# Operation with concentration inequalities and Conjugate of parallel sum

Cosme Louart\*

#### Abstract

Following the concentration of the measure theory formalism, we consider the transformation  $\Phi(Z)$  of a random variable Z having a general concentration function  $\alpha$ . If the transformation  $\Phi$  is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz with  $\lambda > 0$  deterministic, the concentration function of  $\Phi(Z)$  is immediately deduced to be equal to  $\alpha(\cdot/\lambda)$ . If the variations of  $\Phi$  are bounded by a random variable  $\Lambda$  having a concentration function (around 0)  $\beta : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ , this paper sets that  $\Phi(Z)$  has a concentration function analogous to the so-called parallel product of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ :  $(\alpha^{-1} \cdot \beta^{-1})^{-1}$ . We apply this result to (i) express the concentration of large-tailed random vectors, (ii) generalize Hanson Wright inequality, and (iii) provide useful insights on the so-called "multilevel concentration" that appears when  $\Lambda$  is the product of n random variables. This last result is obtained when we formulate the conjugate functions of the parallel sum of n real mappings.

**Keywords:** Concentration of Measure; Hanson-Wright inequality; Conjugate function; Parallel sum.

MSC2020 subject classifications: 60-08, 60B20, 62J07.

# Contents

1	Parallel sum and concentration inequalities			
	1.1 Definition of Parallel sum and application to sum and product of real random			
	variables	4		
	1.2 Formalization with Levy Families	8		
	1.3 Concentration in high dimension	11		
	1.4 Large tailed random vector concentration	16		
	1.5 Consequences for Hanson-Wright concentration inequality	19		
2	Interpretation with conjugate functions			
	2.1 Pseudo inverse of closed convex and opened concave mappings	23		
	2.2 Characterization as a two dimensional extremum	25		
	2.3 Characterization as a one dimensional supremum with subgradient $\ldots$	28		
A	Properties on pseudo-inverse	33		
Re	eferences	39		

\*School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China

# Notations

We denote  $\mathbb{R}_+$  (resp.  $\mathbb{R}_-$ ) the set of positive (resp. negative) or null real numbers<sup>1</sup>,  $\mathbb{R}_* \equiv \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \ \bar{\mathbb{R}} \equiv \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}, \text{ and consider below a mapping } f : \mathbb{R} \to \bar{\mathbb{R}}.$  The set of increasing mappings ( $a \leq b \implies f(a) \leq f(b)$ ) (resp. the set of decreasing mappings) is denoted  $\mathcal{M}_+$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_-$ ) and  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_+ \cup \mathcal{M}_-$  designates the set of monotonous mappings. The support of f is the set  $\text{Dom}(f) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, f(x) \notin \{-\infty, +\infty\}.$  The epigraph of f is defined as:

$$\operatorname{Epi}(f) = \{(x, w) | x \in \mathbb{R}, w \in \mathbb{R}, f(x) \le w\},\$$

We denote  $\mathrm{Id}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  the mapping defined for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  as  $\mathrm{Id}(x) = x$  and for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  we denote the increment function in u:

$$\operatorname{inc}(u): \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$$

$$t \longmapsto \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } t \leq u \\ +\infty & \text{if } t > u, \end{cases}$$

$$(0.1)$$

We note " $\circ$ " the composition between functions and " $\cdot$ " the product, to limit the use of parenthesis, we take the convention that the composition has the priority over the product (which has the priority over the sum). Given two mappings  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , we denote  $f \leq g$  iif.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, f(x) \leq g(x)$ .

Given a set of indexes I and two family of positive scalars  $a = (a_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I_+$  and  $b = (b_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I_+$ , we note " $a \leq O(b)$ " or " $a_i \leq O(b_i)$ ,  $i \in I$ " iff there exists a positive scalar C > 0 such that  $\forall i \in I$ ,  $a_i \leq Cb_i$  the notation " $a \geq O(b)$ " is equivalent to " $b \leq O(a)$ ".

Given a subset A of a topological space,  $\operatorname{Cl}(A)$  is the closure of A,  $\operatorname{Int}(A)$  is the interior and  $\operatorname{Conv}(A) = \{\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \mid x, y \in A, \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$  is the convex hull. When  $\operatorname{Epi}(f)$  is a closed set (resp. when  $\{(x, w) | x \in \mathbb{R}, w \in \mathbb{R}, f(x) \ge w\}$  is closed), f is said to be closed (resp. opened). The mapping  $\operatorname{Cl}(f)$ , or  $\underline{f}$  (the "lower semicontinuous envelope" [5]) is defined as the only mapping whose epigraph is  $\operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi}(f))$ , one will then note  $\operatorname{Int}(f) = \overline{f} = -\operatorname{Cl}(-f)$ . We will say that f is proper if  $f(x) < \infty$ , for at least one  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f(x) > -\infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . The set of closed proper convex mappings f is denoted  $\mathcal{C}^{\cup}$  and we further introduce the notations  $\mathcal{C}^{\cap} \equiv \{-f, f \in \mathcal{C}^{\cup}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{C} \equiv \mathcal{C}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\cap}$ .

Given a set S in a metric space (E, d), and a parameter t > 0, we note  $S_t \equiv \{x \in E, \exists y \in S, d(x, y) \leq r\}$ , the t-neighborhood of S.

#### Introduction

A fundamental result of the concentration of measure theory sets that for any Gaussian random vector  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$ , for any 1-Lipschitz for the euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^p$  mapping  $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|f(Z) - \mathbb{E}[f(Z)]| > t\right) \le 2e^{-t^2/2},$$

the mapping  $\alpha : t \mapsto 2e^{-t^2/2}$  is here called a concentration function of Z. Given a transformation  $F : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz for the euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^p$  and  $\mathbb{R}^q$  we have for any  $Z' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , an independent copy of Z:

$$\|F(Z) - F(Z')\| \le \lambda \|Z - Z'\|$$

and it is easy to deduce, with a slight modification of t, that the concentration function of the random vector  $F(Z) \in \mathbb{R}^q$  is  $\alpha(\cdot/\lambda)$ . The aim of our paper is to express the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We also denote  $\mathbb{R}^*_+ = \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^*_- = \mathbb{R}_- \setminus \{0\}$ 

concentration of F(Z) when  $\lambda$  is not constant but a random variable (possibly dependent on Z). The result is given for the general concentration function of Z and  $\lambda$ .

**Theorem 0.1.** Let us consider two metric spaces (E, d), (E', d'), a random variable  $Z \in E$ , a real random variable  $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that there exist two strictly decreasing mappings  $\alpha, \beta : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for any 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\forall t \ge 0$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|f(Z) - f(Z')| > t\right) \le \alpha(t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda > t\right) \le \beta(t),$$

for any independent copy Z' of Z, and a transformation  $\Phi: E \to E'$  such that:

$$d'(\Phi(Z), \Phi(Z')) \le \Lambda d(Z, Z')$$
 a.s.,

then for any 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f: E' \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|f(Z) - f(Z')| > t\right) \le C(\alpha^{-1} \cdot \beta^{-1})^{-1}(ct), \tag{0.2}$$

for some numerical constants C, c > 0 valid in any settings.

This theorem allows some extension of the famous Hanson-Wright concentration inequality to a wider range of concentration functions (Theorems 1.32 and 1.38).

A more general version of this theorem is given in Theorem 1.26 for  $\alpha, \beta$  which are possibly constant in some parts of their domain, and for a random variable  $\Lambda$  which writes like a product of n random variables, each of which has its own concentration function. Theorem 1.27 gives a similar result for the random variable Z that satisfies weaker so-called "convex concentration" hypotheses and  $\Phi$  takes value in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The mapping  $(\alpha^{-1} \cdot \beta^{-1})^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$  rewrites  $(\tilde{\alpha}^{-1} + \tilde{\beta}^{-1})^{-1} \circ \log$  with the introduction of  $\tilde{\alpha} \equiv \alpha \circ \exp$ and  $\tilde{\beta} \equiv \beta \circ \exp$ . The expression  $(\tilde{\alpha}^{-1} + \tilde{\beta}^{-1})^{-1}$  can be recognized as the so-called parallel sum, originally introduced in electrical engineering to model parallel resistor networks, which was then been generalized to matrices in [4] and to nonlinear operators in convex analysis in [3] (see [5, Chapter 24] for a presentation in the context of setvalued functions). The parallel sum is traditionally denoted  $\Box$ , but since we will also be presenting a parallel product, we found it more convenient to denote it as  $\boxplus$  (and the parallel product as  $\boxtimes$ ). The operation on graphs can easily be represented as shown in Figure 1, and we wonder whether the parallel sum should not rather be called the perpendicular sum.



Figure 1: Left: Classical sum of two functions, Right: Parallel sum of two functions.

The control of non Lipschitz functionals has been studied by different authors. To be brief, one can mention the seminal work of Vu in [16] with binary variables, then the

introduction of specific operator norms on tensors to get concentration of polynomial of Gaussian variables by Latała in [11] and later generalized for more general variables and functionals in [2] and [7]. Their studies let appear the notion of "multilevel concentration inequalities" where the concentration rate usually takes the form:

$$t \mapsto \exp\left(-\inf_{k \in A} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma_k}\right)^k\right),$$

for a finite set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(\sigma_k)_{k \in A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ . The purpose of this paper is to show how these multilevel concentration inequalities, which appeared in different settings, can be related to the parallel sum mechanism. In particular, this form is independent of the properties of the exponential function, indeed in any setting one can make this multilevel form appear in the concentration rate of multiLipschitz functionals (without any "exp" sign). Our main result (Theorem 2.23) can be written in a simpler form as follows.

**Theorem 0.2.** Let us consider two metric spaces (E, d), (E', d'), a random variable  $Z \in E$  and a decreasing mappings  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for any 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\forall t \ge 0$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(Z) - f(Z')\right| > t\right) \le \alpha(t).$$

In addition, given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we consider n real random variable  $\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}$ , n indexes sets containing  $0, A^{(1)}, \ldots, A^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and n families of positive parameters  $\sigma^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A^{(1)}}_+, \ldots, \sigma^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A^{(n)}}_+$  such that:

$$\forall k \in [n]: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\Lambda^{(k)} - \sigma_0^{(k)}\right| > t\right) \le \alpha \left(\inf_{a \in A^{(0)} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}\right).$$

Given a mapping  $\Phi: E \to E', i \in I$ , if we assume that for any independent copy Z' of Z:

$$d'(\Phi(Z), \Phi(Z')) \le \Lambda^{(1)} \cdots \Lambda^{(n)} \cdot d(Z, Z'), \quad a.s.$$

then for any 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f: E' \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|f(Z) - f(Z')| > t\right) \le C\alpha \left(\inf_{a_k \in A^{(k)}, k \in [n]} \left(\frac{ct}{\sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} \cdots \sigma_{a_n}^{(n)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1 + a_1 + \dots + a_n}}\right), \quad (0.3)$$

for some numerical constants C, c > 0 valid in any settings.

There exists a method depicted in Corollary 2.22 to reduce, when possible, the number of points on which one should compute the infimum in (0.3), but it is too elaborate to be described here.

# 1 Parallel sum and concentration inequalities

# **1.1** Definition of Parallel sum and application to sum and product of real random variables

Let us denote  $\mathcal{M}_+$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_-$ ), the set of increasing (resp. decreasing) functions  $f: \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_+ \cup \mathcal{M}_-$ . Note that it is not specified weather the elements of  $\mathcal{M}$  are continuous or not.

The inverse of the concentration functions that appear in the expression of the parallel sum in (0.2) needs to be defined a general settings where there is no invertibility. Given a mapping  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ , we define two pseudo-inverse. The first one  $f^{-1}$  is a closed mappings (i.e. such that  $\{f^{-1} \leq t\}$  is closed for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ) and the second one  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  is an

opened mapping (i.e. such that  $\{f^{-1} \ge t\}$  is closed for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ), see Lemma A.12. We left most of the proofs and the intermediate result in the appendix since they are quite laborious and out of the central message of this article, besides, they become obvious when one considers continuous invertible mappings.

It is somehow not convenient to define at the same time inversion for increasing functions and inversion for decreasing functions, however a simple connection is made through the equivalence  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+ \Leftrightarrow -f \in \mathcal{M}_-$  and the identities  $f^{-1} = (-f)^{-1}(-\operatorname{Id})$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}} = (-f)^{-\overline{1}}(-\operatorname{Id})$ .

**Definition 1.1** (Pseudo-inverse). If  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$ ,  $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$f^{-1}(y) \equiv \inf \{x, f(x) \ge y\} \le \sup \{x, f(x) \le y\} \equiv f^{-1}(y).$$

If  $f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ ,  $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$f^{-1}(y) \equiv \inf \{x, f(x) \le y\} \le \sup \{x, f(x) \ge y\} \equiv f^{-1}(y).$$

For mappings  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  that are constant, one needs to specify which definition to follow<sup>2</sup>.

The mappings  $f^{-1}$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  are respectively and naturally called the "closed" and the "opened" pseudo-inverse.

Note that for continuous bijections  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f^{-1}$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  are both equal to the classical inverse of f. As expected, the pseudo inverse is an involution on the restricted set of closed or opened mappings (this result is justified in the Appendix with the epigraph interpretation of the pseudo-inverse that leads to Lemma A.12).

**Lemma 1.2.** Given  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ :

$$(f^{-\underline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = (f^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = \underline{f}$$
 and  $(f^{-\overline{1}})^{-\overline{1}} = (f^{-\underline{1}})^{-\overline{1}} = \overline{f}$ 

Unlike classical inversion, here, as depicted on Figure 2,  $f^{-1} \circ f(x)$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}} \circ f(x)$  are sometimes different from x. Yet, next lemma gives us an order relation between those two quantities.

Lemma 1.3. Given  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ :

$$f^{-\underline{1}} \circ f \leq \mathrm{Id} \leq f^{-\overline{1}} \circ f$$

Note that applying this first result to  $f^{-1}$  instead of f, one obtains:

$$\underline{f} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \leq \mathrm{Id} \leq \overline{f} \circ f^{-\underline{1}},$$

one can replace  $f^{-1}$  with  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  in the previous inequality.

We displayed on Figure 2 a simple example where the inequality of Lemma 1.3 is strict.

*Proof.* From the definition of the pseudo-inverses, the inclusion  $f(x) \in \{x, f(x) \ge y\} \cap \{x, f(x) \le y\}$  directly implies the two inequalities.

**Definition 1.4.** Given<sup>3</sup>  $f, g \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ , with the same monotonicity let us introduce:

$$f \coprod g \equiv \left(f^{-\underline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}}$$
 and  $f \varlimsup g \equiv \left(f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\overline{1}}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Recalling the definition of the increment function provided in (0.1), with the first expression of the pseudo-inverse  $(f \in \mathcal{M}_+), f^{-1} = \operatorname{inc}(f)$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}} = \operatorname{Int}(\operatorname{inc}(f))$ , and with the second expression  $(f \in \mathcal{M}_+), f^{-1} = \operatorname{Cl}(-\operatorname{inc}(f))$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}} = -\operatorname{inc}(f)$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The mappings denoted " $+\infty$ " and " $-\infty$ " are two constant mappings respectively equal to  $+\infty$  and  $-\infty$  everywhere.



Figure 2: Here  $f^{-\underline{1}} \circ f < f \circ f^{-\underline{1}} = \text{Id} < f^{-\overline{1}} \circ f$ . Note also that,  $f^{-\underline{1}} \circ f$  and  $\text{Cl}(f^{-\overline{1}} \circ f) = \text{Cl}(f^{-\underline{1}} \circ f)$  are both closed but different.

respectively, the "closed parallel sum" and the "opened parallel sum" of f and g.

If f and g are both supported<sup>4</sup> on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , we denote the "closed parallel product" and the "opened parallel product" of f and g:

$$f \boxtimes g|_{\mathbb{R}_+} \equiv \left(f^{-\underline{1}}g^{-\underline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}}\Big|_{\mathbb{R}_+} \qquad \text{and} \qquad f \boxtimes g|_{\mathbb{R}_+} \equiv \left(f^{-\overline{1}}g^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\overline{1}}\Big|_{\mathbb{R}_+},$$

and  $f \boxtimes g(\mathbb{R}_{-}) = -\infty$  or  $f \boxtimes g(\mathbb{R}_{-}) = +\infty$  if  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$  or  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$  respectively.

The concentration of the sum of random variable stated in Proposition 1.9 below partly relies on the inequality  $f^{-1} \circ f \leq \text{Id}$  given by Lemma 1.3. To strictly satisfy our needs, we will thus focus, for this section, on properties concerning closed parallel sum (properties concerning the opened parallel sum can generally be deduced symmetrically).

First note from Lemma A.12 that the closeness of f and g has no impact on the value of  $f \coprod g$ .

**Lemma 1.5.** Given two mappings  $f, g \in M$  with same monotonicity:

$$f \boxplus g = \overline{f} \boxplus \overline{g} = \underline{f} \boxplus \underline{g}$$
 and  $f \boxtimes g = \overline{f} \boxtimes \overline{g} = \underline{f} \boxtimes \underline{g}$ 

Second note that the parallel operations are associative.

