

Distributed Variable Sample-size Stochastic Optimization with Fixed Step-sizes

Jinlong Lei, Peng Yi, Jie Chen, and Yiguang Hong

Abstract—The paper considers distributed stochastic optimization over randomly switching networks, where agents collaboratively minimize the average of all agents’ local expectation-valued convex cost functions. Due to the stochasticity in gradient observations, distributedness of local functions, and randomness of communication topologies, distributed algorithms with a convergence guarantee under fixed step-sizes have not been achieved yet. This work incorporates variance reduction scheme into the distributed stochastic gradient tracking algorithm, where local gradients are estimated by averaging across a variable number of sampled gradients. With an identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.) random network, we show that all agents’ iterates converge almost surely to the same optimal solution under fixed step-sizes. When the global cost function is strongly convex and the sample size increases at a geometric rate, we prove that the iterates geometrically converge to the unique optimal solution, and establish the iteration, oracle, and communication complexity. The algorithm performance including rate and complexity analysis are further investigated with constant step-sizes and a polynomially increasing sample size. Finally, the empirical algorithm performance are illustrated with numerical examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Distributed optimization has wide applications in economic dispatch in power grids [1], [2], trajectory planning and control for multi-robots [3], as well as machine learning over Internet of Things [4]–[6]. In distributed optimization, a group of agents connected over networks cooperatively minimizes the average of all agents’ local cost functions. Prominent first-order distributed optimization algorithms have been developed, including primal domain methods that combine classical (sub)gradient steps with local averaging, such as distributed subgradient methods [7], [8], first-order methods with historical gradients [9], distributed Nesterov gradient methods [10], [11], and distributed gradient tracking methods [12], [13]; dual domain methods employing the Lagrangian dual, e.g., distributed dual decomposition [14] and distributed ADMM [15], [16]; and primal-dual domain methods [17]–[19]. In addition, there are some works on second-order methods for stochastic and distributed optimization [20]–[24]. Please refer to the survey [25], [26] for the recent progress.

Among various formulations in distributed optimization, stochastic optimization has particular research interests in multi-agent networks due to its applications in distributed estimation, stochastic control and machine learning [27]–[29], where the local cost function is the expectation of a stochastic

function. In big data driven applications, the expectation is a sum of sampling functions, while it might be prohibitive or cumbersome to compute the exact gradient. Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) becomes popular since it is relatively easy to implement and scales well in large datasets [30].

In distributed stochastic optimization, each agent utilizes locally available sampled gradients and neighboring information to cooperatively seek the optimal solution. For non-smooth convex cost functions, [27] investigated a distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithm and showed its mean convergence with both the gradient estimation error and the step-size diminishing to zero, while [31] further considered the asynchronous distributed SGD over random networks and proved almost sure convergence with two diminishing step-size sequences. For non-convex problems, [28] showed that distributed SGD methods with diminishing step-sizes can guarantee the almost sure convergence to Karush-Kuhn-Tucker points. Beyond the distributed SGD, [32] proposed a primal-dual method for distributed stochastic convex optimization over random networks corrupted with stochastic communication noises, and showed the almost sure convergence with diminishing step-sizes. *However, a convergent algorithm with non-diminishing step-sizes is desirable in distributed stochastic optimization, since it can lead to a faster convergence rate, save the communication cost, and endow the multi-agent network with adaptivity under model drifting [33].* As far as we know, distributed algorithms for *stochastic convex optimization* with a convergence guarantee under non-diminishing step-sizes have not been achieved yet.

There have been some distributed algorithms investigating *strongly convex stochastic optimization*. For example, [34] proposed a subgradient-push method over time-varying directed graphs with convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(\ln(k)/k)$, while [35] designed a stochastic subgradient descent with time-dependent averaging and obtained a convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$. In addition, [36] considered a distributed stochastic mirror descent method with rate $\mathcal{O}(\ln(k)/k)$ for non-smooth functions. While for random networks, [37] established the mean-squared convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for distributed SGD. Since the aforementioned works [34]–[37] adopted diminishing step-sizes, the derived convergence rates are not comparable with the geometric rate of deterministic strongly convex optimization with constant step-sizes. Recently, [38] and [39] proposed distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods with constant step-sizes, but only showed that the iterates are attracted to a *neighborhood* of the optimal solution in expectation at a geometric rate. With a different perspective, [40] proposed a distributed penalty gradient method for constrained stochastic optimization with

The authors are with the Department of Control Science and Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai, 201804, China;

Email address: leijinlong@tongji.edu.cn (J. Lei), yipeng@amss.ac.cn (P. Yi), chenjie@bit.edu.cn (J. Chen) yghong@iss.ac.cn (Y. Hong).

a fixed step-size, but also showed the geometric convergence to a *neighborhood* of the optimal solution. Thereby, how to distributedly achieve a linear convergence for strongly convex stochastic optimization needs further investigation.

Variance reduction schemes have gained increasing research interests in stochastic convex optimization [41]–[44]. In the class of variable sample-size schemes, the true gradient is estimated by the average of an increasing size of sampled gradients, which can progressively reduce the variance of the sample-averaged gradients. For example, [41] obtained the geometric rate for strongly convex problems, while [42] combined the accelerated method and proved the rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ for smooth convex problems. Alternative variance reduction schemes like SAGA [43] and SVRG [44], mainly applied to finite-sum optimization problems in machine learning, lead to the recovery of the convergence rates in deterministic cases. Such schemes are also investigated in distributed finite-sum optimization [45]–[47], but *relying on periodically using exact gradients*. However, distributed variance reduced schemes for general distributed stochastic optimization without using exact gradients remains open.

This paper aims to provide a fast and communication-efficient algorithm for distributed stochastic optimization, where the communication is many times of local computation cost. We incorporate the variable sample-size scheme into the distributed stochastic gradient tracking algorithm [48], and derive the following results.

- We propose a distributed algorithm, where each agent estimates its local gradients by a variable number of sampled gradients, takes a weighted averaging of its neighbors' iterates, and moves towards the negative direction of the locally weighted combination of its neighbours' gradient estimations.
- Assume that each sampled gradient is unbiased with a bounded variance, and each gradient function is Lipschitz continuous. For i.i.d. random networks with connected mean graph, we prove the almost sure convergence for *merely convex* functions, only requiring the sample size $N(k)$ satisfies $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N(k)} < \infty$, which is not necessary monotonically increasing.
- If the global cost function is strongly convex, we prove the geometric convergence with a geometrically increasing sample size, and obtain the iteration, communication, and oracle complexity $\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$, $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}| \ln(1/\epsilon))$ for achieving an ϵ -optimal solution $\mathbb{E}[\|x - x^*\|] < \epsilon$. We further show that with a constant sample size, the estimates geometrically converge to a neighborhood of the optimal solution, and investigate the polynomial rate and complexity bounds with a polynomially increasing sample size. The above results quantitatively provide the trade-off between communication complexity and computation complexity for distributed stochastic optimization.

The novel perspective of this paper is that by progressively reducing the variance of gradient noises through increasing the sample size, we can adopt constant step-sizes to achieve an exact convergence in distributed stochastic optimization. Com-

pared with algorithms with diminishing stepsizes in [27], [28], [31], the proposed algorithm can achieve a faster convergence with constant step-sizes, hence can significantly reduce the communication costs. Moreover, for strongly convex stochastic optimization, the derived iteration complexity is of the same order as the centralized algorithm in *deterministic* cases [49]. The oracle complexity is also comparable with centralized SGD, for example, the bound of [50] is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ for making the suboptimality gap $\mathbb{E}[F(x)] - F(x^*) < \epsilon$. Compared with existing distributed stochastic optimization methods [34]–[39] and [45]–[47], *the proposed scheme saves the communication costs without increasing the overall sampling burden too much or using the exact gradient periodically*.

The paper is organized as follows. A distributed variable sample-size stochastic gradient tracking algorithm is proposed in Section II. The almost sure convergence for convex functions is provided in Section III. Then the geometric (resp. polynomial) convergence rate along with complexity bounds are established in Section IV for strongly convex functions with geometrically (resp. polynomially) increasing sample size. The numerical studies are presented in Section V, while concluding remarks are given in Section VI. In addition, the proofs of lemmas and theorems are presented in Appendix.

Notations. Depending on the argument, $|\cdot|$ stands for the absolute value of a real number or the cardinality of a set. The Euclidean norm of a vector or a matrix is denoted as $\|\cdot\|_2$ or $\|\cdot\|$. The spectral radius of a matrix A is denoted as $\rho(A)$. Let \otimes denote the Kronecker product. The expectation of a random variable is denoted as $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$. Let $\mathbf{1}_n$ denote the n -dimensional column vectors with all entries equal to 1 and I_d denote the $d \times d$ identity matrix. A directed graph is denoted by $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a finite set of nodes and an edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ if node j can receive information from agent i . A directed path in \mathcal{G} from v_1 to v_p is a sequence of distinct nodes, v_1, \dots, v_p , such that $(v_m, v_{m+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $m = 1, \dots, p-1$. The graph \mathcal{G} is termed *strongly connected* if for any two distinct nodes $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, there is a directed path from node i to node j . Given a nonnegative matrix $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, denote by $\mathcal{G}_A = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_A\}$ the corresponding digraph, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_A$ if $a_{ij} > 0$.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM

In this section, we first formulate a distributed stochastic optimization problem. Then we propose a fully distributed stochastic gradient tracking algorithm, which used a variable number of sampled gradients to estimate exact gradients.

A. Problem formulation

We consider a network of n agents indexed as $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ has an expectation-valued cost function $f_i(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} [h_i(x, \xi_i)]$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the random vector $\xi_i : \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is defined on the probability space $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathbb{P})$, and $h_i : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a proper scalar-valued function. The agents in the network need to cooperatively find an optimal solution that minimizes the average of all agents'

local cost functions, i.e.,

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x). \quad (1)$$

The discrete time is slotted at $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The interaction among the agents at time k is described by a directed graph $\mathcal{G}(k) = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}(k)\}$, where $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}(k)$ if node i can receive information from agent j at time k . Denote by $\mathcal{N}_i(k) \triangleq \{j \in \mathcal{V} : (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}(k)\}$ the neighboring set of node i at time k . The corresponding adjacency matrix is $A(k) = [a_{ij}(k)]_{i,j=1}^n$, where $a_{ij}(k) > 0$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}(k)$ and $a_{ij}(k) = 0$, otherwise. Below are the assumptions on the communication graphs.

Assumption 1: (i) At each time $k \geq 0$, $A(k)$ is doubly stochastic, i.e., $\mathbf{1}_n^T A(k) = \mathbf{1}_n^T$ and $A(k) \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$.

(ii) $\{A(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is an i.i.d. matrix sequence.

(iii) The graph $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{A}}$ generated by the expected adjacency matrix $\bar{A} = \mathbb{E}[A(k)]$ is strongly connected.

