
Token Sample Complexity of Attention

Léa Bohbot Cyril Letrouit Gabriel Peyré
ENS, PSL Univ. LMO, Univ. Paris-Saclay, CNRS CNRS, ENS, PSL Univ.
François-Xavier Vialard
LIGM, Univ. Gustave Eiffel, CNRS

Abstract

As context windows in large language models continue to expand, it is essential to characterize how attention behaves at extreme sequence lengths. We introduce token-sample complexity: the rate at which attention computed on n tokens converges to its infinite-token limit. We estimate finite- n convergence bounds at two levels: pointwise uniform convergence of the attention map, and convergence of moments for the transformed token distribution. For compactly supported (and more generally sub-Gaussian) distributions, our first result shows that the attention map converges uniformly on a ball of radius R at rate $C(R)/\sqrt{n}$, where $C(R)$ grows exponentially with R . For large R , this estimate loses practical value, and our second result addresses this issue by establishing convergence rates for the moments of the transformed distribution (the token output of the attention layer). In this case, the rate is $C'(R)/n^\beta$ with $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, and $C'(R)$ depends polynomially on the size of the support of the distribution. The exponent β depends on the attention geometry and the spectral properties of the tokens distribution. We also examine the regime in which the attention parameter tends to infinity and the softmax approaches a hardmax, and in this setting, we establish a logarithmic rate of convergence. Experiments on synthetic Gaussian data and real BERT models on Wikipedia text confirm our predictions.

1 Introduction

The remarkable success of Transformer models in natural language processing and beyond has been driven by attention mechanisms that can flexibly handle very long input sequences [Vaswani et al., 2017, Devlin et al., 2019]. Recent large-context Transformers extend context windows from 100K to 10M tokens [Reid et al., 2024, Hooper et al., 2024], allowing models to attend over entire books or codebases in a single forward pass. This trend raises fundamental questions about how attention mechanisms behave in the regime of extremely large sequences, and how much benefit is gained by providing ever more tokens as input. In this work, we introduce the notion of *token sample complexity* to characterize the precision gained by feeding additional tokens into an already-trained attention model. Classical statistical sample complexity focuses on how a model’s performance changes as the amount of training data increases. In contrast, we assume the transformer is already trained and examine a different asymptotic setting: for a fixed input distribution, we let the number n of tokens in the context grow. As this input dimension n increases, our objective is to understand how the resulting attention outputs behave in this limit. We quantify here how many tokens are required for the attention outputs to approach their limiting behavior as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We formalize the infinite-token limit of a Transformer’s self-attention as a continuous operator on probability measures. Following [De Bie et al., 2019, Pevny and Kovarik, 2019], we view a sequence of n tokens as an empirical distribution $\hat{\mu}_n$ that approximates an underlying token distribution μ . We define the attention mechanism in the limit of infinitely many tokens as an operator Γ acting on μ , providing a continuous reference that finite- n attention approximates. This measure-theoretic

perspective was pioneered by [Sander et al., 2022] and extended to study Transformers as interacting particle systems [Lu et al., 2019, Geshkovski et al., 2024, 2025, Castin et al., 2025, Burger et al., 2025, Bruno et al., 2025, Zimin et al., 2025, Chen et al., 2025].

We use this infinite-token limit to formalize *token sample complexity*: the rate at which finite- n attention approaches its infinite-limit counterpart. With compactly supported token distributions, one naturally expects parametric convergence at rate $1/\sqrt{n}$. This is not what we observe experimentally. On both synthetic Gaussian data and BERT applied to Wikipedia, convergence is slower, following sub-parametric rates $n^{-\beta}$ with $\beta < 1/2$. The exponent β depends on the *attention horizon* (how far the kernel reaches) and the *spectral reach* (the scale of token variance): when these grow large, as with hardmax attention, convergence can slow down dramatically, even approaching logarithmic rates.

1.1 Contributions

In this paper, we develop the notion of *token sample complexity* for attention mechanisms: the rate at which attention outputs converge to their continuous limit as n grows. We analyze this at two levels: (i) the almost-sure convergence of the *attention map* itself at a given query x , and (ii) the convergence in law of the *transformed distribution* for random inputs. More precisely, our key contributions are the following.

In Section 3, we quantify attention map convergence. Proposition 3.3 establishes pointwise convergence at rate $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ with exponential dependence on attention horizon and spectral reach. Theorem 3.4 provides uniform convergence on balls B_R for sub-Gaussian tokens, with explicit quantitative estimation of the rate.

In Section 4, we analyze moment convergence, directly relevant for downstream tasks relying on aggregate statistics. Theorem 4.4 gives rates for the moment of any Lipschitz or quadratic function of the attention, covering mean and covariance. For compact support, Proposition 4.1 yields $C(R)/\sqrt{n}$ with $C(R)$ exponential in radius R , becoming uninformative for large R . This reveals a fundamental trade-off: by tracking a more relevant characteristic distance, in Theorem 4.4 we obtain polynomial (rather than exponential) dependence on scale, with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\beta})$ where $\beta < 1/2$ depends on attention horizon and spectral properties of the token distribution, which better captures real-data behavior.

In Section 5, we complete our analysis by deriving convergence rates for infinite horizon (hardmax) attention in the Gaussian case: Proposition 5.1 shows that convergence becomes only logarithmic in n , of order $1/\sqrt{\ln n}$.

In Section 6, we illustrate our theoretical findings on synthetic data. These results are further motivated by real-data experiments: using a BERT model [Devlin et al., 2019] on long text inputs (Wikipedia documents), we empirically observe the predicted deceleration of convergence rates. Observed rates remain strictly slower than $1/\sqrt{n}$, demonstrating that the sub-parametric convergence regime governs attention behavior in practice.

1.2 Background and related work

Classical PAC sample complexity. In statistical learning theory, *sample complexity* refers to the number of training samples N required for a learning algorithm to achieve a probably approximately correct (PAC) solution [Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014]. The classical question is: given i.i.d. examples of fixed dimension, how many samples are needed so that, with high probability, the learned model’s error is within ε of the optimum? Classical results show N scales with hypothesis class complexity (VC dimension, Rademacher complexity), but crucially assumes each sample has fixed, finite dimension. This is the regime of standard PAC theory: we collect more fixed-size data points (images, sentences) to improve generalization.

Token sample complexity (this work). In our setting, we consider an entirely different kind of complexity question: the model is *already trained*, and we are not collecting new independent samples; instead, we are increasing the number of tokens in a single input sequence. Modern Transformer encoders like BERT process an input as a single sequence of tokens (e.g. words or subword tokens in a sentence) of length n . Importantly, n is not fixed—the architecture allows variable-

length input, and indeed self-attention inherently permits an unbounded number of tokens by design [Vaswani et al., 2017]. Thus, we can think of n as a parameter of the problem instance, akin to an input dimension that can grow.

This inference-time perspective aligns with a growing interest in processing extended contexts at inference. In-context learning (ICL) exemplifies this: Transformers solve tasks often requiring more tokens than seen during training [Brown et al., 2020, Zhang et al., 2023, Sander et al., 2024, Huang et al., 2024, Zhang et al., 2025]. Similarly, chain-of-thought prompting elicits multi-step reasoning purely through extended input sequences [Wei et al., 2022]. As these methods push n beyond training-time lengths, understanding how attention accuracy scales with n during inference becomes a natural question.

Transformers and self-attention A Transformer model is built from layers that mix content across positions via *self-attention* and process each position with feed-forward networks [Vaswani et al., 2017]. In a Transformer encoder, an input sequence of n tokens is represented as row vectors $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ in \mathbb{R}^d (typically after an initial embedding and positional encoding). A self-attention head computes output vectors z_i as weighted aggregates of a value matrix $V = [x_1; \dots; x_n]$ using affinities between tokens. In the common softmax attention, the attention weight from token i to token j is

$$a_{ij} = \frac{\exp((x_i W^Q) \cdot (x_j W^K)^\top / \sqrt{d})}{\sum_{j'=1}^n \exp((x_i W^Q) \cdot (x_{j'} W^K)^\top / \sqrt{d})},$$

where W^Q, W^K are learned projection matrices for queries and keys. Then $z_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (x_j W^V)$ (with W^V the value projection). The multi-head attention mechanism repeats this process with multiple sets of (W^Q, W^K, W^V) and concatenates the results. Crucially, the self-attention mechanism has *no intrinsic limitation on n* : the sums run from 1 to n , and aside from computational or memory constraints, one can feed as many tokens as desired. This is in stark contrast to, say, fixed-size CNNs or RNNs that might struggle with very long dependencies. Attention’s power lies in its ability to capture long-range interactions, but this comes at the expense of a quadratic cost $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ in sequence length, motivating research into more efficient variants.

Sparse attention and efficient variants Our results also give insight into the error created when the input tokens are randomly sub-sampled, which can be viewed as a simple model of attention sparsification. In practice, more advanced sparsification strategies are used, such as restricting tokens to local neighborhoods as in Longformer [Beltagy et al., 2020] and BigBird [Zaheer et al., 2020], or explicitly projecting keys and values to lower-dimensional subspaces as in Linformer [Wang et al., 2020]. Although our findings do not cover those methods, they offer an initial step toward a theoretical understanding of such approaches.

Transformers with arbitrarily many tokens To mathematically analyse convergence rate in the large n limit, it is crucial to define the limit mean field model, which corresponds to defining attention as operating over a probability distribution of tokens. This mean field model was initially presented in [De Bie et al., 2019] and [Pevny and Kovarik, 2019], followed by its formulation for Transformers in the work of [Vuckovic et al., 2020], [Sander et al., 2022], [Geshkovski et al., 2024], and [Geshkovski et al., 2025]. It can also be coupled with a neural ODE framework to model infinitely deep transformers, as studied for instance in [Sander et al., 2022], note however that our contributions do not address this setting and focus on a single attention layer. Similarly, [Geshkovski et al., 2024], [Geshkovski et al., 2025] and [Castin et al., 2025] develop a *Transformer PDE* for standard softmax attention and prove it is the mean-field limit of an n -particle system as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The paper [Geshkovski et al., 2025] models tokens as points evolving on the *sphere* \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , to mimic the normalization layers in real Transformers, and connects the resulting equations to various models in mathematical physics. Recent works that build on this mean-field view also include [Karagodin et al., 2024] (clustering with causal masking) and [Bruno et al., 2025] (meta-stable clustering). Notably, [Castin et al., 2025] prove that the Transformer PDE preserves Gaussianity, reducing the dynamics to mean and covariance evolution. In our work, we focus on a single attention layer in the infinite-token limit, using the Gaussian case as a tractable baseline to derive explicit convergence rates and build intuition for extensions to Gaussian mixtures and other sub-Gaussian distributions.

2 Mathematical preliminaries

2.1 Definition of self-attention

We fix $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Vectors live in \mathbb{R}^d with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. For $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\text{softmax}(w)_i := \frac{e^{w_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n e^{w_j}}.$$

Definition 2.1 (Single-head self-attention). Let $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ and set $A := K^\top Q / \sqrt{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. For a sequence $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$, the single-head self-attention map $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^k)^n$ is

$$f(X)_i = V \sum_{j=1}^n P_{ij}(X) x_j, \quad P_{ij}(X) = \text{softmax}(x_i^\top A^\top x_j).$$

Definition 2.2 (Multi-head self-attention). Let H_{heads} divide d and set $k = d/H_{\text{heads}}$. For each head $h \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{heads}}\}$, let $Q^{(h)}, K^{(h)}, V^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ and an output projection $W^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$. Denoting by $f^{(h)}$ the single-head map associated with $(Q^{(h)}, K^{(h)}, V^{(h)})$, the multi-head operator is

$$f_{\text{MH}}(X) = \sum_{h=1}^{H_{\text{heads}}} W^{(h)} f^{(h)}(X) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n.$$

Permutation equivariance and measure modeling. Self-attention without positional information is equivariant to reindexing: for any permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)}) = (f(X))_{\sigma(1:n)}.$$

Hence, one may represent the sequence via its empirical distribution

$$\hat{\mu}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i},$$

and analyze attention at the level of probability measures. This naturally leads to formalizing the infinite-token limit by viewing attention as an operator on such measures.

Definition 2.3 (Continuous (mean-field) self-attention). Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the set of Borel probability measures. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$\Gamma_\mu(x) := V \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle} y \, d\mu(y)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle} \, d\mu(y)} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \quad F(\mu) := (\Gamma_\mu)_\# \mu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^k).$$

When $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y_i}$, $F(\hat{\mu}_n)$ coincides with the empirical law of the discrete self-attention outputs.

2.2 Centering and exponential tilting

Reduction to the centered case. All our results are stated for centered sub-Gaussian distributions, but they extend straightforwardly to non-centered sub-Gaussian distributions, up to adding some constants (related to the mean of the distribution) to the bounds. To keep the presentation as simple as possible, we focus on the centered case in the paper.

Attention as exponential tilting (importance sampling) Let $X \sim \mu$ be a token and assume the denominators below are finite. Then

$$\Gamma_\mu(x) = V \frac{\mathbb{E}[X e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}]} = V \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_{Ax}}[X], \quad d\mathbb{Q}_{Ax} = \frac{e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}]} d\mathbb{P}.$$

where we use the *Esscher transform* for $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, defined by the tilted measure

$$d\mathbb{Q}_t := \frac{e^{\langle t, X \rangle}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle t, X \rangle}]} d\mathbb{P}.$$

Thus, the empirical (finite- n) attention is the Monte Carlo importance-sampling estimator of this tilted expectation.

2.3 Sub-Gaussian background

Sub-Gaussian models provide a convenient level of generality for our purpose: they let us move beyond the compact support setting while strictly containing it as a particular case (see Hoeffding’s lemma in [Hoeffding, 1963]). Sub-Gaussian distributions are extensively used in statistics due to their exponential-type tails and sharp concentration properties for linear and Lipschitz functionals [Boucheron et al., 2013, Vershynin, 2018, Wainwright, 2019, Ch. 2]. They naturally model bounded random variables, sensor noise, and high-dimensional data with controlled tail behavior. They also cover mixtures of Gaussian embeddings that have been recently studied in the context of Transformers.

We adopt the standard log-moment generating function (log-MGF) characterization of sub-Gaussian vectors to formalize our theoretical framework.

Definition 2.4 (Sub-Gaussian vector). A centered random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is *sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix* $\Sigma \succ 0$ if

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\langle t, X \rangle\}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t\right). \quad (1)$$

This matrix formulation of sub-Gaussianity captures potential anisotropy in the distribution—when Σ is ill-conditioned, different directions exhibit varying tail behaviors. While an equivalent scalar formulation $\Sigma := \sigma^2 I$ exists for isotropic cases, the matrix parameterization provides greater generality. Remarkably, we can link the sub-Gaussianity matrix parameter through the classical inequality $\text{Cov}(X) \preceq \Sigma$, with a tight bound for Gaussian variables.

Furthermore, the sub-Gaussian condition (1) implies several useful facts: exponential concentration for linear and Lipschitz functionals, closure under linear transformations $X \mapsto BX$, and stability under convex combinations and exponential tilting. This last property is particularly relevant for transformer architectures, where attention mechanisms reweight token representations through exponential softmax operations based on key-query similarities. Adopting sub-Gaussian tokens is therefore both technically practical and theoretically justified, allowing us to leverage the rich toolbox of high-dimensional concentration theory.

3 Convergence of the attention map

We analyze the convergence of empirical attention when tokens follow a sub-Gaussian distribution in the sense of Definition 2.4. This allows us to quantify how unbounded yet light-tailed token distributions affect this pointwise convergence.

In this section, we examine how fast $\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2$ converges to zero. We first establish that $\|\Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2$ grows at most linearly in Euclidean norm. Then we provide both a pointwise high-probability convergence for any token $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a uniform convergence rate over all tokens in a ball of radius R . In both cases we highlight the dependence of the estimated rate on the attention parameters and the token distribution properties.

