

On some Statistical Properties of Multivariate q -Gaussian Distribution and its application to Smoothed Functional Algorithms[☆]

Debarghya Ghoshdastidar, Ambedkar Dukkipati, Shalabh Bhatnagar

*Department of Computer Science & Automation
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore - 560012
email: {debarghya.g, ambedkar, shalabh}@csa.iisc.ernet.in*

Abstract

The importance of the q -Gaussian distribution lies in its power-law nature, and its close association with Gaussian, Cauchy and uniform distributions. This distribution arises from maximization of a generalized information measure. In this work, we study some key properties related to higher order moments and q -moments of the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution. Further, we present an algorithm to generate multivariate q -Gaussian distribution.

We use these results of the q -Gaussian distribution to improve upon the smoothing properties of Gaussian and Cauchy kernels. Based on this, we propose a Smoothed Functional (SF) scheme for gradient and Hessian estimation using q -Gaussian distribution. Our work extends the class of distributions that can be used in SF algorithms by including the q -Gaussian distributions for a range of q -values. We propose four two-timescale algorithms for optimization of a stochastic objective function using gradient descent and Newton based search methods. We prove that each of the proposed algorithms converge to a local optimum. Performance of the algorithms is shown by simulation results on a queuing model.

Keywords: generalized information measures; q -Gaussian; comoments; smoothed functional algorithms; two-timescale stochastic approximation; gradient and Newton algorithms

1. Introduction

Shannon [37] provided the concept of entropy as a measure of information, or more precisely, a measure of uncertainty given by probability distributions. Rényi [32] was the first to introduce the concept of generalized measures of information when he proposed the first well-known generalization of Shannon entropy, known as α -entropy or Rényi entropy, based on Kolmogorov-Nagumo averages. Several other generalizations have also been studied in the literature [24, 30, 13], and have been extensively used in physics and other disciplines.

One of the most recently studied generalized information measure is the nonextensive entropy, due to Tsallis [44], defined as

$$H_q(p) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x)^q \ln_q(p(x)), \quad (1)$$

[☆]Part of this work has been presented in IEEE 2012 International Symposium on Information Theory [17].

where p is the probability mass function of the discrete random variable on the set \mathcal{X} , and the q -logarithm is defined as $\ln_q(x) = \frac{x^{1-q}-1}{1-q}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \neq 1$. It is called nonextensive because of its pseudo-additive nature [44], *i.e.*, $H_q(pr) = H_q(p) + H_q(r) + (1-q)H_q(p)H_q(r)$. Although this generalization had been introduced earlier by Havrda and Charvát [19], Tsallis provided interpretations in the context of statistical mechanics. Borges [10] presents a detailed discussion on the mathematical structure induced by this nonextensive entropy. Suyari [41] generalized the Shannon-Khinchin axioms to the nonextensive case. The most important characteristic of these generalized information measures is that, on maximization, they give rise power-law distributions, while maximization of Shannon entropy gives rise to exponential distributions.

The concept of maximization of information measure can be attributed to Kullback's minimum discrimination theorem [26], which establishes important connections between statistics and information theory. This theorem shows that exponential distributions can be obtained by minimizing Kullback-Leibler divergence under given moment constraints. One can consider maximum entropy [21] as a special case, where maximization of Shannon entropy under moment constraints leads to exponential distributions. For example, given mean and variance of a random variable, maximum entropy gives rise to Gaussian distribution.

While exponential distributions have been extensively studied and used in statistical modeling, the power-law behavior has been observed in most of the real-world data [3, 29]. As we mentioned earlier, the importance of Tsallis entropy has been attributed to its connections with power-law distributions. In this respect, recently Tsallis entropy has been used to study this behavior in different applications like finance, earthquakes and network traffic [1, 2]. Compared to the exponential family, the Tsallis distributions, *i.e.*, the family of distributions resulting from maximization of Tsallis entropy, have an additional shape parameter q , similar to that in (1), which controls the nature of the power-law tails.

In this paper, we study the multivariate form of q -Gaussian distributions, which are Type-II power-law distributions, obtained from Tsallis entropy maximization. Although, these distributions have been extensively studied in literature in context of generalized limit theorems [48, 49, 47] and practical applications [43, 36], the statistical aspects of the multivariate form of the distribution has not been looked into. Our main objective are (i) to study the statistical properties of the q -Gaussian distribution, and (ii) apply these distributions in smoothed functional algorithms for stochastic optimization.

Stochastic techniques play a key role in optimization problems, where the objective function does not have an analytical expression. Such problems are often encountered in discrete event systems, which are quite common in engineering and financial world. Most often, the data, obtained via statistical survey or simulation, contains only noisy estimates of the objective function to be optimized. One of the most commonly used solution methodologies involves stochastic approximation algorithms, particularly the Robbins-Monro Algorithm [33], which is used to find the zeros of a given function. Based on this approach, gradient descent algorithms have been developed, in which the parameters controlling the system track the zeros of the gradient of the objective. However, these algorithms require an estimate of the cost gradient. Kiefer and Wolfowitz [23] provide such a gradient estimate using several parallel simulations of the system. More efficient techniques for gradient estimation, using one or two simulations, have been developed based on the smoothed functional approach [22, 34], simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation [38], perturbation analysis [20] and likelihood ratio [28] methods. A stochastic variation of Newton-based optimization methods, also known as adaptive Newton-based schemes has also been studied

in the literature. These algorithms require estimation of the Hessian of the cost objective along with the gradient estimate. Such estimates may be obtained by finite differences [16, 35], simultaneous perturbation approaches [39] or smoothed functional schemes [5].

When the above estimation schemes are employed in gradient or Newton based optimization methods, the time complexity of the algorithms increase as each update iteration requires the estimation procedure. A more efficient approach is to simultaneously perform gradient estimation and parameter updation using different step-size schedules. These classes of algorithms constitute the multi-timescale stochastic approximation algorithms [6]. Two-timescale optimization algorithms have been developed using simultaneous perturbations [8, 9] and smoothed functional [7, 5] schemes. The main issue with such algorithms is that, although convergence of the algorithm to a local optimum is guaranteed, the global optimum is often not achieved in practice. Bhatnagar [5] proves that both gradient and Hessian SF schemes that are based on Gaussian perturbations converge to a local minima, and provides a detailed comparison of the performance of various multi-timescale algorithms for stochastic optimization on a queuing system. The results presented there indicate that the performance of the SF algorithms depends considerably on several tuning parameters, such as the variance of the normal distribution, and also the step-sizes.

We look into smoothed functional algorithms with power-law perturbations, arising out of maximization of Tsallis entropy. Prior work (Rubinstein [34]) indicated that the class of distributions that can be used for the perturbation random variables in SF algorithms include Gaussian, Cauchy and uniform distributions. Our main contribution is to include the q -Gaussian distribution to this class for a wide range of q -values, which encompass the above three distributions as special cases.

Summary of our contributions

Though stochastic optimization algorithms are guaranteed to converge to a local optimum of the objective function, the challenge is to achieve the global optimum. The smoothed functional schemes have become popular due to their smoothing effects on local fluctuations. However, the smoothing kernels used in practice (Gaussian or Cauchy) do not provide “ideal performance”. Although with proper tuning of parameters, we can reduce the cost, we do not achieve globally optimal performance many times. Hence, new methods are sought.

We propose a new SF method where the smoothing kernel is a q -Gaussian distribution, which is a power-law generalization of the Gaussian distribution, that result from maximization of generalized information measure. We prove an important result related to the comoments of multivariate q -Gaussian distributions. This result leads to better understanding of moments in the multivariate case. We study the existence conditions of the usual moments and q -moments of the multivariate q -Gaussian distributions. Moreover, though Thistleton [43] provides a method to sample the univariate q -Gaussian distribution, it cannot be extended to the multivariate case. We formally present an algorithm for generating samples from a multivariate q -Gaussian distribution using the results in [48].

We also show that the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution satisfies all the conditions for smoothing kernels discussed in [34]. So far only uniform, Gaussian and Cauchy have been considered to be potential smoothing p.d.f.s [34, 40]. Since these distributions are special cases of q -Gaussian, this result allows us to work with a larger class of distributions in SF algorithms, where the “shape parameter” q , which controls the power-law behavior of q -Gaussian, also controls the smoothness of the convolution, thereby providing additional tuning.

We present estimators for gradient and the Hessian of a function using q -Gaussian smoothing kernel. We also present multi-timescale algorithms for stochastic optimization using q -Gaussian

based SF that incorporate both gradient and Newton based search procedures, and prove the convergence of the proposed algorithms to the neighbourhood of a local optimum. Further, we perform simulations on a queuing network to illustrate the benefits of the q -Gaussian based SF algorithms compared to their Gaussian counterparts.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The framework for the optimization problem and some of the preliminaries are presented in Section 2. Some general results regarding the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution have been proved in Section 3. Section 4 deals with gradient descent algorithms using q -Gaussian SF. This section presents the form of the gradient estimator, the corresponding algorithms and their convergence. Similar results and proposed algorithms for adaptive Newton-based search have been presented in Section 5. Section 6 deals with the implementation of the proposed algorithms, and simulations based on a numerical setting. We describe the sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian in this section. Finally, Section 7 provides the concluding remarks.

2. Background and Preliminaries

In this section, we first describe the framework of the optimization problem. We also discuss about the Smoothed Functional scheme, that is commonly used to estimate derivatives of a stochastic function. Finally, we provide a brief idea about the generalization of Gaussian distribution studied in nonextensive information theory.

2.1. Problem Framework

Let $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a parameterized Markov process, depending on a tunable parameter $\theta \in C$, where C is a compact and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^N . Let $P_\theta(x, dy)$ denote the transition kernel of $\{Y_n\}$ when the operative parameter is $\theta \in C$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ be a Lipschitz continuous cost function associated with the process.

Assumption I. *The process $\{Y_n\}$ is ergodic for any given θ as the operative parameter, i.e., as $L \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} h(Y_m) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\nu_\theta}[h(Y)],$$

where ν_θ is the stationary distribution of $\{Y_n\}$.

Our objective is to minimize the long-run average cost

$$J(\theta) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} h(Y_m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x) \nu_\theta(dx), \quad (2)$$

by choosing an appropriate $\theta \in C$. The existence of the above limit is assured by Assumption I and the fact that h is continuous, hence measurable. In addition, we assume that the average cost $J(\theta)$ satisfies the following requirement.

Assumption II. *The function $J(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable for all $\theta \in C$.*

Definition 2.1 (Non-anticipative sequence). *A random sequence of parameter vectors, $(\theta(n))_{n \geq 0} \subset C$, controlling a process $\{Y_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, is said to be non-anticipative if the conditional probability $P(Y_{n+1} \in dy | \mathcal{F}_n) = P_\theta(Y_n, dy)$ almost surely for all $n \geq 0$ and all Borel sets $dy \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(m), Y_m, m \leq n)$, $n \geq 0$ are the associated σ -fields.*

It can be verified that under a non-anticipative parameter sequence $(\theta(n))$, the sequence $(Y_n, \theta(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is Markov. We assume the existence of a stochastic Lyapunov function.

Assumption III. *Let $(\theta(n))$ be a non-anticipative sequence of random parameters controlling the process $\{Y_n\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(m), Y_m, m \leq n)$, $n \geq 0$ be a sequence of associated σ -fields. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$, a compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and a continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, with $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \infty$, such that*

$$(i) \sup_n \mathbb{E}[V(Y_n)^2] < \infty, \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \mathbb{E}[V(Y_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq V(Y_n) - \epsilon_0, \text{ whenever } Y_n \notin \mathcal{K}, n \geq 0.$$

While Assumption II is a technical requirement, Assumption III ensures that the process under a tunable parameter remains stable. Assumption III will not be required, for instance, if, in addition, the single-stage cost function h is bounded. It can be seen that the sequence of parameters obtained using any of our algorithms below form a non-anticipative sequence.

2.2. Smoothed Functionals

Here, we present an idea about the smoothed functional approach proposed by Katkovnik and Kulchitsky [22]. We consider a real-valued function $f : C \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, defined over a compact set C . Its smoothed functional is defined as

$$S_\beta[f(\theta)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta) f(\theta - \eta) d\eta = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\theta - \eta) f(\eta) d\eta, \quad (3)$$

where $G_\beta : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel function, with a parameter β taking values from \mathbb{R} . The idea behind using smoothed functionals is that if $f(\theta)$ is not well-behaved, *i.e.*, it has a fluctuating character, then $S_\beta[f(\theta)]$ is “better-behaved”. This can ensure that any optimization algorithm with objective function $f(\theta)$ does not get stuck at a local minimum, but converges to a global minimum. The parameter β controls the degree of smoothness. Rubinstein [34] established that the SF algorithm achieves these properties if the kernel function satisfies the following sufficient conditions:

$$(P1) \ G_\beta(\eta) = \frac{1}{\beta^N} G\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right), \text{ where } G(x) \text{ corresponds to } G_\beta(x) \text{ with } \beta = 1, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$G\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right) = G_1\left(\frac{\eta^{(1)}}{\beta}, \frac{\eta^{(2)}}{\beta}, \dots, \frac{\eta^{(N)}}{\beta}\right),$$

$$(P2) \ G_\beta(\eta) \text{ is piecewise differentiable in } \eta,$$

$$(P3) \ G_\beta(\eta) \text{ is a probability distribution function, i.e., } S_\beta[f(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{G_\beta(\eta)}[f(\theta - \eta)],$$

$$(P4) \ \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_\beta(\eta) = \delta(\eta), \text{ where } \delta(\eta) \text{ is the Dirac delta function, and}$$

$$(P5) \ \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} S_\beta[f(\theta)] = f(\theta).$$

A two-sided form of SF is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} S'_\beta[f(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta)(f(\theta - \eta) + f(\theta + \eta)) \, d\eta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\theta - \eta)f(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta - \theta)f(\eta) \, d\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The Gaussian distribution satisfies the above conditions, and has been used as a smoothing kernel in [22, 40]. The SF approach provides a method [7] for estimating the gradient or Hessian of any function which satisfies Assumptions I–III as shown in [5], where the Gaussian smoothing kernel is used. The gradient estimator obtained using (3) is given by

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{\beta ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \eta(n)h(Y_m) \quad (5)$$

for large M , L and small β . The stochastic process $\{Y_m\}$ is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$, where $\theta(n) \in C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is obtained through an iterative scheme, and $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ is a N -dimensional vector of i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables $\eta^{(1)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n)$. Similarly, a two-simulation gradient estimator has been suggested using (4), which is of the following form

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{2\beta ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \eta(n)(h(Y_m) - h(Y'_m)) \quad (6)$$

for large M , L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are two processes governed by parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively, $\theta(n)$ and $\eta(n)$ being defined as earlier. The respective one and two simulation estimates for the Hessian case are given by

$$\nabla_\theta^2 J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{\beta^2 ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n))h(Y_m) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\nabla_\theta^2 J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{2\beta^2 ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n))[h(Y_m) + h(Y'_m)], \quad (8)$$

where $H(\eta)$ is a matrix given by $H_{i,j}(\eta) = (\eta^{(i)})^2 - 1$ for $i = j$, and $\eta^{(i)}\eta^{(j)}$ for $i \neq j$.

2.3. Generalized information measure and q-Gaussian distribution

A continuous form of the Shannon entropy, also known as differential entropy, has been extensively studied in statistical mechanics, probability and statistics. It is defined as

$$H(p) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) \ln p(x) \, dx, \quad (9)$$

where $p(\cdot)$ is a p.d.f. defined on the sample space \mathcal{X} . Following the lines of the discrete form generalization given by Tsallis [44], Dukkipati et al. [15, 14] provides a measure theoretic formulation of continuous form Tsallis entropy functional, defined as

$$H_q(p) = \frac{1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} (p(x))^q dx}{q - 1}, \quad q \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

This function results when the natural logarithm in (9) is replaced by the q -logarithm defined earlier. The differential Shannon entropy can be retrieved from (10) as $q \rightarrow 1$.

The q -Gaussian distribution was developed to describe the process of Lévy super-diffusion [31], but has been later studied in other fields, such as finance [36] and statistics [42]. Its importance lies in its power-law nature, due to which the tails of the q -Gaussian decay at a slower rate than the Gaussian distribution, depending on the choice of q .

It results from maximizing Tsallis entropy under certain ‘deformed’ moment constraints, known as normalized q -expectation defined by

$$\langle f \rangle_q = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)p(x)^q dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)^q dx}. \quad (11)$$

This form of an expectation considers an escort distribution $p_q(x) = \frac{p(x)^q}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)^q dx}$, and has been shown to be compatible with the foundations of nonextensive statistics [46]. Prato and Tsallis [31] maximized Tsallis entropy under the constraints, $\langle x \rangle_q = \mu_q$ and $\langle (x - \mu)^2 \rangle_q = \beta_q^2$, which are known as q -mean and q -variance, respectively. These are generalizations of standard first and second moments, and tend to the usual mean and variance, respectively, as $q \rightarrow 1$. This results in the q -Gaussian distribution that has the form

$$G_{q,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{\beta_q K_q} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(3-q)\beta_q^2} (x - \mu_q)^2 \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (12)$$

where, $y_+ = \max(y, 0)$ is called the Tsallis cut-off condition [45], which ensures that the above expression is defined, and K_q is the normalizing constant, which is given by

$$K_q = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{3-q}}{\sqrt{1-q}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{5-3q}{2(1-q)}\right)} & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{3-q}}{\sqrt{1-q}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3-q}{2(q-1)}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} & \text{for } 1 < q < 3, \end{cases}$$

with Γ being the Gamma function, which exists over the specified intervals.

The function defined in (12) is not integrable for $q \geq 3$, and hence, q -Gaussian is a probability density function only when $q < 3$. Further, it has been shown by Prato and Tsallis [31] that the variance of the above distribution is finite only for $q < \frac{5}{3}$, and is given by $\beta = \sqrt{\frac{3-q}{5-3q}}\beta_q$.

A multivariate form of the q -Gaussian distribution has been proposed in [47]. Vignat and Plastino [49] provide an explicit form of this distribution. Considering zero mean, and usual

covariance matrix of the N -variate distribution to be $E[XX^T] = \beta^2 I_{N \times N}$, it is defined as

$$G_{q,\beta}(X) = \frac{1}{\beta^N K_{q,N}} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4)-(N+2)q)} \frac{\|X\|^2}{\beta^2} \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (13)$$

where $K_{q,N}$ is the normalizing constant given by

$$K_{q,N} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \right) & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} \right) & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The multivariate normal distribution can be obtained as a special case when $q \rightarrow 1$, while the uniform distribution is obtained when $q \rightarrow -\infty$. A similar distribution can also be obtained by maximizing Rényi entropy [12]. In this paper, we study the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution, and develop smoothed functional algorithms based on it.

3. Some properties of multivariate q -Gaussian

Before going into further analysis of q -Gaussians as smoothing kernels, we look at the support set of the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution with covariance $\beta^2 I_{N \times N}$. We denote the support set as

$$\Omega'_q = \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|x\|^2 < \frac{((N+4)-(N+2)q)\beta^2}{(1-q)} \right\} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \mathbb{R}^N & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

A standard q -Gaussian distribution has mean zero and unit variance. So, the support set can be expressed as above by substituting $\beta = 1$.

3.1. Moments and q -moments of joint q -Gaussian distribution

The following result provides an expression for the moments of N -variate q -Gaussian distributed random vector. This is a consequence of the results presented in [18]. The result is considered only for $q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$ as above this value, the variance of q -Gaussian is not finite [31].

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots, X^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a random vector, where the components are uncorrelated and identically distributed, each being distributed according to a q -Gaussian distribution with zero mean and unit variance, with parameter $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$. Also, let $\rho(X) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4)-(N+2)q)} \|X\|^2\right)$. Then, for any $b, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, we have*

$$E_{G_q} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] = \begin{cases} \bar{K} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q} \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!} \right), & \text{if } b_i \text{ is even for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\bar{K} = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b+1\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}+1+\frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}+1\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b+1+\frac{N}{2}+\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{b_i}{2}\right)} & \text{if } q \in (-\infty, 1), \\ \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}+b-\frac{N}{2}-\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{b_i}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}+b\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}-\frac{N}{2}\right)} & \text{if } q \in \left(1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right), \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

exists only if the above Gamma functions exist. Further, the existence of the Gamma functions occurs under the condition $b < \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-q}\right)$ if $q < 1$, and $\left(\frac{1}{q-1} + b - \frac{N}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}\right) > 0$, for $1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$.

Proof. Since $\rho(X)$ is non-negative over Ω'_q , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(X)} & \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{K_{q,N}} \int_{\Omega'_q} (x^{(1)})^{b_1} (x^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (x^{(N)})^{b_N} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4) - (N+2)q)} \|x\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}-b} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality in (16) can be easily proved. If for some $i = 1, \dots, N$, b_i is odd, then the above function is odd, and its integration is zero over Ω'_q , which is symmetric with respect to any axis by definition. For the other cases, since the function is even, the integral is same over every orthant. Hence, we may consider the integration over the first orthant, *i.e.*, where each component is positive. For $q < 1$, we can reduce the above integral, using [18, equation (4.635)], to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(X)} & \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right)}{K_{q,N} \Gamma(\bar{b})} \left(\frac{(N+4) - (N+2)q}{1-q}\right)^{\bar{b}} \int_0^1 (1-y)^{\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b\right)} y^{(\bar{b}-1)} dy \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we set $\bar{b} = \left(\frac{N}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}\right)$. One can observe that the integral in (18) is in the form of a Beta function. Since b_i 's are even, we can expand $\Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right)$ using the expansion of Gamma function of half-integers to get $\Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right) = \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!} \sqrt{\pi}$. The claim can be obtained by substituting $K_{q,N}$ from (14) and using the relation $B(m, n) = \frac{\Gamma(m)\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma(m+n)}$. It is easy to verify that all the Gamma functions in the equality exist provided $b < \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-q}\right)$. The result for the interval $1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$ can be proved in a similar way (see equations (4.635) and (4.636) of [18]). \square

Corollary 3.2. *In the limiting case, as $q \rightarrow 1$,*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}_{G_q(X)} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}_{G(X)} \left[(X^{(i)})^{b_i} \right].$$

We obtain a generalized version of moments and comoments from Proposition 3.1. The higher order moments and comoments can be calculated using $b = 0$ in (16). The following result gives an expression and existence condition for the m^{th} order moments and comoments, *i.e.*, the case where $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = m$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let X be the random vector considered in Proposition 3.1, and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = m$, then the comoment is given by*

$$E_{G_q(X)} \left[(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N} \right] = \begin{cases} \bar{K} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!}, & \text{if } b_i \text{ is even for all } i = 1, \dots, N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\bar{K} = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N+m}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} & \text{if } q \in (-\infty, 1), \\ \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N+m}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{q-1}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} & \text{if } q \in \left(1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right), \\ \text{otherwise undefined.} & \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The above expression ascertains that the m^{th} order moments and comoments exists only for $q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right)$. We now extend to compute the generalized q -moments and q -comoments of the joint q -Gaussian distribution.

Corollary 3.4. *Consider the q -Gaussian distributed random vector $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with zero mean and identity covariance. For any $b, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, we have*

$$\left\langle \frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right\rangle_q = \frac{2}{(N+2-Nq)} E_{G_q(X)} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^{b+1}} \right], \quad (21)$$

which exists for $b < \frac{1}{1-q}$ if $q < 1$, and $\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right) > \max\left(0, \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2} - b - 1\right)$ for $q > 1$. Here, $\langle \cdot \rangle_q$ is the q -expectation defined in (11).

The existence conditions above indicate that compared to those in Proposition 3.1, the interval of existence reduces for $q < 1$ and increases for $q > 1$. In fact, q -expectation computed from the above proposition holds even for $q > \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$, which is discussed in the following few results.

We now consider a q -Gaussian distributed random vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with usual mean μ and usual covariance Σ . All the above results hold for the normalized vector $X = \Sigma^{-1/2}(Y - \mu)$. Using such a transformation along with Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.4, we can compute the q -mean and q -covariance of Y as

$$q\text{-mean, } \langle Y \rangle_q = \mu, \quad (22)$$

$$q\text{-covariance, } \langle YY^T \rangle_q = \left(\frac{(N+4) - (N+2)q}{(N+2) - Nq} \right) \Sigma. \quad (23)$$

However, we can observe from the existence conditions in Proposition 3.4 that these q -moments exist for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, *i.e.*, even when the usual moments do not exist. Thus, we may define the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution in terms of its q -moments. Considering the q -mean and q -covariance matrix to be μ_q and Σ_q respectively, the N -variate q -Gaussian distribution is defined as

$$G_{q, \Sigma_q}(X) = \frac{1}{K'_{q, N} |\Sigma_q|^{1/2}} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} (X - \mu_q)^T \Sigma_q^{-1} (X - \mu_q) \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad (24)$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where the normalizing constant

$$K'_{q, N} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N}{1-q}\right)} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right). \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

This definition is more useful as it is defined over a wider range of q 's, and includes the entire interval over which the function is integrable. It becomes more significant as the distribution for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ can be mapped to the multivariate Students'- t distribution. The support set of the above distribution is given by

$$\Omega_q = \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : (X - \mu_q)^T \Sigma_q^{-1} (X - \mu_q) < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q} \right\} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \mathbb{R}^N & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

The definition in (24) provide a better scope to study the higher order q -moments and q -comoments of the distribution. They can be easily evaluated using Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.4. We provide a more interesting observation regarding the existence of these q -moments.

Corollary 3.5. *For the random vector X in Proposition 3.1, the m^{th} order q -moments and q -comoment exist when*

$$\frac{1}{q-1} < \frac{N}{2} + \max\left(0, \frac{m}{2} - 1\right),$$

i.e., q -mean ($m = 1$) and q -covariance ($m = 2$) exist for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, but for $m > 2$, the q -moments exist only for $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+m-2})$.

