

Efficient Stochastic Gradient Descent for Strongly Convex Optimization

Tianbao Yang

GE Global Research, San Ramon, CA, 94583, USA

TYANG@GE.COM

Lijun Zhang

Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, 48824, USA

ZHANGLIJ@MSU.EDU

Abstract

We motivate this study from a recent work on a stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method with only one projection (Mahdavi et al., 2012), which aims at alleviating the computational bottleneck of the standard SGD method in performing the projection at each iteration, and enjoys an $O(\log T/T)$ convergence rate for strongly convex optimization. In this paper, we make further contributions along the line. First, we develop an epoch-projection SGD method that only makes a constant number of projections less than $\log_2 T$ but achieves an optimal convergence rate $O(1/T)$ for *strongly convex optimization*. Second, we present a proximal extension to utilize the structure of the objective function that could further speed-up the computation and convergence for sparse regularized loss minimization problems. Finally, we consider an application of the proposed techniques to solving the high dimensional large margin nearest neighbor classification problem, yielding a speed-up of orders of magnitude.

1. Introduction

Recent years have seen the emergence of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) (Nemirovski et al., 2009; Bach and Moulines, 2011; Bottou, 2010) as an important tool for solving large-scale optimization problems in machine learning. In each iteration, SGD reduces the computational cost of the standard gradient descent by sampling one (or a small set of) examples for computing a stochastic (sub)gradient. Thus, the computational cost of SGD is independent of the size of the data, making it appealing for large-scale optimization. However, when the optimization domain is complex (e.g., a PSD cone), the projection operation in each iteration, which is to ensure the feasibility of the intermediate solutions, becomes the computational bottleneck.

To improve the computational efficiency of SGD, Mahdavi et al. (2012) proposed a SGD method with only one projection that moves the domain constraint to the objective function with a Lagrangian multiplier and solves the problem by a standard SGD method. Its claim is that by performing one projection at the end of the iteration, the final solution shares a similar convergence rate (e.g., an $O(\log T/T)$ convergence rate for strongly convex optimization) as a standard SGD method. When the target function is both smooth and strongly convex, Zhang et al. (2013) shows that it is possible to maintain the optimal

$O(1/T)$ rate by performing $O(\kappa \log_2 T)$ projections, where κ is the conditional number of the problem, namely the ratio of the smoothness parameter to the strong convexity parameter.

Besides the one-projection SGD method, another line of research is projection-free algorithms (Jaggi, 2012; Clarkson, 2010; Ying and Li, 2012; Jaggi, 2011; Hazan, 2008), which mostly build upon the Frank-Wolfe technique (Frank and Wolfe, 1956) that eschews the projection in favor of a linear optimization step. Recently, Hazan and Kale (2012); Garber and Hazan (2013) extended these batch algorithms to stochastic or online algorithms. In (Hazan and Kale, 2012) the authors present an online Frank-Wolfe (OFW) algorithm that can also be used for stochastic optimization. OFW exhibits $O(1/T^{1/3})$ rate for general convex optimization problems, which is much slower than the optimal $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ rate. In (Garber and Hazan, 2013), the authors present several new algorithms that enjoy faster convergence rates than OFW (e.g., $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ for general convex optimization). In particular, their algorithm for online strongly convex optimization has an $O(\log T)$ regret bound. However, a problem with their algorithm for strongly convex optimization is that it needs to store all the loss functions, correspondingly all the data, received in the past iterations and to compute the gradient of them at the current solution. It therefore makes them not appropriate for large scale strongly convex optimization that we are interested in this work. Therefore, we resort to reduction techniques for alleviating the projection burden on a standard SGD method.

This paper extends the one-projection SGD method (Mahdavi et al., 2012) in two aspects. First, we develop an epoch-projection SGD method, achieving an optimal $O(1/T)$ rate for strongly convex optimization with no more than $\log_2 T$ projections. Compared to (Zhang et al., 2013), our method is advantageous because it does not require the smoothness assumption and the number of projection is independent of the conditional number. Second, we present a proximal extension of the epoch-projection SGD method by utilizing the structure of the objective function. In learning problems with a sparse regularizer, the proximal epoch-projection SGD method can guarantee the intermediate solutions are sparse and could possibly speed-up the computation and the convergence. As an application, we discuss how to utilize the proposed method to solve the optimization problem in high dimensional large margin nearest neighbor classification.

2. Related Work

The goal is to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x}), \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{D} is bounded convex domain. We assume that it can be characterized by an inequality, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : c(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\} \tag{2}$$

We also assume the optimal solution lies in a bounded ball $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq r\}$, where r is the radius of the ball. We consider the objective function $f(\mathbf{x})$ to be a β -strongly convex.

A standard SGD method solves the problem by iterating the updates in (3) with $\eta_t = 1/(2\beta t)$:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\mathbf{x}_t - \eta_t \tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t) \right], \quad (3)$$

and returning the averaged solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t / T$ as the final solution, where $\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}; \varepsilon_t)$ is a stochastic (sub)gradient of $f(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}; \varepsilon_t)] \in \partial f(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}]$ is a projection operator defined by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}] = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2$. When the problem domain \mathcal{D} is complex (e.g., a polyhedron or a PSD cone), computing the projection can be very expensive. Taking the projection into a PSD cone in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as an example, it requires a full singular value decomposition (SVD) that could cost up to an unbearable $O(d^3)$ time complexity.