Remark 1: Random graphs modelled in Assumption 1 can cover i.i.d. undirected graphs [51], random gossip and broadcast communications [31], [37], etc. Assumption 1(i) requires each digraph $\mathcal{G}(k)$ to be weight-balanced, which is also used in existing works, such as [7], [11], [13]. Specifically, for the gossip scheme in undirected and connected underlying graphs, the doubly stochastic adjacency matrix was designed [52]. Nevertheless, it is usually non-trivial to generate doubly stochastic weights for general digraphs, but there are distributed algorithms to fulfill the task, e.g., [53]. Assumption 1(ii) implies that the graph sequence $\{\mathcal{G}(k)\}$ is independent and identically distributed over time k . Assumption 1(iii) imposes a mild connectivity condition among agents that in expectation, an agent can receive the information from every other agent directly or indirectly through a directed path. \square

We require the cost functions to be convex and smooth.

Assumption 2: For each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$,

(i) the cost function f_i is convex;

(ii) the gradient function ∇f_i is L -Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla f_i(x_1) - \nabla f_i(x_2)\| \leq L \|x_1 - x_2\|, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Denote by $X^* \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \nabla F(x) = 0\}$ the optimal solution set and by F^* the optimal function value. By the first-order optimality condition, the optimal solution $x^* \in X^*$ satisfies $\nabla F(x^*) = 0$.

Suppose that for agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists a *stochastic first-order oracle* that returns a sampled gradient $\nabla_x h_i(x, \xi)$ given x, ξ , which is an *unbiased* estimator of $\nabla f_i(x)$ with a bounded second-order moment.

Assumption 3: There exists a constant $\nu > 0$ such that for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i}[\nabla_x h_i(x, \xi_i)] = \nabla f_i(x)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i}[\|\nabla_x h_i(x, \xi_i) - \nabla f_i(x)\|^2 | x] \leq \nu^2$.

B. Distributed algorithm with variable sample-sizes

Each agent i at time k maintains two estimates $x_i(k)$ and $y_i(k)$, which are used to estimate the optimal solution and to track the average gradient, respectively. Since the exact gradient of each expectation-valued cost function $f_i(x)$ is

unavailable, we approximate it by averaging through a variable number of sampled gradients,

$$\tilde{g}_i(x_i(k)) = \frac{1}{N(k)} \sum_{p=1}^{N(k)} \nabla_x h_i(x_i(k), \xi_i^p(k)), \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

where $N(k)$ is the number of sampled gradients utilized at time k and the samples $\{\xi_i^p(k)\}_{p=1}^{N(k)}$ are randomly and independently generated from the probability space $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathbb{P})$. The gradient estimate given by (2) is an unbiased estimate of the exact gradient $\nabla f_i(x_i(k))$, and the variance of the gradient observation noise $\tilde{g}_i(x_i(k)) - \nabla f_i(x_i(k))$ can be progressively reduced by increasing the sample size $N(k)$. By combining the distributed gradient tracking scheme with such a variance reduction scheme, we obtain Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributed variable sample-size stochastic gradient tracking algorithm

Initialization: Set $k := 0$. For any $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $y_i(0) = \tilde{g}_i(x_i(0))$ with arbitrary initial $x_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Iterate until convergence.

Each agent $i = 1, \dots, n$ updates its estimates as follows,

$$x_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{ij}(k) x_j(k) - \alpha_i y_i(k), \quad (3a)$$

$$y_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{ij}(k) y_j(k) + \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k+1)) - \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k)), \quad (3b)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$ is the *fixed* step-size used by agent i , and $\tilde{g}_i(x_i(k))$ is given in (2).

Note that for each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the implementation of (3a) requires its neighbors' estimates of the optimal solution $\{x_j(k)\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)}$, while the update of $y_i(k+1)$ characterized by (3b) uses its local gradient estimate as well as its neighbors' information $\{y_j(k)\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)}$ to asymptotically track the dynamical average gradient across the network. Therefore, Algorithm 1 is fully distributed since each agent merely relies on its local samples and its neighboring agents' information.

III. ALMOST SURE CONVERGENCE FOR CONVEX FUNCTIONS

In this section, we provide the almost sure convergence of the algorithm for merely convex cost functions.

A. Preliminary lemmas

Define the gradient observation noise as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} w_i(k) &\triangleq \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k)) - \nabla f_i(x_i(k)), \\ w(k) &\triangleq (w_1(k)^T, \dots, w_n(k)^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Denote by

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &\triangleq (x_1(k)^T, \dots, x_n(k)^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}, \\ y(k) &\triangleq (y_1(k)^T, \dots, y_n(k)^T)^T, \\ \nabla f(k) &\triangleq (\nabla f_1(x_1(k))^T, \dots, \nabla f_n(x_n(k))^T)^T, \\ \text{and } \alpha &\triangleq \text{diag}\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\text{diag}\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ denotes a diagonal matrix with α_i in the i th diagonal. Then Algorithm 1 can be written in a compact form as follows,

$$x(k+1) = (A(k) \otimes I_d)x(k) - (\alpha \otimes I_d)y(k), \quad (6a)$$

$$y(k+1) = (A(k) \otimes I_d)y(k) + \nabla f(k+1) + w(k+1) - \nabla f(k) - w(k). \quad (6b)$$

Denote the averaged estimate of the optimal solution and the averaged gradient across the network as

$$\bar{x}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(k) \text{ and } \bar{y}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i(k). \quad (7)$$

We further denote by $D_\perp = I_n - \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n}$, and by

$$\tilde{x}(k) \triangleq (D_\perp \otimes I_d)x(k) = x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k), \quad (8)$$

$$\tilde{y}(k) \triangleq (D_\perp \otimes I_d)y(k) = y(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}(k). \quad (9)$$

Define $\mathcal{F}(k) \triangleq \{x(0), A(0), \dots, A(k-1), \{\xi_i^p(t)\}_{p=1}^{N(t)}, 0 \leq t \leq k, i = 1, \dots, n\}$. From Algorithm 1 it is seen that both $x(k)$ and $y(k)$ are adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$, hence $\tilde{x}(k)$ and $\tilde{y}(k)$ are adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$.

Recall that $\tilde{x}(k)$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$ and $A(k)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}(k)$. Then by using $A(k) \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n}$ and $A(k)^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}(k)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}(k)^T (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n)^T (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k) | \mathcal{F}(k)] \\ &= \tilde{x}(k)^T \left(\mathbb{E}[A(k)^T A(k)] - \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n} \right) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k) \\ &\leq \rho \left(\mathbb{E}[A(k)^T A(k)] - \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n} \right) \|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying the Jensen's inequality for conditional expectations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] \\ &\leq \rho_1 \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \text{ with } \rho_1 \triangleq \sqrt{\rho(\mathbb{E}[A(k)^T A(k)] - \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n})}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By Assumption 1, we see that the graph generated by the matrix $\mathbb{E}[A(k)^T A(k)]$ is undirected and connected. Thus, $\rho(\mathbb{E}[A(k)^T A(k)] - \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T}{n}) \in (0, 1)$. The parameter ρ_1 depends on the network topology, where larger ρ_1 implies worse network connectivity. It was shown in [52, Proposition 5] that when the weight of adjacency matrix following the Lazy Metropolis rule, $1 - \rho_1 = \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)$ for path or star graph, $1 - \rho_1 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ for lattice graph, etc. For general classes of graphs, there are some distributed algorithms to estimate the network connectivity for fixed graphs, such as [54].

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha} &\triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i, \quad c_1 \triangleq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i - \bar{\alpha})^2}, \\ \alpha_{\max} &\triangleq \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \alpha_i, \text{ and } c_2 \triangleq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In the following lemma, We obtain the following bounds on the consensus errors $\tilde{x}(k)$ and $\tilde{y}(k)$.

Lemma 1: Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. With Algorithm 1, we have that, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k+1)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] \\ &\leq \rho_1 \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + c_1 \|\tilde{y}(k)\| + \alpha_{\max} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k+1)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] \leq (\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L) \|\tilde{y}(k)\| + L \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \\ &+ c_2 L \|\tilde{y}(k)\| + \mathbb{E}[\|w(k+1) - w(k)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix A-A. ■

Lemma 2: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Consider Algorithm 1, where $\alpha_i < \frac{(1-\rho_1)^2}{(2-\rho_1)L}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Define $e(k) \triangleq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2 + \|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2]}$. Then

$$\rho_2 \triangleq \frac{2\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L + \sqrt{\alpha_{\max}^2 L^2 + 4\alpha_{\max} L}}{2} < 1,$$

and the following holds with $p_k \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{n\nu}}{\sqrt{N(k+1)}} + \frac{\sqrt{n\nu}}{\sqrt{N(k)}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^K e(s)^2} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{1-\rho_2^2}} e(0) + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{1-\rho_2} \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^K p_s^2} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}}{1-\rho_2} \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(s)\|^2]}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix A-B. ■

B. Almost sure convergence

Next, we give the almost sure convergence of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Let $\{x(k)\}$ and $\{y(k)\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1, where $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N(k)} < \infty$. Then there exist sufficiently small $\alpha_i > 0, i \in \mathcal{V}$, which possibly depends on ρ_1, L , and

$$d_\alpha \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i - \bar{\alpha})^2}}{\sqrt{n\bar{\alpha}}}, \quad (15)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{x}(k) - x_i(k)\| &= 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad a.s., \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}(k)) &= F^*, \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix A-C. ■

Remark 2: Theorem 1 shows that the exact convergence in an almost sure sense can be achieved for convex problems with constant step-sizes by adaptively choosing the sample size. The proposed algorithm with constant step-sizes can achieve a faster convergence rate compared with the algorithms with diminishing step-sizes [34]–[37]. As similar discussions in [56], one major reason for considering the agent-specific stepsize is due to the heterogeneity of agents and lacking of coordination involved in distributed computation. Theorem 1 validates that the distributed variable sample-size stochastic gradient tracking algorithm with uncoordinated constant step-sizes can also achieve the exact convergence to an optimal solution in the almost sure sense.

Theorem 1 uses the same sample size just for the ease of proof presentation. Suppose agents utilize different sample size, i.e., agent i uses $N_i(k)$ at time k . Denote by $N_{\min}(k) = \min\{N_i(k), i \in \mathcal{V}\}$. Then the condition $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N(k)} < \infty$ can be replaced with $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N_{\min}(k)} < \infty$. There are many ways for choosing the batch-size $N(k)$, for example $k \ln^2(k)$ or $k^{1+\delta}$ with $\delta > 0$. \square

The following corollary gives a sufficient condition on constant step-sizes when all agents take an identical step-size. It quantitatively characterizes the dependence on the Lipschitz constant L and the network connectivity parameter ρ_1 . It can be seen that a larger Lipschitz constant L leads to a smaller upper bound of the step-size, while a better network connectivity (i.e., smaller ρ_1) implies a larger step-size.

Corollary 1: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\alpha_i \equiv \alpha$ and

$$\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{c_0 + 1 + 2\sqrt{3}L - \sqrt{(c_0 + 1 + 2\sqrt{3}L)^2 - 4c_0}}{2L} \right) \quad (17)$$

with $c_0 \triangleq \frac{(1-\rho_1)^2}{(2-\rho_1)}$. Then the results established in (16) hold.

