Stochastic Saddle-Point Optimization for Wasserstein Barycenters

Daniil Tiapkin Faculty of Computer Science Higher School of Economics unkoll@yandex.ru Alexander Gasnikov Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS gasnikov@yandex.ru

Pavel Dvurechensky Weierstrass Institute for Applied Analysis and Stochastics, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS pavel.dvurechensky@wias-berlin.de

Abstract

We study the computation of non-regularized Wasserstein barycenters of probability measures supported on the finite set. The first result gives a stochastic optimization algorithm for the discrete distribution over the probability measures which is comparable with the current best algorithms. The second result extends the previous one to the arbitrary distribution using kernel methods. Moreover, this new algorithm has a total complexity better than the Stochastic Averaging approach via the Sinkhorn algorithm in many cases.

1 Introduction

Considerable interest among the ML community in the last few years to Wasserstein barycenter optimization problem has led to many interesting results, see [28, 9] for a survey. In particular, to find ε population Wasserstein barycenter of a set of probability measures (pictures) it is sufficient to take $\sim \varepsilon^{-2}$ measures. There are two different numerical approaches to this problem: 1) offline; 2) online. The first approach assumes that we can store all the measures somewhere in memory and have access to all of them immediately, probably in parallel. The second approach assumes that from time to time we obtain a new measure (in an online regime) and based on this new information to make a better barycenter estimation. These are the main lines of many modern approaches, see [28, 9] for references. For the first approach, it is possible to use a big arsenal of modern decentralized distributed algorithms, for example, [12, 10, 17, 20]¹ or other offline algorithms [31, 5]. For the second, online approach, as far as we know, there is a certain lack of theoretical results. Thus, in this paper, we focus on the online setting with all measures unavailable in advance. But the interest in this direction has grown in the last few months [4, 9, 2].

One of the main tricks to make both of these approaches computationally tractable is to use entropic regularization of Wasserstein or other Optimal Transport distances [6, 28]. Unfortunately, one has to choose regularization parameter very small, i.e. proportional to ε [28, 22], to get a good approximation for the non-regularized distance and barycenter. This leads to numerical instabilities.

¹These papers contain the best-known bounds for decentralized distributed sum-type optimization problems with smooth dual problem and dual-friendly (cheap) stochastic oracle. This situation is well suited to Wasserstein barycenter problem formulation in the offline approach.

In particular, one of the reasons is the high sensitivity of Sinkhorn's algorithm 2 to regularization parameter [6, 32]. There are alternatives to Sinkhorn's type algorithms (different generalizations see in [19, 24] and references therein). These alternatives might be found in the calculation of non-regularized Wasserstein distance (to solve Optimal Transport problem) by Simplex method or Interior points methods. These approaches can be competitive as it have been recently shown in [8]. But all these approaches are still too expensive since they assume just another way to solve the expensive problem of Wasserstein distance calculation many times. So, due to this it's natural to ask:

Is it possible to find in online manner population Wasserstein barycenter with precision ε (in function) by using an optimal number of measures as a function of ε ($\sim \varepsilon^{-2}$) without (approximate) calculations of (regularized) Wasserstein distances and its subgradients?

An affirmative answer to this question makes up the subject of this paper.

To propose such an online approach that does not require to calculate Wasserstein distance and its subgradient we use saddle-point representation for Wasserstein barycenter problem formulation. Since the problem of searching (population) Wasserstein barycenter is a convex stochastic programming problem we obtain (partially) stochastic convex-concave saddle-point representation. Then we adapt Stochastic Mirror Descent [26] for this (partially infinite-dimensional) saddle-point problem. At the end by using RKHS trick in a variant of [16] we demonstrate how to make our approach practical one (with finite complexity).

Notation. We define $\operatorname{Mat}_{n \times m}(X)$ as a space of all matrices of size $n \times m$ with entries from the set X. We denote by [n] an n-element set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and e^v, e^A for $v \in \mathbb{R}^n, A \in \operatorname{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ as a pointwise exponent. Also we define Δ^n as a n-dimensional probability simplex $\Delta^n = \{(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \mid \forall i \in [n] : s_i \ge 0, \sum_{i=1}^n s_i = 1\}$ and $\Delta^n_{\delta} = \Delta^n \cap \{s_i \ge \delta \forall i \in [n]\}$. $\mathbf{1}_n$ as a n-dimensional vector consisting of ones. If the dimension is deducible from the context, the index omitted. As e_i we recall the i-th coordinate vector.

2 Saddle-point representation

2.1 Background in optimal transport

In this section, we recall some basic definitions of the optimal transport, following Peyré and Cuturi [28]. Since we deal only with discrete measures, we suggest only discrete optimal transport problem.

Optimal transport problem. For a fixed non-negative matrix C and two discrete probability measures r,c with n-element support define *a transportation cost* between measures r and c associated with the cost matrix C as a solution to the following optimization problem

$$L_C(r,c) = \min_{X \in \mathcal{U}(r,c)} \langle C, X \rangle, \tag{1}$$

where X is called a transport plan and $\mathcal{U}(r,c)$ is a transport polytope, defined as $\mathcal{U}(r,c) = \{X \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}_+) \mid X\mathbf{1} = r, X^T\mathbf{1} = c\}.$

If r and c are probability measures onto discrete n-element metric space (\mathcal{M}, d) , we can define as a *p*-Wasserstein distance between these two measures as the *p*-th root of a transportation cost associated with the matrix $D_{i,j}^p = d(x_i, x_j)^p$, where x_i and x_j are elements of \mathcal{M} . Formally, $\mathcal{W}_p(r,c) = (L_{D^p}(r,c))^{1/p}$.