Recently, [Mahdavi et al. \(2012\)](#) proposed an one-projection SGD method. It moves the constraint $c(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ to the objective with an appropriate multiplier λ ¹, i.e.,

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda[c(\mathbf{x})]_+, \quad (4)$$

where $[s]_+ = \max(0, s)$, and then optimizes the above objective by a SGD method:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}} \left[\underbrace{\mathbf{x}_t - \eta_t (\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t) + \lambda \nabla [c(\mathbf{x}_t)]_+)}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}} \right] = \frac{r}{\max(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}\|_2, r)} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}, \quad (5)$$

and finally projects the averaged solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t / T$ into the domain \mathcal{D} , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T], \quad (6)$$

where $\nabla c(\mathbf{x})$ is a (sub)gradient of $c(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is an operator that projects the solution into the ball \mathcal{B} , which can be computed much more efficiently than $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ in the update (3) of a standard SGD. It is well known that a standard SGD method by (3) suffers from an $O(\log T/T)$ convergence rate for the averaged solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t / T$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x})] \leq \frac{G^2(1 + \log T)}{2\beta T},$$

where G is an universal bound on the stochastic gradient $\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t)\|_2 \leq G$. Similarly, the one-projection method by (4,5 and 6) enjoys a similar order of $O(\log T/T)$ convergence rate in terms of T for the solution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T$.

It is notable that several recent works achieve the optimal $O(1/T)$ convergence rate for strongly convex optimization or strongly convex and smooth optimization by making modifications to the standard SGD method ([Hazan and Kale, 2011](#); [Rakhlin et al., 2012](#)). Inspired by the Epoch-SGD method ([Hazan and Kale, 2011](#)), we improve the convergence rate of one-projection SGD from $O(\log T/T)$ to $O(1/T)$ by making use of the idea of ‘‘epoch’’. In contrast to the Epoch-SGD method that performs T projections, the proposed algorithm only needs a constant number of projections less than $\log_2 T$ and still enjoys the optimal $O(1/T)$ rate. Recently, [Zhang et al. \(2013\)](#) propose an algorithm for stochastic strongly convex and smooth optimization with $O(\kappa \log_2 T)$ projections. However, several key differences make the proposed algorithm more attractive.

1. Instead of having one additional parameter δ by using a smooth log-exponential term $\delta \log(1 + \exp(\lambda c(\mathbf{x})/\delta))$ ([Mahdavi et al., 2012](#)), we directly use $[c(\mathbf{x})]_+$ that yields no difference in the convergence analysis.

1. Their algorithm and analysis rely on both the smoothness and the strong convexity of the objective function. Instead, we only assume the objective function is strongly convex.
2. The number of projections in their algorithm is $O(\kappa \log_2 T)$, where κ is the conditional number and can be very large in real applications. In contrast, the proposed algorithm only requires no more than $\log_2 T$ projections.

3. Epoch-projection SGD (Epro-SGD) Algorithm

In this section, we first present an epoch-projection SGD (Epro-SGD) method and its convergence analysis. Second, we present its proximal extension for a sparse regularizer and its application in high dimensional large margin nearest neighbor classification.

Let \mathbf{x}_* denote the optimal solution to (1). Similar to previous studies, we make the following assumptions:

- A1. Assume the problem (1) is a strongly convex problem, i.e., $c(\mathbf{x})$ is convex and $f(\mathbf{x})$ is β -strongly convex in \mathcal{B} . A function $f(\mathbf{x})$ is β -strongly convex, if for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$f(s\mathbf{x} + (1-s)\mathbf{y}) \leq sf(\mathbf{x}) + (1-s)f(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\beta}{2}s(1-s)\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2,$$

The strongly convexity of $f(\mathbf{x})$ implies that $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}_*) + (\beta/2)\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$.

- A2. Assume the stochastic gradient $\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}; \varepsilon)$ is uniformly bounded by G_1 , i.e., $\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}; \varepsilon)\|_2 \leq G_1$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$.
- A3. Assume the gradient $\nabla c(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly bounded by G_2 , i.e., $\|\nabla c(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \leq G_2$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$.
- A4. Assume there exists a positive value $\rho > 0$ such that $\min_{c(\mathbf{x})=0} \|\nabla c(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \geq \rho$.

The detailed steps of the Epro-SGD algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1. The Epro-SGD algorithm is built upon two recently proposed algorithms, namely the one-projection SGD (Opro-SGD) algorithm and the Epoch-SGD algorithm. The updates in intra-epoch are the same as Opro-SGD, and the epoch updating scheme is the same to Epoch-SGD. In contrast to Opro-SGD, Epro-SGD projects the solution into the problem domain \mathcal{D} at the end of each epoch and uses it as a starting point of the next epoch. It is this feature that makes the Epro-SGD algorithm could perform better than Opro-SGD, since Opro-SGD has no control of the intermediate solutions. Epro-SGD differentiates from Epoch-SGD in that Epro-SGD eschews the projection into the problem domain \mathcal{D} in the intra-epoch updates in favor of bounding the solution in a r -radius ball which subsumes the optimal solution. As a result, when computing the projection is very expensive (e.g., projecting the solution into a PSD cone as we discuss shortly), Epro-SGD could yield much faster running time than Epoch-SGD.

