

# Zeroth-order Gradient and Quasi-Newton Methods for Nonsmooth Nonconvex Stochastic Optimization

Luke Marrinan

Uday V. Shanbhag \*

Farzad Yousefian

January 18, 2024

## Abstract

We consider the minimization of a Lipschitz continuous and expectation-valued function, denoted by  $f$  and defined as  $f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]$ , over a closed and convex set  $\mathcal{X}$ . Our focus lies on obtaining both asymptotics as well as rate and complexity guarantees for computing an approximate stationary point (in a Clarke sense) via zeroth-order schemes. We adopt a smoothing-based approach reliant on minimizing  $f_\eta$  where  $f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[f(\mathbf{x} + \eta\mathbf{u})]$ ,  $\mathbf{u}$  is a random variable defined on a unit sphere, and  $\eta > 0$ . In fact, it has been observed that a stationary point of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem is a  $2\eta$ -stationary point for the original problem in the Clarke sense. In such a setting, we develop two sets of schemes with promising empirical behavior. (I) We develop a smoothing-enabled *variance-reduced zeroth-order gradient* framework (**VRG-ZO**) for minimizing  $f_\eta$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ . In this setting, we make two sets of contributions for the sequence generated by the proposed zeroth-order gradient scheme. (a) The residual function of the smoothed problem tends to zero almost surely along the generated sequence, allowing for making guarantees for  $\eta$ -Clarke stationary solutions of the original problem; (b) To compute an  $\mathbf{x}$  that ensures that the expected norm of the residual of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem is within  $\epsilon$  requires no greater than  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-2})$  projection steps and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}\epsilon^{-4})$  function evaluations. (II) Our second scheme is a zeroth-order stochastic quasi-Newton scheme (**VRSQN-ZO**) reliant on a combination of randomized and Moreau smoothing; the corresponding iteration and sample complexities for this scheme are  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-5}\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ , respectively. These statements appear to be novel and there appear to be few available results that can contend with general nonsmooth, nonconvex, and stochastic regimes via zeroth-order approaches.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the following stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})], \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued, nonsmooth, and nonconvex function,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed and convex set, and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes a random variable associated with the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Our interest lies in the case when  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous and at any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} : \Omega \mapsto \Xi$  is a  $d$ -dimensional random variable with  $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . We denote a realization of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  and  $\tilde{f}(x, \boldsymbol{\xi})$  by  $\xi$  and  $\tilde{f}(x, \xi)$ , respectively. Recall that function  $f$  is  $L_0$ -Lipschitz continuous on the set

---

\*LM, UVS are in Ind. & Manuf. Engg., Pennsylvania State University (lwm5431,vv3@psu.edu) while FY is in Ind. & Sys. Engg., Rutgers University (farzad.yousefian@rutgers.edu). This work was funded in part by the ONR under grants N00014-22-1-2589 and N00014-22-1-2757, and in part by the DOE under grant DE-SC0023303. A very preliminary version of this work appeared in [26].

$\mathcal{X}$  if there exists a scalar  $L_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})| \leq L_0 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$ . Our goal lies in devising randomized zeroth-order stochastic gradient and stochastic quasi-Newton (SQN) methods with iteration and sample complexity guarantees for approximating a stationary point to (1) in nonsmooth nonconvex regimes. Despite significant literature on contending with nonsmooth stochastic convex optimization problems [27], most nonconvex generalizations are restricted to structured regimes where nonconvexity often emerges as an expectation-valued smooth function while nonsmoothness arises in a deterministic form. Often,  $\tilde{f}(\bullet, \xi)$  may be both nonconvex and nonsmooth and proximal stochastic gradient schemes [16, 20] cannot be adopted. We now discuss some relevant research in nonsmooth and nonconvex regimes.

Table 1: Previous work on stochastic, nonsmooth, nonconvex settings.

Author	Convex	Smooth	Deter.**	Uncon. %	Oracle*	Comments
Burke, Lewis, Overton (2005)	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	Gradients in neighborhood of iterate are assumed to be available.
Xu and Yin (2017)	✗	✗ nonconvex part is proximable	✓	✓	✓	Prox-linear algorithm applied to nonconvex problem.
Ghadimi, Lan, Zhang (2016)	✗ nonconvex part is smooth	✗ nonsmooth part is convex	✓	✓	✓	A randomized zeroth-order algorithm leveraging Gaussian smoothing is introduced.
Nesterov and Spokainy (2017)	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	Zeroth-order Gaussian smoothing
Zhang, Lin, Jegelka, Sra, Jadbabaie (2020)	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	Negative result for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization.
<b>VRG-ZO</b>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Zeroth-order method reliant on randomized smoothing.

\* Provides element of subdifferential; \*\* Deterministic; %: Unconstrained.

Table 2: Previous work on SQN in convex, nonconvex, smooth, nonsmooth settings.

Author	Convex	Smooth	Deter.**	Uncon. %	Oracle*	Comments
Wang, Ma, Goldfarb, Liu (2017)	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	A stochastic, limited memory BFGS scheme for nonconvex optimization is introduced.
Curtis, Que (2019)	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	Convergence for an SQN schemes based on gradient sampling is delivered.
Bollapragada, Wild (2023)	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	An adaptive sampling zeroth-order quasi-Newton method is proposed.
<b>VRSQN-ZO</b>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Zeroth-order SQN reliant on randomized and Moreau smoothing.

\* Provides element of subdifferential; \*\* Deterministic; %: Unconstrained.

(a) *Nonsmooth nonconvex optimization.* In [4], Burke, Lewis, and Overton demonstrate how gradient sampling schemes allow for approximating the Clarke subdifferential of a function that is differentiable almost everywhere and proceed to develop a robust *gradient sampling* scheme [5], proving subsequential convergence to an  $\epsilon$ -Clarke stationary point when  $f$  is locally Lipschitz. Further, in [19], Kiwiel proves sequential convergence to Clarke stationary points without requiring compactness of level sets. There have also been efforts to develop statements in structured regimes where  $f$  is either weakly convex [13, 14] or  $f = g + h$  and  $h$  is smooth and possibly nonconvex while

$g$  is convex, nonsmooth, and proximal [31, 20].

(b) *Nonsmooth nonconvex stochastic optimization.* Most efforts have been restricted to structured regimes where  $f(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]$ ,  $h$  is smooth and possibly nonconvex while  $g$  is closed, convex, and proper with an efficient proximal evaluation. In such settings, proximal stochastic gradient techniques [16] and their variance-reduced counterparts [16, 20] were developed. More recently, a comprehensive examination of nonsmooth and nonconvex problems can be found in the monograph [11]; related efforts for resolving probabilistic and risk-averse settings via sample-average approximation approaches have been examined in [10, 24].

(c) *Zeroth-order methods.* Deterministic [7] and randomized smoothing [28, 15] have been the basis for resolving a broad class of nonsmooth optimization problems [21, 33]. When the original objective function is nonsmooth and nonconvex, Nesterov and Spokoiny [23] examine unconstrained nonsmooth and nonconvex optimization problems via Gaussian smoothing. Zeroth-order stochastic approximation methods for nonconvex stochastic optimization in the constrained setting were also proposed [1].

(d) *SQN methods under nonconvexity and nonsmoothness.* (i) *Nonsmooth or nonconvex settings.* Among recent work, Wang et al. [29] presented a SQN method for unconstrained minimization of expectation-valued, smooth, and nonconvex functions. In [6], a damped regularized variant of the L-BFGS algorithm for smooth nonconvex problems is developed. Variable sample-size SQN schemes in nonsmooth convex settings are examined by Jalilzadeh et al. [18]. (ii) *The nonsmooth nonconvex setting.* SQN type schemes in the structured nonsmooth convex setting, where the objective function can be separated into a smooth nonconvex part and a nonsmooth convex part, have been examined in [30] and [32]. Further in [12], an SQN scheme reliant on gradient sampling has been developed for addressing unconstrained nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. (iii) *SQN via zeroth-order information.* The work on zeroth-order SQN methods has been much limited. In [3], an adaptive sampling zeroth-order SQN method is developed. However, convergence guarantees are not provided. A summary of the related work is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

*Motivation.* Our work draws motivation from the absence of efficient schemes for resolving stochastic optimization problems when the integrand is both nonsmooth and nonconvex. Our framework is inspired by recent work by Zhang et al. [35], where the authors show that for a suitable class of nonsmooth functions, computing an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $f$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{x}$ , is impossible in finite time where  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies  $\min \{ \|g\| \mid g \in \partial f(\mathbf{x}) \} \leq \epsilon$ . This negative result is a consequence of the possibility that the gradient can change in an abrupt fashion, thereby concealing a stationary point. To this end, they introduce a notion of  $(\delta, \epsilon)$ -stationarity, a weakening of  $\epsilon$ -stationarity; specifically, if  $\mathbf{x}$  is  $(\delta, \epsilon)$ -stationary, then there exists a convex combination of gradients in a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}$  with norm at most  $\epsilon$ . However, this does not imply that  $\mathbf{x}$  is  $\delta$ -close to an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $\mathbf{x}$  as noted by Shamir [25] since the convex hull might contain a small vector without any of the vectors being necessarily small. However, as Shamir observes, one needs to accept that the  $(\delta, \epsilon)$ -stationarity notion may have such pathologies. Instead, an alternative might lie in minimizing a smoothed function  $f_\eta$ , defined as  $f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[f(\mathbf{x} + \eta\mathbf{u})]$  where  $\mathbf{u}$  is a suitably defined random variable. In fact, a Clarke-stationary point of  $f_\eta$  is a  $2\eta$ -Clarke stationary point (in terms of the enlarged Clarke subdifferential) [17]. This avenue allows for leveraging a richer set of techniques but may still be afflicted by similar challenges.

**Goal.** *Development of zeroth-order smoothing approaches in constrained and stochastic regimes with a view towards developing finite-time and asymptotic guarantees for stochastic gradient and SQN schemes.*

*Outline and contributions.* We develop a zeroth-order framework in regime where  $f$  is expectation-valued over a closed and convex set  $\mathcal{X}$ , where locally randomized smoothing is carried out via spherical smoothing. This scheme leads to zeroth-order stochastic gradient (VRG-ZO) and SQN (VRSQN-ZO) frameworks, where the gradient estimator is constructed via (sampled) function values. After providing some preliminaries on the notion of stationarity and randomized smoothing in section 2, our main algorithmic contributions are captured in section 3 and section 4, while preliminary numerics and concluding remarks are provided in section 5 and section 6, respectively. Next, we briefly summarize our key contributions.

(A) VRG-ZO schemes. On applying VRG-ZO to an  $\eta$ -smoothed problem, where  $\eta > 0$  is a smoothing parameter, under suitable choices of the steplength and mini-batch sequences, we show that the norm of the residual function of the smoothed problem tends to zero almost surely. When VRG-ZO is applied to (1), the expected squared residual (associated with the smoothed problem) diminishes at the rate of  $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$  in terms of projection steps on  $\mathcal{X}$ , leading to an iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-2})$  and a complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}\epsilon^{-4})$  in terms of sampled function evaluations. Here,  $\epsilon$  denotes an arbitrary bound on the expected norm of the residual of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem.

(B) VRSQN-ZO schemes. On applying VRSQN-ZO to an  $\eta$ -smoothed problem, where the indicator function associated with the convex set  $\mathcal{X}$  is replaced by its Moreau-smoothed counterpart, under suitable choices of the steplength and mini-batch sequences, we show that the norm of the residual of the smoothed problem tends to zero almost surely. When VRSQN-ZO is applied with variance reduction, we obtain iteration and sample complexities of the form  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-5}\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ , respectively.

**Notation.** We use  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^\top$ , and  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  to denote a column vector, its transpose, and its Euclidean norm, respectively. We define  $f^* \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $f_\eta^* \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $f_\eta(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the smoothed approximation of  $f$ . Given a continuous function, i.e.,  $f \in C^0$ , we write  $f \in C^{0,0}(\mathcal{X})$  if  $f$  is Lipschitz on  $\mathcal{X}$  with parameter  $L_0$ . Given a continuously differentiable function, i.e.,  $f \in C^1$ , we write  $f \in C^{1,1}(\mathcal{X})$  if  $\nabla f$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  with parameter  $L_1$ . We write a.s. for ‘‘almost surely’’ and  $\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]$  denotes the expectation with respect to a random variable  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ .  $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\mathbf{v}]$  denotes the Euclidean projection of  $\mathbf{v}$  onto the closed convex set  $\mathcal{X}$ .