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix A-D. \blacksquare

IV. RATE ANALYSIS FOR STRONGLY CONVEX FUNCTIONS

This section explores the convergence properties of Algorithm 1 when the global cost function is strongly convex. The geometric (resp. polynomial) convergence rate is obtained if the number of the sampled gradients increases at a geometric (resp. polynomial) rate. In addition, the complexity bounds for obtaining an ϵ -optimal solution are established as well.

A. Linear convergence rate analysis

Assumption 4: The global cost function $F(x)$ is η -strongly convex, i.e., for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(\nabla F(x_1) - \nabla F(x_2))^T (x_1 - x_2) \geq \eta \|x_1 - x_2\|^2.$$

With Assumption 4, the problem (1) has a unique optimal solution, denoted by x^* , and $\nabla F(x^*) = 0$. We analyze the algorithm performance by characterizing the interactions among three error sequences: (i) the distance from the average estimate to the optimal solution $\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|$; (ii) the consensus error $\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|$; and (iii) the consensus error of the gradient trackers $\|y(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}(k)\|$. We will bound the three error sequences in terms of linear combinations of their past values in the following lemma.

Lemma 3: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2(ii), and 4 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $0 < \alpha_i \leq \frac{2}{\eta+L}$. Define

$$z(k) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|] \\ \mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|] \\ \mathbb{E}[\|y(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}(k)\|] \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and} \quad (18)$$

$$J(\alpha) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta & \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} & \frac{c_1}{n} \\ c_1L & \rho_1 + \frac{c_1L}{\sqrt{n}} & \alpha_{\max} \\ c_2L^2 & L + \frac{c_2L^2}{\sqrt{n}} & \rho_1 + \alpha_{\max}L \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{\alpha}, c_1, \alpha_{\max}, c_2$ are defined in (11). Then the following component-wise linear matrix inequality holds for any $k \geq 0$,

$$z(k+1) \leq J(\alpha)z(k) + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \\ \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \\ \mathbb{E}[\|w(k+1) - w(k)\|] + \frac{c_2L}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Proof: The proof can be found in Appendix B-A. \blacksquare

Next, we show the geometric convergence of Algorithm 1 with geometrically increasing sample size and suitably selected step-sizes. For non-identical step-sizes α_i , we have $d_\alpha > 0$ by the definition (15). Define $\kappa \triangleq L/\eta$ and let α_i satisfy the following with ρ_1 defined by (10):

$$0 < \alpha_i L < \min \left\{ \beta^*, \frac{1 - \rho_1}{d_\alpha \kappa (L + \eta)} \right\}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (20)$$

where $\beta^* \triangleq \frac{c_4 + \sqrt{c_4^2 + 4c_3(1 - \rho_1)^2}}{2c_3}$

with $c_3 = (\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1})(1 + \kappa d_\alpha^2) + \kappa \sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1}$, and $c_4 = (1 + (\kappa + 1)d_\alpha)(1 - \rho_1) + 1 + \kappa d_\alpha^2 + \kappa \sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1}d_\alpha(1 - \rho_1)$.

Theorem 2: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2(ii), 3, and 4 hold. Let $\{x(k)\}$ and $\{y(k)\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil$ for some $q \in (0, 1)$. Suppose the step-size $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies (20), then the spectral radius of $J(\alpha)$ in (18), denoted by $\rho(J(\alpha))$, is strictly smaller than 1. In addition, the error sequence $z(k)$ converges to zero at a linear rate,

$$\mathcal{O}(\max\{\rho(J(\alpha)), q\}^k).$$

Proof: The proof can be found in Appendix B-B. \blacksquare

Eqn. (20) gives a sufficient condition for selecting step-sizes $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ to guarantee that $\rho(J(\alpha)) < 1$. It shows how parameters η, L, d_α and ρ_1 influence the selection of constant step-sizes. Theorem 2 implies that if the number of sampled gradients is increased at a geometric rate $\lceil q^{-2k} \rceil$ with $q \in (0, 1)$, the error sequences $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|]$ converge to zero at a geometric rate. We omitted the big O constant in the statement of Theorem 2 due to its complicated expression. However, it is noticed from (18) that $J(\alpha)$ is just a 3×3 matrix, which can be computed if the problem-related constants are given. In this case, the explicit convergence rate can be computed with the inequality (B.10) in Appendix B.B.

The following corollary shows the convergence rate for the case with an identical step-size, i.e., $\alpha_i \equiv \alpha$. Define

$$\hat{J}(\alpha) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \alpha\eta & \frac{\alpha L}{\sqrt{n}} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_1 & \alpha \\ \sqrt{n}\alpha L^2 & L + \alpha L^2 & \rho_1 + \alpha L \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

The condition (22), making $\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)) < 1$, implies that a better network connectivity (namely a smaller ρ_1) leads to a larger α , while the ill-conditioned optimization problem with a large κ narrows the possible selection of α .

Corollary 2: Suppose Assumptions 1, 2(ii), 3, and 4 hold. Let $\{x(k)\}$ and $\{y(k)\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1, where

$$\alpha_i \equiv \alpha < \frac{2 - \rho_1 + \sqrt{(2 - \rho_1)^2 + 4(1 + \kappa)(1 - \rho_1)^2}}{2L(1 + \kappa)}. \quad (22)$$

Set $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil$ for some $q \in (\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)), 1)$. Then

$$z(k) \approx \hat{J}(\alpha)^k z(0) + \nu q^{k-1} (I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha)/q)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ 0 \\ (1+q+\alpha L)\sqrt{n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix B-C. ■

For strongly convex stochastic optimization, [38]–[40] also proved geometric convergence rates but only to a neighborhood of the optimal solution. By progressively reducing the gradient noises with geometrically increasing batch-sizes, we prove that the exact and geometric convergence in a mean-squared sense. The following Corollary shows that when a constant sample size is used in Algorithm 1, the linear convergence to a neighborhood of the optimal solution can be obtained as well. It can be seen that the bounds depend on the network structure, batch-size and step-size, as well as the problem parameters η, L, ν .

Corollary 3: Let Assumptions 1, 2(ii), 3, and 4 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $N(k) \equiv B$ for some positive integer B , where $\alpha_i \equiv \alpha, i \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies (22). Then $\sup_{l \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(l) - x^*\|]$ and $\sup_{l \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|x(l) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(l)\|]$ converge to $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|]$ and $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|]$ with a geometric rate $\mathcal{O}(\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha))^k)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|] \\ & \leq \frac{\nu((1-\rho_1)^2 + \rho_1\alpha L)}{\sqrt{B}\eta((1-\rho_1)^2 - (1+\kappa)\alpha^2 L^2 - (2-\rho_1)\alpha L)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|] \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha\sqrt{n}\nu(\alpha L^2 + \eta(2+\alpha L))}{\sqrt{B}\eta((1-\rho_1)^2 - (1+\kappa)\alpha^2 L^2 - (2-\rho_1)\alpha L)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix B-D. ■

B. Complexity analysis

Based on the geometric convergence rate established in Theorem 2, we are able to establish the complexity bounds for obtaining an ϵ -optimal solution satisfying $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$. The iteration complexity is defined as $K(\epsilon)$ such that $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$ for any $k \geq K(\epsilon)$. The oracle complexity, measured by the total number of sampled gradients for deriving an ϵ -optimal solution, can be computed as $\sum_{k=0}^{K(\epsilon)} N(k)$.

Theorem 3: Let Assumptions 1, 2(ii), 3, and 4 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil$ for some $q \in (0, 1)$, where the step-size $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies (20).

(i) When $\rho(J(\alpha)) < q < 1$, the iteration and oracle complexity required to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution are $\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$ and $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$, respectively.

(ii) When $0 < q < \rho(J(\alpha))$, the iteration and oracle complexity required to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution are $\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$ and $(1/\epsilon)^{\frac{2 \ln(1/q)}{\ln(1/\rho(J(\alpha)))}}$, respectively.

Proof: (i). $\rho(J(\alpha)) < q$. With Theorem 2, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\|z(k)\| \leq C_1 q^k$. Then for any $k \geq K_1(\epsilon) =$

$\ln(C_1/\epsilon) \frac{1}{\ln(1/q)}$, we have $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$. This allows us to bound the oracle complexity by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K_1(\epsilon)} N(k) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K_1(\epsilon)} q^{-2k} \leq \frac{q^{-2(K_1(\epsilon)+1)}}{q^{-2}-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-q^2} q^{-2 \frac{1}{\ln(1/q)} \ln(C_1/\epsilon)} = \frac{1}{1-q^2} e^{\ln(q^{-2}) \frac{1}{\ln(1/q)} \ln(C_1/\epsilon)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-q^2} e^{2 \ln(C_1/\epsilon)} = \frac{C_1^2}{(1-q^2)\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii). $\rho(J(\alpha)) > q$. With Theorem 2, there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that $\|z(k)\| \leq C_2 \rho(J(\alpha))^k$. Then for any $k \geq K_2(\epsilon) \triangleq \frac{1}{\ln(1/\rho(J(\alpha)))} \ln\left(\frac{C_2}{\epsilon}\right)$, we have $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$. This allows us to bound the oracle complexity by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K_2(\epsilon)} N(k) &\leq \frac{q^{-2(K_2(\epsilon)+1)}}{q^{-2}-1} \leq \frac{1}{1-q^2} q^{-2 \frac{1}{\ln(1/\rho(J(\alpha)))} \ln\left(\frac{C_2}{\epsilon}\right)} \\ &= \frac{e^{\ln(q^{-2}) \frac{1}{\ln(1/\rho(J(\alpha)))} \ln(C_2/\epsilon)}}{1-q^2} = \frac{1}{1-q^2} \left(\frac{C_2}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{2 \ln(1/q)}{\ln(1/\rho(J(\alpha)))}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3: Theorem 3 shows that for geometrically increasing batch-size, the number of iterations required to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution is $\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$, which matches the *optimal* iteration complexity for strongly convex optimization in the deterministic regime. The oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 for making $\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|] \\ \mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|] \\ \mathbb{E}[\|y(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}(k)\|] \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ when $q \in (\rho(J(\alpha)), 1)$. Recall that for the centralized SGD, the oracle complexity for making either the suboptimality gap $\mathbb{E}[F(x)] - F(x^*) < \epsilon$ or the mean-squared error $\mathbb{E}[\|x - x^*\|^2] < \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ (see e.g., [50]), which implies that the oracle complexity for obtaining $\mathbb{E}[\|x - x^*\|] < \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$. Thus, the number of sampled gradient required by Algorithm 1 with $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil, q \in (\rho(J(\alpha)), 1)$ to achieve a given solution accuracy matches that of the centralized SGD. □

Next, we investigate the communication complexity for obtaining an approximate solution. We consider a special case with fixed graph and impose the following condition.

Assumption 5: (i) $\mathcal{G}(k) \equiv \mathcal{G}$, where \mathcal{G} is strongly connected.