Next, we analyze the convergence rate of the Epro-SGD algorithm. Without a surprise, the analysis is a combination of that for Opro-SGD and that for Epoch-SGD. Nevertheless,

Algorithm 1 Epoch-projection SGD (Epro-SGD)

- 1: **Input:** an initial step size η_1 , total number of iterations T , and number of iterations in the first epoch T_1 , a Lagrangian multiplier $\lambda > G_1/\rho$
 - 2: **Initialization:** $\mathbf{x}_1^1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $k = 1$.
 - 3: **while** $\sum_{i=1}^k T_i \leq T$ **do**
 - 4: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T_k$ **do**
 - 5: Compute a stochastic gradient $\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t)$
 - 6: Compute $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k = \mathbf{x}_t^k - \eta_k(\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t^k; \varepsilon_t) + \lambda \nabla [c(\mathbf{x}_t^k)]_+)$
 - 7: Update $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k] = \frac{r}{\max(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k\|_2, r)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k$
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T^k = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T^k]$, where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T^k = \sum_{t=1}^{T_k} \mathbf{x}_t^k / T_k$.
 - 10: Update $\mathbf{x}_1^{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T^k$, $T_{k+1} = 2T_k$, $\eta_{k+1} = \eta_k/2$
 - 11: Set $k = k + 1$
 - 12: **end while**
-

a detailed analysis can facilitate our understanding on the Epro-SGD algorithm. We first present a main theorem stating the convergence rate of the Epro-SGD algorithm.

Theorem 1 *Under the assumptions made in (A1~A4), if we let $\mu = \rho/(\rho - G_1/\lambda)$ and $G^2 = G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2$, and set $T_1 = 8$, $\eta_1 = \mu/(2\beta)$, then the total number of epochs k^\dagger is given by*

$$k^\dagger = \left\lceil \log_2 \left(\frac{T}{8} + 1 \right) \right\rceil \leq \log_2(T/4)$$

and the final solution $\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1}$ enjoys a convergence rate of

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1})] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{32\mu^2 G^2}{\beta T}$$

Remark: Before proving the theorem, we make a few remarks. First, the theorem implies that Epro-SGD achieves an optimal bound $O(1/T)$ that matches the lower bound for a strongly convex problem (Hazan and Kale, 2011). Second, in contrast to Opro-SGD that projects the solution once and enjoys a convergence rate $O(\log T/T)$, Epro-SGD uses no more than $\log_2(T/4)$ projections to obtain an $O(1/T)$ convergence rate. Third, in contrast to Epoch-SGD whose convergence rate is bounded by $O\left(\frac{8G_1^2}{\beta T}\right)$, the bound of Epoch-SGD is only worse by a factor of constant $4\mu^2 G^2/G_1^2$. In particular, if we consider a PSD cone constraint where $\rho = 1$ and choose $\mu = 2, \lambda = 2G_1/\rho$, then $G^2 = 5G_1^2$ and the bound of Epro-SGD is only worse by a factor of 80. Compared to Zhang et al. (2013)'s algorithm that requires $O(\kappa \log_2 T)$ projections, the number of projections required by Epro-SGD is independent of the conditional number of the problem. Finally, it is notable that there is a tradeoff in the value of λ . The larger λ , the larger G and the smaller μ .

To prove the theorem, we first prove the following lemma that states the convergence of intra-epoch updates (i.e., the Opro-SGD method).

Lemma 1 *Under the assumptions made in (A1~A4), if we apply the update $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta(\tilde{\nabla}f(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t) + \lambda\nabla[c(\mathbf{x}_t)]_+)$ and $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k]$ with T iterations, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{\rho}{\rho - G_1/\lambda} \left[\eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2) + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2]}{2\eta T} \right]$$

Proof [Proof of Theorem 1] Let $\mu = \rho/(\rho - G_1/\lambda)$, $G^2 = G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2$, $V_k = \frac{\mu^2 G^2}{2^{k-2}\beta}$. Define $\Delta_k = f(\mathbf{x}_1^k) - f(\mathbf{x}_*)$. We first prove that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k] \leq V_k$$

We prove the inequality by induction. It is true for $k = 1$ because of Lemma 4, $\mu > 1$ and $G^2 > G_1^2$. Now assume it is true for k and we prove it for $k + 1$. For a random variable X measurable with respect to the randomness up to epoch $k + 1$. Let $\mathbb{E}_k[X]$ denote the expectation conditioned on all the randomness up to epoch k . Following Lemma 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\Delta_{k+1}] \leq \mu \left[\eta_k G^2 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2]}{2\eta_k T_k} \right]$$

Since $\Delta_k = f(\mathbf{x}_1^k) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \geq \beta\|\mathbf{x}_1^k - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2/2$ by the strong convexity, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{k+1}] \leq \mu \left[\eta_k G^2 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k]}{\eta_k T_k \beta} \right] = \eta_k \mu G^2 + \frac{V_k \mu}{\eta_k T_k \beta} = \frac{V_k}{4} + \frac{V_k}{4} = \frac{V_k}{2}$$

where we use the fact $\eta_k = V_k/(4\mu G^2) = \mu/(2^k \beta)$ and $T_k = 16\mu^2 G^2/(V_k \beta) = 2^{k+2}$. Thus, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1})] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{k^\dagger+1}] \leq V_{k^\dagger+1} = \frac{\mu^2 G^2}{2^{k^\dagger-1}\beta}$$

Note that the total number of epochs satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k^\dagger} T_k = 8(2^{k^\dagger} - 1) \leq T$$

