

# A Penalty-Based Method for Communication-Efficient Decentralized Bilevel Programming

Parvin Nazari <sup>a</sup>, Ahmad Mousavi <sup>b</sup>, Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh <sup>c</sup>, George Michailidis <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Amirkabir University of Technology, Iran

<sup>b</sup>University of Florida, USA

<sup>c</sup>University of Pennsylvania, USA

---

## Abstract

Bilevel programming has recently received attention in the literature, due to its wide range of applications, including reinforcement learning and hyper-parameter optimization. However, it is widely assumed that the underlying bilevel optimization problem is solved either by a *single* machine or in the case of multiple machines connected in a star-shaped network, i.e., federated learning setting. The latter approach suffers from a high communication cost on the central node (e.g., parameter server) and exhibits privacy vulnerabilities. Hence, it is of interest to develop methods that solve bilevel optimization problems in a communication-efficient *decentralized* manner. To that end, this paper introduces a *penalty function* based decentralized algorithm with theoretical guarantees for this class of optimization problems. Specifically, a distributed alternating gradient-type algorithm for solving consensus bilevel programming over a decentralized network is developed. A key feature of the proposed algorithm is to estimate the hyper-gradient of the penalty function via decentralized computation of *matrix-vector* products and few *vector communications*, which is then integrated within an alternating algorithm to obtain finite-time convergence analysis under different convexity assumptions. Our theoretical result highlights improvements in the iteration complexity of decentralized bilevel optimization, all while making efficient use of vector communication. Empirical results on both synthetic and real datasets demonstrate that the proposed method performs well in real-world settings.

*Key words:* Bilevel Optimization; Decentralized Learning, Penalty Function, Convergence Analysis

---

## 1 Introduction

Decentralized optimization has attracted significant attention in various scientific and engineering fields [22,38]. The main objective is to minimize a finite-sum function  $f(x) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and each individual agent (client)  $i$  in a connected network of  $n$  agents only knows its own function  $f_i$ . The agents collaborate by iteratively sharing information with other connected agents in their neighborhood, aiming to converge to the optimal solution of the network. Decentralized optimization offers advantages such as scalability to the network size, data ownership, and privacy preservation in data-sensitive applications [22,38].

Bilevel programming has found applications in various fields, including economics, transportation, management, and machine learning. Some early works, such as [1,11],

transformed the bilevel problem into a single-level optimization problem by replacing the lower-level problem (Eq.(1)) with its optimality conditions. Recently, gradient-based approaches designed for the original bilevel problem have gained popularity due to their simplicity and effectiveness [6,16,18,27,51]. In an attempt to move away from traditional bilevel optimization, [47] proposed a federated bilevel optimization problem, where the inner and outer objectives are distributed over a *star-shaped* network (Eq.(1) and Figure 1(a)). This approach employs *local updates* between two communication rounds, and clients (nodes) only need to compute matrix-vector products and exchange vectors. Although it achieves non-federated iteration complexity using only vector operations, it may suffer from high communication costs on the parameter (central) server and privacy vulnerabilities.

There has been a recent interest in solving finite sum bilevel programming (Eq. (1)) over a *decentralized* network architecture [7,52]. However, the existing methods tend to be complicated and impractical for large-scale bilevel applications. Specifically, the proposed algorithms [7,52] involve

---

*Email addresses:* p.nazari@aut.ac.ir (Parvin Nazari),  
mousavis@ufl.edu (Ahmad Mousavi),  
tarzanaq@umich.edu (Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh),  
gmichail@ufl.edu (George Michailidis).

expensive Hessian computations within nodes and/or communication of matrices between nodes (refer to Section 2 for further discussion).

This paper addresses these challenges and presents theory and algorithms for *fast and communication-efficient* decentralized bilevel optimization. The main contributions are:

- **Lightweight Computation and Communication:** Development of a Decentralized Alternating Gradient Method (DAGM) for solving bilevel problems with lightweight decentralized communication and computation. DAGM approximates the original consensus problem using a penalized reformulation and estimates its hyper-gradient through a Decentralized Inverse Hessian-Gradient-Product (DIHGP) using *local matrix-vector products* and *decentralized communication of vectors*. The DIHGP approach employs a few terms in the Neumann series to provide a stable inverse Hessian approximation without explicitly instantiating any matrices, utilizing efficient vector-Jacobian products similar to [28], but in a decentralized setting.
- **Iteration Complexity and Acceleration:** From a theoretical perspective, we establish convergence rates and communication complexity bounds achievable by DAGM for smooth strongly convex, convex, and non-convex bilevel problems. Remarkably, the iteration complexity of DAGM achieves a linear acceleration (an  $n^{-1}$  factor in the complexity bound) even with vector communication, in comparison with extensive matrix computation/communication results in [7,52]; see Table 1.
- **Experimental Evaluation:** From a practical perspective, we assess DAGM’s performance in addressing large-scale problems and pinpoint the essential elements that contribute to the resilience and scalability of DIHGP. As far as we know, this marks the initial empirical and theoretical exploration of Neumann series-based DIHGP featuring vector costs within the realm of bilevel optimization.

**Organization:** Section 2 discusses prior works. Section 3 presents the problem formulation and assumptions. Section 4 introduces the DAGM algorithm, and Section 5 establishes its theoretical results. Section 6 presents simulation results demonstrating the improved convergence speed of DAGM. Finally, Section 7 provides concluding remarks.

**Notation.** For a differentiable function  $h(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in which  $y = y(x) : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we denote  $\nabla h \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  the gradient of  $h$  as a function of  $x$  and  $\nabla_x h, \nabla_y h$  the partial derivatives of  $h$  with respect to  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively.  $\nabla_{xy}^2 h$  and  $\nabla_y^2 h$  denote the Jacobian matrix and the Hessian matrix of  $h$ , respectively. A mapping  $h$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous if and only if (iff) for some  $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\|h(x) - h(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Also, it is said to be  $\mu$ -strongly convex iff for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+, h(x) \geq h(y) + \nabla h(y)^\top (x - y) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y\|^2, \forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ . Additional notation is defined when required, but for reference purposes the reader can also find it summarized in Table 2.

## 2 Related work

**Bilevel programming** was first formulated by [46] in the context of game theory. The available single-level methods [1,11,34] reformulated the bilevel problem into a single-level constrained optimization, and developed penalty and augmented Lagrangian methods to solve it. Recent works [9,12,13,16,17,31,41,51] developed alternating optimization methods to solve the original bilevel problems. For example, [12,13,17,31] applied gradient-type algorithms for the inner and outer iterative updates where the outer gradient  $\nabla f(x)$  is estimated via iterative differentiation (ITD) in either a reverse (automatic differentiation) or forward manner. [9,16,17,41] developed alternating gradient methods where the hypergradient is approximated via implicit differentiation (AID) which involves solving a linear system. The asymptotic and finite-time analysis of both ITD and AID approaches have been extensively studied [14,16,18,44]. For example, [14] provided the asymptotic convergence of a back-propagation approach as one of ITD-based algorithms by assuming the inner-level problem is strongly convex. [44] gave a similar analysis for a *truncated* back-propagation approach. [16] provided a finite-time convergence analysis for an AID-based algorithm by assuming the inner-level problem is strongly convex.

**Decentralized optimization** has been extensively studied and employed in many applications, including large-scale machine learning tasks [49]. A popular algorithm for decentralized optimization is the corresponding decentralized gradient descent that has been extensively studied in the literature [24,35,36,38,45,53,55]. Despite many studies of the single-level decentralized optimization problem, *decentralized bilevel* variants have been elusive possibly due to additional challenges posed by the complexity of the nested problems and hyper-gradient computation (involving inverse Hessian estimation). Recently, [15,26] and [47] developed bilevel optimization in *homogeneous* and general *heterogeneous* (Problem (1)) federated settings, respectively. [21] studied asynchronous distributed bilevel optimization. Recently, [7,29,30,48,52] developed bilevel programming over decentralized networks. Specifically, [29,30] considered a variant of bilevel Problem (1), where only the low-level objective involves distribution over many nodes. Our work is closely related to [7,52] where the authors studied the general bilevel Problem (1) and showed that their proposed algorithms enjoy  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$  sample complexity. However, these algorithms involve expensive Hessian computations within nodes and/or communicating matrices between agents. Gossip-type methods [52] also require bidirectional communication of matrices between the agents; each iteration involves one “gossip” round (all  $m$  edges communicate bidirectionally) and thus needs to wait for the slowest communication (out of the  $2m$  ones) to be completed. To address these challenges, this paper introduces a penalized reformulation of the bilevel Problem (1). This enables the application of a standard alternating gradient-type optimization approach using Neumann series, employing




Fig. 1. Distributed Bilevel Learning.

suitable step-sizes that exclusively necessitate matrix-vector products and constrained vector communications. The Neumann series framework offers a decentralized algorithm that exhibits enhanced speed and scalability, comparable to prior works such as [28,47], capable of accommodating millions of parameters. A distinguishing aspect of our work, unlike [7,52], lies in achieving linear acceleration (an  $n^{-1}$  improvement in complexity) even when involving vector computation/communication, contrasting the extensive reliance on matrix computation/communication in [7,52].

### 3 Decentralized Bilevel Optimization

Consider the finite-sum bilevel optimization problem [47]:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x, y^*(x)), \quad (\text{Outer}) \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } y^*(x) \in \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x, y). \quad (\text{Inner}) \quad (1b)$$

In bilevel optimization over a decentralized network [7,52],  $n$  agents form a connected undirected network  $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ , and cooperatively solve Problem (1). Note that  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  denotes the set of agents,  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  the set of edges in the network, and  $f_i, g_i$  are the local objective functions available only to the agent  $i$ ; a depiction is given in Figure 1(b). For each  $i$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{N}_i$  the set of *neighbors* of the agent  $i$  in the underlying network, i.e.,  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$  if and only if  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ . Each edge  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$  has an associated weight  $w_{ij} \geq 0$ , which measures how much agent  $i$  values the information received by the agent  $j$ . We impose the following assumptions on the network matrix  $W$  and on the inner and outer objective functions.

**Assumption A (Mixing matrix)** The nonnegative symmetric matrix  $W = [w_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$  associated with network  $\mathcal{G}$  encodes its connectivity structure so that:

- A1.**  $w_{ij} = 0$  if agents  $i$  and  $j$  are not connected.
- A2.**  $W$  is doubly stochastic, i.e.,  $W1_n = 1_n$  and  $W^\top 1_n = 1_n$ .
- A3.**  $\text{null}\{I_n - W\} = \text{span}\{1_n\}$ .
- A4.** There exist constants  $0 \leq \theta \leq \Theta < 1$ , such that for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ :  $0 \leq \theta \leq w_{ii} \leq \Theta < 1$ .

Assumption A is widely used in the decentralized optimization literature [4,37,38]. The mixing matrix  $W$  satisfying this assumption can be constructed by the Metropolis method [45,50]; for further details, see (20). Under Assumptions **A1.**–**A3.**, the Perron-Frobenius theorem [42] implies that the eigenvalues of  $W$  lie in  $(-1, 1]$ , the multiplicity of eigenvalue 1 is one, and

$$\sigma := \|W - \frac{1}{n} 1_n 1_n^\top\| = \max\{|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_n|\} \in (0, 1), \quad (2)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the mixing rate of the network and  $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1$  are the eigenvalues of  $W$ .