## 2 Stationarity and smoothing

We first recap some concepts of Clarke’s nonsmooth calculus [8] that allow for providing stationarity conditions. The directional derivative, crucial in addressing nonsmooth optimization problems, is defined next.

**Definition 1 (Directional derivatives and Clarke generalized gradient [8]).** The directional derivative of  $h$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  in a direction  $v$  is defined as

$$h^\circ(\mathbf{x}, v) \triangleq \limsup_{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, t \downarrow 0} \left( \frac{h(\mathbf{y} + tv) - h(\mathbf{y})}{t} \right). \quad (2)$$

The Clarke generalized gradient of  $h$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  can then be defined as

$$\partial h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \left\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h^\circ(\mathbf{x}, v) \geq \zeta^\top v, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In other words,  $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}, v) = \sup_{g \in \partial h(\mathbf{x})} g^\top v$ . □

If  $h$  is  $C^1$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ , the Clarke generalized gradient reduces to the standard gradient, i.e.,  $\partial h(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h(\mathbf{x})$ . If  $\mathbf{x}$  is a local minimizer of  $h$ , then we have that  $0 \in \partial h(\mathbf{x})$ . In fact, this claim can be

extended to convex constrained regimes, i.e., if  $\mathbf{x}$  is a local minimizer of  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} h(\mathbf{x})$ , then  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies  $0 \in \partial h(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the normal cone of  $\mathcal{X}$  defined at  $\mathbf{x}$  [8]. Furthermore, if  $h$  is locally Lipschitz on an open set  $\mathcal{C}$  containing  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $h$  is differentiable almost everywhere on  $\mathcal{C}$  by Rademacher's theorem [8]. Suppose  $\mathcal{C}_h$  denotes the set of points where  $h$  is not differentiable. We now provide some properties of the Clarke generalized gradient.

**Proposition 1 (Properties of Clarke generalized gradients [8]).** Suppose  $h$  is  $L_0$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then the following hold for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

- (i)  $\partial h(\mathbf{x})$  is a nonempty, convex, and compact set and  $\|g\| \leq L_0$  for any  $g \in \partial h(\mathbf{x})$ .
- (ii)  $h$  is differentiable almost everywhere. (iii)  $\partial h(\mathbf{x})$  is an upper-semicontinuous map defined as  $\partial h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \text{conv} \{ g \mid g = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathcal{C}_h \ni \mathbf{x}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \}$ .  $\square$

We may also define the  $\delta$ -Clarke generalized gradient [17] as

$$\partial_{\delta} h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \text{conv} \{ \zeta \mid \zeta \in \partial h(\mathbf{y}), \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq \delta \}. \quad (4)$$

Notice that  $\delta$ -Clarke generalized gradient of  $\mathbf{x}$  is given by the convex hull of elements in the Clarke generalized gradient of vectors within a distance  $\delta$  of  $\mathbf{x}$ . When  $h$  is a nonsmooth and nonconvex function, we address nonsmoothness by considering a locally randomized smoothing technique. Given a function  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a scalar  $\eta > 0$ , a spherically smoothed approximation of  $h$ , denoted by  $h_{\eta}$ , is defined as

$$h_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}} [h(\mathbf{x} + \eta \mathbf{u})], \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  denotes a random variable uniformly distributed on a unit ball  $\mathbb{B}$ , defined as  $\mathbb{B} \triangleq \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|u\| \leq 1\}$ , with realizations denoted by  $u \in \mathbb{B}$ . We now recall some properties of spherical smoothing, where  $\mathbb{S} \triangleq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|v\| = 1\}$  is the surface of  $\mathbb{B}$ .

**Lemma 1 (Properties of spherical smoothing [9, Lemma 1]).** Suppose  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous function and its smoothed counterpart  $h_{\eta}$  is defined as (5), where  $\eta > 0$  is a given scalar. Then the following hold.

- (i)  $h_{\eta}$  is  $C^1$  over  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{n}{\eta}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in \eta \mathbb{S}} \left[ h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \right]$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Suppose  $h \in C^{0,0}(\mathcal{X}_{\eta})$  with parameter  $L_0$ . For any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$ , the following hold.

- (ii)  $|h_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - h_{\eta}(\mathbf{y})| \leq L_0 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$ .
- (iii)  $|h_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x})| \leq L_0 \eta$ .
- (iv)  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h_{\eta}(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \frac{L_0 n}{\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$ .
- (v) Suppose  $h \in C^{0,0}(\mathcal{X}_{\eta})$  with parameter  $L_0$  and  $g_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}, v) \triangleq \left(\frac{n(h(\mathbf{x}+v)-h(\mathbf{x}))v}{\eta\|v\|}\right)$  for  $v \in \eta \mathbb{S}$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in \eta \mathbb{S}} [\|g_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})\|^2] \leq L_0^2 n^2$ .  $\square$

In developing VRG-Z0, we minimize an  $L_0$ -Lipschitz function on  $\mathcal{X}_{\eta_0}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}_{\eta_0} \triangleq \mathcal{X} + \eta_0 \mathbb{B}$  represents the Minkowski sum of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\eta_0 \mathbb{B}$ . Further, we assume that the random variable  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x})$  admits suitable bias and moment properties. We develop schemes for computing approximate stationary points of (1) by an iterative scheme. However, we formalize the relationship between the original problem and its smoothed counterpart. This is provided in [9] by leveraging results from [21, 22].

**Proposition 2 (Stationarity of  $f_\eta \implies 2\eta$ -Clarke stationarity of  $f$ ).** Consider (1) where  $f$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function and  $\mathcal{X}$  is a closed, convex, and bounded set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(i) For any  $\eta > 0$  and any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial_{2\eta} f(\mathbf{x})$ . Furthermore, if  $0 \notin \partial f(\mathbf{x})$ , then there exists an  $\tilde{\eta}$  such that  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_{\tilde{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$  for  $0 < \tilde{\eta} \leq \eta$ .

(ii) For any  $\eta > 0$  and any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $0 \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ , then  $0 \in \partial_{2\eta} f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ .

Intuitively, this means that if  $\mathbf{x}$  is a stationary point of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem, then  $\mathbf{x}$  is a  $2\eta$ -Clarke stationary point of the original problem. Next, we introduce a residual function that captures the departure from stationarity [2]. Recall that when  $h$  is a differentiable but possibly nonconvex function and  $\mathcal{X}$  is a closed and convex set, then  $\mathbf{x}$  is a stationary point of (1) if and only if

$$G_\beta(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \beta \left( \mathbf{x} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[ \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\beta} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) \right] \right) = 0.$$

When  $f$  is not necessarily smooth as considered here, a residual of the smoothed problem can be derived by replacing  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$  by  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x})$ . In particular, the residual  $G_{\eta,\beta}$  denotes the stationarity residual with parameter  $\beta$  of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem while  $\tilde{G}_{\eta,\beta}$  is its counterpart arising from using an error-afflicted estimate of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Definition 2 (The residual mapping).** Given  $\beta > 0$  and a smoothing parameter  $\eta > 0$ , for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and an arbitrary vector  $\tilde{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let the residual mappings  $G_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\tilde{G}_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{e})$  be defined as  $G_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \beta \left( \mathbf{x} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[ \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\beta} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) \right] \right)$  and  $\tilde{G}_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{e}) \triangleq \beta \left( \mathbf{x} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[ \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\beta} (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{e}) \right] \right)$ , respectively.

This allows for deriving a bound on  $G_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x})$  in terms of  $\tilde{G}_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{e})$  and  $\tilde{e}$  as follows.

**Lemma 2** ([9, Lemma 6]). For any  $\beta, \eta > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\tilde{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\|G_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq 2\|\tilde{G}_{\eta,\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{e})\|^2 + 2\|\tilde{e}\|^2.$$

Next, we recall a result that relates the residual function as  $\gamma$  changes [2].

**Lemma 3.** Suppose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\{\gamma_k\}$  is a diminishing sequence. Then, for any  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $k \geq 0$ ,  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x})\|$ .

We use the following result in establishing the almost sure convergence guarantees.

**Lemma 4 (Robbins-Siegmund Lemma).** Let  $v_k$ ,  $u_k$ ,  $\alpha_k$ , and  $\beta_k$  be nonnegative random variables, and let the following relations hold almost surely.

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{k+1} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k] \leq (1 + \alpha_k)v_k - u_k + \beta_k \quad \text{for all } k, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k < \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta_k < \infty,$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$  is the collection  $v_0, \dots, v_k, u_0, \dots, u_k, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_0, \dots, \beta_k$ . Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v_k = v$  a.s. and  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_k < \infty$  a.s., where  $v \geq 0$  is some random variable.

### 3 A randomized zeroth-order gradient method

In this section, we provide the main assumptions, outline the proposed zeroth-order method, derive some preliminary results, and present our convergence analysis.

---

**Algorithm 1** VRG-ZO: Variance-reduced randomized zeroth-order gradient method

---

- 1: **input:** Given  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ , stepsize  $\gamma > 0$ , smoothing parameter  $\eta > 0$ , mini-batch sequence  $\{N_k\}$ , and an integer  $R_{\ell,K}$  randomly selected from  $\{\ell \triangleq \lceil \lambda K \rceil, \dots, K\}$  using a discrete uniform distribution where  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and  $K \geq 1$ .
  - 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$  **do**
  - 3:   Generate a random mini-batch  $v_{j,k} \in \eta\mathbb{S}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$
  - 4:   Compute  $\{g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})\}_{j=1}^{N_k}$ , where for all  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$ ,  

$$g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) := \left(\frac{n}{\eta}\right) \left(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k})\right) \frac{v_{j,k}}{\|v_{j,k}\|}$$
  - 5:   Compute mini-batch inexact ZO gradient.  $g_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})}{N_k}$
  - 6:   Update  $\mathbf{x}_k$  as follows.  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} := \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\mathbf{x}_k - \gamma g_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)]$
  - 7: **end for**
  - 8: Return  $\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}}$
- 

### 3.1 Preliminaries

**Assumption 1 (Problem properties).** Consider problem (1).

- (i)  $f$  is  $L_0$ -Lipschitz on  $\mathcal{X} + \eta_0\mathbb{B}$  for some  $\eta_0 > 0$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a nonempty, closed, and convex set.
- (iii) For all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} + \eta_0\mathbb{S}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mid \mathbf{x}] = f(\mathbf{x})$ .
- (iv) For all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} + \eta_0\mathbb{S}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x})|^2 \mid \mathbf{x}] \leq \nu^2$  for some  $\nu > 0$ .

We introduce a variance-reduced randomized zeroth-order scheme presented by Algorithm 1 and define a zeroth-order gradient estimate of  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k})$  as

$$g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) \triangleq \left(\frac{n}{\eta}\right) \left(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k})\right) \frac{v_{j,k}}{\|v_{j,k}\|},$$

where  $v_{j,k} \in \eta\mathbb{S}$ . Intuitively,  $g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})$  generates a gradient estimate by employing sampled function evaluations  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k})$  and  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})$ ; in short, the zeroth-order oracle, given an  $\mathbf{x}_k$  and a perturbation vector  $v_{j,k}$ , produces two evaluations, i.e.,  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k})$  and  $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})$ . We formally define the stochastic errors emergent from the randomized scheme based on a mini-batch approximation.

**Definition 3.** For all  $k \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, N_k$ , let  $\mathbf{e}_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \mathbf{e}_{j,k}}{N_k}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k}}{N_k}$ ,

$$\mathbf{e}_{j,k} \triangleq \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k), \quad \mathbf{e}_{j,k} \triangleq \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k), \quad (6)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k} \triangleq g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k}), \quad \text{and } \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k} \triangleq g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}). \quad (7)$$

As per our notation, we reserve boldface (such as  $\mathbf{e}_{j,k}$ ) for random variables while their realizations are not emboldened (such as  $e_{j,k}$ ). The history of Algorithm 1 at iteration  $k$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_0 \triangleq \{x_0\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \{\xi_{j,k-1}, v_{j,k-1}\} \right\}, \quad \text{for } k \geq 1. \quad (8)$$

We impose the following independence requirement on  $\xi_{j,k}$  and  $v_{j,k}$ , which is mild, since  $v_{j,k}$  is user-defined.

**Assumption 2 (Independence).** Random samples  $\xi_{j,k}$ ,  $v_{j,k}$  are generated independent of each other for all  $k \geq 0$  and  $1 \leq j \leq N_k$ .

We now analyze the bias and moment properties of the two error sequences.

