

Finite-Time Decoupled Convergence in Nonlinear Two-Time-Scale Stochastic Approximation

Yuze Han ^{*} Xiang Li [†] Zhihua Zhang [‡]

November 27, 2024

Abstract

In two-time-scale stochastic approximation (SA), two iterates are updated at varying speeds using different step sizes, with each update influencing the other. Previous studies on linear two-time-scale SA have shown that the convergence rates of the mean-square errors for these updates depend solely on their respective step sizes, a phenomenon termed decoupled convergence. However, achieving decoupled convergence in nonlinear SA remains less understood. Our research investigates the potential for finite-time decoupled convergence in nonlinear two-time-scale SA. We demonstrate that, under a nested local linearity assumption, finite-time decoupled convergence rates can be achieved with suitable step size selection. To derive this result, we conduct a convergence analysis of the matrix cross term between the iterates and leverage fourth-order moment convergence rates to control the higher-order error terms induced by local linearity. Additionally, a numerical example is provided to explore the possible necessity of local linearity for decoupled convergence.

1 Introduction

Stochastic approximation (SA), initially introduced by [Robbins and Monro \[1951\]](#), is an iterative method for finding the root of an unknown operator based on noisy observations. This method has gained substantial attention over the past few decades, finding applications in stochastic optimization and reinforcement learning [[Kushner and Yin, 2003](#), [Borkar, 2009](#), [Mou et al., 2020, 2022a,b](#), [Li et al., 2023b,a](#)]. However, certain scenarios require managing two iterates updated at different time scales using varying step sizes. Examples include stochastic bilevel optimization [[Ghadimi and Wang, 2018](#), [Chen et al., 2021](#), [Hong et al., 2023](#)], temporal difference learning [[Sutton et al., 2009](#), [Xu et al., 2019](#), [Xu and Liang, 2021](#), [Wang et al., 2021](#)] and actor-critic methods [[Borkar and Konda, 1997](#), [Konda and Tsitsiklis, 2003](#), [Wu et al., 2020](#), [Xu et al., 2020](#)]. These cases highlight the limitations of traditional SA and underscore the need for a two-time-scale SA approach to better capture the complexities involved.

In this paper, we study the two-time-scale SA [[Borkar, 1997](#)], a variant of the classical SA algorithm, designed to identify the roots of systems comprising two coupled, potentially nonlinear

^{*}Center for Applied Statistics and School of Statistics, Renmin University of China; email: hanyuze97@ruc.edu.cn.

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University; email: lx10077@pku.edu.cn.

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University; email: zhzhang@math.pku.edu.cn.

equations. We focus on two unknown Lipschitz operators, $F : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $G : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, with the aim of finding the root pair (x^*, y^*) satisfying:

$$\begin{cases} F(x^*, y^*) = 0, \\ G(x^*, y^*) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Given that F and G are unknown, we assume access to a stochastic oracle that provides noisy evaluations of $F(x, y)$ and $G(x, y)$ at any input pair (x, y) . Specifically, for any x and y , the oracle returns $F(x, y) + \xi$ and $G(x, y) + \psi$ where ξ and ψ represent noise components. Utilizing this stochastic oracle, we apply the nonlinear two-time-scale SA to solve the problem defined in (1) by iteratively updating estimates x_t and y_t for x^* and y^* , respectively, as follows:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha_t (F(x_t, y_t) + \xi_t), \quad (2a)$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t - \beta_t (G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t), \quad (2b)$$

where x_0 and y_0 are initialized arbitrarily in \mathbb{R}^{d_x} and \mathbb{R}^{d_y} . The noise components ξ_t and ψ_t are modeled as martingale difference sequences. The step sizes α_t and β_t are chosen such that $\beta_t \ll \alpha_t$, making y_t “quasi-static” relative to x_t . This difference in step sizes simulates a setting where y_t remains nearly fixed while x_t undergoes rapid updates, as discussed in [Konda and Tsitsiklis \[2004\]](#).

Assuming that for a given y , the equation $F(x, y) = 0$ has a unique solution $H(y)$, where H is a Lipschitz operator. Under this assumption, we can regard two-time-scale SA as a single-loop approximation of the following double-loop process:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inner loop: compute } x = H(y), \text{ or equivalently, solve } F(x, y) = 0 \text{ for a fixed } y, \\ \text{Outer loop: iteratively find the root of } G(H(y), y) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This formulation ensures that the solution to (1) satisfies $x^* = H(y^*)$; in other words, for $y = y^*$, x^* is precisely the root of the inner loop. We designate the update of x_t as the “fast-time-scale” update and that of y_t as the “slow-time-scale” update, referring x_t and y_t as the *fast iterate* and *slow iterate*, respectively.

Our primary interest lies in the behavior of the *slow iterate* y_t , a focus we illustrate through a classic example. Consider the case of Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) with Polyak-Ruppert averaging, which is an instance of two-time-scale SA. To minimize a strongly convex objective f , the SGD with PR-averaging updates are defined as follows:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha_t (\nabla f(x_t) + \xi_t) \text{ with } \alpha_t = \frac{\alpha_0}{(t+1)^a} \text{ (} 0 < a \leq 1 \text{)}, \quad (4a)$$

$$y_{t+1} = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{\tau=0}^t x_\tau = y_t - \beta_t (y_t - x_t) \text{ with } \beta_t = \frac{1}{t+1}, \quad (4b)$$

where (4a) is the classic SGD update rule [[Robbins and Monro, 1951](#)] and (4b) is the Polyak-Ruppert averaging step [[Polyak and Juditsky, 1992](#), [Ruppert, 1988](#)]. This setup aligns with the formulation (3), where we have $F(x, y) = \nabla f(x)$ and $G(x, y) = y - x$, resulting in $x^* = y^* = \arg \min_x f(x)$ and $H(y) \equiv x^*$. As shown in [Moulines and Bach \[2011\]](#), the convergence rate for $\mathbb{E} \|x_t - x^*\|^2$ is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$, achieving the optimal rate $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ only when the step size parameter $a = 1$ and the initial step size α_0 is sufficiently large. In contrast, with two-time-scale SA, the slow-time-scale update

satisfies $\mathbb{E}\|y_t - y^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$ as long as $a \geq 0.5$. This result implies that using the slow-time-scale update (4b) enables optimal convergence rates with greater flexibility in choosing step sizes for the fast-time-scale update in (4a). Since the convergence rate of y_t is the desired result, the behavior of x_t , which serves as an auxiliary iterate, becomes secondary.

In the above example, each iterate’s convergence rate depends only on its own step size. Similar results were achieved by Kaledin et al. [2020] for linear operators F and G , yielding

$$\mathbb{E}\|y_t - y^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\|x_t - H(y_t)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t). \quad (5)$$

Here $y_t - y^*$ and $x_t - H(y_t)$ represent the errors of the outer and inner loops in (3), respectively. We refer to the phenomenon where each iterate’s convergence rate depends solely on its own step size as *decoupled convergence*.

However, when F and G are nonlinear operators, the interactions between the two iterates become more complex, making the path to (5) less straightforward. The asymptotic analysis in Mokkadem and Pelletier [2006], under an additional local linearity assumption, provides evidence supporting decoupled convergence for sufficiently large t . Nevertheless, there is no corresponding non-asymptotic guarantee for any finite t . Consequently, our research goal is to

Establish the *finite-time decoupled convergence* in (5) for nonlinear two-time-scale SA.

The significance of decoupled convergence rates is twofold. First, as analyzed for the SGD example in (4), decoupled convergence allows greater flexibility in selecting step sizes for the fast iterate without affecting the convergence behavior of the main focus, the slow iterate. Additionally, decoupled convergence rates offer a more refined analysis than previous work [Doan, 2022, Shen and Chen, 2022], especially in strict two-time-scale scenarios. Such refined rates are valuable for further asymptotic trajectory analysis [Liang et al., 2023] and online statistical inference [Li et al., 2022, 2023a].

Contributions In this paper, we focus on nonlinear two-time-scale SA under the assumptions of strong monotonicity and martingale difference noise, as specified in Assumptions 2.3 and 2.6. Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- **Theoretical contribution:** Under the nested local linearity assumption (Assumption 2.5), we derive detailed convergence rates for $\mathbb{E}\|x_t - H(y_t)\|^2$, $\mathbb{E}\|y_t - y^*\|^2$ and $\|\mathbb{E}(x_t - H(y_t))(y_t - y^*)^\top\|$ in Theorem 3.1, establishing finite-time decoupled convergence in Corollary 3.1 with appropriate step size selection.
- **Technical contribution:** To capture the intricate interaction between two iterates, we introduce a detailed characterization of the matrix cross term $\|\mathbb{E}(x_t - H(y_t))(y_t - y^*)^\top\|$, a component previously unexplored in non-asymptotic analyses for nonlinear cases (see Remark 3.1). Specifically, under local linearity, we derive the convergence rate of this matrix cross term as an intermediate result and employ fourth-order moment convergence rates to control the higher-order error terms arising from local linearity (see Section 3.3). This proof framework advances previous results for linear two-time-scale SA [Kaledin et al., 2020], providing a foundational approach for future convergence analyses that address both nonlinearity and variable step sizes.

- **Empirical contribution:** We provide a particular example and demonstrate through numerical experiments that local linearity is essential to establish decoupled convergence in Section 4.1. This observation offers valuable insights for further theoretical analysis.

Notation For a vector x , $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm; for a matrix A , $\|A\|$ to denote the spectral norm. We use $o(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$, and $\Theta(\cdot)$ to hide universal constants and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ to hide both universal constants and log factors. We denote $\max\{a, b\}$ as $a \vee b$ and $\min\{a, b\}$ as $a \wedge b$. The ceiling function $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to the input number. For two non-negative numbers a and b , $a \lesssim b$ ($a \propto b$) indicates the existence of a positive number C such that $a \leq Cb$ ($a = Cb$) with C depending on parameters of no interest. For two positive sequence $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, $a_n \sim b_n$ signifies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 1$. By $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$ we denote almost sure convergence; by \xrightarrow{d} we denote the convergence in distribution. We abbreviate $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as $[n]$.

Organization The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the basic assumptions. Sections 3 and 4 focus on theoretical analysis and numerical results, respectively. Section 5 provides the conclusion. Additional related work and examples are included in the appendices due to space limitations.

2 Assumptions

In this section, we present the main assumptions required for our analysis.

Assumption 2.1 (Lipschitz conditions of F and H). *For any fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, there exists an operator $H : \mathbb{R}^{d_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ such that $x = H(y)$ is the unique solution of $F(H(y), y) = 0$. H and F satisfy that for $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$,*

$$\|H(y_1) - H(y_2)\| \leq L_H \|y_1 - y_2\|, \quad (6)$$

$$\|F(x, y_1) - F(H(y_1), y_1)\| \leq L_F \|x - H(y_1)\|. \quad (7)$$

Condition (7) introduces a star-type Lipschitz condition, which is less restrictive and allows for greater flexibility in modeling and analysis.

Assumption 2.2 (Nested Lipschitz condition of G). *The operator G satisfies that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$,*

$$\|G(x, y) - G(H(y), y)\| \leq L_{G,x} \|x - H(y)\|, \quad (8)$$

$$\|G(H(y), y) - G(H(y^*), y^*)\| \leq L_{G,y} \|y - y^*\|. \quad (9)$$

The nested structure within Assumption 2.2 aligns with the conceptual framework that views a two-time-scale SA as an approximation of the formulation presented in (3). This type of nested Lipschitz condition is also adopted in Shen and Chen [2022].

Assumption 2.3 (Star-type strong monotonicity). *For any fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, $F(\cdot, y)$ is strongly monotone at $H(y)$, i.e., there exists a constant $\mu_F > 0$*

$$\langle x - H(y), F(x, y) - F(H(y), y) \rangle \geq \mu_F \|x - H(y)\|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}. \quad (10)$$

$G(H(\cdot), \cdot)$ is strongly monotone at y^ , i.e., there exists a constant $\mu_G > 0$ such that*

$$\langle y - y^*, G(H(y), y) - G(H(y^*), y^*) \rangle \geq \mu_G \|y - y^*\|^2, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}. \quad (11)$$

The star-type strong monotonicity assumption of F and G also appears in previous work [Doan, 2022, Shen and Chen, 2022]. A direct consequence of the above assumptions is $L_F \geq \mu_F$ and $L_{G,y} \geq \mu_G$.

Assumption 2.4 (Uniform local linearity of H). *Assume that H is differentiable and there exist constants $S_H \geq 0$ and $\delta_H \in [0.5, 1]$ such that $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$,*

$$\|H(y_1) - H(y_2) - \nabla H(y_2)(y_1 - y_2)\| \leq S_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H}.$$

This assumption is equivalent to the Hölder continuity of ∇H (see Proposition B.1) and relaxes the requirement of Lipschitz continuity for ∇H used in Shen and Chen [2022]. A direct conclusion of Assumptions 2.4 and 2.1 is that $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, with $R_H = \frac{2L_H}{S_H}$, $\|\nabla H(y_1)\| \leq L_H$ and

$$\|H(y_1) - H(y_2) - \nabla H(y_2)(y_1 - y_2)\| \leq S_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{\delta_H} \cdot \min\{\|y_1 - y_2\|, R_H\}. \quad (12)$$

Although a finite-time decoupled convergence rate for nonlinear two-time-scale SA is not established in the literature, asymptotic decoupled convergence has been explored under a local linearity assumption [Mokkadem and Pelletier, 2006]. Inspired by this work, we consider the following nested local linearity assumption.

Assumption 2.5 (Nested local linearity up to order $(1+\delta_F, 1+\delta_G)$). *There exist matrices B_1, B_2, B_3 with compatible dimensions, constants $S_{B,F}, S_{B,G} \geq 0$ and $\delta_F, \delta_G \in (0, 1]$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x, y) - B_1(x - H(y))\| &\leq S_{B,F} \left(\|x - H(y)\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F} \right), \\ \|G(x, y) - B_2(x - H(y)) - B_3(y - y^*)\| &\leq S_{B,G} \left(\|x - H(y)\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_G} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This assumption follows the spirit that two-time-scale SA can be viewed as an approximation of the two-loop procedure (3). The parameters δ_F and δ_G quantify the order of errors in this linear approximation condition. It is natural to ask under what conditions Assumption 2.5 holds. To address this, we can show that if the operators F and G can be locally approximated around the root (x^*, y^*) by linear functions of $x - x^*$ and $y - y^*$, up to a higher-order error, then the nested local linearity condition follows naturally—assuming certain prior assumptions are satisfied (see Proposition B.2). Moreover, Assumption 2.5, along with the previous assumptions, implies $\|B_1\| \leq L_F$, $\|B_2\| \leq L_{G,x}$, $\|B_3\| \leq L_{G,y}$, $\frac{B_1+B_1^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_F I$, and $\frac{B_3+B_3^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_G I$.

Next, we focus on noise models. We denote by \mathcal{F}_t the filtration containing all the history generated by (2) before time t , i.e., $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{x_0, y_0, \xi_0, \psi_0, \xi_1, \psi_1, \dots, \xi_{t-1}, \psi_{t-1}\}$.

Assumption 2.6 (Conditions on the noise). *The sequences of random variables $\{\xi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{\psi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ are martingale difference sequences satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \Gamma_{11}^2, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\psi_t\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \Gamma_{22}^2, \\ \|\mathbb{E}[\xi_t \xi_t^\top | \mathcal{F}_t]\| \leq \Sigma_{11}, \quad \|\mathbb{E}[\psi_t \psi_t^\top | \mathcal{F}_t]\| \leq \Sigma_{22}, \quad \|\mathbb{E}[\xi_t \psi_t^\top | \mathcal{F}_t]\| \leq \Sigma_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In Assumption 2.6, the boundedness of the fourth-order moments is imposed to control the higher-order error terms introduced by Assumption 2.5.

The final assumption is the requirements for the step sizes.

Assumption 2.7 (Conditions on step sizes). *With the constants μ_F , μ_G , δ_F and δ_G defined in Assumptions 2.3 and 2.5, the step sizes $\{\alpha_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{\beta_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i) *Constant bounds: $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1$, $\beta_t \leq \iota_2$, $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa$, $\frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \leq \rho$, where ι_1 , ι_2 , κ and ρ are problem-dependent constants with specific forms defined in (34) in Appendix B.*
- (ii) *Growth conditions: $1 \leq \frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} \leq 1 + (\frac{\delta_F \mu_F}{16} \alpha_t) \wedge (\frac{\delta_F \mu_G}{16} \beta_t) \wedge (\frac{\delta_G \mu_G}{8} \beta_t)$ and $1 \leq \frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G}{64} \beta_t$ for any $t \geq 1$.*
- (iii) *$\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$ is non-increasing in t , and $\prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t^2)$.*

Conditions (i) and (ii) are similar to Kaledin et al. [2020, Assumption A2], though our conditions are more intricate to handle non-linearity. Condition (iii) is a technical requirement introduced to simplify the proof. Notably, these conditions are naturally satisfied as long as both α_t and β_t decrease with t , with β_t decreasing faster than α_t . Additionally, our setup includes single-time-scale SA as a special case if a constant ratio $\beta_t/\alpha_t \equiv \kappa' \leq \kappa$ that satisfies Assumption 2.7 is adopted. Further discussion is provided in Appendix B.

3 Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we establish finite-time decoupled convergence under the assumptions outlined in Section 2. Section 3.1 presents the main results, followed by a discussion of key challenges in achieving decoupled convergence without the local linearity in Section 3.2. The framework of proof under the local linearity is provided in Section 3.3.

3.1 Main Results

To analyze the convergence rate of (x_t, y_t) to (x^*, y^*) , it is common to examine the mean square errors $\mathbb{E}[\|x_t - x^*\|^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|y_t - y^*\|^2]$. Recall that two-time-scale SA can be viewed as an approximation of the two-loop procedure in (3). It is thus more fundamental to consider the following residual variables [Doan, 2022]:

$$\hat{x}_t = x_t - H(y_t), \quad \hat{y}_t = y_t - y^*. \quad (14)$$

Here, \hat{x}_t and \hat{y}_t represent the errors of the inner and outer loops in (3), respectively. Furthermore, given the Lipschitz continuity of H in Assumption 2.1, we can bound $\|x_t - x^*\|$ as $\|x_t - x^*\| \leq \|\hat{x}_t\| + L_H \|\hat{y}_t\|$. Thus, it suffices to focus on (\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t) .

Our main results, based on the assumptions in Section 2, are stated as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.7 hold. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \mathcal{C}_x \alpha_t, \quad (15)$$

$$\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| \leq \mathcal{C}_{xy,1} \beta_t + \mathcal{C}_{xy,2} \alpha_t \beta_t \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \mathcal{C}_{y,1} \beta_t + \mathcal{C}_{y,2} \alpha_t \beta_t \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} + \mathcal{C}_{y,3} \alpha_t \beta_t \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}. \quad (17)$$

The exact constants are given in (80) in Appendix F.

In Theorem 3.1, observe that the step size α_t of the fast iterate also influences the convergence rate of the slow iterate through terms involving the parameters δ_F and δ_G . In the following discussion, we focus on polynomially diminishing step sizes and examine the conditions required for achieving decoupled convergence.

Corollary 3.1 (Decoupled convergence rates). *Under the same setting of Theorem 3.1, if we use polynomially diminishing step sizes $\alpha_t = \frac{\alpha_0}{(t+T_0)^a}$ and $\beta_t = \frac{\beta_0}{(t+T_0)^b}$ with $a, b \in (0, 1]$, $1 \leq \frac{b}{a} \leq 1 + \frac{\delta_F}{2} \wedge \delta_G$ and properly chosen α_0, β_0 and T_0 , then we have $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$, $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$. For an example choice of the constants, please refer to (81) in Appendix F.*

Remark 3.1 (Comparison with previous work). *Note that $x_t - x^* = \hat{x}_t + H(y_t) - H(y^*)$. Then, by Corollary 3.1 and the Lipschitz continuity of H , we have $\mathbb{E}\|x_t - x^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$ and $\|\mathbb{E}(x_t - x^*)(y_t - y^*)^\top\| = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$. This result is consistent with the central limit theorem established in Makkadem and Pelletier [2006]:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t^{-1/2}(x_t - x^*) \\ \beta_t^{-1/2}(y_t - y^*) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_x & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_y \end{pmatrix}\right). \quad (18)$$

Moreover, our analysis provides a more refined characterization of the matrix cross term, as (18) only implies $(x_t - x^*)(y_t - y^*)^\top = o(\sqrt{\alpha_t\beta_t})$ in probability.

To establish the convergence rate in (17), the convergence rate of the matrix cross term in (16) is an essential intermediate result. Neither decoupled convergence for the strict two-time-scale case nor an analysis of the matrix cross term is present in prior work on general nonlinear cases [Shen and Chen, 2022, Doan, 2022].

Remark 3.2 (Step size selection for the optimal convergence rate). *To achieve the optimal convergence rate of the slow iterate $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$, we could choose $\beta_t \sim \beta_0 t^{-1}$ and $\alpha_t \sim \alpha_0 t^{-a}$ with $(1 + \frac{\delta_F}{2} \wedge \delta_G)^{-1} \leq a \leq 1$. In particular, when $\delta_F = \delta_G = 1$, the feasible range for a in $\alpha_t \sim \alpha_0 t^{-a}$ is $2/3 \leq a \leq 1$. Our results ensure that achieving $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ convergence for the slow iterate allows greater flexibility in the step size selection for the fast iterate, extending beyond the single-time-scale case considered in Shen and Chen [2022].*

3.2 Challenges in Achieving Decoupled Convergence without Local Linearity

In this subsection, we present an analysis without the local linearity assumption and discuss the main challenges in establishing decoupled convergence rates in Section 3.1. To simplify, we focus only on the fundamental terms here; for a full analysis, see Appendix E.

With the residual variables defined in (14), their update rules can be derived as follows:

$$\hat{x}_{t+1} = \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) - \alpha_t \xi_t + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}), \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{y}_{t+1} = \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) + \beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t. \quad (20)$$

By squaring both sides of (19) and (20) and taking expectations, we obtain inequalities that characterize the one-step descent of the mean squared errors:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 - (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \lesssim \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \alpha_t^2 \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 - (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \lesssim \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \beta_t^2. \quad (22)$$

The cross term $\beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ in both inequalities highlights the interaction between \hat{x}_t and \hat{y}_t , which is crucial for determining their convergence rates. Without this term, one could easily conclude that $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$ and $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$ by following the approach in [Moulines and Bach \[2011\]](#).

We now clarify that the cross term $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ indeed slows down the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2$. According to the central limit theorem in [\(18\)](#), the tightest bound we can expect for this term is $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha_t \beta_t})$. However, substituting this bound into [\(22\)](#) yields $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha_t \beta_t})$, indicating that the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ remains influenced by the step size of the fast iterate \hat{x}_t .

To achieve decoupled convergence, it is necessary to eliminate the dependence of [\(21\)](#) and [\(22\)](#) on the cross term $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$. Recent work by [Kaledin et al. \[2020\]](#) demonstrates that for linear two-time-scale SA, decoupled convergence can be achieved by analyzing a matrix cross term $\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ as an intermediate step.¹ Inspired by this approach, we aim to relate \hat{x}_t and \hat{y}_t through a matrix cross term under the local linearity condition, replacing $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ with $\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$, which is more tractable for analysis.

3.3 Framework of Proof

Our analysis is organized into four main steps. First, we establish the coarse convergence rates without assuming local linearity. Next, under the assumption of local linearity, we introduce a matrix cross term in the one-step descent lemmas. Then, we analyze the fourth-order moments to control the higher-order error terms induced by local linearity. Finally, we integrate the above results and derive the precise convergence rates. To simplify the presentation, we focus on the leading terms, deferring the formal expressions to [Appendix F.1](#).

Step 1: Convergence rates without local linearity In the first step, we derive approximate convergence rates without the local linearity assumption. Combining the inequalities in [\(21\)](#) and [\(22\)](#), we obtain the following coarse convergence rate:

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t). \quad (23)$$

This rough convergence rate provides the foundation for deriving more precise results. The proof of [\(23\)](#) can be found in [Appendix E](#).

Step 2: Introduction of the matrix cross term With [Assumption 2.5](#), we replace the cross term $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ in [\(21\)](#) and [\(22\)](#) with $\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$, and derive the following updated inequalities for one-step descent:

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 - (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \lesssim \beta_t \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \alpha_t^2 + \Delta_{x,t}, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_G \beta_t}{3}\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \lesssim \beta_t \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t^2 + \Delta_{y,t}, \quad (25)$$

$$\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_{t+1} \hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| - \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| \lesssim \beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \alpha_t \beta_t + \Delta_{xy,t}. \quad (26)$$

Here $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{xy,t}$ and $\Delta_{y,t}$ represent the higher-order terms induced by [Assumption 2.5](#). The explicit forms of these terms are given in [\(83\)](#), [\(87\)](#) and [\(85\)](#) in [Appendix F](#). These inequalities provide a more detailed characterization of the interaction between \hat{x}_t and \hat{y}_t .

¹More precisely, they introduce $\|\mathbb{E} z_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$, where $\|z_t - \hat{x}_t\| \rightarrow 0$ in probability.