We conclude the discussion on moments of q -Gaussian by the following remark. Proposition 3.1 can be stated for a multivariate q -Gaussian distribution with zero mean, unit q -covariance matrix. The result in (16) holds with the term $((N+4) - (N+2)q)$ replaced by $(N+2 - Nq)$, the other terms remaining exactly same. Even the existence conditions for the moments do not change. This observation will be frequently used later in the paper, and will be referred as Proposition 3.1.

3.2. q -Gaussian as a Smoothing Kernel

The first step in applying q -Gaussians for SF algorithms is to ensure that the q -Gaussian satisfies the Rubinstein conditions described here as properties (P1)–(P5) in Section 2.2.

Proposition 3.6. *The N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution (24), with q -covariance $\beta^2 I_{N \times N}$ satisfies the kernel properties (P1)–(P5) for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and $q \neq 1$.*

Proof. (P1) From (24), it is evident that $G_{q,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{\beta^N} G_q\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)$.

(P2) For $1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $G_{q,\beta}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus,

$$\nabla_x G_{q,\beta}(x) = -\frac{2x}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \frac{G_{q,\beta}(x)}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \|x\|^2\right)}. \quad (27)$$

For $q < 1$, (27) holds when $x \in \Omega_q$. On the other hand, when $x \notin \Omega_q$, we have $G_{q,\beta}(x) = 0$ and hence, $\nabla_x G_{q,\beta}(x) = 0$. Thus, $G_{q,\beta}(x)$ is differentiable for $q > 1$, and piecewise differentiable for $q < 1$.

(P3) $G_{q,\beta}(x)$ is a distribution for $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and hence, the corresponding SF $S_{q,\beta}(\cdot)$, parameterized by both q and β , can be written as $S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{G_{q,\beta}(x)}[f(\theta - x)]$.

(P4) $G_{q,\beta}$ is a probability distribution satisfying $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(0) = \infty$. So, $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(x) = \delta(x)$.

(P5) This property trivially holds due to convergence in mean as

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(x) f(\theta - x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) f(\theta - x) dx = f(\theta).$$

Hence the claim. □

From the above result, it follows that q -Gaussian can be used as a kernel function, and hence, given a particular value $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and some $\beta > 0$, the one-sided and two-sided SFs of any function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are respectively given by

$$S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - x) f(x) dx, \quad (28)$$

$$S'_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - x) f(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(x - \theta) f(x) dx, \quad (29)$$

where the nature of the SFs are controlled by both q and β .

4. Gradient Estimation with q -Gaussian SF

The objective is to estimate the gradient of the average cost $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ using the SF approach, where existence of $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ follows from Assumption II.

4.1. One-simulation q -Gaussian SF Gradient Estimate

The gradient of smoothed functional (smoothed gradient) is defined as [34]

$$\nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta ,$$

where Ω_q is the support set defined as in (26). As there is no functional relationship between θ and η over Ω_q , *i.e.*, $\frac{d\eta^{(j)}}{d\theta^{(i)}} = 0$ for all i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^{(i)} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) &= \frac{1}{\beta^N K'_{q,N}} \frac{2(\eta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q) \sum_{k=1}^N (\theta^{(k)} - \eta^{(k)})^2}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \right)^{\frac{q}{1-q}} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \frac{(\eta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)})}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) , \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\rho(\eta) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta\|^2 \right)$. Hence, substituting $\eta' = \frac{\eta-\theta}{\beta}$, and using the symmetry of $G_{q,\beta}(\cdot)$ and $\rho(\cdot)$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \right) \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} G_q(\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \, d\eta' \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta')} \left[\frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} J(\theta + \beta\eta') \middle| \theta \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

In the sequel (Proposition 4.6), we show that $\|\nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$. Hence, for large M and small β , the form of gradient estimate suggested by (31) is

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)M} \right) \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \left(\frac{\eta(n) J(\theta + \beta\eta(n))}{\rho(\eta(n))} \right) , \quad (32)$$

where $\eta(1), \eta(2), \dots, \eta(n)$ are uncorrelated identically distributed standard q -Gaussian distributed random vectors. Considering that in two-timescale algorithms (discussed later), the value of θ is updated concurrently with the gradient estimation procedure, we estimate $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n))$ at each stage. By ergodicity assumption (Assumption I), we can write (32) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n)) \approx \left(\frac{2}{\beta M L (N+2-Nq)} \right) \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \frac{\eta(n) h(Y_m)}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2 \right)} \quad (33)$$

for large L , where the process $\{Y_m\}$ has the same transition kernel as defined in Assumption I, except that it is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.

4.2. Two-simulation q -Gaussian SF Gradient Estimate

In a similar manner, based on (4), the gradient of the two-sided SF can be written as

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta. \quad (34)$$

The first integral can be obtained as in (31). The second integral is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N + 2 - Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{(\eta - \theta)}{\rho(\frac{\eta - \theta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta(N + 2 - Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} G_q(\eta') J(\theta - \beta\eta') \, d\eta', \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta' = \frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}$. Thus, we obtain the gradient as a conditional expectation

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \left(\frac{1}{\beta(N + 2 - Nq)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)} \left(J(\theta + \beta\eta) - J(\theta - \beta\eta) \right) \middle| \theta \right]. \quad (35)$$

In sequel (Proposition 4.8) we show that $\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, which can be used to approximate (35) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{1}{\beta ML(N + 2 - Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \frac{\eta(n)(h(Y_m) - h(Y'_m))}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2 \right)} \quad (36)$$

for large M, L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are governed by $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.

4.3. Proposed Gradient Descent Algorithms

We propose two-timescale algorithms corresponding to the estimates obtained in (33) and (36). Let $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ be two step-size sequences satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption IV. $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ are two positive sequences satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b(n)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b(n) = \infty$ and $a(n) = o(b(n))$, i.e., $\frac{a(n)}{b(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It must be noted that in the algorithms described below, although M is chosen to be a large quantity (to ensure convergence), the quantity L is arbitrarily picked and can be any finite positive number. The averaging of the inner summation in (33) and (36) is obtained in our algorithms using two-timescale stochastic approximation. In principle, one may select $L = 1$. However, it is generally observed that a value of L typically between 5 and 500 results in better performance [5]. Further, the algorithms require generation of N -dimensional random vectors, consisting of uncorrelated q -Gaussian distributed random variates. This can be done using the method described in Section 6.2.

For $\theta = (\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(N)})^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta) = (\mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(1)}), \dots, \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(N)}))^T$ represent the projection of θ onto the set C . For simulation, we need to project the perturbed random vectors $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ onto C using the above projection. The quantities $(Z^{(i)}(n), i = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$ are used to estimate $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ in the following recursions.

The G q -SF2 algorithm is similar to the G q -SF1 algorithm, except that we use two parallel simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively, and update the gradient estimate, in Step 9, using the single-stage cost function of both simulations as in (36).

Algorithm 1 : The Gq-SF1 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q and β .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix the parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate the simulation Y_{nL+m} governed with parameter $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2\eta^{(i)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 13: $\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n)Z^{(i)}(nL))$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: Set $\theta(n+1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n+1), \theta^{(2)}(n+1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n+1))^T$.
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

4.4. Convergence of Gradient SF Algorithms

We now look into the convergence of the algorithms proposed in Section 4.3. The analysis presented in the shorter version of this paper [17] was along the lines of [5]. In this paper, we deviate from that approach to provide a more straightforward technique to prove the convergence of the algorithms to a local optimum.

4.4.1. Convergence of Gq-SF1 Algorithm

First, let us consider the update along the faster timescale, *i.e.*, Step 9 of the Gq-SF1 algorithm. We define $\tilde{\theta}(p) = \theta(n)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p) = \eta(n)$ and $\tilde{b}(p) = b(n)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$, $n \geq 0$. It follows from Assumption IV that $a(p) = o(\tilde{b}(p))$, $\sum_p \tilde{b}(p) = \infty$ and $\sum_p \tilde{b}(p)^2 < \infty$. We can rewrite Step 9 of Algorithm 1 as the following iteration for all $p \geq 0$:

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[g(Y_p) - Z(p)], \quad (37)$$

where

$$g(Y_p) = \frac{2\tilde{\eta}(p)h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))}.$$

Here, $\rho(\cdot)$ is defined as in Proposition 3.1 and $\{Y_p : p \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Markov process parameterized by $\mathcal{P}_C(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))$. Let $\mathcal{G}_p = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}(k), \tilde{\eta}(k), Y_k, k \leq p)$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where $g(Y_p)$ is \mathcal{G}_p -measurable for each $p \geq 0$.

We summarize the results presented by Borkar [11, Chapter 6, Lemma 3 – Theorem 9] in the following theorem. This result leads to the stability and convergence of iteration (37), which runs on the faster timescale.

Algorithm 2 : The Gq-SF2 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q and β .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix the parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate two simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with control parameters $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) - h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 13: $\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n)Z^{(i)}(nL))$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

Theorem 4.1. Consider the iteration, $x_{p+1} = x_p + \gamma(p)[f(x_p, Y_p) + M_p]$. Let the following conditions hold:

1. $\{Y_p : p \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Markov process satisfying Assumptions I and III,
2. for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $x_p \equiv x$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, Y_p has a unique invariant probability measure ν_x ,
3. $(\gamma(p))_{p \geq 0}$ are step-sizes satisfying $\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \gamma(p) = \infty$ and $\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \gamma^2(p) < \infty$,
4. $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous in its first argument uniformly w.r.t the second,
5. M_p is a martingale difference noise term with bounded variance,
6. if $\tilde{f}(x, \nu_x) = \mathbf{E}_{\nu_x}[f(x, Y)]$, then the limit $\hat{f}(x(t)) = \lim_{a \uparrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{f}(ax(t), \nu_{ax(t)})}{a}$ exists uniformly on compacts, and
7. the ODE $\dot{x}(t) = \hat{f}(x(t))$ is well-posed and has the origin as the unique globally asymptotically stable equilibrium.

Then the update x_p satisfies $\sup_p \|x_p\| < \infty$, almost surely, and converges to the stable fixed points of the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\dot{x}(t) = \hat{f}(x(t), \nu_{x(t)}).$$

Rewriting the update (37) as

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p) [E[g(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - Z(p) + A_p], \quad (38)$$

where $A_p = g(Y_p) - E[g(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ is \mathcal{G}_p -measurable. The following result shows that $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ satisfies Condition 5 in Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *For all values of $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with a bounded variance.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for all $p \geq 0$, $E[A_p|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] = 0$. So $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|h(Y_p)}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \right)^2 + \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|h(Y_p)}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right] \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))^2} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right]. \quad (39)$$

For $q \in (-\infty, 1)$, $\|\eta\| < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}$ and $\rho(\eta) \geq 1$ for all $\eta \in \Omega_q$. So, we can write (39) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))^2} \right) \mathbb{E} [h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(1-q)^2} \mathbb{E} [h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lipschitz continuity of h , there exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $|h(Y_p)| \leq \alpha_1(1 + \|Y_p\|)$ for all p , and hence, by Assumption III, we can claim

$$\mathbb{E} [h(Y_p)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq 2\alpha_1^2 (1 + \mathbb{E} [\|Y_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]) < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

For $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we apply Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in (39) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^2} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^4}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^4} \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [h^4(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second expectation can be shown to be finite as before, while we apply Proposition 3.1 to study the existence of $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(j)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} \right]$. We can observe that in this case, $b = 4$ and $b_i = 4$ if $i = j$, otherwise $b_i = 0$. So the condition mentioned in Proposition 3.1 is satisfied which implies that term is finite, and hence, the claim. \square

We can write the parameter update (Step 13 of Gq-SF1) as

$$\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - \tilde{b}(n)\zeta(n) \right),$$

where $\zeta(n) = \frac{a(n)}{\tilde{b}(n)} Z^{(i)}(nL) = o(1)$ since $a(n) = o(\tilde{b}(n))$. Thus, the parameter update recursion can be seen to track the ODE

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Hence, the recursion $\theta(n)$, $n \geq 0$ appears quasistatic when viewed from the timescale of $(\tilde{b}(n))$, and hence, in the update (38), one may let $\tilde{\theta}(p) \equiv \theta$ and $\tilde{\eta}(p) \equiv \eta$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the following ODE:

$$\dot{Z}(t) = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - Z(t). \quad (41)$$

Lemma 4.3. *The sequence of updates $(Z(p))$ is uniformly bounded with probability 1. Further,*

$$\left\| Z(p) - \left(\frac{2\tilde{\eta}(p)J(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \right) \right\| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. It can be easily verified that iteration (38) satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 4.1. Thus, by Theorem 4.1, $(Z(p))$ converges to ODE (41) as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{(\theta+\beta\eta)}} \left[\frac{2\eta h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)}.$$

We can also see that

$$\lim_{a \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{a} \left(\frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - aZ(t) \right) = -Z(t).$$

All the conditions in Theorem 4.1 are seen to be verified and the claim follows. \square

From Lemma 4.3, Steps 13 and 15 of Gq-SF1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(n+1) &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) - a(n) \left[\frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right] \right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) + a(n) \left[-\nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) + \Delta(\theta(n)) + \xi_n \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where the error in the gradient estimate is given by

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) - \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \quad (43)$$

and the noise term is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n &= \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] - \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \middle| \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

which is a martingale difference term. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(0), \dots, \theta(n), \eta(0), \dots, \eta(n-1))$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where ξ_0, \dots, ξ_{n-1} are \mathcal{F}_n -measurable for each $n \geq 0$.

We state the following result due to Kushner and Clark [27, Theorem 5.3.1, pp 189–196], adapted to our scenario, which leads to the convergence of the updates in (42).

Lemma 4.4. *Given the iteration, $x_{n+1} = \mathcal{P}_C(x_n + \gamma(n)(f(x_n) + \xi_n))$, where*

1. \mathcal{P}_C represents a projection operator onto a constraint set C , which is closed and bounded,
2. $f(\cdot)$ is a continuous function,
3. $(\gamma(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is a positive sequence satisfying $\gamma(n) \downarrow 0$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma(n) = \infty$, and
4. $\sum_{n=0}^m \gamma(n)\xi_n$ converges a.s.

Under the above conditions, the update (x_n) converges to the asymptotically stable fixed points of the ODE

$$\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x(t))), \quad (45)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x)) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_C(x + \epsilon f(x)) - x}{\epsilon} \right)$.

The following result shows that the noise term ξ_n satisfies the last condition in Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $M_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\xi_k$. Then, for all values of $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an almost surely convergent martingale sequence.*

Proof. We can easily observe that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] &= \frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)}{\beta\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \theta(k) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)}{\beta\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$, since $\theta(k)$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, whereas $\eta(k)$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_k . It follows that $(\xi_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence, and hence $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale sequence. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\xi_k^{(j)} \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \theta(k) \right] \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{\eta(k)^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta(k)^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta(k))^2} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k))^2 \middle| \theta(k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, by definition $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta) = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)]$, where the expectation is with respect to the stationary distribution. So, by Jensen's inequality, we can claim $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)^2]$ and $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta)^4 \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)^4]$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Using these facts along with arguments similar to Lemma 4.2, it can be seen that $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] < \infty$ for all k , and hence, if $\sum_n a(n)^2 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|M_{n+1} - M_n\|^2] &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_n\|^2] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 \sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_n\|^2] < \infty \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows from the martingale convergence theorem [50]. \square

Now, we deal with the error term $\Delta(\theta(n))$ in (42).

Proposition 4.6. *For a given $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$, and for all $\theta \in C$, the error term*

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta).$$

Proof. For small $\beta > 0$, using Taylor series expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) = J(\theta) + \beta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta + o(\beta^2).$$

So we can write (31) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{2}{(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{J(\theta)}{\beta} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T}{\rho(\eta)} \right] \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta}{\rho(\eta)} \middle| \theta \right] + o(\beta) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We consider each term in (46). The i^{th} component in the first term is $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = 0$ by Proposition 3.1 for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Similarly, the i^{th} component in the third term can be written as

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta}{\rho(\eta)} \right]^{(i)} = \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{j,k} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right].$$

It can be observed that in all cases, each term in the summation is an odd function, and so from Proposition 3.1, we can show that the third term in (46) is zero. Using a similar argument, we claim that the off-diagonal terms in $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T}{\rho(\eta)} \right]$ are zero, while the diagonal terms are of the form $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right]$, which exists for all $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ as the conditions in Proposition 3.1 are always satisfied on this interval. Further, we can compute that for all $q \in (-\infty, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{(N+2-Nq)}{2}. \quad (47)$$

The claim follows by substituting the above expression in (46). \square

Now, we consider the following ODE for the slowest timescale recursion:

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(t)) \right), \quad (48)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x)) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_C(x + \epsilon f(x)) - x}{\epsilon} \right)$. In accordance with Lemma 4.4, it can be observed that the stable points of (48) lie in the set

$$K = \left\{ \theta \in C \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right) = 0 \right\}. \quad (49)$$

We have the following key result which shows that iteration (42) tracks ODE (48), and hence, the convergence of our algorithm is proved.

Theorem 4.7. *Under Assumptions I – IV, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Gq-SF1 converges to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the stable attractor of (48), defined as*

$$K^{\epsilon} = \{x : \|x - x_0\| < \epsilon, x_0 \in K\}$$

with probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 that the update in (42) converges to the stable fixed points of the ODE

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(t)) + \Delta(\theta(t)) \right). \quad (50)$$

Now starting from the same initial condition, the trajectory of (50) converges to that of (48) uniformly over compacts, as $\Delta(\theta(t)) \rightarrow 0$. Since from Proposition 4.6, we have $\|\Delta(\theta(n))\| = o(\beta)$ for all n , the claim follows. \square

4.4.2. Convergence of Gq-SF2 Algorithm

Since the proof of convergence here is along the lines of Gq-SF1, we do not describe it explicitly. We just briefly describe the modifications that are required in this case. In the faster timescale, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the updates given by $Z(nL)$ track the function

$$\left(\frac{2\eta(n)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right) (J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) - J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))).$$

So we can rewrite the slower timescale update for Gq-SF2 algorithm, in a similar manner as (42), where the noise term is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n = & \frac{1}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta(n))} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \mid \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta(n))} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n)) \mid \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

with each part being bounded (as in Lemma 4.5). We have the following proposition for the error term

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta).$$

Proposition 4.8. For a given $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$,

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta)$$

for all $\theta \in C$.

Proof. Using Taylor's expansion, we have for small β ,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) - J(\theta - \beta\eta) = 2\beta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + o(\beta^2).$$

One can use similar arguments as in Proposition 4.6 to rewrite (35) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbf{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{2}{\rho(\eta)} \eta \eta^T \right] \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + o(\beta),$$

which leads to the claim. \square

The above leads to a result similar to Theorem 4.7, which proves convergence of the Gq-SF2 algorithm.

Theorem 4.9. Under Assumptions I – IV, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Gq-SF2 converges to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the stable attractor of (48), with probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorems 4.7 and 4.9 give the existence of some $\beta_0 > 0$ for a given $\epsilon > 0$ such that the proposed gradient-descent algorithms converge to the ϵ -neighbourhood of a local minimum. However, these results do not give the precise value of β_0 . Further, they do not guarantee that this neighbourhood lies within a close proximity of a global minimum.

5. Hessian Estimation using q -Gaussian SF

In this section, we extend the proposed Gradient based algorithms by incorporating an additional Hessian estimate. This leads to Newton based search algorithms. The existence of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$ is assumed as per Assumption II, and we estimate the same using SF approach.

5.1. One-simulation q -Gaussian SF Hessian Estimate

By following Rubinstein [34], we define the smoothed Hessian, or Hessian of the SF, as

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta, \quad (51)$$

where Ω_q is the support set of the q -Gaussian distribution as defined in (26). Now, the $(i, j)^{th}$ element of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)$ is

$$\left[\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) \right]_{i,j} = \frac{4q}{\beta^4(N+2-Nq)^2} \frac{(\theta^{(i)} - \eta^{(i)}) (\theta^{(j)} - \eta^{(j)})}{\rho(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta})^2} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)$$

for $i \neq j$, where $\rho(X) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|X\|^2\right)$. For $i = j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)]_{i,i} &= -\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \frac{1}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) \\ &\quad + \frac{4q}{\beta^4(N+2-Nq)^2} \frac{(\theta^{(i)} - \eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})^2} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can write

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) = \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} H\left(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}\right) G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta), \quad (52)$$

$$\text{where } H(\eta) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \frac{\eta^{(i)}\eta^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta)^2}\right) & \text{for } i \neq j, \text{ and} \\ \left(\frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} - \frac{1}{\rho(\eta)}\right) & \text{for } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

The function $H(\cdot)$ is a generalization of a similar function given in [5], which can be obtained as $q \rightarrow 1$. Hence, from (51), we have

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \left(\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right) \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) H\left(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}\right) J(\eta) \, d\eta.$$

Substituting $\eta' = \frac{\eta - \theta}{\beta}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} G_q(-\eta') H(-\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \, d\eta' \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta')} \left[H(\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \middle| \theta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

As in the case of gradient, in sequel (Proposition 5.3) we show that $\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we obtain an estimate of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n))$ of the form

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{2}{\beta^2 M L (N+2-Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n)) h(Y_m), \quad (55)$$

for large M , L and small β , where the process $\{Y_m\}$ is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.

5.2. Two-simulation q -Gaussian SF Hessian Estimate

Similarly, the Hessian of two-sided SF can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{1}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} H(\eta) \left(J(\theta + \beta\eta) + J(\theta - \beta\eta) \right) \middle| \theta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

By using Proposition 5.7 (discussed later in Proposition 5.7), we obtain the estimate as

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{1}{\beta^2 ML(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n)) [h(Y_m) + h(Y'_m)], \quad (57)$$

for large M, L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are governed by the parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively.

5.3. Proposed Newton-based Algorithms

We now propose two-timescale algorithms that perform a Newton based search, and require one and two simulations, respectively. In particular, the one-simulation (resp. two-simulation) algorithm uses gradient and Hessian estimates obtained from (31) and (54) (resp. (35) and (56)).

Algorithm 3 : The Nq-SF1 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q, β and ε .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, W^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate the simulation Y_{nL+m} governed with parameter $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2\eta^{(i)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: $W_{i,i}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,i}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{2q(\eta^{(i)}(n))^2}{(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right) \right]$.
 - 11: **for** $j = i + 1$ to N **do**
 - 12: $W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,j}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{4q\eta^{(i)}(n)\eta^{(j)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} \right]$.
 - 13: $W_{j,i}(nL + m + 1) = W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1)$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Project $W(nL)$ using \mathcal{P}_{pd} , and compute its inverse. Let $M(nL) = \mathcal{P}_{pd}(W(nL))^{-1}$.
 - 18: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 19: $\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n) \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL) Z^{(j)}(nL) \right)$.
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \theta^{(2)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

One of the problems with Newton-based algorithms is that the Hessian has to be positive definite for the algorithm to progress in the descent direction. This is satisfied in the neighbourhood of a local minimum, but it may not hold always. Hence, the estimate obtained during recursion has to be projected onto the space of positive definite and symmetric matrices. Let $\mathcal{P}_{pd} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \mapsto \{\text{symmetric matrices with eigenvalues} \geq \varepsilon\}$ be the function that projects any $N \times N$ matrix onto the set of symmetric positive definite matrices, whose minimum eigenvalue is at least ε for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We assume that the projection \mathcal{P}_{pd} satisfies the following:

Assumption V. *If $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are sequences of matrices satisfying the condition $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n - B_n\| = 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A_n) - \mathcal{P}_{pd}(B_n)\| = 0$ as well.*

For ε small, such a projection always exists since the set of positive definite matrices is dense in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Methods for performing projection and inverse computation are discussed later.

The basic approach of the algorithms is similar to the proposed gradient descent algorithms, and we use two step-size sequences, $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying Assumption IV. In the recursions below, the estimate of $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ is obtained from the sequence $(Z^{(i)}(n), i = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$, while $(W_{i,j}(n), i, j = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$ estimates $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$.

In the Nq-SF2 algorithm, we generate two simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with parameters $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively, instead of a single simulation. The single-stage costs obtained from both simulations are used to update the gradient and the Hessian estimates, which are used for the optimization update rule (Step 19).

5.4. Convergence of Newton SF Algorithms

5.4.1. Convergence of Nq-SF1 Algorithm

The convergence analysis is quite similar to that of Gq-SF1, except for an additional Hessian update. Let us consider the updates along the faster timescale, *i.e.*, Steps 9 and 10 of the Nq-SF1 algorithm. We use $\tilde{\theta}(p)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p)$ and $\tilde{b}(p)$ defined in Section 4.4, *i.e.*, $\tilde{\theta}(p) = \theta(n)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p) = \eta(n)$ and $\tilde{b}(p) = b(n)$ for all $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$, $n \geq 0$. We can rewrite Step 9 as the following iteration for all $p \geq 0$,

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)(g_1(Y_p) - Z(p)), \quad (58)$$

where $g_1(Y_p) = \left(\frac{2\eta(n)h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$. Here, $\rho(\cdot)$ is defined in (54) and $\{Y_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov process parameterized by $\mathcal{P}_C(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))$. Similarly, the update of the Hessian matrix can be expressed as

$$W(p+1) = W(p) + \tilde{b}(p)(g_2(Y_p) - W(p)), \quad (59)$$

where $g_2(Y_p) = \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))h(Y_p)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$. As before, let $\mathcal{G}_p = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}(k), \tilde{\eta}(k), Y_k, k \leq p)$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where $g_1(Y_p)$ and $g_2(Y_p)$ are \mathcal{G}_p -measurable for each $p \geq 0$.

