

# Blended Conditional Gradients: the unconditioning of conditional gradients

Gábor Braun<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian Pokutta<sup>1</sup>, Dan Tu<sup>1</sup>, and Stephen Wright<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ISyE, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA,  
{gabor.braun,sebastian.pokutta}@isye.gatech.edu, dan.tu@gatech.edu  
<sup>2</sup>Computer Sciences Department, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI,  
swright@cs.wisc.edu

July 19, 2022

## Abstract

We present a *blended conditional gradient* approach for minimizing a smooth convex function over a polytope  $P$ , that combines the Frank–Wolfe algorithm (also called conditional gradient) with gradient-based steps different from away steps and pairwise steps, however, still achieving linear convergence for strongly convex functions and good practical performance. Our approach retains all favorable properties of conditional gradient algorithms, most notably avoidance of projections onto  $P$  and maintenance of iterates as sparse convex combinations of a limited number of extreme points of  $P$ . The algorithm decreases measures of optimality (primal and dual gaps) rapidly, both in the number of iterations and in wall-clock time, outperforming even the efficient “lazified” conditional gradient algorithms of Braun et al. [2017]. *Nota bene* the algorithm is lazified itself. We also present a streamlined algorithm when  $P$  is the probability simplex.

## 1 Introduction

A common paradigm in convex optimization is minimizing a smooth convex function  $f$  over a polytope  $P$ . Popular algorithms include the projected gradient descent algorithm (PGD, also called gradient projection) and the Frank–Wolfe Frank and Wolfe [1956] or conditional gradient (CG) algorithm Levitin and Polyak [1966]. Both are first-order methods, i.e., requiring access only to gradients  $\nabla f(x)$  and function values  $f(x)$ . While PGD uses projections onto  $P$  to ensure feasibility of iterates, CG employs a linear programming (LP) oracle to minimize a linear function over  $P$  at each iteration. Potential computational bottlenecks include the projection steps for PGD and the LP oracle steps for CG. The cost of each depends on complexity of the domain  $P$ .

In this work, we blend the two approaches, resulting in *blended conditional gradient* (BCG), which in addition to the conditional gradients framework also uses a “simplex descent oracle” to take steps in the direction of the negative gradient in the convex hull of “active vertices,” which are some of the vertices of  $P$  encountered in previous iterations. No projections are required. Building on Braun et al. [2017], BCG also uses a “weak-separation” oracle in place of the LP oracle traditionally used in the Frank–Wolfe procedure,

providing a good enough, but possibly far from optimal solution to an LP problem. With these two oracles, BCG captures the best features of the PGD and CG approaches, while it typically keeps the set of active vertices at a small size, improving both the efficiency of the procedure and the “simplicity” of the iterates. BCG is *not* merely a variant of the fully-corrective Frank–Wolfe algorithm (see, for example, Holloway [1974], Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015]), as it does not simply “correct” iterates but rather it makes better use of the active vertices via gradient steps with a guarantee of significant progress.

Our BCG approach has similar theoretical convergence rates to the pairwise-step and away-step variants of the Frank–Wolfe algorithm, even to their “lazified” variants in Braun et al. [2017], however, in several cases, we observe empirically higher convergence rates in both the primal and dual gaps for BCG than for Pairwise Frank–Wolfe, Away-step Frank–Wolfe, (vanilla) Frank–Wolfe, and the lazified variants described in Braun et al. [2017]. While the lazified variants have an advantage over the baseline methods only when the LP oracle is expensive, our BCG approach consistently outperforms the other variants in most circumstances.

## Related work

There has been an extensive body of work on conditional gradient algorithms; see the excellent overview of Jaggi [2013]. Here we review only those papers most closely related to our work.

Our main inspiration comes from Braun et al. [2017], Lan et al. [2017], which introduces the weak-separation oracle to eliminate calling the LP oracle in every iteration, and from Rao et al. [2015], which drops elements from the active set and uses projected gradient steps to improve the objective over the current basis. Linearly convergent variants of conditional gradients for strongly convex functions were studied as early as Guélat and Marcotte [1986] for special cases and Garber and Hazan [2013] for the general case (though the latter work involves very large constants). More recently, linear convergence has been established for various pairwise-step and away-step variants of conditional gradients in Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015], relying on a small set of active vertices for improved steps. More memory-efficient decomposition-invariant variants were established in Garber and Meshi [2016] and Bashiri and Zhang [2017]. Modification of descent directions and step sizes, reminiscent of drop steps, have been considered by Freund and Grigas [2016], Freund et al. [2017]. The use of an oracle based on a subset of the vertices of  $P$ , cheaper than the full LP oracle, has been considered in Kerdreux et al. [2018]. Garber et al. [2018] proposes a fast variant of conditional gradients for matrix recovery problems.

## Contribution

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- (i) *Blended Conditional Gradients (BCG)*. We provide new algorithms that blend different types of gradient steps: the traditional conditional gradient steps of Frank and Wolfe [1956], the lazified conditional gradient steps of Braun et al. [2017], and simplified projected gradient descent steps, however avoiding projections, away steps and pairwise steps. Linear convergence is achieved for strongly convex functions (see Theorem 3.2), and  $O(1/t)$  convergence for general smooth functions. While the linear convergence proof of the Away-step Frank–Wolfe Algorithm [Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi, 2015, Theorem 1, Footnote 4] requires the objective function  $f$  to be defined on the Minkowski sum  $P - P + P$ , by contrast, BCG does not need  $f$  to be defined outside the polytope  $P$ . The algorithm has complexity comparable to pairwise or away-step variants of conditional gradients, both in per-iteration running time and space. It is affine-invariant and parameter-free (which some papers call adaptive): it does not require estimates of parameters of the input data, like smoothness, strong convexity or the diameter of  $P$ . It maintains iterates as (often very sparse) convex combinations of vertices — much sparser than the baseline

conditional gradient methods —, which is important for some applications. The extra sparsity is due to the aggressive reuse of active vertices, and adding a new active vertex only as a last resort. In wall-clock time, BCG is often *orders of magnitude* faster than Pairwise Frank–Wolfe and its lazified version in Braun et al. [2017].

- (ii) *Simplex Gradient Descent (SiGD)*. In Section 4, we describe a gradient descent procedure for minimizing a smooth function over the probability simplex, which is used to implement one of the oracles required by BCG.
- (iii) *Computational Experiments*. We provide benchmarks exemplifying the excellent computational behavior of BCG compared to the current state of the art on standard problems, including video co-localization, sparse regression, structured SVM training, and structured regression. We observe significant computational speed-ups and in several cases empirically better convergence rates.

## Outline

We summarize preliminary material in Section 2, including two oracles that are building blocks for our BCG procedure. The BCG approach based on these oracles is described and analyzed in Section 3, establishing linear convergence rates. The simplex gradient descent routine, implementing one of the oracles, is described in Section 4. We discuss further variations in Section 5 and provide numerical experiments in Section 6. Auxiliary material is relegated to the appendix.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $e_i$  denote the  $i$ -th coordinate vector,  $\mathbb{1} := (1, \dots, 1) = e_1 + e_2 + \dots$  denote the all-one vector,  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the Euclidean norm ( $\ell_2$ -norm), the letter  $D = \text{diam}(P)$  denote the  $\ell_2$ -diameter of  $P$ , and  $\text{conv } S$  denote the convex hull of a set  $S$  of points. The *probability simplex*  $\Delta^k := \text{conv}\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$  is the convex hull of the coordinate vectors in dimension  $k$ .

Let  $f$  be a differentiable convex function. Recall that  $f$  is  $L$ -smooth, if

$$f(y) - f(x) - \nabla f(x)(y - x) \leq L\|y - x\|^2/2 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in P.$$

The function  $f$  has *curvature*  $C$  if

$$f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)x) \leq f(x) + \gamma \nabla f(x)(y - x) + C\gamma^2/2, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in P \text{ and } 0 \leq \gamma \leq 1.$$

(Note that an  $L$ -smooth function always has curvature  $C \leq LD^2$ .) Finally,  $f$  is *strongly convex* if for some  $\alpha > 0$  we have

$$f(y) - f(x) - \nabla f(x)(y - x) \geq \alpha\|y - x\|^2/2, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in P.$$

We will use the following fact about strongly convex function when optimizing over  $P$ .