Figure 1: Illustration for Step 4 of the proof sketch.

Step 3: Analysis of the fourth-order moments To control the higher-order terms in $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{xy,t}$ and $\Delta_{y,t}$, we analyze the fourth-order moments of the errors, with their one-step descent given by:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 - (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 \lesssim \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + \alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \alpha_t^4, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 - \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \lesssim \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^4. \quad (28)$$

Combining these inequalities with a suitably chosen Lyapunov function and applying the coarse convergence rate from (23), we derive the following convergence rate:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t^2). \quad (29)$$

Step 4: Integration of results With the results from the previous steps, we now integrate them to obtain the final convergence rates, as stated in Theorem 3.1. Figure 1 provides a visual representation of the process. The integration follows the following procedure.

- Black arrow: The convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ in (15) follows from the coarse rate (23).
- Brown arrow: Using the fourth-order convergence rates in (29), we control the higher-order terms in $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{y,t}$, and $\Delta_{xy,t}$.
- Blue arrows: Combining the recursions (24) and (26) with a properly chosen Lyapunov function and applying the coarse rate in (23), we derive the convergence rate of $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ in (16).
- Red arrows: Substituting the convergence rates of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ and $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ into the recursion (25) yields the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ in (17).

4 Numerical Experiments

This section is devoted to numerical experiments. In Section 4.1, we devise an example without local linearity to explore the necessity of local linearity for decoupled convergence. In Section 4.2, we consider several examples to illustrate the decoupled convergence rate in Section 3. Due to space limitations, details on parameter selection and more examples are provided in Appendix G.




Figure 2: The convergence results within Example 4.1. We calculate the line slopes using data from the 10^5 to 10^6 iteration range.

4.1 An Example without Local Linearity

The central limit theorem in Mokkadem and Pelletier [2006] and our non-asymptotic convergence rates in Section 3 demonstrate that for nonlinear two-time-scale SA, under certain local linearity assumptions, employing step sizes decaying at different rates leads to decoupled convergence. This raises a natural question: *Is local linearity essential for achieving decoupled convergence?* To investigate, we devise the following example.

Example 4.1. Given a one-to-one 1-Lipschitz continuous function $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the following two-dimensional nonlinear SA problem with the operators $F, G : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$F(x, y) = x - H(y), \quad G(x, y) = -|x - H(y)| \cdot \text{sign}(y) + y, \quad (30)$$

where $\text{sign}(x) = 1_{x>1} - 1_{x<0}$ is the sign function.

Since $G(x, y)$ involves the sign and absolute value functions, it does not satisfy the local linearity assumption (Assumption 2.5). However, it does meet the Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4 with parameters all equal to 1, and the unique root is $(x^*, y^*) = (H(0), 0)$.

In Example 4.1, the sign and absolute value functions are introduced to ensure that the inequality (22) holds with the reverse direction. Hence, the interaction term $\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ would slow the convergence of \hat{y}_t . To illustrate this effect, we consider a one-dimensional example with $H(y) = y$, noise terms $\xi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\psi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 0.01)$, and step sizes $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(t+1)^{-a}$ and $\beta_t = \beta_0(t+1)^{-b}$. Figure 2 presents results on a log-log scale, plotting the averaged values of $|\hat{x}_t|^2$ and $|\hat{y}_t|^2$ against the number of iterations for difference (a, b) pairs. The slope of each line in the log-log plot reflects the convergence rate, as a relationship of the form $y = r x^{-s}$ corresponds to $\log y = -s \log x + \log r$.

In Figure 2, despite using distinctly different time scales, the slope of the orange line (representing the slow iterate y_t) nearly matches that of the blue line (representing the fast iterate x_t). This indicates that the nonlinear interaction in Example 4.1 hinders the convergence of the slow iterate y_t , preventing decoupled convergence in this case and implying that local linearity may be essential for achieving decoupled convergence.

4.2 Illustration for the Decoupled Convergence

In this subsection, we illustrate the decoupled convergence in Section 3 through two numerical results. We first define the auxiliary function

$$\tilde{h}_\delta(x) = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(x)|x|^\delta/\delta, & |x| \leq 1, \\ \text{sign}(x)(|x| - 1 + 1/\delta), & |x| > 1. \end{cases}$$

One can check that when $\delta \geq 1$, \tilde{h}_δ is 1-Lipschitz continuous. In the following examples, we use step sizes $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(t+1)^{-a}$ and $\beta_t = \beta_0(t+1)^{-b}$ and present the results on a log-log scale for both cases.

Stochastic bilevel optimization Stochastic bilevel optimization is a typical application for two-time-scale SA. For a detailed discussion, please refer to Appendix C. Here, we consider the following problem with $f(x, y) = (x + \tilde{h}_2(y))^2 + \sin(x + \tilde{h}_2(y))$ and $g(x, y) = (x + \tilde{h}_2(y))^2 + y^2 + \sin(y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} & (\tilde{x}^*(y) + \tilde{h}_2(y))^2 + y^2 + \sin(y), \\ \text{s.t. } & \tilde{x}^*(y) := \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (x + \tilde{h}_2(y))^2 + \sin(x + \tilde{h}_2(y)). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We apply two-time-scale SA, with F and G defined in (43) in Appendix C, to solve this problem, assuming noise terms $\xi_t, \psi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The results, depicted in Figure 3, illustrate decoupled convergence for different (a, b) pairs.




Figure 3: The convergence results for unbiased two-time-scale SA to solve (31).

A variant of Example 4.1 The second result is based on a variant of Example 4.1:

$$F(x, y) = x - y, \quad G(x, y) = -\tilde{h}_{1.5}(|x - y|) \cdot \text{sign}(y) + y. \quad (32)$$

Assumption 2.5 holds with $S_{B,F} = 0$ (allowing δ_F to be set to 1) and $\delta_G = 0.5$. We apply two-time-scale SA (2) with $\xi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\psi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 0.01)$ as in Section 4.1, to find the root. The results are shown in Figure 4. Based on Corollary 3.1, decoupled convergence is expected within the range $1 \leq b/a \leq 1.5$. Interestingly, as Figure 4 demonstrates, decoupled convergence is observed even when $b/a = 1/0.6 > 1.5$.




Figure 4: The convergence results for the example in (32).

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have investigated the potential for finite-time decoupled convergence in nonlinear two-time-scale SA under the strongly monotone condition, wherein the mean-square errors of different iterates depend solely on their respective step sizes. Viewing the two-time-scale SA as an approximation of a two-loop procedure, our primary focus is on the outer-loop iterate, i.e., the slow iterate y_t .

Under a nested local linearity assumption, we have established the first finite-time decoupled convergence for nonlinear two-time-scale SA with appropriate step size selection. This decoupled convergence offers greater flexibility in choosing the step size for the fast iterate x_t , without impacting the convergence rate of the main focus, the slow iterate y_t . Our analytical framework advances the approach for the linear operators in Kaledin et al. [2020] to adapt complexities introduced by non-linearity. In particular, we have derived a refined characterization of the matrix cross term, surpassing previous asymptotic results [Mokkadem and Pelletier, 2006], and applied fourth-order moment convergence rates to manage higher-order error terms induced by local linearity. Additionally, we have provided a numerical example exploring the possible necessity of local linearity for achieving decoupled convergence. We would believe our proof approach and numerical findings could inspire further theoretical developments for nonlinear two-time-scale SA and similar methods.

Despite the progress made in our paper, several avenues for future research remain. First, our exploration of local linearity’s necessity for decoupled convergence relies on numerical experiments, which have inherent limitations. Providing theoretical guarantees would offer stronger validation. Second, our results could be extended to include scenarios with Markovian noise or non-strongly monotone operators, broadening the applicability of our approach. Finally, investigating the asymptotic trajectory behavior and developing online statistical inference methods for two-time-scale SA based on our non-asymptotic convergence results would be interesting future directions.

Appendices

A Related Work

Our research investigates the finite-time convergence rate of nonlinear two-time-scale SA and endeavors to establish the decoupled convergence. To contextualize our results, we provide more background of two-time-scale SA.

Almost sure convergence Two-time-scale SA was originally introduced by [Borkar \[1997\]](#), who derived an almost sure convergence in the presence of martingale difference noise [[Borkar and Konda, 1997](#), [Borkar, 2009](#)]. Subsequently, the almost sure convergence under Markovian noise was established. [[Tadic, 2004](#), [Karmakar and Bhatnagar, 2018](#), [Yaji and Bhatnagar, 2020](#)]. These convergence results crucially depend on the stability condition. Addressing this, [Lakshminarayanan and Bhatnagar \[2017\]](#) delved into studying sufficient conditions that ensure the stability of two-time-scale SA when subjected to martingale difference noise. Recently, [Doan \[2022\]](#) established almost sure convergence under the strongly monotone condition, without relying on the stability condition.

Decoupled convergence for the linear case When both F and G are linear, H is also linear. Leveraging this linear structure, [Konda and Tsitsiklis \[2004\]](#) focused on a linearly transformed error $z_t = x_t - H(y_t) + L_t(y_t - y^*)$, demonstrating that its update does not depend on y_t . Here $\{L_t\}$ is a matrix sequence converging to zero. Based on this insight, they prove that $\beta_t^{-1/2}(y_t - y^*)$ converges in distribution to a normal distribution under martingale difference noise. It can be extrapolated from their analysis that the $\alpha_t^{-1/2}(x_t - x^*)$ and $\alpha_t^{-1/2}(x_t - H(y_t))$ also converge in distribution to a normal distribution. Drawing inspiration from this technique, [Kaledin et al. \[2020\]](#) derived finite-time convergence rates, establishing that $\mathbb{E}\|y_t - y^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$ and $\mathbb{E}\|x_t - H(y_t)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$ hold for both martingale difference and Markovian noise. Concurrent to our work, [Haque et al. \[2023\]](#) achieved the same rates with asymptotically optimal leading terms; [Kwon et al. \[2024\]](#) examined constant stepsize schemes and provided a refined characterization of the bias and variance terms. For a variant of two-time-scale SA with sparse projection, [Dalal et al. \[2020\]](#) derived that $\|y_t - y^*\| = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\beta_t)$ and $\|x_t - x^*\| = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\alpha_t)$ hold with high probability.

Convergence rates for the nonlinear case When either F or G is nonlinear, the coupling between x_t and y_t is in a more complex nonlinear form, complicating the analysis of nonlinear two-time-scale SA. Decoupling the inner-loop error $x_t - H(y_t)$ from the outer-loop iterate y_t , as done by [Konda and Tsitsiklis \[2004\]](#) in the linear case, is no longer feasible. Under the strongly monotone and Lipschitz conditions, [Doan \[2022\]](#) and [Doan \[2021\]](#) achieved the $\mathcal{O}(t^{-2/3})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(t^{-2/3})$ convergence rates for the slow iterate with martingale difference noise and Markovian noise, respectively. Further assuming the Lipschitz continuity of ∇H , [Shen and Chen \[2022\]](#) improved this rate to $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$. [Huang et al. \[2024\]](#) obtained the same rate for the more general multi-sequence SA without this additional condition, although requiring a stronger monotonicity assumption than [Shen and Chen \[2022\]](#). An alternative approach to achieve the $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ rate without relying on the Lipschitz condition of ∇H is to leverage an averaging step to improve the estimates of the operators [[Zeng and Doan, 2024](#), [Doan,](#)

2024].² Moreover, concentration bounds have been developed in Borkar and Pattathil [2018] and a functional central limit theorem is provided in Faizal and Borkar [2023].

Decoupled convergence analysis remains largely in the domain of asymptotic results. Under local linearity condition of F and G around (x^*, y^*) and assuming stability, Mokkadem and Pelletier [2006] demonstrated that $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t^{-1/2}(x_t - x^*) \\ \beta_t^{-1/2}(y_t - y^*) \end{pmatrix}$ converges weakly to a normal distribution. Recently, this central limit theorem has been extended to settings with Markovian noise by Hu et al. [2024] and to continuous-time dynamics by Sharrock [2022]. To the best of our knowledge, our work provides the first finite-time (non-asymptotic) decoupled convergence rate for the nonlinear case.

In the absence of the strong monotonicity in the outer loop of (3), two-time-scale SA has been studied within the framework of bilevel optimization [Hong et al., 2023, Zeng et al., 2024].³ Specifically, when the objective function of the outer loop is convex or non-convex, the convergence rate of the slow time scale is $\mathcal{O}(t^{-1/4})$ (function value gap) or $\mathcal{O}(t^{-2/5})$ (square of gradient norm). The latter is improved to $\mathcal{O}(t^{-1/2})$ by assuming either the Lipschitz continuity of ∇H [Shen and Chen, 2022] or a stronger monotonicity condition for the inner loop [Huang et al., 2024].

Beyond our framework The spirit of employing different time scales extends beyond the algorithmic procedure outlined in (2). Yin et al. [2009] delved into the analysis of SA adapting to a Markovian state, which evolves at a faster time scale than the step size. Li et al. [2022] investigated local SGD with local step sizes and effective step sizes decaying at different rates. Here the effective step size accumulates the impact of local updates. Liang et al. [2023] proposed a projected variant of SA, where the projection probability in each iteration decays at a rate distinct from that of the step size. Moreover, two-time-scale methods have also found application in minimax optimization [Heusel et al., 2017, Lin et al., 2020] and multi-agent RL [Chen et al., 2023], among other domains.

B Omitted Details in Section 2

In this section, we present the omitted details in Section 2.

B.1 Further Discussion on the Assumptions

An assumption closely related to Assumption 2.4 is the Hölder continuity of ∇H .

Assumption 2.4† (δ_H -Hölder continuity of ∇H). *We assume that H is differentiable and there exists constants $\tilde{S}_H \geq 0$ and $\delta_H \in [0, 1]$ such that $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$,*

$$\|\nabla H(y_1) - \nabla H(y_2)\| \leq \tilde{S}_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{\delta_H}. \quad (33)$$

Assumptions 2.4 and 2.4 are equivalent, as shown in an upcoming proposition. This proposition extends Berger et al. [2020, Theorem 4.1, Euclidean case] from scalar-valued functions to vector-valued functions. Therefore, in this paper, we do not distinguish between these two assumptions.

²During preparing the current revision of our work [Han et al., 2024], we came across Doan [2024], which achieves the $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ convergence rate by introducing an averaging step and using step sizes of $\Theta(1/t)$ for both iterates. Similarly, Zeng and Doan [2024] applies this technique to a slightly different setting. In contrast, our work focuses on establishing *decoupled convergence*, allowing the step sizes to decay at different rates for greater flexibility.

³Hong et al. [2023] and Zeng et al. [2024] focused on the alternating version of two-time-scale SA. For the comparison between our iteration (2) and the alternating version, see Appendix D.1.

Proposition B.1. Under Assumption 2.4†, Assumption 2.4 holds with $S_H = \frac{\tilde{S}_H}{1+\delta_H}$; under Assumption 2.4, Assumption 2.4† holds with $\tilde{S}_H = 2^{1-\delta_H} \sqrt{1+\delta_H} \left(\frac{1+\delta_H}{\delta_H}\right)^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} S_H$.⁴ For this equivalence, we do not require $\delta_H \geq 0.5$.

To demonstrate how Assumption 2.5 can be guaranteed, we introduce the following standard local linearity assumption.

Assumption 2.5† (Local linearity up to order $(1+\delta_F, 1+\delta_G)$). There exists matrices $A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{21}, A_{22}$ with compatible dimensions, constants $S_{A,F}, S_{A,G} \geq 0$ and $\delta_F, \delta_G \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - x^*) - A_{12}(y - y^*)\| &\leq S_{A,F} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F} \right), \\ \|G(x, y) - A_{21}(x - x^*) - A_{22}(y - y^*)\| &\leq S_{A,G} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_G} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2.5† implies both F and G are differentiable at (x^*, y^*) , leading to $A_{11} = \nabla_x F(x^*, y^*)$, $A_{12} = \nabla_y F(x^*, y^*)$, $A_{21} = \nabla_x G(x^*, y^*)$, $A_{22} = \nabla_y G(x^*, y^*)$. Moreover, assuming Assumption 2.4 holds, the implicit function theorem implies $\nabla H(y^*) = -A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}$. Notably, Assumption 2.5† with $\delta_F = \delta_G = 1$ is the local linearity assumption in Makkadem and Pelletier [2006].

Proposition B.2. Under Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4 and 2.5† as well as $\delta_H \geq \delta_F \vee \delta_G$, Assumption 2.5 holds with parameters

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= A_{11}, \quad B_2 = A_{21}, \quad B_3 = A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}, \\ S_{B,F} &= S_{A,F} + L_F(S_H \vee 2L_H), \quad S_{B,G} = S_{A,G} + L_{G,x}(S_H \vee 2L_H). \end{aligned}$$

The inclusion of the condition $\delta_H \geq \delta_F \vee \delta_G$ in Proposition B.2 stems from the nested structure in Assumption 2.5. This structure is introduced to capture the nested nature of the two-loop procedure in (3), where H is a crucial link between the inner and outer loops. Transforming Assumption 2.5† into a nested form necessitates a more refined smoothness condition on H to preserve local linearity. Additionally, in Proposition B.2, B_3 equals the Schur complement of A_{11} in the matrix $(A_{11}, A_{12}; A_{21}, A_{22})$.

Finally, we give the detailed definition of the constants in Assumption 2.7.

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_1 &= \frac{\mu_F}{4L_F^2} \wedge \frac{1}{12\mu_F}, \quad \iota_2 = \frac{\mu_G}{L_{G,x}^2} \wedge \frac{1}{14\mu_G}, \quad \kappa = \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{(28d_x \vee 200L_{G,y})L_H L_{G,x}} \wedge \frac{\mu_F}{5\mu_G}, \\ \rho &= \frac{\mu_F}{(16d_x \vee 200)L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

As long as $\beta_t/\alpha_t = o(1)$ and $\beta_t = o(1)$, e.g., $\alpha_t \sim \alpha_0 t^{-a}$ and $\beta_t \sim \beta_0 \sim t^{-b}$, Assumption 2.7 will hold for sufficiently large t , regardless of the initial values α_0 and β_0 . However, if β_t/α_t remains constant, α_0 and β_0 must be appropriately chosen to satisfy Assumption 2.7. This comparison highlights the advantage of using different time scales over the single-time-scale case in terms of flexible parameter selection.

⁴We make the contention that $\left(\frac{1+\delta_H}{\delta_H}\right)^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} = 1$ if $\delta_H = 0$.

B.2 Proof of Proposition B.1

Proof of Proposition B.1. The proof is divided into two parts. The first part is straightforward while the second part follows a similar procedure as the proof of Berger et al. [2020, Theorem 4.1]

Assumption 2.4† \implies **Assumption 2.4**. For any unit vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, we define $f(y) = \langle e, H(y) \rangle$. Then $f'(y) = \nabla H(y)^\top e$. By the mean-value theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(y_1) - f(y_2) - \langle f'(y_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle &= \int_0^1 \langle f'(y_2 + t(y_1 - y_2)) - f'(y_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle dt \\
&\leq \|y_1 - y_2\| \int_0^1 \|f'(y_2 + t(y_1 - y_2)) - f'(y_2)\| dt \\
&\leq \|y_1 - y_2\| \int_0^1 \|\nabla H(y_2 + t(y_1 - y_2)) - \nabla H(y_2)\| dt \\
&\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \tilde{S}_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H} \int_0^1 t^{\delta_H} dt \\
&\leq \frac{\tilde{S}_H}{1 + \delta_H} \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of f , we have

$$\langle e, H(y_1) - H(y_2) - \nabla H(y_2)(y_1 - y_2) \rangle \leq \frac{\tilde{S}_H}{1 + \delta_H} \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H}.$$

Since e is an arbitrary unit vector, Assumption 2.4 holds with $S_H = \frac{\tilde{S}_H}{1 + \delta_H}$.

Assumption 2.4 \implies **Assumption 2.4†**. Under Assumption 2.4, we have for any $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ and any unit vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, it holds that

$$-S_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H} \leq \langle e, H(y_1) - H(y_2) - \nabla H(y_2)(y_1 - y_2) \rangle \leq S_H \|y_1 - y_2\|^{1+\delta_H}. \quad (35)$$

Now we fix two arbitrary points \bar{y}_1 and $\bar{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ with $\bar{y}_1 \neq \bar{y}_2$. Without loss of generality, we assume $H(\bar{y}_1) = 0$ and $\nabla H(\bar{y}_1) = 0$. Otherwise, we could replace $H(y)$ by $\tilde{H}(y) =: H(y) - H(\bar{y}_1) - \nabla H(\bar{y}_1)(y - \bar{y}_1)$ in (35). For any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, setting $(y_1, y_2) = (z_1, \bar{y}_1)$ and (z_1, \bar{y}_2) in (35) yields

$$-S_H \|z_1 - \bar{y}_1\|^{1+\delta_H} \leq \langle e, H(z_1) \rangle \leq \langle e, H(\bar{y}_2) + \nabla H(\bar{y}_2)(z_1 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle + S_H \|z_1 - \bar{y}_2\|^{1+\delta_H}. \quad (36)$$

Similarly, setting $(y_1, y_2) = (z_2, \bar{y}_1)$ and (z_2, \bar{y}_2) in (35) yields

$$S_H \|z_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^{1+\delta_H} \geq \langle e, H(z_2) \rangle \geq \langle e, H(\bar{y}_2) + \nabla H(\bar{y}_2)(z_2 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle - S_H \|z_2 - \bar{y}_2\|^{1+\delta_H}. \quad (37)$$

Subtracting the rightmost and leftmost sides of (36) from (37), we obtain

$$\langle e, \nabla H(\bar{y}_2)(z_2 - z_1) \rangle \leq S_H \left(\|z_1 - \bar{y}_1\|^{1+\delta_H} + \|z_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^{1+\delta_H} + \|z_1 - \bar{y}_2\|^{1+\delta_H} + \|z_2 - \bar{y}_2\|^{1+\delta_H} \right).$$

Let $\tilde{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ be an arbitrary unit vector, $z_1 = \frac{\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 - \alpha \tilde{e}}{2}$ and $z_2 = \frac{\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \alpha \tilde{e}}{2}$ with α a positive constant determined later. Then we have

$$\alpha \langle e, \nabla H(\bar{y}_2) \tilde{e} \rangle \leq 2S_H \left(\left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 + \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^{1+\delta_H} + \left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 - \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^{1+\delta_H} \right). \quad (38)$$

Since the function $h(x) = x^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}}$ is concave, Jensen's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 + \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^{1+\delta_H} + \left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 - \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^{1+\delta_H} &\leq 2^{\frac{1-\delta_H}{2}} \left(\left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 + \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^2 + \left\| \frac{\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1 - \alpha \tilde{e}}{2} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1-\delta_H}{2}} \left(\frac{\|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^2 + \alpha^2}{2} \right)^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the last step uses the parallelogram identity. Plugging (39) into (38), dividing both sides by α and setting $\alpha = k \|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1\|$, we obtain

$$\langle e, \nabla H(\bar{y}_2) \tilde{e} \rangle \leq 2^{1-\delta_H} S_H \frac{(1+k^2)^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}}}{k} \|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^{\delta_H}.$$

If $\delta_H = 0$, letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\langle e, \nabla H(\bar{y}_2) \tilde{e} \rangle \leq 2^{1-\delta_H} S_H \|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^{\delta_H}.$$

If $\delta_H > 0$, setting $k = 1/\sqrt{\delta_H}$ yields

$$\langle e, \nabla H(\bar{y}_2) \tilde{e} \rangle \leq 2^{1-\delta_H} S_H \sqrt{1+\delta_H} \left(\frac{1+\delta_H}{\delta_H} \right)^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} \|\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1\|^{\delta_H}.$$

Since e and \tilde{e} are two arbitrary unit vectors and $\nabla H(\bar{y}_1) = 0$, summarizing the two cases shows that Assumption 2.4[†] holds with $\tilde{S}_H = 2^{1-\delta_H} \sqrt{1+\delta_H} \left(\frac{1+\delta_H}{\delta_H} \right)^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} S_H$. \square

B.3 Proof of Proposition B.2

We first introduce some important facts that can be proved by the definition of differentiability or the implicit function theorem.

Fact B.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.5[†] holds.*

(i) *Both F and G are differentiable at (x^*, y^*) and*

$$A_{11} = \nabla_x F(x^*, y^*), \quad A_{12} = \nabla_y F(x^*, y^*), \quad A_{21} = \nabla_x G(x^*, y^*), \quad A_{22} = \nabla_y G(x^*, y^*).$$

(ii) *Under Assumptions 2.4, $\nabla H(y^*) = -A_{11}^{-1} A_{12}$.*

(iii) *Under Assumptions 2.3 and 2.4, $\frac{A_{11} + A_{11}^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_F I$ ⁵ and $\frac{A_{11,c} + A_{11,c}^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_G I$ with $A_{11,c} := A_{22} - A_{21} A_{11}^{-1} A_{12}$ denoting the Schur complement of A_{11} in the matrix $(A_{11}, A_{12}; A_{21}, A_{22})$.*

⁵The condition $\frac{A_{11} + A_{11}^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_F I$ implies that every eigenvalue (in the complex field) of A_{11} has a strictly positive real part and thus A_{11} is non-singular.

