

Nesterov Meets Optimism: Rate-Optimal Optimistic-Gradient-Based Method for Stochastic Bilinearly-Coupled Minimax Optimization

Chris Junchi Li^{◇*} Angela Yuan^{†*} Gauthier Gidel[‡] Michael I. Jordan^{◇§}

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California, Berkeley[◇]

Department of Computer Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles[†]

DIRO, Université de Montréal and Mila[‡]

Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley[§]

November 1, 2022

Abstract

We provide a novel first-order optimization algorithm for bilinearly-coupled strongly-convex-concave minimax optimization called the AcceleratedGradient OptimisticGradient (AG-OG). The main idea of our algorithm is to leverage the structure of the considered minimax problem and operates Nesterov’s acceleration on the individual part and optimistic gradient on the coupling part of the objective. We motivate our method by showing that its continuous-time dynamics corresponds to an organic combination of the dynamics of optimistic gradient and of Nesterov’s acceleration. By discretizing the dynamics we conclude polynomial convergence behavior in discrete time. Further enhancement of AG-OG with proper restarting allows us to achieve rate-optimal (up to a constant) convergence rates with respect to the conditioning of the coupling and individual parts, which results in the first single-call algorithm achieving improved convergence in the deterministic setting and rate-optimality in the stochastic setting under bilinearly coupled minimax problem sets.

1 Introduction

Optimization is the workhorse of machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence research; indeed, many basic ML learning tasks can be cast as a minimization problem. In an increasing number of applications, however, such as generative adversarial networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2020), robust/adversarial optimization (Bai and Jin, 2020; Madry et al., 2017), Markov games (MGs) (Shapley, 1953), and reinforcement learning (RL) (Sutton and Barto, 2018; Du et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2018), the goal is to solve instead a minimax problem of the form:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (1)$$

When $\mathcal{L}(x, y) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function that is convex in x and concave in y , we refer to this problem as a *convex-concave saddle-point problem*. In this work, we focus on designing sharp or optimal deterministic and stochastic first-order algorithms for solving convex-concave saddle-point problems of the form (1).

Unlike in the minimization setting, there are no general convergence guarantees when simple gradient methods are used on convex-concave objectives. Indeed, there are examples showing the divergence

*Equal contribution.

of gradient descent ascent (GDA) on bilinear objectives (Liang and Stokes, 2019; Gidel et al., 2018). This has led to the development of extrapolation-based methods that include the extra-gradient (EG) method (Korpelevich, 1976) and the optimistic gradient descent ascent (OGDA) method (Popov, 1980), both of which can be shown to converge in the convex-concave setting. While the EG algorithm summons an additional gradient oracle at each step, the OGDA algorithm can be seen as a single-call version of EG (Gidel et al., 2018; Hsieh et al., 2019). In this paper, we design algorithms based on the idea of the OGDA iteration, aiming to improve its performance while retaining the convergence guarantee.

We focus on a specific instance of the general minimax problem, which we call the *bilinearly coupled strongly convex-strongly concave saddle point problem* (bi-SC-SC), formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \equiv f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y} - g(\mathbf{y}), \quad (2)$$

where f is L_f -smooth and μ_f -strongly convex, and g is L_g -smooth and μ_g -strongly convex. Here $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y}$ is called the bilinear coupling term and is L_H -smooth where $L_H \equiv \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})}$. Moreover, we consider throughout this paper the unconstrained problem where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^m$ except specified in some application instances. When considering $L := \max(L_H, L_f, L_g)$ and $\mu = \min(\mu_f, \mu_g)$, the standard OGDA algorithm can be shown to yield a coarse-grained complexity of $\frac{L_f \vee L_g \vee L_H}{\mu_f \wedge \mu_g} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ when applied to Problem (2) (Gidel et al., 2018; Mokhtari et al., 2020). In fact this rate is optimal *in the coarse sense*, as has been shown by Azizian et al. (2020) that the minimal complexity is $\Omega\left(\frac{L}{\mu} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$. Nevertheless, the above convergence rate has a dependency on the parameters L_f, L_g, L_H and also μ_f, μ_g as a whole. Moreover, when reducing to an individual optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{y})$, it does not achieve accelerated rate. This motivates and illustrates the difficulty of deriving *fine-grained* convergence rates that depend on the condition numbers of f, g and H separately and for which a notion of acceleration is possible.

Providing fine-grained rates in the *unbalanced* strongly-convex-strongly-concave setting where $\mu_x \neq \mu_y$ is of particular importance when the constants μ_x, μ_y, L_H, L_x and L_y are drastically different. For instance when μ_g is significantly larger than μ_f , decoupling the dependencies on L_f, μ_f and L_g, μ_g from the coarsened smoothness and strong convexity parameters $L_f \vee L_g, \mu_f \wedge \mu_g$ would significantly improve the theoretical complexity. In this paper, we focus on accelerating OGDA when constrained to the specific problem (2), and show that it enjoys a *fine-grained, accelerated* convergence rate in the sense that it has sharp dependency on the aforementioned Lipschitz constants in an individual fashion. More precisely, one can reduce the complexity due to the condition number of f and g by a square root. Overall, the best rate that can be achieved in this setting is given by the lower bound $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu_f} + \frac{L_g}{\mu_g}} + \sqrt{\frac{L_H^2}{\mu_f \mu_g}}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, established by Zhang et al. (2021a). With the goal of matching such a first-order complexity, we are devoted to the problem of: *Designing rate-optimal single-call algorithms for deterministic and stochastic bilinearly coupled saddle point problems.*

1.1 Contributions

We list our contributions in this subsection. First, we present a novel algorithm that blends acceleration dynamics based on the single-call OGDA algorithm for the adversarial part and Nesterov’s acceleration for the individual part. We refer to this blend as the Accelerated Gradient-Optimistic Gradient (AG-OG) algorithm. Second, we illustrate how the dynamics of AG-OG can be seen as the summation of the OGDA dynamics and Nesterov’s acceleration dynamics, which simplifies the understanding of

acceleration on OGDA and provides insights into the convergence proof. Additionally, equipped with a scheduled restarting technique, we derive an “accelerated optimistic gradient with Nesterov’s acceleration and restarting” (AVATAR) method that achieves an upper bound that matches the lower bound on Problem (2). Finally, when it comes to stochastic settings, we present a stochastic version of AVATAR and establish its convergence at an optimal rate. Overall, our work provides novel acceleration schemes for deterministic/stochastic OGDA under bilinearly-coupled saddle point problems (2) (Thms 3.4 and 4.2). Our algorithm is simple, shows high interpretability in discrete and continuous dynamics, and is the first single-call algorithm with a rate-optimal convergence rate with known sharpest bias term in the stochastic settings.

1.2 Related Work

Deterministic Case. Many works have studied the linear convergence rate of gradient-based methods for games in the context of strongly monotone operators (which is implied by strong convex-concavity) (Mokhtari et al., 2020) and several works (Yang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021b; Cohen et al., 2020; Wang and Li, 2020; Xie et al., 2021) have slowly bridged the gap with the lower bound provided for *unbalanced* strongly-convex-strongly-concave objective. There has been a series of papers along this direction (Mokhtari et al., 2020; Cohen et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020a; Wang and Li, 2020; Xie et al., 2021), and only very recently have optimal results that reach the lower bound been presented Kovalev et al. (2021); Thekumparampil et al. (2022); Jin et al. (2022). These three works proposed improved methods leveraging convex duality. However, it could be challenging to extend the proposed methods to the non-bilinear coupling term case or the stochastic case. In particular, none of these previous works provide result in the non-finite-sum stochastic case.

Stochastic Case. There exists a rich literature on stochastic variational inequalities with application to solving stochastic minimax problems (Juditsky et al., 2011; Hsieh et al., 2019; Chavdarova et al., 2019; Alacaoglu and Malitsky, 2022; Zhao, 2022; Beznosikov et al., 2022). However, only a few works have proposed fined-grained bounds suited to the (Bil-)SC-SC setting. To the best of our knowledge, most fined-grained bounds have been proposed in the finite-sum setting (Palaniappan and Bach, 2016; Jin et al., 2022). Two closely related works are Li et al. (2022), who provide a convergence rate for extra-gradient in the purely bilinear setting and Du et al. (2022), who study an accelerated version of extra-gradient, dubbed as AcceleratedGradient-ExtraGradient (AG-EG) in the Bil-SC-SC setting. Our work provides results in the same vein as Du et al. (2022) but instead employs the optimistic gradient instead of extra-gradient to handle the bilinear coupling part. Optimistic-gradient-based methods have been considered extensively in literature due to its requiring fewer gradient oracle calls per iteration than standard extra-gradient and can be applied to the online learning setting (Golowich et al., 2020). Note that, in general, EG and OG methods often share some similarities in their analyses, but also acknowledge significant differences (Golowich et al., 2020, §3.1), (Gorbunov et al., 2022, §2). More specifically in our case, using a *single-call algorithm* that reuses previously calculated gradients alters the recursion (Eq. (31)). Although the main part of the proof follows the streamline of estimating Nesterov’s acceleration terms first, an additional squared error norm involving the previous iterates is present, intrinsically implying an additional iterative rule (Eq. (32)) underneath the original iterative rule essential for proving bounded iterates. In addition, due to the accumulated error across iterates, the maximum stepsize allowed in single-call algorithms is forced to be smaller.¹

¹Limited by space, we refer readers to §B.1 and §B.3 for technical details.

1.3 Examples

In this subsection, we use two examples to showcase the applications of formulation (2). In the first example, we demonstrate how the parameters of a linear state-value function can be estimated by solving (2). In the second example, we illustrate that turning the constraint in a robust learning problem into penalty and we get an objective in the form of (2).

Policy Evaluation in Reinforcement Learning. The policy evaluation problem in RL can be formulated as a convex-concave bilinearly-coupled saddle-point problem. Provided a sequence of $\{s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1}\}_{t=1}^n$ where

- s_t, s_{t+1} are the current state (at time t) and future state (at time $t + 1$), respectively;
- a_t is the action at time t generated by policy π , that is, $a_t = \pi(s_t)$;
- $r_t = r(s_t, a_t)$ is the reward obtained after taken action a_t at state s_t .

Our goal is to estimate the value function of a fixed policy π in the discounted, infinite-horizon setting with discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, where for each state s

$$V^\pi(s) \equiv \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \mid s_0 = s, a_t = \pi(s_t), \forall t \geq 0 \right].$$

If a linear function approximation is adopted, i.e. $V^\pi(s) = \phi(s)^\top \mathbf{x}$ where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a feature mapping from the state space to feature space, we estimate the model parameter \mathbf{x} via minimizing the empirical *mean-squared projected Bellman error (MSPBE)*:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{C}^{-1}}^2. \quad (3)$$

where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{M}} \equiv \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}}$ denotes the \mathbf{M} -norm, for positive semi-definite matrix \mathbf{M} , of an arbitrary vector \mathbf{x} , and

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \phi(s_t) (\phi(s_t) - \gamma \phi(s_{t+1}))^\top, \quad \mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n r_t \phi(s_t), \quad \mathbf{C} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \phi(s_t) \phi(s_t)^\top.$$

Applying first-order optimization directly to (3) would necessitate computing the inversion (and storing) of the matrix \mathbf{C} , or alternatively computing the matrix-vector product $\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ for a vector \mathbf{v} at each step, and would be computationally costly or even prohibited. To circumvent inverting matrix \mathbf{C} a reformulation via *conjugate function* can be resorted to; that is, solving (3) is equivalent to solving the following saddle-point (or minimax) problem (Du et al., 2017; Du and Hu, 2019):

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}} -\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}.$$

Such an instance falls under the category of minimax problem (2) where the individual part is convex-concave, and is further enhanced to be strongly-convex-strongly-concave when a regularizer term is added on top and \mathbf{C} is strictly positive definite.

