

# Stability and optimality in stochastic gradient descent

Panos Toulis, Dustin Tran, and Edoardo M. Airoldi  
Harvard University

March 27, 2022

## Abstract

Stochastic gradient methods have increasingly become popular for large-scale optimization. However, they are often numerically unstable because of their sensitivity to hyperparameters in the learning rate; furthermore they are statistically inefficient because of their suboptimal usage of the data’s information. We propose a new learning procedure, termed *averaged implicit stochastic gradient descent* (ai-SGD), which combines stability through proximal (implicit) updates and statistical efficiency through averaging of the iterates. In an asymptotic analysis we prove convergence of the procedure and show that it is statistically optimal, i.e., it achieves the Cramér-Rao lower variance bound. In a non-asymptotic analysis, we show that the stability of ai-SGD is due to its robustness to misspecifications of the learning rate with respect to the convexity of the loss function. Our experiments demonstrate that ai-SGD performs on par with state-of-the-art learning methods. Moreover, ai-SGD is more stable than averaging methods that do not utilize proximal updates, and it is simpler and computationally more efficient than methods that do employ proximal updates in an incremental fashion.

## 1 Introduction

Consider a random variable  $\xi \in \Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , a parameter space  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and a loss function  $\ell : \Theta \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We wish to solve the following stochastic optimization problem:

$$\theta_* = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} [\ell(\theta, \xi)], \quad (1)$$

where the expectation is with respect to  $\xi$ . Typically, we assume the expected loss function  $f(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E} [\ell(\theta, \xi)]$  to be convex (see Section 2). Formulation (1) encompasses a wide variety of machine learning tasks. For example, learning through least-mean squares, logistic regression or SVM, can be cast into (1) by considering  $\ell$  as the KL-divergence between the distribution of  $\xi$  and the model family parameterized by  $\theta$ . Iterative procedures that approximate the solution  $\theta_*$  are known as stochastic approximations (Ljung *et al.*, 1992). Stochastic approximation was initiated by the seminal work of Robbins and Monro (1951), and found wide applicability in recursive estimation in statistics (Sakrison, 1965; Nevel’son *et al.*, 1973), and systems identification in engineering (Benveniste *et al.*, 2012). If an empirical distribution of  $\xi$  is used, one recovers the problem of empirical loss minimization, which includes maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), or maximum

a posteriori (MAP) if there are regularization terms, which are widely used in machine learning and statistics (Hastie *et al.*, 2009). The learning methods that are applied in such problems do not directly approximate  $\theta_*$ , but rather an estimator of it (e.g., MLE or MAP), and are usually called incremental.

In this work we will study a stochastic approximation procedure to solve (1) defined for data-points  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , as follows:

$$\theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - \gamma_n \partial \ell(\theta_n, \xi_n), \quad \theta_0 \in \Theta, \quad (2)$$

$$\bar{\theta}_n = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i, \quad (3)$$

where  $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots\}$  are i.i.d. realizations of  $\xi$  and assumed to be a continuous stream of data,  $\partial \ell(\theta, \xi_n)$  is a subgradient of the loss function with respect to  $\theta$  at realized value  $\xi_n$ , and  $\{\gamma_n\}$  is a non-increasing sequence of positive real numbers. We will refer to procedure defined by (2) and (3) as *averaged implicit stochastic gradient descent*, or ai-SGD for short. Our approximation procedure combines two ideas, namely an implicit formulation of the updates in Eq. (2) as  $\theta_n$  appears on both sides of the update, and averaging of the iterates  $\theta_n$  in Eq. (3).

The implicit update (2) is equivalent to a stochastic proximal step (Bertsekas, 2011) as follows:

$$\theta_n = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\gamma_n} \|\theta - \theta_{n-1}\|^2 + \ell(\theta, \xi_n) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where the right-hand side is a proximal operator.<sup>1</sup> Update (4) is a stochastic version of the proximal point algorithm by Rockafellar (1976) which has been generalized through the idea of splitting algorithms (Lions and Mercier, 1979; Beck and Teboulle, 2009; Singer and Duchi, 2009; Duchi *et al.*, 2011); see (Parikh and Boyd, 2013) for a comprehensive review. Stochastic proximal methods such as Eqs. (2) and (4) have been analyzed in regards to convergence –under various forms and assumptions– by Bertsekas (2011); Ryu and Boyd (2014); Rosasco *et al.* (2014). A statistical analysis of implicit update (2) without averaging was given by Toulis *et al.* (2014) who derived the asymptotic variance of  $\theta_n$  as estimator of  $\theta_*$  and provided an algorithm to efficiently compute (2) for the family of generalized linear models. Regret analyses of implicit methods have been given by Kivinen *et al.* (2006); Kulis and Bartlett (2010). Further intuitions for proximal methods (4) for learning problems have been given by Krakowski *et al.* (2007) and Nemirovski *et al.* (2009) who have shown that proximal methods can fit better in the geometry of the parameter space  $\Theta$ , and Toulis and Airoldi (2014) who have made a connection to shrinkage methods in statistics.