Proof of Proposition B.2. Note that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 together with Fact B.1 imply that $\|A_{11}\| \leq L_F$ and $\|A_{21}\| \leq L_{G,x}$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - H(y))\| &\leq \|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - x^*) - A_{12}(y - y^*)\| \\
&\quad + \|A_{11}(H(y) - x^* + A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}(y - y^*))\| \\
&= \|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - x^*) - A_{12}(y - y^*)\| \\
&\quad + \|A_{11}(H(y) - H(y^*) - \nabla H(y^*)(y - y^*))\| \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} S_{A,F} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \\
&\quad + L_F S_H \|y - y^*\| \cdot \min \left\{ \|y - y^*\|^{\delta_H}, R_H \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) also uses (12) and $R_H = \frac{2L_H}{S_H}$. If $\|y - y^*\| \leq 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - H(y))\| &\leq S_{A,F} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) + L_F S_H \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_H} \\
&\leq S_{A,F} \|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + (S_{A,F} + L_F S_H) \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F}.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - H(y))\| &\leq S_{A,F} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) + 2L_F L_H \|y - y^*\| \\
&\leq S_{A,F} \|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + (S_{A,F} + 2L_F L_H) \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the two cases yields

$$\|F(x, y) - A_{11}(x - H(y))\| \leq S_{A,F} \|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_F} + (S_{A,F} + L_F \max\{S_H, 2L_H\}) \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_F}. \quad (40)$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|G(x, y) - A_{21}(x - H(y)) - (A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12})(y - y^*)\| \\
&\leq \|G(x, y) - A_{21}(x - x^*) - A_{22}(y - y^*)\| + \|A_{21}(H(y) - x^* + A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}(y - y^*))\| \\
&\leq S_{A,G} \left(\|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_G} \right) + L_{G,x} S_H \|y - y^*\| \cdot \min\{\|y - y^*\|^{\delta_H}, R_H\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (40), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|G(x, y) - A_{21}(x - H(y)) - (A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12})(y - y^*)\| \\
&\leq S_{A,G} \|x - x^*\|^{1+\delta_G} + (S_{A,G} + L_{G,x} \max\{S_H, 2L_H\}) \|y - y^*\|^{1+\delta_G}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the near linearity conditions in Assumption 2.5 follow with $B_1 = A_{11}$, $B_2 = A_{21}$, $B_3 = A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}$, $S_{B,F} = S_{A,F} + L_F(S_H \vee 2L_H)$ and $S_{B,G} = S_{A,G} + L_{G,x}(S_H \vee 2L_H)$. Furthermore, all bounds on B_1, B_2, B_3 follows naturally from Fact B.1.

Finally, we check the lower bounds for $\frac{B_1+B_1^\top}{2}$ and $\frac{B_3+B_3^\top}{2}$. Since the proof idea is the same, we take the former as an example. By Assumption 2.3 and (40), it follows that

$$\mu_F \|x - x^*\|^2 \leq \langle x - x^*, F(x, y^*) \rangle \leq \langle x - x^*, B_1(x - x^*) \rangle + S_{B,F} \|x - x^*\|^{2+\delta_F}$$

$$= \left\langle x - x^*, \frac{B_1 + B_1^\top}{2} (x - x^*) \right\rangle + S_{B,F} \|x - x^*\|^{2+\delta_F}.$$

Dividing $\|x - x^*\|^2$ on the both sides of the last inequality and letting x converge to x^* along the direction v , we then have that $\mu_F \leq v^\top \frac{B_1 + B_1^\top}{2} v$ for any unit one vector v , which implies that $\frac{B_1 + B_1^\top}{2} \succeq \mu_F I$. \square

C Motivating Applications

In this subsection, we present three example applications to illustrate the satisfaction of the introduced assumptions. In these examples, our primary focus is on evaluating the performance of the slow iterate y_t , with the fast iterate x_t playing a secondary role as an auxiliary sequence.

Assumption C.1. (i) Assume f is a μ -strongly convex and L -smooth and $x_o^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} f(x)$.

(ii) f has a S -smooth Hessian matrix that is, $\|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(y)\| \leq S\|x - y\|$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$.

Example C.1 (SGD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging). *SGD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging has been introduced in Section 1. Suppose that we want to minimize a function f satisfying Assumption C.1(i) with access only to the noisy observations of the true gradients. To find the true minimizer x_o^* , the stochastic gradient method (SGD) [Robbins and Monro, 1951] iteratively updates the iterate x_t by (4a). In order to improve the convergence of SGD, an additional averaging step (4b) is often used [Polyak and Juditsky, 1992, Ruppert, 1988] Obviously, these two updates are a special case of the nonlinear two-time-scale SA in (2) with $F(x, y) = \nabla f(x)$, $G(x, y) = y - x$ and $H(y) \equiv x^*$. It follows that $G(H(y), y) = y - x^*$ and $y^* = x^* = x_o^*$. One can check that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.5 hold with $L_H = S_H = S_{B,G} = 0$, $L_F = L$, $\mu_F = \mu$, $L_{G,x} = L_{G,y} = \mu_G = 1$, $S_{B,F} = S$ and $\delta_F = 1$.*

Now we contextualize this example within the framework of (3). In the inner loop, our goal is to reduce the norm of $\nabla f(x)$, while in the outer loop, we strive to approach x_o^* . Under Assumption C.1(i), the two objectives coincide. Moulines and Bach [2011] have demonstrated that $\mathbb{E}\|x_t - x^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$ and $\mathbb{E}\|y_t - y^*\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/t)$ as long as $\alpha \geq 1/2$. Given the improved convergence rate of the averaged sequence, our primary interest lies in the slow iterate y_t .

Example C.2 (SGD with momentum). *Stochastic heavy ball (SHB) is a variant of SGD based on momentum and adaptive step sizes and has been shown to be effective [Gadat et al., 2018]. A “normalized” version of SHB [Gupal and Bazhenov, 1972, Gitman et al., 2019] iteratively runs*

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= x_t - \alpha_t(x_t - \nabla f(y_t) - \xi_t), \\ y_{t+1} &= y_t - \beta_t x_t. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Here one should interpret x_t as a (stochastic) search direction that is defined to be a combination of the current stochastic gradient $\nabla f(y_t) + \xi_t$ and past search direction x_t .⁶ Under Assumption C.1, these two updates are a special case of the nonlinear two-time-scale SA in (2) with $F(x, y) = x - \nabla f(y)$, $G(x, y) = x$ and $H(y) = \nabla f(y)$. It follows that $G(H(y), y) = \nabla f(y)$, $y^* = x_o^*$ and $x^* = 0$. One can check that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.5 hold with $L_H = L_{G,y} = L$, $L_F = L_{G,x} = 1$, $\mu_F = 1$, $\mu_G = \mu$, $\delta_H = 1$, $S_H = S/2$, $S_{B,F} = 0$, $S_{B,G} = S$ and $\delta_G = 1$.

⁶Here we employ a slightly different update rule for y_t to be consistent with Doan [2022]. As analyzed in Appendix D.1, this modification makes no difference in terms of convergence rates.

Now, we integrate this example into the framework of (3). In the inner loop, our objective is to approximate the gradient of a fixed y , while in the outer loop, we aim to locate the stationary point (also the minimizer) x_o^* . Thus, our primary focus lies in the slow iterate y_t .

The next application is bilevel optimization, a topic with a long history in the optimization literature [Bracken and McGill, 1973, Colson et al., 2007]. With some abuse of notation, we examine the following (unconstrained) bilevel optimization problem:

$$\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \ell(y) := g(\tilde{x}^*(y), y) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{x}^*(y) := \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} f(x, y), \quad (42)$$

where $f(x, y)$ is the *inner objective function* and $\ell(y)$ is the *outer objective function*. We refer to $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} f(x, y)$ as the *inner problem* and $\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \ell(y)$ as the *outer problem*.

Assumption C.2. (i) For each $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, $f(\cdot, y)$ is λ_1 -strongly convex w.r.t. x .

(ii) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, $\langle \nabla \ell(y), y - y_o^* \rangle \geq \lambda_0 \|y - y_o^*\|^2$, where $\lambda_0 > 0$ and $y_o^* = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \ell(y)$.

(iii) $g, \nabla g, \nabla f$ are $\nabla^2 f$ are Lipschitz continuous.

Assumption C.2 is standard in the literature [Ghadimi and Wang, 2018, Chen et al., 2021, Shen and Chen, 2022]. Under Assumption C.2, we have

$$\nabla \ell(y) = \nabla_y g(\tilde{x}^*(y), y) - \nabla_{yx}^2 f(\tilde{x}^*(y), y) [\nabla_{xx}^2 f(\tilde{x}^*(y), y)]^{-1} \nabla_x g(\tilde{x}^*(y), y)$$

and the solution of the inner problem is unique for any y . Thus $\tilde{x}^*(y)$ is well-defined.

Example C.3 (Stochastic bilevel optimization). Suppose that we want to solve the problem (42) with access only to the noisy observations of the true gradients and Hessians. To employ two-time-scale SA (2), we first give the definitions of $F(x, y)$ and $G(x, y)$:

$$F(x, y) = \nabla_x f(x, y), \quad G(x, y) = \nabla_y g(x, y) - \nabla_{yx}^2 f(x, y) [\nabla_{xx}^2 f(x, y)]^{-1} \nabla_x g(x, y), \quad (43)$$

where $G(x, y)$ is a surrogate of $\nabla \ell(y)$ by replacing $\tilde{x}^*(y)$ with x . It follows that $H(y) = \tilde{x}^*(y)$ and $G(H(y), y) = \nabla \ell(y)$. One can apply the following approximation method [Shen and Chen, 2022, Hong et al., 2023]:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= x_t - \alpha_t h_F^t = x_t - \alpha_t (F(x_t, y_t) + \xi_t), \\ y_{t+1} &= y_t - \beta_t h_G^t = y_t - \beta_t (G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where h_F^t and h_G^t are estimations of $F(x_t, y_t)$ and $G(x_t, y_t)$, respectively.⁷ For their explicit forms, please refer to Hong et al. [2023]. Under Assumption C.2, we have $y^* = y_o^*$, $x^* = \tilde{x}^*(y_o^*)$, and Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4 hold with $\mu_F = \lambda_1$, $\mu_G = \lambda_0$, $\delta_H = 1$, and the remaining constants depending on the Lipschitz constants in Assumption C.2 (see Shen and Chen, 2022, Lemma 1). Assumption 2.5 can also be guaranteed under higher-order regular conditions.

Given the two-level structure inherent in bilevel optimization, it is convenient to contextualize this example within the framework of (3), with the outer problem being the ultimate goal. More discussion is deferred to Appendix D.2.

⁷In Hong et al. [2023], h_G^t is in fact an estimation of $F(x_{t+1}, y_t)$. For the comparison between the two versions, see Appendix D.1.

D Extensions

In this section, we discuss two variants of two-time-scale SA (2) inspired by the applications in Appendix C.

D.1 Alternating Two-Time-Scale SA

As mentioned in Examples C.2 and C.3, there are some scenarios where the two iterates are updated in an *alternating* way [Hong et al., 2023, Zeng et al., 2024], i.e.,

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha_t(F(x_t, y_t) + \xi_t), \quad (45a)$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t - \beta_t(G(x_{t+1}, y_t) + \psi_t). \quad (45b)$$

The SHB method in Gitman et al. [2019] is a special case of (45). In the context of Example C.2, it takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= x_t - \alpha_t(x_t - \nabla f(y_t) - \xi_t), \\ y_{t+1} &= y_t - \beta_t x_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

In comparison, the original (2) updates the two iterates *simultaneously*. Now we demonstrate that the two versions are approximately equivalent, provided the step size is sufficiently small. We could rewrite (45b) as

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t+1} &= y_t - \beta_t(G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t) + \Lambda_t, \text{ with} \\ \|\Lambda_t\| &= \|\beta_t(G(x_t, y_t) - G(x_{t+1}, y_t))\| \leq \alpha_t \beta_t L_{G,x} (\|F(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\xi_t\|). \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound of Λ_t follows from the Lipschitz condition (9) and the update rule of x_t (45a). Then the update rule of the residual sequence $\hat{y}_t = y_t - y^*$ takes the form

$$\hat{y}_{t+1} = \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) + \beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t + \Lambda_t. \quad (47)$$

By comparing (47) with the simultaneous version's update rule (20), the only difference lies in the term Λ_t . In our step size selection in 3.1, we always have $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, Λ_t has significantly smaller magnitudes compared to other terms. Replacing (20) with (47) would introduce only negligible higher-order terms in the one-step descent lemmas related to y_t (i.e., Lemmas E.2, F.3, F.4 and F.6). Such minor modifications would not affect the convergence rate.

D.2 Biased Noise in Bilevel Optimization

In Example C.3, the form of $F(x, y)$ suggests that the estimator h_F^t is expected to be unbiased. However, h_G^t is generally biased due to the inversion of the Hessian matrix in $G(x, y)$. It implies the requirement $\mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0$ in Assumption E.1 may not be satisfied strictly. However, we claim that: *If there exists a constant $c_b > 0$ such that $\|\mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t]\|^2 \leq c_b \beta_t$ for all $t \geq 0$,*⁸ *the bias of the noise would not affect the convergence rate.*

To explain its rationale, we decompose the noise of the slow iterate as $\psi_t = \psi_{t,1} + \psi_{t,2}$, where $\psi_{t,1} = \psi_t - \mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t]$ represents the martingale difference part, and $\psi_{t,2} = \mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t]$ is the bias. Importantly, the bias term $\psi_{t,2}$ satisfies $\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \leq c_b \beta_t$. Then the update rule of \hat{y}_t becomes

$$\hat{y}_{t+1} = \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) + \beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_{t,1} + \beta_t \psi_{t,2}. \quad (48)$$

⁸This condition is inspired by Shen and Chen [2022, Assumption 3].

Influence of the bias on the one-step descent lemma of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$. We square the right-hand side of (48) and compare it with the square of the right-hand side of (20) (see Eq. 62 in Appendix E.2). The additional terms are $\beta_t\langle\hat{y}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ and $\beta_t^2\langle A, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ for $A = -G(x_t, y_t)$, $-\psi_{t,1}$ or $\psi_{t,2}$. Analyzing the terms in the original one-step descent lemma, e.g., Lemma E.2 or F.3, we observe that the coefficients are of the order $\Theta(\beta_t)$ or $\Theta(\beta_t^2)$. Thus, the term $\beta_t^2\langle A, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ can only alter the constant factors in terms $-\mu_G\beta_t\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$, $L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ and $\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2$ in Lemma E.2, and the terms $-\frac{2\mu_G\beta_t}{3}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$, $2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ and $\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2$ in Lemma F.3. Regarding the term $\beta_t\langle\hat{y}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$, we could apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For example, we have $|\beta_t\langle\hat{y}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle| \leq \frac{\beta_t}{4}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \beta_t\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \leq \frac{\beta_t}{4}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_b\beta_t^2$. Plugging this into Lemma E.2 (or F.3) only modifies the constant factors in terms $-\mu_G\beta_t\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ and $\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2$ (or $-\frac{2\mu_G\beta_t}{3}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ and $\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2$).

Influence of the bias on the one-step descent lemma of $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\|$. Recall that the update rule of \hat{x}_t is (19). To derive the update rule of $\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top$, replacing (20) with (48) induces additional terms $\beta_t\langle\hat{x}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$, $\beta_t\langle H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}), \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ and $-\alpha_t\beta_t\langle F(x_t, y_t) + \xi_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$. By examining the existing terms in Lemma F.4, we could conclude that $-\alpha_t\beta_t\langle F(x_t, y_t) + \xi_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ only changes the constant factors in $\beta_t L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ and $\Sigma_{12}\alpha_t\beta_t$. The terms $\beta_t\langle\hat{x}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ and $\beta_t\langle H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}), \psi_{t,2}\rangle$ can also be controlled by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_t\langle\hat{x}_t, \psi_{t,2}\rangle| &\leq \frac{L_{G,x}\beta_t}{2}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t}{2L_{G,x}}\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \leq \frac{L_{G,x}\beta_t}{2}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_b\beta_t^2}{2L_{G,x}}, \\ |\beta_t\langle H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}), \psi_{t,2}\rangle| &\leq \frac{\beta_t}{2}\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t}{2L_{G,x}}\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{L_H^2\beta_t^3}{2}\|G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t\|^2 + \frac{c_b\beta_t^2}{2L_{G,x}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the Lipschitz continuity of H in (6) and the update rule of y_t in (2b). Therefore, substituting the above inequalities into Lemma F.4 only affects the constant factors in $\beta_t L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$, $\beta_t c_{xy,1}^{de}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$, $c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2$.

The analysis for other lemmas, e.g., Lemma F.6, follows from a similar argument. Therefore, as long as $\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \leq c_b\beta_t$, the bias introduced by $\psi_{t,2}$ only impacts the constant factors in terms $-\frac{3\mu_G\beta_t}{2}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4$, $18L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$, $20L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$, $18\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ and $28\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2$ in Lemma F.6, while the orders of these terms remain unchanged. Consequently, the convergence rates in Theorems E.1 and F.1 remain unaffected.

To ensure $\|\psi_{t,2}\|^2 \leq c_b\beta_t$, we could use i.i.d. samples to estimate the inversion of the Hessian matrix $[\nabla_{xx}^2 f(x_t, y_t)]^{-1}$ in the expression of $G(x_t, y_t)$. The bias then decays exponentially with the number of samples, requiring only $\mathcal{O}(\log \beta_t^{-1})$ samples in each iteration. For the details, please refer to Ghadimi and Wang [2018, Lemma 3.2] and Hong et al. [2023, Lemma 2.4].

E Convergence Rates without Local Linearity

In this section, we focus on the convergence rates of nonlinear two-time-scale SA without imposing local linearity on F and G , i.e., without Assumption 2.5. For Assumption 2.4, we consider the more general case $\delta_H \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, we only need the following weaker version of Assumptions 2.6 and 2.7 throughout this section.

Assumption E.1 (Martingale difference noise with bounded variance). *The sequences of random variables $\{\xi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{\psi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ are martingale difference sequences satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\psi_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \Gamma_{11}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\psi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \Gamma_{22}. \quad (49)$$

Assumption E.2 (Conditions on step sizes). *The step sizes $\{\alpha_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{\beta_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- *Constant bounds: $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1, \beta_t \leq \iota_2, \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa, \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \leq \rho$ with*

$$\iota_1 = \frac{\mu_F}{4L_F^2}, \quad \iota_2 = \frac{\mu_G}{L_{G,y}^2}, \quad \kappa = \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{28L_H L_{G,x}(1 \vee L_{G,y})} \wedge \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}, \quad \rho = \frac{\mu_F}{16L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2}.$$

- *Growth conditions: $1 \leq \frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} \leq 1 + (\frac{\mu_F}{4} \alpha_t) \wedge (\frac{\mu_G}{8} \beta_t)$ and $1 \leq \frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G}{32} \beta_t$ for any $t \geq 1$.*

We first give the formal statement of inequalities (21) and (22).

Lemma E.1 (One-step descent lemma of the fast iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4, E.1 and E.2 hold. For any $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,2} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where $\{c_{x,i}\}_{i \in [4]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (52).

Lemma E.2 (One-step descent lemma of the slow iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4, E.1 and E.2 hold. For any $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2L_{G,x} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_G \beta_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

By combining Lemmas E.1 and E.2 and using carefully designed Lyapunov functions, we can achieve the following convergence results.

Theorem E.1 (Convergence rates without local linearity). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4, E.1 and E.2 hold.*

- (i) *If the step sizes satisfy $\sum_{t=1}^\infty \beta_t = \infty$, $\sum_{t=1}^\infty \alpha_t^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_{t=1}^\infty \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} < \infty$, then as t goes to infinity,*

$$\hat{x}_t = x_t - H(y_t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y}_t = y_t - y^* \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

- (ii) *If $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$ is non-increasing in t , then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \left(3\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{7L_H L_{G,y} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^2}{L_{G,x}}\right) + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t \\ &\quad + c_{x,5} \beta_t + c_{x,6} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + c_{x,7} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \left(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^2 + \frac{2L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2}{7L_H L_{G,y}}\right) + \frac{128L_{G,x}^2\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F\mu_G^2}\alpha_t \\ &\quad + c_{y,1}\beta_t + c_{y,2}\frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{c_{x,i}\}_{i \in [7] \setminus [4]}$ and $\{c_{y,i}\}_{i \in [2]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (68) and (69). If $\delta_H \geq 0.5$, then $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$.

The details proofs are Lemmas E.1, E.2 and Theorem E.1 are given in Appendices E.1, E.2 and E.3, respectively.

E.1 Proof of Lemma E.1

Proof of Lemma E.1. We first present the specific forms of the constants.

$$c_{x,1} = 4L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2, \quad c_{x,2} = 7L_H L_{G,y}, \quad c_{x,3} = 2L_H^2 \Gamma_{22}, \quad c_{x,4} = \frac{16S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F}. \quad (52)$$

Recall that $\hat{x}_t = x_t - H(y_t)$. We then consider

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{t+1} &= x_{t+1} - H(y_{t+1}) = x_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) - \alpha_t \xi_t - H(y_{t+1}) \\ &= \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) - \alpha_t \xi_t + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &= \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) - \alpha_t \xi_t + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\|^2 \\ &= \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) - \alpha_t \xi_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle - 2\alpha_t \langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), \xi_t \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

We then analyze each term on the right-hand side of (54).

For the first term, noting that $F(H(y_t), y_t) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 &= \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 - 2\alpha_t \langle \hat{x}_t - H(y_t), F(x_t, y_t) \rangle + \|\alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\ &= \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 - 2\alpha_t \langle \hat{x}_t, F(x_t, y_t) - F(H(y_t), y_t) \rangle \\ &\quad + \alpha_t^2 \|F(x_t, y_t) - F(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 - 2\mu_F \alpha_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_F^2 \alpha_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\ &= (1 - 2\mu_F \alpha_t + L_F^2 \alpha_t^2) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{7\mu_F \alpha_t}{4}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the inequality uses strong monotone and Lipschitz continuity of F in (10) and (7) respectively.

For the second term, recall that $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{x_0, y_0, \xi_0, \psi_0, \xi_1, \psi_1, \dots, \xi_{t-1}, \psi_{t-1}\}$. We then take the conditional expectation of the second term on the right-hand side of (54) w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t and using Assumption E.1 to have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) - \alpha_t \xi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] + 2\alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&\leq 2L_H^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\beta_t G(x_t, y_t) - \beta_t \psi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] + 2\alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&\leq 2L_H^2 \beta_t^2 \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + 2L_H^2 \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\psi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] + 2\alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&\leq 2L_H^2 \beta_t^2 \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + 2L_H^2 \beta_t^2 \Gamma_{22} + 2\alpha_t^2 \Gamma_{11} \\
&\leq 4L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\beta_t^2 L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} + 2\alpha_t^2 \Gamma_{11},
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where the last inequality uses the following inequality that depends on the fact $G(H(y^*), y^*) = 0$ and Assumption 2.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G(x_t, y_t)\| &\leq \|G(x_t, y_t) - G(H(y_t), y_t)\| + \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(H(y^*), y^*)\| \\
&\leq L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\| + L_{G,y} \|\hat{y}_t\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

and thus

$$\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \leq 2L_{G,x}^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,y}^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2.$$

For the last term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle &= \underbrace{\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), \nabla H(y_t)(y_{t+1} - y_t) \rangle}_{\spadesuit_1} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), \nabla H(y_t)(y_t - y_{t+1}) + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle}_{\spadesuit_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

For one thing, Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4 imply that $\|\nabla H(y_t)\| \leq L_H$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\spadesuit_1 \mid \mathcal{F}_t] &= \beta_t \langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), \nabla H(y_t) G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\
&\leq \beta_t L_H \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\| \|G(x_t, y_t)\| \\
&\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F L_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|G(x_t, y_t)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

For another thing, by Assumption 2.4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla H(y_t)(y_t - y_{t+1}) + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\| &\leq S_H \|y_t - y_{t+1}\| \cdot \min \left\{ \|y_t - y_{t+1}\|^{\delta_H}, R_H \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} S_H \beta_t (\|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\psi_t\|) \cdot \min \left\{ \beta_t^{\delta_H} (\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{\delta_H} + \|\psi_t\|^{\delta_H}), R_H \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} S_H \beta_t (\|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\psi_t\|) \cdot \left(\min \left\{ \beta_t^{\delta_H} \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{\delta_H}, R_H \right\} + \min \left\{ \beta_t^{\delta_H} \|\psi_t\|^{\delta_H}, R_H \right\} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} S_H \left(2\beta_t \|G(x_t, y_t)\| R_H + \frac{1}{1 + \delta_H} \beta_t^{1 + \delta_H} \|\psi_t\|^{1 + \delta_H} + \frac{\delta_H}{1 + \delta_H} \min \left\{ \beta_t^{\delta_H} \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{\delta_H}, R_H \right\}^{\frac{1 + \delta_H}{\delta_H}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \beta_t^{1 + \delta_H} \|\psi_t\|^{1 + \delta_H} \right) \\
&\leq S_H \left(\frac{2 + 3\delta_H}{1 + \delta_H} \beta_t \|G(x_t, y_t)\| R_H + \frac{2 + \delta_H}{1 + \delta_H} \beta_t^{1 + \delta_H} \|\psi_t\|^{1 + \delta_H} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where (a) uses $(a + b)^{\delta_H} \leq a^{\delta_H} + b^{\delta_H}$ for any $a, b > 0$ and $\delta_H \in [0, 1]$, (b) uses the inequality that $\min\{a + b, c\} \leq \min\{a, c\} + \min\{b, c\}$ for any non-negative a, b, c , and (c) follows from Young's inequality $ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$ for any $a, b, p, q \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Note that Jensen's inequality implies $\mathbb{E}[\|\phi_t\|^{1+\delta_H} | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\|\phi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t])^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \leq \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla H(y_t)(y_t - y_{t+1}) + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\| | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 6L_H\beta_t \|G(x_t, y_t)\| + 4S_H\beta_t^{1+\delta_H}\Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\spadesuit_2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\| \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla H(y_t)(y_t - y_{t+1}) + H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\| | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \left(6L_H\beta_t \|G(x_t, y_t)\| + 4S_H\beta_t^{1+\delta_H}\Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combing these two inequalities, we then obtain the preceding relation

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\leq 7L_H\beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|G(x_t, y_t)\| + 4S_H \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} 7L_H\beta_t \left(L_{G,x} \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| \right) + 4S_H \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \\ &\leq 7L_H\beta_t \left(L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| \right) + 4S_H \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \\ &\leq 7L_H\beta_t \left(L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| \right) + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{16S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \\ &\leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 7L_H L_{G,y} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \frac{16S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where the last inequality uses the relation obtained from the choices of step sizes $7L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4}$.

