

Tailoring Gradient Methods for Differentially-Private Distributed Optimization

Yongqiang Wang, Angelia Nedić

Abstract—Decentralized optimization is gaining increased traction due to its widespread applications in large-scale machine learning and multi-agent systems. The same mechanism that enables its success, i.e., information sharing among participating agents, however, also leads to the disclosure of individual agents’ private information, which is unacceptable when sensitive data are involved. As differential privacy is becoming a de facto standard for privacy preservation, recently results have emerged integrating differential privacy with distributed optimization. However, directly incorporating differential privacy design in existing distributed optimization approaches significantly compromises optimization accuracy. In this paper, we propose to redesign and tailor gradient methods for differentially-private distributed optimization, and propose two differential-privacy oriented gradient methods that can ensure both rigorous ϵ -differential privacy and optimality. The first algorithm is based on static-consensus based gradient methods and it can ensure both almost sure convergence to an optimal solution and a finite privacy budget even when the number of iterations goes to infinity. To our knowledge, it is the first algorithm that can achieve both goals simultaneously. The second algorithm is based on dynamic-consensus (gradient-tracking) based distributed optimization methods and, hence, it is applicable to general directed interaction graph topologies. Numerical simulations using a distributed estimation problem and experimental results on a benchmark dataset confirm the effectiveness of the proposed approaches.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of optimizing a global objective function through the cooperation of multiple agents has gained increased attention in recent years. This is driven by its wide applicability to many engineering and scientific domains, ranging from cooperative control [1], distributed sensing [2], sensor networks [3], to large-scale machine learning [4]. In many of these applications, each agent only has access to a local objective function and can only communicate with its local neighbors. The agents cooperate to minimize the summation of all individual agents’ local objective functions. Such a distributed optimization problem can be formulated in the following general form:

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

where m is the number of agents, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a decision variable common to all agents, while $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a local objective function private to agent i .

The work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grants ECCS-1912702, CCF-2106293, and CCF-2106336.

Yongqiang Wang is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA yongqi@clermson.edu

Angelia Nedić is with the School of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281, USA angelia.nedich@asu.edu

Plenty of approaches have been reported to solve the above distributed optimization problem since the seminal work of [5], with some of the commonly used approaches including gradient methods (e.g., [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11]), distributed alternating direction method of multipliers (e.g., [12], [13]), and distributed Newton methods (e.g., [14]). Among these approaches, gradient-based approaches are gaining increased traction due to their efficiency in both computation complexity and storage requirement, which is particularly appealing for agents with limited computational or storage capabilities. In general, existing gradient based distributed optimization algorithms can be divided into two categories. The first category combines gradient-descent operations and average-consensus mechanisms (referred to as static-consensus hereafter) by directly concatenating gradient-descent with a consensus operation of individual agents’ optimization variables. Typical examples include [6], [15]. Such approaches are simple and efficient in computation since they only require an agent to share one variable in each iteration. However, these approaches are only applicable in balanced graphs (the sum of each agent’s in-neighbor coupling weights equal to the sum of its out-neighbor coupling weights). The second category circumvents the balanced-graph restriction by exploiting consensus mechanisms able to track time-varying signals (so-called dynamic consensus, applicable to general directed graphs) to track the global gradient (see, e.g., [9], [10], [11], [16], [17]). It can ensure convergence to an optimal solution under constant stepsizes and, hence, can achieve faster convergence. However, such approaches need every agent to maintain and share an additional gradient-tracking variable besides the optimization variable, which doubles the communication overhead.

Despite the enormous success of gradient based distributed optimization algorithms, they all explicitly share optimization variables and/or gradient estimates in every iteration, which becomes a problem in applications involving sensitive data. For example, in the rendezvous problem where a group of agents uses distributed optimization to cooperatively find an optimal assembly point, participating agents may want to keep their initial positions private, which is particularly important in unfriendly environments [13]. In sensor network based localization, the positions of sensor agents should be kept private in sensitive (hostile) environments as well [13], [18]. In fact, without an effective privacy mechanism in place, the results in [13], [18], [19] show that a participating agent’s sensitive information, such as position, can be easily inferred by an adversary or other participating agents in distributed-optimization based rendezvous and localization approaches. Another example underscoring the importance of privacy protection in distributed optimization is machine learning where exchanged data may contain sensitive information such as

medical records or salary information [20]. In fact, recent results in [21] show that without a privacy mechanism in place, an adversary can use shared information to precisely recover the raw data used for training (pixel-wise accurate for images and token-wise matching for texts).

To address the pressing need for privacy protection in distributed optimization, recently plenty of efforts have been reported to counteract potential privacy breaches in distributed optimization. One approach resorts to partially homomorphic encryption, which has been employed in both our own prior results [13], [22], and others [23], [24]. However, such approaches incur heavy communication and computation overhead. Another approach employs the structural properties of distributed optimization to inject temporally or spatially correlated uncertainties, which can also provide privacy protection in distributed optimization. For example, [20], [25] showed that privacy can be enabled by adding a *constant* uncertain parameter in the projection step or stepsizes. The authors of [26] showed that network structure can be leveraged to construct spatially correlated “structured” noise to cover information. However, since the uncertainties injected by these approaches are correlated, their enabled privacy is restricted: projection based privacy depends on the size of the projection set – a large projection set nullifies privacy protection whereas a small projection set offers strong privacy protection but requires *a priori* knowledge of the optimal solution; “structured” noise based approaches require each agent to have a certain number of neighbors that do not share information with the adversary. Differential Privacy (DP) [27] is becoming increasingly popular in privacy protection. It employs uncorrelated noises, and hence can provide strong privacy protection for a participating agent, even when all its neighbors are compromised. As DP is achieving remarkable successes in various applications [28], [29], [30], [31], [32] and becoming a de facto standard for privacy protection, some efforts have also been reported incorporating DP-noise with distributed optimization. For example, DP based approaches have been proposed to obscure shared information in distributed optimization by injecting DP-noise to exchanged messages [18], [33], [34], [35], or objective functions [36]. However, while obscuring information, a persistent DP-noise also unavoidably compromises the accuracy of optimization, leading to a fundamental trade-off between privacy and accuracy. In fact, recently the investigation in [21] indicates that DP-based defense can achieve reasonable privacy protection “*only when the noise variance is large enough to degrade accuracy [21].*”

In this paper, we propose to tailor gradient methods for differentially-private distributed optimization. More specifically, motivated by the observation that persistent DP-noise has to be repeatedly injected in every iteration of gradient based methods to ensure a strong privacy protection, which results in significant reduction in optimization accuracy, we propose to gradually weaken coupling strength in distributed optimization to attenuate DP-noise that is added to every shared message. We judiciously design the weakening factor sequences such that the consensus and convergence to an optimal solution are ensured even in the presence of persistent DP-noise.

The main contributions are as follows: 1) We propose two gradient-based methods for differentially private distributed optimization. The first one is based on static-consensus combined with a gradient method, which needs every agent to store and share one variable in each iteration. The second one is based on dynamic-consensus (gradient-tracking) combined with an approximate gradient method, which needs every agent to store and share two variables, but it is applicable to general directed graphs; 2) We rigorously prove that both algorithms can ensure almost sure convergence of all agents to the optimal solution even in the presence of persistent DP-noise, which, to our knowledge, has not been achieved before; 3) We prove that both algorithms can ensure rigorous ϵ -differential privacy for participating agents’ objective functions, even when all communications are observable to adversaries. More interestingly, the first algorithm can ensure a finite privacy budget even when the number of iterations goes to infinity. To our knowledge, it is the first algorithm that can achieve this goal under the constraint of ensured almost sure convergence to the optimal solution; 4) Even without taking privacy into consideration, the two proposed algorithms and theoretical derivations are of interest themselves. Except requiring the global objective function to be convex and the gradients of agents’ objective functions to be Lipschitz continuous, we do not impose additional assumptions such as coercive or strongly-convex objective functions, or bounded gradients, which are commonly used in existing gradient based distributed optimization algorithms. The convergence analysis for the two proposed algorithms has fundamental differences from existing proof techniques. More specifically, existing convergence analysis of distributed gradient descent algorithms (e.g., [6]) and their stochastic variants (e.g., [37] and [38]) rely on the geometric (exponential) decreasing of consensus errors, which is possible only when all nonzero coupling weights are lower bounded by a positive constant. Such geometric (exponential) decreasing of consensus errors is key to proving exact convergence of all agents’ iterates to an optimal solution. In our case, since the coupling strength decays to zero, such geometric (exponential) decreasing of consensus errors does not exist any more. The fundamental difference is even more pronounced in the case of the proposed gradient-tracking based algorithm. In all existing gradient-tracking based methods and their stochastic variants, the fundamental idea of convergence analysis is to formulate the error dynamics as a linear time-invariant system of inequalities, whose convergence is determined by a constant systems matrix (denoted as A in [17], [39], J in [11], or G in [40]). Then, by proving that the spectral radius of this systems matrix is a constant value strictly less than one, such analysis can prove exponential (linear) convergence. However, for a decaying coupling strength, under the conventional formulation, the spectral radius of the systems matrix will converge to one, which makes it impossible to use the conventional spectral-radius based analysis. Therefore, to prove convergence of our algorithms, we developed a new martingale convergence theorem based analyzing approach, which is fundamentally different from conventional proof techniques.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Sec. II gives

the problem formulation and some results for a later use. Sec. III presents a static-consensus based gradient method for differentially-private distributed optimization and establishes the almost sure convergence of all agents' iterates to an optimal solution as well as ϵ -differential privacy guarantees. Sec. IV presents a dynamic-consensus based gradient method for differentially-private distributed optimization and establishes the almost sure convergence of the method to an optimal solution as well as ϵ -differential privacy guarantees. Sec. V presents both numerical simulations and experimental results on a benchmark dataset MNIST. Finally, Sec. VI concludes the paper.

Notations: We use \mathbb{R}^d to denote the Euclidean space of dimension d . We write I_d for the identity matrix of dimension d , and $\mathbf{1}_d$ for the d -dimensional column vector with all entries equal to 1; in both cases we suppress the dimension when clear from the context. For a vector x , x_i denotes its i th element. We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the inner product. We write $\|A\|$ for the matrix norm induced by the vector norm $\|\cdot\|$, unless stated otherwise. We let A^T denote the transpose of a matrix A . We also use other vector/matrix norms defined under a certain transformation determined by a matrix W , which will be represented as $\|\cdot\|_W$. A matrix is column-stochastic when its entries are nonnegative and elements in every column add up to one. A square matrix A is said to be doubly-stochastic when both A and A^T are column-stochastic. Often, we abbreviate *almost surely* by *a.s.*

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

A. On distributed optimization

We consider a network of m agents, interacting on a general directed graph. We describe a directed graph using an ordered pair $\mathcal{G} = ([m], \mathcal{E})$, where $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is the set of nodes (agents) and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq [m] \times [m]$ is the edge set of ordered node pairs describing the interaction among agents. For a nonnegative weighting matrix $W = \{w_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, we define the induced directed graph as $\mathcal{G}_W = ([m], \mathcal{E}_W)$, where the directed edge (i, j) from agent j to agent i exists, i.e., $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_W$ if and only if $w_{ij} > 0$. For an agent $i \in [m]$, its in-neighbor set \mathbb{N}_i^{in} is defined as the collection of agents j such that $w_{ij} > 0$; similarly, the out-neighbor set $\mathbb{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ of agent i is the collection of agents j such that $w_{ji} > 0$.

The optimization problem (1) can be reformulated as the following equivalent multi-agent optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{md}} f(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x_i) \text{ s.t. } x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_m \quad (2)$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is agent i 's decision variable and the collection of the agents' variables is $x = [x_1^T, x_2^T, \dots, x_m^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$.

We make the following assumption on objective functions.

Assumption 1. *Problem (1) has an optimal solution θ^* . The objective function $F(\cdot)$ is convex and each $f_i(\cdot)$ has Lipschitz continuous gradients over \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., for some $L > 0$,*

$$\|\nabla f_i(u) - \nabla f_i(v)\| \leq L\|u - v\|, \quad \forall i \in [m] \text{ and } \forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Under Assumption 1, the optimization problem (2) has an optimal solution $x^* = [(\theta^*)^T, (\theta^*)^T, \dots, (\theta^*)^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$.

In the analysis of our methods, we use the following results.

Lemma 1 ([41], Lemma 11, page 50). *Let $\{v^k\}$, $\{u^k\}$, $\{\alpha^k\}$, and $\{\beta^k\}$ be random nonnegative scalar sequences such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k < \infty$ a.s. and*

$$\mathbb{E}[v^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 + \alpha^k)v^k - u^k + \beta^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^k = \{v^\ell, u^\ell, \alpha^\ell, \beta^\ell; 0 \leq \ell \leq k\}$. Then $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k < \infty$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v^k = v$ for a random variable $v \geq 0$ a.s.

Lemma 2. *Let $\{v^k\}$, $\{\alpha^k\}$, and $\{p^k\}$ be random nonnegative scalar sequences, and $\{q^k\}$ be a deterministic nonnegative scalar sequence satisfying $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k < \infty$ a.s., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p^k < \infty$ a.s., and the following inequality*

$$\mathbb{E}[v^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 + \alpha^k - q^k)v^k + p^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^k = \{v^\ell, \alpha^\ell, p^\ell; 0 \leq \ell \leq k\}$. Then, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k v^k < \infty$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v^k = 0$ hold almost surely.

Proof. From the given relation we have almost surely

$$\mathbb{E}[v^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 + \alpha^k)v^k - q^k v^k + p^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

By Lemma 1 with $u^k = q^k v^k$, and $\beta^k = p^k$, it follows that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k v^k < \infty$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v^k = v$ for a random variable $v \geq 0$ a.s. Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k = \infty$, it follows that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} v^k = 0$ a.s. This and the fact $v^k \rightarrow v$ a.s. imply that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v^k = 0$ a.s. ■

Lemma 3. *Consider the problem $\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(z)$, where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function. Assume that the optimal solution set Z^* of the problem is nonempty. Let $\{z^k\}$ be a random sequence such that for any optimal solution $z^* \in Z^*$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha^k)\|z^k - z^*\|^2 - \eta^k(\phi(z^k) - \phi(z^*)) + \beta^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds a.s., where $\mathcal{F}^k = \{z^\ell, \alpha^\ell, \beta^\ell, \ell = 0, 1, \dots, k\}$, $\{\alpha^k\}$ and $\{\beta^k\}$ are random nonnegative scalar sequences satisfying $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k < \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k < \infty$ a.s., while $\{\eta^k\}$ is a deterministic nonnegative scalar sequence with $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^k = \infty$. Then, $\{z^k\}$ converges almost surely to some solution $z^* \in Z^*$.