Two recent stochastic proximal methods are Prox-SVRG (Xiao and Zhang, 2014) and Prox-SAG (Schmidt *et al.*, 2013, Section 6). The main idea in both methods is to replace the gradient in (4) with another stochastic gradient that has the same expectation but smaller variance. Our ai-SGD method differs from the aforementioned stochastic proximal methods in three important ways. First, ai-SGD works with a continuous stream of data  $\{\xi_n\}$  and thus aims to approximate  $\theta_*$ . Prox-SVRG and Prox-SAG are incremental methods as they solve the empirical loss minimization problem, i.e.,  $\xi_n$  are resampled from a finite dataset, and thus approximate the MLE/MAP of  $\theta_*$ , say  $\hat{\theta}_n$ ; they can thus achieve a linear rate of convergence to  $\hat{\theta}_n$  but this variable itself is an estimator of  $\theta_*$  for which  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_*\|^2 \right] = O(1/n)$ , which matches our result for ai-SGD as

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, we will use the terms “implicit” and “proximal” interchangeably.

well. In large datasets the differences between the two regimes diminish, but the finite-sample assumption in incremental methods simplifies the analysis. Second, ai-SGD employs averaging of the iterates, whereas Prox-SVRG and Prox-SAG keep an estimate of the full gradient averaged over all datapoints. Third, implementation of ai-SGD is particularly simple. In contrast, Prox-SVRG introduces additional periodic calculations that are controlled by several hyperparameters, whereas Prox-SAG additionally requires storage of the gradient for every datapoint.

Averaging of the iterates in Eq.(3) is the other key component of ai-SGD. Averaging was proposed and analyzed in the stochastic approximation literature by Ruppert (1988) and Bather (1989). Polyak and Juditsky (1992) substantially expanded the scope of the averaging method by proving asymptotic optimality of  $\theta_n$  for estimating  $\theta_*$  in many applications. Their results showed clearly that slowly-convergent stochastic approximations need to be averaged. Recent work has analyzed non-implicit updates with averaging (Xu, 2011; Shamir and Zhang, 2012; Bach and Moulines, 2013) and has shown their superiority in numerous learning tasks. All aforementioned averaging methods we will refer to as *explicit* because they substitute the implicit step (2) with an explicit update  $\theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - \gamma_n \partial \ell(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)$ .

## 1.1 Contributions and overview of results

We give a proof of convergence for ai-SGD under only assumptions of convexity and linear loss. Our proof is simpler, and more general in certain aspects, than related convergence analyses and implies the typical  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  rate of convergence for  $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_n) - f(\theta_*)]$ , where  $f(\theta)$  is the expected loss function (see Section 3.1). In an asymptotic analysis we show that the sequence  $\{\theta_n\}$  of ai-SGD iterates is *statistically optimal*, in the sense that the information in the sample  $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots\}$  is used in full for the estimation of  $\theta_*$ , and thus no other unbiased estimator of  $\theta_*$  can do better in the limit. This result also implies a  $O(1/n)$  convergence rate for  $f(\cdot)$  under strong convexity (Section 3.2). In a non-asymptotic analysis we derive bounds for  $\mathbb{E}[|\theta_n - \theta_*|^2]$  and show that ai-SGD achieves the same convergence rate as averaging methods with explicit updates, but at the same time it is robust to misspecifications of the learning rate with respect to problem convexity (Section 3.3). Finally, we perform experiments on several standard machine learning tasks that confirm our theoretical insights, suggesting that ai-SGD combines asymptotic efficiency with a desirable robustness and simplicity compared to other competing methods.

## 2 Preliminaries

The symbol  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\}$  will denote the filtration defined by the iterates and datapoints up to step  $n$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is the typical Euclidean norm. For two matrices  $A, B$  we will write  $A \succeq B$  to indicate that  $A - B$  is positive semi-definite. In our theoretical analysis we will work with a combination of one or more of the following assumptions.

**Assumption 2.1** (Learning rates). *The learning rate sequence  $\{\gamma_n\}$  of ai-SGD is defined as  $\gamma_n = \gamma n^{-\alpha}$ , where  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ .*

**Assumption 2.2** (Convexity of loss). *The loss function is convex with respect to  $\theta$ , i.e.,*

$$\ell(\theta_1, \xi) + \partial \ell(\theta_1, \xi)^\top (\theta_2 - \theta_1) \leq \ell(\theta_2, \xi), \quad (5)$$

for any realized  $\xi \in \Xi$  and for all  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ .

**Assumption 2.3** (Differentiable linear loss). *The loss function  $\ell(\theta, \xi)$  is almost-surely differentiable and linear with respect to parameter  $\theta$ , i.e., the random vector  $\xi$  can be decomposed into  $\xi = (x, y)$  such that  $\ell(\theta, \xi) \equiv \ell(x^\top \theta, y)$ . The vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  represents the feature vector and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  for some  $d' \leq d$  represents the outcome vector.*

**Assumption 2.4** (Convexity of expected loss). *The expected loss function  $f(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)]$  satisfies one of the following conditions for all  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ :*

(a)  $f(\theta)$  is convex, i.e.,

$$f(\theta_1) + \partial f(\theta_1)^\top (\theta_2 - \theta_1) \leq f(\theta_2),$$

(b)  $f(\theta)$  is strongly-convex with parameter  $\mu$ , i.e.,

$$f(\theta_1) + \partial f(\theta_1)^\top (\theta_2 - \theta_1) + (\mu/2) \|\theta_2 - \theta_1\|^2 \leq f(\theta_2).$$

**Assumption 2.5** (Taylor approximation). *For a sequence  $\{\theta_n\}$  that converges to  $\theta_\star$  in quadratic mean, there is a constant  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $\theta_n$  in  $\|\theta_n - \theta_\star\| \leq \epsilon$ , there is a positive semi-definite  $d \times d$  matrix  $F$  such that*

$$\partial \ell(\theta_n, \xi) - \partial \ell(\theta_\star, \xi) = F(\theta_n - \theta_\star) + r_n, \quad (6)$$

where  $\{r_n\}$  is a sequence of random variables for which  $\|r_n\| = o(\|\theta_n - \theta_\star\|)$  almost-surely.

**Assumption 2.6** (Hessian of loss). *Let  $\ell$  be almost-surely twice differentiable everywhere on  $\Theta$ , with the Hessian denoted by  $\nabla^2 \ell(\theta, \xi)$ . For all  $\theta \in \Theta$ :*

(a) There exists a positive constant  $\sigma^2 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla \ell(\theta, \xi)\|^2] \leq \sigma^2. \quad (7)$$

(b) There is a positive constant  $M > 0$  such that

$$\text{trace}(\nabla^2 \ell(\theta, \xi)) \leq M, \text{ almost-surely.} \quad (8)$$

**Remarks.** The convexity Assumption 2.4 is standard in the literature. The stronger convexity Assumption 2.2 is used only to prove convergence of ai-SGD without the need to assume strong convexity, and we believe that it can be weakened. Assumption 2.3 is important because it implies that in the implicit update (2) the vectors  $\partial f(\theta_n, \xi)$  and  $\partial f(\theta_{n-1}, \xi)$  are in fact collinear (see Lemma 3.1). This is a key result that allows a probabilistic analysis of the implicit update, and also implies that a computationally efficient implementation of ai-SGD is possible (see Lemma 3.1, Remark). Furthermore, Assumption 2.3 is not very restrictive as it includes a large variety of machine learning models. For example generalized linear models (e.g., least-mean squares, logistic regression), generalized linear mixed models, time series models, all satisfy the constraints of Assumption 2.3. A notable exception would be when the loss includes a regularization term. There are two reasons why ai-SGD, in its current form, still works well without regularization. First, a

constant data stream is assumed and thus regularization is –theoretically– not necessary. More importantly, ai-SGD is performing regularization *implicitly* at every iteration since the proximal equation (4) shrinks the estimate  $\theta_n$  towards  $\theta_{n-1}$ , and thus  $\theta_n$  is regularized. We confirmed this intuition in our experiments, where we observed that regularization hasn’t improved ai-SGD but hasn’t worsened it either. However, a complete theoretical understanding of direct regularization with ai-SGD will be the subject of future work. Regarding Assumption 2.5, it is used in order to decompose  $\theta_n$  into a sum of weighted averages of random variables, and study its asymptotic properties as an estimator of  $\theta_*$ . Such assumptions and proof techniques are typical in stochastic approximation (Kersting, 1977; Schwabe, 1986; Polyak and Juditsky, 1992). Assumption 2.6(a) is standard in the analysis of stochastic approximations (see, for example, (Nemirovski *et al.*, 2009)). Assumption 2.6(b) is less standard. However, Lipschitz continuity of the Hessian  $\nabla^2$  together with a bounded parameter space  $\Theta$  –both are typical assumptions in the literature (Moulines and Bach, 2011; Nemirovski *et al.*, 2009, respectively)–, imply Assumption 2.6(b). Weaker conditions are also possible; for example in least-mean squares or logistic regression, Assumption 2.6(b) is valid under almost-surely bounded features, i.e.,  $\|x_n\|^2 \leq R^2$ .

