

Fine-grained Generalization Analysis of Structured Output Prediction*

Waleed Mustafa¹, Yunwen Lei², Antoine Ledent¹ and Marius Kloft¹

¹TU Kaiserslautern

²University of Birmingham

mustafa@cs.uni-kl.de, y.lei@bham.ac.uk, {ledent, kloft}@cs.uni-kl.de

Abstract

In machine learning we often encounter structured output prediction problems (SOPPs), i.e. problems where the output space admits a rich internal structure. Application domains where SOPPs naturally occur include natural language processing, speech recognition, and computer vision. Typical SOPPs have an extremely large label set, which grows exponentially as a function of the size of the output. Existing generalization analysis implies generalization bounds with at least a square-root dependency on the cardinality d of the label set, which can be vacuous in practice. In this paper, we significantly improve the state of the art by developing novel high-probability bounds with a logarithmic dependency on d . Moreover, we leverage the lens of algorithmic stability to develop generalization bounds in expectation without any dependency on d . Our results therefore build a solid theoretical foundation for learning in large-scale SOPPs. Furthermore, we extend our results to learning with weakly dependent data.

1 Introduction

Structured output prediction (SOP) refers to a broad class of machine learning problems with a rich structure in the output space. For instance, the output may be a sequence of tags in part-of-speech (POS) tagging, a sentence in machine translation, or a grid of segmentation labels in image segmentation.

A distinguishing property of these tasks is that the loss function admits a decomposition along the output structures. For instance, if the output is a sequence of partial labels, the loss function could be the Hamming distance. The output structure makes those problems substantially different, both algorithmically and theoretically, from well-studied machine-learning methods such as binary classification. Algorithms specifically targeted at SOPPs have been put forward in [Lafferty *et al.*, 2001; Ciliberto *et al.*, 2016; Taskar *et al.*, 2003; Tsochantaridis *et al.*, 2005; Vinyals *et al.*, 2015; Lucchi *et al.*, 2013; Chen *et al.*, 2017], to mention but a few.

Whilst the subject of SOP is well explored from a practical point of view, existing theoretical analyses have several limitations. For instance, the results in [Taskar *et al.*, 2003; Collins, 2001] apply only to specific factor graphs and bound errors measured only by the Hamming loss, while other losses such as *edit distance* and *BLUE scores* are more natural in many applications. [McAllester, 2007] introduced guarantees that apply to general losses but only to randomized linear algorithms and admit only a square-root dependence on the size of substructures. In [Cortes *et al.*, 2016], the authors introduced general bounds that apply to general factor graphs and general losses from the viewpoint of function class capacity. However, the associated bounds exhibit a square-root dependence on the number d of categories a subset of substructures can take, which can become vacuous when applied to extreme multi-class contexts [Lei *et al.*, 2019] or models that assume a large dependence between the substructures.

In this paper, we aim to advance the state of the art in the theoretical foundation of SOP by developing generalization bounds applicable to large-scale problems with millions of labels. Our contributions are as follows.

1. We apply the celebrated technique of Rademacher complexity to develop high-probability generalization bounds with a *log* dependency on the size of the label set. This substantially improves the existing state of the art, which comes with at least a square-root dependency. We achieve this improvement by using covering numbers measured by the ℓ_∞ -norm, which can exploit the Lipschitz continuity of loss functions with respect to (w.r.t.) the ℓ_∞ -norm. For comparison, the existing complexity analysis uses the Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. the ℓ_2 -norm [Cortes *et al.*, 2016], which does not match the regularity of loss functions in structured output prediction and thus leads to suboptimal bounds.
2. We leverage the framework of algorithmic stability to further remove the log dependency for generalization bounds in expectation. We consider two popular methods for structured output prediction: stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and regularized risk minimization (RRM). We adapt the existing stability analysis in a way to exploit the Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ -norm of loss functions in SOP.
3. We extend our discussion to learning with weakly dependent training examples, which are widespread in SOPPs. For example, in natural language processing (NLP), a data set can come in the form of sets of documents, while learning

*To appear in IJCAI 2021

is performed at the sentence level. While assuming that the sentences are independent is inaccurate, it is reasonable to assume that the dependency between sentences decreases when their distance in a document increases.

The remaining parts of the paper are structured as follows. We discuss some related work in Section 2 and present the problem formulation in Section 3. We present our main results on generalization bounds in Section 4, which are extended to learning with dependent examples in Section 5. We conclude the paper in Section 6.

2 Related Work

We first review some work on structured output prediction. Many algorithms have been developed to solve structured output prediction problems. Early techniques considered generative probabilistic models (e.g., hidden Markov models [Rabiner and Juang, 1986]). Motivated by the success of support vector machines (SVM), large-margin models for structured data were proposed in [Taskar *et al.*, 2003; Tsochantaridis *et al.*, 2005]. To reduce the model complexity, conditional random fields (CRFs) [Lafferty *et al.*, 2001] model the conditional distribution of the structured outputs rather than modeling the joint probability of the input and output. A key property of these models is that their prediction step can be viewed as maximising a scoring function. Such a scoring function enjoys a decomposition over the substructure so that the maximisation can be done efficiently. CRFs were combined with convolutional neural networks (CNNs) in [Chen *et al.*, 2017] to approach semantic segmentation problems, achieving better performance than CNNs alone.

In [Collins, 2001; Taskar *et al.*, 2003], the authors showed a generalization bound for their proposed models. However, they considered restricted models and losses (Hamming loss). A PAC-Bayesian bound is proved in [McAllester, 2007] for Bayesian prediction algorithms. In [Cortes *et al.*, 2016] the authors introduced a more general generalization bound that applies to general losses and models. Their bound scales as the square root of the number of classes. This can lead to vacuous bounds when the number of classes per substructure and their dependence on each other continue to increase.

[Ciliberto *et al.*, 2016] introduced the *implicit embedding* approach to structured output prediction where the label is encoded into a vector in some Hilbert space via an encoding function. A decoding function is also defined so that prediction is performed by composing a regression function and the decoding function, thus establishing a connection between structured output prediction and regression. They provided generalization bounds of the order of $O(m^{-\frac{1}{4}})$, where m is the number of samples, which can be a problem for large m . Recently, [Ciliberto *et al.*, 2019] introduced the setting of localized structured output prediction, where they assume a form of weak dependence between substructures. Their model utilizes such assumption by treating each part of the structure as an independent sample. They prove bounds of the order $O((ml)^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ for their method, where l is the number of substructures, under weakly dependent samples.

We now review the related work for multi-class clas-

sification (MCC), which is a specific case of structured output prediction. Various capacity measures of function classes were used to study generalization bounds of MCC, including Rademacher complexities [Lei *et al.*, 2015; Maurer, 2016; Li *et al.*, 2018; Maximov *et al.*, 2018; Musayeva *et al.*, 19], covering numbers [Zhang, 2004; Lei *et al.*, 2019; Ledent *et al.*, 2019] and the fat-shattering dimension [Guermeur, 2017]. While initial analyses implied generalization bounds with at least a linear dependency on the number of classes [Koltchinskii and Panchenko, 2002], the couplings among class components were exploited recently to get a dependency that can be as mild as square-root [Cortes *et al.*, 2016; Li *et al.*, 2018] or even logarithmic [Lei *et al.*, 2019; Wu *et al.*, 2021].

3 Problem Formulation

SOP refers to machine learning problems with an internal structure in the outputs (and potentially also in the inputs). For example in sequence-to-sequence prediction, both the input and output are sequences. In syntax analysis, the inputs are sequences of words and the output is a parse tree.

Let \mathcal{X} be an input space (e.g., sentences in a given language) and \mathcal{Y} be an output space (e.g., POS tags for the input sentences). In structured output prediction, the output space can often be decomposed into a number of substructures. Take POS tags as an example, where each word tag represents a substructure and the sequence of tags constitutes the structured output. Formally we define $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{Y}_l$, where \mathcal{Y}_k is the set of possible classes a substructure k can take. For a point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, let y^k denote the k -th element in y (i.e., $y = (y^1, \dots, y^l)$).

We aim to learn a scoring function $h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ based on which we can perform the prediction as $\hat{y}(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} h(x, y)$. The score function in structured output prediction can be described via a factor graph $G = (V, F, E)$, where $V = [l] := \{1, \dots, l\}$ is the set of variable nodes, F is a set of factor nodes, and E is a set of undirected edges between a variable node and a factor node. Let $\mathcal{N}(f)$ be the set of nodes connected to the factor f by an edge and $\mathcal{Y}_f = \prod_{k \in \mathcal{N}(f)} \mathcal{Y}_k$. For brevity, we assume that $|\mathcal{Y}_f| = d$ for all f , where $|\mathcal{Y}_f|$ denotes the cardinality of \mathcal{Y}_f . Now we define the scoring function $h(x, y)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ as

$$h(x, y) = \sum_{f \in F} h_f(x, y_f),$$

where $y_f := \{y^j : j \in \mathcal{N}(f)\}$ and $h_f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Figure 1 gives an example of factor graphs and scoring functions.

Let $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ be a training set with $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ being independently drawn from a distribution \mathcal{D} over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. We use a loss function $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ to measure the performance of prediction models, based on which we can define the margin loss [Cortes *et al.*, 2016] as $L_\rho : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$L_\rho(x, y, h) = \Phi^* \left(\max_{y' \neq y} \{L(y', y) - \frac{1}{\rho} [h(x, y) - h(x, y')]\} \right), \quad (1)$$




Figure 1: Examples of factor graphs. Panel (a) represents a factor graph with only one factor node. Note that $\mathcal{N}(f_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{f_1} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_3 \times \mathcal{Y}_4$. If $\mathcal{Y}_i = \{1, 2, 3\}$ for all i , then $|\mathcal{Y}_{f_1}| = 3^4$. The corresponding scoring function is $h(x, y) = h_{f_1}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4)$. Panel (b) depicts an example of factor graph that assumes a sequence-like structure. The scoring function in this case is $h(x, y) = h_{f_1}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3) + h_{f_2}(x, y^2, y^3, y^4) + h_{f_3}(x, y^3, y^4, y^5)$. Panel (c) depicts an example of tree-like factor graph.

where $\Phi^*(r) = \min(M, \max(0, r))$, $M = \max_{y, y'} L(y, y')$ and $\mathcal{H} \subset \{h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ is some hypothesis class. Note that $L_\rho(x, y, h) \geq L(\hat{y}(x), y)$. Therefore, the obtained bounds for L_ρ will also hold for L . We then define the population risk $R(h)$ and empirical risk $R_S(h)$ to quantify the performance of a model h on testing and training examples, respectively as:

$$R(h) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[L_\rho(x, y, h)], \quad R_S(h) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m L_\rho(x_i, y_i, h).$$

Let Ψ be a feature function which maps an input-output example $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ to \mathbb{R}^D , where D is the dimension of feature space. In structured output prediction, the feature extractor takes a composite form according to the factor graph G , that is, $\Psi(x, y) = \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x, y_f)$, where $\Phi_f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We consider a linear scoring function $h^w(x, y) = \langle w, \Psi(x, y) \rangle$ indexed by a $w \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Then the hypothesis space becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_p = \{(x, y) \mapsto \langle w, \Psi(x, y) \rangle : \|w\|_p \leq \Lambda, (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\|w\|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^D |w_i|^p)^{1/p}$ is the ℓ_p -norm of $w = (w_1, \dots, w_D)$. We also define the class of loss functions

$$F_{p, \Lambda, \rho} := \{(x, y) \mapsto L_\rho(x, y, h^w) : h^w \in \mathcal{H}_p\}. \quad (3)$$

4 Main Results

In this section, we present our main results on generalization bounds for structured output prediction. We consider two types of generalization bounds: complexity-based bounds and stability-based bounds. Our aim is to develop bounds with a very mild dependency on the size of the label set, thus laying a solid foundation for structured output prediction, where the size of label set \mathcal{Y} is often extremely large in practice. A key discovery to both our stability-based and complexity-based analysis is to note the Lipschitz continuity of loss functions w.r.t. infinity-norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.