**Fact 2.1** (Geometric strong convexity guarantee). [Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi, 2015, Theorem 6 and Eq. (28)] Given a strongly convex function  $f$ , there is a value  $\mu > 0$  called the geometric strong convexity such that

$$f(x) - \min_{y \in P} f(y) \leq \frac{(\max_{y \in S, z \in P} \nabla f(x)(y - z))^2}{2\mu} \quad x \in \text{conv } S, \quad S \subseteq \text{vertex } P,$$

for any  $x \in P$  and for any subset  $S$  of the vertices of  $P$  for which  $x$  lies in the convex hull of  $S$ .

The value of  $\mu$  depends both on  $f$  and the geometry of  $P$ .

## 2.1 Simplex Descent Oracle

Given a convex objective function  $f$ , an ordered finite set  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$  of points, we define  $f_S: \Delta^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f_S(\lambda) := f\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i v_i\right). \quad (1)$$

Let us assume that  $f_S$  is  $L_{f_S}$ -smooth. Oracle 1 returns an improving point  $x'$  in  $\text{conv } S$  together with a vertex set  $S' \subseteq S$  such that  $x' \in \text{conv } S'$ .

---

**Oracle 1** Simplex Descent Oracle  $\text{SiDO}(x, S, f)$

---

**Input:** finite set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , point  $x \in \text{conv } S$ , convex smooth function  $f: \text{conv } S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ ;

**Output:** finite set  $S' \subseteq S$ , point  $x' \in \text{conv } S'$  satisfying either (1)  $f(x') \leq f(x)$  and  $S' \neq S$ , or (2)  $f(x) - f(x') \geq [\max_{u,v \in S} \nabla f(x)(u - v)]^2 / (4L_{f_S})$ .

---

In Section 4 we provide an implementation (Algorithm 2) of this oracle via a simplified projected gradient step, which not only avoids projection altogether, but does not require knowledge of the smoothness parameter  $L_{f_S}$  either. As a by-product, it leads to the Simplex Gradient Descent algorithm (Algorithm 3) over the probability simplex.

## 2.2 Weak-Separation Oracle

---

**Oracle 2** Weak-Separation Oracle  $\text{LPsep}_P(c, x, \Phi, K)$

---

**Input:** linear objective  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , point  $x \in P$ , accuracy  $K \geq 1$ , objective value  $\Phi > 0$ ;

**Output:** Either (1) vertex  $y \in P$  with  $c(x - y) \geq \Phi/K$ , or (2) **false**:  $c(x - z) \leq \Phi$  for all  $z \in P$ .

---

The weak-separation oracle Oracle 2 was introduced in Braun et al. [2017] to be employed in place of the LP oracle traditionally used in the conditional gradients method. Provided with a point  $x$  and a linear objective  $c$ , it decides whether there exists  $y \in P$  with  $cx - cy \geq \Phi/K$  (positive answer) or  $cx - cz \leq \Phi$  for all  $z \in P$  (negative answer). (In our applications,  $c = \nabla f(x)$  is the gradient of the objective at the current iterate  $x$ .) Oracle 2 could be implemented simply by the standard LP oracle of minimizing  $cz$  over  $z \in P$ . However, it allows more efficient implementations that supplement the traditional oracle with either or both of the following two algorithmic elements: (1) *Caching*: testing vertices of  $P$  that were solutions of earlier oracle calls, to see if they yield a positive answer, and (2) *Early Termination*: terminating the LP procedure as soon as a vertex of  $P$  has been discovered that satisfies the criterion for a positive answer. (This technique requires an LP implementation that considers vertex solutions.) These techniques resulted in orders-of-magnitude speedups in wall-clock time in the computational tests of Braun et al. [2017], as well as very sparse convex combinations of vertices for the iterates  $x_t$ , which is a desirable feature in many applications.

## 3 Blended Conditional Gradients

We now present our main algorithm, *Blended Conditional Gradients (BCG)* (Algorithm 1), and establish its convergence rate. The algorithm expresses each iterate  $x_t$ ,  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  as a convex combination of a set

$S_t$  of active vertices of  $P$ , as in the Pairwise and Away-step Frank–Wolfe algorithms. At each iteration, the algorithm calls either Oracle 1 or Oracle 2 in search of the next iterate, whichever promises the smaller function value, using a simple test via (local) dual gaps in Line 6; the same greedy principle is used in the Away-step Frank–Wolfe algorithm (and in the lazified Away-step Frank–Wolfe algorithm using *local* dual gaps.) When Oracle 2 returns a negative answer, this is interpreted as a failure to make progress due to trying to reduce the function value too much, so no step is taken, but the per-iteration improvement target  $\Phi_t$  is reduced by a factor of 2 to aim for a smaller decrease in the next iteration of BCG. (When the implementation provides the exact dual gap, Line 13 can be improved as  $\Phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in P} \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v)/2$ , and a traditional Frank–Wolfe step used to obtain  $x_{t+1}$ .) Note that  $2\Phi_t$  also upper bounds the dual gap, and hence can be used in stopping criteria.

---

**Algorithm 1** Blended Conditional Gradients (BCG)

---

**Input:** smooth convex function  $f$ , start vertex  $x_0 \in P$ , weak-separation oracle  $\text{LPsep}_P$ , accuracy  $K \geq 1$

**Output:** points  $x_t$  in  $P$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$

```

1:  $\Phi_0 \leftarrow \max_{v \in P} \nabla f(x_0)(x_0 - v)/2$  {Initial dual gap estimate}
2:  $S_0 \leftarrow \{x_0\}$ 
3: for  $t = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
4:    $v_t^A \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{v \in S_t} \nabla f(x_t)v$ 
5:    $v_t^{FW-S} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in S_t} \nabla f(x_t)v$ 
6:   if  $\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S}) \geq \Phi_t$  then
7:      $x_{t+1}, S_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{SiDO}(x_t, S_t)$  {SiDO gradient step}
8:      $\Phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \Phi_t$ 
9:   else
10:     $v_t \leftarrow \text{LPsep}_P(\nabla f(x_t), x_t, \Phi_t, K)$ 
11:    if  $v_t = \text{false}$  then
12:       $x_{t+1} \leftarrow x_t$ 
13:       $\Phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \Phi_t/2$  {update dual gap estimate}
14:       $S_{t+1} \leftarrow S_t$ 
15:    else
16:       $x_{t+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in [x_t, v_t]} f(x)$  {FW update with line search}
17:      Choose  $S_{t+1} \subseteq S_t \cup \{v_t\}$  minimal such that  $x_{t+1} \in S_{t+1}$ .
18:       $\Phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \Phi_t$ 
19:    end if
20:  end if
21: end for

```

---

*Remark 3.1.* In Line 17, the active set  $S_{t+1}$  is required to be minimal to ensure that  $|S_{t+1}| \leq \dim P + 1$  by Caratheodory’s theorem. In practice, the  $S_t$  are invariably small and no explicit reduction in size is necessary. The key requirement, in theory and practice, is that if after a call to Oracle SiDO the new iterate  $x_{t+1}$  lies on a face of the convex hull of the vertices in  $S_t$ , then at least one element of  $S_t$  is dropped to form  $S_{t+1}$ . This requirement ensures that the local pairwise gap in Line 6 is not too large due to stale vertices in  $S_t$ , which can block progress. The smallness of  $S_t$  is crucial to the efficiency of the algorithm, in rapidly determining the maximizer and minimizer of  $\nabla f(x_t)v$  over the active set  $S_t$  (Lines 4 and 5).

The constants in the convergence rate described in our main theorem (Theorem 3.2 below) depend on a modified curvature-like parameter of the function  $f$ . Given a vertex set  $S$  of  $P$ , recall from Section 2.1 the

smoothness parameter  $L_{f_S}$  of the function  $f_S: \Delta^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by (1). Let  $C^\Delta := \max_{S: |S| \leq 2 \dim P} L_{f_S}$  be the maximum of the  $L_{f_S}$  over all possible active sets. This is an affine invariant parameter, which we call *simplicial curvature*, that depends on both the shape of  $P$  and  $f$ . The restriction on the size on  $S$  ensures that in the common case of  $L$ -smooth functions, the simplicial curvature is of reasonable magnitude:

$$C^\Delta \leq \frac{LD^2(\dim P)^2}{2},$$

where  $D$  is the diameter of  $P$ . (See Lemma A.1 in the appendix.) For comparison recall the curvature bound  $C \leq LD^2$ . Note however, that the algorithm and convergence rate below are affine invariant, and the only restriction on the function  $f$  is that it has finite simplicial curvature. This restriction readily provides the curvature bound

$$C \leq 2C^\Delta, \quad (2)$$

where the factor 2 arises as the square of the diameter of the probability simplex  $\Delta^k$ . See Lemma A.2 in the appendix for details. Note that  $S$  is allowed to be large enough so that every point of  $P$  is in the convex hull of some  $S$  by Caratheodory's theorem, and that the simplicial curvature provides an upper bound on the curvature

We describe the convergence of BCG (Algorithm 1) in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $f$  be a strongly convex, smooth function over the polytope  $P$  with simplicial curvature  $C^\Delta$  and geometric strong convexity  $\mu$ . Then Algorithm 1 ensures  $f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$ , where  $x^*$  is an optimal solution to  $f$  in  $P$  for some iteration index  $T$  that satisfies*

$$T \leq \left\lceil \log \frac{2\Phi_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + 8K \left\lceil \log \frac{\Phi_0}{2KC^\Delta} \right\rceil + \frac{64K^2C^\Delta}{\mu} \left\lceil \log \frac{4KC^\Delta}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil = O\left(\frac{C^\Delta}{\mu} \log \frac{\Phi_0}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\log$  denotes logarithms to the base 2.