### 3 Theory

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose Assumption 2.3 holds, then the subgradient vector can be written as  $\nabla\ell(\theta, \xi) = \ell'(\theta, \xi)x$ , where  $\xi = (x, y)$  and  $\ell'(\theta, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}$  is the first derivative with respect to  $\theta^\top x$ . Furthermore, for the implicit update (2) of ai-SGD*

$$\nabla\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n) = \lambda_n \nabla\ell(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n), \quad (9)$$

where the scalar  $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the fixed-point equation

$$\lambda_n = \frac{\ell'(\theta_{n-1} - \lambda_n \gamma_n \ell'(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)x_n, \xi_n)}{\ell'(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)}. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* The first part follows from the chain rule of differentiation. For the second one we have  $\nabla\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n) = \ell'(\theta_n, \xi_n)x_n$  and  $\nabla\ell(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n) = \ell'(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)x_n$ , and thus the two gradients are collinear. Assuming some scale factor  $\lambda_n$  as in Eq. (9) it follows that

$$\gamma_n \ell'(\theta_n, \xi_n)x_n = \gamma_n \lambda_n \ell'(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)x_n,$$

which implies Eq. (10) by the definition of  $\theta_n$ . □

**Remark.** One important implication of Lemma 3.1 is that the random variable  $\nabla\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n)$  is measurable by  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} = \{\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{n-1}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$ , which enables the probabilistic analysis of the implicit equation (2). Furthermore, Lemma 3.1 shows that implementation of ai-SGD is computationally easy because it reduces to a simple linear search that solves the fixed point equation (10). For example in the family of all generalized linear models that fixed point can be found very fast as narrow search bounds are available (Toulis *et al.*, 2014, Algorithm 1). Finally, when  $\gamma_n$  is small Eq. (10) implies that  $\lambda_n \approx (1 + \gamma_n \ell''(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n) \|x_n\|^2)^{-1}$  which reveals that  $\lambda_n$  acts as a normalizing term in (9). This fact will be especially useful in the non-asymptotic analysis of Section 3.3.

The following lemma, which is a standard result in the literature, will also be necessary to prove convergence.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 holds. Then for the update (2) it holds*

$$\|\theta_n - \theta_\star\|^2 \leq \|\theta_{n-1} - \theta_\star\|^2 - 2\gamma_n [\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n) - \ell(\theta_\star, \xi_n)].$$

*Proof.* Expand  $\|\theta_{n-1} - \theta_\star\|^2 = \|(\theta_{n-1} - \theta_n) + (\theta_n - \theta_\star)\|^2$ , and use definition (2) and the property of the subgradient for the convex function  $\ell(\cdot, \xi_n)$ . For the full arguments see (Kulis and Bartlett, 2010, Lemma 3.1) or (Bertsekas, 2011, Proposition 2.1).  $\square$

### 3.1 Convergence

**Theorem 3.3.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 hold. Then the estimator  $\bar{\theta}_n$  of ai-SGD converges in quadratic mean to  $\theta_\star$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\|^2] \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbb{E} [f(\bar{\theta}_n) - f(\theta_\star)] = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ .*

The full proof is given in the supplementary material. The main idea is to obtain an upper bound for  $\mathbb{E} [\|\theta_n - \theta_\star\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}]$  with respect to  $\|\theta_{n-1} - \theta_\star\|^2$  using Lemma 3.2. The expectation of the term  $\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n)$  from Lemma 3.2 is achieved through Lemma 3.1, whereby  $\ell(\theta_n, \xi_n)$  can be measured by  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ . The rest of the proof combines ideas from (Bertsekas, 2011; Nemirovski *et al.*, 2009).

### 3.2 Asymptotic analysis

In the asymptotic analysis we will decompose the estimator  $\bar{\theta}_n$  into a sum of weighted averages, which is a standard proof technique in stochastic approximation ((Kersting, 1977; Ruppert, 1988; Polyak and Juditsky, 1992)).

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.4(b) and 2.5 hold, then*

$$\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star = \frac{1}{n} D_0^n (\theta_0 - \theta_\star) + F^{-1} \bar{\varepsilon}_n + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Omega_i^n r_i, \quad (11)$$

where  $\|D_0^n\| = O(1)$ , quantities  $F, r_i$  are defined in Assumption 2.5,  $\varepsilon_i = \nabla \ell(\theta_\star, \xi_i)$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_n$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \|\Omega_i^n\| = o(n)$ . In particular,  $(\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star)$  converges in quadratic mean to the random variable  $F^{-1} \bar{\varepsilon}_n$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star - (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n F^{-1} \varepsilon_i\|^2] \rightarrow 0. \quad (12)$$

**Remark.** The full proof and details for Theorem 3.4 are given in the supplementary material. A key implication of the theorem is that  $\mathbb{E} [n(\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star)(\bar{\theta}_n - \theta_\star)^\top] = F^{-1} V F^{-1} + o(1)$ , where  $V = \text{Var} [\varepsilon] = \text{Var} [\nabla \ell(\theta_\star, \xi)]$ . The quantity  $F^{-1} V F^{-1}$  cannot be improved as it is the Cramér-Rao lower bound, i.e., any other unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta_\star$  will satisfy  $n \mathbb{E} [(\hat{\theta} - \theta_\star)(\hat{\theta} - \theta_\star)^\top] \succeq F^{-1} V F^{-1}$ . Asymptotic optimality of averaged iterates from explicit updates have been proven by Polyak and Juditsky (1992). Our result holds for implicit updates (2) and requires weaker assumptions for the learning rate sequence  $\{\gamma_n\}$ . In particular, Polyak and Juditsky (1992) requires a learning rate sequence that is decreasing appropriately fast, whereas our result for ai-SGD holds even for constant learning rates. Lastly, since the expected loss  $f(\theta)$  is strongly convex, Theorem 3.4 implies immediately that  $\mathbb{E} [f(\bar{\theta}_n) - f(\theta_\star)] = O(1/n)$ , which is the optimal convergence rate for first-order methods (Nesterov, 2004).