Definition 1 (Lipschitz continuity). We say that a loss function $L(x, y, h)$ is (τ, ℓ_∞) -Lipschitz in the last argument if, for any $h, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, we have:

$$|L(x, y, h) - L(x, y, \tilde{h})| \leq \tau \max_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} |h(x, y') - \tilde{h}(x, y')|.$$

The existing analysis [Cortes *et al.*, 2016] uses the (τ_2, ℓ_2) Lipschitz continuity of loss functions:

$$|L(x, y, h) - L(x, y, \tilde{h})| \leq \tau_2 \left(\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} |h(x, y') - \tilde{h}(x, y')|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that the Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. ℓ_∞ -norm is much stronger than that w.r.t. ℓ_2 -norm. Indeed, if L is (τ, ℓ_∞) -Lipschitz then it is also (τ, ℓ_2) Lipschitz since $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|_2$. As a comparison, a (τ_2, ℓ_2) -Lipschitz function can be $(\tau_2 \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|}, \ell_\infty)$ -Lipschitz due to the norm relationship $\|\cdot\|_2 \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|} \|\cdot\|_\infty$ (the equality can hold in some cases).

In Lemma 1 we build the ℓ_∞ -Lipschitz continuity of L_ρ for structured output prediction. A remarkable property is that the involved Lipschitz constant is independent of $|\mathcal{Y}|$. This shows that the loss function in structured output prediction is well behaved in the sense of Lipschitz continuity. However, the existing analysis based on the (τ_2, ℓ_2) -Lipschitz continuity fails to exploit this strong regularity, and therefore only implies suboptimal bounds with at least a square-root dependency on the size of the label set. The proof of Lemma 1 below is given in the appendix.

Lemma 1. *The loss function L_ρ is $(\frac{2}{\rho}, \ell_\infty)$ -Lipschitz with respect to the scoring function h for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.*

4.1 Complexity-based Generalization Bounds

We develop generalization bounds with high probability here. Our basic tool to this aim is the Rademacher complexity.

Definition 2. The empirical Rademacher complexity of a function class \mathcal{H} of real-valued functions is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{R}_S(\mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i f(x_i) \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\{\sigma_i\}$ are random variables with equal probability of being either $+1$ or -1 .

Theorem 1. *Let $\rho > 0$ be. Then the Rademacher complexity of the loss class $F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}$ is bounded as follows:*

$$\mathfrak{R}(F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}) \leq \frac{4}{m} + \frac{144 \sqrt{q-1} \Psi^* \Lambda |F| \tilde{L}}{\rho \sqrt{m}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{L} = \sqrt{\log(2md|F| [8\Psi^* \Lambda m |F| / \rho + 3] + 1) \log(m)}$, $\Psi^* = \sup_{f \in F, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f, x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\Psi_f(x, y)\|_q$, and $q = p/(p-1)$.

The proof strategy is to relate the complexity of the loss class $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$ to a complexity of a scalar linear function class on an extended set of size $m|F|d$, thus moving contribution of d to the complexity from the output dimension to the size of training set. We then utilize standard bounds [Zhang, 2002] that admit log dependency on the size of training set. The detailed proof is given in the appendix.

Remark 1. We now compare our results with related work. In [Cortes *et al.*, 2016], the authors bounded the Rademacher complexity of $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$ by a factor graph Rademacher complexity. Specifically for the loss class (3) they proved $\mathfrak{R}(F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\rho} \hat{\mathfrak{R}}_S^G(\mathcal{H}_p)$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_S^G(\mathcal{H}_p)$ is defined as

$$\frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i \in [m], f \in F, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f} \sqrt{|F|} \epsilon_{i,f,y} \langle w, \Psi_f(x_i, y) \rangle \right].$$

Here $\epsilon = (\epsilon_{i,f,y})_{i \in [m], f \in F, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f}$ and each $\epsilon_{i,f,y}$ is an independent Rademacher variable. Combining the result from Theorem 2 in [Cortes *et al.*, 2016], we get the following bound for learning with ℓ_2 -regularization: $\mathfrak{R}(F_{2,\Lambda,\rho}) \leq O\left(\frac{\Lambda \Psi^* |F| \sqrt{d}}{\rho \sqrt{m}}\right)$. Note the bound exhibit a square-root dependency on the number of classes per factor $d = |\mathcal{Y}_f|$. Thus it is vacuous for typical SOPPs, where the number of class labels grows exponentially w.r.t. the size of the output. For comparison, our bounds enjoy a log dependency on d and therefore still imply meaningful generalization bounds in this setting.

As a direct corollary, we use the connection between generalization and Rademacher complexity to get Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 (Generalization Bounds). *For any $\rho > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $h \in \mathcal{H}_p$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of training data S , the following bound holds:*

$$R(h) \leq R_S(h) + \frac{8}{m} + \frac{288\sqrt{q} - 1\Psi^* \Lambda |F|}{\rho \sqrt{m}} \tilde{L} + M \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{2m}}.$$

4.2 Stability-based Generalization Bounds

In this section, we present generalization bounds in expectation for structured output prediction by leveraging the lens of algorithmic stability. Algorithmic stability is a fundamental concept in statistical learning theory, which measures the sensitiveness of output models when the training dataset of an algorithm A is slightly perturbed. For any algorithm A , we use $A(S)$ to denote the model produced by running A over the training examples S .

Definition 3 (Uniform Stability). A stochastic algorithm A is ϵ -uniformly stable if, for all training datasets $S, \tilde{S} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ that differ by at most one example, we have

$$\sup_{x,y} \mathbb{E}_A [L_\rho(x, y, A(S)) - L_\rho(x, y, A(\tilde{S}))] \leq \epsilon. \quad (6)$$

Algorithmic stability naturally implies quantitative generalization bounds, as shown in the following lemma [Shalev-Shwartz *et al.*, 2010].

Lemma 2 (Generalization via uniform stability). *Let A be ϵ -uniformly stable. Then $|\mathbb{E}_{S,A} [R(A(S)) - R_S(A(S))]| \leq \epsilon$.*

We will apply algorithmic stability to study two representative algorithms for SOP: regularization and stochastic gradient descent. For brevity, we use the abbreviation $R(w) = R(h^w)$, $R_S(w) = R_S(h^w)$, etc. We also write $w^* = \arg \inf_w R(w)$ for the minimizer of the population risk.

Regularized Risk Minimization. RRM is a popular scheme to overcome overfitting in machine learning. The basic idea is to add a regularizer to the empirical risk and build a regularized empirical risk R_S^λ . Then we minimize the resulting objective function to obtain a model w_S as follows:

$$w_S = \arg \min_w [R_S^\lambda(h^w) := R_S(h^w) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|_2^2]. \quad (7)$$

Here we omit the dependency of w_S on the regularization parameter for brevity. In the following lemma to be proved in the appendix, we show that the above regularization algorithm is uniformly stable. Let $\kappa := \sup_{x,y} \|\Psi(x, y)\|_2$.

Lemma 3. *Let A be defined as (7), i.e., $A(S) = w_S$. Then A is $\frac{16\kappa^2}{m\rho^2\lambda}$ -uniformly stable.*

This lemma is a variant of the stability bound in [Bousquet and Elisseeff, 2002], which, however, requires the loss function to be admissible. We adapt their technique to the setting of structured output prediction and a key step in our analysis is again the Lipschitz continuity of the loss function w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ norm. A use of the classical Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. ℓ_2 norm would incur a bound with at least a square-root dependency on d . For comparison, the consideration of Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ norm allows us to get stability bounds independent of the size of the label set.

We can combine the Lipschitz continuity of loss functions, the stability of regularization schemes established in Lemma 3 and Lemma 2 together to get the following generalization bounds for structured output prediction. Let

$$w^\lambda = \arg \inf_w [R^\lambda(w) := R(h^w) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|_2^2]$$

be the minimizer of the regularized risk. We have the following result, whose proof is given in the appendix.

Theorem 3. *Let w_S be defined in (7). Then*

$$\mathbb{E} [R^\lambda(w_S) - R^\lambda(w^\lambda)] \leq \frac{16\kappa^2}{m\rho^2\lambda}. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, if we choose $\lambda = \frac{4\sqrt{2}\kappa}{\sqrt{m\rho}\|w^*\|_2}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} [R(w_S)] - R(w^*) \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\kappa\|w^*\|_2}{\sqrt{m\rho}}. \quad (9)$$

Stochastic Gradient Descent. We now turn to the performance of SGD for structured output prediction. SGD is a popular optimization algorithm with wide applications in learning in a big data setting. Let $w^{(1)}$ be the initial point and $\{\eta_t\}$ be a sequence of positive step sizes. At the t -th iteration, we first randomly select an index i_t according to the uniform distribution over $[m]$, which is used to build a stochastic gradient $L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}})$ ($L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}})$ denotes a subgradient of $L_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^w)$ at $w = w^{(t)}$). Then we update the model along the negative direction of the stochastic gradient

$$w^{(t+1)} = w^{(t)} - \eta_t L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}}). \quad (10)$$

This scheme of selecting a single example to build a stochastic gradient allows SGD to get sample-size independent iteration complexity, and is especially appealing if m is large. Since we consider a linear scoring function h^w , the loss function L_ρ is convex w.r.t. w . In the following lemma to be proved in the appendix, we build the uniform stability of SGD for structured output prediction. Note here we do not require the loss function to be smooth [Lei and Ying, 2020].

