

Online Distributed Optimization with Clipped Stochastic Gradients: High Probability Bound of Regrets

Yuchen Yang¹, Kaihong Lu², Long Wang¹

1. Center for Systems and Control, College of Engineering, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P. R. China
E-mail: ycyang@stu.pku.edu.cn, longwang@pku.edu.cn

2. College of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266590, P. R. China
E-mail: khong_lu@163.com

Abstract: In this paper, the problem of distributed optimization is studied via a network of agents. Each agent only has access to a stochastic gradient of its own objective function in the previous time, and can communicate with its neighbors via a network. To handle this problem, an online distributed clipped stochastic gradient descent algorithm is proposed. Dynamic regrets are used to capture the performance of the algorithm. Particularly, the high probability bounds of regrets are analyzed when the stochastic gradients satisfy the heavy-tailed noise condition. For the convex case, the offline benchmark of the dynamic regret is to seek the minimizer of the objective function each time. Under mild assumptions on the graph connectivity, we prove that the dynamic regret grows sublinearly with high probability under a certain clipping parameter. For the non-convex case, the offline benchmark of the dynamic regret is to find the stationary point of the objective function each time. We show that the dynamic regret grows sublinearly with high probability if the variation of the objective function grows within a certain rate. Finally, numerical simulations are provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of our theoretical results.

Key Words: Distributed optimization, Stochastic gradient, High probability, Heavy-tailed noise

1 Introduction

In multi-agent distributed optimization, the goal of agents is to cooperatively minimize the global objective function formed by the sum of local functions [1]. Along with the penetration of multi-agent networks [2–4], distributed optimization has received ever-increasing attention in recent years [1, 5, 6]. This is due to its wide practical applications in many areas such as large-scale sensor networks [7], and distributed power systems [8].

In practical applications, optimization problems usually occur in uncertain environments. In practical applications, the accurate gradient is hard to obtain due to uncertainties in communications and environments. For instance, when using sensor networks to monitor a remote objective, e.g., bird migration patterns [9], uncertainty is inevitable due to the measurement noise [10]. Thus, it is necessary to study the distributed optimization problem with stochastic gradients. In fact, various online gradient-free algorithms have been achieved. In [11], two decentralized stochastic variants of the Nesterov dual averaging method are proposed. In [12], an online gradient-free distributed projected gradient descent algorithm is presented via a two-point policy. In [13], an online distributed constrained optimization problem under time-varying unbalanced digraphs without an explicit subgradient is studied.

It is worth noting that all the aforementioned investigations study the the bounds of the regrets in expectation. For the algorithm with sublinear regret in expectation, it is necessary to run an algorithm in large numbers of rounds to eliminate the error between the unbiased estimator and the accurate gradient. However, in some practical problems, we can only run the algorithm for a few rounds or even once, so achieving the high probability bound of the regret is desired. For instance, in the problem of tracking a target [14], agents need to track the target as fast as possible. In fact, in centralized optimization, the high probability convergence has

already been studied [15–17]. Unfortunately, the results in [15–17] are not applicable to the distributed cases. More recently, high probability convergence is studied in distributed settings. In [18], the high probability convergence of a distributed stochastic gradient algorithm are provided. In [19], the high probability bound of the dynamic regret is derived via a distributed stochastic mirror descent.

All works [15–19] above focus on the light-tailed noise. For light-tailed noise, such as the sub-Gaussian noise, large variety of concentration techniques are applicable since its tail decays faster than exponential distribution [18]. Even though the light-tailed noise assumption is intuitive, in domains like evolutionary ecology [20], audio source separation [21], finance [22] and machine learning [23], the assumption seems invalid, which implies the necessity of studying heavy-tailed setting.

In this paper, an online distributed optimization problem is studied via a network of agents, where each agent only has access to a stochastic gradient of its own objective function, and can communicate with its neighbors via a network. To address this problem, an online distributed clipped stochastic gradient descent (ODCSGD) algorithm is proposed, and dynamic regrets are used to capture the performance of the algorithm. Furthermore, the high probability bounds of dynamic regrets are analyzed for both convex and non-convex objective functions. The main contributions are summarized as follows.

1. Here we consider the scenario where the stochastic gradient satisfy the heavy-tailed noise condition, as opposed to the lighted-tailed noise condition in [15–19]. More specifically, if a noise follows a heavy-tailed distribution, then the variance of the noise is not necessarily bounded. Thus, the heavy-tailed noise condition is mathematically more general than the lighted-tailed noise condition.