**Assumption B** For all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ :

- B1.** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\nabla_x f_i(x, \cdot)$ ,  $\nabla_y f_i(x, \cdot)$ ,  $\nabla_y g_i(x, \cdot)$ ,  $\nabla_{xy}^2 g_i(x, \cdot)$ ,  $\nabla_y^2 g_i(x, \cdot)$  are  $L_{f_x}$ ,  $L_{f_y}$ ,  $L_g$ ,  $L_{g_{xy}}$ ,  $L_{g_{yy}}$ -Lipschitz continuous for some constants  $L_{f_x} > 0$ ,  $L_{f_y} > 0$ ,  $L_g > 0$ ,  $L_{g_{xy}} > 0$  and  $L_{g_{yy}} > 0$ .
- B2.** For any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ ,  $\nabla_y f_i(\cdot, y)$ ,  $\nabla_{xy}^2 g_i(\cdot, y)$ ,  $\nabla_y^2 g_i(\cdot, y)$  are  $\tilde{L}_{f_y}$ ,  $\tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}$ ,  $\tilde{L}_{g_{yy}}$ -Lipschitz continuous.
- B3.** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we have  $\|\nabla_y f_i(x, y)\| \leq C_{f_y}$  and  $\|\nabla_x f_i(x, y)\| \leq C_{f_x}$  for some positive constants  $C_{f_y}$  and  $C_{f_x}$ .
- B4.** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we have  $\nabla_{xy}^2 g_i(x, y) \preceq C_{g_{xy}} I_{d_2}$  for some positive constant  $C_{g_{xy}}$ .
- B5.** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ , the inner function  $g_i(x, \cdot)$  is  $\mu_g$ -strongly convex and  $C_{g_{yy}}$ -smooth for some constants  $0 < \mu_g \leq C_{g_{yy}} < \infty$ , i.e.,  $\mu_g I_{d_2} \preceq \nabla_y^2 g_i(x, y) \preceq C_{g_{yy}} I_{d_2}$ .

Algorithm	Stationary Measure	Complexity
<b>Strongly convex</b>		
BA [16]	$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - f^*$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 \epsilon^{-1})$
AccBio [19]		$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 \epsilon^{-1})$
AmIGO [2]		$\mathcal{O}(\log \epsilon^{-1})$
<b>DAGM</b> (Decentralized)	$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^*$	$\mathcal{O}(\log(n^{-1} \epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma)))$
<b>Convex</b>		
BA [16]	$f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - f^*$	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5/4})$
AccBio [19]		$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$
<b>DAGM</b> (Decentralized)		$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1} \epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma))$
<b>Non-convex</b>		
BA [16]	$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \ \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\ ^2$	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5/4})$
AID-BiO [20]		$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$
AmIGO [2]		$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$
DBO [7] (Decentralized)		$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$
<b>DAGM</b> (Decentralized)	$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \ \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k))\ ^2$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1} \epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma)^2)$

Table 1

Comparisons between different **deterministic bilevel optimization** approaches with computation/communication to achieve an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point in the non-convex setting and an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution in the convex setting. Here,  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k := (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_{i,k}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K := (1/K) \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ , and  $\sigma$  denotes the spectral gap of the network topology, with  $n$  being the number of nodes.

Assumption B is a standard presence in bilevel optimization research [6,16,18,20]. It guarantees the smooth behavior of first- and second-order derivatives for the local functions  $f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ ,  $g_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , and the solution mapping  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$ .

### 3.1 A Concatenation Formulation and its Properties

As a prelude to understanding the key properties of bilevel gradient descent in a decentralized setting, we begin by providing a concatenation formulation of Eq. (1). Let  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  denote the local copy of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  at node  $i$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x} &:= [\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}, \\
\mathbf{y} &:= [\mathbf{y}_1; \dots; \mathbf{y}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}, \\
\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) &:= [\mathbf{y}_1^*(\mathbf{x}_1); \dots; \mathbf{y}_n^*(\mathbf{x}_n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}, \\
\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &:= [g_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1); \dots; g_n(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}, \\
\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) &:= [f_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1^*(\mathbf{x}_1)); \dots; f_n(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n^*(\mathbf{x}_n))] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the network  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected, the bilevel problem in Eq. (1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_i)) \\
&\text{s.t. } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \quad \forall i,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_i) &:= \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \\
&\text{subj. to } \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{y}_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \quad \forall i.
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma establishes the above claim and characterizes a penalized version of (3) which is more suitable for decentralized implementation.

**Lemma 1** *Under Assumptions A1.- A3,*

- (1) *The bilevel problem in Eq. (1) is equivalent to (3).*
- (2) *For any given penalty parameters  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , the penalized problem associated with (3) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) &:= \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \dot{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \tag{4a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{s.t. } \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}} \left\{ \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{y} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \gamma \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\}, \tag{4b}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{W} := \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2 \times nd_2}$  and  $\dot{\mathbf{W}} := \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times nd_1}$  are the extended mixing matrices;  $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_i))$  and  $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  are the aggregate functions.

Lemma 1 allows us to compute the inner/outer gradients by exchanging information between neighboring nodes. Specifically, it allows to develop an efficient algorithm to approximate the hyper-gradient via decentralized computation of matrix-vector products and few vector communications. Throughout this paper we also assume that the sets of minimizers of the original problem in Eq. (1) and the penalized

consensus problem in Eq. (4) are nonempty.

**Remark 2** Note that as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , the minimizer of (4) and (3) are equivalent [32,40,53]. Indeed, if  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}^* = [\mathbf{x}_1^*; \dots; \mathbf{x}_n^*] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$  denote the solutions of (3) and (4), respectively, then,  $\|\mathbf{x}_i^* - \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*\| = \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Before providing the formal statement of the algorithm, we highlight the inherent challenge of directly applying the decentralized gradient method to the bilevel problem in Eq. (4). To elucidate this point, we deduce the gradient of the outer objective function  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  in the subsequent lemma.

**Lemma 3** Suppose Assumptions A and B5. hold.

(1) For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  is unique and differentiable, and

$$\nabla \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) := (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ .

(2) For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$ , the gradient of  $\mathbf{F}$  as a function of  $\mathbf{x}$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \dot{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\quad + \nabla \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Next, we utilize the above lemma to describe the core difficulties of developing a decentralized optimization method for solving (4). In order to develop a decentralized bilevel gradient-type method, one needs to estimate outer gradient  $\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ . Note that the inner optimizer  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  is not available in general. To circumvent this bottleneck, following existing non-decentralized works [16,18], we replace  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  with an approximation  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}$ , and define the following surrogate of (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \dot{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{h}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h} &:= -[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &:= (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here,  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2 \times nd_2}$  is a block diagonal matrix where its  $i$ -th diagonal block is given by the  $i$ -th local Hessian  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_2}$ . Similarly, the matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times nd_2}$  is a block diagonal matrix where its  $i$ -th diagonal block is given by  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ . Further, the matrix  $\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}$  is a *block neighbor sparse* in the sense that the  $(i, j)$ -th block is non-zero if and only if  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$  or  $j = i$ . Consequently, the Hessian matrix  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  follows the sparsity pattern of the graph  $\mathcal{G}$

and can be computed via exchanging information with the neighboring nodes. Specifically, the  $i$ -th diagonal block is  $\mathbf{H}_{ii}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (1 - w_{ii}) \mathbf{I}_{nd_2} + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)$  and the  $(i, j)$ -th off diagonal block is  $\mathbf{H}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = w_{ij} \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}$  when  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  otherwise.

## 4 DAGM Algorithm

We develop a communications-efficient Decentralized Alternating Gradient Method (DAGM) for solving bilevel problem in Eq. (4).

### 4.1 Hessian Splitting and DIHGP

Note that the formulation of Eq. (8) does not guarantee the sparsity of the inverse Hessian  $[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}$  in the decentralized setting. To overcome this issue, we represent the Hessian inverse as a convergent series of matrices, where each term can be computed using local information. In particular, we approximate the inverse Hessian-gradient-product  $\mathbf{h}$  defined in (8) by *local* Neumann series approximation. To do so, inspired by [33,54], we split the Hessian into matrices  $\mathbf{D}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} &= (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \underbrace{\gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + 2(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \text{diag}(\mathbf{W}))}_{=: \mathbf{D}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - 2\text{diag}(\mathbf{W}) + \mathbf{W}}_{=: \mathbf{B}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{D}$  is a block diagonal positive definite matrix and  $\mathbf{B}$  is a neighbor sparse positive semidefinite matrix. By factoring  $\mathbf{D}^{1/2}$  from both sides of Eq. (9), we get

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}) \mathbf{D}^{1/2}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^{-1} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}.$$

In [33], the authors present the following lemma ensuring that the spectral radius of the matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$  is strictly less than 1.

**Lemma 4** Under Assumptions A and B5., we have

$$0 \preceq \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \preceq \rho \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\rho := 2(1-\theta)/(2(1-\Theta) + \gamma \mu_g) < 1$  and the constants  $\theta, \Theta, \gamma$ , and  $\mu_g$  are defined in Assumptions A and B.

Next, using Lemma 4, we consider the Taylor's series  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{X})^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{X}^j$  with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$  to write the

Hessian inverse  $\mathbf{H}^{-1}$  as

$$\mathbf{H}^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^u \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}. \quad (11)$$

Note that the computation of the above series requires global communication which is not affordable in decentralized settings. Hence, we consider the first  $U + 1$  ( $U \geq 0$ ) terms of the series for defining the approximate Hessian inverse as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \sum_{u=0}^U (\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^u \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}. \quad (12)$$

Since the matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  is block diagonal and  $\mathbf{B}$  is block neighbor sparse, it turns out that the approximate Hessian inverse  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  is  $U$ -hop block neighbor sparse, i.e., the  $(i, j)$ -th block is nonzero if and only if there is at least one path between nodes  $i$  and  $j$  with length  $U$  or smaller. Substituting the explicit expression for  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  in (12) into (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_{(U)} &= -\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1} \mathbf{p} \\ &= -\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \sum_{u=0}^U (\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^u \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbf{p} := \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .

Then, Eq. (13) can be computed by the recursive expression as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_{(s+1)} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{h}_{(s)} - \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} (\mathbf{B} \mathbf{h}_{(s)} - \mathbf{p}). \quad (14a)$$

By using the sparsity pattern of  $\mathbf{B}$ , we can further decompose (14a) into local components as

$$h_{i,(s+1)} = D_{ii}^{-1} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i, j=i} B_{ij} h_{j,(s)} - p_i \right). \quad (14b)$$

Here,  $D_{ii} := \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) + 2(1_{d_2} - w_{ii}) \mathbf{I}_{d_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  is the  $i$ -th diagonal block of matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  in (9). Note that the block  $D_{ii}$  is locally available at node  $i$ . Further, the diagonal blocks  $B_{ii} = (1_{d_2} - w_{ii}) \mathbf{I}_{d_2}$  and the off diagonal blocks  $B_{ij} = w_{ij} \mathbf{I}_{d_2}$  can be computed and stored by node  $i$ . The gradient component  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  is also stored and computed at node  $i$ . Therefore, node  $i$  can execute the recursion in (14b) by having access to the  $h_{j,(s)}$  of its neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ . The Decentralized estimation of Inverse Hessian-Gradient-Product (DIHGP) method runs by agent  $i$  is summarized in the following Algorithm 1.

The following lemma provides bounds for the eigenvalues of the  $U$ -th order inverse approximation  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  in (12) which is adopted from [33].