Lemma 4. *Let $S = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ and $S' = \{z'_1, \dots, z'_m\}$ be two datasets that differ only by a single example. Let $\{w^{(t)}\}$ and $\{\hat{w}^{(t)}\}$ be two sequences produced by SGD based on S and S' , respectively. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_A [\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2] \leq 16e(1 + t/m^2)\kappa^2\rho^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^2.$$

According to Lemma 4, we know that the algorithm becomes more and more unstable as we run more and more iterations. We can use this stability bound to derive generalization bounds of SGD for structured output prediction. The proof is given in the appendix.

Theorem 4. *Let $\{w^{(t)}\}$ be produced by (10) with $\eta_t = \eta$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\bar{w}^{(T)})] - R(w^*) \leq O\left(\left(\sqrt{T} + T/m\right)\kappa^2\eta + \frac{1+T\kappa^2\eta^2}{T\eta}\right), \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{w}^{(T)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w^{(t)}$ is an average of iterates.

The upper bound (11) involves two terms. The first term $\sqrt{T} + T/m$ comes from controlling the generalization error $R(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)})$, while the second term $\frac{1+T\kappa^2\eta^2}{T\eta}$ comes from controlling the optimization error $R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(w^*)$. It is clear the optimization error decreases w.r.t. T , while the generalization error grows in the learning process. Therefore, we need to trade-off these two terms by early-stopping SGD as done by the following corollary. We write $B \asymp \tilde{B}$ if there are absolute constants c_1 and c_2 such that $c_1B \leq \tilde{B} \leq c_2B$.

Corollary 1. *Let $\{w^{(t)}\}$ be the sequence produced by (10) with $\eta_t = \eta$. If we choose $T \asymp m^2$ and $\eta \asymp T^{-\frac{3}{4}}/\kappa$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\bar{w}^{(T)})] - R(w^*) \leq O(\kappa m^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Remark 2. According to Theorem 3 and Corollary 1, we know that both the regularization method and SGD are able to achieve the generalization bound $O(1/\sqrt{m})$, which is minimax optimal. While RRM requires the objective function to be strongly convex, SGD only requires the objective function to be convex. Remarkably, these generalization bounds do not admit any dependency on the size of the label set, and provide a convincing explanation on why SOP often works well even if the problem has more class labels than training examples. To our best knowledge, these are the first label-size free generalization bounds. As compared to Theorem 2 on high-probability bounds, our generalization bounds here are stated in expectation. It should be noted that our bounds in expectation require the loss functions to be convex, while the high-probability analysis also applies to nonconvex cases.

4.3 Applications

In this section we discuss applications of our bounds and compare them to those of [Cortes *et al.*, 2016].

Example 1. Consider pair-wise Markov networks with fixed number of substructures l [Taskar *et al.*, 2003]. Specifically, we have $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{Y}_l$ and $\mathcal{Y}_k \in [c]$ for $k \in [l]$. Further, we have sequence-like connections, i.e., there is an arrangement of output nodes such that if a factor $f \in F$ is connected to two nodes then they are neighbors in that arrangement. Therefore we have $|F| = l-1$ and $d = c^2$. We further assume an unnormalized hamming loss $L(y, y') = \sum_{k=1}^l \mathbb{1}_{y_k \neq y'_k}$ so that we normalize later in the bound to get rid of the dependence on $l = |F| + 1$. For regularized learning with these Markov networks, the Rademacher complexity of loss function classes was bounded in [Cortes *et al.*, 2016]

$$\mathfrak{R}(F_{2,\Lambda,\rho}) \leq O\left(\frac{\Lambda\Psi^*c}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

As a comparison, our Rademacher complexity bound in Theorem 1 reduces to an upper bound on $\mathfrak{R}(F_{2,\Lambda,\rho})$ that has the form

$$O\left(\frac{\Lambda\Psi^* \log m \sqrt{\log(2mc^2l[8\Psi^*\Lambda m/\rho+3]+1)}}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

Therefore, our bound significantly outperforms their bound by dropping their linear dependency on c to a logarithmic dependency. If we further extend the model so that each factor f is connected to v nodes instead of 2, their bound grows, as a function of v , as $O(c^{v/2})$ while ours increase only $O(\sqrt{v})$. Furthermore, according to Theorems 3, 4, we can get generalization bounds $O(\kappa/\sqrt{m})$ in expectation for both RRM and SGD, where the log dependency is further removed.

Example 2. As the second example we consider multi-class classification. In this case we have no substructures and therefore $|F| = 1$, $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \mathcal{Y}$ where $\mathcal{Y} = [c]$, $d = c$. In [Cortes *et al.*, 2016], the Rademacher complexity for multi-class learning with ℓ_2 regularization was shown to satisfy

$$\mathfrak{R}(F_{2,\Lambda,\rho}) \leq O\left(\frac{\Psi^*\Lambda\sqrt{c}}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

Our analysis instead shows $\mathfrak{R}(F_{2,\Lambda,\rho})$ is bounded by

$$O\left(\frac{\Psi^*\Lambda\sqrt{\log(2mc[8\Psi^*\Lambda m/\rho+3]+1)\log m}}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

It is clear that we drop the square root dependency in c in [Cortes *et al.*, 2016] to a log dependence. Analogous to Example 1, the log dependency can be further removed if we consider generalization bounds in expectation, as shown in Theorems 3 and 4.

Example 3. In this example we explore the possibility of combining SOP models above with a learned feature extraction function Ψ as was practically explored in [Chen *et al.*, 2017; Hinton *et al.*, 2012]. Consider the case where Ψ is a CNN that takes x as input and outputs different D -dimensional vector $\Psi_f(x, y_f)$ for each factor f and label y_f . Chaining the covers, one can bound the Rademacher

complexity of the combined class as follows:

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{q-1}\Psi^*\Lambda|F|}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\bar{D}}{m}}\log(\tilde{G})\right),$$

where the notation \tilde{O} hides logarithmic factors, \bar{D} is the number of network parameters and \tilde{G} is a product of norms of network weight matrices. The details of the bound and its derivation of this bound are given in the appendix.

5 Learning Weakly Dependent Sequences

In the above bounds we assumed that the examples are sampled independently from each other. However, this assumption is often violated in practice. For example, consider the problem of POS tagging. We are usually given a dataset of documents each of which contains a sequence of sentences. There are two natural assumptions. (1) We may assume that each document is a long sequence of dependent words. This assumption is too pessimistic. The considered sample size becomes too small, and the prediction complexity increases while, as sentences get further apart, the dependence between them decreases, and thus the effective sample size increases. (2) We may assume that each sentence is independent of the others within and across documents. This assumption on the other hand is too optimistic. Sentences following each other in the same document indeed have some degree of dependence. We formalize this dependence in a hierarchical manner, thus providing a trade-off between these two assumptions. Namely, we assume that the documents are independent of each other while sentences within a document are only weakly dependent. We note that the term document here does not necessarily mean an actual text document but rather any sequence of examples (e.g., for a dataset of videos, one video is a document as it is a sequence of images).

We now formalize the idea above. We are given a training set of independent documents $\{D_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Each document D_i is a sequence of weakly dependent examples $D_i = (z_i^j)_{j=1}^J$. Since the structured output prediction framework in the above section subsumed the usual classification paradigm, we assume that the sequence elements classes follows it. That is, $z_j^i \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} =: \mathcal{Z}$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} defined as above.

Now we define precisely how the examples within each document D_i are weakly dependent. We assume that each example within a given document is sampled from a β -mixing process, defined below, at times $1, 2, \dots, J$.

Definition 4 (Stationary β -mixing Stochastic Process). Let $(z^k)_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be a stationary stochastic process and $\sigma_L = \sigma((z^k)_{k=1}^L)$ and $\sigma_{L+a} = \sigma((z^k)_{k=L+a}^{\infty})$ be the sigma algebras generated by the random variables $Z_1^L = (z^1, \dots, z^L)$ and $Z_{L+a}^{\infty} = (z^{L+a}, \dots, Z^{\infty})$. Define the β -mixing coefficient $\beta(a) := \sup_{L \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B \in \sigma_{L+a}} |P(B|\sigma_L) - P(B)| \right]$.

The process is called β -mixing if $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \beta(a) = 0$. It is called exponentially mixing if $\beta(a) \leq \beta_0 \exp(-\beta_1 a^r)$ or algebraically mixing if $\beta(a) \leq \beta_0/a^r$, for positive β_0, β_1 and r .

Some examples of exponentially mixing process include a class of Autoregressive Moving Average (ARMA)

[Mokkadem, 1988] and a class of Markov process [Rosenblatt, 2012].

Now let \mathcal{H} be a structured output prediction function class as defined in the previous section (see (2)). For $h \in \mathcal{H}$, let $L_h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, M]$ be a loss function over elements of the sequence z^k . An example for such a loss is given in equation (1). Again we are interested in high probability bounds on the difference between two quantities: the empirical risk $\hat{R}_S(h)$ and the true risk $R(h)$, which are defined as

$$R_S(h) = \frac{1}{mJ} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^J L_h(z_i^j), \quad R(h) = \mathbb{E}_S[R_S(h)].$$

Theorem 5 summarizes the main results of this section.

Theorem 5. Let $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$ be the loss class defined in (3) and let S be a set of independent and identically distributed documents $D_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, where each document is a sequence of examples $(z_i^j)_{j=1}^J$ drawn from a β -mixing process. For any integer $a > 0$ such that J is a multiple of $2a$. Let $\delta > 2m(\frac{J}{2a} - 1)\beta(a)$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds uniformly over all $h \in \mathcal{H}_p$

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{2a(q-1)\Psi^*\Lambda|F|}\tilde{L}}{\rho\sqrt{mJ}}\right) + \frac{M\sqrt{a}\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\frac{J}{2a} - 1)\beta(a)}\right)}}{\sqrt{mJ}}, \quad (12)$$

where $\tilde{L} = \sqrt{\log(2mJd|F|[\delta\Psi^*\Lambda mJ/\rho + 3] + 1)\log(mJ)}$.

Remark 3. Note that the bound unsurprisingly depends on the same main quantities as the bound in Theorem 2. To better interpret it consider the following two extreme cases. (1) The elements inside each document are independent of each other. Note that in this case $\beta(a) = 0$, for all a , hence a can be chosen to be 1 and the bound boils down to the bound in Theorem 2. (2) The elements inside each document are strongly dependent. Thus, $\beta(a) \approx 1$ for all a and therefore selecting $a = \frac{J}{2}$ leads to the bound in Theorem 2 with only m training examples. We further note that $\beta(a) \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$, therefore, for any process admitting a fast decaying $\beta(a)$ the term $2m(\frac{J}{2a} - 1)\beta(a)$ approaches 0 fast for moderate a .

