
HIGH PROBABILITY GUARANTEES FOR RANDOM RESHUFFLING*

A PREPRINT

Hengxu Yu

School of Data Science
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
hengxuyu@link.cuhk.edu.cn

Xiao Li

School of Data Science
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
lixiao@cuhk.edu.cn

December 11, 2023

ABSTRACT

We consider the stochastic gradient method with random reshuffling (RR) for tackling smooth nonconvex optimization problems. RR finds broad applications in practice, notably in training neural networks. In this work, we first investigate the concentration property of RR’s sampling procedure and establish a new high probability sample complexity guarantee for driving the gradient (without expectation) below ε , which effectively characterizes the efficiency of a single RR execution. Our derived complexity matches the best existing in-expectation one up to a logarithmic term while imposing no additional assumptions nor changing RR’s updating rule. Furthermore, by leveraging our derived high probability descent property and bound on the stochastic error, we propose a simple and computable stopping criterion for RR (denoted as RR-sc). This criterion is guaranteed to be triggered after a finite number of iterations, and then RR-sc returns an iterate with its gradient below ε with high probability. Moreover, building on the proposed stopping criterion, we design a perturbed random reshuffling method (p-RR) that involves an additional randomized perturbation procedure near stationary points. We derive that p-RR provably escapes strict saddle points and efficiently returns a second-order stationary point with high probability, without making any sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors. Finally, we conduct numerical experiments on neural network training to support our theoretical findings.

Keywords. random reshuffling, high probability analysis, stationarity, stopping criterion, last iterate, escape saddle points, second-order guarantee

1 Introduction

In this work, we focus on the following finite-sum optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \quad (1.1)$$

where each component function f_i is continuously differentiable, though not necessarily convex. This form of optimization problem is ubiquitously found in various engineering fields, including machine learning and signal processing [4, 6]. The gradient descent method is a classical method for solving problem (1.1). However, many contemporary real-world applications of form (1.1) are large-scale, i.e., the number of components n and the problem dimension d are tremendous, thus making the computation of the full gradient of the function f intractable. A notable example of such a scenario is the training of deep neural networks. This observation is one of main motivations of designing stochastic optimization methods.

A popular stochastic optimization method for addressing problem (1.1) is the stochastic gradient method (SGD) [35, 10], which adopts a uniformly random sampling of the component functions with replacement. Despite SGD being studied extensively in theory over the past decades, the variant commonly implemented in practice for tackling (1.1) is the

*X. Li was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grant 12201534.

Algorithm 1: RR: Random Reshuffling

```

Initialization:  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ;
1 for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
2   Sample  $\pi_t = \{\pi_t^1, \dots, \pi_t^n\}$  uniformly at random from  $\Pi$  defined in (1.2);
3   Update the step size  $\alpha_t$  according to a certain rule;
4   Set  $x_t^0 = x_t$ ;
5   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
6      $x_t^i = x_t^{i-1} - \alpha_t \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1});$                                 /* update */
7   end
8   Set  $x_{t+1} = x_t^n$ ;
9 end

```

stochastic gradient method with random reshuffling (RR); see, e.g., [1, 3, 15, 14, 37]. In the following, we review the algorithmic scheme of RR.

In each update, RR implements a gradient descent-type scheme, but it uses only one (or a minibatch) of the component functions for updating rather than all the components, to accommodate the large-scale nature of the contemporary applications. To describe the algorithmic scheme of RR, we define the set of all possible permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as

$$\Pi := \{\pi : \pi \text{ is a permutation of } \{1, 2, \dots, n\}\}. \quad (1.2)$$

At the t -th iteration, RR first samples a permutation π_t from Π uniformly at random. Then, it starts with an initial inner iterate $x_t^0 = x_t$ and updates x_t to x_{t+1} by consecutively applying the gradient descent-type steps as

$$x_t^i = x_t^{i-1} - \alpha_t \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1}) \quad (1.3)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, yielding $x_{t+1} = x_t^n$. We display RR in [Algorithm 1](#).

Let us also mention that the deterministic counterpart of RR — the incremental gradient method — is also widely used in practice and has received considerable attention in the past decades; see, e.g., [29, 1, 13, 28] and the references therein.

The primary difference between RR and SGD lies in that the former employs a uniformly random sampling without replacement. Therefore, RR is also known as “SGD without replacement”, “SGD with reshuffling”, “shuffled SGD”, etc. This sampling scheme introduces statistical dependence and removes the unbiased gradient estimation property found in SGD, making its theoretical analysis more challenging. Nonetheless, RR empirically outperforms SGD [2, 34] and the gradient descent method [1] on many practical problems. Such a superior practical performance over SGD arises partly from the fact that the random reshuffling sampling scheme is simpler and faster to implement than sampling with replacement used in SGD, and partly from the property that RR utilizes all the training samples at each iteration. Owing to these advantages, RR has been incorporated into prominent software packages like PyTorch and TensorFlow as a fundamental solver and is utilized in a wide range of engineering fields, most notably in training neural networks; see, e.g., [1, 3, 14, 37].

Despite its widespread practical usage, the theoretical understanding of RR has been mainly limited to in-expectation complexity bounds and almost sure asymptotic convergence results. Though these results provide insightful characterizations of the performance of RR, they either apply to the average case or are of asymptotic nature, differing partly from the practice that one only runs the method once for a finite number of iterations. Furthermore, a practical and simple stopping procedure for RR, advising when to stop the method and return a meaningful last iterate, is still absent. Such a stopping criterion is especially meaningful in the nonconvex setting. Additionally, for nonconvex problems, existing results for RR have only tackled convergence to a stationary point, which might be an unsatisfactory saddle point. In this study, we aim to establish a set of high probability guarantees for RR, including finding a stationary point, proposing a simple stopping criterion for adaptively stopping RR and returning a meaningful last iterate, and designing a perturbed variant of RR for escaping strict saddle points and returning a second-order stationary point.

1.1 Our Results

Throughout this paper, we impose the standard assumption that each component function f_i is lower bounded and has Lipschitz continuous gradient (see [Assumption 2.1](#)). Our main results are summarized below.

High probability sample complexity. We establish that, with high probability, RR identifies an ε -stationary point by achieving $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^T \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2$ (without taking expectation) using at most $nT \leq \tilde{O}(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-2}\})$

stochastic gradient evaluations (see [Theorem 2.7](#)). Here, T is the total number of iterations and the “ \tilde{O} ” hides a logarithmic term. It is worth noting that our high probability sample complexity matches the best existing in-expectation complexity of RR^2 [[27](#), [31](#)] up to a logarithmic term, under the same Lipschitz continuity assumption on the component gradients. Importantly, our result applies to every single realization of RR with high probability, in contrast to the in-expectation results that average infinitely many runs. Our analysis does not impose any additional assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors nor does it require any modifications to the RR’s updating rule. The main step is presenting a matrix Bernstein’s inequality for sampling without replacement and then applying it to show that the stochastic gradient errors of RR exhibit a concentration property (see [Lemma 2.2](#) and [Proposition 2.3](#)). This further allows us to derive a standard approximate descent property that holds with high probability rather than in expectation, leading to the aforementioned complexity result.

Stopping Criterion. The previously established high probability complexity bound applies to $\min_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|$, which does not provide adequate guidance on when to stop RR nor any information on the last iterate. To tackle this issue, we leverage the high probability approximate descent property derived in the previous part to design a simple and computable stopping criterion for RR. This criterion terminates RR when the norm of the accumulated stochastic gradients falls below a preset tolerance $\eta\varepsilon$, where $\eta > 0$ is some constant. RR equipped with such a stopping criterion is denoted as RR-sc, which introduces few additional computational loads compared to RR. We prove that the stopping criterion must be triggered within $nT_{\text{sc}} \leq \tilde{O}(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-2}\})$ stochastic gradient evaluations with high probability (see [Proposition 3.2](#)), aligning with our previous sample complexity bound. Here, T_{sc} represents the maximum number of iterations of RR-sc. A crucial step in establishing this result is to show that RR-sc exhibits a strict descent property before the stopping criterion is triggered, closely resembling the deterministic gradient descent method. In addition, based on the concentration property of the stochastic error of RR, we establish a last iterate result which states that once RR-sc is terminated by our stopping criterion at iteration $\tau \leq T_{\text{sc}}$, the returned iterate x_τ satisfies $\|\nabla f(x_\tau)\| \leq \Theta(\varepsilon)$ with high probability (see [Theorem 3.4](#)).

Escaping saddle points and second-order guarantee. Our guarantees for RR so far address convergence to a stationary point, which could potentially be a saddle point. To circumvent this issue, we propose to incorporate randomized perturbation [[8](#), [19](#), [20](#)] into RR for escaping strict saddle points. However, implementing the perturbation at each iteration hinders us from deriving a favorable complexity bound due to the intricate interplay among several stochastic noise terms, unless we impose the typical sub-Gaussian tail-type assumption on the stochastic gradient errors as done in most prior works. Fortunately, the stopping criterion we proposed above allows us to identify when the method is near a stationary point, so that we can invoke the randomized perturbation only once after a stationary point is detected to significantly reduce noise level. Based on this approach, we design a perturbed random reshuffling method (denoted as p-RR), which adopts the RR steps for updating and involves a single perturbation when a stationary point is detected. Theoretically, under an additional assumption that each component Hessian is Lipschitz continuous (see [Assumption 4.1](#)), we derive that p-RR provably escapes strict saddle points and efficiently returns an ε -second-order stationary point with high probability, using at most $\tilde{O}(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-5/2}\})$ stochastic gradient evaluations (see [Theorem 4.3](#)). We note that in many nonconvex machine learning and signal recovery problems, the objective functions have a strict saddle property [[6](#), [9](#)], meaning that the second-order stationary points found by p-RR are indeed local / global minimizers. Compared to the analysis of [[20](#)], we avoid the stringent sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors, thanks to the benign properties of RR and our specially designed perturbation procedure that avoids unnecessary perturbation noise. Moreover, the dynamics of RR used to approximate the power method during escaping strict saddle points are more complex, necessitating nontrivial calculations.