**Lemma 5 (Bias and moment properties of  $e$ , and  $\theta$ ).** Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then (i) and (ii) hold a.s. for  $k \geq 0$  and  $N_k \geq 1$ .

(i)  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$  almost surely for all  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$ .

(ii)  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{n^2 \nu^2}{\eta^2 N_k}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{L_0^2 n^2}{N_k}$  almost surely.

*Proof.* (i) To show that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$  a.s., we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 1}}{=} \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) \right) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{\xi_{j,k}\} \right] \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assum. 2}}{=} \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{v\}]}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mathbf{v} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \stackrel{\text{Assum. 1}}{=} \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ 0 \times \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = 0, \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

To show that  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$  a.s., we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E}[g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{n}{\eta} \left( \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \right) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} - \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{\xi_{k,j}\} \right] \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assum. 2}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{n}{\eta} \left( \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \right) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{v_{j,k}\} \right] \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{v\} \right] \mid \mathcal{F}_k \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assum. 1}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{n}{\eta} \left( f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k) \right) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} - \frac{n}{\eta} f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = 0, \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

(ii) To show the first inequality, we bound the conditional second moment of  $\mathbf{e}_k$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_{j,k}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \right\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 1}}{=} \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{\xi_{k,j}\} \right] \right|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Jensen's ineq.}}{\leq} \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}) \right|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{\xi_{k,j}\} \right] \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assum. 1}}{\leq} \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nu^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = \frac{n^2 \nu^2}{\eta^2}, \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

From  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$  a.s., Assumption 2, and Definition 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \frac{1}{N_k^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \mathbf{e}_{j,k} \right\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N_k^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \|\mathbf{e}_{j,k}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = \frac{1}{N_k^2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{e}_{j,k}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the preceding two relations, we obtain  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{n^2 \nu^2}{\eta^2 N_k}$  a.s. To show the second inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \|g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assum. 2}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{\xi_{j,k}\} \right] \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 1 (iii)}}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[ L_0^2 n^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = L_0^2 n^2, \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of the first bound, we have that  $\mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{L_0^2 n^2}{N_k}$  a.s.  $\square$

### 3.2 Convergence and rate analysis

We now derive convergence guarantees under constant and diminishing stepsizes, beginning with the following result.

**Lemma 6.** Let Assumption 1 hold. Consider Definition 3. Suppose  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  is generated by Algorithm 1. Let  $\{\gamma_k\}$  be a non-increasing stepsize sequence (e.g. constant or diminishing) where  $\gamma_0 \in (0, \frac{\eta}{nL_0})$  for  $\eta > 0$ . Then, the following hold.

(i) For  $k \geq 0$ , we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma_k \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2}{4} \leq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) + \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{2\eta}\right) \gamma_k \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2. \quad (9)$$

(ii) Let  $R_{\ell,K}$  be a random integer taking values in  $\{\ell, \dots, K-1\}$  with mass function  $\mathbb{P}\{R_{\ell,K} = j\} = \frac{\gamma_j}{\sum_{i=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_i}$  for any  $j \in \{\ell, \dots, K-1\}$ . Then, for all  $k \geq 0$  we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{\left( \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + (\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2) \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{2n^2\gamma_k}{\eta^2 N_k} \right)}{\left( \left( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{nL_0\gamma_0}{4\eta} \right) \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_k \right)}. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* (i) From Lemma 1 (iv), the gradient mapping  $\nabla f_\eta$  is Lipschitz continuous with the parameter  $L_\eta \triangleq \frac{nL_0}{\eta}$ . From the descent lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) &\leq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\ &= f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + (\nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + e_k + \theta_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) \\ &\quad - (e_k + \theta_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Invoking the properties of the Euclidean projection, we have

$(\mathbf{x}_k - \gamma_k (\nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + e_k + \theta_k) - \mathbf{x}_{k+1})^\top (\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \leq 0$ . This implies that

$$(\nabla f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + e_k + \theta_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) \leq -\frac{1}{\gamma_k} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2. \quad (12)$$

In addition, we may also express  $(e_k + \theta_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k)$  as follows.

$$-(e_k + \theta_k)^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) \leq \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2. \quad (13)$$

Combining the inequalities (11), (12), and (13) we obtain

$$f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \leq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \left( -\frac{1}{2\gamma_k} + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2.$$

From Definition 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) &\leq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \left( -\frac{1}{2\gamma_k} + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \right) \gamma_k^2 \|\tilde{G}_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x}_k, e_k + \theta_k)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2 \\ &= f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - (1 - L_\eta\gamma_k) \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\tilde{G}_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x}_k, e_k + \theta_k)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2 and by the requirement that  $\gamma_k \leq \gamma_0 < \frac{1}{L_\eta}$ ,

$$f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \leq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{(1 - L_\eta\gamma_k)\gamma_k}{4} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 + \left( \frac{\gamma_k}{2} + \frac{\gamma_k(1 - L_\eta\gamma_k)}{2} \right) \|e_k + \theta_k\|^2. \quad (14)$$

From the preceding relation and invoking Lemma 3, we obtain (9).

(ii) Summing (9) from  $k = \ell, \dots, K - 1$  where  $\ell \triangleq \lceil \lambda K \rceil$  and taking expectations with respect to the iterate trajectory, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \mathbb{E}[\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - \mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_K)] \\ &+ \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{2\eta}\right) \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Invoking the definition of  $R_{\ell,K}$  and Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{nL_0\gamma_0}{4\eta}\right) \left(\sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_k\right) \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{R_{\ell,K}}[\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2]] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{nL_0\gamma_0}{4\eta}\right) \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2] \leq \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \mathbb{E}[\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_\ell) - f_\eta^*] + \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from  $\left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_k}{\eta}\right) \leq 1$  for any  $k$ . Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f_\eta^* &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell) + f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_\ell) - f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f_\eta^* + f^* - f^* \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + \mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_\ell) - f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] + |f^* - f_\eta^*| \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 1 (iii)}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

From Lemma 5 (ii),  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}_k\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k]] \leq \frac{2n^2\nu^2}{\eta^2 N_k} + \frac{2L_0^2 n^2}{N_k}$ . From the preceding relations, we obtain the inequality (10).  $\square$

We now present an almost sure convergence guarantee for the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 by relying on the Robbins-Siegmund Lemma.

**Proposition 3 (Asymptotic guarantees for VRG-Z0).** Consider Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold

(a) **[Constant stepsize rule]** Let  $\gamma_k := \gamma < \frac{\eta}{nL_0}$  and  $N_k := (k+1)^{1+\delta}$  for  $k \geq 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then, the following hold. (a-i)  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0$ . (a-ii) Every limit point of  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  lies in the set of  $2\eta$ -Clarke stationary points of (1) in an a.s. sense.

(b) **[Diminishing stepsize rule]** Let  $\{\gamma_k\}$  be a square summable but non-summable diminishing sequence with  $\gamma_0 \in (0, \frac{\eta}{2nL_0})$ , and  $\sum_k \frac{\gamma_k}{N_k} < \infty$ . Then, the following hold. (b-i)  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0$ . (b-ii) Every limit point of  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  lies in the set of  $2\eta$ -Clarke stationary points of (1) in an almost sure sense.

*Proof.* (a-i) Let  $f_\eta^* \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_\eta(\mathbf{x})$ . By taking expectations conditioned on  $\mathcal{F}_k$  on the both sides of the

inequality (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - f_\eta^*) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq (f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*) - (1 - L_\eta \gamma) \frac{\gamma}{4} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{2\eta}\right) \gamma \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{e}_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5 (ii)}}{\leq} (f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*) - (1 - L_\eta \gamma) \frac{\gamma}{4} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{2\eta}\right) \gamma \frac{c}{N_k},
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where  $c := 2 \left( \frac{n^2 \nu^2}{\eta^2} + L_0^2 n^2 \right)$  in view of Lemma 5 (ii). By invoking Lemma 4, the nonnegativity of  $f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*$  and by recalling that  $\gamma < \frac{\eta}{nL_0}$ , we have that  $\{(f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*)\}$  is convergent a.s. and  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 < \infty$  almost surely. It remains to show that with probability one,  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We proceed by contradiction. Suppose with finite probability,  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \xrightarrow{k \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \tilde{\epsilon} > 0$  where  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  is a random subsequence and  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  is a random positive scalar. Consequently, for every  $\xi \in \xi_1$  and  $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ , there exists a random  $\tilde{K}$  such that  $k \geq \tilde{K}$ ,  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \geq \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}}{2}$ . Consequently, we have that  $\sum_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \geq \sum_{k \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \geq \sum_{k \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}, k \geq \tilde{K}} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 = \infty$  with finite probability, leading to a contradiction and implying that  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0$ .

(a-ii) Recall from Proposition 2 that if  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies  $G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , it is a  $2\eta$ -Clarke stationary point of (1), i.e.,  $0 \in \partial_{2\eta} f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ . Since almost every limit point of  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  satisfies  $G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , the result follows.

(b-i) Consider (9), whereby

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - f_\eta^*) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq (f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*) - (1 - L_\eta \gamma_k) \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \left(1 - \frac{L_\eta \gamma_k}{2}\right) \frac{c \gamma_k}{N_k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Based on the nonnegativity of  $f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*$ ,  $\gamma_k \leq \gamma_0 < \frac{\eta}{2nL_0}$  for all  $k$ , and the summability of  $\{\frac{\gamma_k}{N_k}\}$ , we may invoke Lemma 4, implying that  $\{(f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - f_\eta^*)\}$  is convergent a.s. and  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \gamma_k \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 < \infty$  almost surely. Since  $\{\gamma_k\}$  is non-summable, it follows that  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 = 0$  in an almost sure sense. Proving  $\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  follows in a similar fashion to as derived earlier. (b-ii) Omitted.  $\square$

We now provide a formal rate (in terms of projection steps on  $\mathcal{X}$ ) and complexity statement (in terms of sampled function evaluations).

**Theorem 1 (Rate and complexity statements for VRG-Z0).** Consider Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let  $a \geq 0$  be an arbitrary scalar.

(a) [Constant stepsize rule] Let  $\gamma_k := \gamma < \frac{\eta}{nL_0}$  and  $N_k := \lceil 1 + \frac{k+1}{\eta^a} \rceil$  for  $k \geq 0$ .

(a-i) For  $K > \frac{2}{1-\lambda}$  with  $\ell \triangleq \lceil \lambda K \rceil$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2] \leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + 2n^2((\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2))(0.5 - \ln(\lambda))\eta^{a-2}\gamma)}{\left(\left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma}{4} (1-\lambda)K\right)}. \tag{18}$$

(a-ii) Let  $\gamma = \frac{\eta}{2nL_0}$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $K_\epsilon$  be such that  $\mathbb{E} [\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K_\epsilon}})\|] \leq \epsilon$ . Then the following hold.

(a-ii-1) The total number of projection steps is  $K_\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{\min\{-1, a-2\}} \epsilon^{-2})$ .

(a-ii-2) The total sample complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{2\min\{-1, a-2\} - a} \epsilon^{-4})$ .

**(b) [Diminishing stepsize rule]** Let  $\gamma_k = \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k+1}}$  and  $N_k := \lceil 1 + \frac{\sqrt{k+1}}{\eta^a} \rceil$  for  $k \geq 0$ , where  $\gamma_0 < \frac{\eta}{nL_0}$ .  
**(b-i)** For  $K > \frac{2}{1-\lambda}$  with  $\ell \triangleq \lceil \lambda K \rceil$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + 2n^2\gamma_0(\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2)(0.5 - \ln(\lambda))\eta^{a-2})}{\left( \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_0}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma_0}{2} (1-\sqrt{\lambda})\sqrt{K} \right)}. \quad (19)$$

**(b-ii)** Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $K_\epsilon$  be such that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K_\epsilon}})\| \right] \leq \epsilon$ . Then:

(b-ii-1) The total number of projection steps is  $K_\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{2 \min\{-1, a-2\}} \epsilon^{-4})$ .

(b-ii-2) The total sample complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{3 \min\{-1, a-2\} - a} \epsilon^{-6})$ .