For smooth but not necessarily strongly convex functions  $f$ , the algorithm has a convergence rate of  $f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$  after  $O(\max\{C^\Delta, \Phi_0\}/\varepsilon)$  iterations by a similar argument, which is omitted.

*Proof.* The proof tracks that of Braun et al. [2017]. We divide the iteration sequence into epochs that are demarcated by the *negative iterations*, i.e., iterations where the weak-separation oracle (Oracle 2) is called but does not return an improving vertex (in Line 12), which results in the decrease target  $\Phi_t$  being halved. We then bound the number of iterates within each epoch. The result is obtained by aggregating across epochs.

We start by recalling a well-known bound on the function value using the Frank–Wolfe point

$$v_t^{FW} := \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in P} \nabla f(x_t)v,$$

at iteration  $t$  provided by convexity

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - x^*) \leq \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW}).$$

If iteration  $t - 1$  is a negative iteration, we have in particular (using  $x_t = x_{t-1}$  and  $\Phi_t = \Phi_{t-1}/2$ )

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW}) \leq 2\Phi_t. \quad (4)$$

This bound also holds at  $t = 0$ , by definition of  $\Phi_0$ . Thus Algorithm 1 is guaranteed to satisfy  $f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$  at some iterate  $T$  such that  $T - 1$  is a negative iteration and  $2\Phi_T \leq \varepsilon$ . Therefore, the total number of negative iterations  $N_{\text{neg}}$  required to reach this point satisfies

$$N_{\text{neg}} \leq \left\lceil \log \frac{2\Phi_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil, \quad (5)$$

which is also a bound on the total number of epochs. The next stage of the proof finds bounds on the number of iterations of each type within an individual epoch.

If iteration  $t - 1$  is a negative iteration, we have  $x_t = x_{t-1}$  and  $\Phi_t = \Phi_{t-1}/2$ , and because the condition is false at Line 6 of Algorithm 1, we have

$$\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - x_t) \leq \nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S}) \leq 2\Phi_t. \quad (6)$$

This condition also holds trivially at  $t = 0$ , since  $v_0^A = v_0^{FW-S} = x_0$ . By summing (4) and (6), we obtain

$$\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW}) \leq 4\Phi_t,$$

so it follows from Fact 2.1 that

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW})]^2}{2\mu} \leq \frac{8\Phi_t^2}{\mu}.$$

By combining this inequality with (4), we obtain

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \min \{8\Phi_t^2/\mu, 2\Phi_t\}, \quad (7)$$

for all  $t$  such that either  $t = 0$  or  $t - 1$  is a negative iteration. (In fact, (7) holds for *all*  $t$ , because (1) over the epoch that starts at iteration  $t$  (and in fact *all* iterations), the sequence of function values  $\{f(x_s)\}_s$  is non-increasing; and (2)  $\Phi_s = \Phi_t$  for all  $s$  in the epoch.)

We now consider the epoch that starts at iteration  $t$ , and use  $s$  to index the iterations within this epoch. Note that  $\Phi_s = \Phi_t$  for all  $s$  in this epoch.

We distinguish three types of iterations besides negative iterations. The first type is a *Frank–Wolfe* step, in which the weak-separation oracle is called and returns an improving vertex  $v_s \in P$  such that  $\nabla f(x_s)(x_s - v_s) \geq \Phi_s/K = \Phi_t/K$  (Line 16). Using the definition of curvature  $C$ , we have by standard Frank–Wolfe arguments that

$$f(x_s) - f(x_{s+1}) \geq \frac{\Phi_s}{2K} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\Phi_s}{KC} \right\} \geq \frac{\Phi_t}{2K} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\Phi_t}{2KC^\Delta} \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where we used  $\Phi_s = \Phi_t$  and  $C \leq 2C^\Delta$  (from (2)). We denote by  $N_{\text{FW}}^t$  the number of Frank–Wolfe iterations in the epoch starting at iteration  $t$ .

The second type of iteration is a *descent step*, in which Oracle SiDO (Line 7) returns a point  $x_{s+1}$  that lies in the relative interior of  $\text{conv } S_s$ . (The name “descent step” comes from “projected gradient descent”, one of the possible implementations of SiDO.) We thus have  $S_{s+1} = S_s$  and, by the definition of Oracle SiDO,

$$f(x_s) - f(x_{s+1}) \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_s)(v_s^A - v_s^{FW-S})]^2}{4C^\Delta} \geq \frac{\Phi_s^2}{4C^\Delta} = \frac{\Phi_t^2}{4C^\Delta}. \quad (9)$$

We denote by  $N_{\text{gd}}^t$  the number of descent steps that take place in the epoch that starts at iteration  $t$ .

The third type of iteration is one in which Oracle 1 returns a point  $x_{s+1}$  lying on a face of the convex hull of  $S_s$ , so that  $S_{s+1}$  is strictly smaller than  $S_s$ . Similarly to the Away-step Frank–Wolfe algorithm of Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015], we call these steps *drop steps*, and denote by  $N_{\text{drop}}^t$  the number of such steps that take place in the epoch that starts at iteration  $t$ . Note that since  $S_s$  is expanded only at Frank–Wolfe steps, and then only by at most one element, the *total* number of drop steps across the whole algorithm cannot exceed

the total number of Frank–Wolfe steps. We use this fact and (5) in bounding the total number of iterations  $T$  required for  $f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$ :

$$T \leq N_{\text{neg}} + N_{\text{gd}} + N_{\text{FW}} + N_{\text{drop}} \leq \left\lceil \log \frac{2\Phi_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + N_{\text{gd}} + 2N_{\text{FW}} = \left\lceil \log \frac{2\Phi_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + \sum_{t:\text{epoch start}} (N_{\text{gd}}^t + 2N_{\text{FW}}^t). \quad (10)$$

Here  $N_{\text{gd}}$  denotes the total number of descent steps,  $N_{\text{FW}}$  denotes the total number of Frank–Wolfe steps, and  $N_{\text{drop}}$  denotes the total number of drop steps, which is bounded by  $N_{\text{FW}}$ , as just discussed.

Next, we seek bounds on the iteration counts  $N_{\text{gd}}^t$  and  $N_{\text{FW}}^t$  within the epoch starting with iteration  $t$ . For the total decrease in function value during the epoch, Equations (8) and (9) provide a lower bound, while  $f(x_t) - f(x^*)$  is an obvious upper bound, leading to the following estimate using (7).