Proof. By letting $z = z^*$ for an arbitrary $z^* \in Z^*$ and defining $\phi^* = \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^m} \phi(z)$, we obtain a.s. for all k ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 + \alpha^k)\|z^k - z^*\|^2 - \eta^k(\phi(z^k) - \phi^*) + \beta^k$$

Thus, all the conditions of Lemma 1 are satisfied, yielding

$$\{\|z^k - z^*\|\} \text{ converges for each } z^* \in Z^* \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^k(\phi(z^k) - \phi^*) < \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5)$$

From (5) and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^k = \infty$ we have $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi(z^k) = \phi^*$ a.s. Let $\{z^{k_\ell}\}$ be a subsequence such that almost surely

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \phi(z^{k_\ell}) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi(z^k) = \phi^* \quad (6)$$

Relation (4) implies that the sequence $\{z^k\}$ is bounded a.s. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that $\{z^{k_\ell}\}$ converges a.s. to some \tilde{z} (for otherwise, we can in turn select a convergent subsequence of $\{z^{k_\ell}\}$). Therefore, by the continuity of ϕ , one has $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \phi(z^{k_\ell}) = \phi(\tilde{z})$ a.s., which in combination with (6) implies that $\tilde{z} \in Z^*$ a.s. By letting $z^* = \tilde{z}$ in (4), we see that z^k converges to \tilde{z} a.s. ■

B. On differential privacy

We consider Laplace noise for differential privacy. For a constant $\nu > 0$, $\text{Lap}(\nu)$ denotes the Laplace distribution with probability density function $\frac{1}{2\nu}e^{-\frac{|x|}{\nu}}$. This distribution has mean zero and variance $2\nu^2$. Following [42], for the convenience of DP analysis, we represent the distributed optimization problem \mathcal{P} in (1) by four parameters $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}, F, \mathcal{G}_W)$, where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ is the domain of optimization, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$ is a set of real-valued objective functions, with $f_i \in \mathcal{S}$, and $F(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x)$, and \mathcal{G}_W is the induced graph by matrix W . Then we define adjacency as follows:

Definition 1. *Two distributed optimization problems \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are adjacent if the following conditions hold:*

- $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}'$, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}'$, and $\mathcal{G}_W = \mathcal{G}'_W$, i.e., the domain of optimization, the set of individual objective functions, and the communication graphs are identical;
- there exists an $i \in [m]$ such that $f_i \neq f'_i$ but $f_j = f'_j$ for all $j \in [m]$, $j \neq i$.

According to the definition, it can be seen that two distributed optimization problems are adjacent if and only if one agent changes its individual objective function while all others parameters are identical.

Given a distributed optimization problem, we represent an execution of such as algorithm as \mathcal{A} , which is an infinite sequence of the optimization variables, i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \{x^0, x^1, \dots\}$. We consider adversaries that can observe all communicated messages in the network. Therefore, the observation part of an execution is the infinite sequence of shared messages, which is represented by \mathcal{O} . We define the observation mapping as $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}) \triangleq \mathcal{O}$. Given a distributed optimization problem \mathcal{P} , observation sequence \mathcal{O} , and an initial state x^0 , $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, x^0)$ is the set of executions \mathcal{A} that can generate observation \mathcal{O} .

Definition 2. (ϵ -differential privacy [42]). *For a given $\epsilon > 0$, an iterative distributed algorithm solving problem (1) is ϵ -differentially private if for any two adjacent \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , any set of observation sequences $\mathcal{O}_s \subseteq \mathbb{O}$ (with \mathbb{O} denoting the set of all possible observation sequences), and any initial state x^0 , we always have*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}_s, x^0)] \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}_s, x^0)] \quad (7)$$

where the probability \mathbb{P} is taken over the randomness over iteration processes.

The definition of ϵ -differential privacy ensures that an adversary having access to all shared messages in the network cannot gain information with a significant probability of any participating agent's objective function. It can also be seen that a smaller ϵ means a higher level of privacy protection.

III. STATIC-CONSENSUS GRADIENT METHODS FOR DIFFERENTIALLY-PRIVATE DISTRIBUTED OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we tailor a static-consensus based distributed gradient method to construct a differentially-private distributed method with almost sure convergence to an optimal solution. The agent interaction strength is captured by a weight matrix $W = \{w_{ij}\}$, where $w_{ij} > 0$ if there is a link from agent j to

agent i , and $w_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. We let $w_{ii} \triangleq -\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}$ for all $i \in [m]$, where \mathbb{N}_i^{in} is the in-neighbor set of agent i . We make the following assumption on W :

Assumption 2. *The matrix $W = \{w_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is symmetric and satisfies $\mathbf{1}^T W = \mathbf{0}^T$, $W \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}$, $\|I + W - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T}{m}\| < 1$.*

Assumption 2 ensures that the interaction graph induced by W is balanced and connected, i.e., there is a path from each agent to every other agent. It can be seen that $\|I + W - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T}{m}\| = \max\{|1 + \lambda_2|, |1 + \lambda_m|\}$, where $\{\lambda_i, i \in [m]\}$ are the eigenvalues of W , with $\lambda_m \leq \dots \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 = 0$.

To achieve a strong DP, independent DP-noise should be injected repeatedly in every round of message sharing and, hence, constantly affects the algorithm through inter-agent interactions, leading to significant reduction in optimization accuracy. Motivated by this observation, we propose to gradually weaken inter-agent interactions to reduce the influence of DP-noise on optimization accuracy. Interestingly, we prove that by judiciously designing the interaction weakening mechanism, we can still ensure convergence of all agents to a common optimal solution even in the presence of persistent DP-noise.

We first present our new static-consensus based gradient method for differentially-private distributed optimization:

Algorithm 1: DP-oriented static-consensus based distributed optimization

Parameters: Step size λ^k and weakening factor γ^k .

Every agent i maintains one state x_i^k , which is initialized with a random vector in \mathbb{R}^d .

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

- Every agent j adds persistent DP-noise ζ_j^k to its state x_j^k , and then sends the obscured state $x_j^k + \zeta_j^k$ to agent $i \in \mathbb{N}_j^{\text{out}}$.
- After receiving $x_j^k + \zeta_j^k$ from all $j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}$, agent i updates its state as follows:

$$x_i^{k+1} = x_i^k + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} \gamma^k w_{ij} (x_j^k + \zeta_j^k - x_i^k) - \lambda^k \nabla f_i(x_i^k) \quad (8)$$

c) end

The sequence $\{\gamma^k\}$ diminishes with time and is used to suppress the influence of persistent DP-noise ζ_j^k on the convergence point of the iterates. The step size sequence $\{\lambda^k\}$ and attenuation sequence $\{\gamma^k\}$ have to be designed appropriately to guarantee the almost sure convergence of all $\{x_i^k\}$ to a common optimal solution θ^* . The persistent DP-noise processes $\{\zeta_i^k\}$, $i \in [m]$ have zero-mean and γ^k -bounded (conditional) variances, to be specified later in Assumption 3.

A. Convergence analysis

We have to extend Lemma 1 to deal with random vectors.

Lemma 4. *Let $\{\mathbf{v}^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{\mathbf{u}^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be random nonnegative vector sequences, and $\{a^k\}$ and $\{b^k\}$ be random nonnegative scalar sequences such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (V^k + a^k \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T) \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \mathbf{1} - H^k \mathbf{u}^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0$$

holds a.s., where $\{V^k\}$ and $\{H^k\}$ are random sequences of nonnegative matrices and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}^{k+1}|\mathcal{F}^k]$ denotes the conditional expectation given $\mathbf{v}^\ell, \mathbf{u}^\ell, a^\ell, b^\ell, V^\ell, H^\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, k$. Assume that $\{a^k\}$ and $\{b^k\}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ a.s., and that there exists a (deterministic) vector $\pi > 0$ such that $\pi^T V^k \leq \pi^T$ and $\pi^T H^k \geq 0$ hold a.s. for all $k \geq 0$. Then, we have 1) $\{\pi^T \mathbf{v}^k\}$ converges to some random variable $\pi^T \mathbf{v} \geq 0$ a.s.; 2) $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}$ is bounded a.s., and 3) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k < \infty$ holds a.s.

Proof. By multiplying the given relation for \mathbf{v}^{k+1} with π and using $\pi^T V^k \leq \pi^T$ and the nonnegativity of \mathbf{v}^k , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi^T \mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k + a^k (\pi^T \mathbf{1}) (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{v}^k) + b^k \pi^T \mathbf{1} - \pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k$$

Since $\pi > 0$, we have $\pi_{\min} = \min_i \{\pi_i\} > 0$, which yields

$$\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{v}^k = \frac{1}{\pi_{\min}} \pi_{\min} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{v}^k \leq \frac{1}{\pi_{\min}} \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k$$

where the inequality holds since $\mathbf{v}^k \geq 0$. So, one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi^T \mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq \left(1 + a^k \frac{\pi^T \mathbf{1}}{\pi_{\min}}\right) \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \pi^T \mathbf{1} - \pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k$$

By our assumption, $\pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k \geq 0$ holds for all k a.s. Thus, the preceding relation implies that the conditions of Lemma 1 are satisfied with $v^k = \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k$, $\alpha^k = a^k \pi^T \mathbf{1} / \pi_{\min}$ and $\beta^k = b^k \pi^T \mathbf{1}$. So by Lemma 1, it follows that the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k$ exists a.s. Consequently, $\{\pi^T \mathbf{v}^k\}$ is bounded a.s., and since $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}$ is nonnegative and $\pi > 0$, it follows that $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}$ is also bounded a.s. By Lemma 1, we have $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k < \infty$ a.s. ■

Based on Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, we can prove the following general convergence results for static-consensus based distributed algorithms for problem (1).

Lemma 5. *Assume that problem (1) has a solution. Suppose that a distributed algorithm generates sequences $\{x_i^k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that almost surely we have for any optimal solution θ^* ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \\ \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \end{array} \right] \\ & \leq \left(\left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & \frac{\gamma^k}{m} \\ 0 & 1 - \kappa \gamma^k \end{array} \right] + a^k \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \right) \left[\begin{array}{c} \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \end{array} \right] \\ & \quad + b^k \mathbf{1} - c^k \left[\begin{array}{c} F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*) \\ 0 \end{array} \right], \quad \forall k \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{x}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^k$, $\mathcal{F}^k = \{x_i^\ell, i \in [m], 0 \leq \ell \leq k\}$, the random nonnegative scalar sequences $\{a^k\}$, $\{b^k\}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ a.s., the deterministic nonnegative sequences $\{c^k\}$ and $\{\gamma^k\}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c^k = \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k = \infty$, and the scalar $\kappa > 0$ satisfies $\kappa \gamma^k < 1$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\| = 0$ a.s. for all i , and there is a solution $\tilde{\theta}^*$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{x}^k - \tilde{\theta}^*\| = 0$ a.s.

Proof. Let θ^* be an arbitrary but fixed optimal solution of problem (1). Then, we have $F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*) \geq 0$ for all k .

Hence, by letting $\mathbf{v}^k = [\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2, \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2]^T$, from relation (9) it follows that almost surely for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq \left(\left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & \frac{\gamma^k}{m} \\ 0 & 1 - \kappa \gamma^k \end{array} \right] + a^k \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \right) \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \mathbf{1} \quad (10)$$

Consider the vector $\pi = [1, \frac{1}{m\kappa}]^T$ and note $\pi^T \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & \frac{\gamma^k}{m} \\ 0 & 1 - \kappa \gamma^k \end{array} \right] = \pi^T$. Thus, relation (10) satisfies all conditions of Lemma 4. By Lemma 4, it follows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k$ exists a.s., and that the sequences $\{\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2\}$ and $\{\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2\}$ are bounded a.s. From (10) we have the following relation a.s. for the second element of \mathbf{v}^k :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\ & \leq (1 + a^k - \kappa \gamma^k) \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + \beta^k \quad \forall k \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta^k = a^k (\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2)$. Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k < \infty$ a.s. by our assumption, and the sequences $\{\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2\}$ and $\{\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2\}$ are bounded a.s., it follows that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k < \infty$ a.s. Thus, the preceding relation satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2 with $v^k = \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$, $q^k = \kappa \gamma^k$ and $p^k = \beta^k$ due to our assumptions $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ a.s. and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k = \infty$. By Lemma 2 it follows that a.s.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \kappa \gamma^k \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 < \infty, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 = 0 \quad (11)$$

It remains to show that $\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. For this, we consider relation (9) and focus on the first element of \mathbf{v}^k , for which we obtain almost surely for all $k \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 + a^k) \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\gamma^k}{m} + a^k \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + b^k - c^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The preceding relation satisfies Lemma 3 with $\phi = F$, $z^* = \theta^*$, $z^k = \bar{x}^k$, $\alpha^k = a^k$, $\eta^k = c^k$, and $\beta^k = (\frac{\gamma^k}{m} + a^k) \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + b^k$. By our assumptions, the sequences $\{a^k\}$ and $\{b^k\}$ are summable a.s., and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c^k = \infty$. In view of (11), it follows that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k < \infty$ a.s. Hence, all the conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied and, consequently, $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ converges to some optimal solution almost surely. ■

Using Lemma 5, we are in position to establish convergence of Algorithm 1 assuming that persistent DP-noise satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 3. *For every $i \in [m]$ and every k , conditional on the state x_i^k , the random noise ζ_i^k satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^k | x_i^k] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_i^k\|^2 | x_i^k] = (\sigma_i^k)^2$ for all $k \geq 0$, and*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma^k)^2 \max_{i \in [m]} (\sigma_i^k)^2 < \infty \quad (13)$$

where $\{\gamma^k\}$ is the attenuation sequence from Algorithm 1. The initial random vectors satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\|x_i^0\|^2] < \infty, \forall i \in [m]$.