*Proof.* **(a-i)** From (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] &\leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + (\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2)\gamma \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{2n^2}{\eta^2 N_k})}{\left( \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma}{4} (K-\ell) \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + (\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2)\gamma \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{2n^2}{\eta^{2-a}(k+1)})}{\left( \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma}{4} (K-\ell) \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is with respect to both the iterate trajectory and the random integer  $R_{\ell,K}$ , while the last inequality is a consequence of  $N_k := \lceil 1 + \frac{k+1}{\eta^a} \rceil \geq \frac{k+1}{\eta^a}$ . Recall that  $K > \frac{2}{1-\lambda}$  implies  $\ell \leq K-1$  and  $\sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k+1} \leq 0.5 + \ln\left(\frac{N}{\lambda N+1}\right) \leq 0.5 - \ln(\lambda)$ . Further,  $K - \ell \geq K - \lambda K = (1-\lambda)K$  implying that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + 2n^2(\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2)(0.5 - \ln(\lambda))\eta^{a-2}\gamma)}{\left( \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma}{4} (1-\lambda)K \right)}.$$

**(a-ii)** To show (ii-1), using the relation in part (i) and by  $\gamma := \frac{\eta}{2nL_0}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + nL_0^{-1}(\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2)(0.5 - \ln(\lambda))\eta^{a-1})}{(\eta(1-\lambda)K)/(16nL_0)}.$$

From Jensen's inequality,  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\| \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{O}(\eta^{\min\{-1, a-2\}}/K)}$  and thus, we have  $K_\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{\min\{-1, a-2\}} \epsilon^{-2})$ . Next, we show (ii-2). The sample complexity of function evaluations is as follows.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} N_k = \sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} \left[ 1 + \frac{(k+1)}{\eta^a} \right] \leq \mathcal{O}(K_\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{K_\epsilon^2}{\eta^a}\right) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{2 \min\{-1, a-2\} - a} \epsilon^{-4}\right).$$

**(b-i)** Consider the inequality (10). Using  $\frac{\gamma_k}{N_k} \leq \frac{\gamma_0\eta^a}{k+1}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_\ell)] - f^* + 2L_0\eta + (\nu^2 + L_0^2\eta^2) \sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{2n^2\gamma_0}{\eta^{2-a}(k+1)})}{\left( \left(1 - \frac{nL_0\gamma_0}{\eta}\right) \frac{\gamma_0}{2} (1-\sqrt{\lambda})\sqrt{K} \right)},$$

where we note that  $\sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \gamma_k \geq \int_{\ell-1}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{x+1}} dx = 2\gamma_0(\sqrt{K} - \sqrt{\ell}) \geq 2\gamma_0(1 - \sqrt{\lambda})\sqrt{K}$ . As earlier, we have that  $\sum_{k=\ell}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k+1} \leq 0.5 - \ln(\lambda)$ , leading to the inequality in (b-i).

**(b-ii)** From Jensen's inequality and by setting  $\gamma_0 = \frac{\eta}{2nL_0}$ , we obtain that

$\mathbb{E} [\|G_{\eta,1/\gamma_0}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{\ell,K}})\|] \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{O}(\eta^{\min\{-1,a-2\}}K^{-1/2})}$ , thus  $K_\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{2\min\{-1,a-2\}}\epsilon^{-4})$ . Thus (b-ii-1) holds. Next, (b-ii-2) holds by bounding the sample complexity as follows.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} N_k = \sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} [1 + \frac{\sqrt{(k+1)}}{\eta^a}] \leq \mathcal{O}(K_\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{K_\epsilon^{3/2}}{\eta^a}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta^{3\min\{-1,a-2\}-a}\epsilon^{-6}).$$

□

**Remark 1 (Optimal choice of parameter  $a$  in Theorem 1).** (A) Constant stepsize rule.

(i) For  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ , we attain the best iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-2})$  and sample complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3}\epsilon^{-4})$  in terms of dependence of  $\eta$  when  $a = 1$ .

(ii) For  $a \geq 1$ , the iteration complexity does not improve while the sample complexity worsens. This implies that  $a = 1$  is the optimal choice.

(B) Diminishing stepsize rule.

(i) For  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ , then the best obtainable iteration and sample complexities worsen to  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}\epsilon^{-4})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-4}\epsilon^{-6})$ , respectively when  $a = 1$ .

(ii) For  $a \geq 1$ , akin to the prior case,  $a = 1$  is the optimal choice.

(C) Commentary on complexity and availability of  $L_0$ . We observe that *VRG-ZO* achieves better complexity bounds under a constant stepsize, i.e.  $\gamma = \frac{\eta}{2nL_0}$ . However, from a practical perspective, the diminishing stepsize may seem appealing since the parameter  $L_0$  is often unavailable, rendering a challenge in tuning the constant stepsize to establish convergence. In contrast, under a diminishing stepsize, even when  $\gamma_0$  is chosen larger than the unknown threshold  $\frac{\eta}{nL_0}$ , the stepsize  $\gamma_k$  will eventually fall below the threshold for which an error bound of the form (19) is satisfied.

## 4 A Smoothed Quasi-Newton Framework

In this section, we present a stochastic quasi-Newton framework for nonsmooth nonconvex stochastic optimization. After introducing a smoothed unconstrained formulation in section 4.1, we describe the SQN algorithm in section 4.2 and develop a damped L-BFGS scheme in section 4.3. Guarantees of convergence are provided in section 4.4.

### 4.1 A smoothed unconstrained formulation

Consider the unconstrained reformulation of (1), defined as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} h(\mathbf{x}), \text{ where } h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ where } f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})], \quad (20)$$

and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the indicator function of the set  $\mathcal{X}$ . By leveraging randomized smoothing of  $f$  and Moreau smoothing of  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , we define the smoothing of  $h$  as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} h_\eta(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X},\eta}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (21)$$

$$\text{where } f_\eta(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}}[f(\mathbf{x} + \eta\mathbf{u})], \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X},\eta}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \right\},$$

$\mathbb{B} \triangleq \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|u\| \leq 1\}$ , and  $\eta > 0$  denotes a smoothing parameter. We refer to  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X},\eta}(\mathbf{x})$  as the Moreau-smoothed indicator function of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Crucially,  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X},\eta} \in C^{1,1}$  with a  $(1/\eta)$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient defined as  $\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X},\eta}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\eta}(\mathbf{x} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}))$ . By leveraging Lemma 1, for a given smoothing parameter  $\eta$ ,  $h_\eta \in C^{1,1}$  with  $L_\eta$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient where  $L_\eta \triangleq \frac{L_0 n + 1}{\eta}$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** VRSQN-ZO: A VR zeroth-order smoothed quasi-Newton method

---

- 1: **input:**  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\{\gamma_k\} > 0$ ,  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\{N_k\}$ ,  $K$ , and memory parameter  $p \geq 1$ .
- 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$  **do**
- 3:   **for**  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$  **do**
- 4:     Generate a random sample  $v_{j,k} \in \eta\mathbb{S}$  and compute the stochastic ZO gradient

$$g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) := \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k}))v_{j,k}}{\|v_{j,k}\|_\eta} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_k - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_k)}{\eta}.$$

- 5:   **end for**
- 6:   Evaluate  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})}{N_k}$ .
- 7:   **if**  $k < p$  **then**
- 8:     Update  $\mathbf{x}_k$  as follows.  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} := \mathbf{x}_k - \gamma_k \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ .
- 9:   **else**
- 10:     Discard the vectors  $s_{k-p}, y_{k-p}, \bar{y}_{k-p}$  from storage
- 11:     Generate  $r_k$  by passing  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ ,  $s_{k-p}, \dots, s_{k-1}$ ,  $y_{k-p}, \dots, y_{k-1}$ , and  $\bar{y}_{k-p}, \dots, \bar{y}_{k-1}$  to L-BFGS-SMOOTHED.
- 12:     Update  $\mathbf{x}_k$  as follows.  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} := \mathbf{x}_k - \gamma_k r_k$ .      $\triangleright$  **L-BFGS update**
- 13:   **end if**
- 14:   **for**  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$  **do**
- 15:     Use the generated samples  $v_{j,k} \in \eta\mathbb{S}$  to compute

$$g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) := \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \xi_{j,k}))v_{j,k}}{\|v_{j,k}\|_\eta} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})}{\eta}.$$

- 16:   **end for**
  - 17:   Evaluate  $\hat{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})}{N_k}$ .
  - 18:   Evaluate  $s_k := \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k$  and  $y_k := \hat{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ .
  - 19:   Evaluate  $\bar{y}_k := \Phi_k y_k + (1 - \Phi_k) H_{k+1,0}^{-1} s_k$  where  $\Phi_k$  is defined by (26).
  - 20: **end for**
  - 21: **Return**  $\mathbf{x}_K$
- 

Next, we present the assumptions and comment on distinctions with prior work.

**Assumption 3 (Problem properties).** Consider problem (21).

- (i) Function  $\tilde{f}(\bullet, \xi)$  is  $L_0$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for almost every  $\xi$ .
- (ii) For all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \mid \mathbf{x}] = f(\mathbf{x})$  almost surely.
- (iii) For all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{x})|^2 \mid \mathbf{x}] \leq \nu^2$  almost surely for some  $\nu > 0$ .
- (iv) The set  $\mathcal{X}$  is nonempty, closed, and convex.

**Remark 2.** (i) Most prior work on SQN schemes [29, 30] require twice differentiability of  $\tilde{f}(\bullet, \xi)$ , such that  $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^2 \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\| \leq \kappa$  for all  $\mathbf{x}, \xi$  and some  $\kappa > 0$  (e.g., see AS.5 in [29]). We considerably weaken this assumption by allowing the objective function to be Lipschitz continuous and possibly nondifferentiable. (ii) In the prior section,  $\tilde{f}(\bullet, \xi)$  was required to be  $L_0$ -Lipschitz on  $\mathcal{X} + \eta_0 \mathbb{B}$ ,

whereas we now require that it is  $L_0$ -Lipschitz on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We believe this assumption can be weakened by considering problem of the form (20) where the objective function is augmented by a smooth nonconvex function, with possibly unbounded gradients over  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The study of such extensions is left as a future direction to our work.

## 4.2 Algorithm Description

We now present a zeroth-order SQN algorithm, called **VRSQN-Z0** and presented by Algorithm 2, for addressing problem (20). Some of the key characteristics of this method are as follows. (i) **VRSQN-Z0** is primarily a derivative-free quasi-Newton method, reliant on the sampled objective function evaluations. (ii) It leverages randomized smoothing of the objective function and Moreau smoothing of the constraint set. (iii) It employs a damped limited-memory BFGS scheme called **L-BFGS-SMOOTHED** (see Algorithm 3) for efficiently constructing inverse Hessian approximations of the expectation-valued nonconvex objective function. (iv) Lastly, our method is equipped with variance reduction which improves the iteration complexity in stochastic regimes.

Next, we describe the outline of **VRSQN-Z0**. The sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  denotes the iterates generated by the method. Similar to **VRG-Z0**, at iteration  $k$  in **VRSQN-Z0**, a mini-batch of random samples  $v_{j,k} \in \eta\mathbb{S}$  of size  $N_k$  is generated and used for evaluating of  $\bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , a derivative-free estimate (with respect to  $f$ ) of  $\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)$ . A key difference with **VRSQN-Z0** lies in the use of an inverse Hessian approximation in updating  $\mathbf{x}_k$ . As shown later, the main update rule of **VRSQN-Z0** can be compactly represented as  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \gamma_k H_k \bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  where  $H_k$  denotes a zeroth-order inverse Hessian approximation of the smoothed function. This framework is inspired by but distinct from [29]; it is (i) *derivative-free* and (ii) *can accommodate nonsmoothness in the nonconvex term*. In computing the product  $H_k \bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , we employ a stochastic damped L-BFGS scheme. This scheme employs two auxiliary stochastic zeroth-order gradients evaluated at successive iterates. Let us define

$$\hat{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})}{N_k}, \quad \bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k})}{N_k}, \quad (22)$$

$$\text{where } g_\eta(\bullet, v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) \triangleq \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\bullet + v_{j,k}, \xi_{j,k}) - \tilde{f}(\bullet, \xi_{j,k}))v_{j,k}}{\|v_{j,k}\|_\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta}(\bullet - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\bullet)). \quad (23)$$

As shown in Algorithm 2,  $\hat{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$  is evaluated after  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1}$  is computed during the iteration  $k$ . However,  $\bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  is used in the computation of  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1}$  and so, it is evaluated prior to the main L-BFGS step. Note that although  $\hat{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$  is computed at iteration  $k$ , it is used at time  $k+1$ . Importantly, this circumvents the need for the storage of the generated mini-batch for the next iteration and helps with memory efficiency. For  $k \geq 0$ , let the stochastic gradient difference  $y_k$  and iterate difference  $s_k$  be defined as

$$y_k \triangleq \hat{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - \bar{g}_{\eta,N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) \quad \text{and } s_k \triangleq \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k, \text{ respectively.} \quad (24)$$

We now define  $\bar{y}_k$  with a view towards satisfying the curvature condition  $s_k^\top \bar{y}_k > 0$ .

$$\bar{y}_k = \Phi_k y_k + (1 - \Phi_k) H_{k+1,0}^{-1} s_k \quad (25)$$

$$\text{where } \Phi_k = \begin{cases} \frac{0.75 s_k^\top H_{k+1,0}^{-1} s_k}{s_k^\top H_{k,0}^{-1} s_k - s_k^\top y_k}, & \text{if } s_k^\top y_k < 0.25 s_k^\top H_{k+1,0}^{-1} s_k \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and given a user-defined constant  $\delta > 0$ , for  $k \geq 1$

$$H_{k,0} = \nu_k^{-1} \mathbf{I}, \text{ where } \nu_k = \max \left\{ \frac{y_{k-1}^\top y_{k-1}}{s_{k-1}^\top y_{k-1} + \delta s_{k-1}^\top s_{k-1}}, \delta \right\}. \quad (27)$$

Observe that the additional term  $\delta s_{k-1}^\top s_{k-1}$  allows us to develop suitable boundedness claims. In addition, this implies that  $\|H_{k,0}\| = \frac{1}{\nu_k}$ . In contrast with [29], we provide bounds on the smallest and largest eigenvalue of  $H_k$  in terms of  $\eta$ . Next, we study the properties of the first and second moments of random errors in the zeroth-order approximation of the gradient map. Throughout, we define the history of the algorithm as earlier in (8) by  $\mathcal{F}_k$  at iteration  $k$ .

