
Optimal Accelerated Variance Reduced EXTRA and DIGing for Strongly Convex and Smooth Decentralized Optimization

Huan Li¹ Zhouchen Lin² Yongchun Fang¹

Abstract

We study stochastic decentralized optimization for the problem of training machine learning models with large-scale distributed data. We extend the famous EXTRA and DIGing methods with accelerated variance reduction (VR), and propose two methods, which require the time of $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations and $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds to reach precision ϵ , where κ_s and κ_b are the stochastic condition number and batch condition number for strongly convex and smooth problems, κ_c is the condition number of the communication network, and n is the sample size on each distributed node. Our stochastic gradient computation complexity is the same as the single-machine accelerated variance reduction methods, such as Katyusha, and our communication complexity is the same as the accelerated full batch decentralized methods, such as MSDA, and they are both optimal. We also propose the non-accelerated VR based EXTRA and DIGing, and provide explicit complexities, for example, the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the $O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity for the VR based EXTRA. The two complexities are also the same as the ones of single-machine VR methods, such as SAG, SAGA, and SVRG, and the non-accelerated full batch decentralized methods, such as EXTRA, respectively.

1. Introduction

Emerging machine learning applications involve huge amounts of data samples, and the data are often distributed across multiple machines for storage and computational reasons. In this paper, we consider the following distributed convex optimization problem with m nodes, and each node has n local training samples:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^m f_{(i)}(x), \quad \text{where} \quad f_{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f_{(i),j}(x), \quad (1)$$

where the local component function $f_{(i),j}$ represents the j th sample of node i , and it is not accessible by any other node in the communication network. The network is abstracted as a connected and undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is the set of nodes, and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges. Nodes i and j can send information to each other if and only if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. The goal of the networked nodes is to cooperatively solve problem (1) via local computation and communication, that is, each node i makes its decision only based on the local computations on $f_{(i)}$, for example, the gradient, and the local information received from its neighbors in the network.

When the local data size n is large, the cost of computing the full batch gradient $\nabla f_{(i)}$ at each iteration is expensive. To address the issue of large-scale distributed data, stochastic decentralized algorithms are often used to solve problem (1), where each node only randomly samples one component gradient at each iteration (extendable to the mini-batch settings with more than one randomly selected function). Most decentralized algorithms alternate between computations and communications. Thus, to compare the performance of such methods, two measures are used: the number of communication

¹Institute of Robotics and Automatic Information Systems, College of Artificial Intelligence, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China (lihuanss@nankai.edu.com, fangyc@nankai.edu.cn).

²Key Laboratory of Machine Perception (MOE), School of Electronics Engineering and Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China (zlin@pku.edu.cn).

. Correspondence to: Huan Li <lihuanss@nankai.edu.cn>.

rounds and the number of stochastic gradient evaluations, where one communication round allows each node to send information to their neighbors, and one stochastic gradient evaluation refers to computing the randomly sampled $\nabla f_{(i),j}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in parallel.

Although stochastic decentralized optimization has been a hot topic in recent years, and several algorithms have been proposed, to the best of our knowledge, in the class of algorithms not relying on the expensive dual gradient evaluations, there is no algorithm optimal in both the number of communication rounds and the number of stochastic gradient evaluations, where “optimal” means matching the corresponding lower bounds. In this paper, we extend two famous decentralized algorithms, that is, EXTRA (Shi et al., 2015) and DIGing (Nedić et al., 2017), to the stochastic decentralized optimization. Furthermore, we propose two accelerated stochastic decentralized algorithms which are optimal in the above two measures.

1.1. Notations and Assumptions

Denote $x_{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ to be the local variable for node i . To simplify the algorithm description in a compact form, we introduce the aggregate objective function $f(\mathbf{x})$ with its aggregate variable \mathbf{x} and aggregate gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{(1)}^T \\ \vdots \\ x_{(m)}^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}), \quad \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla f_{(1)}(x_{(1)})^T \\ \vdots \\ \nabla f_{(m)}(x_{(m)})^T \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Denote x^* to be one minimizer of problem (1), and let $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{1}(x^*)^T$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the column vector of m ones. Denote I as the identity matrix, and $\mathcal{N}_{(i)}$ as the neighborhood of node i . Denote $\text{Ker}(U) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m | Ux = 0\}$ as the kernel space of matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $\text{Span}(U) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m | y = Ux, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$ as the linear span of all the columns of U .

We make the following assumptions for the functions in (1).

Assumption 1 Each $f_{(i)}(x)$ is $L_{(i)}$ -smooth and μ -strongly convex. Each $f_{(i),j}(x)$ is $L_{(i),j}$ -smooth and convex.

We say a function $g(x)$ is L -smooth if its gradient satisfies $\|\nabla g(\mathbf{y}) - \nabla g(\mathbf{x})\| \leq L\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|$. Motivated by (Hendrikx et al., 2020b;a), we define several notations as follows:

$$L_f = \max_i L_{(i)}, \quad \bar{L}_{(i)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n L_{(i),j}, \quad \bar{L}_f = \max_i \bar{L}_{(i)}, \quad \kappa_s = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, \quad \kappa_b = \frac{L_f}{\mu}. \quad (3)$$

Then, $f(\mathbf{x})$ is also μ -strongly convex and L_f -smooth. It always holds that $L_{(i)} \leq \bar{L}_{(i)} \leq nL_{(i)}^1$, which further gives

$$L_f \leq \bar{L}_f \leq nL_f \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_b \leq \kappa_s \leq n\kappa_b. \quad (4)$$

We follow (Hendrikx et al., 2020a) to call κ_b the batch condition number, and κ_s the stochastic condition number, which are classical quantities in the analysis of batch optimization methods and finite-sum optimization methods. Generally, we have $\kappa_s \ll n\kappa_b$, see (Allen-Zhu, 2018) for the example and analysis.

In decentralized optimization, communication is often represented as a matrix multiplication with a matrix W . We make the following assumptions for the weight matrix W associated to the network.

Assumption 2

1. $W_{i,j} \neq 0$ if and only if agents i and j are neighbors or $i = j$. Otherwise, $W_{i,j} = 0$.
2. $W = W^T$, $I \succeq W \succeq \sigma I$, and $W\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$.

We let $\sigma = 0$ for EXTRA, and $\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ for DiGing. Assumption 2.2 implies that the singular values of W lie in $[\sigma, 1]$, and its largest one $\sigma_1(W)$ equals 1. Moreover, if the network is connected, we have $\sigma_2(W) < 1$, where $\sigma_2(W)$ means the second largest singular value. We often use

$$\kappa_c = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma_2(W)} \quad (5)$$

¹See footnote 14 in (Allen-Zhu, 2018) for the analysis.

as the condition number of the communication network, which upper bounds the ratio between the largest singular value and the smallest positive singular value of the gossip matrix $(I - W)$.

As will be introduced in the next section, we often use κ_c and κ_b to describe the number of communication rounds, and κ_s for the number of stochastic gradient evaluations in stochastic decentralized optimization.

1.2. Literature Review

In this section, we give a brief review for the decentralized and stochastic methods, and Table 1 sums up the complexities of the representative ones.

1.2.1. FULL BACH DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHMS

The development of decentralized algorithms has gained significant attention for a long time (Bertsekas, 1983; Tsitsiklis et al., 1986). The modern distributed gradient descent (DGD) was proposed in (Nedić & Ozdaglar, 2009) for the general network topology, and was further extended in (Nedić, 2011; Ram et al., 2010a; Yuan et al., 2016). These algorithms are usually slow due to the diminishing step-size, and suffer from the sublinear convergence even for strongly convex and smooth objectives. To avoid the diminishing step-size and speed up the convergence, several methods with gradient tracking have been proposed. Typical examples include EXTRA (Shi et al., 2015; Li & Lin, 2020), DIGing (Qu & Li, 2018; Nedić et al., 2017), NIDS (Li et al., 2019), and other similar algorithms (Xu et al., 2015; Xin et al., 2018). Especially, EXTRA and NIDS have the $O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ complexity both in communications and full batch gradient evaluations to solve problem (1) to reach precision ϵ , which is the best among the non-accelerated algorithms. Another typical class of distributed algorithms is based on the Lagrangian function, and they work with the Fenchel dual. Examples include the dual ascent (Terelius et al., 2011; Scaman et al., 2017; Uribe et al., 2018), ADMM (Iutzeler et al., 2016; Makhdoumi & Ozdaglar, 2017; Aybat et al., 2018), and the primal-dual method (Lan et al., 2020; Scaman et al., 2018; Hong et al., 2017; Jakovetić, 2019). However, the dual-based methods often need to compute the gradient of the Fenchel conjugate of the local functions, called dual gradient in the sequel, which is expensive.

Nesterov’s acceleration technique is an efficient approach to speed up the convergence of first-order methods, and it has also been successfully applied to decentralized optimization. Typical examples include the distributed Nesterov gradient with consensus (Jakovetić et al., 2014), the accelerated distributed Nesterov gradient descent (Qu & Li, 2020), the multi-step dual accelerated method (MSDA) (Scaman et al., 2017; 2019), accelerated penalty method (Li et al., 2018), accelerated EXTRA (Li & Lin, 2020), and the accelerated proximal alternating predictor-corrector method (APAPC) (Kovalev et al., 2020b). Some of these methods have suboptimal computation complexity, and Chebyshev acceleration (CA) (Arioli & Scott, 2014) is a powerful technique to further reduce the computation cost. Scaman et al. (Scaman et al., 2017; 2019) proved the $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ lower bound on the number of communication rounds and the $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ lower bound on the number of full batch gradient evaluations, which means that any first-order non-stochastic decentralized methods cannot be faster than these bounds. The MSDA and APAPC methods with CA achieve these lower bounds.