### 3.3 Non-asymptotic analysis and stability

In the non-asymptotic analysis we study the sequence  $\mathbb{E} [|\theta_n - \theta_\star|^2]$ , i.e., the individual iterates of ai-SGD. If those iterates are stable with respect to specification of the learning rate, it follows that their average  $\bar{\theta}_n$  will also be stable. Our main goal in this section is to compare the stability properties of implicit updates (2) against a typical explicit procedure which uses iterates defined through the recursion  $\theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - \gamma_n \partial \ell(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.3, 2.4(b), 2.6 hold. Let  $b_n \triangleq \mathbb{E} [|\theta_n - \theta_\star|^2]$ , then*

$$b_n \leq \left(1 - 2 \frac{\gamma_n \mu}{1 + \gamma_n M}\right) b_{n-1} + \gamma_n^2 \sigma^2. \quad (13)$$

Therefore, the error  $b_n$  is approximately

$$b_n = O(e^{-\frac{2\mu\gamma}{\alpha} n^{1-\alpha}}) b_0 + \frac{\gamma^2 \sigma^2}{\mu} O(n^{-\alpha}). \quad (14)$$

A more accurate approximation in Theorem 3.5 is possible. For example, if  $\alpha = 1/k$ , then the integral is a sum of terms  $n^{1-1/k}$ ,  $n^{1-2/k}$ ,  $n^{1-3/k}$  and so on. In the limit the term  $n^{1-1/k}$  is dominant, but in the short-run other terms are important as well for stability. A full understanding of this dependence between the lower-order terms with stability will be the focus of future work in ai-SGD.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.5 hold, and  $\sigma^2 = 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E} [|\nabla \ell(\theta, \xi)|^2] = 0$ . Then, for the implicit procedure it holds*

$$\max_i \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E} [|\theta_i - \theta_\star|^2]}{\mathbb{E} [|\theta_0 - \theta_\star|^2]} \right\} = O(1). \quad (15)$$

Let  $2c > 0$  be a small constant and define  $\tilde{n}_c = [(1+c)\gamma\mu]^{1/\alpha}$ , then for the explicit procedure

$$\max_i \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E} [|\theta_i - \theta_\star|^2]}{\mathbb{E} [|\theta_0 - \theta_\star|^2]} \right\} = O((1+2c)^{\max\{1, \tilde{n}_c\}}). \quad (16)$$

**Remarks.** We first note that  $M \geq \mu$  since by Assumptions 2.4(b) and 2.6(b), the largest eigenvalue of the Hessian of the expected loss is at most  $M$ , whereas the lowest eigenvalue is  $\mu$ . The term  $(1 - 2 \frac{\gamma_n \mu}{1 + \gamma_n M})$  in Eq. (13) is critical to discount the bias from the initial condition  $b_0$ ; small values for those factors are preferred because the initial conditions are discounted faster. The equivalent term in explicit stochastic gradient descent is  $(1 - 2\mu\gamma_n)$  under similar assumptions (Nemirovski *et al.*, 2009, Eq. (2.8)). There is a clear benefit to the terms of the implicit procedure. First,  $|1 - 2 \frac{\gamma_n \mu}{1 + \gamma_n M}| < 1$ , and thus the initial conditions are always discounted, which is reflected in the result (15) of Corollary 3.6. In contrast, it is well-known that in explicit procedures a mis-specification of the learning rate can cause significant instability as seen in result (16) of Corollary 3.6; if  $\gamma\mu \gg 1$  then the initial bias can be amplified in an arbitrary way until it starts to decay. Second, the stability of the implicit procedure comes at virtually no cost as the rate of convergence for the implicit procedure (Eq. (14)) is identical, in the limit, with the rate of the explicit one.

