

Solving Tall Dense Linear Programs in Nearly Linear Time

Jan van den Brand* Yin Tat Lee† Aaron Sidford‡ Zhao Song§

In this paper we provide an $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ time randomized algorithm for solving linear programs with d variables and n constraints with high probability. To obtain this result we provide a robust, primal-dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration interior point method inspired by the methods of Lee and Sidford (2014, 2019) and show how to efficiently implement this method using new data-structures based on heavy-hitters, the Johnson–Lindenstrauss lemma, and inverse maintenance. Interestingly, we obtain this running time without using fast matrix multiplication and consequently, barring a major advance in linear system solving, our running time is near optimal for solving dense linear programs among algorithms that don’t use fast matrix multiplication.

arXiv:2002.02304v2 [cs.DS] 22 Aug 2021

*janvdb@kth.se. KTH Royal Institute of Technology.

†yintat@uw.edu. University of Washington and MSR Redmond.

‡sidford@stanford.edu. Stanford University.

§zhaos@ias.edu. Princeton University and Institute for Advanced Study.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Our Results	5
1.2	Previous Work	6
2	Overview of Approach	8
2.1	A Robust Primal-Dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ IPM	8
2.2	Heavy Hitters, Congestion Detection, and Sketching the Central Path	11
3	Preliminaries	14
4	Linear Programming Algorithm	15
4.1	Interior Point Method	15
4.2	Vector Data Structure	17
4.3	Leverage Score Maintenance	18
4.4	Inverse Maintenance	19
4.5	Linear Programming Algorithm	20
5	Robust Primal Dual LS-Path Following	28
5.1	Stability of Weight Changes	29
5.2	Newton Step Progress	31
5.3	Following the Central Path	34
6	Vector Maintenance	39
6.1	ℓ_2 -heavy Hitter	39
6.2	Maintaining Accumulated Sum	42
6.3	Vector Maintenance Algorithm and Analysis	45
7	Leverage Score Maintenance	50
7.1	Computing Few Leverage Scores	52
7.2	Detecting Leverage Scores Change	53
7.3	Leverage Score Maintenance	56
8	Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints	59
9	Open Problems	69
10	Acknowledgements	69
A	Misc Technical Lemmas	76
B	Maintaining Near Feasibility	78
B.1	Increase of Infeasibility Due to x	78
B.2	Increase of Infeasibility Due to x' and s'	80
B.3	Improving Infeasibility	88
C	Constructing the Initial Point	95
D	Gradient Maintenance	99

List of Algorithms

1	Path Following (Theorem 5)	16
2	LP Algorithm (based on Algorithm 1)	21
3	LP Algorithm (based on Algorithm 1), Continuation of Algorithm 2	27
4	Approximate Matrix-vector Product (Lemma 33)	40
5	Maintain Accumulated Matrix-vector Product (Lemma 36)	43
6	Maintain Multiplicative Approximation (Theorem 8)	46
7	Leverage Score Maintenance (Theorem 9)	51
8	Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints (Theorem 10)	60
9	Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints (Continuation of Algorithm 8)	61
10	Maintaining Infeasibility	80
11	Maintaining Feasibility	88
12	Algorithm for Maintaining $\nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ (Theorem 60)	99

1 Introduction

Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ solving a linear program (P) and its dual (D):

$$(P) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n: \mathbf{A}^\top x = b} c^\top x \text{ and } (D) = \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d: \mathbf{A}y \geq c} b^\top y. \quad (1.1)$$

is one of the most fundamental and well-studied problems in computer science and optimization. Developing faster algorithms for (1.1) has been the subject of decades of extensive research and the pursuit of faster linear programming methods has lead to numerous algorithmic advances and the advent of fundamental optimization techniques, e.g. simplex methods [Dan51], ellipsoid methods [Kha80], and interior-point methods (IPMs) [Kar84].

The current fastest algorithms for solving (1.1) are the IPMs of Lee and Sidford [LS15] and Cohen, Lee, and Song [CLS19]. These results build on a long line of work on IPMs [Kar84, Ren88, Vai90, Vai89a, VA93, NN94, Ans96], fast matrix multiplication [Str69, CW82, Str86, CW90, Sto10, Wil12, Gal14, GU18], and linear system solvers [CW13, MM13, NN13, LMP13, CLM⁺15]. The first, [LS15] combined an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iteration IPM from [LS14, LS19] with new techniques for *inverse maintenance*, i.e. maintaining an approximate inverse of a slowly changing matrix, to solve (1.1) in time $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})\sqrt{d} + d^{2.5})$ with high probability. For sufficiently large values of $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$ or n , this is the fastest known running time for solving linear programming up to polylogarithmic factors.

The second, [CLS19], developed a stable and robust version of the IPM of [Ren88] (using techniques from [LS14, LS19]) and combined it with novel randomization, data structure, and rectangular matrix multiplication [GU18] techniques to solve (1.1) in time $\tilde{O}(\max\{n, d\}^\omega)$ with high probability where $\omega < 2.373$ is the current best known matrix multiplication constant [Wil12, Gal14]. When $n = \tilde{\Theta}(d)$, this running time matches that of the best known linear system solvers for solving $n \times n$ linear systems and therefore is the best possible barring a major linear system solving advance.

Though, these results constitute substantial advances in algorithmic techniques for linear programming, the running times of [LS15] and [CLS19] are incomparable and neither yield a nearly linear running time when n grows polynomially with d , i.e. when $d = n^\delta$ for any $\delta > 0$ neither [LS15] or [CLS19] yields a nearly linear running time. Consequently, it has remained a fundamental open problem to determine whether or not it is possible to solve high-dimensional linear programs to high-precision in nearly linear time for any polynomial ratio of n, d , and $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$. Though achieving such a nearly linear runtime is known in the simpler setting of linear regression [CW13, MM13, NN13, LMP13, CLM⁺15, Coh16], achieving analogous results for solving such tall linear programs has been elusive.

In this paper we provide the first such nearly linear time algorithm for linear programming. We provide an algorithm which solves (1.1) with high probability in time $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$. Whenever \mathbf{A} is dense, i.e. $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = \Omega(nd)$, and sufficiently tall, i.e. $n = \Omega(d^2)$, this constitutes a nearly linear running time. In contrast to previous state-of-the-art IPMs for linear programming [LS15, CLS19] our algorithm doesn't need to use fast matrix multiplication and thereby matches the best known running time for regression on dense matrices which does not use fast matrix multiplication.

To achieve this result, we introduce several techniques that we believe are independent interest. First, we consider the IPM of [LS19] and develop an efficiently implementable robust primal-dual variant of it in the style of [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20] which only requires solving $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ linear systems. Prior to [LS14, LS19], obtaining such an efficient $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM was a major open problem in the theory of IPMs. We believe our primal dual method and its analysis is simpler than that of [LS19]; by developing a primal-dual method we eliminate the need for explicit ℓ_p -Lewis weight computation for $p \neq 2$ as in [LS19] and instead work with the simpler ℓ_2 -Lewis weights or leverage

scores. Further, we show that this primal dual method is highly stable and can be implemented efficiently given only multiplicative estimates of the variables, Hessians, and leverage scores.

With this IPM in hand, the problem of achieving our desired running time reduces to implementing this IPM efficiently. This problem is that of maintaining multiplicative approximations to vectors (the current iterates), leverage scores (a measure of importance of the rows under local rescaling), and the inverse of matrix (the system one needs to solve to take a step of the IPM) under small perturbations. While variants of vector maintenance have been considered recently [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20] and inverse maintenance is well-studied historically [Kar84, NN89, Vai89a, NN91, LS14, LS15, CLS19, LSZ19, LS19, Bra20], none of these methods can be immediately applied in our setting where we cannot afford to pay too much in terms of n each iteration.

Our second contribution is to show that these data-structure problems can be solved efficiently. A key technique we use to overcome these issues is heavy-hitters sketching. We show that it is possible to apply a heavy hitters sketch (in particular [KNPW11, Pag13]) to the iterates of the method such that we can efficiently find changes in the coordinates. This involves carefully sketching groups of updates and dynamically modifying the induced data-structure. These sketches only work against non-adaptive adversaries, and therefore care is need to ensure that the sketch is used only to save time and not affect the progression of the overall IPM in a way that break this non-adaptive assumption. To achieve this we use the sketches to propose short-lists of possible changes which we then filter to ensure that the output of the datastructure is deterministic (up to a low probability failure event). Coupling this technique with known Johnson-Lindstrauss sketches yields our leverage score maintenance data structure and adapting and simplifying previous inverse maintenance techniques yields our inverse maintenance data structure. We believe this technique of sketching the central path is powerful and may find further applications.

1.1 Our Results

The main result of this paper is the following theorem for solving (1.1). This algorithm's running time is nearly linear whenever the LP is sufficiently dense and tall, i.e. $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) = \tilde{\Omega}(nd)$ and $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d^2)$. This is the first polynomial time algorithm with a nearly linear running time for high-dimensional instances (i.e. when d can grow polynomially with n). This algorithm does not use fast matrix multiplication (FMM) and consequently its running time matches the best known running time for checking whether there even exists x such that $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$ for dense \mathbf{A} without using FMM.

Theorem 1 (Main Result). *There is an algorithm (Algorithm 2) which given any linear program of the form (1.1) for non-degenerate¹ $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$ computes a point $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that*

$$c^\top x \leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + \delta \cdot \|c\|_2 \cdot R \text{ and}$$

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top x - b\|_2 \leq \delta \cdot \left(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F \cdot R + \|b\|_2 \right)$$

where R is the diameter of the polytope in ℓ_2 norm, i.e. $\|x\|_2 \leq R$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$. Further, the expected running time of the method is $O((nd + d^3) \log^{O(1)} n \log \frac{n}{\delta})$.

Remark 2. See [Ren88, LS14] on the discussion on converting such an approximate solution to an exact solution. For integral \mathbf{A}, b, c , it suffices to pick $\delta = 2^{-O(L)}$ to get an exact solution where $L = \log(1 + d_{\max} + \|c\|_\infty + \|b\|_\infty)$ is the bit complexity and d_{\max} is the largest absolute

¹We assume throughout that \mathbf{A} is *non-degenerate* meaning it has full-column rank and no-zero rows. This assumption can be avoided by preprocessing \mathbf{A} to check for zero rows and adding a tiny amount of noise to the matrix to make it full-column rank. There are other natural ways to remove this assumption, see e.g. [LS19].

value of the determinant of a square sub-matrix of \mathbf{A} . For many combinatorial problems $L = O(\log(n + \|b\|_\infty + \|c\|_\infty))$.

Beyond this result (Section 4) we believe our robust primal-dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM (Section 5) and our data structures for maintaining multiplicative approximations to vectors (Section 6), leverage scores (Section 7), and the inverse of matrices (Section 8) are of independent interest.

1.2 Previous Work

Linear programming has been the subject of extensive research for decades and it is impossible to completely cover to this impressive line of work in this short introduction. Here we cover results particularly relevant to our approach. For more detailed coverage of prior-work see, e.g. [NN94, Ye11].

IPMs: The first proof of a polynomial time IPM was due to Karmarkar in [Kar84]. After multiple running time improvements [Kar84, NN89, Vai89a, NN91] the current fastest IPMs are the aforementioned results of [LS19] and [CLS19]. Beyond these results, excitingly the work of [CLS19] was recently extended to obtain comparable running time improvements for solving arbitrary empirical risk minimization problems (ERM) [LSZ19] and was recently simplified and de-randomized by van den Brand [Bra20]. These works consider variants of the vector maintenance problem and our work is inspired in part by them. Our IPM leverages the barrier from [LS19] in a new way, that enables the application of robustness techniques from [LS19, CLS19, Bra20] and new techniques for handling approximately feasible points.

Heavy Hitters and Sketching: Sketching is a well-studied problem with a broad range of applications. Johnson-Lindenstrauss sketches were used extensively in previous IPMs [LS19], but only for the restricted application of computing leverage scores. Further sketching techniques have been used for the purpose of dimension reduction and sampling in other optimization contexts, e.g. solving linear systems [LMP13, CW13, NN13, MM13, CLM⁺15, Coh16] and certain forms of ℓ_p -regression [CP15]. Our methods make use of ℓ_2 -heavy hitters sketches [CM04, NNW14, CCFC02, KNPW11, Pag13, CH09, LNNT16], in particular the ℓ_2 -sketches of [KNPW11, Pag13], to decrease iteration costs. We are unaware of these sketches being used previously to obtain provable improvements for solving offline (as opposed to online, streaming, or dynamic optimization problems) variants of linear programming previously. We believe this is due in part to the difficulty of using these methods with non-oblivious adversaries and consequently we hope the techniques we use to overcome these issues may be of further use. Also, note that the definition of ℓ_2 -heavy hitters problem (Lemma 34) that we use is equivalent to ℓ_∞/ℓ_2 -sparse recovery problem. Though the ℓ_2/ℓ_2 -sparse recovery [Don06, CRT06, GLPS10, Pri13, Has16, NS19, Son19] is a more standard task in compressed sensing, we are unaware of how to efficiently use its guarantees for our applications.

Leverage Scores and Lewis Weights: Leverage scores [SS11, Mah11, LMP13, CLM⁺15] (and more broadly Lewis weights [Lew78, BLM89, CP15, LS19]) are fundamental notions of importance of rows of a matrix with numerous applications. In this paper we introduce a natural online problem for maintaining multiplicative approximations to leverage scores and we show how to solve this problem efficiently. Though we are unaware of this problem being studied previously, we know that in the special case of leverage scores induced by graph problems, which are known as effective resistances, there are dynamic algorithms for maintaining them, e.g [DGGP19]. However, these algorithms seem tailored to graph structure and it is unclear how to apply them in our setting. Further, there are streaming algorithms for variants of this problem [AGM13, KLM⁺17, KNST20], however their running time is too large for our purposes.

Inverse Maintenance: This problem has been studied extensively and are a key component in obtaining efficient linear programming running times with previous IPMs [Kar84, NN89, Vai89a, NN91, LS14, LS15, LS19, CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20, Sid15, Lee16, Son19] and other optimization methods [LSW15, AKPS19]. Outside the area of optimization, this problem is also known as Dynamic Matrix Inverse [San04, BNS19]. Our method for solving inverse maintenance is closely related to these results with modifications needed to fully take advantage of our leverage score maintenance, obtain $\text{poly}(d)$ (as opposed to $\text{poly}(n)$ runtimes), ensure that randomness used to make the algorithm succeed doesn't affect the input to the data structure, and ultimately produce solvers that are correct in expectation.

2 Overview of Approach

We prove Theorem 1 (Section 4) in two steps. First we provide a new robust, primal-dual, $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iteration IPM inspired by the LS-barriers of [LS14, LS19] and central path robustness techniques of [LS14, CLS19, LSZ19, LS19, Bra20] (See Section 5). Then, we show how to implement this IPM efficiently using new data-structures based on heavy hitters, the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma, and inverse maintenance (Section 6, Section 7, and Section 8). Here we provide an overview of tools, techniques, and approach to executing these two steps.

2.1 A Robust Primal-Dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ IPM

Here we provide an overview of our approach to deriving our robust, primal-dual, $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iteration IPM. We assume throughout this section (and the bulk of the paper) that \mathbf{A} is *non-degenerate*, meaning it is full-column rank and no non-zero rows. By standard techniques, in Section 4.5 we efficiently reduce solving (1.1) in general to solving an instance of where this assumption holds.

We first give a quick introduction to primal-dual path IPMs, review the central path from [LS19] and from it derive the central path that our method is based on, and explain our new IPM.

Primal-Dual Path Following IPMs: Our algorithm for solving the linear programs given by (1.1) is rooted in classic primal-dual path-following IPMs. Primal-dual IPMs, maintain a *primal feasible point*, $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$, a *dual feasible point* $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $s = \mathbf{A}y - c \geq 0$, and attempt to decrease the *duality gap*

$$\text{gap}(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c^\top x - b^\top y = (\mathbf{A}y + s)^\top x - (\mathbf{A}^\top x)^\top y = s^\top x.$$

Note that $\text{gap}(x, y)$ upper bounds the error of x and y , i.e. $\text{gap}(x, y) \leq \epsilon$ implies that x and y are each optimal up to an additive ϵ in objective function, and therefore to solve a linear program it suffices to decrease the duality gap for primal and dual feasible points.

Primal-dual path-following IPMs carefully trade-off decreasing the duality gap (which corresponds to objective function progress) with staying away from the inequality constraints, i.e. $x \geq 0$ and $s \geq 0$ (in order to ensure it is easier to make progress). Formally, they consider a (*weighted*) *central path* defined as the unique set of $(x_\mu, y_\mu, s_\mu) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ for $\mu > 0$ that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_\mu \mathbf{S}_\mu \mathbf{1} &= \mu \cdot \tau_{\text{weight}}(x_\mu, s_\mu), \\ \mathbf{A}^\top x_\mu &= b, \\ \mathbf{A}y_\mu + s_\mu &= c, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathbf{X}_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(x_\mu)$, $\mathbf{S}_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(s_\mu)$, and $\tau_{\text{weight}} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *weight function*. These methods maintain primal and dual feasible points and take Newton steps on the above non-linear inequalities to maintain feasible points that are more central, i.e. have (2.1) closer to holding, for decreasing μ . Since many properties of the central path can be defined in terms of just x_μ and s_μ we often describe methods using only these quantities and we adopt the following notation.

Definition 3 (Feasible Point). We say that $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is a *feasible point* if there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$ and $\mathbf{A}y + s = c$.

Now, perhaps the most widely-used and simple weight function is $\tau_{\text{weight}}(x, s) \leftarrow \tau_{\text{std}}(x, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$,

i.e. the all-ones vector. Central path points for this weight function are the solution to the following

$$x_\mu = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n: \mathbf{A}^\top x = b} c^\top x - \mu \sum_{i \in [n]} \log(x_i) \text{ and}$$

$$(y_\mu, s_\mu) = \operatorname{argmax}_{(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n: \mathbf{A}^\top y + s = c} b^\top y - \mu \sum_{i \in [n]} \log(s_i),$$

i.e. optimization problems trading off the objective function with logarithmic barriers on the inequality constraints. There are numerous methods for following this central path [Ren88, Meh92, Gon92, NN94, YTM94]. By starting with nearly-central feasible points for large μ and iteratively finding nearly-central feasible points for small μ , they can compute ϵ -approximate solutions to (1.1) in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ -iterations. For these methods, each iteration (or Newton step) consists of nearly-linear time computation and solving one linear system in the matrix $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{Diag}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

The first such $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ -iteration IPM with this iteration cost was established by Renegar in 1988 [Ren88] and no faster-converging method with the same iteration cost was developed until the work of Lee and Sidford in 2014 [LS19, LS14]. It had been known since seminal work of Nesterov and Nemirovski in 1994 [NN94] that there is a weight function that yields a $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration primal-dual path-following IPM, however obtaining any $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM that can be implemented with iterations nearly as efficient as those of [Ren88] was a long-standing open problem.

The Lewis Weight Barrier and Beyond The work of [LS19, LS14] addressed this open problem in IPM theory and provided an efficient $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM by providing new weight functions and new tools for following the central path they induce. In particular, [LS19] introduced the *Lewis weight barrier* which induces the central path in which for some $p > 0$

$$\tau_{\text{weight}}(x, s) \leftarrow \tau_{\text{s}}(x, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^{(p)}(\mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})$$

where for any $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $\sigma^{(p)}(\mathbf{B})$ are the ℓ_p -Lewis weights of the rows of \mathbf{B} [Lew78], a fundamental and natural measure of importance of rows with respect to the ℓ_p -norm [BLM89, CP15, LS19]. In the case of non-degenerate \mathbf{B} , they are defined recursively as the vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^n$ which satisfies

$$w = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{W}^{(1/2)-(1/p)} \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-(2/p)} \mathbf{B})^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(1/2)-(1/p)})$$

where $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Diag}(w)$. In the special case when $p = 2$,

$$w = \sigma(\mathbf{B}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{B} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})^\dagger \mathbf{B}^\top)$$

is known as the *leverage scores* of the rows of \mathbf{A} and is a fundamental object for dimension reduction and solving linear systems [SS11, Mah11, LMP13, NW14, Woo14, CLM⁺15, SWZ19].

The work of [LS19] formally showed that there is an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration primal-dual IPM which uses $\tau_{\text{weight}}(x, s) \leftarrow \tau_{\text{s}}(x, s)$ when $p = \Omega(\log n)$. This choice of p is motivated by drew geometric connections between Lewis weights and ellipsoidal approximations of polytopes [LS19]. Further, [LS19] showed how to modify this IPM to have iterations of comparable cost to the methods which use $\tau_{\text{std}}(x, s)$. This was achieved by leveraging and modifying efficient algorithms for approximately computing Lewis weights and leverage scores and developing techniques for dealing with the noise such approximate computation induces.

To obtain the results of this paper we further simplify [LS19] and provide more robust methods for following related central paths. Our first observation is that the central path induced by τ_{s} can

be re-written more concisely in terms of only leverage scores. Note that (2.1) and the definition of Lewis weights imply that there is w_μ with

$$\mathbf{X}_\mu \mathbf{S}_\mu \mathbf{1} = \mu \cdot w_\mu \text{ and } w_\mu = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_\mu^{(1/2)-(1/p)} \mathbf{S}_\mu^{-1} \mathbf{A})$$

for $\mathbf{W}_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(w_\mu)$. Substituting the first equation into the second, gives more compactly that for $\alpha = 1/p$

$$\mathbf{X}_\mu \mathbf{S}_\mu \mathbf{1} = \mu \cdot \mathbf{Diag}(\sigma(\mathbf{S}_\mu^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}_\mu^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})).$$

Consequently, rather than defining centrality in terms of Lewis weights, we would get the same central path as the one induced by $\tau_{\text{ls}}(x, s)$ by letting $\tau_{\text{weight}}(x, s) \leftarrow \sigma(\mathbf{S}_\mu^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}_\mu^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})$, i.e. defining it in terms of leverage scores. In other words, the optimality of the central path conditions forces $\mathbf{X}_\mu \mathbf{S}_\mu \mathbf{1}$ to be a type of Lewis weight if we carefully define centrality in terms of leverage scores. Though $\tau_{\text{weight}}(x, s) \leftarrow \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})$ induces the same central path as $\tau_{\text{ls}}(x, s)$, these weight functions can be different outside the central path and thereby lead to slightly different algorithms if only approximate centrality is preserved. Further, with the current state-of-the-art theory, leverage scores are simpler to compute and approximate, as Lewis weight computation is often reduced to leverage score computation [CP15, LS19].

Formally, in this paper we consider the following regularized-variant of this centrality measure:

Definition 4 (Weight Function). Throughout this paper we let $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/(4 \log(4n/d))$ and for all $x, s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ let $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$ where $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Diag}(x)$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{Diag}(s)$.

This centrality measure is the same as the Lewis weight barrier except that we add a multiple of the all-ones vector, $\frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$, to simplify our analysis. Further, this allows us to pick $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/(4 \log(4n/d))$ as opposed to $\alpha = 1/\Omega(\log n)$ due to the extra stability it provides. Since we use this weight function throughout the paper we overload notation and let $\tau(x, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ and $\tau(\mathbf{B}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\mathbf{B}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$.

Our Robust Primal-Dual Method: We obtain our results by proving that there is an efficient primal-dual path-following IPM based on $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. We believe that our analysis is slightly simpler than [LS19] due to its specification in terms of leverage scores, rather than the more general Lewis weights, but remark that the core ingredients of its analysis are similar. Formally, we provide Newton-method type steps that allow us to control centrality with respect to this measure and increase μ fast enough that this yields an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration method.

Beyond providing a simplified $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM, we leverage this analysis to provide a robust method. Critical to the development of recent IPMs is that it is possible to design efficient primal-dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ -iteration IPMs that take steps using only crude, multiplicative approximations to x and s [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20]. These papers consider the standard central path but measure centrality using potential functions introduced in [LS14, LS19]. This robustness allows these papers to efficiently implement steps by only needing to change smaller amounts of coordinates.

Similarly, we show how to apply these approximate centrality measurement techniques to the central path induced by $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. We show that it suffices to maintain multiplicative approximations to the current iterate $(x, s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n)$, the regularized leverage scores $(\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1})$, and the inverse of the local Hessian $((\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A})^{-1})$ to maintain approximate centrality with respect to $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. Interestingly, to do this we slightly modify the type of steps we take in our IPM. Rather than taking standard Newton steps, we slightly change the steps sizes on x and s to account for the effect of $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ (see Definition 17). Further, approximation of the Hessian causes the x iterates to be infeasible, but in Section B we discuss how to modify the steps to control this infeasibility and still prove the desired theorem.

The main guarantees of this new IPM are given by Theorem 5 (Section 4.1) and proven in Section 5 and Section B. This theorem formalizes the above discussion and quantifies how much the iterates, leverage scores, and Hessian can change in each iteration. These bounds are key to obtaining an efficient method that can maintain multiplicative approximations to these quantities.

2.2 Heavy Hitters, Congestion Detection, and Sketching the Central Path

It has long been known that the changes to the central path are essentially sparse or low-rank on average. In Renegar’s IPM [Ren88], the multiplicative change in x and s per iteration are bounded in ℓ_2 . Consequently, the matrices for which linear systems are solved in Renegar’s method do not change too quickly. In fact, this phenomenon holds for IPMs more broadly, and from the earliest work on polynomial time IPMs [Kar84], to the most recent fastest methods [LS14, LS15, LSZ19, LS19, Bra20], and varied work in between [NN89, Vai89b, NN91] this bounded change in IPM iterates has been leveraged to obtain faster linear programming algorithms.

Our IPM also enjoys a variety of stability properties on its iterates. We show that the multiplicative change in the iterates are bounded in a norm induced by $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ and therefore are also bounded in ℓ_2 . This is known to imply that changes to $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ can be bounded over the course of the algorithm and we further show that this implies that the changes in the weight function, $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$, can also be bounded. These facts, combined with the robustness properties of our IPM imply that to obtain an efficient linear programming algorithm it suffices to maintain multiplicative approximations to the following three quantities (1) the vectors $x, s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, (2) the regularized leverage scores $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$, and (3) the Hessian inverse $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ under bounds on how quickly these quantities change.

We treat each of these problems as a self contained data-structure problem, the first we call the *vector maintenance problem*, the second we call the *leverage score maintenance problem*, and the third has been previously studied (albeit different variants) and is called the *inverse maintenance problem*. For each problem we build efficient solutions by combining techniques from the sketching literature (e.g. heavy hitters sketches and Johnson-Lindenstrauss sketches) and careful potential functions and tools for dealing with sparse and low rank approximations. (Further work is also needed to maintain the gradient of a potential used to measure proximity to the central path (Section D) and this is discussed in the appendix.)

In the remainder of this overview, we briefly survey how we solve each of these problems. A common issue that needs to be addressed in solving each problem is that of hiding randomness and dealing with adversarial input. Each data-structure uses sampling and sketching techniques to improve running times. While these techniques are powerful and succeed with high probability, they only work against an *oblivious adversary*, i.e. one which provides input that does not depend on the randomness of the data structure. However, the output of our data-structures are used to take steps along the central path and provide the next input, so care needs to be taken to argue that the output of the data structure, as used by the method, doesn’t somehow leak information about the randomness of the sketches and samples into the next input. A key contribution of our work is showing how to overcome this issue in each case.

Vector Maintenance: In the vector maintenance problem, we receive two online sequences of vectors $h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}, \dots \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g^{(1)}, g^{(2)}, \dots \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and must maintain the sum $y^{(t)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{A} h^{(i)}$ for a fixed matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. The naive way of solving this would just compute $\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} h^{(t)}$ in iteration t and add it to the previous result. Unfortunately, this takes $O(\text{nnz}(A))$ time per iteration, which is too slow for our purposes. Luckily we do not have to maintain this sum exactly. Motivated by the robustness of our IPM, it is enough to maintain a multiplicative approximation $\tilde{y}^{(t)} \approx_\epsilon y^{(t)}$

of the sum. An exact definition of this problem, together with our upper bounds, can be found in Section 4.2 and the formal proof of these results can be found in Section 6.

We now outline how vector maintenance problem can be solved. For simplicity assume we already have an accurate approximation $\tilde{y}^{(t-1)} \approx_{\epsilon/2} y^{(t-1)}$. Then we only have to change the entries i of $\tilde{y}^{(t-1)}$ where $y_i^{(t)} \not\approx_{\epsilon/2} y_i^{(t-1)}$, because for all other i we have $\tilde{y}_i^{(t-1)} \approx_{\epsilon} y_i^{(t)}$. This means we must detect the large entries of $y^{(t)} - y^{(t-1)} = \mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}h^{(t)}$, which can be done via heavy hitter techniques. From past research on heavy hitters, we know one can construct a small, sparse, random matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ with $k \ll n$, such that known the much smaller vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $x = \Phi y$ allows for a quick reconstruction of the large entries of y . Thus for our task, we maintain the product $\Phi\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}$, which can be done quickly if $g^{(t)}$ does not change in too many entries compared to $g^{(t-1)}$. Then we can reconstruct the large entries of $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}h^{(t)}$ by computing $(\Phi\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A})h^{(t)}$. Note that this product can be computed much faster than $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}h^{(t)}$, because $\Phi\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}$ is a $k \times d$ matrix and $k \ll n$.

One issue we must overcome, is that the output of our data-structure must not leak any information about Φ . This matrix is randomly constructed and the large entries of y can only be reconstructed from $x = \Phi y$, if the vector y is independent from the randomness in Φ . Thus if the output of the data-structure depends on Φ and the next future input $h^{(t)}$ depends on the previous output, then the required independence can no longer be guaranteed. We overcome this problem by computing any entry $y_i^{(t)}$ exactly, whenever the heavy hitter techniques detect a large change in said entry. As we now know the value of said entry exactly, we can compare it to the previous result and verify, if the entry did indeed change by some large amount. This allows us to define the output of our data-structure in a deterministic way, e.g. maintain $\tilde{y}_i^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon} y_i^{(t)}$ by setting $\tilde{y}_i^{(t)} = y_i^{(t)}$ whenever $\tilde{y}_i^{(t-1)} \not\approx_{\epsilon} y_i^{(t)}$. (The exact deterministic definition we use is slightly more complex, but this is the high-level idea.)

So far we only explained how we can detect large changes in $y^{(t)}$ that occur within a single iteration. However, it could be that some entry changes slowly over several iterations. It is easy to extend our heavy hitter technique to also detect these slower changes. The idea is that we not just detect changes within one iteration (i.e. $y_i^{(t)} \not\approx_{\epsilon/2} y_i^{(t-1)}$) but also changes within any power of two (i.e. $y_i^{(t)} \not\approx_{\epsilon/2} y_i^{(t-2^i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \log t$). To make sure that this does not become too slow, we only check every 2^i iterations if there was a large change within the past 2^i iterations. One can prove that this is enough to also detect slowly changing entries.

Leverage Score Maintenance: In the leverage score maintenance problem, we must maintain an approximation of the regularized leverage scores of a matrix of the form $\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, for a slowly changing diagonal matrix $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. That means we are interested in a data-structure that maintains a vector $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\tilde{\tau}_i \approx_{\epsilon} \tau_i := (\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2})_{i,i} + d/n$. The high-level idea for how to solve this task is identical to the previously outlined vector-maintenance: we try to detect for which i the value τ_i changed significantly, and then update $\tilde{\tau}_i$ so that the vector stays a valid approximation. We show that detecting these indices i can be reduced to the previous vector maintenance. Here we simply outline this reduction, a formal description of our result can be found in Section 4.3 and its proof and analysis is in Section 7.

Consider the case where we change from \mathbf{G} to some \mathbf{G}' . We want to detect indices i where the i th leverage score changed significantly. Define $\mathbf{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2} - (\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}'\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}'^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and note that

$$(\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2})_{i,i} = \|e_i^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\|_2^2,$$

so a large change in the i th leverage score, when changing $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to $\mathbf{G}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, results in a large norm of $e_i^\top\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}$, if $\mathbf{G}_{i,i}$ and $\mathbf{G}'_{i,i}$ are roughly the same. (As \mathbf{G} is slowly changing there

are not too many i where $\mathbf{G}_{i,i}$ and $\mathbf{G}'_{i,i}$ significantly. So we can just compute the i th leverage score exactly for these entries to check if the i th score changed significantly.) By multiplying this term with a Johnson-Lindenstrauss matrix \mathbf{J} the task of detecting a large leverage score change, becomes the task of detecting rows of $\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{J}$ for which the row-norm changed significantly. Given that \mathbf{J} only needs some $O(\log n)$ columns to yield a good approximation of these norms, we know that any large change in the i th leverage score, must result in some index j where $|(\mathbf{G}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{J})_{i,j}|$ must be large. Detecting these large entries can be done in the same way as in the vector-maintenance problem by considering each column of $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{J}$ as a vector.

To make sure that no information about the random matrix \mathbf{J} is leaked, we use the same technique previously outlined in the vector-maintenance paragraph. That is, after detecting a set $I \subset [n]$ of indices i for which the leverage score might have changed significantly, we compute the i th leverage score to verify the large change and set $\tilde{\tau}_i$ to be this computed leverage score, if the change was large enough. Unlike the vector case however, the i th leverage score is not computed in a deterministic way (as this would be prohibitively expensive). Instead we use another random Johnson-Lindenstrauss matrix \mathbf{J}' , so the output $\tilde{\tau}$ is actually defined w.r.t the input and this new matrix \mathbf{J}' . By using a fresh independent Johnson-Lindenstrauss \mathbf{J}' to verify changes to leverage scores, this data structure works against an adaptive adversary.

Inverse Maintenance: In the inverse maintenance problem, we maintain a spectral sparsifier of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and its inverse, for a slowly changing diagonal matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Using the leverage score data-structure, we can assume an approximation to the leverage scores of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ is given. Hence, we can sample $\tilde{O}(d)$ many rows of \mathbf{A} to form a spectral sparsifier. This allows us to get a spectral sparsifier and its inverse in $\tilde{O}(d^\omega)$. To speed up the runtime, we follow the idea in [LS15], which resamples the row only if the leverage score changed too much. This makes sure the sampled matrix is slowly changing in ℓ_0 sense and hence we can try to apply the lazy low-rank update idea in [CLS19] to update the inverse in $\tilde{O}(d^2)$ time. Unfortunately, this algorithm works only against oblivious adversary and the sampled matrix is changing too fast in ℓ_2 sense, which is required for the leverage score maintenance.

Fortunately, we note that we do not need a sparsifier that satisfies both conditions at all time. Therefore, our final data structure has two ways to output the inverse of the sparsifier. The sparsifier that works only against oblivious adversary is used in implementing the Newton steps and the sparsifier that is slowly changing is used to compute the sketch $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{J}$ used in the leverage score maintenance problem mentioned above.

For the Newton steps, we only need to make sure the sparsifier does not leak the randomness since the input \mathbf{W} depends on the Newton step. Since we only need to solve linear systems of the form $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} x = b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can handle this problem by adding an appropriate noise to the output x . This makes sure the randomness we use in this data structure does not leak when the output x is used. This idea is also used [LS15], but extra care is needed to remove the $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$ per step cost in their algorithm.

For computing the sketch $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{J}$, we do not need to worry about leakage of randomness, but only need to make sure it is slowly changing in ℓ_2 sense. Instead of using [CLS19] as a black-box, we show how to combining the idea of resampling in [LS15] and the low-rank update in [CLS19]. This gives us an alternate smoother scheme that satisfies the requirement for slowly changing.

3 Preliminaries

Here we discuss varied notation we use throughout the paper. We adopt similar notation to [LS14] and some of the explanations here are copied directly from this work.

Matrices: We call a matrix \mathbf{A} *non-degenerate* if it has full column-rank and no zero rows. We call symmetric matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ positive semidefinite (PSD) if $x^\top \mathbf{B}x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive definite (PD) if $x^\top \mathbf{B}x > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Matrix Operations: For symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we write $\mathbf{A} \preceq \mathbf{B}$ to indicate that $x^\top \mathbf{A}x \leq x^\top \mathbf{B}x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define \prec, \succeq , and \succ analogously. For $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we let $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}$ denote the Schur product, i.e. $[\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}]_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{A}_{i,j} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{i,j}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. We use $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$ to denote the number of nonzero entries in \mathbf{A} .

Diagonals: For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we define $\text{diag}(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{diag}(\mathbf{A})_i = \mathbf{A}_{ii}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define $\mathbf{Diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as the diagonal matrix with $\text{diag}(\mathbf{Diag}(x)(x)) = x$. We often use upper case to denote a vectors associated diagonal matrix and in particular let $\mathbf{X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(x)$, $\mathbf{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(s)$, $\mathbf{W} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(w)$, $\mathbf{T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\tau)$, $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\bar{x})$, $\bar{\mathbf{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\bar{s})$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\bar{w})$, $\mathbf{X}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(x_t)$, $\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{Diag}(s_t)$, $\mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{Diag}(w_t)$, and $\mathbf{T}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\tau_t)$.

Fundamental Matrices: For any non-degenerate matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ we let $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top$ denote the orthogonal projection matrix onto \mathbf{A} 's image. Further, we let $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A}))$ denote \mathbf{A} 's *leverage scores* and we let $\tau(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$ denote its regularized leverage scores. Further, we define $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\sigma(\mathbf{A}))$, $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\tau(\mathbf{A}))$, $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A}) \circ \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A})$ (where \circ denotes entrywise product), and $\Lambda(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma(\mathbf{A}) - \mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{A})$.

Approximations: We use $x \approx_\epsilon y$ to denote that $\exp(-\epsilon)y \leq x \leq \exp(\epsilon)y$ and $\mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{B}$ to denote that $\exp(-\epsilon)\mathbf{B} \preceq \mathbf{A} \preceq \exp(\epsilon)\mathbf{B}$.

Norms: For PD $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{A}}$ denote the norm where $\|x\|_{\mathbf{A}}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^\top \mathbf{A}x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For positive $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ we let $\|\cdot\|_w$ denote the norm where $\|x\|_w^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [n]} w_i x_i^2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For any norm $\|\cdot\|$ and matrix \mathbf{M} , its induced operator norm of \mathbf{M} is defined by $\|\mathbf{M}\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|\mathbf{M}x\|$.

Time and Probability: We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to hide factors polylogarithmic in n and d . We say an algorithm has a property “with high probability (w.h.p.) in n ” if it holds with probability at least $1 - 1/O(\text{poly}(n))$ for any polynomial by choice of the constants in the runtime of the algorithm.

Misc: We let $[z] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, 2, \dots, z\}$. We let $\mathbf{1}_n, \mathbf{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the all-one and all-zero vectors, $\mathbf{0}_n, \mathbf{I}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the all zero and identity matrices, and drop subscripts when the dimensions are clear. We let $\mathbf{1}_i$ denote the indicator vector for coordinate i , i.e. the i -th basis vector.