Remark 1. Given that γ^k decreases with time, (13) can be satisfied even when $\{\sigma_i^k\}$ increases with time. For example, under $\gamma^k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.9}})$, an increasing $\{\sigma_i^k\}$ with increasing rate no larger than $\mathcal{O}(k^{0.3})$ still satisfies the summable condition in (13). Allowing $\{\sigma_i^k\}$ to be increasing with time is key to enabling the strong ϵ -differential privacy in Theorem 2.

Theorem 1. Under Assumption 1, Assumption 2, and Assumption 3, Algorithm 1 converges to a solution of problem (1) a.s. when γ^k and λ^k satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k = \infty$, and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma^k} < \infty$.

Proof. The basic idea is to apply Lemma 5 to the quantities $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$. We divide the proof into two parts to analyze $\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2$, respectively.

Part I: We first analyze $\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2$. For the sake of notational simplicity, we represent $\nabla f_i(x_i^k)$ as g_i^k . Stacking x_i^k and g_i^k into augmented vectors $(x^k)^T = [(x_1^k)^T, \dots, (x_m^k)^T]$ and $(g^k)^T = [(g_1^k)^T, \dots, (g_m^k)^T]$, respectively, we can write the dynamics of Algorithm 1 as

$$x^{k+1} = (I + \gamma^k W \otimes I_d) x^k + \gamma^k \zeta_w^k - \lambda^k g^k \quad (14)$$

where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product, and $(\zeta_w^k)^T = [(\zeta_{w1}^k)^T, \dots, (\zeta_{wm}^k)^T]$ with

$$\zeta_{wi}^k \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij} \zeta_j^k \quad (15)$$

From (14) we can obtain the following relationship for the average vector $\bar{x}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^k$ by using the zero column-sum property of W :

$$\bar{x}^{k+1} = \bar{x}^k + \gamma^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k - \frac{\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_i^k \quad (16)$$

where

$$\bar{\zeta}_w^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \zeta_{wi}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij} \zeta_j^k = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m w_{ii} \zeta_i^k}{m}$$

We used the definition $w_{ii} \triangleq -\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}$ and the balanced property of W in the last equality above. Using (16) and the preceding relation, we relate \bar{x}^k to an optimal solution

$$\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^* = \bar{x}^k - \theta^* - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\lambda^k g_i^k + \gamma^k w_{ii} \zeta_i^k)$$

which further implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 &= \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 - \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \lambda^k g_i^k + \gamma^k w_{ii} \zeta_i^k, \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m (\lambda^k g_i^k + \gamma^k w_{ii} \zeta_i^k) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 - \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \lambda^k g_i^k + \gamma^k w_{ii} \zeta_i^k, \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda^k g_i^k \right\|^2 + \frac{2}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma^k w_{ii} \zeta_i^k \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation, given $\mathcal{F}^k = \{x^0, \dots, x^k\}$, and using the assumption that the noise ζ_i^k is with zero mean and variance $(\sigma_i^k)^2$ conditionally on x_i^k (see Assumption 3), from the preceding relation we obtain a.s. for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] \\ &\leq \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 - \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle g_i^k, \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{m^2} (\lambda^k)^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m g_i^k \right\|^2 + \frac{2}{m} (\gamma^k)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m w_{ii}^2 (\sigma_i^k)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We next estimate the inner product term, for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle g_i^k, \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle &= \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle g_i^k - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k), \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k), \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Recalling that $g_i^k = \nabla f_i(x_i^k)$, by the Lipschitz continuous property of $\nabla f_i(\cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^k \langle g_i^k - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k), \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle &\geq -L\lambda^k \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\| \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\| \\ &\geq -\frac{\gamma^k}{2} \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 - \frac{L^2(\lambda^k)^2}{2\gamma^k} \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

By the convexity of $F(\cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k), \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle &= 2\lambda^k \langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle \\ &\geq 2\lambda^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Combining (18), (19), and (20) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\lambda^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle g_i^k, \bar{x}^k - \theta^* \rangle &\geq -\frac{\gamma^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{L^2(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma^k} \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 + 2\lambda^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We next estimate the second last term in (17):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m g_i^k \right\|^2 &= \frac{1}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m (g_i^k - \nabla f_i(\theta^*)) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{L^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \theta^*\|^2 = \frac{L^2}{m} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Further using the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k + \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + 2m\|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

we have from (22) that

$$\frac{1}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m g_i^k \right\|^2 \leq \frac{2L^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + 2L^2 \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 \quad (24)$$

Substituting (21) and (24) into (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k \right] &\leq \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^k}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &+ L^2(\lambda^k)^2 \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^k} + 4 \right) \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 - 2\lambda^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*)) \\ &+ \frac{4L^2(\lambda^k)^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 + \frac{2(\gamma^k)^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m w_{ii}^2 (\sigma_i^k)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Part II: Next we analyze $\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2$. Using (14) and (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1} &= (I + \gamma^k W \otimes I_d) x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k \\ &+ \gamma^k \left(\zeta_w^k - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1} \otimes \zeta_{w,i}^k \right) - \lambda^k \left(g^k - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1} \otimes g_i^k \right) \end{aligned}$$

Noting $\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k = \frac{1}{m} (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d) x^k$, $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1} \otimes \zeta_{w,i}^k = (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d) \zeta_w^k$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1} \otimes g_i^k = (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d) g^k$, we can rewrite the preceding equality as

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1} &= (I + \gamma^k W \otimes I_d - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d) x^k \\ &+ \gamma^k \left(I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d \right) \zeta_w^k - \lambda^k \left(I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \otimes I_d \right) g^k \\ &= \hat{W}_k x^k + \gamma^k \Xi \zeta_w^k - \lambda^k \Xi g^k \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with $\hat{W}_k \triangleq (I + \gamma^k W - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T) \otimes I_d$ and $\Xi \triangleq (I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T) \otimes I_d$.

Since $(I + \gamma^k W - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T) \mathbf{1} = 0$ holds and we always have $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$, it follows that

$$\hat{W}_k (\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) = \left(\left(I + \gamma^k W - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T}{m} \right) \times \mathbf{1} \right) \otimes (I_d \times \bar{x}^k) = 0$$

By subtracting $\hat{W}_k (\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) = 0$ from the right hand side of (26), we obtain

$$x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1} = \hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) + \gamma^k \Xi \zeta_w^k - \lambda^k \Xi g^k$$

which further leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 &= \|\hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) - \lambda^k \Xi g^k\|^2 \\ &+ 2 \left\langle \hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) - \lambda^k \Xi g^k, \gamma^k \Xi \zeta_w^k \right\rangle + \|\gamma^k \Xi \zeta_w^k\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) - \lambda^k \Xi g^k\|^2 \\ &+ 2 \left\langle \hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) - \lambda^k \Xi g^k, \gamma^k \Xi \zeta_w^k \right\rangle \\ &+ m(\gamma^k)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}^2 \|\zeta_j^k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from $\|\Xi\| = 1$ and the definition of $\zeta_{w,i}^k$ in (15). Taking the conditional expectation with respect

to $\mathcal{F}^k = \{x^0, \dots, x^k\}$ and using Assumption 3 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] &\leq \|\hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k) - \lambda^k \Xi g^k\|^2 + m(\gamma^k)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}^2 (\sigma_j^k)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\|\hat{W}_k (x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k)\| + \|\lambda^k \Xi g^k\| \right)^2 \\ &+ m(\gamma^k)^2 \left(\max_{j \in [m]} \sigma_j^k \right)^2 C_W \end{aligned}$$

where $C_W = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}^2$. Using the fact $\|\Xi\| = 1$ and $\|\hat{W}_k\| = \|I + \gamma^k W - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\| = 1 - \gamma^k |\nu|$ where $-\nu$ is some non-zero eigenvalue of W (see Assumption 2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] &\leq (1 - \gamma^k |\nu|)^2 (1 + \epsilon) \|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &+ (1 + \epsilon^{-1}) (\lambda^k)^2 \|g^k\|^2 + m(\gamma^k)^2 \left(\max_{j \in [m]} \sigma_j^k \right)^2 C_W \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, where we used $(a+b)^2 \leq (1+\epsilon)a^2 + (1+\epsilon^{-1})b^2$ valid for any scalars a, b , and $\epsilon > 0$.

We next focus on estimating the term involving the gradient g^k in the preceding inequality. Noting that $g^k = m \nabla f(x^k)$ and that $f(\cdot)$ has Lipschitz continuous gradients (with Lipschitz constant $\frac{L}{m}$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g^k\|^2 &= m^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*) + \nabla f(x^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq 2m^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*)\|^2 + 2m^2 \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq 2L^2 \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + 2m^2 \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since $x^* = \mathbf{1} \otimes \theta^*$, using the relationship in (23), we obtain

$$\|g^k\|^2 \leq 4L^2 (\|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 + m \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2) + 2m^2 \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2$$

Finally, substituting the preceding relation back in (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] &\leq (1 - \gamma^k |\nu|)^2 (1 + \epsilon) \|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &+ 4(1 + \epsilon^{-1}) L^2 (\lambda^k)^2 (\|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 + m \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2) \\ &+ 2(1 + \epsilon^{-1}) (\lambda^k)^2 m^2 \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2 + m(\gamma^k)^2 \left(\max_{j \in [m]} \sigma_j^k \right)^2 C_W \end{aligned}$$

By letting $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma^k |\nu|}{1 - \gamma^k |\nu|}$ and consequently $1 + \epsilon = (1 - \gamma^k |\nu|)^{-1}$ and $1 + \epsilon^{-1} = (\gamma^k |\nu|)^{-1}$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|x^{k+1} - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] &\leq \left(1 - \gamma^k |\nu| + \frac{4L^2(\lambda^k)^2}{|\nu|\gamma^k} \right) \|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{4mL^2(\lambda^k)^2}{|\nu|\gamma^k} \|\bar{x}^k - \theta^*\|^2 + \frac{4(\lambda^k)^2 m^2}{|\nu|\gamma^k} \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2 \\ &+ m(\gamma^k)^2 \left(\max_{j \in [m]} \sigma_j^k \right)^2 C_W \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

By combining (25) and (28), and using Assumption 3, we have $\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$ and $\mathbb{E} [\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - \bar{x}^{k+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 5 with $\kappa = |\nu|$, $c^k = 2\lambda^k$, $a^k = \max\{L^2(\lambda^k)^2 \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^k} + 4\right), \frac{4mL^2(\lambda^k)^2}{|\nu|\gamma^k}\}$, and

$b^k = (\gamma^k)^2 \max\{\frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m w_{ii}^2(\sigma_i^k)^2, \frac{4(\lambda^k)^2 m^2}{|\nu| \gamma^k} \|\nabla f(x^*)\|^2 + m (\max_{j \in [m]} \sigma_j^k)^2 C_W\}$ where $C_W = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} w_{ij}^2$. ■

Remark 2. Communication imperfections can be modeled as channel noises [7], [43], which can be regarded as the DP-noise here. Therefore, Algorithm 1 can also counteract such communication imperfections in distributed optimization.

Remark 3. Because the evolution of x_i^k to the optimal solution satisfies the conditions in Lemma 5, we can leverage Lemma 5 to examine the convergence speed. The first relationship in (11) (i.e., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \kappa \gamma^k \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 < \infty$) implies that $\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$ decreases to zero with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma^k})$, and hence we have x_i^k converging to \bar{x}^k no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(k\gamma^k)^{0.5}})$. Moreover, given that a^k and b^k in (12) are summable (and hence decrease to zero no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$) and c^k in (12) corresponds to λ^k (which is square summable and hence decreases to zero no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.5}})$), we have that \bar{x}^k converges to an optimal solution with a speed no worse than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.5}})$ [41]. Therefore, the convergence of every x_i^k to an optimal solution, which is equivalent to the combination of the convergence of x_i^k to \bar{x}^k and the convergence of \bar{x}^k to an optimal solution, should be no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(k\gamma^k)^{0.5}})$. (For example, under $\gamma^k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.6}})$, $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(k\gamma^k)^{0.5}})$ is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.2}})$.) Moreover, from (27), it can be seen that the decreasing speed of $\|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2$ increases with an increase in $|\nu|$, which corresponds to the spectral radius of W . Therefore, the decreasing speed of $\|x^k - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{x}^k\|^2$ to zero increases with an increase in the spectral radius of W defined in Assumption 2.

B. Privacy analysis

Similar to [42], we define the sensitivity of an algorithm to problem (1) as follows:

Definition 3. At each iteration k , any initial state x^0 and any adjacent distributed optimization problems \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , the sensitivity of an algorithm is

$$\Delta^k \triangleq \sup_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, x^0), x' \in \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}, x^0)} \|x^k - x'^k\|_1 \right\} \quad (29)$$

Then, following the reasoning of Lemma 2 in [42], we have the following lemma:

Lemma 6. At each iteration k , if each agent adds a noise vector $\zeta_i^k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ consisting of p independent Laplace noises with parameter ν^k such that $\sum_{k=1}^T \frac{\Delta^k}{\nu^k} \leq \epsilon$, then the iterative distributed algorithm is ϵ -differentially private for iterations from $k = 0$ to $k = T$.