We believe that our developments for RR are innovative and can serve as a foundation for facilitating further high probability analyses that elucidate its performance.

1.2 Prior Arts

Thanks to its wide implementation in large-scale optimization problems such as training neural networks, RR has gained significant attention recently. Numerous studies have aimed to understand its theoretical properties. In the following, we present an overview of these theoretical findings, which is necessarily not exhaustive due to the extensive body of research on this topic.

Finite-time complexity bounds in expectation. Unlike SGD that uses unbiased stochastic gradients, one of the main challenges in analyzing RR lies in the dependence between the stochastic gradients at each iteration. Various works have focused on deriving complexity bounds for RR; see, e.g., [[15](#), [27](#), [31](#), [36](#), [33](#), [5](#)]. For instance, the work [[27](#)]

²Here, it refers to the in-expectation complexity for the original RR. Let us mention that there are improved complexity results for different algorithmic oracles such as variance reduction method with RR’s sampling scheme and RR with a specifically searched permutation order at each iteration; see, e.g., [[18](#), [26](#), [25](#)].

establishes an $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ sample complexity for driving the expected squared distance between the iterate and the optimal solution below ε , under the assumptions that the objective function f is strongly convex and each f_i has Lipschitz continuous gradient. The authors concluded that RR outperforms SGD in this setting when ε^{-1} is relatively large based on this complexity result. In the smooth nonconvex case where f is nonconvex and each f_i has Lipschitz continuous gradient, it was shown in [27, 31] that RR has a sample complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-2}\})$ for driving the expected gradient norm below ε . However, all the mentioned complexity results for RR hold in expectation, characterizing the performance of the algorithm by averaging infinitely many runs. Hence, they may not effectively explain the performance of a single run of RR. By contrast, our sample complexity guarantee applies to every single run with high probability, characterizing the performance of RR more practically.

Asymptotic convergence. For strongly convex objective function with component Hessian being Lipschitz continuous, the work [14] presents that the squared distance between the q-suffix averaged iterate and the optimal solution converges to 0 at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/t^2)$, given that the sequence of iterates generated by RR is uniformly bounded. In the smooth nonconvex case, the almost sure asymptotic convergence result for the gradient norm was derived using a unified convergence framework established in [23]. Additionally, the work [24] proves the almost sure asymptotic convergence rate results for RR under the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality. Though these asymptotic convergence results provide valuable theoretical guarantees, they primarily offer insights into the long-term behavior of the algorithm when $t \rightarrow \infty$.

High probability guarantees for stochastic optimization methods. Recently, there has been growing interest in studying the high probability convergence behaviors of stochastic optimization methods for finding stationary points. The works [10] and [16] obtain high probability complexity bounds for smooth nonconvex and nonsmooth strongly convex SGD, respectively, both under the sub-Gaussian tailed stochastic gradient errors assumption. Similarly, the authors in [40] analyzed RR for strongly convex objectives by relying on a constant bound (independent of n) on each stochastic gradient error, which immediately implies sub-Gaussian tail. However, such sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions may be too optimistic in practical applications [41]. When it comes to heavy-tailed stochastic gradient errors, i.e., the standard bounded variance assumption, the clipped-SGD with momentum or large batch size for smooth convex problems and the clipped-SGD with momentum and normalization for smooth nonconvex problems are studied in [11] and [7], respectively. One can observe that these analyses either impose the stringent sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors or require modifications to the algorithms. Our high probability complexity guarantee is derived for the original RR, without assuming any additional restrictions on the stochastic gradient errors.

Stopping criterion. There exist proposed stopping criteria for nonconvex SGD-type methods; see, e.g., [39, 32, 22] and the references therein. These proposals are either about discussing statistical stationarity or suggesting an asymptotic gradient-based stopping criterion. To the best of our knowledge, a stopping criterion for RR has yet to be explored. Our stopping criterion provides a simple and adaptive approach to stop RR and enables non-asymptotic guarantees for the returned last iterate.

Escaping saddle points. By introducing random noise perturbation into SGD, it was proved in [8] that a simple perturbed version of SGD escapes strict saddle points and visits a second-order stationary point in polynomial time for locally strongly convex problems. Later, the works [19, 20] generalize this result to more general problem classes and improve to a polylogarithmic dependence on the problem dimension d , which aligns with the complexity of SGD for finding first-order stationary points up to a polylogarithmic term. It is worth mentioning that most existing works along this line impose sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors appeared in SGD. To our knowledge, the topic on escaping strict saddle points has remained largely unexplored for RR. Our development on escaping strict saddle points yields the first second-order stationarity guarantee for RR. Crucially, the properties of RR and our specially designed perturbation procedure allow us to avoid the stringent sub-Gaussian tail assumption on the stochastic gradient errors.

2 High Probability Sample Complexity Guarantee

In this section, we establish high probability sample complexity guarantee for RR for finding stationary points. We impose the following standard smoothness assumption on the component functions throughout this section.

Assumption 2.1. For all $i \in [n]$, f_i in (1.1) is bounded from below by \bar{f}_i and its gradient ∇f_i is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $L \geq 0$.

Let \bar{f} be a lower bound of f in (1.1). It was established in [21, Proposition 3] that the following variance-type bound is true once Assumption 2.1 holds:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \leq A(f(x) - \bar{f}) + B, \quad (2.1)$$

where $A = 2L > 0$ and $B = \frac{A}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{f} - \bar{f}_i) \geq 0$. The bound (2.1) plays a crucial role in our later analysis.

2.1 Concentration for Sampling Without Replacement

We first present a matrix Bernstein's inequality for sampling matrices without replacement, which is an outcome by combining several known results.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ be a finite set of symmetric matrices. Suppose that the set is centered (i.e., $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n = 0$) and has a uniform bounded operator ℓ_2 -norm $\|X_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq b, \forall i$. Suppose further that the permutation π is sampled uniformly at random from Π defined in (1.2). For any $1 \leq m \leq n$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m X_{\pi^i} \right\|_{\text{op}} \geq s \right] \leq 4\tilde{d} \exp \left(-\frac{s^2/2}{\lambda m/n + bs/3} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Here, $\lambda m/n$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $V = \frac{m}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2$ and $\tilde{d} = \text{tr}(V)/\|V\|_{\text{op}} \geq 1$ is the intrinsic dimension of V .

Proof. Let $\sigma^i, \forall 1 \leq i \leq m$ be sampled uniformly at random from $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with replacement in an i.i.d. manner. Then, for $\{X_{\sigma^1}, \dots, X_{\sigma^m}\}$, we have the following concentration inequality [38, Theorem 7.7.1]:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m X_{\sigma^i} \right\|_{\text{op}} \geq s \right] \leq 4\tilde{d} \exp \left(-\frac{s^2/2}{\lambda m/n + bs/3} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\lambda m/n$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $V = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[X_{\sigma^i}^2] = \frac{m}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2$ and $\tilde{d} = \text{tr}(V)/\|V\|_{\text{op}}$ is the intrinsic dimension of V . Note that the derivation of (2.3) is based on a Chernoff-bounds-type argument, which bounds the tail (failure) probability from above using the matrix moment generating function (MGF) $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_\sigma[\text{tr}(\exp(\theta \sum_{i=1}^m X_{\sigma^i}) - I)]$ for $\theta > 0$.

The key ingredient in our proof is a fundamental observation from Hoeffding's original work [17, Theorem 4]. Namely, the MGF of sampling without replacement is upper bounded by that of the i.i.d. sampling with replacement; see also [12] for a restatement with explicit details for the above matrix MGF. Specifically, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\text{tr} \left(\exp \left(\theta \sum_{i=1}^m X_{\pi^i} \right) - I \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\text{tr} \left(\exp \left(\theta \sum_{i=1}^m X_{\sigma^i} \right) - I \right) \right]. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus, we can obtain from (2.4) that the tail probability of sampling without replacement has at least the same upper bound shown in (2.3), which establishes (2.2). \square

In the following proposition, we apply this concentration tool for the stochastic gradient errors caused by sampling stochastic gradients without replacement in RR.

Proposition 2.3 (concentration property of stochastic gradient errors). *Let π be sampled uniformly at random from Π defined in (1.2). For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^i (\nabla f_{\pi^j}(x) - \nabla f(x)) \right\|^2 \leq 4n (A (f(x) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8/\delta). \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, we can construct the matrix

$$X_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x) \\ (\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x))^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.6)$$

One can verify that X_i has rank 2 and has two nonzero eigenvalues

$$\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)\| \quad \text{and} \quad -\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)\|.$$

Therefore, by (2.1), we have

$$\|X_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)\|^2} \leq \sqrt{n (A (f(x) - \bar{f}) + B)}. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, we have $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} (\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)) (\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x))^\top & 0 \\ 0 & \|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq n (A (f(x) - \bar{f}) + B), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.1) again in the inequality. Hence, X_i satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.2 with $b = \sqrt{\lambda} = \sqrt{n(A(f(x) - \bar{f}) + B)}$. Next, let $4\tilde{d}\exp(-s^2/2(\lambda i/n + bs/3)) \leq \delta$. Solving an upper bound for s gives $\sqrt{\frac{b^2}{9} \log^2(4\tilde{d}/\delta) + \frac{2\lambda i}{n} \log(4\tilde{d}/\delta) + \frac{b}{3} \log(4\tilde{d}/\delta)}$, which can be further upper bounded by $2b \log(4\tilde{d}/\delta)$ using $\lambda = b^2$ and $\log(4\tilde{d}/\delta) > 1$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with the derived upper bound for s provides

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=1}^i (\nabla f_{\pi^j}(x) - \nabla f(x)) \right\| \geq 2b \log(4\tilde{d}/\delta) \right] \leq \delta, \quad (2.8)$$

where we have used $\| \sum_{j=1}^i X_{\pi^j} \|_{\text{op}} = \| \sum_{j=1}^i (\nabla f_{\pi^j}(x) - \nabla f(x)) \|$. By invoking b and the fact that $\tilde{d} = 2$ for the constructed X_i 's, we conclude the desired result. \square

Let us introduce two important quantities associated with the t -th iteration of RR: 1) the accumulation of the stochastic gradients g_t , and 2) the stochastic error e_t caused by using g_t to approximate the true gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$. They are defined as

$$\begin{cases} g_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1}), \\ e_t = g_t - \nabla f(x_t). \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Next, we present an important lemma for bounding the stochastic error e_t of RR with high probability, which serves as the fundamental ingredient for deriving our high probability results.