We can rewrite (58) and (59) as

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[E[g_1(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - Z(p) + A_p], \quad (60)$$

$$W(p+1) = W(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[E[g_2(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - W(p) + B_p], \quad (61)$$

where $A_p = g_1(Y_p) - E[g_1(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ and $B_p = g_2(Y_p) - E[g_2(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ are \mathcal{G}_p -measurable.

Lemma 4.2 shows that $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with bounded variance for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$. We present a similar result for the sequence $(B_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 5.1. *For all values of $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(B_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with bounded variance.*

Proof. It is obvious that for all $p \geq 0$, $E[B_p|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] = 0$, which implies $(B_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence. Using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E[\|H(\tilde{\eta}(p))\|^2 h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}], \quad (62)$$

where we use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the 2-norm for the matrices B_p and $H(\tilde{\eta}(p))$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We know that $\|H(\eta)\| \leq \|H(\eta)\|_F$, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H(\eta)\|_F^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{4q^2}{(N+2-Nq)^2 \rho(\eta)^4} \right) \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left(\eta^{(i)} \right)^2 \left(\eta^{(j)} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{4q}{(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)^3} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\eta^{(i)} \right)^2 + \frac{N}{\rho(\eta)^2} \\ &= \frac{4q^2 \|\eta\|^4}{(N+2-Nq)^2 \rho(\eta)^4} - \frac{4q \|\eta\|^2}{(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)^3} + \frac{N}{\rho(\eta)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

For $q \in (0, 1)$, $\|\eta\|^2 < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}$ and $\rho(\eta) \geq 1$ for all $\eta \in \Omega_q$. So, we can write (62) as

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} (\|H(\eta)\|^2) E[h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} (\|H(\eta)\|_F^2) E[h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}], \end{aligned}$$

where $\sup_{\eta} \|H(\eta)\|_F^2$ is finite from (63). Further by the Lipschitz continuity of h and Assumption III, we can claim $E[h(Y_p)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] < \infty$ a.s. Thus, $E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] < \infty$ a.s. for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in (0, 1)$.

For $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E[\|H(\tilde{\eta}(p))\|_F^2 h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ &\leq \frac{64q^2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^4} E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] + \frac{16N}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E\left[\frac{h^2(Y_p)}{\rho(\eta)^2} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality on the first term in (64), we obtain

$$E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] \leq E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^8}{\rho(\eta)^8}\right]^{1/2} E[h^4(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]^{1/2}.$$

The second expectation is finite a.s. from earlier discussion. When we expand $\|\eta\|^8$ in the first expectation, we can observe that for each term $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = 8$ and $b = 8$, where b and b_i are as defined in Proposition 3.1. Hence, the same proposition can be used to claim the existence and finiteness of the expectation for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. Similar arguments are applicable for the second term in (64). The claim follows. \square

The iterations (58) and (59) are independent of each other for a fixed n , and hence, they can be dealt with separately. We can write the parameter update in the slower timescale (Step 19 of Nq-SF1) as

$$\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - \tilde{b}(n)\zeta(n) \right),$$

where $\zeta(n) = \frac{a(n)}{\tilde{b}(n)} \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL) Z^{(i)}(nL) = o(1)$ since $a(n) = o(\tilde{b}(n))$. Thus, as before, the parameter update recursion is quasistatic when viewed from the timescale of $(\tilde{b}(n))$, and hence, one may let $\tilde{\theta}(p) \equiv \theta$ and $\tilde{\eta}(p) \equiv \eta$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, when analyzing (38). The system of ODEs associated with these updates is the following:

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = 0, \tag{65}$$

$$\dot{Z}(t) = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - Z(t), \tag{66}$$

$$\text{and } \dot{W}(t) = \frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} - W(t). \tag{67}$$

Lemma 4.3 related to the convergence of the gradient updates still holds. We prove similar results for the Hessian update.

Lemma 5.2. *The sequence $(W(p))$ is uniformly bounded with probability 1. Further,*

$$\left\| W(p) - \left(\frac{2H(\tilde{\eta}(p))J(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right) \right\| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Observing the fact that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\nu_{(\theta+\beta\eta)}} \left[\frac{2H(\eta)h(Y_p)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right] = \frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)},$$

the proof turns out to be exactly similar to that of Lemma 4.3. \square

Thus, both $Z(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ updates eventually track the gradient and Hessian of $S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]$. So, after incorporating the projection considered in Step 17, we can write Steps 17 and 19 of Nq-SF1 algorithm as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(n+1) &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) - a(n) \left[\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \right] \right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) + a(n) \left[-\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 J(\theta(n)) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) + \Delta(\theta(n)) + \xi_n \right] \right), \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where, using (31) and (54), we have

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 J(\theta(n)) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \tag{69}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \middle| \theta(n) \right] \\ - \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

It may be noted that the last term in (69) is the same as (70). The objective is to show that the error term $\Delta(\theta(n))$ and the noise term ξ_n satisfy conditions similar to those mentioned in Section 4.4. Then, we can use similar arguments to prove the convergence of Nq -SF1. Considering the error term, we have the following proposition regarding convergence of the Hessian of SF to the Hessian of the objective function J as $\beta \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 5.3. *For a given $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we have*

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta).$$

for all $\theta \in C$ and $\beta > 0$.

Proof. We use Taylor's expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$ to rewrite (54) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)J(\theta) | \theta] + \beta \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) | \theta] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\eta | \theta] + \frac{\beta^3}{6} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T (\nabla_{\theta}^3 J(\theta)\eta)\eta | \theta] + o(\beta^3) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Let us consider each of the terms in (71). It is evident for all $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, $i \neq j$, $\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j}] = 0$. Even for the diagonal elements, we have for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i}] = \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right]. \quad (72)$$

For $q < 1$, a simple application of Proposition 3.1 show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} = \frac{\frac{1}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{1-q}} = \frac{N+2-Nq}{2}. \quad (73)$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{N+2-Nq}{2}$ for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. Substituting this expression in (72), we get $\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i}] = 0$. Thus, the first term in (71) is zero. Expanding the inner product, $(i, j)^{th}$ element of the second term can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) | \theta] &= \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} [\eta^{(k)} H(\eta)_{i,j}] \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right] & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In all the expectations above, since the total number of exponents in the numerator is odd, hence, for any combination of i, j, k , the functions are odd and so, by Proposition 3.1, the expectations are zero in all cases. Thus, the second term in (71) is zero. Due to similar reasons, the fourth term in (71) is also zero. Now, we consider the second term. For $i \neq j$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right],$$

which is zero unless $i = k, j = l$ or $i = l, j = k$. So using the fact that $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$ is symmetric, *i.e.*, $[\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} = [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{l,k}$, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = \frac{4q [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,j}}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right]. \quad (74)$$

Referring to Proposition 3.1, we have in this case, $b = b_i = b_j = 2$ and $b_k = 0$ for all other k . So $\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{2} = 2$ and $\frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} (\frac{b_i}{2})!} = \frac{b_j!}{2^{b_j} (\frac{b_j}{2})!} = \frac{1}{2}$. For any $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, the arguments of the Gamma functions are positive, and hence, the Gamma functions exist. For $q < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] &= \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \\ &= \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{1-q} \left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right)} \\ &= \frac{(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q}, \end{aligned}$$

while for $q > 1$, we again have $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q} \right)$.

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = (N+2-Nq) [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,j}$$

for $i \neq j$ by substituting in (74). Now for $i = j$, using (53)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] &= \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 \eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that the above expectations are zero for $k \neq l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] &= \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k \neq i} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{2q [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i}}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right]. \quad (75) \end{aligned}$$

We again refer to Proposition 3.1 to compute each term in (75). For the first term, $b = 2$ and $b_i = 4$. So we can verify the conditions in Proposition 3.1 hold for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \left(\frac{4!}{2^4 2!} \right) \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right)} = \frac{3(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q}$$

for $q \in (0, 1)$. The same result also holds for $1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$. The second term in (75) is similar to the one in (74), and can be computed in the same way. From (47), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{2} \right).$$

Substituting all these terms in (75) results in the following.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) \mid \theta] \\ &= (N+2-Nq) \left(\frac{3}{2} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq i} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \right) \\ &= (N+2-Nq) [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows by substituting all the above expressions in (71). \square

The following result is a direct consequence of Propositions 4.6 and 5.3.

Corollary 5.4. *Under Assumption V, $\|\Delta(\theta)\| = o(\beta)$ for all $q \in (0, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$.*

Proof. We write $\Delta(\cdot)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\theta) &= \left(\mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right) \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} (\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta(\theta)\| &\leq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]\|. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Since, $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ is continuously differentiable on compact set C , hence $\sup_{\theta \in C} \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| < \infty$. Also, since $\mathcal{P}_{pd}(\cdot)$ is a positive definite matrix, its inverse always exists, *i.e.*, for any given matrix A , $\|(\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A))^{-1}\| < \infty$ considering any matrix norm. Thus, in order to justify the claim, we need to show that other terms are $o(\beta)$. From Proposition 4.6, it follows that $\|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]\| = o(\beta)$, and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \left(\mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} \right\| \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

We note that for any matrix A , eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A)$ are lower bounded by ε . Hence, the first two terms, which are upper bounded by the maximum eigenvalues of the inverse of the projected matrices, can at most be $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Also from Proposition 5.3, the third term is $o(\beta)$. The claim follows. \square

The following result deals with the noise term ξ_n in a way similar to Gq-SF1. For this we consider the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ as defined in Section 4, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(0), \dots, \theta(n), \eta(0), \dots, \eta(n-1))$.

Lemma 5.5. *Defining $M_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a(k)\xi_k$, $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an almost surely convergent martingale sequence for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$.*

Proof. As $\theta(k)$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, while $\eta(k)$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_k for all $k \geq 0$, we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$. Thus $(\xi_k, \mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale difference sequence and $(M_k, \mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale sequence. As shown in Lemmas 4.5 and 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right)^{-1}\frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta\rho(\eta)(N+2-Nq)}\right\|^2\right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right)^{-1}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)}\right\|^2J(\theta + \beta\eta)^2\right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2}\sup_{\eta}\left(\frac{J(\theta + \beta\eta)^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\sum_{j=1}^N\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$ is the upper bound for the maximum eigenvalue of the inverse of the projected Hessian matrix. The claim follows using similar arguments as in Lemma 4.5. \square

Thus, we have the main theorem which affirms the convergence of the Nq-SF1 algorithm. The proof of this theorem is exactly the same as that of Theorem 4.7.

Theorem 5.6. *Under Assumptions I – V, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Nq-SF1 converges almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the set of stable attractors of the ODE*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(t)}^2 J(\theta(t)) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(t)} J(\theta(t)) \right), \quad (77)$$

where the domain of attraction is given by

$$K = \left\{ \theta \in C \mid \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)^T \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right) = 0 \right\}. \quad (78)$$

5.4.2. Convergence of Nq-SF2 Algorithm

The convergence of Nq-SF2 algorithm to a local minimum can be showed by extending the results in the previous section in the same way as done for the Gq-SF2 algorithm. We just show the result regarding convergence of smoothed Hessian to the Hessian of the objective function as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, which has been used in (57).

Proposition 5.7. *For a given $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, for all $\theta \in C$ and $\beta > 0$,*

$$\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\| = o(\beta).$$

Proof. For small $\beta > 0$, using Taylor's expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ and $J(\theta - \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) + J(\theta - \beta\eta) = 2J(\theta) + \beta^2 \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) + o(\beta^3).$$

Thus the Hessian of the two-sided SF (56) is

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E} [2H(\eta)J(\theta) | \theta] + \beta^2 \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\eta | \theta] + o(\beta^3) \right),$$

which can be computed as in Proposition 5.3 to arrive at the claim. \square

The key result related to convergence of Nq-SF2 follows.

Theorem 5.8. *Under Assumptions I – V, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Nq-SF2 converges almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the set of stable attractors of the ODE (77).*

Thus, the convergence analysis of all the proposed algorithms show that by choosing a small $\beta > 0$ and any $q \in (0, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, all the SF algorithms converge to a local optimum. In the special case of $q \rightarrow 1$, we retrieve the algorithms presented in [5], and so the corresponding convergence analysis holds.

6. Simulations using the Proposed Algorithms

6.1. Numerical Setting

We consider a multi-node network of $M/G/1$ queues with feedback as shown in the figure below. The setting here is a generalized version of that considered in [5].




Figure 1: Queuing Network.

There are K nodes, which are fed with independent Poisson external arrival processes with rates $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_K$, respectively. After departing from the i^{th} node, a customer either leaves the system with probability p_i or enters the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ node with probability $(1-p_i)$. Once the service at the K^{th} node is completed, the customer may rejoin the 1^{st} node with probability $(1-p_K)$. The service time processes of each node, $\{S_n^i(\theta_i)\}_{n \geq 1}, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$ are defined as

$$S_n^i(\theta_i) = U_i(n) \left(\frac{1}{R_i} + \|\theta_i(n) - \bar{\theta}_i\|^2 \right), \quad (79)$$

where for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$, R_i are constants and $U_i(n)$ are independent samples drawn from the uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$. The service time of each node depends on the N_i -dimensional tunable parameter vector θ_i , whose individual components lie in a certain interval $\left[\left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{\min}, \left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{\max} \right]$,

$j = 1, 2, \dots, N_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$. $\theta_i(n)$ represents the n^{th} update of the parameter vector at the i^{th} node, and $\bar{\theta}_i$ represents the target parameter vector corresponding to the i^{th} node.

The cost function is chosen to be the sum of the total waiting times of all the customers in the system. For the cost to be minimum, $S_n^i(\theta_i)$ should be minimum, and hence, we should have $\theta_i(n) = \bar{\theta}_i, i = 1, \dots, K$. Let us denote

$$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \theta_K \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \bar{\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\theta}_1 \\ \bar{\theta}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\theta}_K \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is evident that $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $N = \sum_{i=1}^K N_i$. In order to compare the performance of the various algorithms, we consider the performance measure to be the Euclidian distance between $\theta(n)$ and $\bar{\theta}$,

$$\|\theta(n) - \bar{\theta}\| = \left[\sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \left(\theta_i^{(j)}(n) - \bar{\theta}_i^{(j)} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

6.2. Implementation Issues

Before discussing about the results of simulation, we address some of the issues regarding implementation of the proposed algorithms.

6.2.1. Sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian distribution

All the algorithms require generation of a multivariate q -Gaussian distributed random vector, whose individual components are uncorrelated and identically distributed. This implies that the random variables are q -independent [47]. For the limiting case of $q \rightarrow 1$, q -independence is equivalent to independence of the random variables. Hence, we can use standard algorithms to generate i.i.d. samples. This is typically not possible for q -Gaussians with $q \neq 1$. Thistleton et al. [43] proposed an algorithm for generating one-dimensional q -Gaussian distributed random variables using generalized Box-Müller transformation. This method can be easily extended to the two-variable case. But, there exists no standard algorithm for generating N -variate q -Gaussian random vectors. However, Vignat and Plastino [48] provide a relationship between multivariate Gaussian and q -Gaussian random vectors, which can be used to generate q -Gaussian random variates.

A method can be obtained by making use of the one-to-one correspondence between q -Gaussian and Students'- t distributions for $q > 1$. In fact, the generalized Box-Müller method for sampling q -Gaussian is a modified version of the polar method [25] for generating Students'- t variates. Further, a duality property of q -Gaussians can be used to relate the distributions for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$ and $q \in (-\infty, 1)$. This observation was first made by Vignat and Plastino [48].

Based on the above mentioned relations [48], we formally present an algorithm, which can be used to generate multivariate q -Gaussian distribution. For simplicity, we denote the q -Gaussian distribution with q -mean μ_q and q -covariance Σ_q as $\mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$.

Theoretical justification behind the above algorithm is provided in the following results [48].

Lemma 6.1. *Given $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{N \times N})$ and $a \sim \chi^2(m)$, $m > 0$, then the vector $Y = \sqrt{\frac{m}{a}} Z \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$, where $q = \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right)$.*

Lemma 6.2. Let $Y \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$ for some $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$ and

$$X = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2-q}{N+2-Nq}} Y}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{q-1}{N+2-Nq} Y^T Y}}.$$

Then $X \sim \mathcal{G}_{q'}(0, I_{N \times N})$, where $q' = \left(1 - \frac{q-1}{(N+4)-(N+2)q}\right)$.

Lemma 6.3. If $Y \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$ for some $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, then $X = \left(\mu_q + \Sigma_q^{1/2} Y\right) \sim \mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$.

Sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian distribution

Given :

- $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$
- q -mean, $\mu_q \in \mathbb{R}^N$
- q -covariance matrix $\Sigma_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$

Procedure :

1. Generate N -dimensional vector $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{N \times N})$
2. Generate chi-squared random variate

$$a \sim \begin{cases} \chi^2\left(\frac{2(2-q)}{1-q}\right) & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \chi^2\left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1}\right) & \text{for } 1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N}). \end{cases}$$

3. Compute

$$Y = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{a+Z^T Z}} & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \sqrt{\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1}} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{a}} & \text{for } 1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N}). \end{cases}$$

Output :

$$X = \left(\mu_q + \Sigma_q^{1/2} Y\right) \sim \mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$$

6.2.2. Hessian projection

The projection of Hessian in the Newton based algorithms requires some discussion. We require the projected matrix to have eigenvalues bounded below by $\varepsilon > 0$. This can be done by performing the eigen-decomposition of the Hessian update $W(nL)$, and computing the projected matrix by

making all the eigenvalues less than ε to be equal to ε . However, this method requires large amount of time and memory resources for the eigen-decomposition. To reduce the computational efforts, various methods have been studied in literature [4, 39, 51] for obtaining projected Hessian estimates. We consider a variation of Newton’s method, where the off-diagonal elements of the matrix are set to zero. This is similar to the Jacobi variant algorithms discussed in [5], and it simplifies the update as Steps 11–15 in the algorithms are no longer required. The projection of Hessian can be easily obtained by projecting each diagonal element to $[\varepsilon, \infty)$, and its inverse can then be directly computed. The simulations are shown using the Jacobi variants of the proposed Newton algorithms, while the gradient-based algorithms are implemented as proposed. For simplicity, we refer the two Jacobi variants as Nq-SF1 and Nq-SF2, respectively.

6.3. Experimental Results

For the simulations, we first consider a two queue network with the arrival rates at the nodes being $\lambda_1 = 0.2$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.1$ respectively. We consider that all customers leaving node-1 enter node-2, *i.e.*, $p_1 = 0$, while customers serviced at node-2 may leave the system with probability $p_2 = 0.4$. We also fix the constants in the service times at $R_1 = 10$ and $R_2 = 20$, respectively, for the two nodes. The service time parameters for either node are two-dimensional vectors, $N_1 = N_2 = 2$, with components lying in the interval $\left[\left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{min}, \left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{max} \right] = [0.1, 0.6]$ for $i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2$. Thus the constrained space C is given by $C = [0.1, 0.6]^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. We fix the target parameter vector at $\bar{\theta} = (0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3)^T$.

The simulations were performed on an Intel Core i5 machine with 3.7GiB memory space and linux operating system. We run the algorithms by varying the values of q and β , while all the other parameters are held fixed at $M = 10000$, $L = 100$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. For all the cases, the initial parameter is assumed to be $\theta(0) = (0.1, 0.1, 0.6, 0.6)^T$. The step-sizes $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$, $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ were taken to be $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, respectively. For each q, β pair, 20 independent runs were performed with each run of 10^6 iterations taking about 0.5 seconds. We compare the performance of all the proposed algorithms with the four SF algorithms proposed in [5], which use Gaussian smoothing. Figure 2 shows the convergence behavior of the proposed q -Gaussian based algorithms with $q = 0.8$, where the smoothness parameter is $\beta = 0.005$.




Figure 2: Convergence behavior of various algorithms for $q = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.005$.

Table 1 presents the performance of the gradient based algorithms and the Jacobi versions of the Newton based algorithms. The values of β are chosen over the range where the Gaussian SF algorithms perform well [5], whereas the values of q are chosen over the range $(-\infty, 1 + \frac{2}{N}) = (-\infty, 1.5)$. It may be noted that $q \rightarrow 1$ corresponds to the Gaussian case, while $q = 1.4$ corresponds

to Cauchy. We show the distance of the final updates $\theta(M)$ from the optimum $\bar{\theta}$, averaged over 20 trials. The variance of the updates is also shown to indicate the robustness of the algorithms. We observe that the two-simulation algorithms perform better than their one-simulation counterparts.

Table 1: Performance of all algorithm for different values of q with $\beta = 0.005$.

q	G q -SF1	G q -SF2	N q -SF1	N q -SF2
-10	0.05859±0.03606	0.06081±0.05528	-	-
-5	0.01621±0.01189	0.01225±0.00566	-	-
-1	0.00580±0.00927	0.00117±0.00080	-	-
-0.5	0.00151±0.00107	0.00035±0.00025	-	-
0.001	0.00207±0.00519	0.00035±0.00062	0.00106±0.00060	0.00019±0.00005
0.2	0.00206±0.00377	0.00011±0.00005	0.00079±0.00030	0.00017±0.00007
0.4	0.00048±0.00024	0.00012±0.00005	0.00067±0.00029	0.00013±0.00004
0.6	0.00068±0.00082	0.00011±0.00003	0.00209±0.00647	0.00010±0.00004
0.8	0.00046±0.00033	0.00013±0.00002	0.00619±0.01305	0.00068±0.00077
1.0 (Gaussian)	0.00290±0.00654	0.00030±0.00013	0.00087±0.00064	0.00058±0.00138
1.1	0.00055±0.00016	0.00014±0.00003	0.03249±0.05359	0.00132±0.00061
1.2	0.00057±0.00021	0.00016±0.00003	0.00417±0.00618	0.00123±0.00138
1.3	0.00070±0.00044	0.00018±0.00004	0.00421±0.00551	0.00207±0.00204
1.4 (Cauchy)	0.00191±0.00065	0.00062±0.00030	0.00366±0.00257	0.00361±0.00417
1.49	0.00813±0.00291	0.00494±0.00228	0.01582±0.00741	0.00931±0.00761

We now focus on the effect of the value of q used in the algorithms. For each value of β , the instances where the distance for the q -Gaussian is less than Gaussian-SF are highlighted. Also, the least distance obtained for each β is marked. In the case of the gradient descent algorithms, it can be seen that better results are usually obtained for $q > 1$ for low values of β . As β increases lower values of q give better performance, while the higher q -values tend to make the algorithm unstable (higher variance). The extreme left and right columns indicate a deterioration in the standard error performance, which can be attributed to the dependence of the noise term and error term, respectively, on the parameter β .

Table 2: Performance of G q -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.0005	0.001	0.005	0.01	0.05	0.1
-10	0.06036±0.04502	0.08081±0.05699	0.06081±0.05528	0.02630±0.00787	0.02245±0.00741	0.02176±0.00894
-5	0.09589±0.11057	0.02078±0.02135	0.01225±0.00566	0.00650±0.00407	0.00527±0.00260	0.00819±0.00448
-1	0.01731±0.03489	0.02113±0.02057	0.00117±0.00080	0.00040±0.00015	0.00100±0.00022	0.00216±0.00064
-0.5	0.05658±0.10012	0.00362±0.00572	0.00035±0.00025	0.00019±0.00008	0.00104±0.00027	0.00165±0.00050
0.001	0.00336±0.00264	0.00136±0.00256	0.00035±0.00062	0.00019±0.00010	0.00090±0.00032	0.00214±0.00070
0.2	0.00481±0.00475	0.00090±0.00086	0.00011±0.00005	0.00016±0.00008	0.00103±0.00048	0.00314±0.00124
0.4	0.00473±0.00421	0.00076±0.00103	0.00012±0.00005	0.00026±0.00007	0.00091±0.00021	0.00327±0.00078
0.6	0.00581±0.00276	0.00062±0.00113	0.00011±0.00003	0.00025±0.00010	0.00112±0.00061	0.00618±0.00149
0.8	0.00100±0.00194	0.00026±0.00037	0.00013±0.00002	0.00023±0.00007	0.00142±0.00061	0.01331±0.00146
Gaussian	0.00483±0.00531	0.00160±0.00142	0.00030±0.00013	0.00026±0.00015	0.00094±0.00044	0.01119±0.00168
1.1	0.00102±0.00178	0.00033±0.00048	0.00014±0.00003	0.00026±0.00012	0.00139±0.00045	0.04619±0.00229
1.2	0.00120±0.00154	0.00018±0.00019	0.00016±0.00003	0.00022±0.00008	0.00208±0.00035	0.04432±0.00286
1.3	0.00316±0.00670	0.00074±0.00061	0.00018±0.00004	0.00030±0.00014	0.00515±0.00066	0.04825±0.00176
Cauchy	0.00314±0.00398	0.00145±0.00135	0.00062±0.00030	0.00138±0.00053	0.01462±0.00060	0.05675±0.00373
1.49	0.00424±0.00226	0.00600±0.00431	0.00494±0.00228	0.00682±0.00230	0.02771±0.00178	0.06799±0.00536

Before presenting the results of the N q -SF2 algorithm, we provide a brief discussion about the step-size sequences. The analysis along the faster timescale for the Newton based algorithms shows that the gradient and Hessian updates are independent, and hence, their convergence to the smoothed gradient and Hessian, respectively, can be independently analyzed. This also provides a scope to update the gradient and Hessian along different timescales without affecting the conver-

gence of the algorithms. Bhatnagar [5] used a faster timescale to update the Hessian, due to which inverse of the Hessian converges much faster compared to the gradient update. This improves the performance of the N-SF algorithms. We study the effect of the timescales on the proposed algorithms. Since, both the one-simulation and two-simulation algorithms involve the step-sizes in a similar way, we consider only G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 algorithms. We use a different step-size ($c(n)$) for Hessian estimation. We fix the step-size sequence corresponding to the slower timescale at $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $n \geq 1$. and let the other sequences to be of the form $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^\gamma}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$. In order to satisfy Assumption IV, we need to consider $\gamma, \delta \in (0.5, 1)$. We study the relative performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 algorithms, when the Hessian is updated on various timescales. Tables 3 and 4 show the effect of δ on the N q -SF2 algorithm for varying q , while β is held fixed at 0.005, and γ is fixed at 0.75 and 0.85, respectively. The value of δ is varied from 0.55 to γ so that $b(n) = o(c(n))$, due to reasons discussed in [5]. We mark the cases where N q -SF2 performs better than G q -SF2.