3.1 At most linear growth of the attention map

We start with a preliminary result that quantifies the growth of the attention map norm with the query norm. Lemma 3.1 establishes that the attention map $\Gamma_\mu(x)$ cannot grow faster than linearly in the query norm $\|x\|_2$. This linear growth property is crucial for controlling the behavior of attention mechanisms and will be instrumental in establishing convergence rates.

Let us denote by $\|\Sigma\|_2 := \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$ the largest eigenvalue of Σ , where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes both the matrix norm and the Euclidean norm (clear from the context).

Lemma 3.1 (At-most linear growth of Γ). *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$. For any matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$ and any $x, t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, define*

$$\Gamma_\mu(x) := V \nabla K(Ax), \quad K(t) := \ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle t, X \rangle}].$$

Then

$$\|\Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq 2 \|V\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2 \|x\|_2.$$

Proof. Following the proof in [Bobkov and Götze, 2025], we define the auxiliary function $P(t) = \frac{1}{2}\langle t, \Sigma t \rangle - K(t)$ which satisfies $P(t) \geq 0$ by definition of the sub-gaussianness. By Jensen's inequality, we have $K(t) \geq 0$ which implies $P(t) \leq \frac{1}{2}\langle t, \Sigma t \rangle$. Moreover, by convexity of $K(t)$, we have $P'' \leq \Sigma$. By Taylor expansion, this implies

$$0 \leq P(h+t) = P(t) + \langle \nabla P(t), h \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle h, \Sigma h \rangle.$$

Minimizing over h the r.h.s. leads to

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla P(t), \Sigma^{-1} \nabla P(t) \rangle \leq P(t).$$

Therefore, we get by the triangle inequality

$$\|\nabla K(t)\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} = \|\Sigma t - \nabla P(t)\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} \leq \|t\| + \sqrt{2P(t)} \leq 2\|t\|_{\Sigma},$$

where we used the Mahalanobis norm $\|\cdot\|_S$ defined for a positive definite matrix S by $\|x\|_S = x^\top S x = \|S^{1/2}x\|_2^2$.

Converting this estimate for the standard Euclidean norm leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla K(Ax)\|_2 &= \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^{-1/2} \nabla K(Ax) \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \nabla K(Ax) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \|\Sigma^{1/2} Ax\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Coming back to the attention map, we have $\Gamma_\mu(x) = V \nabla K(Ax)$, which yields the claimed linear growth. \square

Gaussian distributions saturate this sub-Gaussian bound: $K(t) = \frac{1}{2}t^\top \Sigma t$ exactly, so ∇K is linear and Lemma 3.1 is tight up to constants. As a result, the class of Gaussian distributions is preserved layer-wise [Castin et al., 2025], which allows to follow the evolution of tokens by tracking only means and covariances. This makes Gaussians a calibrating case for both growth bounds and deviation inequalities (see for example [Wainwright, 2019, Sec. 2.1], and [Vershynin, 2018, Sec. 2.5]).

Lemma 3.2 (Exact linearity under Gaussian inputs (Castin and al. 2025)). *If $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, then for all x , the log-MGF is quadratic and the population attention map is exactly linear:*

$$\Gamma_\mu(x) = V \nabla K(Ax) = V \Sigma Ax. \quad K(t) := \ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle t, X \rangle}] = \frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t.$$

Hence the Gaussian family is preserved by attention, and first/second moments determine the dynamics.

Note that, when μ has a compact support, the transformed distribution of the tokens stays bounded.

3.2 Pointwise convergence of the attention map

Here we prove that the pointwise concentration of the attention map exhibits the classical $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ asymptotic rate for empirical processes, combined with an exponential dependence on $\|\Sigma^{1/2} Ax\|_2^2$ that captures how attention mechanisms amplify signals along high-variance directions. This pointwise analysis provides relevant insights into how individual attention outputs stabilize with increasing context length, with potential applications in attention sketching and approximation methods.

Proposition 3.3 (Pointwise convergence of the attention map for sub-Gaussian tokens). *Let $X \sim \mu$ be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$. For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the empirical attention computed from n i.i.d. tokens satisfies, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq q_{\Sigma, V, d, \delta} \cdot \frac{e^{\frac{5}{2} \|\Sigma^{1/2} Ax\|_2^2}}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (2)$$

where $q_{\Sigma, V, d, \delta} := (2 + \sqrt{3}) \|V\|_2 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \cdot q_{d, 1-\delta}^{1/2}$.

Here $q_{d, 1-\delta}$ denotes the $(1 - \delta)$ -quantile of the $\chi^2(d)$ distribution, which satisfies in particular $q_{d, 1-\delta} \leq d + 2\sqrt{d \ln(1/\delta)} + 2 \ln(1/\delta)$.

The proof of Proposition 3.3 can be found in Appendix B.5. It combines classical tools of statistics with properties of sub-Gaussian distributions.

In the particular case of Gaussians, a sharper estimation can be found in Appendix C.1.

3.3 Uniform convergence of the attention map

In Proposition 3.3, the pointwise bound controls the error at a single, fixed query x . While this result achieves precise control in δ , and a sharp exponential rate, the event of probability δ for which $\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2$ is not controlled depends a priori on the query x , and thus Proposition 3.3 does not ensure global convergence of the attention map. Indeed, when attention processes many tokens across the space of query, we need simultaneous control for all x in this space: a single bad query can ruin global behavior of the attention operator across the distribution.

Establishing an explicit quantitative estimation of this uniform convergence (Theorem 3.4) is substantially more challenging: while classical empirical process theory ensures uniform convergence over $\mathcal{F} = \{y \mapsto ye^{\langle Ax, y \rangle}\}$, extracting quantitative bounds from these results cannot be done off-the-shelf. Our main contribution is therefore to establish such explicit estimations of the rates through a refined analysis.

Theorem 3.4 (Uniform convergence of the attention map for sub-Gaussian tokens). *Let $X \sim \mu$ be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$. For any $R > 0$, $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for $n \geq n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R) := 4e^{2R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - 1\right)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{x \in B_R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2 \leq q_{(\Sigma, A, V, R, d, \delta)} \cdot \frac{e^{8R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2}}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (3)$$

where $q_{(\Sigma, A, V, R, d, \delta)} := \frac{C\sqrt{d}}{\delta} \|V\|_2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \cdot (R\|A\|_2\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}d + \text{tr}(\Sigma)^{1/2}\|A\|_2 + 5^{d/2}\sqrt{d})$.

Note that, despite the substantially more delicate analysis, the exponential rate in $R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2$ remains the same as in Proposition 3.3 up to a constant factor, though the pre-exponential factor is now less precise in δ and carries additional dependence on R , A and Σ . The proof of this result can be found in Appendix B.2.

For Gaussians, a better estimate on the rate can be derived.

Proposition 3.5 (Uniform convergence of the attention map for Gaussian tokens). *Let $X \sim \mu$ be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$. For any $R > 0$, $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for $n \geq n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R) := 4e^{2R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - 1\right)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{x \in B_R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2 \leq q_{(\Sigma, A, V, R, d, \delta)}^{\mathcal{N}} \cdot \frac{e^{R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2}}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (4)$$

where $q_{(\Sigma, A, V, R, d, \delta)}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is defined in Appendix C.3.

In order to extract quantitative bounds from classical results of empirical process theory, our proof of Theorem 3.4 proceeds in three steps: (i) symmetrize and bound the supremum of the class, reduce it along dual directions, and verify sub-Gaussian increments on a product space $G = B_1 \times \mathcal{F}$; (ii) control both a Lipschitz envelope and an unbounded class envelope $F(y) = \|y\|_2 e^{R\|A^\top y\|_2}$ via high-order moments, chaining methods (Dudley's entropy integral) and covering numbers bounds; and (iii) handle the ratio structure of attention without a uniform delta method, since the empirical denominator can get arbitrarily close to zero, even if with small probability. The full proof of Theorem 3.4 can be found in Appendix B.4 (see also Appendix C.3 for specific derivations to the Gaussian case). A similar bound for the covariance matrix can be derived as a corollary to Theorem 3.4 (see Appendix B.6 for proof).

Finally, for compactly supported distributions of tokens, we show the following bound in Proposition 3.6 (see Appendix B.7 for proof).

Proposition 3.6 (Uniform convergence of the attention map for compactly supported tokens). *Let $X \sim \mu$ be centered, with $\text{Supp}(\mu) \subset B_{R_0}$. For any $R > 0$, $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for $n \geq n_{\min}(\delta, A, R, R_0) := 4e^{2RR_0\|A\|_2} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - 1\right)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{x \in B_R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{q_{V, A, R_0, d, \delta}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{2RR_0\|A\|_2}, \quad (5)$$

where $q_{V, A, R_0, d, \delta} := \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{c\sqrt{d}R_0(2R_0^2\|A\|_2 + R_0\|A\|_2 + 2)}{\delta}$.

4 Convergence of the transformed distribution

So far, we have analyzed the convergence of a single attention vector $\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2$ computed for queries in a fixed compact set. However, it is also important to consider the convergence of the output distribution itself. The convergence of the output distribution is particularly relevant for downstream tasks that rely on aggregate token statistics, such as classification or sequence-level predictions. Moreover, in deep transformer architectures, attention layers are stacked: the inputs to subsequent layers depend on the entire reweighted distribution produced by earlier attention mechanisms. Understanding distributional convergence is therefore crucial for analyzing error propagation through the network depth.

To characterize the convergence of the transformed distribution, we estimate the rate at which empirical moments $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))]$ converge as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any Lipschitz function f . We extend this analysis to quadratic functions, enabling us to capture both the mean and covariance of the transformed distribution. These first two moments are natural quantities to study, particularly because they fully characterize Gaussian distributions.

4.1 Compactly supported token distributions

We begin by analyzing the case where the token distributions is bounded, a particular instance of the sub-Gaussian framework. In appearance, this case exhibits more favorable convergence behavior.

From Proposition 3.6, we deduce the following estimation in the compact support setting.

Proposition 4.1 (Lipschitz functional convergence rate for compactly supported tokens). *Let $X \sim \mu$ centered with $\text{Supp}(\mu) \subset B_{R_0}$, and let $f : \mathcal{L}^2(\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mu)$ be a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant L_0 . Recall the definition of the empirical distribution $\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Y_i}$. Let us denote by $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}$ the expectation w.r.t. μ , and $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}$ the expectation w.r.t. the empirical measure. For n i.i.d. tokens, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[f(\Gamma_\mu(X))]\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot L_0 \cdot \left(q_{V,A,R_0,d,\delta} e^{2 \cdot R_0^2 \|A\|_2^2} + q'_{V,R_0,d,\delta} \right)$$

where $q_{V,A,R_0,d,\delta}$ is defined in Proposition 3.6, and $q'_{V,R_0,d,\delta} := \|V\|_2 q_{d,1-\delta}^{1/2} R_0^2$.

Our motivation for examining this specific case is based on two key observations. First, tokens pass through a normalization layer before the attention mechanism, making them effectively compact-supported, and thus we expect the parametric rate predicted by theory to manifest in practice. Second, this assumption is standard in the theoretical study of transformers [Geshkovski et al., 2025], providing additional motivation to investigate it within this framework.

Surprisingly, this simplified framework does not align well with practical observations, particularly for models like BERT. Standard bounded-support analyses assuming tokens lie in a ball of radius R yield parametric rates $C(R, \Sigma, A)/\sqrt{n}$, where $C(R, \Sigma, A)$ grows exponentially in the product of R and attention parameters (such as $\|\Sigma A\|_2$). However, for such bound to be informative we need to compare R with the relevant scales of the problem: the number of tokens n , the variance of the distribution, and the norm of attention matrices. Critically, when the product $R \cdot \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2$ becomes large relative to $\sqrt{\ln n}$, the exponential growth of $C(R, \Sigma, A)$ overwhelms the $1/\sqrt{n}$ decay, and we lose our upper convergence bound. This motivates extending our analyses to the sub-Gaussian setting to get better constants that captures real convergence behavior.

4.2 Sub-Gaussian tokens

We analyze the convergence of empirical attention when tokens follow a sub-Gaussian distribution in the sense of Definition 2.4. This allows us to quantify how unbounded yet light-tailed token distributions affect both pointwise attention outputs and their low-order moments. We obtain a convergence rate estimate of $O(n^{-\beta})$ with $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, where β depends on the attention parameters and the token distribution.

Definition 4.2 (Spectral reach and attention–reach coupling). Let X be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$. Recall $A = K^\top Q$. We define:

1. *The Spectral Reach*

$$\|\Sigma\|_2 := \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma).$$

2. *The Attention Horizon*

$$H := \|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2.$$

3. *The Attention–Reach Coupling (ARC)*

$$\Psi := \|\Sigma\|_2 H^2.$$

Remark 4.3 (Intuition for spectral reach, attention horizon, and ARC). The spectral reach $\|\Sigma\|_2$, the largest eigenvalue of the covariance, measures the maximum scale of variance in the token distribution. The attention horizon H quantifies the effective range of attention: intuitively, how distant tokens can still influence a given query, as determined by token geometry (Σ) and attention weights (A). The product $\Psi = \|\Sigma\|_2 H^2$, the *Attention–Reach Coupling (ARC)*, combines these two factors: larger values mean attention operates over tokens with greater variance spread over wider distances.

We denote by $\mathcal{L}^2(\mu)$ the Hilbert space of measurable functions $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|g\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mu)}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|g(x)\|_2^2 d\mu(x) < \infty$.

Theorem 4.4 (Lipschitz functional convergence rate for sub-Gaussian tokens). *Let X be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$ and define Ψ as above. Let $f : \mathcal{L}^2(\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mu)$ be a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant L_0 . Let us denote by $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}$ the expectation w.r.t. μ , and $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}$ the expectation w.r.t. the empirical measure. For n i.i.d. tokens, with $n \geq \max(n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R), 30)$, where $n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R)$ defined in Proposition 3.5, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[f(\Gamma_{\mu}(X))]\| \leq P(\sqrt{\ln n}, L_0) \cdot O(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+32 \cdot \Psi)}}),$$

where P is a polynomial function.

We highlight the particular case of the mean of the distribution, which is a corollary of the previous result (with $f = \text{id}$).

Corollary 4.5 (Mean convergence rate for sub-Gaussian tokens). *Let X be centered and sub-Gaussian with parameter matrix $\Sigma \succ 0$ and define Ψ as above. Let us denote by $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}$ the expectation w.r.t. μ and $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}$ the expectation w.r.t. the empirical measure. For n i.i.d. tokens, with $n \geq \max(n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R), 30)$, with $n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R)$ defined in Proposition 3.5, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)]\| = P(\sqrt{\ln n}) \cdot O(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+32 \cdot \Psi)}}).$$

where P is a polynomial function.

The same result holds for Gaussian distribution, with a sharper rate.

Proposition 4.6 (Mean convergence rate for Gaussian tokens). *For Gaussian tokens using the same notation we have,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)]\| = O\left((\ln n)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\Psi)}}\right).$$

Remark 4.7. Corollary 4.5 establishes a fundamental trade-off between the complexity of the linear transformation (captured by $H^2 = \|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2$) and the sub-Gaussian parameter (captured by $\|\Sigma\|_2$) in determining the convergence rate. When H^2 is large relative to $\frac{1}{\|\Sigma\|_2}$, we have $\Psi \gg 1$ and the convergence rate can be $n^{-\varepsilon}$ where ε approaches 0, which is slower than the standard parametric rate. Conversely, when H^2 is small relative to $\frac{1}{\|\Sigma\|_2}$, $\Psi \ll 1$ and we recover the standard $n^{-1/2}$ rate.