Lemma 2.4 (concentration property of stochastic error). *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 is valid and the step size α_t satisfies*

$$4\alpha_t n L \leq 1. \quad (2.10)$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\|e_t\|^2 \leq 2\alpha_t^2 n^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + 32\alpha_t^2 n L^2 (A(f(x_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8n/\delta). \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. By the definition of e_t , we have

$$\|e_t\|^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t) \right\|^2. \quad (2.12)$$

Let us define $\Delta_t = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1}) - \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t)\|^2$. By Assumption 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t &\leq L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_t^{i-1} - x_t\|^2 = \alpha_t^2 L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t^{j-1}) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t^2 L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t^{j-1}) - \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t) \right\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t^2 L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left((i-1) \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left\| \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t^{j-1}) - \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t) \right\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (\nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t) - \nabla f(x_t)) \right\|^2 + 2(i-1)^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Let us mention that the above decomposition follows the argument in [27, Lemma 5]. We note that $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \|\nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t^{j-1}) - \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(x_t)\|^2 \leq \Delta_t$. Then, applying Proposition 2.3 and union bound for (2.13) and solving for Δ_t with (2.10) provide with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\Delta_t \leq 2\alpha_t^2 n^3 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + 32\alpha_t^2 n^2 L^2 (A(f(x_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8n/\delta).$$

Finally, recognizing $\|e_t\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \Delta_t$ establishes (2.11). \square

2.2 High Probability Sample Complexity

Based on the previously derived high probability bound for the stochastic error e_t , we can derive the following approximate descent property for RR.

Lemma 2.5 (approximate descent property). *Under the setting of Lemma 2.4, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{t+1}) - \bar{f} &\leq (1 + 32\alpha_t^3 n^2 L^2 A \log^2(8n/\delta)) (f(x_t) - \bar{f}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha_t n}{8} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_t n}{2} \|g_t\|^2 + 32\alpha_t^3 n^2 L^2 B \log^2(8n/\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Proof. We note that the smoothness condition in Assumption 2.1 implies the descent lemma; see, e.g., [30, Lemma 1.2.3]. Then, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{t+1}) &\leq f(x_t) - \alpha_t \left\langle \nabla f(x_t), \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_{\pi_i^t}(x_t^{i-1}) \right\rangle + \frac{\alpha_t^2 L}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_{\pi_i^t}(x_t^{i-1}) \right\|^2 \\ &= f(x_t) - \alpha_t \langle \nabla f(x_t), n \nabla f(x_t) + n e_t \rangle + \frac{\alpha_t^2 L}{2} \|n \nabla f(x_t) + n e_t\|^2 \\ &\leq f(x_t) - \alpha_t n (1 - \alpha_t n L) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha_t^2 n^2 L \|e_t\|^2 + \alpha_t n \langle \nabla f(x_t), -e_t \rangle \\ &\leq f(x_t) - \frac{3\alpha_t n}{4} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha_t^2 n^2 L \|e_t\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_t n}{2} (\|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \|e_t\|^2 - \|g_t\|^2) \\ &\leq f(x_t) - \frac{\alpha_t n}{4} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_t n}{2} \|g_t\|^2 + \alpha_t n \|e_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where the equality is due to the definitions in (2.9) and the fourth line follows from (2.10) and the fact that $\langle a, b \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2 - \|a - b\|^2)$. Finally, by subtracting \bar{f} on both sides of the above inequality, plugging Lemma 2.4, and utilizing (2.10), we obtain the result. \square

In the next lemma, we refine the approximate descent property for RR.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 is valid and the step size α_t satisfies*

$$\alpha_t = \alpha := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4nL}, \frac{1}{(C_1 n^2 T)^{1/3}} \right\}. \quad (2.16)$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that for all $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$,

$$f(x_{t+1}) \leq f(x_t) - \frac{\alpha_t n}{8} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_t n}{2} \|g_t\|^2 + \alpha_t^3 n^2 G. \quad (2.17)$$

Here, $C_1 = 32L^2 A \log^2(8nT/\delta) \geq 0$ and $G = C_1 F + C_2 \geq 0$ with $F = 3(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + 3B/A \geq 0$ and $C_2 = 32L^2 B \log^2(8nT/\delta) \geq 0$.

Proof. Dividing the probability parameter δ by T in Lemma 2.5 and then applying union bound for $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$, we obtain

$$f(x_{t+1}) - \bar{f} \leq (1 + \alpha_t^3 n^2 C_1) (f(x_t) - \bar{f}) - \frac{\alpha_t n}{8} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_t n}{2} \|g_t\|^2 + \alpha_t^3 n^2 C_2, \quad (2.18)$$

which holds for all $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Our remaining discussion is conditioned on the event in (2.18). Unrolling the above recursion gives

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_t) - \bar{f} &\leq \left\{ \prod_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 + \alpha_i^3 n^2 C_1) \right\} (f(x_0) - \bar{f}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{t-2} \left\{ \prod_{i=j+1}^{t-1} (1 + \alpha_i^3 n^2 C_1) \right\} \alpha_j^3 n^2 C_2 + \alpha_{t-1}^3 n^2 C_2. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of our step size in (2.16) and the fact that $t \leq T$, we have

$$\prod_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 + \alpha_i^3 n^2 C_1) = \exp \left(\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \log(1 + \alpha_i^3 n^2 C_1) \right) \leq \exp \left(\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \alpha_i^3 n^2 C_1 \right) \leq 3.$$

Therefore, combining the above two inequalities provides

$$f(x_t) - \bar{f} \leq 3(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + 3 \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \alpha_j^3 n^2 C_2 \leq 3(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + 3B/A = F \quad (2.19)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. Plugging this upper bound into (2.18) yields (2.17). \square

With the developed machineries, we are now ready to establish the high probability sample complexity of RR for finding a stationary point of problem (1.1).

Theorem 2.7 (high probability guarantee for finding stationary points). *Under the setting of Lemma 2.6, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \max \left\{ \frac{45\text{LF}}{T}, \frac{35\text{L}^{2/3}\text{A}^{1/3}\text{F} \log^{2/3}(8nT/\delta)}{n^{1/3}T^{2/3}} \right\}, \quad (2.20)$$

Consequently, to achieve $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2/T \leq \varepsilon^2$, RR needs at most

$$nT = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\max \{ \sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-2} \} \right) \quad (2.21)$$

stochastic gradient evaluations, where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ hides an additional $\log(\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}/\delta)$.

Proof. Summing up (2.17) from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ and rearranging terms provide

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \frac{8(f(x_0) - \bar{f})}{\alpha n T} + 8\alpha^2 n \text{G}.$$

When $n \geq \frac{\text{A}}{2\text{L}} T \log^2(8nT/\delta)$, the step size $\alpha = 1/4n\text{L}$ according to (2.16) and we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \frac{32\text{L}(f(x_0) - \bar{f})}{T} + \frac{\text{G}}{2n\text{L}^2} \leq \frac{45\text{LF}}{T}; \quad (2.22)$$

otherwise, $\alpha = 1/(C_1 n^2 T)^{1/3}$ and we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \frac{35\text{L}^{2/3}\text{A}^{1/3}\text{F} \log^{2/3}(8nT/\delta)}{n^{1/3}T^{2/3}}. \quad (2.23)$$

Combining the above two complexities gives (2.20). Letting the right-hand side of (2.20) equal to ε^2 yields our final complexity result (2.21). \square

Our high probability sample complexity result in Theorem 4.3 matches the best existing in-expectation complexity of RR [27, 31] up to a logarithmic term, under the same Lipschitz continuity assumption on the component gradients (i.e., Assumption 2.1). However, our result is applicable to every single realization of RR with high probability, providing a more practical picture of its performance; see also Section 5.

3 Stopping Criterion

The formulation of a stopping criterion constitutes a crucial part of algorithm design. In deterministic optimization, designing such a criterion can be relatively straightforward. For instance, one can examine the gradient function in the gradient descent method. However, it becomes significantly more challenging to construct a similar measure in the stochastic optimization regime. In the case of RR, computing the full gradient function for monitoring stationarity is not feasible. Therefore, it necessitates the development of a novel estimated stopping criterion for RR, which forms the central theme of this section.

The study of a stopping criterion for RR is motivated by three factors: 1) It offers an adaptive stopping scheme as opposed to running the algorithm for a fixed number of iterations, potentially saving on execution time. 2) It yields a last iterate result, which is especially meaningful in nonconvex optimization. We note that our high probability complexity bound derived in the previous section applies to $\min_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|$ rather than the last iterate. This discrepancy introduces the risk of returning the last iterate without satisfying the complexity bound, as also illustrated in [23, Appendix H]. 3) The stopping criterion provides a promising approach for checking near-stationarity, and it will lay the groundwork for finding a second-order stationary point in Section 4.

3.1 Random Reshuffling with Stopping Criterion

Our primary observation from Lemma 2.6 is that the accumulation of the stochastic gradients g_t (defined in (2.9)) almost mirrors the role of the true gradient for descent. This motivates us to track g_t and use it as a stopping criterion. It is essential to note that g_t is computable and imposes negligible additional computational burden.