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we advance the state of the art in the generalization analysis of structured output prediction. We consider two types of generalization bounds: complexity-based and stability-based bounds. Our complexity-based approach produces bounds with high probability that admit a log dependency on the size of the label set. The stability-based approach further removes this log dependency for generalization bounds in expectation. This significantly improves the existing bounds, which have at least a square root dependency. We also extend our discussion to the setting of learning with weakly dependent training examples.

A very interesting question is to investigate whether the log dependency in the high probability analysis is an artefact

of our analysis or is really essential. Another question is to extend our generalization bounds in expectation to learning with nonconvex functions.

Acknowledgments

MK, AL and WM acknowledge support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) award KL 2698/2-1 and by the German Federal Ministry of Science and Education (BMBF) awards 01IS18051A, 031B0770E, and 01MK20014U. YL acknowledges support by NSFC under Grant No. 61806091.

References

- [Bartlett *et al.*, 2017] Peter L Bartlett, Dylan J Foster, and Matus J Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [Bottou *et al.*, 2018] Léon Bottou, Frank E Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *SIAM Review*, 60(2):223–311, 2018.
- [Bousquet and Elisseeff, 2002] Olivier Bousquet and André Elisseeff. Stability and generalization. *JMLR*, 2:499–526, 2002.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2017] Liang-Chieh Chen, George Papandreou, Iasonas Kokkinos, Kevin Murphy, and Alan L Yuille. Deeplab: Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets, atrous convolution, and fully connected CRFs. *TPAMI*, 40(4):834–848, 2017.
- [Ciliberto *et al.*, 2016] Carlo Ciliberto, Alessandro Rudi, and Lorenzo Rosasco. A consistent regularization approach for structured prediction. In *NeurIPS*, 2016.
- [Ciliberto *et al.*, 2019] Carlo Ciliberto, Francis Bach, and Alessandro Rudi. Localized structured prediction. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [Collins, 2001] Michael Collins. Parameter estimation for statistical parsing models: Theory and practice of. In *IWPT*, pages 4–15, 2001.
- [Cortes *et al.*, 2016] Corinna Cortes, Vitaly Kuznetsov, Mehryar Mohri, and Scott Yang. Structured prediction theory based on factor graph complexity. In *NeurIPS*, 2016.
- [Guermeur, 2017] Yann Guermeur. Lp-norm sauer–shelah lemma for margin multi-category classifiers. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 89:450–473, 2017.
- [Hinton *et al.*, 2012] Geoffrey Hinton, Li Deng, Dong Yu, George E Dahl, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, Navdeep Jaitly, Andrew Senior, Vincent Vanhoucke, Patrick Nguyen, Tara N Sainath, et al. Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups. *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, 29(6):82–97, 2012.
- [Koltchinskii and Panchenko, 2002] Vladimir Koltchinskii and Dmitry Panchenko. Empirical margin distributions and bounding the generalization error of combined classifiers. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1–50, 2002.
- [Lafferty *et al.*, 2001] John D Lafferty, Andrew McCallum, and Fernando CN Pereira. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *ICML*, pages 282–289, 2001.
- [Ledent *et al.*, 2019] Antoine Ledent, Waleed Mustafa, Yunwen Lei, and Marius Kloft. Norm-based generalisation bounds for multi-class convolutional neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1905.12430, 2019.
- [Lei and Ying, 2020] Yunwen Lei and Yiming Ying. Fine-grained analysis of stability and generalization for stochastic gradient descent. In *ICML*, 2020.
- [Lei *et al.*, 2015] Yunwen Lei, Urun Dogan, Alexander Binder, and Marius Kloft. Multi-class svms: From tighter data-dependent generalization bounds to novel algorithms. In *NeurIPS*, 2015.
- [Lei *et al.*, 2019] Yunwen Lei, Ürün Dogan, Ding-Xuan Zhou, and Marius Kloft. Data-dependent generalization bounds for multi-class classification. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(5):2995–3021, 2019.
- [Li *et al.*, 2018] Jian Li, Yong Liu, Rong Yin, Hua Zhang, Lizhong Ding, and Weiping Wang. Multi-class learning: from theory to algorithm. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [Long and Sedghi, 2020] Philip M. Long and Hanie Sedghi. Size-free generalization bounds for convolutional neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [Lucchi *et al.*, 2013] Aurelien Lucchi, Y. Li, and P. Fua. Learning for structured prediction using approximate sub-gradient descent with working sets. In *CVPR*, 2013.
- [Maurer, 2016] Andreas Maurer. A vector-contraction inequality for rademacher complexities. In *ALT*, 2016.
- [Maximov *et al.*, 2018] Yury Maximov, Massih-Reza Amini, and Zaid Harchaoui. Rademacher complexity bounds for a penalized multi-class semi-supervised algorithm. *JAIR*, 61:761–786, 2018.
- [McAllester, 2007] David McAllester. Generalization bounds and consistency. *Predicting structured data*, pages 247–261, 2007.
- [Meir, 2000] Ron Meir. Nonparametric time series prediction through adaptive model selection. *Machine learning*, 39(1):5–34, 2000.
- [Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2008] Mehryar Mohri and Afshin Rostamizadeh. Rademacher complexity bounds for non-iid processes. *NeurIPS*, 21, 2008.
- [Mohri *et al.*, 2018] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of machine learning*. MIT press, 2018.
- [Mokkadem, 1988] Abdelkader Mokkadem. Mixing properties of arma processes. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 29(2):309–315, 1988.
- [Musayeva *et al.*, 19] Khadija Musayeva, Fabien Lauer, and Yann Guermeur. Rademacher complexity and generalization performance of multi-category margin classifiers. *Neurocomputing*, 342:6–15, 19.

- [Neyshabur *et al.*, 2015] Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. Norm-based capacity control in neural networks. In Peter GrÅEnwald, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale, editors, *COLT*, volume 40 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, Paris, France, 03–06 Jul 2015. PMLR.
- [Rabiner and Juang, 1986] Lawrence Rabiner and B Juang. An introduction to hidden markov models. *IEEE ASSP Magazine*, 3(1):4–16, 1986.
- [Rosenblatt, 2012] Murray Rosenblatt. *Markov Processes, Structure and Asymptotic Behavior: Structure and Asymptotic Behavior*, volume 184. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Shalev-Shwartz *et al.*, 2010] Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Ohad Shamir, Nathan Srebro, and Karthik Sridharan. Learnability, stability and uniform convergence. *JMLR*, 11:2635–2670, 2010.
- [Taskar *et al.*, 2003] Ben Taskar, Carlos Guestrin, and Daphne Koller. Max-margin markov networks. *NeurIPS*, 16, 2003.
- [Tsochantaridis *et al.*, 2005] Ioannis Tsochantaridis, Thorsten Joachims, Thomas Hofmann, and Yasemin Altun. Large margin methods for structured and interdependent output variables. *JMLR*, 6:1453–1484, 2005.
- [Vinyals *et al.*, 2015] Oriol Vinyals, Alexander Toshev, Samy Bengio, and Dumitru Erhan. Show and tell: A neural image caption generator. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2021] Liang Wu, Antoine Ledent, Yunwen Lei, and Marius Kloft. Fine-grained generalization analysis of vector-valued learning. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- [Yu, 1994] Bin Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- [Zhang, 2002] Tong Zhang. Covering number bounds of certain regularized linear function classes. *JMLR*, 2, 2002.
- [Zhang, 2004] Tong Zhang. Statistical analysis of some multi-category large margin classification methods. *JMLR*, 5:1225–1251, 2004.

Supplementary Material for “Fine-grained Generalization Analysis of Structured Output Prediction”

A Proof of Lemma 1

In this section, we present the proof of Lemma 1.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $h, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ be arbitrary scoring functions. Given arbitrary $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |L_\rho(x, y, h) - L_\rho(x, y, \tilde{h})| \\
 & \leq \left| \left(\max_{y' \neq y} L(y', y) - \frac{1}{\rho} [h(x, y) - h(x, y')] \right) - \left(\max_{y' \neq y} L(y', y) - \frac{1}{\rho} [\tilde{h}(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y')] \right) \right| \\
 & \leq \max_{y' \neq y} \left| -\frac{1}{\rho} [h(x, y) - h(x, y')] + \frac{1}{\rho} [\tilde{h}(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y')] \right| \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left[\max_{y' \neq y} |h(x, y') - \tilde{h}(x, y')| + |h(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y)| \right] \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \left[\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |h(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y)| + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |h(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y)| \right] \\
 & \leq \frac{2}{\rho} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |h(x, y) - \tilde{h}(x, y)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the Lipschitz continuity. □

B Proofs on Generalization Bounds with High Probability

In this section we sketch the proof of Theorem 1. A key step is to control the complexity of the loss function class (3), which is highly nonlinear and therefore is challenging to deal with. Our basic idea is to relate this complexity to a complexity of a *linear* function class, which is easier to deal with. Indeed, define the following extended function class based on the training sample \tilde{S}

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda} := \{v \mapsto \langle w, v \rangle : w \in \mathbb{R}^D, \|w\|_p \leq \Lambda, v \in \tilde{S}\},$$

where \tilde{S} is defined by

$$\tilde{S} := \{\Psi_f(x, y) : x \in S|_{\mathcal{X}}, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f, f \in F\}.$$

The basic idea in constructing \tilde{S} is as follows. For each input x in the original training set and each feature function $\Psi_f(\cdot, \cdot)$, we construct $|\mathcal{Y}_f|$ training examples as $\Psi_f(x, y')$, for all $y' \in \mathcal{Y}_f$. Therefore, the cardinality of \tilde{S} is $md|F|$. A remarkable discovery is that the complexity of the highly nonlinear loss function class $F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}$ on a dataset of size m can be upper bounded by that of the much simpler linear function class $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda}$ on a dataset of size $md|F|$, via the tool of ℓ_∞ covering numbers.

Definition 5. Let \mathcal{H} be a class of real-valued functions defined over a space Z and $S := \{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \subset Z$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, the empirical ℓ_∞ -covering number denoted by $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{H}, S)$ with respect to S is defined as the minimum cardinality N of collection of vectors $v^1, \dots, v^N \in \mathbb{R}^m$, which we refer to as a cover, such that

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \min_{j=1, \dots, N} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} |h(z_i) - v_i^j| \leq \epsilon.$$

We now formally start building the connection between the complexity of $F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}$ and that of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda}$.

