

Non-asymptotic Global Convergence Analysis of BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe Line Search

Qiujiang Jin* Ruichen Jiang† Aryan Mokhtari‡

Abstract

In this paper, we establish the first explicit and non-asymptotic global convergence analysis of the BFGS method when deployed with an inexact line search scheme that satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions. We show that BFGS achieves a global convergence rate of $(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa})^k$ for μ -strongly convex functions with L -Lipschitz gradients, where $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ denotes the condition number. Furthermore, if the objective function's Hessian is Lipschitz, BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search achieves a linear convergence rate only determined by the line search parameters and independent of the condition number. These results hold for any initial point x_0 and any symmetric positive definite initial Hessian approximation matrix B_0 , although the choice of B_0 affects the iteration count required to attain these rates. Specifically, we show that for $B_0 = LI$, the rate of $\mathcal{O}((1 - \frac{1}{\kappa})^k)$ appears from the first iteration, while for $B_0 = \mu I$, it takes $d \log \kappa$ iterations. Conversely, the condition number-independent linear convergence rate for $B_0 = LI$ occurs after $\mathcal{O}\left(\kappa\left(d + \frac{M\sqrt{f(x_0) - f(x_*)}}{\mu^{3/2}}\right)\right)$ iterations, whereas for $B_0 = \mu I$, it holds after $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M\sqrt{f(x_0) - f(x_*)}}{\mu^{3/2}}(d \log \kappa + \kappa)\right)$ iterations. Here, d denotes the dimension of the problem, M is the Lipschitz parameter of the Hessian, and x_* denotes the optimal solution. We further leverage these global linear convergence results to characterize the overall iteration complexity of BFGS when deployed with the Armijo-Wolfe line search.

*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA {qiujiang@austin.utexas.edu}

†Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA {rjiang@utexas.edu}

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA {mokhtari@austin.utexas.edu}

1 Introduction

In this paper, we focus on solving the following unconstrained convex minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x), \tag{1}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is strongly convex and twice differentiable. Quasi-Newton methods are among the most popular algorithms for solving this class of problems due to their simplicity and fast convergence. Like gradient descent-type methods, they require only gradient information for implementation, while they aim to mimic the behavior of Newton’s method by using gradient information to approximate the curvature of the objective function.

There are several variations of quasi-Newton methods, primarily distinguished by their update rules for the Hessian approximation matrices. The most well-known among these include the Davidon-Fletcher-Powell (DFP) method [Dav59; FP63], the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) method [Bro70; Fle70; Gol70; Sha70], the Symmetric Rank-One (SR1) method [CGT91; KBS93], and the Broyden method [Bro65]. Apart from these classical quasi-Newton methods, other variants have also been proposed in the literature, including randomized quasi-Newton methods [GGR16; GR17; KGRR20; LYZ21; LYZ22], greedy quasi-Newton methods [RN21a; LYZ21; LYZ22; JD23], and those based on online learning techniques [JJM23; JM23]. In this paper, we mainly focus on the global convergence analysis of the BFGS method, which is arguably the most successful quasi-Newton method in practice.

The classic analyses of BFGS, including [BDM73; DM74; GT82; DMT89; Yua91; Al-98; LF99; YOY07; MER18; GG19], primarily focused on demonstrating local asymptotic superlinear convergence without addressing an explicit global convergence rate when BFGS is deployed with a line-search scheme. While there were attempts to establish global convergence for quasi-Newton methods using line search or trust-region techniques in [Pow71; Pow76; BNY87; BN89; KBS93; BKS96], these efforts did not provide explicit global convergence rates. Instead, they offered only asymptotic convergence guarantees, failing to fully characterize the global convergence rate of classical quasi-Newton methods.

In recent years, there have been efforts to characterize the explicit convergence rate of BFGS within a local neighborhood of the solution, establishing a superlinear convergence rate of the form $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})^k$; see, for example, [RN21c; RN21b; YLCZ23; JM20]. However, these results focus solely on local convergence analysis of BFGS under conditions where the stepsize is consistently set to one, the iterate remains close to the optimal solution, and the initial Hessian approximation matrix meets certain necessary conditions. Consequently, these analyses do not extend to providing a global convergence guarantee. For more details on this subject, we refer the reader to the discussion section in [JJM24].

To the best of our knowledge, the only two works closely related to this paper that characterize an explicit global linear convergence rate for the BFGS method are [KTSK23] and [JJM24]. Both studies focus on the convergence analysis of BFGS with exact line search. In [KTSK23], it was demonstrated that BFGS achieves a global linear rate of $(1 - \frac{2\mu^3}{L^3}(1 + \frac{\mu \text{Tr}(B_0^{-1})}{k})^{-1}(1 + \frac{\text{Tr}(B_0)}{Lk})^{-1})^k$, where μ is the strong convexity parameter and

L represents the Lipschitz constant of the gradient, B_0 is the initial Hessian approximation matrix, and $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. Notably, after running BFGS for $k = O(d)$ iterations, this rate approaches the rate of $(1 - \frac{2\mu^3}{L^3})^k$, which is significantly slower than the convergence rate of gradient descent. In [JJM24], the authors improved this result by showing a better global linear convergence rate as well as a faster superlinear convergence rate. Specifically, when the function is L -Lipschitz and μ -strongly convex, it is shown that BFGS initialized with $B_0 = LI$ achieves a global linear rate of $(1 - \frac{\mu^{3/2}}{L^{3/2}})^k$ for $k \geq 1$, while BFGS with $B_0 = \mu I$ achieves the same linear rate after $d \log \frac{L}{\mu}$ iterations. Under the additional assumption that the objective's Hessian is Lipschitz, the authors further showed that BFGS attains an improved linear convergence rate of $(1 - \frac{\mu}{L})^k$ and eventually a superlinear rate of the form $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})^k$ when the number of iterations exceeds some specific thresholds.