4 Linear Programming Algorithm

Here we prove the main result of this paper that there is a $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ time algorithm for solving linear programs. This theorem is restated below for convenience:

Theorem 1 (Main Result). *There is an algorithm (Algorithm 2) which given any linear program of the form (1.1) for non-degenerate² $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$ computes a point $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that*

$$c^\top x \leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + \delta \cdot \|c\|_2 \cdot R \text{ and}$$

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top x - b\|_2 \leq \delta \cdot \left(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F \cdot R + \|b\|_2 \right)$$

where R is the diameter of the polytope in ℓ_2 norm, i.e. $\|x\|_2 \leq R$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$. Further, the expected running time of the method is $O((nd + d^3) \log^{O(1)} n \log \frac{n}{\delta})$.

The proof for Theorem 1 uses four intermediate results, which we formally state in the next Sections 4.1, to 4.4. Each of these intermediate results is self-contained and analyzed in its own section, Sections 5 to 8 correspondingly. In this section we show how these results can be combined to obtain Theorem 1. The first result is a new, improved IPM as outlined in Section 2.1. The exact statement is given in Section 4.1 and its analysis can be found in Section 5 and Section B. Here we give a rough summary to motivate the other three results used by our linear programming algorithm.

Our IPM is robust in the sense, that it makes progress, even if we maintain the primal dual solution pair (x, s) only approximately. Additionally, the linear system that is solved in each iteration, allows for spectral approximations. More accurately, it is enough to maintain a spectral approximation of an inverse of a matrix of the form $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ for some diagonal matrix \mathbf{W} . For this robust IPM we also require to compute approximate leverage scores, which allows the IPM to converge in just $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations. These properties of our IPM motivate three new data-structures:

(i) In Section 4.2, we present a data-structure that can maintain an approximation of the primal dual solution pair (x, s) efficiently. More formally, this data-structure maintains an approximation of the sum $\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}$ for diagonal matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and vectors $h^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The data-structure is proven and analyzed in Section 6.

(ii) In Section 4.3 we present a data-structure that can main approximate leverage scores, required by the IPM. Its correctness is proven in Section 7.

(iii) The last requirement of the IPM is for us to maintain a spectral approximation of $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ for some diagonal matrix \mathbf{W} . We present a data-structure that can maintain this inverse approximately in $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega - \frac{1}{2}} + d^2)$ amortized time per step, when the matrix \mathbf{W} changes slowly w.r.t ℓ_2 -norm and if we have estimates of the leverage scores of $\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}$. The exact result is stated in Section 4.4 and proven in Section 8.

With this we have all tools available for proving the main result Theorem 1. In Section 4.5 we show how to combine all these tools to obtain the fast linear programming algorithm.

4.1 Interior Point Method

In Section 5 we derive and analyze the core subroutine of our primal-dual robust $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration IPM (Algorithm 1). This subroutine takes an approximate central point for parameter $\mu^{(\text{init})}$ and

²We assume throughout that \mathbf{A} is *non-degenerate* meaning it has full-column rank and no-zero rows. This assumption can be avoided by preprocessing \mathbf{A} to check for zero rows and adding a tiny amount of noise to the matrix to make it full-column rank. There are other natural ways to remove this assumption, see e.g. [LS19].

in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d} \log(\mu^{(\text{target})}/\mu^{(\text{init})}))$ iterations outputs an approximate central path point for any given parameter $\mu^{(\text{target})}$. Here we simply state the routine (Algorithm 1) and the main theorem regarding its performance (Theorem 5). We defer the full motivation of the method and its analysis (i.e. the proof of Theorem 5) to Section 5. In the remainder of this section we argue how with the appropriate data-structures, this theorem implies our main result.

Algorithm 1: Path Following (Theorem 5)

```

1 procedure CENTERING( $x^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, s^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \mu^{(\text{init})} > 0, \mu^{(\text{target})} > 0, \epsilon > 0$ )
2    $\alpha \leftarrow 1/(4 \log(4n/d)), \lambda \leftarrow \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(\frac{2^{16}n\sqrt{d}}{\alpha^2}), \gamma \leftarrow \min(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda})$ 
3    $\mu \leftarrow \mu^{(\text{init})}, x \leftarrow x^{(\text{init})}, s \leftarrow s^{(\text{init})}$ 
4   while true do
5     Pick any  $\bar{x}, \bar{s} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  such that  $\bar{x} \approx_{\epsilon} x, \bar{s} \approx_{\epsilon} s$ 
6     Find  $\bar{v}$  such that  $\|\bar{v} - v\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma$  where  $v = \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)/w$ 
7     Let  $\Phi(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\lambda(v_i - 1)) + \exp(-\lambda(v_i - 1))$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
8     if  $\mu = \mu^{(\text{target})}$  and  $\Phi(\bar{v}) \leq \frac{2^{16}n\sqrt{d}}{\alpha^2}$  then break;
9      $h = \gamma \nabla \Phi(\bar{v})^{b(\bar{\tau})}$  for  $\bar{\tau} \approx_{\epsilon} \tau(x, s)$ ; // See Lemma 28 for definition of  $(\cdot)^b$ 
10    Pick any  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $\mathbf{H} \approx_{(c\epsilon)/(d^{1/4} \log^3 n)} \mathbf{A}^{\top} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}] = \mathbf{A}^{\top} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$  for
      small constant  $c > 0$ .
11    Let  $\mathbf{Q} = \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^{\top} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}, \bar{\mathbf{W}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}$ 
12     $x \leftarrow x + (1 + 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$ 
13     $s \leftarrow s + (1 - 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{S}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$ 
14    Pick any  $\bar{x}^{(\text{new})}, \bar{s}^{(\text{new})}, \bar{\tau}^{(\text{new})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  with  $\bar{x}^{(\text{new})} \approx_{\epsilon} x, \bar{s}^{(\text{new})} \approx_{\epsilon} s, \bar{\tau}^{(\text{new})} \approx_1 \tau(x, s)$ 
15     $\delta_{\lambda} \leftarrow \text{MAINTAINFEASIBILITY}(x, s, \bar{\tau}^{(\text{new})});$  // Algorithm 10
16     $x \leftarrow x + \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(\text{new})} (\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{(\text{new})})^{-1} \mathbf{A} \delta_{\lambda}$ 
17    if  $\mu > \mu^{(\text{target})}$  then  $\mu \leftarrow \max\{\mu^{(\text{target})}, (1 - \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}})\mu\};$ 
18    else if  $\mu < \mu^{(\text{target})}$  then  $\mu \leftarrow \min\{\mu^{(\text{target})}, (1 + \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}})\mu\};$ 
19  return  $(x, s)$ 

```

Theorem 5. *There exists a constant $\zeta > 0$ such that, given $x^{(\text{init})}, s^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \mu^{(\text{init})} > 0, \mu^{(\text{target})} > 0$, and $\epsilon \in (0, \alpha/16000)$ with $x^{(\text{init})} s^{(\text{init})} \approx_{2\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{init})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{init})}, s^{(\text{init})})$ and*

$$\frac{1}{\mu^{(\text{init})}} \|\mathbf{A}x^{(\text{init})} - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{(\text{init})} \mathbf{S}^{(\text{init})} - \mathbf{1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{\zeta \epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}$$

Algorithm 1 outputs $(x^{(\text{final})}, s^{(\text{final})})$ such that

$$x^{(\text{final})} s^{(\text{final})} \approx_{\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{target})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{final})}, s^{(\text{final})}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu^{(\text{target})}} \|\mathbf{A}x^{(\text{final})} - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{(\text{final})} \mathbf{S}^{(\text{final})} - \mathbf{1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{\zeta \epsilon^2}{\sqrt{d} \log^6 n}$$

$$\text{in } O\left(\sqrt{d} \log(n) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \alpha} \cdot \log\left(\frac{\mu^{(\text{target})}}{\mu^{(\text{init})}}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha^3}\right)\right) \text{ iterations.}$$

Furthermore, throughout Algorithm 1, we have

- $xs \approx_{4\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$ for some μ where (x, s) is immediate points in the algorithms

- $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1}\delta_s\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, and $\|\text{diag}(\tau)^{-1}\delta_\tau\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq 2\epsilon$ where δ_x , δ_s and δ_τ is the change of x , s and τ in one iteration and $\|x\|_{\tau+\infty} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|x\|_\infty + C_{\text{norm}}\|x\|_\tau$ for $C_{\text{norm}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{10}{\alpha}$ (See Section 5.1).

Remark 6. We will take $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly} \log(n)$.

Note that the complexity of Theorem 5 depends on the cost of implementing Lines 5, 6, 12, and 13 of Algorithm 1, as well as the cost of Algorithm 10. Here Lines 5, 12 and 13 ask us to maintain an approximation of the primal dual solution pair (x, s) . A data-structure for this task is presented in Section 4.2. Additionally, to compute Lines 12 and 13, we must have access to an approximate inverse of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$ (see Line 10). The task of maintaining this inverse will be performed by the data-structure presented in Section 4.4. At last, consider Line 6. To implement this line, we must have an approximation of the leverage scores $\tau(x, s)$. In Section 4.3, we present a data-structure that can efficiently maintain such an approximation.

To help us analyze the cost of Algorithm 10, we prove the following in Section B.

Theorem 7 (Maintain Feasibility). *The additional amortized cost of calling MAINTAINFEASIBILITY in Line 15 of Algorithm 1 is $\tilde{O}(nd^{0.5} + d^{2.5}/\epsilon^2)$ per call, plus the cost of querying $\tilde{O}(n/\sqrt{d} + d^{1.5}/\epsilon^2)$ entries of x and s (assuming x, s are given implicitly, e.g. via some data structure).*

4.2 Vector Data Structure

Consider an online sequence of $n \times n$ diagonal matrices $\mathbf{G}^{(1)}, \mathbf{G}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{G}^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and vectors $h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\delta^{(1)}, \dots, \delta^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define $y^{(t+1)} := \sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}$. In this subsection we describe a data-structure that can efficiently maintain an approximation $\bar{y}^{(t)} \approx_\epsilon y^{(t)}$, when the relative changes $\|(\mathbf{Y}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}\|_2$ and $\|(\mathbf{Y}^{(k)})^{-1} \delta^{(k)}\|_2$ are small. This is motivated by the following requirement of our IPM: we must maintain a multiplicative approximation of a sequence of vectors $x^{(t)}, s^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (see Line 5 of Algorithm 1), where $x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \delta_x^{(k)}$, $s^{(k+1)} = s^{(k)} + \delta_s^{(k)}$ and the terms $\delta_x^{(k)}$ and $\delta_s^{(k)}$ are roughly of the form (see Lines 12 and 13 of Algorithm 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x^{(k)} &= (1 + 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}^{(k)}) \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{1/2} v^{(k)}, \\ \delta_s^{(k)} &= (1 - 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{1/2} v^{(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

To maintain an approximation of $x^{(t)}$, we can then use the data-structure for maintaining an approximation of $y^{(t)}$ by choosing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} &= (1 + 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{-1/2}, \\ h^{(k)} &= -\mathbf{Q}^{(k)} \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{1/2} v^{(k)}, \\ \delta^{(k)} &= \left(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} \right)^{1/2} v^{(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we can maintain an approximation of $s^{(t)}$ by a slightly different choice of parameters. The exact result, which we prove in Section 6, is the following Theorem 8:

Theorem 8 (Vector Maintenance). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 6), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE*($\mathbf{A}, g, x^{(0)}, \epsilon$): Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, initial vector $x^{(0)}$, and target accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^5 n)$ time.

- $\text{SCALE}(i, u)$: Given $i \in [n]$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ sets $g_i = u$ in $O(d \log^5 n)$ amortized time.
- $\text{QUERY}(h^{(t)}, \delta^{(t)})$: Let $g^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the scale vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ during t -th call to QUERY and let $h^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \delta^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vectors given during that query. Define

$$x^{(t)} = x^{(0)} + \sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \sum_{k \in [t]} \delta^{(k)}.$$

Then, w.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y \approx_\epsilon x^{(t)}$. Furthermore, the total cost over T steps is

$$O \left(T \left(n \log n + \sum_{k \in [T]} \left(\left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \delta^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \right) \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^6 n \right) \right).$$

- $\text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i)$: Output $x_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ exactly in amortized time $O(d \log n)$.

4.3 Leverage Score Maintenance

The IPM of Theorem 5, requires approximate leverage scores of some matrix of the form $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}$, where \mathbf{G} is a diagonal matrix (see Line 6 of Algorithm 1, where $\mathbf{G} = (\overline{\mathbf{X}}/\overline{\mathbf{S}})^{1/2}$). Here the matrix \mathbf{G} changes slowly from one iteration of the IPM to the next one, which allows us to create a data-structure that can maintain the scores more efficiently than recomputing them from scratch every time \mathbf{G} changes. In Section 7 we prove the following result for maintaining leverage scores:

Theorem 9 (Leverage Score Maintenance). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 7), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- $\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, g, \epsilon)$: Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and target accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(nd\epsilon^{-2} \log^4 n)$ time.
- $\text{SCALE}(i, u)$: Given $i \in [n]$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ sets $g_i = u$ in $O(d\epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n)$ time.
- $\text{QUERY}(\Psi^{(t)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)})$: Let $g^{(t)}$ be the vector g during t -th call to QUERY , assume $g^{(t)} \approx_{1/16} g^{(t-1)}$ and define $\mathbf{H}^{(t)} = \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A}$. Given random input-matrices $\Psi^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that

$$\Psi^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(24 \log n)} (\mathbf{H}^{(t)})^{-1}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(24 \log n)} (\mathbf{H}^{(t)})^{-1}.$$

and any randomness used to generate $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)}$ is independent of the randomness used to generate $\Psi^{(t)}$, w.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs a vector $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ independent of $\Psi^{(1)}, \dots, \Psi^{(t)}$ such that $\tilde{\tau}_i \approx_\epsilon \tau_i(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})$ for all $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, the total cost over T steps is

$$O \left(\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \right\|_F \right)^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-4} n \log^7 n + T \left(T_\Psi + \epsilon^{-2} d^2 \log^3 n \right) \right)$$

where T_Ψ is the time required to multiply a vector with $\Psi^{(t)}$ (i.e. in case it is given implicitly via a data structure).

4.4 Inverse Maintenance

For the IPM we must approximately maintain the inverse $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ undergoes changes to the diagonal matrix \mathbf{W} (see Line 10 of Algorithm 1 where $\mathbf{W} = \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}$). By using estimates of the leverage scores of $\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}$ (as maintained by Theorem 9, Section 4.3), we are able to maintain the inverse in amortized $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega - \frac{1}{2}} + d^2)$ time per step, even for $n \gg d$. The exact result is stated as Theorem 10 and proven in Section 8.

Theorem 10 (Inverse Maintenance). *Given a full rank matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with $n \geq d$ and error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, there is a data structure that approximately solves a sequence of linear systems $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} y = b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for positive diagonal matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ through the following operation:*

- *INITIALIZE($\mathbf{A}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\tau}, \epsilon$): Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, shifted leverage score estimates $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, and accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(d^\omega)$ time.*
- *UPDATE($\tilde{w}, \tilde{\tau}$): Output a matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and vector $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ where Ψ^{-1} is close to $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ is close to \tilde{w} .*
- *SOLVE(b, \bar{w}, δ): Input $\bar{w} \approx_1 \tilde{w}$ and $\delta > 0$, output $y = \Psi b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some random matrix $\Psi^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that is close to $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.*

Let $\tau(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})$. Suppose that all estimate shifted leverage scores $\tilde{\tau}_i \in (1 \pm \frac{1}{16 \lceil \log d \rceil}) \tau(w)_i$ for $i \in [n]^3$ and that there is a sequence $w^{(0)}, w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the $w^{(k)}$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \|(\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^{-1} (w^{(k+1)} - w^{(k)})\|_{\tau(w^{(k)})}^2 + \|(\mathbf{T}(w^{(k)}))^{-1} (\tau(w^{(k+1)}) - \tau(w^{(k)}))\|_{\tau(w^{(k)})}^2 \leq O(1) \quad (4.1)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ with $K = n^{O(1)}$. Further assume that the update sequence $\tilde{w}^{(0)}, \tilde{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $\tilde{w}^{(k)} \approx_{\epsilon/(16 \log d)} w^{(k)}$ for all k and the $\tilde{w}^{(k)}$ are independent to the output of UPDATE and SOLVE. (The input $b^{(k)}$ can depend on the previous output of the data structure.) Then, we have the following:

- *The amortized time per call of UPDATE is $O(n + \epsilon^{-2} \cdot (d^{\omega - \frac{1}{2}} + d^2) \cdot \log^{3/2}(n))$.*
- *The time per call of SOLVE is $O(n + \delta^{-2} \cdot d^2 \cdot \log^2(n/\delta))$.*
- *UPDATE outputs some $\Psi, \tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ where $\Psi^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})} \mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})} \approx_\epsilon \tilde{w}$.*
- *SOLVE outputs some $y = \Psi b$ where $\Psi^{-1} \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Psi b] = (\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} b$.*

In general, Theorem 10 does not work against adaptive adversaries, i.e. the input w and $\tilde{\tau}$ to the UPDATE procedure is not allowed to depend on previous outputs. In Section 8 we show, that this algorithm can be improved such that the input w and $\tilde{\tau}$ is allowed to depend on the output of SOLVE. However, the input is still not allowed to depend on the output of UPDATE.

Lemma 11. *Theorem 10 holds even if the input w and $\tilde{\tau}$ of the algorithm depends on the output of SOLVE. Furthermore, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in [K-1]} \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k+1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k+1)} - \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k)} \right\|_F \right] \leq 16K \log^{5/2} n$$

where $\Psi^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}(k)$ is the output of the k -th step of UPDATE($\tilde{w}^{(k)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(k)}$).

³Recall that $\tau(w)_i = (\sqrt{\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}})_{i,i} + \frac{d}{n}, \forall i \in [n]$

4.5 Linear Programming Algorithm

Here we show how to combine the tools from Section 4.1 to 4.4 to obtain a linear program solver that runs in $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ time. First, we give a brief summary of our linear programming algorithm, Algorithm 2. The algorithm consists of two phases. In the first phase we construct a good initial feasible solution, and in the second we move along the central path towards the optimal solution.

The construction of the initial point works as follows: via a simple transformation (stated below as Theorem 12), we obtain a feasible solution pair (x, s) where both x and s are close to the all 1 vector and hence good enough as a point close to the central path of the standard log barrier function. However, we need to find a point such that $xs \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot (\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha}\mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha}\mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}1)$. By picking $x = 1$ and $\mu = 1$, the initial slack s needs to satisfy $s \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}\mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}1$, which (up to the additive $\frac{d}{n}1$) is exactly the condition for ℓ_p Lewis weight with $p = \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$. Cohen and Peng showed that such a vector s can be found efficiently as long as $p \in (0, 4)$ [CP15]. We note that such s might not satisfy $\mathbf{A}y + s = c$. That is why we define $c^{(\text{tmp})} := \mathbf{A}y + s$ for $y = 0$, so that (x, s) is a feasible solution pair for the cost vector $c^{(\text{tmp})}$. In the first phase of Algorithm 2, we move the point (x, s) along the central path of the temporary cost vector $c^{(\text{tmp})}$ and bring the points to a location where we can switch the cost $c^{(\text{tmp})}$ to c without violating the centrality conditions. This is how we obtain our feasible starting point for the cost vector c . In the subsequent second phase, we move along the path for the cost c until it is close to the optimal solution.

Moving along these two paths of the first and second phase is performed via the IPM of Algorithm 1 (Section 4.1, Theorem 5). Note that Algorithm 1 does not specify in Line 5 how to obtain the approximate solution pair (\bar{x}, \bar{s}) , so we must implement this step on our own. Likewise, we must specify how to efficiently compute the steps in Lines 12 and 13. These implementations can be found in the second part of Algorithm 2. The high-level idea is to use the data-structures presented in Section 4.2 to 4.4.

To illustrate, consider Line 13 of Algorithm 1, which computes

$$s \leftarrow s + (1 - 2\alpha)\overline{\mathbf{S}}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Q}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}h$$

for $\overline{\mathbf{W}} = \overline{\mathbf{X}}\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}\overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\overline{\mathbf{X}}^{-1/2}\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$ for $\mathbf{H} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}\overline{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A}$. We split this task into three parts: (i) compute $r := \mathbf{A}^\top\overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2}\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}h$, (ii) compute $v := \mathbf{H}^{-1}r$, and (iii) compute $(1 - 2\alpha)\overline{\mathbf{S}}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2}\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}\overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2}\mathbf{A}v = (1 - 2\alpha)\mathbf{A}v$. Part (i), the vector r , can be maintained efficiently, because we maintain the approximate solutions \bar{x}, \bar{s} (thus also \bar{w}) and vector h , (by Algorithm 12, Theorem 60, of Section D) in such a way, that per iteration only few entries change on average. Part (ii) is solved by the inverse maintenance data-structure of Section 4.4 (Theorem 10). The last part (iii) is solved implicitly by the data-structure of Section 4.2 (Theorem 8), which is also used to obtain the approximate solutions \bar{x}, \bar{s} in Line 5 of Algorithm 1. We additionally run the data-structure of Section 4.3 (Theorem 9) in parallel, to maintain an approximation of the leverage scores, which allows us to find the approximation \bar{v} required in Line 6. These modifications to Algorithm 1 are given in the second part of Algorithm 2.

The following theorem shows how to reduce solving any bounded linear program to solving a linear program with a non-degenerate constrain matrix and an explicit initial primal and dual interior point. This theorem is proven in Appendix C.

Theorem 12 (Initial Point). *Consider linear program $\min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x=b, x \geq 0} c^\top x$ with n variables and d constraints. Assume that*

1. *Diameter of the polytope : For any $x \geq 0$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$, we have that $\|x\|_2 \leq R$.*
2. *Lipschitz constant of the linear program : $\|c\|_2 \leq L$.*
3. *The constraint matrix \mathbf{A} is non-degenerate.*

Algorithm 2: LP Algorithm (based on Algorithm 1)

```

1 global variables
2    $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \mu > 0$ 
3    $D_{\text{INVERSE}};$  // Inverse Maintenance data structure (Theorem 10)
4    $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}, D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)};$  // Matrix Vector Maintenance data structure (Theorem 8)
5    $D_{\text{LEVERAGE}};$  // Leverage Score Maintenance data structure (Theorem 9)
6    $D_{\text{GRADIENT}};$  // Gradient Maintenance data structure (Theorem 60)
7    $\bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n;$  //  $\bar{\tau}_{\gamma/8} \approx (\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1})$ 

   /* The following parameters are the same as in Theorem 5 */
8    $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/(4 \log(4n/d));$  // Maintain  $\mathbf{X}s \approx_{\epsilon} \mu \cdot (\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1})$ 
9    $\epsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha}{16000};$  // Distance to the central path
10   $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(\frac{2^{16} n \sqrt{d}}{\alpha^2}), \gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(\epsilon/4, \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda});$  // Potential parameter  $\lambda$  and step size  $\gamma$ 

11 procedure SOLVE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, b \in \mathbb{R}^n, c \in \mathbb{R}^d, \delta > 0$ )
   /* Initialize data structures and initial primal dual points  $(x, s)$  */
12  Modify the LP and obtain an initial  $x, y$  and  $s$  by Lemma 12 to accuracy  $\delta/8n^2$ 

   /* For notational simplicity, we use  $\mathbf{A}, b, c, n, d$  for the modified LP
      induced by Lemma 12 in the remainder of the code. */
13  Use Theorem 13 to compute  $s$  such that  $s \approx_{\epsilon} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$ 
14   $\tau \leftarrow s, \mu \leftarrow 1;$  // Since  $x = 1$  (Lemma 12),  $\mathbf{X}s \approx_{\epsilon} \mu \tau$ 
15   $D_{\text{INVERSE}}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha} x^{1-2\alpha}, \tau, \gamma/512 \log n)$ 
16   $D_{\text{LEVERAGE}}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha} x^{1-2\alpha}, \gamma/8)$ 
17   $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{S}^{-1} x, x, \gamma/8), D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, 1, s, \gamma/8)$ 
18   $D_{\text{GRADIENT}}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, \mu \tau / (xs), \tau, x, \gamma);$  // Theorem 60

   /* Find the "center" of the linear program with  $(\mathbf{A}, b, \mathbf{A}y + s)$  */
19   $c^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow s;$  // This is same as  $c^{(\text{tmp})} = \mathbf{A}y + s$  for  $y = 0$ 
20   $x, s, \bar{\tau}, \mu \leftarrow \text{CENTERING}(x, s, \tau, \mu, \Theta(n^2 \sqrt{d}/(\gamma \alpha^2)));$  // This keeps  $\mathbf{A}y + s$  unchanged.

   /* Switch central path from  $c^{(\text{tmp})}$  to  $c$  */
21   $s^{(\text{new})} \leftarrow s + c - c^{(\text{tmp})};$  // This is the same as  $s \leftarrow c - (\mathbf{A}y + s)$  for current  $y$ 
22   $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, 1, s^{(\text{new})}, \gamma/8)$ 

   /* Solve the linear program with  $(\mathbf{A}, b, c)$  */
23   $x, s, \bar{\tau}, \mu \leftarrow \text{CENTERING}(x, s, \bar{\tau}, \mu, \delta^2/(8^3 n^4 d))$ 

   /* Output the solution */
24  Decrease  $\frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathbf{A}^{\top} x - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^{\top} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2$  to small enough  $O(\delta/n^2)$  via Corollary 57
25  Return an approximate solution of the original linear program according to Lemma 12

```

For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, the modified linear program $\min_{\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} = \bar{b}, \bar{x} \geq 0} \bar{c}^\top \bar{x}$ with

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & 1_n \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ 0 & 1 \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ \frac{1}{R} b^\top - 1_n^\top \mathbf{A} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+2) \times (d+1)},$$

$$\bar{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{R} b \\ (n+1) \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \text{ and } \bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$$

satisfies the following:

- $\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_d \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\bar{s} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n + \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ are feasible primal dual vectors.

- Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ be primal dual vectors of the modified LP and $\Phi_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} - \bar{b}\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}^2$, then

$$\|\bar{x}\|_\infty \leq (1 + O(\Phi_b)) \cdot O(n).$$

- Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ be primal dual vectors of the modified LP with $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s} \approx_{0.5} \mu \cdot \tau(\bar{x}, \bar{s})$ for $\mu < \delta^2 / (8d)$ and small enough $\Phi_b := \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} - \bar{b}\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}^2 = O(1)$ (i.e. \bar{x} does not have to be feasible).

The vector $\hat{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cdot \bar{x}_{1:n}$ where $\bar{x}_{1:n}$ is the first n coordinates of \bar{x} is an approximate solution to the original linear program in the following sense

$$c^\top \hat{x} \leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + O(nLR) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta),$$

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2 \leq O(n^2) \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta),$$

$$\hat{x} \geq 0.$$

As outlined before, the initial points given in Theorem 12 do not satisfy

$$xs \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot (\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1).$$

To satisfy this condition we pick $x = 1$ and $\mu = 1$, and pick the initial slack vector s to satisfy $s \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1$, which is exactly the condition for ℓ_p Lewis weight with $p = \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$. The following theorem shows that such a vector s can be found efficiently as long as $p \in (0, 4)$. This vector s might not be a valid slack vector, so as outlined before, the algorithm runs in two phases: first using a cost vector $c^{(tmp)}$ for which the initial s is feasible, and then switching to the correct c .

Theorem 13 ([CP15]). *Given $p \in (0, 4)$, $\eta > 0$ and non-degenerate $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ w.h.p. in n , we can compute $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ with $w \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{A}) + \eta 1$ in $\tilde{O}((\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega) \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ time.*

Proof. Our proof is similar to [CP15], which proved a variant when $\eta = 0$. Consider the map $T(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{W}^{\frac{2}{p}-1} (\sigma(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{A}) + \eta 1))^{p/2}$. Further, fix any positive vectors $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $v \approx_\alpha w$. We have that $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{A} \approx_{|1-\frac{2}{p}| \alpha} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A}$ and hence

$$a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i \approx_{|1-\frac{2}{p}| \alpha} a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i. \quad (4.2)$$

Note that

$$T(v)_i^{2/p} = \frac{v_i^{1-\frac{2}{p}} a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i + \eta}{v_i^{1-\frac{2}{p}}} = a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i + \eta v_i^{\frac{2}{p}-1}.$$

Using (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(v)_i^{2/p} &\leq e^{|1-\frac{2}{p}|\alpha} a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i + \eta v_i^{\frac{2}{p}-1} \\ &\leq e^{|1-\frac{2}{p}|\alpha} (a_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} a_i + \eta w_i^{\frac{2}{p}-1}) = e^{|1-\frac{2}{p}|\alpha} T(w)_i^{2/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $T(v)_i^{2/p} \geq e^{-|1-\frac{2}{p}|\alpha} T(w)_i^{2/p}$. Taking $p/2$ power of both sides, we have

$$e^{-|\frac{p}{2}-1|\alpha} T(w)_i \leq T(v)_i \leq e^{|\frac{p}{2}-1|\alpha} T(w)_i.$$

Hence, $T(v) \approx_{|p/2-1|\alpha} T(w)$.

Consequently, let $w_0 = \eta \mathbf{1}$ and consider the algorithm $w_{k+1} = T(w_k)$. Since $\eta > 0$ we have that

$$w_0 = w_0 \eta^{-p/2} \eta^{p/2} \leq T(w_0) \leq w_0 \eta^{-p/2} (1 + \eta)^{p/2} \leq w_0 \exp(p\eta^{-1}/2).$$

Consequently, $T(w_0) \approx_{p\eta^{-1}/2} w_0$ and after k steps we have that $T(w_k) \approx_{\exp(|p/2-1|k p \eta^{-1}/2)} w_k$. Since for $p \in (0, 4)$, we have that $|p/2 - 1| < 1$ we see that after $O(\log(\eta^{-1}/\epsilon))$ steps we have $w_k \approx_\epsilon T(w_k)$. Further, since $w_k \geq \eta \mathbf{1}$ implies that $T(w_k) \geq \eta \mathbf{1}$ we have that $w_k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ as desired. To implement the steps, one can check, by the same proof, that it suffices to get a $\approx_{O(\epsilon)}$ multiplicative approximation to $T(w)$ in each step, which can be done in $\tilde{O}((\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega)/\epsilon^2)$ per step by standard leverage score estimation techniques. \square

Now, we first prove the correctness of the Algorithm 2.

Lemma 14. *Algorithm 2 outputs x such that w.h.p. in n*

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top x &\leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + LR \cdot \delta, \\ \|\mathbf{A}^\top x - b\|_2 &\leq \delta \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F \cdot R + \|b\|_2), \\ x &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We define the primal dual point (x, s) via the formula of lines 12 and 13. We start by showing that our implementation of Algorithm 1 in Algorithm 2 satisfies all required conditions, i.e. that we can apply Theorem 5. Throughout this proof, states hold only w.h.p. and therefore the restatement of this is often omitted for brevity.

Invariant: $\bar{x} \approx_{\gamma/4} x$, $\bar{s} \approx_{\gamma/4} s$, $\bar{\tau} \approx_{\gamma/4} \sigma(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2-\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$ and $\Psi_{(\text{safe})} \approx_\epsilon (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$: We first show that throughout CENTERING, we have the invariant above, assuming the input parameter $\tau_i^{(\text{init})}$ satisfied $\tau_i^{(\text{init})} \approx_{\gamma/4} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$. Theorem 8 shows that $x^{(\text{tmp})} \approx_{\gamma/8} x$ and $s^{(\text{tmp})} \approx_{\gamma/8} s$ (Line 42 and 43). Then, by the update rule (Line 29 and 30), we have that $x^{(\text{tmp})} \approx_{\gamma/8} \bar{x}$ and $s^{(\text{tmp})} \approx_{\gamma/8} \bar{s}$. Hence, we have the desired approximation for \bar{x} and \bar{s} .

Next, Theorem 10 shows that

- $\Psi^{(\alpha)} \approx_{\gamma/(512 \log n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1-2\alpha} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ (Line 15) and

- $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)} \approx_{\gamma/(512 \log n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1-2\alpha} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ (Line 39).

Hence, we can apply Theorem 9 and get

$$\tau^{(\text{tmp})} \approx_{\gamma/8} \sigma(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2-\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1$$

(Line 16 and Line 44). Again, by update rule (Line 31), we have the desired approximation for $\bar{\tau}$.

Finally, $\Psi_{(\text{safe})} \approx_\epsilon (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ follows from Theorem 10 (Line 40). These invariants also imply $\|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty \leq \gamma$ and that D_{Gradient} (Theorem 60) maintains $\nabla \Phi(\bar{v}')^{b(\bar{\tau})}$ for some $\|\bar{v}' - v\|_\infty \leq \gamma$. Thus, in summary, CENTERING of Algorithm 2 behaves like CENTERING of Theorem 5.

Invariant: $xs \approx \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$: Initially, $x = 1$ due to the reduction (Lemma 12), $\mu = 1$ and $s \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1$ (Line 13). Hence, $xs \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot (\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1)$ initially.

We change x, s, μ in Line 20 by calling CENTERING. By Theorem 5 we then have $xs \approx_\epsilon \mu \tau$ after this call to CENTERING. Next, consider the step where we switch the cost vector on Line 21. Let $s^{(\text{new})}$ be the vector s after Line 21 and s is before Line 21. Since $\mathbf{A}y + s = c^{(\text{tmp})}$ we have that $\mathbf{A}y + s^{(\text{new})} = c^{(\text{tmp})} - s + s^{(\text{new})} = c$, i.e. s is a valid slack vector for cost c . Further, we have that, by design

$$\frac{s^{(\text{new})} - s}{s} = \frac{c - c^{(\text{tmp})}}{s}.$$

First, we bound the denominator. We have that $xs \approx_{1/2} \mu \tau$, so for all $i \in [n]$ we have

$$s_i \geq \frac{\mu}{2x_i} \frac{d}{n} \geq \frac{\mu}{\Omega(n^2)}$$

where we used $\|x\|_\infty \leq O(n)$ by Lemma 12 as we ensure x is sufficiently close to feasible for the modified linear program by Theorem 5. For the numerator, we note that $\|c\|_\infty \leq 1$ for the modified linear program and $\|c^{(\text{tmp})}\|_\infty = \|s\|_\infty \leq 3$ for the s computed by Theorem 13 in Line 13. again by the definition of s (Line 13) and the modified \mathbf{A} and y . Hence, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{s^{(\text{new})} - s}{s} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{16n^2}{\mu} \leq \frac{\gamma \alpha^2}{c \cdot \sqrt{d}}.$$

for any constant c by choosing the constant in the $O(\cdot)$ in Line 20 appropriately. Thus $xs \approx_{2\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$ and $\bar{\tau} \approx_{\gamma/4} \sigma(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2-\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} 1$, so when we call CENTERING in Line 23, we again obtain $xs \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$.

Conclusion: Before the algorithm ends, we have $xs \approx_{1/4} \mu \tau$. In Line 24, we reduce $\Phi_b := \|\mathbf{A}^\top x - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2$ to some small enough $\Phi_b = O(\delta/n^2)$. By Corollary 57 this does not move the vector x too much, i.e. we still have $x \cdot s \approx_{1/2} \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$. Hence, by the choice of the new μ in Line 23, Lemma 12 shows that we can output a point \hat{x} with the desired properties. \square

Finally, we analyze the cost of the Algorithm 2.

Lemma 15. *Algorithm 2 takes $O((nd + d^3) \log^{O(1)} n \log(n/\delta))$ time with high probability in n .*

Proof. For simplicity, we use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to suppress all terms that are $\log^{O(1)} n$. We first note that all parameters $\alpha, \epsilon, \lambda, \gamma$ are either $\log^{O(1)} n$ or $1/\log^{O(1)} n$. The cost of Algorithm 2 is dominated by the repeated calls to CENTERING.

Number of iterations: By Theorem 5 the calls to CENTERING in Lines 20 and 23 perform $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d} \log(1/\delta))$ many iterations in total.

Cost of D_{Inverse} : Note that $\|\tau^{-1}\delta_\tau\|_{\tau+\infty} = 2\epsilon$, $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1}\delta_s\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \epsilon/2$, and $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \epsilon/2$ by Theorem 5. Hence, the weight of the vector $w = \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha}x^{1-2\alpha}$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{W}^{-1}\delta_w\|_\tau = O(\epsilon)$. Note however, that we need $D_{\text{INVERSE.UPDATE}}$ to compute the inverse with accuracy $O(\gamma/\log n)$ and hence Theorem 10 requires the relative movement of w to be less than $\gamma/\log n$. This can be fixed by splitting the step into $\tilde{O}(1)$ pieces. Now, Theorem 10 shows that the total cost is $\tilde{O}(d^\omega + \sqrt{d} \log(1/\delta)(n + d^{\omega-\frac{1}{2}} + d^2)) = \tilde{O}((\sqrt{d}n + d^\omega + d^{2.5}) \log(1/\delta))$ where the term d^ω is the initial cost and $d^{\omega-\frac{1}{2}} + d^2$ is the amortized cost per step. Note that the solver runs with accuracy $\tilde{O}(d^{-1/4})$ so the total time for all calls to $D_{\text{INVERSE.SOLVE}}$ will be $\tilde{O}((\sqrt{d}n + d^3) \log(1/\delta))$.

Cost of D_{Leverage} : By Lemma 11, the total movement of the projection matrix is

$$\sum_{k \in [K-1]} \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F = \tilde{O}(K)$$

where K is the number of steps and $w = \mathbf{S}^{-1-2\alpha}x^{1-2\alpha}$. Then, Theorem 9 shows that the total cost is $O(\frac{n}{d}K^2 \cdot d) = O(nK^2) = O(nd \log^2(1/\delta))$.

Cost of $D_{\text{MatVec}}^{(x)}$ and $D_{\text{MatVec}}^{(s)}$: By Theorem 8, the total cost for $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}$ is bounded by $\tilde{O}(K^2 \max \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_2^2 \cdot d + Kn)$ where $\max \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_2^2$ is the maximum movement in one step in ℓ_2 -norm. Note that $\tau \geq \frac{d}{n}$ and hence $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_2^2 \leq \frac{n}{d} \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_\tau^2 = \tilde{O}(\frac{n}{d})$. Hence, we have that the cost is $\tilde{O}(d \log^2(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{n}{d} \cdot d) = \tilde{O}(nd)$. The bound for $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}$ is the same.