Theorem B.1. *Given the notation above, the following holds*

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}, S) \leq \log \mathcal{N}_\infty\left(\frac{\rho}{2|F|}\epsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda}, \tilde{S}\right). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

This result shows that one can use the covering numbers of the class $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda}$ to control the covering numbers of $F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}$. The advantage of this result is that we now only need to control a covering number of a scalar real-valued function class as opposed to a multi-class-multi-factored class. This reduces the complexity of the problem significantly as controlling covering numbers of scalar function classes is a well-studied problem. In particular, we refer to a covering number bound of linear function classes [Zhang, 2002]. Note considering a large dataset only comes at a slight penalty since the covering number bound in the following lemma enjoys only a log dependency on the cardinality of dataset.

Lemma 5 ([Zhang, 2002]). *Let \mathcal{L} be a class of linear functions on a set of size n . That is, $\mathcal{L} = \{\langle w, x \rangle, x, w \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$. If $\|x\|_q \leq b$ and $\|w\|_p \leq a$, where $2 \leq q < \infty$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then $\forall \epsilon > 0$,*

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{L}, n) \leq 36(q-1) \frac{a^2 b^2}{\epsilon^2} \log[2[4ab/\epsilon + 2]n + 1],$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{L}, n)$ is the worst case covering number of the class \mathcal{L} on a dataset of size n .

The result controls the covering numbers by norms of the data and weights. As a direct corollary of Lemma 5 and Theorem B.1, we derive the following bound on the covering numbers of loss function classes.

Corollary 2. *Given the notation above, the following holds*

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}, S) \leq C \frac{(\Psi^*)^2 \Lambda^2 |F|^2}{\epsilon^2 \rho^2} L_{\log},$$

where $C = 144(q-1)$, $L_{\log} = \log[2[8\Psi^* \Lambda |F|/\epsilon \rho + 2]md|F| + 1]$.

Now that we established bounds on the log of covering numbers, we use these bounds to give bounds on the Rademacher complexity of $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$. To that extent, we use Dudley's theorem to obtain a bound on the Rademacher complexities given bounds on the log covering numbers and thus establishing Theorem 1. The scoring function $h(x, y)$ can be viewed as the probability for the class y given an input x . In our analysis we would like to treat the function $h(x, \cdot)$ as a real-valued vector. That is the vector of class probabilities for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}^k$. This is possible since the set of classes \mathcal{Y}^k is finite. Formally for any general function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (here, we assume a general finite output space \mathcal{Y}_0), where $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \{c_1, \dots, c_K\}$ is some finite set with size K , we denote the vector $(f(x, c_1), \dots, f(x, c_K)) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ by $[f(x, \mathcal{Y}_0)]$. Therefore, we have $[f(x, \mathcal{Y}_0)]_k = f(x, c_k)$. In what follows we always use the notation $f(x, c_k)$ instead of $[f(x, \mathcal{Y}_0)]_k$. Note that for any $c \in \mathcal{Y}_0$, there is a corresponding $k_c \in [K]$ such that $c = c_{k_c}$ and therefore we have $f(x, c) = [f(x, \mathcal{Y}_0)]_{k_c}$ where k_c is the corresponding index of c .

Proof of Theorem B.1. We start by proving (B.1). The idea is to start with an (ϵ, ℓ_∞) -cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$ and use it to construct a $(\frac{\rho}{|F|}\epsilon, \ell_\infty)$ -cover for $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$ with the same size. To that extent, let

$$C := \{\mathbf{r}^j = (r_{1,1,1}^j, \dots, r_{m,d,l}^j) : j = [N]\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{mdl},$$

be an (ϵ, ℓ_∞) -cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p,\Lambda}$, where N is the cardinality of the cover. Now we use C to construct a cover for $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}^1$. To simplify notation, denote by $\mathbf{r}_{i,\dots,f}^j$ the vector $(\mathbf{r}_{i,1,f}^j, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{i,d,f}^j) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Further let $\Psi_f(x, \cdot)$ denote the matrix $(\Psi_f(x, y_1)^T, \dots, \Psi_f(x, y_d)^T) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times D}$, where y_1, \dots, y_d are the elements of \mathcal{Y}_f and define the corresponding dot product as $\langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x, \cdot) \rangle := \left(\langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x, y_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x, y_d) \rangle \right) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Now we claim that the set

$$\left\{ \left(L_\rho(x_1, y_1, \sum_{f \in F} \mathbf{r}_{1,\dots,f}^j), \dots, L_\rho(x_m, y_m, \sum_{f \in F} \mathbf{r}_{m,\dots,f}^j) \right) : j \in [N] \right\} \in \mathbb{R}^m$$

is an $(\frac{\rho}{|F|}\epsilon, \ell_\infty)$ -cover to the set

$$\left\{ \left(L_\rho \left(x_1, y_1, \left\langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x_1, \cdot) \right\rangle \right), \dots, L_\rho \left(x_m, y_m, \left\langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x_m, \cdot) \right\rangle \right) \right) : w \in \|w\|_p \leq \Lambda \right\}.$$

Indeed by the construction of C , we have for any $w \in \mathbb{R}^D$ such that $\|w\|_p \leq \Lambda$, there exists $j(w)$ such that

$$\max_{i \in [m]} \max_{j \in [d]} \max_{f \in F} |\mathbf{r}_{i,j,f}^{j(w)} - \langle w, \Psi_f(x_i, y_j) \rangle| \leq \epsilon. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{i \in [m]} \left| L_\rho \left(x_i, y_i, \left\langle w, \sum_{f \in F} \Psi_f(x_i, \cdot) \right\rangle \right) - L_\rho \left(x_i, y_i, \sum_{f \in F} \mathbf{r}_{i, \cdot, f}^{j(w)} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{2}{\rho} \max_{i \in [m]} \left\| \sum_{f \in F} \langle w, \Psi_f(x_i, \cdot) \rangle - \sum_{f \in F} \mathbf{r}_{i, \cdot, f}^{j(w)} \right\|_\infty \\
& = \frac{2}{\rho} \max_{i \in [m]} \max_{j \in [d]} \left| \sum_{f \in F} (\langle w, \Psi_f(x_i, y_j) \rangle - r_{i, j, f}^{j(w)}) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{2|F|}{\rho} \max_{i \in [m]} \max_{j \in [d]} \max_{f \in F} |\langle w, \Psi_f(x_i, y_j) \rangle - r_{i, j, f}^{j(w)}| \\
& \leq \frac{2|F|}{\rho} \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from ℓ_∞ -Lipschitzness of L_ρ and the second inequality is from triangle inequality. The last inequality is from the choice of $j(w)$ to satisfy (B.2). Therefore we can conclude that

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}, S) \leq \log \mathcal{N}_\infty\left(\frac{\rho}{2|F|} \epsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{p, \Lambda}, \tilde{S}\right).$$

□

Before we prove Theorem 1, we first state the classical result of Dudley's entropy integral. The result is classic. Proofs can be found in [Bartlett *et al.*, 2017].

Theorem B.2. *Let \mathcal{F} be a real-valued function class taking values in $[0, 1]$, and assume that $0 \in \mathcal{F}$. Let S be a finite sample of size m . We have the following relationship between the empirical Rademacher complexity $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{F})$ and the covering number $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, S)$.*

$$\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \inf_{\alpha > 0} \left(4\alpha + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} \int_\alpha^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, S)} d\epsilon \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof is a straight forward application of the Dudley's entropy integral to the upper bounds obtained in Corollary 2. To simplify notation let $B = \frac{12\sqrt{(q-1)\Psi^* \Lambda |F|}}{\rho}$, and $A = 16\Psi^* \Lambda m d |F|^2 / \rho$, and $D = 6md|F| + 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{R}(F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}) & \leq \frac{4}{m} + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}^1, S)} d\epsilon \\
& \leq \frac{4}{m} + \frac{12B}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^1 \frac{\sqrt{\log(\frac{A}{\epsilon} + D)}}{\epsilon} d\epsilon \\
& \leq \frac{4}{m} + \frac{12B}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\log(Am + D)} \log m
\end{aligned}$$

Where the first inequality is the Dudley's entropy integral. The second inequality follows from substituting the upper bounds obtained in Corollary 2. The last inequality follows by noticing that $\log \frac{A}{\epsilon} \leq \log Am$ for $\epsilon \in [1/m, 1]$ and therefore can be taken outside of the integral, meaning it suffices to evaluate $\int_{\frac{1}{m}}^1 \frac{1}{\epsilon} d\epsilon$.

We then substitute the values of B , A , and D to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{R}(F_{p, \Lambda, \rho}) & \leq \frac{4}{m} + \frac{144\sqrt{q-1}\Psi^* \Lambda |F|}{\rho\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\log(16\Psi^* \Lambda m^2 d |F|^2 / \rho + 6md|F| + 1)} \log m \\
& = \frac{4}{m} + \frac{144\sqrt{q-1}\Psi^* \Lambda |F|}{\rho\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\log(2md|F| [8\Psi^* \Lambda m |F| / \rho + 3] + 1)} \log m.
\end{aligned}$$

□

C Proofs on Generalization Bounds in Expectation

C.1 Regularized Risk Minimization

We say a function g is λ -strongly convex if

$$g(w) \geq g(w') + \langle w - w', g'(w') \rangle + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w - w'\|_2^2,$$

where $g'(w')$ is a subgradient of g at $w = w'$.