Robust Learning. A robust learning or robust optimization problem targets to minimize an objective function (here the least-square) formulated as a minimax (saddle-point) optimization problem (Ben-Tal et al., 2009; Du and Hu, 2019; Thekumparampil et al., 2022)

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}: \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_0\| \leq \mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a coefficient matrix and \mathbf{y} is a noisy observation vector, which is perturbed by a vector of \mathcal{R} -bounded norm. Transforming (4) to a penalized objective gives a formulation of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 - \rho \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_0\|^2.$$

When ρ is selected to be strictly greater than $\frac{1}{2}$, we get a strongly-convex-strongly-concave bilinearly-coupled saddle-point optimization problem.

Organization. The rest of this work is organized as follows. §2 introduces the basic settings and assumptions necessary for our algorithm and theoretical analysis. Our proposed AcceleratedGradient-OptimisticGradient (AG-OG) Descent Ascent algorithm is formally introduced in §3.3 and further generalized to the Stochastic AcceleratedGradient-OptimisticGradient (S-AG-OG) Descent Ascent in §4. §5 concludes the whole paper. Due to space limitations, we defer all proof details along with numerical experiment results to the supplementary materials.

Notations. For two sequences of positive scalars $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we denote $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$ (resp. $a_n = O(b_n)$) if $a_n \geq Cb_n$ (resp. $a_n \leq Cb_n$) for all n , and also $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ if both $\Omega(b_n)$ and $a_n = O(b_n)$ hold, for some absolute constant $C > 0$. Let $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ denote the maximal and minimal eigenvalues of a real symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} . We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the ℓ_2 -norm throughout the paper. We will explain other notation at its first appearance.

2 Preliminaries

In minimax optimization the goal is to find the Nash equilibrium point of problem (1), defined as a pair $[\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{y}^*] \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ satisfying:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}).$$

In order to analyze first-order gradient methods for this problem, we assume access to the gradients of the objective $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Thus, finding the Nash equilibrium of the original convex-concave optimization problem (1) and (2) reduces to finding the point where the gradients vanish. Accordingly, we use W to denote the gradient vector field and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ the concatenation of \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} , and analogously for \mathbf{z}^* :

$$W(\mathbf{z}) := \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ -\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y} \\ -\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{x} + \nabla g(\mathbf{y}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Based on this formulation, our goal is to find the stationary point of the monotone operator (or vector field) $W(\mathbf{z})$, namely a $\mathbf{z}^* = [\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{y}^*] \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ satisfying (in the unconstrained case)

$$W(\mathbf{z}^*) = 0. \quad (6)$$

Problem (6) is referred to as the *variational inequality (VI) formulation* of minimax optimization. The compact representation of the convex-concave saddle-point problem as a VI allows us to simplify the notation.

In the gradient field (5), there are individual parts that points towards the direction optimizing f, g cooperatively, and adversarial part which corresponds to the gradient vector field of a bilinear minimax problem. For the individual part, we let $F(\mathbf{z}) := f(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{y})$ and correspondingly $\nabla F(\mathbf{z})^\top = [\nabla f(\mathbf{x})^\top, \nabla g(\mathbf{y})^\top]$. For the adversarial part, we define the operator $H(\mathbf{z})^\top = [(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y})^\top, -(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{x})^\top]$. Note that the representation allows us to write $W(\mathbf{z})$ in Problem (6) as the summation of the two vector fields $W(\mathbf{z}) = \nabla F(\mathbf{z}) + H(\mathbf{z})$.

We introduce our main assumptions as follows:

Assumption 2.1 (Convexity and Smoothness) *We assume that $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ_f -strongly convex and L_f -smooth, $g(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ_g -strongly convex and L_g -smooth. Formally we have for $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\forall \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^m$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|^2 &\leq f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}') - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}'), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' \rangle \leq \frac{L_f}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|^2, \\ \frac{\mu_g}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|^2 &\leq g(\mathbf{y}) - g(\mathbf{y}') - \langle \nabla g(\mathbf{y}'), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}' \rangle \leq \frac{L_g}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F(\mathbf{z})$ is $L_f \vee L_g$ -smooth and μ -strongly convex, where $\mu = \mu_f \wedge \mu_g$.

The above assumption adds convexity and smoothness constraints to the individual parts $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{y})$. For the adversarial part $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$, without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n \geq m > 0$ is a tall matrix. Note that as \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are exchangeable, tall matrices cover all circumstances. Moreover, the bilinear structure of the coupling function yields the property that for all $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$:

$$\langle H(\mathbf{z}) - H(\mathbf{z}'), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}' \rangle = 0. \quad (7)$$

Regarding the stochastic setting, we assume access to an unbiased stochastic oracle, $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}, \zeta)$, of $H(\mathbf{z})$ and an unbiased stochastic oracle $\nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}; \xi)$ of $\nabla F(\mathbf{z})$. Furthermore, we consider the case where the variances of such stochastic oracles are bounded.

Assumption 2.2 (Bounded Variance) *We assume that the stochastic gradients admit bounded second moments $\sigma_H^2, \sigma_F^2 \geq 0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}; \zeta) - H(\mathbf{z})\|^2 \right] \leq \sigma_H^2, \quad \mathbb{E}_\zeta \left[\|\nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}; \xi) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z})\|^2 \right] \leq \sigma_F^2.$$

Note that the bounded noise assumption is common in the stochastic optimization literature.² Under the above assumptions, our goal is to find a ϵ -optimal solution \mathbf{z} such that $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \epsilon$. In the section that follows, we achieve this goal by adopting carefully crafted blending between Nesterov's acceleration, optimism, and scheduled restarting.

²We leave the generalization to models of unbounded noises to future work.

3 Accelerated Gradient Optimistic Gradient Descent Ascent

In this section, we discuss key elements of our algorithm design—the so-called *Optimistic Gradient Descent-Ascent (OGDA)* and *Nesterov’s acceleration method*—that together solves the bilinear saddle-point problem. Such an approach allows us to demonstrate the main properties of our approach that will eventually guide our analysis in the discrete-time case. In §3.1 we review the two key elements of our algorithm, OGDA and Nesterov’s acceleration. §3.2 motivates AG-OG from a continuous-time perspective and discusses how to blend the above two components. In §3.3 we derive a method to accelerate OGDA on bilinear saddle-point problems, yielding the Accelerated Gradient-Optimistic Gradient (AG-OG) descent ascent algorithm, and demonstrate its convergence. Finally in §3.4 we show that proper restarting on top of the AG-OG algorithm achieves sharp convergence rates matching the lower bound of Zhang et al. (2021a).

3.1 Building Elements

In this subsection we review the complexity results of two simple algorithms as the building elements of our proposed AG-OG algorithm: the OGDA algorithm (8) operating on $H(\mathbf{z})$, which enjoys a $\kappa \log(1/\epsilon)$ iteration complexity, and also Nesterov’s acceleration scheme operating on $F(\mathbf{z})$, which enjoys a $\sqrt{\kappa} \log(1/\epsilon)$ iteration complexity; here κ denotes the corresponding condition number in each of the two settings, separately.

Optimistic Gradient Descent Ascent. The Optimistic Gradient Descent Ascent (OGDA) algorithm has received considerable attention in the recent literature, especially for the problem of training Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2020). In the general variational inequality setting, the iteration of OGDA takes the following form (Popov, 1980):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathbf{z}_k - \eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}), \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{z}_k - \eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Note that at step k , the scheme performs a gradient descent-ascent step at the *extrapolated point* $\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$. Equivalently, with simple algebraic modification (8) can be written in a standard form (Gidel et al., 2018):

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - 2\eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) + \eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{9}$$

Treating $W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}})$ as a prediction of the future, $W(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}})$, this update rule can be viewed as an approximation of the implicit *proximal point (PP) method*:

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Another popular tractable approximation of the PP method is the ExtraGradient (EG) method (Korpelevich, 1976):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \eta W(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}), \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \eta W(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Although similar conceptually to OGDA (8), EG requires two gradient computations per iterate, which doubles the number of gradient computations of OGDA. Both OGDA and EG dynamics (8) alleviate the cyclic behavior by extrapolation from the past and exhibit a complexity of $(L/\mu) \log(1/\epsilon)$ (Gidel et al., 2018; Mokhtari et al., 2020) in general setting (1) with L -smooth, μ -strongly-convex- μ -strongly-concave objectives.³

Nesterov’s Acceleration Scheme. Turning to the minimization problem, while vanilla gradient descent enjoys a gradient complexity of $\kappa \log(1/\epsilon)$ on L -smooth, μ -strongly convex problems, with $\kappa = L/\mu$ being the condition number, Nesterov’s method (Nesterov, 1983), when equipped with proper restarting, achieves an improved gradient complexity of $\sqrt{\kappa} \log(1/\epsilon)$. We adopt the following version of the Nesterov acceleration, known as the “second scheme” (Tseng, 2008; Lin et al., 2020b):

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} &= \frac{k}{k+2} \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \frac{2}{k+2} \mathbf{z}_k, & (10a) \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), & (10b) \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} &= \frac{k}{k+2} \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \frac{2}{k+2} \mathbf{z}_{k+1}. & (10c) \end{cases}$$

Subtracting (10a) from (10c) and combining the resulting equation with (10b), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} &= \frac{2}{k+2} (\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}_k) = -\eta_k \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \\ \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} &= \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} - \eta_k \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Moreover, shifting the index forward by one in (10a) and combining it with (10c) to cancel the \mathbf{z}_{k+1} term, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k+2}{k+3} \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}} &= \frac{k}{k+3} \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} - \frac{k+1}{k+3} \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} \\ \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}} &= \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} + \frac{k}{k+3} (\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Thus, by a simple notational transformation, (11) plus (12) (and hence the original update rule (10)) is exactly equivalent to the original updates of Nesterov’s acceleration scheme (Nesterov, 1983). Here, \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} denotes a $\frac{2}{k}$ -weighted-averaged iteration. In other words, compared with the vanilla gradient descent that proceeds as $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k)$, Nesterov’s acceleration conducts a step at the negated gradient direction evaluated at a *predictive iterate* of the weighted-averaged iterate of the sequence. This enables a larger choice of stepsize, reflecting the enhanced stability. An analogous interpretation has also been discussed in recent work on the heavy-ball-based acceleration method (Sebbouh et al., 2021, §1.3).