Cost of maintaining $\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}h$ (D_{Gradient}): The cost of maintaining $\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}h$ is exactly equals to d times the number of coordinates changes in $\bar{x}, \bar{s}, \bar{\tau}$. Note that we change the exact x, s, τ by at most around $(1 \pm \gamma/8)$ multiplicative factor in every step. So, the total number of entry changes performed to $\bar{x}, \bar{s}, \bar{\tau}$ is bounded by $\tilde{O}(K^2 (\max \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_2^2 + \max \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}\delta_s\|_2^2 + \max \|\tau^{-1}\delta_\tau\|_2^2))$, where \max refers to the maximum movement in any step in ℓ_2 -norm. As we showed before, all the movement terms are bounded by $\tilde{O}(\frac{n}{d})$ (see the paragraphs regarding $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}$, $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}$, and D_{INVERSE}). So in total there are $\tilde{O}(n \log^2(1/\delta))$ many entry changes we perform to $\bar{x}, \bar{s}, \bar{\tau}$. Hence, the total cost of maintenance is again $\tilde{O}(nd \log^2(1/\delta))$.

Cost of implementing MaintainFeasibility (Algorithm 10): By Theorem 7 we pay $\tilde{O}(nd^{0.5} + d^{2.5})$ amortized time per call to MAINTAINFEASIBILITY. Additionally, we must compute $\tilde{O}(n/\sqrt{d} + d^{1.5})$ entries of x in each iteration (i.e. call $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}. \text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i)$), which costs $\tilde{O}(d)$ per call, so we have total cost of $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ after $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations.

Removing the extra $\log(1/\delta)$ term: We note that all the extra $\log(1/\delta)$ terms are due to running the data structures for $\sqrt{d} \log(1/\delta)$ steps. However, we can we reinitialize the data structures every \sqrt{d} iterations. This decreases the K dependence from K^2 to $K\sqrt{d}$.

Independence and Adaptive Adversaries: Randomized data-structures often can not handle inputs that depend on outputs of the previous iteration. For example Theorem 10 is such a case, where the input to UPDATE is not allowed to depend on the output of any previous calls to UPDATE. In our Algorithm 2 the input to the data-structures inherently depends on their previous output, so here we want to verify that this does not cause any issues.

The data-structures $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}$ and $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}$ are given by Theorem 8, which explicitly states that the data-structure works against adaptive adversaries. This means, that the input is allowed to depend on the output of previous iterations. Likewise, D_{LEVERAGE} works against adaptive adversaries by Theorem 9 (provided the input $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)}$ are chosen by randomness independent of the randomness chosen for $\Psi^{(\alpha)}$ which is the case by Lemma 11). The only issue is with D_{INVERSE} (given by Theorem 10), where the input $w, \tilde{\tau}$ to UPDATE is not allowed to depend on the output of previous calls to UPDATE (however, w and $\tilde{\tau}$ are allowed to depend on the output of SOLVE by Lemma 11). Also note, that the inputs \bar{w}, b, δ to SOLVE are allowed to depend on any previous output of UPDATE and SOLVE, as Theorem 10 only has issues with the inputs w and $\tilde{\tau}$ to UPDATE. So to show that our algorithm works, we are only left with verifying that the input $w, \tilde{\tau}$ to UPDATE does not depend on previous results of UPDATE. Let us prove this by induction.

The result of UPDATE is $\Psi^{(\alpha)} \leftarrow D_{\text{INVERSE}} \cdot \text{UPDATE}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1-2\alpha} \bar{x}^{1-2\alpha}, \bar{\tau})$, and when executing this line for the very first time, it can obviously not depend on a previous output yet. The matrix $\Psi^{(\alpha)}$ is only used as input to $D_{\text{LEVERAGE}} \cdot \text{QUERY}(\Psi^{(\alpha)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)})$, but by Theorem 9 the output of this procedure does not depend on $\Psi^{(\alpha)}$. Hence $\Psi^{(\alpha)}$ does not affect anything else, which also means the input $\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1-2\alpha} \bar{x}^{1-2\alpha}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ to the next call of $D_{\text{INVERSE}} \cdot \text{UPDATE}$ do not depend on previous $\Psi^{(\alpha)}$. \square

Algorithm 3: LP Algorithm (based on Algorithm 1), Continuation of Algorithm 2.

```

26 procedure CENTERING( $x^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, s^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \tau^{(\text{init})} > 0, \mu^{(\text{init})} > 0, \mu^{(\text{target})} > 0$ )
27    $\mu \leftarrow \mu^{(\text{init})}, \bar{\tau} \leftarrow \tau^{(\text{init})}, \tau^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow \tau^{(\text{init})}, \bar{x} \leftarrow x^{(\text{init})}, x^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow x^{(\text{init})}, \bar{s} \leftarrow s^{(\text{init})},$ 
    $s^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow s^{(\text{init})}$ 
28   while TRUE do
29      $\bar{x}_i = x_i^{(\text{tmp})}$  for all  $i$  such that  $\bar{x}_i \not\approx_{\gamma/8} x_i^{(\text{tmp})}$ ; // Ensure  $\bar{x} \approx_{\gamma/4} x$ 
30      $\bar{s}_i = s_i^{(\text{tmp})}$  for all  $i$  such that  $\bar{s}_i \not\approx_{\gamma/8} s_i^{(\text{tmp})}$ ; // Ensure  $\bar{s} \approx_{\gamma/4} s$ 
31      $\bar{\tau}_i = \tau_i^{(\text{tmp})}$  for all  $i$  such that  $\bar{\tau}_i \not\approx_{\gamma/8} \tau_i^{(\text{tmp})}$ 
32      $\bar{w} \leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{s}, \bar{v} \leftarrow \mu \cdot \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}\bar{\tau}$ ; // Ensure  $\|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty \leq \gamma$  where  $v = \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)/w$ 

   /* Check termination conditions */
33   Let  $\Phi(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exp(\lambda(v-1)) + \exp(-\lambda(v-1))$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
34   if  $\mu = \mu^{(\text{target})}$  and  $\Phi(\bar{v}) \leq \frac{2^{16}n\sqrt{d}}{\alpha^2}$  then break;

   /* Update  $h = \gamma \nabla \Phi(\bar{v})^b$ ,  $r = \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}h$  (See Lemma 28 for  $(\cdot)^b$  definition) */
35    $D_{\text{GRADIENT}}.\text{UPDATE}(i, \bar{v}_i, \bar{\tau}_i, \bar{x}_i)$  for  $i$  where  $\bar{v}_i, \bar{\tau}_i$  or  $\bar{x}_i$  changed
36    $h, r \leftarrow D_{\text{GRADIENT}}.\text{QUERY}()$ 

   /* Pick any  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $\mathbf{H} \approx_{(c\epsilon)/(d^{1/4} \log^3 n)} \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$  */
   /* Let  $\mathbf{Q} = \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}$  */
   /* Update the inverse,  $\Psi^{(\alpha)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)} \approx_\epsilon (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1-2\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1-2\alpha} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$  and
      $\Psi_{(\text{safe})} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \approx_{c\epsilon/(d^{1/4} \log^3 n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$  */
37    $\Psi^{(\alpha)}, g \leftarrow D_{\text{INVERSE}}.\text{UPDATE}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1-2\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1-2\alpha}, \bar{\tau})$  // Update the approximate
   inverse
38    $D_{\text{LEVERAGE}}.\text{UPDATE}(\sqrt{g})$ ; // Only scale coordinates where  $g$  changed.
   //  $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}$  are implicit representations of calls to  $D_{\text{INVERSE}}.\text{SOLVE}$ 
39    $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)}(b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\text{INVERSE}}.\text{SOLVE}(b, \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1-2\alpha} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1-2\alpha}, \gamma/512 \log n)$ 
40    $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}(b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\text{INVERSE}}.\text{SOLVE}(b, \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}, (c\epsilon)/(d^{1/4} \log^3 n))$ 

   /*  $x \leftarrow x + (1+2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$ ,  $s \leftarrow s + (1-2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{S}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$  */
41    $D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}.\text{SCALE}(\bar{x}/\bar{s})$ ; // Only scale coordinates where  $\bar{x}$  or  $\bar{s}$  changed.
42    $x^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}.\text{QUERY}((1+2\alpha) \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)} r, (1+2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}} h)$ 
43    $s^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}.\text{QUERY}((1-2\alpha) \Psi_{(\text{safe})} r, 0_n)$ 
44    $\tau^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow D_{\text{LEVERAGE}}.\text{QUERY}(\Psi^{(\alpha)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(\alpha)})$ 
45    $\delta_\lambda \leftarrow \text{MAINTAINFEASIBILITY}(D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}, D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}; \mu)$ ; // Algorithm 10
46    $x^{(\text{tmp})} \leftarrow D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}.\text{QUERY}(\delta_\lambda, 0)$ 
47   if  $\mu > \mu^{(\text{target})}$  then  $\mu \leftarrow \max(\mu^{(\text{target})}, (1 - \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}})\mu)$ ;
48   else if  $\mu < \mu^{(\text{target})}$  then  $\mu \leftarrow \min(\mu^{(\text{target})}, (1 + \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}})\mu)$ ;
49    $x \leftarrow D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(x)}.\text{COMPUTEEXACT}(1, \dots, n), s \leftarrow D_{\text{MATVEC}}^{(s)}.\text{COMPUTEEXACT}(1, \dots, n)$ 
50   return  $(x, s, \tau^{(\text{tmp})}, \mu)$ 

```

5 Robust Primal Dual LS-Path Following

Here we provide our stable primal-dual $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ -iteration primal-dual IPM for solving (1.1). In particular we provide the main subroutines for making progress along the central path as discussed in Section 2.1 and prove Theorem 1 given in Section 4.1.

As discussed we assume throughout that \mathbf{A} is *non-degenerate*, meaning it has full-column rank and no zero rows and consider the primal dual central path (2.1) induced by the weight function $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n} \mathbf{1}$ where $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Diag}(x)$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{Diag}(s)$ (See Definition 4).

Rather than precisely following the central path, we follow the approach of [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20] and instead follow it approximately. The primary goal of this section is to design an efficient primal dual IPM that only maintains x , s , $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}$, and $\tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ multiplicatively and yet converges in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations.

Our algorithms maintain a near feasible point $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ (see Definition 3) and attempt to improve the quality of this point with respect to the central path. Formally, we consider the vector $w = \mathbf{X}s$, and then attempt to make $w \approx \mu \cdot \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. We measure this quality of approximation or *centrality* as follows.

Definition 16 ((μ, ϵ) -centered point). We say that point $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is (μ, ϵ) -centered if $\mu > 0$ and $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}s$ for $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Diag}(w)$ satisfies $w \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$.

Similar to previous papers [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20] our algorithms measure progress or the quality of this approximation by

$$\Phi(x, s, \mu) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(\mu \cdot \tau_i \cdot w_i^{-1}) \quad \text{with } \phi(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exp(\lambda(v-1)) + \exp(-\lambda(v-1))$$

for a setting of $\lambda = 2\epsilon^{-1} \log(2^{16} n \sqrt{d} \alpha^{-2})$ we derive later. In contrast to these recent papers, here our potential function does not depend solely on w as x and s are used to determine the value of τ . For notational convenience, we often let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vector with $v_i = \mu \cdot \tau_i \cdot w_i^{-1}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and overload notation letting $\Phi(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(v_i)$.

To update our points and improve the potential we consider attempting to move w in some direction h suggested by $\nabla \Phi(v)$. To do so we solve for $\delta_s, \delta_x, \delta_y$ satisfying the following

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}}\delta_s + \bar{\mathbf{S}}\delta_x = \bar{\mathbf{W}}h, \quad \mathbf{A}^\top \delta_x = 0, \quad \text{and } \mathbf{A}\delta_y + \delta_s = 0$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\mathbf{S}}$. Solving this system of equations, we have

$$\delta_x = \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A})) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \quad \text{and } \delta_s = \bar{\mathbf{S}}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h.$$

Often, our algorithms we will not have access to $\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$ exactly and instead we will only have a spectral approximation \mathbf{H} . In these cases we will instead consider $\mathbf{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$ as a replacement for \mathbf{P} . Further, to account for the change due to σ , we slightly change our steps size amounts. Formally, we define our steps as follows:

Definition 17 (Steps). We call (δ_x, δ_s) an ϵ -Newton direction from $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ if $\bar{x} \approx_\epsilon x$, $\bar{s} \approx_\epsilon s$, and $\mathbf{H} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$ with $\epsilon \leq 1/80$, and $\delta_x, \delta_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are given as follows

$$\delta_x = (1 + 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \quad \text{and } \delta_s = (1 - 2\alpha) \bar{\mathbf{S}}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$$

when

$$\mathbf{Q} = \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}.$$

Note that, since we use \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{Q} (rather than a true orthogonal projection) it is not necessarily the case that $\mathbf{A}^\top \delta_x = 0$. Consequently, we will need to take further steps to control this error and this is analyzed in Section B.

Much of the remaining analysis is bounding the effect of such a step and leveraging this analysis to tune ϕ and h . In Section 5.1 we bound the change in the point when we take a Newton step, in Section 5.2 we bound the effect of a Newton step on centrality for arbitrary Φ , and in Section 5.3 we analyze the particular structure of Φ and use this to prove Theorem 1.

5.1 Stability of Weight Changes

Here we bound the change in x and s when we take an Newton step from a centered point. For a point $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ we will wish to analyze the movement both with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ for $\tau = \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. To simplify this analysis we define the following mixed norm $\|\cdot\|_{\tau+\infty}$ by

$$\|x\|_{\tau+\infty} = \|x\|_\infty + C_{\text{norm}} \|x\|_\tau \text{ for } C_{\text{norm}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{10}{\alpha}.$$

Note that by the definition of α we have $C_{\text{norm}} \geq 10$. We leverage this norm extensively in our analysis and make frequent use of the following simple facts about such norms.

Fact 18 (Norm Facts). *For any $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that $\|\mathbf{Diag}(d)\|_{\tau+\infty} = \|d\|_\infty$. For any $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we have $\|\mathbf{M}\|_\tau = \|\mathbf{T}^{1/2} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}^{-1/2}\|_2$ for $\mathbf{T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\tau)$.*

Next, we relate leverage scores of the projection matrix $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{A})$ considered in taking a Newton step to the leverage scores used to measure centrality, i.e. $\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})$.

Lemma 19. *For (μ, ϵ) -centered point (x, s) with $\epsilon \in [0, 1/80)$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) \leq \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}) \leq 2 \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}).$$

Proof. By assumption $w = \mathbf{X}s$ satisfies $w \approx_\epsilon \mu[\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}]$. Since leverage scores lie between 0 and 1, this implies $e^{-\epsilon \frac{d}{n}} \leq \mu^{-1} w \leq e^\epsilon 2$. Consequently $e^{-\alpha \epsilon} 2^{-\alpha} \mathbf{I} \preceq \mu^\alpha \mathbf{W}^{-\alpha} \preceq e^{\alpha \epsilon} (\frac{d}{n})^{-\alpha} \mathbf{I}$ and since $\alpha = 1/(4 \log(4n/d))$ we have that entrywise

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{W}^{-\alpha}) &\geq \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2}) \cdot \frac{e^{-2\alpha \epsilon} 2^{-2\alpha}}{e^{2\alpha \epsilon} (\frac{d}{n})^{-2\alpha}} = \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2}) \cdot e^{-4\alpha \epsilon} (2n/d)^{-2\alpha} \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2})}{e^{1/2+4\alpha \epsilon}} \end{aligned}$$

and analogous calculation shows that

$$\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{W}^{-\alpha}) \leq \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2}) \cdot e^{4\alpha \epsilon} (2n/d)^{2\alpha} \leq \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2}) e^{1/2+4\alpha \epsilon}.$$

The result then follows from the assumption $\epsilon \leq 1/80$. \square

Leveraging Lemma 19 we obtain the following bounds on \mathbf{Q} and $\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$ for Newton directions.

Lemma 20. *Let (δ_x, δ_s) denote an ϵ -Newton direction from (μ, ϵ) -centered (x, s) with $\epsilon \in [0, 1/80)$. Then $\mathbf{Q} \preceq e^{3\epsilon} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{A})$. Further, for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\tau \leq e^{4\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau \text{ and } \|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\tau \leq e^{3\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau.$$

Further, $\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\infty \leq 2 \|h\|_\tau$ and therefore $\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq e^{4\epsilon} + 2/C_{\text{norm}}$.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{H} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$, we have $\mathbf{H}^{-1} \preceq e^\epsilon (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and

$$\mathbf{Q} \preceq e^\epsilon \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} = e^\epsilon \mathbf{P} (\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}) \preceq e^\epsilon \mathbf{I}.$$

Since \mathbf{Q} is PSD this implies $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_2 \leq e^\epsilon$ and since $\bar{w} \approx_{2\epsilon} w$ and $w \approx_\epsilon \mu\tau$ this implies

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\tau \leq e^{1.5\epsilon} \mu^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_2 \leq e^{2.5\epsilon} \mu^{-1/2} \|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_2 \leq e^{4\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau.$$

Similarly, we have $0 \preceq \mathbf{Q} \preceq e^\epsilon \mathbf{I}$ and hence $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\|_2 \leq 1$ (using that $\epsilon \leq 1/80$). Therefore, we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\tau \leq e^{1.5\epsilon} \mu^{-1/2} \|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_2 \leq e^{1.5\epsilon} \mu^{-1/2} \|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_2 \leq e^{3\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau.$$

Further, by Cauchy Schwarz and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}^{1/2}$ we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\infty^2 = \max_{i \in [n]} \left[e_i^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \right]^2 \leq \max_{i \in [n]} \left[\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \right]_{i,i} \cdot \left[h^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \right]$$

Since $\mathbf{Q} \preceq e^\epsilon \mathbf{I}$ we have

$$h^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \leq e^\epsilon h^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}} h \preceq \mu e^{4\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau^2.$$

Further, by $\mathbf{Q} \preceq e^\epsilon \mathbf{P} (\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2}) \preceq e^{3\epsilon} \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2})$ and Lemma 19 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \in [n]} \left[\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \right]_{i,i} &\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{e^{3\epsilon} \sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2})_i}{\bar{w}_i} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{6\epsilon}}{\mu} \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^{1/2})_i}{\tau_i} \\ &\leq \frac{2e^{6\epsilon}}{\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these and using $\epsilon \leq 1/80$ yields the desired bounds. \square

Leveraging Lemma 19 we obtain the following bounds on the multiplicative stability of Newton directions.

Lemma 21. *Let (δ_x, δ_s) denote an ϵ -Newton direction from (μ, ϵ) -centered (x, s) and let $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. Then the following hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\tau &\leq (1 - 2\alpha) e^{5\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau & \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\infty &\leq (1 - 2\alpha) 3 \|h\|_\tau, \\ \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\tau &\leq (1 + 2\alpha) e^{4\epsilon} \|h\|_\tau, \text{ and} & \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty &\leq (1 + 2\alpha) [e^\epsilon \|h\|_\infty + 3 \|h\|_\tau]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s = (1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{S}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{S}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$. Since $s \approx_\epsilon \bar{s}$ and $\bar{w} \approx_{2\epsilon} w$ the bounds on $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\tau$ and $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\infty$ follow immediately from Lemma 18 and Lemma 20.

Similarly, $\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x = (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{X}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h$. Since $\bar{x} \approx_\epsilon x$ and $\bar{w} \approx_{2\epsilon} w$, we have $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} h\|_\tau \leq e^\epsilon \|h\|_\tau$ and $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} h\|_\infty \leq e^\epsilon \|h\|_\infty$. The bounds on $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\tau$ and $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty$ follow by triangle inequality and the same derivation as for $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\tau$ and $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1} \delta_s\|_\infty$. \square

5.2 Newton Step Progress

Here we analyze the effect of a Newton step from a (μ, ϵ) centered point on the potential $\Phi(x, s, \mu)$. We show that up to some additive error on h in the appropriate mixed norm the potential decreases by $\nabla\Phi(v)^\top h$. The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 22. *Let (δ_x, δ_s) denote an ϵ -Newton direction from (μ, ϵ) -centered (x, s) and suppose that $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|h\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha}{4000}$ for $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$. There are $v', e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$\|v' - \mu \mathbf{W}^{-1} \tau\|_\infty \leq 10\gamma \text{ and } \|e\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \gamma$$

such that

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) = \Phi(x, s, \mu) - \nabla\Phi(v')^\top (h + e)$$

where $[\nabla\Phi(v')]_i$ is the derivative of ϕ at $(v')_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

We prove this theorem in multiple steps. First, in Lemma 23 we directly compute the change in the potential function by chain rule and mean value theorem. Then, in Lemma 24 and Lemma 25 we bound the terms in this change of potential formula and use this to provide a formula for the approximate the change in the potential in Lemma 26. Finally, in Lemma 26 we bound this approximate change and use this to prove Theorem 22.

Lemma 23. *In the setting of Theorem 22 for all $t \in [0, 1]$ let $x_t = x + t\delta_x$ and $s_t = s + t\delta_s$. Then for some t_* , we have that*

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) - \Phi(x_0, s_0, \mu) = -\nabla\Phi(v_{t_*})^\top \mathbf{J}_{t_*} h$$

where for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we let $w_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}_t s_t, v_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \tau_t$, $\tau_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x_t, s_t)$, $\mathbf{T}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Diag}(\tau_t)$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{X}_t^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{J}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 2\alpha)\mathbf{J}_t^s + (1 + 2\alpha)\mathbf{J}_t^x$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_t^s &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t \right] \left[\mathbf{I} + (1 + 2\alpha)\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \right] \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{J}_t^x &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t \right] \left[\mathbf{I} - (1 - 2\alpha)\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \right] \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}) \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the mean value theorem, there is $t \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(v_1) - \Phi(v_0) &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\nabla\Phi(\mu \cdot w_t^{-1} \cdot \tau_t) \right]_i \cdot \mu \cdot \left(\frac{1}{[w_t]_i} \frac{d[\tau_t]_i}{dt} - \frac{[\tau_t]_i}{[w_t]_i^2} \frac{d[w_t]_i}{dt} \right) \\ &= \mu \cdot \nabla\Phi(v_t)^\top \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \left(\frac{d\tau_t}{dt} - \mathbf{T}_t \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{dw_t}{dt} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{dw_t}{dt} = \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} [\mathbf{X}_t \delta_s + \mathbf{S}_t \delta_x] = \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \delta_s + \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x$$

and Lemma 46 combined with chain rule implies that

$$\frac{d\tau_t}{dt} = 2\mathbf{\Lambda}_t \left[\mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{X}_t^{1/2-\alpha} \right]^{-1} \cdot \left[\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2-\alpha} x_t^{1/2-\alpha} \right] = \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \left((1 - 2\alpha)\mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x - (1 + 2\alpha)\mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \delta_s \right).$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbf{T}_t \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{dw_t}{dt} - \frac{d\tau_t}{dt} = [\mathbf{T}_t + (1 + 2\alpha)\mathbf{\Lambda}_t] \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \delta_s + [\mathbf{T}_t - (1 - 2\alpha)\mathbf{\Lambda}_t] \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x.$$

Combining yields that

$$\Phi(v_1) - \Phi(v_0) = -\nabla\Phi(v_t)^\top \left[\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t \right] \left(\left[\mathbf{I} + (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \right] \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \delta_s + \left[\mathbf{I} - (1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \right] \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x \right).$$

The result then follows by the definition of δ_s and δ_x . \square

Lemma 24. *In the setting of Lemma 23 for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t \in [0, 1]$, and $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ we have*

$$\|(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I})y\|_\infty \leq (1 - \beta) \|y\|_\infty + \min\{\|y\|_\infty, \|y\|_{\tau_t}\} \text{ and } \|(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I})y\|_{\tau_t} \leq (1 - \beta) \|y\|_{\tau_t}.$$

Consequently, $\|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t\|_{\tau_t + \infty} \leq 1 - \beta + (1 + C_{\text{norm}})^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\mathbf{X}_t^{1/2 - \alpha} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2 - \alpha} \mathbf{A})$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\sigma_t)$, and $\mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}_t^{1/2 - \alpha} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2 - \alpha} \mathbf{A})$. Since $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t = \mathbf{\Sigma}_t - \mathbf{P}_t^{(2)}$, Lemma 45 and $\sigma_t \leq \tau_t$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I})y\|_\infty &\leq \|(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_t - \beta \mathbf{I})y\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{P}_t^{(2)}y\|_\infty \\ &\leq \max\{1 - \beta, \beta\} \|y\|_\infty + \min\{\|y\|_\infty, \|y\|_{\tau_t}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

On the other hand, we know that $\mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \preceq \mathbf{\Sigma}_t \preceq \mathbf{T}_t$ by Lemma 45 and that $\sigma_t \leq \tau_t$. Consequently, $\mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{T}_t^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \mathbf{T}_t^{-1/2} \preceq \mathbf{I}$ and Lemma 18 yields

$$\|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t} \leq \|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t \mathbf{T}_t^{-1/2} - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_2 \leq \max\{1 - \beta, \beta\}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since for all $c \in [0, 1]$ we have $\min\{\|y\|_\infty, \|y\|_{\tau_t}\} \leq c\|y\|_\infty + (1 - c)\|y\|_{\tau_t}$ and $\max\{1 - \beta, \beta\} \leq 1 - \beta$ as $\beta \leq 1/2$ combining (5.1) and (5.2) yields that for all $c \in [0, 1]$ it is the case that

$$\|(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I})y\|_{\tau_t + \infty} \leq (1 - \beta + c)\|y\|_\infty + (1 - c + C_{\text{norm}}(1 - \beta)) \cdot \|y\|_{\tau_t}.$$

Since for $c = 1/(1 + C_{\text{norm}})$ we have $C_{\text{norm}}c = 1 - c$ we have $C_{\text{norm}}(1 - \beta + c) = 1 - c + C_{\text{norm}}(1 - \beta)$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma 25. *In the setting of Lemma 23 we have that $x_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} x_0$ and $s_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} s_0$. Consequently, $\tau_t \approx_{3\epsilon} \tau_0$ and for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have*

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_{\tau_t} \leq e^{10\epsilon} \|h\|_{\tau_t} \text{ and } \|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\infty \leq 2e^{3\epsilon} \|h\|_{\tau_t}.$$

For all $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ we have

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t + \infty} \leq \frac{2e^{3\epsilon}}{C_{\text{norm}}} + e^{6\epsilon}(e^{16\epsilon} - \beta) \leq 2.$$

Proof. By Lemma 21, $C_{\text{norm}} \geq 3$, $\alpha \leq 1/5$, and $\|h\|_{\tau + \infty} \leq \epsilon$ we have

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty \leq (1 + 2\alpha) [e^\epsilon \|h\|_\infty + 3\|h\|_\tau] \leq \frac{7}{5}\epsilon.$$

Consequently, Lemma 47 and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/100)$ implies that $x_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} x_0$ (where we used that $\frac{7}{5}\epsilon + (\frac{7}{5}\epsilon)^2 \leq \frac{3}{2}\epsilon$). Further the same reasoning implies that $s_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} s_0$. Consequently, $\tau_t \approx_{2 \cdot (3/2)\epsilon} \tau_0$. As (x, s) is (μ, ϵ) -centered we have, Lemma 20, $C_{\text{norm}} \geq 10$, and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/100)$ imply that for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_{\tau_t} \leq e^{10\epsilon} \|h\|_{\tau_t} \text{ and } \|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h\|_\infty \leq 2e^{3\epsilon} \|h\|_{\tau_t}. \quad (5.3)$$

Next, since by assumptions $w_0 \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot \tau_0$ and $\bar{w} \approx_{2\epsilon} w_0$ we have that $\bar{w} \approx_{6\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau_t$ and therefore the above implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t} &\leq e^{6\epsilon} \|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_{\bar{w}} = e^{6\epsilon} \|\mathbf{Q} - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_2 \\ &\leq e^{6\epsilon} \max\{\beta, \|\mathbf{Q}\|_2 - \beta\} \leq e^{6\epsilon} \max\{\beta, e^{16\epsilon} - \beta\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Combining (5.3) and (5.4) and using that $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ yields that for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \beta \mathbf{I})h\|_{\tau_t+\infty} &\leq \beta \|h\|_\infty + \left(2e^{3\epsilon} + C_{\text{norm}} e^{6\epsilon} (e^{16\epsilon} - \beta)\right) \|h\|_{\tau_t} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\beta, \frac{2e^{3\epsilon}}{C_{\text{norm}}} + e^{6\epsilon} (e^{16\epsilon} - \beta)\right\} \|h\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from the fact that $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ and the bounds on ϵ and C_{norm} . \square

Lemma 26. *In the setting of Lemma 23 there is a matrix \mathbf{E}_t with $\|\mathbf{E}_t\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 1000\epsilon$ such that*

$$\mathbf{J}_t = \mathbf{I} + \left((1 - 4\alpha^2) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - 2\alpha \mathbf{I}\right) (2\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{E}_t.$$

Proof. By Lemma 25, $x_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} x_0$, $s_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} s_0$, and $\tau_t \approx_{3\epsilon} \tau_0$. By definition of an ϵ -Newton direction this further implies that $x_t \approx_{\frac{5}{2}\epsilon} \bar{x}$ and $s_t \approx_{\frac{5}{2}\epsilon} \bar{s}$. Further, this implies that $w_t \approx_{3\epsilon} w_0$ and since $w_0 \approx_\epsilon \mu \cdot \tau_0$ by definition of (μ, ϵ) -centered this implies that $w_t \approx_{7\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau_t$. Consequently, Fact 18, Lemma 47, and $\epsilon < 1/80$ implies

$$\|\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 8\epsilon, \|\mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 3\epsilon, \text{ and } \|\mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 3\epsilon.$$

Further, $\|\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 2$ by Lemma 25 with $\beta = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 2$ by Lemma 24 with $\beta = 0$. Combining these facts and applying Lemma 18 we have that there are \mathbf{E}_t^s and \mathbf{E}_t^x with $\|\mathbf{E}_t^s\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 500\epsilon$ and $\|\mathbf{E}_t^x\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 500\epsilon$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_t^s &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\mathbf{I} + (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t\right) \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} + \mathbf{E}_t^s \\ \mathbf{J}_t^x &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\mathbf{I} - (1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t\right) (\mathbf{I} - \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}) + \mathbf{E}_t^x \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\mathbf{E}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{E}_t^s + (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{E}_t^x$ and leveraging the definitions of \mathbf{J}_t yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_t &= (1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{J}_t^s + (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{J}_t^x + \mathbf{E}_t \\ &= (1 + 2\alpha) \mathbf{I} - 4\alpha \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - (1 - 4\alpha^2) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t (\mathbf{I} - 2\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2}) + \mathbf{E}_t. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 27. *In the setting of Lemma 26 we have $\|\mathbf{J}_t - \mathbf{E}_t - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 1 - \alpha$.*

Proof. Lemma 26 implies that for $\beta = 2\alpha(1 - 4\alpha^2)^{-1}$

$$\mathbf{J}_t - \mathbf{E}_t - \mathbf{I} = (1 - 4\alpha^2) \left(\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I}\right) (2\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \mathbf{I}).$$

Further, Lemma 24 and $\alpha \in (0, 1/5)$ implies that $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ and therefore

$$\|\mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_t - \beta \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t} \leq 1 - \beta \leq 1 - 2\alpha.$$

Further, Lemma 25 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|2\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Q}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} &\leq 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2}\mathbf{Q}\overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \\ &\leq 2\left(\frac{2e^{3\epsilon}}{C_{\text{norm}}} + e^{6\epsilon}\left(e^{16\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Combining, and using that $\epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha}{4000}$, $\alpha \in [0, 1/5]$, and $C_{\text{norm}} = 10/\alpha$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{J}_t - \mathbf{E}_t - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} &\leq (1 - 4\alpha^2) \cdot (1 - 2\alpha) \cdot 2\left(\frac{2e^{3\epsilon}}{C_{\text{norm}}} + e^{6\epsilon}\left(e^{16\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\leq (1 - 2\alpha) \cdot ((1/2)\alpha + (1 + 0.002\alpha)(2 + .02\alpha - 1)) \leq 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now have everything we need to prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 22. By Lemma 23 we know that

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) - \Phi(x_0, s_0, \mu) = -\nabla\Phi(v_{t_*})^\top \mathbf{J}_{t_*} h$$

where by Lemma 26 and Lemma 26 we know that for some matrix \mathbf{E}_{t_*} with $\|\mathbf{E}_{t_*}\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} \leq 1000\epsilon$ it holds that $\|\mathbf{J}_{t_*} - \mathbf{E}_{t_*} - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} \leq 1 - \alpha$. Hence, we have $\mathbf{J}_{t_*} h = h + e$ where

$$\|e\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} \leq \|(\mathbf{J}_{t_*} - \mathbf{E}_{t_*} - \mathbf{I})h\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} + \|\mathbf{E}_{t_*}h\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} \leq (1 - \alpha + 1000\epsilon)\|h\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty}. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence, we have

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) - \Phi(x_0, s_0, \mu) = -\nabla\Phi(v_{t_*})^\top (h + e).$$

Lemma 21 implies that $x_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} x_0$, $s_t \approx_{\frac{3}{2}\epsilon} s_0$, and $\tau_t \approx_{3\epsilon} \tau_0$. Consequently, $w_t \approx_{3\epsilon} w$ and $v_{t_*} \approx_{6\epsilon} \mu\mathbf{W}^{-1}\tau$. The definition of (μ, ϵ) -centered implies that $\|\mu\mathbf{W}^{-1}\tau - 1\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ and therefore $\|v_{t_*} - \mu\mathbf{W}^{-1}\tau\|_\infty \leq 10\epsilon$. The bound on $\|e\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty}$ follows from (5.5) and $\|h\|_{\tau_{t_*}+\infty} \leq (1 + 5\epsilon)\|h\|_{\tau+\infty}$. □

5.3 Following the Central Path

Here we use the particular structure of Φ to analyze the effect of Newton steps and changing μ on centrality. First we state the following lemma about the potential function from [LS19]. Then we use it to analyze the effect of centering for one step, Lemma 31, and we conclude the section by proving a simplified variant of Theorem 5.

Lemma 28 (Specialized Restatement of Lemma 61 of [LS19]). *For all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$e^{\lambda\|v-1\|_\infty} \leq \Phi(v) \leq 2n \cdot e^{\lambda\|v-1\|_\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda\Phi(v) - 2\lambda n \leq \|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_1 \quad (5.6)$$

Furthermore, let $v^{b(\tau)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq 1} \langle v, w \rangle$ and $\|v\|_* = \max_{\|w\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq 1} \langle v, w \rangle$. Then, for all $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|v - w\|_\infty \leq \delta \leq \frac{1}{5\lambda}$, we have

$$e^{-\lambda\delta} \|\nabla\Phi(w)\|_* - \lambda n \leq \langle \nabla\Phi(v), \nabla\Phi(w)^b \rangle \leq e^{\lambda\delta} \|\nabla\Phi(w)\|_* + \lambda e^{\lambda\delta} n \quad (5.7)$$

and consequently,

$$e^{-\lambda\delta} \|\nabla\Phi(w)\|_* - \lambda n \leq \|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* \leq e^{\lambda\delta} \|\nabla\Phi(w)\|_* + \lambda e^{\lambda\delta} n. \quad (5.8)$$

Remark. When τ is clear from context we also write v^b for $v^{b(\tau)}$.

Here we provide a general lemma bounding how much Φ can increase for a step of bounded size in the mixed norm.

Lemma 29 (Potential Increase). *Let $v_0, v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|v_1 - v_0\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \delta \leq \frac{1}{5\lambda}$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$. Then for $\|\cdot\|_*$, the dual norm to $\|\cdot\|_{\tau+\infty}$ we have $\Phi(v_1) \leq \Phi(v_0) + \delta e^{\delta\lambda} (\|\nabla\Phi(v_0)\|_* + \lambda n)$.*

Proof. For all $t \in [0, 1]$ let $v_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v_0 + t(v_1 - v_0)$. Note, that this implies that $\|v_t - v_0\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq t\delta \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and therefore, integrating and applying Cauchy Schwarz for arbitrary norms (with $\|\cdot\|_*$ as the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_{\tau+\infty}$) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(v_1) - \Phi(v_0) &= \int_0^1 \nabla\Phi(v_t)^\top (v_1 - v_0) dt \leq \int_0^1 \|\nabla\Phi(v_t)\|_* \|v_1 - v_0\| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 e^{\lambda\delta} (\|\nabla\Phi(v_0)\|_* + \lambda n) \delta dt \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we applied (5.8) of Lemma 28 as $t\delta \leq 1/(5\lambda)$. \square

Lemma 30 (Potential Parameter Stability). *Let (x_0, s) be a (μ, ϵ) -centered point and for all $t \in [0, 1]$ let $x_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_0 + t\delta_x$ where $\|\mathbf{X}_0^{-1}\delta_x\|_{\tau_0+\infty} \leq \epsilon \leq 1/100$. If for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we let $w_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}_t s$, $\tau_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x_t, s)$, and $v_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \tau_t$ then $\|v_1 - v_0\|_{\tau_0+\infty} \leq 16\|\mathbf{X}_0^{-1}\delta_x\|_{\tau_0+\infty}$.*

Proof. Following the calculations in Lemma 23 we have that for $\mathbf{T}_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\tau_t)$

$$v_1 - v_0 = \int_0^1 \mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \tau_t - \mathbf{T}_t \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} w_t \right) dt$$

and for $\Lambda_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda(\mathbf{X}_t^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A})$

$$\mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} = \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x \text{ and } \frac{d}{dt} \tau_t = (1 - 2\alpha) \Lambda_t \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x.$$

Consequently,

$$v_1 - v_0 = - \int_0^1 \mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t \left((1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \Lambda_t - \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x dt.$$

Further, since $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_\infty \leq \epsilon \leq 1/(100)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_1 - v_0\|_{\tau_0+\infty} &\leq \int_0^1 \|\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t \left((1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \Lambda_t - \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x\|_{\tau_0+\infty} dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^1 \|\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \|(1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \Lambda_t - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \|\mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x\|_{\tau_t+\infty} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the proof of Lemma 24 shows that $\|(1 - 2\alpha) \mathbf{T}_t^{-1} \Lambda_t - \mathbf{I}\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 2$ and that $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_\infty \leq \epsilon \leq 1/100$ and (x_0, s) is (μ, ϵ) -centered shows that $\|\mu \mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \mathbf{T}_t\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 2$ and $\|\mathbf{X}_t^{-1} \delta_x\|_{\tau_t+\infty} \leq 2$. Combining yields the result. \square

Lemma 31. *Let (δ_x, δ_s) denote an ϵ -Newton direction from (μ, ϵ) -centered (x, s) with $h = \gamma \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^{b(\bar{\tau})}$ for $\bar{\tau} \approx_\epsilon \tau$ and $\|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty \leq \gamma$ for $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \mathbf{W}^{-1} \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ where $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}s$, $\gamma \leq \min\{\epsilon, \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda}\}$, $\epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha}{4000}$, and $\lambda \geq \log n$. Then*

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x + e_x, s + \delta_s, \mu + \delta_\mu) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma\alpha^2\lambda}{640\sqrt{d}}\right) \cdot \Phi(x, s, \mu) + 4\gamma\lambda n$$

for any $\delta_\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\delta_\mu| \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}}\mu$ and $e_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}$.