Dual problem. The linear program in the definition of a transportation cost can be reformulate using so-called Kantorovich duality in two ways, using some reformulation of results from Peyré and Cuturi [28]:

$$L_C(r,c) = \max_{\substack{\lambda,\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ -C_{i,j} - \lambda_i - \mu_j \le 0}} -\langle \lambda, r \rangle - \langle \mu, c \rangle$$
(2)

and the equivalent one is

$$L_C(r,c) = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n} -\langle \lambda^*(\mu, C), r \rangle - \langle \mu, c \rangle,$$
(3)

²That is «working horse» in many approaches, since it approximately calculates regularized Wasserstein distance.

where $\lambda^* \colon \mathbb{R}^n \times \operatorname{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined element-wise: $\lambda_i^*(\mu, C) = \max_{j \in [n]} (-C_{i,j} - \mu_j).$

Barycenter definition. Suppose we have a random variable $\xi \colon \Omega_{\xi} \to \Delta^n$ on probability simplex, or, equivalently, on the space of probability measures onto \mathcal{M} . Then we can define a *p*-Wasserstein (population) barycenter w.r.t. ξ as the solution to the following optimization problem:

$$r_* = \operatorname*{argmin}_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi)$$

The probability measure induced by ξ we recall P_{ξ} .

2.2 Saddle-point representation

Using a dual approach and the definition of a Wasserstein barycenter, we have the following problem:

$$\min_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi) = \min_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n} -\langle \lambda^*(\mu, D_p), r \rangle - \langle \mu, \xi \rangle \right]$$

For this problem, we will use Theorem 14.60 from Rockafellar and Wets [30] and apply it for the space of all P_{ξ} -measurable functions \mathcal{F} and it is plainly decomposable. We will use the function under the expectation as a function f and it is clear that it is a normal integrand and it is finite since the barycenter is defined. Hence, we have the next equality:

$$\min_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi) = \min_{r \in \Delta^n} \sup_{f_\mu \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[-\langle \lambda^*(f_\mu(\xi), D_p), r \rangle - \langle f_\mu(\xi), \xi \rangle \right].$$
(4)

The *p*-Wasserstein barycenter is a solution to this saddle-point problem.

2.3 Dual variable bound

For the theoretical guarantees of the future algorithms, we need to construct a bound on the optimal value of the dual variable in (3). It will be obtained by using the properties of an entropy regularization of the optimal transport problem and some additional assumptions on r_* .

The core idea is to use known bound from Dvurechensky et al. [13] on the optimal variable in the regularized case and transfer it into non-regularized case.

Entropy regularization. Firstly, let us define an entropy-regularized OT problem:

$$L_C^{\gamma}(r,c) = \min_{X \in \mathcal{U}(r,c)} \langle C, X \rangle + \gamma H(X),$$

where $H(X) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} X_{i,j} \log X_{i,j}$ is an entropy regularizer.

Then we can write a Lagrangian of our optimizer:

$$\mathcal{L}(r,c,X,\lambda,\mu) = \langle C,X \rangle + \gamma H(x) + \langle \lambda,X\mathbf{1}-r \rangle + \langle \mu,X^T\mathbf{1}-c \rangle,$$

From the first-order condition we can easily found an optimal X^* :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X_{i,j}}\mathcal{L} = C_{i,j} + \gamma \log X_{i,j}^* + \gamma + \lambda_i + \mu_j = 0 \iff X_{i,j}^* = \exp\left(\frac{-C_{i,j} - \lambda_i - \mu_j}{\gamma} - 1\right).$$

So, we have an equivalent problem:

$$L_C^{\gamma}(r,c) = \max_{\lambda,\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n} -\langle \lambda, r \rangle - \langle \mu, c \rangle - \gamma \sum_{i,j=1}^n \exp\left(\frac{-C_{i,j} - \lambda_i - \mu_j}{\gamma} - 1\right).$$
(5)

Denote by $\lambda_{\gamma}^*, \mu_{\gamma}^*$ the optimal variables in (5). Then we have the following proposition: **Proposition 1.** $(\lambda_{\gamma}^*, \mu_{\gamma}^*)$ converges to optimal dual variables of non-regularized case (2) as $\gamma \to 0^+$.

Proof. Using Theorem 7.17 and 7.30 from Rockafellar and Wets [30], it is sufficient to prove that the function under minimization in (5) converges point-wise to the function in (2).

Notice that by the properties of the limit it is sufficient to prove that

$$\gamma \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} - 1\right) \underset{\gamma \to 0^+}{\to} \begin{cases} +\infty & \alpha > 0\\ 0 & \alpha \le 0 \end{cases}$$

as a function of α .