2. Different from the existing results on bounds of the regrets in expectation [11–14], we study the high probability bound of the regret. To ensure the high probability bound of

the stochastic gradient, the clippings strategy is employed. Combining the probability theory, convex optimization and consensus theory, we prove that if the graph sequence is B -strongly connected, and the objective function is convex, then a sublinear high probability bound of dynamic regret is guaranteed. For non-convex settings, if the variation of the objective function grows within a certain rate, a sublinear high probability bound of dynamic regret is obtained.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first one to study the online distributed optimization with stochastic gradient satisfying the heavy-tailed noise condition. Our approaches and results guarantee sublinear regret bounds with only a single run of the algorithm. Thus, compared with results on the sublinear bounds of regrets in expectation [11–14], our results are, mathematically and practically, more efficient and rigorous, and are applicable to wider areas such as distributed learning systems and distributed tracking problems where it is desired to run algorithms in a few rounds.

Notations: $[n]$ represents the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for any integer n . $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product operator. $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is the expectation operator. $\|\cdot\|$ represents the 2-norm operator.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, mathematical preliminaries on heavy-tailed noise and graph theory are introduced. In Section 3, we state our main result and give its proof. In Section 4, simulation examples are presented. Section 5 concludes the whole paper.

2 Preliminaries and Problem Formation

2.1 Online Distributed Optimization with Noisy Gradient Information

Let us describe a scenario of online distributed optimization. Consider a multi-agent system consisting of N agents, labeled by set $\mathcal{V} = [N]$. Agents communicate with each other via a time-varying graph sequence \mathcal{G}_t . For agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$, a set of cost functions are given by $\{f_{i,1}, \dots, f_{i,T}\}$, where $f_{i,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not necessarily convex for any $t \in [T]$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$ is unknown to the agents. At each iteration time $t \in [T]$, agent i selects a state $x_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. After the state is selected, the information associated with the local cost function $f_{i,t}$ is received by agent i , that is, information on cost functions is not available before decisions are made by agents. The goal of agents is to cooperatively solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min f_t(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N f_{i,t}(x), \text{ subject to } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1)$$

To evaluate the performance of the online algorithm, a measurement called dynamic regret is adapted, which can be defined as

$$\mathbf{REG}_T^d = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_{i,t}) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t^*). \quad (2)$$

where $x_t^* = \operatorname{argmin} f_t(x)$.

For general non-convex optimization problems, seeking the minimizer is usually NP-hard [24]. Here the offline goal is to find the stationary point each time. Accordingly, the dynamic regret is defined as [25]

$$\mathbf{NREG}_T^d = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \|\nabla f_t(x_{i,t})\|^2. \quad (3)$$

Achieving a sublinear bound for dynamic regret (2) and (3) is rather challenging in the worst case when the objective functions change fast. However, the path length can be used to quantify the difficulty [26]. The path length is defined as follows

$$C_T = \sum_{t=2}^T \|x_t^* - x_{t-1}^*\|. \quad (4)$$

We employ the variation of the function sequence to reflect the difficulty in the worst case [27]:

$$D_T = \sum_{t=2}^T \|f_t - f_{t-1}\|_{\sup} \quad (5)$$

where $\|f_t - f_{t-1}\|_{\sup} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|f_t(x) - f_{t-1}(x)\|$.

Here we assume that agents only have access to a noisy gradient of $f_{i,t}$, denoted by $\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. For the estimation of the gradient, we make the following assumptions:

Assumption 1 For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x)|x] = \nabla f_{i,t}(x), \forall i \in [n].$$

Assumption 2 For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in [N]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x) - \nabla f_{i,t}(x)\|^p|x] \leq \sigma^p$$

for some $\sigma > 0$ and $p \in (1, 2]$.

This is commonly referred to as heavy-tailed noise, as opposed to light-tailed noise such as those that are distributed according to sub-Gaussian distributions. Mathematically, heavy-tailed noise is more general in stochastic optimization. The variance of the light-tailed noise, e.g. sub-Gaussian noise, is finite since its tail decays faster than Gaussian distribution. Thus, light-tailed noise satisfies Assumption 2, but not vice versa.

Assumption 3 For any $i \in [N]$, $f_{i,t}$ is L -smooth, i.e., its gradient is L -Lipchitz. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\nabla f_{i,t}(x) - \nabla f_{i,t}(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|.$$

Moreover, if $f_{i,t}$ is L -smooth, it has a quadratic upperbound, i.e., For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$f_{i,t}(y) \leq f_{i,t}(x) + \langle \nabla f_{i,t}(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|y - x\|^2.$$

Assumption 4 For any $i \in [N]$ and $t \in [T]$, $x_{i,t}$ is almost surely bounded. That is, there exists $B_X > 0$, such that $\|x_{i,t}\| \leq B_X$. Moreover, there exists $B_g > 0$ such that $\|\nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})\| \leq B_g$ and $\|\nabla f_{i,t}(\bar{x}_t)\| \leq B_g$. \bar{x}_t is the average of $x_{i,t}$ for $i \in [N]$.