(ii) $A(k) \equiv A$, where the adjacency matrix A associated with \mathcal{G} is doubly stochastic.

Theorem 4: Let Assumptions 2(ii), 3, 4, and 5 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil, q \in (0, 1)$, where the step-size $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies (20). Then the number of communications required to obtain $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}| \ln(1/\epsilon))$.

Proof: In each iteration k , agent i requires $2|\mathcal{N}_i|$ rounds of communication to obtain its neighbors' information $x_j(k)$ and $y_j(k)$. Thus, the number of communication rounds required across the network at time k is $2|\mathcal{E}|$. Since the number of iterations required to obtain $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$, the number of total communication rounds required is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}| \ln(1/\epsilon))$. ■

There might exist settings where a geometrically increasing batch-size is impractical. To this end, we consider the use of polynomially increasing batch-size that allows for more gentle

growth, and proceed to investigate the convergence rate as well as the complexity bounds.

Theorem 5: Let Assumptions 2(ii), 3, 4, and 5 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $N(k) = \lceil (k+1)^{2\theta} \rceil$, $\theta > 0$, and the step-size $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfying (20). Then $z(k)$ converges to zero at a polynomial rate $\mathcal{O}(k^{-\theta})$. In addition, the number of samples and communications required to make $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$ is $\mathcal{O}((1/\epsilon)^{2+1/\theta})$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}|(1/\epsilon)^{1/\theta})$, respectively.

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix B-E. ■

Remark 4: Though an increasing batch-size implies a higher sampling and computation burden than SGD with a single iteration, the proposed scheme can significantly reduce the communication burden compared with [34]–[38]. Thus, Algorithm 1 is superior in many practical networks especially in wireless networks, where the communication cost is usually much higher than gradient computations. Therefore, the proposed scheme can remarkably save the communication cost by fully exploiting the local computation resources. Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 characterize the trade-off between communication costs and sampling rate, where a higher sampling rate leads to a smaller communication burden. □

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we examine the empirical performance of Algorithm 1 on the distributed parameter estimation problems.

A. Distributed parameter estimation problem

Consider a network of n spatially distributed sensors that aim to estimate an unknown d -dimensional parameter x^* . Each sensor i collects a set of scalar measurements $\{d_{i,p}\}$ generated by the following linear regression model corrupted with noises,

$$d_{i,p} = u_{i,p}^T x^* + \nu_{i,p},$$

where $u_{i,p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the regression vector accessible to agent i and $\nu_{i,p} \in \mathbb{R}$ is a zero-mean Gaussian noise.

Suppose that $\{u_{i,p}\}$ and $\{\nu_{i,p}\}$ are mutually independent Gaussian sequences with distributions $N(0, R_{u,i})$ and $N(0, \sigma_{i,\nu}^2)$, respectively. Then the distributed parameter estimation problem can be modelled as a distributed stochastic quadratic optimization problem,

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \text{ where } f_i(x) = \mathbb{E}[\|d_{i,p} - u_{i,p}^T x\|^2]. \quad (23)$$




Fig. 1: Convergence of Algorithm 1 for convex problems




Fig. 2: Geometric rate of Algorithm 1 for strongly convex problems

Thus, $f_i(x) = (x - x^*)^T R_{u,i}(x - x^*) + \sigma_{i,\nu}^2$ is convex and $\nabla f_i(x) = R_{u,i}(x - x^*)$. By using the observed regressor $u_{i,p}$ and the corresponding measurement $d_{i,p}$, the sampled gradient $u_{i,p} u_{i,p}^T x - d_{i,p} u_{i,p}$ satisfies Assumption 3.

B. Numerical simulations

Set the vector dimension $d = 10$, the agent number $n = 200$, and the true parameter $x^* = \mathbf{1}/\sqrt{d}$. We randomly generate 10 undirected networks, where any two distinct agents are linked with probability 0.1. The adjacency matrix is constructed based on the Metropolis rule. A graph is uniformly sampled at each iteration such that Assumption 1 is ensured.

Validation of Theorem 1. Let each covariance matrix $R_{u,i}$ be positive semidefinite with two eigenvalues equal to 0, that is, each $f_i(x)$ is merely convex. We run Algorithm 1 with $\alpha = 0.01$ and $N_k = \lceil k^{1.1} \rceil$, and display the estimation errors of a sample path in Fig. 1, which shows that the generated iterates will asymptotically converge to the true parameter x^* .

Validation of Theorems 2 and 3. Let each covariance matrix $R_{u,i}$ be positive definite. Then each $f_i(x)$ is strongly convex and x^* is the unique optimal solution to (23). We run Algorithm 1 with $\alpha = 0.01$ and $N_k = \lceil 0.98^{-k} \rceil$, and examine the empirical rate of convergence and oracle complexity, where the empirical mean-squared error is based on averaging across 50 sample trajectories. The convergence rate shown in Fig. 2, demonstrating that the iterates $\{x_k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 converge to x^* at a geometric rate. The oracle complexity is shown in Fig. 3, where x-axis is $1/\epsilon^2$ and y-axis denotes the number of sampled gradients required to ensure

$$e(k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}(k) - x^* \\ x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d) \bar{x}(k) \end{pmatrix} \right\| \right] < \epsilon.$$

In Fig. 3, the blue solid curve represents the empirical data, while the red dashed curve denotes its linear fitting, which implies that the empirical oracle complexity fits well with the established theoretical bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$.

Comparison with [27] and [38]. We compare the performance of Algorithm 1, abbreviated as D-VSS-SGT, with the distributed stochastic gradient descent (D-SGD) [27] and




Fig. 3: Empirical oracle complexity and its fitting of Algorithm 1 for strongly convex problems




Fig. 4: Comparison of Algorithm 1 with D-SGD and D-SGT under the same constant stepsize




Fig. 5: Iteration complexity of Algorithm 1, D-SGD, and D-SGT




Fig. 6: Oracle complexity of Algorithm 1, D-SGD and D-SGT




Fig. 7: Rate of $e(k)$ for batch-sizes $N_k = \lceil \rho^{-k} \rceil$




Fig. 8: Oracle complexity for batch-sizes $N_k = \lceil \rho^{-k} \rceil$




Fig. 9: Algorithm performance with constant batch-size

the distributed stochastic gradient tracking (D-SGT) [38] for strongly convex stochastic optimization.

Firstly, we compare the algorithm performance of the three methods under fixed step-sizes. We set $\alpha = 0.005$ in all three schemes, and $N_k = \lceil 0.98^{-k} \rceil$ in Algorithm 1. The empirical error $e(k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}(k) - x^* \\ x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k) \end{pmatrix} \right\|$ with respect to the number of sampled gradients is given in Figure 4. It shows that the iterates of D-SGD and D-SGT ceased at a neighborhood of the true parameter x^* , while the iterates generated by Algorithm 1 will asymptotically converge to the true value x^* . It also shows that D-SGD and D-SGT are more efficient in utilizing the samples than Algorithm 1 at the first few samples, but with the increasing of gradient samples, Algorithm 1 is superior than D-SGD and D-SGT.

We further compare the iteration and oracle complexity of the three methods, where Algorithm 1 uses a constant stepsize, while D-SGD and D-SGT use decreasing stepsizes. The empirical number of iterations and sampled gradients required to obtain a solution with the same accuracy are demonstrated in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. We see from Fig. 5 that Algorithm 1 can significantly reduce the iteration numbers, so do the communication rounds (costs). Meanwhile, Fig. 6 shows that Algorithm 1 requires more sampled gradients than D-SGD and D-SGT. In fact, in certain applications such as wireless networks, high communication overhead may render a distributed scheme impractical. As such, the variance-reduced method proposed in this work is suitable for network problems when the communication costs are more expensive

than sampling and local computations.

Influence of the batch-sizes. We run Algorithm 1 with $\alpha = 0.01$ and different geometric batch-sizes $N_k = \lceil \rho^{-k} \rceil$. We set $\rho = 0.88, 0.9, 0.92$, and display the empirical rate and oracle complexity in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, respectively. We conclude from the figures that a faster increasing batch-size leads to a better convergence rate (namely, less rounds of communications) while at the cost of more sampled data and heavier computations. Hence, the parameter ρ should be properly selected to balance communication costs, sampling costs and computation costs in practice.

Performance of Algorithm 1 with constant batch-size. Finally, we run the algorithm with $\alpha = 0.01$ and a constant batch-size $N_k \equiv 20$, and display the empirical convergence rate in Fig. 9, which clearly shows that the estimates ceased at a neighborhood of the optimal solution.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We proposed a distributed stochastic gradient tracking algorithm with variable sample-sizes for stochastic optimization over random networks. We proved that with a suitably selected constant stepsize and a properly increasing gradient sample-size, the iterates converge almost surely to the optimal solution for convex problems. For strongly convex problems, we further obtained the geometric convergence rate with geometrically increasing batch-sizes and established the complexity bounds for obtaining an ϵ -optimal solution. Both the iteration complexity and the oracle complexity are comparable with the centralized stochastic gradient descent algorithm. It might

be of interests to embed the push-pull method for resolving distributed stochastic optimization with general digraphs. The extension of the current algorithm to non-convex/non-smooth distributed stochastic optimization is a promising future research direction.

APPENDIX A PROOFS OF SECTION III

A. Proof of Lemma 1.

We first give a bound on $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k+1)\|\|\mathcal{F}(k)\|]$. Note by Assumption 1(i) and $D_\perp = I_n - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n$ that $D_\perp A(k) = (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n)D_\perp$. Then by multiplying both sides of (6a) with $D_\perp \otimes I_d$ from the left, using the definition (8), and $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i}{n}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(k+1) &= (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k) - (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes I_d) y(k) \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes I_d}{n} y(k) \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{=} (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k) - (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes I_d) \tilde{y}(k) \\ &\quad - (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d) \bar{y}(k) + \bar{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d \bar{y}(k) + \frac{\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes I_d}{n} \tilde{y}(k). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{y}(k), \tilde{y}(k)$ are adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$, by using the triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k+1)\|\|\mathcal{F}(k)\|] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k)\|\|\mathcal{F}(k)\|] \\ &\quad + \|\bar{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n\| \|\bar{y}(k)\| + \|(I_n - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \boldsymbol{\alpha}\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

This combined with (10), (11), and $\|(I_n - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \boldsymbol{\alpha}\| \leq \|(I_n - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d\| \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = \max_i \alpha_i$ proves (12).

