta-1} \Gamma(\beta)^2 / \Gamma(2\beta)$  be the normalization constant. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X| &= \frac{1}{B(\beta)} \int_{-1}^1 |x| (1 - x^2)^{\beta-1} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{B(\beta)} \int_0^1 2x (1 - x^2)^{\beta-1} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta \cdot B(\beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to upper bound  $B(\beta)$ . It follows from Theorem 1.5 of [Bat08] that, for any  $x \geq 1$ , we have

$$a \left( \frac{x-1/2}{e} \right)^{x-1/2} \leq \Gamma(x) \leq b \left( \frac{x-1/2}{e} \right)^{x-1/2},$$

where  $a = \sqrt{2e}$  and  $b = \sqrt{2\pi}$  are absolute constants. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} B(\beta) &= \frac{2^{2\beta-1} \Gamma(\beta)^2}{\Gamma(2\beta)} \leq \frac{2^{2\beta-1} b^2 \left( \frac{\beta-1/2}{e} \right)^{2\beta-1}}{a \left( \frac{2\beta-1/2}{e} \right)^{2\beta-1/2}} \\ &= \frac{b^2 \sqrt{e}}{a} (2\beta-1/2)^{-1/2} \left( \frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta-1/2} \right)^{2\beta-1} \\ &\leq \frac{b^2 \sqrt{e}}{a} (2\beta-1/2)^{-1/2} \\ &= \frac{2\pi \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2e}} (2\beta-1/2)^{-1/2} \\ &= \pi (\beta-1/4)^{-1/2} \\ &\leq \pi \left( \frac{3}{4\beta} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used  $\beta-1/4 \geq \frac{3}{4}\beta$  which holds as  $\beta \geq 1$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}|X| \geq \frac{1}{\pi(3/4)^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\beta}},$$

as desired.  $\square$

Since the density of the rescaled beta distribution is homogeneous w.r.t.  $\gamma$ , we have the following result.

**Corollary A.15.** *Fix  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ . Let  $X \sim \text{s-beta}_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\beta, \beta)$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}|X| \geq \frac{\gamma}{3\sqrt{\beta}}.$$

## B Proofs from Section 3.1

### B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.4

We first prove a slightly more general concentration statement to bound the supremum in Lemma 3.4, which will be useful to reuse in other proofs. Let  $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)$  denote the size of the minimal cover of  $\Theta$  in norm  $\|\cdot\|$  at scale  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, the more general statement is given below.

**Lemma B.1.** *Fix  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a subset of a unit ball in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $\phi: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  be such that, as  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$  and for every  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\phi(\theta, Z)] = 0$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . Then, there exist a universal constant  $C > 0$ , such that for every  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} \leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \right] \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-t^2).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi_\theta$  denote the following random vector

$$\Phi_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} \phi(\theta, Z_1) \\ \vdots \\ \phi(\theta, Z_n) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, observe that, the desired quantity is equal to

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\Phi_\theta\|_2 = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle.$$

Then,  $\langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle$  can be seen to be a random process parameterized by a pair  $(x, \theta)$ . We will show that it is, in fact, a subgaussian process. Indeed, note that, by triangle inequality,

$$\|\langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle - \langle x', \Phi_{\theta'} \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq \|\langle x - x', \Phi_\theta \rangle\|_{\psi_2} + \|\langle x', \Phi_\theta - \Phi_{\theta'} \rangle\|_{\psi_2}. \quad (11)$$

Since  $\Phi_\theta^i$  is  $\sigma$ -subgaussian for each  $i$ , we have by Lemma A.7,

$$\|\langle x - x', \Phi_\theta \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma \|x - x'\|_2,$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ . Now, for every  $i$ ,  $(\Phi_\theta - \Phi_{\theta'})^i$  is  $\sigma \|\theta - \theta'\|$ -subgaussian. Therefore, by Lemma A.7, we have

$$\|\langle x', \Phi_\theta - \Phi_{\theta'} \rangle\|_{\psi_2} = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (x')^i (\Phi_\theta^i - \Phi_{\theta'}^i) \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma \|\theta - \theta'\|.$$

Combining the two inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle - \langle x', \Phi_{\theta'} \rangle\|_{\psi_2} &\leq C\sigma \|\theta - \theta'\| + C\sigma \|x - x'\|_2 \\ &= 2C\sigma \cdot \frac{1}{2} [\|\theta - \theta'\| + \|x - x'\|_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle$  is  $(2C\sigma)$ -subgaussian process w.r.t the norm  $\gamma$ , defined as

$$\gamma((x, \theta)) := \frac{1}{2} [\|x\|_2 + \|\theta\|].$$

Moreover, we can see that  $\Theta \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is a subset of a unit ball in  $\gamma$ . By definition of  $\gamma$ , we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \Theta; \gamma, \varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}; \|\cdot\|_2, \varepsilon) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon). \quad (12)$$

Then, using Proposition A.10, we have, for some constant  $K > 0$ , that with probability  $1 - 4\exp(-t^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta} \|\Phi_\theta\|_2 &\leq K\sigma \left[ \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}; \gamma, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right] \\ &\leq K\sigma \left[ \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}; \|\cdot\|_2, \varepsilon) + \log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K\sigma \left[ \int_0^1 \sqrt{n \log \left(1 + \frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)} d\varepsilon + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right] \\ &\leq K'\sigma \left[ \sqrt{n} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right], \end{aligned}$$

as desired, where in (a) we used Example 5.8 from [Wai19], and  $K' > 0$  is some other universal constant.  $\square$

Using Example 5.8 from [Wai19] once again to upper bound  $\sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)}$ , we have the proof of Lemma 3.4.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Fix  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a subset of a unit ball in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $\phi: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  be such that, as  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . Then, there exists a universal constant  $C > 0$ , such that*

$$\Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} \leq C\sigma (\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{d} + t) \right] \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-t^2), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* From Example 5.8 in [Wai19], we have

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon) \leq d \log \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Plugging this into the result of Lemma B.1, with probability at least  $1 - 4 \exp(-t^2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} &\leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \\ &\leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{d \log \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \\ &\leq C'\sigma (\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{d} + t), \end{aligned}$$

for some other universal constant  $C' > 0$ . □

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.5

**Theorem 3.5.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$ . Let  $T = \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, for some constant  $c > 0$ , every  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with*

$$\xi = \exp(-cT^2), \quad m = c \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n + d} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n + d)} \right].$$

*Proof.* We set

$$\lambda := \frac{T}{2}$$

First, we show that the FPR condition holds. Since  $Z$  and  $\hat{\theta}$  are independent, and using the subgaussian nature of  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z)$ , we have by Lemma A.6

$$\Pr_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} [\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z) \geq \lambda] \leq \exp(-c\lambda^2) \leq \exp(-cT^2/4),$$

where  $c > 0$  is some constant. For recall, let's define the set  $\mathcal{I}$  as follows

$$\mathcal{I} = \{i \in [n]: \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \geq \lambda\}.$$

Using Lemma A.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{I}|] &= \mathbb{E}\left|\{i \in [n]: \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \geq \lambda\}\right| \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i)^2}\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{\sup_{\theta} \|\{\phi(\theta, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n\|_2^2}\right],\end{aligned}$$

where for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ . Then, Lemma 3.4 tells us that, for  $t := \sqrt{n+d}$ , we have with probability  $1 - 4\exp(-t^2)$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left[ \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_1), \dots, \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_n) \right]^\top \right\|_2^2 \leq C(n+d),$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ . Thus,

$$\Pr \left[ \mathcal{E} := \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left[ \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_1), \dots, \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_n) \right]^\top \right\|_2^2 \leq C(n+d) \right\} \right] \geq 1 - 4\exp(-t^2).$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{I}| &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{\sup_{\theta} \|\{\phi(\theta, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n\|_2^2}\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{\sup_{\theta} \|\{\phi(\theta, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n\|_2^2} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E})\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E})\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{C(n+d)}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}^c)\right].\end{aligned}$$