A similar convergence rate holds for the covariance matrix. Let

$$\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i) - \bar{\Gamma}_n)(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i) - \bar{\Gamma}_n)^\top, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i),$$

and

$$\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(\Gamma_{\mu}(X)) := \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)\Gamma_{\mu}(X)^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)]\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)^\top].$$

Our main result regarding the convergence rate of the covariance is the following.

Proposition 4.8 (Covariance convergence rate for sub-Gaussian tokens). *With the notation $\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))$ and $\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(\Gamma_{\mu}(X))$ defined above, for n i.i.d. tokens with $n \geq \max(n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R), 30)$, where $n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R)$ is defined in Proposition 3.5, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(\Gamma_{\mu}(X))\|_2 \leq P(\sqrt{\ln n}) O(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+16 \cdot \Psi)}}). \quad (6)$$

The proof follows broadly the same steps as the one of Theorem 4.4. It can be found in Appendix B.6.

5 Hardmax regime

To complete our analysis, we study the case of an infinite horizon regime (the ‘hardmax’ attention). This limit case is practically relevant because, in real Transformer architectures, matrix norms tend to be significant, creating conditions similar to this limiting regime.

In this section, we take a simplified setting of Gaussian distribution in dimension $d = 1$. The key insight is that in the wide horizon regime (where $\|A \cdot \sigma\|_2 \gg 1$), the softmax attention mechanism behaves essentially like a hard-max selector ($A = \infty$), concentrating attention weights on extreme token values. As a consequence, the empirical attention output reduces to a combination of the sample *maximum* and *minimum*. This phenomenon leads to remarkable cancellation effect and the convergence rate is governed by classical Gaussian extreme value theory.

In the whole Section 5, we assume $d = 1$, i.e., we work in the one-dimensional setting.

5.1 Convergence rate of hardmax attention

We consider a set of tokens $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Let $M_n^+ := \max_{j \leq n} X_j$ and $M_n^- := \min_{j \leq n} X_j$ be the maximum and minimum of the token set $(X_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$.

The hardmax-attention is defined by,

$$\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(X_i) := \begin{cases} M_n^+ & \text{if } X_i > 0, \\ M_n^- & \text{if } X_i < 0. \end{cases}$$

This corresponds to a limit behavior where $A = +\infty$, and thus the attention map $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(X_i)$ selects only the token with same sign as X_i and largest modulus.

The empirical mean is

$$\bar{\Gamma}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\Gamma}_i = \frac{I_+}{n} M_n^+ + \frac{I_-}{n} M_n^-$$

where $I_+ = \#\{i : X_i > 0\}$, and $I_- = n - I_+$ denote the number of positive and negative tokens X_i . Note that $I_+ \sim \text{Bin}(n, \frac{1}{2})$.

Our main result in the hardmax regime derives the bias and standard deviation of the absolute value of the empirical mean, both of which are of order $1/\sqrt{\ln(n)}$.

Proposition 5.1 (Hardmax convergence rate). *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, taking the expectation w.r.t. X_1, \dots, X_n :*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\bar{\Gamma}_n|] = \frac{\ln(4) \sigma}{2 \sqrt{2 \ln n}} [1 + o(1)] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{\Gamma}_n^2] = \frac{\pi^2 \sigma^2}{24 \ln n} [1 + o(1)]$$

Therefore, the expectation decreases exactly at the rate $\sigma/\sqrt{\ln n}$.

Remark 5.2. Notice that the symmetry of X yields $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\Gamma}_n] = 0$.

The next subsection is devoted to the proof of this result.

5.2 Proof of Proposition 5.1

We decompose the empirical mean into two components:

$$\bar{\Gamma}_n = \frac{I_+}{n} M_n^+ + \frac{I_-}{n} M_n^- = \frac{1}{2} (M_n^+ + M_n^-) + \left(\frac{2I_+ - n}{2n} \right) (M_n^+ - M_n^-).$$

Setting

$$V_n := \frac{1}{2}(M_n^+ + M_n^-), \quad U_n := \left(\frac{2I_+ - n}{2n}\right)(M_n^+ - M_n^-), \quad (7)$$

we get $\bar{\Gamma}_n = V_n + U_n$.

The key insight is that V_n captures the main asymptotic behavior while U_n represents a smaller-order deviation term.

Before proving Proposition 5.1, we establish several technical results on extreme values of Gaussian random variables.

5.2.1 Extreme value analysis

In this subsection, we derive precise asymptotic rates for V_n and establish bounds on U_n . Extreme value theory provides weak convergence of the maximum and minimum (Lemmas B.17 and B.18 in the Appendix). To obtain convergence in expectation, we establish uniform integrability of both extremes in Lemma 5.3.

Let a_n and b_n be the scaling parameters of extreme values defined by

$$a_n := \sigma(\sqrt{2 \ln n} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2 \ln n}(\log \log n + \log 4\pi)) \quad \text{and} \quad b_n = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2 \ln n}}.$$

Lemma 5.3 (Uniform Integrability of Extremes). *Let $Z_n = \frac{M_n^+ - a_n}{b_n}$ and $Y_n = -\frac{M_n^- + a_n}{b_n}$. Then $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are uniformly integrable.*

The definition of uniform integrability is recalled in Appendix B.8.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We establish the result for Z_n in several steps. The same argument applies to Y_n by symmetry.

Step 1: From equation (1.5) in [Tanguy, 2015], we have the concentration inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_n^+ - \mathbb{E}[M_n^+]| > t) \leq 6e^{-ct\sqrt{\ln n}} \quad (8)$$

Step 2: We show that $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Z_n|] < \infty$.

Let M'_n be an independent copy of M_n^+ and set $Z'_n = \frac{M'_n - a_n}{b_n}$. From Step 1:

$$\sup_n \frac{1}{b_n} \mathbb{E}[|M_n^+ - \mathbb{E}[M_n^+]|] < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Using the convexity of $|\cdot|$ and Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z'_n}[|Z_n - Z'_n|] \geq |Z_n - \mathbb{E}[Z'_n]|.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z_n|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Z_n - Z'_n|] + \mathbb{E}[|Z'_n|]$$

From (9), we can deduce that $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Z_n - Z'_n|] < \infty$. Indeed

$$|Z_n - Z'_n| = \frac{1}{b_n}|M_n - M'_n| \leq \frac{1}{b_n}|M_n - \mathbb{E}[M_n]| + \frac{1}{b_n}|M'_n - \mathbb{E}[M'_n]|.$$

Since, on the other hand $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Z_n|] < \infty$, this gives $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Z_n|] < \infty$.

Step 3: We transfer the concentration around $\mathbb{E}[M_n^+]$ to a concentration around a_n .

Define $\delta_n = \mathbb{E}[M_n^+] - a_n$. Then $|\delta_n| = O(b_n)$, so $|\delta_n| \rightarrow 0$. From the event inclusion

$$\{|M_n^+ - a_n| > t\} \subset \{|M_n^+ - \mathbb{E}[M_n^+]| > t - |\delta_n|\}$$

and (8), we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(|M_n^+ - a_n| > t) \leq 6e^{-c(t-|\delta_n|)\sqrt{\ln n}}.$$

For n large enough, it holds for all $t \geq 1$ that $t - |\delta_n| \geq t/2$, giving

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_n| > t) \leq 6e^{-c't}.$$

Step 4: Using the tail integral formula,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z_n| \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_n| > A\}}] = \int_A^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(|Z_n| > x) dx \leq \int_A^{+\infty} 6e^{-c'x} dx = \frac{6}{c'} e^{-c'A} \rightarrow 0$$

as $A \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in n . \square

Lemma 5.4 (Asymptotic behavior of V_n). *There holds*

$$\mathbb{E}|V_n| = \frac{\ln(4)\sigma}{2\sqrt{2\ln n}} [1 + o(1)] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[V_n^2] = \frac{\sigma^2\pi^2}{24\ln n} [1 + o(1)].$$

Proof. The random variables $Z_n = \frac{M_n^+ - a_n}{b_n}$ and $Y_n = -\frac{M_n^- + a_n}{b_n}$ jointly converge weakly to the joint distribution of two independent Gumbel random variables, which we denote G_+ and G_- (see Lemma B.17 in the Appendix).

By Lemma 5.3, both $|Z_n|$ and $|Y_n|$ are asymptotically uniformly integrable. Since $|Z_n - Y_n| \leq |Z_n| + |Y_n|$, it follows that $|Z_n - Y_n|$ is also asymptotically uniformly integrable. Combining the weak convergence of the sum (Lemma B.18) with the dominated convergence theorem ([van der Vaart, 1998, Theorem 2.20, Section 2.5]), we conclude that $|Z_n - Y_n|$ converges in expectation.

Recall that $V_n = \frac{M_n^+ + M_n^-}{2}$, which can be rewritten as $V_n = \frac{\sigma(Z_n - Y_n)}{2\sqrt{2\ln n}}$. We can therefore deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2\sqrt{2\ln n}|V_n|}{\sigma} \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|G_+ - G_-|]. \quad (10)$$

Since $L := G_+ - G_-$ follows a centered logistic law, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|L|] = \ln 4,$$

which gives:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2\sqrt{2\ln n}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}|V_n| = \ln 4.$$

The variance result follows similarly using $\text{Var}(L) = \pi^2/3$. \square

Lemma 5.5 (Upper Bound on U_n). *Let U_n and V_n defined in (7), it holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_n|] \leq \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[U_n^2] = O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right).$$

Proof. Using $\text{Var}(2I_+ - n) = n$ and $\mathbb{E}[|M_n^+ - M_n^-|^2] = O(a_n^2)$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_n|] \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{2I_+ - n}{2n} \right|^2 \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|M_n^+ - M_n^-|^2] \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4n}} \cdot 2a_n = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n}}.$$

For the second moment, using that $\mathbb{E}[|M_n^+ - M_n^-|^4] = O(a_n^4)$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[U_n^2] \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{2I_+ - n}{2n} \right|^4 \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|M_n^+ - M_n^-|^4] \right)^{1/2} = O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

5.2.2 Conclusion

We first establish the convergence of the mean. Using the triangle inequality,

$$|V_n| - |U_n| \leq |\bar{\Gamma}_n| \leq |V_n| + |U_n|.$$

Taking expectations and using $\mathbb{E}|U_n| = o(\mathbb{E}|V_n|)$ from Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5:

$$(1 - o(1)) \mathbb{E}|V_n| \leq \mathbb{E}|\bar{\Gamma}_n| \leq (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{E}|V_n|$$

which provides the announced equivalent for the mean in Lemma 5.4.

For the variance, we decompose:

$$\text{Var}(\bar{\Gamma}_n) = \text{Var}(V_n) + \text{Var}(U_n) + 2 \text{Cov}(U_n, V_n).$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$|\text{Cov}(U_n, V_n)| \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(U_n) \text{Var}(V_n)}.$$

In addition, from Lemma 5.5, $\mathbb{E}[U_n^2] = O(\ln n/n)$, and from Lemma 5.4, $\text{Var}(V_n) = \Theta(1/\ln n)$.

This gives $\text{Var}(U_n) = o(\text{Var}(V_n))$ and $|\text{Cov}(U_n, V_n)| = |\text{Cov}(U_n, V_n)| \leq \sqrt{O(\frac{\ln n}{n}) \Theta(\frac{1}{\ln n})} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln n}}\right)$ from which $\text{Var}(\bar{\Gamma}_n) \sim \text{Var}(V_n)$ follows. Since $\mathbb{E}(\bar{\Gamma}_n) = \mathbb{E}(V_n) = 0$, this concludes the proof.

5.3 Discussion

Cancellation phenomenon In the wide-horizon regime, softmax behaves like a hard maximum that focuses on extremes. For Gaussian inputs, the maximum and minimum are asymptotically $\pm\sqrt{2 \ln n}$, so the mechanism selects either one with roughly equal probability as n grows, and their contributions cancel, yielding a mean near zero. This symmetry-driven cancellation is specifically Gaussian and implies a slow decay of order $\sigma/\sqrt{\ln n}$, much quicker than any fixed polynomial rate. Observe that real token embeddings (e.g., in BERT) do not display the above saturation. Our interpretation is that their distributions can easily deviate from Gaussian symmetry through skewness, kurtosis, anisotropy, or dependence for example. These departures disrupt the tail balance, removing the cancellation and the characteristic $1/\sqrt{\ln n}$ behavior.

6 Experiments

In this section, we present experiments on both synthetic Gaussian data and real-world Wikipedia tokens using BERT embeddings (1M and 20M tokens). We describe our experimental procedures and design choices, and show that the observed convergence rates are consistent with our theoretical analysis.

Monte carlo experimental protocol For each Monte Carlo experiment with n tokens, we begin by sampling n points from a d -dimensional Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\alpha, \Sigma)$. We then calculate the attention matrix for these tokens and compute the empirical mean $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)] \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance matrix $\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. We measure the error $\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)]\|_2$ and $\|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(\Gamma_{\mu}(X))\|_2$, and repeat this entire procedure for R_{rep} iterations to obtain average error values and associated uncertainty ranges.

The procedure described above constitutes one Monte Carlo experiment for a fixed number of tokens n . We repeat this process for increasing values of n to analyze convergence behavior as n grows.

Convergence rate analysis The theoretical convergence rate follows $O(n^{-\beta})$ with $\beta = \frac{1}{2(1+\Psi)}$. We estimate this rate empirically by performing linear regression on log-scale error values as a function of n across all Monte Carlo experiments, yielding $\hat{\beta}$. Theory predicts that the convergence slope depends on the horizon parameter $H^2 = \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2$ and $\|\Sigma\|_2$. For synthetic experiments, we have access to both A , and Σ and vary both. For fixed token distribution with a given covariance Σ , we can only test the influence of the attention horizon through the attention parameter A (rescaling a fixed matrix).

Modelisation of a limit distribution For synthetic datasets, the limit distribution μ is continuous. For real token distributions, μ is discrete, requiring truncation at N_{\max} tokens to construct $\hat{\mu}_{\lim} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\max}} \delta_{x_i}$ as an approximation for the infinite-token limit. We then choose n_{\max} as the maximum number of tokens sampled uniformly among those N_{\max} tokens in Monte Carlo experiments to estimate mean and covariance. To ensure $\hat{\mu}_{\lim}$ approximates a continuous distribution, we require $N_{\max} \gg n_{\max}$, while n_{\max} must be large enough for Monte Carlo convergence to be reached.

Number of tokens required for convergence To evaluate the number of tokens n_{\max} needed to achieve convergence, we use dimension 1 as a baseline, where Monte Carlo typically converges with 20 – 30 samples. For n samples in dimension d , Monte Carlo convergence rates are governed by CLT fluctuations that scale as $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}}$. To maintain the same accuracy level as in dimension 1, dimension d therefore requires d times more samples than dimension 1. Under this scaling, the experiment in Figure 5 is equivalent to taking ~ 300 tokens in dimension 1. In our first BERT experiments we choose $N_{\max} = 1\text{M} \gg n_{\max} = 10\text{k}$ and in our second experiments $N_{\max} = 20\text{M} \gg n_{\max} = 200\text{k}$.

6.1 Synthetic experiments on Gaussian random variable

Studying the Gaussian case offers an opportunity to test our theory on synthetic datasets for which we have a closed form expression for Γ_{μ} .

In Figure 1 we show the results of the Monte Carlo experiment for a fixed horizon of 0.03 in dimension 1.




Figure 1: Monte Carlo experiments in dimension 1 for Gaussian tokens where $\Delta_E := \|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[\Gamma_{\mu}(X)]\|_2$ and $\Delta_{\text{Cov}} := \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(\Gamma_{\mu}(X))\|_2$.

Higher-dimensional validation. We conduct experiments across multiple dimensions $d \in \{20, 30, 40, 50, 100\}$ with Gaussian tokens $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, with $\Sigma = \lambda_{\max} \mathbf{I}$. The attention horizon is systematically varied from 10^{-2} to 10^2 by rescaling a fixed matrix A , to capture both the low-horizon and high-horizon regimes, and we use a diagonal covariance matrices with identical spectral properties to ensure fair comparison across dimensions.