1.2.2. STOCHASTIC ALGORITHMS ON A SINGLE NODE

Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) has been the workhorse in machine learning. However, since the variance of the noisy gradient will never go to zero, SGD often suffers from the slow sublinear convergence. Variance reduction (VR) was designed to reduce the negative effect of the noise, which can improve the stochastic gradient computation complexity from $O(1/\epsilon)$ to $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. On the other hand, full batch methods, such as gradient descent, require $O(\kappa_b \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ iterations, and thus $O(n\kappa_b \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ individual gradient evaluations for finite-sum problems with n samples, which may be much larger than $O((n + \kappa_s) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ when $\kappa_s \ll n\kappa_b$. Representative examples of VR methods include SAG (Schmidt et al., 2017), SAGA (Defazio et al., 2014), and SVRG (Johnson & Zhang, 2013; Xiao & Zhang, 2014). We can further accelerate the VR methods to the $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity by Nesterovs acceleration technique. Examples include Katyusha (Allen-Zhu, 2018) and its extensions in (Zhou et al., 2019; Kovalev et al., 2020a). Other accelerated stochastic algorithms can be found in (Lan & Zhou, 2018; Lin et al., 2018; Fercoq & Richtárik, 2015; Lin et al., 2015). Lan and Zhou (Lan & Zhou, 2018) proved the $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ lower bound for strongly convex and smooth stochastic optimization, and Katyusha achieves this lower bound.

Table 1. Comparisons of various state-of-the-art decentralized and stochastic algorithms. See (3) and (5) for the definitions of κ_b , κ_s , and κ_c . \tilde{O} hides the poly-logarithmic factors. The complexities of Acc-VR-EXTRA and Acc-VR-DIGing hold under some conditions to restrict the size of κ_c . Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA and Acc-VR-DIGing-CA remove these restrictions.

Methods	stochastic gradient computation complexity	communication complexity	dual gradient based ?
Full batch decentralized algorithms			
EXTRA (Shi et al., 2015) (Li & Lin, 2020)	$O(n(\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
DIGing (Nedić et al., 2017) (Alghunaim et al., 2020)	$O(n(\kappa_b + \kappa_c^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
MSDA+CA (Scaman et al., 2017)	$O(n\sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	yes
OPAPC+CA (Kovalev et al., 2020b)	$O(n\sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Stochastic algorithms on a single node			
VR methods (Schmidt et al., 2017) (Defazio et al., 2014) (Johnson & Zhang, 2013)	$O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	\	no
Katyusha (Allen-Zhu, 2018)	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	\	no
Stochastic decentralized algorithms			
GT-SAGA (Xin et al., 2020)	$O((n + \kappa_c^2 \kappa_s^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$((n + \kappa_c^2 \kappa_s^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
GT-SVRG (Xin et al., 2020)	$O((n + \kappa_c^2 \kappa_s^2 \log \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$((n + \kappa_c^2 \kappa_s^2 \log \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	o
ADFS (Hendrikx et al., 2020a)	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	yes
DVR+CA (Hendrikx et al., 2020b)	$O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\kappa_b \sqrt{\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
DVR+Catalyst (Hendrikx et al., 2020b)	$\tilde{O}((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa_b \kappa_c} \sqrt{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Lower bounds (Hendrikx et al., 2020a)	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	\
Our results for stochastic decentralized optimization			
VR-EXTRA	$O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
VR-DIGing	$O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Acc-VR-EXTRA	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Acc-VR-DIGing	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\kappa_c \sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Acc-VR-EXTRA+CA	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no
Acc-VR-DIGing+CA	$O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	no

1.2.3. STOCHASTIC DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHMS

To address the issue of large-scale distributed data, the authors in (Chen & Sayed, 2012; Ram et al., 2010b) extended the DGD method to the distributed stochastic gradient descent. To further improve the convergence of stochastic decentralized algorithms, Mokhtari and Ribeiro (Mokhtari & Ribeiro, 2016) combined EXTRA with SAGA, and proposed the decentralized double stochastic averaging gradient algorithm, Xin et al. (Xin et al., 2019) combined gradient tracking with the VR technique, and two algorithms are proposed, namely, GT-SATA and GT-SVRG. See (Xin et al., 2020) for a detailed review for the non-accelerated stochastic decentralized algorithms. Hendrikx et al. (Hendrikx et al., 2020a) proposed an accelerated decentralized stochastic algorithm called ADFS, which achieves the optimal $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity. However, ADFS is a dual-based method, and it needs to compute the dual gradient at each iteration, which is expensive. Recently, Hendrikx et al. (Hendrikx et al., 2020b) further proposed a dual-free decentralized method with variance reduction, called DVR, which achieves the $O(\kappa_b \sqrt{\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity and the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity. These complexities can be further improved to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa_b \kappa_c} \sqrt{\frac{n \kappa_b}{\kappa_s}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ and $\tilde{O}((\sqrt{n \kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ by the catalyst acceleration (Lin et al., 2018), respectively, where \tilde{O} hides the poly-logarithmic factor $O(\log \kappa_b)$. We see that DVR-catalyst achieves the optimal stochastic gradient computation complexity up to log factors. However, its communication cost is increased by a factor $O(\sqrt{\frac{n \kappa_b}{\kappa_s}})$ compared with ADFS, which is always much larger than 1 in machine learning applications², and it is of the $O(\sqrt{n})$ order in the worst case. Hendrikx et al. (Hendrikx et al., 2020a) proved the $O((\sqrt{n \kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation and the $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication lower bounds.

1.3. Contributions

Although both the decentralized methods and stochastic methods have a rich literature, and there exist optimal methods matching the corresponding communication lower bound (MSDA and APAPC for example) and stochastic gradient computation lower bound (Katyusha for example), respectively, there is no gradient-type stochastic decentralized method matching the two bounds simultaneously. In this paper we aim to address this issue. Our contributions include:

1. We extend the famous EXTRA and DIGing methods, which have sparked a log of interest in the distributed optimization community, to deal with large-scale distributed data by combining them with the powerful VR technique. We prove the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the $O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity for VR-EXTRA. The stochastic gradient computation complexity is the same as the single-machine VR methods, while the communication complexity is the same as the full batch EXTRA method. For VR-DIGing, we establish the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the $O((\kappa_b + \kappa_c^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity. The latter one is a little worse than that of VR-EXTRA on the dependence of κ_c . Due to the parallelism across m nodes, running VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing with mn samples is as fast as running the single-machine VR methods with n samples.
2. To further speed up the convergence, we combine EXTRA and DIGing with the accelerated VR technique. The proposed Acc-VR-EXTRA achieves the optimal $O((\sqrt{n \kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the optimal $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c \kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity under some mild conditions to restrict the size of κ_c . The proposed Acc-VR-DIGing has the optimal $O((\sqrt{n \kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the $O(\kappa_c \sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity with a little worse dependence on κ_c . The two methods are implemented in a single loop, and thus they are practical. We further combine Acc-VR-EXTRA and Acc-VR-DIGing with the Chebyshev acceleration to remove the restrictions on κ_c , and improve the communication complexity of Acc-VR-DIGing to be optimal. Our complexities do not hide any poly-logarithmic factor. To the best of our knowledge, our methods are the first to exactly achieve both the optimal stochastic gradient computation complexity and the communication complexity in the class of gradient-type methods.

Table 1 summarizes the complexity comparisons to the state-of-the-art stochastic decentralized methods. Our VR-EXTRA has the same stochastic gradient computation complexity as DVR-CA, but our communication cost is lower than theirs when $\kappa_c \leq O(\kappa_b^2)$. For the accelerated methods, our Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA outperforms DVR-catalyst on the stochastic

²As discussed above for the comparison between the VR methods and gradient descent, the stochastic methods have no advantage when $\kappa_s \approx n \kappa_b$. We often assume $\kappa_s \ll n \kappa_b$.

gradient computation complexity by the poly-logarithmic factor $O(\log \kappa_b)$, and our communication cost is also lower than that of DVR-catalyst by the factor $O(\sqrt{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}})$. Although our Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA and Acc-VR-DIGing-CA have the same complexities as ADFS, our methods are gradient-type methods, while theirs require to compute the dual gradient at each iteration, which is much more expensive.

2. Non-accelerated Variance Reduced EXTRA and DIGing

We first review the classical EXTRA and DIGing methods in Section 2.1. Then, we develop the variance reduced EXTRA and DIGing in Sections 2.2 and 2.3. At last, we describe the complexities of the proposed methods in Section 2.4.

2.1. Review of EXTRA and DIGing

A traditional way to analyze the decentralized optimization model is to write problem (1) in the following equivalent manner:

$$\min_{x_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(m)}} \sum_{i=1}^m f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x_{(i)} = x_{(2)} = \dots = x_{(m)}.$$

Following (Alghunaim et al., 2020), we further reformulate the above problem as the following linearly constrained problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad U\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (6)$$

where the symmetric matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfy

$$U\mathbf{x} = 0 \Leftrightarrow V\mathbf{x} = 0 \Leftrightarrow x_{(1)} = \dots = x_{(m)}. \quad (7)$$

Introducing the Lagrangian function, we can apply the basic gradient method with a step-size α in the Gauss–Seidel-like order to compute the saddle point of problem (6), which leads to the following iterations (Alghunaim et al., 2020; Nedić et al., 2017):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - (\alpha \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + U\lambda^k + V^2\mathbf{x}^k), \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k + U\mathbf{x}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Iteration (8) is a unified algorithmic framework, and different choices of U and V give different methods. Specifically, when we choose $U = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ and $V = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$, (8) reduces to the famous EXTRA algorithm (Shi et al., 2015), which consists of the following iterations:

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = (I + W)\mathbf{x}^k - \frac{I + W}{2}\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \alpha (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})).$$

When we choose $U = I - W$ and $V = \sqrt{I - W^2}$, (8) reduces to the DiGing (Nedić et al., 2017) method with the following iterations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}^{k+1} &= W\mathbf{s}^k + \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= W\mathbf{x}^k - \alpha\mathbf{s}^{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Both EXTRA and DIGing belong to the class of gradient tracking methods, since they all track the difference of gradients at each iteration.