Combing the three bounds in (55), (56), and (60), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{7\mu_F \alpha_t}{4} \right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \\ &\quad + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 7L_H L_{G,y} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \frac{16S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \\ &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 7L_H L_{G,y} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| \\ &\quad + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + 2L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 + \frac{16S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \\ &= (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{x,2} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t \mu_F} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + 2\alpha_t^2 \Gamma_{11} \\ &\quad + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses the fact that $4L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4}$ and the constants are defined as the last inequality uses the notations in (52). \square

E.2 Proof of Lemma E.2

Proof of Lemma E.2. Recall that $\hat{y} = y - y^*$. Using (2) we consider

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y}_{t+1} &= y_{t+1} - y^* = y_t - y^* - \beta_t G(x_t, y_t) - \beta_t \psi_t \\ &= \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) + \beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t,\end{aligned}\quad (61)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &= \|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 + \|\beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\beta_t \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), \psi_t \rangle.\end{aligned}\quad (62)$$

We next analyze each term on the right-hand side of (62).

For the first term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 &= \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 - 2\beta_t \hat{y}_t^T G(H(y_t), y_t) + \beta_t^2 \|G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 - 2\mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(H(y^*), y^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - 2\mu_G \beta_t) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2,\end{aligned}\quad (63)$$

where the first inequality also uses $G(H(y^*), y^*) = 0$ and the last inequality uses the relation $L_{G,y}^2 \beta_t^2 \leq \mu_G \beta_t$.

For the second term, taking the conditional expectation on its both sides w.r.t \mathcal{F}_t and using Assumption E.1 and 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\|\beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ = \beta_t^2 \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\psi_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \leq L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \Gamma_{22}.\end{aligned}\quad (64)$$

For the third term, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}2\beta_t \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\ \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} 2\beta_t \|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\| \cdot L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\| \\ \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} 2L_{G,x} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_G \beta_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|.\end{aligned}\quad (65)$$

Finally, taking the conditional expectation of (62) w.r.t \mathcal{F}_t and using (63)–(65) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \leq (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \Gamma_{22} + 2L_{G,x} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_G \beta_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|,$$

which concludes our proof. \square

E.3 Proof of Theorem E.1

Before proving Theorem E.1, we first present a refined one-step descent lemma by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the cross term $\mathcal{O}(\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|)$.

Lemma E.3 (One-step descent lemma). *Under Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4, E.1 and E.2, it follows that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2 \beta_t^2}{2\mu_F \alpha_t} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}, \quad (66)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{2L_{G,x}^2}{\mu_G} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2, \quad (67)$$

where $c_{x,2}$ and $c_{x,3}$ are defined in Lemma E.1.

Proof of Lemma E.3. By Lemma E.1, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{x,2} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_F \alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \left(c_{x,1} \beta_t^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2 \beta_t^2 (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t)}{2\mu_F \alpha_t}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2 \beta_t^2}{2\mu_F \alpha_t} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $2c_{x,1} - c_{x,2}^2 \leq 0$. Similarly, by Lemma E.2, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,x} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_G \beta_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\| + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \left(L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 + \frac{2L_{G,x}^2 (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \beta_t}{\mu_G}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{2L_{G,x}^2}{\mu_G} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

We then complete the proof. \square

Lemma E.3 is akin to Doan [2022, Lemmas 1 and 2]. While there are minor differences, the key distinction lies in the incorporation of δ_H in the term $\mathcal{O}(\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}/\alpha_t)$, which is $\mathcal{O}(\beta_t^2/\alpha_t)$ in Doan [2022]. Combining (66) and (67) through the careful construction of Lyapunov functions, we can establish both almost sure convergence and L_2 -convergence.

Proof of Theorem E.1. We first present the specific forms of the constants:

$$c_{y,1} = \frac{8\Gamma_{22}(2L_H L_{G,x} + 3L_{G,y})}{3\mu_G L_{G,y}}, \quad c_{y,2} = \frac{1280L_{G,x}^2 S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F^2 \mu_G^2}, \quad (68)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{x,5} &= \frac{1120L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y} \Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F^2 \mu_G}, & c_{x,6} &= \frac{21\mu_G L_H L_{G,y} c_{y,1}}{4\mu_F L_{G,x}} + \frac{8L_H^2 \Gamma_{22}}{\mu_F}, \\
c_{x,7} &= \frac{7\mu_G^2 c_{y,2}}{2L_{G,x}^2} + \frac{48S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

We define a Lyapunov function U_t to establish the almost sure convergence

$$U_t = \varrho_0 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \text{ with } \varrho_0 = \frac{2L_{G,x}}{c_{x,2}}.$$

Then using Lemma E.3 and noting that

$$\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_G \mu_F}{4c_{x,2} L_{G,x}} \implies \frac{\mu_G}{4} \beta_t \geq \varrho_0 \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \text{ and } \varrho_0 \frac{\mu_F}{4} \alpha_t \geq \frac{2L_{G,x}^2}{\mu_G} \beta_t,$$

we can obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq U_t - \left(\frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \right) + \left(2\varrho_0 \Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + \varrho_0 c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + \varrho_0 c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \right).$$

Because $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t^2 < \infty$, $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} < \infty$, by the Robbins-Siegmund theorem [Robbins and Siegmund, 1971], we have that (i) U_t converges almost surely and (ii) $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \right) < \infty$ almost surely. Because $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_G \mu_F}{4c_{x,2} L_{G,x}}$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t = \infty$, we then have U_t must converge to zero almost surely.

We then characterize the L_2 -convergence rates by introducing another Lyapunov function \tilde{U}_t

$$\tilde{U}_t = \varrho_1 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \text{ with } \varrho_1 = \frac{8L_{G,x}^2}{\mu_F \mu_G}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_G \mu_F}{4c_{x,2} L_{G,x}} \implies \frac{\mu_G}{4} \beta_t \geq \varrho_1 \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^3}{\alpha_t^2}.$$

Since $\frac{\beta_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \leq \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_{t+1} &\leq \varrho_1 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \varrho_1 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \cdot \left[\left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \left(2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + c_{x,3} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{2L_{G,x}^2}{\mu_G} \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_t - \frac{\beta_t}{4} \left(\mu_F \varrho_1 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mu_G \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \right) + \left(2\varrho_1 \Gamma_{11} \alpha_t \beta_t + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 + \frac{\varrho_1 c_{x,3} \beta_t^3}{\alpha_t} + \frac{\varrho_1 c_{x,4} \beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4} \right) \mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_t + 2\varrho_1 \Gamma_{11} \alpha_t \beta_t + \left(\Gamma_{22} + \frac{c_{x,3} L_{G,x}}{3L_H L_{G,y}} \right) \beta_t^2 + \varrho_1 c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where the last inequality uses $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$. For simplicity, we introduce

$$\alpha_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right).$$

Then iterating (70) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_{t+1} &\leq \beta_{0,t}\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 + 2\varrho_1\Gamma_{11} \cdot \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t}\alpha_\tau\beta_\tau + \left(\Gamma_{22} + \frac{c_{x,3}L_{G,x}}{3L_H L_{G,y}}\right) \cdot \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau^2 + \varrho_1 c_{x,4} \cdot \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau^2} \\ &\leq \beta_{0,t}\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 + \frac{16\varrho_1\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_G}\alpha_t + \frac{8\Gamma_{22}(2L_H L_{G,x} + 3L_{G,y})}{3\mu_G L_{G,y}}\beta_t + \frac{10\varrho_1 c_{x,4}}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma E.4, whose proof is deferred to Appendix E.4.

Lemma E.4 (Step sizes inequalities). *Under Assumption E.2, it follows that*

- (i) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau^2 \leq \frac{8\beta_t}{\mu_G}$ and $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\alpha_\tau^2 \leq \frac{4\alpha_t}{\mu_F}$.
- (ii) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau^2 \leq \frac{4}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t}$ and $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau\beta_{\tau-1} \leq \frac{6}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t}$.
- (iii) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t}\alpha_\tau\beta_\tau \leq \frac{8\alpha_t}{\mu_G}$ and $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau\alpha_{\tau-1} \leq \frac{10}{\mu_F}\beta_t$.
- (iv) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau\beta_{0,\tau-1} \leq \frac{8}{\mu_G}\beta_{0,t}$.
- (v) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau^2} \leq \frac{10}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}$.
- (vi) $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{3}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}$ and $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{\tau-1}} \leq \frac{4}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}$.

As a result of (71), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_{t+1} \leq \beta_{0,t}\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 + \frac{16\varrho_1\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_G}\alpha_t + c_{y,1}\beta_t + c_{y,2} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \quad (72)$$

where $c_{y,1}$ and $c_{y,2}$ are defined in (68). Recall that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2 + c_{x,3}\beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}.$$

Iterating this inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \alpha_{0,t}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_\tau\|^2 + \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \left(2\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2 + c_{x,3}\beta_t^2 + c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}\right) \\ &\leq \alpha_{0,t}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_\tau\|^2 + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F}\alpha_t + \frac{4c_{x,3}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + \frac{3c_{x,4}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \\ &\stackrel{(72)}{\leq} \frac{c_{x,2}^2}{2\mu_F} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t}\beta_\tau \left(\beta_{0,\tau-1}\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 + \frac{16\varrho_1\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_G}\alpha_{\tau-1} + c_{y,1}\beta_{\tau-1} + c_{y,2} \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{\tau-1}^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \alpha_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t + \frac{4c_{x,3}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + \frac{3c_{x,4}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \\
& \leq \frac{c_{x,2}^2 \kappa}{2\mu_F} \left(\frac{8\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0}{\mu_G} \beta_{0,t} + \frac{160\rho_1\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F\mu_G} \beta_t + \frac{6c_{y,1}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + \frac{4c_{y,2}\kappa}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \right) + \alpha_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t + \frac{4c_{x,3}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + \frac{3c_{x,4}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \\
& \leq \frac{7L_H L_{G,y}}{L_{G,x}} \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 + \alpha_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t + c_{x,5} \beta_t + c_{x,6} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + c_{x,7} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \tag{73}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second and fourth inequality use Lemma E.4 and $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \kappa$, the last inequality uses the fact $\kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{28L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$ and the constants are defined in (69).

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{U}_0 = \frac{8L_{G,x}^2 \beta_0}{\mu_F \mu_G \alpha_0} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^2 \leq \frac{8L_{G,x}^2 \kappa}{\mu_F \mu_G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^2 = \frac{2L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2}{7L_H L_{G,y}} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^2. \tag{74}$$

Using (74), we then simplify (73) into

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq (\alpha_{0,t} + 2\beta_{0,t}) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{7L_H L_{G,y}}{L_{G,x}} \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^2 + \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t + c_{x,5} \beta_t + c_{x,6} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} + c_{x,7} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2},$$

which together with $\alpha_{0,t} \leq \beta_{0,t}$ completes the proof. \square

E.4 Proof of Lemma E.4

Proof of Lemma E.4. (i) This mainly follows from (i) in Lemma E.5.

(ii) We first show that $\left(\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t}\right)^2 \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_F}{8\kappa} \beta_t$. This is easy to prove by using

$$\left(\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t}\right)^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G}{32} \beta_t\right)^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F}{32\kappa} \beta_t\right)^2 \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_F}{8\kappa} \beta_t.$$

where the second inequality uses $\kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$ and the last inequality uses $\beta_t \leq \iota_2 < \frac{64\kappa}{\mu_F}$ and $\frac{4\kappa}{\mu_F} = \frac{\iota_2}{3}$. Then the first inequality follows from (iii) in Lemma E.5. For the second inequality, note that $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau \beta_{\tau-1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{32}\right) \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{32}\right) \frac{4}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{6}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t}$.

(iii) The first inequality follows from (iii) in Lemma E.5. The second inequality can be established in a similar way as the first one by exchanging the states of α_t and β_t and applying the fact that $\left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{8}\right) \frac{4}{\mu_F} \leq \frac{4}{\mu_F} + \frac{\iota_2}{2\kappa} \leq \frac{10}{\mu_F}$.

(iv) Note that $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, $1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2} \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G}{4} \beta_t\right)^2$ and $1 - \frac{\mu_G}{4} \beta_t \geq 1 - \frac{\mu_G}{2} \iota_2 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$. It follows that

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau \beta_{0,\tau-1} \leq \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t}^2 \beta_\tau \beta_{0,\tau-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \beta_{0,t} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau}{1 - \frac{\mu_G}{4} \beta_\tau} \\
&\leq 2\beta_{0,t} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau \leq \frac{8\beta_{0,t}}{\mu_G}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (v) Define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 0.1)$, one can check $(1+x)^{2+2\delta_H} \leq 1 + 4.8x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \nu_2 \leq 1$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32}\right)^{2+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{3\mu_G \beta_\tau}{20}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10}. \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^2} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^{1+2\delta_H} \kappa_j^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\
&= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t}\right)^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\
&= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(75)}{\leq} \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10}\right) \\
&= \frac{10\beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10}\right)\right] \leq \frac{10\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (vi) Define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 0.1)$, one can check $(1+x)^{2+2\delta_H} \leq 1 + 4.8x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \nu_2 \leq 1$ and $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32}\right)^{2+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{6}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3}. \quad (76)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_j} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \beta_j^{2\delta_H} \kappa_j^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t}\right)^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(76)}{\leq} \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &= \frac{3\beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t^2}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3}\right)\right] \leq \frac{3\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second inequality, we notice that

$$\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}^{1+2\delta_H} / \beta_\tau^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{\tau-1} / \alpha_\tau} \leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{1+2\delta_H} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32}\right)^3 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G l_2}{32}\right)^3 \leq \frac{4}{3}.$$

It follows that $\sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{\tau-1}} \leq \frac{4}{3} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{4}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}$. □

Lemma E.5. Let $\{\alpha_t, \beta_t\}$ be nonincreasing positive numbers.

(i) If $\beta_t \leq \frac{1}{a}$ and $\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} \leq 1 + \frac{a}{2}\beta_t$ for all $t \geq 1$ and some $a > 0$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t (1 - a\beta_\tau) \leq \frac{2}{a} \beta_t.$$

(ii) If $\beta_t \leq \kappa \alpha_t$, $\alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{a}$, and $\left(\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t}\right)^2 \leq 1 + \frac{a}{2\kappa} \beta_t$ for all $t \geq 1$ and some $a > 0$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t (1 - a\alpha_\tau) \leq \frac{2}{a} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t}.$$

(iii) If $\beta_t \leq \frac{1}{a}$ and $\frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} \leq 1 + \frac{a}{2}\beta_t$ for all $t \geq 1$ and some $a > 0$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t (1 - a\beta_\tau) \leq \frac{2}{a} \alpha_t.$$

Proof of Lemma E.5. See the proof of [Kaledin et al. \[2020, Lemma 14\]](#). □

F Omitted Proofs in Section 3

In this section, we give the detailed proof of Theorem 3.1. For generality, with δ_H define in Assumption 2.4, we assume $\delta_H \in (0, 1]$ instead of $\delta_H \in [0.5, 1]$ throughout this section. We first present the formal version of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem F.1 (Formal version of Theorem 3.1). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.7 hold. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq C_{x,0}^{de} \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) + C_{x,1}^{de} \alpha_t + C_{x,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \quad (77)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| &\leq C_{xy,0}^{de} \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) + C_{xy,1}^{de} \beta_t + C_{xy,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \\ &\quad + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{xy,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq C_{y,0}^{de} \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) + C_{y,1}^{de} \beta_t + C_{y,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \\ &\quad + \left(C_{y,3}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{y,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\ &\quad + \left(C_{y,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{y,6}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where $\{C_{x,i}^{de}\}_{i \in [2] \cup \{0\}}$, $\{C_{xy,i}^{de}\}_{i \in [4] \cup \{0\}}$ and $\{C_{y,i}^{de}\}_{i \in [6] \cup \{0\}}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (146), (164) and (169).

Under Assumption 2.7 (iii), we have $C_{prod} := \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{\prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right)}{\alpha_t^2} < \infty$. With $\delta_H \geq 0.5$ and the constants bounds in Assumption 2.7 (i), the constants in (15), (16) and (17) can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_x &= C_{x,0}^{de} C_{prod} \iota_1 + C_{x,1}^{de} + C_{x,2}^{de} \iota_2^{2\delta_H-1} \kappa^3, \\ \mathcal{C}_{xy,1} &= C_{xy,1}^{de} + C_{xy,2}^{de} \iota_2^{2\delta_H-1} \kappa, \quad \mathcal{C}_{xy,2} = C_{xy,0}^{de} C_{prod} \kappa^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}-1} + C_{xy,3}^{de} + C_{xy,4}^{de} \iota_2^{4\delta_H-2} \kappa^6, \\ \mathcal{C}_{y,1} &= C_{y,1}^{de} + C_{y,2}^{de} \iota_2^{2\delta_H-1} \kappa, \quad \mathcal{C}_{y,2} = C_{y,0}^{de} C_{prod} \kappa^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}-1} + C_{y,3}^{de} + C_{y,4}^{de} \iota_2^{4\delta_H-2} \kappa^6, \\ \mathcal{C}_{y,3} &= C_{y,5}^{de} + C_{y,6}^{de} \iota_2^{4\delta_H-2} \kappa^6. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Next, we give an example choice of the step sizes in Corollary 3.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t &= \frac{128}{(\delta_F \wedge \delta_G) \mu_G \kappa (t + T_0)^a} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_t = \frac{128}{(\delta_F \wedge \delta_G) \mu_G (t + T_0)^b} \\ \text{with } a, b &\in (0, 1], \quad 1 \leq \frac{b}{a} \leq 1 + \frac{\delta_F}{2} \wedge \delta_G, \quad \mathcal{T}_1 = \frac{128}{\mu_G (\kappa \iota_1 \wedge \iota_2 \wedge \frac{\rho}{\kappa})} \quad \text{and} \quad T_0 \geq \lceil \mathcal{T}_1^{1/a} \rceil. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

We emphasize that in the proof, our primary focus is on the order of the mean squared error, rather than optimizing the constants. The constants in (80) serve only to provide an upper bound

that ensures Theorem F.1 holds, and may be quite loose in certain cases, such as SGD with averaging in (4). The step size choice in (81) is thus presented as a feasible example for general cases. For specific examples, however, the optimal values of α_0 , β_0 and T_0 , can vary significantly. For example, in (4), β_0 and T_0 can both be set as 1.

F.1 Formal Statement of the Results in Section 3.3

The subsection is an extended version of Section 3.3. We present the formal statement of the one-step descent inequalities therein. Before present the details result, we first give an operator decomposition lemma, which states that with Assumption 2.5, we could decompose the nonlinear operators F and G as the linear parts plus higher-order error terms.

Lemma F.1 (Operator decomposition). *Suppose that Assumption 2.5 holds. With \hat{x}_t and \hat{y}_t defined in (14), we have the following results.*

- (i) $F(x_t, y_t) = B_1 \hat{x}_t + R_t^F$ with $\|R_t^F\| \leq S_{B,F}(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F})$. It follows that $\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) = (I - \alpha_t B_1) \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t R_t^F$. We further have $\|I - \alpha_t B_1\| \leq 1 - \mu_F \alpha_t$ if $0 \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{\mu_F}{L_F^2}$.
- (ii) $G(H(y_t), y_t) = B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^{GH}$ with $\|R_t^{GH}\| \leq S_{B,G} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}$. It follows that $\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) = (I - \beta_t B_3) \hat{y}_t - \beta_t R_t^{GH}$. We further have $\|I - \beta_t B_3\| \leq 1 - \mu_G \beta_t$ if $0 \leq \beta_t \leq \frac{\mu_G}{L_{G,y}^2}$.
- (iii) $G(x_t, y_t) = B_2 \hat{x}_t + B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^G$ with $\|R_t^G\| \leq S_{B,G}(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G})$.

Then we present the details of the four steps in Section 3.3.

F.1.1 Step 1: Convergence Rates without Local Linearity.

The detailed convergence analysis without local linearity can be found in Appendix E. The convergence rates in (23) is a direct corollary of Theorem E.1.

Corollary F.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4, 2.6 and 2.7 hold. If $\delta_H \geq 0.5$, then we have $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$.*

F.1.2 Step 2: Introduce the Matrix Cross Term

With Assumption 2.5, we could replace $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|$ in Lemma E.1 and E.2 with the matrix cross term $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ at the cost of introducing the higher-order residual terms. We also need to derive the one-step descent lemma of the matrix cross term $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$. To simplify the notation, we define

$$\mathcal{Z}_{t,\delta} := \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^\delta + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^\delta.$$

Lemma F.2 (Refined one-step descent lemma of the fast iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.7 hold. We have for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1}^{de} \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{x,2}^{de} \beta_t \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,3}^{de} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \Delta_{x,t}. \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

where $\Delta_{x,t}$ is a higher-order residual given in

$$\Delta_{x,t} = c_{x,5}^{de} \beta_t \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_H} + c_{x,6}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_F} + c_{x,7}^{de} \beta_t \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+2\delta_G} + c_{x,8}^{de} \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+2\delta_H}, \quad (83)$$

and $\{c_{x,i}^{de}\}_{i \in [8]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (90).

Lemma F.3 (Refined one-step descent lemma of the slow iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 – 2.3 and 2.5 – 2.7 hold. We have for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_G\beta_t}{3}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x}\beta_t \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 + \Delta_{y,t}, \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where $\Delta_{y,t}$ is a higher-order residual given in

$$\Delta_{y,t} = S_{B,G}^2\beta_t (15d_y^2/\mu_G + d_y^2\beta_t + 8d_y\beta_t) \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+2\delta_G} \quad (85)$$

Lemma F.4 (One-step descent lemma of the matrix cross term). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.7 hold. We have that for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t \left(L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xy,1}^{de}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2\right) \\ &\quad + \Sigma_{12}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 + c_{xy,3}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + \Delta_{xy,t}, \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

where $\Delta_{xy,t}$ is a higher-order residual given in

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{xy,t} &= 2\alpha_t S_{B,F} \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_F} + \beta_t S_{B,G} (1 + 2L_H) \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_G} \\ &\quad + \beta_t c_{xy,4}^{de} \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_H} + 2\alpha_t \beta_t S_{B,F} S_{B,G} \mathcal{Z}_{t,2+\delta_F+\delta_G}, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

and $\{c_{xy,i}^{de}\}_{i \in [4]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (101).

The proof of these lemmas can be found in Appendices F.2, F.3 and F.4.

We conclude this step by briefly outlining the proof idea. Upon incorporating the update rules (19) and (20) into our desired error metrics (e.g., $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2$), we decompose the errors into primary components and higher-order terms. For each component, we determine individual upper bounds and then aggregate them accordingly. Specifically, we summarize the higher-order terms into single quantities, $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{y,t}$, and $\Delta_{xy,t}$.

F.1.3 Step 3: Analyze the Fourth-Order Moments

To analyze the residual terms $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{y,t}$ and $\Delta_{xy,t}$, we focus on a single quantity $\mathcal{Z}_{t,4}$ due to the observation from Jensen's inequality: $\mathcal{Z}_{t,\delta} \leq (\mathcal{Z}_{t,4})^{\delta/4}$ if $\delta \leq 4$.⁹ It motivates us to analyze fourth-order moments of errors, i.e., $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4$. To that end, we derive one-step recursions for the conditional fourth-order moments. The derivation process closely parallels that of Lemmas F.2 and F.3.