Figure 2 presents the convergence rate exponent β of Theorem 4.4 as a function of the attention horizon across different dimensions. The experimental results demonstrate strong agreement with theoretical rates of Corollary 4.5 and Proposition 4.8 for both mean and covariance convergence up to an attention horizon of approximately 2.

6.2 BERT experiments

6.2.1 BERT experiments on 1M WikiText tokens with varying horizon

Experimental configuration We conducted experiments using two dataset sizes: $N_{\max} = 1\text{M}$ and $N_{\max} = 20\text{M}$ tokens, respectively. The tokens were obtained by tokenizing the WikiText dataset, which was used for BERT training. We employed the BERT-base-uncased model with 12




Figure 2: Convergence rate exponent β as a function of attention horizon for Gaussian token embeddings across different dimensions. Covariance matrices are diagonal with identical spectral properties across all dimensions to ensure comparable scaling behavior.

layers, 12 attention heads per layer, head dimension of 64, and embedding dimension of 768. We deliberately exceeded the standard 512-token context length to approach the asymptotic behavior of the attention approximation.

Computational implementation To manage memory constraints, we implemented tiled attention with chunk size 4000, maintaining matrix sizes of at most (4000×200000) and keeping memory usage under 3 GB. For the 1 million token experiments, we used $R_{\text{rep}} = 200$ repetitions with a maximum sub-sampling size of 10000 tokens. For the experiment with 20 million tokens, we reduced the repetitions to $R_{\text{rep}} = 20$ with maximum sub-sampling size of 200,000 tokens.


Validation on real transformer architectures. We use a pre-trained BERT model and approximate the limit distribution of the real tokens embeddings using $N_{\text{max}} = 1\text{M}$ tokens extracted from Wikipedia text. We extract the attention parameter A across all 12 layers and attention heads of the BERT model, and rescale it to vary the attention horizon and test its influence on $\hat{\beta}$. The theoretical convergence rate exponent β is computed layer-specifically, accounting for the evolution of spectral properties of token embeddings as they propagate through the network. Specifically, for each layer ℓ , we compute β using the empirical spectral reach parameter λ_{max} of the token embeddings that have passed through layers 1 to $\ell - 1$. This approach captures the progressive transformation of token representations and their impact on attention dynamics.

The layer-specific analysis presented in Figure 3 reveals is consistent with our sub-parametric theoretical framework. The empirical convergence rates exhibit a monotonic decrease as a function of horizon, with slopes that overall match theoretical predictions. This is particularly pronounced for covariance convergence, where the alignment between theory and experiment demonstrates the robustness of our analytical framework even when applied to the complex, non-Gaussian token distributions encountered in natural language processing.


6.2.2 BERT experiments on 20M WikiText tokens with fixed horizon

We empirically validate our theoretical framework using a dataset of 20 million token embeddings extracted from Wikipedia text, processed with the standard BERT tokenizer.

As illustrated in Figures 4 and 5, the convergence rates $n^{-\beta}$ of both mean and covariance exhibit a pronounced deceleration as the attention horizon increases. We compare the experimentally ob-



(a) Mean convergence rates across layers for multi-head attention.




(b) Covariance convergence rates across layers and heads

Figure 3: Layer-specific analysis of convergence rate exponents β for each of the 12 BERT layers. Each theoretical curve (dark red) is computed using the layer-specific spectral reach parameter λ_{\max} of token embeddings at the corresponding depth. The systematic agreement between empirical measurements and theoretical predictions validates our framework across the entire transformer architecture.


served exponent rates β_{exp} against the theoretical rates β_{th} derived under Gaussian assumptions, which coincide with sub-Gaussian rates up to constant factors. The empirical convergence rates are consistent with theoretical predictions, validating our analytical framework.

For comparison, under a uniform distribution on the unit sphere, convergence rates would follow $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ uniformly across all horizon lengths and spectral reach values, contrasting sharply with our observed behavior.

Interpretation. Although real token embeddings have a compactly supported distribution, our experiments reveal convergence rates substantially slower than the parametric $1/\sqrt{n}$. This finding aligns with our theoretical predictions: when the support radius and attention matrix values are significant, the sub-parametric slowdown manifests empirically, confirming that compactness alone does not guarantee fast convergence in practical attention mechanisms.




(a) Convergence rate exponents of mean estimation error across all BERT layers




(b) Convergence rate exponents of covariance estimation error across all BERT layers

Figure 4: Convergence rate exponents β (where convergence follows $n^{-\beta}$) for mean and covariance estimation errors across all 12 layers of BERT, aggregated over all attention heads, as a function of attention horizon. For each layer, we extract token embeddings that have propagated through the model up to that layer and utilize the corresponding query, key, and value matrices Q, K, V . The dark red boundary curves delineate the theoretical bounds β_{th} as a function of horizon, corresponding to the minimum and maximum spectral reach values observed across all token embeddings. Each data point represents the exponent β computed over 20 Monte Carlo trials with sample sizes ranging from 5000 to 200000 tokens, drawn from a corpus of 20 million tokens.



(a) Convergence rate exponent of mean error for each BERT layers



(b) Convergence rate exponent of covariance error for each BERT layers

Figure 5: Display of the same experiments as in figure 4 for each layer separately. Heads for each layers having similar horizon, and same spectral reach, they appear rather grouped. Hence the rates are coherent between heads of a same layer. As we go deeper in the model's layer the convergence seem to be slower and the uncertainty bars grow larger.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced the notion of *token sample complexity* to quantify how attention outputs converge as sequence length n increases. We established in Theorem 3.4 that attention maps achieve uniform convergence on bounded query regions at rate $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ for sub-Gaussian tokens. For statistical moments of the attention output distribution, Proposition 4.1 yields parametric rates in $1/\sqrt{n}$ under compact support assumptions, but with prefactors scaling exponentially in radius R and attention parameters, rendering these bounds impractical at realistic data scales. Extending to sub-Gaussian token distributions, Theorem 4.4 reveals polynomial (rather than exponential) dependence on attention parameters and a sub-parametric rate of $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\beta})$ with $\beta < 1/2$, better aligned with practical behavior. We also derived exact logarithmic convergence rates of order $1/\sqrt{\ln n}$ for the infinite attention horizon limit. Experiments on BERT using Wikipedia text confirmed our theoretical results, with empirical rates strictly below $1/\sqrt{n}$, establishing that sub-parametric convergence characterizes attention on real data.

Acknowledgments This work was granted access to the HPC resources of IDRIS under the allocation 2025-[A0181016159] made by GENCI. The work of Gabriel Peyré was supported by the European Research Council (ERC project WOLF) and the French government under the management of Agence Nationale de la Recherche as part of the “France 2030” program, reference ANR-23-IACL-0008 (PRAIRIE-PSAI). The work of Léa Bohbot was supported by the Fondation CFM, through the Jean-Pierre Aguilar fellowship.

References

- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- Sergey G. Bobkov and Friedrich Götze. Esscher transform and the central limit theorem. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 289(5):110999, 2025.
- Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Non-Asymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Giuseppe Bruno, Francesco Pasqualotto, and Andrea Agazzi. Emergence of meta-stable clustering in mean-field transformer models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- Martin Burger, Samira Kabri, Yury Korolev, Tim Roith, and Lukas Weigand. Analysis of mean-field models arising from self-attention dynamics in transformer architectures with layer normalization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 2025.
- Valérie Castin, Pierre Ablin, José A. Carrillo, and Gabriel Peyré. A unified perspective on the dynamics of deep transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.18322*, 2025.
- Shi Chen, Zhengjiang Lin, Yury Polyanskiy, and Philippe Rigollet. Quantitative clustering in mean-field transformer models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14697*, 2025.
- Yuri Davydov and Serguei Novikov. Remarks on asymptotic independence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04243*, 2020.
- Gabriel De Bie, Gabriel Peyré, and Marco Cuturi. Stochastic deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1556–1565. PMLR, 2019.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.

- Borjan Geshkovski, Cyril Letrouit, Yury Polyanskiy, and Philippe Rigollet. The emergence of clusters in self-attention dynamics. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Borjan Geshkovski, Cyril Letrouit, Yury Polyanskiy, and Philippe Rigollet. A mathematical perspective on transformers. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 62(3):427–479, 2025.
- Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- Coleman Hooper, Sehoon Kim, Hiva Mohammadzadeh, Michael W. Mahoney, Yakun Sophia Shao, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. KVQuant: Towards 10 million context length LLM inference with KV cache quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.18079*, 2024.
- Robert V. Hogg, Joseph W. McKean, and Allen T. Craig. Introduction to Mathematical Statistics. Pearson, 8th edition, 2019.
- Yuchen Huang, Yuan Cheng, and Yudong Liang. In-context convergence of transformers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19660–19722. PMLR, 2024.
- Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, Rong Ge, Sham M. Kakade, and Michael I. Jordan. A short note on concentration inequalities for random vectors with subGaussian norm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03736*, 2019.
- Nikita Karagodin, Yury Polyanskiy, and Philippe Rigollet. Clustering in causal attention masking. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37, 2024.
- Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1302–1338, 2000.
- Yiping Lu, Zhuohan Li, Di He, Zhiqing Sun, Bin Dong, Tao Qin, Liwei Wang, and Tie-Yan Liu. Understanding and improving transformer from a multi-particle dynamic system point of view. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02762*, 2019.
- Saralees Nadarajah. *Extremes and Related Properties of Random Sequences and Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics, 2000.
- Tomas Pevný and Vojtěch Kovarik. Approximation capability of neural networks on spaces of probability measures and tree-structured domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00764*, 2019.
- Michael Reid, Nicolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- Michael E. Sander, Pierre Ablin, Mathieu Blondel, and Gabriel Peyré. Sinkformers: Transformers with doubly stochastic attention. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3515–3530. PMLR, 2022.
- Michael E. Sander, Raja Giryes, Taiji Suzuki, Mathieu Blondel, and Gabriel Peyré. How do transformers perform in-context autoregressive learning? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 43235–43254. PMLR, 2024.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Kevin Tanguy. Some superconcentration inequalities for extrema of stationary Gaussian processes. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 106:239–246, 2015.
- Aad W. Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.

- Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Roman Vershynin. *Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices*. In Yonina C. Eldar and Gitta Kutyniok (eds.), *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, pp. 210–268. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Roman Vershynin. How close is the sample covariance matrix to the actual covariance matrix? *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 25(3):655–686, 2012.
- Jasmina Vuckovic, Aristide Baratin, and Rémi Tachet des Combes. A mathematical theory of attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.02876*, 2020.
- Martin J. Wainwright. *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Sinong Wang, Belinda Z. Li, Madian Khabsa, Han Fang, and Hao Ma. Linformer: Self-attention with linear complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04768*, 2020.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, et al. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17283–17297, 2020.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Spencer Frei, and Peter L. Bartlett. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09927*, 2023.
- Yingcong Zhang, Fangzhao Zhang, Zixuan Yang, and Zhuoran Wang. What and how does in-context learning learn? Bayesian model averaging, parameterization, and generalization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1684–1692. PMLR, 2025.
- Aleksandr Zimin, Anastasiia Kutakh, Yury Polyanskiy, and Philippe Rigollet. Learning Gaussian Mixture Models via Transformer Measure Flows. In *ICML 2025 Workshop on Methods and Opportunities at Small Scale*, 2025.

A Tools of empirical process theory

Before diving into the proof of Theorem 3.4, we recall a few results and definitions from empirical process theory that will be useful to the proof.

First, recall the definition of the Rademacher complexity.

Definition A.1 (Rademacher complexity in \mathbb{R}^d). Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \{f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d\}$ be a class of (measurable) functions and $S = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \sim \mu^n$ an i.i.d. sample. Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ be i.i.d. Rademacher variables, independent of S , with $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_i = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$. The *empirical* Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F} with respect to S is:

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right\|_2 \right].$$

The (expected) Rademacher complexity at sample size n is

$$\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mu^n} [\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{F})].$$

If $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\theta} : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is parameterized by Θ , replace $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$ with $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta}$. For $d = 1$, this reduces to the usual scalar definition.

Intuitively, the Rademacher complexity quantifies the ability of the function class \mathcal{F} to fit random noise on the specific sample $S \sim \mu$. Notice that the expression resembles the empirical expectation we aim to bound. The symmetrization step consists in artificially introducing Rademacher samples ε_i to relate our supremum over \mathcal{F} to a measure of the richness of the class, that relies on measuring the alignment between function outputs $f(Y_i)$ and random noise.

Next, we recall some useful definitions about sub-Gaussian processes and the Dudley's entropy integral, central in the proof Theorem 3.4.

Definition A.2 (Sub-Gaussian ψ_2 norm). For a real-valued random variable Z , its ψ_2 (sub-Gaussian) norm is

$$\|Z\|_{\psi_2} := \inf \left\{ \sigma > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Z^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}.$$

For a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|X\|_{\psi_2} := \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\langle X, v \rangle\|_{\psi_2},$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|v\|_2 = 1\}$. We say X is sub-Gaussian if $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

Definition A.3 (Sub-gaussian increments). Consider a random process $(X_t)_{t \in T}$ on a metric space (T, d) . We say that the process has *sub-Gaussian increments* if there exists $K \geq 0$ such that

$$\|X_t - X_s\|_{\psi_2} \leq K d(t, s) \quad \text{for all } t, s \in T, \quad (11)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ denotes the sub-Gaussian norm.

Definition A.4 (ε -net and covering numbers). Let (T, d) be a metric space. Consider a set $T' \subset T$ and a number $\varepsilon > 0$. A subset $\mathcal{N} \subset T'$ is an ε -net of T if balls of radius ε centered at points in \mathcal{N} cover T' .

The smallest cardinality of an ε -net of T' is called the covering number of K and is denoted $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, T', d)$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, T', d)$ is the smallest number of closed balls with centers in T' and radius ε whose union covers T' .

Theorem A.5 (Dudley's entropy integral). (see [Vershynin, 2018, Theorem 8.1.3, p. 221, 2nd ed.]) Let $(X_t)_{t \in T}$ be a centered random process on a metric space (T, d) with sub-Gaussian increments as in (11), with $K \geq 0$ its sub-Gaussian parameter. Then, there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in T} X_t] \leq CK \int_0^{\text{diam}(T)} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, T, d)} d\varepsilon, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, T, d)$ denotes the covering number of T at scale ε introduced in Definition A.4.

