

# Lean Formalization of Generalization Error Bound by Rademacher Complexity

Sho Sonoda<sup>1,5</sup>

Kazumi Kasaura<sup>2,5</sup>

Yuma Mizuno<sup>3,5</sup>

Kei Tsukamoto<sup>4,5</sup>

Naoto Onda<sup>3,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*RIKEN AIP*

<sup>2</sup>*OMRON SINIC X Corporation*

<sup>3</sup>*University College Dublin*

<sup>4</sup>*The University of Tokyo*

<sup>5</sup>*AutoRes*

[sho.sonoda@riken.jp](mailto:sho.sonoda@riken.jp)

[kazumi.kasaura@sinicx.com](mailto:kazumi.kasaura@sinicx.com)

[mizuno.y.aj@gmail.com](mailto:mizuno.y.aj@gmail.com)

[milanotukamoto@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:milanotukamoto@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

[naoto.onda@sinicx.com](mailto:naoto.onda@sinicx.com)

## Abstract

We formalize the generalization error bound using Rademacher complexity in the Lean 4 theorem prover. Generalization error quantifies the gap between a learning machine’s performance on given training data versus unseen test data, and Rademacher complexity serves as an estimate of this error based on the complexity of learning machines, or hypothesis class. Unlike traditional methods such as PAC learning and VC dimension, Rademacher complexity is applicable across diverse machine learning scenarios including deep learning and kernel methods. We formalize key concepts and theorems, including the empirical and population Rademacher complexities, and establish generalization error bounds through formal proofs of McDiarmid’s inequality, Hoeffding’s lemma, and symmetrization arguments. We make our code available on GitHub.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Generalization is a central concept in machine learning that describes how well a *learning machine*, constructed based on *training data*, can make predictions on unseen *test data*. In practice, minimizing the *training error* is desirable, but this alone does not necessarily guarantee a better performance on *test error*. Overfitting occurs when a machine excessively fits the training data, leading to poor predictive performance on test data. The deviation between the training and test errors is called the *generalization error*, or the *generalization gap*. To quantitatively evaluate this issue and ensure the reliability of learning results, theoretical analysis of generalization error is essential.

In this study, we explain the generalization error bound using *Rademacher complexity* [4] and presents its formalization in Lean 4 [5]. The Rademacher complexity measures the size of a set in a sense, and is a de-facto standard method to derive upper bounds on generalization error in the modern machine learning problems. Formally, it quantifies how well a hypothesis class can fit random noise, represented by *Rademacher variables*. Rademacher complexity is broadly applicable to both *classification and regression problems*, as it can be defined for arbitrary bounded loss functions. Unlike *PAC learning* [13] and *VC dimension* [14], which provide worst-case uniform bounds over all datasets, Rademacher complexity gives a finer, data-dependent estimate of model complexity. This makes it a powerful tool for analyzing modern machine learning models, including *deep learning* and *kernel methods* [8, 10, 2].

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/auto-res/lean-rademacher>

## 2 Statistical Machine Learning and Generalization Error

We formulate the concepts of statistical machine learning and generalization error. We refer to Mohri et al. (2018) [8] as a standard textbook on statistical machine learning theory, and Wainwright (2019) [7] for more mathematical details on the Rademacher complexity and concentration inequalities used in generalization error analysis.




Figure 1: Generalization error of a learning algorithm  $A : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  refers to the gap between the original data source (concept  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ) and the estimated data generator (hypothesis  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ), which is an output of the learning algorithm  $A$  given a dataset  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  generated according to concept  $c$ . Following the convention of graphical models, filled-in circles are observable, while unfilled circles are unobservable.

### 2.1 Conventions in Measure-Theoretic Probability

A *probability space*  $(\Omega, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$  is a triple composed of measurable space  $\Omega$ ,  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{M}$ , and finite positive measure  $\mu$  satisfying  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ .

A *random variable*  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a measurable map from  $\Omega$  to a measurable space  $\mathcal{X}$ . A *realization*  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  of a random variable  $X$  is an image  $X(\omega)$  of  $X$  at a certain element  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Following the convention, we use the uppercase for random variables (e.g.  $X, Y, \dots$ ), while the lowercase for their realizations (e.g.  $x, y, \dots$ ). The *distribution* (or *law*)  $P$  of a random variable  $X$  is the push-forward measure  $X_{\#}\mu$  of  $\mu$  by  $X$ . We write  $X \sim P$ , and say  $X$  is a random sample in  $\mathcal{X}$  drawn according to probability distribution  $P$ , when  $X$  is a random variable with distribution  $P$ .