If $\alpha \leq 0$, it is clear. If $\alpha > 0$ look at the following sentence under the exponent:

$$\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} - 1 + \log \gamma = \frac{\alpha + \gamma \log \gamma}{\gamma} - 1 \to +\infty$$

The corollary for our purpose is that it is sufficient to make a bound "with respect to γ " for $\lambda_{\gamma}^*, \mu_{\gamma}^*$ and use the limit to create a bound on the dual variables of the non-regularized problem.

Then we make the change of variables: $u = -\lambda/\gamma - 1/2$, $v = -\mu/\gamma - 1/2$. Denote by K the matrix $e^{C/\gamma}$. Then we can rewrite (5) in the next form using notation of Cuturi [6]:

$$L_C^{\gamma}(r,c) = \gamma \max_{v,u} \left[\langle u, r \rangle + \langle v, c \rangle - \langle \mathbf{1}, \operatorname{diag} e^u K \operatorname{diag} e^v \rangle \right] + 2\gamma \tag{6}$$

Remark. If (u^*, v^*) are optimal in (6), then $(u^* + \alpha \mathbf{1}, v^* - \alpha \mathbf{1})$ are optimal too. Hence we can assume that $\max_i v^* = \max_{i \in [n]} (-\frac{\mu_{\gamma}}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{2} \iff \min_{i \in [n]} (\mu_{\gamma}^*)_i = 0.$

Now we can use the bound from Lemma 1 of the work Dvurechensky et al. [13] in the assumption r > 0, c > 0:

$$\max_{i} (u^{*})_{i} - \min_{i} (u^{*})_{i} \le R,$$
$$\max_{i} (v^{*})_{i} - \min_{i} (v^{*})_{i} \le R,$$

where $R := -\log(\nu \min_{i \in [n]} \{r_i, c_i\}), \nu = e^{-\|C\|_{\infty}/\gamma}$.

Use the inverse change the variables, we have that

$$\max_{i} (\mu_{\gamma}^{*})_{i} - \min_{i} (\mu_{\gamma}^{*})_{i} \le \|C\|_{\infty} - \gamma \log \min_{i \in [n]} \{r_{i}, c_{i}\}.$$

We know that $\min_{i \in [n]} (\mu_{\gamma}^*)_i = 0$. Hence we can rewrite it in the following way:

$$\|\mu_{\gamma}^*\|_{\infty} \leq \|C\|_{\infty} - \gamma \log \min_{i \in [n]} \{r_i, c_i\}.$$

By limit on γ to 0^+ we can obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1. There is an optimal solution μ^* for a problem (3) such that $\|\mu^*\|_{\infty} \leq \|C\|_{\infty}$.

Then we have a necessary corollary for the following analysis of algorithms:

Corollary 1. Assume that (r^*, f^*_{μ}) is optimal variables in the saddle-point problem (4). Then, if $r^* > 0$, there exists another optimal \hat{f}_{μ} such that $\|\hat{f}_{\mu}(\xi)\|_{\infty} \leq \|C\|_{\infty} P_{\xi}$ -almost surely.

Hence, we can reformulate problem (4) in the following manner for a small enough $\delta > 0$:

$$\min_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E}\mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi) = \min_{r \in \Delta^n_{\delta}} \mathbb{E}\mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi) = \min_{r \in \Delta^n_{\delta}} \sup_{f_\mu \in \mathcal{F}^b} \mathbb{E}\left[-\langle \lambda^*(f_\mu(\xi), D_p), r \rangle - \langle f_\mu(\xi), \xi \rangle\right], \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^b = \{f \colon \Delta^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \mid f \text{ is } P_{\xi}\text{-measurable and } \|f(\xi)\|_{\infty} \le \|C\|_{\infty} P_{\xi}\text{-almost surely}\}.$

3 Algorithms

In this section, we provide algorithms for computation population Wasserstein barycenters using the saddle-point formulation (7) on the assumption of existence a positive optimal r^* .

3.1 Stochastic Mirror Descent

Since our problem is non-smooth and non-strongly convex, we cannot apply accelerated methods. Our solution uses the vector-point field view from the book Bubeck [3] and the additional analysis for the confidence-region convergence from the work of Nemirovski et al. [26].

The first thing that we should mention that it deals with the optimization on closed convex bounded sets and it does not depend on a dimension of the space in general. The proof of the correctness of this algorithm does not use any assumption on finite dimension and it will make an algorithm applicable for arbitrary measures.

Now we are using the most general case of the *stochastic saddle-point mirror descent*. It can be applied to the following type of problems:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x, y),$$

where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are closed convex normed spaces and function f is continuous such that $f(\cdot, y)$ is convex and $f(x, \cdot)$ is concave.