2.2. Development of the VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing

Now, we come to combine (8) with the variance reduction technique proposed in SVRG (Johnson & Zhang, 2013). Specifically, SVRG maintains a snapshot vector $w_{(i)}^k$ after several SGD iterations, and keeps an iterative estimator $\tilde{\nabla} f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k) = \nabla f_{(i),j}(x_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) + \nabla f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k)$ of the full batch gradient for some randomly selected j . When

Algorithm 1 VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing

Initialize: $\alpha = O\left(\frac{1}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}}\right)$, $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}}$, $x_{(i)}^0 = w_{(i)}^0$, where $\kappa = 2\kappa_c$ for EXTRA, and $\kappa = \kappa_c^2$ for DIGing. Let distribution $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$ be to output $j \in [1, n]$ with probability $p_{(i),j} = \frac{L_{(i),j}}{n\bar{L}_{(i)}}$.

$x_{(i)}^1 = x_{(i)}^0 - \alpha \nabla_{(i)}^0 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} (V^2)_{ij} x_{(j)}^0$, and compute $w_{(i)}^1$ by (9d) $\forall i$,

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Step 1: $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k \leftarrow b$ independent samples from $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$ with replacement $\forall i$,

Step 2: Compute $\nabla_{(i)}^k$ by (9a) $\forall i$,

Step 3: For EXTRA, compute $x_{(i)}^{k+1}$ by

$$x_{(i)}^{k+1} = \left(x_{(i)}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} W_{ij} x_{(j)}^k \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(x_{(i)}^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} W_{ij} x_{(j)}^{k-1} \right) - \alpha \left(\nabla_{(i)}^k - \nabla_{(i)}^{k-1} \right) \forall i,$$

For DIGing, compute $x_{(i)}^{k+1}$ by

$$s_{(i)}^{k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} W_{ij} s_{(j)}^k + \nabla_{(i)}^k - \nabla_{(i)}^{k-1}, \quad x_{(i)}^{k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} W_{ij} x_{(j)}^k - \alpha s_{(i)}^{k+1} \quad \forall i,$$

Step 4: Compute $w_{(i)}^{k+1}$ by (9d) $\forall i$.

end for

extending EXTRA and DIGing to stochastic decentralized optimization, a straightforward idea is to replace the local gradient $\nabla f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k)$ in (8) by its VR estimator $\tilde{\nabla} f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k)$. However, in this way the algorithm needs the same number of stochastic gradient evaluations and communication rounds to precision ϵ . As summarized in Table 1, our goal is to provide computation and communication complexities matching those of SVRG and EXTRA/DIGing, respectively, which are not equal. To address this issue, we use the mini-batch VR technique, that is, select b independent samples with replacement as a mini-batch $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}$, and use this mini-batch to update the VR estimator. Moreover, to simplify the algorithm development and analysis, we adopt the loopless SVRG proposed in (Kovalev et al., 2020a). Combing the above ideas, we have the following VR variant of (8) described in a distributed way:

$$\nabla_{(i)}^k = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k} \frac{1}{np_{(i),j}} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(x_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) \right) + \nabla f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k) \quad \forall i, \quad (9a)$$

$$x_{(i)}^{k+1} = x_{(i)}^k - \left(\alpha \nabla_{(i)}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} U_{ij} \lambda_{(j)}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} (V^2)_{ij} x_{(j)}^k \right) \quad \forall i, \quad (9b)$$

$$\lambda_{(i)}^{k+1} = \lambda_{(i)}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} U_{ij} x_{(j)}^{k+1} \quad \forall i, \quad (9c)$$

$$w_{(i)}^{k+1} = \begin{cases} x_{(i)}^{k+1} & \text{with probability } \frac{b}{n}, \\ w_{(i)}^k & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{b}{n}, \end{cases} \quad \forall i, \quad (9d)$$

where the mini-batch VR estimator update rule (9a) is motivated by (Allen-Zhu, 2018), and the probabilistic update of the snapshot vector in (9d) is motivated by (Kovalev et al., 2020a), where we update the full batch gradient $\nabla f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^{k+1})$ if $w_{(i)}^{k+1} = x_{(i)}^{k+1}$; otherwise, we use the old one. Steps (9b) and (9c) come from (8), but replacing the local gradients by their VR estimators. In steps (9a) and (9d), each node selects $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k$ and computes $w_{(i)}^{k+1}$ independent of the other nodes.

At last, we write (9a)-(9d) in the EXTRA/DIGing style. Similar to (2), we denote

$$\nabla^k = \begin{pmatrix} (\nabla_{(1)}^k)^T \\ \vdots \\ (\nabla_{(m)}^k)^T \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

to simplify the algorithm description. From steps (9b) and (9c), we have

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = (2I - U^2 - V^2)\mathbf{x}^k - (I - V^2)\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \alpha (\nabla^k - \nabla^{k-1}) \quad (11)$$

in the compact form. Plugging $U = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ and $V = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ into (11), we have

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = (I + W)\mathbf{x}^k - \frac{I + W}{2}\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \alpha (\nabla^k - \nabla^{k-1}),$$

which is the VR variant of EXTRA, called VR-EXTRA. Plugging $U = I - W$ and $V = \sqrt{I - W^2}$ into (11), we have

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = 2W\mathbf{x}^k - W^2\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \alpha (\nabla^k - \nabla^{k-1}),$$

which is further equivalent to the following method, called VR-DIGing,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}^{k+1} &= W\mathbf{s}^k + \nabla^k - \nabla^{k-1}, \\ \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= W\mathbf{x}^k - \alpha\mathbf{s}^{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing are quite similar to the original EXTRA and DIGing. The only difference is that we replace the local gradients by their VR estimators. Thus, the implementation is as simple as that of the original EXTRA and DIGing. We give the specific descriptions of VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing in Algorithm 1 in a distributed way, including the parameter settings.

2.3. Extension to Large κ_c

The choice of the mini-batch size b in Algorithm 1 may be smaller than 1 when κ is large, which makes Algorithm 1 meaningless. In fact, $b \geq 1$ if and only if $\kappa \leq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$, see the proof of Lemma 6 in Section 4. In this section we consider the case of $\kappa > \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$.

Intuitively speaking, when κ is very large such that $\kappa_g + \kappa \geq \kappa_s + n$, to reach the desired $O((\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity and the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity, as summarized in Table 1, we should perform less stochastic gradient evaluations than communication rounds at each iteration. This observation motivates us to introduce some zero samples for each node, that is to say, let $f_{(i),n+1} = \dots = f_{(i),n'} = 0$ for all i , and consider problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^m f'_{(i)}(x), \quad \text{where} \quad f'_{(i)}(x) = \frac{1}{n'} \sum_{j=1}^{n'} f_{(i),j}(x). \quad (12)$$

We see that problems (12) and (1) are equivalent. To use Algorithm 1 to solve problem (12), we denote

$$L_{(i),j} = \frac{n\mu n' - n\bar{L}_{(i)}}{n' - n}, \quad n < j \leq n' \quad (13)$$

and let each sample be selected with probability $\frac{L_{(i),j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n'} L_{(i),j}}$. Then, we select the samples in $[1, n]$ with probability $\frac{\bar{L}_{(i)}}{\mu n'}$, and select the zero samples with probability $1 - \frac{\bar{L}_{(i)}}{\mu n'}$. The zero samples do not spend time to compute the stochastic gradient. It can be seen that $f'_{(i)}(x)$ is $\frac{nL_{(i)}}{n'}$ -smooth and $\frac{n\mu}{n'}$ -strongly convex. Define the following notations:

$$n' = \kappa, \quad \mu' = \frac{n\mu}{n'}, \quad L'_f = \max_i \frac{nL_{(i)}}{n'} = \frac{nL_f}{n'}, \quad \bar{L}'_{(i)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n'} L_{(i),j}}{n'}, \quad \bar{L}'_f = \max_i \bar{L}'_{(i)}. \quad (14)$$

We can easily check $\bar{L}'_f = \bar{L}'_{(i)} = n\mu$, and $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}'_f, n'\mu'\}}{\max\{L'_f, \kappa\mu'\}} = 1$ since $\kappa \geq \kappa_s \geq \frac{L_f}{\mu}$. Then, we can use Algorithm 1 to solve problem (12).

2.4. Complexities

We prove the convergence of VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing in a unified framework. From Assumption 2, we have the following easy-to-identify lemma, where the third inequality in (15) can be proved similar to Lemma 4 in (Li et al., 2018).

Lemma 1 *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds with $\sigma = 0$ for EXTRA. Let $U = V = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$. Then, we have*

$$\|U\mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq \|V\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad \|V\mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|U\lambda\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\kappa}\|\lambda\|^2, \forall \lambda \in \text{Span}(U), \quad (15)$$

where $\kappa = \frac{2}{1-\sigma_2(W)} = 2\kappa_c$. Suppose that Assumption 2 holds with $\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ for DIGing. Let $U = I - W$ and $V = \sqrt{I - W^2}$. Then, (15) also holds with $\kappa = \frac{1}{(1-\sigma_2(W))^2} = \kappa_c^2$.

