

Efficient Search of First-Order Nash Equilibria in Nonconvex-Concave Smooth Min-Max Problems

Dmitrii M. Ostrovskii* Andrew Lowy* Meisam Razaviyayn*

{dostrovs, lowya, razaviya}@usc.edu

Abstract

We propose an efficient algorithm for finding first-order Nash equilibria in min-max problems of the form $\min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} F(x, y)$, where the objective function is smooth in both variables and concave with respect to y ; the sets X and Y are convex and “projection-friendly”, and Y is compact. Our goal is to find an $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ first-order Nash equilibrium with respect to a stationarity criterion that is stronger than the commonly used proximal gradient norm. The proposed approach is fairly simple: we perform approximate proximal-point iterations on the primal function, with inexact oracle provided by Nesterov’s algorithm run on the regularized function $F(x_t, \cdot)$ with $O(\varepsilon_y)$ regularization term, x_t being the current primal iterate. The resulting iteration complexity is $O(\varepsilon_x^{-2} \varepsilon_y^{-1/2})$ up to a logarithmic factor. As a byproduct, in the regime $\varepsilon_y = O(\varepsilon_x^2)$ our algorithm gives $O(\varepsilon_x^{-3})$ complexity for finding ε_x -stationary point of the natural Moreau envelope of the primal function. Moreover, when $F(x, \cdot)$ is strongly concave, the complexity bound improves to $O(\varepsilon_x^{-2} \kappa_y^{1/2})$ up to a logarithmic factor, where κ_y is the appropriate condition number. In both scenarios, our algorithm outperforms or matches the performance (in terms of convergence rate) of several recently proposed schemes while, arguably, being more transparent, easier to implement, and converging with respect to a stronger criterion. Finally, we extend the approach to non-Euclidean proximal geometries.

1 Introduction and problem setup

We study the following min-max problem:

$$\min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} F(x, y), \quad (1)$$

where X, Y are convex and “projection-friendly” sets in the corresponding Euclidean spaces \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} with non-empty interior, and Y is compact and contained in a Euclidean ball with radius $R_y < \infty$. Function $F : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is concave in y for all $x \in X$, and has Lipschitz gradient, namely, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x F(x', y) - \nabla_x F(x, y)\| &\leq L_{xx} \|x' - x\|, \\ \|\nabla_y F(x, y') - \nabla_y F(x, y)\| &\leq L_{yy} \|y' - y\|, \\ \|\nabla_x F(x, y') - \nabla_x F(x, y)\| &\leq L_{xy} \|y' - y\|, \\ \|\nabla_y F(x', y) - \nabla_y F(x, y)\| &\leq L_{xy} \|x' - x\| \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

*University of Southern California, Viterbi School of Engineering, 3650 McClintock Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90089.

holding uniformly over $x, x' \in X$ and $y, y' \in Y$ with Lipschitz constants L_{xx}, L_{yy}, L_{xy} . Here and later on, $\|\cdot\|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the standard Euclidean norm and inner product (regardless of the space), and $[\nabla_x F(x, y), \nabla_y F(x, y)]$ are the components of the full gradient $\nabla F(x, y)$. Rather than solving problem (1) itself, we focus on the simpler task of finding approximate *first-order Nash equilibria*.

Definition 1. A point $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in X \times Y$ is called $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -approximate first-order Nash equilibrium $((\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE) in the problem (1) if the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} S_X(\hat{x}, \nabla_x F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), L_{xx}) &\leq \varepsilon_x, \\ S_Y(\hat{y}, -\nabla_y F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), L_{yy}) &\leq \varepsilon_y, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the inaccuracy measure S_Z , with Z being a convex subset of a Euclidean space \mathcal{Z} , is defined on triples $z \in Z, \zeta \in \mathcal{Z}^*, L \geq 0$ as follows:

$$S_Z^2(z, \zeta, L) := 2L \max_{z' \in Z} \left[-\langle \zeta, z' - z \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|z' - z\|^2 \right]. \quad (4)$$

Remark 1.1. A more commonly used stationarity measure in the context of constrained minimization of a convex function $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the proximal gradient norm

$$W_Z(\hat{z}, \nabla f(\hat{z}), L) := L \left\| \hat{z} - \Pi_Z \left[\hat{z} - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\hat{z}) \right] \right\|, \quad (5)$$

where $\Pi_Z(\cdot)$ is the operator of Euclidean projection onto Z (see [Nes13b]). In the unconstrained case, both measures reduce to $\|\nabla f(\hat{z})\|$. However, in constrained setup S_Z is a stronger measure: [BR20, Thm. 4] claims the following:

(i) For any z, ζ, L one has $W_Z(z, \zeta, L) \leq S_Z(z, \zeta, L)$; thus, any $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE in the sense of Definition 1 is an $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -approximate first-order stationary point in the sense of proximal gradient norm, i.e., satisfies $W_X(\hat{x}, \nabla_x F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), L_{xx}) \leq \varepsilon_x$ and $W_Y(\hat{y}, -\nabla_y F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), L_{yy}) \leq \varepsilon_y$.

(ii) In the reverse direction there is a gap. For example, in the one-dimensional problem

$$\min_{z \geq R} \left[\frac{L}{2} z^2 \right],$$

the bound $W_Z(\hat{z}, \nabla f(\hat{z}), L) \leq \varepsilon$ implies $S_Z(\hat{z}, \nabla f(\hat{z}), L) \geq \sqrt{2LR\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2}$.

Our goal is to provide an efficient algorithm for finding $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE¹ given access to the full gradient oracle $\nabla F(x, y)$. Following the common trend in the literature on first-order algorithms, we assume that the feasible sets X, Y are “projection-friendly”, i.e., the corresponding projection operators can be computed with a small computational effort; thus, the natural notion of efficiency is simply the number of oracle queries. Besides accuracies $\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y$, Lipschitz constants L_{xx}, L_{yy}, L_{xy} , and the “radius” R_y of Y , we need a parameter quantifying the “size” of the primal problem – that of minimizing the primal function

$$\varphi(x) := \max_{y \in Y} F(x, y). \quad (6)$$

Since X can be unbounded, the natural choice of such parameter is the *primal gap* Δ , defined as

$$\Delta := \varphi(x_0) - \min_{x \in X} \varphi(x),$$

¹Since we do not assume X to be compact, exact FNE might not exist; however $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE exist for any $\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y > 0$.

where x_0 is the initial iterate. To give a concise and intuitive statement our main result, it is helpful to define the “coupling-adjusted” counterpart of L_{yy} , defined as

$$L_{yy}^+ := L_{yy} + \frac{L_{xy}^2}{L_{xx}}, \quad (7)$$

as well as the unit-free quantities – the “complexity factors”

$$T_x := \frac{L_{xx}\Delta}{\varepsilon_x^2}, \quad T_y := \sqrt{\frac{L_{yy}^+ R_y}{\varepsilon_y}}. \quad (8)$$

Upon consulting the literature (e.g., [CDHS17, Nes12]), we recognize T_x as the iteration complexity of finding ε_x -stationary point (with respect to gradient norm) in the class of unconstrained minimization problems with L_{xx} -smooth (possibly nonconvex) objective and initial gap Δ . On the other hand, we recognize T_y as the tight complexity bound for the problem of finding ε_y -stationary point in the class of maximization problems with concave and L_{yy}^+ -smooth objective, given the initial point within R_y distance of an optimum, using first-order information. (This bound is also tight in the constrained setup, with ε_y bounding the proximal gradient norm.) We now state our main result.

Theorem 1.1 (Abridged formulation of Theorem 3.1). *There exists an algorithm that, given the data $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y, L_{xx}, L_{xy}, L_{yy}, R_y, \Delta)$, finds $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE of the problem (1) in*

$$\tilde{O}(T_x T_y) \quad (9)$$

computations of $\nabla F(x, y)$ and projections onto X and Y , where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides logarithmic factors in T_x, T_y .

This result merits some comments.

- Comparing (8)–(9), we see that the complexity of finding $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE in the problem (1) can be interpreted as the product of the “primal” complexity of finding ε_x -stationary point of $F(\cdot, y)$ with fixed y , and the “dual” complexity of finding ε_y -stationary point of the function $\min_{x' \in X} F(x', y) + L_{xx}\|x' - x\|^2$ with fixed $x \in X$. This function has L_{yy}^+ -Lipschitz gradient due to Danskin’s theorem ([Dan66] and [NSLR19, Lem. 24]), and is associated with the Moreau envelope $\max_{x' \in X} [\varphi(x') + L_{xx}\|x' - x\|^2]$.
- Choosing $\varepsilon_y = O(\varepsilon_x^2)$ for given ε_x (more precisely, choosing ε_y such that $T_x = O(T_y^2)$), and using [LJJ19, Prop. 4.12], in the case $X = \mathcal{X}$ we recover the recent result of [TJNO19]: the complexity $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon_x^{-3})$ of finding ε_x -stationary point (in gradient norm) of the Moreau envelope. Such a guarantee is natural if one is only interested in the primal problem, as it implies closeness to some point x at which φ has a subgradient with norm $O(\varepsilon_x)$ ([LJJ19, Lem. 3.8]).
- Our algorithm (and Theorem 1.1 as well) can be routinely extended to composite objectives, e.g., by following [NN13, JN11]. As our focus is on the simplicity of presentation, we avoid such extension here. On the other hand, extension to non-Euclidean geometries

faces some non-trivial challenges that have not been properly addressed in the prior literature.² In Appendix B we discuss these challenges and introduce the necessary adjustments into our framework.

Finally, let us mention that upon finalizing this manuscript, we were notified of the concurrent work [LJJ20] where a method with similar iteration complexity is proposed for nonconvex-concave min-max problems. More thorough overview of related work is given in Sec. 4, and now we give a high-level overview of the approach.

High-level description of the idea. Assume for simplicity that $X = \mathcal{X}$. Our idea is to form the next iterate (x_t, y_t) as a (unique) optimal solution to the convex-concave saddle-point problem

$$\min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} \{F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) := F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) + L_{\text{xx}}\|x - x_{t-1}\|^2\}, \quad (10)$$

where x_{t-1} is the previous primal iterate, and $F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) := F(x, y) - \lambda_y\|y - \bar{y}\|^2$ is the objective regularized with a small $O(\varepsilon_y)$ term à-la Nesterov [Nes12]. By the first-order optimality conditions for (10), the regularized primal function $\varphi^{\text{reg}}(x) = \max_{y \in Y} F^{\text{reg}}(x, y)$ satisfies the following relation:

$$\varphi^{\text{reg}}(x_t) + \frac{1}{4L_{\text{xx}}}\|\nabla_x F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \leq \varphi^{\text{reg}}(x_{t-1}), \quad (11)$$

where $y_t := \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in Y} F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y)$. Inequality (11) mimics the key inequality in the analysis of proximal-point algorithm for *smooth* minimization (see, e.g., [KT98]); repeating the process for T_x iterations ensures that at least one of the search points satisfies $\|\nabla_x F(x_t, y_t)\| \leq \varepsilon_x$. The key novelty here is the application of a proximal-point type method to the “non-smooth” function φ^{reg} (its gradient is only $O(1/\varepsilon_y)$ -Lipschitz by Danskin’s theorem, and not L_{xx} -Lipschitz). This is possible due to the readily available maximization oracle for $F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, \cdot)$ in the form of Nesterov’s accelerated algorithm [Nes83]. Application of this algorithm at each step gives T_y complexity factor (since $F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, \cdot)$ is $O(1/\varepsilon_y)$ -conditioned), and ensures that (x_t, y_t) remains $O(\varepsilon_y)$ -stationary in y .

We refer the reader to Sec. 3.1–3.2 for a more detailed presentation of our approach.

Outline. In Sec. 2 we present the “building blocks” for our algorithm. We first recap Nesterov’s algorithm for smooth convex optimization, and then show how to use it for the approximation of the proximal point operator. Next, in Sec. 3 we outline our approach, present the resulting algorithm, and prove the full version of Theorem 1.1. Finally, we give a brief overview of related work in Sec. 4.

Notation. Throughout the paper, and unless explicitly specified otherwise, $\|\cdot\|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the standard Euclidean norm and inner product regardless of the (Euclidean) space. $[T]$ with $T \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, T\}$. $\log(\cdot)$ is the natural logarithm; $g = O(f)$ means that for any $z \in \operatorname{Dom}(f) = \operatorname{Dom}(g)$ one has $f(z) \leq Cg(z)$ with C being a generic constant; $g = \tilde{O}(f)$ means the same but with C replaced by a poly-logarithmic factor in g . We write $\partial_y F(x(y), y)$ for the partial gradient in y of $F(x(y), y)$ as a function of y ; in other words, $\partial_y F(x(y), y) = \nabla_y F(x, y)$ with $x = x(y)$ substituted post-factum. The remaining notation is introduced along the way when necessary.

