

# A unified recipe for deriving (time-uniform) PAC-Bayes bounds

Ben Chugg<sup>1</sup>, Hongjian Wang<sup>1</sup>, and Aaditya Ramdas<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Machine Learning Department

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Science

Carnegie Mellon University

{benchugg, hjnwang, aramdas}@cmu.edu

February 2023

## Abstract

We present a unified framework for deriving PAC-Bayesian generalization bounds. Unlike most previous literature on this topic, our bounds are anytime-valid (i.e., time-uniform), meaning that they hold at all stopping times, not only for a fixed sample size. Our approach combines four tools in the following order: (a) nonnegative supermartingales or reverse submartingales, (b) the method of mixtures, (c) the Donsker-Varadhan formula (or other convex duality principles), and (d) Ville’s inequality. Our main result is a PAC-Bayes theorem which holds for a wide class of discrete stochastic processes. We show how this result implies time-uniform versions of well-known classical PAC-Bayes bounds, such as those of Seeger, McAllester, Maurer, and Catoni, in addition to many recent bounds. We also present several novel bounds. Our framework also enables us to relax traditional assumptions; in particular, we consider nonstationary loss functions and non-i.i.d. data. In sum, we unify the derivation of past bounds and ease the search for future bounds: one may simply check if our supermartingale or submartingale conditions are met and, if so, be guaranteed a (time-uniform) PAC-Bayes bound.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>A General Recipe for Stochastic Processes</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>PAC-Bayes Bounds via Supermartingales</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PAC-Bayes Bounds via Submartingales</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Extensions</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Omitted Proofs</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Mixtures of Martingales</b>	<b>45</b>

# 1 Introduction

PAC-Bayesian theory is broadly concerned with providing generalization guarantees over mixtures of predictors in statistical learning problems. It emerged in the late 1990s, catalyzed by an early paper of [Shawe-Taylor and Williamson \(1997\)](#) and shepherded forward by McAllester ([McAllester, 1998, 1999, 2003](#)), Catoni ([Catoni, 2003, 2004, 2007](#)), Maurer ([Maurer, 2004](#)), and Seeger ([Seeger, 2002, 2003](#)), among others. The earliest works were focused mainly on classification settings but the techniques have expanded to regression settings ([Audibert, 2004; Alquier, 2008](#)), and more recently to settings beyond supervised learning (e.g., [Seldin and Tishby \(2010\)](#)). We refer the reader to [Alquier \(2021\)](#) and [Guedj \(2019\)](#) for excellent surveys.

In the supervised learning setting, PAC-Bayesian (or simply “PAC-Bayes”) theory seeks to bound the expected risk in terms of the expected empirical risk, where the expectation is with respect to a data-dependent distribution  $\rho$  over the hypothesis space. This is in contrast to uniform convergence guarantees, which give worst case bounds over all hypotheses. The PAC-Bayes approach is not without limitations ([Livni and Moran, 2020](#)), but has led to non-trivial guarantees for SVMs ([Ambroladze et al., 2006](#)), sparse additive models ([Guedj and Alquier, 2013](#)), and neural networks ([Dziugaite and Roy, 2017; Letarte et al., 2019](#)). Whereas uniform convergence bounds typically rely on some notion of the complexity of the hypothesis class, PAC-Bayes bounds depend on the distance between  $\rho$  and a prior distribution  $\nu$ . Depending on the choice of  $\nu$  and  $\rho$ , the resulting bounds can be tighter and easier to compute.

Despite these successes, we point out two drawbacks. First, there does not seem to be a clearly established recipe to deriving PAC-Bayes bounds. Many full-length papers are dedicated to deriving one or two interesting bounds, using different techniques. Is there a common thread to tie the decades of work together? Can a unified view (achieved with the power of hindsight) yield new bounds with relative ease? Second, most existing PAC-Bayes bounds are fixed-time results. That is, the bounds hold at a fixed number of observations determined *a priori*, despite the fact that the distribution  $\rho$  can be data-dependent. In fact, this is the case for the vast majority of the learning theory literature. Undoubtedly, and is a consequence of the vast number of fixed time concentration inequalities stemming from the statistics literature (e.g., the Chernoff bound and the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality; see [Boucheron et al. \(2013\)](#) for an overview). However, fixed-time bounds suffer drawbacks. In particular, they are not valid at stopping times; if the bound is computed at a sample size that is itself data-dependent (perhaps resulting from sequential decisions), then it is invalid.

In this work, we take advantage of recent progress on *anytime-valid* concentration inequalities ([Howard et al., 2020, 2021](#)) to give a general framework for developing anytime-valid (a.k.a. time-uniform)<sup>1</sup> PAC-Bayes bounds. Anytime-valid bounds hold at all stopping times. Importantly, this means they hold regardless of whether one has looked at the data or not. They are thus inherently immune to continuous monitoring of data and adaptive stopping.

Recently, concurrent to our own work, [Haddouche and Guedj \(2022\)](#) derived a few anytime-valid PAC-Bayes bounds. They also employ supermartingales and Ville’s inequality, two ingredients which are also central to our approach. Our general framework will encompass their results, recovering their theorems as special cases of our own. More importantly however, our unified framework will cover a broad slew of existing PAC-Bayes bounds. See [Table 1](#) for a summary of these results.

---

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, “anytime-valid” and “time-uniform” are synonymous. However, this is not always the case. See the discussion at the end of [Section 1.1](#).




Figure 1: An overview of the tools employed in this paper, and how they relate to previous work on time-uniform bounds.

At a high level, our approach combines four tools in the following order: (a) nonnegative supermartingales or reverse submartingales, (b) mixtures of said processes (often called the “method of mixtures”), (c) a change-of-measure inequality which provides a variational representation of some convex divergence (e.g. the Donsker-Varadhan formula in the case of KL divergence), and (d) Ville’s inequality (Ville, 1939), a time-uniform extension of Markov’s inequality to nonnegative supermartingales and reverse submartingales. Recent work has established that principles (a)+(d) yield a unified approach to deriving time-uniform Chernoff bounds (e.g., Howard et al. (2020)), while using (a)+(b)+(d) yields a unified approach to deriving confidence sequences (e.g., Howard et al. (2021)). This paper shows that adding (c) yields a unified approach to PAC-Bayes bounds. See Figure 1 for a schema of how this work relates to the wider world of unified recipes and time-uniform bounds.

## 1.1 Setting

We observe a sequence of data  $(Z_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  where each  $Z_i$  lies in some domain  $\mathcal{Z}$ . The data have a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{Z}^\infty$ . We emphasize that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a distribution over *sequences* of observations, enabling us to consider non-i.i.d. data. We will specify the precise distributional assumptions later on. Each time step  $t$  is associated with a function  $f_t : \mathcal{Z} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , where  $\Theta$  is some (measurable) space. Each  $\theta \in \Theta$  gives rise to the *loss function*  $f_t(\cdot, \theta)$ . Thus,  $f_t$  should be seen as a family of loss functions parameterized by  $\Theta$ . If  $f = f_t$  does not change with time, we say it is *stationary*.

In a typical supervised learning task, the domain is taken to be the product  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the feature space and  $\mathcal{Y}$  the label space. In this case, we might consider the (stationary) loss function  $f_t(Z_t, \theta) = (Y_t - \langle \theta, X_t \rangle)^2$ , where  $Z_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ . However, PAC-Bayesian bounds have proven useful outside of supervised learning (e.g., estimating means (Catoni and Giulini, 2017, 2018), clustering (Seldin and Tishby, 2010), and discrete density estimation (Seeger, 2003; Seldin and Tishby, 2009)). Thus, we choose to adopt the more general notation. We note that allowing the loss function to change as a function of time is not the typical assumption in the PAC-Bayes literature. However, we find that our framework can handle non-stationary losses at no extra cost, so we see no harm (and some benefit) in this additional level of generality.

For a fixed  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the cumulative empirical risk and the expected risk at time  $t$  are, respectively,

$$\widehat{R}_t(\theta) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(Z_i, \theta), \quad R_t(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\widehat{R}_t(\theta)]. \quad (1)$$

Uniform convergence guarantees provide bounds between the empirical and expected risk simultaneously for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Such bounds typically depend on quantities such as the VC dimension or the Rademacher complexity of the family of losses. In contrast, PAC-Bayes bounds seek to give guarantees on the difference between  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \widehat{R}_t(\theta)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} R_t(\theta)$  for all data-dependent mixture distributions  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , where  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  is the set of probability distributions over  $\Theta$ . Additionally, we assume that we begin with a (data-free) prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  over the parameters.

In order to orient the reader, we state a PAC-Bayes bound due to [Catoni \(2003\)](#) for bounded, stationary losses in  $[0, 1]$ . The order of quantifiers below is particularly important to note. Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . For all  $n$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho}[R_n(\theta) - \widehat{R}_n(\theta)] \leq \frac{\lambda}{8n} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})}{\lambda}, \quad (2)$$

where  $D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu)$  is the KL divergence between  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  (defined in [Section 2](#)). Thus, we see that our generalization guarantee depends not on a measure of complexity of the class of functions  $\{f(\cdot, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$  as it would in uniform convergence bounds. Instead, it depends on the divergence between our prior  $\nu$  and a data-dependent  $\rho$ . The KL divergence is the most common measure of divergence used in PAC-Bayes bounds because of the famous “change of measure” inequality by [Donsker and Varadhan \(1975\)](#). However, the Rényi divergence ([Bégin et al., 2016](#)),  $f$  divergences ([Ohnishi and Honorio, 2021](#)), and Integral Probability Metrics ([Amit et al., 2022](#)) have also been studied.

A remark now on anytime-valid and time-uniform bounds. As stated, [\(2\)](#) is a fixed-time bound. This is because the universal quantifier on  $n$  is “outside” the probability statement, which is characteristic of most concentration inequalities. A time-uniform bound, on the other hand, incorporates the number of samples “inside” the probability statement. It is of the form “with probability  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $n, \dots$ ” (moving forward, we will substitute  $t$  for  $n$  to draw attention to the distinction). While a minor ordinal difference, this is a major mathematical distinction with ramifications across science and any kind of data-driven decision-making ([Howard et al., 2021](#); [Grünwald et al., 2020](#); [Ramdas et al., 2022](#)). Importantly, time-uniform results are immune to “peeking” because they remain valid at stopping times.

Anytime-valid bounds, meanwhile, are (in)equalities that hold at arbitrary stopping times. A full discussion of the distinction between anytime-valid and time-uniform bounds is beyond the scope of this work, but we refer the interested reader to [Ramdas et al. \(2020\)](#) for further detail (see Lemmas 2 and 3 in particular). Suffice it to say that for probability statements, time-uniform is synonymous with anytime-valid. For expectations, however, they are not. This manuscript is concerned with anytime-valid probability statements, so we use the two terms interchangeably.

## 1.2 Contributions and Outline

In this work, we identify a general martingale-like structure at the heart of many existing PAC-Bayes bounds. This structure takes the form of either a nonnegative supermartingale or a nonnegative reverse submartingale. Such an identification enables us to (i) give a general framework for seeking new bounds, and (ii) give time-uniform extensions of many existing PAC-Bayes bounds. Our main contribution is a general result ([Theorem 3.1](#)) which provides a time-uniform PAC-Bayes bound for any process which is (upper bounded by) a nonnegative supermartingale or reverse submartingale. We proceed to instantiate this bound with a variety of particular processes and relate them to existing results in the literature ([Table 1](#)). For those bounds which admit a supermartingale struc-

ture, we find that their time-uniform extensions remain as tight as their fixed-time counterparts. For those that admit a reverse submartingale structure we provide two results: (i) a time-uniform bound holding for all  $t \geq 1$  which loses at most a constant factor plus an iterated logarithm term (i.e.,  $\log \log(t)$ ) over the original, and (ii) a bound which holds for all times  $t \geq n$ , where  $n$  is some time of special interest chosen beforehand. The latter remain just as tight as the original fixed-time bounds. Finally, our framework enables us to relax many traditional assumptions. For instance, many of our bounds do not require i.i.d. data. In fact, our supermartingale based bounds require no explicit assumptions on the data. Table 2 provides an overview of distributional assumptions.

As was mentioned in the introduction, the closest work to ours is the concurrent preprint of Haddouche and Guedj (2022). They apply Ville’s inequality to a supermartingale identified by Bercu and Touati (2008), which gives a time-uniform PAC-Bayes bound for unbounded (stationary) loss functions. In Section 4 we will demonstrate that this supermartingale was known to be a part of a much wider class of stochastic processes known as sub- $\psi$  processes (Howard et al., 2020), and provide an anytime-valid PAC-Bayes result for this large class, recovering their result as a special case.

Stepping back from the particulars, our work is best viewed in the spirit of recent progress in time-uniform Chernoff bounds and sequential estimation (Figure 1). We draw much inspiration from the recent works by Howard et al. (2020, 2021) who study a unifying approach to time-uniform bounds via supermartingales. Howard et al. (2020) showed that all Chernoff bounds can be made time-uniform at no loss (and sometimes a gain) by identifying an appropriate supermartingale and applying Ville’s inequality (Ville (1939), our Lemma 2.1). In other words, applying Ville’s inequality to nonnegative supermartingales is a unifying strategy for generating Chernoff bounds. This insight was the inspiration for seeking to identify underlying supermartingales in PAC-Bayes bounds. Howard et al. (2021) then built upon this foundation, and developed confidence sequences (i.e., confidence intervals that hold at all stopping times) with zero asymptotic width using a variety of mixtures of supermartingales. This “method of mixtures” plays an important role in our results in two respects. For one, it’s required since the PAC-Bayes framework gives bounds over mixtures of hypotheses. Second, it yields novel PAC-Bayes bounds by considering mixing the supermartingales underlying existing bounds with various distributions.

Interestingly, we find that not all existing PAC-Bayes bounds can be given time-uniform generalizations based on nonnegative supermartingales. For some, including those of Seeger (2003); Tolstikhin and Seldin (2013); Germain et al. (2015) which ultimately rely on applying convex functions to the risk and empirical risk, we must instead rely on *reverse submartingales*. Our inspiration for such tools comes from recent work by Manole and Ramdas (2023), who showed that convex functionals and divergences are reverse submartingales (with respect to the exchangeable filtration). Since there also exists a reverse-time Ville’s inequality, backwards submartingales and Ville’s inequality provide a second unifying recipe for deriving time-uniform bounds.

In short, this paper shows that adding a change-of-measure inequality to the techniques of these previous papers provides a unified recipe to derive time-uniform PAC-Bayesian inequalities.

**Outline.** The rest of the manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 provides relevant background on (reverse) martingales, Ville’s inequalities, and the change-of-measure inequality which lies at the heart of PAC-Bayesian analysis. Section 3 provides a “master theorem” which gives an anytime-valid PAC-Bayes bound for general nonnegative stochastic processes which are upper bounded by either a supermartingale or reverse submartingale. Section 4 then explores various

	<i>Existing result</i>	<i>Our result</i>
<i>Forward supermartingale</i>	McAllester (1999), Thm. 1	Corollary 4.3
	Catoni (2003)	Corollary 4.2
	Catoni (2007)	Corollary 4.7
	Seldin et al. (2012), Thm. 5 & 6	Corollary 6.5
	Seldin et al. (2012), Thm. 7 & 8	Corollary 6.6
	Balsubramani (2015), Thm. 1	Corollary 6.6
	Alquier et al. (2016), Thm. 4.1	Corollary 4.2
	Haddouche et al. (2021), Thm. 3	Corollary 4.8
	Haddouche and Guedj (2022), Thm. 5	Corollary 4.1
	Haddouche and Guedj (2022), Thm. 7	Corollary 4.9
<i>Reverse submartingale</i>	McAllester (1999), Thm. 1	Corollary 5.4
	Seeger (2002), Thm. 1	Corollary 5.3
	Maurer (2004), Thm. 5	Corollary 5.3
	Catoni (2007), Thm. 1.2.6	Corollary 5.1
	Germain et al. (2009), Thm. 2.1	Corollary 5.1
	Seldin et al. (2012), Thm. 4	Corollary 6.7
	Tolstikhin and Seldin (2013), Eqn. 3	Corollary 5.3
	Germain et al. (2015), Thm. 18	Corollary 5.1
	Bégin et al. (2016), Thm. 9	Corollary 6.2
	Thiemann et al. (2017), Thm. 3	Corollary 5.5
Alquier (2021), Eqn. (3.1)	Corollary 5.3	
Amit et al. (2022), Prop. 4 and 5	Corollary 6.1	

Table 1: A summary of how various existing results are related to our framework. The first column refers to the type of underlying process used to construct the bound. For supermartingales, the time-uniform extension sacrifices no tightness compared to the original. For reverse submartingales, we lose essentially an iterated logarithm factor over the fixed-time bound (but the fixed-time bound remains recoverable at no loss). The final column points to which corollary implies the existing result (either directly or as a consequence of selecting certain parameters; the precise relationship will be described in the text). The above results are mostly corollaries of Theorem 3.1 (a PAC-Bayes framework with the KL divergence), but several rely on Theorem 6.2 (a framework for general  $\phi$ -divergences) or Theorem 6.4 (a framework for Rényi divergences). The PAC-Bayes literature is large and we cannot include all previous results and their relationships, but we hope this gives the reader an idea of the scope of our approach. All existing results, save for those of Haddouche and Guedj (2022) and Balsubramani (2015), are fixed-time bounds. We do not provide numbers in the second and third rows because the bounds were not explicitly written out in Catoni (2003, 2007). See Alquier (2021) for a summary.

consequences in the supermartingale case, and Section 5 does the same for the reverse submartingale case. Section 6 then discusses a number of extensions. More specifically, Sections 6.1 and 6.2 study extensions of our master Theorem to Integral Probability Metrics,  $\phi$ -divergences, and the



Rényi divergence. Section 6.3 gives some connections to recent work on time-uniform confidence sequences, and Section 6.4 demonstrates that our results hold in the slightly different setting of martingale difference sequences.