3.2 Motivations of AG-OG from Continuous-Time Perspectives

We now consider the problem of accelerating the OGDA dynamics. We adopt a continuous-time perspective to motivate our algorithm design and guide our convergence analysis. The design hinges on adopting separate dynamics for the individual and coupling parts of the minimax problem.⁴

³In fact an analogous result holds true for general smooth, strongly monotone variational inequalities. We refer to Mokhtari et al. (2020) for background and related work.

⁴In fact, a direct acceleration via momentum leads to sub-optimality for the refined case (2) where the condition number of the three parts are entangled (Gidel et al., 2019).

Dynamics of OGDA. Our derivation is based on writing ordinary differential equation (ODE) representations for OGDA and Nesterov’s acceleration, and sequencing these ODEs in a particular way such that the OGDA component only applies to the coupling term $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$. We begin by rearranging the terms in the OGDA dynamics (9), yielding the following updates:

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \eta H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - \underbrace{\eta \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}) \right)}_{\epsilon_{k-1}}.$$

In comparison with some of the alternatives, our OGDA algorithm is featured by the *single-call property* that reuses gradients from past iterates and the sample and iteration complexities match up. Note in our paper H is a linear operator due to the bilinearity of $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$, but can be nonlinear in general. For deriving the continuous limit of the OGDA iteration, we let $\widehat{Z}(t) = \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ for $t = (k + \frac{1}{2})\Delta t$ and set $\eta = \Delta t \rightarrow 0$ as $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, by the Lipschitz property of H and using the fact that $\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}} \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta) \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\epsilon_{k-1} \leq o(\eta) = o(\Delta t)$. Dividing both sides by Δt and letting $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain a first-order ODE for (9) that is equivalent to gradient descent-ascent:

$$\dot{\widehat{Z}} + H(\widehat{Z}) = 0. \quad (13)$$

We note here that ODE (13) is a coarse-grained dynamics and its discretization can be either EG or GDA as well. However, as can be seen later in Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, the intuition of blending (13) with another dynamics motivates a strongly interpretable algorithm together with its theoretical analysis.

Dynamics of Nesterov’s Acceleration. Su et al. (2014) derived the following ODE for the standard form of Nesterov’s scheme:

$$\ddot{Z} + \frac{3}{t}\dot{Z} + \nabla F(Z) = 0. \quad (14)$$

Note that Eq. (10) exhibits the same ODE (14) with $Z(k\Delta t) = \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}$ and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, a compact way of writing (14) is

$$\dot{\widehat{Z}} + \frac{t}{2}\nabla F(Z) = 0, \quad (15)$$

where $\widehat{Z} = Z + \frac{t}{2}\dot{Z}$. Intuitively, while Z represents the continuous dynamics of \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} (averaging point), \widehat{Z} represents the dynamics of \mathbf{z}_k . The equality $\widehat{Z} = Z + \frac{t}{2}\dot{Z}$ exactly matches the relationship between \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} and \mathbf{z}_k shown in the update rule (10c). More specifically, starting from the lens of discrete time updates (10c) and (10b), where $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \frac{k}{2}(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}) + \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}$, $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}})$, by choosing $L' > L$ where L is the Lipschitz constant of f , $\eta_k = \frac{k}{2L'}$, $t = k\Delta t$, $\Delta t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L'}}$ and finally let $L' \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that (also noting that $\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} - \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}$ is $o(\Delta t)$):

$$\widehat{Z} = Z + \frac{t}{2}\dot{Z}, \quad \dot{\widehat{Z}} + \frac{t}{2}\nabla F(Z) = 0,$$

which again leads to the ODE (14). On a related note, the dynamics of Z is the averaged iteration and is highly related to the idea of anchoring (Ryu et al., 2019).

Blending the Two Dynamics. To solve the saddle-point problem with bilinear coupling (2), we blend the aforementioned continuous-time dynamics (13) corresponding to OGDA on the (linear) coupling component H , and also (15) that conducts Nesterov’s acceleration on the individual component f . Note that Eqs. (15) and (13) admit different timescales so the resulting continuous-time dynamics of AG-OG cannot be a direct addition, and a modified timescale analysis is essential to obtain the desired result.

We derive the following proposition, where the derivation of the ODE approximation is deferred to §C:

Proposition 3.1 *We let $\eta_k = \frac{k+1}{2L' + \sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}L'_H(k+1)}$, where we assume arbitrarily large $L' > L$ and $L'_H > L_H$. Furthermore by letting $\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L'}\sqrt{L'_H}}$, as $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\frac{L'_H}{\sqrt{L'}} \rightarrow c \in [0, \infty)$ the ODE for the AG-OG Algorithm 1 under this scaling condition is*

$$\hat{Z} + c_t \left(H(\hat{Z}) + \nabla F(Z) \right) = 0, \quad \hat{Z} = Z + \frac{t}{2} \dot{Z}, \quad (16)$$

where $c_t \equiv \frac{t(1 \vee c)^2}{2 + \sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}c(1 \vee c)t}$. Eq. (16) is also equivalent to a single-line higher-order ODE

$$\frac{t}{2} \ddot{Z} + \frac{3}{2} \dot{Z} + c_t \left(\nabla F(Z) + HZ + \frac{t}{2} H\dot{Z} \right) = 0. \quad (17)$$

We finalize this subsection with a convergence rate result for the combined dynamics in ODE (16). Throughout the paper we use \mathbf{z}^* to denote a solution to Problem (2). We conduct a standard continuous-time analysis based on the following Lyapunov energy function: $\mathcal{E} = t^2(F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\hat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$, and compute the time-derivative $\dot{\mathcal{E}}$. In contrast with existing analysis for the optimization setting (Su et al., 2014), our analysis reposes on the use of a continuous-time Gronwall-inequality-based analysis. The overall result is the following theorem, whose proof is deferred to §C.1:

Theorem 3.2 *We define the gap function as $V(Z) = F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle$ and have*

$$V(Z(T)) \leq \frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{2}{T} + \frac{\sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}c}{1 \vee c} \right) \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2.$$

Note in the special case where $c = 0$, the result recovers the standard continuous-time convergence rate as in Su et al. (2014). Later in §3.3 we will prove a similar result (Theorem 3.4) in the discrete-time context. We note in the meantime that the continuous-time analysis is much simpler and more informative than the (comparatively more complicated) discrete-time analysis.

3.3 Accelerating OGDA on Bilinear Saddle Point Problems

In this subsection and §3.4, we show that an organic combination of the two algorithms in §3.1 achieves a desirable convergence rate in discrete time and when equipped with scheduled restarting, obtains a lower bound complexity of $(\sqrt{L_f/\mu_f} \vee \sqrt{L_g/\mu_g} + L_H/\sqrt{\mu_f\mu_g}) \log(1/\epsilon)$. Our algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1. In Line (2) and (4) the update rules of the evaluated point and the extrapolated point of f follows that in (10), while in Line (3) and (5) the updates follows the OGDA dynamics (8) with each step modified by (10b).

We first state an elementary lemma that shows the non-expansive property of \mathbf{z}_k , whose proof is presented in §D.3.

Algorithm 1 AcceleratedGradient-OptimisticGradient (AG-OG)($\mathbf{z}_0^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_{-1/2}, K$)

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 2: $\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} = (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \alpha_k\mathbf{z}_k$
 - 3: $\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \right)$
 - 4: $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} = (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \alpha_k\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$
 - 5: $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \right)$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **Output:** \mathbf{z}_K^{ag}
-

Lemma 3.3 (Bounded Iterates) *Under Assumptions 2.1, we set the parameters as $L = L_f \vee L_g$, $L_H = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})}$, $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L_H(k+2)}}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+2}$ in Algorithm 1, at any iterate $k < K$, \mathbf{z}_k stays within the region defined by the initialization \mathbf{z}_0 :*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\| \leq \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|,$$

where we recall that \mathbf{z}^* denotes the unique solution of Problem (2).

Lemma 3.3 establishes the following last-iterate boundedness: the \mathbf{z}_k iteration is bounded within the ball centered at \mathbf{z}^* and radius $\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|$ and is essential in proving convergence of iteration \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} , where handling additional recursions brought by gradient evaluated from a previous step is the main technical difficulty. With the parameter choice in Lemma 3.3, Line 4 can also be seen as an average step that makes the cycling last iterates shrink toward the center of convergence. Equipped with Lemma 3.3, we are ready to state the following convergence theorem for discrete-time AG-OG:

Theorem 3.4 *Under Assumption 2.1 and setting the parameters as in Lemma 3.3, the output of Algorithm 1 satisfies:*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{4L + 2\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L_H(K+1)}}{\mu(K+1)^2} \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2. \quad (18)$$

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is provided in §B.1. The choice of $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+2}$ is vital for Nesterov’s accelerated gradient descent to achieve desirable convergence behavior (Nesterov, 1983). The convergence rate in (18) for strongly convex problems is slow and is not even a linear convergence. However, in the next subsection we show how a simple restarting technique not only achieves the linear convergence rate, but also matches the lower bound in Zhang et al. (2021a).

3.4 Improving Convergence Rates via Restarting

Normally, as f and g has different strong convexity parameters (μ_f and μ_g), it is not ideal to use the same stepsize η_k for both the descent step on $f(x)$ and the ascent step on $g(y)$. We accordingly introduce a scaling reduction technique (Du et al., 2022) that allows us to consider applying a single scaling for all parameters. Setting $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_g}{\mu_f}}\mathbf{y}$, we have $\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}}H(\mathbf{z}) = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_f}{\mu_g}}\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}H(\mathbf{z})$ and $\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}}G(\mathbf{y}) = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_f}{\mu_g}}\nabla G(\mathbf{y})$. Other scaling changes are listed as follows:

$$L = L_f \vee \frac{\mu_f}{\mu_g}L_g, \quad L_H = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B}) \cdot \frac{\mu_f}{\mu_g}}, \quad \eta_{k,\mathbf{y}} = \frac{\eta_k \mu_f}{\mu_g}, \quad \mu = \mu_f, \quad (19)$$

Algorithm 2 Accelerated optimistic gradient with nesterov Acceleration And Restarting (AVATAR)

Require: Initialization \mathbf{z}_0^0 , total number of epochs $N \geq 1$, per-epoch iterates ($K_n : n = 0, \dots, N - 1$)

- 1: **for** $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ **do**
 - 2: $\mathbf{z}_{\text{out}} = \text{AG-OG}(\mathbf{z}_0^n, \mathbf{z}_0^n, \mathbf{z}_0^n, K_n)$
 - 3: Set $\mathbf{z}_0^{n+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{z}_{\text{out}}$
 //Warm-starting from the previous output
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: **Output:** \mathbf{z}_0^N
-

where by $\eta_{k,\mathbf{y}}$ we mean that when updating $\mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, we adopt stepsize η_k on the first n coordinates and $\eta_{k,\mathbf{y}}$ on the last m coordinates. With the new scaling, by scheduled restarting the AGOG algorithm 1, we call the restarting Algorithm 2 the AVATAR, the overall algorithm the AGOG-Avatar and have the following Corollary 3.5.