We know that, almost surely,

$$\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z)^2 \leq \kappa^2.$$

Thus, almost surely,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - \lambda)_+\right)^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i)^2 \leq \kappa^2 n^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda\right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}^c)\right] &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}^c] \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 n^2}{C(n+d)} \\ &\leq \frac{4\kappa^2 n}{C \exp(n+d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|Z|] &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda \right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda \right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}^c) \right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda \right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} \right] - \frac{4\kappa^2 n}{C \exp(n+d)} \\
&\geq^{(a)} \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - n\lambda \right)_+^2}{C(n+d)} - \frac{4\kappa^2 n}{C \exp(n+d)} \\
&\geq \frac{n^2 T^2 / 4}{C(n+d)} - \frac{4\kappa^2 n}{C \exp(n+d)} \\
&= c \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n+d} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n+d)} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows by Jensen's inequality and  $c = 1/4C$ .  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.6

**Theorem 3.6.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$ , such that the following holds. Fix  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $T = \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of problem  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, for any  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , we have  $\exp(\varepsilon) - 1 \geq c(T - 2\delta\kappa)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider an arbitrary distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  and a function  $\phi$  s.t.  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a 1-subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$  and  $|\phi| \leq \kappa$  almost surely. Consider a sample  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  and let  $Z_0$  be a freshly sampled point; let  $S_n^{(i)}$  be a sample with  $Z_i$  substituted by  $Z_0$ . Let  $\hat{\theta}$  be a learner trained on  $S_n$  and  $\hat{\theta}^{(i)}$  be a learner trained on  $S_n^{(i)}$ . Then, since  $\hat{\theta}$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP and noting that  $\phi(\theta, Z)$  is supported on  $[-\kappa, \kappa]$ , we may apply Lemma A.1 of [FS17] and get

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) - \mathbb{E} \phi(\hat{\theta}^{(i)}, Z_i) \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \phi(\hat{\theta}^{(i)}, Z_i) \right| (\exp(\varepsilon) - 1) + 2\delta\kappa.$$

By independence of  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $Z_i$ , we conclude that  $\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i)$  is 1-subgaussian random variable. It is well-known that  $\mathbb{E}|X| \leq C\sigma$  if  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -subgaussian for some constant  $C$  (see part (ii) of Proposition 2.5.2 of [Ver18] for  $p = 1$ ), thus the above gives

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right| \leq C(\exp(\varepsilon) - 1) + 2\delta\kappa.$$

Then, for any  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\phi$  we get that,

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \leq C(\exp(\varepsilon) - 1) + 2\delta\kappa.$$

Thus,

$$T \leq C(\exp(\varepsilon) - 1) + 2\delta\kappa,$$

which, after rearranging, implies the desired result.  $\square$

## C Proofs of fingerprinting lemmas (Section 3.2)

### C.1 Proof of Lemma 3.8

**Lemma 3.8** (Sparse fingerprinting). *Fix  $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $k \in [d]$ . For each  $\mu \in [-k/d, k/d]^d$ , let  $\mathcal{Z}_k$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}$  be as in Definition 3.7. Let  $\pi = \text{s-beta}_{[-k/d, k/d]}(\beta, \beta)^{\otimes d}$  be a prior and set*

$$\phi_\mu(\theta, Z) := \left\langle \theta, \left( Z - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right) \right\rangle_{\text{supp}(Z)}.$$

Then, for every learning algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with sample  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_\mu(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] = \frac{2\beta d}{k} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left\langle \mu, \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)}[\hat{\theta}] \right\rangle.$$

*Proof.* For each  $j \in [d]$ , let  $\mathcal{I}_j := \{i \in [n] : Z_i^j \neq 0\}$  as the index of the training points such that their  $j$ -th coordinate is non-zero. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_\mu(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} \left( (\hat{\theta})^j \left( Z_i^j - \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right) \right) \right] \quad (13)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} (\hat{\theta})^j \left( Z_i^j - \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right) \right]. \quad (14)$$

Then, define the following function

$$g^j(\mu^j) := \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\theta})^j \mid \{\mathcal{I}_r\}_{r \in [d]}, \{Z_i^m\}_{m \neq j, i \in [n]} \right].$$

We claim

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} (\hat{\theta})^j \cdot \left( Z_i^j - \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right) \mid \{\mathcal{I}_r\}_{r \in [d]}, \{Z_i^m\}_{m \neq j, i \in [n]} \right] = \frac{k}{d} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right)^2 \right) \frac{d}{d\mu^j} g^j(\mu^j). \quad (15)$$

The proof is based on the following two observations: 1) conditioned on  $\{Z_i^m\}_{m \neq j, i \in [n]}$ ,  $\hat{\theta}$  is a function of  $\{Z_i^j\}_{i \in [n]}$ , 2) conditioned on  $\{\mathcal{I}_r\}_{r \in [d]}$  the non-zero elements in  $\{Z_i^j\}_{i \in [n]}$  are sampled i.i.d from  $\{\pm 1\}$  with mean  $\frac{d}{k} \mu^j$ . Then, based on these observations Equation (15) follows as an straightforward application of [Ste16, Lemma 4.3.7].

Recall the definition of  $\pi$  and notice that  $\pi$  is a product measure. Let  $\pi^j$  be the distribution on the

$j$ -th coordinate. By the definition of the prior distribution, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu^j \sim \pi^j} \left[ \frac{k}{d} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right)^2 \right) \frac{d}{d\mu^j} g^j(\mu^j) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{C} \int_{-\frac{k}{d}}^{+\frac{k}{d}} \frac{k}{d} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} v \right)^2 \right) \frac{d}{dv} g^j(v) \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} v \right)^2 \right)^{\beta-1} dv \\
&= \frac{1}{C} \int_{-\frac{k}{d}}^{+\frac{k}{d}} \frac{k}{d} \frac{d}{d\mu^j} g^j(v) \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} v \right)^2 \right)^{\beta} dv \\
&= \frac{2}{C} \int_{-\frac{k}{d}}^{+\frac{k}{d}} \frac{d}{k} \beta v \left( 1 - \left( \frac{d}{k} v \right)^2 \right)^{\beta-1} g^j(v) dv \\
&= 2\beta \frac{d}{k} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^j \sim \pi^j} \left[ g^j(\mu^j) \mu^j \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{\mu}(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} (\hat{\theta})^j \left( Z_i^j - \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} (\hat{\theta})^j \left( Z_i^j - \frac{d}{k} \mu^j \right) \mid \{\mathcal{I}_r\}_{r \in [d]}, \{Z_i^m\}_{m \neq j, i \in [n]} \right] \right] \\
&= 2\beta \frac{d}{k} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ g^j(\mu^j) \cdot \mu^j \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follow from Equations (15) and (16). Then, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ g^j(\mu^j) \cdot \mu^j \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\theta})^j \cdot \mu^j \mid \{\mathcal{I}_r\}_{r \in [d]}, \{Z_i^m\}_{m \neq j, i \in [n]} \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\theta})^j \cdot \mu^j \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the definition of inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$2\beta \frac{d}{k} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ g^j(\mu^j) \cdot \mu^j \right] = 2\beta \frac{d}{k} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \hat{\theta}, \mu \rangle \right],$$

as was to be shown. □

## C.2 Proof of Lemma 3.9

Before we proceed with the proof, we state the necessary lemmata. Throughout this section, for a real number  $p \in [-1, 1]$ , we will write  $X \sim p$  to denote the fact that  $X$  is a random variable on  $\{\pm 1\}$  with mean  $p$ . The following is a classical fingerprinting result.