In this paper, we aim to expand upon the framework presented in [JJM24] by exploring the use of an inexact line search. Specifically, we focus on the BFGS method combined with the Armijo-Wolfe line search, the most commonly used line search criteria in the practical application of BFGS [NW06]. For minimizing a L -smooth and μ -strongly convex function, we present a global convergence rate of the form $(1 - \frac{\mu}{L})^k$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result demonstrating a global linear convergence rate for BFGS that matches the rate of gradient descent. Furthermore, we demonstrate that if the objective function's Hessian is Lipschitz continuous, BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search converges at a linear rate determined solely by the line search parameters and not dependent on the problem's condition number, $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$, when the number of iterations is sufficiently large. By combining both linear convergence results, we further establish the total iteration complexity of BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present the assumptions, notations, and intermediate results useful for the global convergence analysis. First, we state the following assumptions on the objective function f .

Assumption 2.1. *The function f is strongly convex with parameter $\mu > 0$, i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \geq \mu \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Assumption 2.2. *The gradient of f is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $L > 0$, i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Both Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are common in the convergence analysis of the quasi-Newton methods. These two conditions, together with the fact that the function is twice differentiable, lead to $\mu I \preceq \nabla^2 f(x) \preceq LI$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Using these two assumptions, we will show a global linear convergence rate where the contraction factor is $\mathcal{O}(1 - \frac{\mu}{L})$.

To achieve a faster linear convergence rate that is independent of the problem condition number, we would require an additional assumption that the objective function Hessian is Lipschitz continuous, as stated next.

Assumption 2.3. *The Hessian of f is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $M > 0$, i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(y)\| \leq M\|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Assumption 2.3 is also commonly used in the analysis of quasi-Newton methods. This assumption provides a fundamental smoothness condition for the Hessian of the objective function f .

2.1 BFGS Update

Next, we state the general update rule for quasi-Newton methods at iteration k . If we denote x_k as the iterate at time k , the vector $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$ as the objective function gradient at x_k , and B_k as the Hessian approximation matrix at step k , then the update is given by

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \eta_k d_k, \quad d_k = -B_k^{-1} g_k, \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_k > 0$ is the step size and d_k can be regarded as the descent direction. Now we proceed to state the update of the Hessian approximation matrix. To formally define the update of BFGS, we first define the variable difference and gradient difference vectors as

$$s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k, \quad y_k = \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k),$$

respectively. Given these two vectors, the Hessian approximation matrix update for BFGS can be written as

$$B_{k+1} = B_k - \frac{B_k s_k s_k^\top B_k}{s_k^\top B_k s_k} + \frac{y_k y_k^\top}{s_k^\top y_k}. \quad (3)$$

To circumvent the computationally expensive task of Hessian inversion, one can define the inverse Hessian approximation matrix as $H_k := B_k^{-1}$ and apply the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula to obtain

$$H_{k+1} := \left(I - \frac{s_k y_k^\top}{y_k^\top s_k} \right) H_k \left(I - \frac{y_k s_k^\top}{s_k^\top y_k} \right) + \frac{s_k s_k^\top}{y_k^\top s_k}.$$

It is well-known that when the objective function is strongly convex, the Hessian approximation matrices B_k are always symmetric and positive definite as long as the initial matrix B_0 is symmetric positive definite. Hence, throughout this paper, we assume that all B_k and H_k matrices are symmetric positive definite.

As mentioned earlier, to establish a global convergence guarantee for the BFGS method, it is necessary to pair it with a line search scheme to properly select the stepsize η_k . In this paper, we focus on implementing BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search, which we will detail in the following subsection.

2.2 Armijo-Wolfe Line Search

We consider inexact line search step size $\eta_k > 0$ that satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions

$$f(x_k + \eta_k d_k) \leq f(x_k) + \alpha \eta_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k, \quad (4)$$

$$\nabla f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)^\top d_k \geq \beta \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k, \quad (5)$$

where $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ and $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. The first condition in (4) is known as the Armijo condition, which ensures that the step size η_k gives a sufficient decrease in objective function f . The second condition in (5) is known as the curvature condition, which guarantees that the slope $\nabla f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)^\top d_k$ at η_k is not strongly negative. Otherwise, it indicates that we can significantly decrease the function value by further moving along the direction d_k . Together, the conditions in (4) and (5) provide an upper and lower bound on the admissible step size η_k , respectively. We should also add that in some references, the conditions in the Armijo-Wolfe line search are known as the weak Wolfe conditions [Wol69], [Wol71]. In the following lemma, we present some key properties for the case that the step size η_k satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider the BFGS method with Armijo-Wolfe inexact line search, where the step size satisfies the conditions in (4) and (5). Then, for any initial point x_0 and any symmetric positive definite initial Hessian approximation matrix B_0 , the following results hold for all $k \geq 0$:*

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})}{-g_k^\top s_k} \geq \alpha, \quad \frac{y_k^\top s_k}{-g_k^\top s_k} \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{and} \quad f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k).$$

Proof. Recall that $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$. Given the condition in (4) and the fact that $s_k = \eta_k d_k$, we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k) + \alpha g_k^\top s_k.$$

Moreover, since B_k is symmetric positive definite, we have $-g_k^\top s_k = \eta_k g_k^\top B_k^{-1} g_k > 0$ (unless $g_k = 0$ and we are at the optimal solution). This further leads to the first claim, which is

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})}{-g_k^\top s_k} \geq \alpha.$$

Similarly, the above argument implies that $\alpha g_k^\top s_k < 0$ and as a result $f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k)$ and the last claim also follows.