The quality of the solution (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) is evaluated through the duality gap:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x, \tilde{y}) - \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\tilde{x}, y).$$

The setup of the mirror descent algorithm consists of:

1) Mirror maps for $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} : \Phi_{\mathcal{X}}(x), \Phi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ that respect norms in corresponding spaces and $R^2 = \sup_x \Phi(x) - \inf_x \Phi(x)$ is finite for \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} (called $R^2_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $R^2_{\mathcal{Y}}$);

2) Unbiased stochastic subgradient oracles $g(x,y,\eta)$ for $\partial_x f(x,y)$ and $h(x,y,\zeta)$ for $\partial_y(-f(x,y))$. We need the a.s. bounds on their dual norm $B_{\mathcal{X}}, B_{\mathcal{Y}}$ or/and bound on the second moment of their dual norm $L_{\mathcal{X}}, L_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Let us suppose (\bar{x}_N, \bar{y}_N) is the output of the algorithm after N iteration. Then we have the following theorem as a combination of theorems from the work of Nemirovski et al. [26]:

Theorem 2. To obtain an ε -precision in terms of duality gap with probability at least $1 - \sigma$:

$$\Pr\left[\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}}f(x,\bar{y}_N) - \max_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}f(\bar{x}_N,y) \le \varepsilon\right] \ge 1 - \sigma;$$

it is sufficient to make the following number of iterations:

$$N = \frac{O(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \min\left\{ (R_{\mathcal{X}} B_{\mathcal{X}} + R_{\mathcal{Y}} B_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 \log^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right), (R_{\mathcal{X}} L_{\mathcal{X}} + R_{\mathcal{Y}} L_{\mathcal{Y}})^2 \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right\}.$$

The probability is taken with respect to random samples of η and ζ during the running time.

3.2 Algorithm for finite-support measures over a probability simplex

In this case we assume that $\text{Supp}(\xi) = \{c_1, \ldots, c_m\}$ is finite. Then any function $f_{\mu} \in \mathcal{F}^b$ can be represented as a matrix M_{μ} of size $m \times n$ and the value of a function defined $f_{\mu}(c_i)$ as an *i*-th row of M_{μ} : $f_{\mu}(c_i) = (M_{\mu})_i$. The value of a function on the point out of the $\text{Supp}(\xi)$ is zero.

Moreover, we associate the space of functions on this finite support with a space of matrices and we do not make a difference between f_{μ} and M_{μ} except that we define an action of the first one on the probability simplex.

Thus we the have next optimization problem:

$$\min_{r \in \Delta^n} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{W}_p^p(r,\xi) = \min_{r \in \Delta^n_\delta} \sup_{\substack{f_\mu \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \\ \|M_\mu\|_{\infty} \le \|D_p\|_{\infty}}} \mathbb{E} \left[-\langle \lambda^*(f_\mu(\xi), D_p), r \rangle - \langle f_\mu(\xi), \xi \rangle \right].$$
(8)

Recall the function under an expectation after substitution ξ into f_{μ} as $\psi(r, \mu, c_k)$. Then for the problem (8) we can apply the stochastic saddle-point mirror descent.

Theorem 3. Algorithm 1 obtains *p*-Wasserstein barycenters with an ε -precision and the level of confidence σ after

$$N = O\left(\frac{n\|D_p\|_{\infty}^2}{\varepsilon^2} \min\left\{\frac{m}{\sigma^2}, \max(n\log n, m)\log^2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right\}\right)$$

iterations and its total complexity is O(nN)*.*

Remark. If we conclude that $||D_p||_{\infty}^2$ and σ are constants and $m \ge n \log n$, we have a complexity $O(n^2m \cdot \varepsilon^{-2})$. It is the same complexity as the Iterative Bregman Projections (IBP) algorithm [27, 23]. However, our algorithm is from family of Stochastic Mirror Descent-based algorithms and any improvements of this general framework could improve our algorithm.

Proof. Firstly, we prove the correctness of the algorithms using Theorem 2. For this we need to describe our setup of the mirror descent.

1) For a mirror map for a truncated simplex Δ_{δ}^{n} , we choose a typical setup as an entropy: $\Phi_{\mathcal{X}}(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i \log r_i$. Then we can easily bound a diameter of the simplex from the properties of an entropy $R_{\mathcal{X}}^2 = \log n$ and easily get an operator of projection as an exponential weighting that computes in O(n) time. This mirror map respects $\|\cdot\|_1$ norm.

2) For a mirror map for the second component of optimization, we choose default mirror map $\Phi_{\mathcal{Y}}(f_{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} ||M_{\mu}||_{F}^{2}$. For this mirror map we can bound a search space using the multidimensional Pythagorean theorem and obtain $R_{\mathcal{Y}}^{2} = m \cdot n \cdot 2 ||D_{p}||_{\infty}^{2}$. The projection can be computed in a lazy way. This mirror map respects $||\cdot||_{F}$ norm.

For next point we should define our stochastic subgradient oracles. For this purpose we will use the source of randomness as a random sample c_t . It is clear that it gives us unbiased oracle. Hence:

$$G(r, f_{\mu}, c_t) = \partial_r \psi(r, f_{\mu}(c_t), c_t) = -\lambda^* (f_{\mu}(c_t), D_p),$$
⁽⁹⁾

$$H(r, f_{\mu}, c_t) = (\partial_{f_{\mu}(c_t)} \left[-\psi(r, f_{\mu}(c_t), c_t) \right])_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i \partial_{(M_{\mu})_t} \max_{j \in [n]} \left[-(D_p)_{ij} - (M_{\mu})_{tj} \right] + c_t.$$
(10)

On each iteration oracle G gives us t-th row of the full subgradient matrix (up to the probability of c_t) and this way can be associated with random coordinate descent.

However, these subgradients can be calculated in $O(n^2)$ time and it is too long for us. To fix that issue we apply a pure random coordinate technique to the G and same technique for H: we will sample index $i \in [n]$ from distribution associated with r and calculate only *i*-th term of the sum in the definition of H and the expectation is not changed and stay unbiased.