Algorithm 2: RR-sc: Random Reshuffling with Stopping Criterion

Input: tolerance η , target accuracy ε ;
Initialization: $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t = 0$;

```

1 while true do
2   Set  $g_t = 0$ ;
3   Update the step size  $\alpha_t$  according to a certain rule;
4   Sample  $\pi_t = \{\pi_t^1, \dots, \pi_t^n\}$  uniformly at random from  $\Pi$  defined in (1.2);
5   Set  $x_t^0 = x_t$ ;
6   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
7      $x_t^i = x_t^{i-1} - \alpha_t \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1});$  /* update */
8      $g_t = g_t + \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1})/n;$ 
9   end
10  if  $\|g_t\| \leq \eta\varepsilon$  then /* stopping criterion */
11    Set  $\tau = t$ ;
12    return  $x_\tau$ ;
13  else
14    Set  $x_{t+1} = x_t^n$ ;
15  end
16  Set  $t = t + 1$ ;
17 end

```

We design RR with stopping criterion (denoted as RR-sc) in [Algorithm 2](#). In this algorithm, we calculate the accumulation of the stochastic gradients used in the update and store it in g_t . After each iteration, we check

$$\|g_t\| \leq \eta\varepsilon, \quad (\text{stopping criterion}) \quad (3.1)$$

where ε is the desired accuracy and $\eta > 0$ is some constant tolerance. Once this criterion is triggered, we stop the algorithm and return the last iterate x_τ . In this subsection, we establish that the stopping criterion is guaranteed to be triggered with high probability, ensuring that RR-sc will be terminated after a finite number of iterations T_{sc} that is defined through

$$nT_{\text{sc}} = 6F(\eta\varepsilon)^{-2} \max \left\{ nL, 2\sqrt{n\text{AFL}}(\eta\varepsilon)^{-1} \log(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta) \right\} \sim \tilde{O}(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-2}\}).$$

The following lemma reveals the strict descent property of RR-sc before triggering the stopping criterion.

Lemma 3.1 (strict descent property of RR-sc). *Suppose that [Assumption 2.1](#) is valid and the step size α_t satisfies*

$$\alpha_t = \alpha := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4nL}, \frac{\eta\varepsilon}{8\sqrt{n\text{AFL}} \log(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta)} \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then, RR-sc decreases the objective function value at each iteration with high probability, namely,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[f(x_{t+1}) - f(x_t) \leq -\frac{\alpha_t n}{4} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2, \forall t \leq k \right] \geq 1 - \delta k / T_{\text{sc}} \quad (3.3)$$

holds for any $k \leq \min\{T_{\text{sc}}, \tau\} - 1$.

Proof. We prove this result by induction. Let us first consider the base case $k = 0$ and assume without loss of generality that $\tau > 0$. Note that we have $4\alpha_t nL \leq 1$ by (3.2). Applying [Lemma 2.4](#) (by setting $\delta = \delta/T_{\text{sc}}$) and (2.15) with $t = 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_1) &\leq f(x_0) - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{4} \|\nabla f(x_0)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{2} \|g_0\|^2 + \alpha_0 n \|e_0\|^2 \\
&\leq f(x_0) - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{4} \|\nabla f(x_0)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{2} \|g_0\|^2 \\
&\quad + \alpha_0 n \left(2\alpha_0^2 n^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_0)\|^2 + 32\alpha_0^2 n L^2 (A(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta) \right) \\
&\leq f(x_0) - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{2} \|g_0\|^2 + 32\alpha_0^3 n^2 L^2 (A(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta)
\end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\leq f(x_0) - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{4} \|g_0\|^2 \leq f(x_0) - \frac{\alpha_0 n}{4} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2,$$

where the second inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/T_{\text{sc}}$, the third inequality is due to $4\alpha_t nL \leq 1$, and the last two inequalities are due to the second term in the step size condition (3.2) and the fact that $\|g_0\|^2 > \eta^2 \varepsilon^2$.

Next, suppose that the conclusion holds for some $k - 1$, where $k \leq \min\{T_{\text{sc}}, \tau\} - 1$. Then, conditioned on the event

$$\left\{ f(x_{t+1}) - f(x_t) \leq -\frac{\alpha_t n}{4} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2, \forall t \leq k - 1 \right\}, \quad (3.5)$$

we can follow the same steps as in (3.4) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{k+1}) &\leq f(x_k) - \frac{\alpha_k n}{2} \|g_k\|^2 + 32\alpha_k^3 n^2 L^2 (A(f(x_k) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta) \\ &\leq f(x_k) - \frac{\alpha_k n}{2} \|g_k\|^2 + 32\alpha_k^3 n^2 L^2 (A(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/T_{\text{sc}}$ and the second inequality is because we have conditioned on the event (3.5). Following the last two steps in (3.4) and applying union bound for $t = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ finishes the induction process and hence the proof. \square

We next show that RR-sc is guaranteed to stop within T_{sc} iterations based on the above descent property, clarifying our stopping criterion.

Proposition 3.2 (stopping time). *Under the setting of Lemma 3.1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, RR-sc terminates within T_{sc} iterations, i.e., $\mathbb{P}[\tau \leq T_{\text{sc}} - 1] \geq 1 - \delta$.*

Proof. Let the event that the algorithm terminates after T_{sc} iterations, namely $\{\tau \geq T_{\text{sc}}\}$, be denoted by E_1 and the event

$$\left\{ f(x_{t+1}) \leq f(x_t) - \frac{\alpha_t n}{4} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2, \forall t \leq \min\{T_{\text{sc}}, \tau\} - 1 \right\} \quad (3.6)$$

be denoted by E_2 . For the event $E_1 \cap E_2$, we have

$$f(x_{T_{\text{sc}}}) - f(x_0) \leq -\sum_{t=0}^{T_{\text{sc}}-1} \frac{\alpha_t n}{4} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2 \leq -\frac{3}{8} F < \bar{f} - f(x_0) \quad (3.7)$$

where the second inequality is by the choice of the step size and the definition of T_{sc} . However, (3.7) implies that $f(x_{T_{\text{sc}}}) < \bar{f}$, meaning $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$. Consequently, we have $\mathbb{P}(E_1) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}(E_2) \leq \delta$ due to Lemma 3.1. \square

3.2 The Last Iterate Result

In this subsection, we derive that when RR-sc terminates, the underlying stopping criterion holds, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla f(x_\tau)\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

The following lemma establishes the fact that small $\|g_t\|$ implies small $\|\nabla f(x_t)\|$.

Lemma 3.3. *Under the setting of Lemma 3.1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \frac{8}{3} \|g_t\|^2 + \frac{2}{3} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2, \quad \forall t \leq \tau.$$

Proof. By applying Lemma 2.4 for all $0 \leq t \leq T_{\text{sc}} - 1$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 &\leq 2\|g_t\|^2 + 2\|e_t\|^2 \leq 2\|g_t\|^2 + 4\alpha_t^2 n^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 64\alpha_t^2 nL^2 (A(f(x_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where we have applied union bound for $t = 0, \dots, T_{\text{sc}} - 1$. It is clear that conditioned on (3.8), Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 hold with probability 1, which give $f(x_t) - \bar{f} \leq f(x_0) - \bar{f}$, $\forall t \leq \min\{T_{\text{sc}}, \tau\}$ and $\tau \leq T_{\text{sc}} - 1$, respectively. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 &\leq 2\|g_t\|^2 + 4\alpha_t^2 n^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 64\alpha_t^2 nL^2 (A(f(x_0) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_{\text{sc}}/\delta), \quad \forall t \leq \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above inequality for $\|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2$ with $4\alpha_t nL \leq 1$, together with the second term of α_t in (3.2), gives the desired result. \square

When RR-sc stops at iteration τ , we have $\|g_\tau\| \leq \eta\varepsilon$. In addition, the above lemma indicates when $\|g_t\|$ is small, the true gradient $\|\nabla f(x_t)\|$ can also be made small once the step size is appropriately chosen. This observation motivates us to derive the property of the true gradient when the method terminates, yielding a last iterate complexity result.

Theorem 3.4 (last iterate guarantee). *Under the setting of Lemma 3.1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, RR-sc terminates at iteration τ satisfying $\tau \leq T_{\text{sc}} - 1$. Furthermore, when the tolerance constant is set as $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\|\nabla f(x_\tau)\| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we can condition on (3.8) to conduct a deterministic argument. The termination of RR-sc is guaranteed by Proposition 3.2. Then, plugging $\|g_\tau\|^2 \leq \eta^2\varepsilon^2$ and the choice of η into Lemma 3.3 yields $\|\nabla f(x_\tau)\|^2 \leq \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{6} \leq \varepsilon^2$, which completes the proof. \square

We conclude this section by offering two remarks. Suppose that the stopping criterion is triggered at iteration t . Our RR-sc returns x_t rather than x_{t+1} after running the $(t+1)$ -th iteration. Indeed, we can also return x_{t+1} . By the Lipschitz continuity of the gradient function, we have

$$\|\nabla f(x_{t+1})\| \leq \|\nabla f(x_t)\| + \|\nabla f(x_{t+1}) - \nabla f(x_t)\| \leq \|\nabla f(x_t)\| + \alpha_t n \mathbb{L} \|g_t\| \leq \Theta(\varepsilon).$$

Thus, one could also return x_{t+1} as x_t without sacrificing the last iterate guarantee.

Our stopping criterion also effectively manages false negatives. Specifically, we avoid situations where the underlying criterion $\|\nabla f(x_t)\| \leq \Theta(\varepsilon)$ is already met, but the stopping criterion is triggered much later. To see this, we can follow almost the same arguments of Lemma 3.3 to show that

$$\|g_t\|^2 \leq \frac{9}{4} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{3} \eta^2 \varepsilon^2, \quad t \leq \tau. \quad (3.9)$$

When the tolerance is set as $\eta \geq \sqrt{27/8}$, our stopping criterion must already be triggered once we have implicitly $\|\nabla f(x_t)\| \leq \varepsilon$.