---

**Algorithm 1**  $h_{i,(U)} = \text{DIHGP}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, U, \mathbf{W})$  at each node  $i$

---

- 1:  $B_{ii} = (1_{d_2} - w_{ii}) \mathbf{I}_{d_2}$  and  $B_{ij} = w_{ij} \mathbf{I}_{d_2}$ .
  - 2:  $D_{ii} = \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) + 2(1_{d_2} - w_{ii}) \mathbf{I}_{d_2}$ .
  - 3:  $\mathbf{p}_i = \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$ .
  - 4: Find  $h_{i,(0)}$  such that  $D_{ii} h_{i,(0)} + \mathbf{p}_i = 0$ .
  - 5: **for**  $s = 0, \dots, U - 1$  **do**
  - 6:   Exchange the iterate  $h_{i,(s)}$  with neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ .
  - 7:   Set  $\mathbf{b}_i = -\mathbf{p}_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i, j=i} B_{ij} h_{j,(s)}$ .
  - 8:   Find  $h_{i,(s+1)}$  such that  $D_{ii} h_{i,(s+1)} = \mathbf{b}_i$ .
  - 9: **end for**
- 

**Lemma 5** *Suppose Assumptions A and B5. hold. Then, the eigenvalues of the approximate Hessian inverse  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  are bounded as*

$$\lambda \mathbf{I}_{nd_2} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1} \preceq \Lambda \mathbf{I}_{nd_2},$$

where the constants  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  are defined as

$$\lambda := \frac{1}{2(1 - \theta) + \gamma C_{g_{yy}}}, \quad \Lambda := \frac{1 - \rho^{U+1}}{(1 - \rho)((2(1 - \Theta) + \gamma \mu_g))},$$

$\rho$  is defined in Lemma 4 and the remaining constants are defined in Assumptions A and B. Moreover, let  $\mathbf{E} := \mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1/2} \mathbf{H} \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1/2}$  be the error of the Hessian inverse approximation. Then,

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{E} \preceq \rho^{U+1} \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}.$$

Lemma 5 indicates that the error matrix  $\mathbf{E}$  decreases exponentially with increasing  $U$ . Note that the matrix  $\mathbf{E}$  measures the closeness between Hessian inverse approximation matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  and the exact Hessian inverse  $\mathbf{H}^{-1}$ . Hence, as  $U$  increases, the Hessian inverse approximation  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{(U)}^{-1}$  approaches the exact Hessian inverse  $\mathbf{H}^{-1}$ .

## 4.2 The Structure of the DAGM Algorithm

The iteration indices of the outer and inner loops are denoted by  $k \in \{0, \dots, K - 1\}$  and  $t \in \{0, \dots, M\}$ , respectively. For all  $k \geq 0$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{q}_k^t := \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^t) = (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{y}_k^t + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^t)$$

denotes the gradient of the inner function at the current point  $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^t)$ . Given the above gradient, we use decentralized gradient descent (DGD) [38] to minimize (approximately) the inner function as follows:

$$\mathbf{y}_k^{t+1} = \mathbf{y}_k^t - \beta \mathbf{q}_k^t, \quad (15)$$

---

**Algorithm 2 DAGM**


---

- 1: **Inputs:**  $M, K, U \in \mathbb{N}; \{(x_{i,0}, y_{i,0})\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2};$   
 $(\beta, \gamma, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_{++};$  and a mixing matrix  $W$ .
  - 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$  **do**
  - 3:   Set  $\tilde{y}_{i,k-1} = y_{i,k}^0 = y_{i,k-1}^M$  if  $k > 0$   
     and  $y_{i,0}$  otherwise.
  - 4:   **for**  $t = 0, \dots, M - 1$  **do**
  - 5:     Exchange iterate  $y_{i,k}^t$  with neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ .
  - 6:      $q_{i,k}^t = (1 - w_{ii})y_{i,k}^t \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij}y_{j,k}^t +$   
        $\gamma \nabla_y g_i(x_{i,k}, y_{i,k}^t).$
  - 7:      $y_{i,k}^{t+1} = y_{i,k}^t - \beta q_{i,k}^t.$
  - 8:   **end for**
  - 9:    $\tilde{y}_{i,k} = y_{i,k}^M.$
  - 10: Exchange the iterate  $x_{i,k}$  with neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ .
  - 11:  $h_{i,k,(U)} = \text{DIHGP}(x_{i,k}, \tilde{y}_{i,k}, U, W).$
  - 12:  $d_{i,k,(U)} = \frac{1}{\alpha}(1 - w_{ii})x_{i,k} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij}x_{j,k}$   
      $+ \nabla_x f_i(x_{i,k}, \tilde{y}_{i,k}) + \gamma \nabla_{xy}^2 g_i(x_{i,k}, \tilde{y}_{i,k})h_{i,k,(U)}.$
  - 13: Update local iterate:  $x_{i,k+1} = x_{i,k} - \alpha d_{i,k,(U)}.$
  - 14: **end for**
- 

where  $\mathbf{q}_k^t = [q_{1,k}^t; \dots; q_{n,k}^t]$  and its  $i$ -th element is given by

$$q_{i,k}^t = (1 - w_{ii})y_{i,k}^t - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij}y_{j,k}^t + \gamma \nabla_y g_i(x_{i,k}, y_{i,k}^t). \quad (16a)$$

Hence,

$$y_{i,k}^{t+1} = y_{i,k}^t - \beta q_{i,k}^t. \quad (16b)$$

DAGM runs  $M$  steps of (15) to obtain an approximate solution  $\mathbf{y}_k^M$  of the inner problem in Eq. (4b).

Next, we provide the outer-level update by using the estimator  $\mathbf{y}_k^M$  of the inner loop. Each outer-level iteration requires hyper-gradient estimation. As described in the previous section, in the DAGM algorithm, we truncate the first  $U$  summands of the Hessian inverse Taylor's series in (11) to approximate the inverse of the Hessian matrix. Then, we set

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \alpha \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M), \quad (17a)$$

where  $\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  is an estimate of the hyper-gradient by using (13) and setting  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_k^M$  in (7) as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) &:= \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{x}_k + \nabla_x \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) \\ &\quad + \gamma \nabla_{xy}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) \mathbf{h}_{k,(U)}, \quad \text{and} \quad (17b) \\ \mathbf{h}_{k,(U)} &:= -\mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \sum_{u=0}^U (\mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2})^u \mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{p}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that DAGM relies on the DIHGP algorithm that estimates the hyper-gradient by truncating the Taylor's expansion for the DIHGP step. By leveraging DIHGP, we can im-

plement Algorithm 2 using matrix vector products and communication of vectors. We also note that each node  $i$  needs to broadcast  $U + 1$  vectors of  $d_1$  dimension per iteration, namely  $x_{i,k}, \{d_{i,k,(s)}\}_{s=0}^{U-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ , to its neighbors. Hence, at each iteration of DAGM, node  $i$  sends  $(U + 1)|\mathcal{N}_i|$  vectors of the same dimension  $d_1$  to the neighboring nodes. Thus, the per-iteration communication complexity of the DAGM algorithm increases linearly with the approximation order  $U$ . As such, there is a complexity-accuracy trade off for the choice of  $U$ . In particular, increasing  $U$  will boost the approximation accuracy (and thus per-iteration performance) of the DAGM and incur a higher communication burden.

## 5 Convergence Analysis

Next, we provide our theoretical results of DAGM in the strongly convex, convex and non-convex settings, respectively.

Throughout this section, we consider (9)-(17a) with the parameters

$$\gamma = \frac{\kappa_G L_g}{2(\mu_g + L_g)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{2}{\gamma(L_g + \mu_g)}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\kappa_G := \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) / \hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})$ . Let  $\kappa_g := L_g / \mu_g$  denote the condition number and  $\sigma$  is Mixing rate of the network defined in Eq. (2). We also assume  $x_{i,0} = 0$  for simplicity in the analysis. Moreover, for notational convenience, let us define  $\mathbf{f}^* := \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^*))$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k := \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \bar{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times 1}$  where  $\bar{x}_k := (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,k}$ .

In the next result, we establish main convergence properties of the DAGM algorithm.

**Theorem 6 (Strongly convex case)** *Suppose Assumption A on the weight matrix  $W$  and Assumption B on the local functions hold. Further, assume  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are strongly convex with parameter  $\mu_f > 0$ . If*

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2L_F}, \quad U = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_{1/\rho} K \right\rceil, \quad M = \mathcal{O}(\max\{k, \kappa_g\}).$$

Then, for any  $K \geq 1$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - \mathbf{f}^*) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{n} (1 - \nu)^K + \frac{\alpha}{1 - \sigma} \right),$$

where

$$\nu := \min \left( \alpha \mu_F, \frac{2}{\kappa_g + 1} \right). \quad (19)$$

**Theorem 7 (Convex case)** *Suppose Assumption A on the weight matrix  $W$  and Assumption B on the local functions*

hold. Further, assume  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are convex. Let

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{L_F}, \quad U = \left\lceil \log_{1/\rho} K \right\rceil, \quad \text{and} \quad M = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g \log(K)).$$

Then, for any  $K \geq 1$  with  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq R$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \left( \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - \mathbf{f}^* \right) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{nK} + \frac{\alpha}{1-\sigma} \right),$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ .

**Theorem 8 (Non-convex case)** Suppose Assumption A on the weight matrix  $W$  and Assumption B on  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$  hold. Let

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{8L_F}, \quad U = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_{1/\rho} K \right\rceil, \quad \text{and} \quad M = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g).$$

Then, for any  $K \geq 1$  we have

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{nK} + \frac{\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2} \right).$$

Note that in the strongly convex setting, it follows from Theorem 6 that the iteration complexity of DAGM is  $\mathcal{O}(\log(n^{-1}\epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma)))$  with  $\alpha = \delta^K/(2nL_F)$ , where  $\delta < 1$ . Similarly, in the convex setting, Theorem 7 implies that if  $\alpha = 1/(L_F n K)$ , then DAGM achieves  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma))$  iteration complexity. Finally, in the non-convex case, Theorem 8 establishes that by setting  $\alpha = 1/(8L_F \sqrt{nK})$  gives a  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\epsilon^{-1}/(1-\sigma)^2)$  iteration complexity for DAGM. We also note that the connectivity of a graph is captured by its spectral gap value  $1-\sigma$  [10]. Hence, a larger value of the spectral gap leads to stronger connectivity.

## 6 Numerical Experiments

We numerically investigate the impact of several factors influencing the performance of DAGM on bilevel optimization problems.

### 6.1 Decentralized Hyper-parameter optimization (HO)

HO is the process of finding the best set of hyper-parameter values that cannot be learned using the training data alone [14]. An HO problem can be formulated as a bilevel optimization problem as follows: the outer objective  $f(\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}); \mathcal{D}^{\text{val}})$  aims to minimize the validation loss with respect to the hyper-parameters  $\mathbf{x}$ , and the inner objective function  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}})$  obtains a learning algorithm by minimizing the training loss with respect to the model parameters  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , where  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{val}}$  denote the training and validation datasets, respectively. Given a loss function  $\ell$ , a set of  $n$

agents,  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{val}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{val}}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n^{\text{val}}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{tr}}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n^{\text{tr}}\}$ , the decentralized HO problem can be formulated as (1) where  $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}); \mathcal{D}^{\text{val}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}); \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{val}})$  and  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) := \ell(\mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) + \mathbf{y}^\top \exp(\mathbf{x})$ . Note that  $\exp(\cdot)$  stands for the element-wise exponential function. Further, by using the  $\exp(\cdot)$  function gives positive  $\exp(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  which is desirable as outputs of the inner optimizer. In our experiments, for any  $(z_i, b_i) \in \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}$ , we consider the following choices of loss functions:

- **Linear:**  $\ell(\mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) = (\mathbf{y}^\top z_i - b_i)^2$ ;
- **Logistic:**  $\ell(\mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) = \log(1 + \exp(-b_i \mathbf{y}^\top z_i))$ ;
- **Support Vector Machine (SVM):**

$$\ell(\mathbf{y}; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) = \max\{0, 1 - b_i \mathbf{y}^\top z_i\};$$

- **Softmax:**  $\ell(\mathbf{y}, u; \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}) = -\log \frac{e^{y_{b_i}^\top z_i + u_{b_i}}}{\sum_{j=1}^C e^{y_j^\top z_i + u_j}}$ ;

where  $C$  is the number of classes and  $b_i \in [C]$ . The inner and outer step-sizes  $(\alpha, \beta)$  are chosen from the set:  $\{1e-2, 5e-3, 1e-3, 5e-4, 1e-4\}$ . The number of DIHGP updates  $U$  is set to 3. The mixing matrix  $W = [w_{ij}]$  is defined as

$$w_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1 + \max\{\deg(i), \deg(j)\}}, & \text{if } \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}, \\ 1 - \sum_{\{i, k\} \in \mathcal{E}} w_{ik}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where  $\deg(i)$  is the degree of the agent  $i$ , i.e., the number of neighbors of the agent. This corresponds to the Metropolis weight matrix for which the weight on each edge is one over one plus the larger degree at its two incident vertices, and the self-weights are chosen so the sum of weights at each node is 1 [4]. The connected network is randomly generated with connectivity ratio  $r = 0.5$ .