**Lemma C.1** (Lemma 5 of [DSSUV15]). *Let  $f: \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be arbitrary. Define  $g: [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by*

$$g(p) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} [f(X)].$$



Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} \left[ f(X) \sum_{i \in [n]} (X_i - p) \right] = (1 - p^2)g'(p).$$

Armed with the above result, we proceed to the proof of Lemma 3.9. We will first prove a *per-coordinate version* of Lemma 3.9. We make a note that the proofs combine techniques for beta-fingerprinting results of [SU17] and the scaling matrix technique of [KLSU19; ADHLR24].

**Lemma C.2** (Per-coordinate version of Lemma 3.9). *Let  $f: \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be arbitrary. Let  $\pi = \text{s-beta}_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\beta, \beta)$  be a prior distribution. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} \left[ \frac{1 - (p/\gamma)^2}{1 - p^2} f(X) \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - p) \right] = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} [p \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} f(X)].$$

*Proof.* Let

$$g(p) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} [f(X)].$$

Then, by Lemma C.1, we have for any  $p \in [-1, 1]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} \left[ \frac{1 - (p/\gamma)^2}{1 - p^2} f(X) \sum_{i \in [n]} (X_i - p) \right] = \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right) g'(p).$$

Recalling the definition of scaled symmetric beta distribution from Definition A.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim p^{\otimes n}} \left[ \frac{1 - (p/\gamma)^2}{1 - p^2} f(X) \sum_{i \in [n]} (X_i - p) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} \left[ \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right) g'(p) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma B(\beta)} \int_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right) g'(p) dp \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma B(\beta)} \int_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta} g'(p) dp \\ &= \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{\gamma B(\beta)} \left[ \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta} g(p) \Big|_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} - \int_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} \left( \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta} \right)' g(p) dp \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma B(\beta)} \left[ \int_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{p}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \frac{2\beta p}{\gamma^2} g(p) dp \right] \\ &= \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \pi} [p \cdot g(p)], \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used integration by parts. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Applying the above results to each coordinate and summing the equalities gives Lemma 3.9.

**Lemma 3.9** (Fingerprinting lemma with a scaling matrix). *Fix  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \{\pm 1\}^d$  and let  $\beta > 0$  be arbitrary. Consider arbitrary  $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ . For every  $\mu \in [-\gamma, \gamma]^d$ , let  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  be the product distribution on  $\mathcal{Z}$  with mean  $\mu$ , i.e., for every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = \prod_{k=1}^d \left( \frac{1 + z^k \mu^k}{2} \right)$$

let  $\Lambda_\mu$  be a diagonal matrix of size  $d$  where the  $i$ -th diagonal element is given by

$$\Lambda_\mu^{ii} = \frac{1 - (\mu^i/\gamma)^2}{1 - (\mu^i)^2},$$

and let  $\phi_\mu(\theta, z) = \langle \theta, \Lambda_\mu(z - \mu) \rangle$ . Let  $\pi = \mathbf{s}\text{-beta}_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(\beta, \beta)^{\otimes d}$  be a prior. Then, for any algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \sum_{Z \in S_n} \phi_\mu(\hat{\theta}, Z) = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left\langle \mu, \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} [\hat{\theta}] \right\rangle.$$

*Proof.* For a sample  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  and  $j \in [d]$ , we will use  $S_n^j \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to denote a vector  $(Z_1^j, \dots, Z_n^j)$  of  $j^{\text{th}}$  coordinates. For each coordinate  $j \in [d]$ , let  $f_j : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the function such that

$$f_j(S_n^j) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} [\hat{\theta}^j \mid S_n^j]$$

In other words,  $f_j(X)$  is the expected value of  $\theta^j$ , given that  $j^{\text{th}}$  coordinates of samples in  $S_n$  are given by  $X$ . Applying the result of Lemma 3.9 to  $f_j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^j \sim \pi^j} \mathbb{E}_{S_n^j \sim (\mu^j)^{\otimes n}} \left[ \Lambda_\mu^{jj} \cdot f_j(S_n^j) \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i^j - \mu^j) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\mu^j \sim \pi^j} \mathbb{E}_{S_n^j \sim (\mu^j)^{\otimes n}} \left[ \frac{1 - (\mu^j/\gamma)^2}{1 - (\mu^j)^2} f_j(S_n^j) \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i^j - \mu^j) \right] \\ = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^j \sim \pi^j} \left[ \mu^j \cdot \mathbb{E}_{S_n^j \sim (\mu^j)^{\otimes n}} f_j(S_n^j) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the law of total expectation, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \Lambda_\mu^{jj} \cdot \hat{\theta}^j \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i^j - \mu^j) \right] = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left[ \mu^j \cdot \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \hat{\theta}^j \right].$$

Finally, summing the above over all coordinates  $j \in [d]$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \left\langle \Lambda_\mu \hat{\theta}, \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \mu) \right\rangle \right] = \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left[ \left\langle \mu, \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_\mu^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \hat{\theta} \right\rangle \right],$$

as desired.  $\square$

## D Hard problem constructions and proofs of trace value lower bounds

### D.1 Proofs for $\ell_p$ -geometries (Theorem 3.10)

First, recall here the construction of the hard problems  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  in Equation (7), parameterized by  $k \in [d]$

$$\Theta = \mathcal{B}_\infty(d^{-1/p}), \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \{0, \pm 1\}^d : \|z\|_0 = k\}, \quad f(\theta, z) = -k^{-1/q} \langle \theta, z \rangle. \quad (\mathcal{P}_{k,p})$$

First, we show in the simple proposition below that  $\alpha$ -learners for linear problems must agree with the distribution mean.

**Proposition D.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be an  $\alpha$ -learner for  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  be a distribution with mean  $\mu = \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}}[Z]$ . Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \langle \mu, \hat{\theta} \rangle \right] \geq d^{-1/p} \|\mu\|_1 - k^{1/q} \alpha.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is an  $\alpha$ -learner, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ F_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\theta}) \right] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} F_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ f(\hat{\theta}, Z) \right] - \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} f(\theta, Z) \\ &= k^{-1/q} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} \langle \theta, Z \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mathcal{D}} \langle \hat{\theta}, Z \rangle \right] \\ &= k^{-1/q} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \langle \theta, \mu \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \langle \hat{\theta}, \mu \rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

which, after rearranging, becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \langle \mu, \hat{\theta} \rangle \right] &\geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \langle \mu, \theta \rangle - k^{1/q} \cdot \alpha \\ &= d^{-1/p} \|\mu\|_1 - k^{1/q} \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last transition we used duality of  $\ell_\infty$  and  $\ell_1$  norms and the fact that  $\Theta = \mathcal{B}_\infty(d^{-1/p})$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

In the next lemma, we show that every  $\alpha$ -learner for  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  needs to have a large correlation with the training samples in order to achieve small excess risk. The proof is an application of Lemma 3.8 combined with Proposition D.1.