We say a sequence  $\mathbf{X} := \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n$  of random variables (or a *random vector* for short) is *independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.)*, denoted  $\mathbf{X} \sim^{iid} P$ , when each  $X_k$  has the same distribution  $P$ , and all are mutually independent, so as the distribution  $P_{\mathbf{X}}$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  is given by the product  $P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X}) = P^n(\mathbf{X}) := \prod_{k=1}^n P(X_k)$ .

The *expectation* of a measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denoted  $\mathbb{E}_X[f(X)]$  or  $P[f(X)]$ , is the integration of  $f$  with respect to the measure  $P$ , that is,  $\mathbb{E}_X[f(X)] := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)dP(x) = \int_{\Omega} f \circ X(\omega)d\mu(\omega)$ . By  $L^1(P)$ , we write the Banach space of all  $P$ -integrable functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Those concepts are formalized in `namespace MeasureTheory` in Mathlib. Especially, in our source code, the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$  and a random vector  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$  are typically formalized as follows.

```
universe u v
variable {Ω : Type u} [MeasurableSpace Ω]
variable {μ : Measure Ω} [IsProbabilityMeasure μ]
variable {X : Type v} [MeasurableSpace X]
variable {n : ℕ} {X : Fin n → Ω → X} (hX : ∀ k : Fin n, Measurable (X k))
```

### 2.2 Formulation of Statistical Machine Learning

The *sample space*  $\mathcal{X}$  is a measurable set of datasets. Following convention, an *observation* (an *example*, or a *datum*) refers to a single element  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , while a *dataset* (a *sample*, or a *data*) refers to a single sequence of

observations  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X}^n$ . For example, in the image recognition problem, a *single* dataset  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is an  $n$ -fold pairs  $\{(\text{image}_k, \text{label}_k)\}_{k=1}^n$  of images and labels. In statistical machine learning, a single dataset  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^n$  is formulated as a realization of a random vector  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ . In the following, we omit emphasizing the dependency in sample size  $n$ , and simply write  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X}^n$  as  $x, X, \mathcal{X}$  if not necessary.

The *concept class*  $\mathcal{C}$  is a collection of data sources (called *concepts*) that describe how datasets are obtained. In this study, we assume  $\mathcal{C}$  to be a family of random vectors  $\mathbf{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ , or equivalently, probability distributions  $P$  on  $\mathcal{X}^n$ . In the example of the image recognition problem, a single concept is a random vector  $\mathbf{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ , or its law  $P_{\mathbf{X}}(\{\text{image}_k, \text{label}_k\}_{k=1}^n)$ . In statistical machine learning, the concept itself is supposed to be *unobservable*, and only the dataset to be *observable*. In other words, only an image  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{X}(\omega)$  is given, but the map  $\mathbf{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$  itself is not given.

The *hypothesis class*  $\mathcal{F}$  is another collection of data generators (called *hypotheses*, or *learning machines*). Like concepts, hypotheses describe the data generation process. However, unlike concepts, hypotheses have parameters, say  $\theta \in \Theta$ , that we can freely manipulate. For example, in deep learning, the hypothesis class is a set of deep neural networks (DNNs).

A *learning algorithm*  $A$  is a measurable map  $\mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  that describes how to associate datasets with hypotheses. Regarding the data generation process by concepts as a *forward process*, learning algorithm  $A$  corresponds to a *backward process*. In the terms of statistical estimation theory,  $A$  is an *estimator*, and the learned machine  $f$  is an image  $f = A(\mathbf{x})$  of a given dataset  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . For example, in deep learning,  $A$  is the process of empirical risk minimization by using stochastic gradient descent on the parameter space of DNNs.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the *generalization error* (explained in the next subsection) estimates the discrepancy between the learned hypothesis  $f = A(\mathbf{x})$  and the original concept  $c$ . A learning algorithm is considered better if its generalization error is smaller.