4 Perturbed Random Reshuffling and Escaping Saddle Points

The results presented in preceding sections concern convergence to a stationary point. Nonetheless, such guarantees do not eliminate the possibility of RR converging to a saddle point. In this section, we design a perturbed variant of RR and establish that the proposed method provably escapes strict saddle points and returns a second-order stationary point. Towards that end, we impose an additional Lipschitz condition on the Hessian of the component functions in problem (1.1) throughout this section.

Assumption 4.1. *For all $i \in [n]$, the Hessian $\nabla^2 f_i$ is ρ -Lipschitz continuous.*

This Hessian Lipschitz continuity assumption is standard in the analysis of escaping strict saddle points [8, 19, 20]. We also need the following definition of ε -second-order stationary points.

Definition 4.2 (cf. Definition 2.9 of [20]). *For a ρ -Hessian Lipschitz continuous function f , x is an ε -second-order stationary point if*

$$\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2 f(x) \succcurlyeq -\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}I.$$

According to Definition 4.2, we say that x is a strict saddle point if $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) = -\zeta < -\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}$.³

4.1 Algorithm Design and Our Result

We propose integrating randomized perturbation (see, e.g., [20]) into our RR scheme for escaping strict saddle points. Such a perturbation approach has been extensively studied in a series of works on the topic of avoiding saddle points; see, e.g., [8, 19, 20]. However, implementing the perturbation at each iteration of RR is not conducive to establishing strong complexity guarantees. Specifically, the intricate interplay among the stochastic gradient errors in RR, the noise introduced by the manually added randomized perturbations, and the approximation error involved in approximating the power method dynamics during escaping strict saddle points, collectively hinders us from establishing a favorable complexity bound, unless we impose the typical sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors as done in most prior works. Our solution to this issue stems from two observations. First, upon entering the saddle point region, the initial perturbation provides the direction for escaping the saddle region, and the subsequent RR steps

³We make use of the target accuracy ε in the definitions of second-order stationary points and strict saddle points so that we can discuss complexity results, following the convention in [20].

Algorithm 3: p-RR: Perturbed Random Reshuffling

Input: Step sizes α and β , escaping iterations T_e , perturbation radius r_p , escaping radius r_d , tolerance η , target accuracy ε ;

Initialization: $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu = \alpha$, $t_e = -1$, $t = 0$;

```

1 while true do
2   Set  $g_t = 0$ ;
3   Sample  $\pi_t = \{\pi_t^1, \dots, \pi_t^n\}$  uniformly at random from  $\Pi$  defined in (1.2);
4   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
5      $x_t^i = x_t^{i-1} - \mu \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1})$ ; /* update */
6      $g_t = g_t + \nabla f_{\pi_t^i}(x_t^{i-1}) / n$ ;
7   end
8   Set  $x_{t+1} = x_t^n$ ;
9   if  $\|g_t\| \leq \eta\varepsilon$  and  $t_e = -1$  then
10     $x_s = x_t$ ;
11     $\mu = \beta$ ;
12     $x_{t+1} = x_t + p$ , where  $p \sim \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{B}_0(r_p))$ ; /* perturbation */
13     $t_e = 1$ ;
14  else if  $1 \leq t_e \leq T_e$  then
15    if  $\|x_{t+1} - x_s\| \geq r_d$  then /* escaping */
16       $t_e = -1$ ;
17       $\mu = \alpha$ ;
18    else
19       $t_e = t_e + 1$ ;
20    end
21  end
22  if  $t_e = T_e + 1$  then /* second-order stationarity */
23    return  $x_s$ ;
24  end
25   $t = t + 1$ ;
26 end

```

amplify this trend by approximating the power method. Second, our specially designed stopping criterion detailed in Section 3 allows us to detect when the method is near a stationary point, enabling us to inject only the aforementioned initial perturbation after detecting a stationary point. By adopting this approach, we can substantially reduce noise level for theoretical analysis while maintain the possibility of escaping strict saddle points.

Our method is denoted as p-RR and is displayed in Algorithm 3. In particular, whenever a stationary point is detected, p-RR introduces a randomized perturbation to the iterate in Line 12 and performs at most T_e escaping RR steps. Line 15 is to detect whether the iterates have moved a sufficient distance within T_e iterations. We will establish subsequently that such substantial movement serves as an indicator of escaping strict saddle points. Otherwise, it indicates that this stationary point is already a second-order stationary point. We depict the flowchart of p-RR in Figure 1.

To provide theoretical guarantee, we present the choices of parameters in p-RR as follows, where F is a constant defined in Lemma 2.6:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \text{ is defined in (3.2), } \beta &= \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4nL}, \frac{\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}}{R^2L^2n}, \frac{\rho^{1/4}\varepsilon^{1/4}}{RL\sqrt{A}\sqrt{n} \log\left(\frac{8R}{\delta\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon\beta}}\right)}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{8\sqrt{2}R^2\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{AF}\sqrt{n} \log\left(\frac{8R}{\delta\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon\beta}}\right)}, \frac{1}{4R^2\sqrt{\rho n}\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2R^4L\sqrt{AF}\sqrt{n} \log\left(\frac{8R}{\delta\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon\beta}}\right)} \right\}, \quad (4.1) \\
r_d &= \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{\rho}R^2}, \quad r_p = \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{8\sqrt{\rho}R^6}, \frac{\varepsilon^{3/4}}{2\rho^{1/4}R^3\sqrt{L}} \right\}, \quad T_e = \frac{R}{\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon n\beta}}, \quad \text{and } \eta = \frac{1}{2}, \\
\text{where } R &\geq \max \left\{ 32, \left(\frac{3\varepsilon^{3/2}}{4\sqrt{\rho}(F - B/A)} \right)^{1/6}, 2 \log \left(\frac{4\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{\pi}\delta} \cdot \frac{r_d}{r_p} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Flowchart of p-RR.

The dominant terms in the definition of β are the second and the last terms, which give $\beta^{-1} \sim \tilde{O}(\max\{n\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-1}\})$. Here, \tilde{O} hides a polylogarithmic term in $1/\varepsilon\delta$, d , and n due to the definition of R and the logarithmic terms in the definition of β . The remaining terms within β primarily serve to ease our analysis. With these choices of parameters, we present our main result in this section in the following theorem, which states that p-RR provably escapes strict saddle points, leading to a complexity guarantee to a second-order stationary point.

Theorem 4.3 (escape strict saddle points and second-order guarantee). *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 4.1 are valid. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, p-RR with parameters defined in (4.1) returns an ε -second-order stationary point using at most*

$$\tilde{O}\left(\max\left\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-5/2}\right\}\right)$$

stochastic gradient evaluations, where \tilde{O} hides a polylogarithmic term in $1/\varepsilon\delta$, d , n .

In contrast to Theorem 2.7, Theorem 4.3 provides a characterization of convergence to a second-order stationary point, albeit at a possibly higher complexity cost. This ability to avoiding strict saddle points is particularly significant when dealing with nonconvex optimization problems. It is also worth noting that p-RR retains the same update rule of RR, differing only by the inclusion of a single perturbation when a stationary point is detected. Therefore, the per-iteration computational cost and the updating rule of p-RR keep almost unchanged compared to RR.

This sample complexity result is established by quantifying the strict descent property in function value for p-RR. Our proof strategy follows the framework established in [20], with nontrivial modifications. Importantly, we do not require any sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors, thanks to the properties of RR and our specially designed perturbation procedure. Let us suppose that the detected stationary point is a strict saddle point. Towards prove Theorem 4.3, we first show that p-RR will move away from x_s by substantial distance, thus indicating escaping from strict saddle points; see Section 4.2. Then, we derive that such substantial movement in iterates implies sufficient descent in function values; see Section 4.3. Finally, combining with the strict descent property established in Section 3 when the method is far from stationary points yields the final result.

Proof setup. In the sequel, we assume that x_s is a strict saddle point, and hence our remaining task is to establish that p-RR can escape x_s to sufficiently decrease the function value. We use H to denote the Hessian of f at x_s . Then, we have $\lambda_{\min}(H) = -\zeta < -\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}$ according to Definition 4.2. We denote the perturbed iterate in Line 12 as y_0 and the iterates generated by the following T_e escaping RR steps as $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^{T_e}$. The randomness generated in the T_e escaping RR steps is represented as $\mathcal{F}(\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{T_e-1})$. To ease the analysis, we make the following simplifications: 1) Our analysis in this section is for any fixed outcome $\omega \in \mathcal{F}(\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{T_e-1})$ conditioned on Lemma 2.4, so that we can analyze the T_e escaping RR steps after perturbation in a deterministic manner. 2) We discuss the case where p-RR encounters a strict saddle point x_s for the first time without loss of generality. In this case, we have $f(x_s) \leq f(x_0)$ due to Lemma 3.1. Actually, we shall prove Theorem 4.3 by establishing strict descent properties. Therefore, by consecutively conditioning on the strict descent of both normal RR steps and escaping RR steps, $f(x_s) \leq f(x_0)$ always holds whenever p-RR meets a strict saddle point x_s .

We first derive an approximate descent property for the T_e escaping RR steps.