Next, we give a bound on $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k+1)\|\|\mathcal{F}(k)\|]$. From (6a) and $A(k) \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(k+1) - x(k)\| &= \|(A(k) - I_n) \otimes I_d \tilde{x}(k) \\ &\quad - (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \otimes I_d) \tilde{y}(k) - (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d) \bar{y}(k)\| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + \alpha_{\max} \|\tilde{y}(k)\| + c_2 \|\bar{y}(k)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where in the last inequality we use the triangle inequality, $\|A(k) - I_n\| \leq 1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = \alpha_{\max}$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n\| = c_2$. Note by (5) and Assumption 2(ii) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(k+1) - \nabla f(k)\| &= \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x_i(k+1)) - \nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n L^2 \|x_i(k+1) - x_i(k)\|^2} = L \|x(k+1) - x(k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By multiplying both sides of (6b) with $D_\perp \otimes I_d$ from the left, and using the definition (9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}(k+1) &= (A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{y}(k) \\ &\quad + D_\perp \otimes I_d (\nabla f(k+1) - \nabla f(k) + w(k+1) - w(k)). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the triangle inequality, using (A.1), (A.2), and $\|D_\perp\| \leq 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{y}(k+1)\| &\leq \|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{y}(k)\| \\ &\quad + L \|x(k+1) - x(k)\| + \|w(k+1) - w(k)\| \\ &\leq \|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{y}(k)\| + \alpha_{\max} L \|\tilde{y}(k)\| \\ &\quad + L \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + c_2 L \|\bar{y}(k)\| + \|w(k+1) - w(k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Since $\tilde{y}(k)$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$, and $A(k)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}(k)$, similarly to (10), we can obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|(A(k) - \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T/n) \otimes I_d \tilde{y}(k)\|\|\mathcal{F}(k)\|] \leq \rho_1 \|\tilde{y}(k)\|.$$

Then by taking conditional expectation of (A.3) on $\mathcal{F}(k)$, and recalling that $\tilde{y}(k), \bar{y}(k), \tilde{x}(k)$ are adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$, we prove (13). \square

B. Proof of Lemma 2.

Since for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the samples $\{\xi_i^p(k)\}_{p=1}^{N(k)}$ are independent, by Assumption 3 and the definition (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|w_i(k)\|^2 | x_i(k)] &= \frac{1}{N(k)^2} \sum_{p=1}^{N(k)} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h_i(x_i(k), \xi_i^p(k)) - \nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|^2 | x_i(k)]. \\ &\leq \frac{\nu^2}{N(k)}, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|w_i(k)\|^2] \leq \frac{n\nu^2}{N(k)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then by the Jensen's inequality, we obtain that for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|^2]} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}\nu}{\sqrt{N(k)}}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By (A.5) and the triangle inequality, there holds $\mathbb{E}[\|w(k+1) - w(k)\|] \leq p_k$. By taking the unconditional expectations on both sides of (12) and (13), we obtain that for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\begin{array}{c} \|\tilde{x}(k+1)\| \\ \|\tilde{y}(k+1)\| \end{array} \right) &\leq \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{cc} \rho_1 & \alpha_{\max} \\ L & \rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L \end{array} \right)}_{\triangleq \Lambda} \mathbb{E} \left(\begin{array}{c} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \\ \|\tilde{y}(k)\| \end{array} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\begin{array}{c} c_1 \\ c_2 L \end{array} \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\|] + \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ p_k \end{array} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Clearly, the spectral radius of the matrix Λ is $\rho_2 = \frac{2\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L + \sqrt{\alpha_{\max}^2 L^2 + 4\alpha_{\max} L}}{2}$. Note by $\alpha_i < \frac{(1-\rho_1)^2}{(2-\rho_1)L}$ that $\alpha_{\max} L < \frac{(1-\rho_1)^2}{(2-\rho_1)}$, which implies that $\rho_2 < 1$.

By (A.6) and the definition of $e(k)$, we obtain that

$$e(k+1) \leq \rho_2 e(k) + \sqrt{c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\|] + p_k.$$

Therefore, we recursively obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} e(k) &\leq \rho_2^k e(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho_2^t p_{k-1-t} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho_2^t \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k-1-t)\|]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the square on both sides of the above equation, using $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
e(k)^2 &\leq 3\rho_2^{2k}e(0)^2 + 3\left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}\rho_2^t p_{k-1-t}\right)^2 \\
&\quad + 3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)\left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}\rho_2^t \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k-1-t)\|]\right)^2 \\
&\leq 3\rho_2^{2k}e(0)^2 + 3\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}(\rho_2^{t/2})^2 \sum_{t=0}^{k-1}(\rho_2^{t/2} p_{k-1-t})^2 \\
&\quad + 3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}(\rho_2^{t/2})^2 \sum_{t=0}^{k-1}(\rho_2^{t/2} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k-1-t)\|])^2 \\
&\leq 3\rho_2^{2k}e(0)^2 + \frac{3}{1-\rho_2}\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}\rho_2^t p_{k-1-t}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}{1-\rho_2}\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}\rho_2^t \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k-1-t)\|]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}\rho_2^t \leq \frac{1}{1-\rho_2}$. Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho_2^t p_{k-1-t}^2 = \sum_{s=0}^{K-1} p_s^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1-i} \rho_2^k \leq \frac{1}{1-\rho_2} \sum_{s=0}^K p_s^2.$$

By summing the relation over k from 1 to K and adding $e(0)^2$ to both sides, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^K e(k)^2 &\leq 3\sum_{k=0}^K \rho_2^{2k}e(0)^2 + \frac{3}{1-\rho_2}\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho_2^t p_{k-1-t}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}{1-\rho_2}\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho_2^t \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k-1-t)\|]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{3e(0)^2}{1-\rho_2^2} + \frac{3}{(1-\rho_2)^2}\sum_{s=0}^K p_s^2 + \frac{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}{(1-\rho_2)^2}\sum_{s=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(s)\|]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This combined with $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} \leq a + b + c$ proves the lemma. \square

C. Proof of Theorem 1

By multiplying both sides of (6a) with $\frac{(\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_d)}{n}$ from the left and using Assumption 1(i), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k) &= -\frac{\mathbf{1}_n^T \alpha \otimes I_d}{n} y(k), \quad \forall k \geq 0 \\
&\stackrel{(9)}{=} -\bar{\alpha} \bar{y}(k) - \frac{(\mathbf{1}_n^T \alpha - \bar{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n^T) \otimes I_d}{n} \tilde{y}(k).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

By the triangle inequality and (11), we have

$$\|\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k)\| \leq \bar{\alpha} \|\bar{y}(k)\| + \frac{c_1}{n} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|. \tag{A.8}$$

Also, by using (3b) and Assumption 1(i), we obtain that

$$\bar{y}(k+1) = \bar{y}(k) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k+1)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k)).$$

Then by recalling that $y_i(0) = \tilde{g}_i(x_i(0))$, one can recursively show that $\bar{y}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}_i(x_i(k))$ for any $k \geq 0$. From (4) it follows that

$$\bar{y}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(k), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \tag{A.9}$$

Denote

$$g(k) \triangleq \nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\bar{x}(k)). \tag{A.10}$$

By Assumption 2 and the definition $F(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)$, we conclude that $F(x)$ is convex and its gradient function is L -Lipschitz continuous. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\bar{x}(k+1)) &\leq F(\bar{x}(k)) + (\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k))^T g(k) \\
&\quad + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(A.9)}{=} F(\bar{x}(k)) + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + (\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k))^T \left(g(k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) \right) \\
&\quad + (\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k))^T \left(\bar{y}(k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(k) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Define $v(k) \triangleq F(\bar{x}(k)) - F^*$. Note by (A.7) and the definition of $\mathcal{F}(k)$ that $\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k)$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}(k)$. By subtracting F^* from the above equation and taking the conditional expectation on $\mathcal{F}(k)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[v(k+1)|\mathcal{F}(k)] &\leq v(k) + \underbrace{\frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k)\|^2}_{\text{Term 1}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left(g(k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) \right)^T (\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k))}_{\text{Term 2}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\bar{y}(k)^T (\bar{x}(k+1) - \bar{x}(k))}_{\text{Term 3}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{(\bar{x}(k) - \bar{x}(k+1))^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(k)}_{\text{Term 4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

We estimate the four terms on the right hand side of (A.11).

By using (A.8), we bound Term 1 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Term 1} &\leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2 L}{2} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 + \frac{c_1^2 L}{2n^2} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\bar{\alpha} c_1 L}{n} \|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

Note by the Jensen's inequality that for $e = (e_1^T, \dots, e_n^T)^T$, $\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|}{n}\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|e\|^2$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\| \leq \sqrt{n} \|e\|. \tag{A.13}$$

With (A.10) and Assumption 2(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| g(k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i(\bar{x}(k)) - f_i(x_i(k))\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} L \sum_{i=1}^n \|\bar{x}(k) - x_i(k)\| \stackrel{(A.13)}{\leq} \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\tilde{x}(k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

This combined with (A.8) produces that

$$\text{Term 2} \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\bar{y}(k)\| + \frac{c_1 L}{n\sqrt{n}} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By using (A.7), we bound Term 3 by the following

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term 3} &= \bar{y}(k)^T \left(-\bar{\alpha} \bar{y}(k) - \frac{(\mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha} \mathbf{1}_n^T) \otimes I_d}{n} \tilde{y}(k) \right) \\ &\leq -\bar{\alpha} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 + \frac{c_1}{n} \|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|. \quad (\text{A.15}) \end{aligned}$$

By using (A.8), (A.13), and $ab \leq \frac{a^2}{2c} + \frac{cb^2}{2}$, $c > 0$, we bound Term 4 as follows for any $\mu \in (0, 0.5]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term 4} &\leq \|\bar{x}(k) - \bar{x}(k+1)\| \sum_{i=1}^n \|w_i(k)\|/n \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\omega(k)\| + \frac{c_1}{n\sqrt{n}} \|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\omega(k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{\mu \bar{\alpha}^2 L}{2} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\mu n L} \|\omega(k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu \bar{\alpha}^2 L}{2} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 + \frac{c_1^2}{2n^3 \mu \bar{\alpha}^2 L} \|\omega(k)\|^2 \\ &= \mu \bar{\alpha}^2 L \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 + a_1 \|\omega(k)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where $a_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{2\mu n L} + \frac{c_1^2}{2n^3 \mu \bar{\alpha}^2 L}$.