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $S = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ and $S' = \{z'_1, \dots, z'_m\}$ be two datasets that differ only by a single example. Without loss of generality, we assume $z_i = z'_i$ for $i \in [m-1]$. Since R_S is convex (note L_ρ is convex since we consider linear models here and a maximum of convex functions is again convex) we know that R_S^λ is λ -strongly convex. It then follows that

$$R_{S'}^\lambda(w_S) - R_{S'}^\lambda(w_{S'}) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w_S - w_{S'}\|_2^2.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the definition of w_S and the $(2/\rho, \ell_\infty)$ -Lipschitz continuity of L_ρ that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{S'}^\lambda(w_S) - R_{S'}^\lambda(w_{S'}) &= R_S^\lambda(w_S) - R_S^\lambda(w_{S'}) + \frac{L_\rho(x'_n, y'_n, h^{w_S}) - L_\rho(x_n, y_n, h^{w_S})}{m} + \frac{L_\rho(x_n, y_n, h^{w_{S'}}) - L_\rho(x'_n, y'_n, h^{w_{S'}})}{m} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{m\rho} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(|h^{w_S}(x_n, y) - h^{w_{S'}}(x_n, y)| + |h^{w_S}(x'_n, y) - h^{w_{S'}}(x'_n, y)| \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{m\rho} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(|\langle w_S - w_{S'}, \Psi(x_n, y) \rangle| + |\langle w_S - w_{S'}, \Psi(x'_n, y) \rangle| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{m\rho} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \|w_S - w_{S'}\|_2 \|\Psi(x_n, y) + \Psi(x'_n, y)\|_2 \leq \frac{4\kappa}{m\rho} \|w_S - w_{S'}\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the assumption $\max_{x,y} \|\Psi(x, y)\|_2 \leq \kappa$. We can combine the above two inequalities to show

$$\|w_S - w_{S'}\|_2 \leq \frac{8\kappa}{m\rho\lambda}.$$

By using the $(2/\rho, \ell_\infty)$ -Lipschitz continuity again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x,y} |L_\rho(x, y, h^{w_S}) - L_\rho(x, y, h^{w_{S'}})| &\leq \frac{2}{\rho} \sup_{x,y} |h^{w_S}(x, y) - h^{w_{S'}}(x, y)| \\ &= \frac{2}{\rho} \sup_{x,y} |\langle w_S - w_{S'}, \Psi(x, y) \rangle| \leq \frac{2\kappa}{\rho} \|w_S - w_{S'}\|_2 \leq \frac{16\kappa^2}{m\rho^2\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. According to Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we know

$$\mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S) - R_S^\lambda(w_S)] = \mathbb{E}[R(w_S) - R_S(w_S)] \leq \frac{16\kappa^2}{m\rho^2\lambda}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

By the definition of w_S we know $R_S^\lambda(w_S) \leq R_S^\lambda(w^\lambda)$. Note w^λ is independent of the sample, and we know $\mathbb{E}[R_S^\lambda(w^\lambda)] = R^\lambda(w^\lambda)$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S) - R^\lambda(w^\lambda)] &= \mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S) - R_S^\lambda(w_S)] + \mathbb{E}[R_S^\lambda(w_S) - R_S^\lambda(w^\lambda)] + \mathbb{E}[R_S^\lambda(w^\lambda) - R^\lambda(w^\lambda)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S) - R_S^\lambda(w_S)]. \end{aligned}$$

We can combine the above inequality and (C.1) together and get (8). This proves the first inequality. By the definition of w^λ we know $R^\lambda(w^\lambda) \leq R^\lambda(w^*)$. We can plug this inequality back into (8) and get

$$\mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S)] - R(w^*) \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w^*\|_2^2 + \frac{16\kappa^2}{m\rho^2\lambda}.$$

If we choose $\lambda = \frac{4\sqrt{2}\kappa}{\sqrt{m\rho}\|w^*\|_2}$, then we get

$$\mathbb{E}[R^\lambda(w_S)] - R(w^*) \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\kappa\|w^*\|_2}{\sqrt{m\rho}}.$$

The proof is complete. □

C.2 Stochastic Gradient Descent

Proof of Lemma 4. According to Lemma 1, for any w, w' there holds

$$|L_\rho(x, y, h^w) - L_\rho(x, y, h^{w'})| \leq \frac{2}{\rho} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\langle w - w', \Phi(x, y) \rangle| \leq \frac{2\kappa}{\rho} \|w - w'\|_2.$$

It then follows that

$$\|L'_\rho(x, y, h^w)\|_2 \leq \frac{2\kappa}{\rho}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $z_i = z'_i$ for $i \in [m-1]$. We now analyse how $\|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2$ changes along the iterations. Consider two cases at the t -th iteration. If $i_t \neq m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2 &= \|w^{(t)} - \eta_t L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}}) - \hat{w}^{(t)} + \eta_t L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{\hat{w}^{(t)}})\|_2^2 \\ &= \|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 + \eta_t^2 \|L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}}) - L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{\hat{w}^{(t)}})\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \langle w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}, L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}}) - L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{\hat{w}^{(t)}}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The convexity of L_ρ implies that

$$\langle w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}, L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{w^{(t)}}) - L'_\rho(x_{i_t}, y_{i_t}, h^{\hat{w}^{(t)}}) \rangle \geq 0.$$

Together with (C.2), this implies

$$\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2 \leq \|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 + 16\eta_t^2 \kappa^2 \rho^{-2}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

If $i_t = m$, then

$$\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2 \leq \|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2 + \eta_t \|L'_\rho(x_m, y_m, h^{w^{(t)}}) - L'_\rho(x'_m, y'_m, h^{\hat{w}^{(t)}})\|_2.$$

It then follows from C.2 and the elementary inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq (1+r)a^2 + (1+1/r)b^2$ that

$$\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2 \leq (1+r)\|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 + (1+1/r)8\eta_t^2 \kappa^2 \rho^{-2}.$$

Since with probability $1 - 1/m$ we have $i_t \neq m$ and with probability $1/m$ we have $i_t = m$, we can combine the above two cases to show

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_t} [\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2] \leq (1+r/m)\|w^{(t)} - \hat{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 + (1+1/(rm))8\eta_t^2 \kappa^2 \rho^{-2}.$$

We can apply the above inequality recursively and get

$$\mathbb{E}_A [\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2] \leq 16(1+1/(rm))\kappa^2 \rho^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^2 (1+r/m)^{t-j}$$

If we choose $r = m/t$ we know that for any $j \leq t$,

$$(1+r/m)^{t-j} \leq (1+1/t)^t \leq e.$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_A [\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2^2] \leq 16e(1+t/m^2)\kappa^2 \rho^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^2.$$

The proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 4. According to Lemma 4 we know

$$\mathbb{E}_A [\|w^{(t+1)} - \hat{w}^{(t+1)}\|_2] \leq \sqrt{16e}(1 + \sqrt{t}/m)\kappa\rho^{-1}\sqrt{t}\eta.$$

It then follows from the convexity of the ℓ_2 norm that

$$\mathbb{E}_A [\|\bar{w}^{(T)} - \hat{\bar{w}}^{(T)}\|_2] \leq 7(1 + \sqrt{T}/m)\kappa\rho^{-1}\sqrt{T}\eta.$$

This together with Lemma 1 shows the following uniform stability bounds

$$\sup_z \mathbb{E}_A [|L_\rho(x, y, h^{\bar{w}^{(T)}}) - L_\rho(x, y, h^{\hat{\bar{w}}^{(T)}}) |] \leq 14(1 + \sqrt{T}/m)\kappa^2 \rho^{-2} \sqrt{T}\eta.$$

It then follows from Lemma 2 that

$$\mathbb{E} [R(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)})] \leq O(\kappa^2(\sqrt{T} + T/m)\eta).$$

Furthermore, standard convergence rate analysis of SGD shows that [Bottou *et al.*, 2018]

$$\mathbb{E}_A [R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(w^*)] \leq O\left(\frac{1 + T\kappa^2\eta^2}{T\eta}\right).$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [R(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R(w^*)] &= \mathbb{E} [R(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)})] + \mathbb{E} [R_S(\bar{w}^{(T)}) - R_S(w^*)] + \mathbb{E} [R_S(w^*) - R(w^*)] \\ &\leq O((\sqrt{T} + T/m)\eta\kappa^2) + O\left(\frac{1 + T\kappa^2\eta^2}{T\eta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

D Proofs on Learning with Weakly Dependent Examples

In this section we prove our results on Weakly Dependent Examples. We follow the standard analysis that was introduced in [Yu, 1994] and followed by [Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2008; Meir, 2000]. Recall that the goal is to bound the following probability:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_S(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Standard uniform convergence results can not be employed here since z_i^k and $z_i^{k'}$ are not independent for $k \neq k'$ and all $i \in [m]$. Uniform convergence results for mixing sequence have been studied in the literature, e.g., [Meir, 2000; Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2008]). Bounds in the aforementioned works are proved via the so called *independent blocks* technique. The main difference here is that in our settings we have a hierarchical dependence. At the high level, we have independence between documents, while at the low level, we have weak dependence between the sequence of examples within each of the documents. This is unlike previous work which considered only learning with one level of weakly dependent data. Our work can also be extended to the case when we have a higher hierarchy where different levels are weakly dependent with different levels of weak dependence.

Most of the following is based on the standard analysis of *independent blocks* technique for mixing sequences that was introduced in [Yu, 1994] and later employed by [Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2008; Meir, 2000].

For simplicity, assume that $J = 2\mu a$ for positive integers μ and a . Let $H_j = \{i : 2(j-1)a + 1 \leq i \leq (2j-1)a\}$ and $T_j = \{i : (2j-1)a + 1 \leq i \leq 2ja\}$. Further let $Z_i^{H_j} = (z_i^k)_{k \in H_j}$ and similarly $Z_i^{T_j} = (z_i^k)_{k \in T_j}$, for $j \in [\mu]$. We then define the *even* dataset S^0

$$S^0 = \{(Z_i^{H_j})_{j \in [\mu]}\}_{i=1}^m, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

and the *odd* dataset S^1

$$S^1 = \{(Z_i^{T_j})_{j \in [\mu]}\}_{i=1}^m. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

That is we divide each document into 2μ blocks each containing a -consecutive elements. The even dataset S^0 is formed as follows: for each document in the data set S , include only blocks that have even index while the odd dataset is formed similarly. Therefore, any document in S^0 has blocks that are sampled a time steps apart.

Let $L_h^a(Z^{H_j}) = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{k \in H_j} L_h(z^k)$ and similarly $L_h^a(Z^{T_j}) = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{k \in T_j} L_h(z^k)$. The first step is to bound the probability (D.1) by another probability that depends only on the even dataset S^0 . In this way we can work with sequences of blocks that are a steps apart from each other and therefore the dependence between those blocks becomes weaker. The next lemma is a standard lemma [Yu, 1994]. It relates the probability of estimation error on the full set of sequences to that on the even set of sequences.

Lemma 6. *With the notation above, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_S(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \leq 2\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\}. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Proof. According to basic properties of probabilities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_S(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(\frac{R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h)}{2} + \frac{R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^1}(h)}{2} \right) > \epsilon \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^1}(h) \right) > 2\epsilon \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^1}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \\ &= 2\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality is due to the convexity of the sup, the second is combination of the union bound and the fact that for the sum to exceed 2ϵ , at least one of the summands has to exceed ϵ , and the last inequality is due to stationarity of the process generating the documents. \square

Now that we have reduced the problem to the study of the even blocks, the remaining problem is that those blocks are still weakly dependent. Thus, the next step is to reduce the problem further to one with independent blocks so that we can apply standard techniques for independent data. The main idea is to replace the blocks in S^0 with another set of blocks each of which has the same marginal distribution but are independent of each other. Specifically, for $j \in [\mu]$ and $i \in [m]$, we introduce the random variable $\tilde{Z}_i^{H_j} = (\tilde{z}_i^k)_{i \in m, k \in H_j}$ to have the same distribution as $Z_i^{H_j}$ and such that the set of random variables $\{\tilde{Z}_i^{H_j}\}_{i \in [m], j \in [\mu]}$ are independent and similarly we construct $\{\tilde{Z}_i^{T_j}\}_{i \in [m], j \in [\mu]}$. In what follows we use $\tilde{S}, \tilde{S}^0, \tilde{S}^1$ to denote the datasets with independent blocks. The goal then is to establish a connection between (D.4) and a similar quantity that depends only on the independent blocks.