**Synthetic Data.** We first illustrate the performance of Algorithm 2 on a synthetic dataset using a regularized linear regression. We set  $d_1 = d_2 = 2$  and  $n = 100$ . The underlying true signal  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is generated from the standard normal distribution. Each data sample  $z_i$  is generated as  $z_i = (\mathbf{y}^*)^\top z_i + \sigma z_i^\top \mathbf{y}^* + \epsilon_i$ , where  $\sigma = 0.25$  and each  $\epsilon_i$  is drawn from the standard normal distribution. Figure 2 provides the training cost and test mean square error (MSE) of DAGM for solving a regularized linear regression problem over 100 epochs and 10 replicates. From Figure 2, we can see that DAGM with  $K = 1, 5$  and 10 gives accurate predictions and there is a gradual increase in the training cost and MSE from  $K = 1$  to  $K = 15$ .

**Real Data Applications.** The numerical results on real datasets are shown in Figure 3 for the DAGM algorithm. Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show the results for a regularized softmax regression applied to the MNIST dataset [25] and







Fig. 2. Training cost and test MSE of DAGM for solving a regularized linear regression problem over 100 epochs for a synthetic dataset.



(a) Regularized softmax problem applied to MNIST dataset.

(b) Regularized support vector machine (SVM) problem applied to Mushroom dataset.

Fig. 3. Convergence of DAGM algorithm over 100 epochs on the real datasets.




Fig. 4. Distributed Hyper-representation experiments on a 2-layer MLP and MNIST dataset.

a regularized support vector machine (SVM) applied to the Mushroom dataset [3], respectively. We observe that centralized DAGM performs the best in terms of number of gradient computations, and there is a gradual decrease in performance from  $K = 1$  and  $K = 15$ . This indicates the trade-off between communication and convergence rate

in decentralized bilevel optimization as shown in our theoretical analysis. We note that centralized DAGM also does vector communications, but suffers from a high communication cost on the central node.

## 6.2 Decentralized Representation Learning

Next, we consider decentralized representation learning. Modern approaches in meta-learning such as model-agnostic meta-learning [12] and reptile [39] learn representations that are shared across all tasks in a bilevel manner. The hyper-representation problem optimizes a classification model in a two-phased process. The outer objective optimizes the model backbone to obtain better feature representation on validation data ( $\{\mathcal{D}_i^t\}_{i=1}^n$ ), while the inner problem optimizes a header for downstream classification tasks on training data ( $\{\mathcal{D}_i^t\}_{i=1}^n$ ). In this experiment, we use a 2-layer multilayer perceptron (MLP) with 200 hidden units. The outer problem optimizes the hidden layer with 157,000 parameters, and the inner problem optimizes the output layer with 2,010 parameters. We study non-i.i.d. partitioning the MNIST data following federated nested optimization (FedNest) [47], and split each client’s data evenly to train and validation datasets. Thus, each client has 300 train and 300 validation samples. We compare the proposed DAGM algorithm to decentralized Gossip-type bilevel optimization (DGBO) [52], decentralized gradient-tracking bilevel optimization (DGTBO) [7], and FedNest [47] with only one local training. Note that the main difference between these algorithms is on the hyper-gradient updates.

Figure 4 demonstrates the impact on test accuracy, training loss, and CPU time of different algorithms. It can be seen that the centralized FedNest and the decentralized DAGM algorithms perform well in terms of test accuracy and training loss and both algorithm significantly outperform DGBO and DGTBO in terms of CPU times. Specifically, the DAGM algorithm has the best timing performance among all four algorithms due to its decentralized matrix-vector product and vector communication. These findings are in line with the discussion in Section 4 and show that the proposed algorithm is robust and scalable.

## 7 Conclusion

This work introduces a novel decentralized alternating gradient method (DAGM) for bilevel optimization problems. DAGM approximates the hyper-gradient by employing decentralized computation involving *matrix-vector* products and *vector communications*. Convergence rates are established for DAGM under diverse convexity assumptions for the objective function. Notably, our method achieves a linear acceleration (an  $n^{-1}$  acceleration in complexity) even when incorporating vector computation/communication, distinguishing it from existing approaches. Numerical evaluations across various problems corroborate our theoretical findings and demonstrate the strong performance of the proposed method in real-world applications.

## References

[1] Eitaro Aiyoshi and Kiyotaka Shimizu. A solution method for the static constrained stackelberg problem via penalty method. *IEEE*

*Transactions on Automatic Control*, 29(12):1111–1114, 1984.

- [2] Michael Arbel and Julien Mairal. Amortized implicit differentiation for stochastic bilevel optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [3] Arthur Asuncion and David Newman. Uci machine learning repository, 2007.
- [4] Stephen Boyd, Persi Diaconis, and Lin Xiao. Fastest mixing markov chain on a graph. *SIAM review*, 46(4):667–689, 2004.
- [5] Sébastien Bubeck. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015.
- [6] Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. Closing the gap: Tighter analysis of alternating stochastic gradient methods for bilevel problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25294–25307, 2021.
- [7] Xuxing Chen, Minhui Huang, and Shiqian Ma. Decentralized bilevel optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.05670*, 2022.
- [8] Ashok Cutkosky and Róbert Busa-Fekete. Distributed stochastic optimization via adaptive SGD. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [9] Justin Domke. Generic methods for optimization-based modeling. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 318–326. PMLR, 2012.
- [10] John C Duchi, Alekh Agarwal, and Martin J Wainwright. Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 57(3):592–606, 2012.
- [11] Thomas Arthur Edmunds and Jonathan F Bard. Algorithms for nonlinear bilevel mathematical programs. *IEEE transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 21(1):83–89, 1991.
- [12] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.
- [13] Luca Franceschi, Michele Donini, Paolo Frasconi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Forward and reverse gradient-based hyperparameter optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1165–1173. PMLR, 2017.
- [14] Luca Franceschi, Paolo Frasconi, Saverio Salzo, Riccardo Grazi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1568–1577. PMLR, 2018.
- [15] Hongchang Gao. On the convergence of momentum-based algorithms for federated stochastic bilevel optimization problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.13299*, 2022.
- [16] Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02246*, 2018.
- [17] Riccardo Grazi, Luca Franceschi, Massimiliano Pontil, and Saverio Salzo. On the iteration complexity of hypergradient computation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3748–3758. PMLR, 2020.
- [18] Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A two-timescale stochastic algorithm framework for bilevel optimization: Complexity analysis and application to actor-critic. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(1):147–180, 2023.
- [19] Kaiyi Ji and Yingbin Liang. Lower bounds and accelerated algorithms for bilevel optimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:22–1, 2023.
- [20] Kaiyi Ji, Junjie Yang, and Yingbin Liang. Bilevel optimization: Convergence analysis and enhanced design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4882–4892. PMLR, 2021.
- [21] Yang Jiao, Kai Yang, Tiancheng Wu, Dongjin Song, and Chengtao Jian. Asynchronous distributed bilevel optimization. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

- [22] Anastasia Koloskova, Nicolas Loizou, Sadra Boreiri, Martin Jaggi, and Sebastian Stich. A unified theory of decentralized sgd with changing topology and local updates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5381–5393. PMLR, 2020.
- [23] Anastasia Koloskova, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Decentralized stochastic optimization and gossip algorithms with compressed communication. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3478–3487. PMLR, 2019.
- [24] Guanghui Lan, Soomin Lee, and Yi Zhou. Communication-efficient algorithms for decentralized and stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 180(1):237–284, 2020.
- [25] Yann LeCun, Corinna Cortes, and CJ Burges. MNIST handwritten digit database. AT&T Labs [Online]. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>, 2010.
- [26] Junyi Li, Feihu Huang, and Heng Huang. Local stochastic bilevel optimization with momentum-based variance reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01608*, 2022.
- [27] Risheng Liu, Jiabin Gao, Jin Zhang, Deyu Meng, and Zhouchen Lin. Investigating bi-level optimization for learning and vision from a unified perspective: A survey and beyond. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(12):10045–10067, 2021.
- [28] Jonathan Lorraine, Paul Vicol, and David Duvenaud. Optimizing millions of hyperparameters by implicit differentiation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1540–1552. PMLR, 2020.
- [29] Songtao Lu, Xiaodong Cui, Mark S Squillante, Brian Kingsbury, and Lior Horesh. Decentralized bilevel optimization for personalized client learning. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5543–5547. IEEE, 2022.
- [30] Songtao Lu, Siliang Zeng, Xiaodong Cui, Mark Squillante, Lior Horesh, Brian Kingsbury, Jia Liu, and Mingyi Hong. A stochastic linearized augmented lagrangian method for decentralized bilevel optimization. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [31] Dougal Maclaurin, David Duvenaud, and Ryan Adams. Gradient-based hyperparameter optimization through reversible learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2113–2122. PMLR, 2015.
- [32] Aryan Mokhtari, Qing Ling, and Alejandro Ribeiro. An approximate newton method for distributed optimization. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2959–2963. IEEE, 2015.
- [33] Aryan Mokhtari, Qing Ling, and Alejandro Ribeiro. Network newton distributed optimization methods. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 65(1):146–161, 2016.
- [34] Gregory M Moore. *Bilevel programming algorithms for machine learning model selection*. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 2010.
- [35] Parvin Nazari, Esmaeil Khorram, and Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh. Adaptive online distributed optimization in dynamic environments. *Optimization Methods and Software*, pages 1–25, 2019.
- [36] Parvin Nazari, Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh, and George Michailidis. Dadam: A consensus-based distributed adaptive gradient method for online optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, pages 1–15, 2022.
- [37] Angelia Nedić, Alex Olshevsky, and Michael G Rabbat. Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 106(5):953–976, 2018.
- [38] Angelia Nedic and Asuman Ozdaglar. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(1):48–61, 2009.
- [39] Alex Nichol and John Schulman. Reptile: a scalable metalearning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2(3):4, 2018.
- [40] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. Nonlinear equations. *Numerical Optimization*, pages 270–302, 2006.
- [41] Fabian Pedregosa. Hyperparameter optimization with approximate gradient. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 737–746. PMLR, 2016.
- [42] S Unnikrishna Pillai, Torsten Suel, and Seunghun Cha. The perron-frobenius theorem: some of its applications. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 22(2):62–75, 2005.
- [43] Mark Schmidt, Nicolas Roux, and Francis Bach. Convergence rates of inexact proximal-gradient methods for convex optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [44] Amirreza Shaban, Ching-An Cheng, Nathan Hatch, and Byron Boots. Truncated back-propagation for bilevel optimization. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1723–1732. PMLR, 2019.
- [45] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.
- [46] Heinrich von Stackelberg et al. *Theory of the market economy*. Oxford University Press, 1952.
- [47] Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh, Mingchen Li, Christos Thrampoulidis, and Samet Oymak. Fednest: Federated bilevel, minimax, and compositional optimization. In *39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 21146–21179. PMLR, 2022.
- [48] Naoyuki Terashita and Satoshi Hara. Personalized decentralized bilevel optimization over stochastic and directed networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02129*, 2022.
- [49] Konstantinos I Tsianos, Sean Lawlor, and Michael G Rabbat. Consensus-based distributed optimization: Practical issues and applications in large-scale machine learning. In *2012 50th annual allerton conference on communication, control, and computing (allerton)*, pages 1543–1550. IEEE, 2012.
- [50] Lin Xiao and Stephen Boyd. Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging. *Systems & Control Letters*, 53(1):65–78, 2004.
- [51] Junjie Yang, Kaiyi Ji, and Yingbin Liang. Provably faster algorithms for bilevel optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:13670–13682, 2021.
- [52] Shuoguang Yang, Xuezhou Zhang, and Mengdi Wang. Decentralized gossip-based stochastic bilevel optimization over communication networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:238–252, 2022.
- [53] Kun Yuan, Qing Ling, and Wotao Yin. On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(3):1835–1854, 2016.
- [54] Michael Zargham, Alejandro Ribeiro, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Ali Jadbabaie. Accelerated dual descent for network flow optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(4):905–920, 2013.
- [55] Jinshan Zeng and Wotao Yin. On nonconvex decentralized gradient descent. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 66(11):2834–2848, 2018.