Recall the uniform distribution over [n] as U([n]) and the distribution associated with r as P(r). Then we can write our final unbiased stochastic oracles using the knowledge of the subgradient of a maximum:

$$g(r, f_{\mu}, c_t, s) = -n \cdot \max_{j \in [n]} (-(D_p)_{s,j} - (M_{\mu})_{t,j});$$
(11)

$$h(r, f_{\mu}, c_t, q) = -e_{J_q(f_{\mu}, c_t)} + c_t, \tag{12}$$

where multiplication by n in g is required to unbiased property and $J_q(f_\mu, c_t)$ is an index where λ_q^* is maximized.

Then we should bound our subgradients. In this case we will use the knowledge of the subgradient of a maximum and the value of λ^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(r, f_{\mu}, \xi, s)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{*}} &= \|g(r, f_{\mu}, \xi, s)\|_{\infty} = n \left| \max_{j \in [n]} (-(D_{p})_{t,j} - (f_{\mu}(\xi))_{j}) \right| \le 2n \|D_{p}\|_{\infty}, \\ \|h(r, f_{\mu}, \xi, q)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{*}} &\le \|c_{t}\|_{2} + \|e_{J_{q}(f_{\mu}, \xi)}\|_{2} \le 2. \end{aligned}$$

However, in the first case we have a more precise bound on the second moment by $L^2_{\mathcal{X}} = 4n \|D_p\|_{\infty}^2$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|g(r, f_{\mu}, \xi, s)\|_{\mathcal{X}^*}^2\right] \le \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (2n \|D_p\|_{\infty})^2 = 4n \|D_p\|_{\infty}^2 =: L_{\mathcal{X}}^2$$

Thus, using Theorem 2 and the direct computation, the required number of steps is:

$$O\left(\frac{n\|D_p\|_{\infty}^2}{\varepsilon^2}\min\left\{\frac{m}{\sigma^2},\max(n\log n,m)\log^2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right\}\right)$$

Each step can be produced in O(n) time and we obtain required total complexity.

3.3 Algorithm for arbitrary measures over a probability simplex

In this case, we do not make any assumption of $\text{Supp}(\xi)$. The optimization problem (7) is pure infinite-dimensional and we should apply methods of infinite-dimensional optimization. One of the ways is so-called kernel methods. For this purpose, we should give a definition:

Definition 1. A Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a reproducing kernel Hilbert space if there is a symmetric positive-defined function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ called a kernel, such that

 $1. \ \forall x \in \mathcal{X} : k(\cdot, x) \in \mathcal{H};$ $2. \ \forall f \in \mathcal{H} : \langle f, k(\cdot, x) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = f(x);$ $3. \ \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} : \langle k(\cdot, x), k(\cdot, y) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = k(x, y).$

For such type of spaces we can define subgradients with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. Our core idea is searching f^*_{μ} in \mathcal{H}^n using the fact that mirror descent does not use any finite-dimensional facts in the proofs of correctness and converge rate. Hence it is sufficient to find a suitable norm, suitable mirror map and bound on the functional subgradient and it gives us an algorithm. The approach is used in attitude to the variable r is the same as in the previous case except we do not need a random coordinate descent because the cost of iterations increased too much and the winning of O(n) iterations in the

calculation of the subgradient is nothing in the attitude to recalculation of the function f_{μ} .

However, the complexity will depend on the choice of kernel. It because of two constants $R^2 = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{2} ||f||^2$ and $\kappa^2 = \sup_x k(x,x)$ that fully depend on kernel.

Usage of a Gaussian kernel leads to the following result:

Theorem 4. Algorithm 2 (Kernel Mirror Descent) calculates p-Wasserstein barycenter with respect to an arbitrary distribution in

$$N = O\left(\frac{n^2 R^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log^2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right)$$

sample iterations and with

$$O\left(\frac{n^5 R^4}{\varepsilon^4} \log^4\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right)$$

total complexity.

Remark. This algorithm is from a family of Stochastic Averaging (SA) algorithms and the most correct comparison can be obtained with other SA algorithms.

From the article of Dvinskikh [9] we know a total complexity of SA approach based on Sinkhorn algorithm:

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^3 \|D_p\|_{\infty}^2}{\varepsilon^2} \min\left\{\exp\left(\frac{\|D_p\|_{\infty} \log n}{\varepsilon}\right) \left(\frac{\|D_p\|_{\infty} \log n}{\varepsilon} + \log\left(\frac{\|D_p\|_{\infty} \log n}{\gamma \varepsilon^2}\right)\right), \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\gamma \epsilon}}\right\}\right)$$

The complexity of this algorithm depends on the parameter γ which true dependence on n is unknown and in practice this parameter is quite small. From the theoretical point of view if we suggest $\|D_p\|_{\infty}$, R and σ as constants and $\gamma \leq \varepsilon/n^3$, the complexity of our algorithm is better in both parameters.

Proof. Firstly, let us define an inner product in \mathcal{H}^n as $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle f_i, g_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ where f_i is an *i*-th coordinate function of f, then we can define a norm $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}}^n$ with respect to this inner product and, consequently, the simplest mirror-map $\Phi_{\mathcal{Y}}(f) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$. Then we have an $R_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 = nR^2$.