⁹Here we choose the fourth-order for simplicity. It is feasible and natural to use an order smaller than 4, which, however, would increase the complexity of the proof.

Lemma F.5 (One-step descent of the fourth-order moment of the fast iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4 and 2.6 – 2.7 hold. We have for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + c_{xx,1}^{de} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \|\hat{y}_t\| + c_{xx,2}^{de} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + c_{xx,3}^{de} \beta_t^4 \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + 32\alpha_t^4 \Gamma_{11}^2 + 224L_H^4 \beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(20\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 + 20L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 + c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where $\{c_{xx,i}\}_{i \in [5]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (110).

Lemma F.6 (One-step descent of the fourth-order moment of the slow iterate). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 – 2.3 and 2.6 – 2.7 hold. We have for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_G \beta_t}{2} \right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + 4L_{G,x} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^3 + 18L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 20L_{G,x}^4 \beta_t^4 \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 18\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 28\beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

The proof of these lemmas can be found in Appendices F.5 and F.6.

By integrating Lemmas F.5 and F.6 and using a carefully designed Lyapunov function $V_t = \varrho_3 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \|\hat{y}_t\|^4$ for a properly specified ϱ_3 , we can apply the results of Theorem E.1 to determine the convergence rates for the fourth-order moments.

Lemma F.7 (Convergence rates of the fourth-order moments). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 – 2.4 and 2.6 – 2.7 hold. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 &\leq \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \left(2\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G^4 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^4}{27L_{G,x}^4} \right) + \frac{4c_{xx,7}^{de}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{3c_{xx,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}, \\ \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 &\leq \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \left(\frac{L_{G,x}^3 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4}{3\mu_G^2 L_H L_{G,y}} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^4 \right) + \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{\mu_G} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{c_{xx,i}\}_{i \in [7,8]}$ and $\{c_{yy,i}\}_{i \in [2]}$ are problem-dependent constants defined in (142) and (145). Moreover, if $\delta_H \geq 0.5$, then $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 + \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t^2)$.

The proof can be found in Appendix F.7.

F.1.4 Step 4: Integrate Pieces and Derive Convergence

With the aforementioned lemmas, we could integrate them to derive the convergence rates in Theorem F.1, as summarized in the following.

- The convergence rate of $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ in (77) directly follows from Theorem E.1.
- With Lemma F.7, we could manage the higher-order residual terms $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{y,t}$, and $\Delta_{xy,t}$. For the detailed upper bounds, refer to (149), (153) and (155).
- Combine Lemmas F.2 and F.4 by the Lyapunov function $W_t = \varrho_4 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ with a properly specified ϱ_4 and apply the coarse convergence rate of $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ in Theorem E.1. Then we could obtain the convergence rate of $\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ in (78).

- Substituting the convergence rates of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2$ and $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\|$ into Lemma F.3, we could derive the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$ in (79).

The details of proof can be found in Appendix F.8.

F.2 Proof of Lemma F.2

Proof of Lemma F.2. We first present the specific forms of constants:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{x,1}^{de} &= 4L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2, \quad c_{x,2}^{de} = 2d_x L_H L_{G,y}, \quad c_{x,3}^{de} = 2L_H^2 \Gamma_{22}, \quad c_{x,4}^{de} = \frac{96d_x S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F}, \\
c_{x,5}^{de} &= 4d_x \tilde{S}_H(L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) \propto S_H, \quad c_{x,6}^{de} = 4d_x S_{B,F} L_H(L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) \propto S_{B,F}, \\
c_{x,7}^{de} &= \frac{d_x L_H S_{B,G}^2}{L_{G,x}} \propto S_{B,G}^2, \quad c_{x,8}^{de} = \frac{8d_x S_H^2 (L_{G,x}^{2+2\delta_H} \wedge L_{G,y}^{2+2\delta_H})}{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}} \propto S_H^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

The decomposition in (54) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) - \alpha_t \xi_t\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(55)+(56)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1} \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\beta_t^2 L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} + 2\alpha_t^2 \Gamma_{11} \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\underbrace{\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle}_{\spadesuit},
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where we have also used the fact that $4L_H^2 L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4}$. The proof is almost identical to that of Lemma E.1 except that we take additional care on the cross term $\mathbb{E}\spadesuit$.

By Lemma F.1, we have $\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) = (1 - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t R_t^F$ with $\|R_t^F\| \leq S_{B,F}(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F})$ and $y_t - y_{t+1} = \hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_{t+1} = \beta_t(B_2 \hat{x}_t + B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^G + \psi_t)$ with $\|R_t^G\| \leq S_{B,G}(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G})$. By Assumption 2.4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(y_{t+1}) - H(y_t) &= \nabla H(y_t)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^H \\
&= \nabla H(y^*)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^{\nabla H} + R_t^H
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|R_t^H\| \leq S_H \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^{1+\delta_H}$ and $R_t^{\nabla H} = (\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*))(y_{t+1} - y_t)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\spadesuit &= \mathbb{E}\text{tr}(\spadesuit) = -\text{tr}\left(\mathbb{E}(H(y_{t+1}) - H(y_t))(\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t))^\top\right) \\
&\leq d_x \left\| \mathbb{E}(H(y_{t+1}) - H(y_t))(\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t))^\top \right\| \\
&= d_x \left\| \mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y^*)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^{\nabla H} + R_t^H)((I - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t R_t^F)^\top \right\| \\
&\leq d_x \cdot \left[\underbrace{\left\| \nabla H(y^*) \mathbb{E}(y_{t+1} - y_t) \hat{x}_t^\top (1 - \alpha_t B_1)^\top \right\|}_{\spadesuit_1} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|R_t^H\| \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|}_{\spadesuit_2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha_t \left[\underbrace{\left\| \nabla H(y^*) \mathbb{E}(y_{t+1} - y_t) (R_t^F)^\top \right\|}_{\spadesuit_3} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|R_t^{\nabla H}(\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t))^\top\|}_{\spadesuit_4} \right] \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

We then analyze the four terms $\{\spadesuit_i\}_{i \in [4]}$ on the right-hand side of the last inequality.

Proposition F.1. For any random variable $X \geq 0$ and real number $a > 0$, it follows that

$$2\mathbb{E}X^3 \leq a\mathbb{E}X^2 + \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}X^4.$$

- For the term \spadesuit_1 , using $\|I - \alpha_t B_1\| \leq 1 - \mu_F \alpha_t \leq 1$ and $\|\nabla H(y^*)\| \leq L_H$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \spadesuit_1 &= \left\| \nabla H(y^*) \mathbb{E}(y_{t+1} - y_t) \hat{x}_t^\top (I - \alpha_t B_1)^\top \right\| \\ &= \beta_t \left\| \mathbb{E} \nabla H(y^*) (B_2 \hat{x}_t + B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^G) \hat{x}_t^\top (I - \alpha_t B_1)^\top \right\| \\ &\leq \beta_t (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) L_H \left(\|B_2\| \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + \|B_3\| \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + \mathbb{E} \|R_t^G\| \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \\ &\leq \beta_t L_H \left(L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + \mathbb{E} \|R_t^G\| \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \\ &\stackrel{(94)}{\leq} \beta_t L_H \left(2L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + \frac{S_{B,G}^2}{2L_{G,x}} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Here the last inequality uses the following result which could be obtained by Proposition F.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|R_t^G\| \|\hat{x}_t\| &\leq S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}) \\ &\leq L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{S_{B,G}^2}{2L_{G,x}} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

- For the term \spadesuit_2 , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \spadesuit_2 &= \mathbb{E} \|R_t^H\| \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\| \\ &\leq S_H \cdot \mathbb{E} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\| \\ &\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} 2S_H \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \left(\mathbb{E} \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \\ &\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} 2S_H \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \left(2L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + 2L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \\ &\leq 2L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{4S_H^2 \beta_t^{1+\delta_H}}{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}} \left(L_{G,x}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} + L_{G,y}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{12d_x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{48d_x S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \\ &\leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{6d_x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{4S_H^2 \beta_t^{1+\delta_H}}{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}} \left(L_{G,x}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} + L_{G,y}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{48d_x S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where the second and third inequalities also use $(a + b)^{1+\delta} \leq 2(a^{1+\delta} + b^{1+\delta})$ for any $a, b \geq 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, the fourth inequality uses the following results

$$2S_H \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \leq \frac{L_H^{1+\delta_H}}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{2S_H^2}{L_H^{1+\delta_H}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
2S_H \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| &\leq \frac{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}}{2L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{2S_H^2 L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H}}{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H}, \\
2S_H \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| &\leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{12d_x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \frac{48d_x S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F},
\end{aligned}$$

and the last inequality uses $(L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t)^{1+\delta_H} \leq L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{24d_x} < 1$.

- For the term \spadesuit_3 , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\spadesuit_3 &= \beta_t \left\| \nabla H(y^*) \mathbb{E} G(x_t, y_t) (R_t^F)^\top \right\| \\
&\leq \beta_t L_H S_{B,F} \mathbb{E} \|G(x_t, y_t)\| \cdot \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} \beta_t L_H S_{B,F} \mathbb{E} (L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\| + L_{G,y} \|\hat{y}_t\|) \cdot \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \\
&\leq 2\beta_t S_{B,F} L_H (L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} \right). \tag{96}
\end{aligned}$$

- For the term \spadesuit_4 , by the definition of $R_t^{\nabla H}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\spadesuit_4 &= \beta_t \left\| \mathbb{E} (\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*)) G(x_t, y_t) (\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t))^\top \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(33)+(55)}{\leq} \beta_t \tilde{S}_H \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{\delta_H} \|G(x_t, y_t)\| \|\hat{x}_t\| \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} \beta_t \tilde{S}_H \left(L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^{\delta_H} + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \\
&\leq 2\beta_t \tilde{S}_H (L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \right), \tag{97}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses the following results from Young's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^{\delta_H} &\leq \frac{2}{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \frac{\delta_H}{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}, \\
\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} &\leq \frac{1}{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \frac{1+\delta_H}{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (93), (95), (96), and (97) into (92), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \spadesuit &\leq d_x \beta_t L_H \left(2L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + \frac{S_{B,G}^2}{2L_{G,x}} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} \right) \right) \\
&+ d_x \left[\frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{6d_x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{4S_H^2 \beta_t^{1+\delta_H}}{L_H^{1+\delta_H} L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H}} \left(L_{G,x}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} + L_{G,y}^{2+2\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_H} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{48d_x S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \right] \\
&+ 2d_x \alpha_t \beta_t S_{B,F} L_H (L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) (\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F}) \\
&+ 2d_x \beta_t \tilde{S}_H (L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) (\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(90)+(83)}{\leq} \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{c_{x,2}^{de} \beta_t}{2} \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \frac{c_{x,4}^{de} \beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{2 \alpha_t} + \frac{\Delta_{x,t}}{2}, \quad (98)$$

where the last inequality also uses $L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{24d_x}$ and we use the constants $c_{x,5}^{de}$ to $c_{x,8}^{de}$ defined in (90) to hide the problem-dependent coefficients to yield the expression of $\Delta_{x,t}$ in (83). Moreover, by Proposition B.2, we have $c_{x,5}^{de} \propto S_H$. Then plugging (98) into (91) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\stackrel{(91)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1}^{de} \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\beta_t^2 L_H^2 \Gamma_{22} + 2\alpha_t^2 \Gamma_{11} + 2\mathbb{E} \spadesuit \\ &\stackrel{(90)+(98)}{\leq} (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1}^{de} \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{x,2}^{de} \beta_t \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + 2\Gamma_{11} \alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,3}^{de} \beta_t^2 + c_{x,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \Delta_{x,t}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result. \square

F.3 Proof of Lemma F.3

Proof of Lemma F.3. The decomposition in (62) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\beta_t \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(63)+(64)}{\leq} (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \Gamma_{22} \\ &\quad + 2\beta_t \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

The proof is almost identical to that of Lemma E.2 except that we take additional care on the last term.

By Lemma F.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) &= (I - \beta_t B_3) \hat{y}_t - \beta_t R_t^{GH} \\ G(H(y_t), y_t) &= B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^{GH} \\ G(x_t, y_t) &= B_2 \hat{x}_t + B_3 \hat{y}_t + R_t^G \end{aligned}$$

with $\|R_t^{GH}\| \leq S_{B,G} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}$ and $\|R_t^G\| \leq S_{B,G} (\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G})$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\ &\leq d_y \left\| \mathbb{E} (\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)) (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t))^\top \right\| \\ &\leq d_y \left\| \mathbb{E} ((I - \beta_t B_3) \hat{y}_t - \beta_t R_t^{GH}) (-B_2 \hat{x}_t + R_t^{GH} - R_t^G)^\top \right\| \\ &\leq d_y \left[(1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|B_2\| \|\mathbb{E} \hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\| (\|R_t^{GH}\| + \|R_t^G\|) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \beta_t \|B_2\| \mathbb{E} \|R_t^{GH}\| \|\hat{x}_t\| + \beta_t \mathbb{E} \|R_t^{GH}\| (\|R_t^{GH}\| + \|R_t^G\|) \right] \\ &\leq d_y \left[L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E} \hat{y}_t \hat{x}_t^\top\| + S_B \mathbb{E} (\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \|\hat{y}_t\| + 2\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \beta_t L_{G,x} S_{B,G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + 2\beta_t S_{B,G}^2 \mathbb{E} (\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G})^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq d_y L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \frac{\mu_G}{6} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{L_{G,x}^2}{2} \beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\
&\quad + S_{B,G}^2 \left(\frac{15d_y^2}{2\mu_G} + \frac{d_y^2}{2} \beta_t + 4d_y \beta_t \right) \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

where the third inequality uses $\|I - \beta_t B_3\| \leq 1 - \mu_G \beta_t$ and the last inequality uses the following result

$$\begin{aligned}
2S_{B,G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \|\hat{y}_t\| &\leq \frac{\mu_G}{15d_y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{15S_{B,G}^2 d_y}{\mu_G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G}, \\
2S_{B,G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} &\leq \frac{2\mu_G}{15d_y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{15S_{B,G}^2 d_y}{2\mu_G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G}, \\
2S_{B,G} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 &\leq \frac{L_{G,x}}{d_y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \frac{d_y S_{B,G}^2}{L_{G,x}} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G}, \\
\mathbb{E} (\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G})^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} (\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G}).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (100) into (99) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\stackrel{(99)}{\leq} (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^2 \Gamma_{22} \\
&\quad + 2\beta_t \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(100)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{2\mu_G \beta_t}{3} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x} \beta_t \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 + \Delta_{y,t},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\Delta_{y,t}$ defined in (85) to collect the remaining terms. \square

F.4 Proof of Lemma F.4

Proof of Lemma F.4. We first present the specific forms of the constants:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{xy,1}^{de} &= L_H L_{G,x} + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} S_H + 6\iota_2 L_H L_{G,y}^2, \quad c_{xy,2}^{de} = (2 + L_H) \Sigma_{22} + 4\iota_2^{\delta_H} \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{2}}, \quad c_{xy,3}^{de} = S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}}, \\
c_{xy,4}^{de} &= 2\tilde{S}_H (L_{G,x} \wedge L_{G,y}) + 8\iota_2^{\delta_H} S_H (L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \wedge L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H}) + 16\iota_2^{1+\delta_H} S_H (L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} + L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H}) \propto S_H.
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Using the update rules (53) and (61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{x}_{t+1} \hat{y}_{t+1}^\top \right] &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) \right) \left(\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t) \right)^\top}_{\blacklozenge_1} + \alpha_t \beta_t \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_t \psi_t^\top \right] \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \beta_t \left(\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t) \right) \left(G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \right)^\top}_{\blacklozenge_2} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \right)^\top \hat{y}_{t+1}}_{\blacklozenge_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_{t+1} \hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| \leq \|\mathbb{E} \blacklozenge_1\| + \|\mathbb{E} \blacklozenge_2\| + \|\mathbb{E} \blacklozenge_3\| + \alpha_t \beta_t \Sigma_{12}. \tag{102}$$

We then analyze $\{\|\mathbb{E} \blacklozenge_i\|\}_{i \in [3]}$ in the following respectively.

To analyze \blacklozenge_1 , we make use of Lemma F.1 and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\blacklozenge_1 &= ((1 - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t R_t^F) ((1 - \beta_t B_3)\hat{y}_t - \beta_t R_t^{GH})^\top \\ &= (1 - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top (1 - \beta_t B_3)^\top - \beta_t (1 - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t (R_t^{GH})^\top \\ &\quad - \alpha_t R_t^F \hat{y}_t^\top (1 - \beta_t B_3)^\top + \alpha_t \beta_t R_t^F (R_t^{GH})^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and then the spectrum norm on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E}\blacklozenge_1\| &\leq \|(1 - \alpha_t B_1)\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top (1 - \beta_t B_3)^\top\| + \mathbb{E}\|(1 - \alpha_t B_1)\hat{x}_t\| \|\beta_t R_t^{GH}\| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\|(1 - \beta_t B_3)\hat{y}_t\| \|\alpha_t R_t^F\| + \alpha_t \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|R_t^F\| \|R_t^{GH}\| \\ &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t)(1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|R_t^{GH}\| \\ &\quad + \alpha_t (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\| \|R_t^F\| + \alpha_t \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|R_t^F\| \|R_t^{GH}\| \\ &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t)(1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) S_{B,G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \\ &\quad + \alpha_t (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) S_{B,F} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\| \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_t \beta_t S_{B,F} S_{B,G} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \\ &\leq (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t)(1 - \mu_G \beta_t) \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)},\end{aligned}\tag{103}$$

Here we use $\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)}$ to denote the higher-order residual collecting all the remaining terms for simplicity. More specifically, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)} &= \beta_t (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) S_{B,G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \\ &\quad + \alpha_t (1 - \mu_G \beta_t) S_{B,F} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\| \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_t \beta_t S_{B,F} S_{B,G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \left(\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} + \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Now we aim to decouple the cross terms. By Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} &\leq \frac{1}{2 + \delta_G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \frac{1 + \delta_G}{2 + \delta_G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \|\hat{y}_t\| &\leq \frac{1 + \delta_F}{2 + \delta_F} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} + \frac{1}{2 + \delta_F} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F}, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_F} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} &\leq \frac{1 + \delta_F}{2 + \delta_F + \delta_G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G} + \frac{1 + \delta_G}{2 + \delta_F + \delta_G} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these inequalities into the expression of $\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)} &\leq \beta_t S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) + 2\alpha_t S_{B,F} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F}) \\ &\quad + 2\alpha_t \beta_t S_{B,F} S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G}).\end{aligned}\tag{104}$$

To analyze \blacklozenge_2 , we have

$$\|\blacklozenge_2\| \leq \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\| \cdot \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(55)}{\leq} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_F \alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\| \cdot \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)\| \\
& \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \beta_t \sqrt{1 - \mu_F \alpha_t} \cdot L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

To analyze \diamond_3 , we will use the near linearity in Assumption 2.5 again. By Assumption 2.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(y_{t+1}) - H(y_t) &= \nabla H(y_t)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^H \\
&= \nabla H(y^*)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^{\nabla H} + R_t^H,
\end{aligned}$$

where R_t^H and $R_t^{\nabla H}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
R_t^H &:= H(y_{t+1}) - H(y_t) - \nabla H(y_t)(y_{t+1} - y_t), \\
R_t^{\nabla H} &:= (\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*)) (y_{t+1} - y_t).
\end{aligned}$$

with R_t^H satisfies $\|R_t^H\| \leq S_H \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^{1+\delta_H}$. Note that $y_{t+1} - y_t = \beta_t(G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\diamond_3\| &= \|\mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y^*)(y_{t+1} - y_t) + R_t^{\nabla H} + R_t^H)(\hat{y}_t - \beta_t(G(x_t, y_t) + \psi_t))^\top\| \\
&\leq \beta_t \|\nabla H(y^*)\mathbb{E}G(x_t, y_t)\hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t^2 \|\nabla H(y^*)\mathbb{E}G(x_t, y_t)G(x_t, y_t)^\top\| \\
&\quad + \beta_t^2 \|\nabla H(y^*)\mathbb{E}\psi_t\psi_t^\top\| + \|\mathbb{E}R_t^{\nabla H}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| + S_H \mathbb{E}\left[\|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^{1+\delta_H}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|\right] \\
&\leq \beta_t L_H \underbrace{\|\mathbb{E}G(x_t, y_t)\hat{y}_t^\top\|}_{\diamond_1} + \beta_t^2 L_H \underbrace{\|\mathbb{E}\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \Sigma_{22}}_{\diamond_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\|\mathbb{E}R_t^{\nabla H}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\|}_{\diamond_3} + S_H \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^{1+\delta_H}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|}_{\diamond_4}.
\end{aligned}$$

To proceed with the proof, we then analyze $\{\diamond_i\}_{i \in [4]}$ respectively in the following.

- For the term \diamond_1 , we use Lemma F.1 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\diamond_1\| &= \|\mathbb{E}(B_2\hat{x}_t + B_3\hat{y}_t + R_t^G)\hat{y}_t^\top\| \\
&\leq L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + L_{G,y} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{y}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}\|\hat{y}_t\| + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) \\
&\leq L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}\|\hat{y}_t\| + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}).
\end{aligned}$$

- For the term \diamond_2 , the inequality (57) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\diamond_2 = \mathbb{E}\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \leq 2L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,y}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2. \tag{106}$$

- For the term \diamond_3 , (6) and (33) imply $\|\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*)\| \leq \min\{\tilde{S}_H \|\hat{y}_t\|^{\delta_H}, 2L_H\}$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\diamond_3\| &= \|\mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*)) (y_{t+1} - y_t)\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| \\
&\leq \beta_t \|\mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*))G(x_t, y_t)\hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t^2 \|\mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*))\psi_t\psi_t^\top\| \\
&\quad + \beta_t^2 \|\mathbb{E}(\nabla H(y_t) - \nabla H(y^*))G(x_t, y_t)G(x_t, y_t)^\top\| \\
&\leq \beta_t \tilde{S}_H \mathbb{E}\|G(x_t, y_t)\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} + 2L_H \beta_t^2 (\mathbb{E}\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \Sigma_{22}) \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} \beta_t \tilde{S}_H (L_{G,x} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) + 2L_H \beta_t^2 \Sigma_{22} \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^2 L_H (L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

- For the term \diamond_4 , it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\diamond_4 &\leq \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \left[(\|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\psi_t\|)^{1+\delta_H} (\|\hat{y}_t\| + \beta_t \|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \beta_t \|\psi_t\|) \right] \\
&\leq \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} (\|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\psi_t\|)^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \beta_t^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} (\|G(x_t, y_t)\| + \|\psi_t\|)^{2+\delta_H} \\
&\leq 2\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + 2\Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \beta_t^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\| + 4\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \left(\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^{2+\delta_H} + \|\psi_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} 4\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} (L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} (\beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}) \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} \left(4L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + 4L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $(a+b)^\gamma \leq 2^{\gamma-1}(a^\gamma + b^\gamma)$ for any non-negative a, b and $\gamma \geq 1$.

Putting these pieces together, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\diamond_3\| &\leq \beta_t L_H \left(L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + S_{B,G} (\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) \right) \\
&\quad + \beta_t^2 L_H (2L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,y}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \Sigma_{22}) \\
&\quad + \beta_t \tilde{S}_H (L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} + L_{G,y} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) + 2\beta_t^2 \Sigma_{22} + 4\beta_t^2 L_H (L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + L_{G,y}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2) \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H (L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} S_H (\beta_t \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}) \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} S_H \left(4L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + 4L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq \beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t^2 \left((2 + L_H) \Sigma_{22} + 4\beta_t^{\delta_H} \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{2}} \right) + \beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \\
&\quad + 6\beta_t^2 L_H L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t \left(L_H L_{G,x} + \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} S_H + 6\beta_t L_H L_{G,y}^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\
&\quad + \beta_t L_H S_{B,G} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} \right) + 16\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \beta_t \tilde{S}_H L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \\
&\quad + \beta_t \left(\tilde{S}_H L_{G,y} + 4\beta_t^{\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} + 16\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}. \tag{107}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\beta_t \leq \iota_2$. We then simplify (107) into

$$\|\mathbb{E}\diamond_3\| \leq \beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \|\mathbb{E} \hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| + 6\beta_t^2 L_H L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t c_{xy,1}^{de} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{xy,2}^{de} \beta_t^2 + c_{xy,3}^{de} \beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + \Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)}, \tag{108}$$

where $c_{xy,1}^{de}, c_{xy,2}^{de}, c_{xy,3}^{de}$ are constants defined in (101) and $\Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)}$ is a higher-order residual covering all the remaining terms in (107), given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)} &= \beta_t L_H S_{B,G} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} \right) + 16\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \\
&\quad + 4\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \|\hat{y}_t\| + \beta_t \tilde{S}_H L_{G,x} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} \\
&\quad + \beta_t \left(\tilde{S}_H L_{G,y} + 4\beta_t^{\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} + 16\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H} \right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we decouple the cross terms as we did for $\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)}$. By Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_G}\|\hat{y}_t\| &\leq \frac{1+\delta_G}{2+\delta_G}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \frac{1}{2+\delta_G}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{1+\delta_H}\|\hat{y}_t\| &\leq \frac{1+\delta_H}{2+\delta_H}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \frac{1}{2+\delta_H}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|\|\hat{y}_t\|^{1+\delta_H} &\leq \frac{1}{2+\delta_H}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \frac{1+\delta_H}{2+\delta_H}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these inequalities into the expression of $\Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)} &\leq 2\beta_t L_H S_{B,G}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) + 16\beta_t^{2+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{2+\delta_H} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \\ &\quad + \beta_t(\tilde{S}_H L_{G,x} + 4\beta_t^{\delta_H} S_H L_{G,x}^{1+\delta_H})(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) \\ &\quad + \beta_t\left(\tilde{S}_H L_{G,y} + 4\beta_t^{\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{1+\delta_H} + 16\beta_t^{1+\delta_H} S_H L_{G,y}^{2+\delta_H}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} \\ &\leq 2\beta_t L_H S_{B,G}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) + \beta_t c_{xy,4}^{de}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}),\end{aligned}\tag{109}$$

where $c_{xy,4}^{de}$ is defined in (101).