If  $\Phi_t \geq 2KC^\Delta$  then

$$2\Phi_t \geq f(x_t) - f(x^*) \geq N_{\text{gd}}^t \frac{\Phi_t^2}{4C^\Delta} + N_{\text{FW}}^t \frac{\Phi_t}{2K} \geq N_{\text{gd}}^t \frac{\Phi_t K}{2} + N_{\text{FW}}^t \frac{\Phi_t}{2K} \geq (N_{\text{gd}}^t + 2N_{\text{FW}}^t) \frac{\Phi_t}{4K},$$

hence

$$N_{\text{gd}}^t + 2N_{\text{FW}}^t \leq 8K. \quad (11)$$

If  $\Phi_t < 2KC^\Delta$ , a similar argument provides

$$\frac{8\Phi_t^2}{\mu} \geq f(x_t) - f(x^*) \geq N_{\text{gd}}^t \frac{\Phi_t^2}{4C^\Delta} + N_{\text{FW}}^t \frac{\Phi_t^2}{4K^2C^\Delta} \geq (N_{\text{gd}}^t + 2N_{\text{FW}}^t) \frac{\Phi_t^2}{8K^2C^\Delta},$$

leading to

$$N_{\text{gd}}^t + 2N_{\text{FW}}^t \leq \frac{64K^2C^\Delta}{\mu}. \quad (12)$$

There are at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lceil \log \frac{\Phi_0}{2KC^\Delta} \right\rceil \text{ epochs in the regime with } \Phi_t \geq 2KC^\Delta \\ & \left\lceil \log \frac{2KC^\Delta}{\varepsilon/2} \right\rceil \text{ epochs in the regime with } \Phi_t < 2KC^\Delta \end{aligned}$$

Combining (10) with the bounds (11) and (12) on  $N_{\text{FW}}^t$  and  $N_{\text{gd}}^t$ , we obtain (3).  $\square$

## 4 Simplex Gradient Descent

This section presents an implementation of oracle SiDO (Oracle 1), namely Algorithm 2, which requires only  $O(|S|)$  operations beyond the evaluation of  $\nabla f_S(x)$ , and the decomposition of  $x$  as a convex combination of vertices (which is avoided in practice by maintaining  $x$  as convex combination). Apart from the (trivial) computation of the projection of  $\nabla f_S(x)$  onto the linear space spanned by  $\Delta^k$ , no projections need to be computed. Overall this makes the algorithm faster than even a Frank–Wolfe step for typical small sets  $S$ . For alternative implementations of Oracle 1, see Section 4.1. See Section 4.2 for the special case of  $P$  itself being a probability simplex. Here, BCG and its oracles are combined into a single, simple method with better constants in the convergence bounds.

As for correctness of Algorithm 2, note that since  $y$  lies on a face of  $\text{conv } S$  by definition, it is always possible to choose a proper subset  $S' \subseteq S$  in Line 11, for example,  $S' := \{v_i : \lambda_i > \eta d_i\}$ . The following



---

**Algorithm 2** Simplex Gradient Descent Step (SiGD)

---

**Input:** polyhedron  $P$ , smooth convex function  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , subset  $S = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  of vertices of  $P$ , point  $x \in \text{conv } S$

**Output:** set  $S' \subseteq S$ , point  $x' \in \text{conv } S'$

- 1: Decompose  $x$  as a convex combination  $x = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i v_i$ , with  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1$  and  $\lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$
  - 2:  $c \leftarrow [\nabla f(x)v_1, \dots, \nabla f(x)v_k]$   $\{c = \nabla f_S(\lambda)\}$
  - 3:  $d \leftarrow c - (c \mathbb{1})\mathbb{1}/k$   $\{\text{Projection onto the lineality space of } \Delta^k\}$
  - 4: **if**  $d = 0$  **then**
  - 5:     **return**  $x' = v_1, S' = \{v_1\}$   $\{\text{Arbitrary vertex}\}$
  - 6: **end if**
  - 7:  $\eta \leftarrow \max\{\eta \geq 0 : \lambda - \eta d \geq 0\}$
  - 8:  $y \leftarrow x - \eta \sum_i d_i v_i$
  - 9: **if**  $f(x) \geq f(y)$  **then**
  - 10:      $x' \leftarrow y$
  - 11:     Choose  $S' \subseteq S, S' \neq S$  with  $x' \in \text{conv } S'$ .
  - 12: **else**
  - 13:      $x' \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in [x, y]} f(z)$
  - 14:      $S' \leftarrow S$
  - 15: **end if**
  - 16: **return**  $x', S'$
- 

lemma clearly shows with the choice  $h := f_S$  that Algorithm 2 correctly implements Oracle 1. Let  $e_i$  to denote the  $i$ -th coordinate vector in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Delta^k$  be the probability simplex in  $k$  dimensions and suppose that  $h : \Delta^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $L_h$ -smooth function. Given some  $\lambda \in \Delta^k$ , define  $d := \nabla h(\lambda) - (\nabla h(\lambda)\mathbb{1}/k)\mathbb{1}$  and let  $\eta \geq 0$  be the largest value for which  $\tau := \lambda - \eta d \geq 0$ . Let  $\lambda' := \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in [\lambda, \tau]} h(z)$ . Then either  $h(\lambda) \geq h(\tau)$  or*

$$h(\lambda) - h(\lambda') \geq \frac{[\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \nabla h(\lambda)(e_i - e_j)]^2}{4L_h}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $g(x) := h(x - (x\mathbb{1})\mathbb{1}/k)$ , then  $\nabla g(x) = \nabla h(x - (x\mathbb{1})\mathbb{1}/k) - (\nabla h(x - (x\mathbb{1})\mathbb{1}/k)\mathbb{1})\mathbb{1}/k$ , and  $g$  is clearly  $L_h$ -smooth, too. In particular,  $\nabla g(\lambda) = d$ .

The standard gradient descent bound provides for  $\gamma \leq \min\{\eta, 1/L_h\}$

$$\begin{aligned} h(\lambda) - h(\lambda - \gamma d) &= g(\lambda) - g(\lambda - \gamma \nabla g(\lambda)) \geq \gamma \frac{\|\nabla g(\lambda)\|_2^2}{2} \\ &\geq \gamma \frac{[\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \nabla g(\lambda)(e_i - e_j)]^2}{4} = \gamma \frac{[\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \nabla h(\lambda)(e_i - e_j)]^2}{4}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the second inequality uses that the  $\ell_2$ -diameter of the  $\Delta^k$  is 2, and the last equality follows from  $\nabla g(\lambda)(e_i - e_j) = \nabla h(\lambda)(e_i - e_j)$ .

When  $\eta \geq 1/L_h$ , we conclude that  $h(\lambda') \leq h(\lambda - (1/L_h)d) \leq h(\lambda)$ , hence

$$h(\lambda) - h(\lambda') \geq \frac{[\max_{i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}} \nabla h(\lambda)(e_i - e_j)]^2}{4L_h},$$

which is the second case of the lemma. When  $\eta < 1/L_h$ , then setting  $\gamma = \eta$  in (13) clearly provides  $h(\lambda) - h(\tau) \geq 0$ , which is the first case of the lemma.  $\square$

## 4.1 Alternative implementations of Oracle 1

The implementation of Oracle 1 via Algorithm 2 is probably the least expensive possible. We may consider other implementations, based on projected gradient descent, that aim to decrease  $f$  by a greater amount in each step and possibly make more extensive reductions to the set  $S$ . *Projected gradient descent* would seek to minimize  $f_S$  along the piecewise-linear path  $\{\text{proj}_{\Delta^k}(\lambda - \gamma \nabla f_S(\lambda)) \mid \gamma \geq 0\}$ . Such a search is more expensive, but may result in a new active set  $S'$  that is significantly smaller than the current set  $S$  and, since the reduction in  $f_S$  is at least as great as the reduction on the interval  $\gamma \in [0, \eta]$  alone, it also satisfies the requirements of Oracle 1.

More advanced methods for optimizing over the simplex could also be considered, for example, mirror descent (see Nemirovski and Yudin [1983]) and accelerated versions of mirror descent and projected gradient descent; see Lan [2017] for a good overview. The effects of these alternatives on the overall convergence rate of Algorithm 1 has not been studied; the analysis is significantly complicated by the lack of guaranteed improvement in each (inner) iteration.

The accelerated versions are considered in the computational tests in Section 6, but on the examples we tried, the inexpensive implementation of Algorithm 2 usually gave the fastest overall performance. We have not tested mirror descent versions.

## 4.2 Simplex Gradient Descent as a stand-alone algorithm

We describe a variant of Algorithm 1 for the special case in which  $P$  is the probability simplex  $\Delta^k$ . Since optimization of a linear function over  $\Delta^k$  is trivial, we use the standard LP oracle in place of the weak-separation oracle (Oracle 2), resulting in the non-lazy variant Algorithm 3. Observe that the per-iteration cost is only  $O(k)$ . In cases, where  $k$  is very large one can also formulate a version of Algorithm 3 using a weak-separation oracle (Oracle 2) to only partially evaluate coordinates of the gradient similar to coordinate descent. The resulting algorithm is an interpolation of Algorithm 3 below and Algorithm 1 and the details are left to the reader.

When line search is too expensive, one might replace Line 14 by  $x_{t+1} = (1 - 1/L_f)x_t + y/L_f$ , and Line 17 by  $x_{t+1} = (1 - 2/(t+2))x_t + (2/(t+2))e_w$ . These employ the standard step sizes for (projected) gradient descent and the Frank–Wolfe algorithm, and yield the required descent guarantees.