To prove the second claim, we leverage the condition in (5). Specifically, if we subtract $g_k^\top d_k$ from both sides of that condition, we obtain that

$$(g_{k+1} - g_k)^\top d_k \geq (\beta - 1) g_k^\top d_k$$

Next, using the fact that $s_k = \eta_k d_k$, by multiplying both sides by η_k and use the simplification $y_k = g_{k+1} - g_k$ we obtain that

$$y_k^\top s_k \geq (\beta - 1) g_k^\top s_k = -g_k^\top s_k (1 - \beta).$$

Again using the argument that $-g_k^\top s_k$ is positive (if we are not at the optimal solution), we can divide both sides of the above inequality by $-g_k^\top s_k$, leading to the second claim. \square

Remark 2.1 (Discussion on other line search schemes). *While in this paper we only focus on the Armijo-Wolfe line search (specified by conditions in (4) and (5)), our results are also valid for some other line search schemes that require stricter conditions. For instance, in the strong Wolfe line search scheme, the required conditions for the step size are*

$$f(x_k + \eta_k d_k) \leq f(x_k) + \alpha \eta_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k, \quad |\nabla f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)^\top d_k| \leq \beta \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k, \quad (6)$$

with $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ and $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, if a step size η_k satisfies the strong Wolfe conditions, it also satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions.

Another commonly employed line search scheme is Armijo-Goldstein, which imposes the conditions

$$-c_1 \eta_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k \leq f(x_k) - f(x_k + \eta_k d_k) \leq -c_2 \eta_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k,$$

with $0 < c_1 \leq c_2 < 1$. Note that the lower bound on $f(x_k) - f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)$ in the Armijo-Goldstein line search indicates that the step size η_k satisfies the sufficient decrease condition in (4) required for the Armijo-Wolfe conditions, with $\alpha = c_1$. Moreover, given the convexity of f , the upper bound on $f(x_k) - f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)$ in the Armijo-Goldstein line search suggests that $-\eta_k \nabla f(x_k + \eta_k d_k)^\top d_k \leq f(x_k) - f(x_k + \eta_k d_k) \leq -c_2 \eta_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k$. Thus, the step size η_k also meets the curvature condition in (5) required in the Armijo-Wolfe conditions with $\beta = c_2$. Consequently, all convergence results derived in this paper under the Armijo-Wolfe line search conditions are also valid for both the strong Wolfe line search and the Armijo-Goldstein line search.

3 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we present our theoretical framework for analyzing the global linear convergence rates of the BFGS method with the Armijo-Wolfe line search scheme. Our convergence framework is inspired by the approach introduced in [JJM24] for analyzing BFGS with an exact line search. To simplify our presentation, we first introduce some necessary definitions and notations in the following subsection.

3.1 Preliminaries

We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the ℓ_2 -norm of a vector. We denote \mathbb{S}_{++}^d as the set of symmetric positive definite matrices with dimension $d \times d$. Given two symmetric matrices A and B , we write $A \preceq B$ if and only if $B - A$ is symmetric positive semi-definite. We define $\mathbf{Tr}(A)$ as the trace of a matrix A and $\mathbf{Det}(A)$ as the determinant of a matrix A . Further, define the sequence C_k as

$$C_k := \frac{M}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \sqrt{2(f(x_k) - f(x_*))}, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (7)$$

where M is the Lipschitz constant of the Hessian defined in Assumption 2.3 and μ is the strong convexity parameter introduced in Assumption 2.1. Note that C_k is an important parameter in our analysis for measuring the suboptimality of the iterates.

To analyze the dynamics of the Hessian approximation matrices $\{B_k\}_{k=0}^{+\infty}$, we will use the following potential function $\Psi(A)$

$$\Psi(A) := \mathbf{Tr}(A) - d - \log \mathbf{Det}(A), \quad (8)$$

which is well-defined for any matrix $A \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$. This potential function was first introduced in [BN89] and it captures the discrepancy between A and the identity matrix I . Note that $\Psi(A) \geq 0$ for any $A \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ and $\Psi(A) = 0$ if and only if $A = I$.

Before we start convergence analysis, given any weight matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, we first define the weighted versions of the vectors g_k, s_k, y_k, d_k and the matrix B_k as

$$\hat{g}_k = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_k, \quad \hat{s}_k = P^{\frac{1}{2}} s_k, \quad \hat{y}_k = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} y_k, \quad \hat{d}_k = P^{\frac{1}{2}} d_k, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{B}_k = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_k P^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (10)$$

Note that these weighted matrices and vectors preserve many properties of their unweighted counterparts. Below, we list two key properties:

$$\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k = g_k^\top s_k \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k = y_k^\top s_k. \quad (11)$$

Similarly, the update for the weighted version of Hessian approximation matrices closely mirrors the update of their unweighted counterparts, as noted in the following expression:

$$\hat{B}_{k+1} = \hat{B}_k - \frac{\hat{B}_k \hat{s}_k \hat{s}_k^\top \hat{B}_k}{\hat{s}_k^\top \hat{B}_k \hat{s}_k} + \frac{\hat{y}_k \hat{y}_k^\top}{\hat{s}_k^\top \hat{y}_k}, \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Finally, we need to define a key quantity, $\hat{\theta}_k$, which captures the angle between the weighted descent direction and the negative of the weighted gradient direction. In other words, $\cos(\hat{\theta}_k)$ is formally defined as:

$$\cos(\hat{\theta}_k) = \frac{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{\|\hat{g}_k\| \|\hat{s}_k\|}. \quad (12)$$

The behavior of this parameter $\cos(\hat{\theta}_k)$ plays a fundamental role in the convergence analysis of BFGS as we show in our analysis.

3.2 Intermediate Results

In this section, we formally present our framework used for the convergence analysis of BFGS with an inexact line search scheme. First, in the following proposition, we characterize the relationship between the function value decrease at each iteration and some quantities including the key angle $\hat{\theta}_k$ defined in (12).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For a given weight matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, recall the weighted vectors defined in (9). For any weight matrix P and for all $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_*) \leq \left(1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{g}_k}{\hat{m}_k} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k) \right) (f(x_k) - f(x_*)), \quad (13)$$

where \hat{q}_k and \hat{m}_k are defined as

$$\hat{q}_k := \frac{\|\hat{g}_k\|^2}{f(x_k) - f(x_*)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{m}_k := \frac{\hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{\|\hat{s}_k\|^2}. \quad (14)$$

As a corollary, we have that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left[1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right]^k. \quad (15)$$