After it we should calculate stochastic subgradient of the coordinate function $(f_{\mu})_t$:

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(r, f_{\mu}, c) &= \left(\partial_{f_{\mu}}(-\psi(r, f_{\mu}(c), c))\right)_t = \left(\partial_{f_{\mu}}(-\psi(r, \langle f_{\mu}, k(\cdot, c) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, c))\right)_t = \\ &= k(\cdot, c) \cdot \left(\partial_{\mu}(-\psi(r, f_{\mu}(c), c))\right)_t = k(\cdot, c) \left(c_t - \sum_{i=1}^n r_i I\{t = J_i(c)\}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $J_i(c)$ is one of the indexes in λ_i^* where the maximum value is obtained.

We can bound a dual norm of H_t using Riesz representation theorem and replace it with just a norm:

$$\|H_t(r, f_\mu, c, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \le 2\|k(\cdot, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 2\kappa.$$

If we define the step size as $\beta \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}}$, we have the next implicit formula to calculate f_{μ} ($f_{\mu}^{0} = 0$) after k iterations.

Proposition 2. If $f^0_{\mu} = 0$, we have an implicit formula to recalculate f^k_{μ} :

$$(f_{\mu}^{k})_{t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_{t}^{i} \cdot k(\cdot, c^{i}), \qquad \beta_{t}^{k} = \beta \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \cdot \left(-c_{t}^{k} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i}^{k} I\{t = J_{i}(c^{k})\} \right), \qquad (13)$$

where $\{c^k\}$ are random samples from P_{ξ} .

Proof. Prove it by induction on k: basis k = 0 is clear, step follows from the formula of a step of a gradient descent:

$$(f^k_{\mu})_t = (f^{k-1}_{\mu})_t - \beta \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} H_t(r, f^{k-1}_{\mu}, c^k) = (f^{k-1}_{\mu})_t + \beta^k_t k(\cdot, c^k)$$

The main problem in the kernel approach can be seen there: we need to make O(N) iterations to recalculate only one coordinate function of f_{μ} . For calculation of the subgradient in r we should calculate *full* vector f_{μ} in a new sampled measure c^k , it costs O(nN).

Before the final computations of complexity, we should choose the kernel. To reduce assumptions on the optimal f_{μ} , we choose a dense *Gaussian kernel* (see [25, 7] for more detail):

$$k(x,y) = \exp\left(\frac{-\|x-y\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right),$$

where σ^2 is a parameter of the kernel that we can consider as a suitable constant (for instance, $\sigma^2 = 1$).

To use this kernel we need to redefine our function out of a simplex. Using the definition of our function 13, we can consider the following class of functions for optimization:

$$\mathcal{H}' = \left\{ f = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i k(\cdot, x_i) \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \mid \forall i \in [m] : x_i \in \Delta^n, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}; \sup_{x \in \Delta^n} |f(x)| \le \|D_p\|_{\infty} \right\}.$$

However, in this case the proper bound on R^2 can not be found, but we suggest that R^2 does not depends on the dimension n. This suggestion connected to the observation that ℓ_2 -diameter of a simplex is constant in any finite dimension. Another constant can be easily calculated:

$$\kappa^2 = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} k(x, x) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \exp\left(\frac{\|x - x\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) = 1.$$

We should remind that other kernels can be chosen too and such kernels can have known bound in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Our subgradient in f_{μ} is a vector of all H_t for each $t \in [n]$. In this case, we can bound a norm of this subgradient as $B_{\mathcal{Y}} = 2\kappa\sqrt{n}$:

$$\|H(r,f_{\mu},c)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{n}}^{2} = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \|H_{t}(r,f_{\mu},c,s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{2} \le 4n\kappa^{2}.$$

Hence we can calculate a number of iterations and samples as

$$N = O\left(\frac{n^2 R^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log^2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right).$$

However, each step of this functional gradient ascent costs about O(nN) and we have a required total complexity $O(nN^2)$.

Remark. The cost of one iteration can be reduced by using other kernel and some extra techniques such as an incomplete Cholevsky decomposition [33] or random Fourier features [29] but these approaches make the analysis of the algorithm harder because of additional inexactness in the subgradient.

Remark. All the complexities bounds in sections 3.2, 3.3 are based on typically rough enough bounds for the distance to the solution and dual norm of stochastic subgradients. We may expect that in practice we can use significantly smaller constants, that allows to converging faster due to the larger stepsizes. From this side, it can be useful to use adaptive variants of stochastic Mirror Descent (stochastic Universal Mirror Prox): [1] or [14] with adaptive batching idea from [11]. Another way to obtain theoretically better complexity bounds in n is to use specific prox function in Stochastic Mirror Descent (Mirror Prox) developed for saddle point problems on a primal product of unit simplex and ball in ∞ norm [21].

Remark. Pseudocode is presented in one of the two discussed configurations that depends on the choice of step size α in the case of Algorithm 1. From the theoretical point of view, for the version with the bounded second moment we should use $\alpha = \sqrt{\log n}/\sqrt{2n}$ and for the a.s. bounded norm we should use $\alpha = \sqrt{\log n}/(\sqrt{2n})$.