Table 3: Performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different values of q and δ , where $\beta = 0.005$ and the step-sizes are $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$.

$q \backslash \delta$	0.55	0.65	0.75	G q -SF2
0.001	0.00021±0.00009	0.00017±0.00005	0.00019±0.00005	0.00035±0.00062
0.2	0.00017±0.00005	0.00017±0.00004	0.00017±0.00007	0.00011±0.00005
0.4	0.00016±0.00005	0.00012±0.00003	0.00013±0.00004	0.00012±0.00005
0.6	0.00012±0.00006	0.00012±0.00004	0.00010±0.00004	0.00011±0.00003
0.8	0.00012±0.00004	0.00013±0.00002	0.00068±0.00077	0.00013±0.00002
Gaussian	0.00014±0.00003	0.00009±0.00003	0.00058±0.00138	0.00030±0.00013
1.1	0.00013±0.00006	0.00019±0.00008	0.00132±0.00061	0.00014±0.00003
1.2	0.00016±0.00005	0.00013±0.00005	0.00123±0.00138	0.00016±0.00008
1.3	0.00018±0.00004	0.00019±0.00010	0.00207±0.00204	0.00018±0.00004
Cauchy	0.00095±0.00047	0.00076±0.00044	0.00361±0.00417	0.00062±0.00030
1.49	0.00368±0.00155	0.00586±0.00169	0.00931±0.00761	0.00494±0.00228

Table 4: Performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different values of q and δ , where $\beta = 0.005$ and the step-sizes are $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.85}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$.

$q \backslash \delta$	0.55	0.65	0.75	0.85	G q -SF2
0.001	0.00019±0.00006	0.00020±0.00006	0.00019±0.00004	0.00016±0.00005	0.00019±0.00015
0.2	0.00019±0.00008	0.00018±0.00005	0.00019±0.00005	0.00016±0.00007	0.00021±0.00027
0.4	0.00016±0.00006	0.00014±0.00006	0.00014±0.00005	0.00014±0.00006	0.00013±0.00007
0.6	0.00015±0.00006	0.00014±0.00005	0.00011±0.00003	0.00012±0.00005	0.00011±0.00004
0.8	0.00015±0.00007	0.00010±0.00005	0.00011±0.00003	0.00019±0.00009	0.00010±0.00002
Gaussian	0.00012±0.00003	0.00012±0.00004	0.00009±0.00004	0.00015±0.00011	0.00047±0.00026
1.1	0.00017±0.00006	0.00014±0.00004	0.00020±0.00008	0.00054±0.00025	0.00012±0.00005
1.2	0.00015±0.00005	0.00013±0.00006	0.00016±0.00007	0.00193±0.00290	0.00015±0.00006
1.3	0.00015±0.00006	0.00014±0.00004	0.00022±0.00015	0.00272±0.00376	0.00019±0.00005
Cauchy	0.00081±0.00063	0.00073±0.00029	0.00114±0.00098	0.00372±0.00605	0.00077±0.00033
1.49	0.00677±0.00211	0.00465±0.00233	0.00574±0.00094	0.00722±0.00335	0.00589±0.00194

The above results show that significant improvement can be achieved for the Gaussian case by using Newton based search. For other q -values, some amount of improvement is observed. We now provide results for the Jacobi variant of N q -SF2 with $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.55}}$.

We find that although for $q > 1$, the results are not so encouraging, but for $q < 1$, the performance is quite similar to G q -SF2. However, the performance of N q -SF2 is overwhelming for $\beta = 0.001$ and $q \in (0, 1)$ (see Table 5). This indicates that with proper choice of (q, β) -pair, the global optimum may be achieved. The observations regarding very low or high values of β , and high q -values hold for the N q -SF2 algorithm. Thus, it appears that for higher values of q , the

Table 5: Performance of Jacobi variant of Nq -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.0005	0.001	0.005	0.01	0.05	0.1
0.001	0.09423±0.13406	0.00007±0.00005	0.00021±0.00009	0.00046±0.00015	0.00188±0.00078	0.00411±0.00108
0.2	0.02476±0.10495	0.00003±0.00001	0.00017±0.00005	0.00036±0.00014	0.00154±0.00050	0.00361±0.00064
0.4	0.00021±0.00045	0.00005±0.00005	0.00016±0.00005	0.00030±0.00012	0.00159±0.00061	0.00416±0.00130
0.6	0.00081±0.00151	0.00005±0.00007	0.00012±0.00006	0.00023±0.00010	0.00147±0.00063	0.00473±0.00120
0.8	0.00094±0.00126	0.00003±0.00001	0.00012±0.00004	0.00025±0.00009	0.00128±0.00064	0.01049±0.00120
Gaussian	0.00259±0.00405	0.00008±0.00012	0.00014±0.00003	0.00025±0.00009	0.00114±0.00036	0.00723±0.00169
1.1	0.00010±0.00010	0.00004±0.00001	0.00013±0.00006	0.00036±0.00008	0.00150±0.00052	0.03552±0.00159
1.2	0.00028±0.00034	0.00016±0.00027	0.00016±0.00005	0.00027±0.00011	0.00208±0.00070	0.03571±0.00187
1.3	0.00117±0.00274	0.00018±0.00038	0.00018±0.00004	0.00033±0.00009	0.00457±0.00095	0.03990±0.00256
Cauchy	0.00264±0.00479	0.00057±0.00059	0.00095±0.00047	0.00102±0.00049	0.01408±0.00101	0.05291±0.00201
1.49	0.00911±0.00737	0.00361±0.00187	0.00368±0.00155	0.00588±0.00119	0.02773±0.00170	0.06485±0.00298

desirable region $(0, \beta_0)$ for β , mentioned in the convergence theorems, decreases.

We perform similar experiments in a higher dimensional case. For this, we consider a four node network with $\lambda_i = 0.2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$. The probability of leaving the system after service at each node is $p_i = 0.2$ for all nodes. The service process of each node is controlled by a 5-dimensional parameter vector, and a constant set at $R_i = 10$. Thus, we have a 20-dimensional constrained optimization problem, where each component can vary over the interval $[0.1, 0.6]$ and the target is 0.3. The parameters of the algorithms are held fixed at $M = 10000$, $L = 100$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. Each component in the initial parameter vector is assumed to be $\theta^{(i)}(0) = 0.6$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 20$. The step-sizes were taken to be $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.85}}$ and $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$. For each q, β pair, 20 independent runs were performed. Each run of 10^6 iterations took about 1 second on an average.




Figure 3: Convergence behavior of various algorithms for $N = 20$ with $q = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.05$.

Figure 3 shows the convergence behavior of the algorithms for $N = 20$. As in the previous case, the Gq -SF2 usually converges faster than Nq -SF2. The performance of one-simulation algorithms are relatively poor. The following tables show the performance of Gq -SF2 and Nq -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different (q, β) -pairs. Results are shown only over the range of β 's where the performance is better. It can be observed that the trend is similar in higher dimensional case. However, although the Nq -SF2 shows significant improvement over Gq -SF2 for the Gaussian case, it does not perform as well for other values of q . This observation is quite significant as Gq -SF2 requires less number of simulations, and hence less time, than Nq -SF2. So, we can achieve better performance with less time complexity.

Table 6: Performance of the G q -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.005	0.0075	0.01	0.025	0.05	0.075	0.1
-10	0.4510±0.0877	0.3617±0.1100	0.2749±0.0534	0.2051±0.0246	0.1687±0.0240	0.1651±0.0205	0.1758±0.0316
-5	0.4072±0.1072	0.3079±0.0776	0.2635±0.0572	0.1236±0.0221	0.0972±0.0176	0.0787±0.0140	0.0961±0.0249
-1	0.2629±0.1003	0.1534±0.0569	0.1392±0.0877	0.0368±0.0108	0.0199±0.0047	0.0196±0.0024	0.0320±0.0068
-0.5	0.3852±0.1728	0.1265±0.0509	0.0820±0.0278	0.0277±0.0088	0.0146±0.0039	0.0136±0.0031	0.0297±0.0037
0.001	0.2718±0.1072	0.1186±0.0423	0.0742±0.0357	0.0137±0.0035	0.0099±0.0024	0.0134±0.0011	0.0282±0.0036
0.2	0.2580±0.1134	0.1393±0.0709	0.0575±0.0192	0.0136±0.0068	0.0087±0.0017	0.0130±0.0018	0.0271±0.0047
0.4	0.2271±0.1073	0.0875±0.0344	0.0649±0.0202	0.0086±0.0024	0.0090±0.0016	0.0122±0.0018	0.0300±0.0049
0.6	0.2643±0.1757	0.0746±0.0331	0.0397±0.0289	0.0081±0.0028	0.0085±0.0018	0.0124±0.0019	0.0298±0.0031
0.8	0.1627±0.0593	0.0706±0.0307	0.0256±0.0109	0.0056±0.0012	0.0086±0.0014	0.0139±0.0023	0.0344±0.0039
Gaussian	0.2042±0.0525	0.0946±0.0331	0.0770±0.0156	0.0242±0.0056	0.0143±0.0026	0.0153±0.0016	0.0308±0.0032
1.02	0.0850±0.0393	0.0360±0.0164	0.0169±0.0093	0.0055±0.0010	0.0116±0.0023	0.0373±0.0043	0.1150±0.0073
1.04	0.0651±0.0226	0.0407±0.0187	0.0255±0.0087	0.0074±0.0016	0.0118±0.0013	0.0368±0.0045	0.1140±0.0063
1.06	0.1055±0.0577	0.0364±0.0103	0.0281±0.0122	0.0089±0.0018	0.0122±0.0025	0.0408±0.0045	0.1208±0.0086
1.08	0.0858±0.0419	0.0522±0.0202	0.0329±0.0124	0.0136±0.0055	0.0157±0.0022	0.0542±0.0069	0.1405±0.0104
Cauchy	0.1153±0.0445	0.0701±0.0237	0.0572±0.0365	0.0292±0.0070	0.0578±0.0051	0.1118±0.0122	0.1980±0.0134
1.099	0.4316±0.0794	0.3314±0.0630	0.2787±0.0460	0.1916±0.0284	0.1836±0.0420	0.2268±0.0337	0.2781±0.0342

Table 7: Performance of the N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.005	0.0075	0.01	0.025	0.05	0.075	0.1
0.001	1.0666±0.0464	1.0140±0.0865	0.9965±0.0345	0.7596±0.2724	0.0512±0.0085	0.0847±0.0192	0.1048±0.0136
0.2	1.0220±0.0632	1.0042±0.0458	0.5373±0.0938	0.2827±0.2988	0.0469±0.0059	0.0616±0.0145	0.1091±0.0240
0.4	0.9747±0.0322	0.9508±0.0834	0.0663±0.1528	0.0163±0.0025	0.0315±0.0060	0.0540±0.0090	0.0760±0.0128
0.6	0.9623±0.0644	0.9435±0.1048	0.0092±0.0023	0.0125±0.0021	0.0251±0.0036	0.0434±0.0078	0.0553±0.0072
0.8	0.8167±0.1177	0.6973±0.1421	0.0452±0.0464	0.0084±0.0015	0.0192±0.0025	0.0301±0.0049	0.0470±0.0058
Gaussian	0.9740±0.0502	0.8229±0.1640	0.0517±0.1601	0.0093±0.0010	0.0195±0.0022	0.0312±0.0044	0.0459±0.0056
1.02	0.6167±0.1569	0.2524±0.1528	0.1006±0.0595	0.0091±0.0014	0.0219±0.0032	0.0446±0.0058	0.0815±0.0094
1.04	0.7178±0.2099	0.1807±0.0990	0.0315±0.0221	0.0113±0.0011	0.0231±0.0044	0.0452±0.0062	0.0971±0.0139
1.06	0.6975±0.0810	0.2028±0.1510	0.0386±0.0503	0.0121±0.0021	0.0237±0.0052	0.0506±0.0066	0.1050±0.0113
1.08	0.7628±0.1913	0.2550±0.2262	0.0685±0.0121	0.0140±0.0021	0.0306±0.0048	0.0633±0.0098	0.1211±0.0159
Cauchy	0.7859±0.0997	0.2511±0.2316	0.0860±0.2109	0.0508±0.0172	0.0774±0.0102	0.1257±0.0164	0.1975±0.0286
1.099	0.7861±0.1149	0.7216±0.1435	0.6942±0.1239	0.3881±0.0957	0.2844±0.0509	0.3390±0.0497	0.3611±0.0773

7. Conclusions

q -Gaussian distribution is an important power-law distribution that has connections with generalized information measures. Though Gaussian is a special case of this distribution, studying the properties of this distribution poses several challenges, especially in the multivariate case. The main difficulty arises due to the special kind of interdependence among the components of a q -Gaussian random variate. In this paper, we presented some statistical properties of these distributions that helps us to apply these distributions in smoothed functional algorithms.

The power-law behavior of q -Gaussians provide a better control over smoothing of functions as compared to Gaussian distribution. We have extended the Gaussian smoothed functional approach for gradient and Hessian estimation approach to the q -Gaussian case by showing that q -Gaussian satisfies the Rubinstein conditions [34], and developed optimization algorithms based on this. We proposed four two timescale algorithms using gradient and Newton based search. These algorithms generalize the one proposed in [5]. We use a queuing network example to show that for some values of q , the results provided by the proposed algorithms are significantly better than Gaussian SF algorithms. We also present proof of convergence of the proposed algorithms, providing necessary conditions under which the algorithms converge to a local minimum of the objective function. Our simulation results show that while Gaussian based algorithms achieve better performance

with Newton based algorithms, q -Gaussians provide improved performance with gradient based methods that has less time complexity.

References

- [1] Abe, S., Suzuki, N., 2003. Iteration of the internet over nonequilibrium stationary states in Tsallis statistics. *Physical Review E* 67 (016106).
- [2] Abe, S., Suzuki, N., 2005. Scale-free statistics of time interval between successive earthquakes. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 350, 588–596.
- [3] Barabási, A. L., Albert, R., 1999. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286, 509–512.
- [4] Bertsekas, D. P., 1999. *Nonlinear Programming*. Athena Scientific, Belmont.
- [5] Bhatnagar, S., 2007. Adaptive Newton-based multivariate smoothed functional algorithms for simulation optimization. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 18 (1), 27–62.
- [6] Bhatnagar, S., Borkar, V. S., 1998. Two timescale stochastic approximation scheme for simulation-based parametric optimization. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 12, 519–531.
- [7] Bhatnagar, S., Borkar, V. S., 2003. Multiscale chaotic SPSA and smoothed functional algorithms for simulation optimization. *Simulation* 79 (9), 568–580.
- [8] Bhatnagar, S., Fu, M. C., Marcus, S. I., Bhatnagar, S., 2001. Two timescale algorithms for simulation optimization of hidden markov models. *IIE Transactions* 33 (3), 245–258.
- [9] Bhatnagar, S., Fu, M. C., Marcus, S. I., Wang, I. J., 2003. Two-timescale simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation using deterministic perturbation sequences. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 13 (2), 180–209.
- [10] Borges, E. P., 2004. A possible deformed algebra and calculus inspired in nonextensive thermostatics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 340, 95–101.
- [11] Borkar, V. S., 2008. *Stochastic Approximation: A Dynamical Systems Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Costa, J., Hero, A., Vignat, C., 2003. On solutions to multivariate maximum α -entropy problems. *Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2683, 211–226.
- [13] Daróczy, Z., 1970. Generalized information functions. *Information and Control* 16 (1), 36–51.
- [14] Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., Murty, M. N., 2007. Gelfand-Yaglom-Perez theorem for generalized relative entropy functionals. *Information Sciences* 177 (24), 5707–5714.
- [15] Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., Murty, M. N., 2007. On measure-theoretic aspects of nonextensive entropy functionals and corresponding maximum entropy prescriptions. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 384 (2), 758–774.
- [16] Fabian, V., 1971. Stochastic approximation. In: Rustagi, J. J. (Ed.), *Optimizing methods in Statistics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 439–470.
- [17] Ghoshdastidar, D., Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., 2012. q -Gaussian based smoothed functional algorithms for stochastic optimization. In: *International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE.
- [18] Gradshteyn, I. S., Ryzhik, I. M., 1994. *Table of Integrals, Series and Products* (5th ed.). Elsevier.
- [19] Havrda, J., Charvát, F., 1967. Quantification method of classification processes: Concept of structural α -entropy. *Kybernetika* 3 (1), 30–35.
- [20] Ho, Y. C., Cao, X. R., 1991. *Perturbation Analysis of Discrete Event Dynamical Systems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [21] Jaynes, E. T., 1957. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *The Physical Review* 106 (4), 620–630.
- [22] Katkovnik, V. Y. A., Kulchitsky, Y. U., 1972. Convergence of a class of random search algorithms. *Automation Remote Control* 8, 1321–1326.
- [23] Kiefer, E., Wolfowitz, J., 1952. Stochastic estimation of a maximum regression function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 23, 462–466.
- [24] Kolmogorov, A. N., 1958. New metric invariant of transitive dynamical systems and endomorphisms of Lebesgue spaces. *Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences* 119 (5), 861–864.
- [25] Kroese, D. P., Taimre, T., Botev, Z. I., 2011. *Handbook of Monte Carlo Methods*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- [26] Kullback, S., 1959. *Information theory and statistics*. John Wiley and Sons, N.Y.
- [27] Kushner, H. J., Clark, D. S., 1978. *Stochastic Approximation Methods for Constrained and Unconstrained Systems*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

- [28] L'Ecuyer, P., Glynn, P. W., 1994. Stochastic optimization by simulation: Convergence proofs for the GI/G/1 queue in steady state. *Management Science* 40 (11), 1562–1578.
- [29] Pareto, V., 1906. *Manuale di economica politica*. Societa Editrice Libraria.
- [30] Perez, A., 1968. Risk estimates in terms of generalized f -entropies. In: *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Information Theory, Debrecen 1967*. Journal Bolyai Mathematical Society, Budapest, pp. 299–315.
- [31] Prato, D., Tsallis, C., 1999. Nonextensive foundation of Lévy distributions. *Physical Review E*. 60 (2), 2398–2401.
- [32] Rényi, A., 1961. On measures of entropy and information. In: *Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1960*. Vol. 1. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, pp. 547–561.
- [33] Robbins, H., Monro, S., 1951. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22 (3), 400–407.
- [34] Rubinstein, R. Y., 1981. *Simulation and Monte-Carlo Method*. John Wiley, New York.
- [35] Ruppert, D., 1985. A Newton-Raphson version of the multivariate Robbins-Monro procedure. *Annals of Statistics* 13, 236–245.
- [36] Sato, A. H., 2010. q -Gaussian distributions and multiplicative stochastic processes for analysis of multiple financial time series. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 201 (012008).
- [37] Shannon, C. E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communications. *The Bell System Technical Journal* 27.
- [38] Spall, J. C., 1992. Multivariate stochastic approximation using a simultaneous perturbation gradient approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 37 (3), 332–334.
- [39] Spall, J. C., 2000. Adaptive stochastic approximation by the simultaneous perturbation method. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 45, 1839–1853.
- [40] Styblinski, M. A., Tang, T. S., 1990. Experiments in nonconvex optimization: Stochastic approximation with function smoothing and simulated annealing. *Neural Networks* 3 (4), 467–483.
- [41] Suyari, H., 2004. Generalization of Shannon-Khinchin axioms to nonextensive systems and the uniqueness theorem for the nonextensive entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 50, 1783–1787.
- [42] Suyari, H., 2005. Law of error in Tsallis statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 51 (2), 753–757.
- [43] Thistleton, W. J., Marsh, J. A., Nelson, K., Tsallis, C., 2007. Generalized Box-Muller method for generating q -Gaussian random deviates. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 53 (12), 4805–4810.
- [44] Tsallis, C., 1988. Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 52 (1-2), 479–487.
- [45] Tsallis, C., 1995. Some comments on Boltzmann-Gibbs statistical mechanics. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 6, 539–559.
- [46] Tsallis, C., Mendes, R. S., Plastino, A. R., 1998. The role of constraints within generalized nonextensive statistics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 261 (3–4), 534–554.
- [47] Umarov, S., Tsallis, C., 2007. Multivariate generalizations of the q -central limit theorem. [arXiv:cond-mat/0703533](https://arxiv.org/abs/0703533).
- [48] Vignat, C., Plastino, A., 2006. Poincaré's observation and the origin of Tsallis generalized canonical distributions. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 365 (1), 167–172.
- [49] Vignat, C., Plastino, A., 2007. Central limit theorem and deformed exponentials. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 20 (45).
- [50] Williams, D., 1991. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge University Press.
- [51] Zhu, X., Spall, J. C., 2002. A modified second-order SPSA optimization algorithm for finite samples. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Process* 16, 397–409.

Algorithm 4 : The Nq -SF2 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q, β and ε .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, W^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate two independent simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9:
$$Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) - h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta(N+2-Nq) \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right].$$
 - 10:
$$W_{i,i}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,i}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{h(Y_{nL+m}) + h(Y'_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{2q(\eta^{(i)}(n))^2}{(N+2-Nq) \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right) \right].$$
 - 11: **for** $j = i + 1$ to N **do**
 - 12:
$$W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,j}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2q\eta^{(i)}(n)\eta^{(j)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) + h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2 \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} \right].$$
 - 13:
$$W_{j,i}(nL + m + 1) = W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1).$$
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Project $W(nL)$ using \mathcal{P}_{pd} , and compute its inverse. Let $M(nL) = \mathcal{P}_{pd}(W(nL))^{-1}$.
 - 18: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 19:
$$\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n) \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL) Z^{(j)}(nL) \right).$$
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \theta^{(2)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

On some Statistical Properties of Multivariate q -Gaussian Distribution and its application to Smoothed Functional Algorithms[☆]

Debarghya Ghoshdastidar, Ambedkar Dukkipati, Shalabh Bhatnagar

*Department of Computer Science & Automation
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore - 560012
email: {debarghya.g, ambedkar, shalabh}@csa.iisc.ernet.in*

Abstract

The importance of the q -Gaussian distribution lies in its power-law nature, and its close association with Gaussian, Cauchy and uniform distributions. This distribution arises from maximization of a generalized information measure. In this work, we study some key properties related to higher order moments and q -moments of the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution. Further, we present an algorithm to generate multivariate q -Gaussian distribution.

We use these results of the q -Gaussian distribution to improve upon the smoothing properties of Gaussian and Cauchy kernels. Based on this, we propose a Smoothed Functional (SF) scheme for gradient and Hessian estimation using q -Gaussian distribution. Our work extends the class of distributions that can be used in SF algorithms by including the q -Gaussian distributions for a range of q -values. We propose four two-timescale algorithms for optimization of a stochastic objective function using gradient descent and Newton based search methods. We prove that each of the proposed algorithms converge to a local optimum. Performance of the algorithms is shown by simulation results on a queuing model.

Keywords: generalized information measures; q -Gaussian; comoments; smoothed functional algorithms; two-timescale stochastic approximation; gradient and Newton algorithms

1. Introduction

Shannon [37] provided the concept of entropy as a measure of information, or more precisely, a measure of uncertainty given by probability distributions. Rényi [32] was the first to introduce the concept of generalized measures of information when he proposed the first well-known generalization of Shannon entropy, known as α -entropy or Rényi entropy, based on Kolmogorov-Nagumo averages. Several other generalizations have also been studied in the literature [24, 30, 13], and have been extensively used in physics and other disciplines.

One of the most recently studied generalized information measure is the nonextensive entropy, due to Tsallis [44], defined as

$$H_q(p) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x)^q \ln_q(p(x)), \quad (1)$$

[☆]Part of this work has been presented in IEEE 2012 International Symposium on Information Theory [17].

where p is the probability mass function of the discrete random variable on the set \mathcal{X} , and the q -logarithm is defined as $\ln_q(x) = \frac{x^{1-q}-1}{1-q}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \neq 1$. It is called nonextensive because of its pseudo-additive nature [44], *i.e.*, $H_q(pr) = H_q(p) + H_q(r) + (1-q)H_q(p)H_q(r)$. Although this generalization had been introduced earlier by Havrda and Charvát [19], Tsallis provided interpretations in the context of statistical mechanics. Borges [10] presents a detailed discussion on the mathematical structure induced by this nonextensive entropy. Suyari [41] generalized the Shannon-Khinchin axioms to the nonextensive case. The most important characteristic of these generalized information measures is that, on maximization, they give rise power-law distributions, while maximization of Shannon entropy gives rise to exponential distributions.

The concept of maximization of information measure can be attributed to Kullback's minimum discrimination theorem [26], which establishes important connections between statistics and information theory. This theorem shows that exponential distributions can be obtained by minimizing Kullback-Leibler divergence under given moment constraints. One can consider maximum entropy [21] as a special case, where maximization of Shannon entropy under moment constraints leads to exponential distributions. For example, given mean and variance of a random variable, maximum entropy gives rise to Gaussian distribution.

While exponential distributions have been extensively studied and used in statistical modeling, the power-law behavior has been observed in most of the real-world data [3, 29]. As we mentioned earlier, the importance of Tsallis entropy has been attributed to its connections with power-law distributions. In this respect, recently Tsallis entropy has been used to study this behavior in different applications like finance, earthquakes and network traffic [1, 2]. Compared to the exponential family, the Tsallis distributions, *i.e.*, the family of distributions resulting from maximization of Tsallis entropy, have an additional shape parameter q , similar to that in (1), which controls the nature of the power-law tails.