²A notable exception is the work [Zha20] that appeared shortly after the first version of this manuscript. They study composite nonconvex-concave optimization with non-Euclidean geometry, focusing on the minimization of primal (proximal) gradient norm. Their assumptions about the distance-generating function are different: they impose the Legendre property ([BBT16]), while we require bounded gradients; see Appendix B for detailed discussion.

2 Building blocks

Given a convex set Z in a Euclidean space \mathcal{Z} and a pair $z \in Z$, $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}^*$, we define the *prox-mapping*

$$\text{prox}_{z,Z}(\zeta) := \underset{z' \in Z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \langle \zeta, z' \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|z' - z\|^2. \quad (12)$$

In what follows, we assume $\text{prox}_{z,Z}(\zeta)$ to be computationally cheap. Note that in the unconstrained case with $Z = \mathcal{Z}$, one has $\text{prox}_{z,\mathcal{Z}}(\zeta) = z - \zeta$, and in the constrained case $\text{prox}_{z,Z}(\zeta) = \Pi_Z(z - \zeta)$.

Following [DGN14], we use the notion of *inexact first-order oracle* for a smooth convex function.³

Definition 2 (δ -inexact oracle). *Let $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex with L -Lipschitz gradient. Pair $[\tilde{f}(\cdot), \tilde{\nabla}f(\cdot)]$ is called inexact oracle for f with accuracy $\delta \geq 0$ if for any pair of points $z, z' \in Z$ one has*

$$0 \leq f(z') - \tilde{f}(z) - \langle \tilde{\nabla}f(z), z' - z \rangle \leq \frac{L}{2} \|z' - z\|^2 + \delta. \quad (13)$$

Next we present Nesterov's fast gradient method (FGM) for smooth convex optimization with inexact oracle (see [DGN14]) and a simple restart scheme for it. We use them in two scenarios: (a) minimization of a strongly convex and smooth function on X with exact oracle; (b) maximization of a strongly concave and smooth function on Y with δ -inexact oracle.

2.1 Fast gradient method with inexact oracle

Assume we are given initial point $z_0 \in Z$, target number of iterations T , stepsize $\gamma > 0$, and access to a δ -inexact (or, possibly, exact) oracle for function $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies the requirements in Definition 2. We will use a variant of fast gradient method with inexact oracle due to [DGN14], given below as Algorithm 1, that performs T iterations and outputs approximate minimizer z_T of f ; each of these iterations reduces to a single call of $\tilde{\nabla}f(\cdot)$, two prox-mapping computations, and a few entrywise vector operations. Note that the inexact oracle $\tilde{\nabla}f(\cdot)$ is passed as an input parameter (i.e., "function handle"); this means that such an oracle must be implemented as an external procedure.

Assume $\tilde{\nabla}f(\cdot)$ has small enough error δ in the sense of Definition 2. The work [DGN14] proves the standard $O(T^{-2})$ convergence of FGM is preserved in this case. Let us rephrase their result.

Theorem 2.1 ([DGN14, Thm. 5 and Eq. (42)]). *Assume Algorithm 1 is run with $\gamma = 1/L$ and δ -inexact oracle of f that is L -smooth, convex, and minimized at z^* such that $\|z_0 - z^*\| \leq R$, then*

$$f(z_T) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{4LR^2}{T^2} + 2\delta T.$$

As a result, one has

$$f(z_T) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{5LR^2}{T^2} \text{ whenever } \delta \leq \delta_T := \frac{LR^2}{2T^3}. \quad (14)$$

When f is also λ -strongly convex, (14) results in the bound on the distance to z^* :

$$\|z_T - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{10\kappa R^2}{T^2}, \quad (15)$$

³Unlike [DGN14], we do not include L into the definition of inexact oracle, as in our situation this is unnecessary.

where $\kappa = L/\lambda$ is the condition number. That is, we are guaranteed to get twice closer to the optimum after $T = O(\sqrt{\kappa})$ iterations. Following [Nes13a], we exploit this fact to obtain linear convergence via the simple restart scheme given in Algorithm 2, and derive the following result.

Corollary 2.1. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, assume Algorithm 2 is run with $\gamma = 1/L$, parameters T, S satisfying*

$$T \geq \sqrt{40\kappa}, \quad S \geq \log_2 \left(\frac{3LR}{\varepsilon} \right), \quad (16)$$

and $\delta \leq \delta_T$, cf. (14). Then the final iterate z^S satisfies

$$\|z^S - z^*\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3L}, \quad f(z^S) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{18L}, \quad \text{and} \quad S_Z(z^S, \nabla f(z^S), L) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. By (15), with $T \geq \sqrt{40\kappa}$ iterations in s -th epoch we ensure $\|z^s - z^*\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|z^{s-1} - z^*\|$. Hence, after $S \geq \log_2(3LR/\varepsilon)$ epochs, z^S satisfies the first bound in (17). Similarly, we have

$$f(z^s) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{10\kappa[f(z^{s-1}) - f(z^*)]}{T^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}[f(z^{s-1}) - f(z^*)] = 4^{1-s}[f(z^1) - f(z^*)] \leq \frac{20LR^2}{4^s T^2} \leq \frac{LR^2}{2^{2s+1}},$$

where in the end we used $\kappa \geq 1$. Plugging in $2^{2S+1} = 18L^2R^2/\varepsilon^2$, we verify the second inequality in (17). Finally, for the last inequality in (17), we first observe that, due to the smoothness of f ,

$$f(z) - f(z^S) \leq \langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^S\|^2.$$

Minimizing both sides yields $f(z^*) - f(z^S) \leq \min_{z \in Z} [\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^S\|^2]$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} S_Z^2(z^S, \nabla f(z^S), L) &= 2L \max_{z \in Z} \left[-\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \rangle - \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^S\|^2 \right] \\ &= -2L \min_{z \in Z} \left[\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^S\|^2 \right] \leq -2L[f(z^*) - f(z^S)] \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{9}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the final inequality used the second part of (17) proved earlier. \square

When Algorithm 2 will be used for minimization in x , the complexity factor will be parametrized by $\Delta_f = f(z^0) - f(z^*)$ instead of R , and the *exact* oracle $\nabla f(\cdot)$ will be available (function value will not be used). Bounding $LR^2 \leq 2\kappa\Delta_f$ by strong convexity, we make the following observation.

Remark 2.1. *When running Algorithm 2 with $\delta = 0$, the second condition in (16) replaced with*

$$S \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{18\kappa L \Delta_f}{\varepsilon^2} \right), \quad (19)$$

and other parameters set as in the premise of Corollary 2.1, the guarantees in (17) remain valid.

Algorithm 1 Fast Gradient Method

```

1: function FGM( $z_0, Z, \gamma, T, \tilde{\nabla} f(\cdot)$ )
2:    $G_0 = 0$ 
3:   for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$  do
4:      $u_t = \text{prox}_{z_0, Z}(\gamma G_t)$ 
5:      $\tau_t = \frac{2(t+2)}{(t+1)(t+4)}$ 
6:      $v_{t+1} = \tau_t u_t + (1 - \tau_t) z_t$ 
7:      $g_t = \frac{t+2}{2} \tilde{\nabla} f(v_{t+1})$ 
8:      $w_{t+1} = \text{prox}_{u_t, Z}(\gamma g_t)$ 
9:      $z_{t+1} = \tau_t w_{t+1} + (1 - \tau_t) z_t$ 
10:     $G_{t+1} = G_t + g_t$ 
11:   end for
12: return  $z_T$ 
13: end function

```

Algorithm 2 Restart Scheme for FGM

```

1: function RESTARTFGM( $z^0, Z, \gamma, T, S, \tilde{\nabla} f(\cdot)$ )
2:   for  $s \in [S]$  do
3:      $z^s = \text{FGM}(z^{s-1}, Z, \gamma, T, \tilde{\nabla} f(\cdot))$ 
4:   end for
5: return  $z^S$ 
6: end function

```

Algorithm 3 Solving Regularized Dual Problem

```

1: function SOLVEREGDUAL( $y, x_{t-1}, \bar{y}, \gamma_x, \lambda_y, T, S$ )
2:    $\tilde{x}_t(y) = \text{RestartFGM}(x_{t-1}, \mathcal{X}, \frac{2}{3}\gamma_x, T, S, g_t(\cdot))$ 
3:   with  $g_t(x) := \nabla_x F(x, y) - \frac{1}{\gamma_x}(x - x_{t-1})$ 
4:    $\tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y) = \nabla_y F(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) - \lambda_y(y - \bar{y})$ 
5: return  $\tilde{x}_t(y), \tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y)$ 
6: end function

```

2.2 Proximal point operator and its implementation via FGM

Our next goal is to provide a brief overview of the proximal point method, which forms the backbone of our approach, in the context of searching for stationary points of a non-convex function. Then we show how its iteration – the proximal point operator – can be approximated via Algorithm 2.

Given a convex set X and a function $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with L -Lipschitz gradient, possibly nonconvex, the *proximal point operator* of ϕ on X with stepsize $0 < \gamma < 1/L$ is

$$x \mapsto x_{\gamma\phi, X}^+(x) := \underset{x' \in X}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[\phi(x') + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x' - x\|^2 \right]. \quad (20)$$

Observe that, denoting $x^+ = x_{\gamma\phi, X}^+(x)$ for brevity, the first-order optimality condition for (20) writes

$$\langle \nabla \phi(x^+) + \frac{1}{\gamma}(x^+ - x), x' - x^+ \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x' \in X, \quad (21)$$

which reduces to the “implicit gradient” update $x^+ = x - \gamma \nabla \phi(x^+)$ in the unconstrained case. For large stepsize, computing the proximal operator at a point might be as hard as minimizing ϕ . However, with sufficient regularization, namely when $\gamma = c/L$ for $0 < c \leq 1/2$, the task becomes easy, since the objective in (20) is strongly convex and well-conditioned, with condition number

$$\kappa = (1 + c)/(1 - c) \leq 3. \quad (22)$$

On the other hand, with such stepsize the *proximal point method*, as given by the iterate sequence

$$x_t = x_{\gamma\phi, X}^+(x_{t-1}), \quad (23)$$

attains the optimal rate $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ of minimizing the stationarity measure S_X (cf. Definition 1). Indeed, from (20) with $\gamma = c/L$ we get

$$\phi(x^+) + \frac{L}{2c}\|x^+ - x\|^2 \leq \phi(x). \quad (24)$$

Iterating this T times according to (23) results in

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{2c\Delta}{LT}, \quad (25)$$

where $\Delta = \phi(x_0) - \min_{x \in X} \phi(x)$ is the initial gap. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_X^2(x^+, \nabla\phi(x^+), L) &\equiv 2L \max_{x' \in X} \left[-\langle \nabla\phi(x^+), x' - x^+ \rangle - \frac{L}{2}\|x' - x^+\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2L^2 \max_{x' \in X} \left[\frac{1}{c}\langle x^+ - x, x' - x^+ \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\|x' - x^+\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{L^2}{c^2}\|x^+ - x\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we first used the first-order optimality condition (21) and then used Young's inequality; note that the last inequality becomes tight when $X = \mathcal{X}$. Combining (23), (25) and (26), we get

$$\min_{t \in [T]} S_X(x_t, \nabla\phi(x_t), L) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2L\Delta}{cT}},$$

i.e., the iteration complexity

$$T(\varepsilon) = O\left(\frac{L\Delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad (27)$$

of minimizing the stationarity measure S_X up to ε , which matches the lower bound [CDHS17].