Agents communicate with each other via an directed graph $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}, W_t, \mathcal{E}_t)$, where \mathcal{V} denotes the set of agents, \mathcal{E}_t denotes the set of edges where the elements are denoted as (i, j) if and only if agent i can receive a message from agent j at time t , and $W_t = ([W_t]_{ij})_{n \times n}$ denotes the weighted matrix. We denote the set of incoming neighbors of agent i at time t by

$$\mathcal{N}_{i,t} = \{j | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_t\} \cup \{i\}.$$

For a fixed topology $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}, W, \mathcal{E})$, a path of length r from i_1 to i_{r+1} is a sequence of $r + 1$ distinct nodes i_1, \dots, i_{r+1} such that $(i_q, i_{q+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$, for $q \in [r]$. If there exists a path between any two nodes, then $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$ is said to be strongly connected. For $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$, an B -edge set is defined as $\mathcal{E}_{B,t} = \bigcup_{l=0, \dots, B-1} \mathcal{E}_{t+l}$ for some constant $B > 0$. We call that $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$ is B -strongly connected if the directed graph with vertex \mathcal{V} and edge $\mathcal{E}_{B,t}$ is strongly connected for any $t \geq 0$.

Assumption 5 For all $t \geq 1$, the weighted graphs $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}, W_t, \mathcal{E}_t)$ satisfy:

- (a) There exists a scalar $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that $[W_t]_{ij} \geq \eta$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_{i,t}$. Otherwise, $[W_t]_{ij} = 0$.
- (b) The weighted matrix is doubly stochastic, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = 1$.
- (c) $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$ is B -strongly connected. That is, there exists a scalar $B > 0$ such that the graph $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{B,t})$ is strongly connected for any $t \geq 1$.

2.2 Online Distributed Clipped Stochastic Gradient Descent

To solve problem (1), we propose the following ODCSGD algorithm

$$\begin{cases} y_{i,t} = \sum_{j=1}^N [W_t]_{ij} x_{j,t} \\ \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) = \text{clip}_{\lambda_t}(\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})) \\ x_{i,t+1} = y_{i,t} - \eta_t \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is the global step size sequence, $x_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the state of agent i with initial state $x_{i,1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. $\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the non-biased estimation of the gradient $\nabla f_{i,t}$. The step size sequence is non increasing and positive and the clipping operator $\text{clip}_{\lambda_t}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is

$$\text{clip}_{\lambda_t}(y) = \min\left\{1, \frac{\lambda_t}{\|y\|}\right\} y. \quad (7)$$

3 Main Results

Before presenting our main results, we provide some useful lemmas. First we analyze the network error, i.e., the error between each agent's state and their average value at each iteration under (6).

Lemma 1 ([28]) Let Assumption 5 holds for a sequence of weight matrices $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. Consider a set of sequences $\{\xi_{i,t}\}$ for $i \in [N]$ defined by the following relation:

$$\xi_{i,t+1} = \sum_{j=1}^N [W_t]_{ij} \xi_{j,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1}, \text{ for } t \geq 1$$

Let $\bar{\xi}_t$ denote the average of $\xi_{i,t}$ for $i \in [N]$, i.e., $\bar{\xi}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_{i,t}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_{i,t+1} - \bar{\xi}_{t+1}\| &\leq N\gamma\beta^t \max_j \|\xi_{j,1}\| \\ &+ \gamma \sum_{\ell=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-\ell} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\epsilon_{j,\ell+1}\| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\epsilon_{j,t+1}\| + \|\epsilon_{i,t+1}\| \end{aligned}$$

where γ and β are defined as

$$\gamma = \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2N^2}\right)^{-2} \quad \beta = \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2N^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (8)$$

Note that $x_{i,t}$ can be represented by the iteration in Lemma 1. By (8) and algorithm (6), we can bound the network error as follows

Lemma 2 Under Assumption 5, by algorithm (6), for all $i \in [N]$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$\|x_{i,t+1} - \bar{x}_{t+1}\| \leq N\gamma\beta^t R_1 + 2\lambda_t \eta_t + N\gamma \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_l \eta_l,$$

where $\bar{x}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_{i,t}$, γ and β are defined in (8) and $R_1 = \max_i \|x_{i,1}\|$.

Proof: By algorithm (6), it follows that

$$x_{i,t+1} = \sum_{j=1}^N [W_t]_{ij} x_{j,t} - \eta_t \tilde{\nabla} f_i(x_{i,t}).$$

By the second iteration in algorithm (6) and (7), we have $\|\eta_t \tilde{\nabla} f_i(x_{i,t})\| \leq \eta_t \lambda_t$, by Lemma 2, and the decreasing property of $\eta_t \lambda_t$, the lemma is proved.

Moreover, we have

Lemma 3 Under Assumption 5, by algorithm (6), for all $i \in [N]$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|^2 &\leq 3N^2\gamma^2 R_1^2 \frac{1}{1-\beta^2} + 12 \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2 \\ &+ 3N^2\gamma^2 \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^3 \lambda_t^2, \end{aligned}$$

Proof: See Appendix 6.1.