Lemma 4.4 (approximate descent property after perturbation). *Under the setting of Theorem 4.3, for any $0 \leq t \leq T_e - 1$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_{t+1}) - f(y_t) &\leq -\frac{1}{8\beta n} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 32\beta^3 n^2 L^2 (A(f(y_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_e/\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

In addition, the function value is bounded by

$$f(y_t) - \bar{f} \leq 2F - B/A, \quad \forall t \leq T_e. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. By Assumption 2.1, the definition of e_t in (2.9) (replacing x_t with y_t), and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_{t+1}) - f(y_t) &\leq \langle \nabla f(y_t), y_{t+1} - y_t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &= \left\langle -\frac{1}{\beta n} (y_{t+1} - y_t) - e_t, y_{t+1} - y_t \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta n} \left(1 - \frac{\beta n L}{2}\right) \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 - \langle e_t, y_{t+1} - y_t \rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{\beta n} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta n L}{2}\right) \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta n}{2} \|e_t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Replacing $\|\nabla f(y_t)\|^2$ with $\|(y_{t+1} - y_t)/\beta n + e_t\|^2$ in Lemma 2.4 (after applying union bound for $0 \leq t \leq T_e - 1$ and replacing x_t with y_t and α_t with β), using $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$, and solving for $\|e_t\|^2$ with $4\beta n L \leq 1$ (see (4.1)) provide

$$\|e_t\|^2 \leq 8L^2 \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 + 64\beta^2 n L^2 (A(f(y_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_e/\delta). \quad (4.5)$$

Combining the above two inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_{t+1}) - f(y_t) &\leq -\frac{1}{\beta n} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta n L}{2} - 4\beta^2 n^2 L^2\right) \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 32\beta^3 n^2 L^2 (A(f(y_t) - \bar{f}) + B) \log^2(8nT_e/\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By utilizing $4\beta n L \leq 1$, we obtain (4.2).

To prove (4.3), we first note that the condition for deriving (2.19), i.e., $T_e \beta^3 n^2 C_1 \leq 1$ with C_1 defined in Lemma 2.6 (replacing T with T_e), is satisfied due to the definitions of β (its third term), T_e , and R (its first term) in (4.1). Then, based on (4.6), we can follow exactly the same analysis for deriving (2.19) to obtain $f(y_t) - \bar{f} \leq 3(f(y_0) - \bar{f}) + 3B/A$ for any $t \leq T_e$. Finally, the bound on the function value in (4.3) is established by noticing $f(y_0) - \bar{f} = f(y_0) - f(x_s) + f(x_s) - \bar{f} \leq f(y_0) - f(x_s) + f(x_0) - \bar{f}$, the definition of R (its second term) in (4.1), and

$$f(y_0) - f(x_s) \leq \langle \nabla f(x_s), p \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|p\|^2 \leq \varepsilon r_p + \frac{L}{2} r_p^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{4\sqrt{\rho} R^6}, \quad (4.7)$$

where the first inequality in (4.7) is from the smoothness of f and the last inequality is due to the definition of r_p in (4.1). \square

4.2 Escaping Saddle Region by Perturbation

We adopt the ‘‘stuck region’’ concept from [20], which collects all bad initial points around x_s where running escaping RR steps will not leave x_s . Then, the failure probability of escaping x_s can be estimated by bounding the volume of this ‘‘stuck region’’. As per [20], we consider starting the escaping RR steps at any two distinct initial points y_0 and y'_0 such that

$$y'_0 - y_0 = r_s \bar{v} \quad \text{with} \quad r_s = \sqrt{\pi} \delta r_p / \sqrt{d}, \quad (4.8)$$

where \bar{v} is the unit eigenvector of H corresponding to the most negative eigenvalue $-\zeta$ and $\delta > 0$ is the probability parameter. If at least one of the two procedures successfully escapes x_s , then the volume of the ‘‘stuck region’’ can be upper bounded using r_s . To establish this, we argue that they cannot simultaneously stay in the saddle region by showing that at least one of the following two cases will occur:

(C.1) There exists $\bar{t} \leq T_e - 1$ such that $\max\{\|y_{\bar{t}} - x_s\|, \|y'_{\bar{t}} - x_s\|\} \geq r_d$;

$$(C.2) \quad \max\{\|y_{T_e} - x_s\|, \|y'_{T_e} - x_s\|\} \geq r_d.$$

If case (C.1) holds, then we can use it immediately to bound the failure probability of escaping. Therefore, the remaining task is to derive that if (C.1) does not hold, then we must have (C.2).

The following immediate lemma indicates that all inner iterations will also stay around x_s if (C.1) does not hold, which will be utilized to investigate the dynamics of the difference $z_t^i = y_t^i - y_t^i$.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that (C.1) does not hold. Then, under the setting of Theorem 4.3, we have*

$$\max\{\|y_t^i - x_s\|, \|y_t^i - x_s\|\} \leq 2r_d, \quad \forall t \leq T_e - 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n - 1. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. Since (C.1) does not hold, we have

$$\|\nabla f(y_t)\| \leq \|\nabla f(x_s)\| + \|\nabla f(y_t) - \nabla f(x_s)\| \leq \varepsilon + Lr_d. \quad (4.10)$$

We prove the result by induction. For $i = 0$, we have $\|y_t^0 - y_t\| = 0 \leq r_d$. Suppose $\|y_t^k - y_t\| \leq r_d$ holds for all $k \leq i - 1$, then for $k = i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_t^i - y_t\| &= \beta \left\| \sum_{j=1}^i \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(y_t^{j-1}) \right\| \\ &\leq \beta \left[\left\| \sum_{j=1}^i \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(y_t^{j-1}) - \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(y_t) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^i \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(y_t) - \nabla f(y_t) \right\| + i \|\nabla f(y_t)\| \right] \\ &\leq \beta L \sum_{j=1}^i \|y_t^{j-1} - y_t\| + \beta \left\| \sum_{j=1}^i \nabla f_{\pi_t^j}(y_t) - \nabla f(y_t) \right\| + \beta i \|\nabla f(y_t)\| \\ &\leq \beta L n r_d + 2\beta \sqrt{2AF} \sqrt{n} \log(8nT_e/\delta) + \beta i (\varepsilon + Lr_d) \leq \frac{r_d}{4} + \frac{r_d}{4} + \frac{r_d}{4} + \frac{r_d}{4} \leq r_d. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the third inequality follows from Proposition 2.3, (4.3), and (4.10), while the fourth inequality is from the definitions of β (its first, fourth, and fifth terms) and T_e in (4.1). Finally, triangle inequality $\|y_t^i - x_s\| \leq \|y_t^i - y_t\| + \|y_t - x_s\|$ gives (4.9). \square

We now turn to investigate the dynamics of the difference $z_t^i = y_t^i - y_t^i$. For any $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} z_t^{i+1} &:= y_t^{i+1} - y_t^{i+1} = y_t^i - \beta \nabla f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i) - y_t^i + \beta \nabla f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i) \\ &= y_t^i - y_t^i - \beta \left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2 f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i + l(y_t^i - y_t^i)) (y_t^i - y_t^i) dl \right) \\ &= (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^{i+1}}) z_t^i + \beta E_t^i z_t^i, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where $E_t^i = H_{\pi_t^{i+1}} - \int_0^1 \nabla^2 f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i + l(y_t^i - y_t^i)) dl$ and $H_{\pi_t^{i+1}}$ represents the Hessian of $f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}$ at x_s . By unrolling this recursion from $i = n - 1$ to 0, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z_{t+1} &= z_t^n = \prod_{i=n}^1 (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^i}) z_t + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^{i+1} (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^j}) E_t^i z_t^i \\ &= (I - \beta H)^n z_t + U_t z_t + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^{i+1} (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^j}) E_t^i z_t^i, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where $U_t = \prod_{i=n}^1 (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^i}) - (I - \beta H)^n$ and $\prod_{j=n-1}^n (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^j})$ is defined as the identity matrix I for display purpose. Unrolling this equality further to $t = 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} z_t &= (I - \beta H)^{nt} z_0 \\ &+ \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} (I - \beta H)^{n(t-1-k)} \left(U_k z_k + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^{i+1} (I - \beta H_{\pi_k^j}) E_k^i z_k^i \right)}_{:= w_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

By the construction of y_0 and y'_0 in (4.8), it is easy to see that

$$\|(I - \beta H)^{nt} z_0\| = (1 + \beta \zeta)^{nt} r_s. \quad (4.14)$$

We now argue that this term dominates the dynamics of z_t in (4.13), if the sequence $\{y_t\}_{t=0}^{T_e-1}$ stays around x_s , i.e., (C.1) does not hold.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that (C.1) does not hold. Then, under the setting of Theorem 4.3, for w_t defined in (4.13) we have*

$$\|w_t\| \leq (1 + \beta\zeta)^{nt} r_s / 2, \quad \forall t \leq T_e.$$

Proof. We provide several preliminary bounds in preparation. We first bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_t^i\|_{\text{op}} &= \left\| H_{\pi_t^{i+1}} - \int_0^1 \nabla^2 f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i + l(y_t^i - y_t^i)) dl \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left\| \nabla^2 f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(x_s) - \nabla^2 f_{\pi_t^{i+1}}(y_t^i + l(y_t^i - y_t^i)) \right\|_{\text{op}} dl \\ &\leq \frac{\rho}{2} (\|y_t^i - x_s\| + \|y_t^i - x_s\|) \leq 2\rho r_d, \quad \forall t \leq T_e - 1, 0 \leq i \leq n-1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption that (C.1) does not hold and Lemma 4.5. Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_t\|_{\text{op}} &= \left\| \prod_{i=n}^1 (I - \beta H_{\pi_t^i}) - (I - \beta H)^n \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \left\| I - \beta \sum_{i=n}^1 H_{\pi_t^i} + \beta^2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} H_{\pi_t^j} H_{\pi_t^i} + \cdots + (-\beta)^n \prod_{i=n}^1 H_{\pi_t^i} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - I + \beta n H - \sum_{k=2}^n \binom{n}{k} (-\beta)^k H^k \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \beta^i n^i \mathbf{L}^i \leq 4\beta^2 n^2 \mathbf{L}^2, \quad \forall t \leq T_e, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where we have used $\sum_{i=n}^1 H_{\pi_t^i} = nH$, $\|H_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathbf{L}$, and $\|H\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathbf{L}$ in the first inequality, and used $4\beta n \mathbf{L} \leq 1$ in the last inequality. Moreover, with (4.11), (4.15), and $\|H_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathbf{L}$, we obtain

$$\|z_t^{i+1}\| \leq (1 + \beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d) \|z_t^i\|, \quad \forall t \leq T_e - 1, 0 \leq i \leq n-1. \quad (4.17)$$