Of course, the above argument would be meaningless if (25) or (26) were not robust with respect to errors in the computation of $x_{\gamma\phi, X}^+(x)$, that is, errors when minimizing the regularized function

$$\phi_{L,x}(\cdot) := \phi(\cdot) + L\|\cdot - x\|^2. \quad (28)$$

(Here we fixed $c = 1/2$ for definiteness, i.e., $\gamma = 1/(2L)$, cf. (20).) We verify such robustness in two steps. First, we immediately see that (26) is robust with respect to the objective value error in (20). Indeed, let $\tilde{x}^+ \in X$, for given x , satisfy

$$\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+) \leq \phi_{L,x}(x^+) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{24L}, \quad (29)$$

where $x^+ = x_{\phi/2L, X}^+(x)$ is the true minimizer, ε is the desired accuracy in (27), and the constant $1/24$ is fixed for convenience. Consider the counterpart of (23), i.e., the iterate sequence $\tilde{x}_t = \tilde{x}_{\phi/2L, X}^+(\tilde{x}_{t-1})$. Using (24), and proceeding as we did for (25), we obtain

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|\tilde{x}_t - \tilde{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\tilde{x}_t - \tilde{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\Delta}{LT} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{24L^2}, \quad (30)$$

that is, a “robust” counterpart of (25). On the other hand, assume that \tilde{x}^+ , in addition to (29), admits the matching guarantee for the stationarity measure:

$$\mathsf{S}_X(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+), L) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (31)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{S}_X^2(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}^+), L) &\equiv 2L \max_{x' \in X} \left[-\langle \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}^+), x' - \tilde{x}^+ \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|x' - \tilde{x}^+\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2L \max_{x' \in X} \left[-\langle \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}^+) + 2L(\tilde{x}^+ - x), x' - \tilde{x}^+ \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|x' - \tilde{x}^+\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2L \max_{x' \in X} \left[\langle 2L(\tilde{x}^+ - x), x' - \tilde{x}^+ \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|x' - \tilde{x}^+\|^2 \right] \\ &= 2\mathsf{S}_X^2(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+), L/2) + 8L^2 \|\tilde{x}^+ - x\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathsf{S}_X^2(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+), L) + 8L^2 \|\tilde{x}^+ - x\|^2 = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + 8L^2 \|\tilde{x}^+ - x\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where we first used the explicit form of $\nabla\phi_{L,x}$, then estimated the additional term via Young’s inequality, and, finally, used that $\mathsf{S}_X(x, \xi, L)$ is non-decreasing L as follows from the proximal Polyak-Lojasiewicz lemma ([KNS16, Lem. 1]).⁴ Combining this estimate with (30), we arrive at

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathsf{S}_X(\tilde{x}_t, \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}_t), L) \leq \sqrt{\frac{8L\Delta}{T} + \frac{5\varepsilon^2}{6}} \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{L\Delta}{T}} + \varepsilon, \quad (33)$$

which indeed results in the same iteration complexity estimate (27) as for the exact updates (23).

It remains to notice that the point \tilde{x}^+ satisfying (29) and (31) can be obtained by running FGM with restarts (Algorithm 2) with a near-constant total number of oracle calls, since the function $\phi_{L,x}$ to be minimized in (20) has $3L$ -Lipschitz gradient, and is L -strongly-convex. Namely, combining Corollary 2.1 and Remark 2.1, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 2.1 (Implementation of proximal point operator via FGM). *Given $x \in X$, let $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ have L -Lipschitz gradient, and let $x^+ = x_{\phi/(2L),X}^+(x)$ be the minimizer of $\phi_{L,x}$, cf. (28). Let \tilde{x}^+ be the output of Algorithm 2 run with exact oracle $\nabla\phi_{L,x}(\cdot)$, initial point $z_0 = x$, $Z = X$, and parameters*

$$T = 11, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{3L}, \quad \text{and} \quad S \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{72L\Delta_{L,x}}{\varepsilon^2} \right), \quad (34)$$

where $\Delta_{L,x} := \phi(x) - \min_{x'} \phi_{L,x}(x')$. Then

$$\|\tilde{x}^+ - x^+\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6L}, \quad \mathsf{S}_X(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+), L) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+) - \phi_{L,x}(x^+) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{24L}. \quad (35)$$

Proof. Note that $\phi_{L,x}(\cdot)$ is $3L$ -smooth, has condition number $\kappa \leq 3$, and its suboptimality gap at x is $\Delta_{L,x}$. Hence, running Algorithm 2 with $T = 11 > \sqrt{40\kappa}$ inner-loop iterations and

$$S \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{72L\Delta_{L,x}}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{18\kappa(3L)\Delta_{L,x}}{(3\varepsilon/2)^2} \right),$$

⁴Namely, we apply [KNS16, Lemma 1] using the indicator of X as the proximal function $g(x)$ in the lemma premise.

restarts, cf. (19), guarantees the validity of inequalities (17) with the following replacements:

$$z^S \mapsto \tilde{x}^+, z^* \mapsto x^+, f(\cdot) \mapsto \phi_{L,x}(\cdot), L \mapsto 3L, \varepsilon \mapsto \frac{3\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Using that $S_X(x, \xi, L) \leq S_X(x, \xi, 3L)$, by simple algebra we verify all three inequalities in (35). \square

3 Algorithm and main result

Before giving the outline of our approach, let us recap the problem formulation. We assume that $F(x, y)$ is the objective of the nonconvex-concave min-max problem (1) with “prox-friendly” feasible sets X and Y , where Y is contained in a ball with radius R_y . Our goal is to find $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) in a small number of the queries of $\nabla F(x, y)$ and projections onto X and Y . We assume to be given initial point $x_0 \in X$, fix arbitrary point $\bar{y} \in Y$, and use that $\|y - \bar{y}\| \leq 2R_y$ for any $y \in Y$.

3.1 Conceptual algorithm: primal-dual proximal point iteration

First, following [Nes12], we reduce the problem of finding $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE in (1) to the problem of finding approximate FNE of the regularized function

$$F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) := F(x, y) - \frac{\varepsilon_y}{2R_y} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2. \quad (36)$$

This function has a unique maximizer for any $x \in X$ as it is ε_y/R_y -strongly concave. This strong concavity will help us to obtain faster algorithms for finding $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE when applying standard accelerated procedures.

The crux of our approach is to run a version of primal-dual proximal-point method, choosing the next iterate (x_t, y_t) as an approximate optimal solution to the convex-concave saddle-point problem (with unique exact solution):

$$\min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} \{F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) := F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) + L_{xx} \|x - x_{t-1}\|^2\}. \quad (37)$$

To illustrate this idea, let us consider the idealized updates (\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) corresponding to the exact saddle point in (37), which exists and is unique by Sion’s minimax theorem [Sio58]). By definition, we have

$$F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_{t+1}) \leq F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) \leq F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_{t-1}, \hat{y}_t). \quad (38)$$

Using the expression for $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y)$ in (37), the right-hand side of (38) writes

$$F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) + L_{xx} \|\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_{t-1}, \hat{y}_t). \quad (39)$$

Using the left-hand side of (38), and observing that $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) - F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y') \equiv F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) - F^{\text{reg}}(x, y')$ for any $x \in X$ and $y, y' \in Y$, we have $F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) - F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_{t+1}) \geq 0$, and we arrive at the relation

$$F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_{t+1}) + L_{xx} \|\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_{t-1}, \hat{y}_t). \quad (40)$$

Unlike the previous one, this relation can be iterated, and thus analyzed in the same manner as (24), giving the T_x complexity factor. Indeed, repeating this for $t \in [T]$ (modulo the shift of index in y at the last iteration), we get (cf. (25)):

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_{t-1}\|^2 = \frac{F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_1) - F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_T, \hat{y}_T)}{L_{xx}T}.$$

Moreover, we can relate $F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_1) - F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_T, \hat{y}_T)$ to the primal gap $\Delta = \varphi(\hat{x}_0) - \min_{x \in X} \varphi(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_1) &\leq F(\hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_1) \leq \max_{y \in Y} F(\hat{x}_0, y) = \varphi(\hat{x}_0), \\ F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_T, \hat{y}_T) &= \max_{y \in Y} F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_T, y) \geq \max_{y \in Y} F(\hat{x}_T, y) - \frac{\varepsilon_y}{2R_y} \max_{y' \in Y} \|y' - \bar{y}\|^2 \geq \min_{x \in X} \varphi(x) - 2\varepsilon_y R_y. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Thus we guarantee that there exists $\tau \in [T]$ such that

$$\|\hat{x}_\tau - \hat{x}_{\tau-1}\|^2 = \frac{\Delta + 2\varepsilon_y R_y}{L_{xx}T},$$

which mimics (25) up to a small $O(\varepsilon_y)$ additive error. Now we can proceed exactly as in (26), using the primal optimality condition in (37) and the fact that $\nabla_x F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) \equiv \nabla_x F(x, y)$. This results in

$$\mathbf{S}_X(\hat{x}_\tau, \nabla_x F(\hat{x}_\tau, \hat{y}_\tau), L_{xx}) \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{L_{xx}(\Delta + 2\varepsilon_y R_y)}{T}},$$

corresponding to $O(T_x)$ iterations (8) to ensure $\mathbf{S}_X(\hat{x}_\tau, \nabla_x F(\hat{x}_\tau, \hat{y}_\tau), L_{xx}) \leq \varepsilon_x$. At the same time, we remain near-stationary in y : indeed, for any iteration $t \in [T_x]$, including τ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_Y^2(\hat{y}_t, -\nabla_y F(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t), L_{yy}) &= 2L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\langle \nabla_y F(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t), y - \hat{y}_t \rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - \hat{y}_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (\hat{y}_t - \bar{y}), y - \hat{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - \hat{y}_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \nabla_y F(\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) - \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (\hat{y}_t - \bar{y}), y - \hat{y}_t \right\rangle \right] \\ &\leq 2L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (\hat{y}_t - \bar{y}), y - \hat{y}_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - \hat{y}_t\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_y^2}{R_y^2} \|\hat{y}_t - \bar{y}\|^2 \leq 4\varepsilon_y^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used the dual optimality condition for (37) to get rid of the second term, and then used Young's inequality. Thus, $(\hat{x}_\tau, \hat{y}_\tau)$ is an $(\varepsilon_x, O(\varepsilon_y))$ -FNE.

So far, we assumed that the update (37) can be performed exactly, and analyzed the iteration complexity of the corresponding (simplified) iterative procedure. Next we show how to approximate such ‘‘conceptual’’ updates using Algorithm 2, leading to our final algorithm and the main result.

3.2 Implementation of conceptual algorithm

As in the case of the usual proximal point method, the update stemming from the auxilliary min-max problem in (37) cannot be performed exactly. To address this problem, we extend the approach

described in Sec. 2.2 and approximately solve the (primal) minimization problem in (37) up to $O(\varepsilon_x)$ accuracy in the S_X -measure via Algorithm 2 (cf. Proposition 2.1). The key challenge here is that the function to minimize in (37) stems from the nested maximization problem, hence neither it nor its gradient can be computed exactly. Instead, one must provide *inexact oracle* for this function. We do this through the following steps:

- Given the current primal iterate x_{t-1} , consider the minimization problem corresponding to the dual function of (37) evaluated at some fixed $y \in Y$:

$$\psi_t(y) := \min_{x \in X} \{F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) := F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) + L_{xx}\|x - x_{t-1}\|^2\}.$$

Solving this minimization problem for fixed $y \in Y$ by running Algorithm 2 with exact oracle $\nabla_x F(\cdot, y) + 2L_{xx}(\cdot - x_{t-1})$, we obtain approximation $\tilde{x}_t(y)$ of the exact minimizer $\hat{x}_t(y)$. As $F_t(\cdot, y)$ is well-conditioned, it only takes a logarithmic number of oracle calls to ensure a very small (inversely polynomial in the problem parameters) error of approximating $\hat{x}_t(y)$. On the other hand, a version of Danskin's theorem ([NSLR19, Lem. 24]) guarantees that the gradient of $\psi_t(y)$, given by

$$\nabla \psi_t(y) \equiv \partial_y F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t(y), y), \quad (42)$$

is $O(L_{yy}^+)$ -Lipschitz. Hence, $\tilde{x}_t(y)$ provides a δ -inexact oracle for $\psi_t(y)$ according to Definition 2:

$$\tilde{\psi}_t(y) := F^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y), \quad \tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y) := \partial_y F^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y), \quad (43)$$

where the accuracy parameter δ can be arbitrarily chosen. For convenience, we outline the subroutine that returns $\tilde{x}_t(y)$ and the approximate dual gradient $\tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y)$ in Algorithm 3.

- Now, observe that we can switch the order of min and max in (37), recasting it as

$$y_t = \arg \max_{y \in Y} \psi_t(y), \quad x_t = \hat{x}_t(y_t). \quad (44)$$

Naturally, we replace those with the approximate updates given by

$$y_t \approx \arg \max_{y \in Y} \tilde{\psi}_t(y), \quad x_t = \tilde{x}_t(y_t), \quad (45)$$

maximizing $\psi_t(y)$ by running Algorithm 2 with inexact gradient $-\tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y)$ defined in (43), and without using $\psi_t(y)$. Since $\psi_t(y)$ is L_{yy}^+ -smooth and (ε_y/R_y) -strongly concave, in $O(T_y)$ calls of the inexact oracle $-\tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(\cdot)$ Algorithm 2 finds $O(\varepsilon_y)$ -approximate maximizer y_t of ψ_t , ensuring

$$S_Y(y_t, -\nabla \psi_t(y_t), L_{yy}^+) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_y}{3}, \quad \max_{y \in Y} \psi_t(y) - \psi_t(y_t) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_y^2}{18L_{yy}^+}.$$

Combining the first of these inequalities with (42), and recalling that $\tilde{x}_t(y_t) \approx \hat{x}_t(y_t)$ with very high accuracy, we ensure that (x_t, y_t) obtained via (45) is $O(\varepsilon_y)$ -stationary in y (in the sense of Definition 1). As this must be repeated for $t \in [T_x]$, we recover the first term in (9). On the other hand, the second inequality leads to the extra $O(\varepsilon_y^2/L_{yy}^+)$ error in the saddle point relation (38), whereas, as we know from Proposition 2.1, this error must be $O(\varepsilon_x^2/L_{xx})$ in order to preserve the argument in Sec. 3.1. This is easy to fix: it suffices to perform a logarithmic in T_x number of additional restarts when maximizing $\psi_t(y)$ (cf. (34)). Thus, the argument in Sec. 3.1 remains valid, and we find an $(\varepsilon_x, O(\varepsilon_y))$ -FNE of (1) in $\tilde{O}(T_x T_y)$ gradient computations and projections onto X and Y .