3.1 Convex Case

When the objective functions are convex, the following lemma presents the bound for the term $\eta_t(f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - f_{i,t}(x_t^*))$.

Lemma 4 Under Assumptions 4-5, by algorithm (6),

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_t(f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - f_{i,t}(x_t^*)) - \eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}, x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\|x_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2) + 5\eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2 \\ &+ 2\lambda_t \eta_t (N\gamma\beta^{t-1} R_1 + N\gamma \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_l \eta_l) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\langle \theta_{i,t}, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle = \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle$.

Proof: See Appendix 6.2.

Due to the fact that $\theta_{i,t}$ is not unbiased, it is difficult to analyze the high probability bound of the term $\eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}, x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{i,t}^u &= \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) | \mathcal{F}_t], \\ \theta_{i,t}^b &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) | \mathcal{F}_t] - \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}). \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\widehat{\nabla} f_1, \dots, \widehat{\nabla} f_{t-1})$ denotes the σ -field generated by the unbiased estimator by t ($(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is also known as the natural filtration). Based on results in [29], preliminary bounds of $\theta_{i,t}^u$ and $\theta_{i,t}^b$ are presented.

Lemma 5 ([29]) For $t \geq 1$ and $i \in [N]$, under Assumption 1, we have

$$\|\theta_{i,t}^u\| \leq 2\lambda_t.$$

Furthermore, if $\|\nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})\| \leq \frac{\lambda_t}{2}$, then

$$\|\theta_{i,t}^b\| \leq 4\sigma^p \lambda_t^{1-p}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_{i,t}^u\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 16\sigma^p \lambda_t^{2-p}.$$

Then, the high probability bound of the term $\eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}, x_{i,t} - x_i^* \rangle$ is provided as follows.

Lemma 6 Under Assumptions 1-5, for $\lambda_t = 2B_g t^\alpha$ and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(at+b)^\kappa}$, $\kappa > 2\alpha > 0$, by algorithm (6), for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}, x_{i,t} - x_i^* \rangle \\ & \leq 8B_X \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \lambda_t \left(\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_t}\right)^p + \frac{16}{3} B_X B_g \log \frac{2}{\delta} + \sqrt{2F}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: See Appendix 6.3.

Now we are in a position to present our main result.

Theorem 1 Under Assumptions 1-5, for $\lambda_t = 2B_g t^\alpha$ and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(at+b)^\kappa}$, $\kappa > 2\alpha > 0$, by algorithm (6), for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{REG}_T^d & \leq P \frac{1}{\eta_T} + Q \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2}{\eta_T} + R \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t^2 \lambda_t}{\eta_T} \\ & \quad + 2B_X C_T \frac{1}{\eta_T} + \frac{16N}{3} B_X B_g \log \frac{2}{\delta} \frac{1}{\eta_T} \\ & \quad + 8NB_X \sigma^p \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{1-p} \frac{\eta_t}{\eta_T} \\ & \quad + 8N \frac{\sqrt{\sigma^p} B_X}{\eta_T} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2} \end{aligned}$$

where $P = (2B_X \lambda_1 + 2B_g N^2) N \gamma \eta_1 \frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,1} - x_i^*\|^2$, $Q = (5 + 2N \gamma \frac{1}{1-\beta}) N$ and $R = 2B_g N^2 (2 + N \gamma \frac{1}{1-\beta})$.

Proof: See Appendix 6.4.

Based on Theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1 Under the same conditions stated in Theorem 1, if $\lambda_t = 2B_g t^\alpha$ and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(at+b)^\kappa}$ with $\kappa = \frac{p+1}{2p}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2p}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\mathbf{REG}_T^d \sim \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \left(1 + C_T + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \quad (10)$$

Proof: Note that for $a < 1$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t^a} \leq \int_0^T \frac{1}{s^a} dt = \frac{T^{1-a}}{1-a}$$

which yields that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2}{\eta_T} \leq \frac{T^{2\alpha - \kappa + 1}}{2\alpha - \kappa + 1}, \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t^2 \lambda_t}{\eta_T} \leq \frac{T^{\alpha - \kappa + 1}}{\alpha - \kappa + 1},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{1-p} \frac{\eta_t}{\eta_T} & \leq \frac{T^{\alpha(1-p)+1}}{\alpha(1-p)+1}, \\ \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2 & \leq \frac{T^{(2-p)\alpha - 2\kappa + 1}}{(2-p)\alpha - 2\kappa + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $\kappa = \frac{p+1}{2p}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2p}$, $\max\{\kappa, 2\alpha - \kappa + 1, \alpha(1-p) + 1, \frac{1}{2} + \alpha(1 - \frac{p}{2})\} = \frac{p+1}{2p}$. The validity of the corollary is proven.