## 8 Appendix

$\mathbb{R}^d$	The $d$ -dimension Euclidean space
$\mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$	The set of $d_1$ -by- $d_2$ real matrices
$\mathbb{R}_+$	The set of non-negative real numbers
$\mathbb{R}_{++}$	The set of positive real numbers
$[n]$	The set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for any integer $n$
$\lceil x \rceil$	The least integer greater than or equal to $x$
$\mathbf{x}^\top$	Transpose of the vector $\mathbf{x}$
$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$	Concatenation of local vectors $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as $[\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_n]$
$\mathbf{I}_d$	Identity matrix of size $d$
$\mathbf{1}_d$	The all-one vector
$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$	Standard inner product operator
$ \cdot $	The absolute value of a real number or the cardinality of a set
$\otimes$	Kronecker product of matrices
$\ \cdot\ $	The $\ell_2$ -norm of a vector
$\ \mathbf{x}\ $	$\sum_{i=1}^n \ \mathbf{x}_i\ $
$\text{diag}(W)$	The diagonal components of the matrix $W$
$\text{null}\{W\}$	The null space of matrix $W$
$\text{span}\{\mathbf{x}\}$	The span of the vector $\mathbf{x}$
$a\mathbf{I}_d \preceq W \preceq b\mathbf{I}_d$	The eigenvalues of $W$ lie in $[a, b]$ interval
$\lambda_i(W)$	The $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of matrix $W$
$\lambda_{\max}(W), \lambda_{\min}(W),$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(W)$	The largest, smallest, and smallest nonzero eigenvalues of matrix $W$

Table 2  
Summary of Notations and Terminologies

In this section, we provide the detailed convergence analysis of our algorithm. We first provide some technical lemmas used in our analysis. Throughout, we define

$$D_F := \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^*)),$$

$$P_0 := \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\|^2,$$

for notational simplicity.

**Lemma 9** *Suppose Assumptions A and B hold. Set parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  as in Eq. (18). If we select  $M = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g)$ , then*

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\eta^2 \rho^{2(U+1)} + 2C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \\ & \cdot \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^k P_0 + 2\varrho^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where  $\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  is defined in Eq. (17b),  $\rho$  is defined in Lemma 4, and

$$\eta := \frac{\gamma n^2 C_{g_{xy}} C_{f_y}}{(2(1 - \Theta) + \gamma \mu_g)(1 - \rho)}. \quad (22)$$

**Lemma 10** *Consider the definition of objective function  $\mathbf{F}$  in (4a). If Assumptions A, B3, and B4. hold then we have*

$$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^* \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{n\alpha \tilde{C} \hat{C}}{1 - \sigma},$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C} & := C_{f_x} + \gamma C_{g_{xy}} \Lambda C_{f_y}, \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{C} & := C_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} C_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{d_2} - W) + \gamma \mu_g}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

### 8.1 Proof of Theorem 6

*Proof:* By using the smoothness of  $\mathbf{F}$  due to Lemma 14(L3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \\ & + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle + \frac{L_F}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

At this point, we would proceed by bounding the second term, for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ & + \langle \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2) \\ & - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the last equality holds since by (17a) and identity  $(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b})^\top (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{c}) = (1/2) \{ \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{c}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 \}$ ,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by denoting  $\widehat{\Delta}_k := \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))$  and substituting (25) into (24), we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\ &\leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2) \\ &- \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \langle \widehat{\Delta}_k, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1} \rangle, \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

for which, invoking the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_k, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1} \rangle &\leq \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \cdot \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\ &\leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, by setting  $\mathbf{u} = \zeta \mathbf{x}^* + (1 - \zeta) \mathbf{x}_k$  for some  $\zeta \in [0, 1]$  in the above inequality, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \leq (1 - \zeta) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \\ &+ \zeta (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle) \\ &+ \frac{\zeta^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_i))$  is  $\mu_f$ -strongly convex, then  $\mathbf{F}$  is strongly convex with parameter:

$$\mu_F := \mu_f + (2\alpha)^{-1} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \widehat{\mathbf{W}}) = \mu_f + (2\alpha)^{-1} (1 - \sigma).$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\ &\leq (1 - \zeta) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \zeta \mathbf{F}^* - \frac{\zeta \mu_F}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\zeta^2}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with  $\zeta = \alpha \mu_F$  which is less than 1 since  $\alpha \leq 1/(2L_F)$ , this becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) &\leq (1 - \alpha \mu_F) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \\ &+ \alpha \mu_F \mathbf{F}^* - \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by subtracting  $\mathbf{F}^* := \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^*))$  from both sides of the above inequality and using (19) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^* &\leq (1 - \nu) (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \mathbf{F}^*) \\ &- \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2. \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Gamma_k := (1 - \nu)^k$ . Dividing both sides of Eq. (27) by  $\Gamma_{k+1}$ , summing them up for  $k = 0, \dots, K-1$ , and invoking Lemma 9, yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_k} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \mathbf{F}^*) \\ &- \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha \rho^{2(U+1)} \eta^2}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \\ &+ \alpha C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^k P_0 \right. \\ &\left. + 2\varrho^2 \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2 \right). \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$

For the last term in the RHS of Eq. (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{k+1}} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2. \quad (29a) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, take  $M$  such that

$$4\varrho^2 \alpha C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \leq \frac{L_F}{2}. \quad (29b)$$

It is easy to verify that (29b) holds when

$$M \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{8\varrho^2 \alpha C^2}{L_F} \right) / \log \left( \frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g).$$

Plugging (29a) and (29b) into (28) and noting  $\alpha \leq 1/(2L_F)$  yield that

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \mathbf{F}^* \leq \Gamma_K \left[ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{1}{2L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( \frac{\rho^{2(U+1)} \eta^2}{\Gamma_{k+1}} + \frac{C^2 P_0}{\Gamma_{k+1} 2^k} \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \right) \right].$$

Then, by setting  $\nu = \min \left( \alpha \mu_F, \frac{2}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)$  and  $M \geq \frac{k+1}{2}$ , we have

$$\Gamma_{k+1} \geq \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{k+1} \geq \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M}.$$

This result yields

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \mathbf{F}^* \leq \Gamma_K \left[ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{1}{2L_F} \left( \frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1} \right)^{2M} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2(U+1)} \eta^2 + \frac{C^2 P_0}{2L_F} \right].$$

By setting  $U = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_{1/\rho} K \right\rceil$ , we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2U} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K} = 1,$$

which, in conjunction with the choice of

$$M \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(2) / \log \left( \frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1} \right),$$

yields

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \mathbf{F}^* \leq \Gamma_K \left[ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{1}{2L_F} (2\rho^2 \eta^2 + C^2 P_0) \right].$$

Thus, from Lemma 10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^* \\ & \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{\hat{C} n \alpha \tilde{C}}{1 - \sigma} \\ & \leq \Gamma_K \left( D_F + \frac{1}{2L_F} (2\rho^2 \eta^2 + C^2 P_0) \right) + \frac{\hat{C} n \alpha \tilde{C}}{1 - \sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the conclusion.  $\square$

**Lemma 11** *Under the same assumptions and the parameters of Theorem 7, we have*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\hat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \leq \tau,$$

where  $\tau := 2\eta\rho + 2\sqrt{P_0} + \frac{4}{L_F} \varrho \eta \rho + \sqrt{2L_F D_F}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} C &:= L_{f_x} + \frac{1 - \lambda_n(\hat{\mathbf{W}})}{\alpha} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} L_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \\ &+ \frac{n C_{f_y} \gamma L_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} + \frac{n C_{f_y} \gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} L_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \\ \varrho &:= \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}, \\ L_F &:= \frac{(\tilde{L}_{f_y} + n C_f) \cdot \gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \\ &+ \frac{n C_{f_y} \gamma \tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} + \frac{n C_{f_y} \gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} \tilde{L}_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

## 8.2 Proof of Theorem 7

*Proof:* We let  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x}^*$  in (26) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\ & \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2) \\ & - \frac{(1 - L_F \alpha)}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \langle \hat{\Delta}_k, \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1} \rangle \\ & \leq \mathbf{F}^* + L_F (\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2) \\ & + \|\hat{\Delta}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\Delta}_k := \hat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))$ , the second inequality is by the convexity of  $\mathbf{F}$ , assumption  $\alpha \leq 1/L_F$ , and Cauchy-Schwarz.

Summing up both sides of the above inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( L_F (\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2) \right. \\ & \left. + \|\hat{\Delta}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\| \right) \\ & = L_F (\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_K\|^2) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\hat{\Delta}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*) + L_F \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_K\|^2 \\ & \leq L_F \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We now need to bound the quantities  $\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|$  in terms of  $\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|$ . Dropping the first term in Eq. (31), which is positive due to the optimality of  $\mathbf{F}^*$ , we have:

$$\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_K\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|.$$

We now use Lemma 21 with  $S_K = \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2$  and  $\lambda_k = \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{K+1}\| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \\ & + \left( \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_k \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|$  is increasing sequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \\ & + \left( \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| + \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\| \\ & \leq \tau + \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the second inequality is by  $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$  for  $a, b \geq 0$  and the last inequality follows from Lemma 11.

Plugging (32) into (30) and dividing both sides by  $K$  yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*) \\ & \leq \frac{L_F}{K} (\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_K\|^2) \\ & + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\| (\tau + \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|) \\ & \leq \frac{L_F}{K} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{\tau}{K} (\tau + \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|) \\ & = \frac{L_F}{K} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{\tau}{K} (\tau + \|\mathbf{x}^*\|), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is due to assumption  $\mathbf{x}_{i,0} = 0$ .

Finally, by the convexity of  $\mathbf{F}$ , Lemma 10 and the average iterate  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K = (1/K) \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K, \mathbf{y}^*(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_K)) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^* \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^*) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^* + \frac{\hat{C}n\alpha\tilde{C}}{1-\sigma} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K} \left( L_F \|\mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \tau(\tau + \|\mathbf{x}^*\|) \right) + \frac{\hat{C}n\alpha\tilde{C}}{1-\sigma} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K} \left( L_F R^2 + \tau(\tau + R) \right) + \frac{n\alpha\tilde{C}\hat{C}}{1-\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq R$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 12** *Under the same conditions stated in Theorem 8, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K} \left( 64L_F D_F + 5 \left( \left( 2 + \frac{3\rho^2}{16L_F^2} \right) \eta^2 \rho^2 + P_0 \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that the DAGM method achieves consensus across different agents in the graph.

**Lemma 13** *Under the same conditions stated in Theorem 8, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 & \leq \frac{8\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2} \left( \frac{64L_F D_F}{K} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{5}{K} \left( \left( 2 + \frac{3\rho^2}{16L_F^2} \right) \eta^2 \rho^2 + P_0 \right) + n\hat{C}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{C}$  is defined in (23).