Proof. First, we note that $\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k = g_k^\top s_k$ and $\hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k = y_k^\top s_k$ by (11). Using the result $\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})}{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k} \geq \alpha$ in Lemma 2.1, we can show that

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq -\alpha \hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k = \alpha \frac{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{\|\hat{g}_k\|^2} \|\hat{g}_k\|^2. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, note that we have $\frac{\hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k} \geq 1 - \beta$ by Lemma 2.1. Hence, using the definition of $\hat{\theta}_k$ in (12) and the definition of \hat{m}_k in (14), it follows that

$$\frac{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{\|\hat{g}_k\|^2} = \frac{(\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k)^2}{\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \|\hat{s}_k\|^2} \frac{\|\hat{s}_k\|^2}{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k} = \frac{(\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k)^2}{\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \|\hat{s}_k\|^2} \frac{\hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k}{-\hat{g}_k^\top \hat{s}_k} \geq (1 - \beta) \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k)}{\hat{m}_k}.$$

Furthermore, we have $\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 = \hat{q}_k(f(x_k) - f(x_*))$ from the definition of \hat{q}_k in (14). Thus, the inequality in (16) can be rewritten as

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{q}_k}{\hat{m}_k} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k) (f(x_k) - f(x_*)).$$

By rearranging the term in the above equality, we obtain (13). To prove the inequality in (15), note that for any $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{f(x_{i+1}) - f(x_*)}{f(x_i) - f(x_*)} \leq \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right),$$

where the last equality is due to (13). Note that all the terms of the form $1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)$ are non-negative, for any $i \geq 0$. Thus, by applying the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right) &\leq \left[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right) \right]^k \\ &= \left[1 - \frac{\alpha(1 - \beta)}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right]^k \leq \left[1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right]^k. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. *The result in Proposition 3.1 provides a relatively tight bound on the contraction factor, as it closely resembles the contraction factor that would be achieved if BFGS were run with an exact line search, as shown in Proposition 1 of [JJM24]. In fact, the only difference is the additional $\alpha(1 - \beta)$ term in the contraction factor, which stems from the inexact line search. This term is an absolute constant dependent on the line-search parameters and has minimal impact on the convergence rate, while effectively avoiding the need for an exact search in the choice of step size.*

We observe from the above proposition that the convergence rate of BFGS with Armijo-Wolfe line search depends on two products: $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i$ and $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i}$. Thus, to establish an explicit rate, we need to lower bound on $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i$ and $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i}$. As we will demonstrate, the lower bounds established for $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i$ depend on the choice of the weight matrix. Since different weight matrices are used in various sections of the paper, we will establish appropriate lower bounds for $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i$ separately for each case. However, the lower bound for the product $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i}$ does not require separate treatment. We explicitly establish this in the forthcoming proposition by directly referencing Proposition 2 from [JJM24], a classical result for the quasi-Newton method, as discussed in [NW06, Section 6.4].

Proposition 3.2 ([JJM24, Proposition 2]). *Let $\{B_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the Hessian approximation matrices generated by the BFGS update in (3). For a given weight matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, recall the weighted vectors defined in (9) and the weighted matrix in (10). Then we have*

$$\Psi(\hat{B}_{k+1}) \leq \Psi(\hat{B}_k) + \frac{\|\hat{y}_k\|^2}{\hat{y}_k^\top \hat{s}_k} - 1 + \log \frac{\cos^2 \hat{\theta}_k}{\hat{m}_k}, \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

where \hat{m}_k is defined in (14) and $\cos(\hat{\theta}_k)$ is defined in (12). As a corollary, we have for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq -\Psi(\hat{B}_0) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\|\hat{y}_i\|^2}{\hat{y}_i^\top \hat{s}_i}\right). \quad (17)$$

If we take exponentiation on both sides of the above inequality (17) in Proposition 3.2, we can obtain a lower bound for the product $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i}$ with the sum $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\|\hat{y}_i\|^2}{\hat{y}_i^\top \hat{s}_i}$ and $\Psi(\hat{B}_0)$. This classical inequality describing the relationship between the ratio $\frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k)}{\hat{m}_k}$ and the potential function $\Psi(\cdot)$ plays a critical role in the following convergence analysis.

With these preparations and preliminaries in place, we are now set to demonstrate the global linear convergence rates of the BFGS quasi-Newton method using the Armijo-Wolfe line search in the following sections.

4 Global Linear Convergence Rates

Building on the tools introduced in Section 3, we are ready to establish explicit global linear convergence rates for the BFGS method when implemented using the Armijo-Wolfe

line search. Our proof is based on the fundamental inequality in (15) from Proposition 3.1, combined with lower bounds on $\frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k)}{\hat{m}_k}$ and \hat{q}_k . In this section, we choose the weight matrix P as $P = LI$ and accordingly define the weighted initial matrix \bar{B}_0 as:

$$\bar{B}_0 = \frac{1}{L}B_0.$$

The following theorem presents our first global linear convergence rate of the BFGS method for any choice of $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$. Note that the following result only assumes the objective function is μ -strongly convex and its gradient is L -Lipschitz.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, we have the following global linear convergence rate:*

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}{k}} \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{\kappa}\right)^k, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Recall that we choose $P = LI$ throughout the proof. Note that given this weight matrix, it can be easily verified that $\frac{\|\hat{y}_k\|^2}{\hat{s}_k^\top \hat{y}_k} \leq 1$ for any $k \geq 0$ by using [JJM24, Lemma 5(a)]. Hence, we use (17) in Proposition 3.2 to obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq -\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\|\hat{y}_i\|^2}{\hat{s}_i^\top \hat{y}_i}\right) \geq -\Psi(\bar{B}_0),$$

which further implies that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq e^{-\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}.$$

Moreover, for the choice $P = LI$, it can be shown that $\hat{q}_k = \frac{\|g_k\|^2}{L(f(x_k) - f(x_*))} \geq \frac{2}{\kappa}$ by using [JJM24, Lemma 4(a)], which leads to

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \geq \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq \left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^k e^{-\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}.$$