Denote the following set of random variables:

$$\mathbb{S}^k = \cup_{i=1}^m \mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k, \quad \xi^k = \{\mathbb{S}^0, \mathbf{w}^1, \mathbb{S}^1, \mathbf{w}^2 \dots, \mathbb{S}^{k-1}, \mathbf{w}^k\}.$$

The next theorem gives the communication complexity and stochastic gradient computation complexity of Algorithm (9a)-(9d) in a unified way.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, U and V satisfy (7) and (15). Assume $\kappa \leq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$. Let $\alpha = \frac{1}{28 \max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}}$ and $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}}$. Then, Algorithm (9a)-(9d) requires the time of $O((\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{x}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Remark 1 *Let's explain the time of communication rounds and stochastic gradient evaluations. As will be proved in Lemma 6, Algorithm (9a)-(9d) needs $O((\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ iterations to reach precision ϵ . At each iteration, the algorithm performs one round of communication, that is, each node i receives information $x_{(j)}^k$ and $s_{(j)}^k$ from its neighbors $\mathcal{N}_{(i)}$. Then, each node i selects $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k$ randomly and computes $\nabla_{(i)}^k$ with b stochastic gradient evaluations. $w_{(i)}^{k+1}$ is computed with probability b/n , and each time with n stochastic gradient evaluations. So each node computes b stochastic gradients in average at each iteration. Since the computation is performed in parallel across all the nodes, we say that each iteration requires the time of one communication round and b stochastic gradient evaluations in average. By carefully choosing b , we have $O(b(\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Thus, we get the $O((\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity and the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity.*

Theorem 1 holds under assumption $\kappa \leq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$. Although Algorithm 1 also converges when $\kappa \geq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$ with $b = 1$, the computation cost increases to $O((\kappa_g + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. We can use the zero-sample strategy described in Section 2.3 to reduce the computation cost to be optimal, as described in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Assume $\kappa > \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$. Applying Algorithm 1 to solve problem (12), it requires the time of $O((\kappa_b + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find an ϵ -precision solution of problem (1).*

We see that by introducing the zero samples, the complexities in Theorem 2 keep the same as those in Theorem 1. For the particular VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing methods, we have the following complexities accordingly, where we replace κ in Theorems 1 and 2 by $2\kappa_c$ and κ_c^2 , respectively.

Corollary 1 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = 0$. Use the zero-sample strategy if $2\kappa_c \geq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$. Then, the VR-EXTRA method in Algorithm 1 requires the time of $O((\kappa_g + \kappa_c) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{x}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Corollary 2 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. Use the zero-sample strategy if $\kappa_c^2 \geq \max\{\kappa_s, n\}$. Then, the VR-DIGing method in Algorithm 1 requires the time of $O((\kappa_g + \kappa_c^2) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{x}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Remark 2

Algorithm 2 Acc-VR-EXTRA and Acc-VR-DIGing

Initialize: $\alpha = O(\frac{1}{L_f})$, $b = \sqrt{\frac{n \max\{L_f, n\mu\}}{\kappa L_f}}$, $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa\mu}{L_f}}$, $\theta_2 = \frac{L_f}{2L_f b}$, $x_{(i)}^0 = z_{(i)}^0 = w_{(i)}^0$, and $\lambda_{(i)}^0 = 0$ for all i . Let $\kappa = 2\kappa_c$ and $U = V = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ for EXTRA, and $\kappa = \kappa_c^2$, $U = I - W$, and $V = \sqrt{I - W^2}$ for DIGing. Let distribution $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$ be to output $j \in [1, n]$ with probability $p_{(i),j} = \frac{L_{(i),j}}{nL_{(i)}}$.

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

$\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k \leftarrow b$ independent samples from $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$ with replacement $\forall i$,

 Perform steps (16a)-(16f) $\forall i$,

end for

1. The communication complexity of VR-DIGing has a worse dependence on κ_c than that of VR-EXTRA. This is because EXTRA uses $U = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ in problem (6), while DIGing uses $U = I - W$. From Lemma 1, we see that the different choice of U gives a different order of κ .
2. From Table 1, we see that EXTRA and VR-EXTRA have the same communication complexity, and DIGing and VR-DIGing also have the same communication complexity. Thus, extending EXTRA and DIGing to the stochastic decentralized optimization does not need to pay a price of more communication cost.
3. Running VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing with mn samples needs the time of $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations, which is the same as that of running the single-machine VR methods with n samples. On the other hand, when we run the single-machine VR methods with mn samples, the required time increases to $O((\kappa_s + mn) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Thus, the linear speedup is achieved by parallelism when n is larger than κ_s .

3. Accelerated Variance Reduced EXTRA and DIGing

In this section, we develop the accelerated VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing methods. Specifically, we combine (8) with the loopless Katyusha proposed in (Kovalev et al., 2020a), and give the following algorithm (16a)-(16f) in a unified framework. The parameter setting is given in Algorithm 2.

$$y_{(i)}^k = \theta_1 z_{(i)}^k + \theta_2 w_{(i)}^k + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) x_{(i)}^k \quad \forall i, \quad (16a)$$

$$\nabla_{(i)}^k = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(y_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) \right) + \nabla f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k) \quad \forall i, \quad (16b)$$

$$z_{(i)}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1}} \left(\frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1} y_{(i)}^k + z_{(i)}^k - \frac{1}{\theta_1} \left(\alpha \nabla_{(i)}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} U_{ij} \lambda_{(j)}^k + \theta_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} (V^2)_{ij} z_{(j)}^k \right) \right) \quad \forall i, \quad (16c)$$

$$\lambda_{(i)}^{k+1} = \lambda_{(i)}^k + \theta_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{(i)}} U_{ij} z_{(j)}^{k+1} \quad \forall i, \quad (16d)$$

$$x_{(i)}^{k+1} = y_{(i)}^k + \theta_1 \left(z_{(i)}^{k+1} - z_{(i)}^k \right) \quad \forall i, \quad (16e)$$

$$w_{(i)}^{k+1} = \begin{cases} x_{(i)}^{k+1} & \text{with probability } \frac{b}{n}, \\ w_{(i)}^k & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{b}{n}, \end{cases} \quad \forall i. \quad (16f)$$

We will not write (16a)-(16f) in the EXTRA/DIGing style since the resultant methods are complex, and they are not very similar to the original EXTRA and DIGing besides the feature of gradient tracking.

In the above algorithm, steps (16a) and (16e) are the Nesterov's acceleration steps, which are motivated by (Allen-Zhu, 2018; Kovalev et al., 2020a). Steps (16c) and (16d) involve the operation of $U\mathbf{x}$, which is uncomputable for $U = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$ in EXTRA in the distributed environment. Introducing the auxiliary variable $\tilde{\lambda}^k = U\lambda^k$ and multiplying both sides of

(16d) by U leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{z}^{k+1} &= \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1}} \left(\frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1} \mathbf{y}^k + \mathbf{z}^k - \frac{1}{\theta_1} \left(\alpha \nabla^k + \tilde{\lambda}^k + \theta_1 V^2 \mathbf{z}^k \right) \right) \\ \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\lambda}^k + \theta_1 U^2 \mathbf{z}^{k+1}\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

in the compact form. Then, we only need to compute $W\mathbf{z}$, which corresponds to the gossip-style communications. For DIGing, we do not need such auxiliary variables.

3.1. Complexities

Theorem 3 gives the complexities of Algorithm (16a)-(16f) in a unified way, and Corollaries 3 and 4 provide the complexities for the particular Acc-VR-EXTRA and Acc-VR-DIGing methods, respectively.

Theorem 3 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, and U and V satisfy (7) and (15). Assume $\kappa \leq \kappa_b$ and $\kappa \leq \max\{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}, \frac{n^2\kappa_b}{\kappa_s^2}\}$.*

Let $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\kappa\mu}{L_f}}$, $\theta_2 = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{2L_f b}$, $b = \sqrt{\frac{n \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\kappa L_f}}$, and $\alpha = \frac{1}{10L_f}$. Then, Algorithm (16a)-(16f) requires the time of $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b \kappa} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Remark 3

1. If $\kappa > \max\{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}, \frac{n^2\kappa_b}{\kappa_s^2}\}$, we can take the mini-batch size $b = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_f}$. Then, Algorithm (16a)-(16f) also converges with the communication complexity unchanged, but the stochastic gradient computation complexity increases to $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa \bar{L}_f^2}{\mu L_f}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. When $\kappa > \kappa_b$, the convergence is unclear currently.
2. As introduced in Section 1.1, we have $\kappa_b \leq \kappa_s \leq n\kappa_b$, and we always assume $\kappa_s \ll n\kappa_b$ in the analysis of stochastic algorithms. Thus, we can expect $\max\{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}, \frac{n^2\kappa_b}{\kappa_s^2}\}$ to be large for large-scale data. On the other hand, κ_c depends on the network scale and connectivity. For example, $\kappa_c = O(1)$ for the commonly used Erdős–Rényi random graph, and $\kappa_c = O(m \log m)$ for the geometric graph. In the worst case, for example, the linear graph or cycle graph, we have $\kappa_c = O(m^2)$ (Nedić et al., 2018). Thus, we can also expect κ to be not very large when the number of distributed nodes is limited and the network is well connected. So we can expect that the assumption $\kappa \leq \max\{\frac{n\kappa_b}{\kappa_s}, \frac{n^2\kappa_b}{\kappa_s^2}\}$ always holds for large-scale distributed data, for example, thousands of nodes and each node with millions of data.

Corollary 3 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = 0$. Under the assumptions on κ and the parameter settings in Theorem 3 with $\kappa = 2\kappa_c$, the Acc-VR-EXTRA algorithm requires the time of $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b \kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Corollary 4 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. Under the assumptions on κ and the parameter settings in Theorem 3 with $\kappa = \kappa_c^2$, the Acc-VR-DIGing algorithm requires the time of $O(\kappa_c \sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

From Table 1, we see that the communication complexity and stochastic gradient computation complexity of Acc-VR-EXTRA are both optimal under some conditions to restrict the size of κ_c . Similarly, the stochastic gradient computation complexity of Acc-VR-DIGing is also optimal. However, its communication complexity is worse than the corresponding lower bound by the $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c})$ factor. In the next section, we remove the restrictions on κ_c by Chebyshev acceleration.