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $\alpha \leq 1/6$ , and suppose  $k \in [d]$  is such that  $k \geq (6\alpha)^p d$ . Then, for every  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$  for  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$ , there exists  $\mu \in [-k/d, k/d]^d$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z}_k)$  with mean  $\mu$  such that the following holds: let*

$$\phi(\theta, Z) := \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \left\langle \theta, \left( Z - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right) \right\rangle_{\text{supp}(Z)},$$

then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{18k^{1/2-1/p}\alpha}$$

*Proof.* Let

$$\beta = \left( \frac{k^{1/p}}{6d^{1/p}\alpha} \right)^2 \geq 1,$$

and  $\pi = \text{s-beta}_{[-k/d, k/d]}(\beta, \beta)$ . Then, using Corollary A.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} [\|\mu\|_1] &= d \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} |\mu^1| \\ &\geq d \cdot \frac{k/d}{3\sqrt{\beta}} \\ &= \frac{k}{3(k^{1/p}/6d^{1/p}\alpha)} \\ &= 2\alpha d^{1/p} k^{1-1/p} \\ &= 2\alpha d^{1/p} k^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using Lemma 3.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \hat{\theta}, \left( Z_i - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right)_{\text{supp}(Z_i)} \right\rangle &= \frac{2d\beta}{k} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \langle \mu, \hat{\theta} \rangle \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{2d\beta}{k} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left[ d^{-1/p} \|\mu\|_1 - k^{1/q} \alpha \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{2d\beta}{k} \left[ d^{-1/p} \cdot 2\alpha d^{1/p} k^{1/q} - k^{1/q} \alpha \right] \\ &= \frac{2d}{k} \cdot \left( \frac{k^{1/p}}{6d^{1/p}\alpha} \right)^2 \cdot k^{1/q} \alpha \\ &= \frac{2d}{k} \cdot \left( \frac{k^{1/p}}{6d^{1/p}\alpha} \right)^2 \cdot k^{1/q} \alpha \\ &= \frac{d^{1-2/p} k^{1/p}}{18\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the above holds in expectation over draws of  $\mu$ , there exists at least one value of  $\mu$  for which the above holds; let  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{k, \mu}$ . Then, letting

$$\phi(\theta, Z) := \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \left\langle \theta, \left( Z - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right)_{\text{supp}(Z)} \right\rangle,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu, k}^{\otimes n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \left\langle \hat{\theta}, \left( Z_i - \frac{d}{k} \mu \right)_{\text{supp}(Z_i)} \right\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{18k^{1/2-1/p}\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

We now argue that the pair  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  from the lemma above (with  $\phi$  scaled by some constant) constitutes a valid subgaussian tracer. In particular, the lemma below shows that  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  induces a  $O(1)$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta})$  norm.

**Lemma D.3.** Fix  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mu \in [-k/d, k/d]^d$  be arbitrary. Let  $\phi : \Theta \times \mathcal{Z}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be as in Lemma D.2. Let  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu,k}$  be the data distribution from Definition 3.7 for some  $\mu$ , and consider  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mu,k}$ . Then,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a  $C$ -subg process w.r.t. to  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta})$  for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $J \in \binom{[d]}{k}$  be an arbitrary coordinate subset of size  $k$ , and, recalling Definition 3.7, let  $Z_J$  be a random variable with PMF given by  $P_{\mu,k,J}$ . Then,  $Z$  is a uniform mixture of  $\{Z_J\}_{J \in \binom{[d]}{k}}$ .

Fix  $J \in \binom{[d]}{k}$ , and let  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$  be two arbitrary points. First, we upper bound a subgaussian norm of  $\phi(\theta_1, Z_J) - \phi(\theta_2, Z_J)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(\theta_1, Z_J) - \phi(\theta_2, Z_J)\|_{\psi_2} &= \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \|\langle \theta_1 - \theta_2, Z_J \rangle_J\|_{\psi_2} \\ &= \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \left\| \sum_{j \in J} (\theta_1^j - \theta_2^j) Z_J^j \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \sqrt{C_1 \sum_{j \in J} \|(\theta_1^j - \theta_2^j) Z_J^j\|_{\psi_2}^2} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \sqrt{C_1 \sum_{j \in J} C_2 |\theta_1^j - \theta_2^j|^2} \\ &= \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{k}} \cdot \sqrt{C_1 C_2} \sqrt{k} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\infty} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sqrt{C_1 C_2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{1,2} > 0$  are universal constants, in (a) we apply Lemma A.7, in (b) we apply Proposition A.9, and in (c) we use that, since  $\Theta = \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(d^{-1/p})$ , we have  $\|\cdot\|_{\Theta} = d^{1/p} \|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ . Thus, letting  $C = \sqrt{C_1 C_2}$ , we have

$$\|\phi(\theta_1, Z_J) - \phi(\theta_2, Z_J)\|_{\psi_2} \leq C \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Theta}.$$

Now, note that  $\phi(\theta_1, Z) - \phi(\theta_2, Z)$  has the same distribution as a uniform mixture of  $\{\phi(\theta_1, Z_J) - \phi(\theta_2, Z_J)\}_{J \in \binom{[d]}{k}}$ . Then, by Proposition A.8, we also have

$$\|\phi(\theta_1, Z) - \phi(\theta_2, Z)\|_{\psi_2} \leq C \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Theta},$$

which satisfies the first condition in Definition 3.1. Finally, by plugging  $\theta_2 = 0$  into the above, we have

$$\|\phi(\theta_1, Z)\|_{\psi_2} \leq C \|\theta_1\|_{\Theta} \leq C,$$

which satisfies the second condition in Definition 3.1. Thus,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a  $C$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta})$ , as desired.  $\square$

Finally, we lower bound the trace value of  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$ .

**Lemma D.4.** Let  $\alpha \leq 1/6$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be arbitrary, and let  $k \in [d]$  be such that  $k \leq (6\alpha)^p d$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be as in Equation (7). Then, the following trace value lower bounds hold for every  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and some  $\kappa \leq c_1 \sqrt{d}$ ,

$$\text{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha}$$

where  $c_{1,2} > 0$  are universal constants.

*Proof.* Let  $C > 0$  be the constant from Lemma D.3, and  $\phi$  be as in Lemma D.2. Then,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)/C\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a 1-subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta})$ . Moreover,  $\phi(\theta, Z)/C \leq \sqrt{k}/C \leq \sqrt{d}/C$ . Then, letting  $\kappa = \sqrt{d}/C$  and using Lemma D.2, the trace value of  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  can be lower bounded by

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq \frac{1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{18C \cdot k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha},$$

as desired.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.10.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be the family of problems described in Equation (7). There exist universal constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that, for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1/6]$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following trace value lower bounds hold for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\kappa \leq c_1 \sqrt{d}$ :*

(i) *For  $p \leq 2$  and  $k = d$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha}.$$

(ii) *For  $p \geq 2$  and  $k = (6\alpha)^p d \vee 1$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \left[ \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n(6\alpha)^{p/2}} \wedge \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \right].$$

*Proof.* The theorem is a direct consequence of Lemma D.4. For  $p \leq 2$ , plug in  $k = d$  into the statement of Lemma D.4. We obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha} = c_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha}.$$

For  $p \geq 2$ , plug in  $k = (6\alpha)^p \vee 1$ . We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) &\geq c_2 \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha} \\ &= c_2 \left[ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{(6\alpha)^{p(1/2-1/p)} n \alpha} \right] \\ &= c_2 \left[ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{(6\alpha)^{p/2} n} \right], \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

## D.2 Proofs for $\ell_1$ -geometry

For technical reasons, we will need the following refinement of Lemma 3.4 for the special case when the function  $\phi$  is convex and  $\Theta$  is a polytope. In the proof, we use Lemma B.1.

**Lemma D.5.** *Fix  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is (i) a subset of a unit ball in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , and (ii)  $\Theta$  is a polytope with  $N$  vertices. Let  $\phi: \Theta \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable function that is convex in its*

first argument. Let  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$  be such that  $\phi(\theta, Z)$  is a  $\sigma$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . Then, for every  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\Pr \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} \leq C\sigma \left[ \sqrt{n} + \sqrt{\log(N) + t} \right] \right) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t^2)$$

where  $C > 0$  is some universal constant.