Definition A.6 (Data-dependent distance). Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be a sample of random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and let $\mathbb{P}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Y_i}$ denote the empirical measure. For any measurable g , define the empirical $L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ norm under the samples Y_1, \dots, Y_n by

$$\|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} := \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g(Y_i)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

For the indexed class $\mathcal{F} = \{f_x : x \in B_R\}$, the data-dependent distance between f_x and $f_{x'}$ is

$$\|f_x - f_{x'}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_x(Y_i) - f_{x'}(Y_i)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Lemma A.7 (Empirical Lipschitz control). Assume there exists a measurable envelope $L : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $x, x' \in B_R$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|f_x(y) - f_{x'}(y)\|_2 \leq L(y) \|x - x'\|_2.$$

Then, for any samples Y_1, \dots, Y_n ,

$$\|f_x - f_{x'}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \leq \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \|x - x'\|_2.$$

Proof. By the pointwise Lipschitz condition and the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$,

$$\|f_x - f_{x'}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_x(Y_i) - f_{x'}(Y_i)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(Y_i)^2 \|x - x'\|_2^2 = \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 \|x - x'\|_2^2.$$

The claim follows by taking square roots. \square

Lemma A.8 (Bound on empirical Lipschitz envelope). *Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be i.i.d. with law μ . Assume there exists a function L as defined in Lemma A.7 such that $\mathbb{E}[L(Y_1)^2] < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\|L(Y_1)\|_2^2])^{1/2} =: \|L\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Proof. By Cauchy–Schwarz applied to $Z = \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2])^{1/2}.$$

Using the fact that Y_1, \dots, Y_n are i.i.d.,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(Y_i)^2\right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[L(Y_i)^2] = \mathbb{E}[L(Y_1)^2].$$

\square

B Proofs

B.1 Proofs of technical Lemmas for Theorem 3.4

Lemma B.1 (Bound on the covering number of a product space). *Let $\mathcal{F} := \{f_x, x \in \Theta\}$ be a parametric class of Lipschitz function with respect to x . Let $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$ defined in Definition A.6. Consider the product space $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} \times B_1$ and the associated distance defined in Lemma B.3. The covering number of the product space is bounded by:*

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F} \times B_1, d_{\mathcal{G}}((z_1, x_1), (z_2, x_2))) \leq \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}\right) \times \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_1, \|\cdot\|_2\right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F} \times B_1, d_{\mathcal{G}}((z_1, x_1), (z_2, x_2)))$ be the covering number of \mathcal{G} for the distance $d_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Consider an $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -cover of \mathcal{F} and a $\frac{\varepsilon}{2\|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}$ -cover of B_1 . We can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_1^\top f_{x_1}(\cdot) - z_2^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} &\leq \|z_1^\top f_{x_1}(\cdot) - z_1^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot) + z_1^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot) - z_2^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \\ &\leq \|f_{x_1}(\cdot) - f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|z_1 - z_2\|_2 \|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion of the lemma follows immediately. \square

Lemma B.2 (Bound on the covering number). *Let \mathcal{F} be a parametric class of function $\{f_x, x \in \Theta\}$ such that any $f_x \in \mathcal{F}$ is Lipschitz with respect to its index parameter x . Let $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$ be defined by Definition A.6, then:*

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \leq \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_2\right).$$

Proof. Let x_1, \dots, x_M form an $\frac{\delta}{\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}$ cover for Θ . Then $\{f(x_i, \cdot) : i = 1, \dots, M\}$ form an δ cover for \mathcal{F} . Hence the result. \square

The following Lemmas prove that the empirical processes Z_h and $Z_{(z,x)}$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Appendix B.2 are sub-Gaussian processes w.r.t. well-defined metrics.

Lemma B.3 (Sub-gaussian increments in dimension d). *Conditionally on the Y_i , $Z_{(z,x)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \langle z, f_x(Y_i) \rangle$ is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to the distance $d_G((z_1, x_1), (z_2, x_2))$ of the metric space $\mathcal{G} = B_1 \times \mathcal{F}$ defined by:*

$$d_G((z_1, x_1), (z_2, x_2)) := \|f_{x_1}(\cdot) - f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|z_1 - z_2\|_2 \|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}.$$

Proof. By Hoeffding's Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(Z_{(z_1, x_1)} - Z_{(z_2, x_2)})) | Y_1, \dots, Y_n] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon_i (\langle z_1, f_{x_1}(Y_i) \rangle - \langle z_2, f_{x_2}(Y_i) \rangle) \right) \middle| Y_1, \dots, Y_n \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|z_1^\top f_{x_1}(\cdot) - z_2^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This norm admits the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_1^\top f_{x_1}(\cdot) - z_2^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} &= \|z_1^\top f_{x_1}(\cdot) - z_1^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot) + z_1^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot) - z_2^\top f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \\ &\leq \|z_1\|_2 \|f_{x_1}(\cdot) - f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|z_1 - z_2\|_2 \|f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \\ &\leq \|f_{x_1}(\cdot) - f_{x_2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|z_1 - z_2\|_2 \|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the announced distance on the product space \mathcal{G} . \square

Lemma B.4 (Sub-gaussian increments in dimension 1). *Conditionally on the Y_i , $Z_h = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i h_x(Y_i)$ is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Hoeffding's lemma, as for Lemma B.3. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.4

The strategy of the proof of Theorem 3.4 is to analyze the numerator and denominator of the attention ratio separately, and then combine the results. We will prove this Theorem in three parts. We first establish a concentration in expectation and subsequently derive a high-probability bound via Markov's inequality. These steps rely on classical tools from the empirical processes literature.

Part 1: Uniform concentration of the numerator of $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x)$ Recall that the continuous attention map is given by

$$\Gamma_\mu(x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]}.$$

Consider the numerator. It is the expectation of $y \mapsto y e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle}$, for an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, over the sub-Gaussian random vector Y .

Define the function class $\mathcal{F} := \{f_x, x \in B_R\}$, where, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$f_x : y \mapsto y \exp^{\langle Ax, y \rangle} \in L^2(\mu; \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (13)$$

Our goal is to prove a uniform concentration result over the function class \mathcal{F} , indexed by x in the ball B_R .

Let

$$\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_x(Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu}[f_x(Y)] \right\|_2,$$

and define the envelope function of the class \mathcal{F} ,

$$F : y \mapsto \sup_{x \in B_R} \|f_x(y)\|_2 = \|y\|_2 e^{R\|A^\top y\|_2}. \quad (14)$$

Proposition B.5 (Bound on numerator). *With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq C(R\|A\|_2 \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2 d} + 5^{d/2}) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}.$$

Proof. We will first bound $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$, and then apply Markov's inequality to obtain a high-probability concentration bound.

The proof follows two main steps. First, we use a symmetrization lemma (Lemma B.6 below) to relate $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$ to the Rademacher complexity of the function class \mathcal{F} . Next, we use Dudley's entropy integral together with the Lipschitz property of f_x to bound this Rademacher complexity via covering numbers.

Step 1: Symmetrization of $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$

We first derive a symmetrization result that will allow us to link $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$ to the Rademacher complexity of the class \mathcal{F} defined in Section A.

Lemma B.6 (Symmetrization of $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$).

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq 2\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. Let (X_1, \dots, X_n) i.i.d. copies of Y independent of Y .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}} &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_Y[f(Y)] \right\|_2 \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[f(X_i)]) \right\|_2 \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \mathbb{E}_X \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_i) - f(X_i) \right] \right\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Jensen inequality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] &= \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \mathbb{E}_X \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(Y_i) - f(X_i)) \right] \right\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(Y_i) - f(X_i)) \right\|_2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ be i.i.d. Rademacher signs, independent of $S = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$. The random vector of components $\varepsilon_i(f(Y_i) - f(X_i))$ has the same joint distribution as the vector with components $f(Y_i) - f(X_i)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(Y_i) - f(X_i)) \right\|_2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{X,Y,\varepsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (f(Y_i) - f(X_i)) \right\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{Y,\varepsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f(Y_i) \right\|_2 \right] := 2\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F}). \end{aligned}$$

This yields $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq 2\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F})$. □

Step 2: Bounding the Rademacher complexity $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F})$

Now that we have bounded $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}]$ by the Rademacher complexity, the next step of the proof is to use Dudley's entropy integral to bound this Rademacher complexity $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F})$.

In order to do that, we will use some useful definitions introduced in Section A, as well as the Dudley's entropy integral Theorem A.5.

Recall that the Rademacher complexity we want to bound is:

$$\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_{S,\varepsilon} \left[\underbrace{\sup_{x \in B_R} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f_x(Y_i) \right\|_2}_{:= \|Z_x\|_2} \right] =: \mathbb{E}_S \left[\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left[\sup_{x \in B_R} \|Z_x\|_2 \right]}_{(*)} \right].$$

The strategy of the rest of the proof is to apply Dudley's Theorem A.5 to (\star) . In the one-dimensional case, Dudley's theorem can be applied directly to the scalar process $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f_x(Y_i)$, which is a sub-Gaussian process conditioned on the Y_i with respect to the associated empirical norm $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} := \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_i)^2 \right)^{1/2}$ (see Lemma B.4). In the present setting, however, the process takes values in \mathbb{R}^d . To use the same concentration inequality, we therefore project it onto scalar directions—that is, we use the dual norm considering:

$$Z_{(z,x)} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \langle z, f_x(Y_i) \rangle := z^\top Z_x. \quad (15)$$

We must then verify that this scalar process $Z_{(z,x)}$ remains sub-Gaussian, though, now, with respect to an appropriate metric $d_{\mathcal{G}}$ defined on the product space $(\mathcal{G}, d_{\mathcal{G}})$, where $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F} \times B_1$ (Lemma B.3). Once this sub-Gaussian property is established, Dudley's theorem A.5 can be applied to $Z_{(z,x)}$ and the rest of the analysis will require bounds on:

- (i) the moments of the envelope function F (Lemma B.8),
- (ii) the Lipschitz constant of functions in \mathcal{F} , (Lemmas B.7 and B.10), and
- (iii) the covering number of \mathcal{G} (Lemmas B.1 and B.2).

In order to do this we will need the definition A.6 of the empirical distance and Lemmas A.7 and A.8 introduced in Section A, which we will be referring to.

Lemma B.7 (Bound on Lipschitz constant for numerator). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F} := \{f_x, x \in B_R\}$ as defined in (13). With an abuse of notations, denote $f : (x, y) \mapsto y e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle}$. Then, $f(\cdot, y)$ is Lipschitz with respect to x . Let $y \mapsto L(y)$ be its Lipschitz constant. Consider $Y \sim \mu$, a sub-gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^d of matrix parameter Σ , and scalar parameter $\sigma := \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}$. Then, L verifies*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq C \|A\|_2 \sigma^2 d \exp(2 R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2),$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Consider $f_t(y) := y e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ - we will then apply the result to $t = Ax$ using $\nabla_t f(t, y) = A^\top \nabla_x f_x(y)$. The Jacobian of $f(\cdot, y)$ at t is

$$\nabla_t f(t, y) = y y^\top e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}.$$

Let

$$\|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(P)} := \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|\nabla_t f(t, Y)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^4 e^{2\langle t, Y \rangle}] \right)^{1/2},$$

where we used the fact that $Y Y^\top$ is a rank one matrix, hence $\|Y Y^\top\| = \|Y\|_2^2$.

By Cauchy–Schwarz and the sub-Gaussian property of Y ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(P)} &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^8] \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} e^{4\langle t, Y \rangle} \right)^{1/4} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^8] \right)^{1/4} \exp(2 t^\top \Sigma t). \end{aligned}$$

Use $t^\top \Sigma t = x^\top A^\top \Sigma A x \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2$, and take the supremum over $\|x\|_2 \leq R$:

$$\sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq R} \|\nabla_x f_x(y)\|_{L^2(P)} \leq \|A\|_2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|Y\|_2^8 \right)^{1/4} \exp(2 R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2).$$

To express the moment factor,

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|Y\|_2^8 \right)^{1/4} = \left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|Y\|_2^8 \right)^{1/8} \right)^2 \underset{\star}{\leq} (c \sigma \sqrt{d})^2,$$

where \star is an extension to dimension d of a classical bound on sub-Gaussian moments, with c a universal constant (see [Vershynin, 2012, Lemma 5.5]).

Hence

$$\|L\|_{L^2(\mu)} := \sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq R} \|\nabla_x f_x(y)\|_{L^2(P)} \leq C\|A\|_2 \sigma^2 d \exp(2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Then, we will need a bound on the envelope function of the class \mathcal{F} .

Lemma B.8 (Bound on envelope function). *Let F be the envelope function defined in equation (14), and $Y \sim \mu$, a sub-gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^d of parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2]^{1/2} \leq C5^{d/2} \sqrt{d} \sigma e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}.$$

Proof. By Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2]^{1/2} = \mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_2^2 e^{2R\|A^\top Y\|_2}]^{1/2} \leq (\mathbb{E}\|Y\|_2^4)^{1/4} (\mathbb{E}e^{4R\|A^\top Y\|_2})^{1/4}.$$

The first term $(\mathbb{E}\|Y\|_2^4)^{1/4}$ is controlled by the same argument used for $(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|Y\|_2^8)^{1/4}$ in Lemma B.7. Now, let \mathbb{S}^{d-1} be the unit sphere and $U \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ an ε -net with $|U| \leq (1 + 2/\varepsilon)^d$. By a standard estimate (e.g. [Vershynin, 2018, Lemma 4.4.1, p. 116, 2nd ed.]) we have,

$$\|g\|_2 = \sup_{\|u\|=1} \langle g, u \rangle \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \max_{u \in U} \langle g, u \rangle,$$

hence for $g = A^\top Y$,

$$e^{4R\|A^\top Y\|_2} \leq \sum_{u \in U} \exp\left(\frac{4R}{1 - \varepsilon} \langle Au, Y \rangle\right).$$

Taking expectations and using the sub-Gaussian moment generative function bound of equation (1) with $t = \frac{4R}{1 - \varepsilon} Au$,

$$\mathbb{E}e^{4R\|A^\top Y\|_2} \leq (1 + 2/\varepsilon)^d \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{4R}{1 - \varepsilon} \Sigma^{1/2} A \right\|_2^2\right) = (1 + 2/\varepsilon)^d \exp\left(\frac{8R^2}{(1 - \varepsilon)^2} \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2\right).$$

Finally, for $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$(\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2])^{1/2} \leq C5^{d/2} \sqrt{d} \sigma e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Proposition A.7 holds for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. That is for all $x, x' \in B_R$,

$$\|f_x - f_{x'}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 \leq \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 \|x - x'\|_2^2.$$

We formally prove in Lemma B.3 that the empirical process defined in equation (15) is a sub-Gaussian process, with respect to the distance associated to the product space $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{F} \times B_1)$ defined in Lemma B.3. We also need a bound on the covering number of \mathcal{G} . Corresponding Lemmas with their proofs can be found in Appendix B.1.

Now that we have gathered all the necessary tools to bound the Rademacher complexity $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F})$ we can end the proof of Proposition B.5.

Proof of Proposition B.5

Let $R_{L,F} = 2R\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + 2\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$ and apply Theorem A.5 to the centered sub-Gaussian process $Z_{(z,x)}$ with respect to the metric space $(\mathcal{G}, d_{\mathcal{G}})$, in order to bound $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\sup_{(z,x) \in \mathcal{G}} Z_{(z,x)}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon\left[\sup_{(z,x) \in \mathcal{G}} Z_{(z,x)}\right] \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}, d_{\mathcal{G}})} d\delta \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{R_{L,F}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2\right)} + \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_1, \|\cdot\|_2\right)} d\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma B.1 and B.2.

Taking the expectation over Y_i , and using the symmetrization Lemma B.6,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbb{E}_Y \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[\sup_{(z,x) \in \mathcal{G}} Z_{(z,x)} |Y_1, \dots, Y_n\right] \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\int_0^{R_{L,F}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2\right)} d\delta, \right]$$

and

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\int_0^{R_{L,F}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\|F(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}\right), B_1, \|\cdot\|_2} d\delta \right].$$

For the term \mathcal{I} , set the change of variable $u = \frac{\delta}{2R\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}$ for $0 \leq u \leq 1$. For the second term \mathcal{J} , set $u = \frac{\delta}{2\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{1 + \frac{\|F\|_n}{R\|L\|_n}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(Ru, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2)} 2R\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} du \right], \\ \mathcal{J} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{1 + \frac{R\|L\|_n}{\|F\|_n}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(u, B_1, \|\cdot\|_2)} 2\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} du \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we can denote $\|F\|_n := \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$ and $\|L\|_n := \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}$ in the integrand to alleviate the notations.

Recall that $\ln \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, B_r, \|\cdot\|) \leq d \ln(1 + \frac{2r}{\varepsilon})$ (see Corollary 4.2.11. in [Vershynin, 2018]), hence

$$\mathcal{I} \leq 4\sqrt{2d} R \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + 2\sqrt{d \ln 3} \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}]. \quad (16)$$

The same steps for the second term give,

$$\mathcal{J} \leq 4\sqrt{2d} \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + 2R\sqrt{d \ln 3} \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}]. \quad (17)$$

Detailed derivations of (16) and (17) can be found in Appendix B.3. Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(R \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \right). \quad (18)$$

Applying Lemma A.8, $\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \leq \left(\mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2] \right)^{1/2} = (\mathbb{E}[L(Y_1)^2])^{1/2}$, and using Lemma B.7, along with Lemma B.8 it comes,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] &\leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(R C_1 \|A\|_2 \sigma^2 d e^{2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2} + 5^{d/2} C_2 \sigma \sqrt{d} e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C d (R\|A\|_2 \sigma \sqrt{d} + 5^{d/2}) \sigma}{\sqrt{n}} e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2} =: C_0(\Sigma, A, \delta, R). \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C .