We now describe convergence rates for Algorithm 3, noting that better constants are available in the convergence rate expression than those obtained from a direct application of Theorem 3.2.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $f$  be an  $\alpha$ -strongly convex and  $L_f$ -smooth function over the probability simplex  $\Delta^k$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $x^*$  be a minimum point of  $f$  in  $\Delta^k$ . Then Algorithm 3 converges with rate*

$$f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{4L_f k}\right)^T \cdot (f(x_0) - f(x^*)), \quad T = 1, 2, \dots$$

If  $f$  is not strongly convex (that is,  $\alpha = 0$ ), we have

$$f(x_T) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{8L_f}{T}, \quad T = 1, 2, \dots$$

*Proof.* The structure of the proof is similar to that of [Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi, 2015, Theorem 8]. Recall from [Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi, 2015, §B.1], that the pyramidal width of the probability simplex is  $W \geq 2/\sqrt{k}$ , so that the geometric strong convexity of  $f$  is  $\mu \geq 4\alpha/k$ . The diameter of  $\Delta^k$  is  $D = \sqrt{2}$ , and it is easily seen that  $C^\Delta = L_f$  and  $C \leq L_f D^2/2 = L_f$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** Stand-Alone Simplex Gradient Descent

---

**Input:** convex function  $f$ **Output:** points  $x_t$  in  $\Delta^k$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ 

```
1:  $x_0 = e_1$ 
2: for  $t = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
3:    $S_t \leftarrow \{i : x_{t,i} > 0\}$ 
4:    $a_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in S_t} \nabla f(x_t)_i$ 
5:    $s_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{i \in S_t} \nabla f(x_t)_i$ 
6:    $w_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{1 \leq i \leq k} \nabla f(x_t)_i$ 
7:   if  $\nabla f(x_t)_{a_t} - \nabla f(x_t)_{s_t} > \nabla f(x_t)_{x_t} - \nabla f(x_t)_{w_t}$  then
8:      $d_i = \begin{cases} \nabla f(x_t)_i - \sum_{j \in S} \nabla f(x_t)_j / |S_t| & i \in S_t \\ 0 & i \notin S_t \end{cases}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ 
9:      $\eta = \max\{\gamma : x_t - \gamma d \geq 0\}$  {ratio test}
10:     $y = x_t - \eta d$ 
11:    if  $f(x_t) \geq f(y)$  then
12:       $x_{t+1} \leftarrow y$ 
13:    else
14:       $x_{t+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in [x_t, y]} f(x)$ 
15:    end if
16:  else
17:     $x_{t+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in [x_t, e_w]} f(x)$ 
18:  end if
19: end for
```

---

To maintain the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we define  $v_t^A = e_{a_t}$ ,  $v_t^{FW-S} = e_{s_t}$  and  $v_t^{FW} = e_{w_t}$ . In particular, we have  $\nabla f(x_t)_{w_t} = \nabla f(x_t)v_t^{FW}$ ,  $\nabla f(x_t)_{s_t} = \nabla f(x_t)v_t^{FW-S}$ , and  $\nabla f(x_t)_{a_t} = \nabla f(x_t)v_t^A$ . Let  $h_t := f(x_t) - f(x^*)$ .

In the proof, we use several elementary estimates. First, by convexity of  $f$  and the definition of the Frank–Wolfe step, we have

$$h_t = f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW}). \quad (14)$$

Finally, by Fact 2.1 and the estimate  $\mu \geq 4\alpha/k$  for geometric strong convexity, we obtain

$$h_t \leq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW})]^2}{8\alpha/k}. \quad (15)$$

Let us consider a fixed iteration  $t$ . Suppose first that we take a descent step (Line 14), in particular,  $\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S}) \geq \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW})$  from Line 7, together with  $\nabla f(x_t)x_t \geq \nabla f(x_t)v_t^{FW-S}$  yields

$$2\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S}) \geq \nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW}). \quad (16)$$

By Lemma 4.1

$$f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S})]^2}{4L_f} \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW})]^2}{16L_f} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2L_f k} \cdot h_t,$$

where the second inequality follows from (16) and the third inequality follows from (15).

If a Frank–Wolfe step is taken (Line 17), we have similarly to (8)

$$f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) \geq \frac{\nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW})}{2} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW})}{2L_f} \right\}.$$

Combining with (14), we have either  $f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) \geq h_t/2$  or

$$f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW})]^2}{4L_f} \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW})]^2}{16L_f} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2L_f k} \cdot h_t.$$

Since  $\alpha \leq L_f$ , the latter is always smaller than the former, and hence is a lower bound that holds for all Frank–Wolfe steps.

Since  $f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) = h_t - h_{t+1}$ , we have  $h_{t+1} \leq (1 - \alpha/(2L_f k))h_t$  for descent steps and Frank–Wolfe steps, while obviously  $h_{t+1} \leq h_t$  for drop steps (Line 12). For any given iteration counter  $T$ , let  $T_{\text{gd}}$  be the number of descent steps taken before iteration  $T$ ,  $T_{\text{FW}}$  be the number of Frank–Wolfe steps taken before iteration  $T$ , and  $T_{\text{drop}}$  be the number of drop steps taken before iteration  $T$ . We have  $T_{\text{drop}} \leq T_{\text{FW}}$ , so that similarly to (10)

$$T = T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} + T_{\text{drop}} \leq T_{\text{gd}} + 2T_{\text{FW}}. \quad (17)$$

By compounding the decrease at each iteration, and using (17) together with the identity  $(1 - \epsilon/2)^2 \geq (1 - \epsilon)$  for any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$h_T \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2L_f k}\right)^{T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}}} h_0 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2L_f k}\right)^{T/2} h_0 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{4L_f k}\right)^T \cdot h_0.$$

The case for the smooth but not strongly convex functions is similar: we obtain for descent steps

$$h_t - h_{t+1} = f(x_t) - f(x_{t+1}) \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(v_t^A - v_t^{FW-S})]^2}{4L_f} \geq \frac{[\nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v_t^{FW})]^2}{4L_f} \geq \frac{h_t^2}{4L_f}, \quad (18)$$

where the second inequality follows from (14).

For Frank–Wolfe steps, we have by standard estimations

$$h_{t+1} \leq \begin{cases} h_t - h_t^2/(4L_f) & \text{if } h_t \leq 2L_f, \\ L_f \leq h_t/2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Given an iteration  $T$ , we define  $T_{\text{drop}}$ ,  $T_{\text{FW}}$  and  $T_{\text{gd}}$  as above, and show by induction that

$$h_T \leq \frac{4L_f}{T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}}}, \quad \text{for } T \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

Equation (20), i.e.,  $h_T \leq 8L_f/T$  easily follows from this via  $T_{\text{drop}} \leq T_{\text{FW}}$ . Note that the first step is necessarily a Frank–Wolfe step, hence the denominator is never 0.

If iteration  $T$  is a drop step, then  $T > 1$ , and the claim is obvious by induction from  $h_T \geq h_{T-1}$ . Hence we assume that iteration  $T$  is either a descent step or a Frank–Wolfe step. If  $T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} \leq 2$  then by (18) or (19) we obtain either  $h_T \leq L_f < 2L_f$  or  $h_T \leq h_{T-1} - h_{T-1}^2/(4L_f) \leq 2L_f$ , without using any upper bound on  $h_{T-1}$ , proving (20) in this case. Note that this includes the case  $T = 1$ , the start of the induction.

Finally, if  $T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} \geq 3$ , then  $h_{T-1} \leq 4L_f/(T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} - 1) \leq 2L_f$  by induction, therefore a familiar argument using (18) or (19) provides

$$h_T \leq \frac{4L_f}{T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} - 1} - \frac{4L_f}{(T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}} - 1)^2} \leq \frac{4L_f}{T_{\text{gd}} + T_{\text{FW}}},$$

proving (20) in this case, too, finishing the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Algorithmic enhancements

We describe various enhancements that can be made to the BCG algorithm, to improve its practical performance while staying broadly within the framework above. Computational testing with these enhancements is reported in Section 6.

### 5.1 Sparsity and culling of active sets

Sparse solutions (which in the current context means “solutions that are a convex combination of a small number of vertices of  $P$ ”) are desirable for many applications. Techniques for promoting sparse solutions in conditional gradients were considered in Rao et al. [2015]. In many situations, a sparse approximate solution can be identified at the cost of some increase in the value of the objective function.

We explored two sparsification approaches, which can be applied separately or together, and performed preliminary computational tests for a few of our experiments in Section 6. (A full analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.)