**Definition 4.** For all  $k \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, N_k$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{j,k}}{N_k}$ ,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j,k}}{N_k}$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{j,k} \triangleq \left( \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \frac{1}{\eta} (\mathbf{x}_k - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right) - \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k), \text{ and} \quad (28)$$

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{j,k} \triangleq g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \left( \nabla \tilde{f}_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \frac{1}{\eta} (\mathbf{x}_k - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right). \quad (29)$$

where a realization of  $g_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi})$  is given by (23). The realizations of  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k$  are denoted by  $\tilde{e}_k$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_k$ , respectively.

The following result can be shown in a similar vein to the proof of Lemma 5.

**Lemma 7 (Bias and moment properties of  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ ).** Let Assumptions 3 and 2 hold. Then (i) and (ii) hold almost surely for  $k \geq 0$  and  $N_k \geq 1$ .

(i)  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{j,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, N_k$ .

(ii)  $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{n^2 \nu^2}{\eta^2 N_k}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \frac{L_0^2 n^2}{N_k}$ .

### 4.3 Construction of the Inverse Hessian Approximation

Let us define the sequence of limited-memory BFGS matrices  $\{B_k\}$  for  $k \geq p$  as follows.

$$B_{k,i} = B_{k,i-1} + \frac{\bar{y}_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} - \frac{B_{k,i-1} s_j s_j^\top B_{k,i-1}}{s_j^\top B_{k,i-1} s_j}, \text{ where } j = k - p + i - 1, i = 1, \dots, p \quad (30)$$

$$B_k \triangleq B_{k,p}. \quad (31)$$

Also, for  $k \geq p$ , we define the inverse Hessian approximation matrix  $H_k$  as follows.

$$H_{k,i} = V_j^\top H_{k,i-1} V_j + \rho_j s_j s_j^\top, \text{ where } j = k - p + i - 1, i = 1, \dots, p, \quad (32)$$

$$H_k \triangleq H_{k,p},$$

where  $\rho_j \triangleq \frac{1}{\bar{y}_j^\top s_j}$ , and  $V_j \triangleq \mathbf{I} - \rho_j \bar{y}_j s_j^\top$ , for all  $j = k - p, \dots, k - 1$ . Using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we have  $H_k \triangleq B_k^{-1}$  for all  $k \geq p$ . Our proposed ZO SQN scheme uses a damped limited-memory BFGS update rule. The outline of this scheme is provided in Algorithm 3. Here, given a memory parameter  $p \geq 1$ , the vectors  $\{s_j, y_j, \bar{y}_j\}$  for  $i = k - p, \dots, k - 1$ , and  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , the two-loop scheme L-BFGS-SMOOTHED generates the product  $H_k \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , without the need to compute or store matrix  $H_k$  when  $k \geq 1$ . Next, we show that the generated iterate by the proposed ZO algorithm is indeed a well-defined stochastic damped L-BFGS scheme.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  be generated by Algorithm 2, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} := \mathbf{x}_k - \gamma_k d_k, \quad \text{where } d_k \triangleq \begin{cases} \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k), & \text{if } k < p, \\ r_k, & \text{if } k \geq p, \end{cases}$$

where  $r_k$  is returned by Algorithm 3 at iteration  $k$ . Then, the following results hold.

---

**Algorithm 3** L-BFGS-SMOOTHED: Zeroth-Order Damped Limited-Memory BFGS
 

---

- 1: **input:**  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , iterate differences  $s_{k-p}, \dots, s_{k-1}$  and gradient estimate differences  $y_{k-p}, \dots, y_{k-1}$  and  $\bar{y}_{k-p}, \dots, \bar{y}_{k-1}$ , and a user-defined constant  $\delta > 0$ .
  - 2: Initialize  $H_{k,0} := \nu_k^{-1} \mathbf{I}$  where  $\nu_k = \max \left\{ \frac{y_{k-1}^\top y_{k-1}}{s_{k-1}^\top y_{k-1} + \delta s_{k-1}^\top s_{k-1}}, \delta \right\}$ .
  - 3: Initialize  $q_0 := \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$
  - 4: **for**  $j = k - 1 : k - p$  **do**
  - 5:   Compute  $\rho_j := (s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)^{-1}$
  - 6:   Compute scalar  $\alpha_{k-j} := \rho_j s_j^\top q_{k-j-1}$
  - 7:   Update vector  $q_{k-j} := q_{k-j-1} - \alpha_{k-j} \bar{y}_j$
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9: Initialize vector  $r_0 := H_{k,0} q$
  - 10: **for**  $j = k - p : k - 1$  **do**
  - 11:   Update vector  $r_{j-k+p+1} := r_{j-k+p} + (\alpha_{k-j} - \rho_j \bar{y}_j^\top r_{j-k+p}) s_j$
  - 12: **end for**
  - 13: Return  $r_p$
- 

- (a)  $r_k = B_k^{-1} \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  for  $k \geq p$  where the sequence  $\{B_k\}$  is defined by (30)-(31).  
 (b) The pair of  $s_k^\top$  and  $\bar{y}_k$  satisfies the curvature condition. More precisely, we have

$$s_k^\top \bar{y}_k \geq 0.25 s_k^\top H_{k,0}^{-1} s_k, \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

- (c) For any  $k \geq p$ , if  $B_{k,0} > 0$ , then  $B_{k,i}$  and  $H_{k,i}$  are positive definite for all  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , respectively.  
 (d) For all  $k \geq p$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{r}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)$  almost surely where  $h_\eta$  is given by (20).

*Proof.* (a) Consider (32). By unrolling this update rule recursively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k,p} &= \left( \prod_{i=1}^p V_j \right)^\top H_{k,0} \left( \prod_{i=1}^p V_j \right) + \rho_{k-p} \left( \prod_{i=2}^p V_j \right)^\top s_{k-p} s_{k-p}^\top \left( \prod_{i=2}^p V_j \right) \\ &\quad + \rho_{k-p+1} \left( \prod_{i=3}^p V_j \right)^\top s_{k-p+1} s_{k-p+1}^\top \left( \prod_{i=3}^p V_j \right) + \dots \\ &\quad + \rho_{k-2} V_{k-1}^\top s_{k-2} s_{k-2}^\top V_{k-1} + \rho_{k-1} s_{k-1} s_{k-1}^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where  $j = k - p + i - 1$ . Consider Algorithm 3. Note that  $q_0 \triangleq \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  and  $r_0 \triangleq H_{k,0} q_p$ . Next, we derive a formula for  $q$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k-j} &= q_{k-j-1} - \alpha_{k-j} \bar{y}_j = q_{k-j-1} - \rho_j (s_j^\top q_{k-j-1}) \bar{y}_j = q_{k-j-1} - \rho_j (y_j s_j^\top) q_{k-j-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{I} - \rho_j y_j s_j^\top) q_{k-j-1} = V_j q_{k-j-1}, \quad \text{for all } j = k - 1, \dots, k - p. \end{aligned}$$

From the preceding relation, we may write

$$q_\ell = \left( \prod_{i=p-\ell+1}^p V_{k-p+i-1} \right) q_0, \quad \text{for all } \ell = 1, 2, \dots, p. \quad (34)$$

Further, from the algorithm, we have  $\alpha_1 = \rho_{k-1} s_{k-1}^\top q_0$  and

$$\alpha_\ell = \rho_{k-\ell} s_{k-\ell}^\top \left( \prod_{i=p-\ell+2}^p V_{k-p+i-1} \right) q_0, \quad \text{for all } \ell = 2, 3, \dots, p. \quad (35)$$

Multiplying both sides of (33) by  $q_0$  and employing (34) and (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k,p}q_0 &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top H_{k,0}q_p + \left(\prod_{i=2}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top s_{k-p}\alpha_p \\ &\quad + \left(\prod_{i=3}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top s_{k-p-1}\alpha_{p-1} + \dots + V_{k-1}^\top s_{k-2}\alpha_2 + s_{k-1}\alpha_1. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Next, we derive a formula for  $r$ . From the algorithm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{j-k+p+1} &= r_{j-k+p} + (\alpha_{k-j} - \rho_j y_j^\top r_{j-k+p}) s_j \\ &= r_{j-k+p} - \rho_j s_j y_j^\top r_{j-k+p} + \alpha_{k-j} s_j \\ &= V_j^\top r_{j-k+p} + \alpha_{k-j} s_j, \quad \text{for all } j = k-p, \dots, k-1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $r_\ell = V_{k-p+\ell-1}^\top r_{\ell-1} + \alpha_{p-\ell+1} s_{k-p+\ell-1}$ , for all  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , where recall that  $r_0 \triangleq H_{k,0}q_p$ . Unrolling the preceding relation recursively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r_p &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top r_0 + \alpha_p \left(\prod_{i=2}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top s_{k-p} \\ &\quad + \alpha_{p-1} \left(\prod_{i=3}^p V_{k-p+i-1}\right)^\top s_{k-p-1} + \dots + \alpha_2 V_{k-1}^\top s_{k-2} + \alpha_1 s_{k-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

From the preceding relation and (36), we may obtain the result by noting that

$$r_p = H_{k,p}q_0 = H_k \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) = B_k^{-1} \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k).$$

(b) This follows from the definition of  $\Phi_k$  and the proof is omitted.

(c) This can be shown in a fashion similar to [29, Lemma 3.1]. To elaborate, from part (b), we have  $s_{k-1}^\top \bar{y}_{k-1} \geq 0.25 s_{k-1}^\top H_{k,0}^{-1} s_{k-1}$ . For any nonzero vector  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} a^\top H_{k,i} a &= a^\top \left( \left( I - \frac{s_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right) H_{k,i-1} \left( I - \frac{s_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right) + \frac{s_j s_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right) a \\ &= a^\top \left( I - \frac{s_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right) H_{k,i-1} \left( I - \frac{s_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right) a + a^\top \frac{s_j s_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} a > 0, \end{aligned}$$

given that  $H_{k,i-1} > 0$ . Thus, choosing an initial  $H_{k,0} > 0$  ensures  $H_{k,i} > 0$  for all  $i$ .

(d) First note that the update rule (32) implies that  $H_k$  is computed using the terms  $\{s_j, y_j\}$  for  $i = k-p, \dots, k-1$ . Recall that from (24) we have

$$y_{k-1} \triangleq \hat{g}_{\eta, N_{k-1}}(\mathbf{x}_k) - \bar{g}_{\eta, N_{k-1}}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad s_{k-1} \triangleq \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}.$$

In view of the definition of the history of the method in (8), this implies that  $\mathbf{H}_k$  is  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable and so, we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k$ . Thus, from part (a), we may write

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{r}_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{H}_k \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k),$$

where the preceding relation is implied by Lemma 7.  $\square$

#### 4.4 Convergence Analysis

We begin by proving an intermediate result that provides a bound on  $\frac{\|y_{k-1}\|^2}{\|s_{k-1}\|^2}$  based on  $L_\eta$ , where  $L_\eta \triangleq \frac{L_0 n + 1}{\eta}$ .