4 **Experiments**

In this section we test Algorithm 2 for arbitrary distributions using MNIST dataset. The question what we are interested is a dependence of converge of the algorithm on the number of measures.

Each measure for our algorithm is an image of a handwritten digit 3 of size 28×28 after normalization of pixel values. Since our optimized function is an expectation over unknown distribution, we split our data to train and test datasets, and the test dataset is required to calculate an approximation of the function using an exact calculation of 2-Wasserstein distance (using [15]) for each image in the test dataset. It is a quite expensive operation and it makes impossible to use a large number of test examples and we use only 250. We perform the experiment on 1000 train images. However, we calculate barycenters on 6000 train images and consider the output of our algorithm at the end as a «true barycenter».

Kernel Mirror Descent. Firstly we implement the algorithm 2 except the choice of the constant step sizes α and β for more appropriate ones. Also we do not make projections of f_{μ} onto ℓ_{∞} box.

Note, that we don't observe the convergence to zero of 2-Wasserstein distance in Figure 1. This may happens due to several reasons. One of them is possible non i.i.d. data nature and the other one is principle impossibility of calculating the exact duality-gap criteria. We can only estimate this criteria [18].

Comparison with regularized methods. One of the key features of our methods that it does not depend on the regularization constant γ and should provide sharper images. Usage of a small constant γ to reduce a non-regularized error is not possible in practice via Sinkhorn based algorithms because of numerical instability.



Figure 1: Converge of mean of W_2^2 -distance on test data using Kernel Mirror Descent.



Figure 2: Kernel Mirror Descent after 10, 100, 500, 1000 and 6000 iterations and IBP with $\gamma = 0.25$.

1	Algorithm 1: Finite support version	Ā	lgorithm 2: Kernel Mirror Descent	
j	Data: N – number of iterations;		Data: N – number of iterations;	
]	Result: \bar{r} – approximation of barycenter;		Result: \bar{r} – approximation of barycenter;	
1	1 begin		1 begin	
2	Set $r = (1/n, \ldots, 1/n) \in \Delta^n$;	2	Set $r = (1/n, \ldots, 1/n) \in \Delta^n$;	
3	Set $M_{\mu} = 0 \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R});$	3	Set $f_{\mu} = 0$;	
4	Set $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{2n}}, \beta = \frac{\sqrt{nm} \ D_p\ _{\infty}}{\sqrt{2}};$	4	Set $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{2}}, \beta = \frac{\ D_p\ _{\infty}}{2\sqrt{n}};$	
5	for $k = 1$ to N do	5	for $k = 1$ to N do	
6	Sample c_t from P_{ξ} ;	6	Sample c^k from P_{ξ} ;	
7	Sample s from $U([n])$;	7	for $t = 1$ to n do	
8	Sample q from $P(r)$;	8	$(f_{\mu}(c^{k}))_{t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_{t}^{i} k(c^{k}, c^{i});$	
9	$g_s := g(r, M_\mu, c_t, s) \text{ (see (11))};$	9	Calculate all $L(c^k)$:	
10	$h_t := h(r, M_\mu, c_t, q)$ (see (12));	10	Calculate all $\beta_i(e^{-j})$;	
11	$r_s := r_s - \alpha \sqrt{2/Ng_s};$	10	Calculate all p_t (see (15));	
12	$(M_{u})_{t} := (M_{u})_{t} + \beta \sqrt{2/N} h_{t};$	11	$g := G(r^{\kappa}, f_{\mu}(c^{\kappa}), \underline{c^{\kappa}}))$ (see (9));	
13	$r := \prod_{\Lambda n} (r);$	12	$r := \prod_{\Delta^n} (r - \alpha \sqrt{2/Ng});$	
14	$ \begin{bmatrix} \bar{r} := \frac{1}{k}\bar{r} + \frac{k-1}{k}\bar{r}; \end{bmatrix} $	13	$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	
15	Return \bar{r} ;	14	Return \bar{r} ;	

References

- F. Bach and K. Y. Levy. A universal algorithm for variational inequalities adaptive to smoothness and noise. In A. Beygelzimer and D. Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference* on Learning Theory, volume 99 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pages 164– 194, Phoenix, USA, 25–28 Jun 2019. PMLR. URL http://proceedings.mlr.press/v99/ bach19a.html. arXiv:1902.01637.
- [2] M. Ballu, Q. Berthet, and F. Bach. Stochastic optimization for regularized wasserstein estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08695*, 2020.
- [3] S. Bubeck. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity, 2014.