### 8.3 Proof of Theorem 8

*Proof:* From Assumption A, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|1^\top \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k))\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2\alpha} (x_{i,k} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \hat{w}_{ij} x_{j,k}) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (x_{i,k} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \hat{w}_{ij} x_{j,k}) \right\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_k \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_k \right\|^2 \\
&+ 2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_k \right\|^2 \\
&+ 2L_f \|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2, \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Eq. (60).

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|1^\top \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k))\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left\| \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right\|^2 + \frac{2L_f}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which in conjunction with Lemmas 12 and 13 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|1^\top \nabla \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k))\|^2 &\leq j_1 \left( \frac{64L_F D_F}{K} + \frac{1}{K} j_2 \right) \\
&+ \frac{16L_f \alpha^2 n \hat{C}^2}{(1-\sigma)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
j_1 &:= 2 + \frac{16L_f \alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2}, \quad j_2 := 5 \left( \left( 2 + \frac{3\varrho^2}{16L_F^2} \right) \eta^2 \rho^2 + P_0 \right), \\
\hat{C} &:= C_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} C_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{d_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

□

### Proof of Auxiliary Lemmas:

#### 9 Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof:* Let  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\mathbf{y}}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*))$  and  $\{(x_i^*, y_i^*(x_i^*))\}_{i=1}^n$  denote the minimizers of (1) and (3), respectively. The constraints  $x_i = x_j$  and  $y_i = y_j$  enforce that  $y_i^*(x_i) = y_i^*(x_j) = y_j^*(x_j)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ . Since the network is connected, these conditions imply that two sets of variables  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $\{y_1^*(x_1), \dots, y_n^*(x_n)\}$  are feasible for Problem (3) if and only if  $x_1 = \dots = x_n$  and  $y_1^*(x_1) = \dots = y_n^*(x_n)$ . Therefore, Problems (1) and (3) are equivalent in the sense that for all  $i$  and  $j$  the minimizers of (3) satisfy  $x_i^* = \hat{\mathbf{x}}^*$  and  $y_i^*(x_i^*) = \hat{\mathbf{y}}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ .

We now prove the second part. Using Assumption A3., we have  $\text{null}\{\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}\} = \text{span}\{1_n\}$ . Then, for the extended weight matrices  $\mathbf{W} := \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2 \times nd_2}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{W}} := \hat{\mathbf{W}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times nd_1}$ , we get  $\text{null}\{\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}\} = \text{span}\{1_n \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1}\}$  and  $\text{null}\{\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}\} = \text{span}\{1_n \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_2}\}$ . Thus, we have that  $(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})\mathbf{x} = 0$  and  $(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})\mathbf{y} = 0$  hold if and only if  $x_1 = \dots = x_n$  and  $y_1 = \dots = y_n$ , respectively. From Assumption A2., the matrix  $\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}$  is positive semidefinite, which yields that its square root matrix  $(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})^{1/2}$  is also positive semidefinite. As a consequence, the bilevel optimization problem in (3) is equivalent to the optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) \tag{35a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})^{1/2} \mathbf{x} = 0,$$

$$\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x_i, y_i) \tag{35b}$$

$$\text{subj. to } (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})^{1/2} \mathbf{y} = 0,$$

where  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = [y_1^*(x_1); \dots; y_n^*(x_n)]$ .

Note that the minimizer of (35a)  $\mathbf{x}^* = [x_1^*; \dots; x_n^*]$  where  $\{x_i^*\}$  is the solution of (3). Let  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  denote the penalty coefficients for the equality constraints in (35a) and (35b), respectively. Then, using the penalty method we can reformulate (35a) and (35b) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) &:= \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x} \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) \\
\text{subj. to } \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}} \left\{ \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{y} \right. \\
&\left. + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x_i, y_i) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□



## 10 Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof:* Given  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$ , the optimality condition of the inner problem in (4b) at  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  is

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ & := [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} g_1(x_1, y_1^*(x_1)); \dots; \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} g_n(x_n, y_n^*(x_n))] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using the implicit differentiation w.r.t.  $\mathbf{x}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ & + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2 \times nd_2}$  is a block diagonal matrix formed by blocks containing the Hessian of the  $i$ -th local function  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_2}$ . Moreover, the matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times nd_2}$  is a block diagonal matrix formed by blocks containing the Jacobian of the  $i$ -th local function,  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ . Rearranging the terms of (37) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \\ & = -\gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) ((\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})))^{-1} \\ & = -\gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) := (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ . Finally, using the strong convexity of  $\mathbf{g}$  due to Assumption **B5.** and positive definiteness of the matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  due to Lemma 23, we get the desired result.

Next we prove the second part. For the sake of brevity, we define

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ & := [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_1(x_1, y_1^*(x_1)); \dots; \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_n(x_n, y_n^*(x_n))] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}, \\ & \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ & := [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_1(x_1, y_1^*(x_1)); \dots; \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_n(x_n, y_n^*(x_n))] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}. \end{aligned}$$

By considering (4a) and applying the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) & = \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})\mathbf{x} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\ & + \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 11 Proof of Lemma 9

**Lemma 14** *The following statements hold.*

(1) Under Assumptions A and B, we have

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \leq C \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad (38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C & := L_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} L_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \\ & + n C_{f_y} \left( \frac{\gamma \tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} L_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \right) + \alpha^{-1} (1 - \lambda_n(\hat{\mathbf{W}})). \end{aligned}$$

(2) Under Assumptions A, **B4.** and **B5.**,  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $\mathbf{x}$  with constant

$$\varrho := \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}.$$

(3) Under Assumptions A and B,  $\nabla \mathbf{F}$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $\mathbf{x}$  with constant  $L_F$  i.e., for any given  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1}$ , we have

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2)) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\| \leq L_F \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1\|,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} L_F & := \frac{(\tilde{L}_{f_y} + n C_f) \cdot \gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} + L_{f_x} \\ & + n C_{f_y} \left( \frac{\gamma \tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} \tilde{L}_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \right) + \alpha^{-1} (1 - \lambda_n(\hat{\mathbf{W}})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_f$  is defined as in (55).

*Proof: Part 1:*

Let  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . In addition, define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k & = \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})), \\ \Delta_k^1 & = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})), \\ \Delta_k^2 & = \gamma \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \gamma \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})), \\ \Delta_k^3 & = \gamma \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \{ \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \}, \\ \Delta_k^4 & = \gamma \{ \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})), \\ \Delta_k^5 & = \gamma \{ \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \} [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}, \\ \Delta_k^6 & = \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) \{ [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1} - [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows from (6) and (7) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_k &= \Delta_k^1 - \Delta_k^2 = \Delta_k^1 - \Delta_k^3 - \Delta_k^4 \\ &= \Delta_k^1 - \Delta_k^3 - (\Delta_k^5 + \Delta_k^6) \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})).\end{aligned}\quad (39)$$

• **Bounding**  $\|\Delta_k^1\|$ : Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_k^1\| &= \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_i(x_i, y_i) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i))\| \\ &\leq L_{f_x} \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\| \\ &= L_{f_x} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|,\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

where the inequality is due to Assumption **B1**.

• **Bounding**  $\|\Delta_k^3\|$ : From Assumption **B5**., observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\succeq \hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}.\quad (41)$$

On the other hand, since matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is block diagonal and the eigenvalues of each diagonal block  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)$  are bounded by constant  $0 < C_{g_{xy}} < \infty$  due to Assumption **B4**., we get

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \preceq C_{g_{xy}} \mathbf{I}.\quad (42)$$

Hence, from (41) and (42), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| &= \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}.\end{aligned}\quad (43a)$$

From Assumption **B1**., we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(x_i, y_i) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i))\| \\ &\leq L_{f_y} \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\| \\ &= L_{f_y} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|.\end{aligned}\quad (43b)$$

Combining (43a) with (43b), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_k^3\| &= \gamma \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \{\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\}\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} L_{f_y} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}.\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

• **Bounding**  $\|\Delta_k^5\|$ : Note that the Jacobian matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \nabla_{\mathbf{g}}(x_1, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial \nabla_{\mathbf{g}}(x_n, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \nabla_{\mathbf{g}}(x_1, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial \nabla_{\mathbf{g}}(x_n, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_n} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \nabla g_1(x_1, y_1)}{\partial x_1 \partial y_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial \nabla g_1(x_n, y_1)}{\partial x_n \partial y_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \nabla g_n(x_1, y_n)}{\partial x_1 \partial y_n} & \dots & \frac{\partial \nabla g_n(x_n, y_n)}{\partial x_n \partial y_n} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}_1}^2 g_1(\mathbf{x}, y_1) \\ \vdots \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}_n}^2 g_n(\mathbf{x}, y_n) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(\mathbf{x}, y_i) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(\mathbf{x}, y_i^*(x_i))\| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i))\| \\ &\leq L_{g_{xy}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\| \\ &= n L_{g_{xy}} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|,\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

where the inequality follows from Assumption **B1**..

Then, from (41) and (45), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_k^5\| &= \gamma \|\{\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\} [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma L_{g_{xy}} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g}.\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

• **Bounding**  $\|\Delta_k^6\|$ : It follows from (69b) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_k^6\| &\leq \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \\ &\quad \cdot \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1} - [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \gamma C_{g_{xy}} \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1} - [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \gamma C_{g_{xy}} \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}\| \|[\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^{-1}\| \\ &\quad \cdot \|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where the third inequality follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_2^{-1} - A_1^{-1}\| &= \|A_1^{-1}(A_1 - A_2)A_2^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|A_1^{-1}\| \|A_2^{-1}\| \|A_1 - A_2\|, \end{aligned}$$

for any invertible matrices  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

Thus, from (41) and (47), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_k^6\| &\leq \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} \|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \\ &= \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the equality is by the fact that the matrix  $\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}$  does not depend on the argument  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ .

Now, for any vector  $\mathbf{u} := [u_1; \dots; u_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_2}$  with  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \\ &= \sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\mathbf{u}^\top [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] \mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}} \\ &= \sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^\top [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)]^2 u_i}{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, each summand in (49) can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &u_i^\top [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)]^2 u_i \\ &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)\|^2 \|u_i\|^2 \\ &\leq L_{g_{yy}}^2 \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|^2 \|u_i\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where the second inequality holds because Assumption **B1**.

We next combine relations (49) and (50) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n L_{g_{yy}}^2 \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|^2 \|u_i\|^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|^2}} \\ &\leq L_{g_{yy}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|^2} \\ &= L_{g_{yy}} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the second inequality holds since dividing both sides of  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 b_i^2 \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2)(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2)$  by  $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2$  with  $a_i = \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|$  and  $b_i = \|u_i\|$  yields

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|^2 \|u_i\|^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i^*(x_i) - y_i\|^2.$$

Consequently, plugging (51) into (48) yields

$$\|\Delta_k^6\| \leq \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} L_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|. \quad (52)$$

**Bounding**  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}\|$ : Using Assumption **B3**, we have

$$\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i))\| \leq n C_{f_y}. \quad (53)$$

Therefore, by substituting (40), (44), (46), (52) and (53) in (39) and employing the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \leq C_f \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad (54)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_f &:= L_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} L_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \\ &\quad + n C_{f_y} \left( \frac{\gamma L_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} L_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Then, from (4a), we have

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \leq C \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|,$$

where  $C := C_f + \alpha^{-1} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) = C_f + \alpha^{-1}(1 - \lambda_n(\hat{\mathbf{W}}))$ .

This completes the proof of 1.

**Part 2:**

By utilizing Eq. (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})\| &= \|\gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\| \|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))\|^{-1} \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g},\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

where the second inequality is due to (41) and (42).

**Part 3:**

From (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2)) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2)) - \tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\|}_{=: I_1} \\ &+ \underbrace{\|\tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1)) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\|}_{=: I_2}.\end{aligned}\quad (57)$$

We then study each terms separately. Using (54), we have

$$I_1 \leq C_f \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2) - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1)\| \leq \frac{C_f \gamma n C_{g_{xy}} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1\|}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g},\quad (58)$$

where the second inequality comes from 2.