Corollary 3.5 *With scheduled restarting imposed on top of Algorithm 1. Algorithm 2 outputs a solution within an ϵ -ball of \mathbf{z}^* within a number N of iterates, where N satisfies*

$$N \geq \mathcal{O} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu_f} \vee \frac{L_g}{\mu_g}} + \sqrt{\frac{L_H^2}{\mu_f \mu_g}} \right) \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right). \quad (20)$$

We defer the proof of the corollary to §B.2. Intuitively, the convergence rate (20) can be easily seen from the per epoch bound (18). By restarting whenever

$$\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{e} \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2, \quad (21)$$

the total number of restarted epochs would be $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ to fall within the ϵ -ball. Moreover, (21) holds when it satisfies in (20) that $K + 1$ is larger than $\mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu}} \right)$ and $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{L_H}{\mu} \right)$. The rest of the job is done by adopting the scaling reduction argument (19). Our rate in Eq. (20) of Corollary 3.5 exactly matches the lower bound result in Zhang et al. (2021a), which shows that AGOG-Avatar is a simple yet efficient algorithm.

As an additional remark, in the proof of Corollary 3.5, we restart Algorithm 2 every $\mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu_f} \vee \frac{L_g}{\mu_g}} + \sqrt{\frac{L_H^2}{\mu_f \mu_g}} \right)$ iterates, which is a problem dependent constant. However the convergence rate (up to a constant) does not depend on precise choice of the restarting epoch length.

4 Stochastic Accelerated Gradient Optimistic Gradient Descent Ascent

While the complexity result in Corollary 3.5 has also been obtained in Thekumparampil et al. (2022); Kovalev et al. (2021); Jin et al. (2022), in addition to conceptual simplicity our approach has the significant advantage that it yields a stochastic version of the algorithm and a convergence rate for the stochastic case. Indeed, the stochastic version of Algorithm 1 and 2 maintains an optimal convergence behavior. The stochastic AG-OG algorithm simply replaces each deterministic gradient with its stochastic counterpart, with noise represented by ζ_t, ξ_t . The full stochastic AG-OG algorithm is shown in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Stochastic Accelerated Gradient-Optimistic Gradient (S-AG-OG) ($\mathbf{z}_0^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_{-1/2}, K$)

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 2: $\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} = (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \alpha_k\mathbf{z}_k$
 - 3: $\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}; \xi_k) \right)$
 - 4: $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} = (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} + \alpha_k\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$
 - 5: $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}; \xi_k) \right)$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **Output:** \mathbf{z}_K^{ag}
-

Analogous to Lemma 3.3, we first demonstrate a lemma on the boundedness of the stochastic last iterate. We present here a short version of Lemma B.7 and delay the full version and proof to §B.3 and §D.4, respectively.

Lemma 4.1 *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.2 and denote $\sigma^2 = 3\sqrt{2}\sigma_H^2 + 2\sigma_F^2$. Given the maximum epoch number $K > 0$ and stepsize sequence*

$$\eta_k = \frac{k + 2}{4L + D(K, \mathbf{z}_0) + 4\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2}L_H(k + 2)}, \quad (22)$$

where $D(K, \mathbf{z}_0) = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2(K+1)(K+2)(2K+3)/6}{C^2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2}}$ for some absolute constant $C > 0$. We have for $\forall k \in [K - 1]$:

$$\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq (1 + C^2) \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Compared with bounded iterates lemma 3.3, the stochastic analog slightly steps outside the initial circle by a factor of C^2 due to stochastic noise. We give a scheme for choosing constant C in Remark 4.3. Equipped with Lemma 4.1, we can proceed to our stochastic result. See §B.3 for the proof.

Theorem 4.2 *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.2, set the parameters as in Lemma 4.1. Then the output of Algorithm 3 satisfies:*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{8L}{\mu(K+1)^2} + \frac{7.4(1+C^2)L_H}{\mu(K+1)} \right] \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2(C + \frac{1}{C})\sigma}{\mu\sqrt{K+1}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2}. \quad (24)$$

Note that the first term in (24) is exactly equivalent to the bound in (18) except that they differs in constant factors. Larger constants arises when we adopt a smaller stepsize scheme to fit in extra variance terms. However, by a more fine-grained analysis, the constants can be written as variance dependent factors that reduces to the constants in deterministic cases as σ goes to 0. The second term in (24) is the variance term which is in an order of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}})$.

Remark 4.3 *Without the exact knowledge of $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$, we need a different scheme to set up the stepsize η_k . We assume an upper bound on $\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$ defined as Γ_0 and let $C = \frac{\Gamma_0}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2}}$. Thus,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{8L}{\mu(K+1)^2} + \frac{14.8L_H}{\mu(K+1)} \right] \Gamma_0^2 + \frac{4\sigma}{\mu\sqrt{K+1}} \Gamma_0.$$

As in §3.4, we restart the S-AG-OG algorithm and obtain the following optimal complexity:

Corollary 4.4 *With scheduled restarting imposed on top of Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 outputs a solution within an ϵ -ball of \mathbf{z}^* within N iterates, for each N satisfying:*

$$N \geq \mathcal{O} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu_f} \vee \frac{L_g}{\mu_g}} + \sqrt{\frac{L_H^2}{\mu_f \mu_g}} \right) \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu_f^2 \epsilon^2} \right).$$

This result matches the upper bound of Du et al. (2022) which matches in the nonrandom setting the Zhang et al. (2021a) lower bound and admits *worst-case optimality* on the stochastic noise. This is the first convergence rate bound that matches the Zhang et al. (2021a) lower bound and analyzes both deterministic case and stochastic case convergence.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose novel algorithms under both a deterministic setting (AG-OG) and a stochastic setting (S-AG-OG) with structural interpretability and simplicity. To illustrate the design, we provide a continuous-time dynamics approximation that blends optimism with Nesterov’s acceleration and an intuitive proof of convergence by leveraging a novel Lyapunov analysis. When discretizing the dynamics using AG-OG, we conclude desirable polynomial convergence behavior in discrete time. By properly restarting the algorithm, we propose the corresponding AGOG-Avatar and S-AGOG-Avatar algorithms and prove theoretically that our restarted algorithms enjoys rate-optimal sample complexity for finding an ϵ -accurate solution. Future directions include generalizations to stochastic settings, to nonconvexity, and to improvement of statistical error from worst-case optimality to (near) instance-dependent optimality.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported in part by Canada CIFAR AI Chair to GG, by the Mathematical Data Science program of the Office of Naval Research under grant number N00014-18-1-2764 and also the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship program under grant number N00014-21-1-2941 and NSF grant IIS-1901252 to MIJ.

References

- Alacaoglu, A. and Malitsky, Y. (2022). Stochastic variance reduction for variational inequality methods. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 778–816. PMLR. (Cited on page 3.)
- Azizian, W., Scieur, D., Mitliagkas, I., Lacoste-Julien, S., and Gidel, G. (2020). Accelerating smooth games by manipulating spectral shapes. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1705–1715. PMLR. (Cited on page 2.)
- Bai, Y. and Jin, C. (2020). Provable self-play algorithms for competitive reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04017*. (Cited on page 1.)
- Ben-Tal, A., El Ghaoui, L., and Nemirovski, A. (2009). *Robust optimization*, volume 28. Princeton university press. (Cited on page 5.)

- Beznosikov, A., Polyak, B., Gorbunov, E., Kovalev, D., and Gasnikov, A. (2022). Smooth monotone stochastic variational inequalities and saddle point problems—survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13592*. (Cited on page 3.)
- Chavdarova, T., Gidel, G., Fleuret, F., and Lacoste-Julien, S. (2019). Reducing noise in gan training with variance reduced extragradient. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32. (Cited on page 3.)
- Chen, Y., Lan, G., and Ouyang, Y. (2017). Accelerated schemes for a class of variational inequalities. *Mathematical Programming*, 165(1):113–149. (Cited on page 20.)
- Cohen, M. B., Sidford, A., and Tian, K. (2020). Relative lipschitzness in extragradient methods and a direct recipe for acceleration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06572*. (Cited on page 3.)
- Dai, B., Shaw, A., Li, L., Xiao, L., He, N., Liu, Z., Chen, J., and Song, L. (2018). Sbeed: Convergent reinforcement learning with nonlinear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1125–1134. PMLR. (Cited on page 1.)
- Du, S. S., Chen, J., Li, L., Xiao, L., and Zhou, D. (2017). Stochastic variance reduction methods for policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1049–1058. PMLR. (Cited on pages 1 and 4.)
- Du, S. S., Gidel, G., Jordan, M. I., and Li, C. J. (2022). Optimal extragradient-based stochastic bilinearly-coupled saddle-point optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08573*. (Cited on pages 3, 11, 14, 18, and 20.)
- Du, S. S. and Hu, W. (2019). Linear convergence of the primal-dual gradient method for convex-concave saddle point problems without strong convexity. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 196–205. PMLR. (Cited on pages 4 and 5.)
- Du, S. S., Kakade, S. M., Lee, J. D., Lovett, S., Mahajan, G., Sun, W., and Wang, R. (2021). Bilinear classes: A structural framework for provable generalization in rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10897*. (Cited on page 20.)
- Gidel, G., Berard, H., Vignoud, G., Vincent, P., and Lacoste-Julien, S. (2018). A variational inequality perspective on generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10551*. (Cited on pages 2, 7, 8, and 18.)
- Gidel, G., Hemmat, R. A., Pezeshki, M., Le Priol, R., Huang, G., Lacoste-Julien, S., and Mitliagkas, I. (2019). Negative momentum for improved game dynamics. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1802–1811. PMLR. (Cited on page 8.)
- Golowich, N., Pattathil, S., and Daskalakis, C. (2020). Tight last-iterate convergence rates for no-regret learning in multi-player games. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. (Cited on page 3.)
- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. (2020). Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144. (Cited on pages 1 and 7.)