To conclude, we apply the Markov inequality, which yields, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \frac{C_0(\Sigma, A, \delta, R)}{\sqrt{n}}$. This ends the proof of Proposition B.5. \square

Part 2: Uniform concentration of the denominator empirical process An analogous result as Proposition B.5 holds for the denominator with an identical proof using the function class

$$\mathcal{F}' := \{h_x : y \mapsto e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle}, x \in B_R\}.$$

Proposition B.9 (Bound on denominator). *For all $R > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}'} \leq \frac{C'}{\delta} \cdot \frac{\|A\|_2 \sigma \sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} e^{2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}.$$

Proof. The strategy of the proof follows the one of Proposition B.5, in dimension 1. The first step of symmetrization is identical. Then, we detail a few differences compared to the numerator.

First, the Lipschitz constant calculation slightly differs, as shown in Lemma B.10 below.

Lemma B.10 (Bound on Lipschitz constant for denominator). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}'$, and L defined in Lemma A.7*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq C\|A\|_2\sigma\sqrt{d} \exp(2R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2),$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Here, we apply the exact same proof as for Lemma B.7, with $h(t, y) := e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$, using $(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|Y\|_2^4)^{1/4} \leq C\sigma\sqrt{d}$. \square

Then, the sub-Gaussian process under consideration is now

$$Z_h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i h_x(Y_i), \quad (19)$$

(see Lemma B.4 for justification).

In dimension 1, we apply Theorem A.5 to the sub-Gaussian process Z_h - defined in equation (19) - with respect to the metric space $(\mathcal{F}', \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_n)})$ to bound $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} Z_h]$. Note that Dudley's entropy bound extends to $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} |Z_h|]$ using that $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} |Z_h|] = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} \max\{Z_h, -Z_h\}$ (both statement can be found in the literature). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} |Z_h|] &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\text{diam}(\mathcal{F}')} \sqrt{\ln N(\delta, \mathcal{F}', L^2(\mathbb{P}_n))} d\delta \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\text{diam}(B_R)\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}} \sqrt{\ln N\left(\frac{\delta}{\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2\right)} d\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma B.2.

Taking the expectation over Y_i , and using the symmetrization Lemma B.6 (see Appendix B.3 for details),

$$E[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}'}] \leq \frac{C\|A\|_2\sigma\sqrt{d}}{\delta\sqrt{n}} e^{2R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2} := C'_0(\Sigma, A, R; \delta). \quad (20)$$

Finally we also conclude using Markov inequality. \square

Part 3: Uniform concentration of the attention map (ratio bound) The last step of the proof is to combine Propositions B.5 and B.9 to bound the attention's ratio. In the sequel, $x \in B_R$ is fixed, and thus omitted in the notation most of the time. For the sake of clarity, we simplify the notation for both empirical and continuous attention using $N_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i e^{\langle Ax, y_i \rangle}$, $D_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\langle Ax, y_i \rangle}$, and $N := \int y e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle} d\mu(y)$, $D := \int e^{\langle Ax, y \rangle} d\mu(y)$. Then, we can write: $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) = \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{N_n}{D_n}$ and $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(x) = \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{N}{D}$.

Putting everything on the same denominator yields:

$$\left\| \frac{N_n}{D_n} - \frac{N}{D} \right\|_2 = \left\| \frac{N_n D - N D + N D - N D_n}{D D_n} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{\|N_n - N\|_2}{D_n} + \frac{\|N\|_2 |D_n - D|}{D D_n}.$$

To bound below the denominator D_n , note that $D = \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}] \geq 1$ by Jensen's inequality. By Cantelli's inequality, using the fact that $D = \mathbb{E}[D_n]$, it comes that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n \leq 1 - \varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}(D_n \leq D - \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\sigma_{D_n, x}^2}{\sigma_{D_n, x}^2 + \varepsilon^2},$$

where $\sigma_{D_n, x}^2 = \text{Var}(D_n) = \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}) \leq \frac{1}{n} e^{2R^2\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2^2}$ (using the definition 2.4 of sub-Gaussian distribution).

Taking $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, in order for the event $D_n \geq \frac{1}{2}$ to be verified with probability $1 - \delta_1$, n must be greater than

$$n \geq n_{\min}(\delta_1, \Sigma, A, R) := 4e^{2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2} \left(\frac{1}{\delta_1} - 1 \right).$$

Hence, with probability $1 - \delta_1$,

$$\left\| \frac{N_n}{D_n} - \frac{N}{D} \right\|_2 \leq 2(\|N_n - N\|_2 + \|N\|_2 |D_n - D|). \quad (21)$$

By Proposition B.5, the numerator $\|N_n - N\|_2$ satisfies, with probability $1 - \delta_2$,

$$\|N_n - N\|_2 \leq C_1 (R\|A\|_2 \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2 d} + 5^{d/2}) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}. \quad (22)$$

Then, the same derivation as before yields $\|N\|_2 = \|\mathbb{E}[Y e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]\|_2 \leq \text{tr}(\Sigma)^{1/2} e^{2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}$.

Finally, using Proposition B.9, with probability at least $1 - \delta_3$,

$$|D_n - D| \leq \frac{C_2 \|A\|_2 \sigma \sqrt{d}}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \exp(2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2). \quad (23)$$

Combining events (21), (22) and (23), for $n \geq n_{\min}(\delta, \Sigma, A, R)$, with probability $1 - \delta$ (taking $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta_3 = \frac{\delta}{3}$):

$$\left\| \frac{N_n}{D_n} - \frac{N}{D} \right\|_2 \leq \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{2C \sqrt{d} (R\|A\|_2 \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2 d} + \text{tr}(\Sigma)^{1/2} \|A\|_2 + 5^{d/2} \sqrt{d})}{\delta} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{8R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}.$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.4.

B.3 Equations of Theorem 3.4

Below, we detail the derivation of some inequalities in the proof Theorem 3.4 (Appendix B.2). We recall that $\ln \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, B_r, \|\cdot\|) \leq d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2r}{\varepsilon}\right)$.

Equation (16). Let $t = \frac{\|F\|_n}{R\|L\|_n}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &\leq 2R \mathbb{E} \left[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \int_0^{1+t} \sqrt{d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)} du \right] \\ &= 2R \mathbb{E} \left[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \left(\int_0^1 \sqrt{d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)} du + \int_1^{1+t} \sqrt{d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)} du \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2R \mathbb{E} \left[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{2d}}{\sqrt{u}} du + \int_1^{1+t} \sqrt{d \ln 3} du \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2R \mathbb{E} \left[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \left(2\sqrt{2d} + t\sqrt{d \ln 3} \right) \right] \\ &= 4\sqrt{2d} R \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + 2\sqrt{d \ln 3} \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (17). Let $t' = \frac{R\|L\|_n}{\|F\|_n}$, then by the same arguments as above,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[2\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \int_0^{1+\frac{R\|L\|_n}{\|F\|_n}} \sqrt{d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)} du \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \left(4\sqrt{2d} + 2t'\sqrt{d \ln 3} \right) \right] \\ &= 4\sqrt{2d} \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + 2R\sqrt{d \ln 3} \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (20). Taking the expectation over Y_i , and using the symmetrization Lemma B.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] &\leq \mathbb{E}_Y \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}'} |Z_h| \mid Y_1, \dots, Y_n \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\int_0^{2R\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\delta}{\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2\right)} d\delta \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\int_0^2 \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(Ru, B_R, \|\cdot\|_2)} R \|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} du \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} R \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \int_0^2 \sqrt{d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{u}\right)} du \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} R \int_0^2 \sqrt{\frac{2d}{u}} du \mathbb{E}_Y [\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \\
&\leq \frac{c}{\delta} \frac{(\mathbb{E}_Y [L(Y_1)^2])^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \\
&= \frac{C \|A\|_2 \sigma \sqrt{d}}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \exp(2R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows directly from Lemma A.8 and Lemma B.7.

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Proof. Let f a Lipschitz function of parameter L_0 . By considering $f - f(0)$ instead of f if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that $f(0) = 0$.

Step 1: Decomposition of the error We reformulate the mean error to facilitate our analysis. The quantity of interest is

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] \right\|_2.$$

Applying the triangle inequality and adding-subtracting identical terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - \mathbb{E}_x [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} = \left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X))] - f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) \right\|_2$$

and

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] \right\|_2$$

Step 2: Analysis of the second term \mathcal{J} To bound \mathcal{J} , we follow the same methodology as in the proof of Proposition 3.3: we apply the CLT, followed by the derivation of an asymptotic confidence bound using the quantile of the $\chi^2(d)$ law (see Appendix B.5 for more details). We obtain that

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \frac{q_{d,1-\delta}^{1/2} \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(f(\Gamma_\mu(X))))^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where the bound scales with the χ_2 quantile $q_{d,1-\delta}$, and the maximum variance direction of $f(\Gamma_\mu(X))$.

Let $\alpha := 2 \|V\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2$, and let us show that

$$\lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))) \leq \alpha^2 L_0^2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2,$$

from which $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ follows.

Using the at-most-linear growth of Γ_μ of Lemma 3.1, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))) \\
& \leq \text{tr}(\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))) \\
& = \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[(f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) - \mathbb{E}f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))(f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) - \mathbb{E}f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))^\top]) \\
& = \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}((f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) - \mathbb{E}f(\Gamma_\mu(X)))^\top (f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) - \mathbb{E}f(\Gamma_\mu(X))))] \\
& = \mathbb{E}[\|f(\Gamma_\mu(X)) - \mathbb{E}f(\Gamma_\mu(X))\|_2^2] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[\|f(\Gamma_\mu(X))\|_2^2] \leq \alpha^2 L_0^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|X\|_2^2] = \alpha^2 L_0^2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Analysis of the first term \mathcal{I} To bound the first term \mathcal{I} , the key insight is to split the analysis based on whether $|x_i|$ exceeds a threshold R or not, threshold which we will optimize later. We have

$$\mathcal{I} = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)) - f(\Gamma_\mu(x_i)) \right\|_2 \leq \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x_i| < R} \|f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)) - f(\Gamma_\mu(x_i))\|_2 \\
\mathcal{I}_2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x_i| > R} \|f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i))\|_2 \\
\mathcal{I}_3 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x_i| > R} \|f(\Gamma_\mu(x_i))\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathcal{I}_1 , we apply Theorem 3.4, and get with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$,

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|x_i| < R} L_0 \cdot \sup_{x \in B_R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq L_0 \cdot \frac{C_1(\Sigma, A, V, R, \delta_1, d)}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

For \mathcal{I}_2 , we prove the following Proposition,

Proposition B.11. *Recall x_1, \dots, x_n are i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued sub-Gaussian random vectors, with parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}$. Let $R > 0$. For all $n > 0$, and some constants $c, C > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)\|_2 \leq \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right)} \right) \cdot c\sigma \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2n}{\delta}} \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$N_R := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}}, \quad M_n := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|x_i\|_2, \quad p_R := \mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 > R).$$

Since $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x)$ is a convex combination of $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$,

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x)\|_2 \leq M_n.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)\|_2 \leq \frac{N_R}{n} M_n. \quad (25)$$

Our task therefore reduces to finding high-probability bounds for: (i) the maximum norm M_n , and (ii) the fraction N_R/n of samples with norm above R . We begin with a lemma that controls the norm of a sub-Gaussian vector X .

Lemma B.12 ([Vershynin, 2018] see Exercise 6.3.5 p.114, 1st ed.). *There exist universal constants $C, c > 0$ such that for all $R > 0$, if X is a sub-Gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^d with sub-Gaussian norm at most $\sigma = \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2}$,*

$$p_R := \mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 > R) \leq e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2}.$$

with explicitly, $c = \frac{1}{4}$ and $C = 4$.

Then we bound separately $\frac{N_R}{n}$ and M_n .

Step 1: Concentration of $\frac{N_R}{n}$

The indicators $\mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}}$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(p_R). By Hoeffding's inequality, for every $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{N_R}{n} - p_R\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp(-2nt^2).$$

Equivalently, for any $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$,

$$\left|\frac{N_R}{n} - p_R\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta_1}\right)}.$$

Then, we move on bounding the maximum of the x_i 's norm.

Step 2: Union bound for $M_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|x_i\|_2$

The union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \{\|x_i\|_2 \geq t\}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\|x_i\|_2 \geq t) = n \mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 \geq t).$$

Applying Lemma B.12 we get,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq t) \leq n e^{-\left(\frac{t}{c\sigma} - \sqrt{d}\right)^2}.$$

For any $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$, solving $n e^{-\left(\frac{t}{c\sigma} - \sqrt{d}\right)^2} = \delta_2$ yields, with probability at least $1 - \delta_2$,

$$M_n \leq c\sigma(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{n}{\delta_2}}).$$

Combining this result with the step 1, we get with probability at least $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)\|_2 \leq \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta_1}\right)}\right) \cdot c\sigma \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{n}{\delta_2}}\right).$$

Taking $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \frac{\delta}{2}$ concludes the proof of Proposition B.11. \square

We deduce from Proposition B.11, and using the same bound for N_R/n as in Proposition B.11, that with probability at least $1 - \delta_2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} L_0 \cdot \|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)\|_2 \\ &\leq L_0 \cdot \frac{N_R}{n} M_n \\ &\leq L_0 \cdot C_2(\Sigma, R, \delta_2, d, n) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_2(\Sigma, R, \delta_2, d, n) = \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta_2}\right)}\right) \cdot c\sigma \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2n}{\delta_2}}\right).$$

For \mathcal{I}_3 , applying Lemma 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}} \|f(\Gamma_\mu(x_i))\|_2 &\leq L_0 \cdot \underbrace{2\|V\|_2 \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2} \|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2}_{\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}} \|x_i\|_2, \\ &\leq L_0 \cdot \alpha \cdot \frac{N_R}{n} M_n \end{aligned}$$

where we used the notations of Proposition B.11. The same bound on $\frac{N_R}{n} M_n$ holds and gives, with probability $1 - \delta_3$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}} \|f(\Gamma_\mu(x_i))\|_2 \leq L_0 \cdot \alpha \cdot C_2(\Sigma, R, \delta_3, d, n).$$

We return to our initial inequality (24), where, with probability $1 - \delta$ (taking $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta_3 = \frac{\delta}{3}$, and denoting $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{3}$),

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n} [f(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)) - f(\Gamma_\mu(X))] \right\|_2 \leq \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3 \leq f(R).$$

Here, $f(R) = L_0 \cdot \frac{C_1(\Sigma, A, R, \delta', d)}{\sqrt{n}} + L_0 \cdot (1 + \alpha) \cdot C_2(\Sigma, A, R, \delta', n)$ with,

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(\Sigma, A, V, R, \delta', d) &= P_1(\Sigma, A, V, R, \delta', d) \cdot \exp \left\{ 8 \|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|^2 R^2 \right\} \\ C_2(\Sigma, R, \delta', d, n) &= \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta'}\right)} \right) \cdot c\sigma \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2n}{\delta'}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_1(\Sigma, A, V, R, \delta', d) = \frac{C\sqrt{d}}{\delta} \|V\|_2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \cdot (R\|A\|_2 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} d + \text{tr}(\Sigma)^{1/2} \|A\|_2 + 5^{d/2} \sqrt{d})$$

is linear in R .