Proof. Let $\Delta = \Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) - \Phi(x, s, \mu)$. By Theorem 22, we have that for $e, \tau, v' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ given by this theorem it is the case that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= -\nabla\Phi(v')^\top(h + e) \\ &\leq -\gamma \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^{b(\bar{\tau})}, \nabla\Phi(v') \right\rangle + \|\nabla\Phi(v')\|_* \|e\|_{\tau+\infty} \\ &\leq -\gamma e^{-\gamma} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^{b(\tau)}, \nabla\Phi(v') \right\rangle + \|\nabla\Phi(v')\|_* \|e\|_{\tau+\infty} \\ &\leq -\gamma e^{-11\lambda\gamma - \epsilon} \|\nabla\Phi(v')\|_* + \gamma\lambda n + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \gamma \|\nabla\Phi(v')\|_*\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.7), $\|\bar{v} - v'\|_\infty \leq \|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty + \|v - v'\|_\infty \leq 11\gamma$ and Theorem 22. Since $\gamma \leq \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda}$ and $\epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha}{4000}$, (5.8) implies that

$$\Delta \leq -\gamma \frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nabla\Phi(v')\|_* + \gamma\lambda n \leq -\gamma \frac{\alpha}{8} \|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* + 2\gamma\lambda n. \quad (5.9)$$

Now, let $x_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + \delta_x$ and $x_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + \delta_x + e_x$. Further, define $w_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}_1(s + \delta_s)$, $w_2 = \mathbf{X}_2(s + \delta_s)$, $\tau_1 = \tau_{\text{reg}}(x_1, s + \delta_s)$, $\tau_2 = \tau_{\text{reg}}(x_2, s + \delta_s)$, $v_1 = \mu \mathbf{W}_1^{-1} \tau_1$, and $v_2 = \mu \mathbf{W}_2^{-1} \tau_2$. Note, that $\|\mathbf{X}_1^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau_1+\infty} \leq 2\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau_{\text{reg}}(x,s)+\infty} \leq 1/100$ and therefore $\|v_2 - v_1\|_{\tau_1+\infty} \leq 16\|\mathbf{X}_1^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau_1+\infty}$ by Lemma 30. This implies that, $v_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu + \delta_\mu) \mathbf{W}_2^{-1} \tau_2$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_3 - v_1\|_{\tau_1+\infty} &\leq \|v_3 - v_2\|_{\tau_1+\infty} + \|v_2 - v_1\|_{\tau_1+\infty} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_\mu}{\mu} \|v_2\|_{\tau_1+\infty} + 16\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau_1+\infty}.\end{aligned}$$

Further $\|\tau_1\|_1 = 2d$ and $\|v_2\|_\infty \leq 2$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_2\|_{\tau_1+\infty} &\leq \|v_2\|_\infty + \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} [v_2]_i^2 \cdot [\tau_1]_i} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\|\tau_1\|_1}\right) \|v_2\|_\infty \leq 4\sqrt{d}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds on δ_μ and $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau_1+\infty} \leq \gamma\alpha 2^{-15}$ this implies that $\|v_3 - v_1\|_{\tau_1+\infty} \leq \gamma\alpha 2^{-10}$. Consequently, applying Lemma 29 yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x + \delta_x + e_x, s + \delta_s, \mu + \delta_\mu) - \Phi(x + \delta_x, s + \delta_s, \mu) &\leq \gamma\alpha 2^{-10} e^{\lambda\gamma\alpha 2^{-10}} (\|\nabla\Phi(v_1)\|_* + \lambda n) \\ &\leq \gamma\alpha 2^{-10} e^{\lambda\gamma\alpha 2^{-10}} \left(e^{10\gamma\lambda} (\|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* + \lambda n) + \lambda n\right) \\ &\leq \gamma\alpha 2^{-8} \|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* + \gamma\alpha 2^{-6} n.\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we applied Lemma 28 and $\|v - v_1\|_\infty \leq 10\lambda$. Combining with (5.9) yields

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x + e_x, s + \delta_s, \mu + \delta_\mu) \geq \Phi(x, s, \mu) - \frac{\gamma\alpha}{16} \|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* + 3\gamma\lambda n.$$

Finally, for any vector u , we have $\|u\|_* \geq \left\langle u, \frac{\alpha \cdot \text{sign}(u)}{40\sqrt{d}} \right\rangle = \frac{\alpha}{40\sqrt{d}} \|u\|_1$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\alpha \cdot \text{sign}(u)}{40\sqrt{d}} \right\|_{\tau+\infty} &\leq \frac{1}{4} + C_{\text{norm}} \frac{\alpha}{40\sqrt{d}} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tau_i \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} + C_{\text{norm}} \frac{\alpha\sqrt{2d}}{40\sqrt{d}} \leq 1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 28 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_* &\geq \frac{\alpha}{40\sqrt{d}}\|\nabla\Phi(v)\|_1 \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha\lambda}{40\sqrt{d}}(\Phi(v) - 2n)\end{aligned}$$

and combining yields the desired result. \square

We now prove Theorem 32, which is a simplified variant of Theorem 5, where we do not claim that the result $x^{(\text{final})}$ is nearly feasible. For Theorem 32, we analyze Algorithm 1 under the assumption that it does not execute Line 15 (i.e. the function MAINTAINFEASIBILITY is not called). We show in Appendix B that this result can be extended to return a nearly feasible solution, i.e. how to extend Theorem 32 to Theorem 5 by calling Line 15 of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 32. *Assume that the movement e_x of x induced by Line 16 of Algorithm 1 satisfies $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{220}$. Given $x^{(\text{init})}, s^{(\text{init})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, $\mu^{(\text{init})} > 0$, $\mu^{(\text{target})} > 0$, and $\epsilon \in (0, \alpha/16000)$ with $x^{(\text{init})} s^{(\text{init})} \approx_{2\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{init})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{init})}, s^{(\text{init})})$ Algorithm 1 outputs $(x^{(\text{final})}, s^{(\text{final})})$ such that*

$$x^{(\text{final})} s^{(\text{final})} \approx_{\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{target})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{final})}, s^{(\text{final})})$$

in

$$O\left(\sqrt{d}\log(n) \cdot \left(\log\left(\frac{\mu^{(\text{target})}}{\mu^{(\text{init})}}\right) / (\epsilon\alpha) + \frac{1}{\alpha^3}\right)\right)$$

iterations.

Furthermore, during the algorithm 1, we have

- $xs \approx_{4\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau(x, s)$ for some μ where (x, s) is immediate points in the algorithms
- $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, $\|\mathbf{S}^{-1}\delta_s\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, and $\|\text{diag}(\tau)^{-1}\delta_\tau\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq 2\epsilon$ where δ_x , δ_s and δ_τ is the change of x , s and τ in one iteration and $\|a\|_{\tau+\infty} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|x\|_{\infty} + C_{\text{norm}}\|x\|_{\tau}$ for $C_{\text{norm}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{10}{\alpha}$ (See Section 5.1).

Proof. Initially, we have $\Phi(v) \leq 2n \cdot e^{3\epsilon\lambda}$ because of $x^{(\text{init})} s^{(\text{init})} \approx_{2\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{init})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{init})}, s^{(\text{init})})$ and (5.6) of Lemma 28.

We proceed to show that in each iteration $\Phi(v) \leq \min\{2n \cdot e^{3\epsilon\lambda}, 2^{16}n\sqrt{d}\alpha^{-2}\}$. Note that, by Lemma 28 in any iteration this holds, this implies that $\|v - 1\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log(\Phi(v))$. Since $\lambda = \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(2^{16}n\sqrt{d}/\alpha^2) \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(2n)$ this implies that $\|v - 1\|_{\infty} \leq 3.5\epsilon$ which by the choice of ϵ implies that x, s is $(\mu, 4\epsilon)$ centered. Further, Lemma 31 and the design of the algorithm then imply that if $\Phi(v) \geq 2^{16}n\sqrt{d}\alpha^{-2}$ in this iteration, then

$$\Phi(x + \delta_x + e_x, s + \delta_s, \mu + \delta_\mu) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma\alpha^2\lambda}{1280\sqrt{d}}\right) \cdot \Phi. \quad (5.10)$$

Consequently, by induction the claim holds for all iterations and $xs \approx_{4\epsilon} \mu \cdot \tau_{\text{reg}}(x, s)$ for all iterations as desired.

Now recall that $\alpha = 1/(4\log(4n/d)) \geq 1/(2^8n)$ and consequently as $d \leq n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &= \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(2^{16}n\sqrt{d}/\alpha^2) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log(2^{25}n^4) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\epsilon} \log(7n)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &= \min \left\{ \frac{\epsilon}{4}, \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda} \right\} \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{50\lambda} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha\epsilon}{400 \log(7n)}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the reasoning in the preceding paragraph implies that in each step μ is moved closer to $\mu^{(\text{target})}$ by a $1 - \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{15}\sqrt{d}} = 1 - \Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon\alpha}{\log(n)\sqrt{d}}\right)$ multiplicative factor. Hence, it takes $O\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}\log(n)}{\epsilon\alpha} \log\left(\frac{\mu^{(\text{target})}}{\mu^{(\text{init})}}\right)\right)$ iterations to arrive $\mu^{(\text{target})}$. Further, (5.10) shows that it takes $O(\sqrt{d}\log(n)/\alpha^3)$ iterations to decrease Φ to $2^{16}n\sqrt{d}/\alpha^2$. Hence, in total, it takes

$$O\left(\sqrt{d}\log(n) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\alpha} \cdot \log\left(\frac{\mu^{(\text{target})}}{\mu^{(\text{init})}}\right) + \frac{1}{\alpha^3}\right)\right)$$

iterations for the algorithm to terminate. Further, when the algorithm terminates, we have that $x^{(\text{final})}s^{(\text{final})} \approx_{\epsilon} \mu^{(\text{target})} \cdot \tau(x^{(\text{final})}, s^{(\text{final})})$ because $\Phi \leq 2^{16}n\sqrt{d}\alpha^{-2}$, $\lambda = 2\epsilon^{-1} \log(2^{16}n\sqrt{d}\alpha^{-2})$ and (5.6).

Finally, the bounds on the movement of x , s , follow from Lemma 21, the condition $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}$, and the choice of γ . The movement of τ follows from Lemma 14 in [LS15]. \square

6 Vector Maintenance

In this section we prove Theorem 8 (presented in Section 4.2 and restated below) by providing and analyzing our vector maintenance data-structure. Recall that vector maintenance asks to maintain an approximation of the vector $y^{(t+1)} := \sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}$ for an online sequence of diagonal matrices $\mathbf{G}^{(1)}, \mathbf{G}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{G}^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and vectors $h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta^{(1)}, \dots, \delta^{(T)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This data-structure is used in Section 4 to maintain approximately feasible points.

Theorem 8 (Vector Maintenance). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 6), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE($\mathbf{A}, g, x^{(0)}, \epsilon$): Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, initial vector $x^{(0)}$, and target accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^5 n)$ time.*
- *SCALE(i, u): Given $i \in [n]$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ sets $g_i = u$ in $O(d \log^5 n)$ amortized time.*
- *QUERY($h^{(t)}, \delta^{(t)}$): Let $g^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the scale vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ during t -th call to QUERY and let $h^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \delta^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vectors given during that query. Define*

$$x^{(t)} = x^{(0)} + \sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \sum_{k \in [t]} \delta^{(k)}.$$

Then, w.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y \approx_\epsilon x^{(t)}$. Furthermore, the total cost over T steps is

$$O \left(T \left(n \log n + \sum_{k \in [T]} \left(\|(\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}\|_2^2 + \|(\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \delta^{(k)}\|_2^2 \right) \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^6 n \right) \right).$$

- *COMPUTEEXACT(i): Output $x_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ exactly in amortized time $O(d \log n)$.*

We split the proof of Theorem 8 into three parts. First, in Section 6.1, we show how to use sparse-recovery algorithms to build a data-structure for quickly computing the large entries (i.e. ℓ_2 -heavy hitters) of the matrix-vector product $\mathbf{A}h$. Second, in Section 6.2, we show how to use the data-structure of Section 6.1 to obtain a new data-structure that can quickly approximate the partial sum $\sum_{k=t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}$, in time roughly proportional to $d \cdot \|\sum_{k=t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}\|_2^2$. The naive way of computing an approximation of $y^{(t)}$, by using this data-structure for $t_0 = 1$ and $t_1 = t$, would be prohibitively slow and therefore, in the last Section 6.3, we obtain the main result Theorem 8 by instead splitting the sum $\sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}$ into roughly $O(\log n)$ partial sums, each of which is approximated efficiently by the data-structure of Section 6.2.

6.1 ℓ_2 -heavy Hitter

Here we show how to preprocess any matrix \mathbf{A} , such that we can build a data structure which supports quickly computing the large entries of the product $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h$ for changing diagonal \mathbf{G} .

Lemma 33 (Approximate matrix-vector product). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 4), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE(\mathbf{A}, g): Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and a scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^4 n)$ time.*

Algorithm 4: Approximate Matrix-vector Product (Lemma 33)

```

1 members
2    $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  ; // Input matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  and row scaling  $g$ 
3    $\Phi_j = \text{SKETCH}(2^{-j}, n) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j \times n}$  for all  $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$  ; // Sketching matrices
4    $\mathbf{M}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j \times d}$  for all  $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$  ; // Sketched input matrix  $\mathbf{M}_j = \Phi_j \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$ 
5    $\mathbf{R} = \text{JL}(1/100, n) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$  with  $k = O(\log n)$ ; //  $(1 \pm \frac{1}{100})$ -approximate JL-matrix
6    $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$  ; // Sketched input matrix  $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$ 

7 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
8    $\Phi_j \leftarrow \text{SKETCH}(2^{-j}, n)$  for all  $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$  ; // Lemma 34
9    $\mathbf{R} \leftarrow \text{JL}(1/100, n)$  ; // Lemma 35
10   $\mathbf{M}_j \leftarrow \Phi_j \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$  for  $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$ 
11   $\mathbf{J} \leftarrow \mathbf{R} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}, g \leftarrow g$ 

12 procedure SCALE( $i \in [n], u \in \mathbb{R}$ )
13   $\mathbf{M}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{M}_j + (u - g_i) \Phi_j \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{A}$  for  $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$ 
14   $\mathbf{J} \leftarrow \mathbf{J} + (u - g_i) \mathbf{R} e_i e_i^\top \mathbf{A}$ 
15   $g_i \leftarrow u$ 

16 procedure QUERY( $h \in \mathbb{R}^d, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$ )
17   $r \leftarrow \|\mathbf{J}h\|_2, j \leftarrow 1 + \lceil \log_2(r/\epsilon) \rceil$  ; // Estimate  $\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h\|_2$  and which  $\mathbf{M}_j$  to consider
    // Compute  $\mathbf{A}h$  directly if we have the budget to do so
18  if  $j \geq \log_2(n)/2$  then return  $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h$  ;
    // Otherwise compute  $\mathbf{A}h$  approximately using  $\mathbf{M}_j$ 
19  Compute the list  $L \subset [n]$  of possible heavy hitters of  $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h$  from  $\mathbf{M}_j h$  via Lemma 34
20   $v \leftarrow \mathbf{0}_n$ 
21  for  $i \in L$  do
22  | if  $(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i \geq \epsilon$  then  $v_i \leftarrow (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i$ ;
23  return  $v$ 

```

- *QUERY*(h, ϵ): Given a vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, w.h.p. in n , the data-structure outputs the vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$v_i = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i, & \text{if } |(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i| \geq \epsilon \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $\mathbf{G} = \text{Diag}(g)$ in time $O(\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h\|^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^3 n)$.

- *SCALE*(i, u): Sets $g_i \leftarrow u$ in $O(d \log^4 n)$ time.

The proof of Lemma 33 is based on ℓ_2 -heavy hitter sketches. While there exist many results for sketching and computing heavy hitters with different trade-offs [CM04, NNW14, CCFC02, KNPW11, Pag13, CH09, LNNT16], we only require the following Lemma 34 adapted from [KNPW11, Pag13].

Lemma 34 (ℓ_2 -heavy hitter, [KNPW11, Pag13]). *There exists a function SKETCH(ϵ, n) that given $\epsilon > 0$ explicitly returns a matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$ and column sparsity $c = O(\log^2 n)$ in $O(nc + m \text{poly} \log n)$ time, and uses $O(nc)$ spaces to store the matrix Φ . There further exists a function DECODE(y) that given a vector $y = \Phi x$ in time $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$ reports a list $L \subset [n]$*

of size $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ that with probability at least 9/10 includes all i with

$$|x_i| \geq \epsilon \min_{\|y\|_0 \leq \epsilon^{-2}} \|y - x\|_2$$

Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma is a famous result about low-distortion embeddings of points from high-dimensional into low-dimension Eculidean space. It was named after William B. Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss [JL84]. The most classical matrix that gives the property is random Gaussian matrix, it is known that several other matrices also suffice to show the guarantees, e.g. FastJL[AC06], SparseJL[KN14], Count-Sketch matrix [CCFC02, TZ12], subsampled randomized Hadamard/Fourier transform [LDFU13].

Lemma 35 (Johnson–Lindenstrauss (JL) [JL84]). *There exists a function $JL(\epsilon, n)$ that given $\epsilon > 0$ returns a matrix $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log n)$ in $O(mn)$ time. For any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ this matrix \mathbf{J} satisfies with high probability in n that $\|\mathbf{J}v\|_2 \approx_\epsilon \|v\|_2$.*

It is worth to mention that JL lemma is tight up to some constant factor, i.e., there exists a set of points of size n that needs dimension $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2} \log n)$ in order to preserve the distances between all pairs of points [LN17].

Our proof of Lemma 33 is through the analysis of Algorithm 4 which works as follows. The data-structure creates $\log_2 n$ sketching matrices $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{\log_2 n}$ according to Lemma 34, where each Φ_j is constructed for $\epsilon = 2^{-j}$. The data-structure then maintains the matrices $\mathbf{M}_j = \Phi_j \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$, whenever \mathbf{G} is changed by calling SCALE. Whenever QUERY(h, ϵ) is called, the data-structure estimates $\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h\|_2$ via a Johnson-Lindenstrass matrix, and then pick the smallest j , for which $\mathbf{M}_j h = \Phi_j \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h$ is guaranteed to find all i with $|(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i| > \epsilon$, i.e. where Φ_j was initialized for $\epsilon' = 2^{-j} \approx \|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h\|_2$. To make sure that the algorithm works against an adaptive adversary, we compute these entries $(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i$ exactly and output only those entries whose absolute value is at least ϵ (as we might also detect a few i for which the entry is smaller).

We now give a formal proof, that this data-structure is correct.

Proof of Lemma 33. Failure probability: Here we prove Algorithm 4 succeeds with constant probability. Note that Lemma 33 states that the result holds w.h.p. in n , i.e. probability $1 - n^{-c}$ for any constant $c > 0$. To achieve this better probability bound, one can run $O(c \log n) = O(\log n)$ copies of this algorithm in parallel. This also means that for each query we obtain many vectors v_1, \dots, v_ℓ for $\ell = O(\log n)$. We combine them into a single vector by taking the union, i.e. $v_i = (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i$ if there is some j with $(v_j)_i \neq 0$. This increases the time complexities for preprocessing, query and scaling increase by an $O(\log n)$ factor. Consequently, in what follows we show that the runtimes of the algorithm are an $O(\log n)$ factor smaller than the runtime stated in Lemma 33.

Initialize: We use Lemma 34 to create $\Phi_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j \times n}$ for each $j \in [\log_2(n)/2]$ in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time by Lemma 34 as the smallest epsilon is $2^{-\log_2 n/2} = \Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$. These matrices are then multiplied with $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$ to obtain $\Phi_j \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}$. Computing each of these products can be implemented in $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot \log^2 n)$ time as each column of Φ_j has only $O(\log^2 n)$ non-zero elements. Since $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \geq n$, as otherwise there would be some empty rows in \mathbf{A} that could be removed, the initialization takes $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^3 n)$ time.

Queries: For query vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we want to find $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $v_i = (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i$ for all i where $|(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h)_i| \geq \epsilon$ and $v_i = 0$ otherwise. By Lemma 35, $r = \|\mathbf{J}h\|_2$ is a 2-approximation of $\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} h\|_2$.

Now, If $r/\epsilon \geq \sqrt{n}$ then $\|\mathbf{GA}h\|_2/\epsilon \geq \sqrt{n}/2$ and $O(nd)$ time is within the $O(\|\mathbf{GA}h\|^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^3 n)$ time-budget for the query. Hence, the algorithm simply outputs the vector by direct calculations, which takes $O(nd)$ time.

Otherwise, the algorithm uses Lemma 34 to find a list of indices L which contains all i such that $|(\mathbf{GA}h)_i| \geq 2^{-j} \|\mathbf{GA}h\|_2$ with probability at least 9/10. Since $j = 1 + \lceil \log_2(r/\epsilon) \rceil$ and $r \leq 2\|\mathbf{GA}h\|_2$, the heavy hitters algorithm outputs all i such that $|(\mathbf{GA}h)_i| \geq \epsilon$. Hence, the vector v that we output is correct.

To bound the runtime, note that we find the list L by first computing $y := \Phi_j \mathbf{GA}h = \mathbf{M}_j h$ in $O(m_j d) = O((4^j \log^2 n)d)$ time. Then, we use Lemma 34 to decode the list in time $O(4^j \log^2 n)$ time. Hence, in total, it takes $O(\|\mathbf{GA}h\|_2^2 \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^2 n)$.

Scaling: When we set $g_i = u$, i.e by adding $u - g_i$ to entry g_i , then the product $\Phi_j \mathbf{GA}$ changes by adding the outer product $((u - g_i) \cdot \Phi_j \mathbf{1}_i)(\mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{GA})$. This outer product can be computed in $O(d \log^2 n)$ time, because each column of Φ_j has only $O(\log^2 n)$ non-zero entries. Since there are $O(\log n)$ many j , the total time is $O(d \log^3 n)$. \square

6.2 Maintaining Accumulated Sum

Here we extend Lemma 33 to approximately maintain the sum of products $\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$. Note that when the $g^{(k)}$ were all the same, i.e equal to some vector g , then it suffices to maintain $\mathbf{GA} \sum_{k \in [t]} h^{(k)}$, i.e. a single matrix-vector product, and this can be approximated in ℓ_∞ norm using Lemma 33. With this in mind, we split the task of approximating $\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$ into two parts, corresponding to the rows of G which have changed and those which have not. Our algorithm for for this problem, Algorithm 5, stores \mathbf{F} , a diagonal 0-1 matrix where $\mathbf{F}_{ii} = 1$ indicates that $g_i^{(k)} \neq g_i^{(k')}$ for some k, k' . The algorithm then then approximates $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}) \sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}) \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \sum_{k=1}^t h^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{F} \sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$ in two different ways. From Line 28 to 29, the second term is maintained directly. This is efficient because there are not too many rows that are rescaled. From Line 30 to 32, the algorithm then approximates the first term using Lemma 33.

Lemma 36 (Maintain accumulated matrix-vector product). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 5), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE(\mathbf{A}, g): Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and a scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the data-structure pre-processes in $O(\text{nnz}(A) \log^4 n)$ amortized time.*
- *UPDATE(h): The data-structure processes the vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in $O(d)$ amortized time.*
- *SCALE(i, u): Sets $g_i = u$ in $O(d \log^4 n)$ amortized time.*
- *MARKEXACT(i): Marks the i -th row to be calculated exactly in the next call to QUERY in $O(d \log^4 n)$ amortized time.*
- *QUERY(ϵ): Let t be the number of updates before the last query, $h^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the corresponding vectors and scalings during update number k . (That means $h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(t)}$, $g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(t)}$ are the t vectors and scalings since the last call to QUERY.) W.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs the vector v where $v_i = (\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)})_i$ if $|\sum_{k \in [t]} [\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}]_i| \geq \epsilon$, i is set to be exact or g_i was rescaled between this and the previous call to QUERY; otherwise $v_i = 0$. Let \mathbf{F} be the 0-1-matrix with $\mathbf{F}_{i,i} = 1$ when i is marked to be exact or g_i was rescaled*

Algorithm 5: Maintain Accumulated Matrix-vector Product (Lemma 36)

```

1 members
2    $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ; // Input matrix
3    $t \in \mathbb{N}$  ; // Number of updates so far
4    $(h^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ , where  $h^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  ; // Input vectors since last query
5    $D$  ; // Data-structure of Lemma 33, Algorithm 4
6    $F \subset [n]$  ; // Rows rescaled between the past  $t$  queries
7    $g, g^{(\text{old})} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  ; // Current and old row scaling.
8    $(\delta^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$  where  $\delta^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  ; // Relative row scalings
9    $(\bar{h}^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ , where  $\bar{h}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  ; //  $\bar{h}^{(k)} = \sum_{j=k}^t h^{(j)}$  for  $h^{(j)}$  and  $t$  at last query
10   $\bar{g}^{(\text{old})} \in \mathbb{R}^n, (\bar{\delta}^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$  where  $\bar{\delta}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  ; // Snapshots at last call to QUERY

11 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
12    $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}, g \leftarrow g, g^{(\text{old})} \leftarrow g, \bar{g}^{(\text{old})} \leftarrow g$ 
13    $\delta^{(1)} \leftarrow 0_n, \bar{\delta}^{(1)} \leftarrow 0_n, F \leftarrow \emptyset, t \leftarrow 0, \bar{h}^{(1)} \leftarrow 0_n$ 
14    $D.$ INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A}, g$ ) ; // Algorithm 4

15 procedure UPDATE( $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
16    $t \leftarrow t + 1, h^{(t)} \leftarrow h, \delta^{(t+1)} \leftarrow 0_n,$ 

17 procedure SCALE( $i \in \mathbb{N}, u \in \mathbb{R}$ )
18    $\delta_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow u - g_i, g_i \leftarrow u, F \leftarrow F \cup \{i\}$  ; // Save row rescaling for next QUERY

19 procedure MARKEXACT( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ )
20    $F \leftarrow F \cup \{i\}$  ; // Mark row  $i$  to be computed exactly in the next QUERY

21 procedure COMPUTEEXACT( $i \in [n]$ )
22    $x \leftarrow \bar{g}_i^{(\text{old})} e_i^\top \mathbf{A} \bar{h}^{(1)}$  ; //  $g_i^{(\text{old})} e_i^\top \mathbf{A} \sum_{j=1}^t h^{(j)}$ 
23   for  $k$  with  $\bar{\delta}_i^{(k)} \neq 0$  do
24      $x \leftarrow x + \bar{\delta}_i^{(k)} e_i^\top \mathbf{A} \bar{h}^{(k)}$  ; // Adds  $\sum_{k \in [t]} (\delta^{(k)})_i 1_i^\top \mathbf{A} \sum_{j=k}^t h^{(j)}$  to  $x$ 
25   return  $x$  ; // This is cached to improve efficiency in proof of Lemma 36

26 procedure QUERY( $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ )
27    $\bar{g}^{(\text{old})} \leftarrow g^{(\text{old})}, \bar{\delta}^{(k)} \leftarrow \delta^{(k)}$  for all  $k \in [t]$  ; // Save for later COMPUTEEXACT calls
28   Compute  $\bar{h}^{(k)} \leftarrow \sum_{j=k}^t h^{(j)}$  for all  $k \in [t]$ .
29   Set  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $v_i \leftarrow \text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i)$  for all  $i \in F$  and  $v_i \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \notin F$ 
30    $D.$ SCALE( $i, 0$ ) for all  $i \in F$ .
31    $v \leftarrow v + D.$ QUERY( $\sum_{k=1}^t h^{(k)}, \epsilon$ ) ; // Algorithm 4
32    $D.$ SCALE( $i, g_i$ ) for all  $i \in F$ . ; // Algorithm 4
33    $g^{(\text{old})} \leftarrow g, t \leftarrow 0$ , and  $\delta^{(k)} \leftarrow 0_n$  for all  $k$ 
34    $F \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
35   return  $v$ 

```

between this and the previous call to QUERY, then the call to QUERY can be implemented in amortized time

$$O\left(\left\|\left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}\right) \sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}\right\|_2^2 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^3 n\right).$$

- **COMPUTEEXACT**(i): Let $w = \sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)}$ be the vector approximated by the last call to QUERY. Then **COMPUTEEXACT**(i) returns w_i in $O(d)$ amortized time.

Proof. Complexity: The time complexity for the INITIALIZE procedure follows from Lemma 33. The time complexity for UPDATE is clearly $O(d)$. We note that the amortized time for SCALE is $\tilde{O}(d)$ instead of $O(1)$ because every call of SCALE will introduce two calls to D .SCALE in the calls to QUERY. The same holds for MARKEXACT.

The cost of **COMPUTEEXACT**(i) is $O(d + Sd)$, where S is the number of times **SCALE**(i, \cdot) was called for that specific i , between the past two calls to QUERY. This is because $\bar{\delta}^{(k)}$ is set to $\delta^{(k)}$ in the last call to QUERY (Line 27), and the number of k for which $\delta_i^{(k)} \neq 0$ is the number of times **SCALE**(i, \cdot) was called, because of Line 18. Hence the number of iterations of the loop in Line 23 is bounded by S . Without loss of generality, we can assume that **COMPUTEEXACT**(i) is called only once between two calls to QUERY as we could modify the data-structure to save the result and return this saved result during the second call to **COMPUTEEXACT**(i). Thus we can charge the $O(Sd)$ cost of **COMPUTEEXACT** to **SCALE** instead. In summary **SCALE** has amortized cost $\tilde{O}(d)$ and **COMPUTEEXACT** has amortized cost $O(d)$.

Finally, the cost of QUERY mainly consists of the following: (1) computation of sums in Line 28, (2) the calculation on indices in F (i.e. calling **COMPUTEEXACT**), (3) the call of D .QUERY, and finally (4) the calls to D .SCALE.

The cost of (1) is bounded by $O(td)$, which we charge as amortized cost to UPDATE. The cost of (2) is bounded by $O(|F|d)$, which we charge to the amortized cost of **SCALE** and **MARKEXACT**. The cost of (3) is exactly the runtime we claimed due to Lemma 33 since we zero out some of the rows using **scale** (Line 30) which causes the $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})$ term in the complexity. The cost of (4) is bounded by $O(|F|)$ times the cost of D .SCALE. We charge this cost to the **SCALE** and **MARKEXACT** procedure of the current data structure.

Correctness: We now prove that the output of QUERY is correct. Let v be the output of the algorithm. The algorithm QUERY consists of two parts. From Line 28 to 29, we calculate v on indices in F . From Line 30 to 32, we calculate v on indices in F^c .

For any $i \notin F$, we note that g_i is never changed. Hence, we have

$$\sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)})_i = \left(\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} \sum_{k \in [t]} h^{(k)} \right)_i$$

and Lemma 33 yields that we correctly calculate v_i for $i \notin F$. Now, we prove the correctness of v_i for $i \in F$ (i.e. the correctness of **COMPUTEEXACT**). For notational convenience, let $\mathbf{G}^{(0)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{G}^{(\text{old})}$, and note that

$$\left(\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right)_i = \underbrace{\left(\sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} - \mathbf{G}^{(0)}) \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right)_i}_{\text{Computed by Line 23}} + \underbrace{\left(\mathbf{G}^{(0)} \mathbf{A} \sum_{k \in [t]} h^{(k)} \right)_i}_{\text{Computed by Line 22}}.$$

It is easy to see that Line 22 computes the last term, as $\bar{g}^{(\text{old})} = g^{(\text{old})} = g^{(1)}$. The more difficult part is proving that the first term is computed by Line 23. However, note that by design of $\bar{\delta}_k, \delta_k$ we have

$$[g^{(k)}]_i - [g^{(0)}]_i = \sum_{j \in [k]} [g^{(j)}]_i - [g^{(j-1)}]_i = \sum_{j \in [k]} \bar{\delta}_j$$

and therefore we can re-write the i -th entry of $\sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} - \mathbf{G}^{(0)}) \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$ as

$$\mathbf{1}_i^\top \sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} - \mathbf{G}^{(0)}) \mathbf{A}h^{(k)} = \sum_{k \in [t]} \sum_{j \in [k]} \bar{\delta}_j \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{A}h^{(k)} = \sum_{j \in [t]} \bar{\delta}_j \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \left[\sum_{k=j}^t h^{(k)} \right]$$

By the definition of $\bar{h}^{(k)}$ this is precisely what is computed in Line 23.

In summary, `COMPUTEEXACT`(i) computes $(\sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)})_i$ and the vector v computed by `QUERY` is indeed $\sum_{k=1}^t \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$. As the variables $\bar{g}^{(\text{old})}, \bar{\delta}^{(k)}, \bar{h}^{(k)}$ are only changed during `QUERY`, the function `COMPUTEEXACT`(i) computes the i -th entry of the vector approximated by the last call to `QUERY`. \square

6.3 Vector Maintenance Algorithm and Analysis

Using the tools from the past two sections we are now ready to provide our vector maintenance data structure, Algorithm 6, and prove Theorem 8. For simplicity, we assume that the sequence $x^{(t)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_{\text{INIT}} + \sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)})$ satisfies

$$\frac{8}{9}x_i^{(t-1)} \leq x_i^{(t)} \leq \frac{9}{8}x_i^{(t-1)} \text{ for all } i \quad (6.1)$$

We note that this assumption is satisfied for our interior point method. If this assumption is violated, we can detect it easily by Lemma 33 and propagate this change through the data-structure with small amortized cost. However, this would make the data structure have more special cases and make the code more difficult to read.

The idea of Algorithm 6 is as follows. We split the sum $\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$ into $\log t$ partial sums of increasing length. Each partial sum is maintained via the algorithms of Lemma 36, where copy number ℓ is queried after every 2^ℓ iterations. The data-structure also stores vectors $v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(\lceil \log n \rceil)}$, where $v^{(\ell)}$ is the result of these data-structures from the last time they were queried (see Line 25), i.e. each $v^{(\ell)}$ is an approximation of some partial sum of $\sum_{k \in [t]} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$. Note that for Theorem 8 we want to have a multiplicative approximation for the entries, whereas Lemma 36 only yields an additive error. So the partial sums that are maintained in Algorithm 6 by using the data-structure of Lemma 36 are actually of the form $\sum_{k=t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}h^{(k)}$ for some diagonal matrix \mathbf{Z} . By scaling the entries of \mathbf{Z} turn the absolute error into a relative one. We prove that Algorithm 6 can be applied carefully to prove Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. We show that Algorithm 6 can be used to obtain a data-structure with the desired running time. Formally, we run Algorithm 6 and after every n calls to query compute $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $y_i = \text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i)$ for all $i \in [n]$, i.e. the exact state of the vector and then re-initialize the datastructure with `INITIALIZE`($\mathbf{A}, g, y, \epsilon$) for the current value of g . Note that, by Lemma 36, the time to initialize the data structure is $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^5 n)$ and the additional cost this contributes to query is $O(\lceil T/n \rceil \cdot \text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^5 n) = O(Td \log^5 n)$. Consequently, it suffices to prove the theorem when at most n queries occur.

Algorithm 6: Maintain Multiplicative Approximation (Theorem 8)

```

1 members
2    $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $x_{\text{INIT}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ ; // Initial input matrix, vector, and accuracy
3    $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Number of queries so far and current scaling
4    $(D^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil\}}$ ; // Data-structures of Lemma 36 (Algorithm 5)
5    $(z^{(\ell)})_{\ell \geq 0}$  where  $z^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Scalings used in  $D^{(\ell)}$ 
6    $(F^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil\}}$  where  $F_\ell \subset [n]$ ; // Changed coordinates for  $D^{(\ell)}$ 
7    $(v^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil\}}$  where  $v_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Past results of  $D^{(\ell)}$  queries
8    $(\delta^{(t)})_{t \geq 1}$  where  $\delta^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Additive terms in queries
9    $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Past result of this data-structure

10 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x_{\text{INIT}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ )
11    $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}$ ,  $x_{\text{INIT}} \leftarrow x_{\text{INIT}}$ ,  $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon$ ,  $t \leftarrow 1$ ,  $g \leftarrow g$ ,  $y \leftarrow x_{\text{INIT}}$ 
12    $z^{(\ell)} \leftarrow x_{\text{INIT}}$ ,  $v^{(\ell)} \leftarrow 0_n$ ,  $F^{(\ell)} \leftarrow \emptyset$  for all  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil\}$ 
13    $D^{(\ell)}$ .INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $(\mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)})^{-1}g$ ) for all  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil\}$ ; // Algorithm 5

14 procedure SCALE( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ )
15    $g_i \leftarrow u$ 
16    $D^{(\ell)}$ .SCALE( $i$ ,  $u/z_i^{(\ell)}$ ) for all  $\ell = 0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil$ ; // Algorithm 5

17 procedure QUERY( $h^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\delta^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
18   for  $\ell = 0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil$  do
19      $D^{(\ell)}$ .UPDATE( $h^{(t)}$ ); // Algorithm 5
20     // Process coordinates with a new multiplicative change
21     for  $i \in [n]$  with  $z_i^{(\ell)} \notin [\frac{8}{9}y_i, \frac{9}{8}y_i]$  and  $i \notin F^{(\ell)}$  do
22        $v_i^{(\ell)} \leftarrow D^{(\ell)}$ .COMPUTEEXACT( $i$ ); // Set  $v_i^{(\ell)}$  exactly (Algorithm 5)
23        $D^{(\ell)}$ .MARKEXACT( $i$ ); // Compute  $v_i^{(\ell)}$  exactly at next query.
24        $F^{(\ell)} \leftarrow F^{(\ell)} \cup \{i\}$ ; // Record that coordinate  $i$  changed.
25     // Update sum stored in  $D_\ell$  every  $2^\ell$  iterations
26     if  $t = 0 \pmod{2^\ell}$  then
27        $v^{(\ell)} \leftarrow \mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)}D^{(\ell)}$ .QUERY( $\epsilon/4\lceil \log n \rceil$ ) +  $\sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t \delta^{(k)}$ ; // Algorithm 5
28        $z_i^{(\ell)} \leftarrow y_i$  for all  $i \in F^{(\ell)}$ 
29        $D^{(\ell)}$ .SCALE( $i$ ,  $g_i/z_i^{(\ell)}$ ) for all  $i \in F^{(\ell)}$ ; // Algorithm 5
30        $F^{(\ell)} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; // Reset marked coordinates
31    $y \leftarrow x_{\text{INIT}} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_\ell v^{(\ell)}$  where  $a_\ell$  is the  $\ell$ -th bit of  $t$ ; //  $t = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_\ell 2^\ell$ 
32    $t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
33   return  $y$ 

34 procedure COMPUTEEXACT( $i$ ) // Return exact  $i$ th entry.
35    $y \leftarrow (x_{\text{INIT}})_i$ 
36   for  $\ell = 0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil$  do
37     if  $\ell$ -th bit of  $t$  is 1 then  $y \leftarrow y + D^{(\ell)}$ .COMPUTEEXACT( $i$ ); // Algorithm 5
38   return  $y$ 

```

To analyze this data structure, recall that

$$x^{(t)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_{\text{INIT}} + \sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)})$$

and let $y^{(t)}$ be the output of the algorithm at iteration t . Our goal is to prove that the $x^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon} y^{(t)}$. We prove this by induction. We assume $x^{(s)} \approx_{\epsilon} y^{(s)}$ for all $s < t$ and proceed to prove this is also true for $s = t$.