Thus, it follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left[1 - \alpha(1-\beta) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)\right)^{\frac{1}{k}}\right]^k \leq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}{k}} \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{\kappa}\right)^k.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. *The authors in [JJM24] considered the BFGS method with an exact line search and established a global linear convergence rate of $\left(1 - e^{-\frac{\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}{k}} \frac{1}{\kappa(1+\sqrt{\kappa})}\right)^k$. In comparison, our result in (18) achieves a faster linear rate by eliminating a factor of $\sqrt{\kappa}$ in*

the denominator. We note that this improvement comes from the use of Armijo-Wolfe line search conditions. Specifically, under these conditions, we prove that $\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})}{-g_k^\top s_k} \geq \alpha$ as shown in Lemma 2.1, where $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ is a line search parameter. In contrast, using exact line search, the authors in [JJM24] proved that $\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})}{-g_k^\top s_k} \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa+1}}$, thus leading to the extra $\sqrt{\kappa}$ factor in their rate.

From Theorem 4.1, we observe that the linear convergence rate is determined by the quantity $\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$ (recall that $\bar{B}_0 = \frac{1}{L}B_0$). Thus, we consider two different initializations: $B_0 = LI$ and $B_0 = \mu I$. Specifically, note that in the first case where $B_0 = LI$, we have $\Psi(\bar{B}_0) = 0$ and thus it achieves the best linear convergence results according to Theorem 4.1. We present the corresponding global linear rate in Corollary 4.2.

Corollary 4.2 ($B_0 = LI$). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 = LI$, we have the following global linear convergence rate:*

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{\kappa}\right)^k, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (19)$$

In the second case where $B_0 = \mu I$, we have $\Psi(\bar{B}_0) = \Psi(\frac{\mu}{L}I) = d(\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1 + \log \kappa) \leq d \log \kappa$. The corresponding global linear rate is presented in Corollary 4.3.

Corollary 4.3 ($B_0 = \mu I$). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 = \mu I$, we have the following global convergence rate:*

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{d \log \kappa}{k}} \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{\kappa}\right)^k, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Moreover, when $k \geq d \log \kappa$, we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{3\kappa}\right)^k. \quad (20)$$

Corollary 4.2 demonstrates that, when initialized with $B_0 = LI$, the BFGS method employing the Armijo-Wolfe line search achieves a linear rate of $\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{\kappa}\right)^k$, which matches the rate of gradient descent. Conversely, as shown in Corollary 4.3, BFGS initialized with $B_0 = \mu I$ also attains a similar linear convergence rate but requires additional $d \log \kappa$ iterations. This observation might suggest we should prefer the initialization $B_0 = LI$. However, as will be discussed in the following section, when the number of iterations is sufficiently large, BFGS with either initialization can achieve a faster linear convergence rate that is independent of the condition number κ . Moreover, in some scenarios, initializing with $B_0 = \mu I$ may actually result in fewer total iterations needed to reach this faster convergence rate. We will discuss this trade-off in more detail after presenting the linear rate in the following section.

5 Condition Number-Independent Linear Convergence Rates

In this section, we improve the result in the previous section and establish a non-asymptotic, condition number-free global linear convergence rate of the BFGS method when deployed with the Armijo-Wolfe line search. As mentioned earlier, this result requires an additional assumption that the objective function's Hessian is also Lipschitz continuous. Our analysis builds upon the methodology used to analyze global linear convergence rates in the previous section, with a primary difference in the choice of the weight matrix: rather than using $P = LI$, we use $P = \nabla^2 f(x_*)$ for proving our condition number-independent global linear rate. As a result, in this section, the weighted initial matrix \tilde{B}_0 is given by:

$$\tilde{B}_0 = \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_0 \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In the following proposition, we first provide a general global convergence bound with an arbitrary initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$. Later, we will specialize Proposition 5.1 with the initialization $B_0 = LI$ and $B_0 = \mu I$ and obtain concrete global linear convergence rates independent of the condition number.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). Recall the definition of C_k in (7) and $\Psi(\cdot)$ in (8). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, the following result holds:*

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - 2\alpha(1 - \beta) e^{-\frac{\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + 3 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i}{k}} \right)^k, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Proof. Recall that we choose the weight matrix as $P = \nabla^2 f(x_*)$ throughout the proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we start from the key inequality in (13), but we apply different bounds on the \hat{q}_k and $\frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_k)}{\hat{m}_k}$. Specifically, by using [JJM24, Lemma 5(b)], we have $\frac{\|\hat{y}_i\|^2}{\hat{s}_i^\top \hat{y}_i} \leq 1 + C_i$ for any $i \geq 0$. Hence, we use (17) in Proposition 3.2 to obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq -\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\|\hat{y}_i\|^2}{\hat{s}_i^\top \hat{y}_i} \right) \geq -\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i,$$

which further implies that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i)}{\hat{m}_i} \geq e^{-\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i}. \quad (21)$$

Moreover, since $\hat{q}_k \geq \frac{2}{(1+C_k)^2}$ for any $k \geq 0$ by using [JJM24, Lemma 4(b)], we get

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{q}_i \geq \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{2}{(1+C_i)^2} \geq 2^k \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} e^{-2C_i} = 2^k e^{-2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i}, \quad (22)$$

where we use the inequality $1 + x \leq e^x$ for any $x \geq 0$. Combining (22), (21), and (15) from Proposition 3.1, we prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} &\leq \left[1 - \alpha(1 - \beta) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\hat{q}_i}{\hat{m}_i} \cos^2(\hat{\theta}_i) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right]^k \\ &\leq \left(1 - 2\alpha(1 - \beta) e^{-\frac{\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 3 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i}{k}} \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 5.1 demonstrates that the convergence rate of BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search is influenced by $\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$ and the sum $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i$. The first term $\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$ is a constant that depends on our choice of the initial Hessian approximation matrix B_0 . To establish an upper bound on the second term $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i$, we will leverage the non-asymptotic global linear convergence rate provided in Theorem 4.1. This analysis culminates in the following theorem, which guarantees that BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search, initialized with any Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, achieves a linear convergence rate independent of the condition number when the number of iterations is sufficiently large.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, when*

$$k \geq \Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{9}{\alpha(1 - \beta)}C_0\kappa, \quad (23)$$

we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{3} \right)^k. \quad (24)$$