Now, we are ready to establish this lemma. Plugging (103), (105) and (108) into (102), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| &\stackrel{(102)}{\leq} \|\mathbb{E}\blacklozenge_1\| + \|\mathbb{E}\blacklozenge_2\| + \|\mathbb{E}\blacklozenge_3\| + \alpha_t\beta_t\Sigma_{12} \\ &\leq (1-\mu_F\alpha_t)(1-\mu_G\beta_t)\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + \Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)} + \beta_t\sqrt{1-\mu_F\alpha_t}\cdot L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \beta_t L_H L_{G,x}\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + 6\beta_t^2 L_H L_{G,x}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \beta_t c_{xy,1}^{de}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{xy,3}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + \Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)} + \alpha_t\beta_t\Sigma_{12} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2}\right)\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + \beta_t\left(L_{G,x}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xy,1}^{de}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2\right) + \Sigma_{12}\alpha_t\beta_t \\ &\quad + c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 + c_{xy,3}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + \Delta_{xy,t},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the following facts

- Since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{2L_H L_{G,x}}$, $(1-\mu_F\alpha_t)(1-\mu_G\beta_t) + \beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \leq 1 - \mu_F\alpha_t + \beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2}$.
- Since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{12L_H L_{G,x}}$, $\sqrt{1-\mu_F\alpha_t} + 6\beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2} + 6\beta_t L_H L_{G,x} \leq 1$.
- Combining (104) and (109), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{xy,t}^{(1)} + \Delta_{xy,t}^{(2)} &\leq 2\alpha_t S_{B,F}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F}) + \beta_t S_{B,G}(1+2L_H)(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_G}) \\ &\quad + \beta_t c_{xy,4}^{de}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_H} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_H}) + 2\alpha_t\beta_t S_{B,F} S_{B,G}(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+\delta_F+\delta_G}) \\ &=: \Delta_{xy,t}.\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof. \square

F.5 Proof of Lemma F.5

Proof of Lemma F.5. We first present the specific forms of the constants:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{xx,1}^{de} &= 24L_H L_{G,y}, & c_{xx,2}^{de} &= 40L_H^2 L_{G,y}^2, \\ c_{xx,3}^{de} &= 1280L_H^4 L_{G,y}^4, & c_{xx,4}^{de} &= \frac{64S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F}. \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

From the proof of Lemma E.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\stackrel{(54)}{=} \underbrace{\|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2}_{\mathcal{C}_1} + \underbrace{\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) - \alpha_t \xi_t\|^2}_{\mathcal{C}_2} \\ &\quad + 2 \underbrace{\langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1}) \rangle}_{\mathcal{C}_3} + 2 \underbrace{\alpha_t \langle \hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t), -\xi_t \rangle}_{\mathcal{C}_4}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the square of both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 &= (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 + \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4)^2 \\ &= \mathcal{C}_1^2 + \mathcal{C}_2^2 + \mathcal{C}_3^2 + \mathcal{C}_4^2 + 2\mathcal{C}_1(\mathcal{C}_2 + \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4) + (\mathcal{C}_2 + \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4)^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}_1^2 + 4\mathcal{C}_2^2 + 4\mathcal{C}_3^2 + 4\mathcal{C}_4^2 + 2\mathcal{C}_1(\mathcal{C}_2 + \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4), \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

where the last inequality is due to $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. We then analyze these terms respectively in the following.

- For \mathcal{C}_1^2 , we have

$$\mathcal{C}_1^2 \stackrel{(55)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{7\mu_F \alpha_t}{2} + \frac{49\mu_F^2 \alpha_t^2}{16}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^4. \quad (112)$$

- For \mathcal{C}_2^2 , taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq 8(\|\mathbb{E}[H(\hat{y}_t) - H(\hat{y}_{t+1})] \|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] + \alpha_t^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t]) \\ &\stackrel{(6)}{\leq} 8(L_H^4 \beta_t^4 \mathbb{E}[\|G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] + \alpha_t^4 \Gamma_{11}^2) \\ &\stackrel{(114)}{\leq} 8(5L_H^4 \beta_t^4 \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^4 + 7L_H^4 \beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2 + \alpha_t^4 \Gamma_{11}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

where the first inequality is due to $(a + b)^4 \leq 8(a^4 + b^4)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and the last inequality uses (114) below

$$\mathbb{E}[\|G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^4] \leq 5\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^4 + 7\Gamma_{22}^2. \quad (114)$$

To derive (114), we first notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^4 &= (\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - 2\langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle + \|\psi_t\|^2)^2 \\ &= \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^4 + 4\langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle^2 + \|\psi_t\|^4 + 2\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \|\psi_t\|^2 \\ &\quad - 4\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle - 4\|\psi_t\|^2 \langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|G(x_t, y_t)\|^4 + 6\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2\|\psi_t\|^2 + 4\|G(x_t, y_t)\|\|\psi_t\|^3 + \|\psi_t\|^4 \\
&\quad - 4\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2\langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle \\
&\leq 5\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^4 + 7\|\psi_t\|^4 - 4\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2\langle G(x_t, y_t), \psi_t \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Young's inequality, i.e., $ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$ for any non-negative a, b, p, q such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Taking the conditional expectation gives (114).

Then we plug (57) into (113) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq 40L_H^4\beta_t^4(L_{G,x}\|\hat{x}_t\| + L_{G,y}\|\hat{y}_t\|)^4 + 56L_H^4\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2 + 8\alpha_t^4\Gamma_{11}^2 \\
&\leq 320L_H^4L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 320L_H^4L_{G,y}^4\beta_t^4\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + 56L_H^4\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2 + 8\alpha_t^4\Gamma_{11}^2, \tag{115}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $(a+b)^4 \leq 8(a^4 + b^4)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

- For \mathcal{C}_3^2 , taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_3^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq 4\|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|H(y_t) - H(y_{t+1})\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\stackrel{(6)+(55)}{\leq} 4L_H^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|y_t - y_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\leq 4L_H^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\leq 4L_H^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 (\|G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \mathbb{E}[\|\psi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t]) \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} 4L_H^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 (2L_{G,x}^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2L_{G,y}^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22}) \\
&= 8L_H^2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 8L_H^2L_{G,y}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2. \tag{116}
\end{aligned}$$

- For \mathcal{C}_4^2 , taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_4^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 4\alpha_t^2\|\hat{x}_t - \alpha_t F(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \stackrel{(55)}{\leq} 4\alpha_t^2\Gamma_{11}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2. \tag{117}$$

- For $\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2 | \mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathcal{C}_1\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\stackrel{(55)+(56)}{\leq} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 (4L_H^2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 4L_H^2L_{G,y}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\beta_t^2L_H^2\Gamma_{22} + 2\alpha_t^2\Gamma_{11}) \\
&\leq 4L_H^2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 4L_H^2L_{G,y}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2L_H^2\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2. \tag{118}
\end{aligned}$$

- For $\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_3$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_3 | \mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathcal{C}_1\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_3 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&\stackrel{(55)+(60)}{\leq} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \left(\mu_F\alpha_t\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 14L_HL_{G,y}\beta_t\|\hat{x}_t\|\|\hat{y}_t\| + \frac{32S_H^2\Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \right) \\
&\leq \mu_F\alpha_t\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 14L_HL_{G,y}\beta_t\|\hat{x}_t\|^3\|\hat{y}_t\| + \frac{32S_H^2\Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2. \tag{119}
\end{aligned}$$

- For $\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_4$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_4 | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathcal{C}_1\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_4 | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0. \quad (120)$$

Taking the expectation on both sides of (111) w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t and plugging (112), (115) to (120) into it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_F\alpha_t}{2} + \frac{49\mu_F^2\alpha_t^2}{16} + 40L_H^2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2 + 1280L_H^4L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 \\ &\quad + 24L_HL_{G,y}\beta_t\|\hat{x}_t\|^3\|\hat{y}_t\| + 40L_H^2L_{G,y}^2\beta_t^2\|\hat{x}_t\|^2\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 1280L_H^4L_{G,y}^4\beta_t^4\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + \left(20\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2 + 20L_H^2\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 + \frac{64S_H^2\Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F\alpha_t}\right) \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 32\alpha_t^4\Gamma_{11}^2 + 224L_H^4\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{12\mu_F}$ and $\frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{200L_H^2L_{G,x}^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \frac{3\mu_F\alpha_t}{2} + \frac{49\mu_F^2\alpha_t^2}{16} + 40L_H^2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2 + 1280L_H^4L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4 \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{3\mu_F\alpha_t}{2} + \frac{49\mu_F\alpha_t}{192} \cdot 12\mu_F\alpha_t + \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{5} + \frac{1280\mu_F\alpha_t}{12 \cdot 200^2} \cdot 12\mu_F\alpha_t \leq 1 - \mu_F\alpha_t. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and the definition of $\{c_{xx,i}\}_{i \in [4]}$ in (110), we obtain the desired result. \square

F.6 Proof of Lemma F.6

Proof of Lemma F.6. From the proof of Lemma E.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\stackrel{(62)}{=} \underbrace{\|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2}_{\mathcal{D}_1} + \underbrace{\|\beta_t (G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)) - \beta_t \psi_t\|^2}_{\mathcal{D}_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2\beta_t \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) \rangle}_{\mathcal{D}_3} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2\beta_t \langle \hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t), -\psi_t \rangle}_{\mathcal{D}_4}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the square of both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 &= (\mathcal{D}_1 + \mathcal{D}_2 + \mathcal{D}_3 + \mathcal{D}_4)^2 \\ &= \mathcal{D}_1^2 + \mathcal{D}_2^2 + \mathcal{D}_3^2 + \mathcal{D}_4^2 + 2\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{D}_2 + \mathcal{D}_3 + \mathcal{D}_4) + (\mathcal{D}_2 + \mathcal{D}_3 + \mathcal{D}_4)^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_1^2 + 4\mathcal{D}_2^2 + 4\mathcal{D}_3^2 + 4\mathcal{D}_4^2 + 2\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{D}_2 + \mathcal{D}_3 + \mathcal{D}_4), \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

where the last inequality is due to $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$ for any $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. We then analyze these terms respectively in the following.

- For \mathcal{D}_1^2 , we have

$$\mathcal{D}_1^2 \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} (1 - \mu_G\beta_t)\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 = (1 - 2\mu_G\beta_t + \mu_G^2\beta_t^2)\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_G\beta_t}{2}\right)\|\hat{y}_t\|^4, \quad (122)$$

where the last inequality is due to $\beta_t \leq \frac{1}{2\mu_G}$.

- For \mathcal{D}_2^2 , taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] = \beta_t^4 \mathbb{E} [\|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^4 | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Similar to the derivation of (114), we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [\|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t) - \psi_t\|^4] \leq 5\|G(x_t, y_t) - G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^4 + 7\Gamma_{22}^2.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 5\beta_t^4 \|G(x_t, y_t) - G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^4 + 7\beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2 \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} 5L_{G,x}^4 \beta_t^4 \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 7\beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2. \quad (123)$$

- For \mathcal{D}_3^2 , we have

$$\mathcal{D}_3^2 \leq 4\beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 \|G(H(y_t), y_t) - G(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \stackrel{(8)+(63)}{\leq} 4L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2. \quad (124)$$

- For \mathcal{D}_4^2 , taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_4^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 4\beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t - \beta_t G(H(y_t), y_t)\|^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\psi_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} 4\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2. \quad (125)$$

- For $\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathcal{D}_1 \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \stackrel{(63)+(64)}{\leq} L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2. \quad (126)$$

- For $\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_3$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_3 | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathcal{D}_1 \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_3 | \mathcal{F}_t] \stackrel{(63)+(65)}{\leq} 2L_{G,x} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^3. \quad (127)$$

- For $\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_4$, taking the expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_4 | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathcal{D}_1 \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_4 | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0. \quad (128)$$

Taking the expectation on both sides of (121) w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_t and plugging (122) to (128) into it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + 4L_{G,x} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^3 + 18L_{G,x}^2 \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 20L_{G,x}^4 \beta_t^4 \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 18\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 28\beta_t^4 \Gamma_{22}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

F.7 Proof of Lemma F.7

Proof of Lemma F.7. To characterize the L_4 -convergence rate, we define the Lyapunov function

$$V_t = \varrho_3 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \text{ with } \varrho_3 = \frac{54L_{G,x}^4}{\mu_F \mu_G^3}.$$

Derive the one-step descent. We first employ Lemmas F.5 and F.6 to derive the one-step descent of V_t . Since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 20\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2 + 20L_H^2\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 &\leq c_{xx,5}^{de}\alpha_t^2, \\ 32\alpha_t^4\Gamma_{11}^2 + 224L_H^4\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2 &\leq c_{xx,6}^{de}\alpha_t^4. \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

with

$$c_{xx,5}^{de} = 20\Gamma_{11} + 20L_H\Gamma_{22}\kappa^2, \quad c_{xx,6}^{de} = 32\Gamma_{11}^2 + 224L_H^4\Gamma_{22}^2\kappa^4.$$

As a result of $\frac{\beta_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \leq \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] &\leq \varrho_3 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^4 \\ &\stackrel{(88)+(89)}{\leq} \varrho_3 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \left[(1 - \mu_F\alpha_t) \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + c_{xx,1}^{de}\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \|\hat{y}_t\| + c_{xx,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,3}^{de}\beta_t^4 \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,5}^{de}\alpha_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,6}^{de}\alpha_t^4 \right] + \left(1 - \frac{3\mu_G\beta_t}{2}\right) \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + 4L_{G,x}\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^3 \\ &\quad + 18L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 20L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4 \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 18\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 28\beta_t^4\Gamma_{22}^2 \\ &\leq \underbrace{V_t - \varrho_3\mu_F\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^4}_{\mathcal{E}_0} - \frac{3\mu_G\beta_t}{2} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + \underbrace{4L_{G,x}\beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\| \|\hat{y}_t\|^3}_{\mathcal{E}_1} + \underbrace{\varrho_3 c_{xx,1}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \|\hat{y}_t\|}_{\mathcal{E}_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{18L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2}_{\mathcal{E}_3} + \underbrace{\varrho_3 c_{xx,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^3}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2}_{\mathcal{E}_4} + \underbrace{20L_{G,x}^4\beta_t^4 \|\hat{x}_t\|^4}_{\mathcal{E}_5} + \underbrace{\varrho_3 c_{xx,3}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^5}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4}_{\mathcal{E}_6} \\ &\quad + \varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 18\Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \varrho_3 c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^3 \beta_t + 28\Gamma_{22}^2 \beta_t^4. \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

We then analyze \mathcal{E}_0 to \mathcal{E}_6 respectively in the following.

- For \mathcal{E}_0 , we have $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{5\mu_G}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_0 \geq \frac{19}{20} \varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_G \beta_t^2}{4\alpha_t} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4. \quad (131)$$

- For \mathcal{E}_1 , by Young's inequality, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = 4\beta_t \left(\lambda_1^{-1} \mu_G^{-3/4} L_{G,x} \|\hat{x}_t\| \right) \left(\lambda_1 \mu_G^{3/4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^3 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{L_{G,x}^4 \beta_t}{\lambda_1^4 \mu_G^3} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 3\lambda_1^{4/3} \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{2} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4, \quad (132)$$

where the last inequality is by setting $\lambda_1^{4/3} = 1/3$.

- For \mathcal{E}_2 , by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_2 &= \varrho_3 \left(\beta_t^{3/4} \lambda_2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \right) \left(c_{xx,1} \lambda_2^{-1} \beta_t^{5/4} \alpha_t^{-1} \|\hat{y}_t\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{3\lambda_2^{4/3} \varrho_3 \beta_t}{4} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{\varrho_3 (c_{xx,1}^{de})^4 \beta_t^5}{4\lambda_2^4 \alpha_t^4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{200 L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$, we have $\frac{\beta_t^4}{\alpha_t^4} = \frac{\mu_F^4 \mu_G^4}{200^4 L_H^4 L_{G,x}^4 L_{G,y}^4} \leq \frac{54 \cdot 24^4 \mu_F^3 \mu_G}{200^4 \varrho_3 (c_{xx,1}^{de})^4}$. Then setting $\lambda_2^{4/3} = \mu_F/4$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}_2 \leq \frac{3\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{16} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{4^2 \cdot 54 \cdot 24^4 \mu_G \beta_t}{200^4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \frac{3\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{16} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 0.18 \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4. \quad (133)$$

- For \mathcal{E}_3 , by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_3 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{8 \cdot 81 L_{G,x}^4 \beta_t^3}{\mu_F \varrho_3} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4.$$

Since $\beta_t \leq \frac{1}{14\mu_G}$, we have $\beta_t^2 \leq \frac{1}{14^2 \mu_G^2} = \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \mu_G}{14^2 \cdot 54 L_{G,x}^4}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_3 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{8 \cdot 81 \mu_G \beta_t}{14^2 \cdot 54} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 0.062 \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4. \quad (134)$$

- For \mathcal{E}_4 , by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_4 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{2\varrho_3 (c_{xx,2}^{de})^2 \beta_t^5}{\mu_F \alpha_t^2} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4.$$

Since $\alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{12\mu_F}$ and $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{200 L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$, we have $\frac{\beta_t^4}{\alpha_t^2} \leq \frac{\mu_F^2 \mu_G^4}{12^2 \cdot 200^4 L_H^4 L_{G,x}^4 L_{G,y}^4} \leq \frac{54 \cdot 40^2 \mu_F \mu_G}{12^2 \cdot 200^4 \varrho_3 (c_{xx,2}^{de})^2}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_4 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{108 \cdot 40^2 \mu_G \beta_t}{12^2 \cdot 200^4} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + 0.001 \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4. \quad (135)$$

- For \mathcal{E}_5 , since $\beta_t \leq \frac{1}{14\mu_G}$, we have $\beta_t^3 \leq \frac{1}{14^3 \mu_G^3} \leq \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_F}{14^3 \cdot 54 L_{G,x}^4}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_5 \leq 0.001 \varrho_3 \mu_F \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^4. \quad (136)$$

- For \mathcal{E}_6 , since $\alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{12\mu_F}$ and $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{200 L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$, we have $\frac{\beta_t^4}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G^4}{12^3 \cdot 200^4 L_H^4 L_{G,x}^4 L_{G,y}^4} \leq \frac{54 \cdot 1280 \mu_G}{12^3 \cdot 200^4 \varrho_3 c_{xx,3}^{de}} \leq 0.001 \frac{\mu_G}{\varrho_3 c_{xx,3}^{de}}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_6 \leq 0.001 \mu_G \beta_t \|\hat{y}_t\|^4. \quad (137)$$

Plugging (131) to (137) into (130) and taking the expectation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}V_{t+1} &\leq \mathbb{E}V_t - \frac{\varrho_3 \mu_G \beta_t^2}{4\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + \varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \\
&\quad + 18\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \varrho_3 c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^3 \beta_t + 28\Gamma_{22}^2 \beta_t^4 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4}\right) \mathbb{E}V_t + \left(\varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + \varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + 18\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2\right) (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2) \\
&\quad + \varrho_3 c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^3 \beta_t + 28\Gamma_{22}^2 \beta_t^4. \tag{138}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we assume $\prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t)$, then Theorem E.1 with the definitions of $c_{x,7}$ in (69) and $c_{y,2}$ in (68) implies

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \leq c_+ \alpha_t + c_- \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \text{ with } c_- \propto S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}. \tag{139}$$

Also note that $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + \varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + 18\Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2\right) (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2) \\
&\leq \beta_t \left[\varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + (\varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} + 18\Gamma_{22} \kappa) \alpha_t\right] \left(c_+ \alpha_t + c_- \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}\right). \tag{140}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (140) into (138) and using $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1$, $\beta_t \leq \iota_2$, $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa$ and $(c_1 a + c_2 b)(c_3 a + c_4 b) \leq c_1 c_3 a^2 + c_2 c_4 b^2 + (c_2 c_3 + c_1 c_4)(a^2 + b^2)/2$ for $a, b, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}V_{t+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4}\right) \mathbb{E}V_t + c_{yy,1}^{de} \alpha_t^2 \beta_t + c_{yy,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}, \tag{141}$$

where the constants $c_{yy,1}^{de}$ and $c_{yy,2}^{de}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{yy,1}^{de} &= (\varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} + 18\Gamma_{22} \kappa) c_+ + \frac{\varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} c_+ + (\varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} + 18\Gamma_{22} \kappa) c_-}{2} + \varrho_3 c_{xx,6}^{de} \iota_1 + 28\Gamma_{22}^2 \kappa^2 \iota_2, \\
c_{yy,2}^{de} &= \varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} c_- + \frac{\varrho_3 c_{xx,4}^{de} c_+ + (\varrho_3 c_{xx,5}^{de} + 18\Gamma_{22} \kappa) c_-}{2} = S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \cdot h_1(S_H, \Gamma_{22})
\end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

for some function $h_1(\cdot, \cdot)$. Here the last inequality follows from the definitions of $c_{xx,4}^{de}$ in (110) and c_- in (139).

Establish the convergence rates. With the one-step descent inequality (141), we could establish the convergence rates of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4$. For simplicity, we introduce (as we did in the proof of Theorem E.1)

$$\alpha_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \text{ and } \beta_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right).$$

Iterating (141) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}V_{t+1} &\leq \beta_{0,t}\mathbb{E}V_0 + c_{yy,1}^{de} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \alpha_\tau^2 \beta_\tau + c_{yy,2}^{de} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau^4} \\ &\leq \beta_{0,t}\mathbb{E}V_0 + \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{\mu_G} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (i) in Lemma F.8, whose proof is deferred to Appendix F.10.