The vectors $v^{(0)}, \dots, v^{(\lceil \log n \rceil)}$: Assume we currently perform query number t and the data-structure is currently performing the loop of Line 18. Further assume that ℓ is such that $t \bmod 2^{\ell} = 0$, so the data-structure will assign a new vector to $v^{(\ell)}$. Let $g^{(k)}$ be the current state of vector g during query number $k \leq t$. By Lemma 36, the vector

$$v^{(\ell)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)} D^{(\ell)}. \text{QUERY}(\epsilon/8 \lceil \log n \rceil) + \sum_{k=t-2^{\ell}+1}^t \delta^{(k)}$$

satisfies

$$\left| v_i^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=t-2^{\ell}+1}^t [\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}]_i \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2 \lceil \log n \rceil} \cdot z_i^{(\ell)}$$

where $z^{(\ell)}$ is the extra scaling data structure $D^{(\ell)}$ uses.

By Line 22 we see that if $z_i^{\ell} \notin [\frac{8}{9}y_i, \frac{9}{8}y_i]$ then $D^{(\ell)}. \text{MARKEXACT}(i)$ had been called after the last query to $D^{(\ell)}$. Consequently, if $v_i^{(\ell)} \neq \sum_{k=t-2^{\ell}+1}^t [\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}]_i$ (i.e. the error is non-zero) then $\frac{8}{9}y_i^{(t-1)} \leq z^{(\ell)} \leq \frac{9}{8}y_i^{(t-1)}$. By (6.1) and the induction hypothesis $x^{(t-1)} \approx_{\epsilon} y^{(t-1)}$, we have that $z^{(\ell)} \leq e^{\epsilon} (\frac{9}{8})^2 x^{(t)} \leq \frac{7}{5} x^{(t)}$. Hence, for all $i \in [n]$ we have

$$\left| v^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=t-2^{\ell}+1}^t (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \right|_i \leq \frac{7}{10} \frac{\epsilon}{\lceil \log n \rceil} \cdot x_i^{(t)}.$$

Now consider the case that $t \bmod 2^{\ell} \neq 0$ and define $t' = 2^{\ell} \cdot \lfloor t/2^{\ell} \rfloor$. If the error of $v_i^{(\ell)}$ is not zero, then it is still bounded by $\frac{\epsilon}{2 \lceil \log n \rceil} \cdot z_i^{(\ell)}$, because $z_i^{(\ell)}$ was not changed in Line 26. We can now repeat the previous argument: by Line 21, we see that $D^{(\ell)}. \text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i)$ is called whenever $z_i^{\ell} \notin [\frac{8}{9}y_i, \frac{9}{8}y_i]$, which sets the error of $v_i^{(\ell)}$ to zero. Hence, if the error is non-zero, we know that $\frac{8}{9}y_i^{(t-1)} \leq z^{(\ell)} \leq \frac{9}{8}y_i^{(t-1)}$. With the same argument as before we thus have

$$\left| v^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=t'-2^{\ell}+1}^{t'} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \right|_i \leq \frac{7}{10} \frac{\epsilon}{\lceil \log n \rceil} \cdot x_i^{(t)}$$

for all i . (Note that the sum on the left is using t' for its indices while the error bound on the right uses $x^{(t)}$.)

Correctness of x : We compute the vector exactly every n iterations and reset t to 0. Hence, $t \leq n$ and hence $t = \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_i 2^i$ with each $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, i.e. the binary representation of t . Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^t (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_i \sum_{k=2^i \lfloor t/2^i \rfloor - 2^i + 1}^{2^i \lceil t/2^i \rceil} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}).$$

Note that $\sum_{k=2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor - 2^\ell + 1}^{2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)})$ is exactly the vector approximated by $v^{(\ell)}$, because this sum only changes whenever t is a multiple of 2^ℓ , in which case

$$\sum_{k=2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor - 2^\ell + 1}^{2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) = \sum_{k=t-2^i+1}^t (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \approx v_i.$$

Thus for $y^{(t)} := x_{\text{INIT}} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_\ell v^{(\ell)}$, as computed in Line 29, $x^{(t)} \approx_\epsilon y^{(t)}$ due to the following

$$\begin{aligned} \left| y^{(t)} - x^{(t)} \right|_i &= \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_\ell v^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=1}^t (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \right|_i \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} a_\ell \left(v^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor - 2^\ell + 1}^{2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \right) \right|_i \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} \left| v^{(\ell)} - \sum_{k=2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor - 2^\ell + 1}^{2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}) \right|_i \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} \frac{7\epsilon}{10^{\lceil \log n \rceil}} \cdot x_i^{(t)} \leq \frac{7}{10} \epsilon \cdot x_i^{(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

ComputeExact: Note that $D^{(\ell)}. \text{COMPUTEEXACT}(i) = \sum_{k=2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor - 2^\ell + 1}^{2^\ell \lfloor t/2^\ell \rfloor} [\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)}]_i$ and therefore, `COMPUTEEXACT` computes the i th entry of $\sum_{k \in [t]} (\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} + \delta^{(k)})$ exactly.

Complexity: The runtime of initialization and `COMPUTEEXACT` are that of Lemma 36, but increased by an $O(\log n)$ factor, as we run that many instances of these data-structures.

To bound the runtime of `QUERY`, fix some $\ell \geq 0$. We first analyze the complexity of the loop in Line 18 for that specific ℓ . In every iteration we spend $O(n)$ time to determine which coordinates need to be added to $F^{(\ell)}$ (Line 20). A coordinate $i \in [n]$ is added to $F^{(\ell)}$ at most once every 2^ℓ calls to `QUERY` and this happens only when y_i has changed by some $9/8$ multiplicatively from $z_i^{(\ell)}$. Further, if we let $k \geq T - 2^\ell$ denote the last iteration on which $k = 0 \pmod{2^\ell}$ then as $\frac{5}{7} x^{(t-2^\ell)} \leq z_i^{(\ell)} \leq \frac{7}{5} x^{(t-2^\ell)}$ and $y_i \approx x_i^{(t)}$, we can bound the number of indices that were in $F^{(\ell)}$ during the past $t - k$ iterations by the number of indices i for which x_i changed by at least constant factor during the past $t - k$ iterations. The number of such indices is $O((t - k) \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|^2 + \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \delta^{(k)} \right\|^2)$. For every index that was in $F^{(\ell)}$ over the past $t - k$ iterations, the algorithms calls $D_\ell. \text{SCALE}$, $D_\ell. \text{MARKEXACT}$ and $D_\ell. \text{COMPUTEEXACT}$ at most once. Consequently, applying Lemma 36 and summing over every time $t = 0 \pmod{2^\ell}$ held, we have that ignoring the cost of $D^{(\ell)}. \text{QUERY}()$ the runtime of the the loop for a single ℓ is

$$O \left(Tn + Td \log^4 n \cdot \sum_{k \in [t]} \left(\left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|^2 + \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \delta^{(k)} \right\|^2 \right) \right). \quad (6.2)$$

Next, we bound the runtime of the calls to $D^{(\ell)}. \text{QUERY}()$. Consider such a call when $t = 0 \pmod{2^\ell}$. By Lemma 36 and the fact that $D_\ell. \text{MARKEXACT}(i)$ is called for all $i \in F^{(\ell)}$ the runtime of this call is bounded by

$$O(1) \cdot \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}^{(\ell)}) \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t (\mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot d \log^5 n,$$

where the extra $\log^2 n$ term (compared to Lemma 36) is due to the $\log n$ factor in $\varepsilon/\log n$. Now for $i \notin F^{(\ell)}$ and $k \in [t - 2^\ell + 1, t]$ we have $z^{(\ell)} \approx_{O(1)} y^{(k-1)}$ by construction and $y^{(k-1)} \approx_{O(1)} x^{(k)}$ by the preceding correctness proof. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}) \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t (\mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 &\leq 2^\ell \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})(\mathbf{Z}^{(\ell)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 2^\ell \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})(\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 2^\ell \sum_{k=t-2^\ell+1}^t \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since, $D^{(\ell)}.QUERY()$ was called only $O(T/2^\ell)$ times this yields that the total runtime contribution of $D^{(\ell)}.QUERY()$ for a single ℓ is

$$O \left(T \sum_{k \in [t]} \left\| (\mathbf{X}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} h^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} d \log^5 n \right).$$

Summing, over all $O(\log n)$ different values of ℓ and combining with (6.2) then yields the desired running time for query.

Adaptive Adversaries: The algorithm works against adaptive adversaries, because the data structures of Lemma 36 work against adaptive adversaries. \square

7 Leverage Score Maintenance

The IPM presented in this work requires approximate leverage scores of a matrix of the form \mathbf{GA} , where \mathbf{G} is a non-negative diagonal matrix that changes slowly from one iteration to the next. Here we provide a data-structure which exploits this stability to maintain the leverage scores of this matrix more efficiently than recomputing them from scratch every time \mathbf{G} changes. Formally, we provide Algorithm 7 and show it proves the following theorem on maintaining leverage scores:

Theorem 9 (Leverage Score Maintenance). *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure (Algorithm 7), that works against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE(\mathbf{A}, g, ϵ): Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and target accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(nd\epsilon^{-2} \log^4 n)$ time.*
- *SCALE(i, u): Given $i \in [n]$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ sets $g_i = u$ in $O(d\epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n)$ time.*
- *QUERY($\Psi^{(t)}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)}$): Let $g^{(t)}$ be the vector g during t -th call to QUERY, assume $g^{(t)} \approx_{1/16} g^{(t-1)}$ and define $\mathbf{H}^{(t)} = \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A}$. Given random input-matrices $\Psi^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that*

$$\Psi^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(24 \log n)} (\mathbf{H}^{(t)})^{-1}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(24 \log n)} (\mathbf{H}^{(t)})^{-1}.$$

and any randomness used to generate $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)}$ is independent of the randomness used to generate $\Psi^{(t)}$, w.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs a vector $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ independent of $\Psi^{(1)}, \dots, \Psi^{(t)}$ such that $\tilde{\tau}_i \approx_\epsilon \tau_i(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})$ for all $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, the total cost over T steps is

$$O \left(\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-4} n \log^7 n + T \left(T_{\Psi} + \epsilon^{-2} d^2 \log^3 n \right) \right)$$

where T_{Ψ} is the time required to multiply a vector with $\Psi^{(t)}$ (i.e. in case it is given implicitly via a data structure).

The high-level idea for obtaining this data-structure is that when \mathbf{G} changes slowly, the leverage scores of \mathbf{GA} change slowly as well. Thus not too many leverage scores must be recomputed per iteration, when we are interested in some $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation, as the previously computed values are still a valid approximation. The task of maintaining a valid approximation can thus be split into two parts: (i) for some small set J , quickly compute the j -th leverage score for $j \in J$, and (ii) detect which leverage scores should be recomputed, i.e. which leverage scores have changed enough so their previously computed value is no longer a valid approximation.

This section is structured according to the two tasks, (i) and (ii). In Section 7.1 we show how to solve (i), i.e. quickly compute a small number of leverage scores. In Section 7.2 we then show how to solve (ii) by showing how to detect which leverage scores have changed significantly and must be recomputed. The last Section 7.3 then combines these two results to prove Theorem 9.

Before we proceed to prove (i) and (ii), we first give a more accurate outline of how the algorithm of Theorem 9 works. An important observation is, that by standard dimension reduction tricks, a large part of Theorem 9 can be obtained by reduction to the vector data-structures of Section 6. Note that the i -th leverage score of $\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}$ is

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_i = \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{1}_i = \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)}\|_2^2$$

Algorithm 7: Leverage Score Maintenance (Theorem 9)

```

1 members
2    $D$ ; // Data-structure of Corollary 37, Lemma 33, Algorithm 4
3    $(g^{(t)})_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Rows scaling of  $\mathbf{A}$  at time  $t$ 
4    $(\tilde{\tau})_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Approximate shifted leverage scores at time  $t$ 
5    $(\Psi^{(t)})_{t \geq 0}, (\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)})_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ; // Approximate inverses at time  $t$ 
6    $\mathbf{R} = \text{JL}(1/100, d)^\top, (\mathbf{B}^{(t)})_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times b}$ ; // JL-matrix  $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{B}^{(t)} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}$ 

7 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, g \in \mathbb{R}^n, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ )
8    $\mathbf{R} \leftarrow \text{JL}(1/100, d)^\top$ ; //  $\|v^\top \mathbf{R}\|_2 \in (1 \pm \frac{1}{100})\|v\|_2$  w.h.p. in  $n$ 
9    $D.\text{INITIALIZE}(\mathbf{A}, g)$ ; // Algorithm 4
10   $t \leftarrow 0, \varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon, g^{(t)} \leftarrow g, \mathbf{B}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}$ 

11 procedure SCALE( $j \in [n], u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
12   $\mathbf{B}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathbf{B}^{(t)} + (\mathbf{A}^\top e_j)(u - g_j^{(t)})(e_j^\top \mathbf{R})$ ; // Maintain  $\mathbf{B}^{(t)} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}$ 
13   $D.\text{SCALE}(j, u), g_j^{(t)} \leftarrow u$ ; // Make  $D$  represent  $\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}$ . Algorithm 4

14 procedure ESTIMATESCORE( $J \subset [n], t \in \mathbb{N}, \delta \in (0, 1)$ ) // Internal procedure
15   $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} \leftarrow \text{JL}(\delta/8, d)^\top$ 
16  if first step then  $\mathbf{W} \leftarrow \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ ;
17  else //  $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{G}}^2 \mathbf{A} \approx_{\delta/4} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A}$  w.h.p. in  $n$ 
18  |  $\mathbf{W} \leftarrow \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$  where  $\tilde{g}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{g_i^{(t)}}{\sqrt{p_i}} & \text{with probability } p_i = \Theta(\frac{\log n}{\delta^2} \tilde{\tau}_i^{(t)}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 
19  | return  $v \in \mathbb{R}^J$  with  $v_j = \|e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{W}\|_2^2 + \frac{d}{n}$  for  $j \in J$ .

20 procedure FINDINDICES() // Internal Procedure
21   $J \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; // list  $J$  depends only on  $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}$ 
22  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log n \rfloor\}$  s.t.  $t = 0 \bmod 2^i$  do // Compute candidate update indices.
23  |  $F_i \leftarrow \{j : g_j^{(t)} \neq g_j^{(t')}\text{ for some } t - 2^i \leq t' < t\}$ .
24  |  $\mathbf{W} \leftarrow D.\text{QUERY}(\Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{B}^{(t)} - \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{B}^{(t-2^i)}, F_i, \frac{\epsilon}{48 \log n} \sqrt{\frac{d}{nb}})$ ; // Algorithm 4
25  |  $J_i \leftarrow F_i \cup \{j : \mathbf{W}_{j,\ell} \neq 0 \text{ for some } \ell\}$ 
26  |  $v \leftarrow \text{ESTIMATESCORE}(J_i, t, \epsilon/(12 \log n))$ 
27  |  $v^{(\text{old})} \leftarrow \text{ESTIMATESCORE}(J_i, t - 2^i, \epsilon/(12 \log n))$ 
28  |  $J \leftarrow J \cup \{j \text{ such that } v_j \not\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{3 \log n}} v_j^{(\text{old})}\}$ 
29  | return  $J$ 

30 procedure QUERY( $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \Psi_{(\text{safe})} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ )
31   $\Psi^{(t)} \leftarrow \Psi, \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \leftarrow \Psi_{(\text{safe})}$ 
32  if  $t = 0 \bmod 2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}$  or first step then
33  |  $\tilde{\tau}^{(0)} \leftarrow \text{ESTIMATESCORE}([n], t, \epsilon), t \leftarrow 1$ 
34  | return  $\tilde{\tau}^{(0)}$ 
35   $J \leftarrow \text{FINDINDICES}()$  and  $v \leftarrow \text{ESTIMATESCORE}(J, t, \epsilon)$ 
36  For all  $j \in [n]$  set  $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)} \leftarrow v_j$  if  $j \in J$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)} \leftarrow \tilde{\tau}_j^{(t-1)}$  otherwise.
37   $\mathbf{B}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \mathbf{B}^{(t)}, g^{(t+1)} \leftarrow g^{(t)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \tilde{\tau}^{(t)}, t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
38  return  $\tilde{\tau}^{(t-1)}$ 

```

and the term on the right-hand side can be estimated using a JL-matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times b}$. This allows us to greatly reduce the complexity of estimating $\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A})$ as $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{R}$ is essentially just $O(b)$ matrix-vector products, where $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}$ is the matrix and the columns of $(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{R}$ are the vectors. With this in mind, we use the following corollary to prove Theorem 9.

Corollary 37. *There exists a Monte-Carlo data-structure, that holds against an adaptive adversary, with the following procedures:*

- *INITIALIZE(\mathbf{A}, g): Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and a scaling $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the data-structure pre-processes in $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log^4 n)$ time.*
- *QUERY(\mathbf{H}, F, ϵ): Given a matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times b}$ and a set $F \subset [n]$, w.h.p. in n the data-structure outputs the matrix*

$$\mathbf{V}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})\mathbf{GAH})_{i,j}, & \text{if } |(\mathbf{GAH})_{i,j}| \geq \epsilon \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{F} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ is a 0-1 diagonal matrix with $\mathbf{F}_{ii} = 1$ if and only if $i \in F$ in time

$$O(\|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})\mathbf{GAH}\|_F^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot d \cdot \log^3 n + |F| \cdot d \cdot \log^4 n + db).$$

- *SCALE(i, u): Sets $g_i \leftarrow u$ in $O(d \log^4 n)$ time.*

Proof. The algorithm is directly obtained from Lemma 33. Let \mathbf{H}, F, ϵ be the input to QUERY and let D be an instance of Lemma 33. We perform $D.\text{SCALE}(i, 0)$ for all $i \in F$, so the data-structure D represents $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})\mathbf{GA}$. We then obtain \mathbf{V} by setting the i -th column of \mathbf{V} to the result of $D.\text{QUERY}(\mathbf{H}e_i, \epsilon)$ for $i = 1, \dots, b$. Afterward, we call $D.\text{SCALE}$ again, to revert back to the previous scaling. The correctness and the time complexity of this new data-structure follow from Lemma 33. \square

Now that we have Corollary 37, we can outline how we obtain Theorem 9 from it. Given a matrix $\Psi \approx (\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}$, it is easy to compute individual leverage scores (see Section 7.1, Lemma 38). However, such computation requires nearly linear work, which is quite slow for our purposes, and therefore we do not want to recompute every leverage score every time $\mathbf{G}^{(t)}$ changes a bit. Instead, we use Corollary 37 to detect which scores have changed a lot. This is done in Section 7.2, Lemma 39 and Lemma 40. The idea is that, if $\|1_i^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\|_2$ and $\|1_i^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k)}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(k)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(k)}\|_2$ differ substantially, for some $k < t$, then

$$\|1_i^\top \left(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(k)}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(k)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \right) \mathbf{R}\|_2$$

should be quite large as well for some JL-matrix \mathbf{R} , i.e. something we can detect via Corollary 37.

7.1 Computing Few Leverage Scores

We start our proof of Theorem 9 by showing how to quickly compute a small set of leverage scores. This corresponds to the function ESTIMATESCORE in Algorithm 7.

Lemma 38 (Guarantee of ESTIMATESCORE). *Assume $\tilde{\tau}^{(t)} \approx_{1/2} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}$ and $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \approx_{\delta/4} (\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2\mathbf{A})^{-1}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then, ESTIMATESCORE(J, t, δ) returns $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$v_i \approx_{\delta} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)}\mathbf{A})_i + \frac{d}{n}$$

w.h.p. in n . Furthermore, the cost for the first iteration is $O((\text{nnz}(A) + T_{\Psi_{(\text{safe})}}) \cdot (\log n)/\delta^2)$ and the cost of other iterations is $O((T_{\Psi_{(\text{safe})}} + d^2 + d|J|)(\log n)/\delta^2)$.

Proof. Correctness: For the first step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)}\|_2^2 &= e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} e_j \\ &\approx_{\delta/4} e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} e_j \\ &\approx_{\delta/4} e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} e_j = \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j. \end{aligned}$$

where both approximations follows from the assumption $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \approx_{\delta/4} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1}$. Now, by JL, Lemma 35, and the choice of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$, we have

$$\|e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}\|_2^2 \approx_{\delta/4} \|e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)}\|_2^2 \approx_{\delta/2} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j.$$

Hence, we have the result.

For the other case, at Line 18, we sample row i with probability at least $\Theta(1) \frac{\log n}{\delta^2} \tilde{\tau}_i^{(t)} \geq \Theta(1) \frac{\log n}{\delta^2} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_i$ (using the assumption on $\tilde{\tau}_i^{(t)}$). Hence, the leverage score sampling guarantee shows that $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{G}}^2 \mathbf{A} \approx_{\delta/4} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A}$ by choosing large enough constant in the $\Theta(1)$ factor in the probability. Hence, by the same argument as above, we have the result.

Complexity For the first step, it takes $O(nd(\log n)/\delta^2)$ time to compute $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ and takes $O(d^2(\log n)/\delta^2)$ time to compute $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$. After computing $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$, it takes $|J| \log n/\delta^2$ times to compute the norm for each j . Since both d and $|J|$ is smaller than n , the cost is dominated by $O(nd(\log n)/\delta^2)$.

For the other case, we note that $\sum_i \tilde{\tau}_i^{(t)} = O(d)$ and hence $\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_0 = O(d \log n/\delta^2)$. Therefore, it takes $O(d^2 \log n/\delta^2)$ time to compute $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$. Similar as above, the total cost is $O((T_{\Psi_{(\text{safe})}} + d^2 + d|J|) \log n/\delta^2)$. \square

7.2 Detecting Leverage Scores Change

Now that we know how to quickly compute a small set of leverage scores, we must figure out which scores to compute. We only want to recompute the scores, that have changed substantially within some time-span. More accurately, we want to show that FINDINDICES (Algorithm 7) does indeed find all indices that changed a lot. The proof is split into two parts: We first show that we can detect large changes that happen within a sequence of updates of length 2^i in Lemma 39. We then extend the result to all large leverage score changes in Lemma 40.

Lemma 39. *Consider an execution of Line 25 (Algorithm 7) at iteration t . Suppose $\Psi^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/12 \log n} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and $\Psi^{(t-2^i)} \approx_{\epsilon/36 \log n} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1}$. Then $j \in J$ w.h.p. in n if*

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \not\approx_{\epsilon/2 \log n} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}. \quad (7.1)$$

Further, the set J remains the same w.h.p. in n if we replace Line 25 by $J_i \leftarrow [n]$.

Proof. First, we prove that for any $j \in [n]$ with

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \not\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}, \quad (7.2)$$

we have $j \in J_i$ (see Line 25). To do this, consider any $j \notin J_i$, i.e. j is not in F_i and not picked by the function $D.QUERY$. By Line 25 and Corollary 37, j not picked by the function $D.QUERY$ implies that

$$\left| \left((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}_i) \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{B}^{(t)} - \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{B}^{(t-2^i)}) \right)_{j,\ell} \right| \leq \epsilon_\Psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\epsilon}{48 \log n} \sqrt{\frac{d}{nb}}$$

for all ℓ . Since j is not in F_i , it means that g_j does not change in the last 2^i iterations. Hence, we have

$$\left((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}_i) \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{B}^{(t)} - \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{B}^{(t-2^i)}) \right)_{j,\ell} = \left((\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)}) \mathbf{R} \right)_{j,\ell}$$

Using this and that there are only b many columns in \mathbf{R} (namely, there are only b many ℓ), we have that

$$\| \mathbf{1}_j^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)}) \mathbf{R} \|_2^2 \leq \epsilon_\Psi^2 b.$$

Hence, we have that w.h.p. in n

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \|_2^2 + \frac{d}{n} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \|_2^2 + \frac{d}{n} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \|_2 \\ & \leq 2 \| e_j^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)}) \mathbf{R} \|_2 \leq 2 \epsilon_\Psi \sqrt{b} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from JL (Lemma 35) and the choice of \mathbf{R} . By the definition of \approx and that ϵ_Ψ is small enough, we have

$$\left(\| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \|_2^2 + \frac{d}{n} \right)^{1/2} \approx_{4\epsilon_\Psi \sqrt{b}/\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}} \left(\| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \|_2^2 + \frac{d}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Squaring both sides, using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \|_2^2 &= e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} e_j \\ &\approx_{\epsilon/(36 \log n)} e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} e_j \approx_{\epsilon/(36 \log n)} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j \end{aligned}$$

and similarly the fact that $\| e_j^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \|_2^2 \approx_{\epsilon/(18 \log n)} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j$, we have

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \approx_{8\epsilon_\Psi \sqrt{\frac{nb}{d} + \frac{2\epsilon}{18 \log n}}} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}.$$

Using $\epsilon_\Psi = \frac{\epsilon}{144 \log n} \sqrt{\frac{d}{nb}}$, we showed that $j \notin J_i$ implies (7.2) is false. This proves the claim that for any j such that (7.2) holds, we have that $j \in J_i$.

Now, we use the claim to prove the statement of this lemma. Fix any j such that $\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \not\approx_{\epsilon/(2 \log n)} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}$. By the claim, we have that $j \in J_i$, namely, j will be detected by $D.QUERY$. Now, Lemma 38 shows that $v_j \not\approx_{\epsilon/(3 \log n)} v_j^{(\text{old})}$ and hence j will be put into J by Line 28. This proves that $j \in J$.

Finally, we prove that the output remains the same without using $D.QUERY$. Note that $j \in J$ implies $v_j \not\approx_{\epsilon/(3 \log n)} v_j^{(\text{old})}$ by Line 28. Again, by Lemma 38, we see that this implies $\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \not\approx_{\epsilon/(6 \log n)} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-2^i)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}$ w.h.p. in n . Hence, the claim in the beginning shows that $j \in J_i$. Therefore, regardless of whether we use the current definition of J_i or the alternative definition that $J_i = [n]$, the output J remains the same w.h.p. in n . \square

The previous lemma only showed how to detect leverage scores that changed within some time-span of length 2^i , we now show that this is enough to detect all changes, no matter if they happen slowly (over some long time-span) or radically (within one iteration), or something in-between.

Lemma 40 (Guarantee of FINDINDICES). *Under the assumption of Lemma 38 and Lemma 39 let $J^{(t)}$ be the output of FINDINDICES (Algorithm 7) at t -th iteration and*

$$J^{*(t)} = \left\{ j : \tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)} \not\approx_{\epsilon} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \right\}.$$

Then, we have that $J^{*(t)} \subset J^{(t)}$ w.h.p. in n .

Proof. To show that $J^{*(t)} \subset J^{(t)}$, we consider any $j \notin J^{(t)}$. Let t be the current iteration and \bar{t} be the last time $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(\bar{t})}$ is updated. Since the algorithm detects changes of shifted leverage scores at 2^ℓ iterations, we consider a sequence

$$t_0 = t \geq t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_u = \bar{t}$$

such that $t_z \bmod 2^{\ell_z} = 0$ and $t_{z+1} = t_z - 2^{\ell_z}$ for all z (namely, the algorithm is trying to detect the change between t_z and t_{z+1} in Line 24). We can obtain such a sequence of length at most $2 \log t$ as follows: Let $t' = \lfloor t/2^i \rfloor \cdot 2^i$, for the largest i such that $1 \leq 2^i \leq t - k$. Then $k \leq t' \leq t$. We now create a sequence where we first flip the 1s to 0s in the binary representation of t , from least significant to greatest significant bit. This is a sequence $t_0 = t \geq t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_v = t'$ of length $v \leq \log t$. Next, we continue the sequence $t' = t_v \geq t_{v+1} \geq \dots \geq t_u = \bar{t}$ as follows: Consider the sequence in reverse, then we always add $2^{\ell_{z-1}}$ to t_z to obtain t_{z-1} , where ℓ_{z-1} is the position of the least significant 1-bit in t_z . By adding this $2^{\ell_{z-1}}$, we flip the 1-bit of t_z to a 0, but might flip a few more significant 1-bits via the carrier. This creates a sequence that will reach t' after at most $\log t'$ steps. Since we recompute all shifted leverage score every n (or less) iterations, we have $t \leq n$ and hence $u \leq 2 \log n$.

Next, we note that $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t_z)}$ is not updated implies $j \notin J^{(t_z)}$. By Lemma 39, we see that $j \notin J^{(t_z)}$, $t_z \bmod 2^{\ell_z} = 0$ and $t_{z+1} = t_z - 2^{\ell_z}$ implies

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t_z)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \approx_{\epsilon/2 \log n} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t_{z+1})} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \quad (7.3)$$

for $z = 0, 1, \dots, u - 1$. Since there are only $2 \log n$ steps, (7.3) shows that

$$\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(\bar{t})} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \approx_{\epsilon/2} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}. \quad (7.4)$$

Finally, we note that

$$\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)} = \tilde{\tau}_j^{(\bar{t})} \quad (7.5)$$

because $\tilde{\tau}$ has not been updated and that Lemma 38 shows

$$\tilde{\tau}_j^{(\bar{t})} \approx_{\epsilon/2} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(\bar{t})} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n} \quad (7.6)$$

for the last update. Combining (7.4), (7.5) and (7.6), we see that $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A})_j + \frac{d}{n}$ and hence $j \notin J^{*(t)}$. This shows that $j \notin J^{(t)}$ implies $j \notin J^{*(t)}$. Hence, $J^{*(t)} \subset J^{(t)}$. \square

7.3 Leverage Score Maintenance

We can now combine the previous results Lemma 38, Lemma 39 and Lemma 40 to show that Algorithm 7 yields a proof of Theorem

Lemma 41 (Correctness of Theorem 9). *Assume $\epsilon \in [0, 1/4]$, $\Psi^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(12 \log n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}^{(t)} \approx_{\epsilon/(24 \log n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{G}^{(t)})^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ for all t . After each call to QUERY, the returned vector $\tilde{\tau}_j^{(t)}$ satisfies*

$$\tilde{\tau}^{(t)} \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}.$$

Proof. We prove this statement by induction. At the start of the algorithm the vector $\tilde{\tau}^{(0)}$ is a good enough approximation of the shifted leverage scores because of Lemma 38. We are left with proving that with each call to QUERY, $\tilde{\tau}^{(t)}$ is updated appropriately.

By the induction, we have that $\tilde{\tau}^{(t-1)} \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}$. Furthermore, we know that $g^{(t)} \approx_{1/16} g^{(t-1)}$. Hence, we have $\sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}) \approx_{1/4} \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A})$. Using $\epsilon \in [0, 1/4]$, we have that $\tilde{\tau}^{(t-1)} \approx_\epsilon \sigma(\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A}) + \frac{d}{n}$. Hence, the $\tilde{\tau}^{(t-1)}$ is a good enough approximation and satisfies the assumption of Lemma 38 and hence the assumption of Lemma 40. Lemma 40 shows that FINDINDICES() finds all indices that is ϵ far away from the shifted leverage score. Lemma 38 then shows that those $\tilde{\tau}$ will be correctly updated. Hence, all $\tilde{\tau}$ is at most ϵ far away from the target. This finishes the induction. \square

Proof of Theorem 9. The correctness for the approximation ratio of Theorem 9 was already proven in Lemma 41. Here we bound the time complexity and prove that the data-structure works against an adaptive adversary.

Adaptive Adversary: Lemma 39 shows that the output $\tilde{\tau}^{(t)}$ of the data-structure is independent to FINDINDICES and D.QUERY w.h.p. in n . Hence, the output $\tilde{\tau}^{(t)}$ of the data-structure depends only on ESTIMATESCORE. Note that ESTIMATESCORE is calculated using $\Psi_{(\text{safe})}$ and some independently sampled $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$. So, it cannot leak information about the random sketch \mathbf{R} nor the input Ψ . Hence, the data structure works against an adaptive adversary.

To bound the complexity, we first bound how many leverage scores the data structure estimate, namely the size of J .

Size of all J : An index j may be added to J in Line 28. These j must satisfy $\mathbf{W}_{j,\ell} \neq 0$ or $g_j^{(t)} \neq g_j^{(t-2^i)}$, where \mathbf{W} is the result of Line 24 (D.QUERY). Let $\mathbf{W}^{(i,t)}$ be the matrix \mathbf{W} during the t th call to FINDINDICES on scale i , then the sum of the size of all J outputs by FINDINDICES over T iterations is bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \log T} \sum_{k \in T/2^i} \|\mathbf{W}^{(i,k^{2^i})}\|_0 + \sum_{i \in \log T} \sum_{k \in T/2^i} \|g^{(k^{2^i})} - g^{(k^{2^i-2^i})}\|_0 \quad (7.7)$$

For the first term in (7.7), Corollary 37 and the definition of \mathbf{B} shows that $\mathbf{W}_{j,\ell} \neq 0$ if

$$|(\mathbf{G}^{(k^{2^i})} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k^{2^i})} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k^{2^i})} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}^{(k^{2^i-2^i})} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k^{2^i-2^i})} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k^{2^i-2^i})} \mathbf{R})_{j,\ell}| = \Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\log n} \sqrt{\frac{d}{nb}}\right).$$

Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \|\mathbf{W}^{(i,k2^i)}\|_0 \\
& \leq O\left(\frac{nb \log^2 n}{d\epsilon^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \|\mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{R}\|_F^2 \\
& = O\left(\frac{nb \log^2 n}{d\epsilon^2}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \|\mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{R}\|_F \right)^2 \\
& = O\left(\frac{nb \log^2 n}{d\epsilon^2}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{R}\|_F \right)^2 \\
& = O\left(\frac{nb \log^2 n}{d\epsilon^2}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Johnson Lindenstrauss lemma 35 at the end. Now, summing up over $\log T$ scales and using that we restart every $O(n)$ iterations, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\log T} \sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \|\mathbf{W}^{(i,k2^i)}\|_0 = O\left(\frac{nb}{d\epsilon^2} \log^3 n\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2.$$

For the second term in (7.7), we bound it simply by $O(\log n) \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \|g^{(t)} - g^{(t-1)}\|_0$. Hence, the sum of the size of all J is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T |J^{(t)}| & \leq O\left(\frac{n}{d\epsilon^2} \log^4 n\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2 \\
& \quad + O(\log n) \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \|g^{(t)} - g^{(t-1)}\|_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

Complexity The cost of QUERY is dominated by the cost of ESTIMATESCORE, the cost of computing $\Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{B}^{(t)}$ and the cost of D.QUERY. Lemma 38 shows that the total cost of ESTIMATESCORE is bounded by

$$\underbrace{nd\delta^{-2} \log n}_{\text{First Step}} + \underbrace{T \cdot (T_\Psi + d^2) \cdot \delta^{-2} \log n}_{\text{Cost of } T \text{ Step}} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^T |J^{(t)}|}_{\text{Size of } |J|} \cdot \underbrace{d\delta^{-2} \log n}_{\text{Cost per score}}. \tag{7.9}$$

The cost of computing $\Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{B}^{(t)}$ is simply $O(T_\Psi \log n)$ because by assumption we can multiply $\Psi^{(t)}$ with a vector in T_Ψ time, and $\mathbf{B}^{(t)}$ is a $d \times O(\log n)$ matrix. Finally, by Corollary 37, the total cost of D.QUERY is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{\log T} \sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \left\| \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i)} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(k2^i-2^i)} \mathbf{R} \right\|_F^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon} \sqrt{\frac{nb}{d}} \right)^2 \cdot d \log^3 n \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{\log T} \sum_{k=1}^{T/2^i} \|g^{(k2^i)} - g^{(k2^i-2^i)}\|_0 \cdot d \log^4 n
\end{aligned}$$

Simplify the term by the similar calculation on bounding $|J|$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2 \cdot \epsilon^{-2} n \log^7 n + \sum_{t=1}^T \|g^{(t)} - g^{(t-1)}\|_0 \cdot d \log^5 n. \quad (7.10)$$

Combining (7.9) and (7.10) and using (7.8) and $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$, we have the total cost bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & nd\epsilon^{-2} \log^3 n + T((T_\Psi + d^2)\epsilon^{-2} \log^3 n + T_\Psi \log n) \\ & + \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{G}^{(t)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t)} - \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(t-1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{G}^{(t-1)}\|_F \right)^2 \cdot n\epsilon^{-4} \log^7 n \\ & + \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|g^{(t)} - g^{(t-1)}\|_0 \right) \cdot (d\epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n) \end{aligned}$$

We charge the first term to INITIALIZE and the last term to SCALE. This completes the proof for the time complexity. \square

8 Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints

In this section, we show how to approximately maintain the inverse $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with $n \gg d$ in amortized $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-(1/2)} + d^2)$ per step under changes to \mathbf{W} using estimates of the leverage scores of $\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}$. When $n \approx d$, this is a well-studied problem that has been solved in [LS15, AKPS19, CLS19, BNS19, San04]; no information of leverage score is required by these algorithms and it is possible to achieve a runtime of roughly $n^{\omega-(1/2)} + n^2$. However, when $n \gg d$, we need leverage scores to avoid reading the whole matrix \mathbf{A} every step and achieve the (possibly sublinear) time bound of $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-(1/2)} + d^2)$.

One approach to obtain this result is to first approximate $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ by $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A}$ for some sparse diagonal matrix \mathbf{V} with $\tilde{O}(d)$ non-zeros using leverage score sampling each step and then maintain $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A}$ via Woodbury matrix identity. Unfortunately, this does not immediately work as the diagonal matrices \mathbf{V} may then differ widely in every step, inhibiting our ability to perform smaller low-rank updates per step.

To handle this issue of changing \mathbf{V} , [LS15] resampled rows of \mathbf{A} only when the corresponding leverage score changed significantly. With this trick, the diagonal matrix \mathbf{V} changes slowly enough to maintain. However, this approach only works if the input of the algorithm is independent on the output. In [LS15], this issue was addressed by using the maintained inverse as a pre-conditioner to solve linear systems in $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ to high precision and then added noise to the output. However, we cannot afford to read the whole matrix \mathbf{A} each step and therefore need to modify this technique.

To avoid reading the entire matrix \mathbf{A} , we instead make further use of the given leverage score to sample the matrix $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$. Instead of solving $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} x = b$, we use the maintained inverse $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ as a pre-conditioner to solve $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} x = b$. By solving $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} x = b$ very accurately and by adding a small amount of noise, we can hide any information about \mathbf{V} . This is formalized by Algorithm 8 (and its second half Algorithm 9).