- (i) *Promoting drop steps.* Here we relax Line 9 in Algorithm 2 from testing  $f(y) \geq f(x)$  to  $f(y) \geq f(x) - \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon := \min\{\frac{\max\{p, 0\}}{2}, \varepsilon_0\}$  with  $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  some upper bound on the accepted potential increase in objective function value and  $p$  being the amount of reduction in  $f$  achieved on the latest iteration. This technique allows a controlled increase of the objective function value in return for additional sparsity. The same convergence analysis will apply, with an additional factor of 2 in the estimates of the total number of iterations.

	vanilla	(i)	(i), (ii)	$\Delta f(x)$		vanilla	(i), (ii)	$\Delta f(x)$
PCG	112	62	60	2.6%	ACG	300	298	7.4%
LPCG	94	70	64	0.1%	PCG	358	255	8.2%
BCG	60	59	40	0.0%	BCG	211	211	0.0%

Table 1: Effect of sparsification. Left: Video Co-localization over `netgen_08a`. Since we use LPCG and PCG as benchmarks, we report (i) separately as well. Right: Matrix Completion over `movielens100k` instance. BCG without sparsification provides sparser solutions than the baseline methods with sparsification. In the last column, we report the percentage increase in objective function value due to sparsification. (Because this quantity is not affine invariant, this value should serve only to rank the quality of solutions.)

- (ii) *Post-optimization.* Once the considered algorithm has stopped with active set  $S_0$ , solution  $x_0$ , and dual gap  $d_0$ , we re-run the algorithm with the same objective function  $f$  over the facet  $\text{conv } S_0$ , i.e., we solve  $\min_{x \in \text{conv } S_0} f(x)$  terminating when the dual gap reaches  $d_0$ .

These approaches can sparsify the solutions of the baseline algorithms Away-step Frank–Wolfe, Pairwise Frank–Wolfe, and lazy Pairwise Frank–Wolfe; see Rao et al. [2015]. We observed, however, that the iterates generated by BCG are often quite sparse. In fact, the solutions produced by BCG are sparser than those produced by the baseline algorithms even when sparsification is used in the benchmarks but *not* in BCG! This effect is not surprising, as BCG adds new vertices to the active vertex set only when really necessary for ensuring further progress in the optimization.

Two representative examples are shown in Table 1, where we report the effect of sparsification in the size of the active set as well as the increase in objective function value.

We also compared evolution of the function value and size of the active set. BCG decreases function value much more for the same number of vertices because, by design, it performs more descent on a given active set; see Figure 11.

## 5.2 Blending with pairwise steps

Algorithm 1 mixes gradient steps with Frank–Wolfe steps. One might be tempted to replace the Frank–Wolfe steps with (seemingly stronger) pairwise steps, as the information needed for the latter steps is computed anyways. In our tests, however, this variant did not substantially differ in practical performance from the one that uses the standard Frank–Wolfe step (see Figure 8). The explanation is that BCG uses gradient steps that typically provide better directions than either Frank–Wolfe steps or pairwise steps. When the pairwise gap over the active set is small, the Frank–Wolfe and pairwise directions typically offer a similar amount of reduction in  $f$ .

## 6 Computational experiments

To compare our experiments to previous work we used problems and instances similar to those in Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015], Garber and Meshi [2016], Rao et al. [2015], Braun et al. [2017], Lan et al. [2017]. These include structured regression, sparse regression, video co-localization, sparse signal recovery, matrix completion, and Lasso. In particular, we compared our algorithm to the Pairwise Frank–Wolfe algorithm from Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015], Garber and Meshi [2016] and the lazified Pairwise Frank–Wolfe algorithm from Braun et al. [2017]. We also benchmarked against the lazified versions of the vanilla Frank–Wolfe and

the Away-step Frank–Wolfe as presented in Braun et al. [2017] for completeness. We implemented our code in Python 3.6 using Gurobi (see Gurobi Optimization [2016]) as LP solver for complex feasible regions as well as obvious direct implementations for the probability simplex, the cube and the  $\ell_1$ -ball. As feasible regions we used instances from MIPLIB2010 (see Koch et al. [2011]) as done before in Braun et al. [2017] as well as some of the examples in Bashiri and Zhang [2017]. We used quadratic objective functions for the tests with random coefficients, making sure that the global minimum lies outside the feasible region, to make the optimization problem non-trivial; see below in the respective sections for more details.

Every plot contains four diagrams depicting results of a single instance. The upper row measures progress in the logarithm of the function value, while the lower row does so in the logarithm of the dual bound. The first column measures performance in the number of iterations, while the second column does so in wall-clock time. In the graphs we will compare various algorithms denoted by the following abbreviations: Pairwise Frank–Wolfe (PCG), Away-step Frank–Wolfe (ACG), (vanilla) Frank–Wolfe (CG), blended conditional gradients (BCG); we indicate the lazified versions of Braun et al. [2017] by prefixing with an ‘L’. All tests were conducted with an instance-dependent, fixed time limit, which can be easily read off the plots.

The dual bound is an upper bound to the difference to the optimum in function value provided by the algorithm. The lazified versions (including BCG) use it as the required stepwise progress, halving it occasionally, which provides a stair-like appearance in the graphs. The non-lazified algorithms use the dual gap  $\max_{v \in P} \nabla f(x_t)(x_t - v)$  at point  $x_t$ , which has a zigzag appearance, as it is not necessarily monotone decreasing despite the fact that the function value of the iterates  $x_t$  is monotone decreasing.

## Performance comparison

We implemented Algorithm 1 as outlined above and used SiGD for the gradient steps as described in Section 4. For line search in Line 13 of Algorithm 2 we perform standard backtracking line search, and for Line 16 of Algorithm 1, we do ternary search. We provide two representative example plots in Figure 1 to summarize our results.




Figure 1: Two representative examples on Lasso (left) and video co-localization (right).

**Lasso.** We tested BCG on lasso instances and compared them to vanilla Frank–Wolfe, Away-step Frank–Wolfe, and Pairwise Frank–Wolfe. We generated Lasso instances similar to Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015], which has also been used by several follow-up papers as benchmark. Here we solve  $\min_{x \in P} \|Ax - b\|^2$  with  $P$  being the (scaled)  $\ell_1$ -ball. We considered instances of varying sizes and the results (as well as details about the instance) can be found in Figure 2. Note that we did not benchmark any of the lazified versions of Braun et al. [2017] here as the linear programming oracle is so simple that lazification is not beneficial and we used the LP oracle directly.

**Video co-localization instances.** We also tested BCG on video co-localization instances as done in Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015]. It was shown in Joulin et al. [2014] that video co-localization can be naturally reformulated as optimizing a quadratic function over a flow (or path) polytope. To this end we run tests on the same flow polytope instances as used in Lan et al. [2017] obtained from <http://lime.cs.elte.hu/~kpeter/data/mcf/road/> and we depict the results in Figure 3.

**Structured regression.** We also compared BCG against PCG and LPCG on structured regression problems, where we minimize a quadratic objective function over polytopes corresponding to hard optimization problems used as benchmarks in e.g., Braun et al. [2017], Lan et al. [2017], Bashiri and Zhang [2017]. The polytopes were taken from MIPLIB2010 (see Koch et al. [2011]). Additionally, we compare ACG, PCG, and vanilla CG over the Birkhoff polytope for which linear optimization is fast, so that there is little gain to be expected from lazification. See Figures 4 and 5 for results.

**Matrix completion.** Clearly, our algorithm also works directly over compact convex sets. To this end, we also considered Matrix Completion instances over the spectrahedron  $S = \{X \succeq 0 : \text{Tr}[X] = 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Where we solve the problem:

$$\min_{X \in S} \sum_{(i,j) \in L} (X_{i,j} - T_{i,j})^2,$$

where  $D = \{T_{i,j} \mid (i,j) \in L\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is a data set. In our tests we used the data sets Movie Lens 100k and Movie Lens 1m from <https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/> and subsampled in the 1m case to generate 3 different instances.

As in the case of the Lasso benchmarks, we benchmark against ACG, PCG, and CG, as the linear programming oracle is very simple and there is no gain to be expected from lazification. In the case of matrix completion, the performance of BCG is very comparable to ACG, PCG, and CG in iterations which makes sense as over the spectrahedron the gradient approximations computed by the linear optimization oracle are essentially identical to the actual gradient, so that there is no gain from the blending with gradient steps. In wall-clock time in fact, the vanilla CG performs best as the algorithm has the lowest implementation overhead beyond the oracle calls compared to BCG, ACG, and PCG (see Figure 6).