We present the resulting algorithm, which is our main methodological contribution, as Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 FNE Search in Nonconvex-Concave Smooth Min-Max Problem

Require: $\nabla F(\cdot, \cdot), Y, x_0, \bar{y} \in Y, \bar{T}_x, \bar{T}_y, S_y, \gamma_x, \gamma_y, \lambda_y, T^o, S^o$

- 1: **for** $t \in [\bar{T}_x]$ **do** ▷ Using Algorithms 2 and 3 as subroutines
 - 2: $y_t = \text{RestartFGM}(\bar{y}, Y, \gamma_y, \bar{T}_y, S_y, -\tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(\cdot))$
 - 3: with $\tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(y)$ returned by $\text{SolveRegDual}(y, x_{t-1}, \bar{y}, \gamma_x, \lambda_y, T^o, S^o)$
 - 4: $x_t = \tilde{x}_t(y_t)$ returned by $\text{SolveRegDual}(y_t, x_{t-1}, \bar{y}, \gamma_x, \lambda_y, T^o, S^o)$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** (x_τ, y_τ) with $\tau \in \text{Argmin}_{t \in [\bar{T}_x]} \|\nabla_x F(x_t, y_t)\|$
-

3.3 Convergence guarantee for Algorithm 4

Next we state our main result – the full version of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_y &:= \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y}, \quad \Theta := L_{yy}R_y^2, \quad \Theta^+ := L_{yy}^+R_y^2, \\ \delta &:= \min \left[8\varepsilon_y R_y, \frac{\Theta}{2\bar{T}_y^3}, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(\Theta^+ - \Theta)}{\bar{T}_x \bar{T}_y^2}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Let us run Algorithm 4 with

$$\gamma_x = \frac{1}{2L_{xx}}, \quad \gamma_y = \frac{1}{L_{yy}^+ + \lambda_y}, \quad (47)$$

$$\bar{T}_x \geq \frac{10L_{xx}(\Delta + 2\varepsilon_y R_y)}{\varepsilon_x^2}, \quad \bar{T}_y \geq \sqrt{\frac{40(L_{yy}^+ + \lambda_y)}{\lambda_y}}, \quad S_y \geq 2 \max \left[\log_2(\bar{T}_y), \log_2 \left(\frac{\Theta^+}{\delta} \right) \right], \quad (48)$$

$$T^o = 11, \quad \text{and} \quad S^o \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(72 \cdot (3\Delta + 2\Theta + 6\varepsilon_y R_y) \cdot \left[\frac{L_{xx}}{\varepsilon_x^2} + \frac{2\Theta^+}{\delta^2} + \frac{1}{12\delta} \right] \right). \quad (49)$$

Its output is $(2\varepsilon_x, 5\varepsilon_y)$ -FNE in the problem (1), in the sense of Definition 1, after $[T^o S^o S_y \bar{T}_x \bar{T}_y]$ computations of $\nabla F(x, y)$ and twice larger number of projections onto X and Y in total.

We emphasize that our criterion of approximate first-order Nash equilibrium (cf. Definition 1) is stronger than the criterion based on the proximal gradient: the obtained point (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) also satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L_{xx} \left\| \hat{x} - \Pi_X \left(\hat{x} - \frac{1}{L_{xx}} \nabla_x F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \right) \right\| &\leq 2\varepsilon_x, \\ L_{yy} \left\| \hat{y} - \Pi_Y \left(\hat{y} + \frac{1}{L_{yy}} \nabla_y F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \right) \right\| &\leq 5\varepsilon_y, \end{aligned}$$

cf. Remark 1.1. On the other hand, the converse is not true, that is, the above guarantee is not sufficient to conclude that the point is $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE in the sense of Definition 1.

Remark 3.1 (Nonconvex-strongly-concave setup). *As follows from Theorem 3.1, Algorithm 4 can also be used when the objective function $F(x, y)$ is known to be λ_y -strongly concave in y with general λ_y , leading to the complexity estimate $\tilde{O}(T_x(\kappa_y^+)^{1/2})$, where $\kappa_y^+ = L_{yy}^+/\lambda_y$ is the condition number of the dual function in (1), matching the best known rate in this case. It suffices to run the algorithm with parameter values as in the premise of Theorem 3.1, but fixing a prescribed value λ_y .*

3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We use the notation introduced in Sec. 3.1–3.2, and refer to the arguments presented there if needed.

1^o. Consider first the “idealized” update from the primal iterate x_{t-1} :

$$y_t = \arg \max_{y \in Y} \psi_t(y), \quad x_t = \hat{x}_t(y_t). \quad (50)$$

Here, $\psi_t(y)$ and $\hat{x}_t(y)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_t(y) &:= \min_{x \in X} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) = F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t(y), y), \\ \hat{x}_t(y) &:= \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) &:= F(x, y) - \frac{\lambda_y}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2, \\ F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) &:= F^{\text{reg}}(x, y) + L_{xx} \|x - x_{t-1}\|^2 = F_t(x, y) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\psi_t(y)$ is λ_y -strongly concave with $\lambda_y = \varepsilon_y/R_y$. On the other hand, by Danskin’s theorem (see, e.g., [NSLR19, Lem. 24]), $\psi_t(y)$ is continuously differentiable with

$$\nabla \psi_t(y) = \partial_y F^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t(y), y) = \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y), y) - \lambda_y(y - \bar{y}), \quad (52)$$

and $\nabla \psi_t(y)$ is $(L_{yy}^+ + \lambda_y)$ -Lipschitz with L_{yy}^+ defined in (7).

2^o. We now focus on the properties of the point $\tilde{x}_t(y)$ returned when calling

$$\text{SolveRegDual}(y, x_{t-1}, \bar{y}, \gamma_x, \lambda_y, T^o, S^o),$$

cf. line 3 of Algorithm 4, as well as the corresponding pair $[\tilde{\psi}_t(y), \tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y)]$, cf. (43). Note that the function value $\tilde{\psi}_t(y)$ is never computed in Algorithm 4 and we only use it in the analysis. Inspecting the pseudocode of `SolveRegDual` (Algorithm 3), we see that $\tilde{x}_t(y)$ corresponds to the approximate minimizer of $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y)$ (thus also $F_t(x, y)$) in x , obtained by running restarted FGM (Algorithm 2) starting from x_{t-1} , with stepsize $\gamma = 1/(3L_{xx})$, $T^o = 11$ inner loop iterations, and the number of restarts S^o given in (49). Observe that minimizing $F_t(\cdot, y)$ corresponds to computing the proximal operator $\times_{\gamma F(\cdot, y), X}^+(x_{t-1})$ for the function $F(\cdot, y)$ which is L_{xx} -smooth. Hence, due to our choice of input parameters, the premise of Proposition 2.1 is satisfied; applying it with our choice of S^o yields

$$\mathfrak{S}_X(\tilde{x}_t(y), \nabla_x F_t(\tilde{x}_t(y), y), L_{xx}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_x}{2}, \quad (53)$$

$$\|\tilde{x}_t(y) - \hat{x}_t(y)\| \leq \min \left[\frac{\varepsilon_x}{6L_{xx}}, \frac{\delta}{8L_{xy}R_y} \right], \quad (54)$$

$$F_t^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) - F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t(y), y) \leq \min \left[\frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{xx}}, \frac{\delta}{2} \right]. \quad (55)$$

Here, (53) and the first respective terms in (54)–(55) are due to the first of three terms in brackets under logarithm in (49), cf. (34), combined with a very crude uniform over $y \in Y$ estimate

$$F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_{t-1}, y) - \min_{x \in X} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) \leq 3\Delta + 2\Theta + 6\varepsilon_y R_y. \quad (56)$$

(We defer the proof of (56) to appendix in order to streamline the presentation.) On the other hand, the second respective estimates in (54)–(55) correspond to the two remaining terms in brackets under logarithm in (49), cf. (34), combined with the following easy-to-verify relations:

$$\frac{L_{\text{xx}}}{\varepsilon_x^2} = \frac{1}{12\delta} \iff \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{\text{xx}}} = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

$$\left\{ \frac{2\Theta^+}{\delta^2} \geq \frac{16L_{\text{xy}}^2 R_y^2}{9L_{\text{xx}}\delta^2} = L_{\text{xx}} \left(\frac{8L_{\text{xy}}R_y}{6L_{\text{xx}}\delta} \right)^2 =: \frac{L_{\text{xx}}}{(\varepsilon'_x)^2} \right\} \implies \frac{\varepsilon'_x}{6L_{\text{xx}}} = \frac{\delta}{8L_{\text{xy}}R_y}.$$

Now, (53)–(55) have two consequences.

- First, by (55) we immediately have

$$F^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) + L_{\text{xx}}\|\tilde{x}_t(y) - x_{t-1}\|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{\text{xx}}} \leq F^{\text{reg}}(x_{t-1}, y), \quad (57)$$

which mimics (39). The bound (57) will be our departure point when bounding S_X later on.

- The second respective terms in the right-hand side of (54)–(55) together ensure that the pair $[-\tilde{\psi}_t^\delta(y), -\tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(y)]$ with

$$\tilde{\psi}_t^\delta(y) := F_t^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) + \frac{\delta}{4}, \quad \tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(y) = \partial_y F^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) \quad (58)$$

amounts to a δ -inexact first-order oracle for $-\psi_t(y)$ in the sense of Definition 2, namely,

$$0 \leq -\psi_t(y') + \tilde{\psi}_t^\delta(y) + \langle \tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(y), y' - y \rangle \leq \frac{L_{\text{yy}}^+ + \lambda_y}{2}\|y' - y\|^2 + \delta, \quad \forall y, y' \in Y, \quad (59)$$

where we used that ψ_t is $(L_{\text{yy}}^+ + \lambda_y)$ -smooth. Verification of (59) is technical, and we defer it to appendix.

3^o. Now consider the actual update performed in the for-loop of Algorithm 4. Namely, observe that

$$y_t \approx \arg \max_{y \in Y} \psi_t(y), \quad x_t = \tilde{x}_t(y_t), \quad (60)$$

where the precise meaning of “ \approx ”, cf. line 2, is that $y_t = \text{RestartFGM}(\bar{y}, Y, \gamma_y, \bar{T}_y, S_y, -\tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(\cdot))$. In other words, y_t is obtained by running Algorithm 2 with δ -inexact gradient $\tilde{\nabla}\psi_t(\cdot)$, starting from $\bar{y} \in Y$, with \bar{T}_y iterations in the inner calls of FGM and S_y restarts, \bar{T}_y and S_y being given in (48). Recall that $\psi_t(\cdot)$ is $(L_{\text{yy}}^+ + \lambda_y)$ -smooth and λ_y -strongly convex with $\lambda_y = \varepsilon_y/R_y$, and

$$\delta \stackrel{(46)}{\leq} \frac{\Theta}{2\bar{T}_y^3} \leq \frac{(L_{\text{yy}}^+ + \lambda_y)R_y^2}{2\bar{T}_y^3}, \quad (61)$$

i.e., the condition in (14) is satisfied. By our choice of \bar{T}_y and S_y in (48), and Corollary 2.1, we get

$$\|y_t - y_t^*\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_y}{3L_{\text{yy}}^+}, \quad \psi_t(y_t^*) - \psi_t(y_t) \leq \min \left[\frac{\varepsilon_y^2}{18L_{\text{yy}}^+}, \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{18L_{\text{xx}}\bar{T}_y^2} \right], \quad (62)$$

and $S_Y(y_t, -\nabla\psi_t(y_t), L_{\text{yy}}^+ + \lambda_y) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_y}{3},$

where y_t^* is the exact maximizer of ψ_t (cf. (17)). Here we used the first lower bound in (48) for S_y to obtain all estimates except for the second estimate of $\psi_t(y_t^*) - \psi_t(y_t)$, and for this latter estimate we used the second bound in (48) for S_y and the last bound in (46) for δ , and did a series of estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_y &\stackrel{(48)}{\geq} \log_2 \left(\frac{(\Theta^+)^2}{\delta^2} \right) \stackrel{(46)}{\geq} \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{T}_x \bar{T}_y^2 \Theta^+}{\Delta} \right) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{T}_x \bar{T}_y^2 L_{yy}^+ R_y^2}{\Delta} \right) \\
&\geq \log_2 \left(\frac{10 L_{xx} \bar{T}_y^2 L_{yy}^+ R_y^2}{\varepsilon_x^2} \right) \\
&\geq 2 \log_2 \left(\frac{3 L_{yy}^+ R_y}{\varepsilon'_y} \right) \text{ with } \varepsilon'_y \text{ defined by } (\varepsilon'_y)^2 := \frac{\varepsilon_x^2 L_{yy}^+}{L_{xx} \bar{T}_y^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the proximal Polyak-Lojasiewicz lemma ([KNS16, Lem. 1]) implies that $S_Y(y, g, L)$ is non-decreasing in L , hence

$$S_Y(y_t, -\nabla \psi_t(y_t), L_{yy}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_y}{3}. \quad (63)$$