In our source code, especially, a hypotheses class  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid i \in \iota\}$  is typically formalized as follows.

```
universe w
variable {ι : Type w} {f : ι → X → ℝ} (hf : ∀ i, Measurable (f i))
```

## 2.3 Formulation of Generalization Error Analysis

The *training data(set)* refers to a random vector  $\mathbf{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ , and a *test data(set)* refers to another random variable  $X' : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  that is *statistically independent* from training data  $\mathbf{X}$ . In this study, we assume (1) that the training dataset is i.i.d., so  $\mathbf{X} \sim^{iid} P$ , and (2) that both training and test datasets have the same distribution  $P$ , so  $X' \sim P$ . We note that  $P$  itself is unknown, although we are supposed to know that  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $X'$  have the same distribution. This may sound technical, but natural when i.i.d. sampling is easy, thus often assumed in the basic formulations.

A (pointwise) *loss function*  $\ell : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a measurable functional that associates hypotheses with positive numbers. For example, the squared error loss  $\ell(f, (x, y)) := |f(x) - y|^2$  is typical in supervised learning.

The *training error* (a.k.a. *empirical risk*)  $L(f \mid \mathbf{X})$  of a hypothesis  $f$  over a training dataset  $\mathbf{X}$  is the sample average of the pointwise loss function:  $L(f \mid \mathbf{X}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \ell(f, X_k)$ . We note that in the real-world application, we can only compute its realization, say  $L(f \mid \mathbf{x})$ .

The *test error* (a.k.a. *population risk*)  $L(f)$  of a hypothesis  $f$  (over a test dataset  $X$ ) is the expectation of the pointwise loss function:  $L(f) := \mathbb{E}_X[\ell(f, X)]$ . Following the convention, the dependency on  $X$  is omitted for simplicity. By the assumptions that both training and test datasets are i.i.d. samples, namely  $(\mathbf{X}, X) \sim^{iid} P$ , the expectation of the training error over the i.i.d. draw of training dataset is identical to the test error:  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}[L(f \mid \mathbf{X})] = L(f)$ .

The test error  $L(f)$  is understood as measuring the generalization performance of a hypothesis on unseen data, because the distribution  $P$  of test data is unknown. Indeed, it is the (first) definition of the *generalization error* as explained soon below.

The *generalization error* refers to *three* related quantities: (1) population risk (or test error)  $L(f)$  itself, (2) generalization gap (the gap between test and training errors)  $\Delta(f) := L(f) - L(f | \mathbf{X})$ , and (3) excess risk (the population risk relative to its infimum)  $L(f) - \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(f)$ . In all three definitions, the interest lies in the (either absolute or relative) value of population risk  $L(f)$ , and either one will be obtained depending on the estimation technique employed.

In this study, the main theorem (Theorem 1) presents an upper bound on generalization gap  $\Delta(f)$  by using the *Rademacher complexity*, which estimates the second meaning of generalization error. We note that, as clarified in the remark (Remark 2), an upper bound of the gap  $L(f) - L(f | \mathbf{X}) \leq B$  can be trivially turned into the upper bound of the risk  $L(f) \leq L(f | \mathbf{X}) + B$ , which estimates the first meaning of generalization error.

### 3 Rademacher Complexity

We define the empirical and population Rademacher complexities of a hypothesis class  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 1** (Rademacher Variable). A uniform random variable  $\sigma$  taking values in  $\{\pm 1\}$  is called a *Rademacher variable*, and an i.i.d. sequence of Rademacher variables  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := \{\sigma_k\}_{k=1}^n$  (i.e. uniform random vector taking values in  $\{\pm 1\}^n$ ) is called a *Rademacher vector*.

**Definition 2** (Rademacher Complexity). Let  $\mathcal{F} \subset L^1(P)$  be a separable subspace of real-valued integrable functions on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n$  be an i.i.d. random vector drawn from distribution  $P$ . The Empirical Rademacher complexity is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X}) := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k f(X_k) \right| \right] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k f(X_k) \right|, \quad (1)$$

and the (population) Rademacher complexity is defined as its expectation

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}[\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X})] = \int_{\Omega^n} \left[ \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k f(X_k \circ \omega) \right| \right] d\mu^n(\omega). \quad (2)$$

```
def Signs (n : ℕ) : Type := Fin n → ({-1, 1} : Finset ℤ) -- Rademacher vector
```

```
noncomputable
```

```
def empiricalRademacherComplexity
```

```
(n : ℕ) (f : ι → ℳ → ℝ) (x : Fin n → ℳ) : ℝ :=
(Fintype.card (Signs n) : ℝ)-1 *
  Σ σ : Signs n, | (n : ℝ)-1 * Σ k : Fin n, (σ k : ℝ) * f i (x k) |
```

```
noncomputable
```

```
def rademacherComplexity
```

```
(n : ℕ) (f : ι → ℳ → ℝ) (μ : Measure Ω) (X : Ω → ℳ) : ℝ :=
μn [fun ω : Fin n → Ω ↦ empiricalRademacherComplexity n f (X ∘ ω)]
```