**Sparse signal recovery.** We also performed computational experiments on the sparse signal recovery instances from Rao et al. [2015] (see therein for details), where the following well-known sparse signal recovery signal is considered

$$\hat{x} = \underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_1 \leq \tau}{\text{argmin}} \|y - \Phi x\|_2^2.$$

We chose a variety of parameters in our tests including one test that matches the setup in Rao et al. [2015]. As in the case of the Lasso benchmarks, we benchmark against ACG, PCG, and CG, as the linear programming oracle is very simple and there is no gain to be expected from lazification. The results can be found in Figure 7.



## PGD vs. SiGD as subroutine

To demonstrate the superiority of SiGD over PGD we also tested two implementations of BCG, once with standard PGD as subroutine and once with SiGD as subroutine. The results can be found in Figure 8 (right): while PGD and SiGD compare essentially identical in per-iteration progress, in terms of wall clock time the SiGD variant is much faster. For comparison, we also plotted LPCG on the same instance.

## Pairwise steps vs. Frank–Wolfe steps

As pointed out in Section 5.2 a natural extension is to replace the Frank–Wolfe steps in Line 16 in Algorithm 1 with pairwise steps as the information is readily available. In Figure 8 (left) we depict representative behavior: little to no advantage when taking the more complex pairwise step. This is expected as the Frank–Wolfe steps are only needed to add new vertices as the drop steps are subsumed the steps from the SiDO oracle. Note that BCG with Frank–Wolfe steps is slightly faster per iteration, allowing for more steps within the time limit.

## Comparison between lazified variants and BCG

For completeness we also ran tests for BCG against various other lazified variants of conditional gradient descent. The results are consistent with our observations from before which we depict in Figure 9.

## Standard vs. accelerated version

Another natural variant of our algorithm is to replace the SiDO subroutine with its accelerated variant (both possible for PGD and SiGD). As expected, due to the small size of the subproblem, we did not observe any significant speedup from acceleration; see Figure 10.

## 7 Final remarks

In Lan et al. [2017], by means of lazifying conditional gradient sliding an accelerated method based on weak separation was established providing optimal tradeoffs between (stochastic) first-order oracle calls and weak-separation oracle calls. An open question is whether the same tradeoffs and acceleration could be realized by replacing PGD or SiGD by an accelerated method.

## Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Swati Gupta for the helpful discussions. Research reported in this paper was partially supported by NSF CAREER award CMMI-1452463.

## References

- M. A. Bashiri and X. Zhang. Decomposition-invariant conditional gradient for general polytopes with line search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2687–2697, 2017.
- G. Braun, S. Pokutta, and D. Zink. Lazifying conditional gradient algorithms. *Proceedings of ICML*, 2017.

- M. Frank and P. Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 3(1-2): 95–110, 1956.
- R. M. Freund and P. Grigas. New analysis and results for the frank–wolfe method. *Mathematical Programming*, 155(1):199–230, 2016. ISSN 1436-4646. doi: 10.1007/s10107-014-0841-6. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10107-014-0841-6>.
- R. M. Freund, P. Grigas, and R. Mazumder. An extended frank–wolfe method with “in-face” directions, and its application to low-rank matrix completion. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(1):319–346, 2017.
- D. Garber and E. Hazan. A linearly convergent conditional gradient algorithm with applications to online and stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.4666*, 2013.
- D. Garber and O. Meshi. Linear-memory and decomposition-invariant linearly convergent conditional gradient algorithm for structured polytopes. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1605.06492v1*, May 2016.
- D. Garber, S. Sabach, and A. Kaplan. Fast generalized conditional gradient method with applications to matrix recovery problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05581*, 2018.
- J. Guélat and P. Marcotte. Some comments on wolfe’s ‘away step’. *Mathematical Programming*, 35(1): 110–119, 1986.
- Gurobi Optimization. Gurobi optimizer reference manual version 6.5, 2016. URL <https://www.gurobi.com/documentation/6.5/refman/>.
- C. A. Holloway. An extension of the frank and wolfe method of feasible directions. *Mathematical Programming*, 6(1):14–27, 1974.
- M. Jaggi. Revisiting Frank–Wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 427–435, 2013.
- A. Joulin, K. Tang, and L. Fei-Fei. Efficient image and video co-localization with frank-wolfe algorithm. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 253–268. Springer, 2014.
- T. Kerdreux, F. Pedregosa, and A. d’Aspremont. Frank-wolfe with subsampling oracle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07348*, 2018.
- T. Koch, T. Achterberg, E. Andersen, O. Bastert, T. Berthold, R. E. Bixby, E. Danna, G. Gamrath, A. M. Gleixner, S. Heinz, A. Lodi, H. Mittelmann, T. Ralphs, D. Salvagnin, D. E. Steffy, and K. Wolter. MIPLIB 2010. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 3(2):103–163, 2011. doi: 10.1007/s12532-011-0025-9. URL <http://mpc.zib.de/index.php/MPC/article/view/56/28>.
- S. Lacoste-Julien and M. Jaggi. On the global linear convergence of Frank–Wolfe optimization variants. In C. Cortes, N. D. Lawrence, D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, pages 496–504. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/5925-on-the-global-linear-convergence-of-frank-wolfe-optimization-variants.pdf>.
- G. Lan, S. Pokutta, Y. Zhou, and D. Zink. Conditional accelerated lazy stochastic gradient descent. *Proceedings of ICML*, 2017.
- G. G. Lan. *Lectures on Optimization for Machine Learning*. ISyE, April 2017.

E. S. Levitin and B. T. Polyak. Constrained minimization methods. *USSR Computational mathematics and mathematical physics*, 6(5):1–50, 1966.

A. Nemirovski and D. Yudin. *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. Wiley, 1983. ISBN 0-471-10345-4.

N. Rao, P. Shah, and S. Wright. Forward–backward greedy algorithms for atomic norm regularization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 63(21):5798–5811, 2015.

## A Upper bound on simplicial curvature

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $f: P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $L$ -smooth function over a polytope  $P$  with diameter  $D$  in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $S$  be a set of vertices of  $P$ . Then the function  $f_S$  from Section 2.1 is smooth with smoothness parameter at most*

$$L_{f_S} \leq \frac{LD^2|S|}{8}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ . Recall that  $f_S: \Delta^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined on the probability simplex via  $f_S(\alpha) := f(A\alpha)$ , where  $A$  is the linear operator  $A\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i v_i$ . We need to show

$$f_S(\alpha) - f_S(\beta) - \nabla f_S(\beta)(\alpha - \beta) \leq \frac{LD^2|S|}{8} \cdot \|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \Delta^k \quad (21)$$

As a start we rewrite the left-hand side in term of  $f$  and apply the smoothness of  $f$ :

$$f_S(\alpha) - f_S(\beta) - \nabla f_S(\beta)(\alpha - \beta) = f(A\alpha) - f(A\beta) - \nabla f(A\beta) \cdot (A\alpha - A\beta) \leq \frac{L}{2} \cdot \|A\alpha - A\beta\|^2. \quad (22)$$

Let  $\gamma_+ := \max\{\alpha - \beta, 0\}$  and  $\gamma_- := \max\{\beta - \alpha, 0\}$  with the maximum taken coordinatewise. Then  $\alpha - \beta = \gamma_+ - \gamma_-$  with  $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$  nonnegative vectors with disjoint support. In particular,

$$\|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2 = \|\gamma_+ - \gamma_-\|_2^2 = \|\gamma_+\|_2^2 + \|\gamma_-\|_2^2. \quad (23)$$

Let  $\mathbb{1}$  denote the vector of length  $k$  with all its coordinates 1. Clearly  $\mathbb{1}\alpha = \mathbb{1}\beta = 1$ , and therefore  $t := \mathbb{1}\gamma_+ = \mathbb{1}\gamma_-$ . As  $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$  are nonnegative, we have  $t \geq 0$ . If  $t = 0$  then  $\gamma_+ = \gamma_- = 0$  and  $\alpha = \beta$ , hence the claimed (21) is obvious. If  $t > 0$  then  $\gamma_+/t$  and  $\gamma_-/t$  are points of the simplex  $\Delta^k$ , therefore

$$D \geq \|A(\gamma_+/t) - A(\gamma_-/t)\| = \frac{\|A\alpha - A\beta\|}{t} \quad (24)$$

and using (23) with  $k_+$  and  $k_-$  denoting the number of non-zero coordinates of  $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$ , respectively:

$$\|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2 = \|\gamma_+\|_2^2 + \|\gamma_-\|_2^2 \geq t^2 \left( \frac{1}{k_+} + \frac{1}{k_-} \right) \geq t^2 \cdot \frac{4}{k_+ + k_-} \geq \frac{4t^2}{k}. \quad (25)$$