To make the two terms of $f(R)$ of the same order, we choose

$$R^* = \sqrt{\frac{\ln(n)}{16 \|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|^2 + \frac{2c}{\|\Sigma\|_2}}}.$$

Noting $H^2 := \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}A\|^2$, we get the final bound

$$f(R^*) = \left(K_1 + K_2 \cdot \sqrt{\ln(n)} \right) n^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{16H^2}{16H^2 + \frac{2c}{\|\Sigma\|_2}} \right)}.$$

Recalling that $c = \frac{1}{4}$ (see Lemma B.12), we get $f(R^*) = \Theta(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\frac{1}{32}\Psi)}} \sqrt{\ln n})$ with $\Psi := H^2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2$ which concludes the proof of Theorem 4.4. \square

B.5 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Proof. Let μ be as in the statement of Proposition 3.3, and let (x_1, \dots, x_n) be i.i.d. samples from μ . We let $A = K^\top Q$ where K and Q are the key and query matrices in the attention mechanism, and consider the random vector $Z_j(x) := (e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle} x_j, e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

We introduce notation for the numerator and denominator of the attention maps $\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x)$ and $\Gamma_\mu(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) &= \frac{N_n(x)}{D_n(x)} \quad \text{where} \quad N_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle} x_j \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad D_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle} \in \mathbb{R} \\ \Gamma_\mu(x) &= \frac{N(x)}{D(x)} \quad \text{where} \quad N(x) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle} X] \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad D(x) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}] \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

where $X \sim \mu$.

Step 1: Joint Central Limit Theorem (CLT) and Delta Method

Under the assumptions that $\mathbb{E}[\|e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle} X\|_2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}] < \infty$, the strong law of large numbers ensures almost sure convergence

$$N_n(x) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} N(x), \quad D_n(x) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} D(x) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The random vectors $Z_j(x) = (e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle} x_j, e^{\langle Ax, x_j \rangle}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ are i.i.d. with mean $\mathbb{E}[Z_1(x)] = (N(x), D(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Assuming $\mathbb{E}[\|Z_1(x)\|^2] < \infty$, the multivariate central limit theorem yields

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\begin{pmatrix} N_n(x) \\ D_n(x) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} N(x) \\ D(x) \end{pmatrix} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_{d+1}(0, \text{Cov}(Z_1(x)))$$

where $\text{Cov}(Z_1(x)) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}(x) & \Sigma_{12}(x) \\ \Sigma_{21}(x) & \Sigma_{22}(x) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (d+1)}$, and

$$\Sigma_{11}(x) = \text{Cov}(e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle} X) = \mathbb{E}[X^\top X e^{2\langle Ax, X \rangle}] - (\mathbb{E}[X e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}])^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$$

$$\Sigma_{22}(x) = \text{Var}(e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}) = \mathbb{E}[e^{2\langle Ax, X \rangle}] - (\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}])^2 \in \mathbb{R}$$

$$\Sigma_{12}(x) = \Sigma_{21}(x)^\top = \text{Cov}(e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle} X, e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}) = \mathbb{E}[X e^{2\langle Ax, X \rangle}] - \mathbb{E}[X e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}] \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, X \rangle}] \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Applying the multivariate delta method to $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $g(a, b) = a/b$, we obtain,

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\frac{N_n(x)}{D_n(x)} - \frac{N(x)}{D(x)} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_d(0, \text{Cov}(x)),$$

where the asymptotic covariance is denoted $\text{Cov}(x)$ and is equal to

$$\text{Cov}(x) = \nabla g_{(N(x), D(x))} \text{Cov}(Z_1(x)) \nabla g_{(N(x), D(x))}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$$

The gradient of g at $(N(x), D(x))$ is

$$\nabla g_{(N(x), D(x))} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{D(x)} I_d & -\frac{N(x)}{D(x)^2} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (d+1)},$$

where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. The variance $\text{Cov}(x)$ expands as

$$\text{Cov}(x) = \frac{1}{D(x)^2} \Sigma_{11}(x) - \frac{1}{D(x)^3} (N(x) \Sigma_{12}(x)^\top + \Sigma_{12}(x) N(x)^\top) + \frac{1}{D(x)^4} \Sigma_{22}(x) N(x) N(x)^\top.$$

Step 2: Chi-Square Bound

From the asymptotic normality, the squared Euclidean norm converges in distribution to a chi-squared random variable

$$\left\| \sqrt{n} \text{Cov}(x)^{-1/2} (\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)) \right\|_2^2 \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(d).$$

For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for n large enough, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sqrt{n} \text{Cov}(x)^{-1/2} (\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)) \right\|_2^2 \leq q_{d, 1-\delta} \right) \geq 1 - \delta \quad (26)$$

where $q_{d, 1-\delta} := F_{\chi^2(d)}^{-1}(1 - \delta)$ is the $(1 - \delta)$ -quantile of the $\chi^2(d)$ distribution.

To derive the desired inequality for $\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2^2$, we use a spectral inequality.

Step 3: Spectral Bound

Let $\tilde{z}_n = \sqrt{n}(\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x))$. Applying the Rayleigh-Ritz theorem, we get

$$\|\tilde{z}_n\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x)) \|\text{Cov}(x)^{-1/2} \tilde{z}_n\|_2^2.$$

This yields the event inclusion

$$\left\{ \|\text{Cov}(x)^{-1/2} \tilde{z}_n\|_2^2 \leq q_{d, 1-\delta} \right\} \subset \left\{ \|\tilde{z}_n\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x)) q_{d, 1-\delta} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

From (26) and (27), we obtain that for n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{z}_n\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x)) q_{d, 1-\delta}) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Therefore:

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x))^{1/2} q_{d,1-\delta}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta.$$

This spectral inequality allows us to convert bounds on quadratic forms back to Euclidean norm bounds, completing the bridge between the chi-squared concentration and our desired result. The quantile $q_{d,1-\delta}$ can be upper bounded using the Laurent-Massart concentration inequality for chi-squared random variables (see [Laurent and Massart, 2000, Section 4.1 Lemma 1]) stating that, for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\chi^2(d) \geq d + 2\sqrt{dx} + 2x) \leq e^{-x}.$$

Setting $x = \ln(1/\delta)$ in this inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\chi^2(d) \geq d + 2\sqrt{d \ln(1/\delta)} + 2 \ln(1/\delta)\right) \leq \delta.$$

By definition of the quantile function,

$$q_{d,1-\delta} \leq d + 2\sqrt{d \ln(1/\delta)} + 2 \ln(1/\delta).$$

This yields our refined bound, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x))^{1/2} (d + 2\sqrt{d \ln(1/\delta)} + 2 \ln(1/\delta))^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Step 4: Moment Generating Function Representation

We express the variance components using the moment generating function (MGF) $M(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{t^\top X}]$ and its derivatives. For a centered sub-Gaussian X with parameter Σ :

$$M(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle t, X \rangle}], \quad M'(t) = \mathbb{E}[X e^{\langle t, X \rangle}], \quad M''(t) = \mathbb{E}[X X^\top e^{\langle t, X \rangle}].$$

The variance components become

$$\Sigma_{11}(x) = M''(2Ax) - M'(Ax)M'(Ax)^\top.$$

$$\Sigma_{22}(x) = M(2Ax) - M(Ax)^2.$$

$$\Sigma_{12}(x) = M'(2Ax) - M'(Ax)M(Ax).$$

Since $D(x) = M(Ax)$ and $N(x) = M'(Ax)$, the covariance $\text{Cov}(x)$ can be written as

$$\text{Cov}(x) = \frac{M''(2Ax)}{M(Ax)^2} - \frac{M'(Ax)M'(2Ax)^\top + M'(2Ax)M'(Ax)^\top}{M(Ax)^3} + \frac{M(2Ax)}{M(Ax)^4} M'(Ax)M'(Ax)^\top.$$

Let X be Σ -sub-Gaussian with $\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vector u :

$$|\langle u, M'(t) \rangle| \leq \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} e^{t^\top \Sigma t}. \quad (28)$$

$$\langle u, M''(t)u \rangle \leq \sqrt{3}\|\Sigma\|_2 e^{t^\top \Sigma t}. \quad (29)$$

Let us prove this result. Let $Y = \langle u, X \rangle$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|\langle u, M'(t) \rangle| = |\mathbb{E}[Y e^{\langle t, X \rangle}]| \leq (\mathbb{E}[Y^2])^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}[e^{2\langle t, X \rangle}])^{1/2}.$$

Since X is Σ -sub-Gaussian, Y is σ_u -sub-Gaussian with $\sigma_u = \sqrt{u^\top \Sigma u} \leq \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}$. Thus $\mathbb{E}[Y^2] \leq \|\Sigma\|_2$ and $\mathbb{E}[e^{2\langle t, X \rangle}] \leq e^{2t^\top \Sigma t}$.

The second inequality follows similarly using the fourth moment bound $\mathbb{E}[Y^4] \leq 3\|\Sigma\|_2^2$ for sub-Gaussian random variables.

Step 6: Main spectral bound

We will prove the following spectral bound for attention variance. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(x)) \leq (2 + \sqrt{3})\|\Sigma\|_2 e^{5(Ax)^\top \Sigma Ax}.$$

Let u be a unit vector and $t = Ax$. Using $M(t) \geq 1$, and $\frac{M(2t)}{M(t)^4} \leq \frac{1}{M(t)^2} \leq 1$,

$$|u^\top \text{Cov}(x)u| \leq |u^\top M''(2t)u| + |u^\top M'(t)|^2 + 2|u^\top M'(2t)||u^\top M'(t)|.$$

Substituting the bounds from (28) and (29), with $p(t) := t^\top \Sigma t$,

$$|u^\top \text{Cov}(x)u| \leq \|\Sigma\|_2 \left(\sqrt{3}e^{4p(t)} + e^{2p(t)} + 2e^{5p(t)} \right).$$

Since the exponential terms are dominated by $e^{5p(t)}$, we obtain

$$|u^\top \text{Cov}(x)u| \leq (2 + \sqrt{3})\|\Sigma\|_2 e^{5p(t)}.$$

Since this holds for all unit vectors u , the result follows.

Step 7: Conclusion

Combining our results, we obtain that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x) - \Gamma_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{C(\Sigma, A, V, x, \delta, d)}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where

$$C(\Sigma, A, V, x, \delta, d) = (2 + \sqrt{3})\|V\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 e^{\frac{5}{2}(Ax)^\top \Sigma Ax} (d + 2\sqrt{d \ln(1/\delta)} + 2 \ln(1/\delta))^{1/2}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

B.6 Proof of Proposition 4.8

Proof. To alleviate the notation, set $g_i := \Gamma_\mu(x_i)$ and $\hat{g}_i := \Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(x_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, as well as the empirical means $\bar{g}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i$ and $\hat{\bar{g}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{g}_i$. We also denote $g := \Gamma_\mu(X)$ and $\hat{g} := \Gamma_{\hat{\mu}_n}(X)$. Now, decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\hat{g}) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(g)\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(\hat{g}) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(g)\|_2 + \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(g) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(g)\|_2 \\ & = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^\top - g_i g_i^\top) - (\hat{\bar{g}}_n \hat{\bar{g}}_n^\top - \bar{g}_n \bar{g}_n^\top) \right\|_2 + \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(g) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(g)\|_2 \\ & \leq \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^\top - g_i g_i^\top) - (\hat{\bar{g}}_n \hat{\bar{g}}_n^\top - \bar{g}_n \bar{g}_n^\top) \right\|_2, \\ \mathcal{J} &= \|\text{Cov}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}(g) - \text{Cov}_{X \sim \mu}(g)\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 1: Analysis of the second term \mathcal{J}

Recall from Lemma 3.1 that,

$$\|\Gamma_\mu(X)\|_2 \leq \alpha \|X\|_2, \quad \alpha := 2 \|V\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2. \quad (30)$$

As X follows a sub-Gaussian distribution with scalar parameter $\sigma = \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2$, $\|X\|_2$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter $\sigma\sqrt{d}$ (see Lemma 1 in [Jin et al., 2019]). Using the characterization of sub-Gaussianity via the tail bound $\mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 \geq t) \leq 2e^{-t^2/(2\sigma^2)}$, we deduce from Lemma 3.1 that $\|\Gamma_\mu(X)\|_2$ is sub-Gaussian. Moreover, since for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, $|\langle u, \Gamma_\mu(X) \rangle| \leq \|\Gamma_\mu(X)\|_2 \leq \alpha \|X\|_2$, it follows that $\Gamma_\mu(X)$ is a sub-Gaussian random vector.

From Proposition 2.1 in [Vershynin, 2012] applied to the sub-Gaussian vector $\Gamma_\mu(X)$,

$$\mathcal{J} \lesssim_{\sigma, \delta} \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}.$$

Step 2: Analysis of the first term \mathcal{I}

Now bound \mathcal{I} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I} &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^\top - g_i g_i^\top) \right\|_2 + \left\| \bar{\hat{g}}_n \bar{\hat{g}}_n^\top - \bar{g}_n \bar{g}_n^\top \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^\top - g_i \hat{g}_i^\top + g_i \hat{g}_i^\top - g_i g_i^\top) \right\|_2 + \left\| \bar{\hat{g}}_n \bar{\hat{g}}_n^\top - \bar{g}_n \bar{g}_n^\top + \bar{\hat{g}}_n \bar{g}_n^\top - \bar{g}_n \bar{g}_n^\top \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)] + (\|\bar{\hat{g}}_n\|_2 + \|\bar{g}_n\|_2) \|\bar{\hat{g}}_n - \bar{g}_n\|_2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)] \\
\mathcal{I}_2 &= (\|\bar{\hat{g}}_n\|_2 + \|\bar{g}_n\|_2) \|\bar{\hat{g}}_n - \bar{g}_n\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For \mathcal{I}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} [\|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)^2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{I}_{1,\leq R} + \mathcal{I}_{1,>R}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{1,\leq R} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} [\|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)], \\
\mathcal{I}_{1,>R} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} (\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \|g_i\|_2)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\|x_i\|_2 \leq R$, using the notation $N_R := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x_i\|_2 > R\}}$, and $M_n := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|x_i\|_2$, we have $\|\hat{g}_i\|_2 \leq M_n \leq R$, and $\|g_i\|_2 \leq \alpha M_n \leq \alpha R$, where α is defined in (30). Also, from Proposition 3.3, $\|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}}$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{I}_{1,\leq R} \leq (1 + \alpha) R \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

For $\|x_i\|_2 > R$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{1,>R} \leq \frac{N_R}{n} M_n^2 (1 + \alpha)^2 \leq \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right)} \right) \cdot c^2 \sigma^2 \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2n}{\delta}} \right)^2 (1 + \alpha)^2,$$

where we used the result of Proposition B.11.