**Lemma 8.** *Let Assumption 3 hold. Then  $\frac{\|y_{k-1}\|^2}{\|s_{k-1}\|^2} \leq 4L_\eta^2$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* From the definitions of  $y_{k-1}$ ,  $\hat{g}_{\eta, N_{k-1}}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , and  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_{k-1}}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k-1} &= \frac{1}{N_{k-1}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \left( \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k-1}))v_{j,k-1}}{\|v_{j,k-1}\|\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta} (\mathbf{x}_k - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_k)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \left( \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1} + v_{j,k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}))v_{j,k-1}}{\|v_{j,k-1}\|\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta} (\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking norms on both sides and invoking the triangle inequality, non-expansivity of the Euclidean projector, and  $L_0$ -Lipschitz continuity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{k-1}\| &= \frac{1}{N_{k-1}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \left( \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \xi_{j,k-1}))v_{j,k-1}}{\|v_{j,k-1}\|\eta} \right) - \frac{N_{k-1}(\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_k) - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}))}{\eta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \left( \frac{n(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + v_{j,k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1} + v_{j,k-1}, \xi_{j,k-1}))v_{j,k-1}}{\|v_{j,k-1}\|\eta} \right) + \frac{N_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1})}{\eta} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_{k-1}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \frac{nL_0\|s_{k-1}\|}{\eta} + \frac{N_{k-1}}{\eta} \|s_{k-1}\| + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k-1}} \frac{nL_0\|s_{k-1}\|}{\eta} + \frac{N_{k-1}}{\eta} \|s_{k-1}\| \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{2nL_0}{\eta + \frac{\eta}{2}} \right) \|s_{k-1}\| = 2L_\eta \|s_{k-1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Squaring both sides of the above inequality, we obtain the result.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** Suppose  $H_k$  is constructed as in (32), with  $H_0 = \delta I$ . Suppose  $\delta\eta^2 \leq 4$ . Let the smallest and largest eigenvalue of  $H_k$  be denoted by  $\underline{\lambda}_k$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_k$ , respectively. Then, for all  $k$ ,

$$\underline{\lambda}_k \geq \underline{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p} \triangleq \frac{\delta}{32(2+\delta)(p+1)L_\eta^2} \quad \text{and} \quad (38)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_k \leq \bar{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p} \triangleq (4p+1) \left( 1 + \frac{16L_\eta\sqrt{2+\delta}}{\delta} \right)^{2p}. \quad (39)$$

*Proof.* (i) We obtain a lower bound on the lowest eigenvalue of  $H_k$  by finding an upper bound on the largest eigenvalue of  $B_k$ . Under the L-BFGS update rule for  $B_k$ ,

$$B_{k,i} = B_{k,i-1} + \frac{\bar{y}_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} - \frac{B_{k,i-1} s_j s_j^\top B_{k,i-1}}{s_j^\top B_{k,i-1} s_j},$$

where  $k$  is the iteration index,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , and  $j = k - p + i - 1$ . Since  $B_{k,i-1} > 0$ ,  $s_j^\top B_{k,i-1} s_j > 0$ . For convenience, let us define  $a_j^2 \triangleq s_j^\top B_{k,i-1} s_j$  and  $w_j \triangleq B_{k,i-1} s_j$ . Rearranging terms to apply the triangle inequality, and using the notation we have introduced, we may write the above as

$$B_{k,i} = B_{k,i-1} - \frac{w_j w_j^\top}{a_j^2} + \frac{\bar{y}_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j}. \quad (40)$$

Considering the first two terms on the right-hand side, we observe that the matrix norm of the difference may be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| B_{k,i-1} - \frac{w_j w_j^\top}{a_j^2} \right\| &= \max_{\|u\|=1} \left( u^\top \left( B_{k,i-1} - \frac{w_j w_j^\top}{a_j^2} \right) u \right) = \max_{\|u\|=1} \left( u^\top B_{k,i-1} u - \frac{u^\top w_j w_j^\top u}{a_j^2} \right) \\ &= \max_{\|u\|=1} \left( u^\top B_{k,i-1} u \right) - \left\| \frac{w_j^\top u}{a_j} \right\|^2 \leq \|B_{k,i-1}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Finally applying the triangle inequality to (40) combined with (41)

$$\|B_{k,i}\| \leq \left\| B_{k,i-1} - \frac{B_{k,i-1} s_j s_j^\top B_{k,i-1}}{s_j^\top B_{k,i-1} s_j} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\bar{y}_j \bar{y}_j^\top}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \right\| \leq \|B_{k,i-1}\| + \frac{\bar{y}_j^\top \bar{y}_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j}. \quad (42)$$

Note from (26) that  $\bar{\Phi}_{k-1}$  is chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{y}_j^\top \bar{y}_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} &\leq \frac{4\|\Phi_j y_j + (1-\Phi_j) s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j\|^2}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} \leq 8\Phi_j^2 \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \frac{\|s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j\|^2}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} \\ &\leq 8\Phi_j^2 \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \frac{\|B_{j+1,0}\|^2 \|s_j\|^2}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} \leq 8\Phi_j^2 \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \frac{\nu_{j+1}^2 \|s_j\|^2}{\nu_{j+1} \|s_j\|^2} \\ &\leq 8\Phi_j^2 \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{s_j^\top B_{j+1,0} s_j} + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \nu_{j+1} = 8\Phi_j^2 \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{\nu_{j+1} s_j^\top s_j} + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \nu_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma 8 and noting that  $\Phi_j \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{y}_j^\top \bar{y}_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} &\leq \frac{8\Phi_j^2}{\nu_{j+1}} (4L_\eta^2) + 8(1-\Phi_j)^2 \nu_{j+1} \stackrel{(\nu_{j+1} \geq \delta)}{\leq} \frac{8}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2) + 8 \left( \frac{y_j^\top y_j}{s_j^\top y_j + \delta s_j^\top s_j} + \delta \right) \\ &\stackrel{(y_j^\top s_j > 0)}{\leq} \frac{8}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2) + 8 \left( \frac{\|y_j\|^2}{\delta \|s_j\|^2} + \delta \right) \stackrel{(\delta \eta^2 \leq 4)}{\leq} \frac{8}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2) + 8 \left( \frac{\|y_j\|^2}{\delta \|s_j\|^2} + (4L_\eta^2) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2) + \left( \frac{8+8\delta}{\delta} \right) (4L_\eta^2) = \left( \frac{16+8\delta}{\delta} \right) (4L_\eta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Combining this with (42) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[ \|B_{k,i}\| \leq \|B_{k,i-1}\| + \left( \frac{16+8\delta}{\delta} \right) (4L_\eta^2) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Inductively}}{\implies} \left[ \|B_{k,i}\| \leq \|B_{k,0}\| + \left( \frac{16+8\delta}{\delta} \right) \sum_{i=1}^p (4L_\eta^2) \right] \\ &\implies \left[ \|B_{k,i}\| \leq \|B_{k,0}\| + \left( \frac{16+8\delta}{\delta} \right) p (4L_\eta^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Since  $\|B_{k,0}\| = \nu_k \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} \frac{(8+8\delta)}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2)$ ,

$$\|B_k\| \leq \left( \frac{8+8\delta}{\delta} \right) (4L_\eta^2) + \frac{(16+8\delta)p}{\delta} (4L_\eta^2) \leq \left( \frac{(16+8\delta)(p+1)}{\delta} \right) (4L_\eta^2). \quad (45)$$

This implies that for all  $k$ ,  $\lambda_k \geq \frac{\delta}{32(2+\delta)(p+1)L_\eta^2}$ .

(ii) Under the stochastic damped L-BFGS update rule (32), where  $k \geq p$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $j = k-p+i-1$ , we have

$$H_{k,i} = H_{k,i-1} - \rho_j (H_{k,i-1} \bar{y}_j s_j^\top + s_j \bar{y}_j^\top H_{k,i-1}) + \rho_j s_j s_j^\top + \rho_j^2 (\bar{y}_j^\top H_{k,i-1} \bar{y}_j) s_j s_j^\top.$$

By noting that  $\rho_j s_j^\top s_j = \frac{s_j^\top s_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j}$ ,  $\frac{\|\bar{y}_j\| \|\bar{s}_j\|}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} = \left( \frac{\|\bar{y}_j\|^2 \|\bar{s}_j\|^2}{(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)} \right)^{1/2}$ ,

and  $\bar{y}_j^\top H_{k,i-1} \bar{y}_j \leq \|H_{k,i-1}\| \|\bar{y}_j\|^2$ , this allows for deriving the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{k,i}\| &\leq \|H_{k,i-1}\| + \frac{2\|H_{k,i-1}\| \|\bar{y}_j\| \|s_j\| + s_j^\top s_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} + \frac{s_j^\top s_j \|H_{k,i-1}\| \|\bar{y}_j\|^2}{(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)^2} \\ &= \|H_{k,i-1}\| + 2\|H_{k,i-1}\| \left( \frac{\|\bar{y}_j\|^2 \|\bar{s}_j\|^2}{(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)} \right)^{1/2} + \|H_{k,i-1}\| \frac{\|s_j\|^2 \|\bar{y}_j\|^2}{(s_j^\top \bar{y}_j)^2} + \frac{\|s_j\|^2}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from (43) that

$$\frac{\|\bar{y}_j\|^2}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \leq \left(\frac{16+8\delta}{\delta}\right) (4L_\eta^2). \quad (46)$$

In addition, in view of Proposition 4, we have the following bound  $\frac{s_j^\top s_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j}$ .

$$\frac{s_j^\top s_j}{s_j^\top \bar{y}_j} \leq \frac{\|s_j\|^2}{0.25s_j^\top H_{j,0}^{-1}s_j} \leq \frac{\|s_j\|^2}{0.25\nu_j\|s_j\|^2} \leq \frac{4}{\delta}. \quad (47)$$

By invoking (46) and (47), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{k,i}\| &\leq \left(1 + 2\left(\frac{4(16+8\delta)}{\delta^2}\right) (4L_\eta^2)\right)^{1/2} + \frac{4(16+8\delta)}{\delta^2} (4L_\eta^2) \|H_{k,i-1}\| + \frac{4}{\delta} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left(1 + \left(\frac{8\sqrt{2+\delta}}{\delta}\right) (2L_\eta)\right)^2}_{\triangleq \phi} \|H_{k,i-1}\| + \frac{4}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Consequently, the above inequality can be rewritten as  $\|H_{k,i}\| \leq \phi \|H_{k,i-1}\| + \frac{4}{\delta}$ . Noting that  $\|H_{k,0}\| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$ , and proceeding recursively by letting  $i$  run from 1,  $\dots$ ,  $p$ , and observing that  $\phi \geq 1$ , we may write  $\|H_{k,i}\| \leq \frac{\phi^p}{\delta} + \frac{4}{\delta} \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \phi^l \leq (4p+1) \frac{\phi^p}{\delta}$ . Consequently, we obtain  $\bar{\lambda}_k \leq (4p+1) \left(1 + \frac{16L_\eta\sqrt{2+\delta}}{\delta}\right)^{2p}$ .  $\square$

Next, we provide a recursive bound on the smoothed function and establish the asymptotic convergence in terms of the smoothed function in an almost sure sense.

**Proposition 6 (Asymptotic guarantees for VRSQN-Z0).** Let  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  be generated by Algorithm 2 and let Assumptions 3 and 2 hold. Suppose  $\gamma_k \leq \frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p} L_\eta}$  for all  $k$  where  $\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}$  are given by (38)–(39). Let  $\delta\eta^2 \leq 4$ . Then, the following holds for all  $k \geq 0$ .