Therefore, by substituting (A.12), (A.14), (A.15), and (A.16) into (A.11), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v(k+1)|\mathcal{F}(k)] &\leq v(k) - (\bar{\alpha} - (0.5 + \mu)\bar{\alpha}^2 L) \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + a_1 \|\omega(k)\|^2 + a_2 \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\bar{y}(k)\| + a_3 \|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\| \\ &\quad + a_4 \|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2 + a_5 \|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where

$$a_2 \triangleq \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}}, a_3 \triangleq \frac{c_1 L}{n\sqrt{n}}, a_4 \triangleq \frac{c_1^2 L}{2n^2}, a_5 \triangleq \frac{c_1}{n} (1 + \bar{\alpha}L). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Taking the unconditional expectation on both sides of (A.17) and summing it over k from 0 to K , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v(k+1)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[v(0)] + a_1 \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\omega(k)\|^2] \\ &\quad - (\bar{\alpha} - (0.5 + \mu)\bar{\alpha}^2 L) \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\|^2] \\ &\quad + a_2 \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\bar{y}(k)\|] + a_3 \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|] \\ &\quad + a_4 \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2] + a_5 \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\| \|\tilde{y}(k)\|]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Define $\bar{Y}_K \triangleq \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\|^2] \right)^{1/2}$, $\tilde{X}_K \triangleq \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2] \right)^{1/2}$, and $\tilde{Y}_K \triangleq \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2] \right)^{1/2}$. Then by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to (A.19), and using (A.4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v(k+1)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[v(0)] + a_1 n \nu^2 \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{N(k)} \\ &\quad - (\bar{\alpha} - (0.5 + \mu)\bar{\alpha}^2 L) \bar{Y}_K^2 + a_2 \tilde{X}_K \bar{Y}_K \\ &\quad + a_3 \tilde{X}_K \tilde{Y}_K + a_4 \tilde{Y}_K^2 + a_5 \bar{Y}_K \tilde{Y}_K. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Recall from Lemma 2 and $(a+b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ that

$$\bar{Y}_K \leq q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K + q_2 \tilde{Y}_K, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

$$\tilde{X}_K \leq q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K + q_2 \tilde{Y}_K, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where $q_0 \triangleq \left(\frac{3}{1-\rho_2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(0)\|^2 + \|\tilde{y}(0)\|^2] \right)^{1/2}$, $q_1 \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{1-\rho_2}$, $q_2 \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}}{1-\rho_2}$, and

$$\Phi_K \triangleq \nu \left(n \sum_{s=0}^K (N(k+1)^{-1/2} + N(k)^{-1/2})^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_K \bar{Y}_K &\leq q_2 \bar{Y}_K^2 + (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K) \bar{Y}_K, \\ \tilde{X}_K \tilde{Y}_K &\leq q_2^2 \bar{Y}_K^2 + 2q_2 (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K) \bar{Y}_K + (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K)^2 \\ \tilde{Y}_K^2 &\leq q_2^2 \bar{Y}_K^2 + 2q_2 (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K) \bar{Y}_K + (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K)^2, \\ \tilde{Y}_K \bar{Y}_K &\leq q_2 \bar{Y}_K^2 + (q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K) \bar{Y}_K. \end{aligned}$$

This incorporated with (A.20) produces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v(k+1)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[v(0)] + a_1 n \nu^2 \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{N(k)} \\ &\quad - a_0 \bar{Y}_K^2 + b_0 \bar{Y}_K + c_0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where $b_0 \triangleq (a_2 + a_5)(q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K) + 2q_2(a_3 + a_4)(q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K)$, $c_0 \triangleq (a_3 + a_4)(q_0 + q_1 \Phi_K)^2$, and

$$a_0 \triangleq \bar{\alpha} - (0.5 + \mu)\bar{\alpha}^2 L - (a_2 q_2 + a_3 q_2^2 + a_4 q_2^2 + a_5 q_2). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Note from the definitions of c_1 and c_2 in Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 &= \frac{\sqrt{3(c_1^2 + c_2^2 L^2)}}{1-\rho_2} = \frac{\sqrt{3(1+L^2)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 - 3n\bar{\alpha}^2}{1-\rho_2} \\ &< \frac{\sqrt{3n(1+L^2)} \alpha_{\max}}{1-\rho_2}. \end{aligned}$$

This combined with (A.18) and $\mu \in (0, 0.5]$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &> \bar{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}^2 L - \bar{\alpha} \alpha_{\max} L (1 + d_\alpha (1/L + \bar{\alpha})) \frac{\sqrt{3(1+L^2)}}{1-\rho_2} \\ &\quad - \bar{\alpha} L \left(d_\alpha + \frac{d_\alpha^2 \bar{\alpha}}{2} \right) \frac{3(1+L^2) \alpha_{\max}^2}{(1-\rho_2)^2} \text{ with } d_\alpha = \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n\bar{\alpha}}}. \end{aligned}$$

This combined with $-\bar{\alpha} \geq -\alpha_{\max}$ implies that

$$a_0 > \bar{\alpha} \left(1 - \alpha_{\max}^2 L \left(d_\alpha + \frac{d_\alpha^2 \alpha_{\max}}{2} \right) \frac{3(1+L^2)}{(1-\rho_2)^2} \right)$$

$$- \alpha_{\max} L \left(1 + (1 + d_\alpha (L^{-1} + \alpha_{\max})) \frac{\sqrt{3(1+L^2)}}{1-\rho_2} \right).$$

It can be seen that $a_0 > 0$ for sufficiently small $\alpha_i > 0$.

Since $v(k) \geq 0$, from (A.24) it follows that for any $K \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[v(0)] + a_1 n \nu^2 \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{1}{N(k)} - a_0 \bar{Y}_K^2 + b_0 \bar{Y}_K + c_0 \geq 0.$$

By recalling the condition $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N(k)} < \infty$, we conclude from (A.23) that $\Phi_K < \infty$ for any $K \geq 1$. Hence $b_0 < \infty, c_0 < \infty$, and \bar{Y}_K is uniformly bounded. Since $\{\bar{Y}_K\}$ is an increasing sequence, we conclude that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \bar{Y}_K = \bar{Y}_\infty < \infty.$$

Similarly, from (A.21) and (A.22), we obtain that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{Y}_K = \tilde{Y}_\infty < \infty \text{ and } \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_K = \tilde{X}_\infty < \infty.$$

The above two equations imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{y}(k)\|^2] < \infty &\Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 < \infty, \quad a.s., \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2] < \infty &\Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2 < \infty, \quad a.s., \quad (\text{A.26}) \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2] < \infty &\Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2 < \infty, \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from (A.4) and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N(k)} < \infty$ that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|^2] < \infty \Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|w(k)\|^2 < \infty, \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

By using (A.17) and $ab \leq \frac{a^2+b^2}{2}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[v(k+1)|\mathcal{F}(k)] &\leq v(k) - \bar{\alpha}(1 - (0.5 + \mu)\bar{\alpha}L) \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2 \\ &+ a_1 \|\omega(k)\|^2 + \frac{a_2 + a_3}{2} \|\tilde{x}(k)\|^2 + \\ &+ \frac{a_3 + 2a_4 + a_5}{2} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|^2 + \frac{a_2 + a_5}{2} \|\bar{y}(k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

We then use (A.26), (A.27), apply the Robbins-Siegmund theorem in [55] to (A.28), and conclude that $v(k) = F(\bar{x}(k)) - F^*$ converges almost surely to some finite random variable. Therefore, $\{\bar{x}(k)\}$ is almost surely bounded. Let \bar{x} be a cluster point of $\{\bar{x}(k)\}$. Then there exists a subsequence k_s such that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}(k_s) = \bar{x}$. Note from (A.26) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| = 0$, *a.s.*, and hence

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_i(k_s) = \bar{x}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

Note by (A.26) and (A.27) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{y}(k) = 0$, *a.s.* and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w(k) = 0$, *a.s.*, respectively. Then by (A.9) there holds $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i(k)) = 0$. This incorporated with (A.29) produces $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\bar{x}) = 0$. Hence, \bar{x} is an optimal solution to the problem (1). Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}(k)) - F^* = F(\bar{x}) - F^* = 0, \quad a.s.$$

This completes the proof. \square

D. Proof of Corollary 1

Denote by $\beta \triangleq \alpha L$. By (17) and $c_0 < 1$, we have that

$$\beta < \frac{c_0 + 1 + 2\sqrt{3}L - \sqrt{(c_0 + 1 + 2\sqrt{3}L)^2 - 4c_0}}{2} < c_0.$$

This implies that $\beta^2 - (c_0 + 1 + 2\sqrt{3}L)\beta + c_0 > 0$, and hence $(1-\beta)(c_0-\beta) > 2\sqrt{3}\beta L$. By the definition of ρ_2 in Lemma 2, using $\beta < c_0$ and $c_0 = \frac{(1-\rho_1)^2}{(2-\rho_1)}$, there holds

$$1 - \rho_2 > 1 - \rho_1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{c_0^2 + 4c_0}}{2} = \frac{c_0 - \beta}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$(1-\beta)(1-\rho_2) - \sqrt{3}\beta L > (1-\beta) \frac{c_0 - \beta}{2} - \sqrt{3}\beta L > 0.$$

This implies that

$$1 - \beta > \frac{\sqrt{3}\beta L}{1 - \rho_2}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Since all the agents take the same stepsize $\alpha_i \equiv \alpha$, we have $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha$, $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = \sqrt{n}\alpha$, and $q_2 = \frac{\sqrt{3n}\beta}{1-\rho_2}$. Then by (A.18), we obtain that $a_2 = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{n}}$ and $a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = 0$. Thus, from (A.25) it follows that $a_0 = \alpha \left(1 - (0.5 + \mu)\beta - \frac{\sqrt{3}\beta L}{1-\rho_2} \right)$. This combined with (A.30) and $\mu \in (0, 0.5)$ makes $a_0 > 0$. The rest of the proof is the same as that of Theorem 1. \square

APPENDIX B PROOFS OF SECTION IV

A. Proof of Lemma 3.

We first give an upper bound on $\|\bar{x}(k+1) - x^*\|$. By using (A.7), (A.9), and $F(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x}(k+1) - x^*\| &= \|\bar{x}(k) - \bar{\alpha}\bar{y}(k) - \frac{(\mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}\mathbf{1}_n^T) \otimes I_d}{n} \tilde{y}(k) - x^*\| \\ &= \left\| \bar{x}(k) - x^* - \bar{\alpha}\nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) + \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\bar{x}(k)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) - \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(\mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}\mathbf{1}_n^T) \otimes I_d}{n} \tilde{y}(k) \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\bar{x}(k) - \bar{\alpha}\nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) - x^*\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\bar{x}(k)) - \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) \right\| \\ &\quad + \bar{\alpha} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) - \bar{y}(k) \right\| + \frac{c_1}{n} \|\tilde{y}(k)\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|\bar{x}(k) - \bar{\alpha}\nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) - x^*\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(k) - \bar{x}(k)\| + \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|w_i(k)\| + \frac{c_1}{n} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where in (a) we use the triangle inequality and $\|\mathbf{1}_n^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}\mathbf{1}_n^T\| = c_1$, and in (b) we use Assumption 2(ii). \square

We introduce an inequality from [49, Eqn. (2.1.24)] on the η -strongly convex and L -smooth function $f(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (x-y)^T(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)) &\geq \frac{\eta L}{\eta+L} \|x-y\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{\eta+L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