For \mathcal{I}_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_2 &= \left(\|\bar{\hat{g}}_n\|_2 + \|\bar{g}_n\|_2 \right) \|\bar{\hat{g}}_n - \bar{g}_n\|_2 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g_i\|_2 \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right)^2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, \leq R} + \mathcal{I}_{2, > R, \leq R} + \mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, > R} + \mathcal{I}_{2, > R, > R}.
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, \leq R} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \\
\mathcal{I}_{2, > R, \leq R} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i - g_i\|_2 \\
\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, > R} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 \leq R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right) \\
\mathcal{I}_{2, > R, > R} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|\hat{g}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\|x_i\|_2 > R} \|g_i\|_2 \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term $\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, \leq R}$ is bounded by

$$\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, \leq R} \leq (1 + \alpha) R \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(\frac{N_R}{n} M_n (1 + \alpha) \right)^2.$$

The crossed terms $\mathcal{I}_{2, > R, \leq R}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, > R}$ are bounded by,

$$\mathcal{I}_{2, > R, \leq R} \leq \frac{N_R}{n} M_n (1 + \alpha) \cdot \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{2, \leq R, > R} \leq (1 + \alpha)^2 M_n \frac{N_R}{n} \cdot \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

And the last term is again bounded by

$$\mathcal{I}_{2, > R, > R} \leq \frac{N_R}{n} M_n^2 (1 + \alpha)^2.$$

Recall that $\frac{N_R}{n} M_n \leq \left(e^{-c(\frac{R}{\sigma} - C\sqrt{d})^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right)} \right) \cdot c\sigma \left(\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2n}{\delta}} \right).$

Therefore, as in Theorem 4.4, optimizing over R yields the optimal radius R^* ,

$$R^* \approx \sqrt{\frac{\ln(n)}{16 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|^2 + \frac{4c}{\|\Sigma\|_2}}}.$$

Finally, $\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J} = P(\sqrt{\ln(n)}) \cdot O(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+16\cdot\Psi)}})$ where $\Psi := H^2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_2$, and P is a polynomial function of $\ln n$, which concludes the proof. \square

B.7 Proof of Proposition 3.6

The proof of Proposition 3.6 is the same as the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Appendix B.2, except for the step 2 of part 1, where bounds on the Lipschitz constant and envelope function are derived differently. More precisely, Lemma B.7, Lemma B.10 and Lemma B.8 needs to be replaced by Lemma B.13, Lemma B.14, and Lemma B.15 respectively.

Lemma B.13 (Bound on Lipschitz constant of numerator for compactly supported μ). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and L defined in Lemma B.7, for $Y \sim \mu$, with support $\mu \subset B_{R_0}$, and $x \in B_R$,*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} \leq R_0^2 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}.$$

Proof. Consider $f(t, y) := y e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$. Then, with $t = Ax$, $\nabla_t f(t, y) = A^\top \nabla_x f(x, y)$. The Jacobian of $f(\cdot, y)$ at t is

$$\nabla_t f(t, y) = y y^\top e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} &:= \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|\nabla_t f(t, Y)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^4 e^{2\langle t, y \rangle}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq R_0^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [e^{2\langle Ax, Y \rangle}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq R_0^2 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2} \end{aligned}$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwarz to bound $\langle t, z \rangle \leq \|Ax\|_2 \|Y\|_2 \leq RR_0\|A\|_2$. \square

Lemma B.14 (Bound on Lipschitz constant of denominator for compactly supported μ). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}'$, and L defined in Lemma B.10, and let $Y \sim \mu$, with support $\mu \subset B_{R_0}$, and $x \in B_R$. Then,*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} \leq \|A\|_2 R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}.$$

Proof. Consider $f(t, y) := e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$. Then, with $t = Ax$, $\nabla_x f(x, y) = A^\top \nabla_t f(Ax, y)$. The Jacobian of $f(\cdot, y)$ at t is

$$\nabla_t f(t, y) = y e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} &:= \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|\nabla_t f(t, Y)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^2 e^{2\langle t, y \rangle}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma B.15 (Bound on envelope function for compactly supported μ). *For $Y \sim \mu$, with support $\mu \subset B_{R_0}$, and $x \in B_R$,*

$$(\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2])^{1/2} \leq R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}.$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_2^2 e^{2R\|A^\top Y\|_2}] \leq R_0^2 e^{2RR_0\|A\|_2}.$$

\square

To apply those results to prove Proposition 3.6, recall equation (18) for the numerator of attention in the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Appendix B.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(R_0 \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \right).$$

Applying Lemma B.13 and Lemma B.15 yields,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] &\leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\|A\|_2 R_0^3 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2} + R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} R_0 (\|A\|_2 R_0^2 + 1) e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}.\end{aligned}$$

To control the denominator of attention, we apply Lemma B.14 to equation (20),

$$E[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}'}] \leq \frac{c}{\delta\sqrt{n}} \|A\|_2 R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}. \quad (31)$$

Combining those results, the conclusion of part 3 in Appendix B.2 becomes,

$$\begin{aligned}\|N\|_2 &= \|\mathbb{E}[Y e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]\|_2 \leq R_0 e^{RR_0\|A\|_2}, \\ \left\| \frac{N_n}{D_n} - \frac{N}{D} \right\|_2 &\leq \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{c\sqrt{d} R_0 (2R_0^2\|A\|_2 + R_0\|A\|_2 + 2)}{\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{2RR_0\|A\|_2}.\end{aligned}$$

B.8 Lemmas for hardmax convergence rate

In this section, we introduce some useful lemmas about extreme value theory used in the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Definition B.16 (Asymptotic uniform integrability). A family $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ of random variables is *asymptotically uniformly integrable* if:

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}[|X_i| \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_i| > A\}}] = 0.$$

Lemma B.17 (Joint Convergence). Let $Z_n = \frac{M_n^+ - a_n}{b_n}$ and $Y_n = \frac{-M_n^- - a_n}{b_n}$. Joint convergence holds:

$$(Z_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} (G_+, G_-)$$

with G_+, G_- independent, centered Gumbel random variables (variance $\pi^2/6$).

Proof of Lemma B.17. A statement of the weak convergence of the marginals can be found in Theorem 1 of [Tanguy, 2015]. For joint convergence, see Theorem 1.8.3 of [Nadarajah, 2000] applied to Gaussian distribution. \square

Lemma B.18 (Sum Convergence).

$$\frac{2\sqrt{2\ln n}}{\sigma} V_n = \frac{M_n^+ + M_n^-}{\sigma} \sqrt{2\ln n} \xrightarrow{d} L$$

where $L := G_+ - G_-$ follows a standard logistic law with variance $\pi^2/3$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma B.17 and continuity of the mapping $(a, b) \mapsto a + b$. \square

C Gaussian case: additional results and proofs

This section provides additional results for the Gaussian token distribution, including pointwise convergence rates, one-dimensional analysis, and detailed proofs of auxiliary lemmas used in the main text.

C.1 Additionnal results on pointwise convergence

We begin with concentration bounds for fixed query vectors under Gaussian token distribution.

Lemma C.1 (High-probability concentration (Gaussian constants)). For any fixed query $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{C(\Sigma, A, x, \delta, d)}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where

$$C(\Sigma, A, x, \delta, d) = \|V\|_2 \cdot q_{A,x,d,\delta}^{\mathcal{N}} \cdot e^{\frac{1}{2} \|\Sigma^{1/2} Ax\|_2^2}.$$

$$q_{A,x,d,\delta}^{\mathcal{N}} := \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2 + \|\Sigma Ax\|_2^2} q_{d,1-\delta}^{1/2}.$$

C.2 Dimension 1

In the one-dimensional case, sharper convergence rates can be obtained with explicit constants.

Lemma C.2 (Concentration in $d = 1$). *With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(x) - \Gamma_{\mu}(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{C(\sigma, a, x, \delta)}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad C(\sigma, a, x, \delta) = |V| q_{1-\delta/2} \sigma \sqrt{1 + \sigma^2 a_x^2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 a_x^2\right).$$

Proposition C.3 (Mean convergence rate in $d = 1$). *Let $\Psi = (a\sigma)^2 \cdot \sigma^2$ and $\kappa_{1D} = \Psi/(1 + \Psi) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{(a\sigma)^2 \cdot \sigma^2}}$. Then,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\mu}_n}[\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}}(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu_n}[\Gamma_{\mu}(x)]\| = \Theta\left(\ln n n^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\kappa_{1D})}\right), \quad \kappa_{1D} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{(a\sigma)^2 \cdot \sigma^2}}.$$

C.3 Proof of Proposition 3.5

The proof of Proposition 3.5 is the same as the one of Theorem 3.4 in Appendix B.2, except for step 2 of part 1, where bounds on the Lipschitz constant and envelope function are tighter for Gaussian distributions. More precisely, Lemma B.7, Lemma B.10 and Lemma B.8 needs to be replaced by Lemma C.4, Lemma C.5 and Lemma C.6 respectively.

Lemma C.4 (Bound on Lipschitz constant for numerator for Gaussian distribution). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and L defined in Lemma A.7, for $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and $x \in B_R$,*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} \leq c(\Sigma, A, R) \exp(R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2),$$

where $c(\Sigma, A, R)$ is a polynomial function in $\|A\|_2$, $\|\Sigma\|_2$, R , and $\text{tr}(\Sigma)$.

Proof. Consider $f(t, y) := y e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$ - we will then apply the result to $t = Ax$ using $\nabla_t f(t, y) = A^\top \nabla_x f_x(y)$.

The Jacobian of $f(\cdot, y)$ at t is

$$\nabla_t f(t, y) = y y^\top e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

Let $\|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} := \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|\nabla_t f(t, Y)\|_2^2\right)^{1/2} = \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y\|_2^4 e^{2\langle t, y \rangle}]\right)^{1/2}$, where we used the fact that YY^\top is a rank one matrix, hence $\|YY^\top\| = \|Y\|_2^2$.

Notice that, for any measurable function g ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(Y) e^{\langle t, y \rangle}] &= \int g(y) e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \phi_\Sigma(y) dy = \int g(y) \exp\left(\langle t, y \rangle - \frac{1}{2} y^\top \Sigma^{-1} y\right) \frac{dy}{(2\pi)^{d/2} \det(\Sigma)^{1/2}} \\ &= \int g(y) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (y - \Sigma t)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (y - \Sigma t) + \frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t\right) \frac{dy}{(2\pi)^{d/2} \det(\Sigma)^{1/2}} \\ &= e^{\frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t} \int g(y) \phi_\Sigma(y - \Sigma t) dy = e^{\frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t} \mathbb{E}[g(Y + \Sigma t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Using this property, we can write:

$$\|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} = e^{\frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t} \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y + \Sigma t\|_2^4]\right)^{1/2},$$

Note that $t^\top \Sigma t = x^\top A^\top \Sigma A x \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2$, and take the supremum over $\|x\|_2 \leq R$:

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} := \sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq R} \|\nabla_x f_x(y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq c(\Sigma, A) \exp(R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2),$$

where $c(\Sigma, A)$ is a polynomial function in $\|A\|_2$, $\|\Sigma\|_2$, and $\text{tr}(\Sigma)$. \square

Lemma C.5 (Bound on Lipschitz constant for denominator for Gaussian distribution). *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and L defined in Lemma A.7, for $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and $x \in B_R$*

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} \leq c'(\Sigma, A, R) \exp(R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2),$$

where $c'(\Sigma, A, R)$ is a polynomial function in $\|A\|_2$, $\|\Sigma\|_2$, R , and $\text{tr}(\Sigma)$.

Proof. Consider $f(t, y) := e^{\langle t, y \rangle}$ - we will then apply the result to $t = Ax$ using $\nabla_x f(x, y) = A^\top \nabla_t f(t, y)$. The Jacobian of $f(\cdot, y)$ at t is

$$\nabla_t f(t, y) = y e^{\langle t, y \rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

$$\text{Let } \|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} := \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} \|\nabla_t f(t, Y)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

As derived in the proof of Lemma , for any measurable function g ,

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y) e^{\langle t, y \rangle}] = e^{\frac{1}{2} t^\top \Sigma t} \mathbb{E}[g(Y + \Sigma t)].$$

Using this property,

$$\|\nabla_t f(t, y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} = e^{t^\top \Sigma t} \left(\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mu} [\|Y + \Sigma t\|_2^2] \right)^{1/2},$$

Use $t^\top \Sigma t = x^\top A^\top \Sigma A x \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2$, and take the supremum over $\|x\|_2 \leq R$:

$$\|L\|_{L^2(P)} := \sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq R} \|\nabla_x f_x(y)\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq c'(\Sigma, A) \exp(R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2),$$

where $c'(\Sigma, A, R)$ is a polynomial function in $\|A\|_2$, $\|\Sigma\|_2$, R , and $\text{tr}(\Sigma)$. □

Lemma C.6 (Bound on envelope function for Gaussians). *For $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and $x \in B_R$,*

$$(\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2])^{1/2} \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \left(2^{d+1} d + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} 2^{\frac{d}{2}+1}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} (2R \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2)^{d+1} \right) e^{R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}.$$

Proof. Write $Y := \Sigma^{1/2} Z$, where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and notice that $2R \|A^\top Y\|_2 \leq 2R \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2 \|Z\|_2 = t \|Z\|_2$, where $t := 2R \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2$. Then:

$$\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_2^2 e^{2\|A^\top Y\|_2}] \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2^2 \mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_2^2 e^{t\|Z\|_2}] = \|\Sigma\|_2 \mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_2^2 e^{t\|Z\|_2}].$$

As $\|Z\|_2 \sim \chi_d$, writing $c_d := \frac{2^{1-\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}$, one can explicitly compute:

$$E[\|Z\|_2^2 e^{t\|Z\|_2}] = c_d \int_0^\infty r^{d+1} e^{-r^2/2} e^{tr} dr = c_d e^{t^2/2} \int_0^\infty r^{d+1} e^{-(r-t)^2/2} dr.$$

Making the change of variable $r - t = s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty r^{d+1} e^{-(r-t)^2/2} dr &= \int_{-t}^\infty (s+t)^{d+1} e^{-s^2/2} ds \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^\infty (|s|+t)^{d+1} e^{-s^2/2} ds \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^\infty \underbrace{2^d (|s|^{d+1} + t^{d+1})}_{(\star)} e^{-s^2/2} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $(a+b)^{d+1} \leq 2^d(a^{d+1} + b^{d+1})$ in (\star) .

Then use symmetry to compute

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty |s|^{d+1} e^{-s^2/2} ds = 2 \int_0^\infty s^{d+1} e^{-s^2/2} ds = 2 \cdot 2^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+2}{2}\right) = 2^{\frac{d+2}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+2}{2}\right).$$

Combining these results, we obtain that,

$$E[\|Z\|_2^2 e^{t\|Z\|_2}] \leq c_d 2^d (2^{\frac{d+2}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+2}{2}\right) + \sqrt{2\pi} t^{d+1}) e^{t^2/2} = (2^{d+1} d + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} 2^{\frac{d}{2}+1}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} t^{d+1}) e^{t^2/2}.$$

Finally, with $t = 2R \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2$,

$$(\mathbb{E}[F(Y)^2])^{1/2} \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \left(2^{d+1} d + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} 2^{\frac{d}{2}+1}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} (2R \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2)^{d+1} \right) e^{R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2},$$

which is exactly the stated inequality. □

Recall equation (18) for the numerator of attention in the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Appendix B.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(R \mathbb{E}[\|L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] + \mathbb{E}[\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}] \right).$$

Applying Lemma C.4 and Lemma C.6 yields,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}}] \leq \frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(R c(\Sigma, A) + C(d, \Sigma, A, R) \right) e^{R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2},$$

where $C(d, \Sigma, A, R) := \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 (2^{d+1}d + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} 2^{\frac{d}{2}+1}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} (2R\|\Sigma^{1/2}A\|_2)^{d+1})$.

To control the denominator of attention, applying Lemma C.5 to equation (20),

$$E[\|\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}\|_{\mathcal{F}'}] \leq \frac{c'(\Sigma, A)}{\delta \sqrt{n}} e^{R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}. \quad (32)$$

Combining those results, the conclusion of part 3 in Appendix B.2 becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|N\|_2}{D} &= \frac{\|\mathbb{E}[Y e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]\|_2}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\langle Ax, Y \rangle}]} = \|\Sigma A x\|_2 \leq \|\Sigma A\|_2 R, \\ \left\| \frac{N_n}{D_n} - \frac{N}{D} \right\|_2 &\leq \|V\|_2 \cdot \frac{c(\Sigma, A, R, d)}{\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot e^{R^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} A\|_2^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$q_{(\Sigma, A, V, R, d, \delta)}^{\mathcal{N}} = \frac{2c\|V\|_2\sqrt{d}}{\delta} (R c(\Sigma, A, R) + C(d, \Sigma, A, R) + \|\Sigma A\|_2 R c'(\Sigma, A, R)).$$