A key result introduced in [Yu, 1994] relates the means of the original data to that of the independent counterpart. The original result was introduced in the case of only one sequence. We present here a slightly modified lemma that accounts for a set of independent documents. The proof is provided at the end of this section.

Lemma 7. *Let f be a measurable function of the set of even blocks S^0 that is bounded by M , then we have,*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{S^0}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[h]| \leq m(\mu - 1)M\beta(a) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

The next direct corollary controls the probability on the weakly dependent blocks to that of independent blocks.

Corollary 3. *With the notation above, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} + m(\mu - 1)\beta(a), \quad (\text{D.6})$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ denote the probability measure on independent data.

Proof. We can apply Lemma 7 with f being $\mathbb{I} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{S^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\}$ to get the inequality. \square

We note also that $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[\hat{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}] = R(h)$ due to the linearity of expectation and the fact that the blocks in \tilde{S}^0 have the same distributions as blocks of S^0 . We further note that $\hat{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}(h) = \frac{1}{m\mu} \sum_{i \in [m], j \in [\mu]} L_h^a(\tilde{Z}_i^{H_j})$. The first term in the right hand side of (D.6) can be bounded via standard uniform convergence techniques, because we have the probability over independent blocks, by considering the class $(L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}) = \left\{ \frac{1}{a} \sum_{k=1}^a L_h(\cdot) : h \in \mathcal{H} \right\}$ (see for example [Mohri *et al.*, 2018; Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2008]). Therefore, we can apply standard analysis to get for any $\epsilon' > 0$,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}(h) \right) - 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[\mathfrak{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}((L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}))] > \epsilon' \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-2\mu m \epsilon'^2}{M^2} \right).$$

For the left hand side of the last inequality to match the right hand side of (D.6), we set $\epsilon' = \epsilon - 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[\mathfrak{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}((L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}))]$, thus,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-2\mu m \epsilon'^2}{M^2} \right) \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Theorem D.1. *Let $\delta > 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[\mathfrak{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}((L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}))] + \frac{M \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)} \right)}}{\sqrt{2\mu m}}. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Proof. We combine inequalities (D.7), (D.6), and (D.4), and get

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(R(h) - \hat{R}_S(h) \right) > \epsilon \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-2\mu m \epsilon'^2}{M^2} \right) + 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a). \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Therefore, for $\delta > 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we get

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[\mathfrak{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}((L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}))] + \frac{M \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)} \right)}}{\sqrt{2\mu m}}. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

\square

We now aim to control the second term in (D.8) by the worst-case ℓ_∞ -covering number of the dataset. To that end, we first show that the covering number of the class $(L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H})$ on the dataset \tilde{S}^0 is indeed upper bounded by the covering number of the class $(L_h \circ \mathcal{H})$ on the set \tilde{S} . This is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *Given the notation above the following inequality holds*

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S}^0) \leq \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S}).$$

Proof. First we show that the covering number defined on \tilde{S} indeed upper bounds the covering number defined on \tilde{S}^0 . To see this, let $C := \{\mathbf{r}^j = (r_{1,1}^j, \dots, r_{m,l}^j) : j \in [N]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{ml}$ be an ℓ_∞ cover for the class $(L_h \circ \mathcal{H})$ on the dataset \tilde{S} , therefore, for each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, there is a $j^{(h)} \in [N]$ such that,

$$\max_{k \in [l], i \in [m]} |L_h(\tilde{z}_i^k) - r_{i,k}^{j^{(h)}}| \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \in m, k \in \mu} |L_h^a(\tilde{Z}_i^{H_j}) - \frac{1}{a} \sum_{t \in H_j} r_{i,t}^{j^{(h)}}| &= \max_{i \in m, k \in \mu} \left| \frac{1}{a} \sum_{t \in H_j} L_h(\tilde{z}_i^t) - \frac{1}{a} \sum_{t \in H_j} r_{i,t}^{j^{(h)}} \right| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in m, k \in \mu, t \in H_j} |L_h(\tilde{z}_i^t) - r_{i,t}^{j^{(h)}}| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in m, t \in [J]} |L_h(\tilde{z}_i^t) - r_{i,t}^{j^{(h)}}| = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S}^0) \leq \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S}).$$

□

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), mJ) = \sup_{\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{Z}^{mJ}} \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S})$ be the worst case covering number on a dataset of size mJ .

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. By Dudley's entropy integral we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_{\tilde{S}^0}((L_h \circ \mathcal{H})) &\leq \frac{4}{m\mu} + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m\mu}} \int_\epsilon^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h^a \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S}^0)} d\epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{4}{m\mu} + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m\mu}} \int_\epsilon^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), \tilde{S})} d\epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{4}{m\mu} + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m\mu}} \int_\epsilon^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), mJ)} d\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is from lemma 8 and the third inequality is by definition of worst case covering number.

Now substituting in (D.8), we get the following bound, for $\delta > 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + \frac{8}{m\mu} + \frac{24}{\sqrt{m\mu}} \int_\epsilon^1 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), mJ))} d\epsilon + \frac{M \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\mu - 1)\beta(a)}\right)}}{\sqrt{2\mu m}}. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Recall that $\mu = \frac{J}{2a}$, the bound can be written as

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + \frac{16a}{mJ} + \frac{24\sqrt{2a}}{\sqrt{mJ}} \int_\epsilon^1 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, (L_h \circ \mathcal{H}), mJ))} d\epsilon + \frac{M\sqrt{a} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\frac{J}{2a} - 1)\beta(a)}\right)}}{\sqrt{Jm}}. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Now we would like to apply this theory to models that decompose as a factor graphs as above. Thus, for the loss class $F_{p,\Lambda,\rho}$, we have the following bound:

$$R(h) \leq \hat{R}_S(h) + \frac{32a}{mJ} + \frac{288\sqrt{2a(q-1)}\Psi^*\Lambda|F|}{\rho\sqrt{mJ}} \sqrt{\log(2mJd|F|[8\Psi^*\Lambda mJ/\rho + 3] + 1)} \log mJ + \frac{M\sqrt{a} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta - 2m(\frac{J}{2a} - 1)\beta(a)}\right)}}{\sqrt{Jm}}.$$

□

Now we give the proof of lemma 7. Before we prove it, we begin by defining some basic quantities and stating a useful basic lemma. Let Q be a measure defined on the a product space $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2)$, where (Ω_k, Σ_k) for $k \in [2]$ are two measurable spaces. Let Q_k be the marginal distribution of Q on (Ω_k, Σ_k) . We define the following quantity:

$$\beta(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, Q) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{B \in \Sigma_2} |Q(B|\Sigma_1) - Q_2(B)|.$$

The following lemma provides the basic building block for our proof. It controls the difference of expectation with respect to Q and $Q_1 \times Q_2$ of bounded functions by their β -coefficient.

Lemma 9. [Yu, 1994] *Let $h : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded by M and measurable. Let P be the product measure $Q_1 \times Q_2$. Then, the following holds*

$$|E_Q[h] - E_P[h]| \leq M\beta(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, Q)$$

The following is a modification of Corollary 2.7 in [Yu, 1994]. Here, we give a fine grained analysis, that is useful if the sequence of random variables has different mixing coefficients that change over time.

Corollary 4. *Let $m \geq 1$ and $h : \Pi_{i=1}^m \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $(\Pi_{i=1}^m \Omega_i, \Pi_{i=1}^m \Sigma_i)$ -measurable function that is bounded by M . Denote by Q a probability measure defined on the product space $(\Pi_{i=1}^m \Omega_i, \Pi_{i=1}^m \Sigma_i)$. Further let Q_i be the marginal probability measure of Q defined on (Ω_i, Σ_i) and Q^i be the marginal probability measure of Q on $(\Pi_{j=1}^i \Omega_j, \Pi_{j=1}^i \Sigma_j)$, define*

$$\beta_i(Q) = \beta(\Pi_{j=1}^i \Sigma_j, \Sigma_{i+1}, Q^{i+1}).$$

Let $P = \Pi_{i=1}^m Q_i$. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}_P[h] - \mathbb{E}_Q[h]| \leq M \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i(Q)$$

Proof. The proof is by induction.

- The base case $m = 2$ is by Lemma 9.
- Step: assume that the statement holds for $m - 1$, and let $\hat{P} = \Pi_{i=1}^{m-1} Q_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_P[h] - \mathbb{E}_Q[h]| &= |\mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h] + \mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_Q[h]| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h]| + |\mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_Q[h]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{Q_m} |\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h]| + |\mathbb{E}_{Q_m} \mathbb{E}_{Q^{m-1}}[h] - \mathbb{E}_Q[h]| \\ &\leq M \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \beta_i(Q) + M\beta_{m-1} = M \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i(Q), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we introduce the expectation with respect to $Q_m \times Q^{m-1}$, the first inequality is by the triangle inequality, the second inequality is by Jensen's inequality while in the last inequality, the first term follows from the induction hypothesis and the second is by Lemma 9. □

Note that if set $\beta(Q) = \max_{i \in [m-1]} \beta_i(Q)$, we get the same result as in corollary 2.7 in [Yu, 1994]. Our corollary can be useful when β_i is different for each i .

Now we are ready to prove lemma 7.

Proof of Lemma 7. The statement directly follows from the last corollary. Recall that S^0 is a set of m sequence of blocks each with length a , that it can be arranged as the sequence, $S^0 = (Z_1^{H_1}, \dots, Z_m^{H_j})$. Let $\Omega_i = \mathcal{Z}^a$, and $\Sigma_i = \sigma(Z_k^{H_l})$ for $i \in [\mu m]$, where $\sigma(Z)$ denotes the sigma algebra generated by the random variable Z and $k = \lfloor i/\mu \rfloor$ and $l = (i \bmod \mu)$. Now we note that $\beta_i(Q) = 0$, whenever i is divisible by μ and $\beta_i(Q) = \beta(a)$ otherwise. Hence the following holds

$$|\mathbb{E}_{S^0}[h] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{S}^0}[h]| \leq m(\mu - 1)M\beta(a). \tag{D.13}$$

□

E Features Extracted From Neural Networks

In this section, we sketch how one can combine the strategies presented in this paper with other bounds to obtain generalization guarantees for structured output prediction when the features are obtained via Deep Neural Networks.