## 4 Experiments

We conduct experiments using standard benchmarks from both simulated and real datasets. While we indicate results on only a few data sets here, we have indeed seen that they display similar behavior for additional tasks: MNIST (Le Cun *et al.*, 1998), SIDO (Guyon, 2008), and the PASCAL Large Scale Challenge (ALPHA, DELTA, and DNA) (Sonnenburg *et al.*, 2008). We compare our algorithm to the following methods:

- **ASGD**: Averaged stochastic gradient descent with explicit updates of the iterates (Xu, 2011; Shamir and Zhang, 2012; Bach and Moulines, 2013). This is equivalent to ai-SGD where the update (2) is replaced by an explicit step of the form  $\theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - \gamma_n \partial \ell(\theta_{n-1}, \xi_n)$ .
- **Prox-SVRG**: A proximal version of the stochastic gradient descent with progressive variance reduction (SVRG) method (Xiao and Zhang, 2014).
- **Prox-SAG**: A proximal version of the stochastic average gradient (SAG) method (Schmidt *et al.*, 2013). While its theory has not been formally established, Prox-SAG has shown similar linear-rate convergence properties to Prox-SVRG.<sup>2</sup>
- **AdaGrad**: A stochastic gradient method with a form of diagonal scaling to adaptively set the learning rate (Duchi *et al.*, 2011). We note that AdaGrad and similar adaptive methods require second-order information although with the added advantage of being less sensitive than first-order methods to tuning of hyperparameters.
- **Vowpal-Wabbit**: A popular framework with built-in learning algorithms.<sup>3</sup> We use the default algorithm, which is a version of stochastic gradient descent using importance weight aware updates (Karampatziakis and Langford, 2010) and an adaptive learning rate (McMahan and Streeter, 2010). Interestingly, in certain models, the importance weights in Vowpal-Wabbit have equivalent interpretations as proximal updates.

### 4.1 Simulated multivariate normal data

We demonstrate the performance and stability of ai-SGD following a simple normal linear regression example from Section 4.1 in Bach and Moulines (2013). Denote the number of observations to be  $N = 1\text{E}6$  and the number of features to be  $d = 20$ . Let  $\theta_* = (0, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{20}$  be the ground truth. The random variable  $\xi$  is decomposed as  $\xi_n = (x_n, y_n)$ , where the feature vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, H)$  are sampled i.i.d. normal random variables and  $H$  is a randomly generated symmetric matrix with eigenvalues  $1/k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, d$ . The outcome  $y_n$  is sampled from a normal distribution as  $y_n | x_n \sim \mathcal{N}(x_n^\top \theta_*, 1)$  for every datapoint  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Our loss function is defined as the squared residual, i.e.,  $\ell(\theta, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}(y_n - x_n^\top \theta)^2$ , and thus  $f(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)] \equiv (\theta - \theta_*)^\top H(\theta - \theta_*)$ . We choose a constant learning rate  $\gamma_n \equiv \gamma$  according to the average radius of the data  $R^2 = \text{trace}(H)$ , and for both ASGD and ai-SGD we collect iterates  $\theta_n$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . In Figure 1, we plot  $f(\theta_n)$  for each iteration for a maximum of  $N$  iterations, i.e., a full pass over the data, in log-log space.

<sup>2</sup>We note again that the theory and linear convergence rates for Prox-SVRG and Prox-SAG refer to convergence to the empirical minimizer (i.e., MLE or MAP), and not to the ground truth  $\theta_*$ .

<sup>3</sup>Available at [https://github.com/JohnLangford/vowpal\\_wabbit](https://github.com/JohnLangford/vowpal_wabbit).

The benefit of the implicit procedure in ai-SGD becomes increasingly obvious as the learning rate deviates from the optimal. In terms of performance, ai-SGD performs mostly on par with ASGD for the rates at which ASGD is known to be optimal. Notably, ai-SGD remains stable for learning rates that are above the theoretical threshold, i.e.,  $\gamma > 1/R^2$ , for which ASGD diverges (see line for ASGD,  $\gamma = 2/R^2$ ). Naturally, such stability properties of ai-SGD were observed in additional experiments using decaying learning rates.

## 4.2 RCV1 dataset

In this problem, we aim to classify documents belonging to class CCAT in the RCV1 text dataset (Lewis *et al.*, 2004), which has  $d = 47,152$  features and is split into a training set of  $N = 781,265$  observations and a test set of 23,149 observations.<sup>4</sup>

We implement a linear SVM using hinge loss and logistic regression using log loss with a threshold of 0.5. We set the  $L_2$  regularization parameter  $\lambda = 5\text{E-}7$  for log loss and  $1\text{E-}4$  for hinge loss on all methods excluding ai-SGD. For ai-SGD and ASGD, we use the learning rate  $\gamma_n = \eta_0(1 + \lambda\eta_0n)^{-3/4}$  prescribed in Xu (2011), where the constant  $\eta_0$  is determined using a small subset of the data. We set hyperparameters for other methods according to those used in their original papers: for Prox-SVRG, we set the step size  $\eta = 0.01$  and the inner iteration count  $m = N/10$ ; for Prox-SAG, we use the same step size  $\eta$  as in Prox-SVRG.

The results are shown in Figure 2, which indicates that ai-SGD is competitive with all other proximal methods and also second-order methods such as AdaGrad. As Vowpal-Wabbit only reports after a whole number of passes, we note here that after a single pass it achieves a test error of 0.10307 for hinge loss and 0.05599 for log loss. All methods indicate a comparable convergence rate and take roughly a single pass in order to converge. However, ai-SGD required significantly less tuning than Prox-SVRG or Prox-SAG; this observation is investigated further in Section 4.3. It also required less computation and memory than AdaGrad or Vowpal-Wabbit.