- Gorbunov, E., Taylor, A., and Gidel, G. (2022). Last-iterate convergence of optimistic gradient method for monotone variational inequalities. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. (Cited on page 3.)
- Hsieh, Y.-G., Iutzeler, F., Malick, J., and Mertikopoulos, P. (2019). On the convergence of single-call stochastic extra-gradient methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 18.)
- Jin, Y., Sidford, A., and Tian, K. (2022). Sharper rates for separable minimax and finite sum optimization via primal-dual extragradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04640*. (Cited on pages 3 and 12.)
- Juditsky, A., Nemirovski, A., and Tauvel, C. (2011). Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm. *Stochastic Systems*, 1(1):17–58. (Cited on page 3.)
- Korpelevich, G. M. (1976). The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody*, 12:747–756. (Cited on pages 2 and 7.)
- Kovalev, D., Gasnikov, A., and Richtárik, P. (2021). Accelerated primal-dual gradient method for smooth and convex-concave saddle-point problems with bilinear coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.15199*. (Cited on pages 3 and 12.)
- Li, C. J., Yu, Y., Loizou, N., Gidel, G., Ma, Y., Le Roux, N., and Jordan, M. (2022). On the convergence of stochastic extragradient for bilinear games using restarted iteration averaging. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 9793–9826. PMLR. (Cited on pages 3 and 19.)
- Liang, T. and Stokes, J. (2019). Interaction matters: A note on non-asymptotic local convergence of generative adversarial networks. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 907–915. PMLR. (Cited on page 2.)
- Lin, T., Jin, C., and Jordan, M. I. (2020a). Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2738–2779. PMLR. (Cited on page 3.)
- Lin, Z., Li, H., and Fang, C. (2020b). Accelerated optimization for machine learning. *Nature Singapore: Springer*. (Cited on page 8.)
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. (2017). Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06083*. (Cited on page 1.)
- Mokhtari, A., Ozdaglar, A., and Pattathil, S. (2020). A unified analysis of extra-gradient and optimistic gradient methods for saddle point problems: Proximal point approach. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1497–1507. PMLR. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 8.)
- Nesterov, Y. E. (1983). A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$. In *Dokl. akad. nauk Sssr*, volume 269, pages 543–547. (Cited on pages 8 and 11.)
- Palaniappan, B. and Bach, F. (2016). Stochastic variance reduction methods for saddle-point problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29. (Cited on page 3.)
- Popov, L. D. (1980). A modification of the arrow-hurwicz method for search of saddle points. *Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 28(5):845–848. (Cited on pages 2 and 7.)

- Ryu, E. K., Yuan, K., and Yin, W. (2019). Ode analysis of stochastic gradient methods with optimism and anchoring for minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10899*. (Cited on page 9.)
- Sebbouh, O., Gower, R. M., and Defazio, A. (2021). Almost sure convergence rates for stochastic gradient descent and stochastic heavy ball. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3935–3971. PMLR. (Cited on page 8.)
- Shapley, L. S. (1953). Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100. (Cited on page 1.)
- Su, W., Boyd, S., and Candes, E. (2014). A differential equation for modeling nesterov’s accelerated gradient method: theory and insights. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27. (Cited on pages 9 and 10.)
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press. (Cited on page 1.)
- Thekumparampil, K. K., He, N., and Oh, S. (2022). Lifted primal-dual method for bilinearly coupled smooth minimax optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4281–4308. PMLR. (Cited on pages 3, 5, 12, and 18.)
- Tseng, P. (2008). On accelerated proximal gradient methods for convex-concave optimization. *submitted to SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2(3). (Cited on page 8.)
- Wang, Y. and Li, J. (2020). Improved algorithms for convex-concave minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4800–4810. (Cited on page 3.)
- Xie, G., Han, Y., and Zhang, Z. (2021). Dippa: An improved method for bilinear saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08270*. (Cited on page 3.)
- Yang, J., Zhang, S., Kiyavash, N., and He, N. (2020). A catalyst framework for minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:5667–5678. (Cited on page 3.)
- Zhang, J., Hong, M., and Zhang, S. (2021a). On lower iteration complexity bounds for the convex concave saddle point problems. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–35. (Cited on pages 2, 7, 11, 12, and 14.)
- Zhang, S., Yang, J., Guzmán, C., Kiyavash, N., and He, N. (2021b). The complexity of nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 482–492. PMLR. (Cited on page 3.)
- Zhao, R. (2022). Accelerated stochastic algorithms for convex-concave saddle-point problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(2):1443–1473. (Cited on page 3.)

A Experiments

In this section, we study the performance of our AGOG-Avatar Algorithm empirically. We study both deterministic [§A.1] and stochastic settings [§A.2]. In each of these settings we compare our algorithm with the state-of-the-art experimental result.




Figure 1: Comparison with OGDA on different problem sets (Deterministic)

A.1 Deterministic Setting

We present results on synthetic quadratic game datasets:

$$\mathbf{x}^\top A_1 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}^\top A_2 \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}^\top A_3 \mathbf{y}, \quad (25)$$

with various settings of the eigenvalues of A_1, A_2, A_3 .

Comparison with OGDA We use the single-call OGDA algorithm (Gidel et al., 2018; Hsieh et al., 2019) as the baseline. In Figure 1 we plot the AGOG algorithm and the AGOG-Avatar algorithm under three different instances. We use stepsize $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L+\sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}L_H(k+2)}$ in both the AGOG and the AGOG-Avatar algorithms and restart AGOG-Avatar once every 100 iterates. For the OGDA algorithm, we take stepsize $\eta = \frac{1}{2(L\sqrt{L_H})}$. For the parameters of the problem (25), we fix $L_H = 1, L_f = 64, \mu_f = 1$ and change different choices of L_g, μ_g . In Figure 1(a) we take $L_g = 64, \mu_g = 1$. In Figure 1(b) we take $L_g = 1, \mu_g = 1/64$ and in Figure 1(c) we take $L_g = 4096, \mu_g = 64$. We see from 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) when the problem has different L_f, μ_f and L_g, μ_g , changing L_g, μ_g has larger impact on OGDA than on AGOG, matching our theoretical observations.

Comparison with LPD Next, we focus on comparison to the Lifted Primal-Dual (LPD) algorithm (Thekumparampil et al., 2022). We implement the AGOG algorithm and its restarted version, the AGOG-Avatar. Additionally, inspired by the technique of a single-loop direct-approach in Du et al. (2022), we consider a single-loop algorithm named AGOG-Direct that takes advantage of the strongly-convex strongly-concave property of the problem. We refer readers to Du et al. (2022) for the "direct" method. The parameters of LPD are chosen as described in Thekumparampil et al. (2022). For our AGOG and AGOG-Avatar Algorithm, we take $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L+\sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}L_H(k+2)}$ and the scaling parameters are taken as in Eq. (19). For the AGOG-direct algorithm, we take $\eta = \frac{1}{(1+\sqrt{L/\mu_f+(\sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}L_H)^2/\mu_f^2})\mu_f}$ with the same set of scaling parameters. We restart AGOG-Avatar once every 100 iterates.

In Figure 2(a), the bilinear coupling part $\mathbf{y}^\top A_2 \mathbf{x}$ is the dominant part. In Figure 2(b), we set the eigenvalues of A_2 even larger than in Figure 2(a). In Figure 2(c), $\mathbf{x}^\top A_1 \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}^\top A_3 \mathbf{y}$ are the dominant terms. More details on the specific designs of the matrices are shown in the caption of the corresponding figures.




Figure 2: Comparison with LPD on different problem sets (Deterministic)




Figure 3: Comparison of algorithms on different problem sets (Stochastic)

We see from Figures 2(a) and 2(b) that AGOG-Avatar (green line) outperforms LPD and MP in regimes where the bilinear term dominates, and when the eigenvalues of the coupling matrix increase, the performance of AGOG-Avatar relative to other algorithms is enhanced. This is in accordance with our theoretical analysis. In addition, AGOG-Avatar outperforms its non-restarted version (orange line) which has a gentle slope at the end. On the other hand, when the individual part dominates, our AGOG-direct (red line) slightly outperforms LPD. Moreover, AGOG-direct and LPD almost overlap in 2(a) and 2(b).

A.2 Stochastic Setting

We compared stochastic AGOG and its restarted version S-AGOG-Avatar with Stochastic Extra-gradient (SEG) SEG with restarting, respectively (cf. Li et al., 2022). We note that we refer to the averaged iterates version of SEG everywhere when using SEG. For SEG and SEG-restart, we use stepsize $\eta_k = \frac{1}{2(L_V L_H)}$. For AGOG and AGOG-Avatar, we use stepsize $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3} L_H (k+2)}}$. We restart every 100 gradient calculations for both SEG-restart and AGOG-Avatar.

We use the same quadratic game setting as in (25) except that we assume access only to noisy estimates of A_1, A_2, A_3 . We add Gaussian noise to A_1, A_2, A_3 with $\sigma = 0.1$ throughout this experiment. We plot the squared norm error with respect to the number of gradient computations in Figure 3. In 3(a) we consider larger eigenvalues for A_2 than A_1, A_3 . In 3(b), we let A_1, A_2, A_3 to be approximately of the

same scale. In 3(c), as the scale of the eigenvalues shrinks, the noise is relatively larger than in 3(a) and 3(b). The specific choice of parameters are shown in the caption of the corresponding figures. We see from 3(a), 3(c) and 3(c) that S-AGOG-Avatar achieves a more desirable convergence speed than SEG-restart. Also, the restarting technique significantly accelerates the convergence, validating our theory.

B Proof of Main Convergence Results

This section collects the proofs of our main results, Theorem 3.4 [§B.1], Corollary 3.5 [§B.2], and Theorem 4.2 [§B.3].

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof.[Proof of Theorem 3.4] We define the point-wise primal-dual gap function as:

$$V(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') := f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{z}') + \langle H(\mathbf{z}'), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}' \rangle \quad (26)$$

Step 1: Estimating weighted temporal difference in squared norms We first prove a result on bounding the temporal difference of the point-wise primal-dual gap between \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} and \mathbf{z}^* , whose proof is delayed to §D.5.

Lemma B.1 *For arbitrary $\alpha_k \in (0, 1]$ the iterates of Algorithm 1 satisfy for $t = 1, \dots, T$ almost surely*

$$\begin{aligned} & V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k)V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \underbrace{\alpha_k \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) + H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle}_I + \underbrace{\frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2}_{II}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Note that in Lemma B.1, the term I is an inner product with the gradient term and reduces to $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k), \mathbf{z}_k - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle$ of the vanilla gradient algorithm if acceleration and optimistic-gradient are removed. The squared term II is brought by gradient evaluated at \mathbf{z}_k^{md} .

Additionally, throughout the proof of Lemma B.1, we only leverage the convexity and L -smoothness of f and the property of H (7), as well as the update rules in Line (2) and Line (4). The proof involves no update rules regarding the gradient updates and hence Lemma B.1 holds for the stochastic case as well.

Next, to further bound the inner product term I, we introduce a general proposition that holds for two updates starting from the same point. Proposition B.2 is a slight modification from the proof of Proposition 4.2 in Chen et al. (2017) and analogous to Lemma 7.1 in Du et al. (2022). We omit the proof here as the argument comes from simple algebraic tricks. Readers can refer to Du et al. (2022) for more details.

Proposition B.2 (Proposition 4.2 in Chen et al. 2017 and Lemma 7.1 in Du et al. (2021)) *Given an initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, two update directions $\boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the corresponding results $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying:*

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \quad \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_2. \quad (28)$$

For any point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\delta}_2, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 - \mathbf{z} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_2 - \boldsymbol{\delta}_1\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} [\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1\|^2]. \quad (29)$$

Noting that the gradient term $\nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) + H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$ in I of inequality (27) of Lemma B.1 has been used in updating \mathbf{z}_k to \mathbf{z}_{k+1} in Line (5) in Algorithm 1. Comparing Line (5) with Line (3) and by letting $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{z}_k, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 = \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 = \mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ in Proposition B.2, we obtain an upper bound for the inner product term I:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k \cdot I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \eta_k^2 \|H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{\eta_k^2 L_H^2}{2} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where the last inequality is by properties of H and the definition of L_H . Combining Eq. (30) with Eq. (27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k) V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) &\leq \frac{\eta_k \alpha_k L_H^2}{2} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2] + \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Step 2: Building and solving the recursion To build a iterative rule that connects the previous iterate with the current iterate, we first apply the following lemma to connect $\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2$ and $\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2$ and reduce Eq. (31) to compositions of $\{\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2\}_{k=0, \dots, K-1}$ and $\{\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2\}_{k=0, \dots, K-1}$ terms. The proof of Lemma B.3 is delayed to §D.6.