3.2. Chebyshev Acceleration

In this section we remove the restrictions on the size of κ_c , which comes from the matrix U , as shown in (15). To make κ small, our goal is to construct a new matrix \hat{U} by U such that $\text{Ker}(\hat{U}) = \text{Span}(\mathbf{1})$ and $\|\hat{U}\lambda\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{c}\|\lambda\|^2$ for all $\lambda \in \text{Span}(\hat{U})$, where c is a much smaller constant than κ . Moreover, the construction procedure should not take more than $O(\sqrt{\kappa})$ time. Then, we only need to replace U and V by \hat{U} and some matrix \hat{V} in Algorithm (16a)-(16f), where \hat{U} and \hat{V} satisfy the relations in (15). We follow (Scaman et al., 2017) to use Chebyshev acceleration to construct \hat{U} , which is a common acceleration scheme to minimize c .

3.2.1. REVIEW OF CHEBYSHEV ACCELERATION

We first give a brief description of Chebyshev acceleration, which was first used to accelerate distribution optimization in (Scaman et al., 2017). We first introduce the Chebyshev polynomials defined as $T_0(x) = 1$, $T_1(x) = x$, and $T_{k+1}(x) = 2xT_k(x) - T_{k-1}(x)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Given a positive semidefinite symmetric matrix $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that $\text{Ker}(L) = \text{Span}(\mathbf{1})$, denote $\lambda_1(L) \geq \lambda_2(L) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1}(L) > \lambda_n(L) = 0$ as the spectrum of L . Following the notations in (Scaman et al., 2017), we define $\gamma(L) = \frac{\lambda_{n-1}(L)}{\lambda_1(L)}$, $c_1 = \frac{1-\sqrt{\gamma(L)}}{1+\sqrt{\gamma(L)}}$, $c_2 = \frac{1+\gamma(L)}{1-\gamma(L)}$, and $c_3 = \frac{2}{\lambda_1(L)+\lambda_{n-1}(L)}$. Then, c_3L has the spectrum in $[1 - c_2^{-1}, 1 + c_2^{-1}]$. Define

$$P_t(L) = I - \frac{T_t(c_2(I - c_3L))}{T_t(c_2)},$$

which is a polynomial of degree at most t . It can be checked that $P_t(L)$ is a gossip matrix satisfying $\text{Ker}(P_t(L)) = \text{Span}(\mathbf{1})$. Moreover, for the particular choice of $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma(L)}}$, we have $\frac{\lambda_{n-1}(P_t(L))}{\lambda_1(P_t(L))} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda_1(P_t(L)) \leq 1 + \frac{2c_1^t}{1+c_1^t} \leq 2$ (Scaman et al., 2017). In practice, we can compute the operation $P_t(L)\mathbf{x}$ by the following procedure (Scaman et al., 2017):

```

Input:  $\mathbf{x}$ ,
Initialize:  $a^0 = 1$ ,  $a^1 = c_2$ ,  $\mathbf{z}^0 = \mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}^1 = c_2(I - c_3L)\mathbf{x}$ ,
for  $s = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$  do
     $a^{s+1} = 2c_2a^s - a^{s-1}$ ,
     $\mathbf{z}^{s+1} = 2c_2(I - c_3L)\mathbf{z}^s - \mathbf{z}^{s-1}$ .
end for
Output:  $P_t(L)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} - \frac{\mathbf{z}^t}{a^t}$ .
    
```

 3.2.2. REMOVE THE RESTRICTIONS ON THE SIZE OF κ_c

For the particular choice of $U = V = \sqrt{\frac{I-W}{2}}$, define $\hat{U} = \hat{V} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{P_t(U^2)}$. Then, we have $\|\hat{V}^2\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|\hat{U}\lambda\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{8}\|\lambda\|^2$ for all $\lambda \in \text{Span}(\hat{U})$ with $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma(U^2)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\sigma_2(W)}} = \sqrt{\kappa_c}$. So \hat{U} and \hat{V} satisfy the relations in (15), and replacing U and V by \hat{U} and \hat{V} does not destroy the proof of Theorem 3. In the algorithm implementation, we only need to replace the operations $U^2\mathbf{z}$ and $V^2\mathbf{z}$ in (17) by $\frac{1}{4}P_t(U^2)\mathbf{z}$. Moreover, replacing κ by the constant 8 in Theorem 3, we can expect that the assumptions on κ always hold. Since we need $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c})$ time to construct \hat{U} at each iteration, so the communication complexity remains $(\sqrt{\kappa_b\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Corollary 5 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = 0$. Under the parameter settings in Theorem 3 with $\kappa = 8$, Acc-VR-EXTRA with Chebyshev acceleration (CA) requires the time of $(\sqrt{\kappa_b\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k}[\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

For the particular choice of $U = I - W$ and $V = \sqrt{I - W^2}$, define $\hat{U} = \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{4}P_t(U)$ and $\hat{V} = \sqrt{I - (I - \hat{U})^2}$. Then, we have $\|\hat{V}^2\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|\hat{U}\lambda\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{256}\|\lambda\|^2$ for all $\lambda \in \text{Span}(\hat{U})$ with $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma(U)}} = \sqrt{\frac{1-\sqrt{2}/2}{1-\sigma_2(W)}} \leq \sqrt{\kappa_c}$. Similar to the above analysis for the Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA method, we have the following complexity corollary. Note that since we replace κ by the constant 256 in Theorem 3, and using the fact that the construction of \hat{U} needs $O(\sqrt{\kappa_c})$ time at each iteration, we can reduce the communication cost from $O(\kappa_c\sqrt{\kappa_b} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ to $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Corollary 6 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. Under the parameter settings of Theorem 3 with $\kappa = 256$, Acc-VR-DIGing-CA requires the time of $O(\sqrt{\kappa_b\kappa_c} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k}[\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.*

Remark 4

1. From Table 1, we see that Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA and Acc-VR-DIGing-CA have the same communication complexity as MSDA, OPAPC, and ADFS, which is optimal.
2. Running Acc-VR-EXTRA-CA and Acc-VR-DIGing-CA with mn samples needs the time of $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations, which is the same as that of running the single-machine Katyusha with n samples.

On the other hand, when we run the single-machine Katyusha with mn samples, the required time increases to $O((\sqrt{mn\kappa_s} + mn) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Since acceleration takes effect only when $\kappa_s \gg mn$, the parallelism speeds up Katyusha by the \sqrt{m} factor. On the other hand, when $\kappa_s \leq n$, the linear speedup is achieved.

3. Although the linear speedup is not achieved when $\kappa_s \gg mn$, we claim that the $O((\sqrt{n\kappa_s} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity is still optimal. See Corollary 4.3 in (Hendrikx et al., 2020a).
4. We can also combine Chebyshev acceleration with the non-accelerated VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing, and give the $O((\kappa_s + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity and the $O((\kappa_b \sqrt{\kappa_c}) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity, which are the same as those of DVR (Hendrikx et al., 2020b).

4. Proof of Theorems

We prove Theorems 1 and 3 in this section. We first introduce some useful properties.

For L -smooth and convex function $f(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|^2. \quad (18)$$

Let x^* be the optimal solution of problem (1), then, \mathbf{x}^* is also the optimal solution of the following linearly constrained convex problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{s.t. } U\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, there exists $\lambda^* \in \text{Span}(U)$ such that

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} U\lambda^* = 0. \quad (20)$$

The existence of λ^* is proved in (?)Lemma 3.1]shi2015extra. (20) and $U\mathbf{x}^* = 0$ are the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions of problem (19).

4.1. Non-accelerated VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing

We first give a classical property of SVRG (Johnson & Zhang, 2013; Xiao & Zhang, 2014).

Lemma 2 Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, and then for Algorithm (9a)-(9d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\nabla^k - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2] &\leq \frac{4\bar{L}_f}{b} \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4\bar{L}_f}{b} \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Proof 1 From Lemma D.2 in (Allen-Zhu, 2018), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_{(i)}^k} [\|\nabla_{(i)}^k - \nabla f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{b} \mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathcal{D}_{(i)}} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{np_{(i),j}} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(x_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) \right) \right\|^2 \right],$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$ is defined in Algorithm 1. Using identity $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|b\|^2 + 2\|a\|^2$ and (18), from Lemma D.2 in (Allen-Zhu,

2018), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k} [\|\nabla_{(i)}^k - \nabla f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k)\|^2] \\
 & \leq \frac{2}{b} \mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathcal{D}_{(i)}} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{np_{(i),j}} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(x_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(x^*) \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \frac{2}{b} \mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathcal{D}_{(i)}} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{np_{(i),j}} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(x^*) \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & \leq \frac{4\bar{L}_{(i)}}{b} \left(f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k) - f_{(i)}(x^*) - \langle \nabla f_{(i)}(x^*), x_{(i)}^k - x^* \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \frac{4\bar{L}_{(i)}}{b} \left(f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k) - f_{(i)}(x^*) - \langle \nabla f_{(i)}(x^*), w_{(i)}^k - x^* \rangle \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

From the convexity of $f_{(i)}(x)$, the definitions in (2), (3), and (10), and the fact that $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k$ and $\mathbb{S}_{(j)}^k$ are selected independently for all i and j , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\nabla^k - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2] & \leq \frac{4\bar{L}_f}{b} \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \frac{4\bar{L}_f}{b} \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

From the optimality condition in (20) and $U\mathbf{x}^* = 0$, we have the conclusion.

The following property is also useful in the analysis of mini-batch SVRG.

Lemma 3 For Algorithm (9a)-(9d), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\nabla^k] = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k). \quad (22)$$

Proof 2 From the definition of $\nabla_{(i)}^k$ in (9a), and the fact that the elements in $\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k$ are selected independently with replacement, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}_{(i)}^k} [\nabla_{(i)}^k] = \mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathcal{D}_{(i)}} \left[\frac{1}{np_{(i),j}} \left(\nabla f_{(i),j}(x_{(i)}^k) - \nabla f_{(i),j}(w_{(i)}^k) \right) + \nabla f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k) \right] = \nabla f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k).$$

Using the definitions in (2) and (10), we have the conclusion.

The next lemma describes a progress in one iteration of (9a)-(9d).