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}[h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \left(\frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{2}\right) \gamma_k \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 + \left(\frac{L_\eta n^2 (\nu^2 \eta^{-2} + L_0^2) \bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2}{2}\right) \frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k}$ .
- (ii) Further, suppose  $\{\gamma_k\}$  and  $\{N_k\}$  satisfy  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k = +\infty$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k} < \infty$ . Then, the sequence  $\{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2\}$  converges to zero a.s. as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* (i) By invoking the  $L_\eta$ -smoothness of  $h_\eta$  and the boundedness of largest eigenvalue  $\bar{\lambda}_k$  of  $H_k$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) &\leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + (\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k) + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \\ &= h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \gamma_k (\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top H_k \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \gamma_k^2 \|H_k \bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \gamma_k (\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top H_k \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ &\quad - \gamma_k (\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top H_k (\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k) + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \gamma_k^2 \bar{\lambda}_k^2 \|\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{g}_{\eta, N_k}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k$  in view of Definition 4. Taking conditional expectations with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \gamma_k (\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top H_k \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{L_\eta}{2} \gamma_k^2 \bar{\lambda}_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k], \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where the last inequality is implied by Proposition 4. We note that for any  $k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &= \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] + \mathbb{E} [\|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \\ + 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k)^\top \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k]}_{=0} &\leq \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2} + L_0^2)}{N_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last relation is implied by invoking Lemma 7 and that

$$\mathbb{E} [\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_k^\top \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \left( \cup_{j=1}^{N_k} \{\xi_{j,k}\} \right)] \right] = 0.$$

Combining the preceding bound with (49), we obtain the following for  $k \geq 0$ .

$$\mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \left( \gamma_k \lambda_k - \frac{L_\eta \bar{\lambda}_k^2 \gamma_k^2}{2} \right) \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{L_\eta n^2 (\nu^2 \eta^{-2} + L_0^2) \bar{\lambda}_k^2 \gamma_k^2}{2N_k},$$

where we use  $(\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k))^\top H_k \nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) \geq \lambda_k \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2$ . The bound in (i) follows by invoking the bounds provided in Proposition 5 and then recalling that  $\gamma_k \leq \frac{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}}{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p} L_\eta}$ .

(ii) Let  $h_\eta^* \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{x}} h_\eta(\mathbf{x})$  where  $h_\eta(\mathbf{x})$  is given by (21). From part (i), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - h_\eta^* \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - h_\eta^* - \frac{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p} \gamma_k \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2}{2} + \frac{L_\eta n^2 (\nu^2 \eta^{-2} + L_0^2) \bar{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p}^2 \gamma_k^2}{2N_k}.$$

We proceed by invoking Lemma 4. From the non-summability of  $\gamma_k$ , the summability of  $\frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k}$ , and the nonnegativity of  $h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - h_\eta^*$ , we have that  $\{(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - h_\eta^*)\}$  is convergent a.s. and  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 < \infty$  almost surely. It remains to show that with probability one,  $\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . This can be shown by contradiction, in a similar vein to proof of Proposition 3.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** (i) We observe that the a.s. convergence holds when, for example,  $\gamma_k$  is square-summable but non-summable while  $N_k \geq 1$ . In fact, convergence also follows if  $\gamma_k = \gamma$  for every  $k$  where  $\gamma$  is sufficiently small, but  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N_k} < \infty$ . (ii) In addition, a limit point of  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  may not be feasible with respect to (1). For this reason, the stationarity with respect to the smoothed problem (21) does not ensure  $2\eta$ -stationarity with respect to the original problem (1). However, if  $\mathbf{x}_{R_K}$  is indeed feasible with respect to  $\mathcal{X}$ , we may claim  $2\eta$ -stationarity with respect to (1).

**Theorem 2 (Rate and complexity statements for VRSQN-ZO).** Let  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$  be generated by Algorithm 2 and let Assumptions 3 and 2 hold. Suppose  $\gamma_k \leq \frac{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}}{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p} L_\eta}$  for all  $k$  where  $\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p}$  are given by (38)–(39). Let  $\delta\eta^2 \leq 4$ . For a given integer  $K$ , let  $R_K$  be a random variable on  $0, \dots, K-1$  with probability mass function given by  $\mathbb{P}\{R_K = j\} = \frac{\gamma^j}{\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \gamma^i}$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq K-1$ .

(i) [Error bound] If  $h_\eta^* \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{x}} h_\eta(\mathbf{x})$  and  $h_\eta(\mathbf{x})$  is given by (21), then for any  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|^2] \leq \frac{2(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0) - h_\eta^*) + \left( L_\eta n^2 (\nu^2 \eta^{-2} + L_0^2) \bar{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p}^2 \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k}}{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k}. \quad (50)$$

(ii) [Complexity guarantees for an increasing  $N_k$ ] For  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , let  $N_k = \lceil \eta^{-a}(k+1)^{1+b} \rceil$  and  $\gamma_k := \frac{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}}{L_\eta \lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}}$ , where  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b > 0$ . Then for any  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|^2] \leq \left( 2(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0) - h_\eta^*) L_\eta \left( \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta, \delta, p}}{\lambda_{\eta, \delta, p}} \right)^2 + (1 + b^{-1}) \eta^a n^2 (\nu^2 \eta^{-2} + L_0^2) \right) \frac{1}{K}.$$

If  $\delta = \eta^{-2}$ ,  $b, \epsilon > 0$ , to achieve  $\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|] \leq \epsilon$ , the iteration and sample complexities are  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\eta^{-5} + \eta^{a-2})}{\epsilon^{-2}}\right)$  and  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\eta^{-(10+5b+a)} + \eta^{(a-2)(2+b)-a}}{\epsilon^{2(2+b)}}\right)$ , respectively.

(iii) [ Complexity guarantees for  $N_k = 1$  ] Let  $N_k = 1$  and  $\gamma_k = \frac{1}{n\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}\sqrt{L_\eta(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)}\sqrt{K}}$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ . Then, the following holds for  $K \geq \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}\right)^2 \frac{L_\eta}{n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)}$ .

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|^2] \leq \left( (2(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0) - h_\eta^*) + 1) n\sqrt{L_\eta(\nu^2\eta^{-2} + L_0^2)} \right) \left( \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}},$$

Further, if  $\delta := \eta^{-2}$ , the iteration and sample complexities are both  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ .

*Proof.* (i) From Proposition 6, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}\gamma_k\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2}{2} + \frac{L_\eta n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2\gamma_k^2}{2N_k}.$$

Taking unconditional expectations and summing both sides over  $k = 0, \dots, K-1$ ,

$$\frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0)] - \mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_K)] + \frac{L_\eta n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k}.$$

Dividing the both sides by  $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k$  and invoking the definition of the probability mass function  $\mathbb{P}\{R_K = j\} = \frac{\gamma_j}{\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \gamma_i}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{R_K} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0)] - \mathbb{E}[h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_K)] + \frac{L_\eta n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{N_k}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k}.$$

Dividing the both sides by  $\frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{2}$  and using  $\mathbb{E} [h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_K)] \geq h_\eta^*$ , we obtain the inequality.

(ii) Substituting  $N_k := \lceil \eta^{-a}(k+1)^{1+b} \rceil$  and  $\gamma_k = \frac{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{L_\eta \bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}$  in (50), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|^2] \leq \frac{2(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0) - h_\eta^*)L_\eta \bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2 K} + \frac{n^2(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\eta^a}{(k+1)^{1+b}}.$$

Note that for any  $K \geq 1$ , we have  $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{(k+1)^{1+b}} \leq 1 + b^{-1}$  (see [34, Lemma 9]). This implies that the inequality in (ii) holds. To show the complexity results, we proceed as follows. From (38)–(39), we may write

$$\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}} = (4p+1) \left( 1 + \frac{16L_\eta\sqrt{2+\delta}}{\delta} \right)^{2p} 32\delta^{-1}(2+\delta)(p+1)L_\eta^2.$$

Substituting  $\delta := \eta^{-2}$  and noting that  $L_\eta = \frac{L_0 n + 1}{\eta}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}} &= (4p+1) \left( 1 + \frac{16(L_0 n + 1)\sqrt{2+\eta^{-2}}}{\eta\eta^{-2}} \right)^{2p} 32(2\eta^2+1)(p+1) \left( \frac{L_0 n + 1}{\eta} \right)^2 \\ &= (4p+1) \left( 1 + 16(L_0 n + 1)\sqrt{2\eta^2+1} \right)^{2p} 32(2\eta^2+1)(p+1) \left( \frac{L_0 n + 1}{\eta} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$  where we note that  $\eta = \mathcal{O}(1)$ . We conclude that the iteration complexity to ensure that  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|] \leq \epsilon$  is  $K_\epsilon \triangleq \mathcal{O}((\eta^{-5} + \eta^{a-2})\epsilon^{-2})$ . Consequently, the sample complexity is obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} N_k &= \sum_{k=0}^{K_\epsilon} [\eta^{-a}(k+1)^{1+b}] = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-a}K_\epsilon^{2+b}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\eta^{-(10+5b+a)} + \eta^{(a-2)(2+b)-a}\right)\epsilon^{-2(2+b)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) First, we note that the lower bound on  $K$  is obtained by requiring  $\gamma_k \leq \frac{\lambda_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{L_\eta}}$  for  $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{n\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}\sqrt{L_\eta(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)}\sqrt{K}}$ . Consider (50) and for a constant stepsize  $\gamma$  and  $N_k := 1$  for every  $k \geq 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\|^2] \leq \frac{2(h_\eta(\mathbf{x}_0) - h_\eta^*)}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}\gamma K} + \frac{(L_\eta(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2))(n^2\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}^2)\gamma}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}.$$

Substituting  $\gamma := \frac{1}{n\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}\sqrt{L_\eta(\nu^2\eta^{-2}+L_0^2)}\sqrt{K}}$ , we obtain the bound in (iii). The iteration complexity (equal to the sample complexity when  $N_k = 1$  for every  $k$ ) is then obtained from this bound and by noting that  $L_\eta = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1})$  and from (ii),  $\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** (i) Notably, in the complexity bounds in Theorem 2, the exponent of  $\eta$  is invariant with the memory parameter  $p$ . This was shown by choosing  $\delta := \eta^{-2}$  and observing that in the bound on the ratio  $\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\eta,\delta,p}}$ , the exponent of  $\eta$  is invariant with  $p$ .

(ii) *VRSQN-ZO* using  $N_k := \lceil \eta^3(k+1)^{1+b} \rceil$  achieves an iteration and sample complexity of approximately  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-5}\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ , respectively, where the impact of  $b$  is ignored. In terms of the dependence on  $\epsilon$ , these bounds match the iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-2})$  and sample complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}\epsilon^{-4})$  obtained for *VRG-ZO* but display a poorer dependence on  $\eta$  (see Remark 1).

(iii) Unlike *VRG-ZO*, iterates generated by *VRSQN-ZO* are not guaranteed to be feasible. The *VRG-ZO* scheme projects the iterate back onto  $\mathcal{X}$ , enforcing feasibility at each iteration, while *VRSQN-ZO* utilizes a Moreau smoothing of the indicator function, merely penalizing the infeasibility.

(iv) *VRSQN-ZO* using  $N_k := \lceil \eta^3(k+1)^{1+b} \rceil$  and *VRSQN-ZO* using  $N_k := 1$  both attain the same sample complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ , but the former achieves a better iteration complexity. This emphasizes the benefits of employing variance reduction in the proposed scheme. However, the sample complexity of *VRSQN-ZO* under variance reduction may worsen in terms of the dependence on other terms, including  $L_0$  and  $n$  (see the error bounds in Theorem 2).

(v) Finally, key benefits of *VRSQN-ZO* emerge in the form of a “self-scaling” behavior core to *QN* schemes as well as its ability to better deal with ill-conditioning by using larger memory sizes  $p$ . These benefits are less clear by merely examining the complexity bounds.

## 5 Numerical Results

In this section, we examine the performance of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on a set of nonsmooth, nonconvex, and stochastic test problems. The performance of the two algorithms under different steplength and batch size sequences is considered in section 5.1. The effect of increasing the memory size in the context of an ill-conditioned problem will also be examined in section 5.2.