In this paper, we study the multivariate form of q -Gaussian distributions, which are Type-II power-law distributions, obtained from Tsallis entropy maximization. Although, these distributions have been extensively studied in literature in context of generalized limit theorems [48, 49, 47] and practical applications [43, 36], the statistical aspects of the multivariate form of the distribution has not been looked into. Our main objective are (i) to study the statistical properties of the q -Gaussian distribution, and (ii) apply these distributions in smoothed functional algorithms for stochastic optimization.

Stochastic techniques play a key role in optimization problems, where the objective function does not have an analytical expression. Such problems are often encountered in discrete event systems, which are quite common in engineering and financial world. Most often, the data, obtained via statistical survey or simulation, contains only noisy estimates of the objective function to be optimized. One of the most commonly used solution methodologies involves stochastic approximation algorithms, particularly the Robbins-Monro Algorithm [33], which is used to find the zeros of a given function. Based on this approach, gradient descent algorithms have been developed, in which the parameters controlling the system track the zeros of the gradient of the objective. However, these algorithms require an estimate of the cost gradient. Kiefer and Wolfowitz [23] provide such a gradient estimate using several parallel simulations of the system. More efficient techniques for gradient estimation, using one or two simulations, have been developed based on the smoothed functional approach [22, 34], simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation [38], perturbation analysis [20] and likelihood ratio [28] methods. A stochastic variation of Newton-based optimization methods, also known as adaptive Newton-based schemes has also been studied

in the literature. These algorithms require estimation of the Hessian of the cost objective along with the gradient estimate. Such estimates may be obtained by finite differences [16, 35], simultaneous perturbation approaches [39] or smoothed functional schemes [5].

When the above estimation schemes are employed in gradient or Newton based optimization methods, the time complexity of the algorithms increase as each update iteration requires the estimation procedure. A more efficient approach is to simultaneously perform gradient estimation and parameter updation using different step-size schedules. These classes of algorithms constitute the multi-timescale stochastic approximation algorithms [6]. Two-timescale optimization algorithms have been developed using simultaneous perturbations [8, 9] and smoothed functional [7, 5] schemes. The main issue with such algorithms is that, although convergence of the algorithm to a local optimum is guaranteed, the global optimum is often not achieved in practice. Bhatnagar [5] proves that both gradient and Hessian SF schemes that are based on Gaussian perturbations converge to a local minima, and provides a detailed comparison of the performance of various multi-timescale algorithms for stochastic optimization on a queuing system. The results presented there indicate that the performance of the SF algorithms depends considerably on several tuning parameters, such as the variance of the normal distribution, and also the step-sizes.

We look into smoothed functional algorithms with power-law perturbations, arising out of maximization of Tsallis entropy. Prior work (Rubinstein [34]) indicated that the class of distributions that can be used for the perturbation random variables in SF algorithms include Gaussian, Cauchy and uniform distributions. Our main contribution is to include the q -Gaussian distribution to this class for a wide range of q -values, which encompass the above three distributions as special cases.

Summary of our contributions

Though stochastic optimization algorithms are guaranteed to converge to a local optimum of the objective function, the challenge is to achieve the global optimum. The smoothed functional schemes have become popular due to their smoothing effects on local fluctuations. However, the smoothing kernels used in practice (Gaussian or Cauchy) do not provide “ideal performance”. Although with proper tuning of parameters, we can reduce the cost, we do not achieve globally optimal performance many times. Hence, new methods are sought.

We propose a new SF method where the smoothing kernel is a q -Gaussian distribution, which is a power-law generalization of the Gaussian distribution, that result from maximization of generalized information measure. We prove an important result related to the comoments of multivariate q -Gaussian distributions. This result leads to better understanding of moments in the multivariate case. We study the existence conditions of the usual moments and q -moments of the multivariate q -Gaussian distributions. Moreover, though Thistleton [43] provides a method to sample the univariate q -Gaussian distribution, it cannot be extended to the multivariate case. We formally present an algorithm for generating samples from a multivariate q -Gaussian distribution using the results in [48].

We also show that the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution satisfies all the conditions for smoothing kernels discussed in [34]. So far only uniform, Gaussian and Cauchy have been considered to be potential smoothing p.d.f.s [34, 40]. Since these distributions are special cases of q -Gaussian, this result allows us to work with a larger class of distributions in SF algorithms, where the “shape parameter” q , which controls the power-law behavior of q -Gaussian, also controls the smoothness of the convolution, thereby providing additional tuning.

We present estimators for gradient and the Hessian of a function using q -Gaussian smoothing kernel. We also present multi-timescale algorithms for stochastic optimization using q -Gaussian

based SF that incorporate both gradient and Newton based search procedures, and prove the convergence of the proposed algorithms to the neighbourhood of a local optimum. Further, we perform simulations on a queuing network to illustrate the benefits of the q -Gaussian based SF algorithms compared to their Gaussian counterparts.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The framework for the optimization problem and some of the preliminaries are presented in Section 2. Some general results regarding the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution have been proved in Section 3. Section 4 deals with gradient descent algorithms using q -Gaussian SF. This section presents the form of the gradient estimator, the corresponding algorithms and their convergence. Similar results and proposed algorithms for adaptive Newton-based search have been presented in Section 5. Section 6 deals with the implementation of the proposed algorithms, and simulations based on a numerical setting. We describe the sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian in this section. Finally, Section 7 provides the concluding remarks.

2. Background and Preliminaries

In this section, we first describe the framework of the optimization problem. We also discuss about the Smoothed Functional scheme, that is commonly used to estimate derivatives of a stochastic function. Finally, we provide a brief idea about the generalization of Gaussian distribution studied in nonextensive information theory.

2.1. Problem Framework

Let $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a parameterized Markov process, depending on a tunable parameter $\theta \in C$, where C is a compact and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^N . Let $P_\theta(x, dy)$ denote the transition kernel of $\{Y_n\}$ when the operative parameter is $\theta \in C$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ be a Lipschitz continuous cost function associated with the process.

Assumption I. *The process $\{Y_n\}$ is ergodic for any given θ as the operative parameter, i.e., as $L \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} h(Y_m) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\nu_\theta}[h(Y)],$$

where ν_θ is the stationary distribution of $\{Y_n\}$.

Our objective is to minimize the long-run average cost

$$J(\theta) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} h(Y_m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x) \nu_\theta(dx), \quad (2)$$

by choosing an appropriate $\theta \in C$. The existence of the above limit is assured by Assumption I and the fact that h is continuous, hence measurable. In addition, we assume that the average cost $J(\theta)$ satisfies the following requirement.

Assumption II. *The function $J(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable for all $\theta \in C$.*

Definition 2.1 (Non-anticipative sequence). *A random sequence of parameter vectors, $(\theta(n))_{n \geq 0} \subset C$, controlling a process $\{Y_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, is said to be non-anticipative if the conditional probability $P(Y_{n+1} \in dy | \mathcal{F}_n) = P_\theta(Y_n, dy)$ almost surely for all $n \geq 0$ and all Borel sets $dy \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(m), Y_m, m \leq n)$, $n \geq 0$ are the associated σ -fields.*

It can be verified that under a non-anticipative parameter sequence $(\theta(n))$, the sequence $(Y_n, \theta(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is Markov. We assume the existence of a stochastic Lyapunov function.

Assumption III. *Let $(\theta(n))$ be a non-anticipative sequence of random parameters controlling the process $\{Y_n\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(m), Y_m, m \leq n)$, $n \geq 0$ be a sequence of associated σ -fields. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$, a compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and a continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, with $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \infty$, such that*

$$(i) \sup_n \mathbb{E}[V(Y_n)^2] < \infty, \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \mathbb{E}[V(Y_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq V(Y_n) - \epsilon_0, \text{ whenever } Y_n \notin \mathcal{K}, n \geq 0.$$

While Assumption II is a technical requirement, Assumption III ensures that the process under a tunable parameter remains stable. Assumption III will not be required, for instance, if, in addition, the single-stage cost function h is bounded. It can be seen that the sequence of parameters obtained using any of our algorithms below form a non-anticipative sequence.

2.2. Smoothed Functionals

Here, we present an idea about the smoothed functional approach proposed by Katkovnik and Kulchitsky [22]. We consider a real-valued function $f : C \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, defined over a compact set C . Its smoothed functional is defined as

$$S_\beta[f(\theta)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta) f(\theta - \eta) d\eta = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\theta - \eta) f(\eta) d\eta, \quad (3)$$

where $G_\beta : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel function, with a parameter β taking values from \mathbb{R} . The idea behind using smoothed functionals is that if $f(\theta)$ is not well-behaved, *i.e.*, it has a fluctuating character, then $S_\beta[f(\theta)]$ is “better-behaved”. This can ensure that any optimization algorithm with objective function $f(\theta)$ does not get stuck at a local minimum, but converges to a global minimum. The parameter β controls the degree of smoothness. Rubinstein [34] established that the SF algorithm achieves these properties if the kernel function satisfies the following sufficient conditions:

$$(P1) \ G_\beta(\eta) = \frac{1}{\beta^N} G\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right), \text{ where } G(x) \text{ corresponds to } G_\beta(x) \text{ with } \beta = 1, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$G\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right) = G_1\left(\frac{\eta^{(1)}}{\beta}, \frac{\eta^{(2)}}{\beta}, \dots, \frac{\eta^{(N)}}{\beta}\right),$$

$$(P2) \ G_\beta(\eta) \text{ is piecewise differentiable in } \eta,$$

$$(P3) \ G_\beta(\eta) \text{ is a probability distribution function, i.e., } S_\beta[f(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{G_\beta(\eta)}[f(\theta - \eta)],$$

$$(P4) \ \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_\beta(\eta) = \delta(\eta), \text{ where } \delta(\eta) \text{ is the Dirac delta function, and}$$

$$(P5) \ \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} S_\beta[f(\theta)] = f(\theta).$$

A two-sided form of SF is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} S'_\beta[f(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta)(f(\theta - \eta) + f(\theta + \eta)) \, d\eta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\theta - \eta)f(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_\beta(\eta - \theta)f(\eta) \, d\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The Gaussian distribution satisfies the above conditions, and has been used as a smoothing kernel in [22, 40]. The SF approach provides a method [7] for estimating the gradient or Hessian of any function which satisfies Assumptions I–III as shown in [5], where the Gaussian smoothing kernel is used. The gradient estimator obtained using (3) is given by

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{\beta ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \eta(n)h(Y_m) \quad (5)$$

for large M , L and small β . The stochastic process $\{Y_m\}$ is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$, where $\theta(n) \in C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is obtained through an iterative scheme, and $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ is a N -dimensional vector of i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables $\eta^{(1)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n)$. Similarly, a two-simulation gradient estimator has been suggested using (4), which is of the following form

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{2\beta ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \eta(n)(h(Y_m) - h(Y'_m)) \quad (6)$$

for large M , L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are two processes governed by parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively, $\theta(n)$ and $\eta(n)$ being defined as earlier. The respective one and two simulation estimates for the Hessian case are given by

$$\nabla_\theta^2 J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{\beta^2 ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n))h(Y_m) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\nabla_\theta^2 J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{2\beta^2 ML} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n))[h(Y_m) + h(Y'_m)], \quad (8)$$

where $H(\eta)$ is a matrix given by $H_{i,j}(\eta) = (\eta^{(i)})^2 - 1$ for $i = j$, and $\eta^{(i)}\eta^{(j)}$ for $i \neq j$.

2.3. Generalized information measure and q-Gaussian distribution

A continuous form of the Shannon entropy, also known as differential entropy, has been extensively studied in statistical mechanics, probability and statistics. It is defined as

$$H(p) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) \ln p(x) \, dx, \quad (9)$$

where $p(\cdot)$ is a p.d.f. defined on the sample space \mathcal{X} . Following the lines of the discrete form generalization given by Tsallis [44], Dukkipati et al. [15, 14] provides a measure theoretic formulation of continuous form Tsallis entropy functional, defined as

$$H_q(p) = \frac{1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} (p(x))^q dx}{q - 1}, \quad q \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

This function results when the natural logarithm in (9) is replaced by the q -logarithm defined earlier. The differential Shannon entropy can be retrieved from (10) as $q \rightarrow 1$.

The q -Gaussian distribution was developed to describe the process of Lévy super-diffusion [31], but has been later studied in other fields, such as finance [36] and statistics [42]. Its importance lies in its power-law nature, due to which the tails of the q -Gaussian decay at a slower rate than the Gaussian distribution, depending on the choice of q .

It results from maximizing Tsallis entropy under certain ‘deformed’ moment constraints, known as normalized q -expectation defined by

$$\langle f \rangle_q = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)p(x)^q dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)^q dx}. \quad (11)$$

This form of an expectation considers an escort distribution $p_q(x) = \frac{p(x)^q}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)^q dx}$, and has been shown to be compatible with the foundations of nonextensive statistics [46]. Prato and Tsallis [31] maximized Tsallis entropy under the constraints, $\langle x \rangle_q = \mu_q$ and $\langle (x - \mu)^2 \rangle_q = \beta_q^2$, which are known as q -mean and q -variance, respectively. These are generalizations of standard first and second moments, and tend to the usual mean and variance, respectively, as $q \rightarrow 1$. This results in the q -Gaussian distribution that has the form

$$G_{q,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{\beta_q K_q} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(3-q)\beta_q^2} (x - \mu_q)^2 \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (12)$$

where, $y_+ = \max(y, 0)$ is called the Tsallis cut-off condition [45], which ensures that the above expression is defined, and K_q is the normalizing constant, which is given by

$$K_q = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{3-q}}{\sqrt{1-q}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{5-3q}{2(1-q)}\right)} & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{3-q}}{\sqrt{1-q}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3-q}{2(q-1)}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} & \text{for } 1 < q < 3, \end{cases}$$

with Γ being the Gamma function, which exists over the specified intervals.

The function defined in (12) is not integrable for $q \geq 3$, and hence, q -Gaussian is a probability density function only when $q < 3$. Further, it has been shown by Prato and Tsallis [31] that the variance of the above distribution is finite only for $q < \frac{5}{3}$, and is given by $\beta = \sqrt{\frac{3-q}{5-3q}}\beta_q$.

A multivariate form of the q -Gaussian distribution has been proposed in [47]. Vignat and Plastino [49] provide an explicit form of this distribution. Considering zero mean, and usual

covariance matrix of the N -variate distribution to be $E[XX^T] = \beta^2 I_{N \times N}$, it is defined as

$$G_{q,\beta}(X) = \frac{1}{\beta^N K_{q,N}} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4)-(N+2)q)} \frac{\|X\|^2}{\beta^2} \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (13)$$

where $K_{q,N}$ is the normalizing constant given by

$$K_{q,N} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \right) & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} \right) & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The multivariate normal distribution can be obtained as a special case when $q \rightarrow 1$, while the uniform distribution is obtained when $q \rightarrow -\infty$. A similar distribution can also be obtained by maximizing Rényi entropy [12]. In this paper, we study the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution, and develop smoothed functional algorithms based on it.

3. Some properties of multivariate q -Gaussian

Before going into further analysis of q -Gaussians as smoothing kernels, we look at the support set of the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution with covariance $\beta^2 I_{N \times N}$. We denote the support set as

$$\Omega'_q = \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|x\|^2 < \frac{((N+4)-(N+2)q)\beta^2}{(1-q)} \right\} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \mathbb{R}^N & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

A standard q -Gaussian distribution has mean zero and unit variance. So, the support set can be expressed as above by substituting $\beta = 1$.

3.1. Moments and q -moments of joint q -Gaussian distribution

The following result provides an expression for the moments of N -variate q -Gaussian distributed random vector. This is a consequence of the results presented in [18]. The result is considered only for $q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$ as above this value, the variance of q -Gaussian is not finite [31].

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $X = (X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots, X^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a random vector, where the components are uncorrelated and identically distributed, each being distributed according to a q -Gaussian distribution with zero mean and unit variance, with parameter $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$. Also, let $\rho(X) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4)-(N+2)q)} \|X\|^2\right)$. Then, for any $b, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, we have*

$$E_{G_q} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] = \begin{cases} \bar{K} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q} \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!} \right), & \text{if } b_i \text{ is even for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\bar{K} = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b+1\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}+1+\frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}+1\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b+1+\frac{N}{2}+\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{b_i}{2}\right)} & \text{if } q \in (-\infty, 1), \\ \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}+b-\frac{N}{2}-\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{b_i}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}+b\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}-\frac{N}{2}\right)} & \text{if } q \in \left(1, 1+\frac{2}{N+2}\right), \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

exists only if the above Gamma functions exist. Further, the existence of the Gamma functions occurs under the condition $b < \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-q}\right)$ if $q < 1$, and $\left(\frac{1}{q-1} + b - \frac{N}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}\right) > 0$, for $1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$.

Proof. Since $\rho(X)$ is non-negative over Ω'_q , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(X)} & \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{K_{q,N}} \int_{\Omega'_q} (x^{(1)})^{b_1} (x^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (x^{(N)})^{b_N} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{((N+4)-(N+2)q)} \|x\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}-b} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality in (16) can be easily proved. If for some $i = 1, \dots, N$, b_i is odd, then the above function is odd, and its integration is zero over Ω'_q , which is symmetric with respect to any axis by definition. For the other cases, since the function is even, the integral is same over every orthant. Hence, we may consider the integration over the first orthant, *i.e.*, where each component is positive. For $q < 1$, we can reduce the above integral, using [18, equation (4.635)], to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(X)} & \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] \\ & = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right)}{K_{q,N} \Gamma(\bar{b})} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q}\right)^{\bar{b}} \int_0^1 (1-y)^{\left(\frac{1}{1-q}-b\right)} y^{(\bar{b}-1)} dy \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we set $\bar{b} = \left(\frac{N}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2}\right)$. One can observe that the integral in (18) is in the form of a Beta function. Since b_i 's are even, we can expand $\Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right)$ using the expansion of Gamma function of half-integers to get $\Gamma\left(\frac{b_i+1}{2}\right) = \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!} \sqrt{\pi}$. The claim can be obtained by substituting $K_{q,N}$ from (14) and using the relation $B(m, n) = \frac{\Gamma(m)\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma(m+n)}$. It is easy to verify that all the Gamma functions in the equality exist provided $b < \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-q}\right)$. The result for the interval $1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$ can be proved in a similar way (see equations (4.635) and (4.636) of [18]). \square

Corollary 3.2. *In the limiting case, as $q \rightarrow 1$,*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}_{G_q(X)} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right] = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E}_{G(X)} \left[(X^{(i)})^{b_i} \right].$$

We obtain a generalized version of moments and comoments from Proposition 3.1. The higher order moments and comoments can be calculated using $b = 0$ in (16). The following result gives an expression and existence condition for the m^{th} order moments and comoments, *i.e.*, the case where $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = m$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let X be the random vector considered in Proposition 3.1, and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = m$, then the comoment is given by*

$$E_{G_q(X)} \left[(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N} \right] = \begin{cases} \bar{K} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} \left(\frac{b_i}{2}\right)!}, & \text{if } b_i \text{ is even for all } i = 1, \dots, N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\bar{K} = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N+m}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{1-q}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} & \text{if } q \in (-\infty, 1), \\ \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N+m}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{(N+4)-(N+2)q}{q-1}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} & \text{if } q \in \left(1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right), \\ \text{otherwise undefined.} & \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The above expression ascertains that the m^{th} order moments and comoments exists only for $q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right)$. We now extend to compute the generalized q -moments and q -comoments of the joint q -Gaussian distribution.

Corollary 3.4. *Consider the q -Gaussian distributed random vector $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with zero mean and identity covariance. For any $b, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, we have*

$$\left\langle \frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^b} \right\rangle_q = \frac{2}{(N+2-Nq)} E_{G_q(X)} \left[\frac{(X^{(1)})^{b_1} (X^{(2)})^{b_2} \dots (X^{(N)})^{b_N}}{(\rho(X))^{b+1}} \right], \quad (21)$$

which exists for $b < \frac{1}{1-q}$ if $q < 1$, and $\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right) > \max\left(0, \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{b_i}{2} - b - 1\right)$ for $q > 1$. Here, $\langle \cdot \rangle_q$ is the q -expectation defined in (11).

The existence conditions above indicate that compared to those in Proposition 3.1, the interval of existence reduces for $q < 1$ and increases for $q > 1$. In fact, q -expectation computed from the above proposition holds even for $q > \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+2}\right)$, which is discussed in the following few results.

We now consider a q -Gaussian distributed random vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with usual mean μ and usual covariance Σ . All the above results hold for the normalized vector $X = \Sigma^{-1/2}(Y - \mu)$. Using such a transformation along with Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.4, we can compute the q -mean and q -covariance of Y as

$$q\text{-mean, } \langle Y \rangle_q = \mu, \quad (22)$$

$$q\text{-covariance, } \langle YY^T \rangle_q = \left(\frac{(N+4) - (N+2)q}{(N+2) - Nq} \right) \Sigma. \quad (23)$$

However, we can observe from the existence conditions in Proposition 3.4 that these q -moments exist for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, *i.e.*, even when the usual moments do not exist. Thus, we may define the multivariate q -Gaussian distribution in terms of its q -moments. Considering the q -mean and q -covariance matrix to be μ_q and Σ_q respectively, the N -variate q -Gaussian distribution is defined as

$$G_{q, \Sigma_q}(X) = \frac{1}{K'_{q, N} |\Sigma_q|^{1/2}} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} (X - \mu_q)^T \Sigma_q^{-1} (X - \mu_q) \right)_+^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad (24)$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where the normalizing constant

$$K'_{q, N} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-q}{1-q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2-q+N}{1-q}\right)} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\pi^{N/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{q-1}\right)} & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right). \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

This definition is more useful as it is defined over a wider range of q 's, and includes the entire interval over which the function is integrable. It becomes more significant as the distribution for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ can be mapped to the multivariate Students'- t distribution. The support set of the above distribution is given by

$$\Omega_q = \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : (X - \mu_q)^T \Sigma_q^{-1} (X - \mu_q) < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q} \right\} & \text{for } q < 1, \\ \mathbb{R}^N & \text{for } 1 < q < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

The definition in (24) provide a better scope to study the higher order q -moments and q -comoments of the distribution. They can be easily evaluated using Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.4. We provide a more interesting observation regarding the existence of these q -moments.

Corollary 3.5. *For the random vector X in Proposition 3.1, the m^{th} order q -moments and q -comoment exist when*

$$\frac{1}{q-1} < \frac{N}{2} + \max\left(0, \frac{m}{2} - 1\right),$$

i.e., q -mean ($m = 1$) and q -covariance ($m = 2$) exist for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, but for $m > 2$, the q -moments exist only for $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+m-2})$.

We conclude the discussion on moments of q -Gaussian by the following remark. Proposition 3.1 can be stated for a multivariate q -Gaussian distribution with zero mean, unit q -covariance matrix. The result in (16) holds with the term $((N+4) - (N+2)q)$ replaced by $(N+2 - Nq)$, the other terms remaining exactly same. Even the existence conditions for the moments do not change. This observation will be frequently used later in the paper, and will be referred as Proposition 3.1.

3.2. q -Gaussian as a Smoothing Kernel

The first step in applying q -Gaussians for SF algorithms is to ensure that the q -Gaussian satisfies the Rubinstein conditions described here as properties (P1)–(P5) in Section 2.2.

Proposition 3.6. *The N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution (24), with q -covariance $\beta^2 I_{N \times N}$ satisfies the kernel properties (P1)–(P5) for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and $q \neq 1$.*

Proof. (P1) From (24), it is evident that $G_{q,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{\beta^N} G_q\left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)$.

(P2) For $1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $G_{q,\beta}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus,

$$\nabla_x G_{q,\beta}(x) = -\frac{2x}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \frac{G_{q,\beta}(x)}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \|x\|^2\right)}. \quad (27)$$

For $q < 1$, (27) holds when $x \in \Omega_q$. On the other hand, when $x \notin \Omega_q$, we have $G_{q,\beta}(x) = 0$ and hence, $\nabla_x G_{q,\beta}(x) = 0$. Thus, $G_{q,\beta}(x)$ is differentiable for $q > 1$, and piecewise differentiable for $q < 1$.

(P3) $G_{q,\beta}(x)$ is a distribution for $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and hence, the corresponding SF $S_{q,\beta}(\cdot)$, parameterized by both q and β , can be written as $S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{G_{q,\beta}(x)}[f(\theta - x)]$.

(P4) $G_{q,\beta}$ is a probability distribution satisfying $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(0) = \infty$. So, $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(x) = \delta(x)$.

(P5) This property trivially holds due to convergence in mean as

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} G_{q,\beta}(x) f(\theta - x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) f(\theta - x) dx = f(\theta).$$

Hence the claim. □

From the above result, it follows that q -Gaussian can be used as a kernel function, and hence, given a particular value $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ and some $\beta > 0$, the one-sided and two-sided SFs of any function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are respectively given by

$$S_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - x) f(x) dx, \quad (28)$$

$$S'_{q,\beta}[f(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - x) f(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(x - \theta) f(x) dx, \quad (29)$$

where the nature of the SFs are controlled by both q and β .

4. Gradient Estimation with q -Gaussian SF

The objective is to estimate the gradient of the average cost $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ using the SF approach, where existence of $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ follows from Assumption II.