Here  $\mu^n$  is a local notation for the product measure  $\mu^n$  defined as below.

```
local notation "μn" => Measure.pi (fun _ ↦ μ)
```

### 4 Generalization Error Bounds by Rademacher Complexity

Here, we explain the main theorem and its formalization. We refer to Theorem 4.10 from Wainwright (2019) [7] and Theorem 3.3 from Mohri et al. (2018) [8]. To be precise, Mohri et al.'s statement is a corollary of Wainwright's statement tailored for practical purpose. So, we explain Wainwright's version as the main theorem, and Mohri et al.'s version in the remark.

**Theorem 1** (Generalization Error Bound by Rademacher Complexity). *Suppose that the hypothesis class  $\mathcal{F}$  (includes the loss function and) is  $b$ -uniformly bounded, namely there exists a scalar  $b \geq 0$  such that  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} \leq b$ . For any positive integer  $n \geq 1$  and scalar  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , the following holds with probability at least  $1 - \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2b^2}\right)$ :*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}_X[f(X)] \right| \leq 2\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

Here, the phrase “An event  $E(\varepsilon)$  with parameter  $\varepsilon$  holds with probability at least  $1 - \beta(\varepsilon)$ ” is a predicate of probability theory, meaning that the following inequality (a.k.a. *concentration of probability measure*, or tail probability bound, with rate function  $\beta$ ) for complement event  $E^c(\varepsilon)$  holds:

$$P(E^c(\varepsilon)) \leq \beta(\varepsilon), \quad (4)$$

which implies  $P(E(\varepsilon)) \geq 1 - \beta(\varepsilon)$ . Hence, the statement is formalized as below.

`theorem main`

```
[MeasurableSpace  $\mathcal{X}$ ] [Nonempty  $\mathcal{X}$ ] [Nonempty  $\iota$ ] [Countable  $\iota$ ] [IsProbabilityMeasure  $\mu$ ]
(f :  $\iota \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) (hf :  $\forall i$ , Measurable (f i))
(X :  $\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ) (hX : Measurable X)
{b :  $\mathbb{R}$ } (hb :  $0 \leq b$ ) (hf' :  $\forall i$  x, |f i x|  $\leq b$ )
{t :  $\mathbb{R}$ } (ht :  $0 \leq t$ ) (ht' :  $t * b^2 \leq 1 / 2$ )
{ $\varepsilon$  :  $\mathbb{R}$ } (h $\varepsilon$  :  $0 \leq \varepsilon$ ) :
( $\mu^n$  (fun  $\omega \mapsto 2 \cdot \text{rademacherComplexity } n \text{ f } \mu \text{ X} + \varepsilon \leq$ 
  uniformDeviation n f  $\mu$  X (X  $\circ$   $\omega$ ))).toReal  $\leq$ 
(-  $\varepsilon^2 * t * n$ ).exp := by
```

*Remark 1.* In the main theorem, we assume that a hypothesis includes a *loss function*. Namely, in the example of image recognition, a hypothesis is *not* a predictor  $g : \mathcal{X}_{\text{image}} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{label}}$  alone, *but* a composite  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $f((\text{image}, \text{label}), \theta) := \ell(g(\text{image}, \theta), \text{label})$  of  $g$  followed by a loss function  $\ell$  such as a cross-entropy or a squared error loss.

*Remark 2.* In practice, the quantity of primary interest is the population risk  $\mathbb{E}_X[\widehat{f}(X)]$  of the hypothesis  $\widehat{f} = A(\mathbf{X})$  obtained by learning algorithm  $A$ . Because we are only given the training dataset  $\mathbf{X}(\omega) \in \mathcal{X}$  (as a realization), and we do not know the data distribution  $P_{\mathbf{X}}$  itself, this expectation is intractable. Nonetheless, as a consequence of the main theorem, the population risk can be estimated in a tractable manner as follows

$$\mathbb{E}_X[\widehat{f}(X)] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{f}(X_k) + 2\mathcal{R}_n(\text{Im } A) + \sqrt{\frac{2b^2 \log 1/\delta}{n}} \quad (5)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the draw of an i.i.d. sample  $\mathbf{X}$ . This is Mohri et al’s version of the main theorem (Theorem 3.3 in [8]). We note that we further need to compute the Rademacher complexity separately depending on the specific problem.