Lemma 4 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Then, for Algorithm (9a)-(9d), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left(\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \right) - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2] - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau + L_m}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2]
 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

for some $\tau > 0$ and $L_m = \max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}$.

Proof 3 From the L_f -smoothness of $f(\mathbf{x})$ and the definition of L_m , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) & \leq f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k), \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle + \frac{L_m}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \\
 & = f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle + \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle + \frac{L_m}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \\
 & \leq f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2 + \frac{\tau + L_m}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 + \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle,
 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we use Young's inequality in $\stackrel{a}{\leq}$. Since

$$\nabla^k = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - \frac{1}{\alpha}U\lambda^k - \frac{1}{\alpha}V^2\mathbf{x}^k \quad (25)$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \quad (26)$$

from (9b) and (9c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\ & \stackrel{b}{=} \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^k, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle V\mathbf{x}^k, V\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\ & \stackrel{c}{=} \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^k - \lambda^*, \lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k \rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle V\mathbf{x}^k, V\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\ & = \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2 + \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 + \|V\mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|^2 - \|V\mathbf{x}^k - V\mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|^2) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\ & \stackrel{d}{\leq} \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where we use $U\mathbf{x}^* = 0$, $V\mathbf{x}^* = 0$, and the symmetry of U and V in $\stackrel{b}{=}$, (26) in $\stackrel{c}{=}$, $\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 = \|U\mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \|V\mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|^2$ and $\|V(\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2$ in $\stackrel{d}{\leq}$. On the other hand, from (22) and the strong convexity of $f(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle] = \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}^k \rangle \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2. \quad (28)$$

Plugging (27) and (28) into (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})] \\ & \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2]) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2]) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau + L_m}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2] - \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we have the conclusion.

To prove the linear convergence, we should make the constant before $\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2$ in (24) smaller than that before $\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2$, which is established in the next lemma.

Lemma 5 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Let $\alpha = \frac{1}{28L_m}$ and $\lambda^0 = 0$. Then, for Algorithm (9a)-(9d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{1-\nu}{4\kappa L_m \alpha^2} \right) \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \\ & \quad + \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle + f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

with $\nu = \frac{3140}{3141}$.

Proof 4 From the optimality condition in (20) and the smooth property in (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\
 &= f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2L_m} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\
 &= \frac{1}{2L_m\alpha^2} \|\alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) + U\lambda^*\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{a}{=} \frac{1}{2L_m\alpha^2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k + U(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + V^2\mathbf{x}^k + \alpha\nabla^k - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{b}{\geq} \frac{1-\nu}{2L_m\alpha^2} \|U(\lambda^k - \lambda^*)\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{2L_m\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k + V^2\mathbf{x}^k + \alpha\nabla^k - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{c}{\geq} \frac{1-\nu}{2\kappa L_m\alpha^2} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{2}{L_m\alpha^2} + 2L_m\right) \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{2}{L_m} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\nabla^k - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{2}{L_m\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where we use (25) in $\stackrel{a}{=}$, $\|a-b\|^2 \geq (1-\nu)\|a\|^2 - (\frac{1}{\nu}-1)\|b\|^2$ in $\stackrel{b}{\geq}$ for some $0 < \nu < 1$, (15), $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\|^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|a_i\|^2$, the L_f -smoothness of $f(\mathbf{x})$, and $\|V^2\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \leq \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2$ in $\stackrel{c}{\geq}$. Dividing (30) by 2 and plugging it into (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{1-\nu}{4\kappa L_m\alpha^2} \right) \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \\
 &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\tau} + \frac{1}{L_m} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2] - \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{1}{L_m\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \right) \|V\mathbf{x}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau + L_m}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{L_m\alpha^2} + L_m \right) \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k+1}\|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\tau = 12.5L_m$, $\nu = \frac{3140}{3141}$, and $\alpha = \frac{1}{28L_m}$, such that $\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{1}{L_m\alpha^2}(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1) \geq 0$, $\frac{1}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau + L_m}{2} - (\frac{1}{L_m\alpha^2} + L_m)(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1) \geq 0$, and $\frac{1}{2\tau} + \frac{1}{L_m}(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1) \leq \frac{1}{24L_m}$, and using (21), we have the conclusion.

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

Lemma 6 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Let $\alpha = \frac{1}{28L_m}$ and $\lambda^0 = 0$. Then, Algorithm (9a)-(9d) needs $O((\frac{n}{b} + \frac{L_m}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ iterations to find \mathbf{x}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.

1. If $\kappa \leq \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$, let $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{L_m}$. To find an ϵ -precision solution, Algorithm (9a)-(9d) requires the time of $O((\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations.
2. If $\kappa \geq \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$, let $b = 1$. To find an ϵ -precision solution, Algorithm (9a)-(9d) requires the time of $O((\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O((\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations.

Proof 5 From step (9d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w_{(i)}^{k+1}} \left[f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^{k+1}) - \left\langle \nabla f_{(i)}(x^*), w_{(i)}^{k+1} - x^* \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{b}{n} \left(f_{(i)}(x_{(i)}^k) - \left\langle \nabla f_{(i)}(x^*), x_{(i)}^k - x^* \right\rangle \right) \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n} \right) \left(f_{(i)}(w_{(i)}^k) - \left\langle \nabla f_{(i)}(x^*), w_{(i)}^k - x^* \right\rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the definitions in (3) and (10), and the optimality condition in (20), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{b}{n} \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n} \right) \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Multiplying both sides of (31) by $\frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right)$ and adding it to (29), taking expectation with respect to ξ^k , from the easy-to-identity equation $\frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right) (1 - \frac{b}{n}) + \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \leq \frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right) (1 - \frac{b}{10n})$ under the condition $\frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_m b} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} [\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right) \left(1 - \frac{b}{10n} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{1-\nu}{4\kappa L_m \alpha^2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2] \\ & \stackrel{a}{\leq} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right] \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{n}{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right] \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2] \right\} \\ & \quad \times \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{b}{5n}, 1 - \frac{b}{10n}, 1 - \alpha\mu, 1 - \frac{1-\nu}{2\kappa L_m \alpha} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^* \rangle$ for any \mathbf{x} , and $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{b}{10n} - \frac{\bar{L}_f}{6L_m b} > 0$ in $\stackrel{a}{\leq}$. From the setting of α , we know the algorithm needs $O\left(\left(\frac{n}{b} + \frac{L_m}{\mu} + \kappa\right) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ iterations to find \mathbf{x}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.

Case 1. If $\kappa \leq \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$, we have $\kappa\mu \leq \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}$ and $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}} \geq \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}} = 1$, where we use $L_f \leq \bar{L}_f \leq \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}$. On the other hand, since $b = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{L_m}$, we have $\frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_m b} = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}} \leq 1$ and $\frac{n}{b} = \frac{nL_m}{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}} \leq \frac{L_m}{\mu} \stackrel{b}{=} \max\{\frac{L_f}{\mu}, \kappa\}$, where we use $L_m = \max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}$ in $\stackrel{b}{=}$. Then, the communication complexity is $O\left(\left(\frac{L_f}{\mu} + \kappa\right) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, and the stochastic gradient computation complexity is $O\left(b\left(\frac{L_f}{\mu} + \kappa\right) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + n\right) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, where we use $\frac{bL_f}{\mu} = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}L_f}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}\mu} \leq \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\mu} = \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$, and $b\kappa = \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}\kappa}{\max\{L_f, \kappa\mu\}} \leq \frac{\max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\mu}$.

Case 2. If $\kappa \geq \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$, letting $b = 1$, we have $\frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_m b} \leq \frac{\bar{L}_f}{\kappa \mu} \leq 1$. The communication complexity and stochastic gradient computation complexity are both $O((\frac{L_f}{\mu} + n + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O((\frac{L_f}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Now, we prove Theorem 2, which improves the computation complexity in the case of $\kappa \geq \max\{\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu}, n\}$ by the zero-sample strategy.

Proof 6 Replacing n , L_f , μ , and \bar{L}_f in Lemma 6 by n' , L'_f , μ' , and \bar{L}'_f given in (14), respectively, since $\frac{\bar{L}'_f}{\mu'} = n' = \kappa$, from the first case in Lemma 6, we have the $O((\frac{L'_f}{\mu'} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O((\frac{L_f}{\mu} + \kappa) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication complexity, and the $O((\frac{\bar{L}'_f}{\mu'} + n') \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient computation complexity.

Since we select the samples in $[1, n]$ with probability $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n L_{(i),j}}{\sum_{j=1}^n L_{(i),j}} = \frac{n \bar{L}_f}{n \mu \kappa}$, and the zero samples do not spend the computation time, so the valid number of stochastic gradient evaluations is $O(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu \kappa} \kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. On the other hand, we compute the full batch gradient with probability $\frac{b}{n'} = \frac{1}{\kappa}$, which takes $O(n \frac{1}{\kappa} \kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(n \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations in total. So the final valid stochastic gradient computation complexity is $O((\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\mu} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

At last, we explain that the zero samples do not destroy the proof of Lemma 6. For the zero sample $f_{(i),j}(x) = 0$, we have $\nabla f_{(i),j}(x) = 0$. So it also satisfies the convexity and $L_{(i),j}$ -smooth property (18) even for positive $L_{(i),j}$. We can check that (21) and (22) also hold. In the proofs of Lemmas 4 and 5, we use the smoothness and strong convexity of $f'_{(i)}(x)$, as explained in Section 2.3, which also hold.

4.2. Accelerated VR-EXTRA and VR-DIGing

From Lemma D.2 in (Allen-Zhu, 2018) and similar to Lemma 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\nabla^k - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{2\bar{L}_f}{b} (f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle). \quad (32)$$

Similar to (22), we also have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\nabla^k] = \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k). \quad (33)$$

The following lemma is the counterpart of Lemma 4, which gives a progress in one iteration of procedure (16a)-(16f).