**Lemma 1.6.** Given three mappings  $f, g, h \in M$  with same monotonicity one has the identities:

$$(f \boxplus g) \boxplus h = f \boxplus (g \boxplus h)$$

If one additionally assumes that f, g, h have support in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ :

$$(f \boxtimes g) \boxtimes h = f \boxtimes (g \boxtimes h).$$

*Proof.* Let us simply compute:

<sup>4</sup>It

$$(f \boxplus g) \boxplus h = \left( \left( (f^{-1} + g^{-1})^{-1} \right)^{-1} + h^{-1} \right)^{-1} = \left( f^{-1} + g^{-1} + h^{-1} \right)^{-1} = f \boxplus (g \boxplus h).$$

We will next look at the composition of the parallel sum with monotonuous mappings. Unlike the classical sum of functions, the composition distributes towards the sum  $\boxplus$  (and the product  $\boxtimes$ ) on the left.

**Proposition 1.7.** Given  $\alpha, f, g \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\overline{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha}$ :

$$If \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{+}: \quad \alpha \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\alpha \circ f) \boxplus (\alpha \circ g)$$
$$If \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}: \quad \alpha \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\alpha \circ f) \boxplus (\alpha \circ g)$$
$$\boxed{\text{means that } x \in \mathbb{R}_{-} \implies f(x), g(x) \in \{-\infty, +\infty\}.}$$

Be careful that given  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , it is possible that  $\operatorname{Cl}(f \circ g) \neq \operatorname{Cl}(\overline{f} \circ g)$  as seen on Figure 2, that is why we required the assumption  $\underline{\alpha} = \overline{\alpha}$ . The proof is provided in the appendix after Proposition A.16 presenting a more precise result not requiring  $\underline{\alpha} = \overline{\alpha}$ . Note that in the case of invertible continuous mappings  $\alpha, f, g$  it can be proven easily with a simple application of the definitions.

Next lemma explains why the opened parallel sum  $f \equiv g$  appears when  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ . Once again the proof is left in the Appendix.

**Lemma 1.8.** Given  $f, g \in M$ , one has the implications:

$$f \in \mathcal{M}_+ \implies \underline{f} \circ \underline{g} \text{ closed} \quad \text{and} \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_- \implies \underline{f} \circ \overline{g} \text{ closed}$$

We reached the central objective of this subsection: to relate the cumulative distribution function of the sum of random variables with the parallel sum. Although completely trivial, it is at the basis of the main theorems of next subsections.

**Proposition 1.9.** Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and n random variables  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  satisfying for all  $k \in [n]$ :  $\mathbb{P}(X_k > t) \leq \alpha_k(t)$ , for given mappings  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , we have the concentration<sup>5</sup>:

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_k > t\right) \le n\alpha_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \alpha_n(t).$$

Now if we assume that  $\forall k \in [n]$ ,  $X_k \ge 0$  a.s., one has the concentration:

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} X_k > t\right) \le n\alpha_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \alpha_n(t)$$

When n = 2 and  $\alpha = \beta$ , note that  $\alpha \boxplus \beta = \alpha(\frac{1}{2})$ . In particular, the example depicted on Figure 3 shows that the inequality  $\mathbb{P}(X + Y > t) \le 2\alpha(\frac{t}{2})$  can be reached for some values of t.



Figure 3: If the law of  $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is uniformly distributed on the gray triangles, then  $\forall t \in [t_1, t_2]$ :  $\mathbb{P}(X + Y > t) = \frac{2}{3} = 2\mathbb{P}(X > \frac{t}{2}) = 2\mathbb{P}(Y > \frac{t}{2})$ . One can also unbalance the weights between  $T_1$  and  $T_2, T_3$  to get probabilities different from  $\frac{1}{3}$ .

*Proof.* Since for all  $k \in [n]$ , the mappings  $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X_k > t)$  is closed, we know that one actually has:

 $\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}(X_k > t) \le \underline{\alpha}_k(t) \le \alpha_k(t),$ 

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$ Recall that the parallel sum, and the parallel product are both associative operations thanks to Lemma 1.6, there is therefore no need for parenthesis.

therefore, we can assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$  are all closed<sup>6</sup> mappings (recall that  $\alpha_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \alpha_n = \underline{\alpha}_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \underline{\alpha}_n$  thanks to Lemma 1.5). Let us introduce the mapping:

$$\gamma \equiv \alpha_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \alpha_n = \left(\alpha_1^{-1} + \cdots + \alpha_n^{-1}\right)^{-1}$$

Lemma 1.3 (and the fact that  $\alpha_1^{-1}, \ldots, \alpha_n^{-1}$  are closed) allows us to bound:

$$\alpha_1^{-1}(\gamma(t)) + \dots + \alpha_n^{-1}(\gamma(t)) = \left(\alpha_1^{-1} + \dots + \alpha_n^{-1}\right) \circ \left(\alpha_1^{-1} + \dots + \alpha_n^{-1}\right)^{-1} \le t,$$

and consequently:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 + \dots + x_n > t\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 + \dots + x_n > \alpha_1^{-1}(\gamma(t)) + \dots + \alpha_n^{-1}(\gamma(t))\right)$$
$$\le \mathbb{P}\left(X > \alpha_1^{-1}(\gamma(t))\right) + \dots + \mathbb{P}\left(Y > \alpha_n^{-1}(\gamma(t))\right)$$
$$\le \alpha_1 \circ \alpha_1^{-1}(\gamma(t)) + \dots + \alpha_n \circ \alpha_n^{-1}(\gamma(t)) \le n\gamma(t).$$

thanks again to Lemma 1.3 (we assumed at the beginning of the proof that  $\alpha_k$  is closed  $\forall k \in [n]$ ).

The concentration of the product is proven the same way thanks to the fact that for any t > 0:

$$\alpha_1^{-1}(\delta(t)) \cdots \alpha_n^{-1}(\delta(t)) \le t \qquad \qquad \text{where } \delta \equiv \alpha_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \alpha_n.$$

We will now present some important inferences of these small concentration tricks in high dimensional settings.

#### **1.2 Formalization with Levy Families**

To reach smoothly our goal it is convenient to introduce efficient notations that will help picturing the notions.

When one tries to express the rate of convergence of some concentration inequalities when the dimension increases, one can be bothered by the appearance of constants which are inherent to the concentration inequalities but of very little importance as the dimension becomes large (like the "2" appearing in Proposition 1.9). To solve this small problem we will adopt the notion of "Levy families" as introduced by Gromov and Milman in [10] with the important difference that our "Levy family" can be any family of random objects (random variables of  $\mathbb{R}$  or of a general metric space) with any kind of index (dimension, but also class of linear forms, of Lipschitz observations...). In all that follows, the set I is a general set of indices, which may be a set of integers, of scalars, of mappings, or a product of such spaces.

**Definition 1.10.** Given a family of random variables  $X = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$  a family of deterministic variables  $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{X}_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$ , and a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $i \in I$ , we say that X is  $\alpha$ -concentrated around an independent copy if there exist two constants C, c > 0 such that:

$$\forall i \in I: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|X_i - X'_i| > t\right) \le C\alpha_i(ct),\tag{1.1}$$

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$ For similar reasons, we could assume, without loss of generality that they are opened, but that is not useful for this proof.

for any independent copy of  $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ ,  $(X'_i)_{i \in I}$ . We say that X is  $\alpha$ -concentrated around  $\tilde{X}$  if there exist two constants C, c > 0 such that:

$$\forall i \in I: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_i - \tilde{X}_i\right| > t\right) \le C\alpha_i(ct), \tag{1.2}$$

If (1.1) is satisfied, we denote  $X \propto \alpha$  and if (1.2) is satisfied, we denote  $X \in \tilde{X} \pm \alpha$  or when one need to be more precise we denote:

$$X_i \propto \alpha_i, \quad i \in I$$
 or  $X_i \in \tilde{X}_i \pm \alpha_i, \quad i \in I$ 

**Remark 1.11.** A side result from Gozlan states that in some context an inequality (1.2) that would be true for a large class of random variables  $X_i$  could impose an upper bound on C. For instance if  $I = \{(n, f), n \in \mathbb{N}, f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, 1\text{-Lipschitz}\}, X_{n,f} = f(Z_n)$  for some random vector  $Z_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with independent entries,  $m_{n,f} \equiv X_{n,f}$ , a median of  $f(Z_n)$  and  $\alpha : t \mapsto e^{-ct^2}$  then (1.2) would be equivalent to:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, 1\text{-Lipschitz}: \mathbb{P}\left(|f(Z_n) - m_{n,f}| > t\right) \le 2e^{-ct^2}$$

(see [9, Theorem 5.1., Remark 5.3.]).

The notation introduced in Definition 1.10 has the advantage to give intuitive operation schemes to express the concentration of some basic operations.

**Proposition 1.12.** Given two families of real-valued random variables  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$  and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$ , such that  $X \in \tilde{X} \pm \alpha$  and  $Y \in \tilde{Y} \pm \beta$ , then we have the concentrations:

$$X + Y \in \tilde{X} + \tilde{Y} \pm \alpha \boxplus \beta \quad \text{and} \quad XY \in \tilde{X}\tilde{Y} \pm (\alpha \boxtimes \beta) \boxplus \left(\alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{Y}|}\right) \boxplus \left(\beta \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|}\right)$$

**Remark 1.13.** Note that in the setting of Proposition 1.12 above, if  $\alpha = \beta$  are decreasing and  $|\tilde{Y}| \leq |\tilde{X}|$ , then:

$$\begin{split} (\alpha \boxtimes \beta) \boxplus \left( \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{Y}|} \right) \boxplus \left( \beta \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|} \right) &\leq \alpha \circ \sqrt{\mathrm{Id}} \boxplus \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|} \boxplus \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|} \\ &\leq \max \left( \alpha \circ \frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{Id}}}{3}, \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{3|\tilde{X}|} \right) \leq \alpha \circ \frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{Id}}}{3} + \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{3|\tilde{X}|}. \end{split}$$

Therefore, one obtains:

$$XY \in \tilde{X}\tilde{Y} \pm \alpha \circ \sqrt{\mathrm{Id}} + \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|}$$

which shares some similarity with Hanson-Wright result presented in Theorems1.32, 1.38.

*Proof.* The result on the sum was proven in Proposition 1.9, let us then simply bound thanks to Proposition 1.9:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|XY - \tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\right| > t\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X - \tilde{X}\right| \left|Y - \tilde{Y}\right| + \left|X - \tilde{X}\right| \left|\tilde{Y}\right| + \left|Y - \tilde{Y}\right| \left|\tilde{X}\right| > t\right) \\
\le 3(\alpha \boxtimes \beta) \boxplus \left(\alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{Y}|}\right) \boxplus \left(\beta \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{|\tilde{X}|}\right)(t)$$

The concentration rate of a  $\sigma$ -Lipschitz transformations  $f(X) \in \mathbb{R}$  of a random variable  $X \in \mathbb{R}$  is proportional to the Lipschitz parameter since:

$$|f(X) - f(X')| \ge t \implies |X - X'| \ge \frac{t}{\sigma}$$

**Lemma 1.14.** Given a family of random variables  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$  a family of parameters  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{I}_{\perp}$ a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{I}$  and a family of  $\sigma$ -Lipschitz mappings  $f \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}})^{I}$ , one has the implication:

$$X \propto \alpha \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad f(X) \propto \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\sigma}$$

Next Lemma gives the essential key to dress equivalence between the two notations. **Lemma 1.15** ([12], Corollary 1.5). Given a family of random variables  $X = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$ and a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $i \in I$ :

 $X \in m_X \pm \alpha \qquad \iff \qquad \exists \tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^I \mid X \in \tilde{X} \pm \alpha$  $X \propto \alpha$  $\iff$ 

where  $m_X = (m_{X_i})_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$  is a family of medians of X.

One can then wonder if the same is true for the expectation of X replacing the median. It is not always true (even when the expectation exists) but one can provide a useful sufficient condition.

**Lemma 1.16.** Given a family of random variables  $X = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$ , a family of deterministic scalars  $\tilde{X} = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$ , and a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_-^I$  such that:

- $X \in \tilde{X} \pm \alpha$ ,
- For any constant K > 0:  $\alpha \left( K \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha \right) \ge O(1)$ ,

then  $\mathbb{E}[X] \in \mathbb{R}$  is well defined and one has the concentration:

$$X \in \mathbb{E}[X] \pm \alpha.$$

We will later note the second hypothesis:

$$\alpha \left( O\left( \int \alpha \right) \right) \ge O(1). \tag{1.3}$$

Before proving this Lemma let us first justify why (1.3) is generally satisfied by concentration functions.

**Lemma 1.17.** Given a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$  never taking the value 0 and a family of positive parameters  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{I}_{+}$  (the only indexed object with  $\alpha$ ), the family of mappings  $\alpha = f \circ (\sigma \operatorname{Id})$  satisfies (1.3).

*Proof.* One can bound for any constant K > 0:

$$\alpha\left(K\int\alpha\right) = f\left(\sigma K\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(\sigma t)dt\right) = f\left(K\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(t)dt\right) \ge O(1),$$

since  $f\left(K\int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}}f(t)dt\right)$  is independent with  $i \in I$  and strictly bigger than 0.

 $\square$ 

However, (1.3) is generally not satisfied, one could for instance consider  $\alpha_n: t \mapsto$  $\frac{1}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{1}{n}}}$ . One can indeed express:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha_n = \int_1^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+\frac{1}{n}}} = n \left[ -\frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{n}}} \right]_1^\infty = n$$

and note that  $\alpha_n(n) = \frac{1}{(1+n)^{1+\frac{1}{n}}} \leq \frac{1}{n} \underset{n \to \infty}{\to} 0.$ Lemma 1.16 is proven thanks to:

**Lemma 1.18.** Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ , for any  $t, \tau > 0$ :

$$\min\left(1, \alpha(t-\tau)\right) \le \frac{1}{\min(1, \alpha(\tau))} \alpha\left(\frac{t}{2}\right).$$

Proof. If  $t \leq 2\tau$ ,  $\frac{\alpha(t/2)}{\min(1,\alpha(\tau))} \geq \frac{\alpha(t/2)}{\alpha(\tau)} \geq 1$  and if  $t \geq 2\tau$ ,  $\frac{t}{2} \leq t - \tau$  thus  $\alpha(t - \tau) \leq \alpha(\frac{t}{2})$ .  $\Box$ Proof of Lemma 1.16. Starting from the concentration hypothesis:

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|u(X-\tilde{X})\right| > t\right) \le C\alpha(ct),$$

for some constants C, c > 0, one can bound:

$$|\mathbb{E}[X] - \tilde{X}| \le \mathbb{E}[|X - \tilde{X}|] = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{P}\left(|X - \tilde{X}| > t\right) \le \frac{C}{c} \int_0^\infty \alpha \equiv \tau$$

One can finally apply Lemma 1.18 to obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| > t\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X - \tilde{X}\right| > t - \left|\mathbb{E}[X] - \tilde{X}\right|\right)$$
$$\le \min\left(1, C\alpha(c(t - \tau))\right) \le \frac{1}{\min(1, C\alpha(c\tau))} C\alpha\left(\frac{ct}{2}\right),$$

and one knows that  $\frac{1}{\min(1, C\alpha(c\tau))} \leq \max(1, \frac{1}{C\alpha(C\int \alpha)}) \leq O(1)$  thanks to our hypothesis.  $\Box$ 

The proof of Lemma 1.16 directly provides the following result (using  $\mathbb{E}[X]$  as a pivot):

**Lemma 1.19.** Given a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{I}$  such that  $\alpha(O(\int \alpha)) \geq O(1)$ , a family of random variables  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$  and any families of deterministic variables  $\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$ , such that  $X \in \tilde{X} \pm \alpha$ , one has the equivalence:

$$X \in \tilde{X}' \pm \alpha \qquad \iff \qquad \left| \tilde{X} - \tilde{X}' \right| \le O\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha \right).$$

#### **1.3 Concentration in high dimension**

The concentration of the measure theory is only relevant in high dimension where as Talagrand noted in [15]: "A random variable that depends (in a "smooth" way) on the influence of many independent variable (but not too much on any of them) is essentially constant". We give in the two next theorems two fundamental results of the theory, we refer the reader to [12] to a wider list of examples. Recent powerful characterization of product measure in most general settings can be found in [9, 8]. The concentration of a random variable Z of a metric space is expressed thanks to Definition 1.10 through the concentration of any  $f(Z) \in \mathbb{R}$  for f belonging to a certain class of regularity. The random variables f(Z) are classically called "observations" of Z. Depending on the class of regularity of the set of observations that should satisfy the concentration inequality one obtains different class of concentration, typically, from the stronger to the weaker notion: the Lipschitz (see Theorem 1.20), the convex (see Theorem 1.21) and the linear (see Theorems 1.32, 1.38) concentration.

Without particular specification,  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is endowed with the euclidean norm.

**Theorem 1.20** ([12]). Given a family of Gaussian vectors  $Z \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $Z_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)^7$ :

$$f(Z) \propto e^{-\operatorname{Id}^2}, \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz.}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>It is implicitly assumed that the mappings f take value in  $\mathbb{R}$  since the notation " $\propto$ " was just defined for random variable.