**Notation.** As discussed previously, we let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a distribution over sequences  $(Z_t) \in \mathcal{Z}^\infty$ . In order to save ourselves from an overload of notation, we will write  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\cdot]$  to denote the expectation when drawing  $(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}_{(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\cdot]$ . Furthermore, we will use the convention that expectation over lowercase Greek letters refer to expectation over parameters  $\theta \in \Theta$ , e.g.,  $\mathbb{E}_\rho[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho}[\cdot]$ . We also write  $Z^n$  as shorthand for  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ . For a stochastic process  $(A_t)_{t=t_0}^\infty$  (or infinite sequence more generally) we will often simply write  $(A_t)$ , where  $t_0$  will be understood from context. We write  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  for the set of probability distributions over  $\Theta$ . We use  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  to be the set of nonnegative reals (similarly for  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ). When we say that  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  is a prior, it should be assumed that it is data-free, i.e., independent of the data  $(Z_t)$ . Writing, e.g.,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[g(Z_i)]$  for some function  $g$  should be taken to mean that the sequence  $(Z_t)$  was drawn from  $\mathcal{D}$  but we are restricting ourselves to the  $i$ -th value. We may also write  $\mathbb{E}_{Z_i}[g(Z)]$  in this case. Finally, we let  $\mu_i(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_i(Z_i, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ .

## 2 Background

A *forward filtration* is a sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{t+1}$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z_1, \dots, Z_t)$ , we call  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  the canonical (forward) filtration. Intuitively, we conceive of  $\mathcal{F}_t$  as all the information available at time  $t$ . Thus, if a function  $f$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable, it may depend on data  $Z_1, \dots, Z_t$ , but not on any  $Z_i$  for  $i > t$ . If a sequence of functions  $(f_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is such that  $f_t$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t$  measurable for all  $t$ , then we say that  $(f_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is *adapted* to  $\mathcal{F}_t$ . If  $f_{t+1}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t$  measurable for all  $t$ , then we say the sequence is *predictable*.

A *martingale* adapted to the forward filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is a stochastic process  $(S_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  such that  $S_t$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t$  measurable and  $\mathbb{E}[S_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] = S_t$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . If the equality is replaced with  $\leq$  (resp.,  $\geq$ ) we call  $(S_t)$  a *supermartingale* (resp., *submartingale*). Supermartingales are thus decreasing with time in expectation, whereas submartingales are increasing. Martingales stay constant in expectation. For this reason, they often represent fair games. Forward filtrations are in contrast to reverse filtrations, which we cover later in this section. Henceforth, if we discuss filtrations unencumbered by a preceding adjective, then it is a forward filtration.

It's perhaps worth remarking that a martingale is only a martingale *with respect to* a particular measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . For instance, the process  $S_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_i X_i - m$  for i.i.d.  $X_i$  is a martingale iff  $\mathbb{P}(X_i) = m$ . Formally then, one should refer to  $S_t$  as (possibly) being a  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale. However, in our case the measure will usually be clear from context and we will simply refer to martingales. The same discussion holds for sub/supermartingales.

Supermartingales are natural tools to use when deriving anytime-valid bounds due to Ville's inequality (Ville, 1939), given in Lemma 2.1. Informally, Ville's inequality is a time-uniform version of Markov's inequality. It states that a nonnegative supermartingale with initial value 1 remains small (say, less than  $1/\delta$ ) at all times with probability roughly  $1 - \delta$ . A digestible proof of Ville's inequality may be found in Howard et al. (2020).

**Lemma 2.1** (Ville's Inequality for Nonnegative Supermartingales (Ville, 1939)). *Let  $(N_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  be a nonnegative supermartingale with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ . For all times  $t_0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : N_t \geq u) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_{t_0}]}{u}.$$

Ville’s inequality can be restated as  $\mathbb{P}(\forall t \geq t_0 : N_t/N_{t_0} \leq u) \geq 1 - 1/u$ . Written this way, its power for providing time-uniform guarantees becomes evident.

Under appropriate conditions, mixtures of martingales remain martingales. That is, if  $V_t(\theta)$  is a (sub/super) martingale, then  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} V_t(\theta)$  for well-behaved mixtures  $\rho$  is also a (sub/super) martingale. The precise statement and corresponding proof are given in Appendix B. This is useful because if we have a family of nonnegative supermartingales (say) of the form  $N_t(\lambda)$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can look for appropriate mixture distributions  $F$  and conclude that  $\int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} N_t(\lambda) dF(\lambda)$  is also a nonnegative supermartingale, and thus by Ville’s inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall t \geq t_0 : \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} N_t(\lambda) dF(\lambda) \leq 1/\delta\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

This has been called the “method of mixtures”, and was noticed by Wald (1945) and Robbins (1970). Depending on the mixture distribution  $F$ , this bound can be more desirable than that based solely on  $N_t(\lambda)$ . Indeed, this approach has been successfully leveraged to generate time-uniform confidence intervals (i.e., confidence *sequences*) (Howard et al., 2021; Waudby-Smith et al., 2021, 2022). For our part, in Section 4.2 we give a novel PAC-Bayes bound using a Gaussian mixture distribution, as a demonstrative example.

The machinery of nonnegative supermartingales (and their mixtures) in addition to Ville’s inequality is sufficient to give time-uniform PAC-Bayes bounds in a wide variety of situations. Section 4 is dedicated to this task. See the first half of Table 1 for those bounds which are recovered using this technique. However, to recover time-uniform versions of other well-known PAC-Bayes bounds, we must rely on reverse-time martingales. We introduce these next.

A *reverse filtration*  $(\mathcal{R}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras such that  $\mathcal{R}_t \supseteq \mathcal{R}_{t+1}$  for all  $t$ . That is, a reverse filtration represents decreasing information with time. A *reverse martingale*  $(S_t)$  adapted to a reverse filtration  $(\mathcal{R}_t)$  is a stochastic process such that  $S_t$  is  $\mathcal{R}_t$  measurable and  $\mathbb{E}[S_t | \mathcal{R}_{t+1}] = S_{t+1}$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . Again, replacing the equality with  $\leq$  (resp.,  $\geq$ ) results in reverse supermartingales (resp., submartingales). Reverse processes are also called *backwards* or *reverse-time* process. We will use such language interchangeably. An example of a reverse martingale is the empirical mean  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t Z_i$  adapted to the canonical reverse filtration  $\mathcal{R}_t = \sigma(Z_t, Z_{t+1}, \dots)$ . Since filtrations and stochastic processes are typically considered in the context of “increasing” time, reverse-time processes can be initially confounding. When thinking about reverse martingales, we encourage the reader to imagine time flowing backwards, i.e., information being revealed first at time  $t$ , then at time  $t - 1$ ,  $t - 2$  and so on. Thus, reverse submartingales are increasing in expectation in reverse-time and, if one were to plot the expected values such a process would resemble a *supermartingale* in forward time. With this insight in mind, it is relieving to know that there is a variant of Ville’s inequality for reverse submartingales. Proofs may be found in Lee (2019); Manole and Ramdas (2023).

**Lemma 2.2** (Ville’s Inequality for Reverse Submartingales (Lee, 2019)). *Let  $(M_t)$  be a nonnegative reverse submartingale with respect to a reverse filtration  $(\mathcal{R}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ . For all  $t_0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : M_t \geq u) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_{t_0}]}{u}.$$

Section 5 will employ reverse submartingales in order to give time-uniform PAC-Bayes bounds on convex functions  $\varphi$  of the expected and empirical risk. This will enable us to give time-uniform versions of inequalities presented by Seeger (2003); McAllester (1998); Maurer (2004);



Germain et al. (2009, 2015); Tolstikhin and Seldin (2013), among others. Finally, we present the change-of-measure inequality due to Donsker and Varadhan (1975) which is central to the majority of existing PAC-Bayes bounds. A proof is provided in Appendix A.1. Before it is stated, let us recall that the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence (Kullback and Leibler, 1951) between two distributions  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  in  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  is

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mu\|\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\mu}[\log(d\mu(\theta)/d\pi)] = \int_{\Theta} \log\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(\theta)\right)\mu(d\theta),$$

if  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\pi$  (i.e.,  $\mu(A) = 0$  whenever  $\pi(A) = 0$ ), and  $+\infty$  otherwise. Here  $\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}$  is the Radon-Nikodym derivative. As stated in the introduction, the utility of the KL divergence in PAC-Bayes bounds comes from the following the change of measure formula. This was first stated by Kullback (1997) for finite parameter spaces, and then proved more generally by Donsker and Varadhan (1975) and Csiszár (1975).

**Lemma 2.3** (Change of Measure). *Let  $h : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable function. For any  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\nu} \exp(h(\theta)) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\rho}[h(\theta)] - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) \}.$$

While the Donsker-Varadhan formula is the most popular change of measure formula, it is not unique in its ability to furnish PAC-Bayes bounds. In Appendix 6.2, we provide change of measure inequalities for  $\phi$  and Rényi divergences and discuss how we can use such formulas in our bounds.

### 3 A General Recipe for Stochastic Processes

We now present results for nonnegative processes upper bounded by either a supermartingale or a reverse submartingale. We will consider processes  $P(\theta) = (P_t(\theta))_{t \geq 1}$  which are functions of a parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ . While the following theorem does not appear to be in the form of a traditional PAC-Bayes bound, a variety of typical bounds can be recovered by considering particular processes  $P(\theta)$  (Table 1). Many such fruitful processes will be presented throughout the remainder of this manuscript.

**Theorem 3.1** (Master anytime PAC-Bayes bound). *For each  $\theta \in \Theta$ , assume that a stochastic process of interest,  $P(\theta) = (P_t(\theta))_{t=t_0}^{\infty}$ , is upper bounded by another process  $U(\theta) = (U_t(\theta))_{t=t_0}^{\infty}$ , which is such that  $\mathbb{E}[U_{t_0}(\theta)] \leq 1$  and  $\exp U(\theta)$  is either a supermartingale or a reverse submartingale. Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq t_0$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} P_t(\theta) \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \log(1/\delta) \tag{3}$$

*Proof.* For  $t \geq t_0$ , set

$$V_t^{\text{mix}} := \exp \sup_{\rho} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\theta\sim\rho}[U_t(\theta)] - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) \}.$$

If  $\exp U(\theta)$  is a supermartingale (resp., reverse submartingale), then we claim  $(V_t^{\text{mix}})$  is a supermartingale (resp., reverse submartingale). Indeed, Lemma 2.3 gives  $V_t^{\text{mix}} = \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp U_t(\theta)$ , so  $V_t^{\text{mix}}$  is a mixture of supermartingales or reverse submartingales. Therefore, by Lemma B.1, it is itself a supermartingale or reverse submartingale. Applying Ville's inequality (either Lemma 2.1 or 2.2),

Condition on $(f_t)_{t \geq 1}$	Condition on $(Z_t)_{t \geq 1}$	Results
SubGaussian or subexponential	No explicit assumption	Corollaries 4.2, 4.3
Bounded	No explicit assumption	Corollaries 4.4, 4.5
Bernstein	No explicit assumption	Corollary 4.6
Bounded MGF	No explicit assumption	Corollary 4.7
$\mathbb{E}[f_t^2(Z_t, \theta)   \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \infty$	No explicit assumption	Corollaries 4.8, 4.9
$\mathbb{E}[ \Delta_t^2(\theta) ^p   \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ some $1 < p \leq 2$	No explicit assumption	Corollary 4.10
Stationary & MGF of $\varphi(f(\hat{R}_t(\theta), \theta), R(\theta))$ exists	Exchangeable	Corollaries 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2
Stationary & bounded in $[0,1]$	i.i.d.	Corollaries 5.3, 5.4, 5.5

Table 2: A summary of the conditions on the loss and the data required by several bounds. Even though for most rows there is no explicit dependence assumption required of  $(Z_t)$ , the usefulness of the bounds or the establishment of conditions on  $(f_t)$  may sometimes require implicitly making distributional assumptions on the data, but these will often be (much) less restrictive than an i.i.d. assumption. See Section 4.2 after Corollary 4.2 for more discussion. As all results require  $(f_t)$  to be predictable, this requirement is disregarded above. We omit results from Section 6.4 (martingale difference sequences) as the setting is slightly different.

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : \exp \sup_{\rho} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} P_t(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) \} \geq 1/\delta) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : \exp \sup_{\rho} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} U_t(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) \} \geq 1/\delta) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : V_t^{\text{mix}} \geq 1/\delta) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[V_{t_0}^{\text{mix}}] \delta \leq \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows since  $P_t(\theta) \leq U_t(\theta)$  by assumption. The final inequality follows since  $\nu$  is data-free, enabling Fubini's theorem to be applied:  $\mathbb{E}[V_{t_0}^{\text{mix}}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp U_{t_0}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp U_{t_0}(\theta) \leq 1$ . Thus, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq t_0$ ,  $\exp \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} P_t(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) \} \leq 1/\delta$ . Taking logarithms gives the desired result.  $\square$

Several remarks are in order. First, it's worth noting that Theorem 3.1 posits no distributional assumptions on the underlying data. Indeed, it does not even assume that the underlying filtration is based on  $Z_i$ . While our examples in subsequent sections will use either the canonical forward filtration  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z^t)$  or a particular backward filtration  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ , Theorem 3.1 holds for more general processes. Second, we note also that we need not specify that  $\rho$  be absolutely continuous with respect to the prior  $\nu$  in inequality (3) since, if not, then  $D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) = \infty$  and the bound holds trivially. Finally, in addition to bounding  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[V_1^{\text{mix}}]$ , the fact that the prior  $\nu$  is data free is required by Lemma B.1. That is, it is required to ensure that  $\mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp U_t(\theta)$  is a super/submartingale.

The KL divergence in (3) can be replaced by a variety of other divergences, provided they have their own variational representations. We discuss several alternative divergences in Sections 6.1 and 6.2.

## 4 PAC-Bayes Bounds via Supermartingales

We first construct PAC-Bayes bounds via supermartingales in light of Theorem 3.1. Our general framework for doing so is based on *sub- $\psi$ -processes* (Howard et al., 2020), which are generalizations

of processes amenable to exponential concentration inequalities. Many standard concentration inequalities (e.g., Hoeffding, Bennett, Bernstein) implicitly use sub- $\psi$  processes, which if identified yield time-uniform Chernoff bounds (Howard et al., 2020). For our purposes, sub- $\psi$  processes can be used in Theorem 3.1 to yield a time-uniform PAC-Bayes bound (Corollary 4.1). Many existing PAC-Bayes bounds rely on fixed-time concentration inequalities which can be generalized to sub- $\psi$  processes, thus yielding time-uniform extensions. We begin by defining sub- $\psi$  processes and then proceed to give further bounds for light-tailed losses (Section 4.2), and then for heavier-tailed losses (Section 4.3).

#### 4.1 The sub- $\psi$ Condition

Roughly speaking, a sub- $\psi$  process is a stochastic process which is upper bounded by a supermartingale but takes a particular functional form. They are at the heart of recent progress on time-uniform Chernoff bounds (Howard et al., 2020). This section presents a corollary of Theorem 3.1 for sub- $\psi$  processes which, in turn, yields many time-uniform extensions of existing PAC-Bayes bounds. We find that many existing bounds are implicitly relying on sub- $\psi$  processes without recognizing it.