*Proof.* The proof is two-fold: Use McDiarmid’s (bounded difference) inequality, and symmetrization argument. Put the supremum  $\Delta(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X})$  of the absolute deviation and its expectation  $\Delta(\mathcal{F})$  as follows:

$$\Delta(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X}) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}_X[f(X)] \right|, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}[\Delta(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X})]. \quad (6)$$

We call  $\Delta(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{X})$  the *uniform deviation* for short, and formalize it as below.

```
def uniformDeviation (n :  $\mathbb{N}$ ) (f :  $\iota \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) ( $\mu$  : Measure  $\Omega$ ) (X :  $\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ) : (Fin n  $\rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ )  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 
:= fun y  $\mapsto \sqcup i$ , |(n :  $\mathbb{R}$ )-1 *  $\Sigma k$  : Fin n, f i (y k) -  $\mu$  [fun  $\omega' \mapsto f i (X \omega')$  ]|
```

By McDiarmid's inequality, the deviation of the uniform deviation from its mean is upper bounded by  $\varepsilon$  as

$$\Delta(\mathcal{F} \mid \mathbf{X}) - \Delta(\mathcal{F}) < \varepsilon \quad (7)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2b^2}\right)$ . In other words, the following inequality holds:

$$\mu \{\omega \mid \Delta(\mathcal{F} \mid \mathbf{X})(\omega) - \Delta(\mathcal{F}) \geq \varepsilon\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2b^2}\right). \quad (8)$$

`theorem uniformDeviation_mcdiarmid`

```
[MeasurableSpace  $\mathcal{X}$ ] [Nonempty  $\mathcal{X}$ ] [Nonempty  $\iota$ ] [Countable  $\iota$ ] [IsProbabilityMeasure  $\mu$ ]
{ $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ } (hX : Measurable X) (hf :  $\forall i$ , Measurable (f i))
{ $b : \mathbb{R}$ } (hb :  $0 \leq b$ ) (hf' :  $\forall i x$ , |f i x|  $\leq b$ )
{ $t : \mathbb{R}$ } (ht :  $0 \leq t$ ) (ht' :  $t * b^2 \leq 1 / 2$ )
{ $\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}$ } (h\varepsilon :  $0 \leq \varepsilon$ ) :
( $\mu^n$  [fun  $\omega : \text{Fin } n \rightarrow \Omega \mapsto \text{uniformDeviation } n f \mu X (X \circ \omega) -$ 
 $\mu^n$  [fun  $\omega : \text{Fin } n \rightarrow \Omega \mapsto \text{uniformDeviation } n f \mu X (X \circ \omega)]] \geq \varepsilon)) \text{.toReal} \leq$ 
 $(- \varepsilon^2 * t * n) \text{.exp} := \text{by}$ 
```

Based on the symmetrization argument, estimate  $\Delta(\mathcal{F})$  by the Rademacher complexity as below. Take another i.i.d. sequence  $\mathbf{Y} := \{Y_k\}_{k=1}^n \sim^{iid} P$  independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Then,

$$\Delta(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \{f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}_{Y_k}[f(Y_k)]\} \right| \right] \quad (9)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \{f(X_k) - f(Y_k)\} \right] \right| \right] \quad (10)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \{f(X_k) - f(Y_k)\} \right| \right] \quad (11)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \sigma} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_i \{f(X_k) - f(Y_k)\} \right| \right] \quad (12)$$

$$\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \sigma} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_i f(X_k) \right| \right] = 2\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}). \quad (13)$$

`theorem le_two_smul_rademacher`

```
[Nonempty  $\iota$ ] [Countable  $\iota$ ] [IsProbabilityMeasure  $\mu$ ]
( $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ) (hf :  $\forall i$ , Measurable (f i  $\circ X$ ))
{ $b : \mathbb{R}$ } (hb :  $0 \leq b$ ) (hf' :  $\forall i x$ , |f i x|  $\leq b$ ) :
 $\mu^n$  [fun  $\omega : \text{Fin } n \rightarrow \Omega \mapsto \text{uniformDeviation } n f \mu X (X \circ \omega)]] \leq$ 
 $2 \cdot \text{rademacherComplexity } n f \mu X := \text{by}$ 
```

Finally, the combination of the estimates (7) and (13) yields the assertion.  $\square$

## 5 McDiarmid's Inequality

McDiarmid's inequality, a.k.a. the bounded difference inequality, estimates the concentration bound of a function  $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  around its mean  $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X})]$  under the assumption that  $f$  satisfies the bounded difference property. We note that the case when  $f$  is a sum  $f(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$  reproduces *Hoeffding's inequality*. We refer to Corollary 2.21 from [7] for more details.