One can easily deduce (see Lemma 1.14) that this theorem is also true for any family  $(\Phi_n(Z_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ , where for all  $n\in\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Phi_n$  is a  $\lambda_n$ -Lipschitz transformation from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to some metric space and  $\lambda \leq O(1)$ .

A second result was proven by Talagrand and sets only the concentration of convex observation. It is a weaker result but very useful since it allows to study discrete distributions (that can not be obtained through Lipschitz transformation of the Gaussian vectors mentioned in Theorem 1.20).

**Theorem 1.21** ([14]). Given a family of random vectors  $Z \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [0, 1]^n$  with independent entries:

$$f(Z) \propto e^{-\operatorname{Id}^2}$$
, f 1-Lipschitz and convex.

The upper concentration could equivalently had been restricted to 1-Lipschitz and concave f.

**Remark 1.22.** This theorem can be generalized to any family  $(A_n Z_n + b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , for two deterministic  $A \in \prod_n \mathcal{M}_n$  and  $b \in \prod_n \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $||A|| \leq O(1)$  (the convexity of  $f \circ \Phi$  when f is convex can not be ensured by a general transformation  $\Phi$ ). One could sum up this remark saying that the class of  $\alpha$ -convexly concentrated random vectors is stable through bounded affine transformation.

For some specific transformations  $\Phi$  that preserve some convexity properties it is sometimes possible to show the linear concentration of  $\Phi(Z)$  (for instance when  $\Phi$  is build with some entry-wise product or matrix product as in Theorems 1.32 and 1.38, one can refer to [13, Theorem 1] for more general results on polynomials of random matrices).

As said, the convex concentration obtained from Theorem 1.21 is of course weaker than the Lipschitz concentration obtained from Theorem 1.20. Linear concentration, is weaker than both of them and it is interesting to note that in finite dimension, when a concentration function satisfies the integrable properties depicted in Lemma 1.16, the concentration of a linear observation f(Z) happens around  $f(\mathbb{E}(Z))$ . Given a normed vector space  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ , we denote  $(E', \|\cdot\|)$  the so-called "strong dual" of E, composed of the continuous linear forms of E for the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|$  (written the same way as the norm on E for simplicity – no ambiguity being possible) is called the *dual norm* of E' and defined as follows.

$$\forall u \in E', ||u|| = \sup_{||x|| \le 1} |u(x)|.$$

**Lemma 1.23.** Given a family of finite-dimensional vector spaces<sup>8</sup>  $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ , a family of random vectors  $X = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ , a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^I$  such that<sup>9</sup>:

- $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz, convex
- $\alpha\left(O(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha)\right) \ge O(1)$ ,

then  $\mathbb{E}[X] \in E$  is well defined and one has the concentration:

$$u(X) \in u(\mathbb{E}[X]) \pm \alpha, \quad u \in E^*, ||u|| \le 1$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>One could provide a definition of the expectation easily in any reflexive space or even any vector space of functions taking value in a reflexive space. However, for the definition, we require  $u \mapsto \mathbb{E}[u(X_i)]$  to be continuous on  $E^*$ , without further information on  $\mathbb{E}[u(X_i)]$  (like a bound) it can only be true on a finite dimensional space where all linear forms are continuous. If instead of the assumption  $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz, one adopts the assumption  $u(X) \in u(\tilde{X}) \pm \alpha$ ,  $||u|| \leq 1$ , then X is in a sense centered, and it is possible to deduce the result in a general reflexive space.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>The notation of the second hypothesis is explained below Lemma 1.16

This Lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 1.16, therefore we directly pursue to the main result of this subsection: the extension of the concentration provided in Theorems 1.20, 1.21 to some non Lipschitz observation.

A preliminary result allows us express the concentration of a non Lipschitz transformation f(X) when restricted on a set on which the Lipschitz parameter of f is bounded. **Lemma 1.24.** Let us consider a family of metric spaces  $(E_i, d_i)_{i \in I}$ , a family of random variables  $X = (X_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ , and a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_-^I$  such that:

 $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz,

then<sup>10</sup> there exist two constants C, c > 0 such that for any  $i \in I$ , any subsets  $A \subset E_i$ , any 1-Lipschitz mapping  $g: A \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - g(X'_i)| > t, X_i \in A\right) \le \frac{C}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \alpha_i(ct), \tag{1.4}$$

for any independent copy  $X'_i$  of  $X_i$ .

In the same setting, if one assumes this time that the spaces  $(E_i, d_i)_{i \in I}$  are euclidean vector spaces and

 $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz and convex,

then (1.4) is true for any convex  $A \subset E_i$  and any 1-Lipschitz and convex mapping  $g: A \to \mathbb{R}$ .

For simplicity, let us first give a geometrical preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 1.25.** In a metric space (E, d), for any subset<sup>11</sup>  $S \subset E$  and t > 0:

$$S \subset (S_r^c)_r^c.$$

*Proof.* We are going to prove that  $(S_r^c)_r \subset S^c$ . Considering  $z \in (S_r^c)_r$  we know that:

$$\exists x \in E \mid \forall y \in S : \quad d(z, x) \le r \quad \text{and} \quad d(x, y) > r.$$

One can then bound for all  $y \in S$ :

$$d(z,y) = d(z,y) + r - r \ge d(z,y) + d(z,x) - r \ge d(y,x) - r > 0,$$

which directly yields  $z \notin S$ .

*Proof.* <sup>12</sup> of Lemma 1.24. We assume again, without loss of generality that  $\alpha$  is closed. For simplicity, given  $i \in I$  and  $S \subset E_i$  measurable, we will note  $\mathbb{P}(S) = \mathbb{P}(X_i \in S)$ . One can assume without loss of generality that for all  $i \in I$  and all 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : E_i \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(|f(X_i) - m_f| > t) \le \alpha(t), \tag{1.5}$$

 $g(X) \mid X \in A \propto \frac{\alpha}{P(A)^2}, \quad g \text{ 1-Lipschitz}, A \in E.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>This property could be written:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Recall that the *t*-neighborhood of S is defined as  $S_t \equiv \{x \in E, \exists y \in S, \ d(x,y) \leq r\}.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>This proof would be more natural with measure theory notation as it is done in [12] (this proof is inspired in particular from [12, Lemma 1.1.]), but to keep the formalism we adopted in the paper, we will keep the probabilistic notations.

where  $m_f$  is a median of f(X) (C, c = 1). Given  $i \in I$ ,  $A \in E_i$  and  $g : A \to \mathbb{R}$ , 1-Lipschitz and considering a median<sup>13</sup>  $m_g$  of  $g(X_i), X_i \in A$ , one can bound for any independent copy  $X'_i$  of  $X_i$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - g(X'_i)| > t, X_i \in A\right) \le 2\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - m_g| > \frac{t}{2}, X_i \in A\right)$$
(1.6)

Introducing the set  $S = \{g \leq m_g\} \cap A \subset E_i$ , note that:

$$\forall x \in A: \quad g(x) > m_g + t \implies \quad d(x,S) > t,$$

since g is 1-Lipschitz. We then rely on the 1-Lipschitz mapping  $x \mapsto d(x, S)$  to remove the condition  $X_i \in A$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(g(X_i) > m_g + t, X_i \in A\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(d(X_i, S) > t\right)$$
(1.7)

Our issue is then to identify a median of  $d(X_i, S)$  in order to be able to bound the last probability. Inspiring from [12, Lemma 1.1.], let us denote  $t_0 \equiv \alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{P}(S) - \varepsilon)$ , where  $\varepsilon \in (0, \mathbb{P}(S))$  is a parameter that will tend to 0. If  $\mathbb{P}(S_{t_0}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , then 0 is a median of  $d(X_i, S_{t_0})$  and one can bound thanks to Lemma 1.25:

$$\mathbb{P}(S) \le \mathbb{P}\left(d(X_i, S_{t_0}) > t_0\right) \le \alpha(t_0) \le \mathbb{P}(S) - \varepsilon$$

thanks to (1.5) and Lemma 1.3 ( $\alpha$  is closed). This is absurd, therefore:

$$\frac{1}{2} > \mathbb{P}(S_{t_0}) = \mathbb{P}(d(X_i, S) \le t_0),$$

in other words, introducing  $m_S$ , a median of  $d(X_i, S)$ , we know that  $t_0 \ge m_S$ , and one can bound thanks to a combination of (1.7) and (1.5):

$$\mathbb{P}\left(g(X_i) > m_g + t + t_0, X_i \in A\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(d(X_i, S) > t + m_S\right) \le \alpha(t)$$

Noting that -g follows the same conditions as g, one can finally deduce:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - m_g| > t + t_0, X_i \in A\right) \le 2\alpha(t).$$

which can be rewritten:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - m_g| > t, X_i \in A\right) \le \min\left(1, 2\alpha \left(t - t_0\right)\right) \le \min\left(1, 2\bar{\alpha} \left(t - t_0\right)\right).$$

One can then employ Lemmas 1.18 to deduce:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - m_g| > t, X_i \in A\right) \le \frac{1}{\min(1, 2\bar{\alpha}(t_0))} 2\bar{\alpha}\left(t\right)$$

Lemma 1.3 gives the bound:

$$\bar{\alpha}(t_0) = \bar{\alpha}(\alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{P}(S) - \varepsilon)) \ge \mathbb{P}(S) \ge \frac{\mathbb{P}(A)}{2},$$

by definition of  $m_g$  and S. Since the mapping  $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(|g(X_i) - g(X'_i)| > t, X_i \in A)$  is closed, one can finally conclude with (1.6):

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g(X_i) - g(X'_i)| > t, X_i \in A\right) \le \frac{4\alpha\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)}{\mathbb{P}(A)}.$$

In the convex concentration setting, one only considers  $g: A \to \mathbb{R}$ , 1-Lipschitz and convex, therefore the sets  $S \subset A$  are convex, the mapping  $x \mapsto d(x, S)$  is convex and one can then deduce the same bounds.

 $<sup>^{13}</sup>m_g$  satisfies  $\mathbb{P}(g(X) \ge m_g \mid X \in A) \ge \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(g(X) \le m_g \mid X \in A) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Theorem 1.26.** Let us consider a family of metric spaces  $(E_i, d_i)_{i \in I}$ , a family of random variables  $Z \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ , a family of n real random variables  $(\Lambda_1^{(i)})_{i \in I}, \ldots, (\Lambda_n^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{R}^I$  such that there exist n + 1 families of decreasing mappings  $\alpha^{(i)}, \beta_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \beta_n^{(i)} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $i \in I$  such that:

 $f(Z) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz and  $\forall k \in [n] : \Lambda_k \in 0 \pm \beta_k$ ,

Given a supplementary family of metric space (E', d'), and a family of mappings  $\Phi_i : E_i \to E'_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , if we assume that for any independent copy Z' of Z:

$$d'(\Phi(Z), \Phi(Z')) \le C\Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n \cdot d(Z, Z'), \quad a.s.$$

then:

$$f(\Phi(Z)) \propto n\alpha \boxtimes \beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n, \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz}$$

*Proof.* To simplify the proof we will not mention the index  $i \in I$  in this proof, all the following identities and inequalities are true for all  $i \in I$ . As in the proof of Lemma 1.24, let us assume that the constants C, c appearing around  $\alpha$  in the expression of the concentration around a median of Z and around  $\beta_k, k \in [n]$  in the concentration around independent copy of  $\Lambda_k$  are all equal to 1. As in the proof of Proposition 1.9, we assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$  are closed. Then, introducing the notation  $\gamma = \alpha \boxtimes \beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n$  we know from Lemma 1.3 that one can bound for any t > 0:

$$\alpha^{-\underline{1}} \circ \gamma(t) \cdot (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-\underline{1}} \circ \gamma(t) \le t$$
(1.8)

Distinguishing the events " $\Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n \leq (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1} (\gamma(t))$ " and " $\Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n > (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1} (\gamma(t))$ ", we will then employ Lemma 1.24 to bound (where C, c > 0 are the constant appearing in the application of Lemma 1.24 – C = 4 and  $c = \frac{1}{2}$ )

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(\Phi(Z)) - f(\Phi(Z'))\right| > t\right) \\
\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(\Phi(Z)) - f(\Phi(Z'))\right| > t, \ \Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n \le (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1}(\gamma(ct))\right) \\
+ \mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(\Phi(Z)) - f(\Phi(Z'))\right| \ge t, \ \Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n > (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1}(\gamma(ct))\right) \\
\leq \frac{C\alpha\left(\frac{ct}{(\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1}(\gamma(ct))}\right)}{1 - \pi} + \pi \le \frac{C\alpha\left(\alpha^{-1}(\gamma(ct))\right)}{1 - \pi} + \pi \le \frac{C\gamma(ct)}{1 - \pi} + \pi, \quad (1.9)$$

thanks to (1.8), Lemma 1.3 ( $\alpha$  is assumed to be closed) and where we introduced the notation:

$$\pi \equiv \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_n > (\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n)^{-1}(\gamma(ct))\right) \in (0,1).$$

If  $\pi \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then (1.9) implies:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(\Phi(Z)) - f(\Phi(Z'))\right| > t\right) \le 2C\gamma(ct) + \pi$$

If  $\pi > \frac{1}{2}$ , one still has:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(\Phi(Z)) - f(\Phi(Z'))\right| > t\right) \le 1 \le 2\pi$$

Note finally thanks to Proposition 1.9 and Lemma 1.3 that:

$$\pi \leq n\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n \left(\beta_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \beta_n\right)^{-1} \left(\gamma(ct)\right) \leq n\gamma(ct),$$

which finally provides our result.

In the case of a convex concentration, we just provide the concentration for observations  $\Phi(X) \in \mathbb{R}$  for the reasons evoked in Remark 1.22.

**Theorem 1.27.** Let us consider a family of euclidean vector spaces  $(E_i, \|\cdot\|)_{i \in I}$ , a family of random vectors  $Z \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ , a family of convex mappings  $\Lambda_i : E_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in I$  such that there exist two families of decreasing mappings  $\alpha_i, \beta_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+, i \in I$  such that:

$$f(Z) \propto \alpha$$
,  $f$  1-Lipschitz convex and  $\Lambda(Z) \in 0 \pm \beta$ ,

Given a family of convex mappings  $\Phi_i : E_i \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i \in I$ , if we assume that for any independent copy Z' of Z:

$$|\Phi(Z) - \Phi(Z')| \le \Lambda(Z) ||Z - Z'||, \quad a.s$$

then:

$$\Phi(Z) \propto \alpha \boxtimes \beta.$$

*Proof.* One can follow the steps of the proof of Theorem 1.26 with n = 1 and  $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda(Z)$  and just needs to be careful that  $\forall i \in I, \forall t > 0$  the sets

$$A_i \equiv \left\{ z \in E_i \mid \Lambda_i(z) \le \beta_i^{-1}(\tilde{\gamma}_i(t)) \right\}$$

are convex in order to employ the second result of Lemma 1.24.

# 

#### **1.4 Large tailed random vector concentration**

One can employ the Gaussian concentration given in Theorem 1.20 as a pivot to construct vectors having more general concentration decay. The concentration inequalities of Proposition 1.28 and Corollary 1.31 provided below are both clearly sub-optimal but they allow to quickly obtain useful practical results with elementary inferences.

**Proposition 1.28.** Given a sequence of random variables  $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that there exists a sequence of independent Gaussian random variables  $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and an even convex mapping  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ , increasing on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  satisfying  $\phi(0) = 0$  and such that:

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \quad X_i = \phi(Z_i) \quad a.s.$$

Then, noting  $X^{(n)} \equiv (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ , we have the concentration:

$$f(X^{(n)}) \propto \exp\left(-\min\left(\frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}, \frac{(\mathrm{Id}\cdot\phi')^{-1}}{2}\right)^2\right)$$

Let us introduce two elementary preliminary lemmas before the proof of the proposition. They are also valid with the parallel sum replacing the parallel product. The first one is simply a consequence of the fact that:

$$\mathrm{Id}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{inc}(\delta)^{-1} = \delta \, \mathrm{Id}$$

**Lemma 1.29.** Given  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$  and an increasing mapping  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$ :

$$\mathrm{Id}\ \underline{\boxtimes} \operatorname{inc}(\delta) = \mathrm{Id}\ \overline{\boxtimes}\ \operatorname{inc}(\delta) = \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\delta}$$

The second one is a simple consequence of Lemma A.14 that explains how to compute the inverse of a minimum or a maximum of two functions.

**Lemma 1.30.** Given three mappings  $f, g, h \in \mathcal{M}$  of the same monotonicity:

$$f \boxtimes \min(g, h) = \min(f \boxtimes g, f \boxtimes h),$$

and the same holds for the maximum and the opened parallel product.