From (52) and the Lipschitzness of $\nabla_y F(\cdot, y)$ and $\text{prox}_{y_t, Y}(\cdot)$, we see that $x_t = \tilde{x}_t(y_t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_Y^2(y_t, -\nabla_y F(x_t, y_t), L_{yy}) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} S_Y^2(y_t, -\nabla_y F(x_t, y_t), 2L_{yy}) \\
&= 4L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} [\langle \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t), y - y_t \rangle - L_{yy} \|y - y_t\|^2] \\
&\leq 4L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) + \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (y_t - \bar{y}), y - y_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - y_t\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 4L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) - \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (y_t - \bar{y}), y - y_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - y_t\|^2 \right] \\
&= 4L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) + \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (y_t - \bar{y}), y - y_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - y_t\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2S_Y^2(y_t, -\nabla \psi_t(y_t), L_{yy}) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 4L_{yy} \max_{y \in Y} \left[\left\langle \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) + \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (y_t - \bar{y}), y - y_t \right\rangle - \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - y_t\|^2 \right] + \frac{2\varepsilon_y^2}{9} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2 \left\| \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) + \frac{\varepsilon_y}{R_y} (y_t - \bar{y}) \right\|^2 + \frac{2\varepsilon_y^2}{9} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 4 \left\| \nabla_y F(x_t, y_t) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) \right\|^2 + \frac{4\varepsilon_y^2}{R_y^2} \|y_t - \bar{y}\|^2 + \frac{2\varepsilon_y^2}{9} \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{=} 4L_{xy}^2 \|\tilde{x}_t(y_t) - \hat{x}_t(y_t)\|^2 + 16\varepsilon_y^2 + \frac{2\varepsilon_y^2}{9} \\
&\stackrel{(f)}{\leq} 4 \frac{\delta^2}{64R_y^2} + 16\varepsilon_y^2 + \frac{2\varepsilon_y^2}{9} \\
&\stackrel{(g)}{\leq} 21\varepsilon_y^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Here in (a) we used that $S_Y(y, g, L)$ is non-decreasing in L ([KNS16, Lem. 1]); in (b) we used (63); in (c) we used Young's inequality; in (d) we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality; in (e) we used the Lipschitzness of F ; in (f) we used (54); finally, in (g) we used our choice of δ in (46). Thus, the iterate (x_t, y_t) is kept $5\varepsilon_y$ -stationary in y at any iteration t .

4^o. We now revisit (57). Applying it to $y = y_t$, we get

$$F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_t) + L_{\text{xx}}\|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{\text{xx}}} \leq F^{\text{reg}}(x_{t-1}, y_t), \quad (65)$$

which mimics (39). Our goal, however, is to mimic (40), for which we must lower-bound, up to a small error, $F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_t)$ via $F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_{t+1})$, or, equivalently, $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_t)$ via $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_{t+1})$. First,

$$F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_{t+1}) \leq \max_{y \in Y} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y) = \varphi_t(x_t), \quad (66)$$

where $\varphi_t(x) := \max_{y \in Y} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y)$ is the primal function in the saddle-point problem (37). On the other hand, denoting $x_t^* = \hat{x}_t(y_t^*)$, so that (x_t^*, y_t^*) is the unique saddle point in (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_t) &\equiv F_t^{\text{reg}}(\tilde{x}_t(y_t), y_t) \geq F_t^{\text{reg}}(\hat{x}_t(y_t), y_t) = \psi_t(y_t) \stackrel{(62)}{\geq} \psi_t(y_t^*) - \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{18L_{\text{xx}}\bar{T}_y^2} \\ &= F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t^*, y_t^*) - \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{18L_{\text{xx}}\bar{T}_y^2} \\ &= \varphi_t(x_t^*) - \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{18L_{\text{xx}}\bar{T}_y^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

It remains to compare $\varphi_t(x_t)$ and $\varphi_t(x_t^*)$. Combining $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t^*, y_t^*) \geq F_t^{\text{reg}}(x_t^*, y_t)$ with the previous inequality, and observing that $F_t^{\text{reg}}(\cdot, y_t)$ is L_{xx} -strongly convex and minimized at $\hat{x}_t(y_t)$, we obtain

$$\|\hat{x}_t(y_t) - x_t^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{9L_{\text{xx}}^2\bar{T}_y^2}.$$

On the other hand, (54) applied to $y = y_t$ gives

$$\|x_t - \hat{x}_t(y_t)\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{\delta}{8L_{\text{xy}}R_y}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\Delta(\Theta^+ - \Theta)}{64L_{\text{xy}}^2R_y^2\bar{T}_y^2\bar{T}_x} = \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{640L_{\text{xx}}^2\bar{T}_y^2}, \quad (68)$$

where we substituted the last expression in (46) for δ . Combining these estimates, we obtain that

$$\|x_t - x_t^*\|^2 \leq \frac{0.12\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{\text{xx}}^2\bar{T}_y^2}.$$

Now, notice that φ_t is $(3L_{\text{xx}} + L_{\text{xy}}^2/\lambda_y)$ -smooth by Danskin's theorem, and is minimized at x_t^* . Thus,

$$\varphi_t(x_t) - \varphi_t(x_t^*) \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(L_{\text{xx}} + \frac{L_{\text{xy}}^2}{\lambda_y} \right) \|x_t - x_t^*\|^2 \leq \frac{0.18\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{\text{xx}}} \left(1 + \frac{L_{\text{yy}}^+}{\lambda_y\bar{T}_y^2} \right) \leq \frac{0.19\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{\text{xx}}}, \quad (69)$$

where in the last transition we substituted \bar{T}_y from (48). Returning to (66) and (67), we arrive at

$$F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_t) \geq F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_{t+1}) - \frac{0.25\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{xx}}.$$

Combining this with (65) we finally get the desired analogue of (40):

$$F^{\text{reg}}(x_t, y_{t+1}) + L_{xx}\|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 - \frac{7\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{xx}} \leq F^{\text{reg}}(x_{t-1}, y_t). \quad (70)$$

This inequality can be iterated, and we can now proceed as outlined in Sec. 2.2. First we mimic (30):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in [\bar{T}_x]} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\bar{T}_x} \sum_{t \in [\bar{T}_x]} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{F^{\text{reg}}(x_0, y_1) - F^{\text{reg}}(x_{\bar{T}_x}, y_{\bar{T}_x})}{L_{xx}\bar{T}_x} + \frac{7\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{xx}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta + 2\varepsilon_y R_y}{L_{xx}\bar{T}_x} + \frac{7\varepsilon_x^2}{24L_{xx}^2} \leq \frac{5\varepsilon_x^2}{12L_{xx}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where we used the estimates (41) and substituted the expression for T_x . It remains to mimic (32):

$$\begin{aligned} S_X^2(x_t, \nabla_x F(x_t, y_t), L_{xx}) &\leq S_X^2(x_t, \nabla_x F(x_t, y_t), 2L_{xx}) \\ &\equiv 4L_{xx} \max_{x' \in X} [-\langle \nabla_x F(x_t, y_t), x' - x_t \rangle - L_{xx}\|x' - x_t\|^2] \\ &\leq 4L_{xx} \max_{x' \in X} \left[-\langle \nabla_x F_t(x_t, y_t), x' - x_t \rangle - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}\|x' - x_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 4L_{xx} \max_{x' \in X} \left[\langle 2L_{xx}(x_t - x_{t-1}), x' - x_t \rangle - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}\|x' - x_t\|^2 \right] \\ &= 2S_X(x_t, \nabla_x F_t(x_t, y_t), L_{xx}) \\ &\quad + 4L_{xx} \max_{x' \in X} \left[\langle 2L_{xx}(x_t - x_{t-1}), x' - x_t \rangle - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}\|x' - x_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{2} + 4L_{xx}^2 \max_{x' \in X} \left[2\langle x_t - x_{t-1}, x' - x_t \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\|x' - x_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\varepsilon_x^2}{2} + 8L_{xx}^2\|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{10}{3} \right) \varepsilon_x^2 \leq 4\varepsilon_x^2, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where in (a) we used (53) with $y = y_t$, in (b) we used Young's inequality, and (c) was due to (71). Combining this with the result of $\mathbf{3}^\circ$, we conclude that (x_τ, y_τ) with $\tau \in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \bar{T}_x} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2$ is $(2\varepsilon_x, 5\varepsilon_y)$ -FNE. On the other hand, we have performed $\lceil T^\circ S^\circ S_y \bar{T}_x \bar{T}_y \rceil$ iterations of FGM (i.e., iterations in the for-loop of Algorithm 1) in total, with one computation of ∇F and two projections onto Y (and at most the same number of projections onto X) at each iteration. \square

4 Related work

Our goal in this section is to briefly overview the recent stream of works on efficient algorithms for approximate FNE search in nonconvex-concave problems.

To the best of our knowledge, [NSLR19] was the first work providing non-asymptotic convergence rates for FNE search in general nonconvex-concave problems as in (1), without assuming special structure of the objective function. Their approach is to perform gradient descent directly on the primal function of the $O(\varepsilon_y)$ -regularized version of the problem in (1), exploiting the fact that this function has $O(\varepsilon_y^{-1})$ -Lipshitz gradient due to Danskin’s theorem. The resulting complexity is $O(\varepsilon_x^{-2}\varepsilon_y^{-3/2})$ in our notation, the extra $O(\varepsilon_y^{-1})$ factor stemming from the poor smoothness of the primal function, which restricts stepsize to be $O(\varepsilon_y)$.

Subtler analyses have been provided in [TJNO19, KM19], and, more recently, in the concurrent work [LJJ20] of which we became aware upon finalizing this manuscript, and in the work [Zha20] that appeared shortly after the first version of this manuscript. While the underlying idea of solving the intermediate min-max problem (37) is present in all these works, there are considerable differences between them. First, [TJNO19, KM19] focus on the problem of finding an ε_x -stationary point of the Moreau envelope of the primal function, reducing this problem to that of finding $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$ -FNE of the associated min-max problem with $\varepsilon_y = O(\varepsilon_x^2)$. As a result, their complexity writes as $O(\varepsilon_x^{-3})$ for the Moreau envelope; nonetheless, we expect their results to be adaptable to the FNE search problem with complexity similar to ours. More crucially, the algorithms proposed in these works are somewhat less transparent than ours. In particular, [TJNO19] runs a mirror-prox type subroutine to approximate the proximal point step (while also using an FGM-type subroutine), and none of these works uses the readily available technical results such as [DGN14] on inexact-oracle FGM, and those of [LMH15, PLD⁺18] on the FGM-type implementation of the proximal operator. In contrast, our work makes use of the available results to obtain the desired iteration complexity, which results in a more direct analysis and a conceptually simpler algorithm.

Although not directly relevant to this work, in the context of min-max non-convex-concave optimization, let us also mention [LTH19] where min-max optimization problems are studied that are non-convex in one variable and linear in the other variable. Also in the context of algorithms without using gradient oracle, a multi-block algorithm for non-convex-concave min-max problems was proposed in [LTHC94] which uses a tight upper-bound of the function instead of using the gradient oracle. In addition, the recent works [LLC⁺06, WBMR19] propose zeroth-order methods for non-convex-concave min-max optimization problems where only use function evaluations.

References

- [BBT16] H. H. Bauschke, J. Bolte, and M. Teboulle. A descent lemma beyond Lipschitz gradient continuity: first-order methods revisited and applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(2):330–348, 2016.
- [BCL94] K. Ball, E. A. Carlen, and E. H. Lieb. Sharp uniform convexity and smoothness inequalities for trace norms. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 115(1):463–482, 1994.
- [BGHV09] J. Borwein, A. Guirao, P. Hájek, and J. Vanderwerff. Uniformly convex functions on Banach spaces. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 137(3):1081–1091, 2009.
- [BOB19] D. Babichev, D. M. Ostrovskii, and F. Bach. Efficient primal-dual algorithms for large-scale multiclass classification. *arXiv:1902.03755*, 2019.