There are two ways to prove this inequality: directly by using *Hoeffding's lemma* (explained later), or indirectly as a corollary of the *Azuma-Hoeffding inequality* (see e.g. Corollary 2.20 in [7]). In this study, we employed the former direct way. We remark that the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality has never been formalized, which itself is an important future work as well.

**Definition 3** (Bounded Difference Property). Given an  $n$ -tuple  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and an element  $x' \in \mathcal{X}$ , let  $\mathbf{x}(k, x')$  denote a new  $n$ -tuple obtained by replacing the  $k$ -th component  $x_k$  of  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $x'$ . A function  $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the bounded difference property if there exists a sequence  $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^n$  of positive numbers such that for all  $k \in [n]$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ ,  $x' \in \mathcal{X}$ :

$$|f(\mathbf{x}(k, x')) - f(\mathbf{x})| \leq c_k. \quad (14)$$

**Theorem 2** (One-sided McDiarmid's Inequality, or Bounded Differences -). *Suppose that a measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the bounded difference property with bounds  $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^n$ , and suppose that a real number  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $t \leq 1 / \sum_{k=1}^n c_k^2$ . Let  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n \sim P$  be an i.i.d. sequence. Then, for any  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , we have:*

$$\mu \{ \omega \mid f(\mathbf{X})(\omega) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}[f(\mathbf{X})] \geq \varepsilon \} \leq \exp(-2\varepsilon^2 t) \quad (15)$$

`theorem mcdiarmid_inequality_pos`

```
(X : ι → Ω → ℳ) (hX : ∀ i, Measurable (X i)) (hX' : iIndepFun X μ)
(f : (ι → ℳ) → ℝ) (hf' : Measurable f)(c : ι → ℝ)
(hf : ∀ (i : ι) (x : ι → ℳ) (x' : ℳ),
  |f x - f (Function.update x i x')| ≤ c i)      --- bounded difference property
(ε : ℝ) (hε : ε > 0)(t : ℝ) (ht' : t * Σ i, (c i) ^ 2 ≤ 1) :
(μ (fun ω : Ω ↦ (f o (Function.swap X)) ω
  - μ[f o (Function.swap X)] ≥ ε)).toReal
≤ (-2 * ε ^ 2 * t).exp := by
```

## 6 Hoeffding's Lemma

Hoeffding's lemma states that an almost surely bounded random variable  $X$  is sub-Gaussian. It is used to show Hoeffding's inequality and its generalization McDiarmid's inequality. We refer to Lemma D.1 in [8] for more details. In the proof, we use *exponential tilting*, which has already been implemented in `Mathlib.Probability.Moments.Tilted`.

**Theorem 3** (Hoeffding's Lemma). *For a real random variable  $X$  with  $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$  and  $X \in [a, b]$  almost surely, the inequality*

$$\mathbb{E}_X [\exp tX] \leq \exp \left( \frac{t^2(b-a)^2}{8} \right) \quad (16)$$

holds almost surely for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

`theorem hoeffding [IsProbabilityMeasure μ]`

```
(t a b : ℝ) {X : Ω → ℝ} (hX : AEMeasurable X μ)
(h : ∀m ω ∂μ, X ω ∈ Set.Icc a b) (h0 : μ[X] = 0) :
mgf X μ t ≤ exp (t^2 * (b - a)^2 / 8) := by
```

Here, `mgf` is the moment generating function  $\mathbb{E}_X[\exp tX]$  of a real random variable  $X$  defined in `Mathlib.Probability.Moments.Basic` as below:

```
def mgf (X : Ω → ℝ) (μ : Measure Ω) (t : ℝ) : ℝ := μ[fun ω => exp (t * X ω)]
```

## 7 Related Work

### 7.1 Formalization of Machine Learning Theory

Bagnall and Stewart (2019) [3] have also formalized a generalization error bound in Coq via Hoeffding's inequality, which is limited to *finite* hypothesis class, namely  $|H| < \infty$ . On the other hand, we have formalized a more versatile bound in Lean 4 via Rademacher complexity, which covers *infinite* hypothesis class.