Further, similar to the proof of (54) and using Assumption B, we have

$$I_2 \leq \vartheta \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1\|,\quad (59)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta &:= L_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} \tilde{L}_{f_y}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \\ &+ n C_{f_y} \left( \frac{\gamma \tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} \tilde{L}_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Putting (58) and (59) into (57), we obtain

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2)) - \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\| \leq L_f \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1\|,\quad (60)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}L_f &:= \frac{(\tilde{L}_{f_y} + n C_{f_y}) \cdot \gamma C_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} + L_{f_x} \\ &+ n C_{f_y} \left( \frac{\gamma \tilde{L}_{g_{xy}}}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\gamma^2 C_{g_{xy}} \tilde{L}_{g_{yy}}}{(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \mu_g)^2} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (61)$$

Thus, from (4a), we have

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_2)) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_1))\| \leq L_F \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1\|,$$

where  $L_F := L_f + \alpha^{-1} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) = L_f + \alpha^{-1} (1 - \lambda_n(\hat{\mathbf{W}}))$ .  $\square$

The following lemma establishes the convergence of the inner loop in Algorithm 2.

**Lemma 15** *Suppose that Assumptions A and B hold. Let  $\{\mathbf{y}_k^t\}_{t=0}^M$  denote the inner sequence defined in (15). If*

$$\beta = \frac{2}{\gamma(\mu_g + L_g)}, \quad \gamma = \frac{\kappa_G L_g}{2(\mu_g + L_g)}, \quad \kappa_G = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})}{\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})},$$

then we have

$$\|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|.$$

Here,  $\kappa_g := L_g/\mu_g$  and  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  is the minimizer of  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  defined in (4b).

*Proof:* By Eq. (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \beta \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\beta \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}), \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \rangle \\ &\quad + \beta^2 \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1})\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\beta \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \rangle \\ &\quad + \beta^2 \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2,\end{aligned}\quad (62)$$

where the last equality holds since  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) = 0$  due to the optimality of the inner problem in (3).

In the following, we bound the second and third terms of Eq. (62).

Note that from Assumptions **B1.** and **B5.**, the objective function  $\mathbf{g}$  is strongly convex w.r.t  $\mathbf{y}$  with constant  $\mu_g$  and its

gradients  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}$  are Lipschitz continuous (w.r.t  $\mathbf{y}$ ) with constant  $L_g$ . Hence, from Lemma 19, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top (\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\mu_g + L_g} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & + \frac{\mu_g L_g}{\mu_g + L_g} \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality together with (4b) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \rangle \\ & = \langle (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \rangle \\ & + \gamma \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \rangle \\ & \geq \hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & + \frac{\gamma}{\mu_g + L_g} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & + \frac{\gamma \mu_g L_g}{\mu_g + L_g} \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (63a)$$

Next, we bound the last term in RHS of (62). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & = \|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & + \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & = \|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & + \gamma^2 \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & + 2\gamma J. \end{aligned} \quad (63b)$$

where  $J := \langle (\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \rangle$ .

Now, using Assumption **B1.**, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J & \leq \|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\ & \quad \cdot \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\ & = \|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})(\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\ & \quad \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}g_i(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{i,k}^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}g_i(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}))\| \\ & \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \\ & \quad \cdot L_g \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_{i,k}^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}_{i,k})\| \\ & = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) L_g \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (63a) and (63b) into (62) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 - 2\beta(\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \frac{\gamma \mu_g L_g}{\mu_g + L_g})\right) \\ & + \beta^2 \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) L_g \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & + \left(\beta^2 \gamma^2 - \frac{2\beta\gamma}{\mu_g + L_g}\right) \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^{M-1}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & \leq \left( \left(1 - \frac{4\mu_g L_g}{(\mu_g + L_g)^2}\right) + \frac{1}{\gamma(\mu_g + L_g)} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W}) L_g}{\gamma(\mu_g + L_g)}\right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - 2\hat{\lambda}_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \mathbf{W})\right) \right) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses  $\beta = 2/\gamma(\mu_g + L_g)$ .

Setting  $\gamma = \kappa_g L_g / 2(\mu_g + L_g)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 & \leq \left(1 - \frac{4\mu_g L_g}{(\mu_g + L_g)^2}\right) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{4\mu_g^2}{(\mu_g + L_g)^2}\right) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_g}{\mu_g + L_g}\right)^2 \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_g}{\mu_g + L_g}\right) \|\mathbf{y}_k^{M-1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 9.

*Proof:* Let

$$\hat{\Delta}_k := \hat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) = \iota_k + \Delta_k, \quad (64)$$

where  $\iota_k = \hat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \tilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  and  $\Delta_k := \tilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))$ .

**Bounding  $\|\Delta_k\|^2$ :** From Lemma 15 and Eq. (38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 & \leq C^2 \|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where  $\tilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  is defined as in (7). Next, we bound  $\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2$ . Notice that  $\mathbf{y}_k^0 = \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M$  (as defined in Algorithm 2), which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 + 2\varrho^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where the second inequality uses Lemma 15 and Lemma 14(2).

Choose  $M$  such that

$$M \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(4) / \log\left(\frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1}\right).$$

Then, (66) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 + 2\varrho^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\|^2 + 2\varrho^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Thus, combining (67) and (65), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \leq C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \\ & \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k P_0 + 2\varrho^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

**Bounding  $\|\iota_k\|^2$ :** It follows from (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\| &= \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^u \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\|^2 \left\| \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2})^u \right\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\|^2 \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\|^u, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the triangle inequality. Then from Lemma 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{1}{(2(1-\Theta) + \gamma\mu_g)} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\|^u \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(2(1-\Theta) + \gamma\mu_g)} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \rho^u \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(2(1-\Theta) + \gamma\mu_g)(1-\rho)}, \end{aligned} \quad (69a)$$

where the second inequality uses Lemma 4. On the other hand, since matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is block diagonal and the eigenvalues of each diagonal block  $\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 g_i(x_i, y_i)$  are bounded by constant  $0 < C_{g_{xy}} < \infty$  due to Assumption **B4**, which implies that

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \preceq C_{g_{xy}} \mathbf{I}. \quad (69b)$$

Now, we make use of (7) and (17b) as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\iota_k\| &\leq \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\| \|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{k,(U)}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_k^{-1}\| \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2 \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\| \|\mathbf{I}_{nd_2} - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{k,(U)}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k\| \\ &\quad \|\mathbf{H}_k^{-1}\| \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\| \leq \eta \rho^{U+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where  $\eta$  is defined as in Eq. (22) and the second inequality follows from Lemma 5, and Eqs. (69a) and (69b).

Finally, it follows from the fact that  $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$ , Eqs. (70) and (68) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Delta}_k\|^2 &\leq 2\|\iota_k\|^2 + 2\|\Delta_k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\eta^2 \rho^{2(U+1)} + 2C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \\ &\quad \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k P_0 + 2\varrho^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 12 Proof of Lemma 10

First, we have the following lemma, which offers an upper bound for the deviation of each local copy at each iteration from the mean of all local copies.

**Lemma 16** *Suppose Assumptions A, B3. and B4. hold. Then, the iterates  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k=0}^{K-1}$  generated by (17a) satisfy*

$$\|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\| \leq \frac{\alpha \sqrt{n} \tilde{C}}{1 - \sigma},$$

where  $\tilde{C} := C_{f_x} + \gamma C_{g_{xy}} \Lambda C_{f_y}$ .

*Proof:* From the update rule of Algorithm 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_k &= \mathbf{x}_{k-1} - (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_{k-1} + \alpha \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k-1}) \\ &\quad - \alpha \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k-1}) \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{k-1,(U)}^{-1} \mathbf{p}_{k-1}) \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \alpha \mathbf{z}_{k-1} = -\alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}^{k-1-r} \mathbf{z}_r, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k-1} &:= \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k-1}) \\ &\quad - \gamma \nabla_{\mathbf{xy}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k-1}) \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{k-1,(U)}^{-1} \mathbf{p}_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by our definition,

$$\mathbf{x} = [x_1; \dots; x_n], \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1}\right) \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{nd_1 \times 1}.$$

This together with Assumption A and  $x_{i,0} = 0$  give

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\| &= \|\mathbf{x}_k - \left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1}\right)\mathbf{x}_k\| \\
&= \left\| -\alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} (\mathbf{W}^{k-1-r} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1})\mathbf{z}_r \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n} \left( (\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{W}^{k-1-r}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1} \right)\mathbf{z}_r \right\| \\
&= \left\| -\alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} (\mathbf{W}^{k-1-r} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1})\mathbf{z}_r \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n} \left( (\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^\top) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_1} \right)\mathbf{z}_r \right\| \\
&\leq \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \left\| \mathbf{W}^{k-1-r} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^\top \right\| \|\mathbf{z}_r\| \\
&\leq \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \sigma^{k-1-r} \|\mathbf{z}_r\|, \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 22.

We proceed to bound  $\|\mathbf{z}_r\|$ . To do so, we use triangular inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{z}_r\| &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_r, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_r)\| + \gamma \|\nabla_{\mathbf{xy}}^2\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_r, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_r) \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{r,(U)}^{-1} \mathbf{p}_r\| \\
&\leq \sqrt{n}C_{f_x} + \sqrt{n}\gamma C_{g_{xy}} \|\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{r,(U)}^{-1}\| C_{f_y} \\
&\leq \sqrt{n}C_{f_x} + \sqrt{n}\gamma C_{g_{xy}} \Lambda C_{f_y} = \sqrt{n}\tilde{C}, \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is defined in Lemma 16, the second inequality uses Assumptions **B3.** and **B4.**, and last inequality holds follows from Lemma 5.

Next, by substituting (72) into (71), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\| &\leq \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \sigma^{k-1-r} \|\mathbf{z}_r\| \leq \alpha \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \sigma^{k-1-r} \sqrt{n}\tilde{C} \\
&\leq \frac{\alpha\sqrt{n}\tilde{C}}{1-\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 10.

*Proof:* From **A2.**, the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  has an eigenvalue decomposition form  $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{R}$  is some orthogonal matrix and the diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  has the value that falls within the range of  $(0, 1]$  and contains exactly one entry with a

value of 1. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})\mathbf{x}\|^2 &= \|(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}})(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \\
&= \|(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \mathbf{S})\mathbf{R}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{nd_1})(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \\
&\geq (1 - \sigma)^2 \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2, \tag{73a}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because  $\mathbf{1}_{nd_1}^\top(\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) = 0$  and the inequality holds since Eq. (2).

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) &= \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \\
&\quad + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))) \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \hat{C} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - \bar{x}_i| \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \hat{C}\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|, \tag{73b}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since from Lemma 3, (56), (53), and Assumption **B3.**, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))\| &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))\| \\
&\quad + \|\nabla_{y_i^*} f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \|\nabla_{y_i^*} f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))\| \\
&\leq C_{f_x} + \frac{\gamma C_{g_{xy}} C_{f_y}}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{I}_{d_2} - \mathbf{W}) + \gamma\mu_g} := \hat{C}, \tag{74}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i(x_i, y_i^*(x_i)) &\geq f_i(\bar{x}_i, y_i^*(\bar{x}_i)) + \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))(x_i - \bar{x}_i) \\
&\geq f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y_i^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \hat{C}|x_i - \bar{x}_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

By combining (73a) and (73b) and using (4a), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{F}^* &\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{F}^* - \hat{C}\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha}(1 - \sigma)^2 \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{F}^* - \hat{C}\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{F}^* - \frac{n\alpha\tilde{C}\hat{C}}{1-\sigma} \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{f}^* - \frac{n\alpha\tilde{C}\hat{C}}{1-\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from Lemma 16.  $\square$

### 13 Proof of Lemma 11

**Lemma 17** *Under the same assumptions and the parameters of Theorem 7, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*} &\leq \sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2L_F}} \sum_{r=0}^k \|\hat{\Delta}_r\|, \quad \forall k \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\Delta}_r := \widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_r, \mathbf{y}_r^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_r, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_r))$  and  $\mathbf{F}^* := \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^*))$ .