Lemma 7 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Let $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \leq 1$. Then, for Algorithm (16a)-(16f), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\ & \leq (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) \\ & \quad + \theta_2 \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U \mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\tau b} - \theta_2 \right) (f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle) \\ & \quad + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|V \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2] - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

for some $\tau > 0$.

Proof 7 From the L_f -smoothness of $f(\mathbf{x})$, similar to (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) &\leq f(\mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2 \\
 &\leq f(\mathbf{y}^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2 + \frac{\tau + L_f}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2 + \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{a}{=} f(\mathbf{y}^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \nabla^k\|^2 + \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad + \theta_1 \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^* \rangle + \theta_1 \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{z}^* - \mathbf{z}^k \rangle.
 \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where we use

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k = \theta_1(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k) \tag{36}$$

in $\stackrel{a}{=}$, which is from (16e). Since

$$\nabla^k = \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}) + \mu(\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}) - \frac{1}{\alpha}U\lambda^k - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha}V^2\mathbf{z}^k \tag{37}$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \theta_1 U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \tag{38}$$

from (16c) and (16d), similar to (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\theta_1 \langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\
 &= \frac{\theta_1^2}{\alpha} \langle \mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \mu\theta_1 \langle \mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\
 &\quad - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^k, U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle - \frac{\theta_1^2}{\alpha} \langle V\mathbf{z}^k, V\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{b}{=} \frac{\theta_1^2}{\alpha} \langle \mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \mu\theta_1 \langle \mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k+1}, \mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\
 &\quad - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^k - \lambda^*, \lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k \rangle - \frac{\theta_1^2}{\alpha} \langle V\mathbf{z}^k, V\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle \\
 &= \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} (\|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2 + \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2) \\
 &\quad - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} (\|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 + \|V\mathbf{z}^{k+1}\|^2 - \|V\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2) - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{c}{\leq} \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2) + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} (\|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2) - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 - \frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2 - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle,
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where we use (38) in $\stackrel{b}{=}$, $\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 = \|\theta_1 U\mathbf{z}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \theta_1^2 \|V\mathbf{z}^{k+1}\|^2$ and $\|V(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2$ in $\stackrel{c}{\leq}$. On the other hand, from (33), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\theta_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\langle \nabla^k, \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{z}^k \rangle] \\
 &= \theta_1 \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{z}^k \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{d}{=} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \theta_1 \mathbf{x}^* + \theta_2 \mathbf{w}^k + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle \\
 &= \theta_1 \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle + \theta_2 \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{e}{\leq} \theta_1 f(\mathbf{x}^*) + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) f(\mathbf{x}^k) - (1 - \theta_2) f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \theta_2 \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle,
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where we use (16a) in $\stackrel{d}{=}$, and the strong convexity of $f(\mathbf{x})$ in $\stackrel{e}{=}$. Plugging (39) and (40) into (35), and using (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})] \\
 & \leq \theta_1 f(\mathbf{x}^*) + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \theta_2 f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \theta_2 \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle \\
 & \quad + \frac{\bar{L}_f}{\tau b} (f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle) \\
 & \quad + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2]) + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} (\|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2]) \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2]) - \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{z}^{k+1} \rangle] \\
 & \quad - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2] - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2] \\
 & \stackrel{f}{=} \theta_1 f(\mathbf{x}^*) + (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \theta_2 f(\mathbf{w}^k) \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\tau b} - \theta_2 \right) (f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle) \\
 & \quad + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2]) \\
 & \quad - \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \theta_2 U\mathbf{w}^k - (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle] \\
 & \quad - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2] - \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2],
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use (16a) and (16e) in $\stackrel{f}{=}$. Rearranging the terms, we have the conclusion.

Similar to Lemma 5, we establish the smaller constant before $\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2$ than that before $\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2$ in the next lemma.

Lemma 8 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Choose b such that $\theta_2 = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{2L_f b} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\theta_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{10L_f}$, and $\lambda^0 = 0$. Then, for Algorithm (16a)-(16f), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & \leq (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \theta_2 \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{(1 - \nu)\theta_1}{4\kappa L_f \alpha^2} \right) \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2]
 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

with $\nu = \frac{127}{128}$.

Proof 8 From (18) and (20), similar to (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \\
 & \geq \frac{1}{2L_f\alpha^2} \|\alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) + U\lambda^*\|^2 \\
 & \stackrel{a}{=} \frac{1}{2L_f\alpha^2} \|\alpha\mu(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k) + \theta_1(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k) + U(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + \theta_1 V^2 \mathbf{z}^k \\
 & \quad + \alpha\nabla^k - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) + \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})\|^2 \\
 & \geq \frac{1-\nu}{2L_f\alpha^2} \|U(\lambda^k - \lambda^*)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_f\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\alpha\mu(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k) + \theta_1(\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k) \\
 & \quad + \theta_1 V^2 \mathbf{z}^k + \alpha\nabla^k - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) + \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \alpha\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})\|^2 \\
 & \stackrel{b}{\geq} \frac{1-\nu}{2\kappa L_f\alpha^2} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{5\mu^2}{2L_f} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2 \\
 & \quad - \frac{5\theta_1^2}{2L_f\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 - \frac{5}{2L_f} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\nabla^k - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k)\|^2 \\
 & \quad - \left(\frac{5\theta_1^2}{2L_f\alpha^2} + \frac{5L_f\theta_1^2}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where we use (37) in $\stackrel{a}{=}$, (15), the L_f -smoothness of $f(\mathbf{x})$, (36), and $\|V^2 \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \leq \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2$ in $\stackrel{b}{\geq}$. Multiplying both sides of (42) by $\frac{\theta_1}{2}$ and plugging it into (34), using (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & \leq (1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \theta_2 \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\tau b} + \frac{5\bar{L}_f\theta_1}{2bL_f} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) - \theta_2 \right) (f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{y}^k) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}^k), \mathbf{w}^k - \mathbf{y}^k \rangle) \\
 & \quad + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{(1-\nu)\theta_1}{4\kappa L_f\alpha^2}\right) \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \\
 & \quad - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} - \frac{5\theta_1^3}{4L_f\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right)\right) \|V\mathbf{z}^k\|^2 - \left(\frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} - \frac{5\mu^2\theta_1}{4L_f} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right)\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}^k\|^2] \\
 & \quad - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} - \left(\frac{5\theta_1^3}{4L_f\alpha^2} + \frac{5L_f\theta_1^3}{4}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right)\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\theta_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\theta_2 = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{2L_f b}$, $\tau = 3L_f$, $\nu = \frac{127}{128}$, and $\alpha = \frac{1}{10L_f}$ such that $\frac{\bar{L}_f}{\tau b} + \frac{5\bar{L}_f\theta_1}{2L_f b} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) - \theta_2 \leq 0$, $\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} - \frac{5\theta_1^3}{4L_f\alpha^2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \geq 0$, $\frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} - \frac{5\mu^2\theta_1}{4L_f} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \geq 0$, and $\frac{\theta_1^2}{4\alpha} - \frac{\tau\theta_1^2 + L_f\theta_1^2}{2} - \left(\frac{5\theta_1^3}{4L_f\alpha^2} + \frac{5L_f\theta_1^3}{4}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\nu} - 1\right) \geq 0$, we have the conclusion.

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 3.

Lemma 9 Suppose that Assumption 1 and conditions (7) and (15) hold. Assume $\frac{\kappa\mu}{L_f} \leq 1$ and $\kappa \geq 1$. Let $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa\mu}{L_f}}$, $\theta_2 = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{2L_f b}$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{10L_f}$, and $\lambda^0 = 0$.

1. If $\kappa \leq \frac{nL_f \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\bar{L}_f}$, let $b = \sqrt{\frac{n \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\kappa L_f}}$. Then, Algorithm (16a)-(16f) requires the time of $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$

communication rounds and $O((\sqrt{\frac{n\bar{L}_f}{\mu}} + n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.

2. If $\kappa \geq \frac{nL_f \max\{\bar{L}_f, n\mu\}}{\bar{L}_f^2}$, let $b = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_f}$. Then, Algorithm (16a)-(16f) requires the time of $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ communication rounds and $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa \bar{L}_f^2}{L_f \mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ stochastic gradient evaluations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$.

Proof 9 Let $b = \max\{\sqrt{\frac{n\bar{L}_f}{\kappa L_f}}, \sqrt{\frac{n^2\mu}{\kappa L_f}}, \frac{\bar{L}_f}{L_f}\}$, then we know $\theta_2 = \frac{\bar{L}_f}{2L_f b} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $b \in [1, n]$, where we use $\kappa \geq 1$ and $\mu \leq L_f \leq \bar{L}_f \leq nL_f$ given in (4). Multiplying both sides of (31) by $\frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}}$ and adding it to (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & + \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & \leq \left(1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2 + \frac{b}{n} \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}}\right) \left(f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & + \left(\theta_2 + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} \right) \left(f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right) \\
 & + \frac{\theta_2^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
 & + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{(1-\nu)\theta_1}{4\kappa L_f \alpha^2} \right) \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}^k} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2].
 \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

We can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2 + \frac{b}{n} \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} &= 1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2 + \frac{\theta_2}{1 - \frac{n\theta_1}{20b\kappa}} \\
 &= 1 - \theta_1 + \frac{\frac{n\theta_1\theta_2}{20b\kappa}}{1 - \frac{n\theta_1}{20b\kappa}} \stackrel{a}{\leq} 1 - \theta_1 + \frac{\theta_1}{39} = 1 - \frac{38}{39}\theta_1,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\theta_2 + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} = \theta_2 + \left(\frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa} - \frac{b}{n}\right) \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} + \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}\right) \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} = \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}\right) \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}},$$

where we use $\frac{n\theta_2}{20b\kappa} = \frac{n\bar{L}_f}{40L_f b^2 \kappa} \leq \frac{n\bar{L}_f}{40L_f \kappa} \frac{\kappa L_f}{nL_f} = \frac{1}{40}$ and $\frac{n\theta_1}{20b\kappa} \leq \frac{n\theta_1}{20\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{n^2 \mu}} = \frac{1}{40} \stackrel{a}{\leq}$. Taking expectation with respect to