Theorem 10 (Inverse Maintenance). *Given a full rank matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with $n \geq d$ and error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, there is a data structure that approximately solves a sequence of linear systems $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} y = b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for positive diagonal matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ through the following operation:*

- *INITIALIZE($\mathbf{A}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\tau}, \epsilon$): Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, scaling $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, shifted leverage score estimates $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, and accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, the data-structure preprocesses in $O(d^\omega)$ time.*
- *UPDATE($\tilde{w}, \tilde{\tau}$): Output a matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and vector $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ where Ψ^{-1} is close to $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ is close to \tilde{w} .*
- *SOLVE(b, \bar{w}, δ): Input $\bar{w} \approx_1 \tilde{w}$ and $\delta > 0$, output $y = \Psi b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some random matrix $\Psi^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that is close to $\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.*

Let $\tau(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})$. Suppose that all estimate shifted leverage scores $\tilde{\tau}_i \in (1 \pm \frac{1}{16 \lceil \log d \rceil}) \tau(w)_i$ for $i \in [n]^4$ and that there is a sequence $w^{(0)}, w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the $w^{(k)}$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \|(\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^{-1} (w^{(k+1)} - w^{(k)})\|_{\tau(w^{(k)})}^2 + \|(\mathbf{T}(w^{(k)}))^{-1} (\tau(w^{(k+1)}) - \tau(w^{(k)}))\|_{\tau(w^{(k)})}^2 \leq O(1) \quad (4.1)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ with $K = n^{O(1)}$. Further assume that the update sequence $\tilde{w}^{(0)}, \tilde{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}^{(K)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $\tilde{w}^{(k)} \approx_{\epsilon/(16 \log d)} w^{(k)}$ for all k and the $\tilde{w}^{(k)}$ are independent to the output of UPDATE and SOLVE. (The input $b^{(k)}$ can depend on the previous output of the data structure.) Then, we have the following:

⁴Recall that $\tau(w)_i = (\sqrt{\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}})_{i,i} + \frac{d}{n}, \forall i \in [n]$

Algorithm 8: Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints (Theorem 10)

```

1 members
2    $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ ; // Input matrix and error tolerance
3    $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_1 \log n$  for some large enough constant  $c_1$ 
4    $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}, \tilde{\tau}^{(\text{alg})} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Current approximate weight and leverage score
5    $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; // Current maintained sparse weights with  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(\text{alg})} \mathbf{A}$ 
6    $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{O}(d) \times \tilde{O}(d)}$ ; // Current maintained inverse matrix with  $\Psi = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ 

7 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \epsilon$ ) // Assume  $\tilde{\tau} \in (1 \pm \frac{1}{8\lceil \log d \rceil})\tau(w)$ 
8    $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}$ ,  $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})} \leftarrow \tilde{w}$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}^{(\text{alg})} \leftarrow \tilde{\tau}$ ,  $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon$ 
9    $v_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})} / \min\{1, \gamma\epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} & \text{with probability } \min\{1, \gamma\epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$  for  $i \in [n]$ 
10   $\Psi \leftarrow (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ 

11 procedure UPDATE( $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ ) // Assume  $\tilde{\tau} \in (1 \pm \frac{1}{8\lceil \log d \rceil})\tau(w)$ 
12   $y_i \leftarrow \frac{8}{\epsilon}(\tilde{w}_i / \tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$  and  $y_{i+n} \leftarrow 2(\tilde{\tau}_i / \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$  for  $i \in [n]$ 
13  Let  $\pi : [2n] \rightarrow [2n]$  be a sorting permutation such that  $|y_{\pi(i)}| \geq |y_{\pi(i+1)}|$ 
14  For each integer  $\ell$ , we define  $i_\ell$  be the smallest integer such that  $\sum_{j \in [i_\ell]} \tilde{\tau}_{\pi(j)} \geq 2^\ell$ .
15  Let  $k$  be the smallest integer such that  $|y_{\pi(i_k)}| \leq 1 - \frac{k}{2\lceil \log d \rceil}$ 
16  for each coordinate  $j \in [i_k]$  do
17    Set  $i = \pi(j)$  if  $\pi(j) \leq n$  and set  $i = \pi(j) - n$  otherwise
18     $\tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})} \leftarrow \tilde{w}_i$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})} \leftarrow \tilde{\tau}_i$ 
19     $v_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})} / \min\{1, \gamma\epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} & \text{with probability } \min\{1, \gamma\epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 
20    Update  $\Psi$  to  $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$  using Woodbury matrix identity
21  return  $\Psi$ ,  $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ 

```

- The amortized time per call of UPDATE is $O(n + \epsilon^{-2} \cdot (d^{\omega - \frac{1}{2}} + d^2) \cdot \log^{3/2}(n))$.
- The time per call of SOLVE is $O(n + \delta^{-2} \cdot d^2 \cdot \log^2(n/\delta))$.
- UPDATE outputs some Ψ , $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}$ where $\Psi^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})} \mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})} \approx_\epsilon \tilde{w}$.
- SOLVE outputs some $y = \Psi b$ where $\Psi^{-1} \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Psi b] = (\mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} b$.

Before we prove Theorem 10 we prove two helper lemmas. First, note that Theorem 10 asks for the solver to return a solution $y = \Psi b$ where $\Psi^{-1} \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Psi b] = (\mathbf{A}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} b$. The following lemma shows how we can satisfy this condition on the expectation while having only a small additive error to our solution. The later Lemma 43 then shows that this small additive error can be interpreted as a small spectral error of the inverse used to solve the system.

Lemma 42. Let $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be a positive definite matrix and let $\mathbf{M}^{(1)}, \mathbf{M}^{(2)}, \dots$ be a sequence of independent random $d \times d$ matrices, each with $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}^{(k)}] = \mathbf{M}$ that satisfy with high probability $(1 - \epsilon)\mathbf{M} \prec \mathbf{M}^{(k)} \prec (1 + \epsilon)\mathbf{M}$ for some $\frac{1}{8} \geq \epsilon > 0$. Further let $\mathbf{N}^{(1)}, \mathbf{N}^{(2)}, \dots$ be a sequence

Algorithm 9: Inverse Maintenance with Leverage Score Hints (Continuation of Algorithm 8)

22 **procedure** $SOLVE(b \in \mathbb{R}^d, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \delta > 0)$ // Secure and unbiased version
23 $y \leftarrow \text{SECURESOLVE}(b, \bar{w}, \delta/2^{20}). y^{(0)} \leftarrow y.$
24 Let $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be geometrically distributed such that $\mathbb{P}[X \geq k] = 2^{-k}.$
25 **for** $k = 1, \dots, X$ **do**
26 $u_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \bar{w}_i / \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} & \text{with probability } \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ for $i \in [n]$
27 $y^{(k)} \leftarrow 2(y^{(k-1)} - \frac{1}{2}y^{(0)} + \Psi(b - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} y))$; // $\Psi b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{SECURESOLVE}(b, \bar{w}, \frac{1}{8})$
28 **return** $y^{(X)}$

29 **private procedure** $SECURESOLVE(b \in \mathbb{R}^d, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \delta > 0)$ // Used by Lemma 11
30 $u_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \bar{w}_i / \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} & \text{with probability } \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ for $i \in [n]$
31 $c_1 \leftarrow b, c_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta$ where $\eta \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$
32 Initialize y_1 and y_2 as 0 vectors of length d
33 **for** $k = 1, \dots, c_1 \log(n/\delta)$ for some large enough constant c_1 **do**
34 $y_j \leftarrow y_j + \frac{1}{10} \Psi(c_j - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} y_j)$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$
35 **return** $y_1 + \alpha y_2$ where $\alpha = c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{d}} \|y_1\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}}$ for some constant $c_3.$

36 **private procedure** $IDEALSOLVE(b \in \mathbb{R}^d, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n, \delta > 0)$ // Used for proof only
37 $u_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} \bar{w}_i / \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} & \text{with probability } \min\{1, \gamma\delta^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ for $i \in [n]$
38 $c_1 \leftarrow b, c_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta$ where $\eta \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$
39 **return** $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1} (c_1 + \alpha c_2)$ where $\alpha = c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{d}} \|y_1\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}}$ for some constant $c_3.$

of independent identical distributed random $d \times d$ matrices, each satisfying with high probability $\frac{7}{8} \mathbf{N}^{(k)} \prec \mathbf{M}^{-1} \prec \frac{8}{7} \mathbf{N}^{(k)}$. Let X be a geometric distributed random variable with $\mathbb{P}[X \geq k] = 2^{-k}$.

For any vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any initial vector $y^{(0)}$, define $y^{(i+1)} = 2(y^{(i)} - \frac{1}{2}y^{(0)} + \mathbf{N}^{(i+1)}(b - \mathbf{M}^{(i+1)}y^{(i)}))$ for all $i \geq 0$. Then $\mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] = \mathbf{M}^{-1}b$, and with high probability we have

$$\|y^{(X)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} \leq 30\|b - \mathbf{M}y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} + 30\epsilon\|b\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}. \quad (8.1)$$

Proof. We first show that $\mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}]$ exists. To show that, we first bound $\|y^{(i)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}}$ for all i . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(i)} - y^{(0)} &= 2y^{(i-1)} - 2y^{(0)} + 2\mathbf{N}^{(i)}(b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)}y^{(i-1)}) \\ &= 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}^{(i)}\mathbf{M}^{(i)})(y^{(i-1)} - y^{(0)}) + 2\mathbf{N}^{(i)}(b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)}y^{(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|y^{(i)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} \leq 2\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}^{(i)}\mathbf{M}^{(i)}\|_{\mathbf{M}}\|y^{(i-1)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} + 2\|\mathbf{N}^{(i)}(b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)}y^{(0)})\|_{\mathbf{M}}. \quad (8.2)$$

Note that

$$\left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^2 (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1} \preceq \frac{7}{8} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \preceq \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \preceq \frac{8}{7} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \preceq \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^2 (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1}.$$

Hence, we have

$$-0.31 \cdot \mathbf{I} \preceq \left(1 - \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^2\right) \mathbf{I} \preceq \mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \preceq \left(1 - \left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^2\right) \mathbf{I} \preceq 0.24 \cdot \mathbf{I}.$$

Using $\frac{7}{8} \mathbf{M} \preceq \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \preceq \frac{8}{7} \mathbf{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{(i)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} &= \|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}^{1/2} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}^{1/2} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1/2} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1/2} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \mathbf{M}^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{M}^{1/2} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1/2}\|_2 \|\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1/2}\|_2 \|(\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{1/2} \mathbf{M}^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{7}{8}} \cdot 0.31 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{8}{7}} \leq \frac{2}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (8.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^{(i)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} &\leq \frac{4}{5} \|y^{(i-1)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} + 2 \|\mathbf{N}^{(i)} (b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)} y^{(0)})\|_{\mathbf{M}} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{5} \|y^{(i-1)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} + 3 \|b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

where we used that $\frac{7}{8} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \preceq \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \preceq \frac{8}{7} \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ at the end. Using $(1 - \epsilon) \mathbf{M} \prec \mathbf{M}^{(k)} \prec (1 + \epsilon) \mathbf{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} &= \|\mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{M} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1} b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{-1}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} \|\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1} b - \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \left(\|b - \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} + \|\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^{-1} b - b\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \|b - \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} + 2\epsilon \|b\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting this into (8.3), we have

$$\|y^{(i)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} \leq \frac{4}{5} \|y^{(i-1)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} + 6 \|b - \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} + 6\epsilon \|b\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}.$$

Solving it, we have

$$\|y^{(i)} - y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}} \leq 30 \|b - \mathbf{M} y^{(0)}\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} + 30\epsilon \|b\|_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}$$

for all i . Since $\|y^{(i)}\|_{\mathbf{M}}$ is bounded uniformly, $\mathbb{E}y^{(X)}$ exists. This also gives the bound for (8.1).

Now, we compute $\mathbb{E}y^{(X)}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] &= \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[2(y^{(X-1)} - \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \mathbf{N}^{(X-1)} (b - \mathbf{M}^{(X-1)} y^{(X-1)})) | X \geq 1] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \mathbb{E}[y^{(X-1)} - \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \mathbf{N}^{(X-1)} (b - \mathbf{M}^{(X-1)} y^{(X-1)}) | X \geq 1] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)} - \frac{1}{2} y^{(0)} + \mathbf{N}^{(X)} (b - \mathbf{M}^{(X)} y^{(X)})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] + \mathbb{E}_i \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{M}^{(i)}, \mathbf{N}^{(i)}, y^{(i)}} \left[\mathbf{N}^{(i)} (b - \mathbf{M}^{(i)} y^{(i)}) | X = i \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] + \mathbb{E}_i \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{N}^{(i)} | X = i \right] \left(b - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{M}^{(i)} | X = i \right] \mathbb{E} \left[y^{(i)} | X = i \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] + \mathbb{E}_i \left[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{N}] \left(b - \mathbf{M} \mathbb{E} \left[y^{(i)} | X = i \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{N}] (b - \mathbf{M} \mathbb{E}[y^{(X)}]) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $X - 1$ subjects to $X \geq 1$ has the same distribution as X in the third equality, $\mathbf{N}^{(i)}, \mathbf{M}^{(i)}$ and $y^{(i)}$ are independent on the fifth equality, we used that $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{M}^{(i)} = \mathbf{M}$ and that $\mathbf{N}^{(i)}$ are identically distributed on the sixth equality.

As $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{N}^{(X)}]$ is positive definite, this implies $\mathbb{E}y^{(X)} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}b$. \square

Next we provide a general stability lemma about solving linear systems and then use this to prove Theorem 10 and Theorem 11. This lemma is mainly for convenience purpose as the vector maintenance and leverage score maintenance assume we solve the linear system $\mathbf{H}y = b$ by some $y = \Psi b$ where $\Psi \approx \mathbf{H}^{-1}$. The following lemma shows that this definition is same as $\|y - \mathbf{H}^{-1}b\|_{\mathbf{H}}$ is small compared to $\|b\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$.

Lemma 43. *Let $y = \mathbf{H}^{-1}(b + v) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq \epsilon \|b\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ with $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{80}$ for symmetric positive definite $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$. There is a symmetric matrix $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $y = (\mathbf{H} + \Delta)^{-1}b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{H} + \Delta \approx_{20\epsilon} \mathbf{H}$.*

Proof. Note that the claim is trivial if $\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} = 0$ and thus we assume this is not the case. Consequently, by the assumption on v we have $\|b + v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} > 0$ and can define the vectors $\bar{v} = \frac{\mathbf{H}^{-1/2}v}{\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\bar{z} = \frac{\mathbf{H}^{-1/2}(b+v)}{\|b+v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where $s = \text{sign}(b^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}v)$. We define

$$\Delta = s \frac{\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}}{\|b+v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \mathbf{H}^{1/2} \left(\bar{z}\bar{z}^\top - \frac{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top}{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \bar{z}} \right) \mathbf{H}^{1/2}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta y &= \Delta \mathbf{H}^{-1}(b + v) \\ &= s \frac{\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}}{\|b+v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \mathbf{H}^{1/2} \left(\bar{z}\bar{z}^\top - \frac{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top}{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \bar{z}} \right) \mathbf{H}^{-1/2}(b + v) \\ &= s \|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \mathbf{H}^{1/2} \left(\bar{z}\bar{z}^\top - \frac{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top}{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \bar{z}} \right) \bar{z} \\ &= s \|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \mathbf{H}^{1/2} (\bar{z} - (\bar{z} + s\bar{v})) = -v. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $(\mathbf{H} + \Delta)y = b + v - v = b$. Hence, we have $y = (\mathbf{H} + \Delta)^{-1}b$ if $\mathbf{H} + \Delta \succ 0$. In fact, we now prove that $\mathbf{H} + \Delta \approx_{20\epsilon} \mathbf{H}$.

First, we note that $\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ and hence $\frac{\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}}{\|b+v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \leq \frac{2\|v\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}}{\|b\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}} \leq 2\epsilon$. Hence, we have

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \Delta \mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \preceq 2\epsilon \left(\bar{z}\bar{z}^\top + \frac{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top}{(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \bar{z}} \right).$$

The term $\bar{z}\bar{z}^\top$ is simply bounded by \mathbf{I} . We note that $(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \preceq \|\bar{z} + s\bar{v}\|^2 \cdot \mathbf{I} \preceq 4 \cdot \mathbf{I}$. Finally, we note that $(\bar{z} + s\bar{v})^\top \bar{z} \geq 1$ because $s = \text{sign}(\bar{v}^\top \bar{z})$. Hence, we have

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \Delta \mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \preceq 2\epsilon \cdot 5 \cdot \mathbf{I} = 10\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{I}.$$

Similarly, we have $\mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \Delta \mathbf{H}^{-1/2} \succeq -10\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{I}$. Hence, we have $\mathbf{H} + \Delta \approx_{20\epsilon} \mathbf{H}$. \square

We now have all tools available to prove Theorem 10.

Proof of Theorem 10. Since the input $\tilde{w}^{(i)} \approx w^{(i)}$ of the algorithm is independent to the output of the algorithm in the previous iterations, every constraint $i \in [n]$ has $\Theta(\tau_i(w)\epsilon^{-2}\gamma)$ probability of

being picked into $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A}$. Therefore, the expected number of rank changes in Line 16 of $\text{UPDATE}(\tilde{w})$ is given by

$$\Theta(\gamma \epsilon^{-2}) \sum_{j \in [i_\ell]} \tau_j(w) = \Theta(2^\ell \epsilon^{-2} \log(n)).$$

For simplicity, we call such step, a *rank 2^ℓ update*. Hence, the total complexity of $\text{UPDATE}(w)$ over K iterations is

$$O(Kn) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log n \rceil} (\# \text{ of rank } 2^\ell \text{ updates}) \cdot (\text{cost of rank } 2^\ell \text{ update}).$$

Note that a rank 2^ℓ update can be implemented in $O(d^2(2^\ell \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \cdot \log(n))^{\omega-2})$ time. Now, we bound the number of such updates over T iterations.

The algorithm defines an error vector $y_i \leftarrow \frac{8}{\epsilon}(\tilde{w}_i/\tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$ and $y_{i+n} \leftarrow 2(\tilde{\tau}_i/\tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$. We now also define the true error vector $y_i^* \leftarrow \frac{8}{\epsilon}(w_i/w_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$ and $y_{i+n}^* \leftarrow 2(\tau_i/\tau_i^{(\text{alg})} - 1)$ for $i \in [n]$ where $\tau_i^{(\text{alg})}$ is updated to τ_i whenever $\tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg})}$ is updated to $\tilde{\tau}_i$, and likewise $w_i^{(\text{alg})}$ is updated to w_i whenever $\tilde{w}_i^{(\text{alg})}$ is updated to \tilde{w}_i . Let $y^{*(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the true error vector defined by the algorithm directly *after* a rank 2^ℓ update. Assume there is another rank 2^ℓ update after b iterations. Let $y^{*(1)}, y^{*(2)}, \dots, y^{*(j)}, \dots, y^{*(b)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the true error vector *after* the j -th iteration for $j = 1, \dots, b$. We order the entries of each $y^{*(j)}$ and $y^{(j)}$ in the same way such that the entries of $|y^{(b)}|$ (the error vector of the algorithm) are decreasing. Let j_i be the last iteration $w_i^{(\text{alg})}$ (if $i \leq n$) or $\tau_{i-n}^{(\text{alg})}$ (if $i > n$) is updated after this first update. We set $j_i = 0$ if it is never updated after the first update. If it is never updated, then we have $|y_i^{*(j_i)}| = |y_i^{*(0)}| \leq |y_i^{(0)}| + \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil} \leq 1 - \frac{\ell}{2 \lceil \log d \rceil} + \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil}$ where $1 - \frac{\ell}{2 \lceil \log d \rceil}$ comes from the threshold for 2^ℓ update and $\frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil}$ comes from the error of $\tilde{\tau}$ and \tilde{w} compared to τ and w . If it is updated during the interval, we have $|y_i^{*(j_i)}| = \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil}$ (due to the error of $\tilde{\tau}$). In both cases, we have that

$$|y_i^{*(j_i)}| \leq 1 - \frac{\ell}{2 \lceil \log d \rceil} + \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil} \text{ for all } i \in [n].$$

On the other hand, that we are making a 2^ℓ update at step b implies it does not pass the threshold for a $2^{\ell-1}$ update. Hence, we have

$$|y_i^{*(b-1)}| \geq 1 - \frac{\ell-1}{2 \lceil \log d \rceil} - \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log d \rceil} \text{ for all } i \leq i_{\ell-1},$$

where i_ℓ is the one defined in the b -th iteration. In particular, we have that $|y_i^{*(b-1)} - y_i^{*(j_i)}| \geq \frac{1}{4 \lceil \log d \rceil}$ for all $i \leq i_{\ell-1}$. Let $\tau_i^{(j)}$ be the shifted leverage score $\tau(w)$ before the j -th iteration. Then, by the definition of $i_{\ell-1}$, we have

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log^2 d}\right) \cdot 2^{\ell-1} \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \tau_i^{(b-1)} (y_i^{*(b-1)} - y_i^{*(j_i)})^2. \quad (8.4)$$

Next, we note that the denominator of $y_i^{*(j)}$ never changed between j_i and b . Hence, $y_i^{*(j+1)} - y_i^{*(j)}$

is exactly equals to the relative change of w or τ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in [n]} \tau_i^{(b-1)} (y_i^{*(b-1)} - y_i^{*(j_i)})^2 &\leq O(b) \sum_{i \in [n]} \tau_i^{(b-1)} \sum_{j=j_i}^{b-1} (y_i^{*(j+1)} - y_i^{*(j)})^2 \\
&\leq O(b) \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=j_i}^{b-1} \tau_i^{(j)} (y_i^{*(j+1)} - y_i^{*(j)})^2 \\
&= O(b^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

where we used that $\tilde{\tau}_i^{(j)}$ (and thus also $\tau_i^{(j)}$) does not change more than a constant from iteration j_i to iteration $b-1$ in the second inequality and the assumption (4.1) at the end. From (8.4) and (8.5), we see that there is at least $b \geq \Omega(\frac{2^{\ell/2}}{\log d})$ many iterations between two 2^ℓ rank updates. Hence, the total complexity of $\text{UPDATE}(w)$ over K iterations is

$$O(Kn) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log d \rceil} \left(\frac{K \log d}{2^{\ell/2}} \right) \cdot d^2 (\epsilon^{-2} 2^\ell \log(n))^{\omega-2} = O(Kn + \epsilon^{-2} K \cdot (d^{\omega-(1/2)} + d^2) \cdot \log^{3/2}(n)).$$

The cost of SOLVE is clear from the description.

For the correctness of UPDATE , we note that the internal $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the input $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $\left| \frac{\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})} - \tilde{w}}{\tilde{w}} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ and that $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A} \approx_{\epsilon/4} \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(nK)$ due to the matrix Chernoff bound (see e.g. the proof of Lemma 4 in [CLM⁺15]). Here, we used the fact that the input $\tilde{w}^{(\text{new})} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is independent of the algorithm output and hence each sample of v_i are independent. Hence, we have $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$.

For the correctness of SOLVE , assume for now that Ψ in Line 27 satisfies $\Psi^{-1} = (1 \pm 1/8) \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$ and that $y^{(0)}$ is a good approximation of the solution with

$$\|y^{(0)} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})} \leq (\delta/1800) \cdot \|b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}.$$

(This is shown in the proof of Lemma 11.) So Lemma 42 shows that the final result y satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|b - (\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} y\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} &\leq 30 \|b - (\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} y^{(0)}\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} + (\delta/60) \|b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} \\
&\leq \delta/30 \|b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, Lemma 43 shows that we can view the output of the algorithm as Ψb for some spectral approximation $\Psi \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$. \square

Lemma 44. *Theorem 10 holds even if the input w and $\tilde{\tau}$ of the algorithm depends on the output of SOLVE . Furthermore, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in [K-1]} \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k+1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k+1)} - \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}(k)} \right\|_F \right] \leq 16K \log^{5/2} n$$

where $\Psi^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\tilde{w}^{(\text{alg})}(k)$ is the output of the k -th step of $\text{UPDATE}(\tilde{w}^{(k)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(k)})$.

Proof. The output $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the function SECURESOLVE solves satisfies

$$y = \Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}(b + \alpha \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta) \tag{8.6}$$

with $\alpha = \frac{c_3 \epsilon}{\sqrt{d \log(n/\delta)}} \|y_1\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}}$ for some Ψ_{SOLVE} satisfying $\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}} \approx_{\text{poly}(\delta/n)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ as the algorithm performs iterative refinement on our preconditioner Ψ maintained by UPDATE. Note that

$$\alpha^2 \|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta\|_{\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}}^2 \leq 2\alpha^2 \eta^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta = O(\alpha^2 \log(n)d)$$

w.h.p. in n where we used that $\mathbf{U}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2}$ is a rank d orthogonal projection matrix and $\eta \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$. By choosing small enough c_3 , we have

$$\alpha \|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^{1/2} \eta\|_{\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}} \leq \frac{\delta}{200} \|y_1\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}} = \frac{\delta}{200} \|\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}} b\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}} \leq \frac{\delta}{100} \|b\|_{\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}}.$$

By picking small enough c_3 , Lemma 43 shows that we have $y = (\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}^{-1} + \Delta)^{-1} b$ for $\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}^{-1} + \Delta \approx_{\delta/2} \Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}^{-1} \approx_{\delta} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{A}$.

Note that we also have

$$y \sim N(\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}} b, \alpha^2 \Psi_{\text{SOLVE}} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} \Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}).$$

On the other hand, the output $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the function IDEALSOLVE satisfies

$$y^{(\text{ideal})} \sim N((\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1} b, \alpha^2 (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A})^{-1}).$$

Since $\Psi_{\text{SOLVE}}^{-1} \approx_{\text{poly}(\epsilon/(nK))} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{A}$, the total variation between y and $y^{(\text{ideal})} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is $\text{poly}(\epsilon/(nK))$ small.

Now consider what happens when we replace the matrix Ψ in Lines 27 with the function IDEALSOLVE. Note that Theorem 10 then holds when the input $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of the algorithm depends on the output of SOLVE because SOLVE and IDEALSOLVE do not use v and hence cannot leak any information about v . If Theorem 10 does not hold with input depending on SOLVE, when we replace the matrix Ψ in Lines 27 with the function SECURESOLVE instead, then this would give an algorithm to distinguish the functions IDEALSOLVE and SECURESOLVE with probability at least $\text{poly}(\epsilon/(nK))$. This contradicts with the total variation between y and $y^{(\text{ideal})} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

For the Frobenius bound we will write for simplicity $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$ for $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(\text{alg})}$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= 3 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \right\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + 3 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \right\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + 3 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= 3 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[(\sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}})^2 \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A} \right] \\ &\quad + 3 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(k+1)} - \Psi^{(k)}) \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(k+1)} - \Psi^{(k)}) \right] \\ &\quad + 3 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[(\sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}})^2 \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A} \right] \\ &\leq 8 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[(\sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}/\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} - \mathbf{I})^2 \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A} \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right] \\ &\quad + 4 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(k+1)} - \Psi^{(k)}) \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A} (\Psi^{(k+1)} - \Psi^{(k)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_k^{(1)} + E_k^{(2)} \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

where we used $\Psi^{(k+1)} \preceq \frac{9}{8}\Psi^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)} \preceq \frac{9}{8}\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$ in the first inequality.

For the first term, we use $\Psi^{(k)} \preceq \frac{9}{8}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$, $\mathbf{P}^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}}$ and $|\sqrt{x} - 1| \leq |x - 1|$ for $\frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 2$ and get

$$E_k^{(1)} \leq 30 \cdot \text{Tr} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{W}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right)^2 \mathbf{P}^{(k)} \mathbf{P}^{(k)} \right] = 30 \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^{(k)} \left(\frac{w_i^{(k+1)} - w_i^{(k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \right)^2. \quad (8.8)$$

For the second term, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{(k+1)} - \Psi^{(k)} &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A})^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}^{(k)} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} ds \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_s = \mathbf{A}^\top \left((1-s)\mathbf{V}^{(k)} + s\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} \right) \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Let $\mathbf{D}_v^{(k)} = \frac{\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_k^{(2)} &= 4 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} ds \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F^2 \\ &\leq 4 \left(\int_0^1 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F ds \right)^2 \\ &= 4 \left(\int_0^1 \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right) \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq 8 \left\| \mathbf{P}^{(k)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right) \mathbf{P}^{(k)} \right\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\mathbf{H}_s^{-1} \preceq \frac{9}{8}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ at the end. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[E^{(2)}] &= 8 \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{P}^{(k)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right) \mathbf{P}^{(k)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{V}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{V}^{(k)}}{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right) \right] \right] \\ &= 8 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} (\mathbf{P}^{(k)})_{i,j}^2 \cdot \frac{v_i^{(k+1)} - v_i^{(k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{v_j^{(k+1)} - v_j^{(k)}}{w_j^{(k)}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and for each i , $\mathbb{P}(v_i^{(k)} \neq 0) = \min\{1, \gamma \epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg}, k)}\}$. Also, this is independent to whether $v_j^{(k)} \neq 0$. Using the formula of v , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{v_i^{(k+1)} - v_i^{(k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{v_j^{(k+1)} - v_j^{(k)}}{w_j^{(k)}} \right] &\leq \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\min\{1, \gamma \epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg}, k)}\}} \cdot \frac{(w_i^{(\text{alg}, k)})^2}{(w_i^{(k)})^2} & \text{if } i = j \\ 4 \cdot \frac{w_i^{(\text{alg}, k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{w_j^{(\text{alg}, k)}}{w_j^{(k)}} & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \frac{16}{\gamma \epsilon^{-2} \cdot \tilde{\tau}_i^{(k)}} & \text{if } i = j \\ 16 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $w_i^{(\text{alg}, k)} \leq 2w_i^{(k)}$ and $\tau_i^{(k)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_i^{(\text{alg}, k)}$.

Let $\mathcal{I}_k = \{i : w_i^{(\text{alg}, k+1)} \neq w_i^{(\text{alg}, k)}\}$ be the indices that the algorithm resampled at iteration k . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[E_k^{(2)}] &\leq 16 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\mathbf{P}^{(k)})_{i,j}^2 + 16 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{(\mathbf{P}^{(k)})_{i,i}^2}{\gamma \epsilon^{-2} \cdot \sigma_i^{(k)}} \\
&\leq 16 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sum_{j \in [n]} (\mathbf{P}^{(k)})_{i,j}^2 + \frac{16\epsilon^2}{\gamma} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbf{P}_{i,i}^{(k)} \\
&= 16 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sigma_i^{(k)} + \frac{16\epsilon^2}{\gamma} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sigma_i^{(k)} \leq 32 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sigma_i^{(k)} \tag{8.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact $\sum_{j \in [n]} (\mathbf{P}^{(k)})_{i,j}^2 = \sigma_i^{(k)}$ for all i . Finally, we note that by the choice of the indices to update, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sigma_i^{(k)} \leq 2^{\ell_k} + 1 \tag{8.10}$$

where ℓ_k is defined in the k -th step of UPDATE. Hence, we have $\mathbb{E}[E_k^{(2)}] \leq 64 \cdot 2^{\ell_k}$. Using this, (8.7) and (8.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left\| \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k+1)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)}} - \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \mathbf{A} \Psi^{(k)} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{W}^{(k)}} \right\|_F \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{E_k^{(1)}} + \sqrt{E_k^{(2)}} \right] \\
&\leq 6 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{(k)} \left(\frac{w_i^{(k+1)} - w_i^{(k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} + 8 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 2^{\ell_k/2} \\
&\leq 6 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{(k)} \left(\frac{w_i^{(k+1)} - w_i^{(k)}}{w_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} + 8 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 2^{\ell_k/2} \\
&\leq 6K + 8K \log^2 n \leq 16K \log^2 n
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that a rank 2^ℓ update happens at most once every $\frac{2^{\ell/2}}{\log n}$ steps (proved in Theorem 10). \square

9 Open Problems

Our main result is a linear program solver that runs in expected $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ time. For dense constraint matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ this is optimal among algorithms that do not use fast matrix multiplication, barring a major improvement in solving linear systems. The fastest linear system solvers run in $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(A) + d^\omega)$ time, where $\text{nnz}(A)$ is the number of nonzero entries in \mathbf{A} and ω is the matrix exponent. This leads to two open questions: (i) Can the nd term in our complexity be improved to $\text{nnz}(A)$? (ii) Can the d^3 term be improved to d^ω by exploiting fast matrix multiplication?

A major bottleneck for question (i) is how to detect large entries of the product $\mathbf{A}h$ for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. solving the problem of Lemma 33). Currently the complexity of Lemma 33 is $\tilde{O}(\|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}h\|^2 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot d)$, which can be interpreted as “ d times the number of entries larger than ε ”. Note that verifying the answer (that is, for a list of indices $I \subset [n]$, check that $(\mathbf{A}h)_i$ is indeed larger than ε) requires the same complexity for dense matrices \mathbf{A} . However, for matrices with $z \leq d$ entries per row, the verification complexity is just $z \cdot |I|$. This suggests that it might be possible to improve Lemma 33 to run in $\tilde{O}(\|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}h\|^2 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot z)$ for matrices \mathbf{A} with z nonzero entries per row. If such a data structure could be found, it would result in a faster linear programming algorithm.

So far question (ii) has only been answered for the case $d = \Omega(n)$ [CLS19, Bra20] and no progress has been made for the more general case $d = o(n)$, even when allowing for a worse dependency on n than our $\tilde{O}(nd + d^3)$ bound. So far the best dependency on d is $d^{2.5} \gg d^\omega$ [LS14, LS15], so a first step could be to improve our complexity to $\tilde{O}(nd + d^{2.5})$ time. Currently the d^3 bottleneck comes from maintaining the feasibility of the primal solution x in Section B, so a key step would be to improve the complexity of maintaining the feasibility.

10 Acknowledgements

We thank Sébastien Bubeck, Ofer Dekel, Jerry Li, Ilya Razenshteyn, and Microsoft Research for facilitating conversations between and hosting researchers involved in this collaboration. We thank Vasileios Nakos, Jelani Nelson, and Zhengyu Wang for very helpful discussions about sparse recovery literature. We thank Jonathan Kelner, Richard Peng, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong for helpful conversations. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 715672. This project was supported in part by NSF awards CCF-1749609, CCF-1740551, DMS-1839116, CCF-1844855, and Microsoft Research Faculty Fellowship. This project was supported in part by Special Year on Optimization, Statistics, and Theoretical Machine Learning (being led by Sanjeev Arora) at Institute for Advanced Study.

References

- [AC06] Nir Ailon and Bernard Chazelle. Approximate nearest neighbors and the fast johnson-lindenstrauss transform. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 557–563, 2006.
- [AGM13] Kook Jin Ahn, Sudipto Guha, and Andrew McGregor. Spectral sparsification in dynamic graph streams. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques - 16th International Workshop, APPROX 2013, and 17th International Workshop, RANDOM 2013, Berkeley, CA, USA, August 21-23, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 1–10, 2013.
- [AKPS19] Deeksha Adil, Rasmus Kyng, Richard Peng, and Sushant Sachdeva. Iterative refinement for lp-norm regression. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1405–1424. SIAM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1901.06764.pdf>, 2019.
- [Ans96] Kurt M. Anstreicher. Volumetric path following algorithms for linear programming. *Math. Program.*, 76:245–263, 1996.
- [BLM89] Jean Bourgain, Joram Lindenstrauss, and V Milman. Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes. *Acta mathematica*, 162(1):73–141, 1989.
- [BNS19] Jan van den Brand, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic matrix inverse: Improved algorithms and matching conditional lower bounds. In *60th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1905.05067.pdf>, 2019.
- [Bra20] Jan van den Brand. A deterministic linear program solver in current matrix multiplication time. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1910.11957.pdf>, 2020.
- [CCFC02] Moses Charikar, Kevin Chen, and Martin Farach-Colton. Finding frequent items in data streams. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 693–703. Springer, 2002.
- [CH09] Graham Cormode and Marios Hadjieleftheriou. Finding the frequent items in streams of data. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(10):97–105, 2009.
- [CLM⁺15] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. Uniform sampling for matrix approximation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, pages 181–190. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1408.5099.pdf>, 2015.
- [CLS19] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, and Zhao Song. Solving linear programs in the current matrix multiplication time. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 938–942. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1810.07896.pdf>, 2019.
- [CM04] Graham Cormode and Shan Muthukrishnan. An improved data stream summary: the count-min sketch and its applications. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, 2004.

- [Coh16] Michael B. Cohen. Nearly tight oblivious subspace embeddings by trace inequalities. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 278–287, 2016.
- [CP15] Michael B. Cohen and Richard Peng. ℓ_p row sampling by lewis weights. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, (STOC)*, pages 183–192. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1412.0588.pdf>, 2015.
- [CRT06] Emmanuel J Candes, Justin K Romberg, and Terence Tao. Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 59(8):1207–1223, 2006.
- [CW82] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. On the asymptotic complexity of matrix multiplication. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11(3):472–492, 1982.
- [CW90] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 9(3):251–280, 1990.
- [CW13] Kenneth L Clarkson and David P Woodruff. Low rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual ACM symposium on Symposium on theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 81–90. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1207.6365.pdf>, 2013.
- [Dan51] George B Dantzig. Maximization of a linear function of variables subject to linear inequalities. *New York*, 1951.
- [DGGP19] David Durfee, Yu Gao, Gramoz Goranci, and Richard Peng. Fully dynamic spectral vertex sparsifiers and applications. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 914–925. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1906.10530.pdf>, 2019.
- [Don06] David L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.
- [Gal14] François Le Gall. Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. In *ISSAC*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1401.7714.pdf>, 2014.
- [GLPS10] Anna C Gilbert, Yi Li, Ely Porat, and Martin J Strauss. Approximate sparse recovery: optimizing time and measurements. *SIAM Journal on Computing 2012 (A preliminary version of this paper appears in STOC 2010)*, 41(2):436–453, 2010.
- [Gon92] Clovis C Gonzaga. Path-following methods for linear programming. *SIAM review*, 34(2):167–224, 1992.
- [GU18] Francois Le Gall and Florent Urrutia. Improved rectangular matrix multiplication using powers of the coppersmith-winograd tensor. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1029–1046. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1708.05622.pdf>, 2018.
- [Has16] Haitham Al Hassanieh. *Sparse recovery and Fourier sampling*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2016.