## 5.1 Minimum of Two Noise-afflicted Quadratics

Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  be a uniform random variable on  $[0, 2]$ . Define  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[\min[f_1(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}), f_2(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]]$ , where  $f_1(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_i^d (x_i - \boldsymbol{\xi})^2$  and  $f_2(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_i^d (x_i + \boldsymbol{\xi})^2$ . The feasible region,  $\mathcal{X}$ , is a  $d$ -dimensional cube of width 10. We compare the performance of VRG-ZO and VRSQN-ZO equipped with the same sample budget of  $2e6$ , batch size sequence defined by  $N_k := \lceil 10 + \frac{k}{100} \rceil$ , and equivalent selections of  $\gamma = 1e-4$  for VRG-ZO and  $(\gamma = 1, \delta = 1e4)$  for VRSQN-ZO, after 20 replications. For VRG-ZO,  $\ell$  was set to  $\lceil K/2 \rceil$ . In Table 3, the smoothing parameter is set to  $\eta = 0.1$ . We observe that in this problem setting,

Table 3: A simple test problem: Minimum of noise-afflicted quadratics

$d$	$\mathbb{E}[\ G_{\eta, 1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{R_{K, \ell}})\ ^2] / \mathbb{E}[\ \nabla f_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}_{R_K})\ ^2]$		$\mathbb{E}[\ G_{\eta, 1/\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_K)\ ^2] / \mathbb{E}[\ \nabla f_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}_K)\ ^2]$		$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_K)]$	
	VRG-ZO	VRSQN-ZO	VRG-ZO	VRSQN-ZO	VRG-ZO	VRSQN-ZO
3	1.4e-1	5.0e-4	4.1e-2	3.0e-4	1.0e-2	1.0e-4
10	7.0e-1	4.3e-3	7.8e-2	7.0e-4	1.9e-2	2.0e-4
20	2.5e0	5.2e-2	2.0e-1	4.4e-3	5.1e-2	1.1e-3
100	1.2e0	1.1e-1	4.7e-1	1.7e-2	1.2e-1	4.3e-3

VRSQN-ZO improves upon the performance of VRG-ZO in terms of the error of the residual. Expectedly, as the dimension  $d$  grows, the performance of both zeroth-order schemes does tend to degrade in accordance with what is suggested by theory. Next, we examine the trajectories generated by the two schemes. In Figure 1, on the left, we compare the performance of algorithms in the single sample regime while on the right, we compare the performance of VRSQN-ZO under two different stepsize sequences in the setting of the same test problem. We observe from Figure 1 (L), though VRG-ZO




Figure 1: (L): VRSQN-ZO vs. VRG-ZO with  $N_k = 1$ ; (R): VRSQN-ZO with diminishing and constant stepsize rules.

makes rapid progress at the outset, its inability to leverage curvature information as the scheme progresses impacts its performance. On the other hand, VRSQN-ZO tends to display more predictable behavior in reducing the residual. In addition, it can be seen that in line with our expectations for stochastic gradient schemes, the trajectory generated by VRG-ZO displays noisy behavior, while VRSQN-ZO displays a *desirable self-scaling* behavior leading to far less “jagged” behavior of the trajectory. On the right, we compare the performance of VRSQN-ZO under two different choices of stepsize. We note that the performance in this simple setting appears to improve for the case that  $\gamma_k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}})$ . Next, we examine how the scheme performs as if we modify the function  $f$  to take on the form given by  $f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \tilde{f}_i(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})]$ , where  $\tilde{f}_i(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) = (\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi})^\top A_i (\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi})$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Once more, the feasible region,  $\mathcal{X}$ , is a  $d$ -dimensional cube of width 10. From Table 4, we observe that the performance of VRSQN-ZO does not significantly deteriorate with the addition of further quadratics.

Table 4: VRSQN-ZO: Minimizing the minimum of  $n$  quadratics over  $\mathcal{X}$ .

$\sum_{k=1}^K N_k$	$\mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\theta_K)]$				
	1.0e6	2.0e6	3.0e6	4.0e6	5.0e6
$d = 10, n = 10, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	2.0e-5	3.8e-6	3.6e-6	3.7e-6	6.2e-6
$d = 20, n = 10, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	7.7e-5	1.0e-5	7.2e-6	5.5e-6	5.9e-6
$d = 50, n = 10, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	9.6e-4	1.3e-4	6.8e-5	3.9e-5	5.3e-5
$d = 10, n = 20, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	1.1e-5	2.5e-6	1.9e-6	2.1e-6	1.4e-6
$d = 20, n = 20, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	7.7e-5	1.0e-5	7.2e-6	5.5e-6	5.9e-6
$d = 50, n = 20, p = 5, \delta = 1e5$	8.2e-4	1.1e-4	6.2e-5	5.5e-5	4.1e-5

## 5.2 Effect of memory size $p$ on VRSQN-ZO under ill-conditioning

In this section, we examine the effect of the memory size on the performance of VRSQN-ZO in the context of an ill-conditioned problem. In what follows, we fix the stepsize  $\gamma = 1$  and observe how VRSQN-ZO performs under different choices of memory size. It can be seen that when  $p$  grows, the empirical error improves significantly. For instance, when  $d = 4$ , this improvement is by a factor of 10 in terms of empirical error while it is approximately a factor of 2 when  $d$  is raised to 20 and  $n = 10$ .

Table 5: Effect of memory size  $p$  on VRSQN-ZO with  $\text{cond}(A) = 1.2e3$

$\sum_{k=1}^K N_k$	$\mathbb{E}[f_\eta(\mathbf{x}_K)]$							
	$d = 4$				$d = 20$			
	1.0e6	2.0e6	4.0e6	8.0e6	1.0e6	2.0e6	4.0e6	8.0e6
$p=2$	1.0e0	6.3e-1	3.6e-1	1.5e-1	5.3e0	3.1e0	1.6e0	9.2e-1
$p=5$	7.3e-1	3.6e-1	1.6e-1	5.1e-2	4.6e0	2.6e0	1.4e0	7.4e-1
$p=10$	5.4e-1	2.2e-1	7.5e-2	1.8e-2	4.3e0	2.4e0	1.3e0	6.8e-1
$p=20$	4.6e-1	1.6e-1	4.9e-2	9.6e-3	2.8e0	1.9e0	1.0e0	4.8e-1
$p=30$	4.5e-1	1.6e-1	4.7e-2	9.0e-3	2.6e0	1.5e0	7.3e-1	4.6e-1

## 6 Concluding remarks

While a significant amount of prior research has analyzed nonsmooth and nonconvex optimization problems, much of this effort has relied on either the imposition of structural assumptions on the problem or required weak convexity, rather than general nonconvexity. Little research, if any, is available in stochastic regimes to contend with general nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization problems. To this end, we develop a randomized smoothing framework which allows for claiming that a stationary point of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem is a  $2\eta$ -stationary point for the original problem in the Clarke sense. By utilizing a suitable residual function that provides a metric for stationarity for the smoothed problem, we present a zeroth-order framework reliant on utilizing sampled function evaluations. In this setting, we show that the residual function of the smoothed problem tends to zero almost surely along the generated sequence. To compute an  $\mathbf{x}$  that ensures that the expected norm of the residual of the  $\eta$ -smoothed problem is within  $\epsilon$ , we proceed to show that no more than  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-2})$  projection steps and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}\epsilon^{-4})$  function evaluations are required. Further, we propose a zeroth-order stochastic quasi-Newton scheme reliant on a combination of randomized and Moreau smoothing. We establish an almost-sure convergence result and derive the corresponding iteration and sample complexities of  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-5}\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-7}\epsilon^{-4})$ , respectively. These results appear to be novel in addressing constrained nonsmooth nonconvex stochastic optimization.

## References

- [1] K. Balasubramanian and S. Ghadimi. Zeroth-order nonconvex stochastic optimization: Handling constraints, high dimensionality, and saddle points. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 22(1):35–76, Feb 2022.
- [2] A. Beck. *Introduction to Nonlinear Optimization: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications with Python and MATLAB*. SIAM, 2023.
- [3] R. Bollapragada and S. M. Wild. Adaptive sampling quasi-Newton methods for zeroth-order stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 15(2):327–364, 2023.
- [4] J. V. Burke, A. S. Lewis, and M. L. Overton. Approximating subdifferentials by random sampling of gradients. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 27(3):567–584, 2002.
- [5] J. V. Burke, A. S. Lewis, and M. L. Overton. A robust gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth, nonconvex optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 15(3):751–779, 2005.
- [6] H. Chen, H. C. Wu, S. C. Chan, and W. H. Lam. A stochastic Quasi-Newton method for large-scale nonconvex optimization with applications, 2019.
- [7] X. Chen. Smoothing methods for nonsmooth, nonconvex minimization. *Math. Program.*, 134(1, Ser. B):71–99, 2012.
- [8] F. H. Clarke, Yu. S. Ledyayev, R. J. Stern, and P. R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth analysis and control theory*, volume 178 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [9] S. Cui, U. V. Shanbhag, and F. Yousefian. Complexity guarantees for an implicit smoothing-enabled method for stochastic MPECs. *Math. Program.*, 198(2):1153–1225, 2023.
- [10] Y. Cui, J. Liu, and J. S. Pang. Nonconvex and nonsmooth approaches for affine chance-constrained stochastic programs. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 30(3):1149–1211, 2022.
- [11] Y. Cui and J. S. Pang. *Modern nonconvex nondifferentiable optimization*. SIAM, 2021.
- [12] F. E. Curtis and X. Que. A Quasi-Newton algorithm for nonconvex, nonsmooth optimization with global convergence guarantees. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 7(4):399–428, 2015.
- [13] D. Davis and D. Drusvyatskiy. Stochastic model-based minimization of weakly convex functions. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 29(1):207–239, 2019.
- [14] D. Davis and B. Grimmer. Proximally guided stochastic subgradient method for nonsmooth, nonconvex problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 29(3):1908–1930, 2019.
- [15] Y. M. Ermoliev, V. I. Norkin, and R. J.-B. Wets. The minimization of semicontinuous functions: mollifier subgradients. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 33(1):149–167, 1995.
- [16] S. Ghadimi, G. Lan, and H. Zhang. Mini-batch stochastic approximation methods for nonconvex stochastic composite optimization. *Math. Programming*, 155(1-2):267–305, 2016.
- [17] A. A. Goldstein. Optimization of Lipschitz continuous functions. *Math. Programming*, 13(1):14–22, 1977.

- [18] A. Jalilzadeh, A. Nedić, U. V. Shanbhag, and F. Yousefian. A variable sample-size stochastic quasi-Newton method for smooth and nonsmooth stochastic convex optimization. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47(1):690–719, 2022.
- [19] K. C. Kiwiel. Convergence of the gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 18(2):379–388, 2007.
- [20] J. Lei and U. V. Shanbhag. Asynchronous variance-reduced block schemes for composite non-convex stochastic optimization: block-specific steplengths and adapted batch-sizes. *Optimization Methods and Software*, pages 1–31, 2020.
- [21] D. Q. Mayne and E. Polak. Nondifferential optimization via adaptive smoothing. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 43(4):601–613, 1984.
- [22] B.S. Mordukhovich. Variational analysis and generalized differentiation. i. basic theory, ii. applications., 2009.
- [23] Y. Nesterov and V. Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 17(2):527–566, 2017.
- [24] Z. Qi, Y. Cui, Y. Liu, and J.S. Pang. Asymptotic properties of stationary solutions of coupled nonconvex nonsmooth empirical risk minimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(3):2034–2064, 2022.
- [25] O. Shamir. Can we find near-approximately-stationary points of nonsmooth nonconvex functions? In *OPT2020: 12th Annual Workshop on Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [26] U. V. Shanbhag and F. Yousefian. Zeroth-order randomized block methods for constrained minimization of expectation-valued Lipschitz continuous functions. In *2021 Seventh Indian Control Conference (ICC)*, pages 7–12. IEEE, 2021.
- [27] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński. *Lectures on stochastic programming*, volume 9 of *MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2009. Modeling and theory.
- [28] V. A. Steklov. Sur les expressions asymptotiques decertaines fonctions définies par les équations différentielles du second ordre et leurs applications au problème du développement d’une fonction arbitraire en séries procédant suivant les diverses fonctions. *Comm. Charkov Math. Soc.*, 2(10):97–199, 1907.
- [29] X. Wang, S. Ma, D. Goldfarb, and W. Liu. Stochastic Quasi-Newton methods for nonconvex stochastic optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 27(2):927–956, 2017.
- [30] X. Wang, X. Wang, and Y.X. Yuan. Stochastic proximal Quasi-Newton methods for non-convex composite optimization. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 34:922 – 948, 2019.
- [31] Y. Xu and W. Yin. A globally convergent algorithm for nonconvex optimization based on block coordinate update. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, pages 1–35, 2017.
- [32] M. Yang, A. Milzarek, Z. Wen, and T. Zhang. A stochastic extra-step Quasi-Newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *Math. Program.*, 194(1-2):257–303, 2022.
- [33] F. Yousefian, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag. On stochastic gradient and subgradient methods with adaptive steplength sequences. *Automatica*, 48(1):56–67, 2012.

- [34] F. Yousefian, A. Nedić, and U. V Shanbhag. On smoothing, regularization, and averaging in stochastic approximation methods for stochastic variational inequality problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 165:391–431, 2017.
- [35] J. Zhang, H. Lin, S. Jegelka, S. Sra, and A. Jadbabaie. Complexity of finding stationary points of nonconvex nonsmooth functions. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119, pages 11173–11182. PMLR, 2020.