Lemma F.8 (Step sizes inequalities). *Let $\alpha_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t (1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2})$ and $\beta_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t (1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4})$. Under Assumption 2.7, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}(i) \quad &\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^2 \beta_j \leq \frac{8\alpha_t^2}{\mu_G} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^4} \leq \frac{10\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^4}. \\ (ii) \quad &\sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^3 \leq \frac{4\alpha_t^2}{\mu_F}, \quad \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_{0,j-1} \leq \frac{8\beta_{0,t}}{\mu_F} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^3} \leq \frac{3\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t^4}\end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4$ as shown in the following

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \mathbb{E}V_t \leq \beta_{0,t-1}\mathbb{E}V_0 + \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{\mu_G} \alpha_{t-1}^2 + \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}. \quad (143)$$

Since $\kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{200L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}V_0 = \varrho_3 \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^4 \leq \frac{54L_{G,x}^4 \kappa}{\mu_F \mu_G^3} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^4 \leq c_{yy,2}^{de} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^4,$$

where $c_{yy,2}^{de} = \frac{L_{G,x}^3}{3\mu_G^2 L_H L_{G,y}}$. As a result,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq \beta_{0,t-1} \left(c_{yy,2}^{de} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^4 \right) + \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{\mu_G} \alpha_{t-1}^2 + \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}.$$

For the $\{x_t\}$ sequence, notice that (133), (135) and (137) imply the following results

$$\begin{aligned}c_{xx,1}^{de} \beta_t \|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \|\hat{y}_t\| &= \frac{\alpha_t}{\varrho_3 \beta_t} \mathcal{E}_2 \leq \frac{3\mu_F \alpha_t}{16} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{0.18\mu_G \alpha_t}{\varrho_3} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4, \\ c_{xx,2}^{de} \beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 &= \frac{\alpha_t}{\varrho_3 \beta_t} \mathcal{E}_4 \leq \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{8} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{0.001\mu_G \alpha_t}{\varrho_3} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4, \\ c_{xx,3}^{de} \beta_t^4 \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 &= \frac{\alpha_t}{\varrho_3 \beta_t} \mathcal{E}_6 \leq \frac{0.001\mu_G \alpha_t}{\varrho_3} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these inequalities and (129) into (88) and taking the expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 &\stackrel{(88)}{\leq} (1 - \mu_F \alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + c_{xx,1}^{de} \beta_t \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^3 \|\hat{y}_t\| + c_{xx,2}^{de} \mathbb{E}\beta_t^2 \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 \|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,3}^{de} \beta_t^4 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \\ &\quad + c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^4\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G \alpha_t}{5\varrho_3} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_t\|^4 + \left(c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t^2\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^4 \\
&\stackrel{(139)+(143)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G \mathbb{E} V_0}{5\varrho_3} \beta_{0,t-1} \alpha_t + \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{5\varrho_3} \alpha_t \alpha_{t-1}^2 + \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \alpha_t \frac{\beta_{t-1}^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_{t-1}^4} \\
&\quad + \alpha_t \left(c_{xx,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + c_{xx,5}^{de} \alpha_t\right) \left(c_+ \alpha_{t-1} + c_- \frac{\beta_{t-1}^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{t-1}^2}\right) + c_{xx,6}^{de} \alpha_t^4 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G \mathbb{E} V_0}{5\varrho_3} \beta_{0,t-1} \alpha_t + c_{xx,7}^{de} \alpha_t^3 + c_{xx,8}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^3}, \tag{144}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1$, $\beta_t \leq \iota_2$, $\frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_t}{8} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_F \iota_1}{8}$, $\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{8} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{64}$, $\frac{\beta_{t-1}^a \alpha_{t-1}^{-b}}{\beta_t^a \alpha_t^{-b}} \leq \left(\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t}\right)^a$ for any $a, b > 0$, and the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{xx,7}^{de} &= \frac{8c_{yy,1}^{de}}{5\varrho_3} \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \iota_1}{8}\right)^2 + \left(c_{xx,5}^{de} c_+ + \frac{c_{xx,5}^{de} c_- + c_{xx,4}^{de} c_+}{2}\right) \left[1 + \frac{\mu_F \iota_1}{8} + \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{64}\right)^4\right] + c_{xx,6}^{de} \iota_1, \\
c_{xx,8}^{de} &= \frac{10c_{yy,2}^{de}}{\mu_G} \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{64}\right)^8 + \left(c_{xx,4}^{de} c_- + \frac{c_{xx,5}^{de} c_- + c_{xx,4}^{de} c_+}{2}\right) \left[1 + \frac{\mu_F \iota_1}{8} + \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{64}\right)^4\right] \\
&\lesssim S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \cdot h_2(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \tag{145}
\end{aligned}$$

for some function $h_2(\cdot, \cdot)$. Here the last inequality follows from the definitions of $c_{xx,4}^{de}$ in (110), c_- in (139) and $c_{yy,2}^{de}$ in (142). Iterating (144) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 &\leq \alpha_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G \mathbb{E} V_0}{5\varrho_3} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \alpha_\tau \beta_{0,\tau-1} + c_{xx,7}^{de} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \alpha_\tau^3 + c_{xx,8}^{de} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \alpha_{\tau+1,t} \frac{\beta_\tau^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau^3} \\
&\leq \alpha_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{8\mu_G}{5\varrho_3 \mu_F} \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} V_0 + \frac{4c_{xx,7}^{de}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{3c_{xx,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (ii) in Lemma F.8. Since $\frac{\mu_G \beta_j}{\mu_F \alpha_j} \leq \frac{\mu_G}{\mu_F} \kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any j , it holds that $\alpha_{0,t} \leq \beta_{0,t}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^4 &\leq \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{8\mu_G}{5\varrho_3 \mu_F} \beta_{0,t} \left(\frac{\varrho_3 \beta_0}{\alpha_0} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^4\right) + \frac{4c_{xx,7}^{de}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{3c_{xx,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{8\mu_G \kappa}{5\mu_F}\right) \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{8\mu_G^4}{5 \cdot 54 L_{G,x}^4} \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^4 + \frac{4c_{xx,7}^{de}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{3c_{xx,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4} \\
&\leq 2\beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{x}_0\|^4 + \frac{\mu_G^4}{27 L_{G,x}^4} \beta_{0,t} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{y}_0\|^4 + \frac{4c_{xx,7}^{de}}{\mu_F} \alpha_t^2 + \frac{3c_{xx,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

F.8 Proof of Theorem F.1

Proof of Theorem F.1. Since the conditions of Theorem F.1 are stronger than those of Theorem E.1. The first inequality follows from Theorem E.1 with

$$C_{x,0}^{de} = 3\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \frac{7L_H L_G y \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^2}{L_{G,x}}, \quad C_{x,1}^{de} = \frac{8\Gamma_{11}}{\mu_F} + c_{x,5}\kappa + c_{x,6}\kappa^2, \quad C_{x,2}^{de} = c_{x,7} \propto S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}, \quad (146)$$

where the constants $\{c_{x,i}\}_{i \in [7] \setminus [4]}$ are defined in (69).

The proof of the other two inequalities is divided into three parts. We first use Lemma F.7 to analyze the high-order terms defined in Lemmas F.2 to F.4, then derive the convergence rate of $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\|$ and finally use this to establish the rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$.

Analyze the high-order terms. Since we assume $\prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t^2)$, then Lemma F.7 with the definitions of $C_{xx,8}^{de}$ in (145) and $C_{yy,2}^{de}$ in (142) implies

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^4 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^4 \leq c_{+,2} \alpha_t^2 + c_{-,2} \frac{\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4} \quad \text{with } c_{-,2} = S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H} \cdot h_3(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \quad (147)$$

for some function $h_3(\cdot, \cdot)$. Note that the terms in $\Delta_{x,t}$, $\Delta_{y,t}$ and $\Delta_{xy,t}$ all have their exponents lying between 2 and 4. Then we could apply Jensen's inequality to control them by the fourth-order terms or apply Young's inequality to bound them by second-order and fourth-order terms.

We first focus on $\Delta_{x,t}$, which is defined in (83). By Jensen's inequality and Assumption 2.7, for $z = \|\hat{x}_t\|$ or $\|\hat{y}_t\|$ and $\gamma \in [0, 2]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}z^{2+\gamma} \leq (\mathbb{E}z^4)^{\frac{2+\gamma}{4}} \leq c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\gamma}{4}} \alpha_t^{1+\frac{\gamma}{2}} + c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\gamma}{4}} \left(\frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \right)^{1+\frac{\gamma}{2}} \leq c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\gamma}{4}} l_1^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \alpha_t + c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\gamma}{4}} l_2^{\delta_H \gamma} \kappa^\gamma \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}. \quad (148)$$

Substituting (148) into (83), we obtain

$$\Delta_{x,t} \leq c_{x,9}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + c_{x,10}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \quad (149)$$

where the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{x,9}^{de} &= 2c_{x,5}^{de} c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{4}} l_1^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} + 2c_{x,6}^{de} c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_F}{4}} l_1^{1+\frac{\delta_F}{2}} + 2c_{x,7}^{de} c_{+,2}^{\frac{1+\delta_G}{2}} l_1^{\delta_G} + 2c_{x,8}^{de} c_{+,2}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} l_1^{\delta_H} l_2^{\delta_H}, \\ c_{x,10}^{de} &= 2c_{x,5}^{de} c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{4}} l_2^{\delta_H^2} \kappa^{\delta_H} + 2c_{x,6}^{de} c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_F}{4}} l_1 l_2^{\delta_H \delta_F} \kappa^{\delta_F} + 2c_{x,7}^{de} c_{-,2}^{\frac{1+\delta_G}{2}} l_2^{2\delta_H \delta_G} \kappa^{2\delta_G} + 2c_{x,8}^{de} c_{-,2}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} l_2^{2\delta_H^2 + \delta_H} \kappa^{2\delta_H} \\ &= S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_4(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

for some function $h_4(\cdot, \cdot)$. Here the last inequality follows from the definitions of $c_{x,5}^{de}$ to $c_{x,8}^{de}$ in (90) and $c_{-,2}$ in (147).

For $\Delta_{y,t}$ defined in (85), we have

$$\Delta_{y,t} \leq c_{y,1}^{de} \beta_t (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^{2+2\delta_G}) \quad \text{with } c_{y,1}^{de} = S_{B,G}^2 \left(\frac{15d_y^2}{\mu_G} + d_y^2 l_2 + 8d_y l_2 \right). \quad (151)$$

By Young's inequality, for $z = \|\hat{x}_t\|$ or $\|\hat{y}_t\|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{y,1}^{de} \beta_t z^{2+2\delta_G} &\leq (1 - \delta_G) \left[\left(\frac{4L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t^2}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \right)^{1-\delta_G} z^{2(1-\delta_G)} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_G}} + \delta_G \left[c_{y,1}^{de} \beta_t \left(\frac{4L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t^2}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \right)^{\delta_G-1} z^{4\delta_G} \right]^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} \\ &\leq \frac{4L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t^2}{\mu_F \alpha_t} z^2 + c_{y,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} z^4 \text{ with } c_{y,2}^{de} \propto S_{B,G}^{\frac{2}{\delta_G}}, \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

where we use $c_{y,2}^{de}$ to hide the problem-dependent coefficients. Plugging this inequality and (147) into (151) and noting that $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{24L_H L_{G,x}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{y,t} &\leq \frac{4L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t^2}{\mu_F \alpha_t} (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2) + c_{y,2}^{de} \left(c_{+,2} \alpha_t \beta_t^2 + c_{-,2} \frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} \\ &\leq \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{6} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \frac{4L_H L_{G,x} \beta_t^2}{\mu_F \alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{y,2}^{de} \left(c_{+,2} \alpha_t \beta_t^2 + c_{-,2} \frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}. \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

Finally, we concentrate on $\Delta_{xy,t}$, which is defined in (87). We first tackle the first term. By Young's inequality, for $z = \|\hat{x}_t\|$ or $\|\hat{y}_t\|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\alpha_t S_{B,F} z^{2+\delta_F} &\leq \frac{2 - \delta_F}{2} \left[(L_{G,x} \beta_t)^{\frac{2-\delta_F}{2}} z^{2-\delta_F} \right]^{\frac{2}{2-\delta_F}} + \frac{\delta_F}{2} \left[2\alpha_t S_{B,F} (L_{G,x} \beta_t)^{\frac{\delta_F-2}{2}} z^{2\delta_F} \right]^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\ &\leq \frac{L_{G,x} \beta_t}{4} z^2 + c_{xy,5}^{de} \beta_t \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} z^4 \text{ and } c_{xy,5}^{de} \propto S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

where we use $c_{xy,5}^{de}$ to hide the problem-dependent coefficients. Other terms can be controlled by (148). Recall that $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1$ and $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa$. Plugging the above inequality and (148) into (87) yields

$$\Delta_{xy,t} \leq L_{G,x} \beta_t (\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2) + c_{xy,6}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + c_{xy,7}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + \left(c_{xy,8}^{de} \alpha_t^2 \beta_t + c_{xy,9}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \quad (155)$$

where the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{xy,6}^{de} &= 2S_{B,G} (1 + 2L_H) c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_G}{4}} \iota_1^{\frac{\delta_G}{2}} + 2c_{xy,4}^{de} c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{4}} \iota_1^{\frac{\delta_H}{2}} + 4S_{B,F} S_{B,G} c_{+,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_F+\delta_G}{4}} \iota_1^{1+\frac{\delta_F+\delta_G}{2}}, \\ c_{xy,7}^{de} &= 2S_{B,G} (1 + 2L_H) c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_G}{4}} \iota_2^{\delta_H \delta_G} \kappa^{\delta_G} + 2c_{xy,4}^{de} c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_H}{4}} \iota_2^{\delta_H^2} \kappa^{\delta_H} + 4S_{B,F} S_{B,G} c_{-,2}^{\frac{2+\delta_F+\delta_G}{4}} \iota_1 \iota_2^{\delta_H (\delta_F + \delta_G)} \kappa^{\delta_F + \delta_G} \\ &= (S_{B,G} + S_H + S_{B,F} S_{B,G}) S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_5(S_H, \Gamma_{22}), \\ c_{xy,8}^{de} &= c_{xy,5}^{de} c_{+,2} \propto S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \quad c_{xy,9}^{de} = c_{xy,5}^{de} c_{-,2} = S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_6(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \end{aligned} \quad (156)$$

for some functions $h_5(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $h_6(\cdot, \cdot)$. Here the inequalities follows from the definitions of $c_{xy,4}^{de}$ in (90), $c_{xy,5}^{de}$ in (154) and $c_{-,2}$ in (147).

Derive the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\|$. With the upper bounds of the higher-order terms, we could derive the upper bound of $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\|$. Substituting (149), (153) and (155) into (82), (84) and (86) respectively yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq (1 - \mu_F\alpha_t) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + c_{x,1}^{de}\beta_t^2\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{x,2}^{de}\beta_t\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + 2\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{x,3}^{de}\beta_t^2 + c_{x,4}^{de}\frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + c_{x,9}^{de}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{x,10}^{de}\frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (157)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G\beta_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \left(\frac{4L_H L_{G,x}\beta_t^2}{\mu_F\alpha_t} + 2L_{G,x}^2\beta_t^2\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x}\beta_t\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{22}\beta_t^2 + c_{y,2}^{de} \left(c_{+,2}\alpha_t\beta_t^2 + c_{-,2}\frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}, \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2}\right) \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + 2L_{G,x}\beta_t\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + (c_{xy,1}^{de} + L_{G,x})\beta_t\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + \Sigma_{12}\alpha_t\beta_t \\ &\quad + c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 + c_{xy,3}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + c_{xy,6}^{de}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{xy,7}^{de}\frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \\ &\quad + \left(c_{xy,8}^{de}\alpha_t^2\beta_t + c_{xy,9}^{de}\frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}. \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

Define the Lyapunov function

$$W_t = \varrho_4 \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| \quad \text{with } \varrho_4 = \frac{6L_{G,x}}{\mu_F}$$

Since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F\mu_G}{24d_x L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}} \wedge \frac{\mu_F}{5\mu_G}$ and $c_{x,4} = 2d_x L_H L_{G,y}$, one can check

$$\varrho_4 c_{x,4} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \leq \frac{72d_x L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}{\mu_F^2} \cdot \kappa^2 \cdot \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{6} \leq \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{6} \quad \text{and} \quad 2L_{G,x} = \frac{\mu_F\varrho_4}{3}. \quad (160)$$

Combining this and $\frac{\beta_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \leq \frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{t+1} &\stackrel{(157)+(159)}{\leq} W_t - \varrho_4\mu_F\beta_t\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{2}\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| + 2L_{G,x}\beta_t\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \varrho_4 c_{x,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t\hat{y}_t^\top\| \\ &\quad + \left(c_{xy,1}^{de}\beta_t + L_{G,x}\beta_t + \varrho_4 c_{x,1}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^3}{\alpha_t}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2\varrho_4\Gamma_{11}\alpha_t\beta_t + \varrho_4 c_{x,3}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^3}{\alpha_t} \\ &\quad + \varrho_4 c_{x,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + \varrho_4 c_{x,9}^{de}\beta_t^2 + \varrho_4 c_{x,10}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{4+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^3} + \Sigma_{12}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{xy,2}^{de}\beta_t^2 \\ &\quad + c_{xy,3}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} + c_{xy,6}^{de}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{xy,7}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{3+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} + \left(c_{xy,8}^{de}\alpha_t^2\beta_t + c_{xy,9}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\ &\stackrel{(160)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{3}\right) W_t + c_{xy,10}^{de}\beta_t\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{xy,11}^{de}\alpha_t\beta_t + c_{xy,12}^{de}\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H} \\ &\quad + \left(c_{xy,8}^{de}\alpha_t^2\beta_t + c_{xy,9}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^4}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

where we also use Assumption 2.7 and $\varrho_4 = \frac{6L_{G,x}}{\mu_F}$, and the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{xy,10}^{de} &= c_{xy,1}^{de} + L_{G,x} + \varrho_4 c_{x,1}^{de} \rho, \\ c_{xy,11}^{de} &= 2\varrho_4 \Gamma_{11} + \Sigma_{12} + \varrho_4 c_{x,3}^{de} \kappa^2 + \varrho_4 c_{x,9}^{de} \kappa + c_{xy,2}^{de} \kappa + c_{xy,6}^{de}, \\ c_{xy,12}^{de} &= c_{xy,3}^{de} + \varrho_4 c_{x,4}^{de} \kappa^2 + \varrho_4 c_{x,10}^{de} \kappa^3 + c_{xy,7}^{de} \kappa^2 = S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_7(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

for some function $h_7(\cdot, \cdot)$, and the last step follows from the definitions of $c_{xy,3}^{de}$ in (101), $c_{x,4}^{de}$ in (90), $c_{x,10}^{de}$ in (150) and $c_{xy,7}^{de}$ in (156).

For simplicity, we let

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3}\right), \quad \beta_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right).$$

Note that under our assumptions, (139) holds, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_t\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 \leq c_+ \alpha_t + c_- \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^2} \leq c_+ \alpha_t + c_- \kappa^2 \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \quad \text{with} \quad c_- \propto S_H^2 \Gamma_{22}^{1+\delta_H}. \quad (163)$$

Plugging (163) into (161) and iterating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_{t+1} &\leq \tilde{\alpha}_{0,t} W_0 + (c_{xy,10}^{de} c_+ + c_{xy,11}^{de}) \sum_{\tau=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{\tau+1,t} \alpha_\tau \beta_\tau + (c_{xy,10}^{de} c_- \kappa^2 + c_{xy,12}^{de}) \sum_{\tau=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{\tau+1,t} \beta_\tau^{1+2\delta_H} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{\tau+1,t} \left(c_{xy,8}^{de} \alpha_\tau^2 \beta_\tau + c_{xy,9}^{de} \frac{\beta_\tau^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_\tau^4} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_\tau}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\ &\leq C_{xy,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t} + C_{xy,1}^{de} \beta_t + C_{xy,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{xy,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (i) and (ii) in Lemma F.9, whose proof is deferred to Appendix F.10, and also uses $\tilde{\alpha}_{0,t} \leq \beta_{0,t}$, and the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{xy,0}^{de} &= \varrho_4 \kappa \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_0 \hat{y}_0^\top\|, \quad C_{xy,1}^{de} = \frac{6(c_{xy,10}^{de} c_+ + c_{xy,11}^{de})}{\mu_F}, \\ C_{xy,2}^{de} &= \frac{4(c_{xy,10}^{de} c_- \kappa^2 + c_{xy,12}^{de})}{\mu_F} = S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_{xy,2}(S_H, \Gamma_{22}), \\ C_{xy,3}^{de} &= \frac{12c_{xy,8}^{de}}{\mu_F} \propto S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \quad C_{xy,4}^{de} = \frac{9c_{xy,9}^{de}}{\mu_F} = S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_{xy,4}(S_H, \Gamma_{22}) \end{aligned} \quad (164)$$

for some functions $\{h_{xy,i}(\cdot, \cdot)\}_{i=2,4}$. Here we have used the definitions of c_- in (139), $c_{xy,8}^{de}$, $c_{xy,9}^{de}$ in (156) and $c_{xy,12}^{de}$ in (162).

Lemma F.9 (Step sizes inequalities). *Let $\tilde{\alpha}_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t (1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3})$, $\tilde{\beta}_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t (1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2})$ and $\beta_{j,t} = \prod_{\tau=j}^t (1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4})$. Under Assumption 2.7, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad & \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_j \leq \frac{6\beta_t}{\mu_F} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \beta_j^{1+2\delta_H} \leq \frac{4}{\mu_F} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}. \\
(ii) \quad & \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^2 \beta_j \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \leq \frac{12\alpha_t \beta_t}{\mu_F} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^4} \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \leq \frac{9\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}. \\
(iii) \quad & \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \beta_j^2 \leq \frac{4\beta_t}{\mu_G}, \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \beta_j \beta_{0,j-1} \leq \frac{8\beta_{0,t}}{\mu_G} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} = \frac{3\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t}. \\
(iv) \quad & \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_j^2 \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \leq \frac{6\alpha_t \beta_t}{\mu_G} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \leq \frac{6\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}. \\
(v) \quad & \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_j^2 \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} \leq \frac{6\alpha_t \beta_t}{\mu_G} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \leq \frac{6\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{t+1}\hat{y}_{t+1}^\top\| & \leq W_{t+1} \\
& \leq C_{xy,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t} + C_{xy,1}^{de} \beta_t + C_{xy,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{xy,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}. \quad (165)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F \mu_G}{200L_H L_{G,x} L_{G,y}}$, we have $C_{xy,0}^{de} \leq \frac{\mu_G}{33L_H L_{G,y}} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_0 \hat{y}_0^\top\|$. Thus we obtain the second inequality.

Derive the upper bound of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$. Now we are prepared to establish the convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2$. From (165) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_t \hat{y}_t^\top\| & \leq C_{xy,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t-1} + C_{xy,1}^{de} \beta_{t-1} + C_{xy,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_{t-1}^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_{t-1}} + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \alpha_{t-1} \beta_{t-1} + C_{xy,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_{t-1}^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_{t-1}^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\beta_{t-1}}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\
& \leq C_{xy,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t-1} + C_{xy,1}^{de} \zeta \beta_t + C_{xy,2}^{de} \zeta^3 \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+2} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{xy,4}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+9} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \quad (166)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta = 1 + \frac{\mu_F \iota_1}{16} + \frac{\mu_G \iota_2}{64}$. Plugging (166) and (163) into (158) and applying the upper bounds in Assumption 2.7, with $c_{y,3}^{de} = \frac{4L_H L_{G,x}}{\mu_F} + 2L_{G,x}^2 \iota_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + c_{y,3}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^2}{\alpha_t} \left(c_+ \alpha_t + c_- \kappa^2 \beta_t^{2\delta_H}\right) + 2d_y L_{G,x} \beta_t \left[C_{xy,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t-1} + C_{xy,1}^{de} \zeta \beta_t \right. \\
& \quad \left. + C_{xy,2}^{de} \zeta^3 \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+2} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{xy,4}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+9} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \right] \\
& \quad + \Gamma_{22} \beta_t^2 + c_{y,2}^{de} \left(c_{+,2} \alpha_t \beta_t^2 + c_{-,2} \frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}} \\
& \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_t\|^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x} \beta_t \beta_{0,t-1} + \left(c_{y,3}^{de} c_+ + 2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,1}^{de} \zeta + \Gamma_{22} \right) \beta_t^2 \\
& \quad + \left(c_{y,3}^{de} c_- \kappa^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,2}^{de} \zeta^3 \right) \frac{\beta_t^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2d_y L_{G,x} \left(C_{xy,3}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+2} \alpha_t \beta_t^2 + C_{xy,4}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+9} \frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\
& + c_{y,2}^{de} \left(c_{+,2} \alpha_t \beta_t^2 + c_{-,2} \frac{\beta_t^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{167}$$

Iterating (167) and applying (iii), (iv) and (v) in Lemma F.9 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_{t+1}\|^2 & \leq C_{y,0}^{de} \beta_{0,t} + C_{y,1}^{de} \beta_t + C_{y,2}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} + \left(C_{y,3}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{y,4}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\
& + \left(C_{y,5}^{de} \alpha_t \beta_t + C_{y,6}^{de} \frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_G}},
\end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

where the constants are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{y,0}^{de} & = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_0\|^2 + \frac{16d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,0}^{de}}{\mu_G}, \quad C_{y,1}^{de} = \frac{4(c_{y,3}^{de} c_+ + 2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,1}^{de} \zeta + \Gamma_{22})}{\mu_G}, \\
C_{y,2}^{de} & = \frac{3(c_{y,3}^{de} c_- \kappa^2 + 2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,2}^{de} \zeta^3)}{\mu_G} = S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_{y,2}(S_H, \Gamma_{22}), \\
C_{y,3}^{de} & = \frac{6(2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,3}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+2})}{\mu_G} \propto S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}, \\
C_{y,4}^{de} & = \frac{6(2d_y L_{G,x} C_{xy,4}^{de} \zeta^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}+9})}{\mu_G} = S_{B,F}^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_{y,4}(S_H, \Gamma_{22}), \\
C_{y,5}^{de} & = \frac{6c_{y,2}^{de} c_{+,2}}{\mu_G} \propto S_{B,G}^{\frac{2}{\delta_G}}, \quad C_{y,6}^{de} = \frac{6c_{y,2}^{de} c_{-,2}}{\mu_G} = S_{B,G}^{\frac{2}{\delta_G}} S_H \Gamma_{22}^{\frac{1+\delta_H}{2}} \cdot h_{y,6}(S_H, \Gamma_{22})
\end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

for some functions $\{h_{y,i}(\cdot, \cdot)\}_{i=2,4,6}$. Here we have used the definitions of c_- in (139), $C_{xy,2}^{de}$ to $C_{xy,4}^{de}$ in (164), $c_{y,2}^{de}$ in (152) and $c_{-,2}$ in (147). \square

F.9 Proof of Corollary 3.1

Proof of Corollary 3.1. Define $\beta_{0,T} = \prod_{t=0}^T \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4}\right)$. Clearly, $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t}$ is non-increasing and upper bounded by κ . By setting α_t, β_t, T_0 as in (81), we have $\alpha_t \leq \iota_1 \wedge \frac{\iota_2}{\kappa} \wedge \frac{\rho^2}{\kappa}$ for all $t \geq 0$, so the constant bounds in Assumption 2.7 hold. Since $(1+x)^\gamma \leq 1 + \gamma x$ for $x \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, then for any $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\alpha_t} \left(\frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} - 1 \right) & \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_t} \cdot \frac{a}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{\delta_F \mu_G \kappa a}{128} \frac{(t+T_0)^a}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{\delta_F \mu_G \kappa}{64} \frac{1}{(t+T_0)^{1-a}} \leq \frac{\delta_F \mu_F}{16}, \\
\frac{1}{\beta_t} \left(\frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\alpha_t} - 1 \right) & \leq \frac{1}{\beta_t} \cdot \frac{a}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{(\delta_F \wedge \delta_G) \mu_G a}{128} \frac{(t+T_0)^b}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{(\delta_F \wedge \delta_G) \mu_G}{64(t+T_0)^{1-b}} \leq \frac{(\delta_F \wedge \delta_G) \mu_G}{16}, \\
\frac{1}{\beta_t} \left(\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} - 1 \right) & \leq \frac{1}{\beta_t} \cdot \frac{b}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{\mu_G b}{128} \frac{(t+T_0)^b}{t-1+T_0} \leq \frac{\mu_G}{64} \frac{1}{(t+T_0)^{1-b}} \leq \frac{\mu_G}{64}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the growth condition in Assumption 2.7 holds. For $\beta_{0,T}$, if $b = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{0,T} &= \prod_{t=0}^T \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4}\right) \leq \prod_{t=0}^T \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{64}\right) \leq \prod_{t=0}^T \left(1 - \frac{2}{t + T_0}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{T_0^2}{(T + T_0)(T + T_0 - 1)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_T^2).\end{aligned}$$

If $b < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{0,T} &= \prod_{t=0}^T \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_t}{4}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu_G}{4} \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t\right) \leq \exp\left(-32 \sum_{t=0}^T (t + T_0)^{-b}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-32 \int_{T_0}^{T+T_0-1} t^{-b} dt\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(T + T_0 + 1)^{1-b} - T_0^{1-b}}{(1-b)/32}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(-\frac{32T^{1-b}}{1-b}\right)\right) = o(\alpha_T^2).\end{aligned}$$

Then the conditions in Theorem F.1 hold. Note that $\delta_H \geq 0.5$ implies $\frac{\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_t} = \mathcal{O}(\beta_t)$ and $\frac{\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_t^5} = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_t \beta_t)$; $\frac{b}{a} \leq 1 + \frac{\delta_F}{2} \wedge \delta_G \leq 2$ implies $\left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F} \vee \frac{1}{\delta_G}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_t}\right)$ and $\beta_{0,T} = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_T^2) = \mathcal{O}(\beta_T)$. It follows that $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{x}_T \hat{y}_T^\top\| = \mathcal{O}(\beta_T)$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{y}_T\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta_T)$. The upper bound of $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{x}_T\|^2$ is from Theorem 3.1. \square

F.10 Proof of Lemmas F.8 and F.9

Proof of Lemma F.8. The proof is similar to that of Kaledin et al. [2020, Lemma 14].