We also performed a sensitivity analysis on ASGD and ai-SGD by varying the regularization parameter  $\lambda$ , which in this case also affects the size of the learning rate. When we decrease the regularization parameter, the learning rate increases, in which case ASGD performs increasingly worse. While it may converge, the test error can be arbitrarily large. On the other hand, ai-SGD always achieves convergence and its performance is not much affected by the choice of the hyperparameter. When the regularization parameter is about  $1/N$ , e.g., when  $\lambda < 1\text{E-}6$ , ASGD remains stable and achieves the same performance as ai-SGD. However, this may not hold for other choices of loss function beside log loss.

## 4.3 Covtype dataset

We aim to classify class 2 among 7 forest cover types in the covtype dataset (Blackard, 1998), which has  $d = 54$  features and is split into a training set of  $N = 406,708$  observations and a test set of 174,304 observations.

We implement a linear SVM using hinge loss and logistic regression using log loss with a threshold of 0.5. We set the  $L_2$  regularization parameter  $\lambda = 1\text{E-}6$  for hinge loss and  $5\text{E-}7$  for

---

<sup>4</sup>We apply preprocessing as provided in Bottou’s repository available at <http://leon.bottou.org/projects/sgd>.

log loss on all methods excluding ai-SGD. We use the same learning rates specified in 4.2 and, following the settings in the original papers, set the hyperparameters  $\eta = 1\text{E-}3$  and  $m = N/10$  for Prox-SVRG and  $\eta = 1\text{E-}3$  for Prox-SAG.

Figure 4 indicates the misclassification rate on the test set over a number of passes of the training data. We note that after a single pass Vowpal-Wabbit achieves a test error of 0.2522 for hinge loss and 0.24568 for log loss. The results are consistent with those in Section 4.2. Achieving the performances obtained in Figures 2 and 4 for Prox-SVRG and Prox-SAG required computationally intensive searches over the hyperparameter spaces, and perhaps there are easier ways to accomplish it which we are not aware of. We also investigated variations of the parameters in Figure 5, where we changed the stepsize  $\eta$  in the proximal updates or the inner iteration loop  $m$  in Prox-SVRG.

## 5 Conclusion

We propose a learning procedure, termed ai-SGD, and investigate its theoretical and empirical properties. ai-SGD combines simple stochastic proximal steps, also known as implicit updates, with averaging of the iterates which allows for larger step-sizes. Extending the result of Polyak and Juditsky (1992), we show that ai-SGD is statistically optimal, i.e., the variance of the averaged iterate achieves the minimum Cramér-Rao lower bound. Under strongly convex expected loss functions, this implies the optimal  $O(1/n)$  convergence rate. Thus, the theoretical performance of ai-SGD is significantly better than first-order methods that do not employ averaging, and it is on par with first-order explicit methods that employ averaging, as well as adaptive methods that utilize second-order information. However, we also show –theoretically and empirically– that ai-SGD is more stable compared to the aforementioned first-order methods with averaging, because it is by design more robust to misspecifications of the learning rate with respect to the problem convexity. In particular, Theorem 3.5 shows that ai-SGD effectively normalizes the learning rate so that it remains robust to misspecifications of the learning rate with respect to the problem convexity. Furthermore, such stability comes at virtually no cost in computational or statistical efficiency for a large family of machine learning models with linear loss functions (Assumption 2.3). The simplicity of ai-SGD is also very useful in practice. In comparison, other stochastic proximal methods, such as Prox-SVRG or Prox-SAG, require tuning of additional hyperparameters that control periodic calculations over the entire dataset, or storage of gradient information. Our next steps will be to get a better understanding of ai-SGD in non-strongly convex objectives, and obtain a more fine-grained non-asymptotic analysis of its averaged iterates.

## References

- Bach, F. and Moulines, E. (2013). Non-strongly-convex smooth stochastic approximation with convergence rate  $O(1/n)$ . In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 773–781.
- Bather, J. (1989). *Stochastic approximation: A generalisation of the Robbins-Monro procedure*, volume 89. Mathematical Sciences Institute, Cornell University.