Lemma B.3 For any stepsize sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k=0, \dots, K-1}$ satisfying for some positive constant $c > 0$ and the Lipschitz parameter L_H that $\eta_k L_H \leq \sqrt{c/2}$ holds for all k . In Algorithm 1, the following holds for any $k \in [K-1]$:

$$\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \leq 2c^k \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{-\ell} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2. \quad (32)$$

Combining Eq. (32) with (31), bringing in the choice of $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+2}$ and by rearranging the terms, we obtain the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - \frac{k}{k+2} V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) &\leq \frac{1}{\eta_k(k+2)} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k(k+2)} - \frac{2L}{(k+2)^2} \right) \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \frac{2\eta_k L_H^2}{k+2} \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $(k+2)^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (k+2)^2 V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - [(k+1)^2 - 1] V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) &\leq \frac{k+2}{\eta_k} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{k+2}{\eta_k} - 2L \right) \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + 2(k+2)\eta_k L_H^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(k+2)}$, we have

$$\frac{k+2}{\eta_k} - 2L \geq \sqrt{2/c}(k+2)L_H$$

and the previous inequality reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & (k+2)^2 V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - [(k+1)^2 - 1] V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(k+2)\right) \left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2\right] \\ & \quad - \sqrt{2/c}(k+2)L_H \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + (k+2)\sqrt{2c}L_H \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging and summing over k from 0 to $K-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [(K+1)^2 - 1] V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) + \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1)\right) \|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H\right) \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) \\ & \quad - \underbrace{\sqrt{2/c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2) \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2}_{\text{III}_1} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2) \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2}_{\text{III}_2} \end{aligned}$$

Simple algebra yields:

$$\text{III}_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{z}_{l+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_l\|^2 \sum_{k=l}^{K-1} (k+2)c^{k-l} \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} \left[\frac{\ell+2}{1-c} + \frac{c}{(1-c)^2} \right] \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2.$$

Straightforward derivations give that if we choose $c = \frac{2}{3+\sqrt{3}}$,

$$\sqrt{2/c}(k+2) \geq \sqrt{2c} \left[\frac{k+2}{1-c} + \frac{c}{(1-c)^2} \right]$$

holds for all $k \geq 0$. Thus, summing III_1 and III_2 terms we have

$$- \left(\sqrt{2/c} - \sqrt{2c} \right) L_H \text{III}_1 + 2\sqrt{c/2}L_H \text{III}_2 \leq 0.$$

Finally, we solve the recursion as:

$$\begin{aligned} & [(K+1)^2 - 1] V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) + \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1)\right) \|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H\right) \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Step 3: Proving z_k stays within a neighbourhood of z^* In Lemma 3.3 we show that z_k is always bounded within the ball centered at z^* with radius $\|z_0 - z^*\|$.

Lemma B.4 (Lemma 3.3) *Under Assumption 2.1. Set the parameters as $L = L_f \vee L_g$, $L_H = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})}$, $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L_H(k+2)}}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+2}$ in Algorithm 1, at any iterate $k < K$, z_k stays within the region defined by the initialization z_0 :*

$$\|z_k - z^*\|^2 \leq \|z_0 - z^*\|^2$$

where we use z^* to denote the unique solution of Problem (2).

Step 4: Combining everything together Bringing the bounded iterates results in Lemma 3.3 into the recursion (33) and rearranging, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} (K+1)^2 V(z_K^{\text{ag}}, z^*) &\leq (K+1)^2 V(z_K^{\text{ag}}, z^*) + \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1)\right) \|z_K - z^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1)\right) \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $(K+1)^2$ and noting that $V(z_K^{\text{ag}}, z^*) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \mathbb{E} \|z_K^{\text{ag}} - z^*\|^2$, bringing in the choice of $c = \frac{2}{3 + \sqrt{3}}$ and we conclude our proof of Theorem 3.4. \square

We finally remark that a limitation of this convergence rate bound is that the coefficient for L_H in our stepsize choosing scheme is $\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \approx 2.175$ while an improved stepsize in this special case is $\frac{1}{2L_H}$, yielding a sharper coefficient 2. Although the slight difference in constant factors does not harm the practical performance drastically, we anticipate that this constant might be further improved and leave it to future work.

B.2 Proof of Corollary 3.5

Proof.[Proof of Corollary 3.5] The proof of restarting argument is direct. By Eq. (18), if we want $\|z_K^{\text{ag}} - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{e} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2$ to hold, we can choose K such that

$$\frac{4L}{\mu(K+1)^2} \leq \frac{1}{2e}, \quad \frac{2\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}}L_H}{\mu(K+1)} \leq \frac{1}{2e}.$$

This is equivalent to

$$K+1 \geq \sqrt{\frac{8eL}{\mu}}, \quad K+1 \geq \frac{4e\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}}L_H}{\mu}.$$

For a given threshold $\epsilon > 0$, with the output of every epoch satisfying $\|z_K^{\text{ag}} - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{e} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2$, the total epochs required to get within the ϵ -ball centered at z^* would be $\log\left(\frac{\|z_0 - z^*\|^2}{\epsilon}\right)$. Thus, the total number of iterates required to get within the ϵ threshold would be:

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{L}\mu + \frac{L_H}{\mu}\right) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Bringing the choice of scaling parameters in (19) and we conclude our proof of Corollary 3.5. \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof.[Proof of Theorem 4.2] For the stochastic case, we use the same definition of the primal-dual gap function, rewritten as:

$$V(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') := f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{z}') + \langle H(\mathbf{z}'), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}' \rangle \quad (26)$$

Step 1: Estimating weighted temporal difference in squared norms We mentioned in the proof of Theorem 3.4 that Lemma B.1 holds for the stochastic case as well. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k)V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \underbrace{\alpha_k \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) + H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2}_{\text{II}}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By applying Proposition B.2 to the iterates of Algorithm 3. Taking $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}_k$, $\phi_1 = \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$, $\phi_2 = \mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ in Proposition B.2, we obtain the following stochastic version of inequality (30):

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_k \cdot \left\langle \nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}; \xi_k) + \nabla \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+1}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \eta_k^2 \underbrace{\left\| \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \right\|^2}_{(a)} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left[\left\| \mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z} \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z} \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Building and solving the recursion Note that in the stochastic case, unlike Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 3.4, before connecting $\left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2$ with $\left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2$ to get an iterative rule, we need to bound the expectation of (a) with additional noise first.

Throughout the rest of the proof of Theorem 4.2, we denote

$$\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \Delta_f^k = \nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}; \xi_k) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}})$$

Taking expectation over (a), we use the following lemma to depict the upper bound of the quantity. The proof is delayed to §D.7.

Lemma B.5 For any $\beta > 0$, under Assumption 2.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \right\|^2 \leq (1 + \beta)L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 + \left(2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) \sigma_H^2. \quad (34)$$

Taking $\beta = 1$ in Lemma B.5 and bringing the result into the expectation of (27), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_k \eta_k}{2} \left[2L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 + 3\sigma_H^2 \right] + \alpha_k \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k + \Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}^* \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z} \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z} \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Following the above inequality and following similar techniques as in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.4, we can derive the following Lemma B.6, whose proof is delayed to §D.8.

Lemma B.6 For the choice of stepsize such that $\eta_k L_H \leq \frac{\sqrt{c}}{2}$ holds for all k and any constant $r > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k)\mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) &\leq \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] + \frac{3\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-c)}\sigma_H^2 \\ &+ 2\alpha_k\eta_k L_H^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 - \left(\frac{r\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\sigma_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - \frac{k}{k+2}\mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) &\leq \frac{1}{\eta_k(k+2)} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] \\ &+ \frac{4\eta_k L_H^2}{k+2} \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 - \left(\frac{r}{\eta_k(k+2)} - \frac{2L}{(k+2)^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{3\eta_k}{(1-c)(k+2)}\sigma_H^2 + \frac{\eta_k}{(1-r)(k+2)}\sigma_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $(k+2)^2$ and taking $r = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(k+2)^2 \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - [(k+1)^2 - 1] \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ &\leq \frac{k+2}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] + 4\eta_k L_H^2 (k+2) \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{r(k+2)}{\eta_k} - 2L \right) \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \frac{3\eta_k(k+2)}{1-c} \sigma_H^2 + \frac{\eta_k(k+2)}{1-r} \sigma_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{k+2}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2] + 4\eta_k L_H^2 (k+2) \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{k+2}{2\eta_k} - 2L \right) \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \frac{3\eta_k(k+2)}{1-c} \sigma_H^2 + 2\eta_k(k+2) \sigma_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

Telescoping over $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ and using the same techniques as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, we have for $\frac{k+2}{2\eta_k} \geq 2L + \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}L_H(k+2)$ and $c = \frac{1}{2+\sqrt{2}}$ ($c/(1-c) = \sqrt{2} - 1$), write $\sigma^2 = 3\sqrt{2}\sigma_H^2 + 2\sigma_F^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &[(K+1)^2 - 1] \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) + \frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}} L_H \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Proving \mathbf{z}_k stays within a neighbourhood of \mathbf{z}^* We introduce the following Lemma B.7, whose proof is in §D.4

Lemma B.7 Given the maximum epoch number $K > 0$ and stepsize sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ satisfying

(a) $\frac{k+2}{\eta_k} - \frac{k+1}{\eta_{k-1}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}}L_H$ for any $k < K$, we have for $\forall k \in [K-1]$:

$$\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{\eta_0}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2$$

(b) In addition if $\eta_k \leq \frac{k+2}{D}$ for $\forall k \in [K-1]$ where D will be specified in (c) and taking $A(K) := \sqrt{(K+1)(K+2)(2K+3)/6}$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{A(K)^2 \sigma^2}{D^2} \quad (37)$$

(c) Taking $D = \frac{\sigma}{C} \frac{A(K)}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2}}$ for some absolute constant $C > 0$, bound (37) reduces to

$$\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq (1 + C^2) \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \quad (38)$$

Step 4: Combining everything together Combining the choice of stepsize η_k in (a), (b) in Lemma B.7 and $\frac{k+2}{2\eta_k} \geq 2L + \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}L_H(k+2)$, and bound (36) with Eq. (38), by rearranging the terms again, we conclude that for $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{4L+D+4\sqrt{2+\sqrt{2}}L_H(k+2)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (K+1)^2 \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) &\leq \left(4L + 2\sqrt{2+\sqrt{2}}(K+1)(1+C^2)L_H\right) \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(C + \frac{1}{C}\right) \sigma A(K) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2} \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $(K+1)^2$ and noting that $V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{8L}{\mu(K+1)^2} + \frac{7.4(1+C^2)L_H}{\mu(K+1)} \right] \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2(C + \frac{1}{C})\sigma}{\mu\sqrt{K+1}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2}.$$