*Proof.* Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we extend  $\phi$  to a transformation of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  through the entry-wise application (given  $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\phi(z) \equiv (\phi(z_1), \ldots, \phi(z_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ) to obtain the identity  $X^{(n)} = \phi(Z^{(n)})$  (where we naturally defined  $Z^{(n)} \equiv (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ ). We want to apply Theorem 1.26 to the family of random vectors  $(Z^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the mapping  $\Phi \equiv \phi$ . Given an independent copy  $Z'^{(n)}$  of  $Z^{(n)}$ , let us bound:

$$\|\phi(Z^{(n)}) - \phi(Z'^{(n)})\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\phi(Z_i) - \phi(Z'_i))^2}$$
  
$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \max(|\phi'(Z_i)|, |\phi'(Z'_i)|)^2 (Z_i - Z'_i)^2}$$
  
$$\leq \sup_{i \in [n]} (|\phi'(Z_i)|, |\phi'(Z'_i)|) \|Z^{(n)} - Z'^{(n)}\|.$$

One is then left to express the concentration of  $\sup_{i \in [n]} (|\phi'(Z_i)|, |\phi'(Z'_i)|)$ . Let us denote  $\psi \equiv (\phi')|_{\mathbb{R}_+}^{-1}$ : and bound for any  $t \ge 0$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{i\in[n]} (|\phi'(Z_i)|, |\phi'(Z'_i)|) > t\right) \le 2n\mathbb{P}\left(|\phi'(Z_i)| > t\right) \le 2n\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i > \psi(t)\right)$$
$$\le 4ne^{-\frac{\psi(t)^2}{2}} = 2e^{\log(2n) - \frac{\psi(t)^2}{2}}.$$

Now note that if  $t \geq \psi^{-1}(2\sqrt{\log(2n)}),$  then  $\psi(t)^2 \geq 4\log(2n)$  and:

$$\psi(t)^2 - 2\log(2n) \ge \frac{\psi(t)^2}{2},$$

that implies:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{i\in[n]}(|\phi'(Z_i)|,|\phi'(Z'_i)|)>t\right)\leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\min\left(\operatorname{inc}_{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}(t),\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi(t)\right)^2\right).$$

Employing Theorem 1.26, one gets:

$$f(X) \propto \mathcal{E}_2 \boxtimes \mathcal{E}_2 \circ \min\left(\operatorname{inc}_{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi\right), \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz.}$$

where we denoted:

$$\mathcal{E}_2: t \mapsto 2e^{-t^2/2}$$

One can deduce from Lemmas 1.30 and 1.29:

$$\mathcal{E}_{2} \boxtimes \mathcal{E}_{2} \circ \min\left(\operatorname{inc}_{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi\right) = \mathcal{E}_{2} \circ \min\left(\operatorname{Id} \boxtimes \operatorname{inc}_{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}, \operatorname{Id} \boxtimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi\right)$$
$$= \mathcal{E}_{2} \circ \min\left(\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\phi'(2\sqrt{\log(2n)})}, \operatorname{Id} \boxtimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\psi\right)$$

Finally note that:

$$\operatorname{Id} \underline{\boxtimes} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \psi = \left( \operatorname{Id} \cdot \psi^{-1}(\sqrt{2} \operatorname{Id}) \right)^{-1} \\ = \left( (\sqrt{2} \operatorname{Id}) \cdot \phi'(\sqrt{2} \operatorname{Id}) \right)^{-1} \circ \left( \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \operatorname{Id} \cdot \phi' \right)^{-1} \circ \left( \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\sqrt{2}} \right).$$

Let us apply this proposition to the case of random variables with tail  $\frac{1}{(1+t)^q}$ , q > 0. The next corollary is completely artificial but gives a simple illustration of Proposition 1.28. **Corollary 1.31.** Consider the setting of Proposition 1.28 in the case where  $\phi|_{\mathbb{R}_+} : t \mapsto e^{t^2/2q} - 1$ , one has:

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \ge 0: \quad \mathbb{P}(|Z_i| \ge t) \le \frac{2}{(1+t)^q}$$

one besides has the concentration:

$$f(Z) \propto e^{-(\frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\eta})^2} + \frac{1}{(1+t)^{\frac{q}{2}}}, \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz},$$

with  $\eta = (n^{\frac{2}{q}}\sqrt{\log n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . In particular, for any  $r \in (0, \frac{q}{2})$ :

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|f(Z^{(n)}) - f(Z'^{(n)})\right|^r\right] \le O\left(\left(n^{\frac{2}{q}}\sqrt{\log n}\right)^r\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, \ 1\text{-Lipschitz}\right)$$

In previous inequality, the random variable  $f(Z'^{(n)})$  could be replaced with any median of  $f(Z^{(n)})$  and also by  $\mathbb{E}[f(Z^{(n)})]$  under the conditions described in Lemma 1.16.

Proof. In order to employ Proposition 1.28, first note that:

$$\phi'\left(2\sqrt{\log(2n)}\right) = \frac{2}{q}\sqrt{\log(2n)}e^{\frac{2\log(2n)}{q}} = \frac{2}{q}\sqrt{\log(2n)}(2n)^{\frac{2}{q}}.$$

Second, let us bound for u bigger than a constant:

$$u\phi'(u) = \frac{u^2}{a}e^{-\frac{u^2}{2q}} \le \phi(\sqrt{2}u),$$

Note that one could replace here  $\sqrt{2}$  with a smaller variable strictly if one needs to sharpen the inequality). Therefore, for t bigger than a constant (in particular for  $t \ge \eta$ )  $(\operatorname{Id} \cdot \phi')^{-1}(t) \ge \phi^{-1}(t)/\sqrt{2}$  and:

$$2\exp\left(-\left(\frac{(\mathrm{Id}\cdot\phi')^{-1}(t)}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\right) \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{(\phi^{-1}(t))^2}{8}\right) = \frac{2}{(1+t)^{\frac{q}{4}}}$$

Proposition 1.28 then gives us the concentration of f(Z), f 1-Lipschitz.

Following this result we know that there exists some constant C > 0 such that for any family of 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  in the *n* asymptotic (*r* and *q* are constants –  $\eta$  depends on *n*):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|f(Z) - f(Z')\right|^{r}\right] \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(Z) - f(Z')\right|^{r} \geq t\right) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|f(Z) - f(Z')\right| \geq t^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)$$
$$\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} e^{-\frac{t^{1/r}}{\eta}} dt + C \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} \frac{1}{(1 + t^{1/r})^{\frac{q}{4}}} dt$$
$$\leq C \eta^{r} \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} rt^{r-1} e^{-t} dt + O(\eta^{r}) \leq O(\eta^{r})$$

#### 1.5 Consequences for Hanson-Wright concentration inequality

We formulate below the Hanson-Wright inequality as a linear concentration result on random matrices  $X^T A X$  with the widest hypotheses possible on  $\alpha$  (a result with the expectation is provided in Theorem 1.38).

**Theorem 1.32.** Given a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha = (\alpha_{p,n})_{p,n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\mathbb{N}^2}$  and a family of random matrices  $X_{p,n} \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ ,  $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , if one assumes that  $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz convex then one has the concentration:

$$\operatorname{Tr}(BX_{p,n}^T A X_{p,n}) \propto \alpha_{p,n} \circ \max\left(\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{m_{p,n}}, \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}}\right), \quad p, n \in \mathbb{N}, A \in \mathcal{M}_p, B \in \mathcal{M}_n$$

where  $\forall p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we introduced  $m_{p,n}$ , a median of  $||AX_{p,n}B||_F$ 

**Remark 1.33** (Vectorization of a matricial identity). Given  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ , let us introduce the notation  $\check{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{pn}$  satisfying  $\check{M}_{i(j-1)+j} = M_{i,j}$  and an operation having value in  $\mathcal{M}_{pn,pn}$  defined for any  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$  and  $B \in \mathcal{M}_n$  as:

$$(A \otimes B)_{i(j-1)+j,k(l-1)+l} = A_{i,k}B_{l,j}.$$

Through a mere regrouping of indexes in sums, one obtains:

$$\operatorname{Tr}(BMAM^T) = \check{M}^T (A \otimes B) \check{M}$$
(1.10)

One sees with this "vectorization identity" that the study of  $\text{Tr}(BX^TAX)$  boils down to a mere study of  $Z^TCZ$  where  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{pn}$  is a random vector and  $C \in \mathcal{M}_{pn,pn}$  a deterministic matrix.

This Theorem is proven through the application of several small lemmas relying on the mapping inc defined in (0.1). Note that  $inc(u)^{-1} = u$  (the function constant equal to u). One needs first to decide weather the constant function is considered to be in  $\mathcal{M}_{-}$  or in  $\mathcal{M}_{+}$  to be able to compute its inverse (in  $\mathcal{M}_{-}$  or  $\mathcal{M}_{+}$ ).

**Lemma 1.34.** Given a family of random variables  $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{I}$  a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{I}$ , and a family of parameters  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{I}$ :

$$\Lambda \in \delta \pm \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\eta} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \Lambda \in 0 \pm \alpha \circ \min\left(\mathrm{inc}_{2|\delta|}, \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{2\eta}\right).$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\Lambda \leq |\Lambda - \delta| + |\delta|$  thus:

 $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda > t) \le \mathbb{P}(|\Lambda - \delta| \ge t - |\delta|) \le \alpha(t - |\delta|).$ 

Now, if  $t \leq 2|\delta|$ ,  $\min(\operatorname{inc}_{2|\delta|}(t), \frac{t}{2\eta}) = -\infty$  and of course,  $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda > t) \leq \alpha(-\infty) = +\infty$  by definition of  $\mathcal{M}_-$ . When  $t > 2|\delta|$ ,  $t - |\delta| > \frac{t}{2}$  and therefore  $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda > t) \leq \alpha(\frac{t}{2\eta})$  since  $\alpha$  is decreasing.

Proof of Theorem 1.32. Let us assume, without loss of generality that  $A \otimes B$  in (1.10) is a symmetric matrix (the anti-symmetric contribution cancels since  $\check{X}^T(A \otimes B)\check{X} = \check{X}^T(A \otimes B)^T\check{X}$ ). Under this condition,  $X \mapsto \check{X}^T(A \otimes B)\check{X}$  is the sum of a convex and a concave mapping, we are then left to bound its variations.

Given an independent copy of X, X', one can bound:

$$\left| \operatorname{Tr} (BX^T A X) - \operatorname{Tr} (BX'^T A X') \right| \le (\|AXB\|_F + \|BX'^T A\|_F) \|X - X'\|_F.$$

Looking forward to employ Theorem 1.26, let us denote  $\Lambda \equiv ||AXB||_F + ||BX'^TA||_F$ . As a ||A|| ||B||-Lipschitz convex observations of X, one knows that:

$$\|AXB\|_F, \|BX'^TA\|_F \in m \pm \alpha \circ \left(\frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}\right)$$

Therefore, one can deduce thanks to Lemma 1.34 that:

$$\Lambda \propto \alpha \circ \min\left(\operatorname{inc}(m), \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}\right) \leq \bar{\alpha} \circ \min\left(\operatorname{inc}(m), \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}\right),$$

Theorem 1.27 then provides our result<sup>14</sup> since we know from Proposition A.16 (generalization of Proposition 1.7) and Lemmas 1.29 and 1.30 that:

$$\bar{\alpha} \boxtimes \bar{\alpha} \circ \min\left(\operatorname{inc}(m), \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}\right) = \underline{\alpha} \circ \left(\operatorname{Id} \boxtimes \min\left(\operatorname{inc}(m), \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}\right)\right)$$
$$= \underline{\alpha} \circ \min\left(\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{m}, \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}}\right)$$

The rest of the subsection aims at rewriting Theorem 1.32 in the cases where  $X^T A X$  admits an expectation which is linked to some integrability properties of  $\alpha$  (see Lemma 1.16). The first lemma helps us bounding  $\mathbb{E}[||AXB||_F]$  that will be close to the median "m" in Theorem 1.32.

**Lemma 1.35.** Given a random matrix  $X \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  and two deterministic matrices  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$ and  $B \in \mathcal{M}_n$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AXB\|_F] \le O\left(\|A\|_F \|B\|_F \sqrt{\|\mathbb{E}[\check{X}\check{X}^T]}\|\right),$$

where  $\check{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{pn}$  and satisfies  $\forall (i, j) \in [p] \times [n]$ :  $\check{X}_{i(j-1)+j} = X_{i,j}$  as defined in Remark 1.33.

Note that if n = 1,  $\check{X} = X$  and Lemma 1.35 basically sets that :

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AX\|] \le O\left(\|A\|_F \sqrt{\|\mathbb{E}[XX^T]\|}\right).$$

*Proof.* Similarly as (1.10), one has the identity:

$$\operatorname{Tr}(AMBAM^TB) = \operatorname{Tr}\left((A \otimes B)\check{M}\check{M}^T(A \otimes B)\right).$$

Then one can bound thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Jensen inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|AXB\|_{F}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr}(AXBAX^{T}B)}\right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Tr}(AXBAX^{T}B)\right]}$$
$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Tr}((A \otimes B)\check{X}\check{X}^{T}(A \otimes B))\right]} \leq \|A\|_{F}\|B\|_{F}\sqrt{\|\mathbb{E}[\check{X}\check{X}^{T}]\|},$$

since  $||A \otimes B||_F = ||A||_F ||B||_F$ .

Let us now express the conditions for which  $\|\mathbb{E}[\check{X}\check{X}^T]\|$  can be bounded.

**Lemma 1.36.** Given a family of random vectors  $X = (X_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^p$  and a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^I$ , let us denote:

$$\sigma_{\alpha} \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}_{+}} t\alpha(t) dt}.$$

If we assume that  $\|\mathbb{E}[X]\| \leq \sigma_{\alpha}$  and that:

$$u^T X \in u^T \mathbb{E}[X] \pm \alpha, \|u\| = 1$$

then one can bound:

$$\|\mathbb{E}[XX^T]\| \le \sigma_{\alpha}^2,$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>If one had assumed  $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz, then here one would obtain  $f(BX^TAX) \propto \alpha \boxtimes \alpha \circ \min(\operatorname{inc}(m), \operatorname{Id}), f$  1-Lipschitz thanks to Theorem 1.26.

This lemma partly relies on a trivial result which is a direct consequence of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (it is quite similar to  $\mathbb{E}[|Z|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}$ , for a random variable  $Z \in \mathbb{R}$ ). Lemma 1.37. Given a decreasing mapping  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_-$  having value in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha \le \sqrt{\alpha(0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} 2t\alpha(t) dt$$

Proof of Lemma 1.36. When employing Lemma 1.37, one can assume, without loss of generality that  $\alpha = \min(1, \alpha)$  which provides  $\alpha(0) = 1$ . One can then merely bound thanks to Fubini Theorem:

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}[u^T X X^T u] &= \mathbb{E}[(u^T X)^2] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}((u^T X)^2 > t) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(|u^T X| > \sqrt{t}) dt = \int_0^\infty 2t \mathbb{P}(|u^T X| > t) dt \\ &\leq (u^T \mathbb{E}[X])^2 + 2 \int_{u^T \mathbb{E}[X]}^\infty t \mathbb{P}(|u^T X - u^T \mathbb{E}[X]| > t - u^T \mathbb{E}[X]) dt \\ &\leq (u^T \mathbb{E}[X])^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty (t + |u^T \mathbb{E}[X]|) \mathbb{P}(|u^T X - u^T \mathbb{E}[X]| > t) dt \\ &\leq \sigma_\alpha^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty t \alpha dt + \sigma_\alpha \int_0^\infty \alpha dt \leq 5\sigma_\alpha^2, \end{split}$$

and this inequality being true for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $||u|| \leq 1$ , one can conclude that  $||\mathbb{E}[XX^T]|| \leq O(\sigma_{\alpha}^2)$ .

We have now all the elements to prove:

**Theorem 1.38.** Given two families of deterministic matrices  $A \in \prod_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_p$ ,  $B \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_n$ , a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha = (\alpha_{p,n})_{p,n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\mathbb{N}^2}$  and a family of random matrices  $X_{p,n} \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ ,  $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , noting again  $\sigma_{\alpha} \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t\alpha(t)dt}$ , if one assumes that:

- $f(X) \propto \alpha$ , f 1-Lipschitz convex,
- $\alpha \left( O\left( \int \alpha \right) \right) \geq O(1),$
- $\|\mathbb{E}[X]\|_{F} \leq O(\sigma_{\alpha})$

then one has the concentration:

$$\operatorname{Tr}(BX^{T}AX) \in \operatorname{Tr}\left(B\mathbb{E}[X^{T}AX]\right) \pm \max\left(\alpha \circ \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\|_{F} \|B\|_{F} \sigma_{\alpha}}, \alpha \circ \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}}\right)$$

In the case where  $\alpha : t \mapsto Ce^{-(t/\sigma)^2}$ , for a given constant C > 0 and a given family of parameters  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^2}_+$ ,  $\sigma_{\alpha} \leq O(\sigma)$ ,  $\alpha(O(\sigma_{\alpha})) = Ce^{-O(1)} \geq O(1)$ , and one obtains the classical Hanson-Wright inequality ([1]):

$$X^T A X \in \mathbb{E}[X^T A X] \pm \exp\left(-\min\left(\frac{\mathrm{Id}^2}{\|A\|_F^2 \sigma^4}, \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{\|A\|\sigma^2}\right)\right).$$

*Proof.* We already know from Theorem 1.32 and Lemma 1.23<sup>15</sup> that:

$$\operatorname{Tr}(BX^{T}AX) \in \operatorname{Tr}\left(B\mathbb{E}[X^{T}AX]\right) \pm \max\left(\alpha \circ \frac{\operatorname{Id}}{m}, \alpha \circ \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Id}}{\|A\| \|B\|}}\right), \quad (1.11)$$
$$n, p \in \mathbb{N}^{2}, A \in \mathcal{M}_{p}, B \in \mathcal{M}_{n}.$$

where, for every n, p, A, B, m is a median of  $||AXB||_F$ . Now, the concentration of X directly gives:

$$||AXB||_F \in m \pm \alpha \circ \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{||A|| ||B||}, \quad n, p \in \mathbb{N}^2, A \in \mathcal{M}_p, B \in \mathcal{M}_n.$$

Then Lemmas 1.17, 1.19 imply:

$$|\mathbb{E}[\|AXB\|_F] - m| \le O\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha\right) \le O(\|A\|\|B\|\sigma_\alpha).$$
(1.12)

Now, starting from the linear concentration inequality (consequence to Lemma 1.23):

$$u^T X \in u^T \mathbb{E}[X] \pm \alpha, \quad ||u|| = 1,$$

a combination of Lemmas 1.35, 1.36 provides the bound  $\mathbb{E}[\|AXB\|_F] \leq O(\|A\|_F \|B\|_F \sigma_\alpha)$ , one can then conclude from (1.12) that  $m \leq O(\|A\|_F \|B\|_F \sigma_\alpha)$  and inject this bound in (1.11) to obtain the result of the theorem.