Proof. The lemma can be obtained following the same line of reasoning of Lemma 2 in [42]. ■

As indicated in [42], since the change of an objective function f_i can be arbitrary in the adjacency definition in Definition 1, we have to make the following assumption to ensure bounded sensitivity:

Assumption 4. The gradients of all individual objective functions are bounded, i.e., there exists a constant C such that $\|\nabla f_i(x)\|_1 \leq C$ holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 4, if $\{\lambda^k\}$ and $\{\gamma^k\}$ satisfy the conditions in Theorem 1, and all elements of ζ_i^k are drawn independently from Laplace distribution $\text{Lap}(\nu^k)$ with $(\sigma_i^k)^2 = 2(\nu^k)^2$ satisfying Assumption 3, then all agents will converge almost surely to an optimal solution. Moreover,

- 1) Algorithm 1 is ϵ -differentially private with the cumulative privacy budget bounded by $\epsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{2C\lambda^k}{\nu^k}$ for iterations from $k = 0$ to $k = T$ where C is from Assumption 4. And the cumulative privacy budget is always finite for $T \rightarrow \infty$ when the sequence $\{\frac{\lambda^k}{\nu^k}\}$ is summable;
- 2) Suppose that two sequences $\{\nu'^k\}$ and $\{\lambda^k\}$ have a finite sequence-ratio sum $\Phi_{\lambda, \nu'} \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{\nu'^k}$. Then setting the Laplace noise parameter ν^k as $\nu^k = \frac{2C\Phi_{\lambda, \nu'}}{\epsilon} \nu'^k$ ensures that Algorithm 1 is ϵ -differentially private for any $\epsilon > 0$ even when the number of iterations goes to infinity;
- 3) In the special case where $\lambda^k = \frac{1}{k}$ and $\gamma^k = \frac{1}{k^{0.9}}$, setting $\nu^k = \frac{2C\Phi_{\lambda, \nu'}}{\epsilon} k^{0.3}$ with $\Phi \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{1.3}} \approx 3.93$ (which can be verified to satisfy Assumption 3) ensures that Algorithm 1 is always ϵ -differentially private for any $\epsilon > 0$ even when the number of iterations goes to infinity.

Proof. Since the Laplace noise satisfies Assumption 3, it can be obtained from Theorem 1 that all agents will converge to an optimal solution almost surely.

To prove the three statements on privacy, we first prove that the sensitivity of the algorithm satisfies $\Delta^k \leq 2C\lambda^k$. Given two adjacent distributed optimization problems \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , for any given fixed observation \mathcal{O} and initial state x^0 , the sensitivity is determined by $\|\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, x^0) - \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}, x^0)\|_1$ according to Definition 3. Since in \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , there is only one objective function that is different, we represent this different objective function as the i th one, i.e., $f_i(\cdot)$, without loss of generality. Because the observations under \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are identical, we have $o^k \triangleq x_i^k + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} \gamma^k w_{ij} (x_j^k - x_i^k) = x_i'^k + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_i^{\text{in}}} \gamma^k w_{ij} (x_j'^k - x_i'^k) \triangleq o'^k$. Therefore, we have the following relationship for Algorithm 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, x^0) - \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}, x^0)\|_1 \\ &= \left\| o^k - \lambda^k \nabla f_i(x_i^k) - \left(o'^k - \lambda^k \nabla f_i'(x_i'^k) \right) \right\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \lambda^k \nabla f_i(x_i^k) - \lambda^k \nabla f_i'(x_i'^k) \right\|_1 \leq 2C\lambda^k \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained using Assumption 4.

Using Lemma 6, we can easily obtain $\epsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{2C\lambda^k}{\nu^k}$. Hence, ϵ will always be finite even when T tends to infinity if the sequence $\{\frac{\lambda^k}{\nu^k}\}$ is summable, i.e., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{\nu^k} < \infty$.

By scaling ν^k proportionally and using the linear relationship between ϵ and $\frac{1}{\nu^k}$, the second statement can be easily obtained based on the first statement. The third statement can also be easily proven by specializing the selection of λ^k , γ^k , and ν^k sequences. ■

Different from [42] which has to use a summable stepsize (geometrically-decreasing stepsize, more specifically) to ensure a finite privacy budget ϵ when $k \rightarrow \infty$, here we ensure

a finite ϵ even when the stepsize sequence is non-summable. Allowing stepsize sequences to be non-summable is key to avoiding optimization errors in [42] and achieve almost sure convergence. In fact, to our knowledge, this is the first time that almost-sure convergence is achieved under rigorous ϵ -differential privacy for an infinite number of iterations.

Remark 4. In Theorem 2, to ensure that the privacy budget $\epsilon = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2C\lambda^k}{\nu^k}$ is finite even when $k \rightarrow \infty$, the Laplace noise parameter ν^k has to increase with time since $\{\lambda^k\}$ is non-summable. An increasing ν^k will make the relative level between noise ζ_i^k and signal x_i^k increase with time. However, since the increase in ν^k is outweighed by the decrease of γ^k (see Assumption 3), the actual noise fed into the algorithm, i.e., $\gamma^k \text{Lap}(\nu^k)$ still decays with time, which makes it possible for Algorithm 1 to ensure almost sure convergence to an optimal solution. Moreover, according to Theorem 1, such almost sure convergence is not affected by scaling ν^k by any constant coefficient $\frac{1}{c} > 0$ so as to achieve any desired level of ϵ -differential privacy, as long as the Laplace noise parameter ν^k (with associated variance $(\sigma_i^k)^2 = 2(\nu^k)^2$) satisfies Assumption 3.

IV. GRADIENT-TRACKING BASED METHODS FOR DIFFERENTIALLY PRIVATE DISTRIBUTED OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we propose a DP-oriented gradient-tracking based distributed algorithm for general directed graphs and prove that it can ensure all agents to converge to an optimal solution even under persistent DP-noise. In gradient-tracking based algorithms, every agent $i \in [m]$ maintains and updates two iterates, x_i^k and y_i^k , where y_i^k is an estimate of the ‘‘joint agent’’ descent direction. These two iterates are exchanged with local neighbors in two different communication networks, namely, \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{G}_C , which are, respectively, induced by matrices $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$; that is (i, j) is a directed link in the graph \mathcal{G}_R if and only if $R_{ij} > 0$ and, similarly, (i, j) is a directed link in \mathcal{G}_C if and only if $C_{ij} > 0$. We make the following assumption on R and C . Note that, \mathcal{R}_{A^T} is identical to \mathcal{R}_A with the directions of edges reversed.

Assumption 5. The matrices $R, C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ have nonnegative off-diagonal entries ($R_{ij} \geq 0$ and $C_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$). The induced graphs \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{G}_{C^T} satisfy

- 1) \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{R}_{C^T} each contain at least one spanning tree;
- 2) There exists at least one node that is a root of spanning trees for both \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{R}_{C^T} .

Remark 5. The assumption on \mathcal{G}_R and \mathcal{R}_{C^T} is weaker than requiring that both induced graphs of R and C to be strongly connected, which is assumed in most of the existing works.

Next, we provide our algorithm.

Algorithm 2: DP-oriented gradient-tracking based distributed optimization

Parameters: Stepsize λ^k and weakening factors γ_1^k, γ_2^k .

Every agent i maintains two states x_i^k and y_i^k , which are initialized with a random point $x_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y_i^0 = \nabla f_i(x_i^0)$.

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

- a) Every agent j injects zero-mean DP-noises ζ_j^k and ξ_j^k to its states x_j^k and y_j^k , respectively.
- b) Agent i pushes $C_{li}(y_i^k + \xi_i^k)$ to each agent $l \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{out}}$, and it pulls $x_j^k + \zeta_j^k$ from each $j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}$, where the subscript R or C in neighbor sets indicates the neighbors with respect to the graphs induced by these matrices.
- c) Agent i chooses $\gamma_1^k > 0$ and $\gamma_2^k > 0$ satisfying $1 + \gamma_1^k R_{ii} > 0$ and $1 + \gamma_2^k C_{ii} > 0$ with

$$R_{ii} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}} R_{ij}, \quad C_{ii} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{out}}} C_{ji} \quad (30)$$

Then, agent i updates its states as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{k+1} &= (1 + \gamma_1^k R_{ii})x_i^k + \gamma_1^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}} R_{ij}(x_j^k + \zeta_j^k) - \lambda^k y_i^k \\ y_i^{k+1} &= (1 + \gamma_2^k C_{ii})y_i^k + \gamma_2^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{out}}} C_{ij}(y_j^k + \xi_j^k) \\ &\quad + \nabla f_i(x_i^{k+1}) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

d) end

Note that the definition of R_{ii} and C_{ii} in (30) ensures that $R = \{R_{ij}\}$ has zero row sums and $C = \{C_{ij}\}$ has zero column sums.

A. Convergence analysis

We will prove that, when the two sequences $\{\gamma_1^k\}$ and $\{\gamma_2^k\}$ are designed appropriately, all agents’ x -iterates generated by Algorithm 2 converge to an optimal solution *a.s.*, as long as the injected noises ζ_j^k and ξ_j^k have zero-mean and γ_1^k/γ_2^k bounded variances, to be specified later in Assumption 6. To this end, we first extend Lemma 2 to vectors.

Lemma 7. Let $\{\mathbf{v}^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a sequence of non-negative random vectors and $\{b^k\}$ be a sequence of nonnegative random scalars such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ *a.s.* and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq V^k \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \mathbf{1}, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where $\{V^k\}$ is a sequence of non-negative matrices and $\mathcal{F}^k = \{\mathbf{v}^\ell, b^\ell; 0 \leq \ell \leq k\}$. Assume that there exist a vector $\pi > 0$ and a deterministic scalar sequence $\{a^k\}$ satisfying $a^k \in (0, 1)$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k = \infty$, and $\pi^T V^k \leq (1 - a^k)\pi^T$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}^k = 0$ almost surely.

Proof. By multiplying the given relation for \mathbf{v}^{k+1} with π and using $\pi^T V^k \leq (1 - a^k)\pi^T$, we obtain the following relation due to the nonnegativity of the vectors \mathbf{v}^k :

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi^T \mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (1 - a^k)\pi^T \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \pi^T \mathbf{1}, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k = \infty$, and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ *a.s.*, the conditions of Lemma 2 are satisfied with $v^k = \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k$, $a^k = 0$, $q^k = a^k$, and $p^k = b^k \pi^T \mathbf{1}$. By Lemma 2, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi^T \mathbf{v}^k = 0$ *a.s.* The sequence $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}$ being nonnegative and $\pi > 0$ imply that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}^k = 0$ *a.s.* ■

We now proceed to analyze the convergence of Algorithm 2. Defining $(\zeta_w^k)^T = [(\zeta_{w1}^k)^T, \dots, (\zeta_{wm}^k)^T]$ with $\zeta_{wi} \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}} R_{ij} \zeta_j^k$ and $(\xi_w^k)^T = [(\xi_{w1}^k)^T, \dots, (\xi_{wm}^k)^T]$ with

$\xi_{wi} \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{in}}} C_{ij} \xi_j^k$, we write the dynamics of Algorithm 2 in the following more compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= ((I + \gamma_1^k R) \otimes I_d) x^k + \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k - \lambda^k y^k \\ y^{k+1} &= ((I + \gamma_2^k C) \otimes I_d) y^k + \gamma_2^k \xi_w^k + g^{k+1} - g^k \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where we used $g^{k+1} = \nabla f(x^{k+1})$ for notational simplicity.

Lemma 8. [44] (or Lemma 1 in [17]) Under Assumption 5, for every k , the matrix $I + \gamma_1^k R$ has a unique nonnegative left eigenvector u^T (associated with eigenvalue 1) satisfying $u^T \mathbf{1} = m$, and the matrix $I + \gamma_2^k C$ has a unique nonnegative right eigenvector v (associated with eigenvalue 1) satisfying $\mathbf{1}^T v = m$.

According to Lemma 3 in [17], we know that the spectral radius of $R^k \triangleq I + \gamma_1^k R - \frac{1u^T}{m}$ is equal to $1 - \gamma_1^k |\nu_R| < 1$ where ν_R is an eigenvalue of R . Furthermore, there exists a vector norm $\|x\|_R \triangleq \|\tilde{R}x\|_2$ (where \tilde{R} is determined by R [17]) such that $\|R^k\|_R < 1$ is arbitrarily close to the spectral radius of R^k , i.e., $1 - \gamma_1^k |\nu_R| < 1$. Without loss of generality, we represent this norm as $\|R^k\|_R = 1 - \gamma_1^k \rho_R < 1$. Similarly, we have that the spectral radius of $C^k \triangleq I + \gamma_2^k C - \frac{v\mathbf{1}^T}{m}$ is equal to $1 - \gamma_2^k |\nu_C| < 1$ where ν_C is an eigenvalue of C . Furthermore, there exists a vector norm $\|x\|_C \triangleq \|\tilde{C}x\|_2$ (where \tilde{C} is determined by C [17]) such that $\|C^k\|_C < 1$ is arbitrarily close to the spectral radius of C^k , i.e., $1 - \gamma_2^k |\nu_C| < 1$. Without loss of generality, we represent this norm as $\|C^k\|_C = 1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C < 1$.

Defining $\bar{x}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m u_i x_i^k$ and $\bar{y}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}^{k+1} &= \bar{x}^k + \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k - \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} y^k \\ \bar{y}^{k+1} &= \bar{y}^k + \gamma_2^k \bar{\xi}_w^k + \bar{g}^{k+1} - \bar{g}^k \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with $\bar{\zeta}_w^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \zeta_{wi}^k$, $\bar{\xi}_w^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_{wi}^k$, and $\bar{g}^k = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_i^k$.

From (33) and the fact $y^0 = g^0$, we can further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}^{k+1} &= \bar{x}^k + \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k - \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \\ &\quad - \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\bar{y}^k = \bar{g}^k + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \quad (35)$$

Using the relationship $\lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k = \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{y}^k$ and (35), we can rewrite (34) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}^{k+1} &= \bar{x}^k - \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) - \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k \\ &\quad + \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k - \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

In what follows, we use F^* to denote the optimal value of the problem in (1), i.e., $F^* = \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(\theta)$.

Next, we provide a generic convergence result for dynamic-consensus (gradient-tracking) based distributed algorithms for problem (1). To this end, we need a measure under the $\|\cdot\|_R$ norm for the distance between all $x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_m^k$ and \bar{x}^k .

Following [17], we define a matrix norm for all x iterates $\mathbf{x}^k \triangleq [x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_m^k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$:

$$\|\mathbf{x}^k\|_R = \left\| \left[\|\mathbf{x}_{(1)}^k\|_R, \|\mathbf{x}_{(2)}^k\|_R, \dots, \|\mathbf{x}_{(d)}^k\|_R \right] \right\|_2 \quad (37)$$

where the subscript 2 denotes the 2-norm and $\mathbf{x}_{(i)}^k$ denotes the i th column of \mathbf{x}^k . Defining $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k$ as $[\bar{x}^k, \bar{x}^k, \dots, \bar{x}^k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, one can easily see that $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R$ measures the distance between all x_i^k and their average \bar{x}^k . Similarly, we define a matrix norm $\|\cdot\|_C$ for $\mathbf{y}^k \triangleq [y_1^k, y_2^k, \dots, y_m^k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$:

$$\|\mathbf{y}^k\|_C = \left\| \left[\|\mathbf{y}_{(1)}^k\|_C, \|\mathbf{y}_{(2)}^k\|_C, \dots, \|\mathbf{y}_{(d)}^k\|_C \right] \right\|_2 \quad (38)$$

and use $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C$ (with $\text{diag}(v) = \text{diag}(v_1, \dots, v_m)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k \triangleq [\bar{y}^k, \dots, \bar{y}^k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$) to measure the distance between all y iterates and their v -weighted average \bar{y}^k .