4.1. One-simulation q -Gaussian SF Gradient Estimate

The gradient of smoothed functional (smoothed gradient) is defined as [34]

$$\nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta ,$$

where Ω_q is the support set defined as in (26). As there is no functional relationship between θ and η over Ω_q , *i.e.*, $\frac{d\eta^{(j)}}{d\theta^{(i)}} = 0$ for all i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^{(i)} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) &= \frac{1}{\beta^N K'_{q,N}} \frac{2(\eta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(1 - \frac{(1-q) \sum_{k=1}^N (\theta^{(k)} - \eta^{(k)})^2}{(N+2-Nq)\beta^2} \right)^{\frac{q}{1-q}} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \frac{(\eta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)})}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) , \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\rho(\eta) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta\|^2 \right)$. Hence, substituting $\eta' = \frac{\eta-\theta}{\beta}$, and using the symmetry of $G_{q,\beta}(\cdot)$ and $\rho(\cdot)$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \right) \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} G_q(\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \, d\eta' \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta')} \left[\frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} J(\theta + \beta\eta') \middle| \theta \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

In the sequel (Proposition 4.6), we show that $\|\nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$. Hence, for large M and small β , the form of gradient estimate suggested by (31) is

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \left(\frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)M} \right) \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \left(\frac{\eta(n) J(\theta + \beta\eta(n))}{\rho(\eta(n))} \right) , \quad (32)$$

where $\eta(1), \eta(2), \dots, \eta(n)$ are uncorrelated identically distributed standard q -Gaussian distributed random vectors. Considering that in two-timescale algorithms (discussed later), the value of θ is updated concurrently with the gradient estimation procedure, we estimate $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n))$ at each stage. By ergodicity assumption (Assumption I), we can write (32) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n)) \approx \left(\frac{2}{\beta M L (N+2-Nq)} \right) \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \frac{\eta(n) h(Y_m)}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2 \right)} \quad (33)$$

for large L , where the process $\{Y_m\}$ has the same transition kernel as defined in Assumption I, except that it is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.

4.2. Two-simulation q -Gaussian SF Gradient Estimate

In a similar manner, based on (4), the gradient of the two-sided SF can be written as

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta. \quad (34)$$

The first integral can be obtained as in (31). The second integral is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta} G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{(\eta - \theta)}{\rho(\frac{\eta - \theta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} \frac{\eta'}{\rho(\eta')} G_q(\eta') J(\theta - \beta\eta') \, d\eta', \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta' = \frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}$. Thus, we obtain the gradient as a conditional expectation

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \left(\frac{1}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)} \left(J(\theta + \beta\eta) - J(\theta - \beta\eta) \right) \middle| \theta \right]. \quad (35)$$

In sequel (Proposition 4.8) we show that $\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, which can be used to approximate (35) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{1}{\beta ML(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \frac{\eta(n)(h(Y_m) - h(Y'_m))}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|\eta(n)\|^2 \right)} \quad (36)$$

for large M, L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are governed by $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.

4.3. Proposed Gradient Descent Algorithms

We propose two-timescale algorithms corresponding to the estimates obtained in (33) and (36). Let $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ be two step-size sequences satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption IV. $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ are two positive sequences satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b(n)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b(n) = \infty$ and $a(n) = o(b(n))$, i.e., $\frac{a(n)}{b(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It must be noted that in the algorithms described below, although M is chosen to be a large quantity (to ensure convergence), the quantity L is arbitrarily picked and can be any finite positive number. The averaging of the inner summation in (33) and (36) is obtained in our algorithms using two-timescale stochastic approximation. In principle, one may select $L = 1$. However, it is generally observed that a value of L typically between 5 and 500 results in better performance [5]. Further, the algorithms require generation of N -dimensional random vectors, consisting of uncorrelated q -Gaussian distributed random variates. This can be done using the method described in Section 6.2.

For $\theta = (\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(N)})^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta) = (\mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(1)}), \dots, \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(N)}))^T$ represent the projection of θ onto the set C . For simulation, we need to project the perturbed random vectors $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ onto C using the above projection. The quantities $(Z^{(i)}(n), i = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$ are used to estimate $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ in the following recursions.

The G q -SF2 algorithm is similar to the G q -SF1 algorithm, except that we use two parallel simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively, and update the gradient estimate, in Step 9, using the single-stage cost function of both simulations as in (36).

Algorithm 1 : The Gq-SF1 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q and β .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix the parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate the simulation Y_{nL+m} governed with parameter $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2\eta^{(i)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 13: $\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n)Z^{(i)}(nL))$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: Set $\theta(n+1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n+1), \theta^{(2)}(n+1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n+1))^T$.
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

4.4. Convergence of Gradient SF Algorithms

We now look into the convergence of the algorithms proposed in Section 4.3. The analysis presented in the shorter version of this paper [17] was along the lines of [5]. In this paper, we deviate from that approach to provide a more straightforward technique to prove the convergence of the algorithms to a local optimum.

4.4.1. Convergence of Gq-SF1 Algorithm

First, let us consider the update along the faster timescale, *i.e.*, Step 9 of the Gq-SF1 algorithm. We define $\tilde{\theta}(p) = \theta(n)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p) = \eta(n)$ and $\tilde{b}(p) = b(n)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$, $n \geq 0$. It follows from Assumption IV that $a(p) = o(\tilde{b}(p))$, $\sum_p \tilde{b}(p) = \infty$ and $\sum_p \tilde{b}(p)^2 < \infty$. We can rewrite Step 9 of Algorithm 1 as the following iteration for all $p \geq 0$:

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[g(Y_p) - Z(p)], \quad (37)$$

where

$$g(Y_p) = \frac{2\tilde{\eta}(p)h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))}.$$

Here, $\rho(\cdot)$ is defined as in Proposition 3.1 and $\{Y_p : p \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Markov process parameterized by $\mathcal{P}_C(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))$. Let $\mathcal{G}_p = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}(k), \tilde{\eta}(k), Y_k, k \leq p)$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where $g(Y_p)$ is \mathcal{G}_p -measurable for each $p \geq 0$.

We summarize the results presented by Borkar [11, Chapter 6, Lemma 3 – Theorem 9] in the following theorem. This result leads to the stability and convergence of iteration (37), which runs on the faster timescale.

Algorithm 2 : The Gq-SF2 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q and β .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix the parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate two simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with control parameters $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) - h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 13: $\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n)Z^{(i)}(nL))$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

Theorem 4.1. Consider the iteration, $x_{p+1} = x_p + \gamma(p)[f(x_p, Y_p) + M_p]$. Let the following conditions hold:

1. $\{Y_p : p \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Markov process satisfying Assumptions I and III,
2. for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $x_p \equiv x$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, Y_p has a unique invariant probability measure ν_x ,
3. $(\gamma(p))_{p \geq 0}$ are step-sizes satisfying $\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \gamma(p) = \infty$ and $\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \gamma^2(p) < \infty$,
4. $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous in its first argument uniformly w.r.t the second,
5. M_p is a martingale difference noise term with bounded variance,
6. if $\tilde{f}(x, \nu_x) = \mathbf{E}_{\nu_x}[f(x, Y)]$, then the limit $\hat{f}(x(t)) = \lim_{a \uparrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{f}(ax(t), \nu_{ax(t)})}{a}$ exists uniformly on compacts, and
7. the ODE $\dot{x}(t) = \hat{f}(x(t))$ is well-posed and has the origin as the unique globally asymptotically stable equilibrium.

Then the update x_p satisfies $\sup_p \|x_p\| < \infty$, almost surely, and converges to the stable fixed points of the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\dot{x}(t) = \hat{f}(x(t), \nu_{x(t)}).$$

Rewriting the update (37) as

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p) [E[g(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - Z(p) + A_p], \quad (38)$$

where $A_p = g(Y_p) - E[g(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ is \mathcal{G}_p -measurable. The following result shows that $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ satisfies Condition 5 in Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *For all values of $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with a bounded variance.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for all $p \geq 0$, $E[A_p|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] = 0$. So $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|h(Y_p)}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \right)^2 + \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|h(Y_p)}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right] \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))^2} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right]. \quad (39)$$

For $q \in (-\infty, 1)$, $\|\eta\| < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}$ and $\rho(\eta) \geq 1$ for all $\eta \in \Omega_q$. So, we can write (39) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\eta}(p)\|^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))^2} \right) \mathbb{E} [h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(1-q)^2} \mathbb{E} [h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lipschitz continuity of h , there exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $|h(Y_p)| \leq \alpha_1(1 + \|Y_p\|)$ for all p , and hence, by Assumption III, we can claim

$$\mathbb{E} [h(Y_p)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq 2\alpha_1^2 (1 + \mathbb{E} [\|Y_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]) < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

For $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we apply Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in (39) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|A_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^2}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^2} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^4}{\rho(\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}(p))^4} \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [h^4(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second expectation can be shown to be finite as before, while we apply Proposition 3.1 to study the existence of $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(j)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} \right]$. We can observe that in this case, $b = 4$ and $b_i = 4$ if $i = j$, otherwise $b_i = 0$. So the condition mentioned in Proposition 3.1 is satisfied which implies that term is finite, and hence, the claim. \square

We can write the parameter update (Step 13 of Gq-SF1) as

$$\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - \tilde{b}(n)\zeta(n) \right),$$

where $\zeta(n) = \frac{a(n)}{\tilde{b}(n)} Z^{(i)}(nL) = o(1)$ since $a(n) = o(\tilde{b}(n))$. Thus, the parameter update recursion can be seen to track the ODE

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Hence, the recursion $\theta(n)$, $n \geq 0$ appears quasistatic when viewed from the timescale of $(\tilde{b}(n))$, and hence, in the update (38), one may let $\tilde{\theta}(p) \equiv \theta$ and $\tilde{\eta}(p) \equiv \eta$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the following ODE:

$$\dot{Z}(t) = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - Z(t). \quad (41)$$

Lemma 4.3. *The sequence of updates $(Z(p))$ is uniformly bounded with probability 1. Further,*

$$\left\| Z(p) - \left(\frac{2\tilde{\eta}(p)J(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\tilde{\eta}(p))} \right) \right\| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. It can be easily verified that iteration (38) satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 4.1. Thus, by Theorem 4.1, $(Z(p))$ converges to ODE (41) as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{(\theta+\beta\eta)}} \left[\frac{2\eta h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)}.$$

We can also see that

$$\lim_{a \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{a} \left(\frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - aZ(t) \right) = -Z(t).$$

All the conditions in Theorem 4.1 are seen to be verified and the claim follows. \square

From Lemma 4.3, Steps 13 and 15 of Gq-SF1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(n+1) &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) - a(n) \left[\frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right] \right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) + a(n) \left[-\nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) + \Delta(\theta(n)) + \xi_n \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where the error in the gradient estimate is given by

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) - \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \quad (43)$$

and the noise term is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n &= \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] - \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \middle| \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

which is a martingale difference term. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(0), \dots, \theta(n), \eta(0), \dots, \eta(n-1))$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where ξ_0, \dots, ξ_{n-1} are \mathcal{F}_n -measurable for each $n \geq 0$.

We state the following result due to Kushner and Clark [27, Theorem 5.3.1, pp 189–196], adapted to our scenario, which leads to the convergence of the updates in (42).

Lemma 4.4. *Given the iteration, $x_{n+1} = \mathcal{P}_C(x_n + \gamma(n)(f(x_n) + \xi_n))$, where*

1. \mathcal{P}_C represents a projection operator onto a constraint set C , which is closed and bounded,
2. $f(\cdot)$ is a continuous function,
3. $(\gamma(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is a positive sequence satisfying $\gamma(n) \downarrow 0$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma(n) = \infty$, and
4. $\sum_{n=0}^m \gamma(n)\xi_n$ converges a.s.

Under the above conditions, the update (x_n) converges to the asymptotically stable fixed points of the ODE

$$\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x(t))), \quad (45)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x)) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_C(x + \epsilon f(x)) - x}{\epsilon} \right)$.

The following result shows that the noise term ξ_n satisfies the last condition in Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $M_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\xi_k$. Then, for all values of $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an almost surely convergent martingale sequence.*

Proof. We can easily observe that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] &= \frac{2}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)}{\beta\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \theta(k) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)}{\beta\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$, since $\theta(k)$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, whereas $\eta(k)$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_k . It follows that $(\xi_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence, and hence $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale sequence. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\xi_k^{(j)} \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta(k)^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \middle| \theta(k) \right] \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{\eta(k)^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta(k))} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k)) \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta(k)^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta(k))^2} J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta(k))^2 \middle| \theta(k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, by definition $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta) = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)]$, where the expectation is with respect to the stationary distribution. So, by Jensen's inequality, we can claim $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)^2]$ and $J(\theta(k) + \beta\eta)^4 \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_p)^4]$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Using these facts along with arguments similar to Lemma 4.2, it can be seen that $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] < \infty$ for all k , and hence, if $\sum_n a(n)^2 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|M_{n+1} - M_n\|^2] &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_n\|^2] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 \sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_n\|^2] < \infty \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows from the martingale convergence theorem [50]. \square

Now, we deal with the error term $\Delta(\theta(n))$ in (42).

Proposition 4.6. *For a given $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$, and for all $\theta \in C$, the error term*

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta).$$

Proof. For small $\beta > 0$, using Taylor series expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) = J(\theta) + \beta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta + o(\beta^2).$$

So we can write (31) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{2}{(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{J(\theta)}{\beta} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T}{\rho(\eta)} \right] \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta}{\rho(\eta)} \middle| \theta \right] + o(\beta) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We consider each term in (46). The i^{th} component in the first term is $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = 0$ by Proposition 3.1 for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Similarly, the i^{th} component in the third term can be written as

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta}{\rho(\eta)} \right]^{(i)} = \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{j,k} \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right].$$

It can be observed that in all cases, each term in the summation is an odd function, and so from Proposition 3.1, we can show that the third term in (46) is zero. Using a similar argument, we claim that the off-diagonal terms in $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{\eta\eta^T}{\rho(\eta)} \right]$ are zero, while the diagonal terms are of the form $\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right]$, which exists for all $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$ as the conditions in Proposition 3.1 are always satisfied on this interval. Further, we can compute that for all $q \in (-\infty, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{(N+2-Nq)}{2}. \quad (47)$$

The claim follows by substituting the above expression in (46). \square

Now, we consider the following ODE for the slowest timescale recursion:

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(t)) \right), \quad (48)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C(f(x)) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_C(x + \epsilon f(x)) - x}{\epsilon} \right)$. In accordance with Lemma 4.4, it can be observed that the stable points of (48) lie in the set

$$K = \left\{ \theta \in C \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right) = 0 \right\}. \quad (49)$$

We have the following key result which shows that iteration (42) tracks ODE (48), and hence, the convergence of our algorithm is proved.

Theorem 4.7. *Under Assumptions I – IV, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Gq-SF1 converges to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the stable attractor of (48), defined as*

$$K^{\epsilon} = \{x : \|x - x_0\| < \epsilon, x_0 \in K\}$$

with probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 that the update in (42) converges to the stable fixed points of the ODE

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C \left(-\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta(t)) + \Delta(\theta(t)) \right). \quad (50)$$

Now starting from the same initial condition, the trajectory of (50) converges to that of (48) uniformly over compacts, as $\Delta(\theta(t)) \rightarrow 0$. Since from Proposition 4.6, we have $\|\Delta(\theta(n))\| = o(\beta)$ for all n , the claim follows. \square

4.4.2. Convergence of Gq-SF2 Algorithm

Since the proof of convergence here is along the lines of Gq-SF1, we do not describe it explicitly. We just briefly describe the modifications that are required in this case. In the faster timescale, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the updates given by $Z(nL)$ track the function

$$\left(\frac{2\eta(n)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right) (J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) - J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))).$$

So we can rewrite the slower timescale update for Gq-SF2 algorithm, in a similar manner as (42), where the noise term is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n = & \frac{1}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta(n))} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \mid \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n)) \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{\beta(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta(n))} \left[\frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n)) \mid \theta(n) \right] - \frac{\eta(n)}{\rho(\eta(n))} J(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

with each part being bounded (as in Lemma 4.5). We have the following proposition for the error term

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta).$$

Proposition 4.8. For a given $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$,

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta)$$

for all $\theta \in C$.

Proof. Using Taylor's expansion, we have for small β ,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) - J(\theta - \beta\eta) = 2\beta\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + o(\beta^2).$$

One can use similar arguments as in Proposition 4.6 to rewrite (35) as

$$\nabla_{\theta} S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbf{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{2}{\rho(\eta)} \eta \eta^T \right] \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) + o(\beta),$$

which leads to the claim. \square

The above leads to a result similar to Theorem 4.7, which proves convergence of the Gq-SF2 algorithm.

Theorem 4.9. Under Assumptions I – IV, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Gq-SF2 converges to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the stable attractor of (48), with probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorems 4.7 and 4.9 give the existence of some $\beta_0 > 0$ for a given $\epsilon > 0$ such that the proposed gradient-descent algorithms converge to the ϵ -neighbourhood of a local minimum. However, these results do not give the precise value of β_0 . Further, they do not guarantee that this neighbourhood lies within a close proximity of a global minimum.

5. Hessian Estimation using q -Gaussian SF

In this section, we extend the proposed Gradient based algorithms by incorporating an additional Hessian estimate. This leads to Newton based search algorithms. The existence of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$ is assumed as per Assumption II, and we estimate the same using SF approach.

5.1. One-simulation q -Gaussian SF Hessian Estimate

By following Rubinstein [34], we define the smoothed Hessian, or Hessian of the SF, as

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta, \quad (51)$$

where Ω_q is the support set of the q -Gaussian distribution as defined in (26). Now, the $(i, j)^{th}$ element of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)$ is

$$\left[\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) \right]_{i,j} = \frac{4q}{\beta^4(N+2-Nq)^2} \frac{(\theta^{(i)} - \eta^{(i)}) (\theta^{(j)} - \eta^{(j)})}{\rho(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta})^2} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)$$

for $i \neq j$, where $\rho(X) = \left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)} \|X\|^2\right)$. For $i = j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta)]_{i,i} &= -\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \frac{1}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) \\ &\quad + \frac{4q}{\beta^4(N+2-Nq)^2} \frac{(\theta^{(i)} - \eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\frac{\theta-\eta}{\beta})^2} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can write

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) = \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} H\left(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}\right) G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta), \quad (52)$$

$$\text{where } H(\eta) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \frac{\eta^{(i)}\eta^{(j)}}{\rho(\eta)^2}\right) & \text{for } i \neq j, \text{ and} \\ \left(\frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} - \frac{1}{\rho(\eta)}\right) & \text{for } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

The function $H(\cdot)$ is a generalization of a similar function given in [5], which can be obtained as $q \rightarrow 1$. Hence, from (51), we have

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \left(\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right) \int_{\Omega_q} G_{q,\beta}(\theta - \eta) H\left(\frac{\theta - \eta}{\beta}\right) J(\eta) \, d\eta.$$

Substituting $\eta' = \frac{\eta - \theta}{\beta}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \int_{\Omega_q} G_q(-\eta') H(-\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \, d\eta' \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right) \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta')} \left[H(\eta') J(\theta + \beta\eta') \middle| \theta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

As in the case of gradient, in sequel (Proposition 5.3) we show that $\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we obtain an estimate of $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n))$ of the form

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{2}{\beta^2 M L (N+2-Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n)) h(Y_m), \quad (55)$$

for large M , L and small β , where the process $\{Y_m\}$ is governed by parameter $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.

5.2. Two-simulation q -Gaussian SF Hessian Estimate

Similarly, the Hessian of two-sided SF can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{\beta}(\theta - \eta) J(\eta) \, d\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_q} \nabla_{\theta}^2 G_{\beta}(\eta - \theta) J(\eta) \, d\eta \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{1}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} H(\eta) \left(J(\theta + \beta\eta) + J(\theta - \beta\eta) \right) \middle| \theta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

By using Proposition 5.7 (discussed later in Proposition 5.7), we obtain the estimate as

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta(n)) \approx \frac{1}{\beta^2 ML(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} H(\eta(n)) [h(Y_m) + h(Y'_m)], \quad (57)$$

for large M, L and small β , where $\{Y_m\}$ and $\{Y'_m\}$ are governed by the parameters $(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively.

5.3. Proposed Newton-based Algorithms

We now propose two-timescale algorithms that perform a Newton based search, and require one and two simulations, respectively. In particular, the one-simulation (resp. two-simulation) algorithm uses gradient and Hessian estimates obtained from (31) and (54) (resp. (35) and (56)).

Algorithm 3 : The Nq-SF1 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q, β and ε .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, W^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate the simulation Y_{nL+m} governed with parameter $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9: $Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2\eta^{(i)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right]$.
 - 10: $W_{i,i}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,i}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{2q(\eta^{(i)}(n))^2}{(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right) \right]$.
 - 11: **for** $j = i + 1$ to N **do**
 - 12: $W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,j}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{4q\eta^{(i)}(n)\eta^{(j)}(n)h(Y_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} \right]$.
 - 13: $W_{j,i}(nL + m + 1) = W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1)$.
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Project $W(nL)$ using \mathcal{P}_{pd} , and compute its inverse. Let $M(nL) = \mathcal{P}_{pd}(W(nL))^{-1}$.
 - 18: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 19: $\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n) \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL) Z^{(j)}(nL) \right)$.
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \theta^{(2)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-

One of the problems with Newton-based algorithms is that the Hessian has to be positive definite for the algorithm to progress in the descent direction. This is satisfied in the neighbourhood of a local minimum, but it may not hold always. Hence, the estimate obtained during recursion has to be projected onto the space of positive definite and symmetric matrices. Let $\mathcal{P}_{pd} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \mapsto \{\text{symmetric matrices with eigenvalues} \geq \varepsilon\}$ be the function that projects any $N \times N$ matrix onto the set of symmetric positive definite matrices, whose minimum eigenvalue is at least ε for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We assume that the projection \mathcal{P}_{pd} satisfies the following:

Assumption V. *If $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are sequences of matrices satisfying the condition $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n - B_n\| = 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A_n) - \mathcal{P}_{pd}(B_n)\| = 0$ as well.*

For ε small, such a projection always exists since the set of positive definite matrices is dense in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Methods for performing projection and inverse computation are discussed later.

The basic approach of the algorithms is similar to the proposed gradient descent algorithms, and we use two step-size sequences, $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying Assumption IV. In the recursions below, the estimate of $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ is obtained from the sequence $(Z^{(i)}(n), i = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$, while $(W_{i,j}(n), i, j = 1, \dots, N)_{n \geq 0}$ estimates $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$.

In the Nq-SF2 algorithm, we generate two simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with parameters $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$, respectively, instead of a single simulation. The single-stage costs obtained from both simulations are used to update the gradient and the Hessian estimates, which are used for the optimization update rule (Step 19).

5.4. Convergence of Newton SF Algorithms

5.4.1. Convergence of Nq-SF1 Algorithm

The convergence analysis is quite similar to that of Gq-SF1, except for an additional Hessian update. Let us consider the updates along the faster timescale, *i.e.*, Steps 9 and 10 of the Nq-SF1 algorithm. We use $\tilde{\theta}(p)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p)$ and $\tilde{b}(p)$ defined in Section 4.4, *i.e.*, $\tilde{\theta}(p) = \theta(n)$, $\tilde{\eta}(p) = \eta(n)$ and $\tilde{b}(p) = b(n)$ for all $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$, $n \geq 0$. We can rewrite Step 9 as the following iteration for all $p \geq 0$,

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)(g_1(Y_p) - Z(p)), \quad (58)$$

where $g_1(Y_p) = \left(\frac{2\eta(n)h(Y_p)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta(n))} \right)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$. Here, $\rho(\cdot)$ is defined in (54) and $\{Y_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov process parameterized by $\mathcal{P}_C(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))$. Similarly, the update of the Hessian matrix can be expressed as

$$W(p+1) = W(p) + \tilde{b}(p)(g_2(Y_p) - W(p)), \quad (59)$$

where $g_2(Y_p) = \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))h(Y_p)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)$ for $nL \leq p < (n+1)L$. As before, let $\mathcal{G}_p = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}(k), \tilde{\eta}(k), Y_k, k \leq p)$ denote the σ -field generated by the mentioned quantities. We can observe that $(\mathcal{G}_p)_{p \geq 0}$ is a filtration, where $g_1(Y_p)$ and $g_2(Y_p)$ are \mathcal{G}_p -measurable for each $p \geq 0$.

We can rewrite (58) and (59) as

$$Z(p+1) = Z(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[E[g_1(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - Z(p) + A_p], \quad (60)$$

$$W(p+1) = W(p) + \tilde{b}(p)[E[g_2(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] - W(p) + B_p], \quad (61)$$

where $A_p = g_1(Y_p) - E[g_1(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ and $B_p = g_2(Y_p) - E[g_2(Y_p)|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}]$ are \mathcal{G}_p -measurable.

Lemma 4.2 shows that $(A_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with bounded variance for all $q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$. We present a similar result for the sequence $(B_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 5.1. *For all values of $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $(B_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence with bounded variance.*

Proof. It is obvious that for all $p \geq 0$, $E[B_p|\mathcal{G}_{p-1}] = 0$, which implies $(B_p, \mathcal{G}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale difference sequence. Using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E[\|H(\tilde{\eta}(p))\|^2 h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}], \quad (62)$$

where we use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the 2-norm for the matrices B_p and $H(\tilde{\eta}(p))$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We know that $\|H(\eta)\| \leq \|H(\eta)\|_F$, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H(\eta)\|_F^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{4q^2}{(N+2-Nq)^2 \rho(\eta)^4} \right) \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left(\eta^{(i)} \right)^2 \left(\eta^{(j)} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{4q}{(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)^3} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\eta^{(i)} \right)^2 + \frac{N}{\rho(\eta)^2} \\ &= \frac{4q^2 \|\eta\|^4}{(N+2-Nq)^2 \rho(\eta)^4} - \frac{4q \|\eta\|^2}{(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)^3} + \frac{N}{\rho(\eta)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

For $q \in (0, 1)$, $\|\eta\|^2 < \frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}$ and $\rho(\eta) \geq 1$ for all $\eta \in \Omega_q$. So, we can write (62) as

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} (\|H(\eta)\|^2) E[h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} \sup_{\eta} (\|H(\eta)\|_F^2) E[h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}], \end{aligned}$$

where $\sup_{\eta} \|H(\eta)\|_F^2$ is finite from (63). Further by the Lipschitz continuity of h and Assumption III, we can claim $E[h(Y_p)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] < \infty$ a.s. Thus, $E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] < \infty$ a.s. for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in (0, 1)$.