#### 2 Interpretation with conjugate functions

Theorems 1.27, 1.26 at the basis of Theorems 1.32 and 1.38 basically rely on the computation of the  $\boxtimes$  products of mappings:

$$\alpha \circ \exp \circ \log$$
 and  $\alpha \circ \exp \circ \min(\operatorname{inc}, \operatorname{Id} - \lambda_1) \circ \log$ ,

for some value of  $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . It boils down to the computation of the parallel sum between Id and  $\min(\operatorname{inc}, \operatorname{Id} - \lambda_1)$  which is easily computed thanks to Lemma A.14. One naturally wonder what would happen in more complex settings, for instance with the concentration function obtained in Theorems 1.32, 1.38 or, to take a general case, with the mappings:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha' = \phi \circ \exp \circ \alpha \circ \log \\ \beta' = \phi \circ \exp \circ \beta \circ \log \end{cases} \quad \text{with:} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} : \quad \begin{cases} \alpha(t) = \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t - \alpha_a}{a} \\ \beta(t) = \inf_{b \in B} \frac{t - \check{\beta}_b}{b}, \end{cases}$$
(2.1)

 $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $(\check{\alpha}_a)_{a \in A} \in \mathbb{R}^A$  and  $(\check{\beta}_b)_{b \in B} \in \mathbb{R}^B$ , for  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_*$ , two discrete sets<sup>16</sup>.

Once again, Proposition 1.7 and Proposition A.17 can lead us to compute  $\alpha \boxplus \beta$  for instance in:

$$\alpha' \boxtimes \beta' = \phi \circ \exp \circ (\alpha \boxplus \beta) \circ \log$$

Lemma A.14 does not seem adapted in this example where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are both defined with more than 2 parameters  $(\check{\alpha}_a, \check{\beta}_b)_{a \in A, b \in B}$ . This section explains how the discrete

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>To be a direct application of Lemma 1.23, one should actually start with the Lipschitz concentration of  $X^TAX$ , but Theorem 1.32 just provides the concentration of  $\text{Tr}(BX^TAX)$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{M}_n$ ; that is however not an issue since in Lemma 1.23, the only relevant assumption is the concentrations of the observations  $u(X^TAX)$ ,  $u \in E'$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> if one define correctly the value of  $\frac{t-\check{\alpha}_a}{a}$  or  $\frac{t-\check{\beta}_b}{b}$  when a = 0 or b = 0, it is possible to include  $inc(\check{\alpha}_0)$  or  $inc(\check{\beta}_0)$  in these expressions – that will be done in (2.5).

mappings  $a \mapsto \check{\alpha}_a$  and  $b \mapsto \check{\beta}_b$  defined on the discrete sets A and B can be extended to form a concave mappings on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  that happen to be the concave conjugate<sup>17</sup> of  $\alpha^{-1}$  and  $\beta^{-1}$ . A formula then allows to express  $\alpha \boxplus \beta$  as a function of these conjugate mappings (therefore as a function of  $(\check{\alpha}_a, \check{\beta}_b)_{a \in A, b \in B}$ , see Corollaries 2.20 and 2.22).

#### 2.1 Pseudo inverse of closed convex and opened concave mappings

Some result of convex analysis, like Proposition 2.7 or Lemma 2.12 provided below, require a mapping f to be closed convex proper. Symmetric properties are required for concave mappings and therefore, to simplify the picture, we introduce new intuitive notations:

- $\mathcal{M}_{\cup}$ : set of monotonous closed convex proper functions;  $\mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cup} = \mathcal{M}_{\cup} \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup} = \mathcal{M}_{\cup} \cap \mathcal{M}_{-}$ ;
- $\mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ : set of monotonous functions f such that -f is closed convex proper;  $\mathcal{M}^{\cap}_{+} = \mathcal{M}_{\cap} \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^{\cap}_{-} = \mathcal{M}_{\cap} \cap \mathcal{M}_{-}$

The following Lemma connects those sets through the closed or opened pseudoinverse – it is elementary and therefore provided without proof.

**Lemma 2.1.** Given a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ :

- $f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup} \Longrightarrow f^{-\overline{1}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cap};$
- $f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup} \Longrightarrow f^{-\underline{1}} \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup};$
- $f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cap} \Longrightarrow f^{-\underline{1}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup}.$
- $f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cap} \Longrightarrow f^{-\overline{1}} \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cap};$

To simplify the notation, given  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ , one will uniformly write " $f^{-1}$ " the mapping closed or opened defined followingly:

$$f^{-1} = \begin{cases} f^{-\underline{1}} & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cap} \\ f^{-\overline{1}} & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cap}. \end{cases}$$
(2.2)

once again, in the case of constant mappings that belong to all those sets or in the case of increment mappings that either belong to  $\mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cap}$  or  $\mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cap}$ , we need to specify which inverse we are considering.

With this new notation, Lemma 1.2 rewrites  $\forall f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ ,  $(f^{-1})^{-1} = f$  and Lemma 2.1 rewrites:

**Lemma 2.2.** Given  $f \in M$ , one has the equivalence:

$$f \in \mathcal{M}_+^\cup \cup \mathcal{M}_+^\cap \ \Leftrightarrow \ f^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_+^\cup \cup \mathcal{M}_+^\cap \ \text{ and } \ f \in \mathcal{M}_-^\cup \cup \mathcal{M}_-^\cap \ \Leftrightarrow \ f^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_-^\cup \cup \mathcal{M}_-^\cap$$

Let us also mention a simple result to circumcise the epigraph of  $f^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** Given  $f \in M$ :

 $\sup f^{-1} = \sup f_{-1} = \sup \operatorname{Dom}(f) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \inf f^{-1} = \inf f_{-1} = \inf \operatorname{Dom}(f).$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>After removing some useless points if needed.

**Proposition 2.4.** Given a subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ , a family of parameters  $(\sigma_a)_{a \in A}$ , and a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , one has the equivalence:

$$\begin{split} & \text{If } A \subset \mathbb{R}^*_+: \quad \begin{cases} \forall t \in \mathbb{R} : f(t) = \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} & \Longleftrightarrow & \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : f^{-1}(x) = \inf_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a \\ & \forall t \in \mathbb{R} : f(t) = \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} & \Longleftrightarrow & \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : f^{-1}(x) = \sup_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a \end{cases} \\ & \text{If } A \subset \mathbb{R}^*_-: \quad \begin{cases} \forall t \in \mathbb{R} : f(t) = \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} & \Longleftrightarrow & \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : f^{-1}(x) = \sup_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a \\ & \forall t \in \mathbb{R} : f(t) = \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} & \Longleftrightarrow & \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : f^{-1}(x) = \inf_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a \end{cases} \end{split}$$

*Proof.* Considering  $x, t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and assuming  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^*_+$ , let us simply assert the set identity:

$$\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}, \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x\right\} = \left\{t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall a \in A : \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x\right\}$$

$$= \left\{t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall a \in A : t \le xa - \sigma_a\right\} = \left\{t \in \mathbb{R}, t \le \inf_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a\right\}.$$
(2.3)

Therefore, if, say,  $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f(t) = \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a}$ ,  $(A \subset \mathbb{R}^*_+, f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup}_+ \text{ and } f^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}^{\cap}_+)$ , one directly has:

$$f^{-1}(x) = f^{-\overline{1}}(x) = \sup\{t, f(t) \le x\} = \sup\left\{t, \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x\right\}$$
$$= \sup\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}, t \le \inf_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a\right\} = \inf_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a.$$

For the other cases  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cap}$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cup}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cap}$  one can respectively exploit the set identities analogous to (2.3):

$$\begin{cases} \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x \right\} = \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, t \le \sup_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a \right\} & \text{when } A \subset \mathbb{R}_+^* \\ \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x \right\} = \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, t \le \sup_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a \right\} & \text{when } A \subset \mathbb{R}_-^* \\ \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \le x \right\} = \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R}, t \le \inf_{a \in A} xa - \sigma_a \right\} & \text{when } A \subset \mathbb{R}_-^* \end{cases}$$

(note that the two last equalities are justified because the negativity of the elements of A led to the inversion of an inequality in (2.3)).

The converse is just proven from the fact that  $(f^{-1})^{-1} = f$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ .  $\Box$ 

Proposition 2.4 naturally asks the question if it is possible, given a mapping, say,  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cap}_+$ , to find a subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^*_+$  and a family  $(\sigma_a)_{a \in A}$  such that:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}: \quad f(t) = \inf_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a},$$

This is answered by a well known result of convex analysis (Proposition 2.7 below) that sets that mappings in  $\mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$  (like  $f^{-1}$ ) can be expressed from their conjugate, in a form that would write for  $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_{+}^{\cup}$ :

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}: \quad f^{-1}(t) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} ta - (f^{-1})^*(a).$$
 (2.4)

Actually, the supremum can be only taken on  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  since  $f^{-1}$  is increasing. That brings us very close to the sufficient condition in Proposition 2.4, but one still needs to deal with the case a = 0.

To allow ourselves to express Proposition 2.4 in cases where the index set A contains 0 (i.e. somehow allow the division by 0 that appears in the expression of f), let us introduce for any  $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, a \in \mathbb{R}$  the notations:

$$\frac{u}{a}\Big|_{\stackrel{\scriptstyle \cup}{_{+}}} = \begin{cases} \frac{u}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u > 0 \\ -\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u \le 0. \end{cases} \qquad \frac{u}{a}\Big|_{\stackrel{\scriptstyle \cap}{_{+}}} = \begin{cases} \frac{u}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u \ge 0 \\ -\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u \le 0. \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{u}{a}\Big|_{\stackrel{\scriptstyle \cup}{_{-}}} = \begin{cases} \frac{u}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ -\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u \ge 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x = 0, u < 0. \end{cases} \qquad (2.5)$$

Note that the notation  $\|_{l_+^{-n}}$  ensures that  $t \mapsto \frac{x+\check{f}(t)}{t}|_{l_+^{-n}}$  is a closed convex mapping, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . We then rewrite Proposition 2.4 with this new notation and just for the first setting since the equivalence for the other settings can be naturally inferred.

**Proposition 2.5.** Given a subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ , a family of parameters  $(\sigma_a)_{a \in A}$ , and a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , one has the equivalence:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R} : f(t) = \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \Big|_{\stackrel{\frown}{+}} \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : f^{-1}(x) = \inf_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a.$$

*Proof.* Simply note that (we noted  $A^* \equiv A \setminus \{0\}$ ):

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{a \in A} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a} \Big|_{\stackrel{\frown}{+}} = \max\left(\frac{t + \sigma_0}{0} \Big|_{\stackrel{\frown}{+}}, \sup_{a \in A^*} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a}\right) = \max\left(\operatorname{inc}(\sigma_0), \sup_{a \in A^*} \frac{t + \sigma_a}{a}\right) \\ \inf_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a = \min\left(\sigma_0, \inf_{a \in A^*} ax - \sigma_a\right) \end{cases}$$

Where the increment function has been defined in (0.1) (it satisfies  $inc(\sigma_0)^{-1} = \sigma_0$ ). Lemma A.14 giving the pseudo inverse of the maximum then allows us to conclude that the second mapping is the inverse of the first one.

#### 2.2 Characterization as a two dimensional extremum

Traditionally, the conjugate of  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is denoted as  $f^* : u \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} xu - f(x)$ . In the following, this conjugate is only considered for mappings  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  that are closed convex proper (but possibly not monotonous), mainly to be able to use the involution given in Proposition 2.7. Since a symmetric involution also holds for mappings  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that -f is closed convex proper, we will follow the formalism of the previous section where the same notation was used for the open and closed pseudo-inverse. Since not all mappings under consideration will be monotone, two new sets have to be introduced:

$$\mathcal{C}^{\cup} = \left\{ f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}} \text{ closed convex proper} 
ight\}$$
  
 $\mathcal{C}^{\cap} = \left\{ f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}} \mid -f \text{ is closed convex proper} 
ight\}$ 

And we note  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\cap}$ . Let us then define:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R} : \quad f^*(t) = \begin{cases} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} xt - f(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{C}^{\cup} \\ \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} xt - f(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{C}^{\cap}. \end{cases}$$

Be careful that  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap} \subset \mathcal{C}$ , does not imply that  $f^* \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ . Lemma 2.6. Given a mapping  $f \in \mathcal{C}$ :

$$(f \circ - \mathrm{Id})^* = f^*(-\mathrm{Id})$$
 and  $(-f)^* = -f_*(-\mathrm{Id}),$ 

This lemma allows to extend immediately properties valid on  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup}$  to properties valid on  $\mathcal{M}_+^{\cap}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_-^{\cap}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_-^{\cup}$  since:

$$f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup} \implies -f(-\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cap}, \quad f(-\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cup} \quad \text{and} \quad -f \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cap}.$$

As it is defined, the convolution is actually an involution of  $\in \mathcal{C}.$ 

Proposition 2.7 (Fenchel-Moreau: [5], Theorem 13.32, [6], Proposition 1.6.1).

$$f \in \mathcal{C} \implies f^* \in \mathcal{C}$$
 and  $f^{**} = f$ .

**Lemma 2.8.** Any mapping  $f \in C$  is continuous on its domain Dom(f).

*Proof.* Assuming that  $f \in C^{\cup}$ , we know that its domain is an interval of  $\mathbb{R}$ , f is left and right differentiable on the interior of the domain, thus it is continuous, and let us consider, say, the lower bound  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  of the domain (if it exists). The convexity of fimposes  $f(a) \geq \lim_{x \downarrow a} f(x)$  and the lower continuity then imposes  $f(a) = \lim_{x \downarrow a} f(x)$ . The same arguments work for the upper bound and for any mapping in  $C^{\cap}$ .  $\Box$ 

Together with Proposition 2.7, this lemma allows us to set that the conjugates of elements of C are also continuous, in particular for monotonous mappings for which the domain of the conjugate is either in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  or in  $\mathbb{R}_-$ , that gives us the following corollary (with strict inequalities !)

**Corollary 2.9.** Given a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ :

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} \sup_{x>0} xt - f^*(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup} \\ \sup_{x<0} xt - f^*(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cup} \\ \inf_{x>0} xt - f_*(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cap} \\ \inf_{x<0} xt - f_*(x) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_-^{\cap} \end{cases}$$

Given a mapping  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ , let us note  $\check{f} : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  such that<sup>18</sup>:

$$\begin{cases} \forall x \in \left\{\frac{1}{x}, x \in \text{Dom}(f^*)\right\} \setminus \{0\} : \quad \check{f}(x) = -xf\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)\\ \check{f}(0) = \lim_{\substack{x \to 0\\ 1 \in \text{Dom}(f^*)}} \check{f}(x). \end{cases}$$

and the value on  $\{\frac{1}{x}, x \notin \text{Dom}(f^*)\}$  is equal to  $+\infty$  (resp.  $-\infty$ ) if  $f^{-1}$  is convex, (resp. concave). Note that we then know from Lemma 2.8 that  $\check{f}$  is the only mapping of  $\mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$  that is equal to  $t \mapsto -tf(1/t)$  on  $\{\frac{1}{x}, x \in \text{Dom}(f^*)\}$ .

**Proposition 2.10** (Conjugate of Inverse). For all  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ :  $\check{f} = (f^{-1})^*$ .