*Proof:* From the update  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \alpha\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  and the smoothness of  $\mathbf{F}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{L_F}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\
& = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \alpha \langle \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{L_F\alpha^2}{2} \|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\|^2 \\
& = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \alpha \langle \widehat{\Delta}_k, \widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) \rangle \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{L_F\alpha^2}{2} - \alpha\right) \|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \left(\frac{L_F\alpha^2 - \alpha}{2}\right) \|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\Delta}_r$  is defined in Lemma 17.

Then, by using  $\alpha \leq 1/L_F$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) & \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \frac{1}{2L_F} \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) + \frac{1}{2L_F} \sum_{r=0}^k \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that  $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$  for  $a, b \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}^*} & \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2L_F}} \sum_{r=0}^k \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 11.

*Proof:* The proof is similar to that of (68). From Lemmas 14(1) and 15, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \leq C\|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \\
& \leq C\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|, \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  is defined as in (7).

We now bound  $\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|$ . By the warm start strategy,

i.e. setting  $\mathbf{y}_k^0 = \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M$  in Algorithm 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| & \leq \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| + \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \\
& \leq \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| + \varrho\|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\| \\
& = \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| + \varrho\alpha\|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M)\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemmas 14(2) and 15; and the last line uses Eq. (17a).

Consequently, using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| & \leq \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| \\
& \quad + \varrho\alpha\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\| \\
& \quad + \varrho\alpha\|\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\| \tag{76a} \\
& \quad + \varrho\alpha\|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M) - \widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M)\|. \tag{76b}
\end{aligned}$$

We proceed with upper bounding terms (76a) and (76b), separately. To this end, from (75), we have

$$(76a) \leq C\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|.$$

Further, using the arguments similar to Eq. (70), we have

$$(76b) \leq \eta\rho^{U+1}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| & \leq (1 + \varrho\alpha C)\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| \\
& \quad + \varrho\alpha(\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\| + \eta\rho^{U+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by choosing

$$M \geq \log(2 + 2\varrho\alpha C) / \log\left(\frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1}\right),$$



we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\| \\
& + \varrho\alpha (\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\| + \eta\rho^{U+1}) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \\
& + \varrho\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} (\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j))\| + \eta\rho^{U+1}) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| + \varrho\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \\
& (\sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} + \eta\rho^{U+1}), \tag{77}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemmas 20 and 14(3).

Substituting (77) into (75) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\tilde{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\
& \leq C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| + \varrho\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \right. \\
& \left. (\sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} + \eta\rho^{U+1})\right). \tag{78}
\end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the above inequality in a way similar to (64), we have

$$\|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \leq \|\mathbf{l}_k\| + \|\Delta_k\|.$$

Thus, using (78) and (70), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta\rho^{U+1} + C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \right. \\
& \left. + \varrho\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} (\sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} + \eta\rho^{U+1})\right). \tag{79}
\end{aligned}$$

Since by our assumption  $U = \lceil \log_{1/\rho} K \rceil$ , we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^U = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K} = 1, \tag{80a}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \rho^{U+1} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{U+1} \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{U+1} = 2\rho. \tag{80b}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} \\
& \leq 2\sqrt{2L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \mathbf{F}^*} \\
& \leq 2\sqrt{2L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2L_F}} \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|) \\
& \leq 2\sqrt{2L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\sqrt{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2L_F}} \sum_{r=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|), \tag{80c}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\Delta}_k := \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))$  and the third inequality follows from Lemma 17.

Putting (80a)-(80c) back into (79), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\
& \leq \eta\rho + C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M (\|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| + 2\varrho\alpha\eta\rho) \\
& + C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M 2\varrho\alpha K (\sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} \\
& + \sum_{r=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Choose  $M$  such that

$$C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \tag{81a}$$

$$C \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^M 2\varrho\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2K}. \tag{81b}$$

It is easy to verify that (81a) and (81b) hold when

$$\begin{aligned}
M & \geq \log(C \max\{1, 4K\varrho\alpha\}) / \log\left(\frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1}\right) \\
& = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g \log(K)).
\end{aligned}$$

By combining the above inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \\ & \leq \eta\rho + \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\| + 2\rho\alpha\eta\rho \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2L_F(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^*)} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\Delta}_r\|. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above terms and using  $\alpha \leq 1/L_F$  give the desired result.  $\square$

#### 14 Proof of Lemma 12

**Lemma 18** *Suppose Assumptions A and B hold. Set parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  as in Lemma 15. If  $M \geq \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g)$ , then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\eta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2(U+1)} + 2C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \\ & \left( P_0 + 12\rho^2\alpha^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 + \eta^2\rho^{2(U+1)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof:* The proof is similar to that of (68). From Lemma 14(1) and Lemma 15, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \leq C^2 \|\mathbf{y}_k^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where  $\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)$  is defined as in Eq. (7). Next, we bound  $\|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2$ . By the warm start strategy  $\mathbf{y}_k^0 = \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & + 2\|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 + 2\rho^2\|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\ & = 2\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & + 2\rho^2\alpha^2\|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by Lemmas 14(2) and 15, the last line uses Eq. (17a).

Consequently, using the fact that  $\|a + b + c\|^2 \leq 3\|a\|^2 + 3\|b\|^2 + 3\|c\|^2$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & + 6\rho^2\alpha^2\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\|^2 \\ & + 6\rho^2\alpha^2\|\widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\|^2 \\ & + 6\rho^2\alpha^2\|\widehat{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M) - \widetilde{\nabla}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}^M)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (83a)$$

We proceed with upper bounding terms (83a) and (83b) separately. To this end, based on (82), we have

$$(83a) \leq C^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2.$$

Further, using the arguments similar to Eq. (70), we also have

$$(83b) \leq \eta^2\rho^{2(U+1)}.$$

By combining these inequalities one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq (2 + 6\rho^2\alpha^2C^2) \left(\frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1}\right)^{2M} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & + 6\rho^2\alpha^2(\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\|^2 + \eta^2\rho^{2(U+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by setting

$$M \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(4 + 12\rho^2\alpha^2C^2) / \log\left(\frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1}\right),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_k^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_{k-1}^0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & + 6\rho^2\alpha^2(\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))\|^2 + \eta^2\rho^{2(U+1)}) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)\|^2 + 6\rho^2\alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1-j} \\ & (\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j))\|^2 + \eta^2\rho^{2(U+1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Inserting (84) into (82) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \leq C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^k P_0 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 6\varrho^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1-j} (\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j))\|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \eta^2 \rho^{2(U+1)}) \right) \\
& \leq C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \left( P_0 + 12\varrho^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \eta^2 \rho^{2(U+1)}) \right), \tag{85}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1-j} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_j))\|^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Further, using the arguments similar to Eq. (64), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\iota_k\|^2 + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\Delta_k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, according to (85) and (70), we get the desired result.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 12.

*Proof:* Utilizing the  $L_F$ -smooth property of  $\mathbf{F}$  due to Lemma

14(3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) + \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{L_F}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\
& = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \alpha \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{L_F \alpha^2}{2} \|\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M)\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \alpha \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \quad - \alpha \langle \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)), \widehat{\Delta}_k \rangle \\
& \quad + L_F \alpha^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 + L_F \alpha^2 \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) - \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2L_F \alpha) \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) \|\widehat{\Delta}_k\|^2, \tag{86}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\Delta}_k := \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_k^M) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))$ , the equality is the result of (17a), the second inequality holds due to  $(a+b)^2 \leq 2(\|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2)$ , and the last inequality follows from  $ab < (1/2)(a^2 + b^2)$ .

Summing up both sides of (86), using Lemma 18, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))) \\
& \leq -\frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2L_F \alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) 2\eta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2(U+1)} \\
& \quad + 2 \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \\
& \quad \left( P_0 + 12\varrho^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 + \eta^2 \rho^{2(U+1)}) \right). \tag{87}
\end{aligned}$$

Choose  $M$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) 2C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} 12\varrho^2 \alpha \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{and} \\
& 2C^2 \left( \frac{\kappa_g - 1}{\kappa_g + 1} \right)^{2M} \leq 1. \tag{88}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that (88) holds when

$$\begin{aligned}
& M \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( 2C^2 \max\{1, \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) 48\varrho^2 \alpha\} \right) / \log \left( \frac{\kappa_g + 1}{\kappa_g - 1} \right) \\
& = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_g).
\end{aligned}$$

Now applying Eq. (88) into Eq. (87), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}^* &\leq -\alpha \left( \frac{1}{4} - L_F \alpha \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ &+ \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + L_F \alpha^2 \right) \left( (2 + 12\varrho^2 \alpha^2) \eta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2(U+1)} + P_0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Re-arranging the terms and in conjunction with  $\alpha \leq 1/8L_F$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{64L_F} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ &\leq D_F + \frac{5}{64L_F} \left( (2 + \frac{3\varrho^2}{16L_F^2}) \eta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2(U+1)} + P_0 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $D_F := \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^*))$ . Moreover, by setting  $U = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_{1/\rho} K \rceil$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \rho^{2U} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K},$$

which gives the desired result.  $\square$

## 15 Proof of Lemma 13

*Proof:* From (73a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2 K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left\| \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_k \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2 K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left\| \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\mathbf{I}_{nd_1} - \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \mathbf{x}_k + \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{8\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2 K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8\alpha^2}{(1-\sigma)^2 K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_k))\|^2 + \frac{8\alpha^2 n \hat{C}^2}{(1-\sigma)^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where the second inequality uses the fact that  $\|a\|^2 \leq 2\|a+b\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$  for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the last inequality follows from Eq. (7) and (74).

Combining (89) with Lemma 12 gives the desired result.  $\square$

## Useful Results and Facts

In this part we present several technical lemmas used in the proofs.

**Lemma 19** ([5, Lemma 3.11]) *If  $F(x)$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y), x - y \rangle &\geq \frac{\mu L}{\mu + L} \|x - y\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{\mu + L} \|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 20** ([8, Lemma 2]) *If  $F(x)$  is  $L$ -smooth convex function with minimizer  $x^*$  s.t  $\nabla F(x^*) = 0$ , then*

$$\|\nabla F(x)\|^2 = \|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x^*)\|^2 \leq 2L(F(x) - F(x^*)).$$

**Lemma 21** ([43, Lemma 1]) *Assume that the nonnegative sequence  $\{u_k\}$  satisfies the following recursion for all  $k \geq 1$*

$$u_K^2 \leq S_K + \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k u_k,$$

with  $\{S_K\}$  an increasing sequence,  $S_0 \geq u_0^2$  and  $\lambda_k \geq 0$  for all  $k$ . Then, for all  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$u_K \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k + \left( S_K + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

**Lemma 22** ([23, Lemma 16]) *Under Assumptions A1. and A2., we have*

$$\|\mathbf{W}^k - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top\|^2 \leq \sigma^k, \quad \forall k \in [K].$$

**Lemma 23** ([33, Proposition 1]) *Suppose Assumptions A and B5. hold. Then, for the matrices  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$ , and  $\mathbf{B}$  defined in (9), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \mu_g \mathbf{I}_{nd_2} &\preceq \mathbf{H} \preceq (2(1-\theta) + \gamma C_{g_{yy}}) \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}, \\ (2(1-\Theta) + \gamma \mu_g) \mathbf{I}_{nd_2} &\preceq \mathbf{D} \preceq (2(1-\theta) + \gamma C_{g_{yy}}) \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}, \\ \mathbf{0} &\preceq \mathbf{B} \preceq 2(1-\theta) \mathbf{I}_{nd_2}. \end{aligned}$$