Proof. When we have $k \geq \Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 3 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i$, Proposition 5.1 implies that $\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{e} \right)^k \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{3} \right)^k$, which leads to the linear rate in (24). Hence, it is sufficient to establish an upper bound on $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i$. Recall that $C_i := \frac{M}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \sqrt{2(f(x_i) - f(x_*))}$ defined in (7). We decompose the sum into two parts: $\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil - 1} C_i$ and $\sum_{i=\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil}^k C_i$. For the first part, note that since $f(x_{i+1}) \leq f(x_i)$ by Lemma 2.1, we also have $C_{i+1} \leq C_i$ for $i \geq 0$. Hence, we have $\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil - 1} C_i \leq C_0 \lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil \leq C_0(\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 1)$. Moreover, by Theorem 4.1, when $k \geq \Psi(\bar{B}_0)$ we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\Psi(\bar{B}_0)}{k}} \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{\kappa} \right)^k \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{e\kappa} \right)^k \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1 - \beta)}{3\kappa} \right)^k.$$

Hence, this further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil}^k C_i &= C_0 \sum_{i=\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil}^k \sqrt{\frac{f(x_i) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)}} \\
&\leq C_0 \sum_{i=\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil}^k \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{3\kappa}\right)^{\frac{i}{2}} \\
&\leq C_0 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{3\kappa}\right)^{\frac{i}{2}} \leq C_0 \left(\frac{3\kappa}{\alpha(1-\beta)} - 1\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1-\rho)^{\frac{i}{2}} = \frac{\sqrt{1-\rho}}{1-\sqrt{1-\rho}} = \frac{\sqrt{1-\rho}+1-\rho}{\rho} \leq \frac{2}{\rho} - 1$ for any $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Hence, by combining both inequalities, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_i = \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil - 1} C_i + \sum_{i=\lceil \Psi(\bar{B}_0) \rceil}^k C_i \leq C_0 \Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{3C_0\kappa}{\alpha(1-\beta)}.$$

Hence, this proves that (24) is satisfied when $k \geq \Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{9C_0\kappa}{\alpha(1-\beta)}$. \square

The result in Theorem 5.2 demonstrates that when the number of iterations meets the condition $k \geq \Psi(\bar{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa$, BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search achieves a condition number-independent linear convergence rate. The choice of the initial matrix B_0 is critical, as it directly influences the required number of iterations to achieve this rate through $\tilde{B}_0 = \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_0 \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\bar{B}_0 = \frac{1}{L} B_0$. Specifically, different choices of B_0 lead to variations in $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$, thereby affecting the number of iterations needed to reach condition-free linear convergence. While it is possible to optimize the choice of B_0 to minimize the expression $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$, in this paper we focus on two practical initialization schemes: $B_0 = LI$ and $B_0 = \mu I$. In the forthcoming corollaries, we will present the specific convergence results derived from Theorem 5.2 using these initial Hessian approximations.

Corollary 5.3 ($B_0 = LI$). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 hold. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method, where the step size satisfies the Armijo-Wolfe conditions in (4) and (5). For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 = LI$, when*

$$k \geq d\kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa,$$

we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{3}\right)^k. \quad (25)$$

Proof. Since $B_0 = LI$, we have $\bar{B}_0 = \frac{1}{L}B_0 = I$ and $\tilde{B}_0 = \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_0 \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = L\nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-1}$. Thus, it holds that $\Psi(\bar{B}_0) = \Psi(I) = 0$. Moreover, by Assumptions 2.1 and

2.2, we have $\frac{1}{L}I \preceq \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-1} \preceq \frac{1}{\mu}I$, which implies that $I \preceq \tilde{B}_0 \preceq \kappa I$. Thus, we further have

$$\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) \leq \mathbf{Tr}(\kappa I) - d - \log \mathbf{Det}(I) = d\kappa - d \leq d\kappa.$$

Combining these two results, the threshold in (23) can be bounded by $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa \leq d\kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa$. Hence, by Theorem 5.2, the linear rate in (25) is achieved when $k \geq d\kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa$. \square

Corollary 5.4 ($B_0 = \mu I$). *Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the iterates generated by the BFGS method with inexact line search (4), (5) and suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 hold. For any initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 = \mu I$, when*

$$k \geq (1 + 3C_0)d \log \kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa,$$

we have that

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(x_*)}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha(1-\beta)}{3}\right)^k. \quad (26)$$

Proof. Since $B_0 = \mu I$, we have $\bar{B}_0 = \frac{1}{L}B_0 = \frac{1}{\kappa}I$ and $\tilde{B}_0 = \nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}B_0\nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \mu\nabla^2 f(x_*)^{-1}$. Thus, it holds that $\Psi(\bar{B}_0) = \Psi(\frac{1}{\kappa}I) = \frac{d}{\kappa} - d + d \log \kappa \leq d \log \kappa$. Moreover, by Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, we have $\frac{1}{\kappa}I \preceq \tilde{B}_0 \preceq I$. This implies that

$$\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) = \mathbf{Tr}(\tilde{B}_0) - d - \log \mathbf{Det}(\tilde{B}_0) \leq \mathbf{Tr}(I) - d - \log \mathbf{Det}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa}I\right) = d \log \kappa.$$

Combining these two results, the threshold in (23) can be bounded by $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0) + 3C_0\Psi(\bar{B}_0) + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa \leq (1 + 3C_0)d \log \kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa$. Hence, by Theorem 5.2, the linear rate in (26) is satisfied when $k \geq (1 + 3C_0)d \log \kappa + \frac{9}{\alpha(1-\beta)}C_0\kappa$. \square

As evident in the proofs of Corollaries 5.3 and 5.4, the choice of $B_0 = LI$ minimizes the second term $\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$, yet the first term $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0)$ can be as large as κd . On the other hand, the choice of $B_0 = \mu I$ ensures that both $\Psi(\bar{B}_0)$ and $\Psi(\tilde{B}_0)$ can be upper bounded by $d \log \kappa$. Thus, if the initial point satisfies $C_0 \ll \kappa$, or equivalently $f(x_0) - f(x_*) \ll \frac{L^2\mu}{M^2}$, then BFGS with $B_0 = \mu I$ requires fewer number of iterations to achieve the condition number-independent linear convergence rate.