*Proof.* Let us prove the result in the case where, say,  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup}_+$  (the three other cases are treated thanks to identities presented in Lemma 2.6). We know from Proposition 2.7 that:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}: \quad f(t) = \sup_{u>0} \frac{t - \frac{1}{u} f^*(u)}{1/u} = \sup_{x>0} \frac{t - x f^*\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)}{x}.$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>To be clearer about the values of  $\check{f}$  depending on x and the class of f, we filled the following table (the value on 0 is justified with Lemma 2.3):

	$f\in \mathcal{M}_+^\cup$	$f\in \mathcal{M}_+^\cap$	$f\in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cup}$	$f\in \mathcal{M}_{-}^{\cap}$
$x \in (-\infty, 0)$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-xf^*\left(rac{1}{x} ight)$	
x = 0	$-\sup(\operatorname{Dom} f)$	$-\inf(I$	$\operatorname{Dom} f)$	$-\sup(\operatorname{Dom} f)$
$x\in (0,+\infty)$	$-xf^*\left(rac{1}{x} ight)$		$+\infty$	$-\infty$

Proposition 2.4 then directly provides:

$$f^{-1}(t) = \inf_{x>0} tx + xf^*\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) = \inf_{x>0} tx - \check{f}(x).$$

Finally Proposition 2.7 allows to set that since  $f^{-1} = \check{f}^*$ , then  $\check{f} = (\check{f}^*)^* = (f^{-1})^* = \check{f}$ .

One then has this simple consequence of Lemmas A.3 and 2.6.

**Lemma 2.11.** Given  $f \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ :

$$((f \circ (-\mathrm{Id}))^{-1})^* = -\check{f} \circ (-\mathrm{Id})$$
 and  $((-f)^{-1})^* = \check{f} \circ (-\mathrm{Id})$ 

We arrive to the final result of this subsection, the expression of the conjugate of the parallel sum. The definition of the parallel sum was introduced with the closed pseudo-inverse in Section 1, we just saw above that the *opened pseudo-inverse* was more adapted to concave mappings, therefore let us introduce the general " $\mathbb{H}$ " notation for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ :

$$f \boxplus g \equiv (f^{-1} + g^{-1})^{-1} = \begin{cases} f \boxplus g & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \\ f \boxplus g & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{M}^{\cap} \end{cases}$$
(2.6)

and we define similarly " $\boxtimes$ ". One might wonder why we did not set  $f \boxplus g \equiv (f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}}$  for  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup}$  since  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  and  $g^{-\overline{1}}$  are concave. This is actually non necessary thanks to Lemma A.13 that states that  $(f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = f \boxplus g$  (and similarly that  $(f^{-\underline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}})^{-\overline{1}} = f \boxplus g$ ).

Proposition 1.9 and theorem 1.26 both present concentration with *closed* parallel sum, however they naturally adapt to this new notation as we will see in the proof of our last result, Theorem 2.23.

A useful formula given in Proposition 2.13 below links the parallel sum of convex mappings with the so-called infimal convolution. For concave mappings, it is the supremal convolution. As we got used to, we introduce here the same notation  $\oplus$  to designate an operation defined on  $\mathcal{C}^{\cup}$  and on  $\mathcal{C}^{\cap}$ , that will be in the former case the infimal convolution and in the latter case the supremal convolution.

$$\begin{split} f \oplus g : & \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & \bar{\mathbb{R}} \\ & u & \longmapsto \begin{cases} \inf_{\substack{x+y=u \\ (x,y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}} f(x) + g(y), \text{ when } f, g \in \mathcal{C}^{\cup} \\ \sup_{\substack{x+y=u \\ (x,y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}} f(x) + g(y), \text{ when } f, g \in \mathcal{C}^{\cap} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

note that this operation (unlike classical convolution) is not bilinear. More importantly, note that the infimal convolution of two closed convex proper mappings is also closed convex proper (See [6], Exercises 3.13) and the the supremal convolution satisfies symmetric stability properties. The most notable result about this operation  $\oplus$  is that it allows to express the conjugate of the sum as stated below.

Lemma 2.12 ([6], Exercise 3.16 ). Given  $f,g\in\mathcal{C}$ :

$$(f+g)^* = f^* \oplus g^*.$$

**Proposition 2.13.** Given  $n \ge 1$  and n functions  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\alpha_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \alpha_n(t) = \begin{cases} \sup_{u_1 \cdots u_n > 0} \frac{t + \check{\alpha}_1(u_1) + \cdots + \check{\alpha}_n(u_n)}{u_1 + \cdots + u_n} & \text{if } \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \\ \inf_{u_1 \cdots u_n > 0} \frac{t + \check{\alpha}_1(u_1) + \cdots + \check{\alpha}_n(u_n)}{u_1 + \cdots + u_n} & \text{if } \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{M}^{\cap}. \end{cases}$$

Note that when n = 1, and, say,  $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup}$ , this corollary simply writes:

$$\alpha_1(t) = \sup_u \frac{t + \check{\alpha}_1(u)}{u},$$

which is a direct consequence of Propositions 2.10 and 2.7.

*Proof.* Let us prove the result in the case where  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\cup}$ . In that case, we know that  $(\alpha_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \alpha_n)^*$  and  $\check{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \check{\alpha}_n$  are all supported and continuous on  $[0, +\infty)$ . Proposition 2.10 allows us to compute:

$$\alpha_1^{-1} + \dots + \alpha_n^{-1}(t) = \check{\alpha}_1^* + \dots + \check{\alpha}_n^*(t) = (\check{\alpha}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \check{\alpha}_n)^*(t)$$
$$= \inf_{x>0} tx - \sup_{u_1 + \dots + u_n = x} \check{\alpha}_1(u_1) + \dots + \check{\alpha}_n(u_n)$$

where the last identity is a consequence of Corollary 2.9 and the fact that  $\check{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \check{\alpha}_n$  and therefore  $\check{\alpha}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \check{\alpha}_n$  are concave.

One can then employ Proposition 2.4 to get:

$$\alpha_1 \boxplus \dots \boxplus \alpha_n(t) = \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{x} \left( t + \sup_{\substack{u_1 + \dots + u_n = x \\ u_1 > 0, \dots, u_n > 0}} \check{\alpha}_1(u_1) + \dots + \check{\alpha}_n(u_n) \right)$$
$$= \sup_{u_1>0, \dots, u_n>0} \frac{t + \check{\alpha}_1(u_1) + \dots + \check{\alpha}_n(u_n)(x)}{u_1 + \dots + u_n},$$

since  $\forall i \in [n]$ ,  $\check{\alpha}_i(u) = -\infty$  if u < 0 and  $\check{\alpha}_1, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n$  are all continuous on 0 (see Lemma 2.8).

One can then merely employ Lemma 2.11 to deduce the symmetric results in all the other settings.  $\hfill \Box$ 

#### 2.3 Characterization as a one dimensional supremum with subgradient

**Definition 2.14** (Subgradient). Given a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , and a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  the upper subgradient of f on x is the interval:

$$\bar{\partial}f(x) = \left\{g \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R} : f(y) \ge f(x) + g(y - x)\right\}.$$

the lower subgradient of f on x is the interval:

$$\underline{\partial}f(x) = \left\{g \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R} : f(y) \le f(x) + g(y - x)\right\}.$$

Note that with definition, when  $f(x) = \infty$ ,  $\overline{\partial} f(x) = \emptyset$  and when  $f(x) = -\infty$ ,  $\underline{\partial} f(x) = \emptyset$ . This notion will help us identifying arguments of infima and suprema thanks to:

**Lemma 2.15.** Given  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , one has the implications:

$$\begin{cases} f(x) = \inf f & \implies \quad 0 \in \bar{\partial}f(x) \\ f(x) = \sup f & \implies \quad 0 \in \underline{\partial}f(x) \end{cases}$$

Once again we will use the same notation for two different objects defined in a convex and in a concave setting and denote  $\partial f = \overline{\partial} f$  for any f convex and  $\partial f = \underline{\partial} f$  for any f concave. One then has the following important relation.

**Proposition 2.16** ([6], Proposition 5.4.3). Given a mapping  $f \in C$ , the following equivalence is valid for any  $t, x \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$tx = f(t) + f_*^*(x) \qquad \iff \qquad x \in \partial f(t) \qquad \iff \qquad t \in \partial f_*^*(x).$$

**Proposition 2.17.** Given  $n \ge 1$  and n functions  $\alpha^{(1)}, \ldots, \alpha^{(n)} \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ , for any  $t, u_1, \ldots, u_n \in \mathbb{R}$ , one has the identity:

$$\alpha^{(1)} \boxplus \dots \boxplus \alpha^{(n)}(t) = \frac{t + \check{\alpha}^{(1)}(u_1) + \dots + \check{\alpha}^{(n)}(u_n)}{u_1 + \dots + u_n} \notin \{-\infty, +\infty\}$$
(2.7)

if and only if:

$$\frac{t + \check{\alpha}^{(1)}(u_1) + \dots + \check{\alpha}^{(n)}(u_n)}{u_1 + \dots + u_n} \in \partial \check{\alpha}^{(1)}(u_1) \cap \dots \cap \partial \check{\alpha}^{(n)}(u_n)$$
(2.8)

*Proof.* For simplicity we will only consider the case n = 2 and denote  $\alpha = \alpha^{(1)}$ ,  $\beta = \alpha^{(2)}$ , the general case is proven the same way. Let us assume again that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are both convex increasing mappings, given  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , recall the expression given by Proposition 2.13:

$$\alpha \boxplus \beta(t) = \sup_{u',v'>0} \phi(u',v') \qquad \text{where: } \phi: (u',v') \mapsto \frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u') + \beta(v')}{u' + v'} \tag{2.9}$$

The identity  $\phi(u,v) = \sup_{u',v' \in \mathbb{R}} \phi(u',v')$  and  $\phi(u,v) \notin \{-\infty,+\infty\}$  implies:

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \left. \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u'} \right|_{(u,v)} = \frac{\partial \check{\alpha}(u)(u+v) - t - \check{\alpha}(u) - \check{\beta}(v)}{(u+v)^2} \\ 0 \in \left. \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial v'} \right|_{(u,v)} = \frac{\partial \check{\beta}(u)(u+v) - t - \check{\alpha}(u) - \check{\beta}(v)}{(u+v)^2} \end{cases}$$

which directly implies (2.8).

Let us now assume (2.8); Proposition 2.16 provides:

$$\alpha^{-1} \left( \frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v)}{u + v} \right) + \check{\alpha}(u) = \frac{u}{u + v} \left( t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v) \right)$$
$$\beta^{-1} \left( \frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v)}{u + v} \right) + \check{\beta}(v) = \frac{v}{u + v} \left( t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v) \right)$$

then summing the two identities, one obtains:

$$t = \left(\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1}\right) \left(\frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \dot{\beta}(v)}{u + v}\right)$$

Lemma 1.3 allows us to bound<sup>19</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha \boxplus \beta)(t) &= (\alpha \boxplus \beta) \circ \left(\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1}\right) \left(\frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v)}{u + v}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u) + \check{\beta}(v)}{u + v} \\ &\leq \sup_{u', v' \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{t + \check{\alpha}(u') + \check{\beta}(v')}{u' + v'} = (\alpha \boxplus \beta)(t), \end{aligned}$$

which directly implies (2.7).

**Lemma 2.18.** Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$ ,  $u, x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ , an interval such that:

$$\frac{\check{\alpha}(u)+x}{u+y} \in \partial\check{\alpha}(u) \cap B,$$

any  $u' \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the inclusion  $\partial \check{\alpha}(u) \subset \partial \check{\alpha}(u')$  also satisfies:

$$\frac{\check{\alpha}(u') + x}{u' + y} \in \partial\check{\alpha}(u') \cap B$$
<sup>19</sup>When  $\alpha \boxplus \beta$  is concave,  $(\alpha \boxplus \beta) \circ (\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1}) = (\alpha \boxplus \beta) \circ (\alpha^{-\overline{1}} + \beta^{-\overline{1}}) \ge \mathrm{Id}.$ 

Before proving this proposition, let us remark with next lemma that one could have replaced the assumption on the inclusion between two values of  $\partial \check{\alpha}$  with:

$$\partial \alpha^* \left( \frac{1}{u} \right) \subset \partial \alpha^* \left( \frac{1}{u'} \right)$$

**Lemma 2.19.** Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^{\cup} \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cap}$  and two points  $u, v \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ :

$$\partial \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{u}\right) \subset \partial \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{v}\right) \qquad \iff \qquad \partial \check{\alpha}(u) \subset \partial \check{\alpha}(v)$$

In other words, the extreme points of the epigraph of  $\alpha^*$  are exactly the inverse of extreme points of the epigraph  $\check{\alpha}$ .

*Proof.* We assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha$  is convex proper and u > v. We first assume that  $\partial \alpha^*(\frac{1}{u}) \subset \partial \alpha^*(\frac{1}{v})$ . The fact that  $\partial \alpha^*$  is increasing and  $u \neq v$  directly implies that  $\partial \alpha^*(\frac{1}{u})$  is a singleton that we then identify with its unique element. One can even deduce that for any  $u' \in (v, u]$ ,  $\partial \alpha^*(\frac{1}{u'}) = \partial \alpha^*(\frac{1}{u})$ , therefore a simple integration provides:

$$\alpha^*\left(\frac{1}{u}\right) = \alpha^*\left(\frac{1}{v}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{u} - \frac{1}{v}\right)\partial\alpha^*\left(\frac{1}{u}\right),$$

and consequently:

$$\partial \check{\alpha}(u) = \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{u}\right) - \frac{1}{u} \partial \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{u}\right) = \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{v}\right) - \frac{1}{v} \partial \alpha^* \left(\frac{1}{u}\right) \subset \partial \check{\alpha}(v).$$

The converse is proven the same way.

Proof of Lemma 2.18. Considering  $t, u, u' \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the hypotheses of the proposition, note that the result is obvious when u = u' we therefore assume below that  $u \neq u'$ . We know for reasons explained in the proof of Lemma 2.19 that  $\partial \check{\alpha}(u)$  is a singleton that we identify with its unique element and that satisfies thanks to our hypotheses:

$$\partial \check{\alpha}(u) \in \partial \check{\alpha}(u) \cap B.$$

Once again, since  $\partial \check{\alpha}$  is constant on (u', u], one can conclude:

$$\check{\alpha}(u') + x = \underbrace{\check{\alpha}(u) + x}_{=(u+y)\partial\check{\alpha}(u)} + (u'-u)\partial\check{\alpha}(u) = (u'+y)\partial\check{\alpha}(u) \in (u'+y)\partial\check{\alpha}(u') \cap B$$

This last proposition allows us to simplify greatly the " $\boxplus$ " sum of two mappings  $\alpha, \beta$ whose convex or concave conjugate is piece-wise affine. Lemma 2.18 basically sets that the supremum on  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$  in the expression of  $\alpha \boxplus \beta$  given by Proposition 2.13 can be be merely computed on the extreme points of  $\check{\alpha}$  and  $\check{\beta}$  (that can be deduced from the inverse of extreme points of  $\alpha^*$  and  $\beta^*$ , see Lemma 2.19).

In a lot of common settings, the infimum above is computed on a finite discrete set of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , in other words,  $\check{f}$  is piece-wise affine. One can then employ Lemma 2.18 to get the Corollary below.

**Corollary 2.20.** Considering n mappings  $\alpha^{(1)}, \ldots, \alpha^{(n)} \in \mathcal{M}$  such that there exist n discrete<sup>20</sup> subsets  $A^{(1)}, \ldots, A^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ , all containing a point different from 0, and n families of parameters  $(\sigma_a^{(1)})_{a \in A^{(1)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{A^{(1)}}, \ldots, (\sigma_a^{(n)})_{a \in A^{(n)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{A^{(n)}}$  such that  $\forall k \in [n]$ :

$$\alpha^{(k)}(x) = \inf_{a \in A^{(k)}} \frac{x + \sigma_a^{(k)}}{a} \Big|_{-}$$

then,  $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\alpha^{(1)} \boxplus \dots \boxplus \alpha^{(n)}(t) = \inf \left\{ \frac{t + \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} + \dots + \sigma_{a_n}^{(n)}}{a_1 + \dots + a_n} \Big|_{\stackrel{\cap}{+}}, \ a_1 \in A^{(1)}, \dots, a_n \in A^{(n)} \right\}.$$

The same result is obtained if one rather considers mappings in  $\mathcal{M}^{\cap}_+ \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cup}_+ \cup \mathcal{M}^{\cup}_-$  (one then has to replace the signs " $\mathbb{R}_+$ ", " $|_{\cap}$ " and "inf" accordingly).

This corollary relies on a well known result of convex analysis that we therefore provide without proof.

**Lemma 2.21.** Given a finite set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$  and a family of parameters  $(\sigma_a)_{a \in A} \in \mathbb{R}^A$ , there exist  $s \in \mathcal{C}^{\cap}$  such that:

$$\sup_{a \in A} ax - \sigma_a = \sup_{a \in A} ax - s(a).$$

There exists a subset  $\tilde{A} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset A$  such that  $a_1 < \cdots < a_n$  and:

$$\forall i \in [n-1], \forall x \in [a_i, a_{i+1}] : s(x) = \frac{a_{i+1} - x}{a_{i+1} - a_i} \sigma_{a_i} + \frac{x - a_i}{a_{i+1} - a_i} \sigma_{a_{i+1}}$$

and  $\forall x < a_1$ , or  $x > a_n$ ,  $s(x) = +\infty$ . The same results holds if one replace the supremum with infimum, then  $s \in C^{\cap}$  and is equal to  $-\infty$  on  $(-\infty, a_1) \cup (a_n, +\infty)$ . We say that s is the convex or concave affine by part continuation of  $(\sigma_a)_{a \in \tilde{A}}$ 

Proof of Corollary 2.20. First note that given  $k \in [n]$ , the mapping  $\alpha^{(k)}$  is concave opened and increasing as the infimum of concave opened increasing mappings. One can also note that  $-\alpha^{(k)}$  is proper since there exists  $a \in A^{(k)} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha^{(k)}(x) \leq \frac{x + \check{\sigma}_a}{a} \leq \infty$ .