Lemma 9. Assume that the objective function $F(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable and that the problem (1) has an optimal solution. Suppose that a distributed algorithm generates sequences $\{x_i^k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{y_i^k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ under coupling matrices R and C , respectively, such that the following relation holds a.s. for some sufficiently large integer $T \geq 0$ and for all $k \geq T$:

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (V^k + a^k \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T) \mathbf{v}^k + b^k \mathbf{1} - H^k \begin{bmatrix} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 \\ \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (39)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^k = \{x_i^\ell, y_i^\ell; 0 \leq \ell \leq k, i \in [m]\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^k &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1^k \\ \mathbf{v}_2^k \\ \mathbf{v}_3^k \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* \\ \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 \\ \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ V^k &= H^k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \kappa_1 \lambda^k & \kappa_2 \lambda^k \\ 0 & 1 - \kappa_3 \gamma_1^k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - \kappa_4 \gamma_2^k \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_5 \lambda^k & \kappa_6 \lambda^k - \kappa_7 (\lambda^k)^2 \\ 0 & -\kappa_8 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k} \\ 0 & -\kappa_9 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

with $\kappa_i > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 9$ and $\kappa_3, \kappa_4 \in (0, 1)$, while the nonnegative scalar sequences $\{a^k\}$, $\{b^k\}$ and positive sequences $\{\lambda^k\}$, $\{\gamma_1^k\}$, $\{\gamma_2^k\}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^k < \infty$ a.s., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^k < \infty$ a.s., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_i^k)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_i^k} < \infty$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k / \gamma_i^k = 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_1^k / \gamma_2^k < \infty$. Then, we have:

(a) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^k)$ exists almost surely and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_i^k - v_i \bar{y}^k\| = 0, \forall i \text{ a.s.}$$

(b) $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\| = 0$ holds almost surely. Moreover, if the function $F(\cdot)$ has bounded level sets, then $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ is bounded and every accumulation point of $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ is an optimal solution a.s., and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i^k) = F^* \quad \text{for all } i \in [m] \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. Since the results of Lemma 4 are asymptotic, they remain valid when the starting index is shifted from $k = 0$ to $k = T$, for an arbitrary $T \geq 0$. So the idea is to show that

the conditions in Lemma 4 are satisfied for all $k \geq T$, where $T \geq 0$ is large enough.

(a) Because $\kappa_i > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 9$, for $\pi = [\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]^T$ to satisfy $\pi^T V \leq \pi^T$ and $\pi^T H^k \geq 0$, we only need to show that the following inequalities can be true

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 \lambda^k \pi_1 + (1 - \kappa_3 \gamma_1^k) \pi_2 &\leq \pi_2, \\ \kappa_2 \lambda^k \pi_1 + (1 - \kappa_4 \gamma_2^k) \pi_3 &\leq \pi_3, \\ (\kappa_6 \lambda^k - \kappa_7 (\lambda^k)^2) \pi_1 - \kappa_8 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k} \pi_2 - \kappa_9 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k} \pi_3 &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The first inequality is equivalent to $\pi_2 \geq \frac{\kappa_1 \lambda^k}{\kappa_3 \gamma_1^k} \pi_1$. Given that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k / \gamma_1^k = 0$ holds and γ_1^k as well as λ^k are positive according to the assumption, it can easily be seen that for any given $\pi_1 > 0$, we can always find a $\pi_2 > 0$ satisfying the relationship when k is larger than some $T \geq 0$.

The second inequality is equivalent to $\pi_3 \geq \frac{\kappa_2 \lambda^k}{\kappa_4 \gamma_2^k} \pi_1$. Given that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k / \gamma_2^k = 0$ holds and γ_2^k as well as λ^k are positive according to the assumption, it can easily be seen that for any given $\pi_1 > 0$, we can always find a $\pi_3 > 0$ satisfying the relationship when k is larger than some $T \geq 0$.

The third inequality is equivalent to $\pi_1 \geq \frac{\kappa_7 \lambda^k}{\kappa_6} \pi_1 + \frac{\kappa_8 \lambda^k}{\kappa_6 \gamma_1^k} \pi_2 + \frac{\kappa_9 \lambda^k}{\kappa_6 \gamma_2^k} \pi_3$. Since the right hand side converges to zero according to our assumptions on λ^k , γ_1^k and γ_2^k , we can always find a constant π_1 satisfying this inequality for $k \geq T$. Thus, we can always find a vector π satisfying all inequalities in (40) for $k \geq T$ for some large enough $T \geq 0$, and hence the conditions in Lemma 4 are satisfied.

By Lemma 4, it follows that for the three entries of \mathbf{v}^k , i.e., \mathbf{v}_1^k , \mathbf{v}_2^k , and \mathbf{v}_3^k , we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_1 \mathbf{v}_1^k + \pi_2 \mathbf{v}_2^k + \pi_3 \mathbf{v}_3^k \quad (41)$$

exists almost surely and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi^T H^k \mathbf{u}^k < \infty$ holds almost surely with $\mathbf{u}^k = [\|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2, \|\bar{g}^k\|^2]^T$. Since $\pi^T H^k = \left[\kappa_5 \lambda^k \pi_1, (\kappa_6 \lambda^k - \kappa_7 (\lambda^k)^2) \pi_1 - \kappa_8 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k} \pi_2 - \kappa_9 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k} \pi_3 \right]$ and $(\lambda^k)^2$, $\frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k}$, and $\frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k}$ are summable, one has

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 < \infty, \quad a.s. \quad (42)$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\| < \Delta_1, \quad \|\bar{g}^k\| < \Delta_2 \quad a.s. \quad (43)$$

for some random scalars $\Delta_1 > 0$ and $\Delta_2 > 0$ due to the assumption $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k = \infty$.

Now, we focus on proving that both $\mathbf{v}_2^k = \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$ and $\mathbf{v}_3^k = \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2$ converge to 0 *a.s.* The idea is to show that we can apply Lemma 7. By focusing on the second and third elements of \mathbf{v}^k , i.e., \mathbf{v}_2^k and \mathbf{v}_3^k , from (39) we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_2^{k+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_3^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \leq \left(\tilde{V}^k + a^k \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_2^k \\ \mathbf{v}_3^k \end{bmatrix} + \hat{b}^k \mathbf{1} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{c}^k \\ \hat{c}^k \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\hat{b}^k = b^k + a^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F^*)$, $\hat{c}^k = \max \left\{ \kappa_8 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2, \kappa_9 \frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \right\}$, and $\tilde{V}^k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \kappa_3 \gamma_1^k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \kappa_4 \gamma_2^k \end{bmatrix}$, which can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_2^{k+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_3^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \leq \tilde{V}^k \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_2^k \\ \mathbf{v}_3^k \end{bmatrix} + \tilde{b}^k \mathbf{1} \quad (44)$$

where $\tilde{b}^k = b^k + \hat{c}^k + a^k (F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* + \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 + \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2)$.

To apply Lemma 7, noting that γ_1^k and γ_2^k are not summable, we show that the equation $\tilde{\pi}^T \tilde{V}^k = (1 - \alpha \gamma_1^k) \tilde{\pi}^T$ has a solution in $\tilde{\pi} = [\pi_2, \pi_3]$ with $\pi_2, \pi_3 > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. From $\tilde{\pi}^T \tilde{V}^k = (1 - \alpha \gamma_1^k) \tilde{\pi}^T$, one has

$$(1 - \kappa_3 \gamma_1^k) \pi_2 \leq (1 - \alpha \gamma_1^k) \pi_2, \quad (1 - \kappa_4 \gamma_2^k) \pi_3 \leq (1 - \alpha \gamma_1^k) \pi_3$$

which can be simplified as $\alpha \leq \kappa_3$, $\alpha \leq \frac{\kappa_4 \gamma_2^k}{\gamma_1^k}$.

Given $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_1^k / \gamma_2^k < \infty$ according to our assumption, it can be seen that $\frac{\kappa_4 \gamma_2^k}{\gamma_1^k}$ is positive, and hence such an $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\tilde{\pi} > 0$ can always be found.

We next prove that the condition $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{b}^k < \infty$ *a.s.* of Lemma 7 is also satisfied. Indeed, the condition can be met because: (1) b^k , a^k , $\frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_1^k}$, and $\frac{(\lambda^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k}$ are all summable according to the assumption of the Theorem; and (2) $\|\bar{g}^k\|$ (see (43)) and $F(\bar{x}^k) - F^*$, $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$, $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2$ are all bounded *a.s.* due to the existence of the limit in (41). Thus, all the conditions of Lemma 7 are satisfied, so it follows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\| = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_i^k - v_i \bar{y}^k\| = 0$ *a.s.* Moreover, in view of the existence of the limit in (41) and the facts that $\pi_1 > 0$ and $v_1^k = F(\bar{x}^k) - F(\theta^*)$, it follows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^k)$ exists *a.s.*

(b) Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 < \infty$ holds *a.s.* (see (42)), from $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k = \infty$, it follows that we have $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\| = 0$ *a.s.*

Now, if the function $F(\cdot)$ has bounded level sets, then the sequence $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ is *a.s.* bounded since the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^k)$ exists *a.s.* (as shown in part (a)). Thus, $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ *a.s.* has accumulation points. Let $\{\bar{x}^{k_i}\}$ be a sub-sequence such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^{k_i})\| = 0$ *a.s.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{\bar{x}^{k_i}\}$ is *a.s.* convergent, for otherwise we would choose a sub-sequence of $\{\bar{x}^{k_i}\}$. Let $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}^{k_i} = \hat{x}$. Then, by the continuity of the gradient $\nabla F(\cdot)$, it follows $\nabla F(\hat{x}) = 0$, implying that \hat{x} is an optimal point. Since $F(\cdot)$ is continuous, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^{k_i}) = F(\hat{x}) = F^*$. By part (a), $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^k)$ exists *a.s.*, so we must have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\bar{x}^k) = F^*$ *a.s.*

Finally, by part (a), we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 = 0$ *a.s.* for every i . Thus, each $\{x_i^k\}$ has the same accumulation points as the sequence $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ *a.s.*, implying by the continuity of the function $F(\cdot)$ that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i^k) = F^*$ *a.s.* for all i . ■

Remark 6. In Lemma 9(b), the bounded level set condition can be replaced with any other condition ensuring that the sequence $\{\bar{x}^k\}$ is bounded almost surely.

Lemma 9 is critical for establishing convergence properties of the gradient tracking-based distributed algorithm together

with suitable conditions on the DP-noise injected by the agents. We make the following assumption on the noise:

Assumption 6. For every $i \in [m]$, the noise sequences $\{\zeta_i^k\}$ and $\{\xi_i^k\}$ are zero-mean independent random variables, and independent of $\{x_i^0; i \in [m]\}$. Also, for every k , the noise collection $\{\zeta_j^k, \xi_j^k; j \in [m]\}$ is independent. The noise variances $(\sigma_{\zeta_i^k}^k)^2 = \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_i^k\|^2]$ and $(\sigma_{\xi_i^k}^k)^2 = \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_i^k\|^2]$ and their attenuation stepsizes γ_1^k and γ_2^k are such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_1^k)^2 \max_{i \in [m]} (\sigma_{\zeta_i^k}^k)^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_2^k)^2 \max_{j \in [m]} (\sigma_{\xi_j^k}^k)^2 < \infty, \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\lambda^k)^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (\gamma_2^\ell)^2 \max_{j \in [m]} (\sigma_{\xi_j^k}^k)^2 < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The initial random vectors satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\|x_i^0\|^2] < \infty, \forall i \in [m]$.

Remark 7. Given that γ_1^k, γ_2^k , and λ^k decrease with time, (45) can be satisfied even when $\{\sigma_i^k\}$ increases with time. For example, under $\lambda^k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$, $\gamma_1^k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.9}})$, $\gamma_2^k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.7}})$, an increasing $\{\sigma_i^k\}$ with increasing rate no larger than $\mathcal{O}(k^{0.15})$ still satisfies the summable condition in (45).

Theorem 3. Let Assumption 1, Assumption 5, and Assumption 6 hold. If $\{\gamma_1^k\}$, $\{\gamma_2^k\}$, and $\{\lambda^k\}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_i^k)^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{\gamma_i^k} < \infty$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k / \gamma_i^k = 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\gamma_1^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k} < \infty$, then, the results of Lemma 9 hold for Algorithm 2.

Proof. The goal is to establish the relationship in (39), with the σ -field $\mathcal{F}^k = \{x_i^\ell, y_i^\ell; 0 \leq \ell \leq k, i \in [m]\}$. To this end, we divide the derivations into four steps: in Step I, Step II, and Step III, we establish relations for $\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k]$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$, and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$ for the iterates generated by Algorithm 2, respectively. In Step IV, we use them to show that (39) of Theorem 9 holds.

Step I: Relationship for $\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k]$.