As a result,

$$k^\dagger = \left\lfloor \log_2 \left(\frac{T}{8} + 1 \right) \right\rfloor \leq \log_2(T/4)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1})] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{32\mu^2 G^2}{\beta T}$$

■

One might have noticed that the convergence bounds in Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 are expected bounds, while previous works Hazan and Kale (2011); Mahdavi et al. (2012) have shown the high probability bounds for Opro-SGD and Epoch-SGD. Next, we argue that the Epro-SGD algorithm also enjoys a similar high probability bound. A way of achieving this is

to apply the arguments in (Hazan and Kale, 2011), which proposes two alternative methods. One relies on an efficient function evaluator to select the best solutions among multiple trials of run. The second one modifies the updating rule by projecting the solution into the intersection of the domain and a center-shifted bounded ball with decaying radius. We can apply both methods to Epro-SGD, but they recklessly add additional computation burden to Epo-SGD. Instead, we present a theorem below by following the argument in (Mahdavi et al., 2012) that guarantees a similar bound for Epro-SGD in high probability but without invoking additional computation.

Corollary 1 *Under the assumptions made in (A1~A4), if we let $\mu = \rho/(\rho - G_1/\lambda)$, $G^2 = G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2$, $T_0 = \lceil (2G_1^2 + G_1) \ln(m/\delta) + G_1\beta \rceil / (3\mu G^2)$, and set $T_1 = \max(18, T_0)$, $\eta_1 = \mu/(3\beta)$, then the total number of projections k^\dagger is given by*

$$k^\dagger = \left\lceil \log_2 \left(\frac{T}{T_1} + 1 \right) \right\rceil \leq \log_2(T/9)$$

then the final solution $\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1}$ enjoys a convergence rate of

$$f(\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{72\mu^2 G^2}{\beta T}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $m = \lceil 2 \log_2 T \rceil$.

Remark: The high probability bound of Epoch-SGD method is with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, $f(\mathbf{x}_1^{k^\dagger+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{1200G_1^2 \log(1/\tilde{\delta})}{\beta T}$ with a total number of T projections, where $\tilde{\delta} = \frac{\delta}{\lceil \log_2(T/300+1) \rceil}$. In section 3.2, we will make a comparison between the two bounds for a real problem.

3.1. A Proximal Extension for a Sparse Regularizer

In this subsection, we propose a proximal extension of Epro-SGD that can yield substantial improvements in practice by exploiting the structure of the objective function. Assume the objective function is a composite of two components $f(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x})$, where $g(\mathbf{x})$ is a relatively simple function (e.g., ℓ^2 norm square and ℓ_1 norm). Previously, the GD method has been extended to its proximal variant (Nesterov, 2007; Duchi and Singer, 2009; Duchi et al., 2010) to utilize the structure of the objective function. The update of the proximal SGD method is given by the proximal projection:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \tilde{\nabla} \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t))\|_2^2 + g(\mathbf{x}) \quad (7)$$

The advantage of the proximal SGD is that it can guarantee the intermediate solution is sparse if $g(\mathbf{x})$ is a sparse regularizer and it usually yields better convergence than SGD. However, solving the proximal projection involves much work when \mathcal{D} is complex (e.g., a polyhedron or a PSD cone), though the proximal projection in (7) enjoys a closed form solution for very simple domains \mathcal{D} (e.g., \mathbb{R}^d , a bounded ball \mathcal{B}) and simple regularizers

$g(\mathbf{x})$ (e.g., ℓ_2 norm square and ℓ_1 norm). As a side effect, the updating scheme of Epro-SGD provides a natural solution toward the problem. In order to have sparse intermediate solutions, we propose to use the following update in place of step 6 and step 7 in Algorithm 1:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{x}_t^k - \eta(\tilde{\nabla} \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_t^k; \varepsilon_t) + \lambda \nabla [c(\mathbf{x}_t^k)]_+)]\|_2^2 + \eta g(\mathbf{x}) \quad (8)$$

Let us consider the solution of \mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k . In particular, we are interested in a sparse regularizer that is a mixer of ℓ_1 norm and ℓ_2 norm square $g(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mu_1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \mu_2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$. This regularizer is also known as elastic net in the statistical literature. It is found to uncover not only the sparsity structure but also the group structure, and usually to yield better performances than ℓ_1 norm. We will consider an application of such regularizer in next subsection. Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k = \mathbf{x}_t^k - \eta(\tilde{\nabla} \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_t^k; \varepsilon_t) + \lambda \nabla [c(\mathbf{x}_t^k)]_+)$. The problem in (8) reduces to

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k\|_2^2 + \eta \left(\frac{\mu_1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \mu_2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \right) \quad (9)$$

It is not difficult to verify the solution of \mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^k = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}} \left[\frac{1}{\eta \mu_1 + 1} \text{sign}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k) \circ [|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^k| - \eta \mu_2]_+ \right] \quad (10)$$

where $|\mathbf{x}| = (|x_1|, \dots, |x_d|)$, $\text{sign}(\mathbf{x}) = (\text{sign}(x_1), \dots, \text{sign}(x_d))$ and \circ denotes element-wise product. The following Lemma gives a similar result as in Lemma 1.

Lemma 2 *Under the assumptions made in (A1~A4), if we apply the update in equation (8) with T iterations, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{\rho}{\rho - G_1/\lambda} \left[\eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2) + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2]}{2\eta T} + \frac{g(\mathbf{w}_1)}{T} \right]$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T$ denotes the projected solution of the averaged solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t/T$.