Remark 1 From Corollary 1, the sublinearity of the bound in (10) is influenced by term $T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}$. Note that the value of $\log \frac{1}{\delta}$ increases slowly as the value of failure probability δ decreases. For example, due to the facts that $\ln 10^2 = 4.61$, $\ln 10^3 = 6.91$, the term $T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}$ sublinearly increases as $4.61T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}}$, $6.91T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}}$, with probabilities at least 99.99%, 99.999%, respectively. Hence, the sublinearity of term $T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}$ with a probability close to 100% can be ensured by running algorithm (6) in a single round. Moreover, the sublinearity of the bound in (10) is also influenced by C_T . If C_T is sublinear with $T^{-\frac{1+p}{2p}}$, i.e., $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_T}{T^{-\frac{1+p}{2p}}} = 0$, then \mathbf{REG}_T^d has a sublinear bound with high probability. If the minimizer changes fast, C_T may be linear with $T^{-\frac{1+p}{2p}}$, then the sublinearity of the regret can not be guaranteed.

3.2 Non-convex Case

The result on the non-convex case is provided as follows.

Theorem 2 Under Assumptions 1-5, for $\lambda_t = 2B_g t^\alpha$ and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(at+b)^\kappa}$, $\kappa > 2\alpha > 0$, by algorithm (6), for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{NREG}_T^d}{2N} & \leq P \frac{1}{\eta_T} + Q \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t^2 \lambda_t}{\eta_T} + R \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2 \\ & \quad + 4NB_g \sigma^p \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{1-p} \frac{\eta_t}{\eta_T} + ND_T \frac{1}{\eta_T} \\ & \quad + 4NB_g \frac{\sigma^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\eta_T} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2} + \frac{8}{3} B_g^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta} \frac{1}{\eta_T} \\ & \quad + 3N^3 L^2 \gamma^2 \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^3 \lambda_t^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $P = N(f_1(\bar{x}_1) - f_{T+1}(\bar{x}_{T+1})) + N\gamma \frac{\eta_1}{1-\beta} R_1 B_g L + 36N^3 L^2 R_1^2 \frac{1}{1-\beta^2}$, $Q = B_g L \left(2 + N \frac{\gamma}{1-\beta}\right)$ and $R = \left(\frac{L}{2} + 12NL^2\right)$.

Proof: See Appendix 6.5.

Moreover, the high probability bound of the regret via some specific step sizes can be obtained.

Corollary 2 Under the same conditions stated in Theorem 2, if $\lambda_t = 2B_g t^\alpha$ and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(at+b)^\kappa}$ with $\kappa = \frac{p+1}{2p}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2p}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\mathbf{NREG}_T^d \sim \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \left(1 + D_T + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Remark 2 Different from convex settings, D_T is employed as a complexity measure of the problem environment. If D_T




Fig. 1: The Time-varying Graph

is sublinear with $T^{-\frac{1+p}{2p}}$, then $NREG_T^d$ has a sublinear bound with high probability. Accordingly, algorithm (6) performs well.

4 Numerical Simulations

In this section, we use our methods to solve a distributed tracking problem, where sensors aim to cooperatively track a target. Consider a sensor network consisting of 6 sensors, labeled by set $V = \{1, \dots, 6\}$. Each sensor communicates with its neighbors via a time-varying graph shown in Fig.1.

The weight of each edge in Fig.1 is assumed to be 0.8. The switching order is given by (a) \rightarrow (b) \rightarrow (c) \rightarrow (d) \rightarrow (a) \rightarrow \dots . Note that the union of the possible graphs is strongly connected. Then, the connectivity of the graph in Fig.1 satisfies conditions in Assumption 5 with $B = 4$.

The position of the target, denoted by $x_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$, evolves as

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1}^* = x_t^* + \omega_t + v_t, \\ x_0^* = (10, 10)^\top, \quad t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1 \end{cases}$$

where ω_t is the Gaussian noise with zero expectation and $(\frac{1}{T})^2$ variance. v_t is the nonlinear path of the x_t^* :

$$v_t = -10 \left(\frac{1}{T}, \sqrt{\frac{t}{T}} - \sqrt{\frac{t-1}{T}} \right)^\top.$$

Agents aim to track the position of the moving object collaboratively. At time t , each agent observes one of the coordinates of x_t^* with $\xi_{i,t}$, i.e.,

$$z_{i,t} = e_{k_i}^\top x_t^*$$

where e_{k_i} is the k -th unit vector in the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^2 for $k \in \{1, 2\}$. We divide the agents into two groups, where k_i is the remainder of i divided by 2, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$.