We know from Proposition 2.5 that:

$$(\alpha^{(k)})^{-1}(x) = \sup_{a \in A^{(k)}} ax - \sigma_a^{(k)},$$

which implies, thanks to Lemma 2.21 that we just introduced, the existence of a subset  $\tilde{A}^{(k)} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subset A^{(k)}$  with  $a_1 < \cdots < a_n$  such that the convex affine by part continuation of  $(\sigma_a^{(k)})_{a \in \tilde{A}^{(k)}}$ , that we naturally note  $s \in \mathcal{C}^{\cup}$ , satisfies:

$$(\alpha^{(k)})^{-1}(x) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} tx - s(t),$$

it is then not hard to see with Proposition 2.7 that  $s = s^{**} = ((\alpha^{(k)})^{-1})^* = \sigma^{(k)}$ . One can then deduce from Proposition 2.13 and Lemma 2.18 that:

$$\alpha^{(1)} \boxplus \dots \boxplus \alpha^{(n)}(t) = \inf \left\{ \frac{t + \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} + \dots + \sigma_{a_n}^{(n)}}{a_1 + \dots + a_n} \Big|_+^n, \ a_1 \in \tilde{A}^{(1)}, \dots, a_n \in \tilde{A}^{(n)} \right\}$$
$$= \inf \left\{ \frac{t + \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} + \dots + \sigma_{a_n}^{(n)}}{a_1 + \dots + a_n} \Big|_+^n, \ a_1 \in A^{(1)}, \dots, a_n \in A^{(n)} \right\},$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>The discrete assumption allows to consider consecutive points in  $A^{(1)}, \ldots, A^{(n)}$ . This assumption is not necessary yet it simplifies the proof and is sufficient for our needs.

since for all 
$$k \in [n]$$
,  $a \in A^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{A}^{(k)}$ ,  $\sigma_a^{(k)} \ge \sigma^{(k)}(a)$ . since for all  $k \in [n]$ ,  $a \in A^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{A}^{(k)}$ ,  $\sigma_a^{(k)} \ge s(a)$ .

One sees with next corollary that it is even possible to restrict further the number of points on which the extremum in Proposition 2.13 and in Corollary 2.20 above can be computed.

**Corollary 2.22.** In the setting of Corollary 2.20, let us index in increasing order the elements of  $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{\#A}\}$  and  $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{\#B}\}$  and note:

$$\begin{cases} \forall i \in [\#A-1] : \partial \check{\alpha}_i = \frac{\check{\alpha}_{a_{i+1}} - \check{\alpha}_{a_i}}{a_{i+1} - a_i}; & \partial \check{\alpha}_0 = -\infty; & \partial \check{\alpha}_{\#A} = +\infty \\ \forall i \in [\#B-1] : \partial \check{\beta}_i = \frac{\check{\beta}_{b_{i+1}} - \check{\beta}_{b_i}}{b_{i+1} - b_i}; & \partial \check{\beta}_0 = -\infty; & \partial \check{\beta}_{\#B} = +\infty \end{cases}$$

then one can express:

$$\alpha \boxplus \beta(t) = \sup \left\{ \frac{t + \check{\alpha}_{a_i} + \check{\beta}_{b_j}}{a_i + b_j} \Big|_{\stackrel{\cup}{+}}, \; \partial \check{\alpha}_{i-1} \le \partial \check{\beta}_j \le \partial \check{\alpha}_i \; \text{ or } \; \partial \check{\beta}_{j-1} \le \partial \check{\alpha}_i \le \partial \check{\beta}_j \right\}.$$

Proof. It is again a consequence of Propositions 2.17 and Lemma 2.18.

One can then rewrite the result on the concentration of what could be called "*n*-multi Lipschitz transformations" as the one presented in Theorem 1.26 when the concentration functions  $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(n)}$  are all transformations of  $\alpha$  in the spirit of Hanson-Wright Theorem.

**Theorem 2.23.** Let us consider a family of metric spaces  $(E_i, d_i)_{i \in I}$ , a family of random variables  $Z \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$ , a family of n real random variables  $\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^I$  such that there exist a family of decreasing mappings  $\alpha_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $i \in I$ , n families of indexes sets containing  $0, A_i^{(1)}, \ldots, A_i^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $i \in I$  and n families of families of positive parameters  $\sigma^{(1)} \in (\mathbb{R}^{A^{(1)}}_+)^I, \ldots, \sigma^{(n)} \in (\mathbb{R}^{A^{(n)}}_+)^I$  such that:

$$f(Z) \propto \alpha, \quad f \text{ } 1\text{-Lipschitz} \quad \text{ and } \quad \forall k \in [n]: \quad \Lambda^{(k)} \in \sigma_0^{(k)} \pm \alpha \circ \inf_{a \in A^{(k)} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}$$

Given a supplementary family of metric spaces  $(E'_i, d'_i)_{i \in I}$ , and a family of mapping  $\Phi_i : E_i \to E'_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , if we assume that there exists a constant C > 0 such that for any independent copy  $Z' \in \prod_{i \in I} E_i$  of Z and for any  $i \in I$ :

$$d'(\Phi(Z), \Phi(Z')) \le C\Lambda^{(1)} \cdots \Lambda^{(n)} \cdot d(Z, Z'), \quad a.s.$$

then:

$$f(\Phi(Z)) \propto \alpha \circ \inf_{a_k \in A^{(k)}, k \in [n]} \left( \frac{\cdot}{\sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} \cdots \sigma_{a_n}^{(n)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+a_1+\cdots+a_n}}, \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz.}$$

Note that Hanson-Wright can be seen as an application of this theorem to the case n = 1,  $\Lambda = ||AXB|| + ||BX'^TA||$ ,  $A = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\sigma_0 = ||A||_F$ ,  $\sigma_1 = ||A||$ .

*Proof.* Note that if all the concentration of the assumption of the Theorem are true for  $\alpha$ , they are also true for  $\bar{\alpha}$ . For all  $k \in [n]$ , let us introduce the notation<sup>21</sup>  $\beta_{(k)} \equiv$ 

<sup>21</sup>When 
$$a = 0$$
, we have the convention  $\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}|_+ = 0$  if  $t \le \sigma_a^{(k)}$  and  $\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}|_+ = +\infty$  if  $t > \sigma_a^{(k)}$ .

 $\inf_{a \in A^{(k)}} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}|_{\stackrel{\cap}{+}}.$  Applying Theorem 1.26 (employ Lemma 1.34 to go from a concentration  $\Lambda^{(k)} \in \sigma_0^{(k)} \pm \bar{\alpha} \circ \inf_{a \in A^{(k)} \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\sigma_a^{(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}}$  to a concentration  $\Lambda^{(k)} \in 0 \pm \bar{\alpha} \circ \beta_{(k)}$ ) one gets:

$$f(\Phi(Z)) \propto \bar{\alpha} \underline{\boxtimes} (\bar{\alpha} \circ \beta_{(1)}) \underline{\boxtimes} \cdots \underline{\boxtimes} (\bar{\alpha} \circ \beta_{(n)}), \quad f \text{ 1-Lipschitz.}$$

For any  $k \in [n]$ , one can express:

$$\beta_{(k)} = \exp \circ \left( \inf_{a \in A^{(k)}} \frac{\log(\cdot) - \log(\sigma_a^{(k)})}{a} \Big|_{\stackrel{\frown}{+}} \right) = \exp \circ \tilde{\beta}_{(k)} \circ \log,$$

with the notation  $\tilde{\beta}_{(k)}: t \mapsto \inf_{a \in A^{(k)}} \frac{t - \log(\sigma_a^{(k)})}{a}|_{\uparrow}$ . Noting that for all  $k \in [n]$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_{(k)}$  is concave as an infimum of concave mappings, one can deduce thanks to Proposition A.16 (generalization of Proposition 1.7):

$$\bar{\alpha} \boxtimes (\bar{\alpha} \circ \beta_{(1)}) \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes (\bar{\alpha} \circ \beta_{(n)}) \le \underline{\alpha} \circ \exp \circ \left( \operatorname{Id} \boxplus \tilde{\beta}_{(1)} \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \tilde{\beta}_{(n)} \right) \circ \log,$$

and finally obtain (since  $\underline{\alpha} \leq \alpha$ ):

$$f(\Phi(Z)) \propto \alpha \circ \exp \circ \left( \operatorname{Id} \boxplus \tilde{\beta}_{(1)} \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \tilde{\beta}_{(n)} \right) \circ \log_2$$

Recall indeed that by definition of the parallel sum of concave mappings:

Id  $\boxplus \gamma_{(1)} \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \gamma_{(n)} = \operatorname{Id} \overline{\boxplus} \gamma_{(1)} \overline{\boxplus} \cdots \overline{\boxplus} \gamma_{(n)}$ .

The result of the theorem is then deduced with Corollary 2.20, applied to the sequence of mappings:

$$\inf_{a \in \{1\}} \frac{\cdot - 0}{1}, \quad \inf_{a \in A^{(1)}} \frac{\cdot - \log(\sigma_a^{(1)})}{a} \Big|_+^{\circ}, \quad \dots, \quad \inf_{a \in A^{(n)}} \frac{\cdot - \log(\sigma_a^{(n)})}{a} \Big|_+^{\circ}$$

# A Properties on pseudo-inverse

**Definition A.1** ([5], (1.34)). Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we note  $\mathcal{V}(x)$  the set of neighbourhood of x and given a mapping  $f \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , we introduce the classical notation:

$$\liminf_{x \to x_0} f(x) = \sup_{V \in \mathcal{V}(x)} \inf f(V) \qquad \text{ and } \qquad \limsup_{x \to x_0} f(x) = \inf_{V \in \mathcal{V}(x)} \sup f(V)$$

**Proposition A.2** ([5], Lemma 1.24; [6], Proposition 1.1.2.). Given a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , the following items are equivalent:

- (Closeness) The epigraph of f is closed.
- (Lower semicontinuity) Given any  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\liminf_{x \to x_0} f(x) \ge f(x_0)$ .
- Given any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the set  $\{x, f(x) \le t\}$  is closed.

The notion of openness/upper semicontinuity, can then simply be expressed by the following property:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R} : \{x, f(x) \ge t\}$$
 is closed,

in other words, f is closed if and only if -f is opened. This characterization of closeness provides immediately Lemma 1.8 about the closeness of  $f \circ g$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.8.* Considering  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}, \ \underline{f} \circ \underline{g}(x) \le t\right\} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}, \ \underline{g}(x) \le f^{-\overline{1}}(t)\right\} \text{ is a closed set since } g \text{ is closed.}$$

Now, considering  $f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ :

$$\left\{x\in\mathbb{R},\;\underline{f}\circ\overline{g}(x)\leq t\right\}=\left\{x\in\mathbb{R},\;\overline{g}(x)\geq f^{-\underline{1}}(t)\right\}\;\;\text{is a closed set since $g$ is opened.}$$

A second intuitive result on the stability of the closeness through sum is directly deduced from Proposition A.2.

**Lemma A.3.** Given  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$ :

 $f, g \text{ closed } \iff f + g \text{ closed}$  and  $f, g \text{ opened } \iff f + g \text{ opened}$ Besides:

Besiaes:

$$\operatorname{Cl}(f+g) = \underline{f} + \underline{g}$$
 and  $\operatorname{Int}(f+g) = \overline{f} + \overline{g}$ 

The second part of the lemma relies on a simple formula to compute the lower semicontinuous envelope f.

**Lemma A.4** ([5], Lemma 1.31). Given<sup>22</sup>  $f \in M$ , and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ :

If 
$$f \in \mathcal{M}_+$$
:  $\underline{f}(x_0) = \lim_{x \uparrow x_0} f(x)$  and  $\overline{f}(x_0) = \lim_{x \downarrow x_0} f(x)$   
If  $f \in \mathcal{M}_-$ :  $\underline{f}(x_0) = \lim_{x \downarrow x_0} f(x)$  and  $\overline{f}(x_0) = \lim_{x \uparrow x_0} f(x)$ 

The result provided in [5] concerns general mappings  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  and as such, requires the use of "lim inf", we explain below how to connect the two result with simple topology inferences.

*Proof.* Let us just provide the proof of the first equality starting from [5, Lemma 1.31] stating:

$$\underline{f}(x_0) = \liminf_{x \to x_0} f(x) = \sup_{V \in \mathcal{V}(x)} \inf f(V).$$

Let us consider a sequence  $(x_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\forall k\in\mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_k < x$  and  $\lim x_k \to x$ . For all  $V \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ , there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall k \geq K$ ,  $x_k \in V$ . As a consequence,  $\forall k \geq K$ ,  $f(x_k) \geq \inf f(V)$  and  $\lim_{k\to\infty} x_k \geq \inf f(V)$ . This last inequality being true for any  $V \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ , one has in particular (f being increasing, we know that the limit exists):

$$\lim_{x \uparrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{k \to \infty} x_k \ge \inf f(V) \ge \sup_{V \in \mathcal{V}(x)} \inf f(V) = \underline{f}(x_0).$$
(A.1)

For the other inequality, one can note that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $V \in \mathcal{V}(x)$  such that  $x_k \in V$ .

Given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $x_k \neq x$ , we know that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $x_k < x_0 - \varepsilon$ . Now, denoting  $V_{\varepsilon} \equiv (x_0 - \varepsilon, x_0 + \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ , the increasing character of f allows us to bound:

$$f(x_k) \le f(x_0 - \varepsilon) \le \inf f(V_{\varepsilon}) \le \sup_{V \in \mathcal{V}(x_0)} \inf f(V) = \underline{f}(x_0),$$

this being true for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have in particular  $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_k) \leq \underline{f}(x_0)$ , which, together with (A.1) concludes the proof.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>We employ the common short notation  $\lim_{x\uparrow x_0}$  to designate  $\lim_{\substack{x\to x_0\\x\neq x_0}}$ 

Proof of Lemma A.3. Let us simply prove the lower identities since  $f = \underline{f} \implies f$  closed. It is a consequence of the fact that the sum is continuous. Given  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , Lemma A.4 allows us to set for  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ :

$$\operatorname{Cl}(f+g)(x_0) = \lim_{x \uparrow x_0} f(x) + g(x) = \lim_{x \uparrow x_0} f(x) + \lim_{x \uparrow x_0} g(x) = \underline{f}(x) + \underline{g}(x).$$

The properties on increasing mappings can be derived from properties on decreasing mappings and conversely thanks to the following elementary lemma.

Lemma A.5. Given  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ :  $f^{-\underline{1}} = (-f)^{-\underline{1}} \circ (-\operatorname{Id})$  and  $f^{-\overline{1}} = (-f)^{-\overline{1}} \circ (-\operatorname{Id})$ .

Note also that the inverse is an increasing operation on  $\mathcal{M}_{-}$  and decreasing on  $\mathcal{M}_{+}$ .

**Lemma A.6.** 
$$\forall f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-}: f \leq g \implies f^{-\underline{1}} \leq g^{-\underline{1}} \text{ and } f^{-\underline{1}} \leq g^{-\underline{1}}$$
  
 $\forall f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{+}: f \leq g \implies f^{-\underline{1}} \geq g^{-\underline{1}} \text{ and } f^{-\overline{1}} \geq g^{-\overline{1}}$ 

*Proof.* It is obvious from the definitions if, say,  $f, g \in M_-$ , for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f(x) \leq y \implies g(x) \leq y$ , thus:

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R}, f(t) \le y\} \le \{t \in \mathbb{R}, g(t) \le y\},\$$

and one deduce easily the inequality on the infima and suprema which allows to define the closed and open pseudo inverse. The case  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is treated similarly.  $\Box$ 

Lemma A.5 allows us to state immediately that the parallel sum is increasing on its two variables.

**Lemma A.7.** Given  $f, g, h, j \in M$  with same monotonicity:

$$f \leq h \text{ and } g \leq j \implies f \boxplus g \leq h \boxplus j \text{ and } f \boxplus g \leq h \boxplus j$$

Some result concerning the pseudo-inverse rely on an important epigraph-based interpretation of the inversion in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Once again the characterization is not the same for the inversion in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  and in  $\mathcal{M}_-$ , however they are linked thanks to the following elementary lemma provided without proof. Let us introduce three transformation  $\tau, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$  defined for any  $(x, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  as:

$$\tau((x,y)) = (y,x)$$
 and  $\sigma_1((x,y)) = (-x,y)$  and  $\sigma_2((x,y)) = (x,-y).$ 

note that all those transformations commute with one another, if we see them as transformation of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  note also that they commute with the operator Cl.