If we set \mathbf{w}_1 such that $g(\mathbf{w}_1) = 0$, one can prove the same convergence as in Theorem 1.

Remark: With a more careful analysis, one can avoid the positive additional term $g(\mathbf{w}_1)/T$ in above bound. In particular, if we define $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T = \sum_{t=2}^{T+1} \mathbf{x}_t/T$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T]$, we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{\rho}{\rho - G_1/\lambda} \left[\eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2) + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2]}{2\eta T} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1)]}{T} \right]$$

Since usually $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1) \leq 0$, the above bound is usually better than that in Lemma 2. We can also apply the above trick to Lemma 1 for the non-proximal variant. However, the additional factor is replaced by $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1) + g(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - g(\mathbf{x}_1) \leq 0$. If we consider a positive regularizer $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ and non-informative initialization $\mathbf{x}_1 = 0$ and $g(\mathbf{x}_1) = 0$, then this additional term is larger than $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1)$. This to some extent explains why proximal SGD might be better than SGD in convergence.

3.2. An Application to High Dimensional LMNN Classification

In this subsection, we present an important application of Epro-SGD in high dimensional large margin nearest neighbor (LMNN) classification. LMNN classification is one of the state-of-art methods for k-nearest neighbor classification. It learns a PSD distance metric with the goal that the k-nearest neighbors always belong to the same class while examples from different classes are separated by a large margin. To describe the method, we first present some notations. Let $(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ denote a set of data points, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ denote the feature representation and the class label, respectively. Let $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}$ denote a PSD matrix that defines a distance metric by $dist(x_1, x_2) = \|x_1 - x_2\|_A^2 = (x_1 - x_2)^\top A(x_1 - x_2)$. In order to learn a distance metric that separates the examples from different classes by a large margin, one needs first to extract a set of similar (belonging to the same class) and dissimilar (belonging to different classes) data points, denoted by $(x_1^j, x_2^j, x_3^j), j = 1, \dots, N$, where x_1^j shares the same class label to x_2^j and a different class from x_3^j . To this end, for each example $x_1^j = x_i$ one can form x_2^j by extracting the k nearest neighbors defined by an Euclidean distance metric that share the same class label to x_i , and form x_3^j by extracting a set of examples that belong to a different class label. Then one can optimize the following objective:

$$\min_{A \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}} \frac{c}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \ell \left(\|x_1^j - x_2^j\|_A^2 - \|x_1^j - x_3^j\|_A^2 + 1 \right) + (1 - c)tr(AL) + \frac{\mu_1}{2} \|A\|_F^2$$

where $\ell(z) = \max(0, z)$ is a hinge loss and $c \in (0, 1)$ is a balance parameter. Minimizing the first term tends to maximize the margin between $\|x_1^j - x_3^j\|_A^2$ and $\|x_1^j - x_2^j\|_A^2$. The matrix L can be considered to encode some prior knowledge about the distance metric. For example, in the original work by [Weinberger and Saul \(2009\)](#), it is defined as $L = \sum_{l=1}^m \|x_1^l - x_2^l\|_A^2 / m$, where (x_1^l, x_2^l) are all k-nearest neighbor pairs that belong to the same class. Other works have used the weighted summation of distances between all data pairs $L = \sum_{i \neq j}^n w_{ij} \|x_i - x_j\|_A^2 / n(n - 1)$ ([Liu et al., 2010](#)) or intra-class covariance matrix ([Qi et al., 2009](#)). The last term $\|A\|_F^2 / 2$ serves two purposes: regularizing the distance metric and making the objective strongly convex.

However, when it comes to high dimension (i.e., d is relatively large compared to n), the above formulation usually produces sub-optimal solution ([Qi et al., 2009](#)). The reason is that it does not capture the sparsity structure between features. Therefore, we add a sparse regularizer to the objective and solve the following problem:

$$\min_{A \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}} \underbrace{\frac{c}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \ell \left(\|x_1^j - x_2^j\|_A^2 - \|x_1^j - x_3^j\|_A^2 + 1 \right) + (1 - c)tr(AL)}_{\hat{f}(A)} + \overbrace{\frac{\mu_1}{2} \|A\|_F^2 + \mu_2 \|A\|_1^{\text{off}}}^{g(A)} \quad (11)$$

where $\|A\|_1^{\text{off}} = \sum_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}|$ is an element-wise ℓ_1 norm excluding the diagonal entries. The sparse regularizer $\|A\|_1^{\text{off}}$ have been used in ([Qi et al., 2009](#)). However, their purpose is not to learn a distance metric by maximizing the distance margin which has been demonstrated to yield better performance for classification ([Weinberger and Saul, 2009](#)).

Before resorting to Epro-SGD, we first argue that previous methods are not appropriate or not efficient for solving the problem (11). Although the problem can be formulated as a SDP programming problem, general SDP solvers scale poorly with the number of triplets. Second, the GD method presented in (Weinberger and Saul, 2009) needs to project the solution into a PSD cone, which invokes highly expensive SVD for a high dimensional matrix. Third, Qi et al. (2009) targeted on an objective the same as inverse covariance selection and used a block coordinate descent method, which is not appropriate for the objective in (11) whose loss function is not a linear function of the distance metric A .