□

C Understanding the Continuous-Time Dynamics of AG-OG

Due to the complexity of discrete analysis, in §3.2 we describe the continuous dynamics of AG-OG as a hybrid dynamics of OGD and Nesterov's acceleration. After introducing the discrete dynamics of AG-OG in §3.3, we are now ready to present a formal proposition that connects Algorithm 1 with its ODE. We adopt similar stepsize scheme as in Theorem 3.4 by letting $\eta_k = \frac{k+1}{2L' + \sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}L'_H(k+1)}$ where L' and L'_H can be arbitrarily large. Furthermore, we set $\Delta t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L' \vee L'_H}}$, let $\frac{L'_H}{\sqrt{L'}} \rightarrow c$ and use the notation $c_t = \frac{t(1 \vee c)^2}{2 + \sqrt{3+\sqrt{3}}c(1 \vee c)t}$. We derive the following proposition:

Proposition C.1 (Proposition 3.1) *The ODE for the AG-OG Algorithm 1 is*

$$\frac{t}{2} \ddot{Z} + \frac{3}{2} \dot{Z} + c_t \left(\nabla F(Z) + HZ + \frac{t}{2} H \dot{Z} \right) = 0 \quad (39)$$

Proof.[Proof of Proposition 3.1] We recall that in Algorithm 1, Line 3 and 5 yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \right) \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{z}_k - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the first line from the second line, we have

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \right) \quad (40)$$

Furthermore, by shifting indices, we have

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{3}{2}} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \eta_{k+1} \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}}) \right) \quad (41)$$

Combining (40) and (41), we derive the iterative update rule on $\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{3}{2}} &= \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - (\eta_k + \eta_{k+1}) H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \eta_k H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - \eta_{k+1} \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}}) \\ &= \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \eta_{k+1} H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - \eta_{k+1} \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}}) - \eta_k \left(H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Line 2 and 4 in Algorithm 1 imply that

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} + \frac{k}{k+3} (\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{3}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= -\eta_{k+1} \left[H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) \right] - \eta_k \left[H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \right] \\ &\quad - \eta_{k+1} \left[\nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Recalling that in Theorem 3.4 we take the stepsize $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L_H(k+2)}}$ and noting that the stepsize can actually be chosen for any $L' > L, L'_H > L_H$ as $\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L' + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L'_H(k+2)}}$. We let $t = k\Delta t$ where $\Delta t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L' \vee L'_H}}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\eta_k = \frac{k+2}{2L' + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L'_H(k+2)}} = \frac{t\Delta t + 2(\Delta t)^2}{2L'(\Delta t)^2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}L'_H}(t\Delta t + 2(\Delta t)^2)}.$$

We use $c = \frac{L'_H}{L'}$ to depict the relationship between L'_H and L' , simple algebra yields:

$$L'_H = \frac{c}{(1 \vee c)\Delta t}, \quad L' = \frac{1}{(1 \vee c)^2(\Delta t)^2}.$$

Combining this with the value of η_k and we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k &= \frac{t\Delta t + 2(\Delta t)^2}{\frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3} \frac{c}{1 \vee c}}(t + 2\Delta t)} = \frac{(1 \vee c)^2(t + 2\Delta t)}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)(t + 2\Delta t)} \Delta t \\ &= \frac{(1 \vee c)^2 t}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)t} \Delta t + (\Delta t)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which goes to 0 as $L', L'_H \rightarrow \infty$ and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. We let $c_t = \frac{(1\vee c)^2 t}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c(1\vee c)t}}$ and (43) can be shortened as:

$$\eta_k = c_t \Delta t + o(\Delta t).$$

With this choice of η_k , by Taylor expansion we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) &\leq \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta_k) = o(1), \\ \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) &\leq \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{md}} - \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{2}{k+2}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}})\right) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

we rewrite (42) in continuous dynamics by letting $\widehat{Z}(t) = \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $Z(t) = \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Z}(t+1) - \widehat{Z}(t) &= -\eta_{k+1} \left[H(\widehat{Z}(t)) + \nabla F(Z(t)) \right] + o(\eta_k) + o(\eta_{k+1}) \\ &= -c_t \Delta t \left[H(\widehat{Z}(t)) + \nabla F(Z(t)) \right] + o(\Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by Δt and with $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\dot{\widehat{Z}}(t) + c_t \left[H(\widehat{Z}(t)) + \nabla F(Z(t)) \right] = 0. \quad (44)$$

In the final step we calculate the relationship between $\widehat{Z}(t)$ and $Z(t)$. By Line 4, we have

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \frac{k}{2} \left(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} \right) + \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\widehat{Z}(t) = \frac{t}{2} \frac{Z(t) - Z(t-1)}{\Delta t} + Z(t).$$

Letting $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\widehat{Z}(t) = Z(t) + \frac{t}{2} \dot{Z}(t). \quad (45)$$

Combining (44) with (45) we conclude our proof. \square

C.1 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof.[Proof of Theorem 3.2] We first provide an estimate of the time derivative $\dot{\mathcal{E}}$ of the Lyapunov function corresponding to (16), and the result is shown is Lemma C.2:

Lemma C.2 *We set the Lyapunov function as defined in the following (46):*

$$\mathcal{E} = t^2 V(Z) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2, \quad (46)$$

where $c_t = \frac{(1\vee c)^2 t}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c(1\vee c)t}}$. Given the dynamics in (16) starting from $Z(0) = z_0$, we have

$$\dot{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{d}{dt} \left[t^2 V(Z) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \right] \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1\vee c} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2. \quad (47)$$

We postpone the proof of Lemma C.2 to §D.1. Note that both sides of (47) in Lemma C.2 presents the quantity $\frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$ in its original and gradient forms, respectively. By integrating on both sides and applying a Gronwall-type technique, we obtain the following Lemma C.3 which shows that the continuous-time dynamics of AG-EG-ODE are non-expansive with respect to saddle \mathbf{z}^* .

Lemma C.3 *We have*

$$\|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\| \leq \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|. \quad (48)$$

We postpone the rigorous proof of Lemma C.3 to §D.2. Now bringing (48) in Lemma C.3 into (47), we conclude that

$$\dot{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{d}{dt} \left[t^2 V(Z) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \right] \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2.$$

Integrating both sides gives

$$T^2 V(Z) + \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T}{(1 \vee c)^2} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 - \frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} T \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2.$$

Rearranging and dividing both sides by T^2 , we obtain that

$$V(Z) \leq V(Z) + \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T}{(1 \vee c)^2 T^2} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T}{(1 \vee c)^2 T^2} \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2,$$

which concludes our proof. □

D Proof of Auxiliary Lemmas

D.1 Proof of Lemma C.2

Proof.[Proof of Lemma C.2] Since $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is set as

$$\mathcal{E} = t^2 V(Z) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2, \quad (46)$$

we have its time derivative

$$\frac{d\mathcal{E}}{dt} = \underbrace{2tV(Z) + t^2 \langle \nabla V(Z), \dot{Z} \rangle + \frac{2t}{c_t} \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, \dot{\widehat{Z}} \rangle}_{\text{bracketed part}} + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} \|\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2.$$

We want to show the bracketed part above is nonpositive, i.e.

$$2t [F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle] + t^2 \langle \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^*, \dot{Z} \rangle + \frac{2t}{c_t} \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, \dot{\widehat{Z}} \rangle \leq 0.$$

Saddle definition gives $\nabla F(\mathbf{z}^*) + H\mathbf{z}^* = 0$, and hence μ -strong convexity of F implies

$$\begin{aligned} V(Z) &= F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle \\ &\geq \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, \nabla F(\mathbf{z}^*) + H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|Z - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 = \frac{\mu}{2} \|Z - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} & 2t [F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle] + t^2 \langle \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^*, \dot{Z} \rangle + \frac{2t}{c_t} \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, \dot{\widehat{Z}} \rangle \\ & \equiv \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using $\widehat{Z} = Z + \frac{t}{2}\dot{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \frac{2t}{c_t} \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, -c_t [\nabla F(Z) + H\widehat{Z}] \rangle \\ &= -2t \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, \nabla F(Z) + H\widehat{Z} \rangle \\ &\leq -2t \langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle \\ &= -\langle 2t(Z - \mathbf{z}^*) + t^2\dot{Z}, \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality above we used the property of monotone operator H (and also linearity) and conclude $\langle \widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*, H(\widehat{Z} - \mathbf{z}^*) \rangle \geq 0$ which is actually $= 0$ for bilinear operator H . Therefore

$$\text{I} + \text{II} = 2t [F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle] + t^2 \langle \dot{Z}, \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} &= 2t [F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) + \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle] - \langle 2t(Z - \mathbf{z}^*), \nabla F(Z) + H\mathbf{z}^* \rangle \\ &= 2t [F(Z) - F(\mathbf{z}^*) - \langle Z - \mathbf{z}^*, \nabla F(Z) \rangle] \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses the convexity of f . This concludes the desired result of Lemma C.2. \square

D.2 Proof of Lemma C.3

Proof.[Proof of Lemma C.3] To proceed with proof we adopt a Gronwall-type argument. Note

$$\dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left[t^2 V(Z(t)) + \frac{t}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z}(t) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \right] \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} \|\widehat{Z}(t) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$$

Taking integrals on both sides $\int_0^T dt$ gives

$$T^2 V(Z(T)) + \frac{T}{c_t} \|\widehat{Z}(T) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 - \frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} \int_0^T \|\widehat{Z}(t) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 dt$$

Let $y(T) \equiv \int_0^T \|\widehat{Z}(t) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 dt$ then we have by removing the first term

$$\frac{T}{c_t} y'(T) - \frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(0) = \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(T) - \frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(0) \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} y(T) \quad (49)$$

which gives, via quotient rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dT} \left(\frac{c_t y(T)}{T} \right) &= \frac{d}{dT} \left(\frac{(1 \vee c)^2 y(T)}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T} \right) \\ &= (1 \vee c)^2 \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T) y'(T) - c (1 \vee c) y(T)}{(2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T)^2} \leq \frac{2(1 \vee c)^2 y'(0)}{(2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}} c (1 \vee c) T)^2} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1 \vee c)^2 y(T)}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)T} - \frac{(1 \vee c)^2 y(0)}{2} &\leq 2(1 \vee c)^2 y'(0) \int_0^T \frac{1}{(2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)t)^2} dt \\ &= 2 \frac{1 \vee c}{\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}} y'(0) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)T} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$y(T) \leq 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)} y'(0) \left(\frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)T}{2} - 1 \right) = y'(0)T$$