By $\alpha_i \in (0, \frac{2}{\eta+L}]$, we have that $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \frac{2}{\eta+L}]$ and $\frac{2}{\bar{\alpha}} - \eta \geq L$. Define $L' \triangleq \frac{2}{\bar{\alpha}} - \eta$. From Assumptions 2(ii) and 4 it is seen that the function $F(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)$ is η -strongly convex and L' -smooth. Thus, by applying (B.2) with $x = x(k)$ and $y = x^*$, from $\nabla F(x^*) = 0$ and $\frac{2}{\eta+L'} = \bar{\alpha}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{x}(k) - \bar{\alpha} \nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) - x^*\|^2 \\ &= \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|^2 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{x}(k))\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\bar{\alpha}(\bar{x}(k) - x^*)^T(\nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) - \nabla F(x^*)) \\ &\leq \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|^2 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{x}(k))\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{\eta L'}{\eta+L'} \|x_k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta+L'} \|\nabla F(x_k)\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\bar{\alpha}\eta L'}{\eta+L'} \right) \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|^2 - \bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{2}{\eta+L'} - \bar{\alpha} \right) \|\nabla F(x_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\bar{\alpha}\eta L'}{\eta+L'} \right) \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|^2 = (1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta)^2 \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can bound the first term of (B.1) by

$$\|\bar{x}(k) - \alpha \nabla F(\bar{x}(k)) - x^*\| \leq (1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta) \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Therefore, by plugging (B.3) into (B.1) and using (A.13), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x}(k+1) - x^*\| &\leq (1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta) \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\| \\ &+ \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + \frac{c_1}{n} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Next, we provide an upper bound on $\|\tilde{y}(k)\|$. By using $\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x^*) = 0$ and (A.9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{y}(k)\| &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(k) + \nabla f_i(x_i(k)) - \nabla f_i(x^*)) \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|w_i(k)\| + \frac{L}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(k) - x^*\| \\ &\stackrel{(A.13)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)x^*\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\| \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|(\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)x^*\| \\ &\stackrel{(8)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + L \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used the triangle inequality and Assumption 2(ii), in (b) we added and subtracted the term $(\mathbf{1} \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)$ and applied the triangle inequality. This combined with (12) and (13) produces

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{x}(k+1)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] \leq (\rho_1 + c_1 L / \sqrt{n}) \|\tilde{x}(k)\|$$

$$+ \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + c_1 L \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\| + \alpha_{\max} \|\tilde{y}(k)\|, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}(k+1)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] &\leq (\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L) \|\tilde{y}(k)\| \\ &+ (L + c_2 L^2 / \sqrt{n}) \|\tilde{x}(k)\| + \mathbb{E}[\|w(k+1) - w(k)\| | \mathcal{F}(k)] \\ &+ \frac{c_2 L}{\sqrt{n}} \|w(k)\| + c_2 L^2 \|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Therefore, by taking unconditional expectations on both sides of (B.4), (B.5), and (B.6), we prove the lemma. \square

B. Proof of Theorem 2

The spectral radius of the nonnegative matrix $J(\alpha)$ satisfying $\rho(J(\alpha)) < 1$ is equivalent to that all leading principle minors of $I_3 - J(\alpha)$ are positive. Let $J_1 = 1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta$. Then $\det(I_1 - J_1) = \bar{\alpha}\eta > 0$. Let

$$J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \bar{\alpha}\eta & \frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} \\ c_1 L & \rho_1 + \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then by $d_\alpha = \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}\bar{\alpha}}$ and $\kappa = L/\eta$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I_2 - J_2) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\eta & -\frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} \\ -c_1 L & 1 - (\rho_1 + \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \bar{\alpha}L(1 - \rho_1 - \bar{\alpha}d_\alpha \kappa(L + \eta)) / \kappa. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I_3 - J(\alpha)) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\eta & -\frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} & -\frac{c_1}{n} \\ -c_1 L & 1 - (\rho_1 + \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}}) & -\alpha_{\max} \\ -c_2 L^2 & -(L + \frac{c_2 L^2}{\sqrt{n}}) & 1 - (\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -c_2 L^2 \det \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} & -\frac{c_1}{n} \\ 1 - (\rho_1 + \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}}) & -\alpha_{\max} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + (L + \frac{c_2 L^2}{\sqrt{n}}) \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\eta & -\frac{c_1}{n} \\ -c_1 L & -\alpha_{\max} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + (1 - (\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L)) \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\eta & -\frac{\bar{\alpha}L}{\sqrt{n}} \\ -c_1 L & 1 - (\rho_1 + \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -c_2 L^2 \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}L\alpha_{\max}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{c_1}{n} \left(1 - \rho_1 - \frac{c_1 L}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(L + \frac{c_2 L^2}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \left(\alpha_{\max} \bar{\alpha}\eta + \frac{c_1^2 L}{n} \right) \\ &\quad + (1 - (\rho_1 + \alpha_{\max} L)) \bar{\alpha}L(1 - \rho_1 - \bar{\alpha}d_\alpha \kappa(L + \eta)) / \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Note by $d_\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i - \bar{\alpha})^2}}{\sqrt{n}\bar{\alpha}}$ and (11) that

$$c_1 = \sqrt{n}\bar{\alpha}d_\alpha, \quad c_2 = \sqrt{c_1^2 + n\bar{\alpha}^2} = \sqrt{n}\bar{\alpha}\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I_3 - J(\alpha)) &= -\bar{\alpha}^2 L^2 \sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} (\alpha_{\max} L + d_\alpha (1 - \rho_1 - \bar{\alpha}d_\alpha L)) \\ &\quad - \bar{\alpha} L^2 \left(1 + \bar{\alpha}L\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} \right) (\alpha_{\max} + \kappa\bar{\alpha}d_\alpha^2) / \kappa \\ &\quad + \bar{\alpha}L(1 - \rho_1 - \alpha_{\max} L) (1 - \rho_1 - (\kappa + 1)\bar{\alpha}Ld_\alpha) / \kappa \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bar{\alpha}L \left((1 - \rho_1 - \alpha_{\max}L)(1 - \rho_1 - (\kappa + 1)\bar{\alpha}Ld_\alpha) / \kappa \right. \\
&\quad - L \left(1 + \bar{\alpha}L\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} \right) (\alpha_{\max} + \kappa\bar{\alpha}d_\alpha^2) / \kappa \\
&\quad \left. - \bar{\alpha}L\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} (\alpha_{\max}L + d_\alpha(1 - \rho_1 - \bar{\alpha}Ld_\alpha)) \right). \\
&\geq \bar{\alpha}L \left((1 - \rho_1)^2 / \kappa - (\alpha_{\max}L + \bar{\alpha}L(\kappa + 1)d_\alpha)(1 - \rho_1) / \kappa \right. \\
&\quad - L \left(1 + \bar{\alpha}L\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} \right) (\alpha_{\max} + \kappa\bar{\alpha}d_\alpha^2) / \kappa \quad (\text{B.9}) \\
&\quad \left. - \bar{\alpha}L\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} (\alpha_{\max}L + d_\alpha(1 - \rho_1)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From (20) it is seen that $\alpha_i L < \beta^*$, hence $\alpha_{\max}L < \beta^*$ and $\bar{\alpha}L < \beta^*$. Then by (B.9) and (20), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(I_3 - J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \\
&\geq \bar{\alpha}L \left((1 - \rho_1)^2 - \beta^*(1 + (\kappa + 1)d_\alpha)(1 - \rho_1) \right. \\
&\quad - \beta^* \left(1 + \beta^*\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1} \right) (1 + \kappa d_\alpha^2) \\
&\quad \left. - \beta^*\kappa\sqrt{d_\alpha^2 + 1}(\beta^* + d_\alpha(1 - \rho_1)) \right) / \kappa \\
&= \bar{\alpha}L \left(-c_3(\beta^*)^2 - c_4\beta^* + (1 - \rho_1)^2 \right) / \kappa > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note from (20) that $\bar{\alpha}L < \frac{1 - \rho_1}{d_\alpha \kappa (L + \eta)}$. Hence by (B.7) it is seen that $\det(I_2 - J_2) > 0$. Therefore, (20) is a sufficient condition for guaranteeing $\rho(J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) < 1$.

From $N(k) = \lceil q^{-2k} \rceil$ and (A.5) it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \leq \sqrt{n\nu}q^k$ for any $k \geq 0$. Then by using (19) and the triangle equality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
z(k+1) &\leq J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})z(k) + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\nu \\ c_1\nu \\ \sqrt{n\nu}(1+q) + c_2L\nu \end{pmatrix} q^k \\
&\leq J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^{k+1}z(0) + \sum_{t=0}^k J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^t q^{k-t} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\nu \\ c_1\nu \\ \sqrt{n\nu}(1+q) + c_2L\nu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.10})
\end{aligned}$$

By noting that $\rho(J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) < 1$, $J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^k$ converges to zero at the linear rate $\mathcal{O}(\rho(J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}))^k)$ (see [57, Eqn. (7.10.5)]). Thus,

$$z(k) \leq \mathcal{O}(\rho(J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}))^k) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{O}(\rho(J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}))^t) q^{k-1-t}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Note that for any $\rho < q$,

$$\sum_{t=0}^k \rho^t q^{k-t} = q^k \sum_{t=0}^k (\rho/q)^t \leq \frac{q^k}{1 - \rho/q} = \frac{q^{k+1}}{q - \rho},$$

while for any $\rho > q$, $\sum_{t=0}^k \rho^t q^{k-t} \leq \frac{q^{k+1}}{\rho - q}$. Hence $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \rho^t q^{k-t} \leq \frac{\max\{p, q\}^k}{|\rho - q|}$. This combined with (B.11) proves the theorem. \square

C. Proof of Corollary 2

From $\alpha_i \equiv \alpha$, (18), and (21) it follows that $d_\alpha = 0$, $\alpha_{\max} = \alpha$, and $J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \hat{J}(\alpha)$. Thus, $\det(I_2 - J_2) > 0$ by (B.7). Then by defining $\beta \triangleq \alpha L$ and using (B.9), we obtain by (22) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha)) \\
&= -\frac{\beta}{\kappa} \left((1 + \kappa)\beta^2 + (2 - \rho_1)\beta - (1 - \rho_1)^2 \right) > 0. \quad (\text{B.12})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the step-size (22) makes $\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)) < 1$.