ξ^k on both sides of (43) and rearranging the terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & + \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^{k+1} \rangle \right] \\
 & + \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} [\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}} [\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2] \\
 & \leq \left(1 - \frac{38}{39}\theta_1\right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right] \\
 & + \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right] \\
 & + \frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha} - \frac{(1-\nu)\theta_1}{4\kappa L_f \alpha^2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2] \\
 & \stackrel{b}{\leq} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{x}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^k \rangle \right] \right. \\
 & + \frac{\theta_2}{\frac{b}{n} - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} \left[f(\mathbf{w}^k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{w}^k \rangle \right] \\
 & \left. + \left(\frac{\theta_1^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\mu\theta_1}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2] \right\} \\
 & \times \max \left\{ \frac{1 - \frac{38}{39}\theta_1}{1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}}, 1 - \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}, \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1}}, 1 - \frac{(1-\nu)\theta_1}{2\kappa L_f \alpha} \right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x} \rangle \geq f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \lambda^*, U\mathbf{x}^* \rangle$ for any \mathbf{x} , and $\frac{b}{n} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\kappa L_f}} \geq \frac{\theta_1}{20\kappa}$ in \leq . From the settings of θ_1 and α and the assumption $\kappa \geq 1$, we can easily check $\frac{1 - \frac{38}{39}\theta_1}{1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}} \leq 1 - \frac{18}{39}\theta_1 \leq 1 - \frac{18}{39} \frac{\theta_1}{\kappa} = O(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\kappa L_f}})$ due to $\kappa \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu\alpha}{\theta_1}} \leq 1 - \frac{\mu\alpha}{2\theta_1} = O(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\kappa L_f}})$, and $1 - \frac{(1-\nu)\theta_1}{2\kappa L_f \alpha} = O(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\kappa L_f}})$. Thus, the algorithm needs $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ iterations to find \mathbf{z}^k such that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi^k} [\|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$. So the communication complexity is $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. When $b = \sqrt{\frac{n L_f}{\kappa L_f}}$, the stochastic gradient computation complexity is $O(b \sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\sqrt{\frac{n L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. When $b = \sqrt{\frac{n^2 \mu}{\kappa L_f}}$, the stochastic gradient computation complexity is $O(b \sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(n \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. When $b = \frac{L_f}{L_f}$, the stochastic gradient computation complexity is $O(b \sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa L_f^2}{L_f \mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

5. Conclusion

This paper extends the famous EXTRA and DIGing methods with variance reduction. Two accelerated VR based stochastic decentralized algorithms are proposed with the optimal stochastic gradient computation complexity and the optimal communication complexity. We also propose the non-accelerated VR based EXTRA and DIGing. Our stochastic gradient computation complexities keep the same as the single-machine VR methods, such as Katyusha and SVRG, and our communication complexities remain the same as the full batch decentralized methods, such as MSDA, EXTRA, and DIGing.

References

- Alghunaim, S. A., Ryu, E. K., Yuan, K., and H.Sayed, A. Decentralized proximal gradient algorithms with linear convergence rates. *preprint arXiv:1909.06479*, 2020.
- Allen-Zhu, Z. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(221):1–51, 2018.

- Arioli, M. and Scott, J. Chebyshev acceleration of iterative refinement. *Numerical Algorithms*, 66(3):591–608, 2014.
- Aybat, N., Wang, Z., Lin, T., and Ma, S. Distributed linearized alternating direction method of multipliers for composite convex consensus optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(1):5–20, 2018.
- Bertsekas, D. Distributed asynchronous computation of fixed points. *Mathematical Programming*, 27:107–120, 1983.
- Chen, J. and Sayed, A. H. Diffusion adaptation strategies for distributed optimization and learning over networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(8):4289–4305, 2012.
- Defazio, A., Bach, F., and Lacoste-Julien, S. SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pp. 1646–1654, 2014.
- Fercoq, O. and Richtárik, P. Accelerated, parallel, and proximal coordinate descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(4):1997–2023, 2015.
- Hendrikx, H., Bach, F., and Massoulié, L. An optimal algorithm for decentralized finite sum optimization. *preprint arXiv:2005.10675*, 2020a.
- Hendrikx, H., Bach, F., and Massoulié, L. Dual-free stochastic decentralized optimization with variance reduction. *preprint arXiv:2006.14384*, 2020b.
- Hong, M., Hajinezhad, D., and Zhao, M.-M. Prox-PDA: The proximal primal-dual algorithm for fast distributed nonconvex optimization and learning over networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 1529–1538, 2017.
- Iutzeler, F., Bianchi, P., Ciblat, P., and Hachem, W. Explicit convergence rate of a distributed alternating direction method of multipliers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(4):892–904, 2016.
- Jakovetić, D. A unification and generalization of exact distributed first order methods. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 5(1):31–46, 2019.
- Jakovetic, D., Xavier, J., and Moura, J. Fast distributed gradient methods. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(5):1131–1146, 2014.
- Johnson, R. and Zhang, T. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pp. 315–323, 2013.
- Kovalev, D., Horváth, S., and Richtárik, P. Don't jump through hoops and remove those loops: SVRG and Katyusha are better without the outer loop. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory (ALT)*, pp. 451–467, 2020a.
- Kovalev, D., Salim, A., and Richtárik, P. Optimal and practical algorithms for smooth and strongly convex decentralized optimization. *preprint arXiv:2006.11773*, 2020b.
- Lan, G. and Zhou, Y. An optimal randomized incremental gradient method. *Mathematical Programming*, 171:167–215, 2018.
- Lan, G., Lee, S., and Zhou, Y. Communication-efficient algorithms for decentralized and stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 180:237–284, 2020.
- Li, H. and Lin, Z. Revisiting EXTRA for smooth distributed optimization. *SIAM Journal Optimization*, 30(3):1795–1821, 2020.
- Li, H., Fang, C., Yin, W., and Lin, Z. Decentralized accelerated gradient methods with increasing penalty parameters. *arXiv:1810.01053*, 2018.
- Li, Z., Shi, W., and Yan, M. A decentralized proximal-gradient method with network independent step-sizes and separated convergence rates. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(17):4494–4506, 2019.
- Lin, H., Mairal, J., and Harchaoui, Z. Catalyst acceleration for first-order convex optimization: from theory to practice. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(212):1–54, 2018.

- Lin, Q., Lu, Z., and Xiao, L. An accelerated randomized proximal coordinate gradient method and its application to regularized empirical risk minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(4):2244–2273, 2015.
- Makhdoumi, A. and Ozdaglar, A. Convergence rate of distributed ADMM over networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(10):5082–5095, 2017.
- Mokhtari, A. and Ribeiro, A. DSA: Decentralized double stochastic averaging gradient algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(61):1–35, 2016.
- Nedić, A. Asynchronous broadcast-based convex optimization over a network. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(6):1337–1351, 2011.
- Nedić, A. and Ozdaglar, A. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(1):48–61, 2009.
- Nedić, A., Olshevsky, A., and Shi, W. Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(4):2597–2633, 2017.
- Nedić, A., Olshevsky, A., and Rabbat, M. Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 106(5):953–976, 2018.
- Qu, G. and Li, N. Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 5(3):1245–1260, 2018.
- Qu, G. and Li, N. Accelerated distributed Nesterov gradient descent. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(6):2566–2581, 2020.
- Ram, S., Nedić, A., and Veeravalli, V. V. Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 147:516–545, 2010a.
- Ram, S. S., Nedić, A., and Veeravalli, V. V. Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 147:516–545, 2010b.
- Scaman, K., Bach, F., Bubeck, S., Lee, Y. T., and Massoulié, L. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 3027–3036, 2017.
- Scaman, K., Bach, F., Bubeck, S., Lee, Y. T., and Massoulié, L. Optimal algorithms for non-smooth distributed optimization in networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 2740–2749, 2018.
- Scaman, K., Bach, F., Bubeck, S., Lee, Y. T., and Massoulié, L. Optimal convergence rates for convex distributed optimization in networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(159):1–31, 2019.
- Schmidt, M., Le Roux, N., and Bach, F. Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. *Mathematical Programming*, 162:83–112, 2017.
- Shi, W., Ling, Q., Wu, G., and Yin, W. EXTRA: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.
- Terelius, H., Topcu, U., and Murray, R. Decentralized multi-agent optimization via dual decomposition. *IFAC proceedings volumes*, 44(1):11245–11251, 2011.
- Tsitsiklis, J., Bertsekas, D., and Athans, M. Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, 31(9):803–812, 1986.
- Uribe, C. A., Lee, S., Gasnikov, A., and Nedić, A. A dual approach for optimal algorithms in distributed optimization over networks. *arXiv:1809.00710*, 2018.
- Xiao, L. and Zhang, T. A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):2057–2075, 2014.
- Xin, R., Khan, U. A., and Kar, S. A linear algorithm for optimization over directed graphs with geometric convergence. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3):315–320, 2018.

- Xin, R., Khan, U. A., and Kar, S. Variance-reduced decentralized stochastic optimization with accelerated convergence. *preprint arXiv:1912.04230*, 2019.
- Xin, R., Kar, S., and Khan, U. A. Decentralized stochastic optimization and machine learning: A unified variance-reduction framework for robust performance and fast convergence. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(3):102–113, 2020.
- Xu, J., Zhu, S., Soh, Y. C., and Xie, L. Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 2055–2060, 2015.
- Yuan, K., Ling, Q., and Yin, W. On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent. *SIAM Journal Optimization*, 26(3): 1835–1854, 2016.
- Zhou, K., Shang, F., and Cheng, J. A simple stochastic variance reduced algorithm with fast convergence rates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 5975–5984, 2019.