- [4] S. Chewi, T. Maunu, P. Rigollet, and A. J. Stromme. Gradient descent algorithms for bureswasserstein barycenters. arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01700, 2020.
- [5] S. Claici, E. Chien, and J. Solomon. Stochastic Wasserstein barycenters. In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 999–1008. PMLR, 2018. URL http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/claici18a.html.
- [6] M. Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 2292–2300. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [7] A. Dieuleveut and F. Bach. Nonparametric stochastic approximation with large step-sizes. Ann. Statist., 44(4):1363–1399, 08 2016. doi: 10.1214/15-AOS1391. URL https://doi.org/10. 1214/15-AOS1391.
- [8] Y. Dong, Y. Gao, R. Peng, I. Razenshteyn, and S. Sawlani. A study of performance of optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01182*, 2020.
- [9] D. Dvinskikh. Stochastic averaging versus sample average approximation for population wasserstein barycenter calculation, 2020.
- [10] D. Dvinskikh, E. Gorbunov, A. Gasnikov, P. Dvurechensky, and C. A. Uribe. On primal and dual approaches for distributed stochastic convex optimization over networks. In 2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 7435–7440. IEEE, 2019. arXiv:1903.09844.
- [11] D. Dvinskikh, A. Ogaltsov, P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, and V. Spokoiny. Adaptive gradient descent for convex and non-convex stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08380, 2019.
- P. Dvurechensky, D. Dvinskikh, A. Gasnikov, C. A. Uribe, and A. Nedić. Decentralize and randomize: Faster algorithm for Wasserstein barycenters. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, NeurIPS 2018, pages 10783–10793. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper/8274-decentralize-and-randomize-faster-algorithm-for-wasserstein-barycenters.pdf. arXiv:1806.03915.
- [13] P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, and A. Kroshnin. Computational optimal transport: Complexity by accelerated gradient descent is better than by sinkhorn's algorithm. In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1367–1376, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm Sweden, 10–15 Jul 2018. PMLR. URL http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/ dvurechensky18a.html.
- [14] P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, F. Stonyakin, and A. Titov. Generalized Mirror Prox: Solving variational inequalities with monotone operator, inexact oracle, and unknown Hölder parameters. arXiv:1806.05140, 2018.
- [15] R. Flamary and N. Courty. Pot python optimal transport library, 2017. URL https:// pythonot.github.io/.
- [16] A. Genevay, M. Cuturi, G. Peyré, and F. Bach. Stochastic optimization for large-scale optimal transport. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 3440–3448. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- [17] E. Gorbunov, D. Dvinskikh, and A. Gasnikov. Optimal decentralized distributed algorithms for stochastic convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07363*, 2019.
- [18] V. Guigues, A. Juditsky, and A. Nemirovski. Non-asymptotic confidence bounds for the optimal value of a stochastic program. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 32(5):1033–1058, 2017.

- [19] S. Guminov, P. Dvurechensky, N. Tupitsa, and A. Gasnikov. Accelerated alternating minimization, accelerated sinkhorn's algorithm and accelerated iterative bregman projections. *ArXiv Preprint*, 2019, 1906.
- [20] H. Hendrikx, F. Bach, and L. Massoulie. An optimal algorithm for decentralized finite sum optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.10675, 2020.
- [21] A. Jambulapati, A. Sidford, and K. Tian. A direct o $(1/\epsilon)$ iteration parallel algorithm for optimal transport. *ArXiv Preprint*, 2019:2, 1906.
- [22] A. Kroshnin, N. Tupitsa, D. Dvinskikh, P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, and C. Uribe. On the complexity of approximating Wasserstein barycenters. In K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3530–3540, Long Beach, California, USA, 09–15 Jun 2019. PMLR. arXiv:1901.08686.
- [23] A. Kroshnin, N. Tupitsa, D. Dvinskikh, P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, and C. Uribe. On the complexity of approximating Wasserstein barycenters. In K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3530–3540, Long Beach, California, USA, 09–15 Jun 2019. PMLR. URL http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/kroshnin19a. html.
- [24] T. Lin, N. Ho, X. Chen, M. Cuturi, and M. I. Jordan. Revisiting fixed support wasserstein barycenter: Computational hardness and efficient algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04783*, 2020.
- [25] H. Q. Minh. Nonparametric stochastic approximation with large step-sizes. Some Properties of Gaussian Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces and Their Implications for Function Approximation and Learning Theory, 44:307–338, 2010. doi: 10.1007/s00365-009-9080-0. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-009-9080-0.
- [26] A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009. doi: 10.1137/070704277. URL https://doi.org/10.1137/070704277.
- [27] L. Nenna and G. Carlier. Iterative bregman projections for regularized transportation problems. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01096124, 12 2014.
- [28] G. Peyré and M. Cuturi. Computational optimal transport. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [29] A. Rahimi and B. Recht. Random features for large-scale kernel machines. In J. C. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. T. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 1177–1184. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper/3182-random-features-for-large-scale-kernel-machines.pdf.
- [30] R. Rockafellar and R. Wets. Variational Analysis, volume 317. 01 2004. doi: 10.1007/ 978-3-642-02431-3.
- [31] M. Staib, S. Claici, J. M. Solomon, and S. Jegelka. Parallel streaming wasserstein barycenters. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 2647–2658. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper/ 6858-parallel-streaming-wasserstein-barycenters.pdf.
- [32] F. S. Stonyakin, D. Dvinskikh, P. Dvurechensky, A. Kroshnin, O. Kuznetsova, A. Agafonov, A. Gasnikov, A. Tyurin, C. A. Uribe, D. Pasechnyuk, and S. Artamonov. Gradient methods for problems with inexact model of the objective. In M. Khachay, Y. Kochetov, and P. Pardalos, editors, *Mathematical Optimization Theory and Operations Research*, pages 97–114, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing. arXiv:1902.09001.
- [33] G. Wu, E. Y. Chang, Y.-K. Chen, and C. J. Hughes. Incremental approximate matrix factorization for speeding up support vector machines. In *KDD* '06, 2006.