Next, we employ the Epro-SGD algorithm to solve the problem (11). The PSD cone can be written as an inequality constraint $c(A) = -\lambda_{\min}(A) \leq 0$, where $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ denote the minimum eigen-value of a symmetric matrix. To apply the Epro-SGD, we make the correspondences $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow A$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \rightarrow \|A\|_F$, and provide the necessary details below in a question-answer form:

- How to compute the stochastic gradient of $\hat{f}(A)$? We can sample one triplet (x_1^j, x_2^j, x_3^j) (or a small number of triplets) and compute a stochastic gradient by $\tilde{\nabla} f(A; \varepsilon) = c[(x_1^j - x_2^j)(x_1^j - x_2^j)^\top - (x_1^j - x_3^j)(x_1^j - x_3^j)^\top] + (1-c)L$ if $\ell(\|x_1^j - x_2^j\|_A^2 - \|x_1^j - x_3^j\|_A^2 + 1) > 0$, otherwise by $(1-c)L$.
- How to compute the gradient of $[c(A)]_+ = [-\lambda_{\min}(A)]_+$? By the theory of matrix analysis, the gradient of $[c(A)]_+$ is given by $\nabla c(A) = -\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$ if $c(A) > 0$, and zero otherwise, where \mathbf{u} denotes the eigenvector of A associated with its minimum eigenvalue.
- What is the solution to the composite gradient mapping?

$$A_{t+1} = \arg \min_{A \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{2} \|A - \bar{A}_{t+1}\|_F^2 + \eta \left(\frac{\mu_1}{2} \|A\|_F^2 + \mu_2 \|A\|_1^{\text{off}} \right)$$

It can be computed similarly as in (10), except that the diagonal entries are not thresholded.

- What are the appropriate values for $\beta, \rho, G_1, r, \lambda$ that are necessary for running the algorithm? The value of $\beta = \mu_1$. The value of $\rho = \min_{c(A)=0} \|\nabla c(A)\|_F = 1$. The value of $G_2 = 1$. The value of G_1 can be set to $8cR^2 + (1-c)\|L\|_F$ if we assume $\|x_i\|_2 \leq R, i = 1, \dots, n$. The value of r can be set to $\sqrt{2c/\mu_1}$. The value of $\lambda > G_1$ is usually tuned among a set of values to obtain the best performance.

Below, we present a corollary to state the convergence rate of Epro-SGD for solving high dimensional LMNN (11) with a particular choice of $\lambda = 2G_1$.

Corollary 3 *If we let $\lambda = 2G_1, T_0 = (2G_1 \ln(m\delta) + \mu_1 + \ln(m/\delta))/(30G_1)$, k^\dagger denote the total number of epochs, and set $T_1 = \max(18, T_0), \eta_1 = 2/(3\mu_1)$, then the final solution $A_1^{k^\dagger+1}$ of Epro-SGD and its proximal variant for solving the problem (11) enjoys a convergence rate of*

$$f(A_1^{k^\dagger+1}) - f(A_*) \leq \frac{1440G_1^2}{\mu_1 T}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $m = \lceil 2 \log_2 T \rceil$.

Remark: Finally, we discuss the impact of employing a proximal projection in proximal Epro-SGD on accelerating the computation. Note that at each iteration to compute the gradient of $c(A)$, we need to compute the minimum eigen-value and its eigen-vector. For a dense matrix, it usually involves a time complexity of $O(d^2)$. However, by employing a proximal projection, we can guarantee that the intermediate solution A_t is a element-wise sparse solution, for which the computation of the last eigen-pair can be substantially reduced to be linear to the number of non-zeros elements in A_t .

To analyze the running time compared to the Epoch-SGD method, let us assume we are interested in a ϵ -accurate solution. The number of iterations required by Epoch-SGD is $\Omega\left(\frac{1200G_1^2}{\epsilon\mu_1}\right)$, and that required by Epro-SGD is $\Omega\left(\frac{1440G_1^2}{\epsilon\mu_1}\right)$. Taking into account the running time per iteration, the total running time of Epo-SGD is $\Omega\left(\frac{1200G_1^2d^3}{\epsilon\mu_1}\right)$ and that of Epro-SGD with the setting give in Corollary 3 is $\Omega\left(\frac{1440G_1^2N_{\max}}{\epsilon\mu_1}\right)$, where N_{\max} is the maximum number of non-zero elements of in A_t , the intermediate solutions in Epro-SGD. Therefore, the approximate speed-up of Epro-SGD compared to Epoch SGD $\frac{1200d^3}{1440N_{\max}} = \frac{d^3}{1.2N_{\max}}$ would be significantly less than 1 if d is large. For example, if the magnitude of $N_{\max} \simeq d$ and $d = 10^3$, the speed-up is over 10^5 . Even in the extreme case $N_{\max} = d^2$, we still have a potential 800 times speed-up for $d = 10^3$.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented an epoch-projection SGD method that extends the one-projection SGD method for achieving the optimal $O(1/T)$ convergence rate for strongly convex optimization with only a constant number of projections. It is only worse by a factor of a small constant than the optimal algorithm for stochastic strongly convex optimization with projections. However, the speed-up gained from substantially reduced computations could be orders of magnitude. We have considered the proximal extension of epoch-projection SGD and applied it to solving the optimization problem in high dimensional large margin nearest neighbor classification, which yields a significant speed-up compared to SGD methods.