- [JL84] William B Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss. Extensions of lipschitz mappings into a hilbert space. *Contemporary mathematics*, 26(189-206):1, 1984.
- [Kar84] Narendra Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 302–311. ACM, 1984.
- [Kha80] Leonid G Khachiyan. Polynomial algorithms in linear programming. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 20(1):53–72, 1980.
- [KLM⁺17] Michael Kapralov, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, and Aaron Sidford. Single pass spectral sparsification in dynamic streams. In *SIAM J. Comput.*, volume 46(1), pages 456–477. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1407.1289.pdf>, 2017.
- [KN14] Daniel M Kane and Jelani Nelson. Sparser johnson-lindenstrauss transforms. In *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, volume 61(1), pages 1–23. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1012.1577.pdf>, 2014.
- [KNPW11] Daniel M Kane, Jelani Nelson, Ely Porat, and David P Woodruff. Fast moment estimation in data streams in optimal space. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 745–754. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1007.4191.pdf>, 2011.
- [KNST20] Michael Kapralov, Navid Nouri, Aaron Sidford, and Jakab Tardos. Dynamic streaming spectral sparsification in nearly linear time and space. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.12150.pdf>, 2020.
- [LDFU13] Yichao Lu, Paramveer Dhillon, Dean P Foster, and Lyle Ungar. Faster ridge regression via the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. In *Advances in neural information processing systems (NIPS)*, pages 369–377, 2013.
- [Lee16] Yin Tat Lee. *Faster algorithms for convex and combinatorial optimization*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2016.
- [Lew78] D. Lewis. Finite dimensional subspaces of L_p . *Studia Mathematica*, 63(2):207–212, 1978.
- [LMP13] Mu Li, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. Iterative row sampling. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 127–136. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1211.2713.pdf>, 2013.
- [LN17] Kasper Green Larsen and Jelani Nelson. Optimality of the johnson-lindenstrauss lemma. In *58th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 633–638. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1609.02094.pdf>, 2017.
- [LNNT16] Kasper Green Larsen, Jelani Nelson, Huy L Nguyễn, and Mikkel Thorup. Heavy hitters via cluster-preserving clustering. In *57th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 61–70. IEEE, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1604.01357>, 2016.

- [LS14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Path-finding methods for linear programming : Solving linear programs in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$ iterations and faster algorithms for maximum flow. In *55th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 424–433. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.6677.pdf>, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.6713.pdf>, 2014.
- [LS15] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Efficient inverse maintenance and faster algorithms for linear programming. In *56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 230–249. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.01752.pdf>, 2015.
- [LS19] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Solving linear programs with $\sqrt{\text{rank}}$ linear system solves. In *arXiv preprint*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1910.08033.pdf>, 2019. Journal submission.
- [LSW15] Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2015.
- [LSZ19] Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Qiuyi Zhang. Solving empirical risk minimization in the current matrix multiplication time. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 2140–2157. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1905.04447.pdf>, 2019.
- [Mah11] Michael W. Mahoney. Randomized algorithms for matrices and data. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 3(2):123–224, 2011.
- [Meh92] Sanjay. Mehrotra. On the implementation of a primal-dual interior point method. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2(4):575–601, 1992.
- [MM13] Xiangrui Meng and Michael W Mahoney. Low-distortion subspace embeddings in input-sparsity time and applications to robust linear regression. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual ACM symposium on Symposium on theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 91–100. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1210.3135.pdf>, 2013.
- [NN89] Yu Nesterov and Arkadi Nemirovskiy. *Self-concordant functions and polynomial-time methods in convex programming*. USSR Academy of Sciences, Central Economic & Mathematic Institute, 1989.
- [NN91] Yu Nesterov and A Nemirovsky. Acceleration and parallelization of the path-following interior point method for a linearly constrained convex quadratic problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 1(4):548–564, 1991.
- [NN94] Yurii Nesterov and Arkadii Semenovich Nemirovskii. *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*, volume 13. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.
- [NN13] Jelani Nelson and Huy L Nguyễn. OSNAP: Faster numerical linear algebra algorithms via sparser subspace embeddings. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 117–126. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1211.1002.pdf>, 2013.
- [NNW14] Jelani Nelson, Huy L Nguyễn, and David P Woodruff. On deterministic sketching and streaming for sparse recovery and norm estimation. In *Linear Algebra and its*

- Applications*, volume 441, pages 152–167. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1206.5725.pdf>, 2014.
- [NS19] Vasileios Nakos and Zhao Song. Stronger L2/L2 compressed sensing; without iterating. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.02742.pdf>, 2019.
- [NW14] Jelani Nelson and David P. Woodruff. Personal communication. ., 2014.
- [Pag13] Rasmus Pagh. Compressed matrix multiplication. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 5(3):9, 2013.
- [Pri13] Eric C Price. *Sparse recovery and Fourier sampling*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2013.
- [Ren88] James Renegar. A polynomial-time algorithm, based on newton’s method, for linear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 40(1-3):59–93, 1988.
- [San04] Piotr Sankowski. Dynamic transitive closure via dynamic matrix inverse (extended abstract). In *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 509–517, 2004.
- [Sid15] Aaron Daniel Sidford. *Iterative methods, combinatorial optimization, and linear programming beyond the universal barrier*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015.
- [Son19] Zhao Song. *Matrix Theory: Optimization, Concentration and Algorithms*. PhD thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2019.
- [SS11] Daniel A Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1913–1926, 2011.
- [Sto10] Andrew James Stothers. On the complexity of matrix multiplication. 2010.
- [Str69] Volker Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. *Numerische mathematik*, 13(4):354–356, 1969.
- [Str86] Volker Strassen. The asymptotic spectrum of tensors and the exponent of matrix multiplication. In *27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 49–54, 1986.
- [SWZ19] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Relative error tensor low rank approximation. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1704.08246.pdf>, 2019.
- [TZ12] Mikkel Thorup and Yin Zhang. Tabulation-based 5-independent hashing with applications to linear probing and second moment estimation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(2):293–331, 2012.
- [VA93] Pravin M Vaidya and David S Atkinson. A technique for bounding the number of iterations in path following algorithms. *Complexity in Numerical Optimization*, pages 462–489, 1993.

- [Vai89a] Pravin M. Vaidya. A new algorithm for minimizing convex functions over convex sets (extended abstract). In *30th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 338–343, 1989.
- [Vai89b] Pravin M Vaidya. Speeding-up linear programming using fast matrix multiplication. In *30th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 332–337, 1989.
- [Vai90] Pravin M. Vaidya. Reducing the parallel complexity of certain linear programming problems (extended abstract). In *31st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 583–589, 1990.
- [Vil39] Jean Ville. Etude critique de la notion de collectif. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, 45(11):824, 1939.
- [Wil12] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Multiplying matrices faster than coppersmith-winograd. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 887–898. ACM, 2012.
- [Woo14] David P. Woodruff. Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 10(1-2):1–157, 2014.
- [Ye11] Yinyu Ye. *Interior point algorithms: theory and analysis*, volume 44. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [YTM94] Yinyu Ye, Michael J Todd, and Shinji Mizuno. An $O(\sqrt{nL})$ -iteration homogeneous and self-dual linear programming algorithm. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 19(1):53–67, 1994.

A Misc Technical Lemmas

Here we state various technical lemmas from prior work that we use throughout our paper.

Lemma 45 (Projection Matrix Facts (Lemma 47 of [LS19])). *Let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an arbitrary orthogonal projection matrix and let $\Sigma = \mathbf{Diag}(\mathbf{P})$ and $\mathbf{P}^{(2)} = \mathbf{P} \circ \mathbf{P}$. For all $i, j \in [n]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Diag}(x)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1) \quad \Sigma_{ii} &= \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbf{P}_{ij}^{(2)} & (5) \quad \|\Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(2)} x\|_\infty &\leq \|x\|_\infty \\
 (2) \quad \mathbf{0} &\preceq \mathbf{P}^{(2)} \preceq \Sigma \preceq \mathbf{I}, \text{ (in particular, } 0 \leq \Sigma_{ii} \leq 1) & (6) \quad \sum_{i \in [n]} \Sigma_{ii} &= \text{rank}(\mathbf{P}) \\
 (3) \quad \mathbf{P}_{ij}^{(2)} &\leq \Sigma_{ii} \Sigma_{jj} & (7) \quad \left| y^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}^{(2)} y \right| &\leq \|y\|_\Sigma^2 \cdot \|x\|_\Sigma \\
 (4) \quad \|\Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(2)} x\|_\infty &\leq \|x\|_\Sigma & (8) \quad \left| y^\top (\mathbf{P} \circ \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}) y \right| &\leq \|y\|_\Sigma^2 \cdot \|x\|_\Sigma.
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 46 (Derivative of Projection Matrix (Lemma 49 of [LS19])). *Given full rank $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ we have*

$$D_w \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A})[h] = \Delta \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}) + \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}) \Delta - 2\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}) \Delta \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A})$$

where $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Diag}(w)$, $\Delta = \mathbf{Diag}(h/w)$, and $D_w f(w)[h]$ denote the directional derivative of f with respect to w in direction h . In particular, we have that

$$D_w \sigma(\mathbf{W})[h] = 2\Lambda(\mathbf{W}) \mathbf{W}^{-1} h.$$

The next lemma gives a variety of frequently used relationships between different types of multiplicative approximations.

Lemma 47. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\mathbf{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(a)$ and $\mathbf{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(b)$. If $a \approx_\epsilon b$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ then*

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}(a - b)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon + \epsilon^2 \text{ and } \|\mathbf{B}^{-1}(a - b)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon + \epsilon^2.$$

Further, if for $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and either

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}(a - b)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon \text{ or } \|\mathbf{B}^{-1}(a - b)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$$

then $a \approx_{\epsilon + \epsilon^2} b$.

Proof. These follow near immediately by Taylor expansion. □

Here we provide some helpful expectation bounds. This lemma just shows that the relative change of a matrix in Frobenius norm can be bounded by the change in the projection Schur product norm.

Lemma 48 (Matrix Stability). *For full column rank $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have*

$$\left\| \left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A} \left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \right\|_F = \|\delta\|_{\mathbf{P}^{(2)}}$$

where $\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Diag}(\delta)$ and $\mathbf{P} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A})$.

Proof. Direct calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A} \left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \right\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{P} \Delta \mathbf{A} \left(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \right)^{-1/2} \right] \\
&= \text{Tr} [\mathbf{P} \Delta \mathbf{P} \Delta] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} [\mathbf{P} \Delta]_{ij} [\mathbf{P} \Delta]_{ji} \\
&= \sum_{i, j \in [n]} \mathbf{P}_{ij}^2 \delta_i \delta_j
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma (coupled with the one above) shows that we can leverage score sample to have small change in Frobenius norm.

Lemma 49 (Expected Frobenius). *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be non-degenerate and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Further let $\tau \geq \sigma(\mathbf{A})$ and let $\tilde{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be chosen randomly where for all $i \in [n]$ independently $\tilde{\delta}_i = \delta_i/p_i$ with probability p_i and $\tilde{\delta}_i = 0$ otherwise where $p_i = \min\{1, \tau_i \cdot k\}$ for some $k \geq 0$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}] = \delta \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\delta}\|_{\mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{A})}^2] \leq (1 + (1/k)) \cdot \|\delta\|_\sigma^2.$$

Proof. Clearly $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}] = \delta$ by construction. Further, since the different entries of $\tilde{\delta}_i$ are set independently we have that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i \tilde{\delta}_j] = \delta_i \delta_j$ when $i \neq j$. Consequently, letting \mathbf{P} therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\delta}\|_{\mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{A})}^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i, j \in [n]} \mathbf{P}_{i, j}^2 \delta_i \delta_j \right] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{P}_{i, i}^2 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i^2] + \sum_{i, j \in [n]: i \neq j} \mathbf{P}_{i, j}^2 \mathbb{E}[\delta_i \delta_j] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^2 \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i^2] - (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i])^2) + \|\delta\|_{\mathbf{P}^{(2)}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, either $p_i = 1$ and

$$\sigma_i^2 \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i^2] - (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i])^2) = \sigma_i \cdot (\delta_i^2 - \delta_i^2) = 0$$

or $p_i < 1$ and $p_i = k \cdot \tau_i \geq k \cdot \sigma_i$ in which case

$$\sigma_i^2 \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i^2] - (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\delta}_i])^2) \leq \frac{\sigma_i^2 \delta_i^2}{p_i} \leq \frac{\sigma_i}{k} \cdot \delta_i^2.$$

Combining these facts and leveraging that $\mathbf{P}^{(2)} \preceq \Sigma$ (Lemma 45) then yields the result. □

B Maintaining Near Feasibility

In this section we prove the remainder of Theorem 5. Note that when assuming the interior point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ stays feasible, we have proven Theorem 5 by Theorem 32. Thus we are only left with analyzing how to make sure that x stays approximately feasible. This is required because the step δ_x performed by our IPM does not necessarily satisfy $\mathbf{A}^\top \delta_x = 0$, due to the spectral approximation we used for $(\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ in our steps.

Given some infeasible x we can obtain a feasible x' via

$$x' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x - \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} (\mathbf{A}^\top x - b),$$

We show in Lemma 56 that these x and x' are close multiplicatively

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x' - x)\|_{\tau+\infty}^2 \approx \mu^{-1} \|x - x'\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2$$

which motivates that we want to minimize the term on the right. Hence we measure the infeasibility of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ by the potential $\Phi_b : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where for any $x', s' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$

$$\Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) = \mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top x - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Here we prove that throughout the algorithm, we maintain $\Phi_b \leq \frac{\zeta \epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}$, where ϵ is the parameter of Theorem 5 and $\zeta > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant.

The extra parameters $x', s' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ of our potential function Φ_b are motivated by the fact, that we analyze this norm in several steps. Our proof is split into three parts. First, we analyze how much the potential $\Phi_b(x + \delta_x, x', s', \mu)$ increases by performing the IPM step δ_x in Section B.1. Second, we analyze how much the potential increases by moving x', s' to $x' + \delta_x, s' + \delta_s$ in Section B.2. In general, this could incur a constant factor increase of the potential, so we modify the IPM to also perform a small corrective step δ'_x and analyze $\Phi_b(x + \delta_x + \delta'_x, x' + \delta_x, s' + \delta_s, \mu)$ instead. In Section B.3 we show that it takes $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations of the modified IPM until Φ_b increases by a constant factor. After such $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations, the algorithm then performs another more expensive correction step, which decreases the potential again. This way the potential will stay small throughout the entire IPM, which then concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

B.1 Increase of Infeasibility Due to x

First, we show that Φ_b increases slowly when the step δ_x of the IPM is correct in expectation (that is, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A} \delta_x] = 0$). In particular, it takes \sqrt{d} iterations to increase Φ_b by 1.

Lemma 50 (Infeasibility change due to x). *Assume that $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{s}} \approx_1 \mu \overline{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x' \approx_1 x \approx_1 \overline{x}$, $s' \approx_1 s \approx_1 \overline{s}$ and $\overline{\tau} \approx_1 \tau(\overline{x}, \overline{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\overline{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be a random symmetric matrix satisfying*

$$\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \overline{\mathbf{Q}} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}^{-1}] = \overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}.$$

for some $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1)$. Further, let $x^{(\text{new})} = x + \delta_x$ where $\delta_x = \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}) \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\overline{\mathbf{W}} = \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{P} = \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} [\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x', s', \mu)] \leq \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) + O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|h\|_{\overline{\tau}}^2.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}^\top \delta_x] = \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I} - \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}) \overline{\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} h = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For easy of analysis, we define matrix $\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as $\mathbf{Q}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x', s', \mu)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (x + \delta_x) - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (x + \delta_x) - b\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 \right] \\ &= \mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (x + \mathbb{E}[\delta_x]) - b\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x])\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 \right] \\ &= \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) + \mathbb{E} \left[\mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x])\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from $\mathbb{E}[x^2] = (\mathbb{E}[x])^2 + \mathbb{E}[(x - \mathbb{E}[x])^2]$, and the last step follows from (B.1) (the definition of Φ_b) and (B.2).

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x] &= \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{H}^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}) \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h \\ &= \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{H}^{-1} - (\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}) \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h. \end{aligned}$$

We define matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{1/2} \mathbf{H}^{-1} (\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{1/2} = \overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{1/2} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{1/2}.$$

Since $\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{A}$, we have $\|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{I}\|_2 = O(\epsilon_H)$. Further $(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \approx_{O(1)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} = (\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}$, hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x])\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 &\leq O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x])\|_{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}} (\mathbf{H}^{-1} - (\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}) \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{I}) (\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{I}\|_2^2 \cdot \|(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_2^2 \\ &\leq O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_2^2 \\ &\leq O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from definition of matrix \mathbf{M} , the fourth step follows from $\|\mathbf{A}u\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \cdot \|u\|_2$ the fifth step follows from $\|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{I}\|_2 = O(\epsilon_H)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{-1} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\delta_x - \mathbb{E}[\delta_x])\|_{(\mathbf{Q}')^{-1}}^2 &\leq O(\epsilon_H^2 / \mu) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top \overline{\mathbf{X}} h\|_{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= O(\epsilon_H^2 / \mu) \cdot \left\| \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}} \overline{\mathbf{X}} \sqrt{\overline{\mathbf{S}}} h \right\|_{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= O(\epsilon_H^2 / \mu) \cdot \left\| \sqrt{\overline{\mathbf{S}}} \overline{\mathbf{X}} h \right\|_{\mathbf{P}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \overline{\mathbf{X}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A})}^2 \\ &\leq O(\epsilon_H^2 / \mu) \cdot \left\| \sqrt{\overline{\mathbf{S}}} \overline{\mathbf{X}} h \right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from properties of projection matrices. As $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \overline{\mathbf{S}} \approx_1 \mu \overline{\tau}$ and $\overline{\tau} \approx_1 \tau(\overline{x}, \overline{s})$ the result follows. \square

Algorithm 10: Maintaining Infeasibility

```

1 procedure MAINTAININFEASIBILITY( $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \in \mathbb{R}^n, \bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
2   Let  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n, s' \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the previous input to MAINTAININFEASIBILITY.
3   Let  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A}$ 
4   Generate independent random  $\mathbf{H}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that
      
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}] = \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \text{ and } \mathbf{H}_1 \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{Q}.$$

5   Generate independent random  $\mathbf{H}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that
      
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}] = \mathbf{Q}'^{-1} \text{ and } \mathbf{H}_3 \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{Q}'.$$

6   Generate independent random  $\mathbf{H}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that ; // Lemma 52
7
      
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2] = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{S}'^{-1/2}) \mathbf{A},$$

      
$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{Q}^{-1/2}\|_F^2] = O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \text{ and}$$

      
$$\mathbf{H}_2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2] \pm \epsilon_H \cdot \mathbf{Q}'.$$

8   Generate independent random  $\mathbf{H}_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that ; // Lemma 52
9
      
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_4] = \mathbf{Q}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}'^{-1},$$

      
$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2} \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{Q}^{1/2}\|_F^2] = O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \text{ and}$$

      
$$\mathbf{H}_4 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_4] \pm \epsilon_H \cdot \mathbf{Q}'^{-1}.$$


      // These matrices can be generated by leverage score sampling with  $\bar{\tau}$ .
10  Generate independent random  $\delta_b^{(1)}$  and  $\delta_b^{(2)}$  such that ; // Lemma 51
11  .
      
$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_b^{(1)}] = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x, \text{ and } \delta_b^{(1)} \approx \mathbb{E}[\delta_b^{(1)}]$$


      where the approximation error should be as defined in Lemma 51.
12   $\delta_\lambda \leftarrow \mathbf{H}_1^{-1} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_3^{-1} \delta_b^{(1)} + \mathbf{H}_4 \delta_b^{(2)}$  ; // This is computed and returned
13   $\delta_x \leftarrow \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \delta_\lambda, x^{(\text{new})} \leftarrow x + \delta_x$  ; // Defined for analysis and not computed
14  return  $\delta_\lambda$ 

```

B.2 Increase of Infeasibility Due to x' and s'

When $x' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ or $s' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ changes by a multiplicative constant, $\Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)$ changes by a multiplicative constant. As we want that x', s' are close to x, s and x, s change in every step of the IPM, this will blow up Φ_b too quickly.

Our key idea is to move x to some nearby $x^{(\text{new})}$ as we replace x' and s' by x and s , such that (B.1) remains unchanged, i.e. $\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu) \approx \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)$. Algorithm 10 describes how we compute this $x^{(\text{new})}$ and we show in this subsection (Lemma 53) that Φ_b does indeed not change by much when replacing x, x', s' by $x^{(\text{new})}, x, s$.

To compute this new $x^{(\text{new})}$, we need to estimate $b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$. The next lemma shows how to find

δ_b such that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_b] = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$ and $\mu^{-1} \|\delta_b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A})^{-1}}$ are small.

Lemma 51 (Generate $\delta_b^{(1)}$ and $\delta_b^{(2)}$). *Let $\rho \in (0, 1/10)$ denote the failure probability, let $\epsilon_b \in (0, 1/10)$ denote an accuracy parameter. Given $\bar{\tau} \approx_1 \tau(\bar{x}, \bar{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $x' \approx_1 x \approx_1 \bar{x}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{s} \approx_1 \mu\bar{\tau}$. Let $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. There is an algorithm that runs in $\tilde{O}(d^2/\epsilon_b)$ time and outputs vector $\delta_b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_b] = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$. Furthermore, for any fixed vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mu^{1/2} \|v\|_{\mathbf{Q}'} = 1$, we have*

$$\left| v^\top (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]) \right| \leq O(\sqrt{\epsilon_b} \log(1/\rho)) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

with probability at least $1 - \rho$. Furthermore, for any fixed matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have

$$\mu^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b])\|_2 = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F \cdot O(\sqrt{\epsilon_b} \log(d/\rho))$$

with probability at least $1 - \rho$.

Proof. We construct $\delta_b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by the following random sampling scheme:

$$\delta_b = b - \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i \cdot \tilde{x}_i$$

where a_i is the i -th row of \mathbf{A} and

$$\tilde{x}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{x_i}{p_i} & \text{with probability } p_i = \min\{1, \bar{\tau}_i/\epsilon_b\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Clearly, we have $\mathbb{E}[\delta_b] = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$.

Fix any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mu^{1/2} \|v\|_{\mathbf{Q}'} = 1$. If $p_i = 1$, then $\tilde{x}_i = x_i$ and clearly $|v^\top a_i \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - x_i)| = 0 = O(\epsilon_b^2)$. On the other hand, if $p_i < 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| v^\top a_i \cdot \tilde{x}_i \right|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{p_i^2} \cdot \left(v^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} e_i \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{p_i^2} \cdot \left(v^\top (\mathbf{Q}')^{1/2} (\mathbf{Q}')^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} e_i \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_i^2} \cdot \|v\|_{\mathbf{Q}'}^2 \cdot e_i^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{Q}')^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} e_i \\ &= \frac{x_i^2}{p_i^2} \cdot \frac{s'_i}{x'_i} \cdot \|v\|_{\mathbf{Q}'}^2 \cdot e_i^\top \mathbf{S}'^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{Q}')^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{S}'^{-1/2} e_i \\ &= \frac{x_i^2}{p_i^2} \cdot \frac{s'_i}{x'_i} \cdot \|v\|_{\mathbf{Q}'}^2 \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{S}'^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{A})_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from Cauchy-Schwarz.

Using that $x' \approx_1 x$, $\mathbf{X}' s' \approx_1 \mu \bar{\tau}$, and $\bar{\tau} \approx_1 \tau(x', s')$, we have

$$\left| v^\top a_i \cdot \tilde{x}_i \right|^2 = O(\bar{\tau}_i^2/p_i^2) = O(\epsilon_b^2).$$

where the last step follows from $p_i = \bar{\tau}_i/\epsilon_b$ (implied by $p_i < 1$). Further, as in this case, we have

$$\left| v^\top a_i \cdot x_i \right|^2 \leq p_i^2 \left| v^\top a_i \cdot \tilde{x}_i \right|^2 = O(\epsilon_b^2).$$

We see that in either case we have

$$\left|v^\top a_i \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - x_i)\right|^2 = O(\epsilon_b^2). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| v^\top a_i \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - x_i) \right|^2 \right] &= \sum_{p_i < 1} p_i \cdot \left| v^\top a_i \cdot (x_i/p_i - x_i) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{p_i < 1} \frac{1}{p_i} \cdot \left| v^\top a_i x_i \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{p_i < 1} \frac{1}{p_i} \cdot (v^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} e_i)^2 \\ &= \epsilon_b \sum_{p_i < 1} \left(v^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \frac{e_i}{\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_i}} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from $p_i \in [0, 1]$, and the last step follows from $\bar{\tau}_i = p_i \epsilon_b$ as we only consider $p_i < 1$. Using $x' \approx_1 x$ and $\mathbf{X}' s' \approx_1 \mu \bar{\tau}$ this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| v^\top a_i \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - x_i) \right|^2 \right] &= O(\epsilon_b) \sum_{p_i < 1} (v^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mu \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1}} e_i)^2 \\ &= O(\epsilon_b) \cdot \mu \cdot v^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A} v = O(\epsilon_b). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Using (B.4) and (B.5), Bernstein inequality shows

$$\left| v^\top (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]) \right| = \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} v^\top a_i \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - x_i) \right| = O(\sqrt{\epsilon_b \log(1/\rho)} + \epsilon_b \log(1/\rho)) = O(\sqrt{\epsilon_b} \log(1/\rho))$$

with probability at least $1 - \rho$.

For the last conclusion, we consider the SVD of $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and let $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $v_i^\top \mathbf{M} = \lambda_i u_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some orthonormal v_i and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that $\|(\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_i\|_{\mathbf{Q}'} = 1$ and (B.3) shows

$$\left| \mu^{-1/2} \cdot u_i^\top (\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]) \right| = O(\sqrt{\epsilon_b} \log(d/\rho)) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

for all i . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \mu^{-1/2} \cdot \mathbf{M} (\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]) \|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in [d]} (\mu^{-1/2} \cdot v_i^\top \mathbf{M} (\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in [d]} \lambda_i^2 \cdot (\mu^{-1/2} \cdot u_i^\top (\mathbf{Q}')^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_b - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b]))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in [d]} \lambda_i^2 \cdot O(\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho)) = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2 \cdot O(\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from (B.6), and the last step follows from $\sum_{i \in [d]} \lambda_i^2 = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2$ \square

Now, we show that Φ_b changes slowly if we move x to some nearby $x^{(\text{new})}$ when replacing x', s' by x, s , according to the method MAINTAININFEASIBILITY of Algorithm 11.

Lemma 52 (Generate \mathbf{H}_2 and \mathbf{H}_4). For $x \approx_{0.1} x'$ and $s \approx_{0.1} s'$, we can generate \mathbf{H}_2 and \mathbf{H}_4 with properties as defined in Algorithm 10 in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2] &\leq O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_4\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\|_F^2] &\leq O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2).\end{aligned}$$

With high probability, the time for computing \mathbf{H}_2b for any $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is $O(d^2\epsilon_H^{-2}\log n)$ and the time for computing \mathbf{H}_4b is $O(T\log n + d^2\epsilon_H^{-2}\log^2 n)$ where T is the time to compute $\mathbf{M}b$ for \mathbf{M} satisfying $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}'^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{M} \approx_{\epsilon_h/4} \mathbf{Q}'$.

Proof. The statement for $\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2$ follows directly from Lemma 48 and Lemma 49 when we perform the same leverage score sampling on both $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}')^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}')^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{A}$ (i.e. both matrices sample the same entries of their diagonal).

For the other statement, we let $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}$ and $\Delta = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1} - \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}$. By the assumption, we have $\max_i |\mathbf{D}_{ii}^{-1}\Delta_{ii}| \leq \frac{1}{4}$. By Taylor expansion, we have

$$(\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{D} + \Delta)\mathbf{A})^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \sum_{k \geq 1} (-\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}{}^k.$$

Similar to Lemma 42, we can use this to generate a spectral approximation with good expectation by truncating this series by some random X with $\mathbb{P}[X \geq k] = 2^{-k}$ and scaling the terms with 2^k so that the expectation stays the same. More precisely, we let $\mathbf{M}^{(k)}$ be independent solvers satisfying $\mathbf{M}^{(k)} \approx_{\epsilon_H/4} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}$ with $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}^{(k)}] = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}$, we let $\mathbf{N}^{(k)}$ are i.i.d random leverage score samplings $\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta^{(k)}\mathbf{A}$ of $\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A}$ such that

$$\|(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{N}^{(i)}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \leq e^{\epsilon_H/4} \max_i |\mathbf{D}_{ii}^{-1}\Delta_{ii}|$$

and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{N}^{(k)}] = \mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A}$. Now, we define

$$\mathbf{H}_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{M}^{(0)} \sum_{k=1}^X (-2)^k \prod_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{N}^{(i)}\mathbf{M}^{(i)}).$$

Since $\mathbf{M}^{(i)}$, $\mathbf{N}^{(i)}$ are independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{X,\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N}}[\mathbf{H}_4] &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbb{E}_X \left[\sum_{k=1}^X 2^k (-\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}{}^k \right] \\ &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[X \geq k] 2^k (-\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}{}^k \\ &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}{}^k \\ &= (\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{D} + \Delta)\mathbf{A})^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

To bound the Frobenius norm, we let $\mathbf{Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and note that

$$\|\mathbf{Y}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_4\mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_F^2 \leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^X \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^k \right) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^X \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{Y}^{-1}\mathbf{M}^{(0)}(-2)^k \prod_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{N}^{(i)}\mathbf{M}^{(i)})\mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_F^2$$

where we used that $\|\sum_{i=1}^X \mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2 \leq (\sum_{i=1}^X \|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F)^2 \leq (\sum_{k=1}^X (\frac{2}{3})^k) \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^X (\frac{3}{2})^k \|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2)$.

Taking expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}} \left[\|\mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_F^2 \right] &\leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^k \right) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 3^k \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}} \left[\left\| \mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{(0)} \prod_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{M}^{(i)}) \mathbf{Y}^{-1} \right\|_F^2 \right] \\ &\leq 3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 3^k \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}} \left[\left\| \mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{(0)} \mathbf{Y}^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}^{-1}) \right\|_F^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\|\mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_2 \leq e^{\epsilon_H/4}$ and $\|\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}\|_2 \leq e^{\epsilon_H/4} \max_i |\mathbf{D}_{ii}^{-1} \Delta_{ii}| \leq e^{\epsilon_H/4}$ as $x \approx_{0.1} x'$ and $s \approx_{0.1} s'$. Using $\epsilon_H \leq \frac{1}{10}$, we have that $\|\mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_2 \leq e^{1/40}$ and $\|\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(i)} \mathbf{Y}\|_2 \leq e^{1/40} \cdot \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}} \left[\|\mathbf{Y}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{Y}^{-1}\|_F^2 \right] &\leq 3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 3^k e^{1/40(2k-2)} \frac{1}{4^{k-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(1)} \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 \right] \\ &= O(1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(1)} \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Finally, Lemma 48 and Lemma 49 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{N}^{(1)} \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{N}^{(1)} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2 \right] \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|_{\sigma(\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{A})}^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 53 (Infeasibility Change Due to Norm Change). *Assume that $\mathbf{X}s \approx_1 \mu\tau$, $x' \approx_{0.1} x$, $s' \approx_{0.1} s \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider $x^{(\text{new})} = x + \delta_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined in Algorithm 10. Then, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} [\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu)] &= (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) \\ &\quad + O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \cdot (\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x^{(\text{new})} - x)\|_{\tau}^2 &\leq O(\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho) + \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)) \cdot (\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \\ &\quad + O(\epsilon_b \epsilon_H^2 d \log^2(d/\rho)) \\ \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x^{(\text{new})} - x)\|_{\infty}^2 &\leq O(\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho) + \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)) \cdot (\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \\ &\quad + O(\epsilon_b \epsilon_H^2 d \log^2(d/\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \rho$.

Proof. We define the following three matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\ \Delta_{\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}} &= \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{S}'^{-1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \\ \Delta_{\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} &= \mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} - \mathbf{X}'^{1/2} \mathbf{S}'^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}. \end{aligned}$$

and the following two matrices

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \text{ and } \mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{S}'^{-1} \mathbf{A}.$$

Let $\delta_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as Algorithm 10. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\delta_\lambda] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)} + \mathbf{H}_4\delta_b^{(2)}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\delta_b^{(1)}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_4] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\delta_b^{(2)}] \\
&= \mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{X}'^{1/2}\mathbf{S}'^{-1/2})\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x) + (\mathbf{Q}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}'^{-1})(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x) \\
&= \mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\Delta_{\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x) + \Delta_{(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x) \\
&= -\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\Delta_{\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbb{E}[x^{(\text{new})}] - b) \\
&= \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) + \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbb{E}[\delta_\lambda] \\
&= \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) - \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\Delta_{\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) \\
&= \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) \\
&\quad - \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) \\
&\quad + \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}'^{1/2}\mathbf{S}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b) \\
&= \mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}'^{1/2}\mathbf{S}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_b(\mathbb{E}[x^{(\text{new})}], x, s, \mu) \\
&= \|\mathbf{X}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbb{E}[x^{(\text{new})}] - b)\|_2^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{X}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{S}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b)\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{X}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{S}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\top x - b)\|_2^2 \\
&= \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu).
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from definition of Φ_b (see (B.1)), the second step follows from (B.7), the third step follows from property of a projection matrix, the last step follows from definition of Φ_b (see (B.1)).

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu) &= \Phi_b(\mathbb{E}[x^{(\text{new})}], x, s, \mu) + \mu^{-1}\|\mathbf{A}^\top(x^{(\text{new})} - \mathbb{E}[x^{(\text{new})}])\|_{\mathbf{Q}^{-1}}^2 \\
&\leq \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) + \mu^{-1}\|\delta_\lambda - \mathbb{E}[\delta_\lambda]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|\delta_\lambda - \mathbb{E}[\delta_\lambda]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)}]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{H}_4\delta_b^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_4\delta_b^{(2)}]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

For the first term in (B.8), and $\delta_b = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)}]\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \leq \|(\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2]\mathbf{Q}'^{-1})\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \leq \|(\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1})\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_2 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2])\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2(\mathbf{H}_3^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}'^{-1})\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|(\mathbf{H}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1})\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_2 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2])\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}} \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|_{\mathbf{Q}}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

where we used $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_1}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}] = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_3}[\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}] = \mathbf{Q}'^{-1}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\delta_b^{(1)}}[\delta_b^{(1)}] = \delta_b$. Note that $-\mathbf{Q}' \preceq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_2}[\mathbf{H}_2] \preceq \mathbf{Q}'$, $\mathbf{H}_1^{-1} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{Q}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{H}_2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_2}[\mathbf{H}_2] \pm \epsilon_H \cdot \mathbf{Q}'$, $\mathbf{H}_3^{-1} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{Q}'^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{Q} \approx_1 \mathbf{Q}'$ so the first three terms of (B.9) are all upper bounded by

$$O(\epsilon_H^2 \|\delta_b\|_{\mathbf{Q}'^{-1}}^2) = \mu \cdot O(\epsilon_H^2 \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)).$$

For the last term of (B.9) note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2 & \leq 2\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|^2 \\
& = 2\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \delta_b)\|^2 \\
& = \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\|_F^2 \cdot O(\mu\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& = \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\|_2^2 \cdot O(\mu\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \cdot O(\mu\epsilon_b \log^2 d),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 51. In summary this means the first term in (B.8) can be bounded via

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}, \mathbf{H}_2, \mathbf{H}_3, \delta_b^{(1)}} \left[\|\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)}]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2 \right] & \leq O(\mu\epsilon_H^2 \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_2} \left[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \right] \cdot O(\mu\epsilon_b \log^2 d).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_4, \delta_b^{(2)}} \left[\|\mathbf{H}_4\delta_b^{(2)} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_4, \delta_b^{(2)}}[\mathbf{H}_4\delta_b^{(2)}]\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2 \right] & \leq O(\mu\epsilon_H^2 \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu)) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_4} \left[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_4\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\|_F^2 \right] \cdot O(\mu\epsilon_b \log^2 d)
\end{aligned}$$

which via (B.8) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu)] & = (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_2} \left[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \right] \cdot O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_4} \left[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{H}_4\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\|_F^2 \right] \cdot O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& = (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) \\
& \quad + O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \epsilon_b \log^2 d,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 52.

For the movement of the step, note that

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x^{(\text{new})} - x)\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 = \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\delta_\lambda\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 = O(\mu^{-1}) \cdot \|\delta_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}\mathbf{A}}^2 \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where we used that $\mathbf{X}s \approx_1 \mu\tau(x,s)$, $\bar{x}' \approx_1 \bar{x} \approx_1 x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\delta_\lambda^{(1)} = \mathbf{H}_1^{-1}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\delta_b^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Using Lemma 51, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_\lambda^{(1)}\|_{\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}\mathbf{A}}^2 &= O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta_b^{(1)}\|_2^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta_b^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}[\delta_b^{(1)}])\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x)\|_2^2 \\ &= O(\mu) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F^2 \cdot (\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho)) \\ &\quad + O(\mu) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \cdot \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu) \end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - \rho$. Using the definition of \mathbf{H}_2 and Lemma 52, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 &= \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot (\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2]\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{H}_2 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2])\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2) \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_2]\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 + O(\epsilon_H^2) \\ &\leq O(\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2]) + \epsilon_H^2 \\ &= O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \epsilon_H^2) \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 = O(1)$, $\mathbb{E}[x^2] \geq \mathbb{E}[x]^2$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2$, and Lemma (52).

Similarly, we have

$$\|\mathbf{Q}'^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_3^{-1}\mathbf{Q}'^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F^2 \leq O(\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + d\epsilon_H^2).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_\lambda^{(1)}\|_{\mathbf{Q}'}^2 &= O(\mu(\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho) + \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu))) \cdot (\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau(x,s)}^2) \\ &\quad + O(\mu\epsilon_b\epsilon_H^2 d \log^2(d/\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have the same bound for $\|\delta_\lambda^{(2)}\|_{\mathbf{Q}'}^2$. Putting these two into (B.10) gives the result.