- [BR20] B. Barazandeh and M. Razaviyayn. Solving non-convex non-differentiable min-max games using proximal gradient method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08093*, 2020.
- [Bub15] S. Bubeck. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015.
- [CDHS17] Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, O. Hinder, and A. Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points i. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–50, 2017.
- [Dan66] J. M. Danskin. The theory of max-min, with applications. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 14(4):641–664, 1966.
- [Dev11] O. Devolder. Stochastic first order methods in smooth convex optimization. *CORE discussion paper*, 2011.
- [DGN14] O. Devolder, F. Glineur, and Y. Nesterov. First-order methods of smooth convex optimization with inexact oracle. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1-2):37–75, 2014.
- [DL15] C. D. Dang and G. Lan. Stochastic block mirror descent methods for nonsmooth and stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):856–881, 2015.
- [JN11] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. First-order methods for nonsmooth convex large-scale optimization, I: General purpose methods. *Optimization for Machine Learning*, pages 121–148, 2011.
- [KM19] W. Kong and R. D. C. Monteiro. An accelerated inexact proximal point method for solving nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *arXiv:1905.13433*, 2019.
- [KNS16] H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-lojasiewicz condition. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- [KT98] A. Kaplan and R. Tichatschke. Proximal point methods and nonconvex optimization. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 13(4):389–406, 1998.
- [LJJ19] T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. I. Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00331*, 2019.
- [LJJ20] T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. I. Jordan. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02417*, 2020.
- [LLC⁺06] S. Liu, S. Lu, X. Chen, Y. Feng, K. Xu, A. Al-Dujaili, M. Hong, and U.M. Obelilly. Min-max optimization without gradients: Convergence and applications to adversarial ML. In *arXiv preprint*, 2019, arXiv:1909.13806.
- [LMH15] H. Lin, J. Mairal, and Z. Harchaoui. A universal catalyst for first-order optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3384–3392, 2015.

- [LTH19] S. Lu, I. Tsaknakis, and M. Hong. Block alternating optimization for non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications in signal processing and communications. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4754–4758. IEEE, 2019.
- [LTHC94] S. Lu, I. Tsaknakis, M. Hong, and Y. Chen. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. In *arXiv preprint*, 2019, arXiv:1902.08294.
- [Nem04] A. Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $O(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with Lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
- [Nes83] Y. Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 269, pages 543–547, 1983.
- [Nes12] Y. Nesterov. How to make the gradients small. *Optima. Mathematical Optimization Society Newsletter*, (88):10–11, 2012.
- [Nes13a] Y. Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 140(1):125–161, 2013.
- [Nes13b] Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [NN13] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovski. On first-order algorithms for l_1 /nuclear norm minimization. *Acta Numerica*, 22:509–575, 2013.
- [NSLR19] M. Nouiehed, M. Sanjabi, J. D. Lee, and M. Razaviyayn. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08297*, 2019.
- [NY83] A. Nemirovski and D. Yudin. *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. Chichester, 1983.
- [OH18] D. Ostrovskii and Z. Harchaoui. Efficient first-order algorithms for adaptive signal denoising. In *Proceedings of the 35th ICML conference*, volume 80, pages 3946–3955, 2018.
- [PLD⁺18] C. Paquette, H. Lin, D. Drusvyatskiy, J. Mairal, and Z. Harchaoui. Catalyst for Gradient-based Nonconvex Optimization. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, volume 84, pages 613–622, 2018.
- [Roc15] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton university press, 2015.
- [Sio58] M. Sion. On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176, 1958.
- [TJNO19] K. K. Thekumparampil, P. Jain, P. Netrapalli, and S. Oh. Efficient algorithms for smooth minimax optimization. *arXiv:1907.01543*, 2019.

[WBMR19] Z. Wang, K. Balasubramanian, S. Ma, and M. Razaviyayn. Zeroth-order algorithms for nonconvex minimax problems with improved complexities. In *arXiv preprint*, 2020, arXiv:2001.07819.

[Zha20] R. Zhao. A primal dual smoothing framework for max-structured nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04375*, 2020.

A Deferred proofs

A.1 Verification of (59)

By concavity and $(L_{yy}^+ + \lambda_y)$ -smoothness of ψ_t , one has

$$0 \leq -\psi_t(y') + \psi_t(y) + \langle \nabla \psi_t(y), y' - y \rangle \leq \frac{L_{yy}^+ + \lambda_y}{2} \|y' - y\|^2, \quad \forall y, y' \in Y.$$

By (51), (55) and (58),

$$\frac{\delta}{4} \leq \tilde{\psi}_t^\delta(y) - \psi_t(y) \leq \frac{3\delta}{4}, \quad \forall y \in Y.$$

On the other hand, by the second part of (54),

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y) - \nabla \psi_t(y)\| = \|\partial_y F(\tilde{x}_t(y), y) - \partial_y F(\hat{x}_t(y), y)\| \leq L_{xy} \|\hat{x}_t(y) - \tilde{x}_t(y)\| \leq \frac{\delta}{8R_y},$$

hence, since $\|y' - y\| \leq 2R_y$ for any $y', y \in Y$, we get

$$-\frac{\delta}{4} \leq \langle \tilde{\nabla} \psi_t(y) - \nabla \psi_t(y), y' - y \rangle \leq \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

We obtain (59) by summing up the two-sided inequalities above. \square

A.2 Verification of (56)

Let $\varphi_t(x) = \max_{y \in Y} F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y)$ be the primal function of the saddle-point problem in (37). Then

$$\varphi_t(x) - 2L_{yy}R_y^2 \leq F_t(x, y) \leq \varphi_t(x)$$

by bounding the variation of a smooth function $F(x, \cdot)$ over $y \in Y$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} F_t(x_{t-1}, y) - \min_{x \in X} F(x, y) &\leq \varphi_t(x_{t-1}) - \min_x \varphi_t(x) + 2L_{yy}R_y^2 \\ &\leq \varphi_t(x_{t-1}) - \min_{x \in X} \varphi(x) + 2L_{yy}R_y^2 + 2\varepsilon_y R_y, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where we used that $F_t^{\text{reg}}(x, y) \geq F(x, y) - 2\varepsilon_y R_y$. Thus, it only remains to prove that $\varphi_t(x_{t-1})$ decreases in t up to certain error (since $\varphi_1(x_0) \leq \varphi(x_0)$). To this end, we proceed by induction.

The base is obvious: (56) is clearly satisfied when $t = 1$, by observing that

$$\varphi_1(x) - 2\Theta \leq F_1^{\text{reg}}(x, y) \leq \varphi_1(x),$$

and $\varphi_1(x_0) \geq \varphi(x_0) - 2\varepsilon_y R_y$. Now, assume that (56) was satisfied at steps $\tau \in [t-1]$, so that our analysis of these steps was valid. Then, by part 5^o of the proof of Theorem 3.1, in all these previous steps, including step $t-1$, the saddle-point problem (37) has been solved up to accuracy $O(\varepsilon_x^2/L_{xx})$ in primal gap:

$$\varphi_\tau(x_\tau) - \min_x \varphi_\tau(x) \leq \frac{0.19\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{xx}}, \quad \tau \in [t-1], \quad (74)$$

cf. (69). On the other hand, one can easily see that $\varphi_\tau(x_{\tau-1}) \leq \varphi_{\tau-1}(x_{\tau-1})$ for all $\tau \in [\overline{T}_x]$, cf. (37). Combining the two inequalities sequentially, we get

$$\varphi_t(x_{t-1}) \leq \varphi_{t-1}(x_{t-2}) + \frac{0.2\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{xx}} \leq \dots \leq \varphi_1(x_0) + \frac{0.2(t-1)\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{xx}} \leq \varphi(x_0) + \frac{0.2\overline{T}_x\varepsilon_x^2}{L_{xx}} \leq \varphi(x_0) + 2\Delta + 4\varepsilon_y R_y.$$

Combining this with (73), we arrive at (56). \square

B Extension to non-Euclidean geometries

In this section we do *not* assume the norm to be Euclidean (unless explicitly specified otherwise).

B.1 Near-stationary points of a convex function

The first challenge when extending Algorithm 4 to the non-Euclidean setup arises already in the sub-problem of finding a near-stationary point of a smooth and convex function. Therefore, we first focus on this problem in isolation. Given a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d and its dual norm $\|\cdot\|_*$, consider the problem of finding ε -first-order-stationary point $\hat{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of some function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., such that $\|\nabla f(\hat{z})\|_* \leq \varepsilon$, assuming that f is convex and has L -Lipschitz gradient with respect to $\|\cdot\|$, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla f(z') - \nabla f(z)\|_* \leq \|z' - z\|, \quad \forall z', z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and that at least one such point belongs to the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm ball with radius R around the origin.

Recall that, in the Euclidean case, i.e., when $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_* = \|\cdot\|_2$, the recipe of Nesterov [Nes12] is to add the regularizer $r_\varepsilon(z) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2R}\|z\|^2$, observing that the regularized function f_ε has two properties:

(i) f_ε has $(L + \varepsilon)$ -Lipschitz gradient (since $r_\varepsilon(z)$ has ε -Lipschitz gradient) and ε -strongly-convex (since $r_\varepsilon(z)$ is strongly convex, and the strong convexity modulus is additive).

(ii) The gradient of f_ε uniformly approximates the gradient of f with respect to $\|\cdot\|_* = \|\cdot\|_2$, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla f_\varepsilon(z) - \nabla f(z)\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon\|z\|_2}{R} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (75)$$

Property (ii) allows to search for approximate stationary points of f_ε instead of f , whereas property (i) guarantees that restarted FGM (Algorithm 2) finds such a point in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa})$ queries of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ in total, where $\kappa = L/\varepsilon$, which results in the complexity estimate $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ – more precisely,

$$T_\varepsilon = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{LR}{\varepsilon}}\right). \quad (76)$$

It can be shown that this complexity bound is worst-case optimal up to a logarithmic factor [Nes12].

In the setup with a non-Euclidean proximal geometry, one would expect the complexity bound (76) to be preserved. More precisely, assume that the norm $\|\cdot\|$, now not necessarily Euclidean, admits a *distance-generating function (d.-g. f.)* $\omega : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ replacing the squared norm $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_2^2$ in the Euclidean case, with the following properties (see, e.g., [JN11, NN13, OH18] and references therein):⁵

- First, $\omega(\cdot)$ is convex, admits a continuous selection of subgradients (denoted $\nabla\omega(z)$ later on), and has strong convexity modulus 1 with respect to $\|\cdot\|$.
- Second, one can easily solve (explicitly or to high accuracy) optimization problems of the form $\min_{z'}[\langle\zeta, z'\rangle + \omega(z')]$, where ζ is an arbitrary linear form (i.e., element of the dual space identified with \mathbb{R}^d by Riesz theorem), and $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ is the duality pairing (identified with the canonical dot product on \mathbb{R}^d). Equivalently, one requires computational tractability of optimization problems of the form

$$\min_{z' \in \mathbb{R}^d} [\langle\zeta, z'\rangle + D_\omega(z', z)],$$

where $D_\omega(z', z) := \omega(z') - \omega(z) - \langle\nabla\omega(z), z' - z\rangle$ is the Bregman divergence generated by ω . The fulfillment of these requirements is guaranteed by working with d.-g. f.'s that are coordinate-separable (such as entropy on the non-negative orthant or $\|\cdot\|_p^p$ for $p \geq 1$) or “quasi-separable” (e.g., compositions of a separable function and a monotone map on \mathbb{R}), such as $\|\cdot\|_p^2$ with $p \geq 1$.

- Finally, we assume that ω is minimized at the origin (and $\omega'(x) = 0$ is included in the continuous selection of subgradients), and satisfies the following *quadratic growth* condition: the ω -radius functional $\Omega[\cdot]$, defined as

$$\Omega[Z] := \max_{z \in Z} \omega(z) - \min_{z' \in Z} \omega(z'),$$

for compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d , satisfies

$$\Omega[Z_r(0)] \leq r^2 \tilde{O}_d(1), \quad \forall r \geq 0, \tag{77}$$

where $Z_r(z) := \{z' : \|z' - z\| \leq r\}$, and $\tilde{O}_d(1)$ is a logarithmic factor in d . In other words, $\Omega[Z_r]$ grows as the squared radius of the $\|\cdot\|$ -ball, mimicking the squared norm $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_2^2$ in this respect. Note also that the same bound holds for $D_\omega(z, 0) \leq \Omega[Z_r(0)]$ for all $z \in Z_r(0)$. Moreover, these conditions can be “re-centered” to arbitrary point z_0 by replacing $\omega(\cdot)$ with the shifted d.-g. f.

$$\omega_{z_0}(\cdot) := \omega(z - z_0) \tag{78}$$

which is minimized at z_0 and satisfies (77) with $Z_r(z_0)$ instead of $Z_r(0)$; the previous properties hold for ω_{z_0} as well.