**Definition 1** (Sub- $\psi$  process). Let  $(S_t)_{t=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $(V_t)_{t=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be stochastic processes adapted to an underlying filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ . For a function  $\psi : [0, \psi_{\max}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we say  $(S_t, V_t)$  is a sub- $\psi$  process if, for every  $\lambda \in [0, \psi_{\max})$ , there exists some supermartingale  $(L_t(\lambda))_{t=1}^\infty$  with  $L_1(\lambda) \leq 1$  such that, for all  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\exp\{\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t\} \leq L_t(\lambda), \text{ a.s.} \quad (4)$$

Definition 1 may appear rather abstract at first glance. Useful intuition comes from considering what happens when  $(S_t)$  is a martingale. In this case,  $\exp(\lambda S_t)$  is a submartingale by Jensen’s inequality. Thus,  $\psi(\lambda)V_t$  must be a process which appropriately “dominates”  $S_t$  in order to ensure that  $\exp(\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t)$  decreases in expectation rather than increases. For instance, suppose  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  are i.i.d. with mean 0. If  $S_t = \sum_{i \leq t} X_i$ , then taking  $\psi(\lambda)$  to be the log-MGF  $\log \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X_1}$  and  $V_t = t$  is sufficient to turn  $\exp(\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t)$  into a martingale. Indeed,  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \prod_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X_i - \log \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X_1}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \prod_{i=1}^t \exp(\lambda X_i - \log \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda X_1})$ . Corollary 4.7 gives a PAC-Bayes bound based on this process. Another example comes from supposing the  $X_i$  are  $\sigma$ -subGaussian. In that case we may take  $\psi(\lambda) = \lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2$ , keeping  $S_t$  and  $V_t$  the same. In this case  $\exp(\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t)$  is a supermartingale (as opposed to a martingale). This process is used (albeit in more generality) by Corollary 4.2. If, as in the examples above,  $S_t$  is a sum then we may let  $\lambda = \lambda_t$  change as a function of time. This will be the case in the majority of our bounds. Finally, notice that in these examples, we may simply take  $L_t(\lambda) = \exp(\lambda S_t - \psi(\lambda)V_t)$ . This is usually the case. We refer the reader to Howard et al. (2020) for a more lengthy discussion and further examples.

A nonnegative process that is upper bounded by a supermartingale has recently been termed an “e-process” (Ramdas et al., 2022). Theorem 3.1 yields bounds for such processes. Instead of working with more general definitions, however, we prefer to base our discussion on sub- $\psi$  processes specifically because it’s helpful to consider particular functions  $\psi$  and processes  $(V_t)$  which can bound our process  $(S_t)$  of interest. More to the point, we will often consider  $S_t$  to be the martingale

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_i(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - f_i(Z_i, \theta). \quad (5)$$

Different assumptions on  $f_t$  (e.g., bounded, light-tailed, heavy-tailed) will then lead us to particular selections of  $\psi$  and  $(V_t)$ . Moreover, our PAC-Bayes inequalities will bound  $S_t$  in terms of  $\psi$  and

$V_t$ . Consequently, if one finds themselves dealing with a sub- $\psi$  process, then the form of the bound will be immediately apparent.

As we did for more general processes, we will consider sub- $\psi$  processes which are indexed by parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ , and we will write that  $(S_t(\theta), V_t(\theta))$  is a sub- $\psi$  process. This should be taken to mean that, for each fixed  $\theta$ ,  $\exp\{\lambda S_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda)V_t(\theta)\} \leq L_t(\lambda, \theta)$  for an appropriate supermartingale  $L_t(\lambda, \theta)$ . Since, by construction, sub- $\psi$  processes are nonnegative and upper bounded by a supermartingale with unit initial value, we obtain the following corollary of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Assume that for each  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $(S_t(\theta), V_t(\theta))$  is a sub- $\psi$  process. Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a data-free prior and let  $\lambda \in [0, \psi_{max}]$ . Then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the sample, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho}[\lambda S_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda)V_t(\theta)] \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta), \quad (6)$$

for all times  $t \geq 1$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ .

A final remark before we begin applying sub- $\psi$  processes throughout the next several sections. Suppose  $S_t(\theta)$  and  $V_t(\theta)$  are both sums, say  $S_t(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t A_i(\theta)$  (e.g., (5)) and  $V_t = \sum_{i=1}^t B_i(\theta)$ . Then the sub- $\psi$  process takes the functional form  $\exp\{\lambda S_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda)V_t(\theta)\} = \prod_{i=1}^t \{\lambda A_i(\theta) - \psi(\lambda)B_i(\theta)\}$ . If  $\exp\{\lambda S_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda)V_t(\theta)\}$  is a supermartingale, we can take a (predictable) sequence  $(\lambda_i)$  (for  $\lambda_i \in [0, \lambda_{max}]$ ) as opposed to a single constant  $\lambda$ , and consider  $\prod_{i=1}^t \exp\{\lambda_i A_i(\theta) - \psi(\lambda_i)B_i(\theta)\}$ , which remains a supermartingale. The benefit is that the sequence  $(\lambda_i)$  may be chosen so that the bounds have zero asymptotic width. We discuss this more in Sections 4.2 and 6.3. This has been called the method of “predictable plug-ins” (Waudby-Smith and Ramdas, 2023).

## 4.2 Bounded and Light-Tailed Losses

Here we return to our main problem setting and consider anytime bounds on the difference between the expected risk and the empirical risk. By choosing particular sub- $\psi$  processes and applying Theorem 4.1, we can develop anytime bounds for light-tailed losses (this section) and more general losses (Section 4.3). It will often be useful to consider the quantity

$$\Delta_i(\theta) := \mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta),$$

where  $\mu_i(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_i(Z_i, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$ . Note that the process  $(\sum_{i \leq t} \Delta_i(\theta))_{t \geq 1}$  is a martingale. Throughout the remainder of this section, the underlying filtration will be the canonical data filtration  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z_1, \dots, Z_t)$ . A final remark before we begin. Here and in following sections, we will present bounds on the conditional risk  $\sum_i \mu_i(\theta)$ . While this may not resemble the risk in Equation (1) at first glance, observe that by total expectation we have

$$R(\theta) = \frac{1}{t} \left( \mathbb{E}_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1})} \mathbb{E}_{Z_t} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(Z_i, \theta) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right) = \frac{1}{t} \left( \mathbb{E}_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1})} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} f_i(Z_i, \theta) \right] + \mu_t(\theta) \right).$$

By induction,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\widehat{R}_t(\theta)] = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i \leq t} \mu_i(\theta)$ . As we’ll see, decomposing the risk into a sum of conditional risks is crucial for our martingale-based approaches.

**SubGaussian and Bounded Losses.** We begin by giving an anytime-valid PAC-Bayes bound for subGaussian losses. Recall that a random variable  $Y$  is  $\sigma$ -subGaussian conditional on  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(s(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y])) | \mathcal{F}] \leq \exp(s^2 \sigma^2 / 2)$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . We will say the loss  $f_t$  is  $\sigma$ -subGaussian if  $f_t(Z_t, \theta)$  is  $\sigma$ -subGaussian for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  be a predictable sequence of loss functions such that  $f_i$  is  $\sigma_i$ -subGaussian conditional on  $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ . Let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a non-negative predictable sequence and consider any data-free prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\lambda_i^2 \sigma_i^2}{2} + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

The proof is in Appendix A.2. Suppose the loss is stationary and bounded in  $[0, H]$ , implying that it is  $H/2$ -subGaussian. If  $\lambda_i = \lambda$  is constant, then Corollary 4.2 implies that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} f(Z, \theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta) + \frac{\lambda H^2}{8} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda t}, \quad (7)$$

for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . For any fixed time  $n$  of special interest, setting  $\lambda_i = \lambda/n$  for all  $\lambda$  recovers (2) (Catoni’s bound) exactly at time  $n$ , but still makes a nontrivial claim for all  $t \neq n$  at no extra cost. This time-uniform bound for bounded losses was recently given by Haddouche and Guedj (2022). As noted previously, it generalizes well-known fixed-time bounds of the same flavour (Catoni, 2003, 2004, 2007; Alquier et al., 2016). This phenomenon of exactly recovering a fixed-time Chernoff-style bound by a more general time-uniform bound was precisely the main contribution of the unified “supermartingale + Ville” framework of Howard et al. (2020).

A natural question is whether allowing  $\lambda_t$  to change with  $t$  is beneficial. The answer is yes, because it enables time-uniform bounds which converge to  $\mathbb{E}_\rho R_t(\theta)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , which is not possible for a fixed  $\lambda$ . We discuss how to select  $\lambda_t$  to achieve this effect in Appendix 6.3.

The lack of independence assumptions in Corollary 4.2 may seem surprising at first, but it is another consequence of the supermartingale approach. The proof of the Corollary is based on the process

$$N_t(\theta) := \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \left\{ \lambda_i (\mu_i(\theta) - f(Z_i, \theta)) - \frac{\lambda_i \sigma_i^2}{2} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Since  $N_{t-1}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  measurable,  $\mathbb{E}[N_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  is equal to

$$N_{t-1}(\theta) \cdot \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \lambda_t (\mu_t(\theta) - f_t(Z_t, \theta)) - \frac{\lambda_t \sigma_t^2}{2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right\}.$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[f_t(Z_t, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mu_t(\theta)$ , by definition of subGaussianity, the expected value in the above display is at most 1. This demonstrates that  $N_t(\theta)$  is a nonnegative supermartingale, meaning that Theorem 3.1 applies. The same reasoning holds for other bounds we will present. In general, if  $\exp\{\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - g_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\}$  has expectation at most 1, then  $\exp\{\sum_i \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \sum_i g_i\}$  can be upper bounded by a supermartingale, yielding a time-uniform PAC-Bayes bound with no independence assumptions on the data.

However, despite there being no such assumptions, the fact that we must have  $\mathbb{E}[f_t(Z_t, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \infty$  is implicitly relying on a type of dependence between  $f_t$  and the past. In some sense, then, the lack of distributional assumptions places the burden on  $(f_t)$  as opposed to  $(Z_t)$ . Thus, while the mathematics holds with no conditions on  $(Z_t)$ , the bounds may be meaningless for ill-behaved data and/or losses.

We now present a novel bound for subGaussian losses based on the method of mixtures. Fix  $\lambda_i = \lambda$  above to consider the supermartingale  $M_t(\lambda, \theta) := \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \{ \lambda \Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sigma_i^2 \}$ . As discussed in Section 2 and proven in Appendix B, the mixture

$$M_t(\theta) := \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} M_t(\lambda, \theta) dF(\lambda), \quad (9)$$

is also a nonnegative supermartingale for an appropriate distribution  $F$ . By choosing  $F$  to be Gaussian with mean 0 and some fixed variance, we can generate the following bound. The proof is in Appendix A.3.

**Corollary 4.3** (Gaussian-mixture bound for subGaussian losses). *Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  be a predictable sequence of loss functions such that  $f_i$  is  $\sigma_i$ -subGaussian. Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a data-free prior. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \inf_{\beta > 0} \left( \frac{s_t(\beta)}{\beta} (D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log \frac{s_t(\beta)}{\delta}) \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $s_t(\beta) = 1 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^t \sigma_i^2$ .

The parameter  $\beta$  comes from the variance of the Gaussian mixture in Equation (9). Since  $M_t(\theta)$  is a supermartingale for  $F = N(0, \beta)$  for all  $\beta > 0$ , we may take the infimum over all such  $\beta$ .

It is worth comparing the above bound to McAllester's bound (McAllester, 1999). Consider stationary loss functions bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . McAllester's fixed time bound reads

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_n(\theta) + \left( \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(n/\delta)}{2(n-1)} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

In our case,  $f$  being bounded implies that  $\sigma_i^2 = 1/4$  for all  $i$  since  $f$  is  $1/2$ -subGaussian. Fix a time  $n$  of interest, take  $\beta$  such that  $s_t(\beta) = n$ , i.e.,  $\beta = 4(n-1)/n$ . The Gaussian mixture bound then yields McAllester's bound with an extra factor of  $\sqrt{2}$  in the denominator. We can achieve a time-uniform version of McAllester by considering  $\beta = 1$ , in which case  $s_t(\beta) = 1 + t/4 \leq t$  for all  $t \geq 2$  and the bound becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta) + \left( \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(t/\delta)}{t} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (11)$$

which differs from McAllester's by a factor of  $\sqrt{2}$ . We might thus consider (11) to be a time-uniform generalization of McAllester's bound. However, this was for a particular choice of  $\beta$ . In general, our bound contains the parameter  $\beta$  over which we can optimize. In fact, performing this optimization gives an implicit equation for  $\beta$ :

$$\log(s_t(\beta)) + \frac{1}{\beta} = \log(\delta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu).$$

This is difficult to solve in closed-form, but after a choosing a prior and posterior and computing the KL divergence, we might generate an approximate solution computationally. Section 5 will explore another generalization of McAllester's bound using a separate (reverse submartingale based) technique.



Our next result considers bounded loss functions. It relies on a Bernstein-type process, namely

$$B_t(\theta) := \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \left\{ \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \lambda_i^2 (e-2) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right\}. \quad (12)$$

It is so termed because it can be seen to be a supermartingale via the application of Bernstein's inequality. The details are in the proof of the following Proposition, which can be found in Appendix A.4.

**Corollary 4.4** (Anytime bound for bounded losses). *Let  $(Z_t)$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable sequence of loss functions such that  $\|f_t\|_\infty \leq H_t$  for all  $t$  and constants  $H_t > 0$ . Let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a predictable sequence such that  $\lambda_t \in [0, 1/H_t]$  for all  $t$ . Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq (e-2) \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i^2 \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\Delta_i^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

A second result for bounded losses can be obtained via a supermartingale based on a Bennett-like inequality (Boucheron et al., 2013, Theorem 2.9).

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable sequence of loss functions such that  $\|f_t\|_\infty \leq H_t$  for all  $t$  and constants  $H_t > 0$ . Let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a predictable sequence of positive values. Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}_\rho \mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \psi_P(\lambda_i H_i) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta),$$

where  $\psi_P(x) = (e^x - x - 1)$ .

The proof is in Appendix A.5. Both Corollary 4.4 and 4.5 are based on one-sided concentration inequalities and thus hold in the more general setting when losses are not nonnegative.

**Subexponential Losses.** We note briefly that Corollaries 4.2 and 4.3 may be strengthened to handle *sub-exponential* losses, where we say that  $Y$  is subexponential with parameters  $(\sigma, c)$  if  $\mathbb{E} \exp(s(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)) \leq \exp(s^2 \sigma^2 / 2)$  for all  $|s| \leq 1/c$ . SubGaussian random variables are therefore subexponential random variables with  $c = 0$ . To extend Corollary 4.2 to subexponential variables, we take  $\lambda_i \leq 1/c_i$  if  $f_i$  is subexponential with parameter  $(\sigma_i, c_i)$ .

**Losses obeying a Bernstein condition.** The consideration of subexponential random variables naturally leads us to consider a Bernstein condition on the losses, which implies that they're subexponential. In particular, we say that a random variable  $Y$  satisfies *Bernstein's condition* with parameter  $c$  if

$$|\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}(Y))^k]| \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{V}(Y) k! c^{k-2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2.$$

It is well-known that if  $Y$  is Bernstein with parameter  $c$  then it is subexponential with parameters  $(\sqrt{2\mathbb{V}(Y)}, 1/2c)$  (see, e.g., (Boucheron et al., 2013, Theorem 2.10) or (Wainwright, 2019, Corollary 2.10)). For bounded random variables, the resulting concentration inequality can be much tighter

than Hoeffding’s (which is not variance adaptive), especially when the variance of  $Y$  is much smaller than its range. It is therefore worth stating the following PAC-Bayes result for Bernstein-type losses, the proof of which is in Appendix A.6.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)$  be a predictable sequence of loss functions such that  $\mathbb{V}(f_t(Z_t, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \sigma_t^2$  and, for all  $t$  and integers  $k \geq 2$ ,  $|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[(f_t(Z_t, \theta) - \mu_t(\theta))^k | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^2 k! c_t^{k-2}$ . Let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a predictable sequence such that  $\lambda_t \in (0, 1/c_t)$  for all  $t$ . Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t \geq 1$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\lambda_i^2 \sigma_i^2}{2(1 - c_i \lambda_i)} + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

### 4.3 More General Losses

Now we consider less well-behaved losses.

**Losses with bounded MGF.** The first bound we give is an anytime-valid version of Catoni’s bound based on the log-MGF of the loss (Catoni, 2007). It is somewhat of an unusual bound seeing as the empirical risk is “on the wrong side”, i.e., we bound the empirical risk in terms of the log-MGF of the expected risk. However, the bound has proven useful in various estimation problems (Catoni and Giulini, 2017, 2018). The proof may be found in Appendix A.7.

**Corollary 4.7** (Losses with bounded MGF). *Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable loss functions. Let  $(\lambda_i)$  be a nonnegative predictable sequence and consider any data-free prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} f_i(Z_i, \theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \log \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_i f_i(Z, \theta)) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta). \quad (13)$$

Of course, Corollary 4.7 is only informative when the MGF  $\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda f_i(Z, \theta))$  is finite.

**Losses with Bounded Second Moment.** Our second bound in this section assumes only that the conditional second moment of the loss is finite, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_t^2(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \infty$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , and relies on the nonnegative process

$$M_t(\theta) := \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \left\{ \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{\lambda_i^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(Z, \theta)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right\},$$

which can be seen to be a supermartingale via an application of a one-sided Bernstein inequality. Lemma A.2 gives the relevant statement and proof of this result. As far as we are aware, the resulting PAC-Bayes bound is also novel.