5.1 Discussions on the total iteration complexity

Using the two established linear convergence results in Theorems 4.1 and 5.2, we can characterize the total number of iterations required for the BFGS method with the Armijo-Wolfe line search to find a solution with function suboptimality less than ϵ . However, as discussed above, the choice of the initial Hessian approximation B_0 heavily influences the number of iterations required to observe these rates. To simplify our discussion, we focus on the two practical initialization schemes: $B_0 = LI$ and $B_0 = \mu I$.

- (a) $B_0 = LI$: In this case, the first linear convergence result established in Corollary 4.2 leads to a global complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, which is on par with gradient descent. Moreover, the second result in Corollary 5.3 implies a complexity of $\mathcal{O}((d + C_0)\kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, where the first term represents the number of iterations required to attain the linear rate in (25), and the second term represents the additional number of iterations needed to achieve the desired accuracy ϵ from the condition number-independent linear rate. Given these points, if we regard the line search parameters α and β as absolute constants, the overall iteration complexity of BFGS with $B_0 = LI$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\min\left\{\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, (d + C_0)\kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\}\right).$$

- (b) $B_0 = \mu I$: Similarly, in this case, the first linear convergence result in Corollary 4.3 establishes a global complexity of $\mathcal{O}(d \log \kappa + \kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, where the first term represents the number of iterations before the linear convergence rate in (20) begins, and the second term arises from the linear rate itself. Additionally, following the same argument, the second result in Corollary 5.4 indicates a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(C_0 d \log \kappa + C_0 \kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Given these points, the overall iteration complexity of BFGS with $B_0 = \mu I$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\min\left\{d \log \kappa + \kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, C_0 d \log \kappa + C_0 \kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\}\right).$$

We remark that the comparison between these two complexity bounds depends on the relative values of κ , d , C_0 , and ϵ , and neither is uniformly better than the other. It is worth noting that for BFGS with $B_0 = LI$, we achieve a complexity that is consistently superior to the $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ complexity of gradient descent. Moreover, in scenarios where $C_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $d \ll \kappa$, BFGS with $B_0 = \mu I$ could result in an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, which is much more favorable than that of gradient descent.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we analyzed the global non-asymptotic linear convergence rates of the BFGS method when implemented with the Armijo-Wolfe line search. We demonstrated that for an objective function that is μ -strongly convex and has an L -Lipschitz gradient, BFGS achieves a global convergence rate of $(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa})^k$, where $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$. Additionally, assuming that the objective function's Hessian is M -Lipschitz, we show that BFGS achieves a linear convergence rate determined only by the line search parameters and independent of the condition number. Both are global convergence results that hold for any initial point x_0 and any initial Hessian approximation matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, yet the choice of B_0 influences the number of iterations required to observe these rates. Specifically, when initialized with $B_0 = LI$, we demonstrate that BFGS with the Armijo-Wolfe line search achieves a total iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\min\{\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, (d + C_0)\kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\})$, where $C_0 = \frac{M\sqrt{f(x_0) - f(x_*)}}{\mu^{3/2}}$ depends on the initial function suboptimality. Moreover, the initialization $B_0 = \mu I$ leads to an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\min\{d \log \kappa + \kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, C_0 d \log \kappa + C_0 \kappa + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\})$.

References

- [Al-98] M. Al-Baali. “Global and superlinear convergence of a restricted class of self-scaling methods with inexact line searches, for convex functions”. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 9.2 (1998), pp. 191–203 (page 2).
- [Bro65] C. G. Broyden. “A class of methods for solving nonlinear simultaneous equations”. *Mathematics of computation* 19.92 (1965), pp. 577–593 (page 2).
- [Bro70] C. G. Broyden. “The convergence of single-rank quasi-Newton methods”. *Mathematics of Computation* 24.110 (1970), pp. 365–382 (page 2).
- [BDM73] C. G. Broyden, J. E. Dennis Jr, and J. J. Moré. “On the local and superlinear convergence of quasi-Newton methods”. *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics* 12.3 (1973), pp. 223–245 (page 2).
- [BKS96] R. H. Byrd, H. F. Khalfan, and R. B. Schnabel. “Analysis of a symmetric rank-one trust region method”. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 6.4 (1996), pp. 1025–1039 (page 2).
- [BNY87] R. H. Byrd, J. Nocedal, and Y. Yuan. “Global convergence of a class of quasi-Newton methods on convex problems”. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 24.5 (1987), pp. 1171–1190 (page 2).
- [BN89] R. H. Byrd and J. Nocedal. “A Tool for the Analysis of Quasi-Newton Methods with Application to Unconstrained Minimization”. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, Vol. 26, No. 3* (1989) (pages 2, 7).
- [CGT91] A. R. Conn, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. “Convergence of quasi-Newton matrices generated by the symmetric rank one update”. *Mathematical programming* 50.1-3 (1991), pp. 177–195 (page 2).
- [Dav59] W. Davidon. *Variable metric method for minimization*. Tech. rep. Argonne National Lab., Lemont, Ill., 1959 (page 2).
- [DMT89] J. Dennis, H. J. Martinez, and R. A. Tapia. “Convergence theory for the structured BFGS secant method with an application to nonlinear least squares”. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 61.2 (1989), pp. 161–178 (page 2).
- [DM74] J. E. Dennis and J. J. Moré. “A characterization of superlinear convergence and its application to quasi-Newton methods”. *Mathematics of computation* 28.126 (1974), pp. 549–560 (page 2).
- [Fle70] R. Fletcher. “A new approach to variable metric algorithms”. *The computer journal* 13.3 (1970), pp. 317–322 (page 2).
- [FP63] R. Fletcher and M. J. Powell. “A rapidly convergent descent method for minimization”. *The computer journal* 6.2 (1963), pp. 163–168 (page 2).
- [GG19] W. Gao and D. Goldfarb. “Quasi-Newton methods: superlinear convergence without line searches for self-concordant functions”. *Optimization Methods and Software* 34.1 (2019), pp. 194–217 (page 2).