Plugging in back (49) gives

$$\frac{T}{c_t} y'(T) - \frac{2}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(0) \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} y(T) \leq \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c} \frac{c}{1 \vee c} y'(0)T$$

so

$$\frac{T}{c_t} y'(T) = \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)T}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(T) \leq \frac{2 + \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{3}c}(1 \vee c)T}{(1 \vee c)^2} y'(0)$$

so $y'(T) \leq y'(0)$ which indicates

$$\|\widehat{Z}(T) - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$$

completing the proof. \square

D.3 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof.[Proof of Lemma 3.3] Following (33), we drop the V terms and have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1) \right) \|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \right) \|z_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We adopt a "bootstrapping" argument, similar as the Gronwall-type analysis in the Proof of Theorem 3.2. We define $M_K = \max_{0 \leq k \leq K-1} \|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$ and taking a maximum on each term on the right hand side of the above inequality, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1) \right) \|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 &\leq \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \right) M_{K-1} + \sqrt{2/c}L_H \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} M_{K-1} \\ &= \left(2L + \sqrt{2/c}L_H(K+1) \right) M_{K-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we know that $\|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq M_{K-1}$ and hence $M_K = M_{K-1}$ always holds. That yields $M_K = M_0$, and we conclude the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

D.4 Proof of Lemma B.7

Proof.[Proof of Lemma B.7] Starting from (36) that

$$\begin{aligned} & [(K+1)^2 - 1] \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_K^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) + \frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}} L_H \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*) \end{aligned}$$

We first omit the $V(\cdot, \cdot)$ terms and have

$$\frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}} L_H \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2. \quad (50)$$

Rewrite $\|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2$ as the difference between two summations, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \right) \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \omega_{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}} L_H \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms and by the first condition (a) that $\frac{k+2}{\eta_k} - \frac{k+1}{\eta_{k-1}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}} L_H$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \frac{K+2}{\eta_K} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \omega_{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

To construct a valid iterative rule, we divide both sides of the above inequality with $\frac{(K+1)(K+2)}{\eta_{K-1}\eta_K}$ and obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\eta_K}{K+2} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\eta_{K-1}}{K+1} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \omega_{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\eta_{K-1}\eta_K}{(K+1)(K+2)} \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we slightly abuse the notations and use K to denote an arbitrary iteration during the process of the algorithm and use \mathcal{K} to denote the fixed total number of iterates. Thus, $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \sigma^2 \leq$

$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2$ is an upper bound that does not change with the choice of K . It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta_K}{K+2} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \|z_k - z^*\|^2 &\leq \frac{\eta_{K-1}}{K+1} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|z_k - \omega_z\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{c}}{2L_H} \left[\frac{\eta_{K-1}}{K+1} - \frac{\eta_K}{K+2} \right] \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{c}}{2L_H} \left[\frac{\eta_0}{2} - \frac{\eta_K}{K+2} \right] \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\frac{\eta_K}{K+2}$, the result follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \|z_k - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{c}}{2L_H} \left[\frac{\eta_0(K+2)}{2\eta_K} - 1 \right] \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2 \right].$$

Bringing this into Eq. (50), we conclude that

$$\frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}} \mathbb{E} \|z_K - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\eta_0(K+1)}{2\eta_{K-1}} \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2 \right].$$

Dividing both sides by $\frac{K+1}{\eta_{K-1}}$ and we have:

$$\mathbb{E} \|z_K - z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\eta_0}{2} \left[\frac{2}{\eta_0} \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2 \right].$$

Now we change back using the notation K to denote the total iterates and k is the iterates indexes, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|z_k - z^*\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \frac{\eta_0}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k\sigma^2$$

which concludes the proof of (a) of Lemma B.7. Additionally, if $\eta_k \leq \frac{k+2}{D}$ for some quantity D , we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+2)\eta_k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{(k+2)^2}{D} \leq \frac{(K+1)(K+2)(2K+3)}{6D}.$$

We use $A(K) = \sqrt{(K+1)(K+2)(2K+3)/6}$ and noting that $\eta_0 \leq \frac{2}{D}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|z_k - z^*\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \|z_0 - z^*\|^2 + \frac{A(K)^2\sigma^2}{D^2}$$

which concludes our proof of (b). And (c) follows by direct calculation. \square

D.5 Proof of Lemma B.1

Proof.[Proof of Lemma B.1] Recalling that F is L -smooth. To upper-bound the difference in pointwise primal-dual gap between iterates, we first estimate the difference in function values of f via gradients at the extrapolation point. For all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Z}$, the convexity and L -smoothness of $F(\cdot)$ implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - F(\mathbf{u}) &= F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) - \left(F(\mathbf{u}) - F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) \right) \\ &\leq \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\|^2 - \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\mathbf{u} = \omega_{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}$ respectively, we conclude that

$$F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - F(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \leq \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\|^2 - \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \omega_{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle \quad (51)$$

$$F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}) \leq \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\|^2 - \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\rangle \quad (52)$$

Multiplying (51) by α_k and (52) by $(1 - \alpha_k)$ and adding them up, we have

$$F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - \alpha_k F(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k) F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}) \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - (1 - \alpha_k) \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}} \right\|^2 \\ &= \underbrace{\alpha_k \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle}_{\text{I(a)}} + \underbrace{\frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2}_{\text{II}} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where by subtracting Line (2) from Line (4) of Algorithm 1 and by Line (4) it self, the last equality of (54) follows.

Recalling that \mathbf{z}_k^{ag} corresponds to regular iterates and \mathbf{z}_k^{md} corresponds to the extrapolated iterates of Nesterov's acceleration scheme. The squared error term II in (54) is brought by gradient calculation at the extrapolated point instead of the regular point. Note that if we do an implicit version of Nesterov such that $\mathbf{z}_{k-1}^{\text{md}} = \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}$, this squared term goes to zero, and the convergence analysis would be the same as in OGD. This could potentially result in a new implicit algorithm with better convergence guarantee.

On the other hand, for the coupling term of the updates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle - (1 - \alpha_k) \left\langle H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle \\ &= \alpha_k \left\langle H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle = \underbrace{\alpha_k \left\langle H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle}_{\text{I(b)}} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the last equality comes from the following property of $H(\cdot)$ that:

$$\left\langle H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle = 0$$

Summing up Eq. (55) with Eq. (54), we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}) - \alpha_k F(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k) F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}) + \left\langle H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle - (1 - \alpha_k) \left\langle H(\omega_{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle \\ &\leq \underbrace{\alpha_k \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}) + H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \omega_{\mathbf{z}} \right\rangle}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2}_{\text{II}} \end{aligned}$$

where I is the summation of $I(a)$ and $I(b)$. This concludes our proof of Lemma B.1 by bringing in the definitions of $V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*)$, $V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \mathbf{z}^*)$. \square

D.6 Proof of Lemma B.3

Proof.[Proof of Lemma B.3] By Young's inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 &\leq 2 \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + 2\eta_{k-1}^2 L_H^2 \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}} \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + c \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}} \right\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where (a) is by Line (3) and (5) of Algorithm 1 and the definition of L_H , and (b) is by the condition in Lemma B.3 that $\eta_k L_H \leq \sqrt{c}/2$.

Recursively applying the above gives

$$\left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 \leq 2c^k \sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{-\ell} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell \right\|^2 \quad (57)$$

Indeed, from (56)

$$c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 - c^{-(k-1)} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}} \right\|^2 \leq 2c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2$$

so telescoping over $k = 1, \dots, K$ gives

$$c^{-K} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{z}_{\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^K c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2$$

which is just (due to $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{z}_{-\frac{1}{2}}$)

$$\begin{aligned} c^{-K} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^K c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{z}_{\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_0 \right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^K c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^0 c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=2}^K c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 + 2 \sum_{k=0}^0 c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^K c^{-k} \left\| \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which gives (57). \square

D.7 Proof of Lemma B.5

Proof.[Proof of Lemma B.5] We recall that we denote

$$\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \Delta_f^k = \nabla \tilde{F}(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}}; \xi_k) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{md}})$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}; \zeta_{k-\frac{1}{2}})\|^2 = \mathbb{E} \|H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2$$

By first taking expectation over $\zeta_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ condition on $\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ given, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &\leq \mathbb{E} \|H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - \Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \beta) \mathbb{E} \|H(\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}})\|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\beta}) \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \beta) L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\beta}) \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that by Assumption 2.2, $\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \leq \sigma_H^2$ and $\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \leq \sigma_H^2$, we conclude our proof of Lemma B.5. \square

D.8 Proof of Lemma B.6

Proof.[Proof of Lemma B.6] By inequality (35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k) \mathbb{E} V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_k \eta_k}{2} \left[2L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + 3\sigma_H^2 \right] + \alpha_k \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k + \Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}^* \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

The inner product term can be decomposed into

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k + \Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}^* \right\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}^* \right\rangle + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k, \mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}^* \right\rangle + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\rangle = \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Where the expectation of the first two terms all equals 0. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1 - \alpha_k) \mathbb{E} V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_k \eta_k}{2} \left[2L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + 3\sigma_H^2 \right] + \alpha_k \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Delta_f^k, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 \right] - \left(\frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

For any $r > 0$, we pair up

$$-\frac{(1-r)\alpha_k}{2\eta_k}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + \alpha_k\mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta_f^k, \mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k \right\rangle \leq \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_f^k\|^2$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1-\alpha_k)\mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2}\left[2L_H^2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + 3\sigma_H^2\right] + \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_f^k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2\right] - \left(\frac{r\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Next, we connect $\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2$ with the squared norms $\|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2$. For η_k satisfying $\eta_k L_H \leq \frac{\sqrt{c}}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\right\|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ & = 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + 2\eta_{k-1}^2\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - \tilde{H}(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}})\|^2 \\ & = 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + 2\eta_{k-1}^2\mathbb{E}\|H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}) - H(\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}) + \Delta_h^{k-\frac{3}{2}}\|^2 + 2\eta_{k-1}^2\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_h^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 + 4\eta_{k-1}^2L_H^2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}\|^2 + 6\eta_{k-1}^2\sigma_H^2 \\ & = 2\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 + 6\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\eta_{\ell-1}^2\sigma_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Bringing Eq. (59) into (58), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) - (1-\alpha_k)\mathbb{E}V(\mathbf{z}_k^{\text{ag}}, \omega_{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2}\left[4L_H^2\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 + 12L_H^2\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\eta_{\ell-1}^2\sigma_H^2 + 3\sigma_H^2\right] + \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\sigma_F^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2\right] - \left(\frac{r\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2}\left[4L_H^2\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 + 3\frac{c}{1-c}\sigma_H^2 + 3\sigma_H^2\right] + \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\sigma_F^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2\right] - \left(\frac{r\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\alpha_k\eta_kL_H^2\sum_{\ell=0}^k c^{k-\ell}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_\ell\|^2 + \frac{3\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-c)}\sigma_H^2 + \frac{\alpha_k\eta_k}{2(1-r)}\sigma_F^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_k}{2\eta_k}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}\|^2\right] - \left(\frac{r\alpha_k}{2\eta_k} - \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{z}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and that concludes our proof of Lemma B.6. \square