**Corollary 4.8** (Losses with bounded conditional second moment). *Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data. Let  $(\lambda_i)$  be a nonnegative predictable sequence and consider any data-free prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Let  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable loss functions such that  $\sigma_t^2(\theta) =$*

$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_t^2(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \infty$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\lambda_i^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \sigma_i^2(\theta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

We now give another bound assuming only the second moment is finite. It is based on a supermartingale discovered by [Bercu and Touati \(2008\)](#) and the resulting bound (for stationary losses  $f_t$  and constant  $\lambda = \lambda_i$ ) was given by [Haddouche and Guedj \(2022\)](#). Let

$$M_t(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t (\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta)).$$

The *quadratic variation* of  $M_t(\theta)$  is  $[M(\theta)]_t := \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i^2(\theta)$  and its conditional quadratic variation is  $\langle M(\theta) \rangle_t := \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$ . [Bercu and Touati \(2008\)](#) demonstrate that the process

$$L_t(\theta) = \exp \left\{ \lambda M_t(\theta) - \frac{\lambda}{6} \left( [M(\theta)]_t + 2 \langle M(\theta) \rangle_t \right) \right\},$$

is a supermartingale for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . (This is the process which undergirds the results of [Haddouche and Guedj \(2022\)](#).) Our unified proof technique leads us immediately to the following result.

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data and  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable loss functions such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f_t^2(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \infty$ . Let  $(\lambda_i)$  be a nonnegative predictable sequence and consider any data-free prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i^2 \left( \Delta_i^2(\theta) + 2 \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) + \log(1/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu). \quad (14)$$

The proof can be found in [Appendix A.9](#). The right hand side of [\(14\)](#) can be upper bounded to give the more interpretable bound,

$$\sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i^2 \left( f_i^2(Z_i, \theta) + 2 \mathbb{E}[f_i^2(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) + \log(1/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu). \quad (15)$$

If the losses and  $\lambda_i$ 's are stationary, then [\(15\)](#) is similar to [Theorem 7 of Haddouche and Guedj \(2022\)](#), except our bound has a factor of  $1/3$  instead of  $1/2$  on the conditional quadratic variation term. Note however, that by simplifying [\(14\)](#) into [\(15\)](#), we've lost a fair bit of tightness. Indeed, the bound in [\(15\)](#) is most likely looser (depending on the values of the losses) than that in [Corollary 4.8](#), even though both require the same assumptions on the losses.

Using this proposition, [Haddouche and Guedj \(2022\)](#) are able to generalize previous work of [Haddouche et al. \(2021\)](#) on unbounded losses under the Hypothesis Dependent Range Condition (HYPER). The same discussion and generalization thus applies here.

**Losses with bounded  $p$ -th moment,  $1 < p \leq 2$ .** Our final bound in this section weakens the second moment condition even further. In particular, we suppose that the loss  $f_t$  has finite (conditional)  $p$ -th moment, for some  $1 < p \leq 2$ . That is,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[|\mu_t(\theta) - f_t(Z_t, \theta)|^p | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq \kappa,$$

for some  $\kappa > 0$ . Under this assumption, we may follow Wang and Ramdas (2022) to show that the process

$$Q_t(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{\exp\{\zeta_p(\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta))\}}{1 + \lambda_i^p \kappa / p}$$

is a nonnegative supermartingale if  $\zeta_p$  is a non-decreasing function that satisfies the upper influence function bound of Chen et al. (2021),  $\zeta_p(x) \leq \log(1 + x + |x|^p/p)$  (cf. Catoni (2012)). For instance, we might simply consider

$$\zeta_p(x) = \begin{cases} x, & x \leq 0; \\ \log(1 + x + |x|^p/p), & x > 0. \end{cases}$$

This immediately yields the following PAC-Bayes bound. Of course, as we noted previously, this is an implicit bound. However, as pointed out by Wang and Ramdas (2022), root finding methods may be used to efficiently solve the left hand side.

**Corollary 4.10.** *Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a stream of (not necessarily i.i.d.) data and  $(f_t)$  be a sequence of predictable loss functions such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[|\Delta_t(\theta)|^p | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] < \kappa$  for some  $\kappa > 0$  and  $1 < p \leq 2$ . Let  $(\lambda_i)$  be a nonnegative predictable sequence and consider any data-free prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all times  $t$  and measures  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \zeta_p(\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \log(1 + \lambda_i^p \kappa / p) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

## 5 PAC-Bayes Bounds via Submartingales

While Section 4 was able to generalize several fixed-time PAC-Bayes bounds, the sub- $\psi$  approach explored therein does not cover all existing PAC-Bayes bounds. In this section we explore the other half of Theorem 3.1, giving bounds based on reverse-time submartingales.

Throughout this section, for reasons that will become clear later, we will require that the loss is stationary ( $f_t = f$ ) and that the data  $(Z_t)$  are *exchangeable*. In particular, for all  $t \geq 1$ , and permutations  $g : [t] \rightarrow [t]$ ,  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_t) \stackrel{d}{=} (Z_{g(1)}, \dots, Z_{g(t)})$ . Exchangeability is slightly weaker than the i.i.d. assumption. Sampling without replacement gives rise to exchangeable sequences which are not i.i.d. Another example comes from considering  $X_1 + Y, \dots, X_n + Y$  for some random variable  $Y$  and i.i.d.  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Observe that exchangeability implies a common mean, so throughout this section we set  $R(\theta) = R_t(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(Z, \theta)]$  for all  $t$ .

The bounds in the previous section were based on the process  $S_t = \sum_{i=1}^t (\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta))$ , while those in this section will be based on the process  $S_t/t$ . While the partial sums  $(S_t)$  form a martingale, only the *partial means*  $(S_t/t)$  form a reverse submartingale. We'll see that while PAC-bounds based on reverse submartingales can capture a larger variety of relationships between  $R_t(\theta)$  and  $\hat{R}_t(\theta)$ , this comes at the expense of slightly looser bounds in addition to stronger distributional assumptions.

A formidable example of a bound which is not recovered by appealing to supermartingales is that of Germain et al. (2015) (a similar bound was stated by Lever et al. (2010); Theorem 1). This generalizes a class of bounds which consider convex functions acting on the risk and empirical risk. In particular, this recovers earlier bounds of Seeger (2002, 2003); Germain et al. (2009); McAllester (1998, 2003). A similar bound was given recently by Rivasplata et al. (2020) when considering PAC-Bayes bounds for stochastic kernels.

**Proposition 5.1** (Germain et al. (2015)). Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  be i.i.d.,  $\varphi : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex and  $f = f_t$  be stationary and bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . For all  $n$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,

$$\varphi(\mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_n(\theta), \mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta)) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta))) + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda}.$$

Let us consider for a moment attempting to give an anytime-valid version of the above result using the machinery from Section 4. One would need to guarantee that the nonnegative process  $P_t(\theta) = \exp \{ \lambda \varphi(\mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_n(\theta), \mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta)) - \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta))) \}$  is upper bounded by a supermartingale. Since  $\varphi$  may not be linear, however, one cannot write this as a product of exponential terms. We thus require a different approach. Interestingly, one can show that convex functions acting on the empirical risk are reverse submartingales with respect to an appropriate filtration, which we define below. From here, Ville’s inequality for reverse submartingales (Lemma 2.2) will provide us with an anytime version of Proposition 5.1.

Given a sequence of data  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ , the *exchangeable reverse filtration*  $(\mathcal{E}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is the reverse filtration where  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by all (Borel) measurable functions of the data which are permutation symmetric in their first  $t$  arguments. We say a function  $s$  is permutation symmetric if  $s(Z_1, \dots, Z_t) = s(Z_{g(1)}, \dots, Z_{g(t)})$  for all permutations  $g : [t] \rightarrow [t]$ . Formally,  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is written

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \sigma \left( \{s(Z_1, \dots, Z_t) : s \text{ is perm. symmetric}\} \cup \{Z_j\}_{j>t} \right). \quad (16)$$

We find the following intuition helpful when thinking about  $\mathcal{E}_t$ , which comes from Manole and Ramdas (2023).  $\mathcal{E}_1$  might be viewed as an omniscient oracle with access to all information over the whole future. As time goes on, her memory of the past decays but she retains perfect knowledge of the future. Importantly, she does not forget what happened in the past, only the *order* in which events occurred. That is, the oracle  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is omniscient with respect to  $Z_{t+1}, Z_{t+2}, \dots$ , but forgets the order of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_t$ . Manole and Ramdas (2023) also give a sufficient condition for a stochastic process to be a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ .

**Lemma 5.1** (Leave-one-out, Manole and Ramdas (2023), Corollary 5). *If a sequence of functions  $\{h_t : \mathcal{X}^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  satisfies the “leave-one-out” property, namely,  $h_t(X^t) \leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t h_{t-1}(X_{-i}^t)$ , (where  $X_{-i}^t$  omits  $X_i$ ) and if  $h_t$  is permutation invariant for all  $t$ , then  $(h_t)_{t=0}^\infty$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . Moreover, if the expression above holds with equality then  $(h_t)$  is a reverse martingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ .*

To reduce notational clutter, given a convex function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define the function

$$\varphi_t(\theta) := \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)). \quad (17)$$

That is,  $\varphi_t$  simply fixes the second argument of  $\varphi$  as  $R(\theta)$  and sets the first as the empirical risk at time  $t$ . Considering  $\varphi_t$  is useful because the stochastic process  $(\varphi_t(\theta))_{t=1}^\infty$  for fixed  $\theta$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . Intuitively, this is clear by appealing to Lemma 5.1, since the empirical risk  $\widehat{R}_t(\theta)$  is permutation invariant, and the convexity of  $\varphi$  ensures that the leave-one-out property holds.

**Lemma 5.2.** *For an exchangeable sequence  $(Z_t)$ ,  $(\varphi_t(\theta))$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $\varphi_t(\theta)$  is permutation invariant by construction. Thus, by Lemma 5.1, we need only show that it satisfies the leave-one-out property. For each  $i \in [t]$ , define

$$\widehat{R}_t^{(-i)}(\theta) := \frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{j \neq i} f(Z_j, \theta),$$

and observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \widehat{R}_t^{(-i)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \neq i} f(Z_j, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t f(Z_i, \theta) = t\widehat{R}_t(\theta).$$

Consequently, by the convexity of  $\varphi$  and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t(\theta) &= \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) = \varphi\left(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \widehat{R}_t^{(-i)}(\theta), R(\theta)\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \varphi(\widehat{R}_t^{(-i)}(\theta), R(\theta)) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \varphi_0(Z_{-i}^t, \theta), \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z_{-i}^t = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_t)$ .  $\square$

Our reliance on Lemma 5.1 is the reason that this section considers only stationary loss functions (but so do the bounds we generalize). More specifically, stationary losses are required for  $\varphi_t(\theta)$  to be permutation invariant. We cannot in general swap  $Z_i$  and  $Z_k$  if  $f_i$  and  $f_k$  are different.

## 5.1 A Time-Uniform Bound for Convex Functions

As we alluded to in the introduction, while the supermartingale approach of Section 4 was able to generalize fixed-time bounds at no cost, this is not true for the bounds presented in this section. Roughly speaking, this is because even though the process  $\varphi_t(\theta)$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$  (and therefore so is  $\exp(\lambda\varphi_t(\theta))$ ), the process  $\exp\{\lambda\varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda\varphi_t(\theta))\}$  may not be. Thus, we cannot use such a process in Theorem 3.1 to recover (a time-uniform version of) Proposition 5.1 exactly.

Instead, we rely on a “stitching” argument in a similar vein to Howard et al. (2021) and Manole and Ramdas (2023). This entails considering a series of submartingales over geometrically spaced epochs  $[2^{t-1}, 2^t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , each holding with a precise probability such that we may take the union bound over all such intervals to obtain our result. As we'll see, the resulting bounds will suffer at most a constant factor plus an iterated logarithm factor over the originals.

Formally, we consider a “stitching function” function  $\ell : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow (1, \infty)$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ell(k)} \leq 1$ . Different choices will lead to different shapes of the resulting bounds. For clarity, however, we fix the following particular choice of stitching function for the remainder of this manuscript,

$$\ell(k) = k^2 \zeta(2), \quad \text{where} \quad \zeta(2) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-2} \approx 1.645.$$

We also introduce the following “iterated logarithm” factor that captures the small excess error inherent to our anytime-valid bounds:

$$\mathbb{L}_t := \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))) < 2 \log \log 2t + 1.3. \tag{18}$$



Additionally, throughout this section we set

$$\eta(t) := 2^{\lfloor \log_2(t) \rfloor}. \quad (19)$$

Note that  $t/2 \leq \eta(t) \leq t$ . With these definitions in hand, we are ready to state our time-uniform version of Proposition 5.1.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be exchangeable. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex and  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a prior. Let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a sequence of positive values. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp \left\{ \lambda_{\eta(t)} \varphi(\widehat{R}_{\eta(t)}(\theta), R(\theta)) \right\}}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{L}_t}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}}, \quad (20)$$

for  $\mathbb{L}_t$  as in (18) and  $\eta(t)$  as in (19).

*Proof.* Recall the shorthand  $\varphi_t(\theta) = \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta))$ . For  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$M_t^j(\theta) = \lambda_j \varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_j \varphi_j(\theta)). \quad (21)$$

the second term on the right hand side is deterministic and only depends on  $\theta$ , so Lemma 5.2 implies that  $(M_t^j(\theta))$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . Hence, by Jensen's inequality, so is  $(\exp M_t^j(\theta))$ . Moreover, note that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(M_t^j(\theta)) = 1$ . Therefore, Theorem 3.1 implies that, for all  $\rho$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq j : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^j(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(u/\delta)) \leq \delta/u, \quad (22)$$

for  $u > 0$ . Fix  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Recall our definition  $\eta(t) = 2^{\lfloor \log_2(t) \rfloor}$ . Suppose that, for some  $t^* \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_\rho M_{t^*}^{\eta(t^*)}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t^*))/\delta)$ . By construction,  $\eta(t^*) = 2^{k^*}$  where  $k^* = \lfloor \log_2(t^*) \rfloor \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\rho M_{t^*}^{2^{k^*}}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) &= \mathbb{E}_\rho M_{t^*}^{\eta(t^*)}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \\ &\geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t^*))/\delta) \geq \log(\ell(k^* + 1)/\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows since  $\log_2(2t^*) = \log_2(t^*) + 1 \geq \lfloor \log_2(t^*) \rfloor + 1 = k^* + 1$ , and  $\ell$  is an increasing function. We have thus shown that the event  $\{\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta)\}$  is contained in the event

$$\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^{2^k}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(k+1)/\delta) \right\},$$

implying that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^{2^k}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(k+1)/\delta) \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^{2^k}(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(\ell(k+1)/\delta)) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\delta}{\ell(k+1)} = \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we've applied (22) with  $u = \ell(k+1)$ . In other words, expanding  $M_t^{\eta^{(t)}}(\theta)$ , we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho$  and  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\eta^{(t)}} \mathbb{E}_\rho \varphi_t(\theta) &\leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_{\eta^{(t)}} \varphi_{\eta^{(t)}}(\theta)) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta) \\ &\leq \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_{\eta^{(t)}} \varphi_{\eta^{(t)}}(\theta)) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t, \end{aligned}$$

using the definition of  $\ell$  and the fact that  $\log$  is concave. Dividing by  $\lambda$  completes the argument.  $\square$

Comparing Corollary 5.1 and Proposition 5.1, we see there are several differences aside from  $\mathbb{I}_t$ . For one, our expectation is on the outside of  $\varphi_t$  on the left hand side. Of course, because  $\varphi$  is convex,  $\mathbb{E}_\rho \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \geq \varphi(\mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta), \mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta))$ , so our result implies a bound on the latter term. Second, our log-MGF term is based on  $\eta(t) \in [t/2, t]$  instead of  $t$ , thus “lags behind” the fixed-time result. This is a consequence of stitching. However, if there is a fixed time  $n$  of special interest, we can obtain the following time-uniform bound for all  $t \geq n$ , which is just as tight as Proposition 5.1.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be exchangeable. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex and  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a prior. Fix  $\lambda > 0$ . Consider a fixed target time  $n$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq n$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp \{ \lambda \varphi(\widehat{R}_n(\theta), R(\theta)) \}}{\lambda} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda}. \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Corollary 5.1, set

$$M_t^n(\theta) = \exp \{ \lambda \varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda \varphi_n(\theta)) \}.$$

Then  $(M_t^n(\theta))_{t \geq n}$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)_{t \geq n}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} M_n^n(\theta) = 1$ . Therefore, Theorem 3.1 gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq n : \mathbb{E}_\rho M_t^n(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \log(1/\delta)) \leq \delta,$$

which rearranges to the claimed result.  $\square$

Corollary 5.2 requires some interpretation. The right hand side of (23) is constant with respect to  $t$ . While such a bound might be more straightforward for a fixed  $t \geq n$ , our bound shows that it holds simultaneously for all  $t \geq n$ . These bounds are in some sense analogous to Freedman-style deviation inequalities (which hold for all  $t \leq n$ , but with tightness only depending on  $n$  and not improving for  $t \ll n$ ) and perhaps even more analogous to de la Peña-style deviation inequalities (which hold for all  $t \geq n$ , but with tightness only depending on time  $n$  and not improving for  $t \gg n$ ) — see Howard et al. (2020) for a detailed discussion, in particular Figures 1, 4 and 5 for intuition.