Bagnall and Stewart (2019) [3]	Coq	Generalization error bounds for finite hypothesis class
Tassarotti et al. (2021) [9]	Lean	PAC learnability of decision stumps
Vajjha et al. (2021) [11]	Coq	Convergence of reinforcement learning algorithms
Vajjha et al. (2022) [12]	Coq	Stochastic approximation theorem
(ours)	Lean	Generalization error bound by Rademacher complexity

## 7.2 Formalization of Concentration Inequalities

As listed below, a few fundamental concentration inequalities were formalized in the 2020s in several languages. Compared to the advanced progress in Isabelle/HOL, there remains significant room for development in Lean and Coq.

Markov/Chebyshev	Lean (Mathlib), Coq (MathComp-Analysis[1], IBM/FormalML[11]), Isabelle/HOL (HOL-Probability)
Azuma-Hoeffding	n/a
McDiarmid	(ours), Isabelle/HOL (AFP) [6]

## 8 Future Direction

In this study, we have formalized the generalization error bound by Rademacher complexity. The main theorem is a starting point for generalization error analysis for modern machine learning problems. Computing Rademacher complexity for specific problem settings, such as deep learning, kernel machines, and ridge/Lasso regression, is an important future work.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the mathlib community members, particularly Rémy Degenne and Yaël Dillies, for their valuable comments regarding formalization of Hoeffding’s lemma. We would like to thank Reynald Affeldt, Alessandro Bruni, Tetsuya Sato, Hiroshi Unno, and Yoshihiro Mizoguchi for having productive discussion on our formalization project. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI 20K03657, JST PRESTO JPMJPR2125, and JST Moonshot R&D Program JPMJMS2236.

## References

- [1] Reynald Affeldt, Alessandro Bruni, Yves Bertot, Cyril Cohen, Marie Kerjean, Assia Mahboubi, Damien Rouhling, Pierre Roux, Kazuhiko Sakaguchi, Zachary Stone, Pierre-Yves Strub, and Laurent Théry. *MathComp-Analysis: Analysis library compatible with Mathematical Components*, 2025.
- [2] Francis Bach. *Learning Theory from First Principles*. MIT Press, 2024.
- [3] Alexander Bagnall and Gordon Stewart. *Certifying the True Error: Machine Learning in Coq with Verified Generalization Guarantees*. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):2662–2669, 2019.
- [4] Peter L Bartlett and Shahar Mendelson. *Rademacher and Gaussian Complexities: Risk Bounds and Structural Results*. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:463–482, 2002.
- [5] Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. *The Lean 4 Theorem Prover and Programming Language*. In André Platzer and Geoff Sutcliffe, editors, *Automated Deduction – CADE 28*, pages 625–635, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [6] Emin Karayel and Yong Kiam Tan. *Concentration Inequalities*. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2023.



- [7] Martin J. Wainwright. *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [8] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning series. MIT Press, second edition, 2018.
- [9] Joseph Tassarotti, Koundinya Vajjha, Anindya Banerjee, and Jean-Baptiste Tristan. **A Formal Proof of PAC Learnability for Decision Stumps**. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs, CPP 2021*, pages 5–17, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] Matus Telgarsky. **Deep learning theory lecture notes**, 2021. URL: <https://mjt.cs.illinois.edu/dlt/>.
- [11] Koundinya Vajjha, Avraham Shinnar, Barry Trager, Vasily Pestun, and Nathan Fulton. **CertRL: formalizing convergence proofs for value and policy iteration in Coq**. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs, CPP 2021*, pages 18–31, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [12] Koundinya Vajjha, Barry Trager, Avraham Shinnar, and Vasily Pestun. **Formalization of a Stochastic Approximation Theorem**. In June Andronick and Leonardo de Moura, editors, *13th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP 2022)*, volume 237 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 31:1—31:18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [13] L. G. Valiant. **A theory of the learnable**. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984.
- [14] Vladimir N Vapnik and A. Ya Chervonenkis. **On the Uniform Convergence of Relative Frequencies of Events to Their Probabilities**. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 16(2):264–280, 1971.