Since F is convex with Lipschitz gradients, we have

$$F(y) \leq F(x) + \langle \nabla F(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \quad \forall y, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Letting $y = \bar{x}^{k+1}$ and $x = \bar{x}^k$ in the preceding relation and using (36), as well as $\nabla F(\bar{x}^k) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{x}^{k+1}) &\leq F(\bar{x}^k) - \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k - \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k) + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the last term in the preceding inequality by using $(a + b + c + d)^2 \leq 4a^2 + 4b^2 + 4c^2 + 4d^2$ and $\|A \otimes B\|_2 =$

$\|A\|_2 \|B\|_2$. After subtracting F^* on both sides of the resulting inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\bar{x}^{k+1}) - F^* \\ &\leq F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* - \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k - \gamma_1^k \bar{\zeta}_w^k + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 \|u\|^2}{m^2} \|y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k\|^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2L(\gamma_1^k)^2 \|\bar{\zeta}_w^k\|^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \left\| \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation on both sides, with respect to \mathcal{F}^k , leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{x}^{k+1}) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* \\ &\quad - \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k) + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 \|u\|^2}{m^2} \|y^k - (v \otimes I_d)\bar{y}^k\|^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2L(\gamma_1^k)^2 (\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{m^2} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where

$$(\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\zeta}_w^k\|^2] = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{R,j}^{\text{out}}} u_i R_{ij} \right)^2 (\sigma_{\zeta_j^k}^k)^2$$

which follows from the assumption that the noise ζ_j^k is zero mean and independent across the agents at any given time (see Assumption 6). The term $(\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2 &\triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l, \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^\ell \bar{\xi}_w^\ell \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (\gamma_2^l)^2 \|\bar{\xi}_w^l\|^2 + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\ell=0, \ell \neq l}^{k-1} \langle \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l, \gamma_2^\ell \bar{\xi}_w^\ell \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (\gamma_2^l)^2 \|\bar{\xi}_w^l\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (\gamma_2^l)^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{C,j}^{\text{out}}} C_{ij} \right)^2 (\sigma_{\xi_j^k}^k)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

In the preceding derivation, we used the fact that $\bar{\xi}_w^l$ and $\bar{\xi}_w^\ell$ are independent when $l \neq \ell$ (see Assumption 6). Also note that when $\sigma_{\xi_i^k}^k$ is bounded, $(\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2$ is bounded because $(\gamma_2^k)^2$ is summable.

The inner product term in (46) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k \right\rangle \\
& = - \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) + \bar{g}^k \right\rangle \\
& = \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \right\|^2 - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \left\| \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) + \bar{g}^k \right\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where in the second equality we use $-\langle a, b \rangle = \frac{\|a-b\|^2 - \|a\|^2 - \|b\|^2}{2}$ valid for any vectors a and b . Using the inequalities $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$ and $\|a + b\|^2 \geq \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2$, we can bound the first and the last terms in the preceding equality, respectively, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)) - \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \right\|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)}{m} \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + 2 \left\| \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \right\|^2, \\
& - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \left\| \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) + \bar{g}^k \right\|^2 \\
& \leq - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \left\| \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \right\|^2 - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the preceding two inequalities into (48) and combining the common terms lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}^k), \lambda^k \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{m} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) + \lambda^k \frac{u^T v}{m} \bar{g}^k \right\rangle \\
& \leq \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{m} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\nabla f_i(\bar{x}^k) - \nabla f_i(x_i^k)}{m} \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \left\| \frac{(u \otimes I_d)^T}{u^T v} (y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k) \right\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{u^T v L^2 \lambda^k}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\bar{x}^k - x_i^k\|^2 + \frac{\|u\|^2 \lambda^k}{2m u^T v} \|y^k - (v \otimes I_d) \bar{y}^k\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\bar{g}^k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where in the last inequality we used $\|A \otimes B\|_2 = \|A\|_2 \|B\|_2$ and the assumption that each $\nabla f_i(\cdot)$ has Lipschitz continuous gradients with the constant L .

Next, combining (46) and (49) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [F(\bar{x}^{k+1}) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k] \\
& \leq F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* + \frac{u^T v L^2 \lambda^k}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\|u\|^2 \lambda^k}{2m u^T v} + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 \|u\|^2}{m^2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i^k - v_i \bar{y}^k\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \left(\frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} - \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \right) \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \\
& \quad + 2L(\gamma_1^k)^2 (\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{m^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Using the fact that in finite dimensional vector spaces, all norms are equivalent up to a proportionality constant, we always have a constant $\delta_{2,R}$ such that $\|x\|_2 \leq \delta_{2,R} \|x\|_R$ for all x and hence $\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \leq \delta_{2,R}^2 \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$ according to the definition of matrix norm in (37). Similarly, we always have $\sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i^k - v_i \bar{y}^k\|^2 \leq \delta_{2,C}^2 \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2$ for some constant $\delta_{2,C}$ according to the definition of matrix norm in (38). Therefore, (50) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [F(\bar{x}^{k+1}) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k] \\
& \leq F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* + \frac{u^T v L^2 \lambda^k \delta_{2,R}^2 \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2}{m^2} \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\|u\|^2 \lambda^k}{2m u^T v} + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 \|u\|^2}{m^2} \right) \delta_{2,C}^2 \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v) \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \left(\frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} - \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \right) \|\bar{g}^k\|^2 \\
& \quad + 2L(\gamma_1^k)^2 (\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + \frac{2L(\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{m^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Step II: Relationship for $\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_R^2$.

For the convenience of analysis, we write the iterates of (32) on per-coordinate expressions. Define for all $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, and $k \geq 0$, $x^k(\ell) = ([x_1^k]_\ell, \dots, [x_m^k]_\ell)^T$, $y^k(\ell) = ([y_1^k]_\ell, \dots, [y_m^k]_\ell)^T$, $g^k(\ell) = ([g_1^k]_\ell, \dots, [g_m^k]_\ell)^T$, $\zeta_w^k(\ell) = ([\zeta_{w1}^k]_\ell, \dots, [\zeta_{wm}^k]_\ell)^T$, $\xi_w^k(\ell) = ([\xi_{w1}^{k+1}]_\ell, \dots, [\xi_{wm}^{k+1}]_\ell)^T$. In this per-coordinate view, (32) has the following form for all $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, and $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1}(\ell) & = (I + \gamma_1^k R) x^k(\ell) + \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k y^k(\ell) \\
y^{k+1}(\ell) & = (I + \gamma_2^k C) y^k(\ell) + \gamma_2^k \xi_w^k(\ell) + g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

From the definition of $x^{k+1}(\ell)$ in (52), and the relation for \bar{x}^{k+1} in (33), we obtain for all $\ell = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell \mathbf{1} & = (I + \gamma_1^k R) (x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}) \\
& \quad + \gamma_1^k (\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k \left(I - \frac{\mathbf{1} u^T}{m} \right) y^k(\ell)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $(I + \gamma_1^k R) \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$.

Noting that $[\bar{x}^k]_\ell$ is the average of $x^k(\ell)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{m}\mathbf{1}^T(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) = 0$, and abbreviating $I - \frac{\mathbf{1}u^T}{m}$ as $\Pi_u \triangleq I - \frac{\mathbf{1}u^T}{m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell\mathbf{1} &= \bar{R}^k(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) + \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) \\ &\quad - \lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell + v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\ &= \bar{R}^k(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) + \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) \\ &\quad - \lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\ &\quad - \lambda^k\Pi_uv\left([\bar{g}^k]_\ell + \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right]_\ell\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{R}^k = I + \gamma_1^k R - \frac{\mathbf{1}u^T}{m}$ and we used (35) in the last equality.

Taking norm $\|\cdot\|_R$ on both sides of the preceding relationship leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 = \\ &\|\bar{R}^k(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv[\bar{g}^k]_\ell\|_R^2 \\ &+ \left\| \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv\left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right]_\ell \right\|_R^2 \\ &+ 2\langle \bar{R}^k(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\ &\quad - \lambda^k\Pi_uv[\bar{g}^k]_\ell, \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv\left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right]_\ell \rangle_R \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_R$ denotes the inner product induced¹ by the norm $\|\cdot\|_R$.

Taking the expectation (conditioned on \mathcal{F}^k) on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k\right] \\ &= \|\bar{R}^k(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv[\bar{g}^k]_\ell\|_R^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv\left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right]_\ell \right\|_R^2\right] \\ &\leq ((1 - \gamma_1^k\rho_R)\|x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R \\ &\quad + \|\lambda^k\Pi_u(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) + \lambda^k\Pi_uv[\bar{g}^k]_\ell\|_R)^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \gamma_1^k(\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k\Pi_uv\left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right]_\ell \right\|_R^2\right] \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Using the relationship $(a+b)^2 \leq (1+\epsilon)a^2 + (1+\epsilon^{-1})b^2$ on the first term on the right hand side of (53) and setting ϵ

to $\frac{1}{1-\gamma_1^k\rho_R} - 1$ (resulting in $1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k\right] \leq \\ &(1 - \gamma_1^k\rho_R)\|x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 + \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|[\bar{g}^k]_\ell\|_R^2 \\ &+ \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_u\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_R^2 \\ &+ 2(\gamma_1^k)^2\mathbb{E}\left[\|\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2\right] \\ &+ 2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right\|_R^2\right] \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Summing the preceding relations over $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, and noting $\sum_{\ell=1}^d\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - [\bar{x}^{k+1}]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 = \|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_R^2$, $\sum_{\ell=1}^d\|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_R^2 = \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_R^2$, $\sum_{\ell=1}^d\|\zeta_w^k(\ell) - [\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell\mathbf{1}\|_R^2 \leq \delta_{R,2}^2\sum_{i=1}^m\|\zeta_w^k - \bar{\zeta}_w^k\|_2^2$, and $\sum_{\ell=1}^d\left\|\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right\|_R^2 \leq \delta_{R,2}^2\left\|\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right\|_2^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_R^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k\right] \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma_1^k\rho_R)\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 + \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}^k\|_R^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_u\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_R^2 \\ &\quad + 2(\gamma_1^k)^2\delta_{R,2}^2\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^m\|\zeta_{wi}^k - \bar{\zeta}_w^k\|_2^2\right] \\ &\quad + 2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2\delta_{R,2}^2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\gamma_2^l\bar{\xi}_w^l\right\|_2^2\right] \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma_1^k\rho_R)\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 + \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}^k\|_R^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_u\|_R^2}{\rho_R\gamma_1^k}\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_R^2 \\ &\quad + 4m(\gamma_1^k)^2\delta_{R,2}^2(\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + 4(\gamma_1^k)^2\delta_{R,2}^2\sum_{i,j}(R_{ij}\sigma_{\zeta,j}^k)^2 \\ &\quad + 2(\lambda^k)^2\|\Pi_uv\|_R^2\delta_{R,2}^2(\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $\delta_{R,2}$ is constant such that $\|x\|_R \leq \delta_{R,2}\|x\|_2$ for all x . (In finite dimensional vector spaces, all norms are equivalent up to a proportionality constant, represented by $\delta_{R,2}$ here.)

Step III: Relationship for $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2$.

From (33), the ℓ th entries of $[\bar{y}^k]_\ell$ satisfy

$$[\bar{y}^{k+1}]_\ell = [\bar{y}^k]_\ell + \gamma_2^k[\bar{\zeta}_w^k]_\ell + [\bar{g}^{k+1}]_\ell - [\bar{g}^k]_\ell$$

Then, using (52), we obtain for all $\ell = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} y^{k+1}(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^{k+1}]_\ell &= \bar{C}^k(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) + \gamma_2^k\Pi_v\xi_w^k(\ell) \\ &\quad + \Pi_v(g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{C}^k = I + \gamma_2^k C - \frac{1}{m}v\mathbf{1}^T$ and $\Pi_v = (I - \frac{1}{m}v\mathbf{1}^T)$. Note that we used the relationship $(I + \gamma_2^k C)v = v$ and $\frac{1}{m}v\mathbf{1}^T(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) = 0$.

¹It can be seen that the norm $\|\cdot\|_R$ satisfies the Parallelogram Law and, hence, the inner product induced by the norm $\|\cdot\|_R$ exists.

Taking the norm $\|\cdot\|_C$ on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|y^{k+1}(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^{k+1}]_\ell\|_C^2 \\
&= \|\bar{C}^k(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) + \Pi_v(g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell))\|_C^2 \\
&\quad + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v(\xi_w^k(\ell))\|_C^2 + 2\langle \bar{C}^k(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\
&\quad + \Pi_v(g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)), \gamma_2^k \Pi_v \xi_w^k(\ell) \rangle_C \\
&\leq ((1 - \rho_C \gamma_2^k) \|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_C + \\
&\quad \|\Pi_v\|_C \|g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)\|_C)^2 + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \|\xi_w^k(\ell)\|_C^2 \\
&\quad + 2\langle \bar{C}^k(y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) + \Pi_v(g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)), \\
&\quad \gamma_2^k \Pi_v \xi_w^k(\ell) \rangle_C
\end{aligned}$$

where in the inequality we used $\|\bar{C}^k\|_C = 1 - \gamma^k \rho_C$. Taking conditional expectation on both sides leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|y^{k+1}(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^{k+1}]_\ell\|_C^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[((1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C) \|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_C \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\Pi_v\|_C \|g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)\|_C)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\quad + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_w^k(\ell)\|_C^2 \right] \\
&\leq (1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C) \|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_C^2 + \\
&\quad \frac{\|\Pi_v\|_C^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C} \|g^{k+1}(\ell) - g^k(\ell)\|_C^2 + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_w^k(\ell)\|_C^2 \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where in the second inequality we used the relationship $(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)a^2 + (1 + \epsilon^{-1})b^2$ valid for any scalars a, b and $\epsilon > 0$ and set $\epsilon = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C} - 1$.

By summing these relations over $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{y}^{k+1} - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_C^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\leq (1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C) \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \delta_{C,2}^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \|g_i^{k+1} - g_i^k\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\quad + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \|\xi_{wi}^k\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq (1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C) \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_C^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{L^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \delta_{C,2}^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\quad + (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_C^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \sum_{i,j} (C_{ij} \sigma_{\xi,j}^k)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where we used the Lipschitz assumption on g_i and $\delta_{C,2}$ is constant such that $\|x\|_C \leq \delta_{C,2} \|x\|_2$ for all x . (In finite dimensional vector spaces, all norms are equivalent up to a proportionality constant, represented by $\delta_{C,2}$ here.)

Next, we proceed to analyze $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right]$

in (57). Using (32), we have for every index $\ell = 1, \dots, d$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& x^{k+1}(\ell) - x^k(\ell) \\
&= \gamma_1^k R x^k(\ell) + \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k y^k(\ell) \\
&= \gamma_1^k R(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}) + \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k (y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\
&\quad - \lambda^k v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell \\
&= \gamma_1^k R(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}) + \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k (y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) \\
&\quad - \lambda^k v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell - \lambda^k v \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right]_\ell
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $R\mathbf{1} = 0$ in the second equality and $\bar{y}^k = \bar{g}^k + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l$ from (35) in the last equality.