## 5.2 A Time-Uniform Seeger Bound

By choosing particular convex functions  $\varphi$  and applying Corollary 5.1 (or 5.2), we recover time-uniform versions of several classical PAC-Bayes inequalities. We present several of them here, but refer the reader to resources such as Alquier (2021) and Germain et al. (2009) for more comprehensive discussions. A particularly famous result is that of Seeger (2003). To state it, let us define, for any  $p, q \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\text{kl}(p \parallel q) := p \log \left( \frac{p}{q} \right) + (1 - p) \log \left( \frac{1 - p}{1 - q} \right),$$

which is the KL-divergence between Bernoulli distributions with means  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. That  $\text{kl}$  is convex (in each argument,  $p$  and  $q$ ) thus follows from the fact that  $D_{\text{KL}}(\cdot\|\cdot)$  is convex (in distribution space). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{kl}(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2\|q) &= D_{\text{KL}}(\lambda \text{Ber}(p_1) + (1 - \lambda)\text{Ber}(p_2)\|\text{Ber}(q)) \\ &\leq \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p_1)\|\text{Ber}(q)) + (1 - \lambda)D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p_2)\|\text{Ber}(q)) \\ &= \lambda \text{kl}(p_1\|q) + (1 - \lambda) \text{kl}(p_2\|q), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , where  $\text{Ber}(p)$  is a Bernoulli distribution with mean  $p$ . An identical argument holds for the second argument of  $\text{kl}$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\xi(k) := \sum_{\ell=0}^k \mathbb{P}_{Y \sim \text{Bin}(k, \ell/k)}(Y = \ell) = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} (\ell/k)^\ell (1 - \ell/k)^{k-\ell}.$$

As noted by [Maurer \(2004\)](#); [Germain et al. \(2015\)](#),  $\sqrt{k} \leq \xi(k) \leq 2\sqrt{k}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Employing [Corollary 5.1](#) leads to the following bound, which relates  $\xi(k)$  to the log-MGF. Recall that  $\eta(t) = 2^{\lceil \log_2(t) \rceil}$  and  $\mathbb{I}_t < 2 \log \log 2t + 1.3$ . The proof of the following bound can be found in [Appendix A.10](#).

**Corollary 5.3** (Anytime-valid Seeger Bound). *Let  $(Z_t)$  be i.i.d. and consider stationary losses bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a data-free prior. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \text{kl}(\widehat{R}_t(\theta)\|R(\theta)) \leq \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \log(\xi(\eta(t))/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t}{\eta(t)}. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, for any fixed  $n$ , we obtain that for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \text{kl}(\widehat{R}_t(\theta)\|R(\theta)) \leq \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \log(\xi(n)/\delta)}{n}. \quad (25)$$

At time  $t = n$ , [\(25\)](#) recovers the fixed-time Seeger bound. Moreover, by noting that  $\eta(t) \in [t/2, t]$ , [\(24\)](#) provides a guarantee for all  $t \geq 1$ , that is at most a constant factor worse than [\(25\)](#).

A time-uniform McAllester bound ([McAllester, 1998, 2003](#)) — distinct from that derived in [Section 4](#) — follows immediately by applying Jensen's inequality and Pinsker's inequality: For all  $x, y \in (0, 1)$ ,  $2(x - y)^2 \leq \text{kl}(x\|y)$ . This implies that  $2[\mathbb{E}_\rho(\widehat{R}_t(\theta) - R(\theta))]^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}_\rho(\widehat{R}_t(\theta) - R(\theta))^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \text{kl}(\widehat{R}_t(\theta)\|R(\theta))$ . Using this in conjunction with the fact that  $\xi(k) \leq 2\sqrt{k}$  yields the following.

**Corollary 5.4** (Anytime-valid McAllester Bound). *Let  $(Z_t)$  be i.i.d. and consider stationary losses bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a data-free prior. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta) + \left( \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \log(2\sqrt{\eta(t)}/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t}{2\eta(t)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, for any fixed  $n$ , we obtain that for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta) + \left( \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \log(2n/\delta)}{2n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (26)$$

As above, at the fixed time  $t = n$ , (26) recovers McAllester’s bound. Other bounds follow from other choices of  $\varphi$ . Bégin et al. (2016) note that  $\varphi(x, y) = -cx - \log(1 - y(1 - e^{-c}))$  leads to Theorem 1.2.6 of Catoni (2007). Meanwhile, as pointed out by Alquier (2021) and Pérez-Ortiz et al. (2021) we can also generate the bounds of Tolstikhin and Seldin (2013) and Thiemann et al. (2017) by using other inequalities involving kl. We state this final bound only.

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be i.i.d. and consider stationary losses bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a data-free prior. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho R(\theta) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta)}{1 - \lambda/2} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(2\sqrt{\eta(t)}/\delta) + \mathbb{1}_{L_t}}{\eta(t)(1 - \lambda/2)\lambda}, \quad (27)$$

simultaneously for all  $\lambda \in (0, 2)$ .

## 6 Extensions

Owing in part to the ability for PAC-Bayes bounds to provide insight into the performance of neural networks (Dziugaite and Roy, 2017), recent years have seen a surge of interest in and progress on the topic. In this section, we provide some comments on the ability of our unified framework to incorporate some of these advances. In particular, we discuss replacing the KL divergence with integral probability metrics,  $\phi$ -divergences, and Rényi divergences, in addition to how Theorem 3.1 relates to replace the loss function with martingale difference sequences. We also discuss how many of the bounds in the two previous sections give rise to confidence sequences (i.e., time-uniform confidence intervals), and provide some general advice on choosing  $(\lambda_t)$  in the supermartingale bounds.

### 6.1 Replacing the KL Divergence with IPMs

Given that all the bounds provided thus far rely on the KL divergence between  $\rho$  and  $\nu$ , a natural question is whether we can replace this term with an alternative distributional metric? Here we answer in the affirmative and demonstrate that recent work by Amit et al. (2022) which replaces the KL divergence with a variety of *Integral Probability Metrics* (IPMs) can be made time-uniform.

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a family of functions which map  $\Theta$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . The Integral Probability Metric with respect to  $\mathcal{G}$  between two distributions  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  over  $\Theta$  is

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho, \nu) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} g(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \nu} g(\theta)|. \quad (28)$$

IPMs are a large class of divergences. By choosing the appropriate family  $\mathcal{G}$ , one can recover the Total Variation distance, the Wasserstein distance, the Dudley metric, and the Maximum Mean Discrepancy (Sriperumbudur et al., 2009). We note that the KL divergence is not a special case of an IPM.

The following theorem is our main result for IPMs. Just as Theorem 3.1 provided a general framework for generating PAC-Bayes bounds with a KL-divergence term, Theorem 6.1 provides a framework for generating PAC-Bayes bounds with an IPM. The main idea is to replace the use of the Donsker-Varadhan formula with an assumption on the family of functions  $\mathcal{G} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (or, more precisely, *families* of functions).

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 1}$  be a predictable sequence, where each  $\mathcal{G}_t$  is a family of functions from  $\Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $(h_t)$  be a sequence of functions such that  $h_t \in \mathcal{G}_t$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . Suppose that  $(\exp h_t(\theta))_{t \geq t_0}$  is a supermartingale or reverse submartingale (adapted to some filtration) for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp h_{t_0}(\theta) \leq 1$ . Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} h_t(\theta) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) + \log(1/\delta). \quad (29)$$

for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and times  $t \geq t_0$ .

*Proof.* By assumption,  $h_t \in \mathcal{G}_t$  for all  $t$ . Hence  $\gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu} h_t(\theta)$ . Rearranging and exponentiating gives,

$$\exp(\mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu)) \leq \exp \mathbb{E}_{\nu} h_t(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp h_t(\theta),$$

where the final inequality is given by Jensen. Since  $(\exp h_t(\theta))$  is a super or submartingale by assumption and  $\nu$  is data-free,  $(\mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp h_t(\theta))$  is also a super or submartingale by Lemma B.1. Therefore, Ville's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : \exp \{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \} \geq 1/\delta) \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \exp h_t(\theta) \geq 1/\delta) \leq \delta.$$

Since  $\rho$  was arbitrary, this yields that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\exp \{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \} \leq 1/\delta,$$

for all  $t \geq t_0$  and  $\rho$ . Rearranging gives the desired result.  $\square$

Following Amit et al. (2022), we let the family of functions  $\mathcal{G}_t$  be a function of the timestep (hence possibly dependent on data  $Z_1, \dots, Z_t$ ). Sections 4 and 5 are replete with processes  $(\exp h_t(\theta))$  which are super and submartingales, each of which furnishes a separate bound after applying Theorem 6.1. We will not list them all here, trusting that practitioners can combine results as befits their problem of interest. We will, however, state the following consequence of Theorem 6.1 in order to compare our results with those of Amit et al. (2022). In what follows, we use notation and concepts introduced in Section 5, such as  $\eta(t) = 2^{\lfloor \log(t) \rfloor}$ ,  $\mathbb{L}_t = \log(\log_2(2t)\zeta(2))$ ,  $\varphi_t(\theta) = \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta))$ , and the exchangeable reverse filtration  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . We also assume a stationary loss function.

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be exchangeable, and let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function. Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Consider  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$  a family of functions with  $\mathcal{G}_t : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a positive sequence such that, for all natural numbers  $k \geq 0$ ,*

$$\lambda_{2^k} \varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_{2^k} \varphi_{2^k}(\theta)) \in \mathcal{G}_t, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1.$$

Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_{\eta(t)} \varphi(\widehat{R}_{\eta(t)}(\theta), R(\theta)))}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}} + \frac{\gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{L}_t}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}}. \quad (30)$$

Moreover, suppose  $n$  is some fixed time of interest, and that  $\lambda \varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda \varphi_n(\theta)) \in \mathcal{G}_t$  for all  $t \geq n$  and some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq n$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda \varphi(\widehat{R}_n(\theta), R(\theta)))}{\lambda} + \frac{\gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) + \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda}. \quad (31)$$

A proof sketch is provided in Appendix A.11. The previous result parallels Corollaries 5.1 and 5.2 but using IPMs instead of the KL divergence. The reliance of (30) on  $\eta(t)$  and  $\text{IL}_t$  once again arises from stitching. For the fixed time  $t = n$ , (31) gives a generalized version of Corollaries 4 and 5 in Amit et al. (2022). Those results are obtained by considering particular functions  $\varphi$ , as was done in Section 5.2. As noted by Amit et al. (2022), the above bounds are merely “templates” in the sense that, to be insightful, one must choose a family of functions  $\mathcal{G}_t$ . A bound based on the total variation distance can be achieved by considering the family  $\mathcal{G}_t = \{g : \Theta \rightarrow [0, \infty) : \|g\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ , and one based on the Wasserstein distance can be achieved by appealing to Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality. We refer the reader to Amit et al. (2022) for the details of these bounds.

## 6.2 $\phi$ -divergences and Rényi divergences

The KL divergence is a member of a more general family of divergences termed  $\phi$ -divergences (Ali and Silvey, 1966) (often called  $f$ -divergences, but we have reserved  $f$  for our loss). For a convex function  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the  $\phi$ -divergence between measures  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  over  $\Theta$  such that  $\rho \ll \nu$  is

$$D_\phi(\rho \parallel \nu) = \int_\Theta \phi\left(\frac{d\rho}{d\nu}\right) d\nu = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \nu} \left[ \frac{d\rho}{d\nu}(\theta) \right]. \quad (32)$$

The KL divergence is recovered by considering  $\phi(x) = x \log x$ .  $\phi$ -divergences are a nearly orthogonal set of divergences from IPMs, considered in the last section. Indeed, the total variation distance is the only (non-trivial) divergence which is both an IPM and a  $\phi$ -divergence (Sriperumbudur et al., 2012).

The Donsker-Varadhan formula for the KL divergence is an improvement on a more general variational representation of  $\phi$ -divergences (e.g., Sriperumbudur et al. (2009)), which states the following. For any measures  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  and any convex function  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$D_\phi(\rho \parallel \nu) \geq \mathbb{E}_\rho[h(\theta)] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi^*(h(\theta))], \quad (33)$$

where  $\phi^*$  is the convex conjugate of  $\phi$ , i.e.,

$$\phi^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{xy - \phi(x)\}.$$

We can use (33) in place of the Donsker-Varadhan formula in Theorem 3.1, where the term  $\mathbb{E}_\nu \phi^*(h(\theta))$  replaces  $\log \mathbb{E}_\nu \exp h(\theta)$ .

**Theorem 6.2** (Anytime PAC-Bayes with  $\phi$ -divergences). *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function. Let  $P(\theta) = (P_t(\theta))_{t=1}^\infty$  be a stochastic process such that, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $\exp \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi^*(P_t(\theta))]$  is a supermartingale or reverse submartingale (adapted to some underlying filtration). Suppose that  $\exp \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi^*(P_1(\theta))] \leq 1$ . Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho P_t(\theta) \leq D_\phi(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta), \quad (34)$$

for all times  $t \geq 1$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ .

*Proof.* Set  $V_t^{\text{mix}} := \exp \sup_\rho \{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [P_t(\theta)] - D_\phi(\rho \parallel \nu)\}$ . The variational formula for  $D_\phi$  gives  $V_t^{\text{mix}} \leq \exp \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi^*(P_t(\theta))]$ , so by assumption,  $V_t^{\text{mix}}$  is upper bounded by a nonnegative supermartingale or reverse submartingale. From here, the proof follows that of Theorem 3.1.  $\square$



The key distinction between this result and Theorem 3.1 is that while the latter posits that  $\exp P(\theta)$  is (upper bounded by) a nonnegative super/submartingale, here we assume that  $\exp \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi^*(P_t(\theta))]$  plays this role. We consider establishing functions  $\phi$  and processes  $P_t(\theta)$  such that  $\exp \mathbb{E}_\nu \phi^*(h(\theta))$  has this property to be an interesting line of future research. We note that Theorem 6.2 cannot strictly be called a generalization of Theorem 3.1 as the latter relies on the Donsker-Varadhan formula which is tighter than the variational formula for the KL divergence given by (33).

Another (related) family of distances is the *Rényi divergence*. Here, for measures  $\rho \ll \nu$  and any  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ , we define

$$D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu) := \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \left[ \left( \frac{\rho(\theta)}{\nu(\theta)} \right)^\alpha \right].$$

As  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ ,  $D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu) \rightarrow D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu)$ , so by continuity we define  $D_1(\rho \parallel \nu) = D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu)$ . The Rényi divergence yields the following variational formula, which can be seen as an extension of the Donsker-Varadhan formula (Lemma 2.3). It was given by Bégin et al. (2016).

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $h : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable. For any measures  $\rho$  and  $\nu$ , with  $\rho \ll \nu$ , we have*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_\nu[h(\theta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}] \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho h(\theta) - D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu),$$

for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ .

Using this formula, one can give a Theorem in the style of Theorem 3.1 and 6.2 for  $\alpha$ -divergences.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Set  $\alpha > 1$ . Let  $P(\theta) = (P_t(\theta))_{t \geq t_0}$  be a stochastic process such that, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $\exp(P^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta))$  is a supermartingale or reverse submartingale (adapted to some underlying filtration) obeying  $\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{D} \exp P_{t_0}^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta) \leq 1$ . Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho[P_t(\theta)] \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} (D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta)), \quad (35)$$

for all times  $t \geq t_0$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ .

*Proof.* Following Theorems 3.1 and 6.2, put  $V_t^{\text{mix}} = \exp \sup_\rho \{ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \exp P_t(\theta) - D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu) \}$ . Then  $V_t^{\text{mix}} \leq \mathbb{E}_\nu \exp P_t^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta)$  by Lemma 6.3, where the process  $(\mathbb{E}_\nu \exp P_t^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta))_{t \geq t_0}$  is a nonnegative supermartingale or reverse submartingale by assumption and Lemma B.1. It also has initial expected value at most 1 by assumption. Therefore,  $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : V_t^{\text{mix}} \geq 1/\delta) \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t_0 : \mathbb{E}_\nu \exp P_t^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta) \geq 1/\delta) \leq \delta$  by Ville's inequality. Rearranging, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho P_t(\theta) \leq \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \exp P_t(\theta) \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left( D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta) \right),$$

for all  $\rho$  and  $t \geq t_0$ , as claimed.  $\square$

Theorem 6.4 suggests the question: When is  $\exp(P^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(\theta))$  a supermartingale or reverse submartingale? There are several candidates. By Jensen's inequality, a sufficient condition for this quantity to be a reverse submartingale is for  $(P_t(\theta))$  to also be a reverse submartingale. Indeed, if  $(N_t)$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{R}_t)$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} | \mathcal{R}_{t+1}] \geq \mathbb{E}[N_t | \mathcal{R}_{t+1}]^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \geq N_{t+1}^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}, \quad (36)$$

since  $x \mapsto x^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$  is convex. However, to apply Ville's inequality, one would also need to control  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} N_1^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$  which is less easily done, even if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} N_1 \leq 1$ . One might also consider using the processes employed in the proof of Corollary 5.1, but raised to the  $(\alpha-1)/\alpha$ . In that case, of course, raising them to the  $\alpha/(\alpha-1)$  power would result in the original processes. However, in this case we achieve the same bound as Corollary 5.1, but with  $D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu)$  replaced by  $D_{\alpha}(\rho\|\nu)$ . This a weaker result since  $D_{\alpha}(\rho\|\nu) \geq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu)$  for all  $\alpha > 0$ . Instead, to take advantage of Lemma 6.3, we construct an altogether different process. This leads to the following result. As in Section 5 we consider a stationary loss function and exchangeable data. Recall the shorthand  $\varphi_t(\theta) = \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta))$  for a convex function  $\varphi$ , as well as the quantities  $\eta(t) = 2^{\lfloor \log_2(t) \rfloor}$  and  $\mathbb{I}_t = \log(\log_2^2(2t)\zeta(2))$ .