By (24) and (25) we conclude that  $\|A\alpha - A\beta\|^2 \leq kD^2\|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2/4$ , which together with (22) proves the claimed (21).  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $f: P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function over a polytope  $P$  with finite simplicial curvature  $C^\Delta$ . Then  $f$  has curvature at most*

$$C \leq 2C^\Delta.$$

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in P$  be two distinct points of  $P$ . The line through  $x$  and  $y$  intersects  $P$  in a segment  $[w, z]$ , where  $w$  and  $z$  are points on the *boundary* of  $P$ , i.e., contained in facets of  $P$ , which have dimension  $\dim P - 1$ . Therefore by Caratheodory's theorem there are vertex sets  $S_w, S_z$  of  $P$  of size at most  $\dim P$  with  $w \in \text{conv } S_w$  and  $z \in \text{conv } S_z$ . As such  $x, y \in \text{conv } S$  with  $S := S_w \cup S_z$  and  $|S| \leq 2 \dim P$ .

Reusing the notation from the proof of Lemma A.1, let  $k := |S|$  and  $A$  be a linear transformation with  $S = \{Ae_1, \dots, Ae_k\}$  and  $f_S(\gamma) = f(A\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Delta^k$ . Since  $x, y \in \text{conv } S$ , there are  $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta^k$  with  $x = A\alpha$  and  $y = A\beta$ . Therefore by smoothness of  $f_S$  together with  $L_{f_S} \leq C^\Delta$  and  $\|\beta - \alpha\| \leq \sqrt{2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)x) - f(x) - \gamma \nabla f(x)(y - x) &= f(\gamma A\beta + (1 - \gamma)A\alpha) - f(A\alpha) - \gamma \nabla f(A\alpha) \cdot (A\beta - A\alpha) \\ &= f_S(\gamma\beta + (1 - \gamma)\alpha) - f_S(\alpha) - \gamma \nabla f_S(\alpha)(\beta - \alpha) \\ &\leq \frac{L_{f_S} \|\gamma(\beta - \alpha)\|^2}{2} = \frac{L_{f_S} \|\beta - \alpha\|^2}{2} \cdot \gamma^2 \leq C^\Delta \gamma^2 \end{aligned}$$

showing that  $C \leq 2C^\Delta$  as claimed. □




Figure 2: Comparison of BCG, ACG, PCG and CG on Lasso instances. Upper-left:  $A$  is a  $400 \times 2000$  matrix with 100 non-zeros. BCG made 1635 iterations, calling the LP oracle 461 times, with the final solution being a convex combination of 452 vertices giving the sparsity. Upper-right:  $A$  is a  $200 \times 200$  matrix with 100 non-zeros. BCG made 10910 iterations, calling the LP oracle 4815 times, with the final solution being a convex combination of 196 vertices giving the sparsity. Lower-left:  $A$  is a  $500 \times 3000$  matrix with 100 non-zeros. BCG made 2488 iterations, calling the LP oracle 591 times, with the final solution being a convex combination of 563 vertices giving the sparsity. Lower-right:  $A$  is a  $1000 \times 1000$  matrix with 200 non-zeros. BCG made 2288 iterations, calling the LP oracle 1546 times, with the final solution being a convex combination of 526 vertices giving the sparsity.




Figure 3: Comparison of PCG, Lazy PCG, and BCG on video co-localization instances. Upper-Left: Over `netgen_08a` polytope with  $A$  having 3000 rows. BCG made 372 iterations, called LPSep 130 times and the final solution is a convex combination of 80 vertices. Upper-Right: Over `netgen_08a` polytope (same as on the left) with  $A$  having 5000 rows. BCG did 56 iterations, LPSep was talked 18 times, and the final solution is a convex combination of 18 vertices. Lower-Left: Over `road_paths_01_DC_a` polytope with  $A$  having 1000 rows. Even on instances where lazy PCG gains little advantage over PCG, BCG performs significantly better over PCG, BCG performs significantly better with empirically higher rate of convergence. BCG made 23 iterations, LPSep was called 20 times, and the final convex combination has 20 vertices Lower-Right: Over `netgen_08a` polytope with  $A$  having 800 rows. BCG made 909 iterations, LPSep was called 151 times, and the final convex combination has 86 vertices.




Figure 4: Comparison of BCG, LPCG and PCG on structured regression instances. Upper-Left: Over the `disctom` polytope. BCG made 3282 iterations with 1156 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 76 vertices. Upper-Right: Over a `maxcut` polytope over a graph with 28 vertices. BCG made 38 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 31 vertices. Lower-Left: Over the `m100n500k4r1` polytope. BCG made 2882 iterations with 482 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 218 vertices. Lower-right: Over the `spanning tree` polytope over the complete graph with 10 nodes. BCG made 426 iterations with 126 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 131 vertices. BCG outperforms LPCG and PCG, even in the cases where LPCG is much faster than PCG.




Figure 5: Comparison of BCG, ACG, PCG and CG over the Birkhoff polytope. Upper-Left: Dimension 50. BCG made 1267 iterations with 429 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 429 vertices. Upper-Right: Dimension 100. BCG made 116 iterations with 110 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 110 vertices. Lower-Left: Dimension 50. BCG made 461 iterations with 237 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 237 vertices. Lower-right: Dimension 80. BCG made 305 iterations with 216 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 216 vertices. BCG outperforms ACG, PCG and CG in all cases.






Figure 6: Comparison of BCG, ACG, PCG and CG on matrix completion instances over the spectrahedron. Upper-Left: Over the movie lens 100k data set. BCG made 539 iterations with 379 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 367 vertices. Upper-Right: Over a subset of movie lens 1m data set. BCG made 62 iterations with 16 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 16 vertices. Lower-Left: Over a subset of movie lens 1m data set. BCG made 26 iterations with 21 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 21 vertices. Lower-right: Over a subset of movie lens 1m data set. BCG made 52 iterations with 48 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 48 vertices. BCG performs very similar to ACG, PCG, and vanilla CG as discussed.




Figure 7: Comparison of BCG, ACG, PCG and CG on a sparse signal recovery problem. Upper-Left: Dimension is  $5000 \times 1000$  density is 0.1. BCG made 196 iterations with 70 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 70 vertices. Upper-Right: Dimension is  $1000 \times 3000$  density is 0.05. BCG made 801 iterations with 152 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 152 vertices. Lower-Left: Dimension is  $10000 \times 1000$  density is 0.05. BCG made 691 iterations with 62 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 52 vertices. Lower-right: dimension is  $5000 \times 2000$  density is 0.05. BCG made 1188 iterations with 232 LPSep calls and the final solution is a convex combination of 101 vertices. BCG outperforms all other algorithms in all examples significantly.




Figure 8: Comparison of BCG variants on a small video co-localization instance (instance `netgen_10a`). Left: BCG with vanilla Frank–Wolfe steps (red) and with pairwise steps (green). Performance is essentially equivalent here which matches our observations on other instances. Right: Comparison of oracle implementations PGD and SiGD. SiGD is significantly faster in wall-clock time.




Figure 9: Comparison of BCG and LCG, ACG, and PCG. Left: Structured regression instance over the convex hull of Hamiltonian cycles of the complete graph on 16 vertices (TSP polytope) demonstrating significant performance difference in closing the dual gap; BCG made 48524 iterations, LPSep was called 43468 times (almost always terminated early) and final solution is a convex combination of 58 vertices only. Right: Structured regression over the `disctom` polytope; BCG made 580 iterations, LPSep was called 58 times, and final solution is a convex combination of 28 vertices only. Observe that not only the function value decreases faster, but the dual bound, too.




Figure 10: Comparison of BCG, accelerated BCG and LPCG. Left: On a medium size video co-localization instance (`netgen_12b`); accelerated and non-accelerated version perform identically. Right: On a larger video co-localization instance (`road_paths_01_DC_a`); here the accelerated version is better in iterations but not in wall-clock time though. These findings are representative of all our other tests.




Figure 11: Comparison of various variants of algorithms against BCG in terms of function value vs. size of the active set. BCG, ACG, PCG and CG on Lasso instances. Left: Video Co-Localization instance. Right: Sparse signal recovery.