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of functions from \mathcal{X} to a space Z endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_z$ and let \mathcal{H} be the class of linear functions θ from Z to \mathbb{R} such that $\|\theta\|_* \leq \Lambda$ where $\|\cdot\|_*$ denotes the dual norm to $\|\cdot\|_z$. For a sample set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ denote by $\mathcal{N}_{z,\infty}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, S)$ be the covering number of \mathcal{F} with ℓ_∞ and $\|\cdot\|_z$ norms, i.e., the smallest N such that we have cover $\{f^1, \dots, f^N\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists $j \leq N$ such that for all $i \leq m$:

$$\|f(x_i) - f^j(x_i)\|_z \leq \epsilon.$$

The maximum of this quantity over any choice of S will be denoted $\mathcal{N}_{z,\infty}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, m)$.

The following lemma relies on classic concatenation techniques [Bartlett *et al.*, 2017].

Lemma 10. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} is such that $\|f(x)\|_z \leq \kappa$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then*

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}, m) \leq \mathcal{N}_{z,\infty}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2\Lambda}, \mathcal{F}, m\right) \times \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{H}, \kappa, m), \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{H}, \kappa, m)$ denotes the maximum value of $\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{H}, \tilde{S})$ over all $\tilde{S} \subset Z$ with $|\tilde{S}| = m$ and $|s|_z \leq \kappa \quad \forall s \in \tilde{S}$.

Proof. Let $N_1 = \mathcal{N}_{z,\infty}(\epsilon/2\Lambda, \mathcal{F}, m)$ and $N_2 = \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{H}, m)$.

Let $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be any sample set. Let $\{f^1, \dots, f^{N_1}\}$ be the corresponding (z, ∞) cover. For each $j \leq N_1$, we can define the ‘‘training set’’ $S_j := \{f^j(x_1), \dots, f^j(x_m)\}$ and the corresponding ℓ_∞ cover $C_j = \{h_1^j, \dots, h_{N_2}^j\}$ of \mathcal{H} with granularity $\epsilon/2$. Let $D_j = C_j \circ f^j := \{h_1^j \circ f^j, \dots, h_{N_2}^j \circ f^j\}$. We will show that the cover $\cup_{j=1}^{N_1} D_j = \{h_k^j \circ f^j : j \leq N_1, k \leq N_2\}$ is an ϵ cover of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}$ with respect to the ℓ_∞ , which implies the stated result. To see this, observe that for any $h \circ f \in \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}$, we can choose $j \leq N_1$ such that $\|f^j(x_i) - f(x_i)\|_z \leq \epsilon/2\Lambda$ for all $i \leq m$. We can now also choose an element h_k^j ($k \leq N_2$) from the cover C_j such that for all $i \leq m$, $|h(f^j(x_i)) - h_k(f^j(x_i))| \leq \epsilon/2$. We now have that for any $i \leq m$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(h \circ f)(x_i) - (h^k \circ f^j)(x_i)| &\leq |(h \circ f)(x_i) - (h \circ f^j)(x_i)| + |(h \circ f^j)(x_i) - (h^k \circ f^j)(x_i)| \\ &= |h(f(x_i) - f^j(x_i))| + |h((f^j)(x_i)) - h^k(f^j(x_i))| \\ &\leq \|h\|_* \frac{\epsilon}{2\Lambda} + \epsilon/2 \leq \Lambda \frac{\epsilon}{2\Lambda} + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

as expected. At the last line, we have used the duality between the norms $\|\cdot\|_z$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$. \square

Back in our structured output prediction setting, let us consider the situation where the features $\Psi_f(x, y)$ are obtained from a neural network or another parametric method: the features $\Psi_f(x, y_f)$ can be read from the (f, y_f, \cdot) components of the three-way tensor $\Psi^W(x)$, where W denotes a parameter set chosen from a set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\bar{D}}$. We will write \mathcal{F} for the function class $\mathcal{F} = \{\Psi^W : W \in \mathcal{W}\}$. For instance, W can be a vectorization of the weights of the neural network.

Define the augmented dataset

$$\bar{S} := \{(x, f, y_f) : x \in S_{|\mathcal{X}}, f \in F, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f\}.$$

Define the function classes

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}} := \{(x, f, y_f) \mapsto \langle w, \Psi_f(x, y_f) \rangle : w \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{D}}, \|w\|_p \leq \Lambda, (x, f, y_f) \in \bar{S}\} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{p,\Lambda,\rho} = \{(x, y) \mapsto L_\rho(x, y, h) : \|w\|_p \leq \Lambda, W \in \mathcal{W}, (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Similarly to Theorem B.1, it is easy to show that:

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{p,\Lambda,\rho}, S) \leq \log \mathcal{N}_\infty\left(\frac{\rho}{2|F|}\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{p,\Lambda}, \bar{S}\right). \quad (\text{E.4})$$

Thus, assuming we have a way of obtaining bounds for the covering number of the function class corresponding to \mathcal{W} , we can use Lemma 10 in combination with the other techniques in this paper to obtain a generalisation bound valid for all choices of W and all choices of $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{D}}$.

For instance, suppose that \mathcal{W} is a \bar{D} -dimensional ball of radius 1 with respect to some norm $\|\cdot\|_w$, and the Lipschitz constant of the map from $\mathbb{R}^{\bar{D}}$ to $(\mathbb{R}^{\bar{D}})^{\mathcal{X} \times F \times \mathcal{Y}_f}$ which maps W_f to $\Psi^W(\cdot, \cdot)$ is \bar{B} -Lipschitz with respect to the norms $\|\cdot\|_w$ and $\|\cdot\|_{q,\infty}$ (we choose $\|\cdot\|_z = \|\cdot\|_q$). This means that for any $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ and for any $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, $f \in F$ and $y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}_f$, $\|\Psi_f^{W_1}(x_1, y_1) - \Psi_f^{W_2}(x_2, y_2)\|_q \leq \bar{B}\|W_1 - W_2\|_w$. When this property holds, we say that the corresponding function class is (\bar{D}, \bar{L}) -parametrised w.r.t. the relevant norm $\|\cdot\|_q$. We write $\Psi^* = \sup_{f \in F, y \in \mathcal{Y}_f, x \in \mathcal{X}, W \in \mathcal{W}} \|\Psi_f^W(x, y)\|_q$.

Our assumption on the Lipschitz constant \bar{B} implies that for any ϵ , an ϵ -cover of \mathcal{W} gives rise to an $\epsilon\bar{B}$ -cover of \mathcal{F} with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{q,\infty}$ norm (in this case, the same cover works for any training set). Such a cover of the ball \mathcal{W} can easily be obtained from classic results such as Lemma A.8 in [Long and Sedghi, 2020]:

Lemma 11. Let d be a positive integer, $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm, ρ be the metric induced by it, and $\kappa, \epsilon > 0$. A ball of radius κ in \mathbb{R}^d w.r.t. ρ can be covered by $(\frac{3\kappa}{\epsilon})^d$ balls of radius ϵ .

The following is then immediate:

Lemma 12. Let \mathcal{F} be a function class with outputs in a space Z endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_Z$. Suppose that \mathcal{F} is (\bar{D}, \bar{B}) -parametrized with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_Z$. Then, for any training set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, we have the following bound on the covering number of \mathcal{F} :

$$\log \mathcal{N}_{z, \infty}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, S) \leq \bar{D} \log(3\bar{B}/\epsilon).$$

Note that the Lipschitz constant \bar{B} only shows up in log terms, which means that any reasonable control on \bar{B} is enough to yield satisfying generalisation bounds, and the dominant term in the first term of equation (E.6) will be \bar{D} , except in pathological cases.

In [Long and Sedghi, 2020], the Lipschitz constant \bar{B} of convolutional neural networks was bounded in terms of the norms of the weight matrices. Adapting their results (section 3.1) and combining with Lemma 11 above, we obtain

Lemma 13. Consider a neural network architecture with \bar{D} parameters and D_1 outputs where the output layer is equipped with the L_∞ norm. We suppose that the L^2 norms of the inputs are bounded by χ , and consider for each $\beta, \nu > 0$ the class \mathcal{F} of networks with ℓ layers whose weights satisfy the following conditions: (1) the spectral norms of each layers are bounded by $1 + \nu$, and (2) the sum of the spectral norms of the differences between the weight matrices and their initialised values is less than β . For any ϵ and any training set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, we have

$$\log \mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, S) \leq \bar{D} \log(3N/\epsilon), \quad (\text{E.5})$$

where $N = \chi\beta(1 + \nu + \beta/\ell)^\ell$.

In our structured output prediction setting, we now precisely define \mathcal{W} to be the set of weights satisfying the conditions (1) and (2) above. After noting that the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_q$ norms on the feature space Z are within a factor of D of each other and applying our Lemma 10, we have the following bound on the covering number of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{p, \Lambda, \rho}$:

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_\infty(\epsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_p, \bar{S})) \leq \bar{D} \log[12N\Lambda D/\epsilon\rho] + 576 \frac{\sqrt{q-1}(\Psi^*)^2 \Lambda^2 |F|^2}{\epsilon^2 \rho^2} \log[2[16\Psi^* \Lambda |F|/\epsilon\rho + 2]md|F| + 1]. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Plugging this back into E.6 and applying Dudley's entropy theorem similarly to the proof of Theorems 1 and 2, it is straightforward to obtain

$$R(h) \leq R_S(h) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{q-1}\Psi^* \Lambda |F|}{\rho\sqrt{m}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\bar{D}}{m}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(N\Lambda|F|D/\rho)\right) + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{m}}\right),$$

where the notation \tilde{O} hides logarithmic factors, and as above, $N = \chi\beta(1 + \nu + \beta/\ell)^\ell$ with $\chi = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2$, the spectral norms of each layers are bounded by $1 + \nu$, ℓ is the number of layers, and the sum of the spectral norms of the differences between the weight matrices and their initialised values is less than β .

Remark: Whilst the above bounds rely on the parameter-counting strategy from [Long and Sedghi, 2020] to bound the complexity of the feature-extracting network, other approaches to that sub problem are perfectly compatible with our framework.

For instance, norm-based bounds on the feature-extracting network, relying on results from [Bartlett *et al.*, 2017; Neyshabur *et al.*, 2015] etc. (for fully connected networks) or from [Ledent *et al.*, 2019] (for CNNs) can also be plugged into our proof, yielding results with the properties as above in terms of the (lack of) dependence on the number of factors but with various norms of the weights of feature-extracting network replacing the parameter-count term \bar{D} .