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Lemma B.1, let  $\Phi_\theta$  denote the following random vector

$$\Phi_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} \phi(\theta, Z_1) \\ \vdots \\ \phi(\theta, Z_n) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, observe that, the desired quantity is equal to

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\Phi_\theta\|_2 = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle.$$

Let  $V$  be the set of vertices of  $\Theta$  with  $|V| \leq N$ . Since  $\phi$  is convex in its first argument, the supremum above is attained in one of the vertices of  $\Theta$ . Thus,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} = \sup_{\theta \in V, x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle x, \Phi_\theta \rangle = \sup_{\theta \in V} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2}.$$

Thus, we may apply Lemma B.1 to  $V$  instead of  $\Theta$ . Trivially, we have

$$\mathcal{N}(V, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon) \leq |V| = N.$$

Then, we have with probability  $1 - 2\exp(-t^2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n [\phi(\theta, Z_i)]^2} &\leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon + t \right) \\ &\leq C\sigma \left( \sqrt{n} + \sqrt{\log(N) + t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

Intuitively, in the special case when  $\Theta$  is a polytope, the log-number of vertices becomes “effective dimension” instead of  $d$ , due to the fact that  $\phi$  satisfies the convexity requirement. In some cases, we can have  $d \gg \log(N)$ , in which the above gives a tighter concentration. In particular, this is a case in our construction for  $\ell_1$  geometry in Equation (8). With the above result, we can also establish the following refinement of Theorem 3.5.

**Theorem D.6.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$ , and suppose  $\Theta$  is a polytope with  $N > 0$  vertices. Let  $T$  be defined as,

$$T := \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha).$$

Then, for some constant  $c > 0$ , every  $\alpha$ -learner  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with

$$\xi = \exp(-cT^2), \quad m = c \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n + \log(N)} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n + \log(N))} \right].$$

*Proof.* The proof is identical to Theorem 3.5, but using Lemma D.5 instead of Lemma 3.4, and thus, replacing  $d$  with  $\log(N)$  everywhere. We omit the details.  $\square$

Now, recall the construction from Equation (8),

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{\pm 1\}^d, \quad \Theta = \mathcal{B}_1(1) \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(1/s), \quad f(\theta, Z) = -\langle \theta, Z \rangle. \quad (17)$$

It is easy to see that  $f(\cdot, Z)$  above is 1-Lipschitz w.r.t.  $\ell_1$  as  $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{B}_\infty(1)$ . We have the following claim.

**Lemma D.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}_s$  be as in (17),  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1/8 > \alpha > 0$ . Then,*

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_s; n, \alpha) \geq \frac{c\sqrt{s} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)}{n\alpha},$$

where  $\kappa \leq c'\sqrt{s}$  for some constants  $c, c' > 0$

*Proof.* We aim to use Lemma 3.9 to characterize the trace value. Consider the construction of the prior in Lemma 3.9 with the following parameters:  $\gamma = 8\alpha \leq 1$  and  $\beta = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)$ . Then, by combining Lemma 3.9 with and Proposition D.1, there exist a prior  $\pi$  and a family  $\{\Lambda_\mu\}$  of diagonal matrices with non-negative diagonal entries bounded by 1 from above, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mu^{\otimes n}} \left\langle \hat{\theta}, \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_\mu(Z_i - \mu) \right\rangle &= \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left[ \sup_{\theta} \langle \theta, \mu \rangle - \alpha \right] \\ &\geq \frac{2\beta}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \left[ \frac{1}{s} \sup_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ |I|=s}} \sum_{i \in I} |\mu_i| - \alpha \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{\beta}{\gamma^2} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} - 2\alpha \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)}{32\alpha^2} \cdot 2\alpha \\ &\geq \frac{\log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)}{16\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used Proposition 5 of [SU17]. Since this holds in expectation over  $\mu$ , it holds for at least one choice of  $\mu$ . Let  $\mu$  be that value. Now, let  $\phi(\theta, Z) = C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s} \langle \hat{\theta}, \Lambda(Z - \mu) \rangle$ , where  $C$  is the absolute constant from Lemma A.7. For any  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(\theta, Z) - \phi(\theta', Z)\|_{\psi_2} &\leq C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s} \|\langle \theta' - \theta, \Lambda(Z - \mu) \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s} \|\theta' - \theta\|_2 \cdot C^{1/2} \max_i \|\Lambda^i(Z^i - \mu^i)\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{s} \|\theta' - \theta\|_2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|\theta' - \theta\|_{\Theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we apply Lemma A.7, and in (b) we use that for every  $\theta \in \Theta$ , we have  $\|\theta\|_2 \leq 1/\sqrt{s}$ , thus,  $\sqrt{s} \|\cdot\|_2 \leq \|\cdot\|_{\Theta}$ . Plugging  $\theta' = 0$  gives

$$\|\phi(\theta, Z)\|_{\psi_2} \leq \|\theta\|_{\Theta} \leq 1.$$



Thus,  $\{\phi(\theta, Z)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a 1-subg process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta})$ . Finally, we have

$$|\phi(\theta, Z)| \leq C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s}$$

Therefore, setting  $\kappa = C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s}$  and noting that  $\phi$  is linear (and therefore convex) in its first argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_s; n, \alpha) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim \pi} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim \mu^{\otimes n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \phi(\theta, Z_i) \\ &\geq \frac{C^{-1/2} \sqrt{s} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)}{n\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

## E Proofs of the main results (Section 2.2)

### E.1 Proof of Theorem 2.5

**Theorem 2.5.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, for all  $p \in [1, 2)$ , if  $d, n, \xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \alpha \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)}}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}, \quad (3)$$

*then there exist an  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m \in \Omega(\alpha^{-2})$ .*

*Proof.* We begin by noting that the interval for  $\alpha$  in Equation (3) is non-empty only if

$$\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)}}, \frac{1}{6} \right\} \leq c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{n^2}},$$

where we used  $\xi < 1/e$  in the last transition. Via straightforward algebra, the above implies  $d \geq n$ , thus, we may without loss of generality assume  $d \geq n$  in the remainder of the proof.

Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be as in Equation (7), and set  $k$  as in Theorem 3.10. Then, Theorem 3.10 gives the following lower bound on the trace value in this case:

$$T := \text{Tr}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha} \geq \frac{c_2}{c} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)},$$

for some  $\kappa \leq c_1 \sqrt{d}$ . Thus, provided  $c$  is small enough ( $c \leq c_2$ ), by Theorem 3.5, every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m$  satisfying, for some universal constant  $c' > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} m &\geq c' \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n+d} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n+d)} \right] \\ &\geq c' \left[ \frac{c_2^2 d}{n+d} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha^2} - \frac{16c_1^2 dn}{\exp(n+d)} \right] \\ &\geq c' \left[ \frac{c_2^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha^2} - \frac{16c_1^2 d^2}{\exp(d)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we used  $d \geq n$  in the last inequality. Then, we have

$$m \in \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^2}\right),$$

as desired. □

## E.2 Proof of Theorem 2.6

Then, the proof of Theorem 2.6 follows.

**Theorem 2.6.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, if  $d$  is large enough and  $n$ ,  $\xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} \leq \alpha \leq \min\left\{c \cdot \frac{d^{0.49}}{n\sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}}, \frac{1}{8}\right\}, \quad (4)$$

*there exists an  $\ell_1$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m \in \Omega(\log(d)/\alpha^2)$ .*

*Proof.* We begin by noting that the interval for  $\alpha$  in Equation (4) is non-empty only if

$$c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}} \leq c \cdot \frac{d^{0.49}}{n\sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}} \leq c \cdot \frac{d^{0.49}}{n}$$

where we used  $\xi < 1/e$  and  $c < 1/6$  in the last transition. Via straightforward algebra, the above implies  $d^{0.98}/\log(d) \geq n$ , thus, we may without loss of generality assume  $d^{0.98}/\log(d) \geq n$  in the remainder of the proof.