Appendix

Lemma 4 (Hazan and Kale (2011)) For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{2G_1^2}{\beta}$

Lemma 5 (Mahdavi et al. (2012)) Let $c(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > 0$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{c(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2$, then there exists a positive constant $s > 0$ such that

$$c(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0, \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = s\nabla c(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$$

Proof of Lemma 1

Let $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda[c(\mathbf{x})]_+$, and $\mathbb{E}_t[X]$ denote the expectation conditioned on the randomness until round $t - 1$. It is easy to see that $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x})$, $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda c(\mathbf{x})$ and $F(\mathbf{x}_*) = f(\mathbf{x}_*)$. In the following analysis, we use the fact $|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})| \leq G_1 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2$ for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$. The fact is due to that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}; \varepsilon)\| \leq G_1$.

Following standard analysis of GD, we have for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x})^\top \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta} (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_2^2) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t, \xi_t) + \lambda \nabla [c(\mathbf{x}_t)]_+\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \underbrace{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t)^\top (\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_t; \varepsilon_t) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t))}_{\zeta_t(\mathbf{x})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta} (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_2^2) + \eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2) + \zeta_t(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Therefore by the convexity of $F(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{2\eta} (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|_2^2) + \eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2) + \zeta_t(\mathbf{x})$$

Taking expectation over randomness, noting that $\mathbb{E}_t[\zeta_t(\mathbf{x})] = 0$ and taking summation over $t = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x})) \right] \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{2\eta T} + \eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [(F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}))] \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{2\eta T} + \eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2)$$

Since $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} [(F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}_*))] \leq \underbrace{\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2}{2\eta T} + \eta(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2)}_B \quad (13)$$

Next, we assume $c(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) > 0$, otherwise $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T$, and the inequality in Lemma 1 follows $F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) \geq f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)$ and $F(\mathbf{x}_*) = f(\mathbf{x}_*)$. Inequality (13) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)] \leq f(\mathbf{x}_*) + B \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) + \lambda c(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)] \leq f(\mathbf{x}_*) + B \quad (15)$$

By Lemma 5, we have

$$c(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) = c(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) - c(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) \geq (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)^\top \nabla c(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) = \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2 \|\nabla c(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)\|_2 \geq \rho \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2$$

Combining the above inequality with inequality (15), we have

$$\lambda \rho \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2] \leq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_*) - f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)] + B \leq G_1 \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2] + B$$

where the last inequality follows that fact $f(\mathbf{x}_*) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_*) - f(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) + f(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T) \leq G_1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2$. Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2] \leq \frac{B}{\lambda\rho - G_1}$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T)] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T)] + \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T)] - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[G_1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_T\|_2] + B \leq \frac{\lambda\rho}{\lambda\rho - G_1} B \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Corollary 1

To prove the corollary, we need the Bernstein inequality for martingales ([Boucheron et al., 2003](#)) stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (*Bernsteins inequality for martingales*). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a bounded martingale difference sequence with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and with $\|X_i\| \leq K$. Let*

$$S_i = \sum_{j=1}^i X_j$$

be the associated martingale. Denote the sum of the conditional variances by

$$\Sigma_n^2 = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}],$$

Then for all constants $t, \nu > 0$,

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i=1, \dots, n} S_i > t \text{ and } \Sigma_n^2 \leq \nu \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2(\nu + Kt/3)} \right),$$

and therefore,

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i=1, \dots, n} S_i > \sqrt{2\nu t} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} Kt \text{ and } \Sigma_n^2 \leq \nu \right] \leq e^{-t}.$$

Lemma 6 ([Mahdavi et al., 2012](#)) *For any fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$, define $D_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2$ and $\Lambda_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(\mathbf{x})$. We have*

$$\Pr \left(D_T \leq \frac{4}{T} \right) + \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \leq 2(G + G_1) \sqrt{D_T \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon}} + 2(G + G_1) \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon} \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

where $m = \lceil \log_2 T \rceil$.

Proof Define martingale difference $X_t = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t)^\top (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) - \widetilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t, \xi_t))$ and martingale $\Lambda_T = \sum_{t=1}^T X_t$. Define the conditional variance Σ_T^2 as

$$\Sigma_T^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\xi_t} [X_t^2] \leq 4G_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 = 4G_1^2 D_T.$$

Define $K = 4G_1$ and $m = \lceil 2 \log T \rceil$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \geq 2\sqrt{4G_1^2 D_T \tau} + \sqrt{2}K\tau/3 \right) \\
 &= \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \geq 2\sqrt{4G_1^2 D_T \tau} + \sqrt{2}K\tau/3, \Sigma_T^2 \leq 4G_1^2 D_T \right) \\
 &= \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \geq 2\sqrt{4G_1^2 D_T \tau} + \sqrt{2}K\tau/3, \Sigma_T^2 \leq 4G_1^2 D_T, D_T \leq \frac{4r^2}{T} \right) \\
 &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \geq 2\sqrt{4G_1^2 D_T \tau} + \sqrt{2}K\tau/3, \Sigma_T^2 \leq 4G_1^2 D_T, \frac{4r^2}{T} 2^{i-1} < D_T \leq \frac{4r^2}{T} 2^i \right) \\
 &\leq \Pr \left(D_T \leq \frac{4r^2}{T} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr \left(\Lambda_T \geq \sqrt{2 \times 4G_1^2 \frac{4r^2}{T} 2^i \tau} + \sqrt{2}K\tau/3, \Sigma_T^2 \leq 4G_1^2 \frac{4r^2}{T} 2^i \right) \\
 &\leq \Pr \left(D_T \leq \frac{4r^2}{T} \right) + m e^{-\tau}.
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq 4r^2$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $D_T \leq 4r^2 T$, and the last step follows the Bernstein inequality for martingales. We complete the proof by setting $\tau = \ln(m/\epsilon)$. ■