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $(Z_t)$  be exchangeable. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  be a convex function and  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a prior. Put  $\alpha > 1$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \varphi(\widehat{R}_t(\theta), R(\theta)) \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left( D_{\alpha}(\rho\|\nu) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\nu, \mathcal{D}} [\varphi(\widehat{R}_{\eta(t)}(\theta), R(\theta))^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}] + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t \right). \quad (37)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A.12. Similarly to Corollary 5.2, we can obtain a version of the above result which holds for all times  $t \geq n$  for some pre-selected time  $n$ . These results constitute a time-uniform extension of Theorem 9 in Bégin et al. (2016), who give a fixed-time version for binary classification. By taking  $\alpha = 2$ , we obtain a PAC-Bayes bound using the  $\chi^2$  divergence (see Bégin et al. (2016, Corollary 10)). We note that unlike Corollary 5.1, the above result is a bound on the logarithm of  $\varphi$ . By exponentiating both sides, one obtains an intriguing PAC-Bayes bound in multiplicative form.

### 6.3 Confidence Sequences and Choice of $(\lambda_t)$

Our anytime-valid bounds enable us, under some circumstances, to construct time-uniform *confidence sequences*, i.e., sequences of sets which contain the true parameter of interest at all times with high probability (Darling and Robbins, 1967b; Lai, 1976). We will consider the case of a stationary loss with common conditional mean, i.e.,  $\mu(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mu_i(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} [f(Z_t, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . In this setting, a  $(1 - \delta)$ -confidence sequence is a random sequence  $(C_t(\rho, \nu))_{t=1}^{\infty}$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} [\mu(\theta)] \in C_t(\rho, \nu)) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (38)$$

Observe that the confidence sequence depends on the prior  $\nu$  and posterior  $\rho$ . It does not hold simultaneously across all such distributions.

Many of the bounds generated in previous sections are based on processes which are themselves based on tail bounds on the term  $\lambda(\mu_i(\theta) - f(Z_i, \theta))$ , many of which hold for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . By considering  $-\lambda$  and applying the union bound, we may thus obtain a confidence sequence. For instance, the following confidence sequence may be derived from Corollary 4.2.

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let  $f$  be  $\sigma$ -subGaussian and let  $(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}$  be such that  $\mu(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} [f(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  is constant for all  $t \geq 1$ . Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho$  and  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mu(\theta) \in \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i f(Z_i, \theta)}{\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i} \pm W_t \right), \quad \text{where} \quad W_t := \frac{\log(2/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\nu) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i} \quad (39)$$

We note the factor of 2 in  $\log(2/\delta)$  comes from the union bound. We state the above proposition as an example only; many other confidence sequences may be derived from the argument throughout Sections 4 and 5.

Studying confidence sequences provides an opportunity to demonstrate why we allow  $\lambda_t$  to change as a function of time. It is desirable that the width of the sequence,  $W_t$ , goes to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  so that, asymptotically, it converges on the correct value with high probability. This would not be possible with fixed  $\lambda$ , as  $W_t$  would converge to  $\sigma^2\lambda/2 \neq 0$ . On the other hand, following [Waudby-Smith and Ramdas \(2023\)](#), if we instead consider  $\lambda_t \asymp (t \log t)^{-1/2}$ , then we have  $W_t = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\log(t)/t})$ , where  $\tilde{O}$  hides log-log factors. Further, we can attain the optimal rate  $O(\sqrt{\log \log t/t})$  due to the Law of the Iterated Logarithm (LIL) ([Darling and Robbins, 1967a](#)) by the same technique of geometrically spaced union bounds that was used in Section 5.1. The following is obtained via an ingredient of stitching similar to both [Howard et al. \(2021, Theorem 1\)](#) and [Wang and Ramdas \(2022, Corollary 10.2\)](#).

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $f$  be 1-subGaussian and let  $(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}$  be such that  $\mu(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(Z, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  is constant for all  $t \geq 1$ . Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho$  and  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mu(\theta) \in \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t f(Z_i, \theta)}{t} \pm W_t^{\text{stch}} \right),$$

where the width  $W_t^{\text{stch}}$  is

$$2\sqrt{\frac{\log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2 2t}{t}} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu)}{\sqrt{(\log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2(t+1))t}}.$$

The proof is given in Appendix A.13. There has been much recent work on developing sequences  $(\lambda_t)$  which achieve optimal shrinkage rates; we refer the interested reader to [Catoni \(2012\)](#); [Howard et al. \(2021\)](#); [Waudby-Smith and Ramdas \(2023\)](#); [Wang and Ramdas \(2022, 2023\)](#) for further discussion on this point.

## 6.4 Martingale Difference Sequences

Throughout this work we've considered loss functions  $f_t$  acting on  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\Theta$ . While this is a natural setting for PAC-Bayes analysis owing to its connections to learning theory, different settings have been considered. [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Balsubramani \(2015\)](#), for instance, consider PAC-Bayesian inequalities for martingale difference sequences. In this section we briefly demonstrate that our results extend to this setting. This is due to the fact that our workhorse, Theorem 3.1, holds for general stochastic processes.

We consider a sequence of random functions  $(F_t)$  such that  $F_t : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We suppose that  $(F_t)$  is a *martingale difference sequence*, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[F_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 0$  for all  $t \geq 1$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(F_1, \dots, F_t)$ . That is,  $\mathbb{E}[F_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 0$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Note that the expectation is over the functions themselves, not over  $\theta$ . Let  $S_t = \sum_{i=1}^t F_i$  (and, by extension,  $S_t(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t F_i(\theta)$ ).

First, suppose the  $F_t$  are bounded, say  $F_t : \Theta \rightarrow [\alpha_t, \beta_t]$ . Just as we did in Corollary 4.2, we can consider the nonnegative process  $N_t(\theta) = \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i F_i(\theta) - \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i^2 (\beta_i - \alpha_i)^2 \right\}$ , which is a supermartingale since  $\mathbb{E}[F_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$ . (Note that we have substituted  $(\beta_i - \alpha_i)^2/4$  for  $\sigma_i^2$  in (8), since  $F_i$  is  $(\beta_i - \alpha_i)/2$ -subGaussian.) This process, in conjunction with Theorem 3.1, leads to the following result, which is the time-uniform extension of Theorem 5 of [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#).

**Corollary 6.5.** *Let  $(F_t)$  be a martingale difference sequence where  $F_t : \Theta \rightarrow [\alpha_t, \beta_t]$ . Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a prior and  $(\lambda_t)$  a nonnegative predictable sequence. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho F_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i^2 (\beta_i - \alpha_i)^2 + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta),$$

for all  $t \geq 1$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ .

Using similar techniques, we can provide a time-uniform version of Theorem 7 in [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#), a result which also underlies the main theorem of [Balsubramani \(2015\)](#).

**Corollary 6.6.** *Let  $(F_t)$  be a martingale difference sequence where  $F_t : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|F_t(\theta)| \leq H$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  be a prior and  $\lambda \in [0, 1/H]$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t F_i(\theta) \leq \lambda(e-2) \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[F_i^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda},$$

for all  $t \geq 1$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ .

Note that because  $F_t$  is bounded, all (conditional) moments exists. The bound is therefore non-vacuous by assumption. The proof of the above result (and the statement itself) is very similar to that of [Corollary 4.4](#), and is thus omitted. Like that proposition, here  $\lambda$  could be taken to be a sequence  $\{\lambda_t\} \subseteq [0, 1/H]$ , but we leave it stationary for easier to comparison to prior work.

Theorem 1 of [Balsubramani \(2015\)](#) is based on [Corollary 6.6](#) and then choosing  $\lambda$  strategically (and stochastically) in order to tighten the bound. Such techniques have also been used to generate sharp martingale concentration bounds ([Balsubramani, 2014](#)). [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#) also optimize over  $\lambda$  in the fixed-time version of [Corollary 6.5](#) in order to provide a tighter bound (see their Theorems 5 and 6). An anytime version of this result would follow from applying the same procedure to [Corollary 6.5](#).

We note that is tempting to improve [Corollary 6.6](#) by using the conditional variance process underlying [Corollary 4.8](#). This would require that  $F_i \geq 0$ , however, which is impossible for a nontrivial martingale difference sequence.

Our final result generalizes Theorem 4 of [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#), by providing a version of [Corollary 5.1](#) for difference sequences. Here we will broaden the setting slightly from martingale difference sequences and let  $\mathbb{E}[F_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = G$  for all  $t \geq 1$  some  $G : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , meaning that  $\mathbb{E}[F_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = G(\theta)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . The proof of the following bound uses precisely the same mechanics as that of [Corollary 5.1](#), so we do not provide it.

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $(F_t)$  be a random exchangeable sequence of functions with  $F_t : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[F_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = G$  for all  $t \geq 1$  and some fixed  $G : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function. Fix a prior  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and let  $(\lambda_t)$  be a nonnegative and nonincreasing sequence of real numbers. Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$  and at all times  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \varphi \left( \frac{1}{t} S_t(\theta), G(\theta) \right) \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_\rho \mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda_{\eta(t)} \varphi(\frac{1}{\eta(t)} S_{\eta(t)}(\theta), G(\theta)))}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t}{\lambda_{\eta(t)}}.$$

Theorem 4 of [Seldin et al. \(2012\)](#) follows from the above bound by taking  $\varphi = \text{kl}$  (and taking  $\lambda_t = \lambda$  for all  $t$ ) as was done in both [Sections 5.2](#) and [6.1](#).

## 7 Summary

We have demonstrated that underlying many PAC-Bayes bounds is a (typically implicit) supermartingale or reverse submartingale structure. Such structure, when coupled with the method of mixtures and Ville’s inequalities, provides a general method of deriving new bounds and serves to illuminate the connection between existing bounds (Table 1). For instance, we are able to generate PAC-Bayes bounds for sub- $\psi$  processes (Howard et al., 2020, Tables 3 and 4), a broad class of stochastic processes which itself encapsulates a large swath of existing concentration inequalities. More generally, as soon as one identifies a nonnegative supermartingale or reverse submartingale with bounded initial value, our framework supplies a PAC-Bayes bound. We hope this serves to both ease the search for future bounds and to provide a more unified view of the existing literature.

Beyond providing a unifying view of existing bounds, our martingale-based approach provides time-uniform bounds (i.e., valid at all stopping times), whereas the majority of previous bounds in the literature are fixed-time results. Moreover, we are able to shed many traditional distribution assumptions. Many of our bounds do not require i.i.d. data, and those based on supermartingales require no explicit assumptions (Table 2). We hope that the anytime nature of our bounds is not just a theoretical curiosity, but useful for computing generalization bounds in practice. Indeed, because they allow for adaptive stopping and continuous monitoring of data, practitioners are able to repeatedly compute the bounds as more data are used without sacrificing statistical validity. This enables, for instance, deciding when to stop gathering new data based on the evolution of the bound (or confidence sequence, Section 6.3) over time.

**Acknowledgements.** We graciously thank Felix Biggs, who pointed out a flaw in the first version of the paper. BC was partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## References

- Syed Mumtaz Ali and Samuel D Silvey. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 28(1): 131–142, 1966. 26
- Pierre Alquier. PAC-Bayesian bounds for randomized empirical risk minimizers. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 17(4):279–304, 2008. 2
- Pierre Alquier. User-friendly introduction to PAC-Bayes bounds. *arXiv:2110.11216*, 2021. 2, 6, 22, 24
- Pierre Alquier, James Ridgway, and Nicolas Chopin. On the properties of variational approximations of Gibbs posteriors. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):8374–8414, 2016. 6, 13
- Amiran Ambroladze, Emilio Parrado-Hernández, and John Shawe-Taylor. Tighter PAC-Bayes bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 19, 2006. 2
- Ron Amit, Baruch Epstein, Shay Moran, and Ron Meir. Integral probability metrics PAC-Bayes bounds. *arXiv:2207.00614*, 2022. 4, 6, 24, 25, 26
- Jean-Yves Audibert. Aggregated estimators and empirical complexity for least square regression. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 40, pages 685–736, 2004. 2

- Akshay Balsubramani. Sharp finite-time iterated-logarithm martingale concentration. *arXiv:1405.2639*, 2014. [30](#)
- Akshay Balsubramani. PAC-Bayes iterated logarithm bounds for martingale mixtures. *arXiv:1506.06573*, 2015. [6](#), [29](#), [30](#)
- Luc Bégin, Pascal Germain, François Laviolette, and Jean-Francis Roy. PAC-Bayesian bounds based on the Rényi divergence. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 435–444. PMLR, 2016. [4](#), [6](#), [24](#), [27](#), [28](#)
- Bernard Bercu and Abderrahmen Touati. Exponential inequalities for self-normalized martingales with applications. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(5):1848–1869, 2008. [5](#), [17](#)
- Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013. [2](#), [15](#)
- Olivier Catoni. A PAC-Bayesian approach to adaptive classification. *preprint*, 840, 2003. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [13](#)
- Olivier Catoni. *Statistical learning theory and stochastic optimization: Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour, XXXI-2001*, volume 1851. Springer Science & Business Media, 2004. [2](#), [13](#)
- Olivier Catoni. PAC-Bayesian supervised classification: the thermodynamics of statistical learning. *arXiv:0712.0248*, 2007. [2](#), [6](#), [13](#), [16](#), [24](#)
- Olivier Catoni. Challenging the empirical mean and empirical variance: a deviation study. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 48, pages 1148–1185, 2012. [18](#), [29](#)
- Olivier Catoni and Ilaria Giulini. Dimension-free PAC-Bayesian bounds for matrices, vectors, and linear least squares regression. *arXiv:1712.02747*, 2017. [3](#), [16](#)
- Olivier Catoni and Ilaria Giulini. Dimension-free PAC-Bayesian bounds for the estimation of the mean of a random vector. *arXiv:1802.04308*, 2018. [3](#), [16](#)
- Peng Chen, Xinghu Jin, Xiang Li, and Lihu Xu. A generalized Catoni’s M-estimator under finite  $\alpha$ -th moment assumption with  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ . *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):5523–5544, 2021. [18](#)
- Imre Csiszár. I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 146–158, 1975. [9](#)
- DA Darling and Herbert Robbins. Iterated logarithm inequalities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 57(5):1188–1192, 1967a. [29](#)
- Donald A Darling and Herbert Robbins. Confidence sequences for mean, variance, and median. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 58(1):66–68, 1967b. [28](#)
- Bernard Delyon. Exponential inequalities for sums of weakly dependent variables. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 14:752–779, 2009. [41](#)
- MD Donsker and SRS Varadhan. Large deviations for Markov processes and the asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large times. In *Probabilistic Methods in Differential Equations*, pages 82–88. Springer, 1975. [4](#), [9](#)



- Gintare Karolina Dziugaite and Daniel M Roy. Computing nonvacuous generalization bounds for deep (stochastic) neural networks with many more parameters than training data. *arXiv:1703.11008*, 2017. [2](#), [24](#)
- Pascal Germain, Alexandre Lacasse, François Laviolette, and Mario Marchand. PAC-Bayesian learning of linear classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 353–360, 2009. [6](#), [9](#), [18](#), [22](#)
- Pascal Germain, Alexandre Lacasse, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Jean-François Roy. Risk bounds for the majority vote: From a PAC-Bayesian analysis to a learning algorithm. *arXiv:1503.08329*, 2015. [5](#), [6](#), [9](#), [18](#), [19](#), [23](#), [43](#)
- Peter Grünwald, Rianne de Heide, and Wouter M Koolen. Safe testing. In *2020 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*, pages 1–54. IEEE, 2020. [4](#)
- Benjamin Guedj. A primer on PAC-Bayesian learning. *arXiv:1901.05353*, 2019. [2](#)
- Benjamin Guedj and Pierre Alquier. PAC-Bayesian estimation and prediction in sparse additive models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:264–291, 2013. [2](#)
- Maxime Haddouche and Benjamin Guedj. PAC-Bayes with unbounded losses through supermartingales. *arXiv:2210.00928*, 2022. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [13](#), [17](#)
- Maxime Haddouche, Benjamin Guedj, Omar Rivasplata, and John Shawe-Taylor. PAC-Bayes unleashed: generalisation bounds with unbounded losses. *Entropy*, 23(10):1330, 2021. [6](#), [17](#)
- Steven R Howard, Aaditya Ramdas, Jon McAuliffe, and Jasjeet Sekhon. Time-uniform Chernoff bounds via nonnegative supermartingales. *Probability Surveys*, 17:257–317, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [7](#), [10](#), [11](#), [13](#), [22](#), [31](#)
- Steven R Howard, Aaditya Ramdas, Jon McAuliffe, and Jasjeet Sekhon. Time-uniform, nonparametric, nonasymptotic confidence sequences. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):1055–1080, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [20](#), [29](#)
- Solomon Kullback. *Information theory and statistics*. Courier Corporation, 1997. [9](#)
- Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951. [9](#)
- Tze Leung Lai. On confidence sequences. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 265–280, 1976. [28](#)
- A J Lee. *U-statistics: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2019. [8](#)
- Gaël Letarte, Pascal Germain, Benjamin Guedj, and François Laviolette. Dichotomize and generalize: PAC-Bayesian binary activated deep neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. [2](#)
- Guy Lever, François Laviolette, and John Shawe-Taylor. Distribution-dependent PAC-Bayes priors. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 119–133. Springer, 2010. [18](#)
- Roi Livni and Shay Moran. A limitation of the PAC-Bayes framework. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20543–20553, 2020. [2](#)
- Tudor Manole and Aaditya Ramdas. Martingale methods for sequential estimation of convex functionals and divergences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory (forthcoming)*, 2023. [3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [19](#), [20](#)