- [Gol70] D. Goldfarb. “A family of variable-metric methods derived by variational means”. *Mathematics of computation* 24.109 (1970), pp. 23–26 (page 2).
- [GGR16] R. Gower, D. Goldfarb, and P. Richtárik. “Stochastic block BFGS: Squeezing more curvature out of data”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2016, pp. 1869–1878 (page 2).
- [GR17] R. M. Gower and P. Richtárik. “Randomized quasi-Newton updates are linearly convergent matrix inversion algorithms”. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 38.4 (2017), pp. 1380–1409 (page 2).
- [GT82] A. Griewank and P. L. Toint. “Local convergence analysis for partitioned quasi-Newton updates”. *Numerische Mathematik* 39.3 (1982), pp. 429–448 (page 2).
- [JD23] Z.-Y. Ji and Y.-H. Dai. “Greedy PSB methods with explicit superlinear convergence”. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 85.3 (2023), pp. 753–786 (page 2).
- [JJM23] R. Jiang, Q. Jin, and A. Mokhtari. “Online Learning Guided Curvature Approximation: A Quasi-Newton Method with Global Non-Asymptotic Superlinear Convergence”. In: *Proceedings of Thirty Sixth Conference on Learning Theory*. Vol. 195. 2023, pp. 1962–1992 (page 2).
- [JM23] R. Jiang and A. Mokhtari. “Accelerated quasi-newton proximal extragradient: Faster rate for smooth convex optimization”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023) (page 2).
- [JJM24] Q. Jin, R. Jiang, and A. Mokhtari. “Non-asymptotic Global Convergence Rates of BFGS with Exact Line Search”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01267* (2024) (pages 2, 3, 6, 9–12).
- [JM20] Q. Jin and A. Mokhtari. “Non-asymptotic Superlinear Convergence of Standard Quasi-Newton Methods”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13607* (2020) (page 2).
- [KBS93] H. F. Khalfan, R. H. Byrd, and R. B. Schnabel. “A theoretical and experimental study of the symmetric rank-one update”. *SIAM J. Optim.* 3.1 (1993), pp. 1–24 (page 2).
- [KGRR20] D. Kovalev, R. M. Gower, P. Richtárik, and A. Rogozin. “Fast linear convergence of randomized BFGS”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11337* (2020) (page 2).
- [KTSK23] V. Krutikov, E. Tovbis, P. Stanimirović, and L. Kazakovtsev. “On the Convergence Rate of Quasi-Newton Methods on Strongly Convex Functions with Lipschitz Gradient”. *Mathematics* 11.23 (2023), p. 4715 (page 2).
- [LF99] D. Li and M. Fukushima. “A Globally and Superlinearly Convergent Gauss–Newton-Based BFGS Method for Symmetric Nonlinear Equations”. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 37.1 (1999), pp. 152–172 (page 2).
- [LYZ22] D. Lin, H. Ye, and Z. Zhang. “Explicit convergence rates of greedy and random quasi-Newton methods”. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23.162 (2022), pp. 1–40 (page 2).

- [LYZ21] D. Lin, H. Ye, and Z. Zhang. “Greedy and random quasi-Newton methods with faster explicit superlinear convergence”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 6646–6657 (page 2).
- [MER18] A. Mokhtari, M. Eisen, and A. Ribeiro. “IQN: An incremental quasi-Newton method with local superlinear convergence rate”. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 28.2 (2018), pp. 1670–1698 (page 2).
- [NW06] J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer Science Business Media, 2006 (pages 3, 9).
- [Pow76] M. J. Powell. “Some global convergence properties of a variable metric algorithm for minimization without exact line searches”. *Nonlinear programming* 9.1 (1976), pp. 53–72 (page 2).
- [Pow71] M. Powell. “On the convergence of the variable metric algorithm”. *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics* 7.1 (1971), pp. 21–36 (page 2).
- [RN21a] A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. “Greedy Quasi-Newton Methods with Explicit Superlinear Convergence”. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 31.1 (2021), pp. 785–811 (page 2).
- [RN21b] A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. “New Results on Superlinear Convergence of Classical Quasi-Newton Methods”. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 188.3 (2021), pp. 744–769 (page 2).
- [RN21c] A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. “Rates of Superlinear Convergence for Classical Quasi-Newton Methods”. *Mathematical Programming* (2021), pp. 1–32 (page 2).
- [Sha70] D. F. Shanno. “Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization”. *Mathematics of computation* 24.111 (1970), pp. 647–656 (page 2).
- [Wol69] P. Wolfe. “Convergence Conditions for Ascent Methods”. *SIAM Review* 11.2 (1969), pp. 226–235 (page 5).
- [Wol71] P. Wolfe. “Convergence Conditions for Ascent Methods. II: Some Corrections”. *SIAM Review* 13.2 (1971), pp. 185–188 (page 5).
- [YOY07] H. Yabe, H. Ogasawara, and M. Yoshino. “Local and superlinear convergence of quasi-Newton methods based on modified secant conditions”. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 205.1 (2007), pp. 617–632 (page 2).
- [YLCZ23] H. Ye, D. Lin, X. Chang, and Z. Zhang. “Towards explicit superlinear convergence rate for SR1”. *Mathematical Programming* 199.1 (2023), pp. 1273–1303 (page 2).
- [Yua91] Y. Yuan. “A modified BFGS algorithm for unconstrained optimization”. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 11.3 (1991), pp. 325–332 (page 2).