Here we note that the “slow growth” property is not required to obtain convergence guarantees in terms of the ω -radius; rather, it is needed to “translate” such guarantees to those in terms of the $\|\cdot\|$ -norm distance to optimum. Another remark is that the balls Z_r here are only allowed to be centered in the origin (i.e., in the minimum of ω), which makes the condition

⁵Here we first focus on the unconstrained setup for the sake of simplicity; the case where z lives on a “simple” convex body in \mathbb{R}^d can be treated in a similar vein, and is considered later on in Appendix B.2.

significantly less restrictive than that in [DL15] where (77) is required to hold for balls with arbitrary centers, not only those centered at the d.-g. f. minimizer. Note that the latter condition implies the Lipschitzness of $\nabla\omega$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|$, whereas the former does not; we will revisit this circumstance in Appendix B.3.

We call any d.-g. f. satisfying the above three properties *compatible with the norm* $\|\cdot\|$. Whenever one can find a compatible d.-g. f., the usual recipe is to modify a “Euclidean” algorithm by replacing the Euclidean prox-mapping (12) with its generalized counterpart:

$$\text{prox}_{z,\omega}(\zeta) := \underset{z'}{\text{argmin}} [\langle \zeta, z' \rangle + D_\omega(z', z)], \quad (79)$$

which corresponds to replacing the gradient descent step with so-called mirror descent step ([NY83] – “steepest descent” with respect to the d.-g. f. that takes into account the geometry of $\|\cdot\|$). For many standard primitives in convex optimization, such a recipe results in the desirable outcome: the distance to optimum R and the Lipschitz constant L get replaced with their $\|\cdot\|$ -norm counterparts. In particular, this is the case for FGM (Algorithm 1) as Theorem 2.1 generalizes almost verbatim.

Theorem B.1 ([DGN14, Thm. 5 and Eq. (42)]). *Assume f is convex, has L -Lipschitz gradient with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, cf. (75), is and minimized at z^* such that $\|z^* - z_0\| \leq R$.⁶ Consider running Algorithm 1, with prox-mappings in lines 4 and 8 replaced by the generalized prox-mapping (79) with respect to the d.-g. f. ω_{z_0} (the re-centered to z_0 compatible d.-g. f., ω , cf. (78)), with stepsize $\gamma = 1/L$, and δ -inexact oracle in the sense of Definition 2 (with $\|\cdot\|$ being the given norm). Then*

$$f(z_T) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{4L\Omega}{T^2} + 2\delta T \leq \frac{4\tilde{O}_d(1)LR^2}{T^2} + 2\delta T, \quad (80)$$

where $\Omega := \Omega[Z_R(z_0)]$ is the ω -radius of the z_0 -centered ball $Z_R(z_0)$ containing z^* . As a result,

$$f(z_T) - f(z^*) \leq \frac{5L\Omega}{T^2} \leq \frac{5\tilde{O}_d(1)LR^2}{T^2} \text{ whenever } \delta \leq \delta_T := \frac{L\Omega}{2T^3}. \quad (81)$$

Returning to our problem of finding a near-stationary point of $f(\cdot)$, the reasonable approach would be to regularize f with the term

$$r_\varepsilon(z) = \frac{\varepsilon\omega(z)}{\sqrt{\Omega}}, \quad (82)$$

which reduces to $\frac{\varepsilon}{2R}\|z\|_2^2$ in the Euclidean setup with $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_2^2$ used as d.-g. f. However, we immediately see that neither of the properties (i), (ii) remains valid.

- Indeed, while the regularized function $f_\varepsilon(z)$ is strongly convex with respect to $\|\cdot\|$, its gradient can be non-Lipschitz: in fact, the existence of functions that are *strongly convex and smooth at the same time*, with near-constant condition number, is quite special for the Euclidean norm.
- As for the property (ii), it is again a “fortunate coincidence” that in the Euclidean setup $\nabla\omega(z) \equiv z$ and $\|\cdot\|_* \equiv \|\cdot\|$, so $\|\nabla r_\varepsilon(z)\|_* \leq \varepsilon$ on $Z_R(0)$ as a result.

⁶To simplify the exposition, we assume initialization in the prox-center, i.e., $z_0 = \underset{z}{\text{argmin}}[\omega(z)]$.

The first of these issues is easy to fix: instead of treating f_ε as a smooth function (which it is not anymore), one can treat it as a composite function with L -smooth part f and a non-smooth but “simple” term r_ε , simplicity being guaranteed by the compatibility of ω . As such, one can exploit the “tolerance” of Algorithm 1 to such composite objectives: one can use the inexact gradient oracle for f , rather than for f_ε , instead incorporating r_ε into the prox-mapping, i.e., replacing (79) with

$$\text{prox}_{z,\omega,\varepsilon}(\zeta) := \underset{z'}{\operatorname{argmin}} [\langle \zeta, z' \rangle + D_\omega(z', z) + r_\varepsilon(z')] = \underset{z'}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[\langle \zeta, z' \rangle + D_\omega(z', z) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\Omega}} D_\omega(z', z_0) \right].$$

As shown in [Dev11, Sec. 6.3 and Thm. 8], Theorem B.1 generalizes to this most general setup: the guarantees (80)-(81) remain valid, with f in the left-hand side replaced by f_ε , and z^* being the minimizer of f_ε . As a result, using the strong convexity of f_ε , we can proceed with the same restart scheme as before (Algorithm 1). We now state the appropriate modification of Corollary 2.1.

Corollary B.1. *Let f_λ be a composite function given by*

$$f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z) := f(z) + \lambda D_\omega(z, z_0),$$

with $\lambda \geq 0$, and f having L -Lipschitz gradient with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, run Algorithm 2 on $f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}$ with $\gamma = 1/L$, parameters T, S satisfying

$$T \geq \sqrt{40\tilde{O}_d(1)L/\lambda}, \quad S \geq \log_2 \left(\frac{3L\sqrt{\Omega}}{\varepsilon} \right), \quad (83)$$

where $\tilde{O}_d(1)$ is the logarithmic factor in (80), and $\delta \leq \delta_T$, cf. (14). Then the final iterate z^S satisfies

$$\|z^S - z^*\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3L}, \quad f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S) - f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^*) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{18L}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla f(z^S) - \nabla f(z^*)\|_* \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (84)$$

Proof. For the first inequality, note that, with given T , we ensure that, denoting $R_s := \|z^s - z^*\|$,

$$R_s \stackrel{(81)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{5\tilde{L}\Omega[Z_{R_{s-1}}(z^{s-1})]}{T^2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{10\tilde{O}_d(1)LR_{s-1}^2}{\lambda T^2}} \leq \frac{R_{s-1}}{2}.$$

Here the first transition relied on the fact that ω is re-centered to z_{s-1} at s -th epoch, and the second transition used the quadratic growth condition (77). The second inequality in (84) can be verified as in the proof of Corollary 2.1 (with Ω replacing R^2), and the last one follows by smoothness. \square

We see that the first of the two issues with regularization is solved: we simply run Algorithm 2 on f_ε . Alas, the second issue is still present: while $\nabla f(z^S)$ approximates $\nabla f(z^*)$, where z^* minimizes f_ε , we cannot guarantee that $\|\nabla f(z^*)\|_*$ is small: indeed, $\|\nabla f(z^*)\|_* \leq \varepsilon$ is equivalent to

$$\sup_{z \in Z_R} \|\nabla \omega(z)\|_*^2 \leq \Omega, \quad (85)$$

but this latter condition cannot be guaranteed from the compatibility properties of ω (note that strong convexity guarantees the inequality in *reverse direction*). In fact, in the constrained setup, where minimization has to be performed on a convex body $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, (85) breaks for the important class of Legendre d.-g. f.’s – those with gradients diverging on the boundary of the feasible

set [BBT16].⁷ However, in the absence of constraints, or for non-Legendre potentials in the constrained case, (85) can sometimes be guaranteed. Next we consider one such example, which is also practically relevant.

Regularization with $\|\cdot\|_p^2$. Let the norm of interest be $\|\cdot\|_1$ with the dual norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. It is well-known (see, e.g. [NN13]) that, for any $d \geq 3$, the function

$$\omega(z) = \frac{C_d}{2} \|z\|_p^2 \quad \text{with } p = 1 + \frac{1}{\log(d)} \quad \text{and } C_d = \exp\left(\frac{\log d - 1}{\log d + 1}\right) \quad (86)$$

is a compatible d.-g. f. for $\|\cdot\|_1$; in particular, $\omega(z)$ is 1-strongly convex on \mathbb{R}^d with respect to $\|\cdot\|_1$, and $\Omega[Z_1] \leq c \log(d)$ for some universal constant c (with a matching lower bound). At the same time, (85) can be easily verified:

$$\nabla\omega(z) = C_d \|z\|_p^{2-p} z^{p-1}, \quad (87)$$

where the coordinates of $z^{p-1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the $(p-1)$ -th powers of the coordinates of z (with the signs preserved). As a result,

$$\sup_{\|z\|_1 \leq 1} \|\nabla\omega(z)\|_\infty = C_d \sup_{\|z\|_1 \leq 1} \|z\|_p^{2-p} \|z\|_\infty^{p-1} \leq C_d \sup_{\|z\|_1 \leq 1} \|z\|_p \leq \sqrt{2cC_d \log(d)} \leq \sqrt{2ce \log(d)}, \quad (88)$$

where we first used that $\|z\|_\infty \leq \|z\|_p$, then used the bound $\Omega[Z_1] \leq c \log(d)$, and finally used $C_d \leq e$. Thus, (85) is verified, so regularization with $\|\cdot\|_p^2$ preserves the gradient up to $O(\varepsilon)$ additive error.

B.2 Constrained case

We have just seen that in the unconstrained scenario, one can indeed efficiently approximate first-order stationary points of a convex function – at least in the ℓ_1 -geometry setup. Let us now demonstrate that this result can be extended to the constrained scenario. Namely, we now incorporate into the problem a set $Z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, assumed to be convex, compact, and “prox-friendly”: one must be able to efficiently compute the prox-mapping with respect to Z , defined as

$$\text{prox}_{z, Z, \omega}(\zeta) := \underset{z' \in Z}{\text{argmin}} \left[\langle \zeta, z' \rangle + D_\omega(z', z) \right]; \quad (89)$$

note that this is satisfied when Z is a “simple” set such as ℓ_p -ball or a simplex. Accordingly, we modify the d.-g. f. compatibility requirements, now only requiring strong convexity on Z . It is known from [DGN14] that Theorem B.1 extends almost word-to-word to this setting, with the prox-mapping (79) replaced with (89), and $\Omega[Z_R]$ replaced with $\Omega = \Omega[Z]$. Furthermore, the first two inequalities in (84) are preserved as well, under the same premise (83). Now, let us define the natural (ω -adapted) stationarity measure $S_{Z, \omega}$ by

$$S_{Z, \omega}^2(z, \zeta, L) := 2L \max_{z' \in Z} \left[-\langle \zeta, z' - z \rangle - LD_\omega(z', z) \right], \quad (90)$$

⁷E.g., in the “simplex” setup, where the norm is $\|\cdot\|_1$, and d.-g. f. is the negative entropy $h(z) = \sum_{i \in [d]} z_i \log(z_i)$ on the probability simplex $\Delta_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$; in fact, this problem can be recast as the one on the unit ℓ_1 -ball, see, e.g., [BOB19]. The appropriate modification of (85), $\sup_{z \in \Delta_d} \|\nabla h(z)\|_\infty^2 \leq \log(d)$, cannot be valid since the left-hand side is infinite.