Finally for the ℓ_∞ -norm we have

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x\|_\infty = \max_{i \in [n]} |e_i^\top \mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x|$$

where for any $i \in [n]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |e_i^\top \mathbf{X}^{-1}\delta_x|^2 &= |e_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\delta_\lambda|^2 \\ &= |e_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}'^{-1/2}\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\delta_\lambda|^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{S}e_i\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\delta_\lambda\|_2^2 \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S})^{-1/2}e_i\|_2^2 \cdot \|\delta_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{S}'^{-1}\mathbf{A}}^2 \\ &= O((\mu\tau(x,s)_i)^{-1}) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'^{1/2}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}^{1/2}\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}e_i\|_2^2 \cdot \|\delta_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}}^2 \\ &= O((\mu\tau(x,s)_i)^{-1}) \cdot \sigma(x,s)_i \cdot \|\delta_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}}^2 \\ &= O(\epsilon_b\epsilon_H d \log^2(d/\rho) + (\epsilon_b \log^2(d/\rho) + \Phi_b(x, x', s', \mu))) \cdot (\|\ln x' - \ln x\|_{\tau}^2 + \|\ln s' - \ln s\|_{\tau}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 11: Maintaining Feasibility

```

1 procedure MAINTAINFEASIBILITY( $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \in \mathbb{R}^n, \bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ )
2    $\delta_\lambda \leftarrow$  MAINTAININFEASIBILITY( $x, s, \bar{\tau}$ ) ; // Make  $\Phi_b(x + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\delta_\lambda, x, s, \mu)$  unbiased,
   so it stays small with constant probability between any two execution of
   the following if-branch:
3   if it has been  $\sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$  iterations since this branch was executed then
   |   // Reduce  $\Phi_b$ 
4   |    $\delta_\lambda = \delta_\lambda + \mathbf{H}^{-1}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  //  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ 
   /* With constant probability  $\Phi_b(x + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\delta_\lambda, x, s, \mu)$  stays small. If it
   failed, re-try the past  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$  iterations of the IPM since the last
   time this branch was executed. */
5   return  $\delta_\lambda$ 

```

where the first step follows from definition of δ_x , the fifth step follows from $xs \approx \mu\tau(x, s)$, the sixth step follows from the definition of leverage scores, and the last step follows from our previously proven bound on $\|\delta_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{A}\overline{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}}^{-1}\mathbf{A}}$ and Lemma 19 to bound $\sigma(x, s) \leq \tau(x, s)$. \square

B.3 Improving Infeasibility

From Section B.1 and B.2, we see that Φ_b increases slowly over time. Here we show in Lemma 54, that over $\sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ iterations of the IPM, the potential Φ_b changes only by a constant factor. Intuitively, this can be seen by the IPM calling MAINTAINFEASIBILITY (Algorithm 11) which in turn calls Algorithm 10. The previous subsection showed that each call to Algorithm 10 increases Φ_b by only a small amount. As seen in Line 4 of Algorithm 11, after $\sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ iterations we decrease the potential again. Lemma 55 shows that Line 4 does indeed decrease the potential Φ_b sufficiently.

Lemma 54. Consider $T \leq \sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ iterations of the algorithm 1 and let $x^{(k)}, s^{(k)}$ be the input to the k -th call to Algorithm 10. Suppose that $\Phi_b(x^{(1)}, x^{(1)}, s^{(1)}, \mu^{(1)}) \leq \frac{\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}$, $\mu^{(k+1)} = (1 - \frac{\epsilon_\mu}{\sqrt{d}})\mu^{(k)}$, $\forall k \in [T]$ and $\epsilon_b \leq \frac{c\zeta\epsilon^2}{\sqrt{d}\log^2 n}$, $\epsilon_H \leq \frac{c\zeta\epsilon}{d^{1/4}}$ for some small enough constants $\zeta, c > 0$, where ϵ_b is the accuracy parameter used in Lemma 51. Suppose that we update x using an unbiased linear system solver with accuracy ϵ_H as defined in Lemma 50 during the algorithm 1. Assume further

$$\|\ln x^{(k)} - \ln x^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})+\infty} + \|\ln s^{(k)} - \ln s^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})+\infty} \leq 0.1 \text{ for all } 1 < k \leq T.$$

Then, we have

$$\Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k)}) \leq \frac{5\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} \text{ for all } 1 < k \leq T$$

with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Let $\delta_x^{(k)}$ be the vector δ_x as defined in Algorithm 10, when we currently perform the k -th call to that function. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\Phi_b(x^{(k+1)}, x^{(k)}, s^{(k)}, \mu^{(k+1)})] \\
& \leq \Phi_b(x^{(k)} + \delta_x^{(k)}, x^{(k)}, s^{(k)}, \mu^{(k+1)}) + O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|h\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})}^2 \\
& \leq (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot \Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k+1)}) + O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|h\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})}^2 \\
& \quad + O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \cdot \left(\|\ln x^{(k)} - \ln x^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})} + \|\ln s^{(k)} - \ln s^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})} \right) \\
& = (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot (1 + 2\epsilon_\mu d^{-1/2}) \cdot \Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k)}) + O(\epsilon_H^2) \cdot \|h\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})}^2 \\
& \quad + O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& = (1 + O(\epsilon_H^2)) \cdot (1 + 2\epsilon_\mu d^{-1/2}) \cdot \Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k)}) + O(\epsilon_H^2) + O(\epsilon_b \log^2 d) \\
& = (1 + 2\epsilon_\mu d^{-1/2} + O(c\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2})) \cdot \Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k)}) + O(c\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Lemma 50, the second step follows from Lemma 53, the third step follows from $\mu^{(k+1)} \leq (1 - \epsilon_\mu d^{-1/2})\mu^{(k)}$ and $\|\ln x^{(k)} - \ln x^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})} + \|\ln s^{(k)} - \ln s^{(k-1)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k)}, s^{(k)})} \leq 0.1$, the fourth step follows from the step of the IPM with $\|h\|_\tau^2 = O(1)$.

Let $\Phi^{(k)} = \Phi_b(x^{(k)}, x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)}, \mu^{(k)})$. Let

$$\Psi^{(k)} = \frac{\Phi^{(k)} + c\zeta\epsilon^2 \log^{-6} n}{\frac{8\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} + k\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}}. \tag{B.11}$$

Note that $\Psi^{(k)} \geq 1/9$ for $k \leq \sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ (since $\Phi^{(k)} \geq 0$) and further there exists some $c' = O(c)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Psi^{(k+1)}] \leq \frac{\Phi^{(k)} + c\zeta\epsilon^2 \log^{-6} n + c'\epsilon^2\zeta d^{-1/2} + (2\epsilon_\mu + c'\epsilon^2\zeta)d^{-1/2} \cdot \Phi^{(k)}}{\frac{8\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} + k\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2} + \zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}}.$$

We want to construct a supermartingale, so we want that this expectation is less than $\Psi^{(k)}$. This is the case if

$$\frac{c'\epsilon^2\zeta d^{-1/2} + (2\epsilon_\mu + c'\epsilon^2\zeta)d^{-1/2} \cdot \Phi^{(k)}}{\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}} \leq \frac{\Phi^{(k)} + c\zeta\epsilon^2 \log^{-6} n}{\frac{8\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} + k\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}} = \Psi^{(k)},$$

so let us analyze which other conditions are required to satisfy this inequality. For now assume that $\Psi^{(k)} \leq 1$, and $k \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\log^6 n}$, then

$$\Phi^{(k)} \leq \frac{8\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} + k\zeta\epsilon d^{-1/2} < \frac{9\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}.$$

So if we choose c small enough such that $2\epsilon_\mu + c'\epsilon^2\zeta \leq 1/100$ (note that $\epsilon_\mu \ll 1/16000$ by Theorem 5) and $\Phi^{(k)} \leq \frac{9\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}$, then

$$\frac{c'\epsilon^2\zeta d^{-1/2} + (2\epsilon_\mu + c'\epsilon^2\zeta)d^{-1/2} \cdot \Phi^{(k)}}{\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2\zeta d^{-1/2}/100 + d^{-1/2}\Phi^{(k)}/100}{\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2}} \leq 1/9 \leq \Psi^{(k)},$$

which in turn shows that $\mathbb{E}[\Psi^{(k+1)}] \leq \Psi^{(k)}$. In general, without the assumption $\Psi^{(k)} \leq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\min \left\{ \Psi^{(k+1)}, 1 \right\} \right] \leq \min \left\{ \Psi^{(k)}, 1 \right\}.$$

Hence, for $k \leq \sqrt{d}/\log^6 n = T$ we have that $\min \{\Psi^{(k)}, 1\}$ is a non-negative supermartingale.

By Ville's maximal inequality [Vil39] for supermartingales, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\max_{k \in [T]} \min \{\Psi^{(k)}, 1\} > \frac{1}{2} \right] \leq \frac{\min \{\Psi^{(1)}, 1\}}{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{4}}{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

where the second step follows from $\Phi^{(1)} \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, $\max_{k \in [T]} \Psi^{(k)} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$. Under this event, we have for small enough c that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k \in [T]} \Phi^{(k)} &\leq \max_{k \in [T]} \Psi^{(k)} \left(\frac{8\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} + k\zeta\epsilon^2 d^{-1/2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{9\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n} \\ &< \frac{5\zeta\epsilon^2}{\log^6 n}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, to move $\mathbf{A}^\top x - b$ closer to 0, we solve the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{X}}\delta_s + \bar{\mathbf{S}}\delta_x &= 0, \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \mathbf{A}^\top \delta_x &= \delta_b, \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \mathbf{A}\delta_y + \delta_s &= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta_b = b - \mathbf{A}^\top x$. This gives the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_s &= -\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \delta_b, \\ \delta_x &= \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A})^{-1} \delta_b. \end{aligned}$$

We see in Algorithm 11 that every $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations we will try to decrease the potential Φ_b . The following lemma shows that such a step decreases Φ_b sufficiently.

Lemma 55. *Let $\hat{x}, x, s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and consider $x^{(\text{new})} = \hat{x} + \delta_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\delta_x = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}^{-1}(b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1/20]$. Then, we have that*

$$\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu) \leq 5\epsilon_H \cdot \Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu).$$

Proof. For any $p > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu) &= \mu^{-1} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top x^{(\text{new})} - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \mu^{-1} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} + \delta_x) - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \mu^{-1} \cdot \|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}^{-1})(\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b)\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from definition of Φ_b (see (B.1)), the second step follows from $x^{(\text{new})} = \hat{x} + \delta_x$, and the last step follows from definition of δ_x .

Using $\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1}) \\ &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} - 2\mathbf{H}^{-1} + \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} \\ &\preceq (1 - 2e^{-\epsilon_H} + e^{2\epsilon_H}) \cdot (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\ &\preceq 5\epsilon_H \cdot (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from $e^{2\epsilon_H} \leq 1 + 3\epsilon_H$ and $e^{-\epsilon_H} \geq 1 - \epsilon_H$ for $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1/20]$.

Hence, we have

$$\Phi_b(x^{(\text{new})}, x, s, \mu) \leq 5\epsilon_H \mu^{-1} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}}^2 = 5\epsilon_H \cdot \Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu).$$

□

Here we show that the correction step of Lemma 55 does not change the solution x by much, provided that Φ_b is small.

Lemma 56. *Let $\hat{x}, x, s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and consider $\delta_x = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{H} \approx_{\epsilon_H} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1/20]$ as in Lemma 55. Then, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_{\tau(x,s)} &\leq O(1) \cdot \Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu)^{1/2} \\ \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty &\leq O(1) \cdot \Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For the bound on $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty$ consider the following

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty &= O(1) \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} \|1_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x})\|_\infty \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} \|1_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x})\|_2 \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} \|1_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1/2}\|_2 \|\mathbf{H}^{-1/2} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x})\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first factor can be bounded via

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_i^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1/2}\|_2^2 &= O(1) \cdot 1_i^\top \frac{1}{(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{S})^{1/2}} \frac{\mathbf{X}^{1/2}}{\mathbf{S}^{1/2}} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \frac{\mathbf{X}^{1/2}}{\mathbf{S}^{1/2}} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}')^{1/2}} 1_i \\ &= O(1) \cdot \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A})_i}{x_i s_i} = O(\mu^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where at the end we used $\sigma(\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}) \leq \sigma(\mathbf{X}^{1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2-\alpha} \mathbf{A}) \leq \tau(x, s)$ via Lemma 19 and $x s \approx \mu \tau$. The last term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}^{-1/2} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x})\|_2 &= O(1) \cdot \|b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} \\ &= O(\mu^{1/2}) \cdot \sqrt{\Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in summary we have $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_\infty \leq O(1) \cdot \sqrt{\Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu)}$. For the $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ norm we have because of $x s = \mu \tau$, and the definition of Φ_b that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_{\tau(x,s)} &\leq O(\mu^{-1/2}) \cdot \|(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{S})^{1/2} \mathbf{X}^{-1} \delta_x\|_2 \\ &\leq O(\mu^{-1/2}) \cdot \|\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^{-1} (b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x})\|_2 \\ &= O(\mu^{-1/2}) \cdot \|b - \mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}\|_{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{-1}} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \Phi_b(\hat{x}, x, s, \mu)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

To obtain the final solution of our LP, $\Phi_b = \Omega(1/\log^6 n)$ is still too large. Here we show that iterative application of Lemma 55 yields a very accurate solution.

Corollary 57. *There exists some small enough $\zeta = O(1)$, such that given a primal dual pair (x, s) with $\Phi_b(x, x, s, \mu) \leq \frac{4\zeta\epsilon}{\log n}$ and $xs \approx_{1/4} \mu\tau(x, s)$ and any $\delta > 0$, we can compute an x' with*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_b(x', x', s, \mu) &\leq \delta, \\ \|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x - x')\|_{\tau(x,s)+\infty} &\leq O\left(\Phi_b^{1/2}(x, x, s, \mu)\right), \\ x's &\approx_{1/2} \mu\tau(x', s) \end{aligned}$$

in $\tilde{O}((nd + d^3) \log(1/\delta))$ time.

Proof. This follows by repeatedly applying Lemma 55 for small enough $\epsilon_H = O(1)$. We need $O(\log \delta^{-1})$ repetitions to decrease $\Phi_b(x', x, s, \mu)$ down to $c\delta$ for some small enough $c = O(1)$. Note that by Lemma 56 the total movement is bounded by $O\left(\Phi_b^{1/2}(x, x, s, \mu)\right) = O(1)$ as the movement per iteration is exponentially decaying. At last, going from $\Phi_b^{1/2}(x', x, s, \mu)$ to $\Phi_b^{1/2}(x', x', s, \mu)$ increases the potential by at most some $O(1)$ factor given that x and x' differ by at most a constant factor. Thus for small enough $c = O(1)$ we have $\Phi_b^{1/2}(x', x, s, \mu) \leq \delta$. Likewise we have $x's \approx_{1/2} \mu\tau(x', s)$ when the constant factor difference between x and x' is small enough which can be guaranteed by choosing small enough $\zeta > 0$. \square

Throughout the IPM we move x several times. First, we perform the classic IPM step and then we perform the corrective steps of Algorithm 10 and 11. Note that by Lemma 53 the extra movement of x depends on how much x moved in the previous iteration. Here we show that this does not create an amplifying feedback loop, i.e. as long as $\Phi_b \leq 5\zeta\epsilon^2/\log^6 n$, the total movement $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x - x')\|_{\tau+\infty}$ is always bounded by $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By induction over the number of iterations Lemma 53 and Lemma 58 then imply that we always have $\Phi_b \leq 5\zeta\epsilon^2/\log^6 n$ and $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}(x - x')\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \epsilon/2$.

Lemma 58. *For some small enough constants $\zeta, c > 0$ let $\epsilon_b \leq \frac{c\zeta\epsilon^2}{\sqrt{d}\log^2 n}$, $\epsilon_H \leq \frac{c\zeta\epsilon}{d^{1/4}\log^3 n}$ in MAINTAINFEASIBILITY and let ϵ be the parameter of Theorem 5. Let $x^{(k)}, s^{(k)}$ the inputs of the k -th call to MAINTAINFEASIBILITY. Assume*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_b(x^{(k-1)}, x^{(k-2)}, s^{(k-2)}, \mu^{(k-1)}) &\leq 5\zeta\epsilon^2/\log^6 n \\ \|\mathbf{X}^{(k-2)-1}(x^{(k-1)} - x^{(k-2)})\|_{\tau+\infty} &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k' < k$, then we have with high probability

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)-1}(x^{(k)} - x^{(k-1)})\|_{\infty+\tau}^2 \leq \epsilon^2/2. \tag{B.12}$$

Further let $e_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the movement of x induced by calling MAINTAINFEASIBILITY (Algorithm 11), then for small enough constant $\zeta > 0$ we have with high probability that

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}$$

Proof. Theorem 32 yields the bound (B.12) if the extra movement e_x caused by MAINTAINFEASIBILITY satisfies $\|\mathbf{X}^{-1}e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}$.

We define three errors : 1. the movement due to MAINTAININFEASIBILITY, say Err_{MIN} ; 2, the movement due to IF-condition, say Err_{IFC} . Then we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Err}_{\text{MIN}}^2 &= O(\epsilon_b \log^2(d) + \Phi_b(x^{(k-1)}, x^{(k-2)}, s^{(k-2)}, \mu^{(k-1)})) \\
&\quad \cdot (\|\ln x^{(k-1)} - \ln x^{(k-2)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)})}^2 + \|\ln s^{(k-1)} - \ln s^{(k-2)}\|_{\tau(x^{(k-1)}, s^{(k-1)})}^2) \\
&\quad + O(\epsilon_H^2 \epsilon_b d \log^2 n) \\
\text{Err}_{\text{IFC}}^2 &= O(\Phi_b(x^{(k-1)}, x^{(k-2)}, s^{(k-2)}, \mu^{(k-2)}))
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 53 and Lemma 56. These can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Err}_{\text{MIN}}^2 &\leq O(\zeta \epsilon^2 / \log^6 n) \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} + O(\zeta \epsilon^2 / \log^6 n) \\
\text{Err}_{\text{IFC}}^2 &\leq O(\zeta \epsilon^2 / \log^6 n)
\end{aligned}$$

So for small enough $\zeta > 0$ we get

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \text{Err}_{\text{MIN}} + \text{Err}_{\text{IFC}} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}$$

where we use $\gamma\alpha = \Omega(\epsilon / \log^3 n)$. □

Proof of Theorem 5. Note that, when ignoring feasibility, Theorem 5 was proven as Theorem 32. So we are only left with showing that Φ_b stays small and that the condition of Theorem 32 is true, i.e. that the extra movement e_x of x by calling MAINTAINFEASIBILITY in Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{X}^{-1} e_x\|_{\tau+\infty} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{2^{20}}.$$

On one hand, the latter claim was proven in Lemma 58, assuming the infeasibility potential Φ_b is small. On the other hand, Lemma 54 shows that Φ_b does not change more than a multiplicative factor within $\sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ iterations as long as x and s do not change too much in each iteration. Thus by induction we have that Φ_b is small and that x and s do not change much. After $\sqrt{d}/\log^6 n$ iterations the potential is decreased again by Lemma 55, so $\Phi_b(x, x, s, \mu)$ stays small even after $\sqrt{d} \log^6 n$ iterations.

Note that the claim, that Φ_b stays small throughout a sequence of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations, hold only with probability 0.5 by Lemma 54. Thus after every $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations we may have to revert the changes of the past $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations and retry. This increases the total runtime by another $O(\log n)$ factor.

At last, note that during the last iteration of the IPM, we can apply Lemma 55 once more to reduce

$$\Phi_b(x, x, s, \mu) \leq \frac{\zeta \epsilon^2}{\sqrt{d} \log^6 n}.$$

□

We are left with analyzing the complexity of Algorithm 11.

Proof of Theorem 7. We choose two accuracy parameters as follows:

$$\epsilon_b = \Omega(d^{-1/2} \epsilon^{-2} \log^{-2} n) \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_H = \Omega(d^{-1/4} \epsilon^{-1} \log^{-3} n)$$

then Lemma 51 shows that computing δ_b in MAINTAININFEASIBILITY takes $\tilde{O}(d^{5/2} \epsilon^{-2})$ time. The products with $\mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2, \mathbf{H}_3, \mathbf{H}_4$ either need $\tilde{O}(d^2/\epsilon_b^2) = \tilde{O}(d^{5/2} \epsilon^{-2})$ time, or (in case of inverse matrices) require the same time as solving the systems in Lines 12 and 13 of Algorithm 1. So these

costs are subsumed and we do not have to count them. The algorithm used in Lemma 55 involves computing $\mathbf{A}^\top x - b$ which takes $\tilde{O}(nd)$ time and solving a linear system, which is subsumed by Lines 12 and 13 of Algorithm 1. Since this happens every $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{d})$ iterations, the amortized cost is $\tilde{O}(n\sqrt{d})$.

Thus the total additional amortized cost is

$$\tilde{O}(n\sqrt{d} + d^{5/2}\epsilon^{-2}).$$

□

C Constructing the Initial Point

Here we want to prove Lemma 12 which is used to quickly find an initial point for our IPM. Lemma 12 is an extension of the following known reduction. We modify this reduction so that we no longer require our final solution to be feasible.

Lemma 59 ([YTM94, CLS19]). *Consider a linear program $\min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x=b, x \geq 0} c^\top x$ with n variables and d constraints. Assume that*

1. *Diameter of the polytope : For any $x \geq 0$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$, we have that $\|x\|_2 \leq R$.*
2. *Lipschitz constant of the linear program : $\|c\|_2 \leq L$.*

For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, the modified linear program $\min_{\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}=\bar{b}, \bar{x} \geq 0} \bar{c}^\top \bar{x}$ with

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & 1_n \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ 0 & 1 \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ \frac{1}{R} b^\top - 1_n^\top \mathbf{A} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+2) \times (d+1)}, \bar{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{R} b \\ (n+1) \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \text{ and } \bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$$

satisfies the following:

1. $\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_d \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\bar{s} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n + \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ *are feasible primal dual vectors.*

2. *For any feasible primal dual vectors $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ with duality gap $\leq \delta^2$, consider the vector $\hat{x} = R \cdot \bar{x}_{1:n}$ ($\bar{x}_{1:n}$ is the first n coordinates of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$) is an approximate solution to the original linear program in the following sense*

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top \hat{x} &\leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x=b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + LR \cdot \delta, \\ \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2 &\leq 4n^2 \delta \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2), \\ \hat{x} &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 12 (Initial Point). *Consider linear program $\min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x=b, x \geq 0} c^\top x$ with n variables and d constraints. Assume that*

1. *Diameter of the polytope : For any $x \geq 0$ with $\mathbf{A}^\top x = b$, we have that $\|x\|_2 \leq R$.*
2. *Lipschitz constant of the linear program : $\|c\|_2 \leq L$.*
3. *The constraint matrix \mathbf{A} is non-degenerate.*

For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, the modified linear program $\min_{\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}=\bar{b}, \bar{x} \geq 0} \bar{c}^\top \bar{x}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{A}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & 1_n \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ 0 & 1 \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \\ \frac{1}{R} b^\top - 1_n^\top \mathbf{A} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+2) \times (d+1)}, \\ \bar{b} &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{R} b \\ (n+1) \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \text{ and } \bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \end{aligned}$$

satisfies the following:

1. $\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_d \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\bar{s} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_n + \frac{\delta}{L} \cdot c \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ *are feasible primal dual vectors.*

2. *Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ be primal dual vectors of the modified LP and $\Phi_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} - \bar{b}\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}$, then*

$$\|\bar{x}\|_\infty \leq (1 + O(\Phi_b)) \cdot O(n).$$

3. Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ be primal dual vectors of the modified LP with $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s} \approx_{0.5} \mu \cdot \tau(\bar{x}, \bar{s})$ for $\mu < \delta^2/(8d)$ and small enough $\Phi_b := \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} - \bar{b}\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}^2 = O(1)$ (i.e. \bar{x} does not have to be feasible).

The vector $\hat{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cdot \bar{x}_{1:n}$ where $\bar{x}_{1:n}$ is the first n coordinates of \bar{x} is an approximate solution to the original linear program in the following sense

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top \hat{x} &\leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + O(nLR) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta), \\ \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2 &\leq O(n^2) \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta), \\ \hat{x} &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Assume for simplicity that the original input LP satisfies $\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R\|_\infty \geq 0.5(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|/R)$. If this assumption is not satisfied, then we can simply add a variable x_{n+1} and the constraint $(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|/R)x_{n+1} = 0$. Note that this does not increase the value of $\|b\|_2, \|c\|_2$, or R for this new LP. Further, the constraint matrix, $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (n+1)}$ of this new LP satisfies $\|\mathbf{A}'\|_F \leq 2\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|/R$ and the new constraint vector b' satisfies

$$\|(\mathbf{A}')^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b'/R\|_\infty \geq (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|_2/R) \geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{A}'\|_F + \|b\|_2/R)$$

as desired. Consequently, if we take this new LP as input to our reduction we only need to decrease δ by a factor of 2 more than before to obtain the same result. So for now assume $\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b\|_\infty \geq 0.5(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|/R)$.

Given an (infeasible) solution $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ to the modified LP, let $(\bar{x}', \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ be the feasible solution we get via projecting

$$\bar{x}' = \bar{x} + \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}} (\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1} (b - \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}).$$

Then this new point is feasible because

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}' &= \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}} (\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1} (b - \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x} + (b - \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{x}) = b, \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 56 we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\bar{x}' - \bar{x})\|_{\tau+\infty}^2 = O(\Phi_b). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

As \bar{x}' is feasible, we have $\sum_{i \in [n+1]} \bar{x}'_i \leq n+1$ by the constraints of the modified LP and thus $\bar{x}'_i \leq n+1$ for $i \leq n+1$. To bound $\theta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{x}'_{n+2}$ note that for all i with $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R)_i \neq 0$ we have by the constraint for the LP

$$\theta = \frac{(\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{x}'_{1:n} - b/R)_i}{(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R)_i} = \frac{|(\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{x}'_{1:n} - b/R)_i|}{|(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R)_i|}.$$

By choosing i to be the maximizer of the absolute value of the denominator we have

$$\theta \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}^\top \bar{x}'_{1:n} - b/R\|_\infty}{\|(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R)_i\|_\infty} \leq \frac{(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|_2/R)(n+1)}{\|(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R)_i\|_\infty} = O(n)$$

where in the second step we used that $\|\bar{x}'_{1:n}\|_2 \leq \sum_{j \in [n]} \bar{x}'_j \leq n+1$ and in the third step we used the assumption that $\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n - b/R\|_\infty \geq 0.5(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \|b\|_2/R)$. Thus in summary we have $\|\bar{x}'\|_\infty = O(n)$

and $\|\bar{x}\|_\infty \leq (1 + O(\Phi_b)) \cdot O(n)$ by (C.1). This concludes the proof on $\|\bar{x}\|_\infty$ and we are left with proving the last claim of Theorem 12.

For our feasible solution $(\bar{x}', \bar{y}, \bar{s})$ we can bound the duality gap as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n+2]} \bar{x}'_i \cdot \bar{s}_i &= \sum_{i \in [n+2]} \bar{x}_i \cdot \bar{s}_i (1 + \bar{x}_i^{-1} (\bar{x}'_i - \bar{x}_i)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in [n+2]} 2\mu\tau_i (1 + O(\sqrt{\Phi_b})) \\ &= 4\mu d (1 + O(\sqrt{\Phi_b})) \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\bar{x}_i \cdot \bar{s}_i \leq 2\mu\tau_i$, $\tau_i = \sigma_i + n/d$, $\sum_i \sigma_i = d$ and the previous bound on $\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\bar{x}' - \bar{x})\|_{\tau+\infty}^2$. So for $\mu \leq \delta^2/(8d)$ and small enough $\Phi_b = O(1)$, this duality gap is bounded by δ^2 . This allows us to apply Lemma 59, so we can construct a good solution $\hat{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for the original LP from $\bar{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ by taking the first n coordinates and scaling them by R . We further construct an $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from our infeasible solution $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ in the same way. For this infeasible $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top \hat{x} &= c^\top \hat{x}' + c^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}') \\ &\leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + LR \cdot \delta + c^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}'). \end{aligned}$$

The impact of the last error term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}') &\leq \|c^\top\|_2 \cdot \|\hat{x} - \hat{x}'\|_2 \leq L \|\hat{x}' \cdot \hat{x}'^{-1} (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \\ &\leq L \|\hat{x}'\|_2 \cdot \|\hat{x}'^{-1} (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_\infty \\ &\leq LR \cdot O\left(n\sqrt{\Phi_b}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ is feasible, so $\sum_{i \in [n+1]} \bar{x}'_i = n + 1$, which means $\|\hat{x}'\|_2 \leq \|\hat{x}'\|_1 \leq R(n + 1)$. The last step uses that the entries of $\bar{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ are close multiplicatively, so the same is also true for $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\hat{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In summary we thus obtain

$$c^\top \hat{x} \leq \min_{\mathbf{A}^\top x = b, x \geq 0} c^\top x + LR \cdot (\delta + O(n\sqrt{\Phi_b})).$$

We are left with proving the bound on $\|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2$. For this note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}' - b\|_2 + \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \\ &\leq 4n^2 \delta \cdot (\|A\|_F R + \|b\|_2) + \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

via triangle inequality and Lemma 59. So it remains to bound $\|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the first $n + 1$ entries of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ be the last entry of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ (and likewise x' and θ' for the feasible \bar{x}'), then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top (\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{R^2} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}') + (b - R\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n)(\theta - \theta')\|_2^2 + (\mathbf{1}_{n+1}^\top (x - x'))^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{R^2} \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}') + (b - R\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n)(\theta - \theta')\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top (\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top (\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_2 R + \|b - R\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n\|_2 |\theta - \theta'|. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We first bound the term $\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top(\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_2$ in (C.2). Note that $\Phi_b = \mu^{-1}\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top(\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}^2$. So we bound the ℓ_2 -norm via this local norm.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top(\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}((\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1})} \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top(\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_{(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}})^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{A}}) \mu \Phi_b \\ &\leq (\max_{i \in [n]} \bar{x}_i / \bar{s}_i) \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}) \mu \Phi_b \\ &\leq (\max_{i \in [n]} \bar{x}_i / \bar{s}_i) \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F^2 \mu \Phi_b \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot (\max_{i \in [n]} x'_i / \bar{s}_i) \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F^2 \mu \Phi_b \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that x and x' differ by an $1 \pm O(\sqrt{\Phi_b}) = O(1)$ factor. We already argued $\|x'\|_\infty = O(n)$ and we have $x'_s \geq 0.5\tau\mu$, so

$$1/s_i \leq 2x'_i/(\tau\mu) \leq 2nx'_i/(d\mu).$$

With the previous bounds on x this leads to

$$\max_{i \in [n]} x'_i/s_i = O(n^3/(d\mu)) = O(n^3/(d\mu)),$$

which means

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top(\bar{x} - \bar{x}')\|_2^2 \leq O((n^3/d)\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F^2 \Phi_b). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Now, we bound the term $\|b - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n\|_2 |\theta - \theta'|$ in (C.2). Since we know that $|\theta|$ and $|\theta'|$ are bounded by $O(n\delta)$ (this is proven in [CLS19] where they proved Lemma 59), we have the bound

$$\|b - R\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n\|_2^2 \cdot |\theta - \theta'|^2 \leq O(n\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 R^2 + \|b\|_2^2) \cdot n^2 \delta^2. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Putting (C.3) and (C.4) into (C.2), we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top(\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2^2 \leq O((n^3/d)\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F^2 \Phi_b R^2) + O(n\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 R^2 + \|b\|_2^2) \cdot n^2 \delta^2.$$

At last we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|_F &\leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F + (n+1)^{0.5} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{R} b - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{1}_n \right\|_2 \\ &\leq O(n^{0.5} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F + \frac{1}{R} \|b\|_2), \end{aligned}$$

So, in total, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top(\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \leq O(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R n^2 + \|b\|_2 n) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta).$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x} - b\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^\top \hat{x}' - b\|_2 + \|\mathbf{A}^\top(\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \\ &\leq 4n^2 \delta \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2) + \|\mathbf{A}^\top(\hat{x} - \hat{x}')\|_2 \\ &\leq 4n^2 \delta \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2) + O(\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R n^2 + \|b\|_2 n) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta) \\ &\leq O(n^2) \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_F R + \|b\|_2) \cdot (\sqrt{\Phi_b} + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

□

Algorithm 12: Algorithm for Maintaining $\nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ (Theorem 60)

```

1 members
2    $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} \in \{0,1\}^n$  ; // Indicator vectors for a partition of  $[n]$ 
3    $w^{(k,\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  ; // Maintained to be  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ 
4    $x, v, \bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 

5 procedure INITIALIZE( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \epsilon > 0$ )
6    $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}, x \leftarrow x, v \leftarrow v$ 
7   for  $k = 1, \dots, \log^{-1}(1 - \epsilon)$  and  $\ell = 0, \dots, (1.5/\epsilon)$  do
8      $\bar{v}^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow 0_n$ 
9      $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow 1$  and  $\bar{\tau}_i \leftarrow (1 - \epsilon)^{k+1}$  if  $0.5 + \ell\epsilon/2 \leq v_i < 0.5 + (\ell + 1)\epsilon/2$  and
10     $(1 - \epsilon)^{k+1} \leq \tau_i \leq (1 - \epsilon)^k$ .
11     $w^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \cdot \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ 

11 procedure UPDATE( $i \in [n], a \in \mathbb{R}, b \in \mathbb{R}, c \in \mathbb{R}$ )
12   Find  $k, \ell$  such that  $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} = 1$ , then  $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow 0$ .
13    $w^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow w^{(k,\ell)} - \mathbf{A}^\top x_i 1_i$ 
14   Find  $k, \ell$  such that  $0.5 + \ell\epsilon/2 \leq a < 0.5 + (\ell + 1)\epsilon/2$  and  $(1 - \epsilon)^{k+1} \leq b \leq (1 - \epsilon)^k$ , then
15    $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow 0$ .
16    $w^{(k,\ell)} \leftarrow w^{(k,\ell)} + \mathbf{A}^\top c 1_i$ 
17    $v_i \leftarrow a, x_i \leftarrow c, \bar{\tau}_i \leftarrow (1 - \epsilon)^{k+1}$ 

17 procedure QUERY()
18   Find  $s^{(k,\ell)}$  with  $\operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \rangle = \sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$  via Algorithm
19   8 from [LS19].
20   return  $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$  and  $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ 

```

D Gradient Maintenance

In this section we provide a data structure for efficiently maintaining $\nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ in our IPM, i.e. Algorithm 1.

Theorem 60. *There exists a deterministic data-structure that supports the following operations*

- *INITIALIZE ($\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \epsilon > 0$): The data-structure preprocesses the given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, vectors $v, \tau, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and accuracy parameter $\epsilon > 0$ in $O(nd)$ time. The data-structure assumes $0.5 \leq v \leq 2$ and $d/n \leq \tau \leq 2$.*
- *UPDATE(i, a, b, c): Sets $v_i = a, \tau_i = b$ and $x_i = c$ in $O(d)$ time. The data-structure assumes $0.5 \leq v \leq 2$ and $d/n \leq \tau \leq 2$.*
- *QUERY(): Returns $\nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})^b$ for $\|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time. See Lemma 28 for $(\cdot)^b$.*

Proof. We start by explaining the algorithm and analyzing its complexity. Afterwards we prove the correctness.

Algorithm: During preprocessing and updates, the algorithm maintains a partition $V^{(k,\ell)} \subset [n]$ where $i \in V^{(k,\ell)}$ if

$$\begin{aligned} 0.5 + \ell\epsilon/2 &\leq v_i < 0.5 + (\ell + 1)\epsilon/2 \\ (1 - \epsilon)^{k+1} &\leq \tau_i \leq (1 - \epsilon)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally the data-structure maintains the products $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ where $\bar{v}_i^{(k,\ell)} = 1$ if $i \in V^{(k,\ell)}$ and $v_i^{(k,\ell)} = 0$ otherwise.

During queries the data-structure computes the following: Define $\phi(x) := \lambda(\exp(\lambda(x - 1)) - \exp(-\lambda(x - 1))) = (\nabla\Phi(x))_i$, then we apply Algorithm 8 from [LS19] to compute

$$\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \sum_{k,\ell} \phi(0.5 + \ell\epsilon/2) \cdot \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)} / \sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \right\rangle$$

in $O(n \log n)$ time and then return $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ and $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$. The solution can be represented by $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ because all coordinates with same value of τ_i and x_i has the same w_i in the solution. This can be seen easily from the description of Algorithm 8 from [LS19].

Complexity: Every entry change to v, τ might move an index i from some $V^{(k,\ell)}$ to another $V^{(k',\ell')}$ which corresponds to changing one entry of $\bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$ and $\bar{v}^{(k',\ell')}$. So every update to v, τ, x costs only $O(d)$ time to update $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}$.

Correctness: For the given vector v , we can split v into groups by grouping the entries to multiples of $\epsilon/2$. By assumption we have $0.5 \leq v \leq 2$, so we have at most $O(1/\epsilon)$ many groups. By rounding down v on each of these groups we obtain

$$\bar{v} := \sum_k (0.5 + k\epsilon/2) \cdot \sum_{i: 0.5 + k\epsilon/2 \leq v_i < 0.5 + (k+1)\epsilon/2} \mathbf{1}_i$$

which satisfies $\|\bar{v} - v\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/2$. For notational simplicity define

$$\bar{v}^{(k)} := \sum_{i: 0.5 + k\epsilon/2 \leq v_i < 0.5 + (k+1)\epsilon/2} \mathbf{1}_i$$

then $\bar{v} = (0.5 + k\epsilon/2) \sum_k \bar{v}^{(k)}$ and for $\phi(x) := \lambda(\exp(\lambda(x - 1)) - \exp(-\lambda(x - 1))) = (\nabla\Phi(x))_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v}) &= \sum_k \nabla\Phi((0.5 + k\epsilon/2) \cdot \bar{v}^{(k)}) \\ &= \sum_k \phi(0.5 + k\epsilon/2) \cdot \bar{v}^{(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we split $[n]$ into $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(n/d))$ many groups based on multiplicative approximations of τ , in other words we have that

$$\bar{\tau} := \sum_k (1 - \epsilon)^k \sum_{i: (1-\epsilon)^{k+1} \leq \tau_i < (1-\epsilon)^k} \mathbf{1}_i$$

is an entry-wise $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of τ . Then for $\bar{v}^{(k,\ell)} := \bar{v}^{(k)} \cdot \sum_{i:(1-\epsilon)^{k+1} \leq \tau_i < (1-\epsilon)^k} \mathbf{1}_i$, we have

$$\nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}} = \sum_{k,\ell} (1-\epsilon)^k \cdot \phi(0.5 + \ell\epsilon/2) \cdot \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}.$$

Next, Algorithm 8 from [LS19] shows how to compute scalars $s^{(k,\ell)}$ in $O(n \log n)$ time with

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \right\rangle = \sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)}.$$

Note that there is $\|\bar{v}' - \bar{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/\lambda$ with

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \right\rangle \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\sqrt{\bar{\tau}/\tau}\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\bar{\tau}/\tau}} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \right\rangle \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\sqrt{\bar{\tau}/\tau}\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}, w \cdot \sqrt{\bar{\tau}/\tau} \right\rangle \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\sqrt{\bar{\tau}/\tau}\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\bar{\tau}}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\tau}, w \right\rangle \\ &= (1 \pm \epsilon) \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\tau}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v})/\sqrt{\tau}, w \right\rangle \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\|w\|_2 + \|w/\sqrt{\tau}\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\langle \nabla\Phi(\bar{v}')/\sqrt{\tau}, w \right\rangle \\ &= \nabla\Phi(\bar{v}')^b \end{aligned}$$

So $\sum_{k,\ell} s^{(k,\ell)} \bar{v}^{(k,\ell)} = \nabla\Phi(\bar{v}')^b$ for some $\|\bar{v}' - \bar{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. Thus the algorithm returns $\nabla\Phi(\bar{v}')^b$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X} \nabla\Phi(\bar{v}')^b$. \square