The preceding relationship leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|x^{k+1}(\ell) - x^k(\ell)\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \gamma_1^k R(x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}) - \lambda^k (y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell) - \lambda^k v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell \right\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \left\| \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k v \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right]_\ell \right\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

and further

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - x^k(\ell)\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\leq 2 (r^k \|x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}\|_2 + \lambda^k \|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_2 + \\
&\quad \lambda^k \|v\|_2 \|\bar{g}^k\|_2)^2 + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \gamma_1^k \zeta_w^k(\ell) - \lambda^k v \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right]_\ell \right\|_2^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $r^k = \|\gamma_1^k R\|_2 = \gamma_1^k \rho_C$ which is arbitrarily close to the spectral radius of the matrix $\gamma_1^k R$.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|x^{k+1}(\ell) - x^k(\ell)\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\leq 6(r^k)^2 \|x^k(\ell) - [\bar{x}^k]_\ell \mathbf{1}\|_2^2 + 6(\lambda^k)^2 \|y^k(\ell) - v[\bar{y}^k]_\ell\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 6(\lambda^k)^2 \|v\|_2^2 \|\bar{g}^k\|_2^2 + 4(\gamma_1^k)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\zeta_w^k(\ell)\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 4(\lambda^k)^2 \|v\|_2^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2^l \bar{\xi}_w^l \right\|_2^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

By summing over $\ell = 1, \dots, d$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k\|_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\
&\leq 6(r^k)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i^k - \bar{x}^k\|_2^2 + 6(\lambda^k)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i^k - v_i \bar{y}^k\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 6(\lambda^k)^2 \|v\|_2^2 \|\bar{g}^k\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 4(\gamma_1^k)^2 \sum_{i,j} R_{ij}^2 (\sigma_{\xi,j}^k)^2 + 4(\lambda^k)^2 \|v\|_2^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where we used the definition of $(\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2$ in (47).

Plugging (58) into (57) and using $r^k = \gamma_1^k \rho_C$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{y}^{k+1} - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 | \mathcal{F}^k] &\leq \\
&\left(1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C + \frac{6L^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \delta_{2,C}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k}\right) \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \\
&+ \frac{6L^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \delta_{2,R}^2 \rho_C^2 (\gamma_1^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 \\
&+ \frac{6 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}^k\|_2^2 \\
&+ (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \sum_{i,j} (C_{ij} \sigma_{\xi,j}^k)^2 \\
&+ \frac{4L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 (\gamma_1^k)^2 \sum_{i,j} R_{ij}^2 (\sigma_{\zeta,j}^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C} \\
&+ \frac{4L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 (\lambda^k)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C}
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Step IV: We combine Steps I-III and prove the theorem.

Defining $\mathbf{v}^k = [(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}) - F^*), \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2, \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2]^T$, we have the following relations from (51), (55), and (59):

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{v}^{k+1} | \mathcal{F}^k] \leq (V^k + A^k) \mathbf{v}^k - H^k \left[\frac{\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k)\|^2}{\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}^k\|^2} \right] + B^k \tag{60}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
V^k &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{(u^T v) L^2 \delta_{2,R}^2 \lambda^k}{m^2} & \frac{\|u\|^2 \delta_{2,C}^2 \lambda^k}{2m u^T v} \\ 0 & 1 - \gamma_1^k \rho_R & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - \gamma_2^k \rho_C \end{bmatrix}, \\
A^k &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{2L \delta_{2,C}^2 (\lambda^k)^2 \|u\|^2}{m^2} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{2 \|\Pi_u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,R}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_R \gamma_1^k} \\ 0 & \frac{6L^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \delta_{2,R}^2 \rho_C^2 (\gamma_1^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k} & \frac{6L^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \delta_{2,C}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k} \end{bmatrix}, \\
H^k &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} & \frac{u^T v \lambda^k}{2m} - \frac{2L (\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2}{m^2} \\ 0 & -\frac{2 \|\Pi_u v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{R,2}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_R \gamma_1^k} \\ 0 & -\frac{6 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 (\lambda^k)^2}{\rho_C \gamma_2^k} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B^k = \begin{bmatrix} b_1^k \\ b_2^k \\ b_3^k \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{with } b_1^k &= 2L (\gamma_1^k)^2 (\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + \\
&\frac{2L (\lambda^k)^2 (u^T v)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{m^2}, \quad b_2^k = 4m (\gamma_1^k)^2 \delta_{R,2}^2 (\sigma_{R,\zeta}^k)^2 + \\
&4 (\gamma_1^k)^2 \delta_{R,2}^2 \sum_{i,j} (R_{ij} \sigma_{\zeta,j}^k)^2 + 2 (\lambda^k)^2 \|\Pi_u v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{R,2}^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2 \\
b_3^k &= (\gamma_2^k)^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \sum_{i,j} (C_{ij} \sigma_{\xi,j}^k)^2 + \\
&\frac{4L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 (\gamma_1^k)^2 \sum_{i,j} R_{ij}^2 (\sigma_{\zeta,j}^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C} + \\
&\frac{4L^2 \delta_{C,2}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \|\Pi_v\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 (\lambda^k)^2 (\sigma_{C,\gamma_2,\xi}^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k \rho_C}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 5, and the conditions that $(\gamma_1^k)^2$, $(\gamma_2^k)^2$, and $\frac{(\gamma_1^k)^2}{\gamma_2^k}$ are summable in the theorem statement, it follows that all entries of the matrix B^k are summable *a.s.* By defining \hat{b}^k as the maximum element of B^k , we have $B^k \leq \hat{b}^k \mathbf{1}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E} [F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k) - F^* | \mathcal{F}^k]$, $\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$, and $\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 | \mathcal{F}^k]$ for the iterates generated by Algorithm 2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 9 and, hence, the results of Theorem 9 hold. \blacksquare

Remark 8. In networked systems, usually communication imperfections can be modeled as channel noises [43], which can be regarded as a special case of the DP noise considered here. Therefore, Algorithm 2 can also be used to counteract such communication imperfections in distributed optimization.

Remark 9. Because the evolution of x_i^k to the optimal solution satisfies the conditions in Lemma 9, which are in turn derived based on Lemma 2, we can leverage Lemma 9 and Lemma 2 to characterize the convergence speed. More specifically, (44) and the relationship $\tilde{\pi}^T \bar{\mathbf{V}}^k = (1 - \alpha \gamma_1^k) \tilde{\pi}^T$ imply that $\mathbf{v}_2^k \triangleq \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$ and $\mathbf{v}_3^k \triangleq \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k \|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k \|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 < \infty$ according to Lemma 2. Given that summable sequences decay with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$, and γ_1^k is non-summable, we have $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$ and $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ decaying to zero with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma_1^k})$. Furthermore, (42) implies that $\lambda^k \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k)\|^2$ decays to zero with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$, i.e., $\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k)\|^2$ decays to zero with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\lambda^k})$. For example, when γ_1^k and λ^k are set as $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.6}})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.9}})$, respectively, then $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$, $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2$, and $\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k)\|^2$ will decay to zero with a rate no slower than $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.4}})$, $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.4}})$, and $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^{0.1}})$, respectively. Moreover, from the proof in Lemma 9 (specifically (44) and the paragraph below it), we know that the decreasing speed of $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_R^2$, $\|\mathbf{y}^k - \text{diag}(v)\bar{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ increases with an increase in α , which in turn increases with an increase in κ_3 and κ_4 . Further noting that κ_3 and κ_4 correspond to the spectral radius of R and C , respectively, we have that the convergence speed increases with an increase in the spectral radius of R and C defined in Assumption 5 (see (30) for diagonal entries).

B. Privacy analysis

Similar to the privacy analysis in Sec. III-B, we can also analyze the strength of differential privacy for Algorithm 2:

Theorem 4. Under Assumptions 1, 4, and 5, if $\{\lambda^k\}$, $\{\gamma_1^k\}$, and $\{\gamma_2^k\}$ satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3, and all elements of ζ_i^k and ξ_i^k are drawn independently from Laplace distribution $\text{Lap}(v^k)$ with $(\sigma_{\zeta,i}^k)^2 = (\sigma_{\xi,i}^k)^2 = 2(v^k)^2$ satisfying Assumption 6, then all agents will converge almost surely to an optimal solution. Moreover, the cumulative differential-privacy budget ϵ of Algorithm 2 increases with the number of iterations at a rate $\epsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{4C}{v^k}$. In the special case where $\lambda^k = \frac{1}{k}$, $\gamma_1^k = \frac{1}{k^{0.9}}$, $\gamma_2^k = \frac{1}{k^{0.7}}$, and $v^k = 4Ck^{0.15}$, which satisfy all conditions of Theorem 3 and hence ensure almost sure convergence, the privacy budget of Algorithm 2 increases at a rate $\epsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{k^{0.15}}$.

Proof. Since the convergence follows Theorem 3, we only consider the privacy statements. We first prove that the sensitivity of the algorithm satisfies $\Delta^k \leq 4C$ with C given in Assumption 4. Given two adjacent distributed optimization problems \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , for any given fixed observation \mathcal{O} and initial state $[x^0; y^0] \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x^0 \\ y^0 \end{bmatrix}$, the sensitivity is determined by $\|\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, [x^0; y^0]) - \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}, [x^0; y^0])\|_1$ according to Definition 3. Since in \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , there is

only one objective function that is different, we represent the different objective function as the i th one, i.e., $f_i(\cdot)$, without loss of generality. Because the observations (including all shared messages) under \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are identical, we have $o_1^k \triangleq (1 + \gamma_1^k R_{ii})x_i^k + \gamma_1^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}} R_{ij}x_j^k - \lambda^k y_i^k = (1 + \gamma_1^k R_{ii})x_i'^k + \gamma_1^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{R,i}^{\text{in}}} R_{ij}x_j'^k - \lambda^k y_i'^k \triangleq o_1'^k$ and $o_2^k \triangleq (1 + \gamma_2^k C_{ii})y_i^k + \gamma_2^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{in}}} C_{ij}y_j^k = (1 + \gamma_2^k C_{ii})y_i'^k + \gamma_2^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{C,i}^{\text{in}}} C_{ij}y_j'^k \triangleq o_2'^k$. Therefore, we have the following relationship for Algorithm 2:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{O}, [x^0; y^0]) - \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{O}, [x^0; y^0])\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} o_1^k - o_1'^k \\ o_2^k + \nabla f_i^{k+1} - \nabla f_i^k - (o_2'^k + \nabla f_i'^{k+1} - \nabla f_i'^k) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &= \|\nabla f_i^{k+1} - \nabla f_i^k - (\nabla f_i'^{k+1} - \nabla f_i'^k)\|_1 \leq 4C \end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviated $\nabla f_i(x_i^k)$ as ∇f_i^k and used Assumption 4 in the last inequality.

Using Lemma 6, we can easily obtain that the cumulative privacy budget satisfies $\epsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{4C}{\nu^k}$ for T iterations, which completes the proof. The results for the special case can be easily obtained by replacing ν^k with $4Ck^{0.15}$. \blacksquare

Remark 10. To satisfy Assumption 6, ν^k cannot increase faster than $\frac{1}{\gamma_2^k}$, and hence $\frac{1}{\nu^k}$ decreases slower than γ_2^k and is not summable. Therefore, the privacy budget of Algorithm 2 will tend to infinity when k tends to infinity. This is different from Algorithm 1, which can ensure both almost sure convergence and a finite privacy budget even when the number of iterations goes to infinity (see details in Theorem 2). This reduced privacy of Algorithm 2 compared with Algorithm 1 is caused by the fact that Algorithm 2 shares more messages than Algorithm 1 in every iteration (it has been proven that sharing less messages can amplify privacy protection [46], [47]).

Remark 11. Since we use the standard ϵ -differential privacy framework, we characterize the cumulative privacy budget directly. Under relaxed (approximate) ϵ -differential privacy frameworks, such as (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy [48], zero-concentrated differential privacy [49], or Rényi differential privacy [50], advanced composition theories in [48], [49], [50] can be exploited to characterize the cumulative privacy budget.

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

A. Evaluation using distributed estimation

We first evaluate the performance of the two proposed algorithms using a canonical distributed estimation problem where a network of m sensors collectively estimate an unknown parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. More specifically, we assume that each sensor i has a noisy measurement of the parameter, $z_i = M_i\theta + w_i$, where $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times d}$ is the measurement matrix of agent i and w_i is Gaussian measurement noise of unit variance. Then the maximum likelihood estimation of parameter θ can be solved using the optimization problem formulated as (1), with each $f_i(\theta)$ given as $f_i(\theta) = \|z_i - M_i\theta\|^2 + \varsigma\|\theta\|^2$ where ς is a regularization parameter [9].




Fig. 1. The interaction topology of the network

We consider a network of $m = 5$ sensors interacting on the graph depicted in Fig. 1. In the evaluation, we set $s = 3$ and $d = 2$. To evaluate the performance of the proposed Algorithm 1, we ignored the directions of edges in Fig. 1 in the selection of coupling weights and injected Laplace based DP-noise with parameter $\nu^k = 1 + 0.1k^{0.3}$ in every message shared in all iterations. We set the stepsize λ^k and diminishing sequence γ^k as $\lambda^k = \frac{0.02}{1+0.1k}$ and $\gamma^k = \frac{1}{1+0.1k^{0.9}}$, respectively, which satisfy the conditions in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. In the evaluation, we ran our algorithm for 100 times and calculated the average as well as the variance of the optimization error as a function of the iteration index. The result is given by the blue curve and error bars in Fig. 2. For comparison, we also ran the existing static-consensus based distributed gradient descent (DGD) approach in [6] under the same noise, and the differential-privacy approach for distributed optimization (PDOP) in [18] under the same privacy budget. Note that PDOP uses geometrically decreasing stepsizes (which are summable) to ensure a finite privacy budget, but the fast decreasing stepsize also leads to optimization errors. The evolution of the average optimization error and variance of the DGD and PDOP approaches are given by the red and black curves and error bars in Fig. 2, respectively. It is clear that the proposed algorithm has a comparable convergence speed but much better optimization accuracy.