- For the first claim in (i), the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{16}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8} + \frac{\mu_G^2 \beta_\tau^2}{16^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8}.\end{aligned}\tag{170}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^t \beta_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^2 \beta_j &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j^2 \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\ &= \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_t}\right)^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\ &= \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(170)}{\leq} \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8}\right)\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{8\alpha_t^2}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8} \right) \right] \leq \frac{8\alpha_t^2}{\mu_G}.$$

- For the second claim in (i), we define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 1/64)$, one can check $(1+x)^{4+4\delta_H} \leq 1+9x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^4 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4+4\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right)^{4+4\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{9\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10}. \end{aligned} \quad (171)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^4} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^{1+4\delta_H} \kappa_j^4 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \\ &= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t} \right)^4 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \\ &= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^4 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{4} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(171)}{\leq} \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10} \right) \\ &= \frac{10\beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{10} \right) \right] \leq \frac{10\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^4}. \end{aligned}$$

- For the first claim in (ii), the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{16} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{8} + \frac{\mu_F^2 \alpha_\tau^2}{16^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^3 &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j^3 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \\ &= \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_t} \right)^2 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(172)}{\leq} \alpha_t^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \\
&= \frac{4\alpha_t^2}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \right] \leq \frac{4\alpha_t^2}{\mu_F}.
\end{aligned}$$

- For the second claim in (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_{0,j-1} &= \beta_{0,t} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \frac{1}{(1 - \mu_G \beta_j/4) \beta_{j+1,t}} \\
&= \beta_{0,t} \sum_{j=0}^t \frac{\alpha_j}{1 - \mu_G \beta_j/4} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \frac{1 - \mu_F \alpha_\tau/2}{1 - \mu_G \beta_\tau/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

One can check that for $x \in (0, 1/2)$, $\frac{1}{1-x} \leq 1 + 2x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\frac{1}{1 - \mu_G \beta_\tau/4} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}$. It follows that $\frac{1}{1 - \mu_G \beta_\tau/4} \leq 2$ and

$$\frac{1 - \mu_F \alpha_\tau/2}{1 - \mu_G \beta_\tau/4} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4},$$

where the last inequality is due to $\frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{\mu_F \alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_G}{\mu_F} \kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_{0,j-1} &= \beta_{0,t} \sum_{j=0}^t \frac{\alpha_j}{1 - \mu_G \beta_j/4} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \frac{1 - \mu_F \alpha_\tau/2}{1 - \mu_G \beta_\tau/4} \\
&\leq 2\beta_{0,t} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \\
&= \frac{8\beta_{0,t}}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \right] \leq \frac{8\beta_{0,t}}{\mu_F}.
\end{aligned}$$

- For the last claim in (ii), we define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 1/64)$, one can check $(1+x)^{4+4\delta_H} \leq 1+9x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$ and $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^4 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4+4\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right)^{4+4\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{9\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{9\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{64}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}. \quad (173)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{4+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^3} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \beta_j^{4\delta_H} \kappa_j^4 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t}\right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t}\right)^4 \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau}\right)^4 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{2}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(173)}{\leq} \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4 \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &= \frac{3\beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^4}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right)\right] \leq \frac{3\beta_t^{4+4\delta_H}}{\mu_F\alpha_t^4}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma F.9. The proof is similar to that of [Kaledin et al. \[2020, Lemma 14\]](#).

- (i) • For the first claim in (i), since $\frac{\beta_t}{\alpha_t} \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, we have $\frac{\beta_{t-1}}{\beta_t} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_G\beta_t}{32} \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_F\alpha_t}{32}$. Then by exchanging the states of α_t and β_t in (iii) of Lemma E.5, we have $\sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_j \leq \frac{4\beta_t}{\mu_F}$.
- For the last claim in (i), we define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 0.1)$, one can check $(1+x)^{1+2\delta_H} \leq 1+4x$. Since $\mu_G\beta_\tau \leq \mu_G\iota_2 \leq 1$ and $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{1+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G\beta_\tau}{64}\right)^{1+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G\beta_\tau}{16}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{16}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (174)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \beta_j^{1+2\delta_H} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \beta_j^{2\delta_H} \kappa_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \\ &= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t}\right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F\alpha_\tau}{3}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(174)}{\leq} \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \\
&= \frac{4\beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \right] \leq \frac{4\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (ii) • For the first claim in (ii), define $\zeta_\tau = \frac{\alpha_\tau}{\beta_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}$. For $x \in (0,0.2)$, one can check $\exp(x) \leq 1 + 1.2x$. Since $\delta_F \leq 1$, $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{5\mu_G}$ and $\mu_F \alpha_\tau \leq \mu_F \iota_1 \leq 1$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) &\leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \right)^{\frac{3}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\delta_F \mu_F \alpha_\tau}{16} \right)^{\frac{3}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{80} \right) \exp\left(\frac{3\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{16} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{80} \right) \left(1 + \frac{3.6\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{16} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{4} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{12}. \quad (175)
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j^2 \beta_j \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j^2 \beta_j \zeta_j^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&= \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \frac{\beta_j}{\alpha_t \beta_t} \left(\frac{\zeta_j}{\zeta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&= \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(175)}{\leq} \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{12} \right) \\
&= \frac{12\alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{12} \right) \right] \leq \frac{12\alpha_t \beta_t}{\mu_F} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}.
\end{aligned}$$

- For the last claim in (ii), define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$ and $\zeta_\tau = \frac{\alpha_\tau}{\beta_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$ and $\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}$. For $x \in (0,0.2)$, one can check $\exp(x) \leq 1 + 1.2x$ and for $x \in (0,0.1)$, $(1+x)^{5+4\delta_H} \leq 1 + 10x$. Since $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{5\mu_G}$, $\mu_F \alpha_\tau \leq \mu_F \iota_1 \leq 1$ and $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$, the

growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{5+4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right)^{5+4\delta_H} \left(1 + \frac{\delta_F \mu_F \alpha_\tau}{16} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& \leq \left(1 + \frac{5\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{8} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{32} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1.2\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{8} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& = \left(1 + \frac{2\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{9} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{9}.
\end{aligned} \tag{176}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\alpha}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{5+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^4} \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \beta_j^{4\delta_H} \kappa_j^5 \zeta_j^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& = \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_j}{\zeta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& = \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{3} \right) \\
& \stackrel{(176)}{\leq} \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{9} \right) \\
& = \frac{9\beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}}{\mu_F} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_F \alpha_\tau}{9} \right) \right] \leq \frac{9\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\mu_F \alpha_t^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (iii) • The first claim in (iii) follows from (i) in Lemma E.5.
- The proof is the same as that of (iv) in Lemma E.4.
- For the last claim in (i), we define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 0.1)$, one can check $(1+x)^{1+2\delta_H} \leq 1+4x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$ and $\frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau} \leq \frac{\mu_F}{\mu_G}$, the growth condition implies

$$\left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{1+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64}\right)^{1+2\delta_H} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{16}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{3}. \quad (177)
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{2+2\delta_H}}{\alpha_j} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^{1+2\delta_H} \kappa_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t}\right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}\right)^{2\delta_H} \frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(177)}{\leq} \beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{3}\right) \\
&= \frac{3\beta_t^{2\delta_H} \kappa_t}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{3}\right)\right] \leq \frac{3\beta_t^{1+2\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (iv) • For the first claim in (ii), define $\zeta_\tau = \frac{\alpha_\tau}{\beta_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}$. For $x \in (0,0.2)$, one can check $\exp(x) \leq 1 + 1.2x$. Since $\delta_F \leq 1$ and $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) &\leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}\right)^{\frac{3}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\delta_F \mu_G \beta_\tau}{16}\right)^{\frac{3}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64}\right) \exp\left(\frac{3\mu_G \beta_\tau}{16}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64}\right) \left(1 + \frac{3.6\mu_G \beta_\tau}{16}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{3}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6}. \quad (178)
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \alpha_j \beta_j^2 \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} &= \sum_{j=0}^t \alpha_j \beta_j^2 \zeta_j^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right) \\
&= \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_t} \frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t} \left(\frac{\zeta_j}{\zeta_t}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1} \beta_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau \beta_\tau} \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(178)}{\leq} \alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6} \right) \\
&= \frac{6\alpha_t \beta_t \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6} \right) \right] \leq \frac{6\alpha_t \beta_t}{\mu_G} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}.
\end{aligned}$$

- For the last claim in (iv), define $\kappa_\tau = \frac{\beta_\tau}{\alpha_\tau}$ and $\zeta_\tau = \frac{\alpha_\tau}{\beta_\tau}$. Then we have $\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \leq \frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau}$ and $\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau}$. For $x \in (0, 0.2)$, one can check $\exp(x) \leq 1 + 1.2x$ and for $x \in (0, 0.1)$, $(1+x)^{5+4\delta_H} \leq 1 + 10x$. Since $\mu_G \beta_\tau \leq \mu_G \iota_2 \leq 1$, the growth condition implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{5+4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\tau-1}}{\alpha_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{64} \right)^{5+4\delta_H} \left(1 + \frac{\delta_F \mu_G \beta_\tau}{16} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{5\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32} \right) \exp\left(\frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{5\mu_G \beta_\tau}{32} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1.2\mu_G \beta_\tau}{8} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{3} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6}.
\end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^t \tilde{\beta}_{j+1,t} \frac{\beta_j^{6+4\delta_H}}{\alpha_j^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j^{1+4\delta_H} \kappa_j^5 \zeta_j^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \left(\frac{\beta_j}{\beta_t} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_j}{\kappa_t} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_j}{\zeta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&= \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\beta_{\tau-1}}{\beta_\tau} \right)^{4\delta_H} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\tau-1}}{\kappa_\tau} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\zeta_{\tau-1}}{\zeta_\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{2} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(179)}{\leq} \beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}} \sum_{j=0}^t \beta_j \prod_{\tau=j+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6} \right) \\
&= \frac{6\beta_t^{4\delta_H} \kappa_t^5 \zeta_t^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}}{\mu_G} \left[1 - \prod_{\tau=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu_G \beta_\tau}{6} \right) \right] \leq \frac{6\beta_t^{5+4\delta_H}}{\mu_G \alpha_t^5} \left(\frac{\alpha_t}{\beta_t} \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta_F}}.
\end{aligned}$$

(v) The proof of (v) is nearly the same as that of (iv), except that we replace δ_F by $2\delta_G$.

□

G A Supplement to Section 4

In this section, we provide some supplementary materials for Section 4, including details of parameter selection and additional numerical results.

Details of parameter selection for Section 4 and additional numerical results For Figure 2, we initialize $x_0 = y_0 = 2$ and employ the step sizes $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(t+1)^{-a}$ and $\beta_t = \beta_0(t+1)^{-b}$. To find the optimal values of (α_0, β_0) , we perform a grid search on $\{10, 3, 1, 0.3, 0.1\}^2$ for each pair, running 10^5 iterations. We consider $(a, b) \in \{0.7, 0.6\} \times \{1.0, 0.9\}$, which represents different time scales. For each combination, we run 10^6 steps of (2) across 10^3 repetitions.

For both examples in Section 4.2 and the following additional examples, we initialize $x_0 = y_0 = 2$, employ the step sizes $\alpha_t = \alpha_0(t+1)^{-a}$ and $\beta_t = \beta_0(t+1)^{-b}$ with $(a, b) \in \{0.7, 0.6\} \times \{1.0, 0.9\}$. A grid search is performed on $\{10, 3, 1, 0.3, 0.1\}^2$ to find the optimal choices for (α_0, β_0) . For Figures 6 to 8, the grid search is conducted with 10^4 iterations; for others, we use 10^5 iterations. Additionally, when $b = 1$, we impose the condition $\beta_0 \geq 1$ to prevent slow convergence caused by excessively small initial step sizes [Moulines and Bach, 2011]. All experiments are repeated 1000 times.

To calculate the slopes of lines in figures, we use the points from different iterations. For Figures 6 to 8, we use the points in the iterations range from 10^4 to 10^5 ; For Figures 3 and 5, we use iterations from 10^5 to 10^6 ; for Figure 4, we use iterations from 3×10^5 to 10^6 .

Biased case in stochastic bilevel optimization Now we consider a biased version for the stochastic bilevel optimization in Section 4.2. We apply two-time-scale SA (44) with F and G defined in (43) to solve problem (31). The noise satisfies $\xi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\psi_t = \psi_{t,1} + \psi_{t,2}$, where $\psi_{t,1} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\psi_{t,2} = -10 \text{sign}(x_t) \sqrt{\beta_t} \cdot \tilde{\psi}_t$ represents the bias term. Here each $\tilde{\psi}_t$ is uniformly sampled from $[0, 1]$, ensuring $|\psi_{t,2}|^2 \leq 100\beta_t$. The results are depicted in Figure 5. We observe that the bias term does not affect the convergence rate and decoupled convergence is achievable, confirming the achievability of decoupled convergence, as discussed in Appendix D.2.




Figure 5: The convergence results for biased two-time-scale SA to solve (31)

SGD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging We employ SGD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (4) to minimize $f(x) = x^2 + \sin x$ with $\xi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Here f satisfies Assumption C.1 with $\mu = 1$, $L = 3$ and $S = 1$. The results are depicted in Figure 6. The value of a does not affect the convergence rate of $|\hat{y}_t|^2$, which is roughly $\Theta(1/t)$.




Figure 6: The convergence results for SGD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (4)

SGD with momentum We employ two versions of SHB, the simultaneous version (41) and the alternating version (46), to minimize $f(x) = x^2 + \sin x$. The noise satisfies $\xi_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The results are depicted in Figure 7 and 8. The two versions of SHB exhibit similarly and both achieve decoupled convergence, which is consistent with the analysis in Appendix D.1.




Figure 7: The convergence results for simultaneous SHB (41)




Figure 8: The convergence results for alternating SHB (46)

References

- Guillaume O Berger, P-A Absil, Raphaël M Jungers, and Yurii Nesterov. On the quality of first-order approximation of functions with hölder continuous gradient. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 185:17–33, 2020.
- Vivek S Borkar. Stochastic approximation with two time scales. *Systems & Control Letters*, 29(5): 291–294, 1997.
- Vivek S Borkar. *Stochastic approximation: A dynamical systems viewpoint*, volume 48. Springer, 2009.
- Vivek S Borkar and Vijaymohan R Konda. The actor-critic algorithm as multi-time-scale stochastic approximation. *Sadhana*, 22:525–543, 1997.
- Vivek S Borkar and Sarath Pattathil. Concentration bounds for two time scale stochastic approximation. In *2018 56th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 504–511. IEEE, 2018.
- Jerome Bracken and James T McGill. Mathematical programs with optimization problems in the constraints. *Operations research*, 21(1):37–44, 1973.
- Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. Closing the gap: Tighter analysis of alternating stochastic gradient methods for bilevel problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 25294–25307, 2021.
- Zaiwei Chen, Kaiqing Zhang, Eric Mazumdar, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Adam Wierman. Two-timescale q-learning with function approximation in zero-sum stochastic games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04905*, 2023.
- Benoît Colson, Patrice Marcotte, and Gilles Savard. An overview of bilevel optimization. *Annals of operations research*, 153:235–256, 2007.
- Gal Dalal, Balazs Szorenyi, and Gugan Thoppe. A tale of two-timescale reinforcement learning with the tightest finite-time bound. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 3701–3708, 2020.
- Thinh T Doan. Finite-time convergence rates of nonlinear two-time-scale stochastic approximation under Markovian noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01627*, 2021.
- Thinh T Doan. Nonlinear two-time-scale stochastic approximation convergence and finite-time performance. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022.
- Thinh T Doan. Fast nonlinear two-time-scale stochastic approximation: Achieving $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ finite-sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12764*, 2024.
- Fathima Zarin Faizal and Vivek Borkar. Functional central limit theorem for two timescale stochastic approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05723*, 2023.
- Sébastien Gadat, Fabien Panloup, and Sofiane Saadane. Stochastic heavy ball. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 12:461–529, 2018.

- Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02246*, 2018.
- Igor Gitman, Hunter Lang, Pengchuan Zhang, and Lin Xiao. Understanding the role of momentum in stochastic gradient methods. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- A. M. Gupal and L. T. Bazhenov. A stochastic analog of the conjugate gradient method. *Cybernetics*, 8:138–140, 1972.
- Yuze Han, Xiang Li, and Zhihua Zhang. Finite-time decoupled convergence in nonlinear two-time-scale stochastic approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03893v1*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2401.03893v1>.
- Shaan Ul Haque, Sajad Khodadadian, and Siva Theja Maguluri. Tight finite time bounds of two-time-scale linear stochastic approximation with markovian noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00364*, 2023.
- Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local Nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- 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.
- Jie Hu, Vishwaraj Doshi, et al. Central limit theorem for two-timescale stochastic approximation with markovian noise: Theory and applications. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1477–1485. PMLR, 2024.
- Yue Huang, Zhaoxian Wu, Shiqian Ma, and Qing Ling. Single-timescale multi-sequence stochastic approximation without fixed point smoothness: Theories and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13743*, 2024.
- Maxim Kaledin, Eric Moulines, Alexey Naumov, Vladislav Tadic, and Hoi-To Wai. Finite time analysis of linear two-timescale stochastic approximation with Markovian noise. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2144–2203. PMLR, 2020.
- Prasenjit Karmakar and Shalabh Bhatnagar. Two time-scale stochastic approximation with controlled Markov noise and off-policy temporal-difference learning. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(1):130–151, 2018.
- Vijay R Konda and John N Tsitsiklis. On actor-critic algorithms. *SIAM journal on Control and Optimization*, 42(4):1143–1166, 2003.
- Vijay R Konda and John N Tsitsiklis. Convergence rate of linear two-time-scale stochastic approximation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 14(2):796–819, 2004.
- Harold Kushner and G George Yin. *Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications*, volume 35. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

- Jeongyeol Kwon, Luke Dotson, Yudong Chen, and Qiaomin Xie. Two-timescale linear stochastic approximation: Constant stepsizes go a long way. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13067*, 2024.
- Chandrashekar Lakshminarayanan and Shalabh Bhatnagar. A stability criterion for two timescale stochastic approximation schemes. *Automatica*, 79:108–114, 2017.
- Xiang Li, Jiadong Liang, Xiangyu Chang, and Zhihua Zhang. Statistical estimation and online inference via Local SGD. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1613–1661. PMLR, 2022.
- Xiang Li, Jiadong Liang, and Zhihua Zhang. Online statistical inference for nonlinear stochastic approximation with Markovian data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07690*, 2023a.
- Xiang Li, Wenhao Yang, Zhihua Zhang, and Michael I Jordan. A statistical analysis of Polyak-Ruppert averaged Q-learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206, 2023b.
- Jiadong Liang, Yuze Han, Xiang Li, and Zhihua Zhang. Asymptotic behaviors and phase transitions in projected stochastic approximation: A jump diffusion approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12953*, 2023.
- Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020.
- Abdelkader Mokkadem and Mariane Pelletier. Convergence rate and averaging of nonlinear two-time-scale stochastic approximation algorithms. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 16(3):1671–1702, 2006.
- Wenlong Mou, Chris Junchi Li, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. On linear stochastic approximation: Fine-grained Polyak-Ruppert and non-asymptotic concentration. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2947–2997. PMLR, 2020.
- Wenlong Mou, Koulik Khamaru, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Optimal variance-reduced stochastic approximation in Banach spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08518*, 2022a.
- Wenlong Mou, Ashwin Pananjady, and Martin J Wainwright. Optimal oracle inequalities for projected fixed-point equations, with applications to policy evaluation. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022b.
- Eric Moulines and Francis Bach. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24, 2011.
- Boris T Polyak and Anatoli B Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 30(4):838–855, 1992.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- Herbert Robbins and David Siegmund. A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications. In *Optimizing methods in statistics*, pages 233–257. Elsevier, 1971.

- David Ruppert. Efficient estimations from a slowly convergent robbins-monro process. Technical report, Cornell University Operations Research and Industrial Engineering, 1988.
- Louis Sharrock. Two-timescale stochastic approximation for bilevel optimisation problems in continuous-time models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06995*, 2022.
- Han Shen and Tianyi Chen. A single-timescale analysis for stochastic approximation with multiple coupled sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 17415–17429, 2022.
- Richard S Sutton, Hamid Reza Maei, Doina Precup, Shalabh Bhatnagar, David Silver, Csaba Szepesvári, and Eric Wiewiora. Fast gradient-descent methods for temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 993–1000, 2009.
- Vladislav B Tadic. Almost sure convergence of two time-scale stochastic approximation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2004 American Control Conference*, volume 4, pages 3802–3807. IEEE, 2004.
- Yue Wang, Shaofeng Zou, and Yi Zhou. Non-asymptotic analysis for two time-scale TDC with general smooth function approximation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 9747–9758, 2021.
- Yue Frank Wu, Weitong Zhang, Pan Xu, and Quanquan Gu. A finite-time analysis of two time-scale actor-critic methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17617–17628, 2020.
- Tengyu Xu and Yingbin Liang. Sample complexity bounds for two timescale value-based reinforcement learning algorithms. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 811–819. PMLR, 2021.
- Tengyu Xu, Shaofeng Zou, and Yingbin Liang. Two time-scale off-policy TD learning: Non-asymptotic analysis over Markovian samples. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Tengyu Xu, Zhe Wang, and Yingbin Liang. Non-asymptotic convergence analysis of two time-scale (natural) actor-critic algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03557*, 2020.
- Vinayaka G Yaji and Shalabh Bhatnagar. Stochastic recursive inclusions in two timescales with nonadditive iterate-dependent Markov noise. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 45(4):1405–1444, 2020.
- G Yin, Cristina Ion, and Vikram Krishnamurthy. How does a stochastic optimization/approximation algorithm adapt to a randomly evolving optimum/root with jump Markov sample paths. *Mathematical programming*, 120(1):67–99, 2009.
- Sihan Zeng and Think T Doan. Fast two-time-scale stochastic gradient method with applications in reinforcement learning. In *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5166–5212. PMLR, 2024.
- Sihan Zeng, Think T Doan, and Justin Romberg. A two-time-scale stochastic optimization framework with applications in control and reinforcement learning. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(1): 946–976, 2024.