- Beck, A. and Teboulle, M. (2009). A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, **2**(1), 183–202.
- Benveniste, A., Métivier, M., and Priouret, P. (2012). *Adaptive algorithms and stochastic approximations*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated.
- Bertsekas, D. P. (2011). Incremental proximal methods for large scale convex optimization. *Mathematical programming*, **129**(2), 163–195.
- Blackard, J. (1998). *Comparison of neural networks and discriminant analysis in predicting forest cover types*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Forest Sciences, Colorado State University.
- Duchi, J., Hazan, E., and Singer, Y. (2011). Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **12**, 2121–2159.
- Guyon, I. (2008). Sido: A pharmacology dataset.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J., Hastie, T., Friedman, J., and Tibshirani, R. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning*, volume 2. Springer.
- Karampatziakis, N. and Langford, J. (2010). Importance weight aware gradient updates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.1576*.
- Kersting, G. (1977). Almost sure approximation of the robbins-monro process by sums of independent random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 954–965.
- Kivinen, J., Warmuth, M. K., and Hassibi, B. (2006). The p-norm generalization of the lms algorithm for adaptive filtering. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, **54**(5), 1782–1793.
- Krakowski, K. A., Mahony, R. E., Williamson, R. C., and Warmuth, M. K. (2007). A geometric view of non-linear on-line stochastic gradient descent. *Author website*.
- Kulis, B. and Bartlett, P. L. (2010). Implicit online learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-10)*, pages 575–582.
- Le Cun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y., and Haffner, P. (1998). Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of IEEE*, **86**(11), 2278–2324.
- Lewis, D., Yang, Y., Rose, T., and Li, F. (2004). Rcv1: A new benchmark collection for text categorization research. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **5**, 361–397.
- Lions, P.-L. and Mercier, B. (1979). Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, **16**(6), 964–979.
- Ljung, L., Pflug, G. C., and Walk, H. (1992). *Stochastic approximation and optimization of random systems*, volume 17. Springer Science & Business Media.
- McMahan, B. and Streeter, M. (2010). Adaptive bound optimization for online convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*.

- Moulines, E. and Bach, F. R. (2011). Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 451–459.
- Nemirovski, A., Juditsky, A., Lan, G., and Shapiro, A. (2009). Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, **19**(4), 1574–1609.
- Nesterov, Y. (2004). *Introductory lectures on convex optimization*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Nevel’son, M. B., Khasminski, R. Z., and Silver, B. (1973). *Stochastic approximation and recursive estimation*. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI.
- Parikh, N. and Boyd, S. (2013). Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends in optimization*, **1**(3), 123–231.
- Polyak, B. T. and Juditsky, A. B. (1992). Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **30**(4), 838–855.
- Robbins, H. and Monro, S. (1951). A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407.
- Rockafellar, R. T. (1976). Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, **14**(5), 877–898.
- Rosasco, L., Villa, S., and Vü, B. C. (2014). Convergence of stochastic proximal gradient algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.5074*.
- Ruppert, D. (1988). Efficient estimators from a slowly convergent robbins-monro process. Technical report, School of Operations Research and Industrial Engineering, Cornell University.
- Ryu, E. K. and Boyd, S. (2014). Stochastic proximal iteration: A non-asymptotic improvement upon stochastic gradient descent. *Author website, early draft*.
- Sakrison, D. J. (1965). Efficient recursive estimation; application to estimating the parameters of a covariance function. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, **3**(4), 461–483.
- Schmidt, M., Le Roux, N., and Bach, F. (2013). Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. Technical report, HAL 00860051.
- Schwabe, R. (1986). Strong representation of an adaptive stochastic approximation procedure. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, **23**(1), 115–130.
- Shamir, O. and Zhang, T. (2012). Stochastic gradient descent for non-smooth optimization: Convergence results and optimal averaging schemes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.1824*.
- Singer, Y. and Duchi, J. C. (2009). Efficient learning using forward-backward splitting. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 495–503.

- Sonnenburg, S., Franc, V., Yom-Tov, E., and Sebag, M. (2008). Pascal large scale learning challenge.
- Toulis, P. and Airoidi, E. M. (2014). Implicit stochastic gradient descent for principled estimation with large datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.2923*.
- Toulis, P., Rennie, J., and Airoidi, E. (2014). Statistical analysis of stochastic gradient methods for generalized linear models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Xiao, L. and Zhang, T. (2014). A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, **24**, 2057–2075.
- Xu, W. (2011). Towards optimal one pass large scale learning with averaged stochastic gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.2490*.

PANOS TOULIS, Department of Statistics, Harvard University  
*E-mail address:* ptoulis@fas.harvard.edu

DUSTIN TRAN, SEAS, Harvard University  
*E-mail address:* dtran@g.harvard.edu

EDOARDO M. AIROLDI, Department of Statistics, Harvard University  
*E-mail address:* airoidi@fas.harvard.edu




Figure 1: Loss of ASGD ai-SGD on simulated multivariate normal data with  $N = 1E6$  observations  $d = 20$  features. The plot shows that ai-SGD achieves stability in the specification of the learning rate  $\gamma$ , without sacrificing performance.




Figure 2: RCV1 dataset, hinge loss (left) and log loss (right). Classification accuracies on validation data using various optimization routines.




Figure 3: RCV1 dataset, log loss. Sensitivity analysis of ai-SGD and ASGD for the choice of hyperparameter  $\lambda$  in the learning rate.




Figure 4: covtype dataset, hinge loss (left) and log loss (right). Classification accuracies on validation data using various optimization routines.




Figure 5: covtype dataset, hinge loss. Sensitivity analysis of ai-SGD and Prox-SVRG.