With these preliminary bounds, we prove $\|w_t\| \leq (1 + \beta\zeta)^{n(t-1)} r_s / 2$ for $t \leq T_e$ by induction. For the base case, $\|w_0\| = 0$. Suppose that it holds for any $t \leq K$. Then, for all $t \leq K$, we have

$$\|z_t\| \leq \left\| (I - \beta H)^{nt} z_0 \right\| + \|w_t\| \leq 2(1 + \beta\zeta)^{nt} r_s, \quad (4.18)$$

where we have used (4.13), (4.14), and the induction hypothesis. We now consider the case $t = K + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{K+1}\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=0}^K (I - \beta H)^{n(K-k)} \left(U_k z_k + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^{i+1} (I - \beta H_{\pi_k^{j+1}}) E_k^i z_k^i \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K \left\| (I - \beta H)^{n(K-k)} \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| U_k z_k + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^{i+1} (I - \beta H_{\pi_k^{j+1}}) E_k^i z_k^i \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K (1 + \beta\zeta)^{n(K-k)} \left(\|U_k\|_{\text{op}} \|z_k\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 + \beta \mathbf{L})^{n-1-i} \beta \rho r_d (1 + \beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d)^i \|z_k\| \right) \\ &\leq 8(K+1)\beta^2 n^2 \mathbf{L}^2 (1 + \beta\zeta)^{nK} r_s \\ &\quad + 4(K+1)(1 + \beta\zeta)^{nK} n (1 + \beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d)^{n-1} \beta \rho r_d r_s \leq (1 + \beta\zeta)^{nK} r_s / 2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the third inequality follows from (4.15), (4.17), and $\|H_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathbf{L}$, while the fourth inequality is due to (4.16) and (4.18). In addition, the last inequality is by i)

$$8(K+1)\beta^2 n^2 \mathbf{L}^2 \leq 8T_e \beta^2 n^2 \mathbf{L}^2 = 8 \frac{R}{\sqrt{\rho \varepsilon}} \beta n \mathbf{L}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

which is because of the definitions of β (its second term), T_e , and R (its first term) in (4.1), and ii)

$$\begin{aligned} 4(K+1)n(1 + \beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d)^{n-1} \beta \rho r_d &\leq 4 \exp(n \log(1 + \beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d)) \beta n T_e \rho r_d \\ &\leq 4 \exp(n(\beta \mathbf{L} + 2\beta \rho r_d)) \beta n T_e \rho r_d \leq 8\beta n T_e \rho r_d \leq \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

which is from the definitions of β (its first and fifth terms), r_d , T_e , and R (its first term) in (4.1). This finishes the induction process and completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that (C.1) does not hold. Then, under the setting of Theorem 4.3, we have*

$$\max\{\|y_{T_e} - x_s\|, \|y'_{T_e} - x_s\|\} \geq r_d,$$

namely, (C.2) holds.

Proof. By (4.13), (4.14), and Lemma 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{T_e}\| &= \left\| (I - \beta H)^{nT_e} z_0 + W_{T_e} \right\| \geq (1 + \beta\zeta)^{nT_e} r_s - \|W_{T_e}\| \geq (1 + \beta\zeta)^{nT_e} r_s/2 \\ &= (1 + \beta\zeta)^{\beta nT_e \zeta / (\beta\zeta)} r_s/2 \geq \exp(\beta nT_e \zeta / 2) r_s/2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality $(1 + \beta\zeta)^{2/\beta\zeta} \geq 3$ is due to the fact that $(1 + a)^b \geq 1 + ab$ for all $a \geq -1$ and $b = 2/\beta\zeta \geq 2/\beta L \geq 8n > 1$. Then, invoking $\zeta \geq \sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}$, the definitions of T_e and R (its third term) in (4.1), and the definition of r_s in (4.8), gives $\|z_{T_e}\| = \|y_{T_e} - y'_{T_e}\| \geq 2r_d$. This immediately implies $\max\{\|y_{T_e} - x_s\|, \|y'_{T_e} - x_s\|\} \geq r_d$, since otherwise it will contradict with the triangle inequality. \square

We have established that at least one of the two cases (C.1) and (C.2) holds. Based on this result, we are ready to show that Line 15 in p-RR activates, i.e., it escapes the strict saddle point x_s within T_e escaping RR steps, with high probability.

Proposition 4.8 (escaping strict saddle points). *Under the setting of Theorem 4.3, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists t \leq T_e, \|y_t - x_s\| \geq r_d] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. We refer to $\mathbb{B}_{x_s}^d(r_p)$ as the perturbation ball. By the definitions of y_0 and y'_0 in (4.8) and Lemma 4.7, we know that the width of the “stuck region” \mathcal{S} along \bar{v} is at most r_s . Then, with the definition of r_s in (4.8), we can follow the proof of [20, Lemma 5.3] to bound the failure probability of escaping as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|y_t - x_s\| \leq r_d, \forall t \leq T_e] &\leq \frac{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})}{\text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}_{x_s}^d(r_p))} \leq \frac{r_s \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}_{x_s}^{d-1}(r_p))}{\text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}_{x_s}^d(r_p))} = \frac{r_s \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}_0^{d-1}(r_p))}{\text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}_0^d(r_p))} \\ &= \frac{r_s \cdot \Gamma(d/2 + 1)}{r_p \sqrt{\pi} \cdot \Gamma(d/2 + 1/2)} \leq \frac{r_s \sqrt{d}}{r_p \sqrt{\pi}} = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

\square

4.3 Descent Property During Escaping and Proof of Theorem 4.3

In the previous subsection, we have proven that p-RR escapes the strict saddle region with high probability. We now investigate the descent property on the objective function value during escaping and then provide a complete proof of Theorem 4.3.

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.4.

Corollary 4.9. *Under the setting of Theorem 4.3, for any $1 \leq t \leq T_e$, we have*

$$f(y_t) - f(y_0) \leq -\frac{1}{8\beta n t} \|y_t - y_0\|^2 + 64t\beta^3 n^2 L^2 \text{AF} \log^2(8nT_e/\delta). \quad (4.19)$$

Proof. Upon plugging (4.3) into (4.2), we have

$$f(y_{t+1}) - f(y_t) \leq -\frac{1}{8\beta n} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 + 64t\beta^3 n^2 L^2 \text{AF} \log^2(8nT_e/\delta).$$

Unrolling this inequality yields the result. \square

Next, we establish the strict descent property of p-RR during escaping the strict saddle point x_s in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.10 (descent property during escaping). *Under the setting of Theorem 4.3, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[f(y_{\tilde{t}}) - f(x_s) \leq -\frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{4\sqrt{\rho}R^6}\right] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (4.20)$$

Here, $\tilde{t} \leq T_e$ denotes the iteration index that achieves escaping in Proposition 4.8.

Proof. By substituting $\|y_{\bar{t}} - y_0\| = \|y_{\bar{t}} - x_s + x_s - y_0\| \geq \|y_{\bar{t}} - x_s\| - \|p\| \geq r_d/2$ into [Corollary 4.9](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_{\bar{t}}) - f(y_0) &\leq -\frac{1}{8\beta n T_e} \frac{r_d^2}{4} + 64T_e \beta^3 n^2 L^2 \text{AF} \log^2(8nT_e/\delta) \\ &\leq -\frac{\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}}{R^2} r_d^2 + 64 \frac{R}{\sqrt{\rho\varepsilon}} \beta^2 n L^2 \text{AF} \log^2(8nT_e/\delta) \leq -\frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{\rho}R^6}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definitions of T_e , R (its first term), β (its last term), and r_d in [\(4.1\)](#). Finally, plugging the above inequality into $f(y_{\bar{t}}) - f(x_s) = f(y_{\bar{t}}) - f(y_0) + f(y_0) - f(x_s)$, together with [\(4.7\)](#), we arrive at the conclusion. \square

With all the developed machineries, we provide the proof of [Theorem 4.3](#).

Proof of Theorem 4.3. p-RR may alternatively encounter large gradient regions and strict saddle regions. Suppose that p-RR arrives at x after T_{grad} large gradient iterations and K_e times of escaping saddle regions. We use $\{x_{m_1}, \dots, x_{m_{T_{\text{grad}}}}\}$ to denote all the T_{grad} large gradient iterates, while use $\{x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_{K_e}}\}$ and $\{x_{n_1+\bar{t}_1}, \dots, x_{n_{K_e}+\bar{t}_{K_e}}\}$ to denote the starting and ending iterates of the K_e times of escaping, respectively. To apply union bound, we change the notations R , T_e , and β to R' , T'_e , and β' by replacing δ with $\delta/(4K_e)$ in the definitions of R and β in [\(4.1\)](#), and change α in [\(3.2\)](#) to α' by replacing δ with $\delta/2$ and T_{sc} with T_{grad} . We define two events

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &:= \{f(x_{m_t+1}) - f(x_{m_t}) \leq -\alpha' n \varepsilon^2 / 16, \forall t \leq T_{\text{grad}}\}, \\ E_2 &:= \{f(x_{n_k+\bar{t}_k}) - f(x_{n_k}) \leq -\varepsilon^{3/2} / 4R'^6 \sqrt{\rho}, \forall k \leq K_e\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to [Lemma 3.1](#) ($\eta = 1/2$) and [Proposition 4.10](#) (δ will increase to 2δ after considering the randomness of escaping RR steps), applying union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_2) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2T_{\text{grad}}} T_{\text{grad}} - \frac{2\delta}{4K_e} K_e = 1 - \delta.$$

We now define the event

$$E_3 := \{T_{\text{grad}} > 16(f(x_0) - \bar{f})/\alpha' n \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{or} \quad K_e > 4R'^6 \sqrt{\rho}(f(x_0) - \bar{f})/\varepsilon^{3/2}\}$$

It is quick to verify that $E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 = \emptyset$, since otherwise it leads to $f(x) < \bar{f}$. This gives $\mathbb{P}(E_3) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_2) \leq \delta$. Combining the above results and the definitions of β' (its second and last terms dominate), T'_e , and R' in [\(4.1\)](#), we conclude that p-RR returns an ε -second-order stationary point using no more than

$$nT_{\text{grad}} + nT'_e K_e \leq \tilde{O} \left(\max\{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{-3}, n\varepsilon^{-5/2}\} \right)$$


stochastic gradient evaluations with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Here, \tilde{O} hides a polylogarithmic term in $1/\varepsilon\delta$, n , d , which is from the definition of R' (its third term) and β' (its log term) in [\(4.1\)](#). This completes the proof. \square

5 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct practical classification experiments on the widely recognized MNIST dataset⁴. Our model of choice is a two-hidden layer fully connected neural network, which utilizes the smooth tanh activation function and logistic regression in the final layer for the classification task. Each hidden layer in our network comprises 50 units. The training algorithms implemented are RR and SGD. We ensure fairness in comparison by using the same parameter settings for both algorithms. Specifically, the initial point is obtained by running the default initializer of PyTorch, which generates the initial weight matrices with entries following an i.i.d. uniform distribution. We use a batch size of 8 and an initial learning rate of 0.05, which is subsequently step-decayed by a factor of 0.7 after each iteration (here, an iteration refers to an epoch for SGD). This step-decay procedure follows the convention in the training of neural networks. We conduct 100 independent trials for each algorithm to ensure a comprehensive evaluation.