Note by $\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)) < q$ that $\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)/q) < 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=0}^k \hat{J}(\alpha)^t q^{k-t} &= q^k \sum_{t=0}^k (\hat{J}(\alpha)/q)^t \\
&= q^k (I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha)/q)^{-1} (I_3 - (\hat{J}(\alpha)/q)^{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (B.10) and $J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \hat{J}(\alpha)$ implies that for sufficiently large k ,

$$\begin{aligned}
z(k+1) &\approx \hat{J}(\alpha)^{k+1}z(0) \\
&+ q^k (I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha)/q)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\nu \\ c_1\nu \\ \sqrt{n\nu}(1+q) + c_2L\nu \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha$, $c_1 = 0$, and $c_2 = \sqrt{n}\alpha$. \square

D. Proof of Corollary 3

From $N(k) = B$ and (A.5) it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\|w(k)\|] \leq \sqrt{n/B}\nu$. Similarly to (B.10), we obtain that

$$z(k+1) \leq J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^{k+1}z(0) + \sum_{t=0}^k \frac{J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^t}{\sqrt{B}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\nu \\ c_1\nu \\ 2\sqrt{n\nu} + c_2L\nu \end{pmatrix}.$$

It has been shown in Corollary 2 that the step-size satisfying (22) makes $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha$, $c_1 = 0$, and $c_2 = \sqrt{n}\alpha$, $J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \hat{J}(\alpha)$, and $\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha)) < 1$. Hence

$$z(k+1) \leq \hat{J}(\alpha)^{k+1}z(0) + \nu \sum_{t=0}^k \frac{\hat{J}(\alpha)^t}{\sqrt{B}} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ 0\nu \\ 2\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n}\alpha L \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note by [57, Eqn. (7.10.11)] that $\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \hat{J}(\alpha)^p = (I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))^{-1}$. Therefore, z_k converge to $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_k$ with a geometric rate $\mathcal{O}(\rho(\hat{J}(\alpha))^k)$, and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} z(k) \leq \frac{\nu(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))^{-1}}{\sqrt{B}} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ 0 \\ (2 + \alpha L)\sqrt{n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By $(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))^{-1} = \frac{(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))^*}{\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}(k) - x^*\|] \leq \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{B}\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))} \times \\
&[\alpha((1 - \rho_1)(1 - \rho_1 - \alpha L) - \alpha L(1 + \alpha L)) + (2 + \alpha L)\alpha^2 L] \\
&= \frac{\alpha\nu((1 - \rho_1)^2 + \rho_1\alpha L)}{\sqrt{B}\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))}, \quad \text{and} \\
&\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x(k) - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}(k)\|] \\
&\leq \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{B}\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))} [\alpha\sqrt{n}\alpha^2 L^2 + \alpha^2\eta(2 + \alpha L)\sqrt{n}] \\
&= \frac{\alpha^2\sqrt{n\nu}(\alpha L^2 + \eta(2 + \alpha L))}{\sqrt{B}\det(I_3 - \hat{J}(\alpha))}.
\end{aligned}$$

This combined with (B.12) proves the results, \square

E. Proof of Theorem 5

Since $N(k) = \lceil (k+1)^{2\theta} \rceil$ and $\rho(J(\alpha)) < 1$, by using the similar procedures for deriving (B.10) and (B.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} z(k) &\leq J(\alpha)z(k) + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}\nu \\ c_1\nu \\ 2\sqrt{n}\nu + c_2L\nu \end{pmatrix} k^{-\theta} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\rho(J(\alpha))^k) + \sum_{t=1}^k \mathcal{O}(\rho(J(\alpha))^{k-t})t^{-\theta} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $z(k) \leq C_3 k^{-\theta}$ for some $C_3 > 0$, and hence $\|z(k)\| \leq \epsilon$ for any $k \geq K_3(\epsilon) = \left(\frac{C_3}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/\theta}$. Thus, the number of communication rounds required is $2\lceil \mathcal{E} \rceil K_3(\epsilon)$, and the number of sampled gradients required is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K_3(\epsilon)} N(k) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K_3(\epsilon)} (k+1)^{2\theta} \leq \int_1^{K_3(\epsilon)+1} t^{2\theta} dt \\ &= \frac{t^{2\theta+1}}{2\theta} \Big|_1^{K_3(\epsilon)} = (2\theta+1)^{-1} \left(\frac{C_3}{\epsilon}\right)^{(2\theta+1)/\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Yi, Y. Hong, and F. Liu, "Initialization-free distributed algorithms for optimal resource allocation with feasibility constraints and application to economic dispatch of power systems," *Automatica*, vol. 74, pp. 259–269, 2016.
- [2] Q. Liu, X. Le, and K. Li, "A distributed optimization algorithm based on multiagent network for economic dispatch with region partitioning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2019.
- [3] H. Fang, C. Shang, and J. Chen, "An optimization-based shared control framework with applications in multi-robot systems," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 61, no. 1, p. 014201, 2018.
- [4] A. Nedich, A. Olshevsky, and C. A. Uribe, "Fast convergence rates for distributed non-bayesian learning," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 5538–5553, 2017.
- [5] Y. Wang, P. Lin, and Y. Hong, "Distributed regression estimation with incomplete data in multi-agent networks," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 61, no. 9, p. 092202, 2018.
- [6] P. A. Forero, A. Cano, and G. B. Giannakis, "Consensus-based distributed support vector machines," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, no. May, pp. 1663–1707, 2010.
- [7] A. Nedich and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, p. 48, 2009.
- [8] Y. Lou, L. Yu, S. Wang, and P. Yi, "Privacy preservation in distributed subgradient optimization algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 2154–2165, 2017.
- [9] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 944–966, 2015.
- [10] D. Jakovetić, J. Xavier, and J. M. Moura, "Fast distributed gradient methods," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 1131–1146, 2014.
- [11] R. Xin and U. A. Khan, "A linear algorithm for optimization over directed graphs with geometric convergence," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 315–320, 2018.
- [12] A. Nedich, A. Olshevsky, and W. Shi, "Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2597–2633, 2017.
- [13] J. Xu, S. Zhu, Y. C. Soh, and L. Xie, "Convergence of asynchronous distributed gradient methods over stochastic networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 434–448, 2017.
- [14] D. P. Palomar and M. Chiang, "A tutorial on decomposition methods for network utility maximization," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1439–1451, 2006.
- [15] J. F. Mota, J. M. Xavier, P. M. Aguiar, and M. Püschel, "D-admm: A communication-efficient distributed algorithm for separable optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 2718–2723, 2013.
- [16] W. Shi, Q. Ling, K. Yuan, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "On the linear convergence of the ADMM in decentralized consensus optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1750–1761, 2014.
- [17] T.-H. Chang, A. Nedich, and A. Scaglione, "Distributed constrained optimization by consensus-based primal-dual perturbation method," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1524–1538, 2014.
- [18] P. Yi, Y. Hong, and F. Liu, "Distributed gradient algorithm for constrained optimization with application to load sharing in power systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 83, pp. 45–52, 2015.
- [19] J. Lei, H.-F. Chen, and H.-T. Fang, "Primal-dual algorithm for distributed constrained optimization," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 96, pp. 110–117, 2016.
- [20] N. N. Schraudolph, J. Yu, and S. Günter, "A stochastic quasi-newton method for online convex optimization," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, vol. 2, 2007, pp. 436–443.
- [21] A. Mokhtari and A. Ribeiro, "Global convergence of online limited memory BFGS," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 16, pp. 3151–3181, 2015.
- [22] A. Mokhtari, W. Shi, Q. Ling, and A. Ribeiro, "DQM: decentralized quadratically approximated alternating direction method of multipliers," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 19, pp. 5158–5173, 2016.
- [23] H. Wai, N. M. Freris, A. Nedic, and A. Scaglione, "SUCAG: stochastic unbiased curvature-aided gradient method for distributed optimization," in *57th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1751–1756.
- [24] Y. Li, N. M. Freris, P. G. Voulgaris, and D. M. Stipanovic, "D-SOP: distributed second order proximal method for convex composite optimization," in *2020 American Control Conference*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 2844–2849.
- [25] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, "A survey of distributed optimization," *Annual Reviews in Control*, 2019.
- [26] G. Notarstefano, I. Notarnicola, A. Camisa *et al.*, "Distributed optimization for smart cyber-physical networks," *Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 253–383, 2019.
- [27] S. S. Ram, A. Nedich, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 147, no. 3, pp. 516–545, 2010.
- [28] P. Bianchi and J. Jakubowicz, "Convergence of a multi-agent projected stochastic gradient algorithm for non-convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 391–405, 2012.
- [29] A. Agarwal and J. C. Duchi, "Distributed delayed stochastic optimization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2011, pp. 873–881.
- [30] L. Bottou, F. E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, "Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning," *SIAM Review*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 223–311, 2018.
- [31] K. Srivastava and A. Nedich, "Distributed asynchronous constrained stochastic optimization," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 772–790, 2011.
- [32] J. Lei, H.-F. Chen, and H.-T. Fang, "Asymptotic properties of primal-dual algorithm for distributed stochastic optimization over random networks with imperfect communications," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 2159–2188, 2018.
- [33] A. H. Sayed *et al.*, "Adaptation, learning, and optimization over networks," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 7, no. 4-5, pp. 311–801, 2014.
- [34] A. Nedich and A. Olshevsky, "Stochastic gradient-push for strongly convex functions on time-varying directed graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 3936–3947, 2016.
- [35] M. O. Sayin, N. D. Vanli, S. S. Kozat, and T. Başar, "Stochastic subgradient algorithms for strongly convex optimization over distributed networks," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 248–260, 2017.
- [36] D. Yuan, Y. Hong, D. W. Ho, and G. Jiang, "Optimal distributed stochastic mirror descent for strongly convex optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 90, pp. 196–203, 2018.
- [37] D. Jakovetić, D. Bajovic, A. K. Sahu, and S. Kar, "Convergence rates for distributed stochastic optimization over random networks," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 4238–4245.
- [38] S. Pu and A. Nedich, "Distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods," *Mathematical Programming*, pp. 1–49, 2020.

- [39] R. Xin, A. K. Sahu, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Distributed stochastic optimization with gradient tracking over strongly-connected networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07266*, 2019.
- [40] S. A. Alghunaim and A. H. Sayed, "Distributed coupled multi-agent stochastic optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 175–190, 2020.
- [41] U. V. Shanbhag and J. H. Blanchet, "Budget-constrained stochastic approximation," in *Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2015*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 368–379.
- [42] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan, "Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming," *Math. Programming*, vol. 156, no. 1-2, pp. 59–99, 2016.
- [43] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien, "SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2014, pp. 1646–1654.
- [44] R. Johnson and T. Zhang, "Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2013, pp. 315–323.
- [45] A. Mokhtari and A. Ribeiro, "Dsa: Decentralized double stochastic averaging gradient algorithm," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 2165–2199, 2016.
- [46] K. Yuan, B. Ying, J. Liu, and A. H. Sayed, "Variance-reduced stochastic learning by networked agents under random reshuffling," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 351–366, 2018.
- [47] R. Xin, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Variance-reduced decentralized stochastic optimization with accelerated convergence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04230*, 2019.
- [48] S. Pu, W. Shi, J. Xu, and A. Nedich, "A push-pull gradient method for distributed optimization in networks," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3385–3390.
- [49] Y. Nesterov, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 87.
- [50] E. Hazan and S. Kale, "Beyond the regret minimization barrier: optimal algorithms for stochastic strongly-convex optimization," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 2489–2512, 2014.
- [51] I. Lobel and O. Asuman, "Distributed subgradient methods for convex optimization over random networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1291–1306, 2011.
- [52] A. Nedic, A. Olshevsky, and M. G. Rabbat, "Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 953–976, 2018.
- [53] J. Cortés and B. Ghahserifard, "Distributed strategies for generating weight-balanced and doubly stochastic digraphs," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 539–557, 2012.
- [54] M. Franceschelli, A. Gasparri, A. Giua, and C. Seatzu, "Decentralized estimation of laplacian eigenvalues in multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 1031–1036, 2013.
- [55] H. Robbins and D. Siegmund, "A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications," in *Optimizing Methods in Statistics*. Elsevier, 1971, pp. 23 3–257.
- [56] J. Xu, S. Zhu, Y. C. Soh, and L. Xie, "Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes," in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 2055–2060.
- [57] C. D. Meyer, *Matrix Analysis and Applied Linear Algebra*. SIAM, 2000.