We can easily verify that, under (83), one has

$$\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}(z^S, \nabla f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S), L + \lambda) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \sqrt{\frac{L + \lambda}{L}}. \quad (91)$$

Indeed, the argument mimics that in (18):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}^2(z^S, \nabla f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S), L + \lambda) &= 2(L + \lambda) \max_{z \in Z} \left[-\left\langle \nabla f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle - (L + \lambda) D_\omega(z, z^S) \right] \\ &= -2(L + \lambda) \min_{z \in Z} \left[\left\langle \nabla f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle + (L + \lambda) D_\omega(z, z^S) \right]; \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand, for any $z \in Z$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z) - f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S) &= f(z) - f(z^S) + \lambda[D_\omega(z, z_0) - D_\omega(z^S, z_0)] \\ &\leq \left\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|z - z^S\|^2 + \lambda[D_\omega(z, z_0) - D_\omega(z^S, z_0)] \\ &\leq \left\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle + LD_\omega(z, z^S) + \lambda[D_\omega(z, z_0) - D_\omega(z^S, z_0)] \\ &= \left\langle \nabla f(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle + LD_\omega(z, z^S) + \lambda[D_\omega(z, z^S) + \left\langle \nabla \omega(z^S) - \nabla \omega(z_0), z - z^S \right\rangle] \\ &= \left\langle \nabla f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S), z - z^S \right\rangle + (L + \lambda) D_\omega(z, z^S), \end{aligned}$$

where we first used the smoothness of f , then the 1-strong convexity of ω ; finally, we used the well-known three-point identity for the Bregman divergence (see, e.g., [Bub15, Eq. (4.1)]). Minimizing both sides over $z \in Z$, and recalling that $f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^S) - f_{\lambda\sqrt{\Omega}}(z^*) \leq \varepsilon^2/(18L)$, we arrive at (91). \square

Applying (B.1) with $\lambda = \varepsilon/\sqrt{\Omega}$, i.e., to the regularized function f_ε , cf. (82), we see that that one can obtain $O(\varepsilon)$ -stationary point – either in the sense of the dual gradient norm in the unconstrained case, or in the sense of $\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}^2(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ criterion – in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{LR}/\varepsilon)$ prox-mapping computations, by running appropriately generalized version of Algorithm 2.

Remark B.1. Using the first-order optimality conditions in (90), one can verify that $\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}^2(z, \nabla f(z), L) &\geq 2L^2 D_\omega(z, \nabla \omega_Z^*[\nabla \omega(z) - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(z)]) \\ &[= 2L^2 D_{\omega_Z^*}(\nabla \omega(z) - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(z), \nabla \omega(z))] \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

with equality in the unconstrained case. Here, $\omega_Z^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Fenchel dual of ω on Z , i.e.,

$$\omega_Z^*(\zeta) := \max_{z \in Z} [\langle \zeta, z \rangle - \omega(z)],$$

and $\nabla \omega_Z^*[\nabla \omega(z) - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(z)]$ is the mirror descent update from z . The second representation in (92) is by the standard properties of the Bregman divergences ([Roc15]). From it, noting that $\nabla \omega_Z^*$ is 1-Lipschitz with respect to $\|\cdot\|_*$, we conclude that $\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}(z, \nabla f(z), L)$ under-estimates the dual gradient norm $\|\nabla f(z)\|_*$ in the unconstrained setup, this estimate only being tight in the Euclidean case, i.e., when $\omega(z) = \frac{1}{2} \|z\|_2^2$. On the other hand, from the first representation we see that $\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}(z, \nabla f(z), L)$ over-estimates the (mirror-descent) proximal gradient norm measure $\mathsf{W}_{Z,\omega}(z, \nabla f(z), L)$, defined by

$$\mathsf{W}_{Z,\omega}^2(z, \nabla f(z), L) = L^2 \left\| z - \nabla \omega_Z^*[\nabla \omega(z) - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(z)] \right\|^2.$$

Thus, $\mathsf{S}_{Z,\omega}$ results in a stronger stationarity criterion than $\mathsf{W}_{Z,\omega}$ in the constrained case; in the unconstrained case the two measures coincide, and the resulting criterion is weaker than the gradient norm one (unless in the Euclidean setup).

Summarizing the results of this section, we see that one of the two key “computational primitives” in our framework – the search of a near-stationary point of a smooth and concave function – extends to the ℓ_1 -geometry with distance-generating function given by (86), where the accuracy can be measured by the $S_{Z,\omega}$ measure (cf. (90)) or by the dual gradient norm in the unconstrained case. Thus, we have extended the results of Sec. 2.1. Our next goal is to similarly extend the results of Sec. 2.2, i.e., to implement the non-Euclidean proximal point algorithm with inexact iterations.

B.3 Bregman proximal point algorithm

We now focus on the problem corresponding to the second “building block” of Algorithm 4. Given a function $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with L -Lipschitz gradient with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, where $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is convex and “prox-friendly” with respect to a compatible with $\|\cdot\|$ d.-g. f. ω , the goal is to find a point $\hat{x} \in X$ such that $S_{X,\omega}(\hat{x}, \nabla\phi(\hat{x}), L) \leq \varepsilon$. As in Sec. 2.2, we will achieve this result via proximal point updates implemented using Algorithm 2. First, we define the Bregman proximal point operator following [Nem04]:

$$x \mapsto x_{\gamma\phi, X, \omega}^+(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{x' \in X} \left[\phi(x') + \frac{1}{\gamma} D_\omega(x', x) \right]; \quad (93)$$

note that the objective in (93) is $1/\gamma$ -strongly convex with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. We denote $x^+ := x_{\gamma\phi, X, \omega}^+(x)$ for brevity, and fix $\gamma = 1/(2L)$. The first-order optimality condition reads

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{2L} \nabla\phi(x^+) + \nabla\omega(x^+) - \nabla\omega(x), x' - x^+ \right\rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x' \in X. \quad (94)$$

Following Sec. 2.2, we first analyze the exact (“conceptual”) updates

$$x_t = x_{\phi/(2L), X, \omega}^+(x_{t-1}). \quad (95)$$

By (93) we have $\phi(x_{t-1}) \geq \phi(x_t) + 2LD_\omega(x_t, x_{t-1})$ for any $t \in [T]$, which allows to mimic (25):

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \leq 2D_\omega(x_t, x_{t-1}) \leq \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} D_\omega(x_t, x_{t-1}) \leq \frac{\Delta}{LT}. \quad (96)$$

On the other hand, we can bound the stationarity measure proceeding as in (26):

$$\begin{aligned} S_{X,\omega}^2(x^+, \nabla\phi(x^+), L) &\equiv 2L \max_{x' \in X} [-\langle \nabla\phi(x^+), x' - x^+ \rangle - LD_\omega(x', x^+)] \\ &\leq 2L^2 \max_{x' \in X} [2\langle \nabla\omega(x^+) - \nabla\omega(x), x' - x^+ \rangle - D_\omega(x', x^+)] \\ &\leq 2L^2 \max_{x' \in X} \left[2\|\nabla\omega(x^+) - \nabla\omega(x)\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x' - x^+\|^2 - D_\omega(x', x^+) \right] \\ &\leq 4L^2 \|\nabla\omega(x^+) - \nabla\omega(x)\|_*^2, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where we first used Young’s inequality and then the strong convexity of ω . Note that in the unconstrained case, and with $S_{X,\omega}^2(x^+, \nabla\phi(x^+), L)$ replaced by $\|\nabla f(x^+)\|_*^2$, the bound (97) becomes an equality; on the other hand, we have not been able to find a tighter bound for $W_{X,\omega}^2(x^+, \nabla\phi(x^+), L)$; all this indicates that (97) is likely unimprovable in general. Now, the inequalities (96) and (97),

when combined together, imply that, in order to proceed as in the Euclidean case, one must require that the d.-g. f. ω is *smooth* on X with respect to $\|\cdot\|$, i.e., for some $\ell_{X,\omega} \geq 1$ one has

$$\|\nabla\omega(x'') - \nabla\omega(x')\|_* \leq \ell_{X,\omega} \|x'' - x'\|, \quad \forall x', x'' \in X. \quad (98)$$

Indeed, when combined with (96)–(97), this implies that, after T iterations (95),

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathsf{S}_{X,\omega}(x_t, \nabla\phi(x_t), L) \leq 2\ell_{X,\omega} \sqrt{\frac{L\Delta}{T}},$$

i.e., essentially the same convergence rate as in the Euclidean case (up to the extra factor $\ell_{X,\omega}$). Moreover, similarly to the Euclidean case, this argument preserves “robustness” with respect to errors in (93). Indeed, denoting $\phi_{L,x,\omega}(\cdot)$ the objective in (93), assume that \tilde{x}^+ satisfies

$$\phi_{L,x,\omega}(\tilde{x}^+) \leq \phi_{L,x,\omega}(x^+) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{24L} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{S}_{X,\omega}(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x,\omega}(\tilde{x}^+), L + \lambda) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

cf. (29)–(31). As we know from the results of Appendix B.2, this can be guaranteed by running Algorithm 2 on $\phi_{L,x,\omega}$ with appropriately chosen parameter values. On the other hand, the iterate sequence $\tilde{x}_t = \tilde{x}_{\phi/2L, X, \omega}^+(\tilde{x}_{t-1})$ would satisfy the counterpart of (96),

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|\tilde{x}_t - \tilde{x}_{t-1}\|^2 \leq 2D_\omega(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}_{t-1}) \leq \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} D_\omega(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}_{t-1}) \leq \frac{\Delta}{LT} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{24L^2},$$

and that of (97):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{S}_{X,\omega}^2(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}^+), 2L + \lambda) &\leq 2(2L + \lambda) \max_{x' \in X} [-\langle \nabla\phi_{L,x,\omega}(\tilde{x}^+), x' - \tilde{x}^+ \rangle - (L + \lambda)D_\omega(x', x)] \\ &\quad + 2L(2L + \lambda) \max_{x' \in X} [2\langle \nabla\omega(\tilde{x}^+) - \nabla\omega(x), x' - \tilde{x}^+ \rangle - D_\omega(x', x)] \\ &\leq 2\mathsf{S}_{X,\omega}^2(\tilde{x}^+, \nabla\phi_{L,x}(\tilde{x}^+), L + \lambda) + 8L(L + \lambda) \|\nabla\omega(\tilde{x}^+) - \nabla\omega(x)\|_*^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + 8L(L + \lambda) \|\nabla\omega(\tilde{x}^+) - \nabla\omega(x)\|_*^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Young’s inequality and strong convexity. This results in the analogue of (33):

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathsf{S}_X(\tilde{x}_t, \nabla\phi(\tilde{x}_t), L) \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\ell_{X,\omega}^2(L + \lambda)\Delta}{T} + \frac{5}{6} \left(\ell_{X,\omega} \frac{L + \lambda}{L} \varepsilon \right)^2} \leq \ell_{X,\omega} \left[3\sqrt{\frac{(L + \lambda)\Delta}{T} + \frac{L + \lambda}{L} \varepsilon} \right].$$

Taking $\lambda = L$, we arrive at the desired complexity estimate $O(L\Delta/\varepsilon^2)$ as in the Euclidean case.

Discussion: d.-g. f. smoothness is restrictive. While trivially satisfied in the Euclidean case with $\ell_{X,\omega} = 1$ for any X , the smoothness assumption (98) – which is also made, e.g., in [DL15, Zha20] – is strong in the general Bregman scenario. For example, the negative entropy $h(x) = \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i \log(x_i)$, perhaps the most common choice of a non-Euclidean d.-g. f., is *not* smooth on its domain, the probability simplex Δ_d . (In fact, it is easy to see that no Legendre d.-g. f., i.e., such that $\|\nabla\omega(x)\|_* \rightarrow \infty$ when $x \rightarrow \partial \text{dom}(\omega)$, can satisfy (98) with $X = \text{dom}(\omega)$ for any finite $\ell_{X,\omega}$.) Likewise, the previously considered $\|\cdot\|_p^2$ -function (cf. (86)) does not satisfy (98) with respect to $\|\cdot\|_1$

on the set $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_1 \leq r\}$ for any finite $\ell_{X,\omega}$, however small is $r > 0$, unless when $d = 1$.⁸ More generally, as implied by [BGHV09, Theorem 3.5 and its omitted dual version] in combination with [BCL94, p. 469], there does not exist a function which is simultaneously strongly convex and smooth, with dimension-independent condition number, with respect to ℓ_p -norm for $p \neq 2$. It would be interesting to exhibit $(X, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ for which both compatibility of ω and (98) hold simultaneously with *moderate* ℓ_X .

Alternatively, one could consider circumventing (98) whatsoever by discarding Bregman regularization in favor of working directly with the norm. Indeed, using conjugacy of $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|^2$ and $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_*^2$ one can derive the $O(L\Delta/\varepsilon^2)$ convergence rate for minimizing the gradient norm up to ε by *steepest descent* with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, i.e., replacing the Bregman divergence in (79) by $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|^2$. The resulting prox-mapping is tractable whenever $\|\cdot\|^2$ is a “simple” function, which is the case, in particular, for $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_p$ for $p \geq 1$. Likewise, the proximal point operator, when adjusted in this manner, retains its tractability as $\|\cdot\|_p^2$ is $O(1)$ -strongly convex with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$ when $1 < p \leq 2$, so the results of Appendix B.3 can be adapted for such $\|\cdot\|^2$ -regularized proximal point algorithm.

⁸To see this, one can explicitly compute the Hessian $\nabla^2\omega(x)$, defined almost everywhere on \mathbb{R}^d , and observe that its first diagonal element $[\nabla^2\omega(x)]_{11}$ “explodes”, i.e., $H_{11}(x) \rightarrow \infty$ when $x = ue_1 + (1-u)e_2$ with $u \rightarrow 0$.