We display the gradient norm statistics for the last iterate in both algorithms in [Figure 2a](#). It can be observed that RR not only tends to yield a smaller gradient norm of the last iterate, but also exhibits a superior concentration property. This empirical observation corroborates our theoretical findings that the gradient norm in RR converges with high probability


⁴The dataset is available at <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, in which it has 60000 training samples and 10000 test samples.



(a) Gradient norm statistics for the last iterate over 100 independent runs.

(b) Training loss and test accuracy of RR and SGD over 100 independent runs.

Figure 2: Comparison of performance between RR and SGD.

Figure 3: Evolution of $\|g_t\|$, $\|\nabla f(x_t)\|$, and test accuracy of RR.

(see [Theorem 2.7](#)). In [Figure 2b](#), we show the training loss and test accuracy of RR and SGD. We can conclude that RR provides a slightly smaller training loss and demonstrates a slightly superior test accuracy.

In addition, we conduct experiments to study the stopping criterion $\|g_t\| \leq \eta\varepsilon$ defined in [\(3.1\)](#). The result is displayed in [Figure 3](#). We observed that $\|g_t\|$ finally aligns with $\|\nabla f(x_t)\|$ after 20 iterations (epochs), corroborating our [Theorem 3.4](#). It is also demonstrated that $\|g_t\|$ decreases along with the iteration index t . Upon setting the stopping criterion in [\(3.1\)](#) to $\|g_t\| \leq 7 \times 10^{-3}$, the training process completes around the 17th iteration (epoch), yielding a converged test accuracy. This suggests that $\|g_t\|$ is a practical measure that can be used as a stopping criterion.

Finally, we also conduct experiments on p-RR. The performance of p-RR closely mirrors that of RR, likely due to the fact that RR will not be trapped by strict saddle points in practical implementations. Therefore, we choose to omit these displays.

6 Conclusion and Discussions

In this work, we established a series of high probability guarantees for RR. In particular, we derived a high probability sample complexity guarantee for identifying a stationary point by studying the concentration property of the sampling scheme in RR. Furthermore, we proposed a stopping criterion for RR, which gives rise to RR-sc. Such a stopping criterion terminates the method after a finite number of iterations and returns an iterate with its gradient below ε with high probability. Lastly, we designed a perturbed random reshuffling method (p-RR) for escaping strict saddle points. High probability convergence result to a second-order stationary point was established for p-RR, without making any sub-Gaussian tail-type assumptions on the stochastic gradient errors.

The dependence on n in [\(2.5\)](#) is caused by bounding the random variable in [\(2.7\)](#) using variance. While it does not affect our complexity, improving n to i (if possible) could be insightful. Additionally, our current second-order complexity

guarantee does not match the one for finding a stationary point, which is a natural direction for further improvement. We leave these areas for future exploration.

References

- [1] Dimitri P Bertsekas. Incremental proximal methods for large scale convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 129(2):163–195, 2011.
- [2] Léon Bottou. Curiously fast convergence of some stochastic gradient descent algorithms. In *Proceedings of the symposium on learning and data science*, volume 8, pages 2624–2633, 2009.
- [3] Léon Bottou. Stochastic gradient descent tricks. In *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, pages 421–436. Springer, 2012.
- [4] Léon Bottou, Frank E Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *SIAM Review*, 60(2):223–311, 2018.
- [5] Jaeyoung Cha, Jaewook Lee, and Chulhee Yun. Tighter lower bounds for shuffling sgd: Random permutations and beyond. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [6] Yuejie Chi, Yue M Lu, and Yuxin Chen. Nonconvex optimization meets low-rank matrix factorization: An overview. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(20):5239–5269, 2019.
- [7] Ashok Cutkosky and Harsh Mehta. High-probability bounds for non-convex stochastic optimization with heavy tails. *Adv. in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4883–4895, 2021.
- [8] Rong Ge, Furong Huang, Chi Jin, and Yang Yuan. Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 797–842, 2015.
- [9] Rong Ge, Chi Jin, and Yi Zheng. No spurious local minima in nonconvex low rank problems: A unified geometric analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [10] Saeed Ghadimi and Guanghui Lan. Stochastic first- and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2013.
- [11] Eduard Gorbunov, Marina Danilova, and Alexander Gasnikov. Stochastic optimization with heavy-tailed noise via accelerated gradient clipping. *Adv. in Neural Info. Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [12] David Gross and Vincent Nesme. Note on sampling without replacing from a finite collection of matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1001.2738*, 2010.
- [13] M Gürbüzbalaban, A Ozdaglar, and Pablo A Parrilo. Convergence rate of incremental gradient and incremental Newton methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(4):2542–2565, 2019.
- [14] Mert Gürbüzbalaban, Asu Ozdaglar, and PA Parrilo. Why random reshuffling beats stochastic gradient descent. *Mathematical Programming*, 186(1-2):49–84, 2021.
- [15] Jeff Haochen and Suvrit Sra. Random shuffling beats SGD after finite epochs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2624–2633, 2019.
- [16] Nicholas J. A. Harvey, Christopher Liaw, Y. Plan, and Sikander Randhawa. Tight analyses for non-smooth stochastic gradient descent. *Annual Conference Computational Learning Theory*, 2018.
- [17] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- [18] Xinmeng Huang, Kun Yuan, Xianghui Mao, and Wotao Yin. An improved analysis and rates for variance reduction under without-replacement sampling orders. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [19] Chi Jin, Rong Ge, Praneeth Netrapalli, Sham M Kakade, and Michael I Jordan. How to escape saddle points efficiently. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1724–1732, 2017.
- [20] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, Rong Ge, Sham M Kakade, and Michael I Jordan. On nonconvex optimization for machine learning: Gradients, stochasticity, and saddle points. *Journal of the ACM*, 68(2):1–29, 2021.
- [21] Ahmed Khaled and Peter Richtárik. Better theory for sgd in the nonconvex world. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [22] Hunter Lang, Lin Xiao, and Pengchuan Zhang. Using statistics to automate stochastic optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [23] Xiao Li and Andre Milzarek. A unified convergence theorem for stochastic optimization methods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 33107–33119, 2022.

- [24] Xiao Li, Andre Milzarek, and Junwen Qiu. Convergence of random reshuffling under the kurdyka-łojasiewicz inequality. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(2):1092–1120, 2023.
- [25] Yucheng Lu, Wentao Guo, and Christopher De Sa. GraB: Finding provably better data permutations than random reshuffling. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [26] Grigory Malinovsky, Alibek Sailanbayev, and Peter Richtárik. Random reshuffling with variance reduction: New analysis and better rates. *Conference on Uncertainty in Arti. Intell.*, 2021.
- [27] Konstantin Mishchenko, Ahmed Khaled, and Peter Richtárik. Random reshuffling: Simple analysis with vast improvements. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [28] Aryan Mokhtari, Mert Gürbüzbalaban, and Alejandro Ribeiro. Surpassing gradient descent provably: A cyclic incremental method with linear convergence rate. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1420–1447, 2018.
- [29] Angelia Nedić and Dimitri P Bertsekas. Incremental subgradient methods for nondifferentiable optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(1):109–138, 2001.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [31] Lam M Nguyen, Quoc Tran-Dinh, Dzung T Phan, Phuong Ha Nguyen, and Marten Van Dijk. A unified convergence analysis for shuffling-type gradient methods. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):9397–9440, 2021.
- [32] Vivak Patel. Stopping criteria for, and strong convergence of, stochastic gradient descent on Bottou-Curtis-Nocedal functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 195(1-2):693–734, 2022.
- [33] Shashank Rajput, Anant Gupta, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Closing the convergence gap of SGD without replacement. *International Conference On Machine Learning*, 2020.
- [34] Benjamin Recht and Christopher Ré. Parallel stochastic gradient algorithms for large-scale matrix completion. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 5(2):201–226, 2013.
- [35] Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- [36] Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. How good is SGD with random shuffling? In *Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125, pages 3250–3284, 2020.
- [37] Ruo-Yu Sun. Optimization for deep learning: An overview. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China*, 8(2):249–294, 2020.
- [38] Joel A. Tropp. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(1-2):1–230, 2015.
- [39] George Yin. A stopping rule for the Robbins-Monro method. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 67(1):151–173, 1990.
- [40] Chulhee Yun, Shashank Rajput, and Suvrit Sra. Minibatch vs local SGD with shuffling: Tight convergence bounds and beyond. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [41] Jingzhao Zhang, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Andreas Veit, Seungyeon Kim, Sashank Reddi, Sanjiv Kumar, and Suvrit Sra. Why are adaptive methods good for attention models? *Adv. in Neu. Info. Process. Systems*, 2020.