We also evaluated Algorithm 2 which is applicable to general directed graphs. More specifically, still using the topology in Fig. 1, we selected R and C matrices according to Assumption 5 and set the stepsize and diminishing sequences as $\lambda^k = \frac{0.02}{1+0.1k}$, $\gamma_1^k = \frac{1}{1+0.1k^{0.9}}$, and $\gamma_2^k = \frac{1}{1+0.1k^{0.7}}$, respectively, which satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3. We injected Laplace noises ζ_i^k and ξ_i^k (both have parameter $\nu^k = 1 + 0.1k^{0.1}$) on all shared x_i^k and y_i^k respectively to enable differential privacy, and it can be verified that the noise satisfies Assumption 6. We ran our algorithm for 100 times and calculated the average as well as the variance of the optimization error as a function of the iteration index. The result is given by the blue curve and error bars in Fig. 3. For comparison, we also ran the conventional dynamic-consensus based Push-Pull method in [17] under the same noise and the PDOP based differential-privacy approach for distributed optimization. Because the PDOP based approach requires the stepsize to be decaying with a geometric rate, we set the stepsize of Push-Pull to 0.95^k and used a geometrically decaying noise such that it has the same privacy budget as our approach. The evolution of the average optimization error and




Fig. 2. Comparison of Algorithm 1 with existing distributed gradient descent algorithm (DGD) in [6] (under the same noise) and the differential-privacy approach for decentralized optimization PDOP in [18] (under the same privacy budget) using the distributed estimation problem




Fig. 3. Comparison of Algorithm 2 with existing dynamic-consensus based distributed gradient algorithm (Push Pull) in [17] (under the same noise) and the PDOP-based differential-privacy approach in [18] for Push Pull (under the same privacy budget) using the distributed estimation problem

variance of Push Pull (with the same noise as our approach) and PDOP-privacy based Push Pull (with the same privacy budget as our approach) are depicted by the red and black curves and error bars in Fig. 3, respectively. It is clear that the proposed algorithm has a comparable convergence speed but gained significant improvement in optimization accuracy.

B. Evaluation using image classification on MNIST

We also used decentralized training of a convolutional neural network (CNN) to evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithms. More specially, we consider five agents which collaboratively train a CNN using the MNIST dataset [51] under the topology in Fig. 1. The MNIST data set is a large benchmark database of handwritten digits widely used




Fig. 4. Comparison of Algorithm 1 with existing distributed gradient descent algorithm (DGD) in [6] (under the same noise) and the differential-privacy approach for decentralized optimization PDOP in [18] (under the same privacy budget) using the MNIST image classification problem




Fig. 5. Comparison of Algorithm 2 with existing dynamic-consensus based distributed gradient algorithm (Push Pull) in [17] (under the same noise) and the PDOP-based differential-privacy approach in [18] for Push Pull (under the same privacy budget) using the MNIST image classification problem

for training and testing in the field of machine learning [52]. Each agent has a local copy of the CNN. The CNN has 2 convolutional layers with 32 filters with each followed by a max pooling layer, and then two more convolutional layers with 64 filters each followed by another max pooling layer and a dense layer with 512 units. Each agent has access to a portion of the MNIST dataset, which was further divided into two subsets for training and validation, respectively. To evaluate the proposed Algorithm 1, We set the stepsize as $\lambda^k = \frac{1}{1+0.01k}$ and the weakening factor γ^k as $\frac{1}{1+0.01k^{0.9}}$. The Laplace noise parameter was set to $\nu^k = 1 + 0.01k^{0.3}$ to enable ϵ -differential privacy. The evolution of the training and testing accuracies averaged over 50 runs are illustrated by the solid and dashed blue curves in Fig. 4. To compare the convergence performance of our algorithm with the conventional distributed gradient descent algorithm under differential-privacy induced noise, we also implemented the distributed

gradient descent (DGD) algorithm in [6] to train the same CNN using stepsize $\frac{1}{1+0.01k}$ under the same Laplace noise. The results are illustrated by the solid and dotted red curves in Fig. 4. It can be seen that the proposed algorithm has a much better robustness to differential-privacy noise. Moreover, to compare with the existing differential-privacy approach for distributed optimization, we also implemented the differential privacy approach PDOP in [42] on DGD under the same privacy budget ϵ . PDOP uses geometrically decaying stepsizes and noises to ensure a finite privacy budget. However, such fast-decaying stepsizes turned out to be unable to train the complex CNN model (see training and testing accuracies in solid and dashed black curves in Fig. 4, respectively under $\lambda^k = 0.95^k$ and $\nu^k = 0.98^k$). These comparisons corroborate the advantage of the proposed Algorithm 1.

To show the influence of differential-privacy noise on the final optimization accuracy, we also scaled the noise by 0.5 and 2 respectively and obtained the training and testing accuracies. To compare the strength of enabled privacy protection, we ran the DLG attack model proposed in [21], which is the most powerful inference algorithm reported to date in terms of reconstructing exact raw data from shared gradient/model updates. The attacker was assumed to be able to observe all messages shared among the agents. The training/testing accuracies under different levels of DP-noise and DLG attacker's inference errors are summarized in Table 1. It can be seen that there is a trade-off between privacy and accuracy.

Using the same interaction topology, CNN network, and MNIST dataset, we also evaluated the performance of the proposed Algorithm 2 under differential-privacy noise. The parameters of Algorithm 2 were set as $\lambda^k = \frac{1}{1+0.01k}$, $\gamma_1^k = \frac{1}{1+0.01k^{0.9}}$, and $\gamma_2^k = \frac{1}{1+0.01k^{0.7}}$. The Laplace noise parameter was set as $\nu^k = \frac{1}{1+0.01k^{0.1}}$. The evolution of the training and testing accuracies averaged over 50 runs are illustrated by the solid and dashed blue curves in Fig. 5. For comparison, we also implemented the dynamic-consensus based Push Pull algorithm in [17] to train the same CNN using stepsize 0.02 under the same Laplace noise. The results are illustrated by the solid and dotted red curves in Fig. 5. It can be seen that the same amount of noise, which is tolerable to our proposed Algorithm 2, completely prevents the Push Pull algorithm from training the CNN model. Moreover, we also applied PDOP based differential-privacy approach in [42] to Push Pull, which uses geometrically decaying stepsizes and noises to ensure a finite privacy budget. However, under the same privacy budget, the fast-decaying stepsize for Push Pull turned out to be unable to train the complex CNN model either (see Fig. 5 for training and testing accuracies in solid and dashed black curves, respectively, under $\lambda^k = 0.95^k$ and $\nu^k = 0.98^k$). These comparisons corroborate the advantage of the proposed Algorithm 2.

To show the influence of differential-privacy noise on the final optimization accuracy and the strength of enabled privacy, we also scaled the noise by 0.5 and 2 respectively and obtained the training/testing accuracies as well as DLG attacker's inference errors. The results are given in Table 1, which confirms the trade-off between privacy and accuracy.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Although DP is becoming the de facto standard for publicly sharing information, its direct incorporation into distributed optimization leads to significant reduction in optimization accuracy due to the need to iteratively and repeatedly inject independent noises. This paper proposes two DP-oriented gradient based distributed optimization algorithms that ensure both ϵ -differential privacy and optimization accuracy. In fact, the two algorithms can ensure almost sure convergence of all agents to the optimal solution even in the presence of persistent DP noise, which, to our knowledge, has not been reported before. Both algorithms are also proven able to ensure rigorous ϵ -differential privacy for a finite number of iterations. And the first algorithm is proven able to ensure a finite privacy budget even when the number of iterations goes to infinity. Numerical simulations and experimental results using a benchmark dataset confirm that both algorithms have a better accuracy compared with their respective existing counterparts, while maintaining a comparable convergence speed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Ben Liggett for the help in numerical experiments. They would also like to thank the associate editor and anonymous reviewers, whose comments helped improve the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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*, vol. 47, pp. 278–305, 2019.
- [2] J. A. Bazerque and G. B. Giannakis, "Distributed spectrum sensing for cognitive radio networks by exploiting sparsity," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1847–1862, 2009.
- [3] C. Zhang and Y. Wang, "Distributed event localization via alternating direction method of multipliers," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 348–361, 2017.
- [4] K. I. Tsianos, S. Lawlor, and M. G. Rabbat, "Consensus-based distributed optimization: Practical issues and applications in large-scale machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 50th annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2012, pp. 1543–1550.
- [5] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Problems in decentralized decision making and computation." MIT, Tech. Rep., 1984.
- [6] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [7] K. Srivastava and A. Nedic, "Distributed asynchronous constrained stochastic optimization," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 772–790, 2011.
- [8] 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.
- [9] 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.
- [10] G. Qu and N. Li, "Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1245–1260, 2017.
- [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] 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.
- [13] C. Zhang, M. Ahmad, and Y. Wang, "ADMM based privacy-preserving decentralized optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 565–580, 2019.

TABLE I
TRAINING/TESTING ACCURACIES AND DLG ATTACKER'S INFERENCE ERRORS UNDER DIFFERENT LEVELS OF DP-NOISE

Noise Level ^a	Algorithm 1			Algorithm 2		
	×0.5	×1	×2	×0.5	×1	×2
Training Accuracy	0.951	0.925	0.859	0.924	0.921	0.910
Testing Accuracy	0.951	0.929	0.861	0.926	0.922	0.913
Final DLG Error	310.2	350.3	412.5	301.1	336.7	389.7

^aConsidering the noise in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 as the base level for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively.

- [14] E. Wei, A. Ozdaglar, and A. Jadbabaie, "A distributed Newton method for network utility maximization-I: Algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 2162–2175, 2013.
- [15] K. Yuan, Q. Ling, and W. Yin, "On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1835–1854, 2016.
- [16] P. Di Lorenzo and G. Scutari, "NEXT: In-network nonconvex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 120–136, 2016.
- [17] S. Pu, W. Shi, J. Xu, and A. Nedić, "Push-pull gradient methods for distributed optimization in networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2021.
- [18] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and N. Vaidya, "Differentially private distributed optimization," in *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, 2015, pp. 1–10.
- [19] D. A. Burbano-L, J. George, R. A. Freeman, and K. M. Lynch, "Inferring private information in wireless sensor networks," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2019, pp. 4310–4314.
- [20] F. Yan, S. Sundaram, S. Vishwanathan, and Y. Qi, "Distributed autonomous online learning: Regrets and intrinsic privacy-preserving properties," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 2483–2493, 2012.
- [21] L. Zhu, Z. Liu, and S. Han, "Deep leakage from gradients," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 14774–14784.
- [22] C. Zhang and Y. Wang, "Enabling privacy-preservation in decentralized optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 679–689, 2018.
- [23] N. M. Freris and P. Patrinos, "Distributed computing over encrypted data," in *2016 54th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1116–1122.
- [24] Y. Lu and M. Zhu, "Privacy preserving distributed optimization using homomorphic encryption," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 314–325, 2018.
- [25] 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.
- [26] S. Gade and N. H. Vaidya, "Private optimization on networks," in *American Control Conference*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1402–1409.
- [27] C. Dwork, A. Roth *et al.*, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 9, no. 3-4, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [28] S. Han, U. Topcu, and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private distributed constrained optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 50–64, 2016.
- [29] M. T. Hale and M. Egerstedt, "Cloud-enabled differentially private multiagent optimization with constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1693–1706, 2017.
- [30] Y. Wang, Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and G. E. Dullerud, "Differential privacy in linear distributed control systems: Entropy minimizing mechanisms and performance tradeoffs," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 118–130, 2017.
- [31] X. Zhang, M. M. Khalili, and M. Liu, "Recycled admm: Improving the privacy and accuracy of distributed algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 1723–1734, 2019.
- [32] J. He, L. Cai, and X. Guan, "Differential private noise adding mechanism and its application on consensus algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 4069–4082, 2020.
- [33] J. Cortés, G. E. Dullerud, S. Han, J. Le Ny, S. Mitra, and G. J. Pappas, "Differential privacy in control and network systems," in *IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2016, pp. 4252–4272.
- [34] Y. Xiong, J. Xu, K. You, J. Liu, and L. Wu, "Privacy preserving distributed online optimization over unbalanced digraphs via subgradient rescaling," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2020.
- [35] T. Ding, S. Zhu, J. He, C. Chen, and X.-P. Guan, "Differentially private distributed optimization via state and direction perturbation in multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- [36] E. Nozari, P. Tallapragada, and J. Cortés, "Differentially private distributed convex optimization via functional perturbation," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 395–408, 2016.
- [37] S. Sundhar Ram, A. Nedić, 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.
- [38] A. Koloskova, N. Loizou, S. Boreiri, M. Jaggi, and S. Stich, "A unified theory of decentralized sgd with changing topology and local updates," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5381–5393.
- [39] S. Pu and A. Nedić, "Distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 187, no. 1, pp. 409–457, 2021.
- [40] R. Xin, A. K. Sahu, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Distributed stochastic optimization with gradient tracking over strongly-connected networks," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2019, pp. 8353–8358.
- [41] B. Polyak, "Introduction to optimization," *Optimization software Inc., Publications Division, New York*, vol. 1, 1987.
- [42] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and N. Vaidya, "Differentially private distributed optimization," in *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, New York, NY, USA, 2015.
- [43] S. Kar and J. M. Moura, "Distributed consensus algorithms in sensor networks with imperfect communication: Link failures and channel noise," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 355–369, 2008.
- [44] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [45] Y. Wang and A. Nedic, "Tailoring gradient methods for differentially-private distributed optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01113*, 2022.
- [46] V. Feldman, I. Mironov, K. Talwar, and A. Thakurta, "Privacy amplification by iteration," in *IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 521–532.
- [47] B. Balle, G. Barthe, M. Gaboardi, and J. Geumlek, "Privacy amplification by mixing and diffusion mechanisms," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [48] P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, "The composition theorem for differential privacy," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1376–1385.
- [49] M. Bun and T. Steinke, "Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds," in *Theory of Cryptography Conference*. Springer, 2016, pp. 635–658.
- [50] I. Mironov, "Rényi differential privacy," in *The 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 263–275.
- [51] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. Burges, "The MNIST database of handwritten digits," <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1994.
- [52] L. Deng, "The MNIST database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 141–142, 2012.