Proof [Proof of Corollary 1] Next, we prove a high probability bound for $F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_T) - F(\mathbf{x}_*)$ as in (13), then the proof follows the same as that of Lemma 1 and of Theorem 1. Note that for β -strong convex function $F(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x})^\top \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_t) - \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2$$

Combining the above inequality with the inequality in (12) and taking summation over all $t = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T (F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x})) \leq \underbrace{\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{2\eta} + \eta T(G_1^2 + \lambda^2 G_2^2)}_{BT} + \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\beta}{2} D_T \quad (16)$$

We substitute the bound in Lemma 6 into the above inequality with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$. We consider two cases. In the first case, we assume $D_T \leq 4/T$. As a result, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(\mathbf{x}^*) = \sum_{t=1}^T (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) - \tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_t, \xi_t))^\top (\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_t) \leq 2G_1 \sqrt{T D_T} \leq 4G_1,$$

which together with the inequality in (16) leads to the bound

$$\sum_{t=1}^T (F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq 4G_1 + BT.$$

In the second case, we assume

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq 4G_1 \sqrt{D_T \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon}} + 4G_1 \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon} \leq \frac{\beta}{2} D_T + \left(\frac{8G_1^2}{\beta} + 4G_1 \right) \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon},$$

where the last step uses the fact $2\sqrt{ab} \leq a^2 + b^2$. We thus have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T (F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \left(\frac{8G_1^2}{\beta} + 4G_1 \right) \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon} + BT$$

Combing the results of the two cases, we have, with a probability $1 - \epsilon$,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (F(\mathbf{x}_t) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \left(\frac{8G_1^2}{\beta} + 4G_1 \right) \ln \frac{m}{\epsilon} + 4G_1 + B$$

Following the same analysis, we can obtain

$$f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_T) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mu \left[\frac{(8G_1^2 + 4G_1) \ln(m/\epsilon) + 4G_1\beta}{T\beta} + \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2}{2\eta T} + \eta G^2 \right].$$

■

References

- Francis Bach and Eric Moulines. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. In *NIPS*, pages 451–459, 2011.
- Léon Bottou. Large-Scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Computational Statistics (COMPSTAT'2010)*, pages 177–187, Paris, France, 2010.
- Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Olivier Bousquet. Concentration inequalities. In *Advanced Lectures on Machine Learning*, pages 208–240, 2003.
- Kenneth L. Clarkson. Coresets, sparse greedy approximation, and the frank-wolfe algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 6(4), 2010.
- John C. Duchi and Yoram Singer. Efficient learning using forward-backward splitting. In *NIPS*, pages 495–503, 2009.
- John C. Duchi, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Yoram Singer, and Ambuj Tewari. Composite objective mirror descent. In *COLT*, pages 14–26, 2010.
- M. Frank and P. Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval Research Logistics*, 3, 1956.
- Dan Garber and Elad Hazan. A linearly convergent conditional gradient algorithm with applications to online and stochastic optimization. *ArXiv:1301.4666 math.LG*, 2013.
- Elad Hazan. Sparse approximate solutions to semidefinite programs. In *LATIN*, pages 306–316, 2008.

- Elad Hazan and Satyen Kale. Beyond the regret minimization barrier: an optimal algorithm for stochastic strongly-convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research - Proceedings Track*, 19:421–436, 2011.
- Elad Hazan and Satyen Kale. Projection-free online learning. In *ICML*, 2012.
- Martin Jaggi. *Sparse Convex Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, October 2011.
- Martin Jaggi. Revisiting Frank-Wolfe: Projection-Free Sparse Convex Optimization. In *ICML*, 2012.
- Wei Liu, Xinmei Tian, Dacheng Tao, and Jianzhuang Liu. Constrained metric learning via distance gap maximization. In *AAAI*, 2010.
- Mehrdad Mahdavi, Tianbao Yang, Rong Jin, Shenghuo Zhu, and Jinfeng Yi. Stochastic gradient descent with only one projection. In *NIPS*, pages 503–511, 2012.
- A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 19:1574–1609, 2009.
- Yurri Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function. Core discussion papers, 2007.
- Guo-Jun Qi, Jinhui Tang, Zheng-Jun Zha, Tat-Seng Chua, and Hong-Jiang Zhang. An efficient sparse metric learning in high-dimensional space via l1-penalized log-determinant regularization. In *ICML*, pages 841–848, 2009.
- Alexander Rakhlin, Ohad Shamir, and Karthik Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. In *ICML*, 2012.
- Kilian Q. Weinberger and Lawrence K. Saul. Distance metric learning for large margin nearest neighbor classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 10:207–244, 2009.
- Yiming Ying and Peng Li. Distance metric learning with eigenvalue optimization. *JMLR.*, 13:1–26, 2012.
- Lijun Zhang, Tianbao Yang, Rong Jin, and Xiaofei He. $O(\log t)$ projections for stochastic optimization of smooth and strongly convex functions. 2013.