4.1 Convex Case

We choose the average of the local square loss as the measure of the tracking error:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(z_{i,t} - e_{k_i}^\top x_t)^2]. \quad (11)$$

Note that the local gradient is not accurate, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\nabla} f_{i,t} = (e_{k_i}^\top (x - x^*) + \xi_{i,t}) e_{k_i}$$

where $\xi_{i,t}$ is the heavy-tailed noise. We consider a typical noise, the t -distribution t_2 with the probability density function

$$t_2(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$




Fig. 2: Tracking Error in 2-D Plane




Fig. 3: The Dynamic Regret Averaged by Iteration

where $\Gamma(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$. We can verify that t_2 has zero expectation and unbounded variance. Then we solve problem (11) by our algorithm. In simulation, we choose $T = 5000$ with the parameter $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(0.5t+10)^{0.5}}$ and $\lambda_t = 2t^{0.1}$.

The initial values are randomly chosen from $[9, 10] \times [9, 10]$. By running our algorithm in a single round, we present the estimation of the target's trajectory of each agent in Fig. 2. Additionally, we plot the dynamic regret divided by time, as depicted in Fig. 3.

4.2 Non-convex Case

In non-convex settings, the value function is modified as follows

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) = \frac{1}{4n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(z_{i,t}^2 - e_{k_i}^\top x_t)^2]. \quad (12)$$

By algorithm (6), with $\eta_t = \frac{1}{(0.5t+10)^{0.4}}$ and $\lambda_t = 2t^{0.1}$, we plot the corresponding $NREG_T^d/T$ which can be referred to Fig. 4. Note that both REG_T^d/T and $NREG_T^d/T$ decay, indicating REG_T^d and $NREG_T^d$ grow sublinearly. These observations are consistent with our obtained results.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed an ODCSGD algorithm for the distributed optimization problem. By implementing the algorithm, every agent adjusts its state value by the clipped gradient estimation from its local cost function and the local state information received from its immediate neighbors. We show that if the time-varying graph sequence is B -strongly connected and the objective function is convex, the corresponding high probability bound of the dynamic re-




Fig. 4: $NREG_T^d/T$

gret is $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}}(1 + C_T + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$. Moreover, in the non-convex settings, the corresponding high probability bound of the regret is $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1+p}{2p}}(1 + D_T + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$. Numerical simulations have been presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of our theoretical results.

When constraints exist in distributed optimization problems, more complicated distributed stochastic algorithms, such as the one based on the primal-dual strategy, are needed. How to study the bound of regret of those distributed algorithms in high probability is still an interesting open topic.

6 Appendix

6.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof of Lemma 3: By Lemma 2, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|^2 &\leq 3\left((N\gamma\beta^t R_1)^2 + 4\lambda_t^2 \eta_t^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ N^2\gamma^2\left(\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_l \eta_l\right)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality results from $(a_1 + \dots + a_n)^2 \leq n(a^2 + \dots + a_n^2)$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \left(\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_l \eta_l\right)^2 &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \left(\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l}\right) \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} (\lambda_l \eta_l)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \sum_{t=l+1}^T \beta^{t-l} (\lambda_l \eta_l)^2 \eta_t \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta}\right)^2 \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \lambda_l^2 \eta_l^3. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $t \in [T]$, we derive the result.

6.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof of Lemma 4: By the convexity of $f_{i,t}$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - f_{i,t}(x_t^*) &\leq \langle \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t+1} - x_t^* \rangle + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - y_{i,t} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - x_t^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Starting with the first term and via the boundedness of the $\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})$, there holds that

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t+1} - x_t^* \rangle = \frac{1}{\eta_t} \langle y_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}, x_{i,t+1} - x_t^* \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2\eta_t} (\|y_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|y_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta_t} (\|y_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta_t} (\|x_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we applied the convexity of the norm $\|\cdot\|$. The second term is bounded by the network error as

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t} - x_{i,t} \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t \rangle + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), \bar{x}_t - x_{i,t} \rangle \\ &\leq \lambda_t (\|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \|y_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|) \leq 2\lambda_t \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

The third term can be bounded by algorithm (6)

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1} \rangle = \eta_t \|\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})\|^2 \leq \eta_t \lambda_t^2.$$

Taking the summation and using Lemma 2 lead to the validity of Lemma 4.

6.3 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof of Lemma 6: $\|\nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})\| \leq \frac{\lambda_t}{2}$ is already satisfied. First, we bound $\sum_{t=1}^n \eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}^b, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle$. By Assumption 4 and Lemma 5, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}^b, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \|\theta_{i,t}^b\| \|x_{i,t} - x^*\| \\ &\leq 8B_X \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \lambda_t^{1-p} \sigma^p. \end{aligned}$$

We use the Freedman's inequality [29] to bound another term. Note that $\{\langle \theta_{i,t}^u, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a sequence of martingale difference. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= \eta_t \|\theta_{i,t}^u\| \|x_{i,t} - x^*\| = 4B_X \eta_t \lambda_t, \\ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}^u, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\leq 32\sigma^p B_X \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2 = F. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_t \leq c = 8B_X B_g$ almost surely, it follows from the Freedman's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\left|\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}^u, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle\right| > a \text{ and } \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}^u, x_{i,t} - x^* \rangle)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq F\right) \\ \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{a^2}{2F + \frac{2}{3}ca}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose a such that

$$2 \exp\left\{-\frac{a^2}{2F + \frac{2}{3}ca}\right\} = \delta$$

which gives

$$a = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2c}{3} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{4c^2}{9} \log^2\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) + 8F} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{3}c \log \frac{2}{\delta} + \sqrt{2F}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for any $a, b \geq 0$.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1: Note that the exact gradient is bounded by B_g , one has that

