
TernaryVote: Differentially Private, Communication Efficient, and Byzantine Resilient Distributed Optimization on Heterogeneous Data

Richeng Jin¹ Yujie Gu¹ Kai Yue² Xiaofan He³ Zhaoyang Zhang¹ Huaiyu Dai²

Abstract

Distributed training of deep neural networks faces three critical challenges: privacy preservation, communication efficiency, and robustness to fault and adversarial behaviors. Although significant research efforts have been devoted to addressing these challenges independently, their synthesis remains less explored. In this paper, we propose *TernaryVote*, which combines a ternary compressor and the majority vote mechanism to realize differential privacy, gradient compression, and Byzantine resilience simultaneously. We theoretically quantify the privacy guarantee through the lens of the emerging f -differential privacy (DP) and the Byzantine resilience of the proposed algorithm. Particularly, in terms of privacy guarantees, compared to the existing sign-based approach *StoSign*, the proposed method improves the dimension dependence on the gradient size and enjoys privacy amplification by mini-batch sampling while ensuring a comparable convergence rate. We also prove that *TernaryVote* is robust when less than 50% of workers are blind attackers, which matches that of *SIGNSGD* with majority vote. Extensive experimental results validate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

1. Introduction

In the past decades, the ever-growing computational power distributed across the network and massive data generated daily have enabled the unprecedented success of distributed machine learning techniques (Dean et al., 2012). In the classic parameter server paradigm for distributed learning, the training process consists of multiple workers coordinated by the central server that updates a global model iteratively

using the model updates from the workers. In distributed stochastic gradient descent (SGD), the server updates the model with the average of the stochastic gradients computed by the workers using their local datasets (Bertsekas & Tsitsiklis, 2015).

While harnessing the computing power of the distributed workers, distributed SGD faces several critical challenges. Firstly, the local training data collected by the workers may contain sensitive information (e.g., medical data (Rieke et al., 2020)), which hinders their willingness to participate in collaborative training. Despite that the federated learning (FL) paradigm offers a certain degree of privacy protection by practicing the principle of data minimization, there is no formal and rigorous quantification of privacy (Kairouz et al., 2021b). Secondly, in applications like FL, the workers are usually equipped with limited communication capability while the size of modern neural networks is unprecedentedly growing, which renders communication latency a major bottleneck. Finally, the distributed training paradigm is vulnerable to fault and adversarial behaviors, and any faulty worker can ruin the convergence of distributed SGD by sending a sufficiently large gradient (Bernstein et al., 2019).

Significant research efforts have been devoted to addressing the aforementioned challenges. More specifically, various differentially private (DP) mechanisms (Abadi et al., 2016; Agarwal et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020a; Kairouz et al., 2021a; Agarwal et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2022), gradient compression schemes (Alistarh et al., 2017; Haddadpour et al., 2020; Stich et al., 2018; Bernstein et al., 2018; Karimireddy et al., 2019; Safaryan & Richtárik, 2021; Jin et al., 2024), and Byzantine robust aggregators (Blanchard et al., 2017; Yin et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2019; Karimireddy et al., 2021; Farhadkhani et al., 2022; Allouah et al., 2023a), have been proposed to alleviate the privacy concern, the communication efficiency issue, and the vulnerability against Byzantine attacks, respectively. Although a few pioneering works, e.g., (Guerraoui et al., 2021; Allouah et al., 2023b), have studied the combination of DP mechanisms and Byzantine robust schemes, the requirement for communication efficiency is often ignored. Among these approaches, *SIGNSGD* with majority vote (Bernstein et al., 2019) is of particular interest since it offers both Byzantine resilience and a sig-

¹Department of Information and Communication Engineering, Zhejiang University, China. ²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA. ³Electronic Information School, Wuhan University, China.. Correspondence to: Richeng Jin <richengjin@zju.edu.cn>.

nificant reduction in communication overhead. However, it fails to converge in the presence of data heterogeneity (Chen et al., 2020b). (Xiang & Su, 2023) shows the differential privacy guarantee of the stochastic-sign compressor that is proposed in (Jin et al., 2020) to address the non-convergence issue of SIGNSGD, which reveals the potential of providing differential privacy, communication efficiency, and Byzantine resilience in a unified framework. Nonetheless, the ϵ -DP guarantee in (Xiang & Su, 2023) has a linear dependency on d (i.e., the dimension of gradients), which renders the privacy protection less meaningful for modern neural networks with d in the order of hundreds of millions. Recently, (Jin et al., 2023) has observed that incorporating random sparsification into the stochastic-sign compressor leads to privacy amplification for distributed mean estimation. Inspired by this, we incorporate ternary compression into the majority vote mechanism and propose *TernaryVote*. Similar to the sign-based approaches, the ternary-based majority vote mechanism is expected to provide a certain degree of Byzantine resilience. We make the aspiration rigorous and show that the non-convergence issue of the sign-based approach can be addressed while ensuring differential privacy and further improving communication efficiency.