For $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|B_p\|^2 | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E[\|H(\tilde{\eta}(p))\|_F^2 h^2(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}] \\ &\leq \frac{64q^2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^4} E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] + \frac{16N}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2} E\left[\frac{h^2(Y_p)}{\rho(\eta)^2} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality on the first term in (64), we obtain

$$E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^4}{\rho(\eta)^4} h^2(Y_p) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{p-1}\right] \leq E\left[\frac{\|\eta\|^8}{\rho(\eta)^8}\right]^{1/2} E[h^4(Y_p) | \mathcal{G}_{p-1}]^{1/2}.$$

The second expectation is finite a.s. from earlier discussion. When we expand $\|\eta\|^8$ in the first expectation, we can observe that for each term $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = 8$ and $b = 8$, where b and b_i are as defined in Proposition 3.1. Hence, the same proposition can be used to claim the existence and finiteness of the expectation for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. Similar arguments are applicable for the second term in (64). The claim follows. \square

The iterations (58) and (59) are independent of each other for a fixed n , and hence, they can be dealt with separately. We can write the parameter update in the slower timescale (Step 19 of Nq-SF1) as

$$\theta^{(i)}(n+1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - \tilde{b}(n)\zeta(n) \right),$$

where $\zeta(n) = \frac{a(n)}{\tilde{b}(n)} \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL) Z^{(i)}(nL) = o(1)$ since $a(n) = o(\tilde{b}(n))$. Thus, as before, the parameter update recursion is quasistatic when viewed from the timescale of $(\tilde{b}(n))$, and hence, one may let $\tilde{\theta}(p) \equiv \theta$ and $\tilde{\eta}(p) \equiv \eta$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, when analyzing (38). The system of ODEs associated with these updates is the following:

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = 0, \tag{65}$$

$$\dot{Z}(t) = \frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\rho(\eta)} - Z(t), \tag{66}$$

$$\text{and } \dot{W}(t) = \frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} - W(t). \tag{67}$$

Lemma 4.3 related to the convergence of the gradient updates still holds. We prove similar results for the Hessian update.

Lemma 5.2. *The sequence $(W(p))$ is uniformly bounded with probability 1. Further,*

$$\left\| W(p) - \left(\frac{2H(\tilde{\eta}(p))J(\tilde{\theta}(p) + \beta\tilde{\eta}(p))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right) \right\| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Observing the fact that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\nu_{(\theta+\beta\eta)}} \left[\frac{2H(\eta)h(Y_p)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right] = \frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)},$$

the proof turns out to be exactly similar to that of Lemma 4.3. \square

Thus, both $Z(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ updates eventually track the gradient and Hessian of $S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]$. So, after incorporating the projection considered in Step 17, we can write Steps 17 and 19 of Nq-SF1 algorithm as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(n+1) &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) - a(n) \left[\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \right] \right) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta(n) + a(n) \left[-\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 J(\theta(n)) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) + \Delta(\theta(n)) + \xi_n \right] \right), \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where, using (31) and (54), we have

$$\Delta(\theta(n)) = \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 J(\theta(n)) \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} J(\theta(n)) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\nabla_{\theta(n)}^2 S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \right)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta(n)} S_{q,\beta} [J(\theta(n))] \tag{69}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \middle| \theta(n) \right] \\ - \mathcal{P}_{pd} \left(\frac{2H(\eta(n))J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \right)^{-1} \frac{2\eta(n)J(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))}{\beta\rho(\eta(n))(N+2-Nq)} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

It may be noted that the last term in (69) is the same as (70). The objective is to show that the error term $\Delta(\theta(n))$ and the noise term ξ_n satisfy conditions similar to those mentioned in Section 4.4. Then, we can use similar arguments to prove the convergence of Nq -SF1. Considering the error term, we have the following proposition regarding convergence of the Hessian of SF to the Hessian of the objective function J as $\beta \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 5.3. *For a given $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, we have*

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \right\| = o(\beta).$$

for all $\theta \in C$ and $\beta > 0$.

Proof. We use Taylor's expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$ to rewrite (54) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{2}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)J(\theta) | \theta] + \beta \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) | \theta] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\eta | \theta] + \frac{\beta^3}{6} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T (\nabla_{\theta}^3 J(\theta)\eta)\eta | \theta] + o(\beta^3) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Let us consider each of the terms in (71). It is evident for all $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, $i \neq j$, $\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j}] = 0$. Even for the diagonal elements, we have for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i}] = \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right]. \quad (72)$$

For $q < 1$, a simple application of Proposition 3.1 show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}\right)} = \frac{\frac{1}{1-q} + \frac{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{1-q}} = \frac{N+2-Nq}{2}. \quad (73)$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \frac{N+2-Nq}{2}$ for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. Substituting this expression in (72), we get $\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i}] = 0$. Thus, the first term in (71) is zero. Expanding the inner product, $(i, j)^{th}$ element of the second term can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) | \theta] &= \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} [\eta^{(k)} H(\eta)_{i,j}] \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 \eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)]^{(k)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(k)}}{\rho(\eta)} \right] & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In all the expectations above, since the total number of exponents in the numerator is odd, hence, for any combination of i, j, k , the functions are odd and so, by Proposition 3.1, the expectations are zero in all cases. Thus, the second term in (71) is zero. Due to similar reasons, the fourth term in (71) is also zero. Now, we consider the second term. For $i \neq j$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)} \eta^{(j)} \eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right],$$

which is zero unless $i = k, j = l$ or $i = l, j = k$. So using the fact that $\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)$ is symmetric, *i.e.*, $[\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} = [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{l,k}$, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = \frac{4q [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,j}}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right]. \quad (74)$$

Referring to Proposition 3.1, we have in this case, $b = b_i = b_j = 2$ and $b_k = 0$ for all other k . So $\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{b_k}{2} = 2$ and $\frac{b_i!}{2^{b_i} (\frac{b_i}{2})!} = \frac{b_j!}{2^{b_j} (\frac{b_j}{2})!} = \frac{1}{2}$. For any $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, the arguments of the Gamma functions are positive, and hence, the Gamma functions exist. For $q < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] &= \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1 + \frac{N}{2}\right)} \\ &= \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{1-q} \left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right)} \\ &= \frac{(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q}, \end{aligned}$$

while for $q > 1$, we again have $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q} \right)$.

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,j} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] = (N+2-Nq) [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,j}$$

for $i \neq j$ by substituting in (74). Now for $i = j$, using (53)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] &= \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 \eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{k,l=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\eta^{(k)} \eta^{(l)}}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that the above expectations are zero for $k \neq l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) | \theta] &= \frac{2q}{(N+2-Nq)} \sum_{k \neq i} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^2 (\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{2q [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i}}{(N+2-Nq)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] - \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right]. \quad (75) \end{aligned}$$

We again refer to Proposition 3.1 to compute each term in (75). For the first term, $b = 2$ and $b_i = 4$. So we can verify the conditions in Proposition 3.1 hold for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$. We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(i)})^4}{\rho(\eta)^2} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{1-q} \right)^2 \left(\frac{4!}{2^4 2!} \right) \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} - 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-q} + 1\right)} = \frac{3(N+2-Nq)^2}{4q}$$

for $q \in (0, 1)$. The same result also holds for $1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N})$. The second term in (75) is similar to the one in (74), and can be computed in the same way. From (47), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_q(\eta)} \left[\frac{(\eta^{(k)})^2}{\rho(\eta)} \right] = \left(\frac{(N+2-Nq)}{2} \right).$$

Substituting all these terms in (75) results in the following.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [H(\eta)_{i,i} (\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) \eta) \mid \theta] \\ &= (N+2-Nq) \left(\frac{3}{2} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq i} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{k,k} \right) \\ &= (N+2-Nq) [\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)]_{i,i}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows by substituting all the above expressions in (71). \square

The following result is a direct consequence of Propositions 4.6 and 5.3.

Corollary 5.4. *Under Assumption V, $\|\Delta(\theta)\| = o(\beta)$ for all $q \in (0, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, $q \neq 1$.*

Proof. We write $\Delta(\cdot)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\theta) &= \left(\mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right) \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} (\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta(\theta)\| &\leq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]\|. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Since, $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ is continuously differentiable on compact set C , hence $\sup_{\theta \in C} \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\| < \infty$. Also, since $\mathcal{P}_{pd}(\cdot)$ is a positive definite matrix, its inverse always exists, *i.e.*, for any given matrix A , $\|(\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A))^{-1}\| < \infty$ considering any matrix norm. Thus, in order to justify the claim, we need to show that other terms are $o(\beta)$. From Proposition 4.6, it follows that $\|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) - \nabla_{\theta} S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]\| = o(\beta)$, and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \left(\mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta))^{-1} \right\| \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)])^{-1} \right\| \left\| \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 S_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)]) - \mathcal{P}_{pd} (\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

We note that for any matrix A , eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}_{pd}(A)$ are lower bounded by ε . Hence, the first two terms, which are upper bounded by the maximum eigenvalues of the inverse of the projected matrices, can at most be $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Also from Proposition 5.3, the third term is $o(\beta)$. The claim follows. \square

The following result deals with the noise term ξ_n in a way similar to Gq-SF1. For this we consider the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ as defined in Section 4, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta(0), \dots, \theta(n), \eta(0), \dots, \eta(n-1))$.

Lemma 5.5. *Defining $M_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a(k)\xi_k$, $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an almost surely convergent martingale sequence for all $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$.*

Proof. As $\theta(k)$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, while $\eta(k)$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_k for all $k \geq 0$, we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$. Thus $(\xi_k, \mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale difference sequence and $(M_k, \mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale sequence. As shown in Lemmas 4.5 and 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right)^{-1}\frac{2\eta J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta\rho(\eta)(N+2-Nq)}\right\|^2\right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\frac{2H(\eta)J(\theta + \beta\eta)}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)}\right)^{-1}\right\|^2\left\|\frac{\eta}{\rho(\eta)}\right\|^2J(\theta + \beta\eta)^2\right] \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2}\sup_{\eta}\left(\frac{J(\theta + \beta\eta)^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\sum_{j=1}^N\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\eta^{(j)})^2}{\rho(\eta)^2}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$ is the upper bound for the maximum eigenvalue of the inverse of the projected Hessian matrix. The claim follows using similar arguments as in Lemma 4.5. \square

Thus, we have the main theorem which affirms the convergence of the Nq-SF1 algorithm. The proof of this theorem is exactly the same as that of Theorem 4.7.

Theorem 5.6. *Under Assumptions I – V, given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Nq-SF1 converges almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to a point in the ε -neighbourhood of the set of stable attractors of the ODE*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C\left(\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\nabla_{\theta(t)}^2 J(\theta(t))\right)^{-1}\nabla_{\theta(t)} J(\theta(t))\right), \quad (77)$$

where the domain of attraction is given by

$$K = \left\{\theta \in C \mid \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)^T \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_C\left(-\mathcal{P}_{pd}\left(\nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\right)^{-1}\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)\right) = 0\right\}. \quad (78)$$

5.4.2. Convergence of Nq-SF2 Algorithm

The convergence of Nq-SF2 algorithm to a local minimum can be showed by extending the results in the previous section in the same way as done for the Gq-SF2 algorithm. We just show the result regarding convergence of smoothed Hessian to the Hessian of the objective function as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, which has been used in (57).

Proposition 5.7. *For a given $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, for all $\theta \in C$ and $\beta > 0$,*

$$\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] - \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\| = o(\beta).$$

Proof. For small $\beta > 0$, using Taylor's expansion of $J(\theta + \beta\eta)$ and $J(\theta - \beta\eta)$ around $\theta \in C$,

$$J(\theta + \beta\eta) + J(\theta - \beta\eta) = 2J(\theta) + \beta^2 \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta) + o(\beta^3).$$

Thus the Hessian of the two-sided SF (56) is

$$\nabla_{\theta}^2 S'_{q,\beta}[J(\theta)] = \frac{1}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\mathbb{E}[2H(\eta)J(\theta)|\theta] + \beta^2 \mathbb{E}[H(\eta)\eta^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 J(\theta)\eta|\theta] + o(\beta^3) \right),$$

which can be computed as in Proposition 5.3 to arrive at the claim. \square

The key result related to convergence of Nq-SF2 follows.

Theorem 5.8. *Under Assumptions I – V, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, the sequence $(\theta(n))$ obtained using Nq-SF2 converges almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to a point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of the set of stable attractors of the ODE (77).*

Thus, the convergence analysis of all the proposed algorithms show that by choosing a small $\beta > 0$ and any $q \in (0, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, all the SF algorithms converge to a local optimum. In the special case of $q \rightarrow 1$, we retrieve the algorithms presented in [5], and so the corresponding convergence analysis holds.

6. Simulations using the Proposed Algorithms

6.1. Numerical Setting

We consider a multi-node network of $M/G/1$ queues with feedback as shown in the figure below. The setting here is a generalized version of that considered in [5].




Figure 1: Queuing Network.

There are K nodes, which are fed with independent Poisson external arrival processes with rates $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_K$, respectively. After departing from the i^{th} node, a customer either leaves the system with probability p_i or enters the $(i+1)^{th}$ node with probability $(1-p_i)$. Once the service at the K^{th} node is completed, the customer may rejoin the 1^{st} node with probability $(1-p_K)$. The service time processes of each node, $\{S_n^i(\theta_i)\}_{n \geq 1}, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$ are defined as

$$S_n^i(\theta_i) = U_i(n) \left(\frac{1}{R_i} + \|\theta_i(n) - \bar{\theta}_i\|^2 \right), \quad (79)$$

where for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$, R_i are constants and $U_i(n)$ are independent samples drawn from the uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$. The service time of each node depends on the N_i -dimensional tunable parameter vector θ_i , whose individual components lie in a certain interval $\left[\left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{min}, \left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{max} \right]$,

$j = 1, 2, \dots, N_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$. $\theta_i(n)$ represents the n^{th} update of the parameter vector at the i^{th} node, and $\bar{\theta}_i$ represents the target parameter vector corresponding to the i^{th} node.

The cost function is chosen to be the sum of the total waiting times of all the customers in the system. For the cost to be minimum, $S_n^i(\theta_i)$ should be minimum, and hence, we should have $\theta_i(n) = \bar{\theta}_i, i = 1, \dots, K$. Let us denote

$$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \theta_K \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \bar{\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\theta}_1 \\ \bar{\theta}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\theta}_K \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is evident that $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $N = \sum_{i=1}^K N_i$. In order to compare the performance of the various algorithms, we consider the performance measure to be the Euclidian distance between $\theta(n)$ and $\bar{\theta}$,

$$\|\theta(n) - \bar{\theta}\| = \left[\sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \left(\theta_i^{(j)}(n) - \bar{\theta}_i^{(j)} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

6.2. Implementation Issues

Before discussing about the results of simulation, we address some of the issues regarding implementation of the proposed algorithms.

6.2.1. Sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian distribution

All the algorithms require generation of a multivariate q -Gaussian distributed random vector, whose individual components are uncorrelated and identically distributed. This implies that the random variables are q -independent [47]. For the limiting case of $q \rightarrow 1$, q -independence is equivalent to independence of the random variables. Hence, we can use standard algorithms to generate i.i.d. samples. This is typically not possible for q -Gaussians with $q \neq 1$. Thistleton et al. [43] proposed an algorithm for generating one-dimensional q -Gaussian distributed random variables using generalized Box-Müller transformation. This method can be easily extended to the two-variable case. But, there exists no standard algorithm for generating N -variate q -Gaussian random vectors. However, Vignat and Plastino [48] provide a relationship between multivariate Gaussian and q -Gaussian random vectors, which can be used to generate q -Gaussian random variates.

A method can be obtained by making use of the one-to-one correspondence between q -Gaussian and Students'- t distributions for $q > 1$. In fact, the generalized Box-Müller method for sampling q -Gaussian is a modified version of the polar method [25] for generating Students'- t variates. Further, a duality property of q -Gaussians can be used to relate the distributions for $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$ and $q \in (-\infty, 1)$. This observation was first made by Vignat and Plastino [48].

Based on the above mentioned relations [48], we formally present an algorithm, which can be used to generate multivariate q -Gaussian distribution. For simplicity, we denote the q -Gaussian distribution with q -mean μ_q and q -covariance Σ_q as $\mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$.

Theoretical justification behind the above algorithm is provided in the following results [48].

Lemma 6.1. *Given $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{N \times N})$ and $a \sim \chi^2(m)$, $m > 0$, then the vector $Y = \sqrt{\frac{m}{a}}Z \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$, where $q = \left(1 + \frac{2}{N+m}\right)$.*

Lemma 6.2. Let $Y \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$ for some $q \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N+2})$ and

$$X = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2-q}{N+2-Nq}} Y}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{q-1}{N+2-Nq} Y^T Y}}.$$

Then $X \sim \mathcal{G}_{q'}(0, I_{N \times N})$, where $q' = \left(1 - \frac{q-1}{(N+4)-(N+2)q}\right)$.

Lemma 6.3. If $Y \sim \mathcal{G}_q(0, I_{N \times N})$ for some $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$, then $X = \left(\mu_q + \Sigma_q^{1/2} Y\right) \sim \mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$.

Sampling algorithm for multivariate q -Gaussian distribution

Given :

- $q \in (-\infty, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \frac{2}{N})$
- q -mean, $\mu_q \in \mathbb{R}^N$
- q -covariance matrix $\Sigma_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$

Procedure :

1. Generate N -dimensional vector $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{N \times N})$
2. Generate chi-squared random variate

$$a \sim \begin{cases} \chi^2\left(\frac{2(2-q)}{1-q}\right) & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \chi^2\left(\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1}\right) & \text{for } 1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N}). \end{cases}$$

3. Compute

$$Y = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{N+2-Nq}{1-q}} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{a+Z^T Z}} & \text{for } -\infty < q < 1, \\ \sqrt{\frac{N+2-Nq}{q-1}} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{a}} & \text{for } 1 < q < (1 + \frac{2}{N}). \end{cases}$$

Output :

$$X = \left(\mu_q + \Sigma_q^{1/2} Y\right) \sim \mathcal{G}_q(\mu_q, \Sigma_q)$$

6.2.2. Hessian projection

The projection of Hessian in the Newton based algorithms requires some discussion. We require the projected matrix to have eigenvalues bounded below by $\varepsilon > 0$. This can be done by performing the eigen-decomposition of the Hessian update $W(nL)$, and computing the projected matrix by

making all the eigenvalues less than ε to be equal to ε . However, this method requires large amount of time and memory resources for the eigen-decomposition. To reduce the computational efforts, various methods have been studied in literature [4, 39, 51] for obtaining projected Hessian estimates. We consider a variation of Newton’s method, where the off-diagonal elements of the matrix are set to zero. This is similar to the Jacobi variant algorithms discussed in [5], and it simplifies the update as Steps 11–15 in the algorithms are no longer required. The projection of Hessian can be easily obtained by projecting each diagonal element to $[\varepsilon, \infty)$, and its inverse can then be directly computed. The simulations are shown using the Jacobi variants of the proposed Newton algorithms, while the gradient-based algorithms are implemented as proposed. For simplicity, we refer the two Jacobi variants as Nq-SF1 and Nq-SF2, respectively.

6.3. Experimental Results

For the simulations, we first consider a two queue network with the arrival rates at the nodes being $\lambda_1 = 0.2$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.1$ respectively. We consider that all customers leaving node-1 enter node-2, *i.e.*, $p_1 = 0$, while customers serviced at node-2 may leave the system with probability $p_2 = 0.4$. We also fix the constants in the service times at $R_1 = 10$ and $R_2 = 20$, respectively, for the two nodes. The service time parameters for either node are two-dimensional vectors, $N_1 = N_2 = 2$, with components lying in the interval $\left[\left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{min}, \left(\theta_i^{(j)} \right)_{max} \right] = [0.1, 0.6]$ for $i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2$. Thus the constrained space C is given by $C = [0.1, 0.6]^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. We fix the target parameter vector at $\bar{\theta} = (0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3)^T$.

The simulations were performed on an Intel Core *i5* machine with *3.7GiB* memory space and linux operating system. We run the algorithms by varying the values of q and β , while all the other parameters are held fixed at $M = 10000$, $L = 100$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. For all the cases, the initial parameter is assumed to be $\theta(0) = (0.1, 0.1, 0.6, 0.6)^T$. The step-sizes $(a(n))_{n \geq 0}$, $(b(n))_{n \geq 0}$ were taken to be $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, respectively. For each q, β pair, 20 independent runs were performed with each run of 10^6 iterations taking about 0.5 seconds. We compare the performance of all the proposed algorithms with the four SF algorithms proposed in [5], which use Gaussian smoothing. Figure 2 shows the convergence behavior of the proposed q -Gaussian based algorithms with $q = 0.8$, where the smoothness parameter is $\beta = 0.005$.




Figure 2: Convergence behavior of various algorithms for $q = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.005$.

Table 1 presents the performance of the gradient based algorithms and the Jacobi versions of the Newton based algorithms. The values of β are chosen over the range where the Gaussian SF algorithms perform well [5], whereas the values of q are chosen over the range $(-\infty, 1 + \frac{2}{N}) = (-\infty, 1.5)$. It may be noted that $q \rightarrow 1$ corresponds to the Gaussian case, while $q = 1.4$ corresponds

to Cauchy. We show the distance of the final updates $\theta(M)$ from the optimum $\bar{\theta}$, averaged over 20 trials. The variance of the updates is also shown to indicate the robustness of the algorithms. We observe that the two-simulation algorithms perform better than their one-simulation counterparts.

Table 1: Performance of all algorithm for different values of q with $\beta = 0.005$.

q	G q -SF1	G q -SF2	N q -SF1	N q -SF2
-10	0.05859±0.03606	0.06081±0.05528	-	-
-5	0.01621±0.01189	0.01225±0.00566	-	-
-1	0.00580±0.00927	0.00117±0.00080	-	-
-0.5	0.00151±0.00107	0.00035±0.00025	-	-
0.001	0.00207±0.00519	0.00035±0.00062	0.00106±0.00060	0.00019±0.00005
0.2	0.00206±0.00377	0.00011±0.00005	0.00079±0.00030	0.00017±0.00007
0.4	0.00048±0.00024	0.00012±0.00005	0.00067±0.00029	0.00013±0.00004
0.6	0.00068±0.00082	0.00011±0.00003	0.00209±0.00647	0.00010±0.00004
0.8	0.00046±0.00033	0.00013±0.00002	0.00619±0.01305	0.00068±0.00077
1.0 (Gaussian)	0.00290±0.00654	0.00030±0.00013	0.00087±0.00064	0.00058±0.00138
1.1	0.00055±0.00016	0.00014±0.00003	0.03249±0.05359	0.00132±0.00061
1.2	0.00057±0.00021	0.00016±0.00003	0.00417±0.00618	0.00123±0.00138
1.3	0.00070±0.00044	0.00018±0.00004	0.00421±0.00551	0.00207±0.00204
1.4 (Cauchy)	0.00191±0.00065	0.00062±0.00030	0.00366±0.00257	0.00361±0.00417
1.49	0.00813±0.00291	0.00494±0.00228	0.01582±0.00741	0.00931±0.00761

We now focus on the effect of the value of q used in the algorithms. For each value of β , the instances where the distance for the q -Gaussian is less than Gaussian-SF are highlighted. Also, the least distance obtained for each β is marked. In the case of the gradient descent algorithms, it can be seen that better results are usually obtained for $q > 1$ for low values of β . As β increases lower values of q give better performance, while the higher q -values tend to make the algorithm unstable (higher variance). The extreme left and right columns indicate a deterioration in the standard error performance, which can be attributed to the dependence of the noise term and error term, respectively, on the parameter β .