Let  $s = d^{0.98}$ . Note that, letting  $V$  be the set of vertices of the polytope  $\Theta = \mathcal{B}_1(1) \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(1/s)$ , we have

$$V = \left\{z \in \left\{0, \pm\frac{1}{s}\right\} : \|z\|_0 = s\right\}.$$

The proof of this fact is straightforward and it is based on showing that every point in  $\Theta$  can be written as a convex combination of the points in  $V$ . Thus,

$$\log |V| = \log\left(2^s \binom{d}{s}\right) \leq s \log(de/s) + s = s \log(de^2/s).$$

By the choice of  $s$  and using Lemma D.7, we have, for some  $\kappa \leq c_1\sqrt{s}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
T := \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_s; n, \alpha) &\geq c_2 \frac{d^{0.49} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\sqrt{14})}\right)}{n\alpha} \\
&\geq^{(a)} c_2 \frac{d^{0.49} \log\left(\frac{d}{16s}\right)}{n\alpha} \\
&= c_2 \frac{d^{0.49} \log\left(\frac{d^{0.02}}{16}\right)}{n\alpha} \\
&= c_2 \frac{d^{0.49} (0.02 \cdot \log(d) - \log(16))}{n\alpha} \\
&\geq^{(b)} c_2 \frac{d^{0.49} \cdot 0.01 \cdot \log(d)}{n\alpha} \\
&\geq^{(c)} \sqrt{\log(1/\xi)},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) and (b) hold provided  $d$  (and thus  $s$ ) is large enough, and (c) holds provided  $c > 0$  in Equation (4) is small enough. By Theorem D.6, every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable, where

$$\begin{aligned}
m &\geq c' \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n + \log |V|} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n + \log |V|)} \right] \\
&\geq c' \left[ \frac{0.01^2 c_2^2 \cdot d^{0.98} \log(d)}{n + \log |V|} \cdot \frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2} - \frac{16c_1^2 \cdot sn}{\exp(n + \log |V|)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $d^{0.98} \geq n \log(d) \geq n$  (for  $d \geq 3$ ). Moreover,  $\log |V| \leq s \log(de^2/s) = d^{0.98} \log(e^2 d^{0.02}) \leq C d^{0.98} \log(d)$ , for some universal  $C > 0$ . Thus, for  $d$  large enough,

$$m \in \Omega\left(\frac{\log(d)}{\alpha^2}\right),$$

as desired. □

### E.3 Proof of Theorem 2.7

**Theorem 2.7.** *There exists a universal constant  $c > 0$  such that, for all  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , if  $d, n, \xi \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are such that*

$$\frac{1}{6} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{d^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq \alpha \leq \min \left\{ c \cdot \left( \frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)} \right)^{1/p}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

*then there exist an  $\ell_p$ -Lipschitz-bounded problem such that every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with*

$$m \in \Omega\left(\frac{1}{(6\alpha)^p}\right).$$

*Proof.* Throughout, we assume  $c$  is a sufficiently small constant. Assume  $c < 1/6$ . Then, we begin by noting that the interval for  $\alpha$  in Equation (5) is non-empty only if

$$\frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{1/p}} \leq c \cdot \left( \frac{d}{n^2 \log(1/\xi)} \right)^{1/p} \leq \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left( \frac{d}{n^2} \right)^{1/p},$$

where we used  $\xi < 1/e$  and  $c < 1/6$  in the last transition. Via straightforward algebra, the above implies  $d \geq n$ , thus, we may without loss of generality assume  $d \geq n$  in the remainder of the proof.

Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be as in Equation (7), and set  $k$  as in Theorem 3.10. Then, Theorem 3.10 gives the following lower bound on the trace value

$$T := \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \geq c_2 \left[ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{(6\alpha)^{p/2}n} \right] \quad (19)$$

for some  $\kappa \leq c_1\sqrt{d}$ . Note that, from (5), we have

$$\alpha \geq \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{1/p}} \geq \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{d^{1/p}}$$

Now, note that, the minimum in Equation (19) is achieved in the second term iff  $\alpha \geq d^{-1/p}/6$ . Then, the lower bound on the trace value becomes

$$T \geq c_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{(6\alpha)^{p/2}n} \geq \frac{c_2}{(6c)^{p/2}} \cdot \sqrt{\log(1/\xi)} \geq \sqrt{\log(1/\xi)}$$

where the second transition follows from Equation (5) and the third transition holds whenever  $c > 0$  is small enough (e.g., when  $c \leq c_2^{2/p}/6$ ). Then, by Theorem 3.5 every  $\alpha$ -learner is  $(\xi, m)$ -traceable with  $m$  satisfying, for some universal constant  $c' > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} m &\geq c' \left[ \frac{n^2 T^2}{n+d} - \frac{16\kappa^2 n}{\exp(n+d)} \right] \\ &\geq c' \left[ \frac{c_2^2 d}{n+d} \cdot \frac{1}{(6\alpha)^p} - \frac{16c_1^2 dn}{\exp(n+d)} \right] \\ &\geq c' \left[ \frac{c_2^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{(6\alpha)^p} - \frac{16c_1^2 d^2}{\exp(d)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where we used  $d \geq n$  in the last transition. Thus,

$$m \in \Omega \left( \frac{1}{(6\alpha)^p} \right),$$

as desired. □

#### E.4 Proof of Theorem 2.9

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$  be arbitrary. Then, there exist a universal constant  $c > 0$  and a problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, \ell) \in \mathcal{L}_p^d$  such that any  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP learner of  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $\delta \leq c/n$  satisfies,*

$$\alpha \geq c \cdot \min \left\{ \left( \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2 n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{\varepsilon n}, 1 \right\}.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.10, for some problem  $\mathcal{P}$ , we have

$$T := \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) \geq c' \left[ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha^{p/2}} \right]$$

Then Theorem 3.6 implies

$$\exp(\varepsilon) - 1 \geq c'' [T - 2\delta\kappa],$$

Note that for all  $\varepsilon \leq 1$ , we have  $2\varepsilon \geq \exp(\varepsilon) - 1$ . Thus,

$$2\varepsilon \geq c' [T - 2\delta\kappa].$$

which implies,

$$2(\varepsilon/c'' + \delta\kappa) \geq T \geq c' \left[ \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha^{p/2}} \right].$$

Then, for some  $C > 0$ ,

$$C(\varepsilon \vee \delta\kappa) \geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{n\alpha} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\alpha^{p/2}}$$

Rearranging gives

$$\alpha \geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{Cn(\varepsilon \vee \delta\kappa)} \wedge \left( \frac{\sqrt{d}}{Cn(\varepsilon \vee \delta\kappa)} \right)^{2/p}$$

Note that if  $\varepsilon \geq \delta\kappa$ , the desired bound is immediate. For  $\delta\kappa \geq \varepsilon$ , we have, since  $\delta \leq c/n$  and  $\kappa \leq c'\sqrt{d}$ ,

$$\alpha \geq \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{C'\sqrt{d}} \wedge \left( \frac{\sqrt{d}}{C'\sqrt{d}} \right)^{2/p} \geq (C')^{-2/p},$$

for some  $C' > 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

## F Connection between trace value and non-private sample complexity

From the main part of the paper, we observe that the trace value is typically inversely proportional to  $\alpha$ . We start by proving two innocuous results (Propositions F.1 and F.3) that establish an absolute upper bound on trace value. It will then allow us to extract lower bounds on  $\alpha$  by plugging in our lower bounds on trace value (Theorems F.2 and F.4). We start with the  $p \in (1, \infty)$  case, and then consider  $p = 1$ .