- Andreas Maurer. A note on the PAC Bayesian theorem. *arXiv:0411099*, 2004. 2, 6, 8, 23, 42
- David McAllester. Simplified PAC-Bayesian margin bounds. In *Learning Theory and Kernel Machines*, pages 203–215. Springer, 2003. 2, 18, 23
- David A McAllester. Some PAC-Bayesian theorems. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 230–234, 1998. 2, 8, 18, 23
- David A McAllester. PAC-Bayesian model averaging. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 164–170, 1999. 2, 6, 14
- Yuki Ohnishi and Jean Honorio. Novel change of measure inequalities with applications to PAC-Bayesian bounds and Monte Carlo estimation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1711–1719. PMLR, 2021. 4
- María Pérez-Ortiz, Omar Rivasplata, John Shawe-Taylor, and Csaba Szepesvári. Tighter risk certificates for neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22, 2021. 24
- Aaditya Ramdas, Johannes Ruf, Martin Larsson, and Wouter Koolen. Admissible anytime-valid sequential inference must rely on nonnegative martingales. *arXiv:2009.03167*, 2020. 3, 4
- Aaditya Ramdas, Peter Grünwald, Vladimir Vovk, and Glenn Shafer. Game-theoretic statistics and safe anytime-valid inference. *arXiv:2210.01948*, 2022. 4, 11
- Omar Rivasplata, Ilja Kuzborskij, Csaba Szepesvári, and John Shawe-Taylor. PAC-Bayes analysis beyond the usual bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:16833–16845, 2020. 18
- Herbert Robbins. Statistical methods related to the law of the iterated logarithm. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41(5):1397–1409, 1970. 8
- Matthias Seeger. PAC-Bayesian generalisation error bounds for gaussian process classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:233–269, 2002. 2, 6, 18
- Matthias Seeger. Bayesian Gaussian process models: PAC-Bayesian generalisation error bounds and sparse approximations. Technical report, University of Edinburgh, 2003. 2, 3, 5, 8, 18, 22
- Yevgeny Seldin and Naftali Tishby. PAC-Bayesian generalization bound for density estimation with application to co-clustering. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 472–479. PMLR, 2009. 3
- Yevgeny Seldin and Naftali Tishby. PAC-Bayesian analysis of co-clustering and beyond. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(12), 2010. 2, 3
- Yevgeny Seldin, François Laviolette, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, John Shawe-Taylor, and Peter Auer. PAC-Bayesian inequalities for martingales. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(12):7086–7093, 2012. 6, 29, 30
- John Shawe-Taylor and Robert C Williamson. A PAC analysis of a Bayesian estimator. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 2–9, 1997. 2
- Bharath K Sriperumbudur, Kenji Fukumizu, Arthur Gretton, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Gert RG Lanckriet. On integral probability metrics,  $\phi$ -divergences and binary classification. *arXiv:0901.2698*, 2009. 24, 26

- Bharath K Sriperumbudur, Kenji Fukumizu, Arthur Gretton, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Gert RG Lanckriet. On the empirical estimation of integral probability metrics. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:1550–1599, 2012. [26](#)
- Niklas Thiemann, Christian Igel, Olivier Wintenberger, and Yevgeny Seldin. A strongly quasiconvex PAC-Bayesian bound. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 466–492. PMLR, 2017. [6](#), [24](#)
- Ilya O Tolstikhin and Yevgeny Seldin. PAC-Bayes-empirical-Bernstein inequality. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013. [5](#), [6](#), [9](#), [24](#)
- Jean Ville. Étude critique de la notion de collectif. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, 45(11):824, 1939. [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019. [15](#), [40](#)
- A Wald. Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 16(2): 117–186, 1945. [8](#)
- Hongjian Wang and Aaditya Ramdas. Catoni-style confidence sequences for heavy-tailed mean estimation. *arXiv:2202.01250*, 2022. [18](#), [29](#)
- Hongjian Wang and Aaditya Ramdas. Huber-robust confidence sequences. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (forthcoming)*, 2023. [29](#)
- Ian Waudby-Smith and Aaditya Ramdas. Estimating means of bounded random variables by betting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, to appear with discussion, 2023. [3](#), [12](#), [29](#)
- Ian Waudby-Smith, David Arbour, Ritwik Sinha, Edward H Kennedy, and Aaditya Ramdas. Time-uniform central limit theory, asymptotic confidence sequences, and anytime-valid causal inference. *arXiv:2103.06476*, 2021. [8](#)
- Ian Waudby-Smith, Lili Wu, Aaditya Ramdas, Nikos Karampatziakis, and Paul Mineiro. Anytime-valid off-policy inference for contextual bandits. *arXiv:2210.10768*, 2022. [8](#)

## A Omitted Proofs

### A.1 Proof of Lemma [2.3](#)

Let  $h : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable. Recall that the Gibbs measure is defined as

$$\frac{d\rho_G}{d\pi}(\theta) = \frac{\exp h(\theta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\phi \sim \pi} \exp(h(\phi))}.$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\pi) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\rho_G) &= \int_{\Theta} \log \left( \frac{d\rho}{d\pi}(\theta) \right) - \log \left( \frac{d\rho}{d\rho_G}(\theta) \right) \rho(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \log \left( \frac{d\rho}{d\pi}(\theta) \frac{d\rho_G}{d\rho}(\theta) \right) \rho(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \log \left( \frac{d\rho_G}{d\pi}(\theta) \right) \rho(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \log \left( \frac{\exp h(\theta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\phi \sim \pi} \exp(h(\phi))} \right) \rho(d\theta) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \left\{ h(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \exp(h(\phi)) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \exp(h(\phi)).
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \exp(h(\theta)) = \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\pi) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\rho_G). \quad (40)$$

Since the KL divergence is nonnegative, we have

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \exp(h(\theta)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\pi).$$

Since this holds for arbitrary  $\rho$ , it follows that

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \exp(h(\theta)) \geq \sup_{\rho} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h(\theta) - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\pi) \right\}.$$

Moreover, by Equation (40), equality is reached when  $\rho = \rho_G$  (since in that case  $D_{\text{KL}}(\rho\|\rho_G) = 0$ ) so we may replace the inequality above with an equality.

## A.2 Proof of Corollary 4.2

Let  $\psi(\lambda) = \lambda^2/2$ . Define the process

$$P_t(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^t \psi(\lambda_i) \sigma_i^2.$$

We claim that  $\exp(P_t(\theta))$  is a supermartingale. Since  $\lambda_i$  and  $f_i(Z_i, \theta)$  are  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  measurable for all  $i \leq t-1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(P_t(\theta)) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^t \exp(\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \psi(\lambda_i) \sigma_i^2) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda_t) \sigma_t^2) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \exp(\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \psi(\lambda_i) \sigma_i^2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - \psi(\lambda_t) \sigma_t^2) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \exp(P_{t-1}(\theta)),
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the final line is at most  $\exp(P_{t-1}(\theta))$  due to Hoeffding's lemma:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta)) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t (\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta))) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq \exp(\lambda_t^2 \sigma_t^2 / 8),$$

for all  $\lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}$ . This proves that  $\exp(P_t(\theta))$  is a supermartingale, and also that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp P_1(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_0] \leq 1$ . Consequently, we may apply Corollary 4.1 to obtain that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \Delta_i(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^t \psi(\lambda_i) \sigma_i^2 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu) + \log(1/\delta),$$

for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ . The result follows from rearranging.

### A.3 Proof of Corollary 4.3

Let  $g(\lambda; a, b^2)$  be the density of a Gaussian with mean  $a$  and variance  $b^2$ . We are interested in  $g(\lambda; 0, \gamma^2)$  for some fixed  $\gamma$ . Before proving the PAC-Bayes bound, we prove the following lemma. Let  $D_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i(\theta)$  and  $H_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \sigma_i^2$ .

**Lemma A.1.** *For*

$$M_t(\lambda, \theta) := \exp \left\{ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^t \sigma_i^2 \right\},$$

we have

$$M_t(\theta) = \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} M_t(\lambda, \theta) dF(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}} \exp \left( \frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t} \right).$$

*Proof.* Compute

$$\begin{aligned} M_t(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \lambda D_t - \frac{\lambda^2 H_t}{2} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda^2}{2\gamma^2} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{2\lambda \gamma^2 D_t - \lambda^2 \gamma^2 H_t - \lambda^2}{2\gamma^2} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-\lambda^2 (1 + \gamma^2 H_t) + 2\lambda \gamma^2 D_t}{2\gamma^2} \right) d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $u = 1 + \gamma^2 H_t$  and  $v = \gamma^2 D_t$ . Now rewrite the above expression as

$$\begin{aligned} M_t(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-u(\lambda^2 - 2\lambda v/u)}{2\gamma^2} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-(\lambda - v/u)^2 + (v/u)^2}{2\gamma^2/u} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-(\lambda - v/u)^2}{2\gamma^2/u} \right) d\lambda \exp \left( \frac{v^2}{2u\gamma^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{1/u}}{\sqrt{1\gamma^2/u} \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-(\lambda - v/u)^2}{2\gamma^2/u} \right) d\lambda \exp \left( \frac{v^2}{2u\gamma^2} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{1/u} \exp \left( \frac{v^2}{2u\gamma^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows because

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2/u} \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \exp \left( \frac{-(\lambda - v/u)^2}{2\gamma^2/u} \right) d\lambda = \int_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} g(\lambda; v/u, 2\gamma^2/u) d\lambda = 1,$$

where  $g(\lambda; v/u, \gamma^2/u)$  is the density of a Gaussian with mean  $v/u$  and variance  $2\gamma^2/u$ . Thus, we have obtained that

$$M_t(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} \exp\left(\frac{v^2}{2u\gamma^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}} \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}\right).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

From here, in order to apply Corollary 4.1, write this as

$$\begin{aligned} M_t(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}} \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t} + \log([\sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 H_t}]^{-1})\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t} - \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \gamma^2 H_t)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.1 yields with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and  $\rho$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ \frac{\gamma^2 D_t^2}{1 + \gamma^2 H_t} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \gamma^2 H_t) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

Rearranging and taking square roots gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\rho[D_t] &\leq \left[ (\gamma^{-2} + H_t) \log(1 + \gamma^2 H_t) + (\gamma^{-2} + H_t) \left( D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu) + \log(1/\delta) \right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \left[ (\gamma^{-2} + H_t) \left( D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu) + \log((1 + \gamma^2 H_t)/\delta) \right) \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all  $\gamma^2 > 0$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\rho[D_t] &\leq \inf_{\gamma^2 > 0} \left[ (\gamma^{-2} + H_t) \left( D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu) + \log((1 + \gamma^2 H_t)/\delta) \right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \inf_{\gamma^2 > 0} \left[ \frac{s_t(\gamma^2)}{\gamma^2} \left( D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu) + \log(s_t(\gamma^2)/\delta) \right) \right]^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that  $s_t(c) = 1 + cH_t$ . Taking  $\beta = \gamma^2$  and expanding the definition of  $D_t$  completes the proof.

#### A.4 Proof of Corollary 4.4

Set

$$\xi_t(\theta) := \lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - \lambda_t^2 (e - 2) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}],$$

for all  $t \geq 1$ . First we claim that the process in Equation (12), i.e.,

$$B_t(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \xi_i(\theta),$$



is a nonnegative supermartingale. To see this, we recall the inequalities

$$1 + x \leq e^x \leq 1 + x + (e - 2)x^2, \quad (41)$$

for all  $x \leq 1$  (the former holds for all  $x$ ). Since  $\lambda_t \leq \frac{1}{2H}$  by assumption, we have

$$|\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta)| \leq \lambda_t (|\mu_t(\theta)| + |f_t(Z_t, \theta)|) \leq \lambda_t 2H \leq 1,$$

so we may apply (41) with  $x = \lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta)$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \Delta_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})] &\leq 1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \lambda^2 (e - 2) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= 1 + \lambda^2 (e - 2) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda^2 (e - 2) \Delta_t^2(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})], \end{aligned}$$

where the equality in the second line follows by definition of  $\Delta_t(\theta)$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\xi_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \Delta_t(\theta) - \lambda^2 (e - 2) \Delta_t^2(\theta)) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[B_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^t \exp(\xi_i(\theta)) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \exp \xi_i(\theta) = B_{t-1}(\theta).$$

$(B_t(\theta))$  is thus a nonnegative supermartingale and the result follows from applying Theorem 3.1.

## A.5 Proof of Corollary 4.5

Recall that  $\psi_P(x) = e^x - x - 1$ . Consider the nonnegative process

$$S_t(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^t \exp \left\{ \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{\mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \psi_P(\lambda_i H_i) \right\}.$$

The function  $x^{-2} \psi_P(x)$  is nondecreasing (at  $x = 0$  we continuously extend the function to  $1/2$  following the proof of Corollary 4.8). Since  $\mu_i(\theta) \leq H_i$  by assumption, we have

$$\frac{1}{(\lambda_i \mu_i(\theta))^2} \psi_P(\lambda_i \mu_i(\theta)) \leq \frac{1}{(\lambda_i H_i)^2} \psi_P(\lambda_i H_i),$$

that is,

$$e^{\lambda_i \mu_i(\theta)} \leq \frac{\mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \psi_P(\lambda_i H_i) + \lambda_i \mu_i(\theta) + 1.$$

Taking a log and adding the following inequality (due to Jensen's inequality) on both sides,

$$-\log \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_i f_i(Z_i, \theta)} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq -\mathbb{E}[\lambda_i f_i(Z_i, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = -\lambda_i \mu_i(\theta),$$

we have,

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta)} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \log \left( \frac{\mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \phi(\lambda_i H_i) + \lambda_i \mu_i(\theta) + 1 \right) - \lambda_i \mu_i(\theta) \leq \frac{\mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \phi(\lambda_i H_i),$$

where we've used the fact that  $\log(1 + x) \leq x$ . Exponentiating then yields

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta)} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{\mu_i^2(\theta)}{H_i^2} \phi(\lambda_i H_i) \right\}.$$

This demonstrates that  $(S_t(\theta))$  is a supermartingale, and the result thus follows from applying Theorem 3.1.

## A.6 Proof of Corollary 4.6

Recall our assumption:  $\mathbb{E}[(f_i(Z_i, \theta) - \mu_i(\theta))^k] \leq \frac{1}{2}k!\sigma_i^2c_i^{k-2}$ . By [Wainwright \(2019, Proposition 2.10\)](#), this implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta))|\mathcal{F}_{i-1})] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda^2\sigma_i^2}{2(1 - c_i|\lambda|)}\right), \quad (42)$$

whenever  $|\lambda| < 1/c_t$ . Consider the quantity

$$N_t(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^t \exp\left\{\lambda_i\Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{\lambda_i^2\sigma_i^2}{2(1 - c_i\lambda_i)}\right\}.$$

Similarly to the proof in [Appendix A.2](#),  $(N_t(\theta))$  is a supermartingale by appealing to [\(42\)](#), since  $0 < \lambda_i \leq 1/c_i$  by assumption. From here we apply [Theorem 3.1](#).

## A.7 Proof of Corollary 4.7

Consider the process  $W_t(\theta) = \lambda_t f_t(Z_t, \theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z, \theta))$  and, by mild abuse of notation, let

$$W_{\leq t}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^t W_i(\theta).$$

Since  $\lambda_t$  and  $f_t$  are assumed to be  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  measurable,  $\log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z, \theta))$  is also  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  measurable. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(W_t(\theta))|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z_t, \theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z, \theta))|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z_t, \theta)) \cdot [\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z, \theta))]^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= [\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z, \theta))]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(\lambda_t f_t(Z_t, \theta))|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp(W_{\leq t}(\theta))] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\exp(W_{\leq t-1}(\theta)) \exp(W_t(\theta))|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(W_{\leq t-1}(\theta)) \mathbb{E}[\exp(W_t(\theta))|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(W_{\leq t-1}(\theta))], \end{aligned}$$

and by induction we may conclude that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(W_{\leq t}(\theta)) = 1$ . Employing a very similar argument, we see that  $\exp(W_t(\theta))$  is a supermartingale. Applying [Corollary 4.1](#) we obtain that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i f_i(Z_i, \theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \rho} \sum_{i=1}^t \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_i f_i(Z, \theta)) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu) + \log(1/\delta).$$

## A.8 Proof of Corollary 4.8

First we prove a self-contained result concerning the relevant supermartingale. From here, the result follows immediately from an application of [Corollary 4.1](#).