Table 2: Performance of G q -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.0005	0.001	0.005	0.01	0.05	0.1
-10	0.06036±0.04502	0.08081±0.05699	0.06081±0.05528	0.02630±0.00787	0.02245±0.00741	0.02176±0.00894
-5	0.09589±0.11057	0.02078±0.02135	0.01225±0.00566	0.00650±0.00407	0.00527±0.00260	0.00819±0.00448
-1	0.01731±0.03489	0.02113±0.02057	0.00117±0.00080	0.00040±0.00015	0.00100±0.00022	0.00216±0.00064
-0.5	0.05658±0.10012	0.00362±0.00572	0.00035±0.00025	0.00019±0.00008	0.00104±0.00027	0.00165±0.00050
0.001	0.00336±0.00264	0.00136±0.00256	0.00035±0.00062	0.00019±0.00010	0.00090±0.00032	0.00214±0.00070
0.2	0.00481±0.00475	0.00090±0.00086	0.00011±0.00005	0.00016±0.00008	0.00103±0.00048	0.00314±0.00124
0.4	0.00473±0.00421	0.00076±0.00103	0.00012±0.00005	0.00026±0.00007	0.00091±0.00021	0.00327±0.00078
0.6	0.00581±0.00276	0.00062±0.00113	0.00011±0.00003	0.00025±0.00010	0.00112±0.00061	0.00618±0.00149
0.8	0.00100±0.00194	0.00026±0.00037	0.00013±0.00002	0.00023±0.00007	0.00142±0.00061	0.01331±0.00146
Gaussian	0.00483±0.00531	0.00160±0.00142	0.00030±0.00013	0.00026±0.00015	0.00094±0.00044	0.01119±0.00168
1.1	0.00102±0.00178	0.00033±0.00048	0.00014±0.00003	0.00026±0.00012	0.00139±0.00045	0.04619±0.00229
1.2	0.00120±0.00154	0.00018±0.00019	0.00016±0.00003	0.00022±0.00008	0.00208±0.00035	0.04432±0.00286
1.3	0.00316±0.00670	0.00074±0.00061	0.00018±0.00004	0.00030±0.00014	0.00515±0.00066	0.04825±0.00176
Cauchy	0.00314±0.00398	0.00145±0.00135	0.00062±0.00030	0.00138±0.00053	0.01462±0.00060	0.05675±0.00373
1.49	0.00424±0.00226	0.00600±0.00431	0.00494±0.00228	0.00682±0.00230	0.02771±0.00178	0.06799±0.00536

Before presenting the results of the N q -SF2 algorithm, we provide a brief discussion about the step-size sequences. The analysis along the faster timescale for the Newton based algorithms shows that the gradient and Hessian updates are independent, and hence, their convergence to the smoothed gradient and Hessian, respectively, can be independently analyzed. This also provides a scope to update the gradient and Hessian along different timescales without affecting the conver-

gence of the algorithms. Bhatnagar [5] used a faster timescale to update the Hessian, due to which inverse of the Hessian converges much faster compared to the gradient update. This improves the performance of the N-SF algorithms. We study the effect of the timescales on the proposed algorithms. Since, both the one-simulation and two-simulation algorithms involve the step-sizes in a similar way, we consider only G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 algorithms. We use a different step-size ($c(n)$) for Hessian estimation. We fix the step-size sequence corresponding to the slower timescale at $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $n \geq 1$. and let the other sequences to be of the form $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^\gamma}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$. In order to satisfy Assumption IV, we need to consider $\gamma, \delta \in (0.5, 1)$. We study the relative performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 algorithms, when the Hessian is updated on various timescales. Tables 3 and 4 show the effect of δ on the N q -SF2 algorithm for varying q , while β is held fixed at 0.005, and γ is fixed at 0.75 and 0.85, respectively. The value of δ is varied from 0.55 to γ so that $b(n) = o(c(n))$, due to reasons discussed in [5]. We mark the cases where N q -SF2 performs better than G q -SF2.

Table 3: Performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different values of q and δ , where $\beta = 0.005$ and the step-sizes are $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$.

$q \backslash \delta$	0.55	0.65	0.75	G q -SF2
0.001	0.00021±0.00009	0.00017±0.00005	0.00019±0.00005	0.00035±0.00062
0.2	0.00017±0.00005	0.00017±0.00004	0.00017±0.00007	0.00011±0.00005
0.4	0.00016±0.00005	0.00012±0.00003	0.00013±0.00004	0.00012±0.00005
0.6	0.00012±0.00006	0.00012±0.00004	0.00010±0.00004	0.00011±0.00003
0.8	0.00012±0.00004	0.00013±0.00002	0.00068±0.00077	0.00013±0.00002
Gaussian	0.00014±0.00003	0.00009±0.00003	0.00058±0.00138	0.00030±0.00013
1.1	0.00013±0.00006	0.00019±0.00008	0.00132±0.00061	0.00014±0.00003
1.2	0.00016±0.00005	0.00013±0.00005	0.00123±0.00138	0.00016±0.00008
1.3	0.00018±0.00004	0.00019±0.00010	0.00207±0.00204	0.00018±0.00004
Cauchy	0.00095±0.00047	0.00076±0.00044	0.00361±0.00417	0.00062±0.00030
1.49	0.00368±0.00155	0.00586±0.00169	0.00931±0.00761	0.00494±0.00228

Table 4: Performance of G q -SF2 and N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different values of q and δ , where $\beta = 0.005$ and the step-sizes are $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.85}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^\delta}$.

$q \backslash \delta$	0.55	0.65	0.75	0.85	G q -SF2
0.001	0.00019±0.00006	0.00020±0.00006	0.00019±0.00004	0.00016±0.00005	0.00019±0.00015
0.2	0.00019±0.00008	0.00018±0.00005	0.00019±0.00005	0.00016±0.00007	0.00021±0.00027
0.4	0.00016±0.00006	0.00014±0.00006	0.00014±0.00005	0.00014±0.00006	0.00013±0.00007
0.6	0.00015±0.00006	0.00014±0.00005	0.00011±0.00003	0.00012±0.00005	0.00011±0.00004
0.8	0.00015±0.00007	0.00010±0.00005	0.00011±0.00003	0.00019±0.00009	0.00010±0.00002
Gaussian	0.00012±0.00003	0.00012±0.00004	0.00009±0.00004	0.00015±0.00011	0.00047±0.00026
1.1	0.00017±0.00006	0.00014±0.00004	0.00020±0.00008	0.00054±0.00025	0.00012±0.00005
1.2	0.00015±0.00005	0.00013±0.00006	0.00016±0.00007	0.00193±0.00290	0.00015±0.00006
1.3	0.00015±0.00006	0.00014±0.00004	0.00022±0.00015	0.00272±0.00376	0.00019±0.00005
Cauchy	0.00081±0.00063	0.00073±0.00029	0.00114±0.00098	0.00372±0.00605	0.00077±0.00033
1.49	0.00677±0.00211	0.00465±0.00233	0.00574±0.00094	0.00722±0.00335	0.00589±0.00194

The above results show that significant improvement can be achieved for the Gaussian case by using Newton based search. For other q -values, some amount of improvement is observed. We now provide results for the Jacobi variant of N q -SF2 with $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$, $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.55}}$.

We find that although for $q > 1$, the results are not so encouraging, but for $q < 1$, the performance is quite similar to G q -SF2. However, the performance of N q -SF2 is overwhelming for $\beta = 0.001$ and $q \in (0, 1)$ (see Table 5). This indicates that with proper choice of (q, β) -pair, the global optimum may be achieved. The observations regarding very low or high values of β , and high q -values hold for the N q -SF2 algorithm. Thus, it appears that for higher values of q , the

Table 5: Performance of Jacobi variant of Nq -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.0005	0.001	0.005	0.01	0.05	0.1
0.001	0.09423±0.13406	0.00007±0.00005	0.00021±0.00009	0.00046±0.00015	0.00188±0.00078	0.00411±0.00108
0.2	0.02476±0.10495	0.00003±0.00001	0.00017±0.00005	0.00036±0.00014	0.00154±0.00050	0.00361±0.00064
0.4	0.00021±0.00045	0.00005±0.00005	0.00016±0.00005	0.00030±0.00012	0.00159±0.00061	0.00416±0.00130
0.6	0.00081±0.00151	0.00005±0.00007	0.00012±0.00006	0.00023±0.00010	0.00147±0.00063	0.00473±0.00120
0.8	0.00094±0.00126	0.00003±0.00001	0.00012±0.00004	0.00025±0.00009	0.00128±0.00064	0.01049±0.00120
Gaussian	0.00259±0.00405	0.00008±0.00012	0.00014±0.00003	0.00025±0.00009	0.00114±0.00036	0.00723±0.00169
1.1	0.00010±0.00010	0.00004±0.00001	0.00013±0.00006	0.00036±0.00008	0.00150±0.00052	0.03552±0.00159
1.2	0.00028±0.00034	0.00016±0.00027	0.00016±0.00005	0.00027±0.00011	0.00208±0.00070	0.03571±0.00187
1.3	0.00117±0.00274	0.00018±0.00038	0.00018±0.00004	0.00033±0.00009	0.00457±0.00095	0.03990±0.00256
Cauchy	0.00264±0.00479	0.00057±0.00059	0.00095±0.00047	0.00102±0.00049	0.01408±0.00101	0.05291±0.00201
1.49	0.00911±0.00737	0.00361±0.00187	0.00368±0.00155	0.00588±0.00119	0.02773±0.00170	0.06485±0.00298

desirable region $(0, \beta_0)$ for β , mentioned in the convergence theorems, decreases.

We perform similar experiments in a higher dimensional case. For this, we consider a four node network with $\lambda_i = 0.2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$. The probability of leaving the system after service at each node is $p_i = 0.2$ for all nodes. The service process of each node is controlled by a 5-dimensional parameter vector, and a constant set at $R_i = 10$. Thus, we have a 20-dimensional constrained optimization problem, where each component can vary over the interval $[0.1, 0.6]$ and the target is 0.3. The parameters of the algorithms are held fixed at $M = 10000$, $L = 100$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. Each component in the initial parameter vector is assumed to be $\theta^{(i)}(0) = 0.6$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 20$. The step-sizes were taken to be $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.85}}$ and $c(n) = \frac{1}{n^{0.75}}$. For each q, β pair, 20 independent runs were performed. Each run of 10^6 iterations took about 1 second on an average.




Figure 3: Convergence behavior of various algorithms for $N = 20$ with $q = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.05$.

Figure 3 shows the convergence behavior of the algorithms for $N = 20$. As in the previous case, the Gq -SF2 usually converges faster than Nq -SF2. The performance of one-simulation algorithms are relatively poor. The following tables show the performance of Gq -SF2 and Nq -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithms for different (q, β) -pairs. Results are shown only over the range of β 's where the performance is better. It can be observed that the trend is similar in higher dimensional case. However, although the Nq -SF2 shows significant improvement over Gq -SF2 for the Gaussian case, it does not perform as well for other values of q . This observation is quite significant as Gq -SF2 requires less number of simulations, and hence less time, than Nq -SF2. So, we can achieve better performance with less time complexity.

Table 6: Performance of the G q -SF2 algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.005	0.0075	0.01	0.025	0.05	0.075	0.1
-10	0.4510±0.0877	0.3617±0.1100	0.2749±0.0534	0.2051±0.0246	0.1687±0.0240	0.1651±0.0205	0.1758±0.0316
-5	0.4072±0.1072	0.3079±0.0776	0.2635±0.0572	0.1236±0.0221	0.0972±0.0176	0.0787±0.0140	0.0961±0.0249
-1	0.2629±0.1003	0.1534±0.0569	0.1392±0.0877	0.0368±0.0108	0.0199±0.0047	0.0196±0.0024	0.0320±0.0068
-0.5	0.3852±0.1728	0.1265±0.0509	0.0820±0.0278	0.0277±0.0088	0.0146±0.0039	0.0136±0.0031	0.0297±0.0037
0.001	0.2718±0.1072	0.1186±0.0423	0.0742±0.0357	0.0137±0.0035	0.0099±0.0024	0.0134±0.0011	0.0282±0.0036
0.2	0.2580±0.1134	0.1393±0.0709	0.0575±0.0192	0.0136±0.0068	0.0087±0.0017	0.0130±0.0018	0.0271±0.0047
0.4	0.2271±0.1073	0.0875±0.0344	0.0649±0.0202	0.0086±0.0024	0.0090±0.0016	0.0122±0.0018	0.0300±0.0049
0.6	0.2643±0.1757	0.0746±0.0331	0.0397±0.0289	0.0081±0.0028	0.0085±0.0018	0.0124±0.0019	0.0298±0.0031
0.8	0.1627±0.0593	0.0706±0.0307	0.0256±0.0109	0.0056±0.0012	0.0086±0.0014	0.0139±0.0023	0.0344±0.0039
Gaussian	0.2042±0.0525	0.0946±0.0331	0.0770±0.0156	0.0242±0.0056	0.0143±0.0026	0.0153±0.0016	0.0308±0.0032
1.02	0.0850±0.0393	0.0360±0.0164	0.0169±0.0093	0.0055±0.0010	0.0116±0.0023	0.0373±0.0043	0.1150±0.0073
1.04	0.0651±0.0226	0.0407±0.0187	0.0255±0.0087	0.0074±0.0016	0.0118±0.0013	0.0368±0.0045	0.1140±0.0063
1.06	0.1055±0.0577	0.0364±0.0103	0.0281±0.0122	0.0089±0.0018	0.0122±0.0025	0.0408±0.0045	0.1208±0.0086
1.08	0.0858±0.0419	0.0522±0.0202	0.0329±0.0124	0.0136±0.0055	0.0157±0.0022	0.0542±0.0069	0.1405±0.0104
Cauchy	0.1153±0.0445	0.0701±0.0237	0.0572±0.0365	0.0292±0.0070	0.0578±0.0051	0.1118±0.0122	0.1980±0.0134
1.099	0.4316±0.0794	0.3314±0.0630	0.2787±0.0460	0.1916±0.0284	0.1836±0.0420	0.2268±0.0337	0.2781±0.0342

Table 7: Performance of the N q -SF2 (Jacobi variant) algorithm for different values of q and β .

$q \backslash \beta$	0.005	0.0075	0.01	0.025	0.05	0.075	0.1
0.001	1.0666±0.0464	1.0140±0.0865	0.9965±0.0345	0.7596±0.2724	0.0512±0.0085	0.0847±0.0192	0.1048±0.0136
0.2	1.0220±0.0632	1.0042±0.0458	0.5373±0.0938	0.2827±0.2988	0.0469±0.0059	0.0616±0.0145	0.1091±0.0240
0.4	0.9747±0.0322	0.9508±0.0834	0.0663±0.1528	0.0163±0.0025	0.0315±0.0060	0.0540±0.0090	0.0760±0.0128
0.6	0.9623±0.0644	0.9435±0.1048	0.0092±0.0023	0.0125±0.0021	0.0251±0.0036	0.0434±0.0078	0.0553±0.0072
0.8	0.8167±0.1177	0.6973±0.1421	0.0452±0.0464	0.0084±0.0015	0.0192±0.0025	0.0301±0.0049	0.0470±0.0058
Gaussian	0.9740±0.0502	0.8229±0.1640	0.0517±0.1601	0.0093±0.0010	0.0195±0.0022	0.0312±0.0044	0.0459±0.0056
1.02	0.6167±0.1569	0.2524±0.1528	0.1006±0.0595	0.0091±0.0014	0.0219±0.0032	0.0446±0.0058	0.0815±0.0094
1.04	0.7178±0.2099	0.1807±0.0990	0.0315±0.0221	0.0113±0.0011	0.0231±0.0044	0.0452±0.0062	0.0971±0.0139
1.06	0.6975±0.0810	0.2028±0.1510	0.0386±0.0503	0.0121±0.0021	0.0237±0.0052	0.0506±0.0066	0.1050±0.0113
1.08	0.7628±0.1913	0.2550±0.2262	0.0685±0.0121	0.0140±0.0021	0.0306±0.0048	0.0633±0.0098	0.1211±0.0159
Cauchy	0.7859±0.0997	0.2511±0.2316	0.0860±0.2109	0.0508±0.0172	0.0774±0.0102	0.1257±0.0164	0.1975±0.0286
1.099	0.7861±0.1149	0.7216±0.1435	0.6942±0.1239	0.3881±0.0957	0.2844±0.0509	0.3390±0.0497	0.3611±0.0773

7. Conclusions

q -Gaussian distribution is an important power-law distribution that has connections with generalized information measures. Though Gaussian is a special case of this distribution, studying the properties of this distribution poses several challenges, especially in the multivariate case. The main difficulty arises due to the special kind of interdependence among the components of a q -Gaussian random variate. In this paper, we presented some statistical properties of these distributions that helps us to apply these distributions in smoothed functional algorithms.

The power-law behavior of q -Gaussians provide a better control over smoothing of functions as compared to Gaussian distribution. We have extended the Gaussian smoothed functional approach for gradient and Hessian estimation approach to the q -Gaussian case by showing that q -Gaussian satisfies the Rubinstein conditions [34], and developed optimization algorithms based on this. We proposed four two timescale algorithms using gradient and Newton based search. These algorithms generalize the one proposed in [5]. We use a queuing network example to show that for some values of q , the results provided by the proposed algorithms are significantly better than Gaussian SF algorithms. We also present proof of convergence of the proposed algorithms, providing necessary conditions under which the algorithms converge to a local minimum of the objective function. Our simulation results show that while Gaussian based algorithms achieve better performance

with Newton based algorithms, q -Gaussians provide improved performance with gradient based methods that has less time complexity.

References

- [1] Abe, S., Suzuki, N., 2003. Iteration of the internet over nonequilibrium stationary states in Tsallis statistics. *Physical Review E* 67 (016106).
- [2] Abe, S., Suzuki, N., 2005. Scale-free statistics of time interval between successive earthquakes. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 350, 588–596.
- [3] Barabási, A. L., Albert, R., 1999. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286, 509–512.
- [4] Bertsekas, D. P., 1999. *Nonlinear Programming*. Athena Scientific, Belmont.
- [5] Bhatnagar, S., 2007. Adaptive Newton-based multivariate smoothed functional algorithms for simulation optimization. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 18 (1), 27–62.
- [6] Bhatnagar, S., Borkar, V. S., 1998. Two timescale stochastic approximation scheme for simulation-based parametric optimization. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 12, 519–531.
- [7] Bhatnagar, S., Borkar, V. S., 2003. Multiscale chaotic SPSA and smoothed functional algorithms for simulation optimization. *Simulation* 79 (9), 568–580.
- [8] Bhatnagar, S., Fu, M. C., Marcus, S. I., Bhatnagar, S., 2001. Two timescale algorithms for simulation optimization of hidden markov models. *IIE Transactions* 33 (3), 245–258.
- [9] Bhatnagar, S., Fu, M. C., Marcus, S. I., Wang, I. J., 2003. Two-timescale simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation using deterministic perturbation sequences. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 13 (2), 180–209.
- [10] Borges, E. P., 2004. A possible deformed algebra and calculus inspired in nonextensive thermostatics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 340, 95–101.
- [11] Borkar, V. S., 2008. *Stochastic Approximation: A Dynamical Systems Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Costa, J., Hero, A., Vignat, C., 2003. On solutions to multivariate maximum α -entropy problems. *Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2683, 211–226.
- [13] Daróczy, Z., 1970. Generalized information functions. *Information and Control* 16 (1), 36–51.
- [14] Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., Murty, M. N., 2007. Gelfand-Yaglom-Perez theorem for generalized relative entropy functionals. *Information Sciences* 177 (24), 5707–5714.
- [15] Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., Murty, M. N., 2007. On measure-theoretic aspects of nonextensive entropy functionals and corresponding maximum entropy prescriptions. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 384 (2), 758–774.
- [16] Fabian, V., 1971. Stochastic approximation. In: Rustagi, J. J. (Ed.), *Optimizing methods in Statistics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 439–470.
- [17] Ghoshdastidar, D., Dukkipati, A., Bhatnagar, S., 2012. q -Gaussian based smoothed functional algorithms for stochastic optimization. In: *International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE.
- [18] Gradshteyn, I. S., Ryzhik, I. M., 1994. *Table of Integrals, Series and Products* (5th ed.). Elsevier.
- [19] Havrda, J., Charvát, F., 1967. Quantification method of classification processes: Concept of structural α -entropy. *Kybernetika* 3 (1), 30–35.
- [20] Ho, Y. C., Cao, X. R., 1991. *Perturbation Analysis of Discrete Event Dynamical Systems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [21] Jaynes, E. T., 1957. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *The Physical Review* 106 (4), 620–630.
- [22] Katkovnik, V. Y. A., Kulchitsky, Y. U., 1972. Convergence of a class of random search algorithms. *Automation Remote Control* 8, 1321–1326.
- [23] Kiefer, E., Wolfowitz, J., 1952. Stochastic estimation of a maximum regression function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 23, 462–466.
- [24] Kolmogorov, A. N., 1958. New metric invariant of transitive dynamical systems and endomorphisms of Lebesgue spaces. *Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences* 119 (5), 861–864.
- [25] Kroese, D. P., Taimre, T., Botev, Z. I., 2011. *Handbook of Monte Carlo Methods*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- [26] Kullback, S., 1959. *Information theory and statistics*. John Wiley and Sons, N.Y.
- [27] Kushner, H. J., Clark, D. S., 1978. *Stochastic Approximation Methods for Constrained and Unconstrained Systems*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

- [28] L'Ecuyer, P., Glynn, P. W., 1994. Stochastic optimization by simulation: Convergence proofs for the GI/G/1 queue in steady state. *Management Science* 40 (11), 1562–1578.
- [29] Pareto, V., 1906. *Manuale di economica politica*. Societa Editrice Libraria.
- [30] Perez, A., 1968. Risk estimates in terms of generalized f -entropies. In: *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Information Theory, Debrecen 1967*. Journal Bolyai Mathematical Society, Budapest, pp. 299–315.
- [31] Prato, D., Tsallis, C., 1999. Nonextensive foundation of Lévy distributions. *Physical Review E*. 60 (2), 2398–2401.
- [32] Rényi, A., 1961. On measures of entropy and information. In: *Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1960*. Vol. 1. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, pp. 547–561.
- [33] Robbins, H., Monro, S., 1951. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22 (3), 400–407.
- [34] Rubinstein, R. Y., 1981. *Simulation and Monte-Carlo Method*. John Wiley, New York.
- [35] Ruppert, D., 1985. A Newton-Raphson version of the multivariate Robbins-Monro procedure. *Annals of Statistics* 13, 236–245.
- [36] Sato, A. H., 2010. q -Gaussian distributions and multiplicative stochastic processes for analysis of multiple financial time series. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 201 (012008).
- [37] Shannon, C. E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communications. *The Bell System Technical Journal* 27.
- [38] Spall, J. C., 1992. Multivariate stochastic approximation using a simultaneous perturbation gradient approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 37 (3), 332–334.
- [39] Spall, J. C., 2000. Adaptive stochastic approximation by the simultaneous perturbation method. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 45, 1839–1853.
- [40] Styblinski, M. A., Tang, T. S., 1990. Experiments in nonconvex optimization: Stochastic approximation with function smoothing and simulated annealing. *Neural Networks* 3 (4), 467–483.
- [41] Suyari, H., 2004. Generalization of Shannon-Khinchin axioms to nonextensive systems and the uniqueness theorem for the nonextensive entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 50, 1783–1787.
- [42] Suyari, H., 2005. Law of error in Tsallis statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 51 (2), 753–757.
- [43] Thistleton, W. J., Marsh, J. A., Nelson, K., Tsallis, C., 2007. Generalized Box-Muller method for generating q -Gaussian random deviates. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 53 (12), 4805–4810.
- [44] Tsallis, C., 1988. Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 52 (1-2), 479–487.
- [45] Tsallis, C., 1995. Some comments on Boltzmann-Gibbs statistical mechanics. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 6, 539–559.
- [46] Tsallis, C., Mendes, R. S., Plastino, A. R., 1998. The role of constraints within generalized nonextensive statistics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 261 (3–4), 534–554.
- [47] Umarov, S., Tsallis, C., 2007. Multivariate generalizations of the q -central limit theorem. [arXiv:cond-mat/0703533](https://arxiv.org/abs/0703533).
- [48] Vignat, C., Plastino, A., 2006. Poincaré's observation and the origin of Tsallis generalized canonical distributions. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 365 (1), 167–172.
- [49] Vignat, C., Plastino, A., 2007. Central limit theorem and deformed exponentials. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 20 (45).
- [50] Williams, D., 1991. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge University Press.
- [51] Zhu, X., Spall, J. C., 2002. A modified second-order SPSA optimization algorithm for finite samples. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Process* 16, 397–409.

Algorithm 4 : The Nq -SF2 Algorithm

- 1: Fix M, L, q, β and ε .
 - 2: Set $Z^{(i)}(0) = 0, W^{(i)}(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.
 - 3: Fix parameter vector $\theta(0) = (\theta^{(1)}(0), \theta^{(2)}(0), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(0))^T$.
 - 4: **for** $n = 0$ to $M - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Generate a random vector $\eta(n) = (\eta^{(1)}(n), \eta^{(2)}(n), \dots, \eta^{(N)}(n))^T$ from a standard N -dimensional q -Gaussian distribution.
 - 6: **for** $m = 0$ to $L - 1$ **do**
 - 7: Generate two independent simulations Y_{nL+m} and Y'_{nL+m} governed with $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) + \beta\eta(n))$ and $\mathcal{P}_C(\theta(n) - \beta\eta(n))$ respectively.
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 9:
$$Z^{(i)}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))Z^{(i)}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{\eta^{(i)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) - h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right].$$
 - 10:
$$W_{i,i}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,i}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{h(Y_{nL+m}) + h(Y'_{nL+m})}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)} \left(\frac{2q(\eta^{(i)}(n))^2}{(N+2-Nq)\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)} \right) \right].$$
 - 11: **for** $j = i + 1$ to N **do**
 - 12:
$$W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1) = (1 - b(n))W_{i,j}(nL + m) + b(n) \left[\frac{2q\eta^{(i)}(n)\eta^{(j)}(n)(h(Y_{nL+m}) + h(Y'_{nL+m}))}{\beta^2(N+2-Nq)^2\left(1 - \frac{(1-q)}{(N+2-Nq)}\|\eta(n)\|^2\right)^2} \right].$$
 - 13:
$$W_{j,i}(nL + m + 1) = W_{i,j}(nL + m + 1).$$
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Project $W(nL)$ using \mathcal{P}_{pd} , and compute its inverse. Let $M(nL) = \mathcal{P}_{pd}(W(nL))^{-1}$.
 - 18: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 19:
$$\theta^{(i)}(n + 1) = \mathcal{P}_C \left(\theta^{(i)}(n) - a(n) \sum_{j=1}^N M_{i,j}(nL)Z^{(j)}(nL) \right).$$
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: Set $\theta(n + 1) = (\theta^{(1)}(n + 1), \theta^{(2)}(n + 1), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(n + 1))^T$.
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: Output $\theta(M) = (\theta^{(1)}(M), \theta^{(2)}(M), \dots, \theta^{(N)}(M))^T$ as the final parameter vector.
-