### F.1 Lower bounds for $p \in (1, \infty)$

**Proposition F.1.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of problem  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, we have*

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) \cdot \sqrt{n} \leq C \cdot \sqrt{d},$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  be an arbitrary subgaussian tracer. Consider the process  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  defined as

$$X_\theta := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i),$$

where  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . We will argue that  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$ . First, consider arbitrary  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{\theta_1} - X_{\theta_2}\|_{\psi_2} &= \frac{1}{n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (\phi(Z_i, \theta_1) - \phi(Z_i, \theta_2)) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq^{(a)} \frac{C}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\phi(Z_i, \theta_1) - \phi(Z_i, \theta_2)\|_{\psi_2}^2} \\ &\leq^{(b)} \frac{C}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_\Theta} \\ &= \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_\Theta, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we applied Lemma A.7, and in (b) we used the fact that  $\{\phi(\theta, Z_i)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is 1-subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . Moreover, for every  $\theta \in \Theta$ , we similarly have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_\theta\|_{\psi_2} &= \frac{1}{n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(Z_i, \theta) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq^{(a)} \frac{C}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\phi(Z_i, \theta)\|_{\psi_2}^2} \\ &\leq^{(b)} \frac{C}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\theta\|_\Theta} \\ &= \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \|\theta\|_\Theta, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we applied Lemma A.7, and in (b) we used the fact that  $\{\phi(\theta, Z_i)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is 1-subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . Thus,  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is  $C/\sqrt{n}$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|)$  as per Definition 3.1. Therefore, by Proposition A.10, we have, with probability at least  $1 - 4 \exp(-t^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta; \|\cdot\|_\Theta, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{d \log \left(1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right)} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} [\sqrt{d} + t], \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where in second inequality we use [Wai19, Example 5.8]. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| &= \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > u \right] du \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + u \right] du \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} \right] dt \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty 4 \exp(-t^2) dt \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{C'}{\sqrt{n}} \\
&\leq 2(C \vee C') \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C' > 0$  is some universal constant, (a) follows by a change of variables  $u = Ct/\sqrt{n}$ , and (b) follows from Equation (21). By Definition 2.3, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) &= \inf_{\alpha\text{-learner } \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{S_n=(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{S_n=(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right] \\
&\leq 2(C \vee C') \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By rearranging the terms we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

We now show that Theorem 3.10 implies lower bounds on the sample complexity of learning  $\ell_p$ -Lipshitz-bounded problems for every  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . In particular, we show that the problems considered in Theorem 3.10 require many samples to learn (equivalently, we show a lower bound on optimal error  $\alpha$ ).

**Theorem F.2.** *Let  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be arbitrary. Let  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$  be as in Equation (7), and set  $k$  as in Theorem 3.10. Suppose there exist an  $\alpha$ -learner for  $\mathcal{P}_{k,p}$ . Then,*

(i) for  $p \in [1, 2]$ , we have

$$\alpha \geq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}},$$

(ii) for  $p \in (2, \infty)$ , we have

$$\alpha \geq c \left[ \frac{1}{n^{1/p}} \wedge \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} \right],$$

for some universal constant  $c > 0$ .

*Proof.* First, consider an arbitrary  $k \in [d]$ . We apply Proposition F.1 to the result of Lemma D.4. We then have the following double inequality

$$c_2 \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{k^{1/2-1/p} n \alpha} \leq \text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_{k,p}; n, \alpha) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}.$$

Solving for  $\alpha$  in the above, we have

$$\alpha \geq \frac{c_2}{C} \cdot \frac{(d/k)^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

First, consider the case  $p \in [1, 2]$ . Then  $k = d$ , and we have

$$\alpha \geq \frac{c_2}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

as desired. Now, consider the case  $p \in (2, \infty)$ . Then  $k = (6\alpha)^p d \vee 1$ , and we have

$$\alpha \geq \frac{c_2}{C} \cdot \frac{(d/k)^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{c_2}{C} \left[ \frac{(1/6\alpha)^{p/2-1}}{\sqrt{n}} \wedge \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} \right].$$

Solving for  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\alpha \geq \left[ \left( \frac{c_2}{C 6^{p/2-1}} \right)^{2/p} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \wedge \left[ \frac{c_2}{C} \cdot \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} \right].$$

Note that, since  $2/p \leq 1$ , we have

$$\left( \frac{c_2}{C 6^{p/2-1}} \right)^{2/p} = \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{6c_2}{C} \right)^{2/p} \geq \frac{1}{6} \left[ 1 \wedge \frac{6c_2}{C} \right].$$

Thus,

$$\alpha \geq \left[ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{c_2}{C} \right] \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \wedge \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} \right],$$

as desired. □

## F.2 Lower bounds for $p = 1$ .

Now, consider the case  $p = 1$ . For  $p = 1$ , we consider the problem as in Equation (8). We will need the following refinement of Proposition F.1 in a special case when  $\Theta$  is a polytope with few vertices. Intuitively,  $d$  in the statement Proposition F.1 can be replaced by  $\log N$  where  $N$  is the number of vertices of  $\Theta$ .

**Proposition F.3.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Consider an arbitrary SCO problem  $\mathcal{P} = (\Theta, \mathcal{Z}, f)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\Theta$  is a polytope with  $N$  vertices. Let  $\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha)$  be the trace value of problem  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, we have*

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) \cdot \sqrt{n} \leq C \cdot \sqrt{\log N},$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .



*Proof.* Let  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  be an arbitrary subgaussian tracer. Similarly to the proof of Proposition F.1, consider the process  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  defined as

$$X_\theta := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i),$$

where  $S_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}$ . As in the proof of Proposition F.1,  $\{X_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$  is a  $C/\sqrt{n}$ -subgaussian process w.r.t.  $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$  for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .

Let  $V$  be the set of vertices of  $\Theta$ ; then  $|V| = N$ , as per the proposition statement. Since  $\phi$  is convex in its first argument, the mapping  $\theta \mapsto X_\theta$  is also convex (almost surely). Then,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |X_\theta| = \sup_{\theta \in V} |X_\theta|.$$

Therefore, by Proposition A.10, we have, with probability at least  $1 - 4 \exp(-t^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(V; \|\cdot\|_\Theta, \varepsilon)} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log N} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C\sqrt{\log N}}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| &= \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > u \right] du \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + u \right] du \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right| > C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + \frac{Ct}{\sqrt{n}} \right] dt \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty 4 \exp(-t^2) dt \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}} + \frac{C'}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq 2(C \vee C')\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C' > 0$  is some universal constant, (a) follows by a change of variables  $u = Ct/\sqrt{n}$ , and (b)

follows from Equation (21). By Definition 2.3, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}; n, \alpha) &= \inf_{\alpha\text{-learner } \mathcal{A}_n} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{S_n=(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{T}_\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{S_n=(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\theta, Z_i) \right] \\
&\leq 2(C \vee C') \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By rearranging the terms we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

Then, sample complexity lower bounds for  $\ell_1$  geometry follow.

**Theorem F.4.** *Let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be arbitrary. Let  $\mathcal{P}_s$  be as in Equation (8) and set  $s = d^{0.99}$ . Suppose there exists an  $\alpha$ -learner for  $\mathcal{P}_s$ . Then, for large enough  $d$ , we have*

$$\alpha \geq c \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}},$$

for some universal constant  $c > 0$ .

*Proof.* Lemma D.7 gives the following lower bound on the trace value of  $\mathcal{P}_s$ ,

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_s; n, \alpha) \geq \frac{c\sqrt{s} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\vee 14)}\right)}{n\alpha}.$$

At the same time, noting that  $\Theta$  is a polytope with vertices given by

$$V = \left\{ z \in \left\{ 0, \pm \frac{1}{s} \right\}^d : \|z\|_0 = s \right\},$$

which has cardinality

$$|V| = \binom{d}{s} \leq \left(\frac{de}{s}\right)^s,$$

we have by Proposition F.3

$$\text{Tr}_\kappa(\mathcal{P}_s; n, \alpha) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{s \log(de/s)}{n}},$$

for some universal  $C > 0$ . Combining this with the lower bound on trace value, we have

$$\frac{c\sqrt{s} \log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\vee 14)}\right)}{n\alpha} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{s \log(de/s)}{n}},$$

which gives

$$\alpha \geq \frac{c}{C} \frac{\log\left(\frac{d}{16(s\vee 14)}\right)}{\sqrt{\log(de/s)n}}.$$

Recall that  $s = d^{0.99}$ . For large enough  $d$ , we have  $s \vee 14 = s$ . Also, note that  $\log(d/s) \geq \log(d)/100$ . Then, for large enough  $d$ , we have

$$\alpha \geq c' \sqrt{\frac{\log(d)}{n}},$$

for some universal  $c' > 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

## G Traceability of VC classes (Section 1.1.3)

First, we state the main result.