**Lemma A.8.** Given a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ :

$$\operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi}(-f)) = \operatorname{Cl}\left(\sigma_2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \operatorname{Epi}(f))\right)$$
 and  $\operatorname{Epi}(f(-\operatorname{Id})) = \sigma_1(\operatorname{Epi}(f)).$ 

Just the characterisation of the closed pseudo-inverse is provided below since one would need to introduce the notion of hypograph to introduce properly similar characterization for opened pseudo-inverse.

**Proposition A.9** (Inversion of monotonic closed mappings). Given a mapping  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  closed and monotonic, the set  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  defined as

$$F = \operatorname{Cl}(\tau(\operatorname{Epi}(f)))$$
 if  $f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$  and  $F = \operatorname{Cl}(\tau(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \operatorname{Epi}(f)))$  if  $f \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$ 

is the epigraph of  $f^{-1}$ .

This Proposition is first proven for decreasing mappings thanks to the following lemma (we also provide a symmetric result for increasing mappings since it will be useful later).

**Lemma A.10.** Given  $f \in M$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$If f \in \mathcal{M}_{-}: \begin{cases} y \ge f(x) \implies f^{-\underline{1}}(y) \le x \implies y \ge \underline{f}(x) \\ y \le f(x) \implies f^{-\overline{1}}(y) \ge x \implies y \le \overline{f}(x) \end{cases}$$
$$If f \in \mathcal{M}_{+}: \begin{cases} y \le f(x) \implies f^{-\underline{1}}(y) \le x \implies y \le \overline{f}(x) \\ y \ge f(x) \implies f^{-\underline{1}}(y) \ge x \implies y \ge \overline{f}(x) \end{cases}$$

For each setting  $f \in M_-$  and  $f \in M_+$ , the second implication sequence is deduced from the first one thanks to the following lemma.

**Lemma A.11.** Given a mapping  $h \in M$ :

$$(-h)^{-\underline{1}} = h^{-\underline{1}} \circ (-\operatorname{Id})$$
 and  $(h \circ (-\operatorname{Id}))^{-\underline{1}} = -h^{-1}$ 

*Proof.* By definition of the closed and the open pseudo-inverse, if, say,  $h \in M_+$  then  $-h, h \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \in M_-$  and:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : (-h)^{-\underline{1}}(x) &= \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}, -h(x) \le y\} = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}, h(x) \ge -y\} = h^{-\underline{1}}(-y) \\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R} : (h(-\operatorname{Id}))^{-\underline{1}}(x) &= \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}, h(-x) \le y\} = \inf\{-x \in \mathbb{R}, h(x) \ge y\} \\ &= -\sup\{x \in \mathbb{R}, h(x) \ge y\} = -h^{-\overline{1}}(y). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is exactly the same if  $h \in \mathcal{M}_-$ .

Proof of Lemma A.10. For  $f \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , Recalling that  $f^{-1}(y) = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}, f(t) \leq y\}$ , we directly see that  $f(x) \leq y \implies f^{-1}(y) \leq x$ . For the second implication, note that  $\underline{f} \leq f$  and thus  $f^{-1} \geq \underline{f}^{-1}$  thanks to Lemma A.5, note also that  $\{t \in \mathbb{R}, \underline{f}(t) \leq y\}$  is closed (thanks to Proposition A.2, since  $\underline{f}$  is closed), therefore there exists  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(t) \leq y$  and  $t = f^{-1}(y)$ . That finally provides:

$$x \ge f^{-\underline{1}}(y) \underset{f^{-\underline{1}} \ge \underline{f}^{-\underline{1}}}{\Longrightarrow} x \ge \underline{f}^{-\underline{1}}(y) \underset{\underline{f}^{-\underline{1}}(y)=t}{\Longrightarrow} \underline{f}(x) \le \underline{f}(t) \underset{\underline{f}(t) \le y}{\Longrightarrow} \underline{f}(x) \le y.$$

The proof of the first sequence of implications when  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is the similar, one just needs here to use the fact that  $\{t \in \mathbb{R}, \overline{f} \ge y\}$  is closed.

As planned the two remaining sequences of implications are proven thanks to Lemma A.11 that allows to deduce results on  $f^{-\overline{1}}$  from results on  $f^{-\underline{1}}$ .

*Proof of Proposition A.9.* If  $f \in M_-$ , then for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we have thanks to Lemma A.10 the equivalence:

$$(x,y) \in F \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (y,x) \in \operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi} f) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{f}(y) \le x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y \ge f^{-1}(x) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x,y) \in \operatorname{Epi}(f^{-1})$$

The case  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$  can be deduced from the previous case and Lemmas A.5, A.8:

$$\operatorname{Epi}(f^{-\underline{1}}) = \operatorname{Epi}((-f)^{-\underline{1}}(-\operatorname{Id})) = \sigma_1(\operatorname{Epi}((-f)^{-\underline{1}})$$
  
=  $\sigma_1 \circ \operatorname{Cl}(\tau(\operatorname{Epi}(-f))) = \operatorname{Cl}(\sigma_1(\tau(\sigma_2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \operatorname{Epi}(f))))) = \operatorname{Cl}(\tau(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \operatorname{Epi}(f))),$ 

since<sup>23</sup>  $(\operatorname{Cl}(-f))^{-\underline{1}} = (-f)^{-\underline{1}}$ ,  $\sigma_1 \circ \tau \circ \sigma_2 = \tau$  and Cl commutes with  $\tau, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>Recall that given a mapping  $h : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $\operatorname{Cl}(h)$  is the mapping whose epigraph id  $\operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi}(h))$ .

The epigraph interpretation provided in Proposition A.9 allows to show very quickly a lot of important results among which one can find Lemma 1.2. We reformulated it in next lemma that is just a consequence of the fact that  $\operatorname{Epi}(\underline{f}) = \operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi}(\underline{f})) = \operatorname{Cl}(\operatorname{Epi}(\overline{f}))$ .

# Lemma A.12. Given $f \in \mathcal{M}$ :

• 
$$f^{-\underline{1}} = \operatorname{Cl}(f^{-\underline{1}}) = \operatorname{Cl}(f^{-\overline{1}}) = \underline{f}^{-\underline{1}} = \overline{f}^{-\underline{1}},$$
  
•  $f^{-\overline{1}} = \operatorname{Let}(f^{-\overline{1}}) = \operatorname{Let}(f^{-1}) = f^{-\overline{1}} = \overline{f}^{-\overline{1}}.$ 

• 
$$f^{-\overline{1}} = \operatorname{Int}(f^{-\overline{1}}) = \operatorname{Int}(f^{-\underline{1}}) = f^{-\overline{1}} = \overline{f}^{-1}$$

- $(f^{-\underline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = \underline{f}$ ,
- $(f^{-\overline{1}})^{-\overline{1}} = \overline{f}$

This lemma together with Lemma A.3 allows us to justify that there are only two possible definition of the parallel sum for mappings in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Lemma A.13.** Given  $f, g \in M$  with the same monotonicity:

$$(f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = f \coprod g$$
 and  $(f^{-\underline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}})^{-\overline{1}} = f \boxplus g$ 

Proof. It is a simple consequence of Lemmas A.12 and A.3:

$$(f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = (\operatorname{Cl}(f^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}}))^{-\underline{1}} = (\operatorname{Cl}(f^{-\overline{1}}) + \operatorname{Cl}(g^{-\overline{1}}))^{-\underline{1}} = (f^{-\underline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} = f \boxplus g$$

We further get an easy way to compute the inverse of minima and maxima of mappings of  $\mathcal{M}.$ 

**Lemma A.14.** Given two mappings  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ :

$$\min(f,g)^{-\underline{1}} = \min(f^{-\underline{1}},g^{-\underline{1}})$$
 and  $\max(f,g)^{-\underline{1}} = \max(f^{-\underline{1}},g^{-\underline{1}}).$ 

If  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ :

$$\min(f,g)^{-1} = \max(f^{-1},g^{-1})$$
 and  $\max(f,g)^{-1} = \min(f^{-1},g^{-1})$ 

*Proof.* Let us simply note that when  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_-$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(\min(f,g))) &= \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(f) \cup \operatorname{Epi}(g)) = \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(f)) \cup \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(g)) = \operatorname{Epi}(\min(f^{-1}, g^{-1})) \\ \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(\max(f,g))) &= \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(f) \cap \operatorname{Epi}(g)) = \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(f)) \cap \tau(\operatorname{Epi}(g)) = \operatorname{Epi}(\max(f^{-1}, g^{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

The case  $f,g \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is again deduced thanks to Lemma A.5.

In order to prove the different result about the composition of the parallel sum (Propositions 1.7 and A.17), let us now express the pseudo-inverse of the composition of two functions.

Lemma A.15. Given  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$ :

$$\begin{split} \text{if } f,g \in \mathcal{M}_+ \colon & \begin{cases} (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \\ (\underline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ (\underline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ \end{cases} & \quad \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_+, g \in \mathcal{M}_- \colon \begin{cases} (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ (\underline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \\ (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \\ (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \\ (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ \end{array} & \quad \text{if } f \in \mathcal{M}_-, g \in \mathcal{M}_+ \colon \begin{cases} (\underline{f} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \\ (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ (\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\overline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}} \\ \end{array} \end{split}$$

*Proof.* Let us first assume that  $f \in \mathcal{M}_-$  and  $g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ . First note that  $\underline{f} \circ g, g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\underline{1}} \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , and considering  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , one can show straightforwardly the identity:

$$(\underline{f} \circ g)^{-1}(y) = \inf \left\{ x, \underline{f}(g(x)) \le y \right\} = \inf \left\{ x, g(x) \ge f^{-1}(y) \right\} = g^{-1} \circ f^{-1}(y),$$

following the definition of  $(f \circ g)^{-1}$  and  $g^{-1}$  and thanks to the induction:  $\underline{f}(g(x)) \leq y \Leftrightarrow g(x) \geq f^{-1}(y)$  given by Lemma A.10 (note that  $\underline{f}^{-1} = f^{-1}$  thanks to Lemma A.12 and that the closeness of g is unnecessary).

Now, if we assume  $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$  and  $g \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , we have thanks to Lemma A.11:

$$(\underline{f} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = (\underline{f} \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ g)^{-\underline{1}}$$
  
=  $(-\circ g)^{-\underline{1}} \circ (f \circ (-\operatorname{Id}))^{-\underline{1}} = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ (-f^{-\overline{1}}) = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}}.$ 

When  $f,g \in M_+$ , let us use the second result of Lemma A.10 concerning increasing mappings to set for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$(\overline{f}\circ g)^{-\underline{1}}(y) = \inf\left\{x,\overline{f}(g(x)) \ge y\right\} = \inf\left\{x,g(x) \ge f^{-\underline{1}}(y)\right\} = g^{-\underline{1}}\circ f^{-\underline{1}}(y),$$

Finally, if we assume  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , one can show:

$$(\overline{f} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = (\overline{f} \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} = (- \circ g)^{-\underline{1}} \circ (f \circ (-\operatorname{Id}))^{-\underline{1}}$$
$$= g^{-\underline{1}} \circ (-\operatorname{Id}) \circ -f^{-\overline{1}} = g^{-\underline{1}} \circ f^{-\overline{1}}$$

Let us now give a general result on the composition of parallel sum on the left, whose Proposition 1.7 is a consequence.

**Proposition A.16.** Given  $\alpha, f, g \in \mathcal{M}$ :

$$If \alpha, f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{+} : \underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\underline{\alpha} \circ f) \boxplus (\underline{\alpha} \circ g),$$
  

$$If \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{+} \text{ and } f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-} : \underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\overline{\alpha} \circ f) \boxplus (\overline{\alpha} \circ g),$$
  

$$If \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-} \text{ and } f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{+} : \underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\overline{\alpha} \circ f) \boxplus (\overline{\alpha} \circ g),$$
  

$$If \alpha, f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-} : \underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = (\underline{\alpha} \circ f) \boxplus (\underline{\alpha} \circ g).$$

*Proof.* Let us compute when  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$  (we put the lemma reference on the top of each equality for justification):

$$\underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) \stackrel{A.12}{=} (\alpha^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} \circ (f^{-\underline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}})^{-\underline{1}}$$

$$\stackrel{A.15}{=} (\operatorname{Int}(f^{-\underline{1}}) \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}} + \operatorname{Int}((g^{-\underline{1}}) \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}}$$

$$\stackrel{A.12}{=} (f^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}}$$

$$\stackrel{A.15}{=} ((\underline{\alpha} \circ f)^{-\overline{1}} + (\underline{\alpha} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}})^{-\underline{1}} \stackrel{A.13}{=} \underline{\alpha} \circ f \boxplus \underline{\alpha} \circ g.$$

If  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ :

$$\underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = \left(f^{-\underline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\underline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \left((\overline{\alpha} \circ f)^{-\overline{1}} + (\overline{\alpha} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \overline{\alpha} \circ f \boxplus \overline{\alpha} \circ g.$$
If  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$  and  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$ :  

$$\underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = \left(f^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \left((\overline{\alpha} \circ f)^{-\overline{1}} + (\overline{\alpha} \circ g)^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \overline{\alpha} \circ f \boxplus \overline{\alpha} \circ g.$$
If  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$  and  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{-}$ :  

$$\underline{\alpha} \circ (f \boxplus g) = \left(f^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}} + g^{-\overline{1}} \circ \alpha^{-\overline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \left((\underline{\alpha} \circ f)^{-\underline{1}} + (\underline{\alpha} \circ g)^{-\underline{1}}\right)^{-\underline{1}} = \underline{\alpha} \circ f \boxplus \underline{\alpha} \circ g.$$

$$\Box$$

Next result allows to connect the parallel sum with the parallel product. Note that here the composition is made on the right, this result is not a consequence of Proposition 1.7.

**Proposition A.17.** Given two mappings  $f, g \in M$  with support in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , one has the identity:

$$(f \boxtimes g) \circ \exp = (f \circ \exp) \boxplus (g \circ \exp).$$

Proof of Proposition A.17. Note that  $\exp^{-1} = \exp^{-1} = \log$  (and conversely) and that  $\exp, \log$  are both closed and opened. Given  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , one can express thanks to Lemma A.15:

$$(f^{-1} \cdot g^{-1})^{-1} \circ \exp = (\log \circ (f^{-1} \cdot g^{-1}))^{-1} = (\log \circ f^{-1} + \log \circ g^{-1}))^{-1}$$
$$= ((\overline{f} \circ \exp)^{-1} + (\overline{g} \circ \exp)^{-1}))^{-1} = ((f \circ \exp)^{-1} + (g \circ \exp)^{-1}))^{-1}$$
$$= (f \circ \exp) \boxplus (g \circ \exp)$$

since, exp being a bijection between  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+$  it is not hard to see, looking at the epigraph that  $\operatorname{Cl}(f \circ \exp) = f \circ \exp$ , and therefore, thanks to Lemma A.12:

$$(\overline{f} \circ \exp)^{-\underline{1}} = (\operatorname{Cl}(\overline{f} \circ \exp)^{-\underline{1}} = (f \circ \exp)^{-\underline{1}} = (\operatorname{Cl}(f \circ \exp))^{-\underline{1}} = (f \circ \exp)^{-\underline{1}}.$$

If  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_-$ , the previous computations are almost the same, with the small difference that one will see this time appear  $\underline{f}$  and  $\underline{g}$  in the sequence of computations.  $\Box$ 

#### References

- [1] Radoslaw Adamczak. A note on the hanson-wright inequality for random vectors with dependencies. 2015.
- [2] Radosław Adamczak and Paweł Wolff. Concentration inequalities for non-lipschitz functions with bounded derivatives of higher order. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162:531–586, 2015.
- [3] W Anderson, T Morley, and G Trapp. Fenchel duality of nonlinear networks. *IEEE Transactions* on Circuits and Systems, 25(9):762–765, 1978.
- [4] William N Anderson Jr and Richard James Duffin. Series and parallel addition of matrices. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 26(3):576–594, 1969.
- [5] HH Bauschke and PL Combettes. Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces. CMS books in mathematics, Springer, 2011.
- [6] Dimitri Bertsekas. Convex optimization theory, volume 1. Athena Scientific, 2009.
- [7] Friedrich Götze, Holger Sambale, and Arthur Sinulis. Concentration inequalities for bounded functionals via log-sobolev-type inequalities. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 34:1623–1652, 2021.
- [8] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, Yan Shu, and Prasad Tetali. Characterization of a class of weak transport-entropy inequalities on the line. 2018.
- [9] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, and Prasad Tetali. Kantorovich duality for general transport costs and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273(11):3327–3405, 2017.
- [10] Mikhael Gromov and Vitali D Milman. A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality. American Journal of Mathematics, 105(4):843–854, 1983.
- [11] Rafał Latała. Estimates of moments and tails of gaussian chaoses. 2006.
- [12] Michel Ledoux. The concentration of measure phenomenon. ed. by peter landweber et al. vol. 89. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, page 181, 2005.

- [13] Elizabeth S Meckes and Mark W Meckes. Concentration and convergence rates for spectral measures of random matrices. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 156:145–164, 2013.
- [14] Michel Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS*, 104:905–909, 1995.
- [15] Michel Talagrand. A new look at independence. The Annals of probability, pages 1-34, 1996.
- [16] Van H Vu. Concentration of non-lipschitz functions and applications. Random Structures & Algorithms, 20(3):262–316, 2002.