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(x_t^*) &= f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(\bar{x}_t) + f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_t(x_t^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \nabla f_{j,t}(x_{i,t}), x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t \rangle + f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_t(x_t^*) \\ &\leq B_g N \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_t(x_t^*). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we simplify the above as follows

$$f_{j,t}(\bar{x}_t) - f_{j,t}(x_{i,t}) \leq B_g \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|.$$

Summing by $i \in [N]$, we derive the difference between the dynamic regret and the bound derived in Lemma 4.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(x_t^*) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - f_{i,t}(x_t^*) \\ &\quad + 2NB_g \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

With Assumption 4, we derive that

$$\|x_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t} - x_{t-1}^*\|^2 \leq 4B_X \|x_t^* - x_{t-1}^*\|$$

where $B_X = \sup_{\mathcal{X}} \|x\|$. The inequality above indicates that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} (\|x_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\|x_{i,t} - x_{t-1}^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_{t+1}^*\|^2) \\ &\quad + 4B_X \|x_t^* - x_{t-1}^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $i \in [N]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \|x_{i,t} - x_t^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_t^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_{i,1} - x_1^*\|^2 - \|x_{i,2} - x_2^*\|^2 + \sum_{t=2}^T (\|x_{i,t} - x_{t-1}^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - \|x_{i,t+1} - x_{t+1}^*\|^2) + 4B_X \|x_t^* - x_{t-1}^*\| \\ &\leq \|x_{i,1} - x_1^*\|^2 + 4B_X C_T. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms in (9), we have for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with the probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \left(\sum_{i=1}^N f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(x_t^*) \right) \\ &\leq (5 + 2N\gamma \frac{1}{1-\beta}) N \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2 \\ &\quad + (2B_X \lambda_1 + 2B_g N^2) N \gamma \eta_1 \frac{1}{1-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ 2B_g N^2 (2 + N\gamma \frac{1}{1-\beta}) \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \lambda_t \\ &+ 8NB_X \sigma^p \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{1-p} \eta_t + 2B_X C_T \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,1} - x_1^*\|^2 + \frac{32}{3} B_X^2 L \log \frac{2}{\delta} + \sqrt{2F} \end{aligned}$$

where $F = 32\sigma^p B_X \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2$ and the inequality above is satisfied by the Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t \eta_t \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_l \eta_l = \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \sum_{t=l+1}^{T-1} \beta^{t-l} \lambda_t \eta_t \lambda_l \eta_l \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \lambda_{l+1} \eta_{l+1} \lambda_l \eta_l \leq \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \lambda_l^2 \eta_l^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the decreasing step size η_t , the dynamic regret is bounded.

6.5 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2: By the L -smoothness of $f_{i,t}$, there holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(\bar{x}_{t+1}) &\leq f_t(\bar{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}_{t+1} - \bar{x}_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t), \bar{x}_{t+1} - \bar{x}_t \rangle \\ &= f_t(\bar{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \frac{\eta_t}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Considering $\langle \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t), \frac{\eta_t}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) \rangle$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t), \frac{\eta_t}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) \rangle - \frac{\eta_t}{N} \|\nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t)\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\eta_t}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\langle \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t), (\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t), (\nabla f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - \nabla f_{i,t}(\bar{x}_t)) \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|\tilde{\nabla} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})\| \leq \lambda_t$, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_t \|\nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t)\|^2 &\leq N (f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_t(\bar{x}_{t+1})) + \frac{L}{2} \eta_t^2 \lambda_t^2 \\ &\quad + \eta_t B_g L \|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \eta_t \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \theta_{i,t}, \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Next we provide the bound of the term $\eta_t \langle \theta_{i,t}, \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t) \rangle$. Replacing $2B_X$ to B_g in Lemma 6, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \theta_{i,t}, \nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t) \rangle \leq 4NB_g \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \lambda_t \left(\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_t} \right)^p \\ &\quad + \frac{8}{3} NB_g^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta} + N\sqrt{2F} \end{aligned}$$

where $F = 8B_g^2\sigma^p \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^{2-p} \eta_t^2$. In addition, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T (f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_t(\bar{x}_{t+1})) - f_1(\bar{x}_1) + f_{T+1}(\bar{x}_{T+1}) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T (f_t(\bar{x}_t) - f_{t+1}(\bar{x}_{t+1})) \leq D_T. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $i \in [N]$ and $t \in [T]$, by $(a_1 + \dots + a_n)^2 \leq n(a^2 + \dots + a_n^2)$, one has that

$$\|\nabla f_t(x_{i,t})\|^2 \leq 2\|\nabla f_t(\bar{x}_t)\|^2 + 2NL^2\|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|^2.$$

Then by Lemma 2, Lemma 3 and the decreasing property of η_t , the validity of the Theorem is ensured.