**Theorem G.1.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\xi < 0.1$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an arbitrary VC concept class with VC dimension  $d_{\text{vc}}$ . Then, there exists an optimal algorithm in terms of number of samples such that it is  $(\xi/(n \log(n)), m)$ -traceable with  $m \leq O(d_{\text{vc}} \log^2(n))$ . Moreover, when  $\mathcal{H}$  is the class of thresholds, we have  $m \in O(1)$ .*

To prove it we use an information-theoretic notion that controls the difficulty of tracing from [SZ20].

**Definition G.2.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a data distribution, and  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be a learning algorithm. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_{j,i})_{j \in \{0,1\}, i \in [n]}$  be an array of i.i.d. samples drawn from  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_n) \sim \text{Ber}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\otimes n}$ , where  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  are independent. Define training set  $S_n = (Z_{U_i,i})_{i \in [n]}$ . Then, define

$$\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) := I(\mathcal{A}_n(S_n); \mathbf{U} | \mathbf{Z}).$$

In the next theorem, we show that the existence of a tracer for a learning algorithm provides a lower bound on the CMI of the algorithm. A similar observation is made in [ADHLR24].

**Lemma G.3.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \geq 2$  and  $\xi < 1/2$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be an arbitrary learning algorithm that is  $(\xi/(n \log(n)), m)$ -traceable. Then, it holds  $\sup_{\mathcal{D}} \text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) \geq m - 3\xi$ .*

The following two results from [SZ20] and [HDMR21] provide upper bounds on the CMI of sample compression schemes. We skip the formal definitions of sample compression schemes and refer the reader to [LW86; MY16; BHMZ20].

**Lemma G.4** (Thm 4.2. [SZ20]). *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an arbitrary concept class with VC dimension  $d_{\text{vc}}$ . Then, there exists an algorithm such that for every data distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) \leq O(d_{\text{vc}} \log^2(n))$ .*

**Lemma G.5** (Thm 3.4. [HDMR21]). *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the concept class of threshold in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, there exists an algorithm such that for every data distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) \leq 2 \log 2$ .*

*Proof of Theorem G.1.* The proof is simply by combining Lemma G.4 with Lemma G.3. For the case of the class of thresholds, we use Lemma G.5.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma G.3.* Assume there exists a tracer with recall of  $m$  and FPR of  $\xi/(n \log(n))$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the distribution used by the tracer (see Definition 2.3). Define the following random set

$$\mathcal{V}^1 = \{i \in [n] : \exists j \in \{0,1\} \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{j,i}) \geq \lambda \text{ and } \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{1-j,i}) < \lambda\}.$$

Also, for every  $i \in [n]$ , define the following random variable

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \mathbb{1} \{\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{\bar{U}_i,i}) < \lambda\}.$$

By the definition of mutual information and  $\mathbf{U} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Z}$ , we have

$$\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) = H(\mathbf{U}) - H(\mathbf{U} | \mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) \tag{22}$$

$$= n - H(\mathbf{U} | \mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}). \tag{23}$$

Therefore, to lower bound  $\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n)$ , we need to upper bound  $\text{H}(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta})$ . By the sub-additivity of the entropy, we have

$$\text{H}(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}).$$

Then, by monotonicity of the entropy and the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) &\leq \text{H}(U_i, \mathcal{G}_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) \\ &\leq \text{H}(\mathcal{G}_i) + \text{H}(U_i|\mathcal{G}_i, \mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

In the next step, by the definition of conditional entropy,

$$\text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i = 1) + \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0).$$

Define the random variable  $Y_i = \mathbb{1}(i \in \mathcal{V}^1)$ . Notice that  $Y_i$  is  $(\hat{\theta}, \mathbf{Z})$ -measurable random variable. Then, using the notations for the disintegrated conditional entropy from [HDMR21], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i = 1) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{H}^{\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i=1}(U_i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{H}^{\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i=1}(U_i) \mathbb{1}\{Y_i = 1\} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{H}^{\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i=1}(U_i) \mathbb{1}\{Y_i = 0\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The main observation is that under the events  $Y_i = 1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_i = 1$ ,  $U_i$  is deterministically known from  $(\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta})$ . It follows because

$$\{Y_i = 1\} \wedge \{\mathcal{G}_i = 1\} \Leftrightarrow \{\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{j,i}) \geq \lambda \text{ and } \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{1-j,i}) < \lambda\} \wedge \{\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{\bar{U}_i,i}) < \lambda\} \Rightarrow U_i = j.$$

Therefore, since  $\text{H}^{\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i=1}(U_i) \leq 1$  with probability one, by Equation (25)

$$\text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}, \mathcal{G}_i = 1) \leq \Pr(Y_i = 0).$$

Thus, from Equations (24) and (25), we obtain the following upper bound

$$\text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) \leq \Pr(Y_i = 0) + \text{H}_b(\Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0)) + \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0),$$

where  $\text{H}_b(\cdot) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the binary entropy function defined as  $\text{H}_b(x) = -x \log(x) - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ . We can lower bound  $\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n)$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) &\geq n - \sum_{i=1}^n \text{H}(U_i|\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\theta}) \\ &\geq n - \sum_{i=1}^n [\Pr(Y_i = 0) + \text{H}_b(\Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0)) + \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1) - \sum_{i=1}^n (\text{H}_b(\Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0)) + \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows because  $n - \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 0) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1)$  as  $Y_i$  is an indicator random variable. In the next step, by the definition of FPR from Definition 2.3 and the definition of CMI in Definition G.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0) &= \mathbb{E} [\Pr(\mathcal{G}_i = 0|\mathbf{U})] \\ &= \Pr_{S_n \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, Z \sim \mathcal{D}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left( \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z) \geq \lambda \right) \\ &\leq \xi / (n \cdot \log(n)), \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1) - \frac{\xi}{\log(n)} - n\text{H}_b\left(\frac{\xi}{n \log(n)}\right)$$

By the recall condition from Definition 2.3 and the definition of CMI in Definition G.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \mathbb{E}_{S_n=(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\otimes n}, \hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{A}_n(S_n)} \left[ |i \in [n] : \phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \geq \lambda| \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr\left(\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_i) \geq \lambda\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr\left(\phi(\hat{\theta}, Z_{U_i, i}) \geq \lambda \wedge \mathcal{G}_i\right) + \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i^c) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1) + \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(\mathcal{G}_i^c) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1) + \frac{\xi}{\log(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

We also use the following well-known inequality,  $\text{H}_b(x) \leq -x \log(x) + x$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CMI}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_n) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(Y_i = 1) - \frac{\xi}{\log(n)} - n\text{H}_b\left(\frac{\xi}{n \log(n)}\right) \\ &\geq m - \frac{2\xi}{\log(n)} - n \left( \frac{\xi}{n \cdot \log(n)} - \frac{\xi}{(n \cdot \log(n))} \log\left(\frac{\xi}{(n \cdot \log(n))}\right) \right) \\ &\geq m - \xi \left( \frac{1}{e} + \frac{3}{\log(n)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows because  $-x \log(x) \leq 1/e$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

□