**Lemma A.2.** Let  $(X_t)$  be nonnegative random variables where  $X_i$  has conditional mean  $\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[X_i] = \mathbb{E}[X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$  and conditional variance  $\mathbb{V}_{i-1}(X_i) = \mathbb{V}(X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}) < \infty$ . For any predictable sequence of positive real numbers  $\{\lambda_i\}$ , the following process is a nonnegative supermartingale:

$$L_t := \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i (\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[X_i] - X_i) - \frac{\lambda_i^2}{2} (\mathbb{V}_{i-1}(X_i) + \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[X_i]^2) \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $L_{t-1}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  measurable, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[L_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = L_{t-1} \cdot \exp \left\{ \lambda_t (\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[X_t] - X_t) - \frac{\lambda_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[X_t^2] \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right\}.$$

Since  $\lambda_t$  is predictable, in order to show the above term is bounded by  $L_{t-1}$  it suffices to show that for any nonnegative random variable  $X$  with finite mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(\mu - X))] \leq \exp(\lambda^2\sigma^2/2),$$

for all  $\lambda > 0$ . This fact follows from applying a one-sided Bernstein inequality to  $-X$ , but we supply the proof for completeness. Let  $Z = -X$  and put  $\phi(s) = e^s - s - 1$ . Let

$$g(s) = \begin{cases} \phi(s)/s^2, & s \neq 0, \\ 1/2, & s = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $g(s)$  simply defines the continuous extension of  $\phi(s)/s^2$  at  $s = 0$ . Indeed,  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(s)/s^2 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^-} \phi(s)/s^2 = 1/2$ . Note also  $g(s)$  is an increasing function for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, for all  $s \leq 0$ ,

$$\phi(s) = s^2 g(s) \leq s^2 g(0) = \frac{s^2}{2}.$$

Since  $Z \leq 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , we may take  $s = \lambda Z$  in the above expression to obtain  $\phi(\lambda Z) \leq (\lambda Z)^2/2$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Z}] - \lambda \mathbb{E}[Z] - 1 \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[Z^2].$$

Remarking that  $\lambda \mathbb{E}[Z] \leq 0 \leq e^{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Z]}$  gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]))] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Z}] - \lambda \mathbb{E}[Z] \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \leq \exp(\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[Z^2]/2),$$

where the final inequality uses  $1 + s \leq e^s$  for all  $s$ . Replacing  $Z$  with  $-X$  completes the proof.  $\square$

## A.9 Proof of Corollary 4.9

Let  $(\lambda_i)$  be a predictable sequence. [Delyon \(2009\)](#) shows that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\exp(x - x^2/6) \leq 1 + x + x^2/3$ . Applying this with  $x = \lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta)$  and taking expectations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp \{ \lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - \lambda_t^2 \Delta_t(\theta)^2 / 6 \} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &\leq 1 + \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^2 \Delta_t(\theta)^2 / 3 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= 1 + \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^2 \Delta_t(\theta)^2 / 3 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &\leq \exp \{ \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^2 \Delta_t(\theta)^2 / 3 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\Delta_t(\theta)$  is mean zero. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \lambda_t \Delta_t(\theta) - \frac{\lambda_t^2}{6} (\Delta_t^2(\theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \leq 1,$$

and we conclude that

$$M_t(\theta) = \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i \Delta_i(\theta) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i^2 (\Delta_i^2(\theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) \right\},$$

is a nonnegative supermartingale with initial value  $\mathbb{E}[M_1(\theta)] \leq 1$ . Applying Theorem 3.1 gives that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and  $\rho$ ,

$$\sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i \leq t} \left( \lambda_i^2 \mathbb{E}_\rho [(\Delta_i^2(\theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}])] \right) + \log(1/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu).$$

This proves the first part of the result. From here, we can simplify the bound by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \leq t} \Delta_i^2(\theta) + 2 \sum_{i \leq t} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] &= \sum_{i=1}^t (\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z_i, \theta))^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[(\mu_i(\theta) - f_i(Z, \theta))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^t [f_i(Z_i, \theta)^2 - 2\mu_i(\theta) f_i(Z_i, \theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[f_i(Z, \theta)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mu_i(\theta)^2] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^t [f_i(Z_i, \theta)^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[f_i(Z, \theta)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]], \end{aligned}$$

where we've used that the loss is nonnegative (therefore so is  $\mu_i(\theta)$ ). This gives that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t$  and  $\rho$ ,

$$\sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_\rho \Delta_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i \leq t} \lambda_i^2 \left( f_i(Z_i, \theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[f_i(Z, \theta)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) + \log(1/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu).$$

If the losses and  $\lambda_i$ 's are stationary, then this reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \mu(\theta) \leq \mathbb{E}_\rho \widehat{R}_t(\theta) + \frac{\lambda}{6t} \sum_{i \leq t} \left( f(Z_i, \theta) + 2\mathbb{E}[f(Z_i, \theta)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right) + \frac{\log(1/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \|\nu)}{t\lambda}.$$

## A.10 Proof of Corollary 5.3

For  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  i.i.d, Maurer (2004, Theorem 1) proved the inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(Z_t) \sim \mathcal{D}} \exp \{ n \text{kl}(\widehat{R}_n(\theta) \| R(\theta)) \} \leq \mathbb{E}_{B \sim \text{Bin}(n, R(\theta))} \exp \{ n \text{kl}(B/n \| R(\theta)) \},$$

where Bin denotes the binomial distribution. Following [Germain et al. \(2015\)](#), the latter quantity is equal to  $\xi(n)$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{B \sim \text{Bin}(n, R(\theta))} \exp \left( n \text{kl} \left( \frac{B}{n} \parallel R(\theta) \right) \right) &= \mathbb{E}_{B \sim \text{Bin}(n, R(\theta))} \left( \frac{B/n}{R(\theta)} \right)^B \left( \frac{1 - B/n}{1 - R(\theta)} \right)^{n-B} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbb{P}(B = k) \left( \frac{k/n}{R(\theta)} \right)^k \left( \frac{1 - k/n}{1 - R(\theta)} \right)^{n-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} R(\theta)^k (1 - R(\theta))^{n-k} \left( \frac{k/n}{R(\theta)} \right)^k \left( \frac{1 - k/n}{1 - R(\theta)} \right)^{n-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (k/n)^k (1 - k/n)^{n-k} = \xi(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying [Corollary 5.1](#) with  $\varphi = \text{kl}$  and  $\lambda_{\eta(t)} = \eta(t)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \varphi_t(\theta) &\leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\rho, \mathcal{D}} \exp(\eta(t) \varphi_{\eta(t)}(\theta))}{\eta(t)} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t}{\eta(t)} \\
&\leq \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \parallel \nu) + \log(\xi(\eta(t))/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t}{\eta(t)},
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. Finally, [\(25\)](#) follows from similar arguments and applying [Corollary 5.2](#).

### A.11 Proof of [Corollary 6.1](#)

The proof follows that of [Corollary 5.1](#) very closely, so we provide only the outline. Define

$$h_t^j(\theta) = \lambda_j \varphi_t(\theta) - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(\lambda_j \varphi_j(\theta)).$$

Then  $(\exp h_t^j(\theta))$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$  obeying  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp h_j^j(\theta)] = 1$ . [Theorem 6.1](#) along with our assumption implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t^{2^k}(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \geq \log(u/\delta)) \leq \delta/u.$$

The event  $\{\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta)\}$  is contained in the event  $\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \{\exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t^{2^k} - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho) \geq \log(\ell(k+1)/\delta)\}$ , where  $\ell$  is the stitching function introduced in [Section 5.1](#). The union bound over all such events implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} h_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) - \gamma_{\mathcal{G}_t}(\rho, \nu) \geq \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta)) \leq \delta.$$

This proves the first part the result. The second part comes from applying [Theorem 6.1](#) to the process  $(h_t^n(\theta))$  with  $t_0 = n$ .

### A.12 Proof of [Corollary 6.2](#)

Let  $\alpha_0 = \alpha/(\alpha - 1)$ . Define the quantity

$$S_t^j(\theta) = \log \varphi_t(\theta) - \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \log \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta \sim \nu, \mathcal{D}}[\varphi_j^{\alpha_0}(\vartheta)].$$

Note that the final term is not a function of  $\theta$ . First, we claim that  $(\exp S_t^j(\theta))_{t \geq 1}$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . Recalling that  $\varphi_t(\theta)$  is reverse submartingale with respect to the same filtration, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp S_t^j(\theta) | \mathcal{E}_{t+1}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\varphi_t(\theta) | \mathcal{E}_{t+1}]}{\mathbb{E}_{\nu, \mathcal{D}}[\varphi_j^{\alpha_0}(\vartheta)]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}}} \geq \frac{\varphi_{t+1}(\theta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\nu, \mathcal{D}}[\varphi_j^{\alpha_0}(\vartheta)]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}}} = \exp S_{t+1}^j(\theta).$$

Therefore, it follows from (36) that  $([\exp S_t^j(\theta)]^{\alpha_0})_{t \geq 1}$  is a reverse submartingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{E}_t)$ . Next we observe that, by construction,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\exp S_j^j(\theta)^{\alpha_0}] = 1$ . Therefore, by Theorem 6.4, for all  $\rho$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq j : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_t^j(\theta) \geq \alpha_0^{-1}(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(u/\delta))) \leq \delta/u,$$

for  $u > 0$ . Let  $\ell(k) = k^2 \zeta(2)$  be the stitching function introduced in Section 5.1. Following the proof of Corollary 5.1, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) \geq \alpha_0^{-1}(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(\ell(\log_2(2t))/\delta))\} \\ & \subseteq \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \{\exists t \geq 2^k : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_t^{2^k}(\theta) \geq \alpha_0^{-1}(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(\ell(k+1)/\delta))\}. \end{aligned}$$

The argument is identical to before: if there is some  $t^*$  such that the first event holds, then  $n(t^*) = 2^{k^*}$  for some  $k^*$  so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_{t^*}^{2^{k^*}}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_{t^*}^{\eta(t^*)}(\theta) \geq \alpha_0(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(\ell(\log_2(2t^*))/\delta)) \\ &\geq \alpha_0(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(\ell(k^*+1)/\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

since  $\log_2(2t^*) = 1 + \log_2(t^*) \geq 1 + \lfloor \log_2(t^*) \rfloor = 1 + k^*$ . Applying the union bound, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 1 : \mathbb{E}_{\rho} S_t^{\eta(t)}(\theta) \geq \alpha_0^{-1}(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta}{\ell(k)} = \delta.$$

That is, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq 1$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \log \varphi_t(\theta) - \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \log \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta \sim \nu, \mathcal{D}}[\varphi_{\eta(t)}^{\alpha_0}(\vartheta)] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_0}(D_{\alpha}(\rho \| \nu) + \log(1/\delta) + \mathbb{I}_t).$$

The desired result then follows by rearranging, and by noting that  $\log \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \varphi_t(\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho} \log \varphi_t(\theta)$ .

### A.13 Proof of Corollary 6.4

Let

$$W_t(\Lambda, \delta) = \frac{\log(2/\delta) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho \| \nu) + \frac{1}{2}t\Lambda^2}{t\Lambda} \quad (43)$$

be the width of the CS in (39) when the error level is set to  $\delta$ , the sequence  $\{\lambda_t\}$  is set to a constant  $\Lambda > 0$ , and  $\sigma$  is set to 1. Let  $t_j = 2^j$ ,  $\delta_j = \frac{\delta(1+j)^{-1/4}}{3.15}$ , and  $\Lambda_j = \sqrt{\log(2/\delta_j)2^{-j}}$ . Note that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta_j < \delta$ . By Corollary 6.3, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_j$ , for all  $\rho$  and integers  $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mu(\theta) \in \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t f(Z_i, \theta)}{t} \pm W_t(\Lambda_j, \delta_j) \right)$ . Therefore, by union bound, we have for all  $\rho$  and  $t$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \mu(\theta) \in \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t f(Z_i, \theta)}{t} \pm W_t^{\text{stch}^*} \right), \quad \text{where } W_t^{\text{stch}^*} := W_t(\Lambda_j, \delta_j) \text{ for } t_j \leq t < t_{j+1}.$$



Next, we show the straightforward fact that  $W_t^{\text{stch}^*}$  satisfies an iterated logarithmic rate. Note that  $\log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2(t+1) \leq \log(2/\delta_j) \leq \log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2 2t$

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^{\text{stch}^*} &= \frac{\log(2/\delta_j) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu) + \frac{1}{2}t\Lambda_j^2}{t\Lambda_j} \\ &\leq \frac{2\log(2/\delta_j) + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu)}{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta_j)t}} \\ &= 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta_j)}{t}} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu)}{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta_j)t}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2 2t}{t}} + \frac{D_{\text{KL}}(\rho||\nu)}{\sqrt{(\log(6.3/\delta) + 1.4 \log \log_2(t+1))t}}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.

## B Mixtures of Martingales

**Lemma B.1** (Mixture of martingales). *Let  $\{(M_t(\theta))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} : \theta \in \Theta\}$  be a family of martingales (resp., super/submartingales) on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}, \mathbb{P})$ , indexed by  $\theta$  in a measurable space  $(\Theta, \mathcal{B})$  such that*

- (i) *each  $M_t(\theta)$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable; and*
- (ii) *each  $\mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable.*

*Let  $\mu$  be a finite measure on  $(\Theta, \mathcal{B})$  such that for all  $t$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \otimes \mu\text{-almost everywhere } M_t(\theta) \geq 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mu} \mathbb{E}[|M_t(\theta)|] < \infty.$$

*Then the mixture  $(M_t^{\text{mix}})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , where  $M_t^{\text{mix}} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mu} M_t(\theta)$ , is also a martingale (or super/submartingale).*

*Proof.* First consider the case of supermartingales. Take any  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ . Recall conditions (i) and (ii): (i) each  $M_t(\theta)$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable; and (ii) each  $\mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable. Due to this, we can apply Fubini's theorem to  $M_t(\theta)$  on  $\mathbb{P}|_A \otimes \mu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}_A \int M_t(\theta) \mu(d\theta) \right] &= \int \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_A M_t(\theta)] \mu(d\theta) \\ &= \int \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \mu(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Next, again by the assumptions, either  $\mathbb{P}|_A \otimes \mu$ -a.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq 0$ , or

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbb{E} [|\mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]|] \mu(d\theta) &\leq \int \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E}[|M_t(\theta)| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \mu(d\theta) \\ &= \int \mathbb{E} [|M_t(\theta)|] \mu(d\theta) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can apply Fubini's theorem to  $\mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$  on  $\mathbb{P}|_A \otimes \mu$ :

$$\int \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \mu(d\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}_A \int \mathbb{E}[M_t(\theta)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \mu(d\theta) \right].$$

Therefore, for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}_A \int M_t(\theta) \mu(d\theta) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}_A \int \mathbb{E} [M_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \mu(d\theta) \right].$$

Further, by Fubini's theorem,  $\int \mathbb{E} [M_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \mu(d\theta)$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int M_t(\theta) \mu(d\theta) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] = \int \mathbb{E} [M_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \mu(d\theta),$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_t^{\text{mix}} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int M_t(\theta) \mu(d\theta) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &= \int \mathbb{E} [M_t(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \mu(d\theta) \\ &\leq \int M_{t-1}(\theta) \mu(d\theta) = M_{t-1}^{\text{mix}}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that  $M_t^{\text{mix}}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable is again guaranteed by Fubini's theorem. Hence  $(M_t^{\text{mix}})$  is a supermartingale. The case with submartingales can be proven by considering  $-M_t(\theta)$ . The case with martingales is proven by combining the cases with supermartingales and submartingales.  $\square$

We remark that the above lemma, albeit stated in terms of forward (super/sub)martingales, immediately implies that the mixture of *reverse* (super/sub)martingales is again a reverse (super/sub)martingale. This is because we allow the indices of the process to run through  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ . To wit, letting  $\{(N_t(\theta))_{t=1}^\infty : \theta \in \Theta\}$  be a family of reverse submartingales on a reverse filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t=1}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$  satisfying the similar measurability assumptions, we may set  $M_{-t}(\theta) = N_t(\theta)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{-t} = \mathcal{G}_t$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ , and trivially extrapolate  $M_0(\theta) = M_1(\theta) = \dots = N_1(\theta)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{F}_1$  to make each  $(M_t(\theta))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  a forward submartingale on the forward filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . Lemma [B.1](#) is therefore applicable.