References

- [1] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [2] L. Wang and F. Xiao, "A new approach to consensus problems in discrete-time multiagent systems with time-delays," *Science in China Series F: Information Sciences*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 625–635, 2007.
- [3] L. Wang, F. Jiang, G. Xie, and Z. Ji, "Controllability of multi-agent systems based on agreement protocols," *Science in China Series F: Information Sciences*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 2074–2088, 2009.
- [4] L. Wang and F. Xiao, "Finite-time consensus problems for networks of dynamic agents," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 950–955, 2010.
- [5] A. Nedić and A. Olshevsky, "Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 601–615, 2015.
- [6] S. Rahili and W. Ren, "Distributed continuous-time convex optimization with time-varying cost functions," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1590–1605, 2017.
- [7] H. Habibzadeh, Z. Qin, T. Soyata, and B. Kantarci, "Large-scale distributed dedicated- and non-dedicated smart city sensing systems," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 17, no. 23, pp. 7649–7658, 2017.
- [8] G. Chen and Z. Guo, "Initialization-free distributed fixed-time convergent algorithms for optimal resource allocation," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 845–854, 2022.
- [9] G. Barrenetxea, F. Ingelrest, G. Schaefer, and M. Vetterli, "Wireless sensor networks for environmental monitoring: The sensorscope experience," in *2008 IEEE International Zurich Seminar on Communications*, 2008, pp. 98–101.
- [10] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and M. G. Rabbat, "Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 953–976, 2018.
- [11] S. Lee, A. Nedić, and M. Raginsky, "Stochastic dual averaging for decentralized online optimization on time-varying communication graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, pp. 6407–6414, 2017.
- [12] Y. Pang and G. Hu, "Randomized gradient-free distributed online optimization via a dynamic regret analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–8, 2023.
- [13] Y. Xiong, X. Li, K. You, and L. Wu, "Distributed online optimization in time-varying unbalanced networks without explicit subgradients," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 4047–4060, 2022.
- [14] S. Shahrampour and A. Jadbabaie, "Distributed online optimization in dynamic environments using mirror descent," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, pp. 714–725, 2018.
- [15] L. Madden, E. Dall'Anese, and S. Becker, "High-probability convergence bounds for non-convex stochastic gradient descent," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05610*, 2020.
- [16] Y. Hong and J. Lin, "High probability convergence of adam under unbounded gradients and affine variance noise," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02000*, 2023.
- [17] Z. Liu, T. D. Nguyen, T. H. Nguyen, A. Ene, and H. Nguyen, "High probability convergence of stochastic gradient methods," in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, Eds., vol. 202. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023, pp. 21 884–21 914.
- [18] K. Lu, H. Wang, H. Zhang, and L. Wang, "Convergence in high probability of distributed stochastic gradient descent algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [19] Y. Yang, K. Lu, and L. Wang, "Online distributed optimization with stochastic gradients: high probability bound of regrets," *Control Theory Technol.*, 2024.
- [20] B. Jourdain, S. Méléard, and W. A. Woyczynski, "Lévy flights in evolutionary ecology," *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, vol. 65, pp. 677–707, 2012.
- [21] A. Liutkus and R. Badeau, "Generalized wiener filtering with fractional power spectrograms," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2015, pp. 266–270.
- [22] B. B. Mandelbrot, "Fractals and scaling in finance," *Springer*, 1997.
- [23] U. Simsekli, L. Sagun, and M. Gurbuzbalaban, "A tail-index analysis of stochastic gradient noise in deep neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., vol. 97. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019, pp. 5827–5837.
- [24] K. Lu and L. Wang, "Online distributed optimization with nonconvex objective functions via dynamic regrets," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 6509–6524, 2023.
- [25] J. Li, C. Li, J. Fan, and T. Huang, "Online distributed stochastic gradient algorithm for non-convex optimization with compressed communication," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1-16, 2023.
- [26] K. Lu, G. Li, and L. Wang, "Online distributed algorithms for seeking generalized nash equilibria in dynamic environments," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2289–2296, 2021.
- [27] O. Besbes, Y. Gur, and A. Zeevi, "Non-stationary stochastic optimization," *Operations Research*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 1227–1244, 2015.
- [28] S. Sundhar Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, "A new class of distributed optimization algorithms: Application to regression of distributed data," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 71–88, 2012.
- [29] T. D. Nguyen, T. H. Nguyen, A. Ene, and H. L. Nguyen, "High probability convergence of clipped-sgd under heavy-tailed noise," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05437*, 2023.