Our contributions. Our main technical contributions are summarized as follows.

- We analyze the differential privacy guarantee of the ternary compressor (Jin et al., 2023) in the use case of SGD, based on which *TernaryVote* is proposed. In sharp contrast to the results in (Xiang & Su, 2023), the privacy guarantee of *TernaryVote* has a dependency on \sqrt{d} (instead of d), and *TernaryVote* enjoys privacy amplification by mini-batch training data sampling.
- Under the bounded gradient assumption, we show that *TernaryVote* converges in expectation with a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T} + B/\sqrt{M})$ (which matches that of *StoSign* (Xiang & Su, 2023)) in the low-privacy regime (i.e., a small B), in which T is the number of communication rounds, M is the number of workers, and B is a tuning parameter for ternary compression. In the high-privacy regime (in μ_T -GDP) with $B = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T}/\mu_T)$, it converges in expectation with a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\mu_T + \mu_T/\sqrt{T})$, which matches that of DP-SGD with the classic Gaussian mechanism (Fang et al., 2022).
- We theoretically quantify the Byzantine resilience of *TernaryVote*, which can tolerate up to $K = M - 1$ blind attackers (Bernstein et al., 2019) in which M is the number of normal workers.
- Experimental results on the MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and CIFAR-10 datasets validate the effectiveness of the proposed method.

2. Related Work

Differential Privacy Mechanism: Since the seminar work (Abadi et al., 2016) introduces the classic Gaussian mechanism into deep learning, there has been a surging interest in developing various DP mechanisms. To cope with the communication efficiency issue, significant research efforts have been devoted to studying discrete mechanisms. (Dwork et al., 2006) introduces the one-dimensional binomial noise, which is extended to the general d -dimensional case in (Agarwal et al., 2018) with more comprehensive analysis in terms of (ϵ, δ) -DP. (Canonne et al., 2020; Kairouz et al., 2021a) investigate the DP guarantees of discrete Gaussian noise. (Agarwal et al., 2021) and (Chen et al., 2022) propose the Skellam mechanism and the Poisson binomial mechanism, respectively, with Rényi DP guarantees. (Chaudhuri et al., 2022; Guo et al., 2023) achieve privacy-aware compression through numerical mechanism design, and (Zhu & Blaschko, 2023) studies the impact of random sparsification on DP-SGD (Abadi et al., 2016). For distributed mean estimation, (Chen et al., 2020a) proposes the subsampled and quantized Kashin’s response (SQKR) mechanism that achieves order-optimal estimation error. (Chen et al., 2023) studies privacy amplification by compression for central (ϵ, δ) -DP, while (Jin et al., 2023) considers the privacy amplification of random sparsification through the lens of f -DP. However, none of these works takes the Byzantine resilience of the proposed mechanisms into consideration.

Robustness: In practice, the workers may fail to deliver correct information due to hardware or software failure, data corruption, transmission error, or malicious adversaries. To address this issue, various Byzantine resilient mechanisms have been proposed (Blanchard et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2018; Mhamdi et al., 2018; Yin et al., 2018; Karimireddy et al., 2021; Farhadkhani et al., 2022; Karimireddy et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2023; Allouah et al., 2023a). A few works investigate the robustness of differentially private mechanisms. Specifically, (Sun et al., 2019; Naseri et al., 2022) empirically show that adding Gaussian noise to the model updates mitigates backdoor attacks and white-box membership inference attacks. (Nguyen et al., 2022) combines clustering, adaptive clipping, and the Gaussian mechanism to defend against poisoning attacks while realizing client-level DP. (Guerraoui et al., 2021) shows that most of the existing Byzantine resilient aggregation rules, including Krum (Blanchard et al., 2017), Bulyan (Mhamdi et al., 2018), Trimmed mean (Yin et al., 2018), and Median (Yin et al., 2018), suffer from the curse of dimensionality when combined with the Gaussian mechanism. (Allouah et al., 2023b) studies the tradeoff between privacy, robustness, and accuracy in distributed learning and proposes the smallest maximum eigenvalue averaging method for Byzantine resilient aggregation. However, it results in a computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$. In addition, none of the aforementioned works

considers the communication efficiency.

(Zhang & Hu, 2023) incorporates sparsification and variance reduction into the classic Gaussian mechanism, which demonstrates robustness against Byzantine attackers empirically. (Zhu & Ling, 2022) shows the DP guarantees of the sign-flipping mechanism (only for the scalar case) and extends the robust stochastic model aggregation (RSA) method (Li et al., 2019) to its differentially private variant. (Xiang & Su, 2023) proves the differential privacy guarantee and the Byzantine resilience of the stochastic-sign compressor in (Jin et al., 2020). However, the privacy guarantee in (Xiang & Su, 2023) has a linear dependency on d .

3. Problem Setup and Preliminaries

3.1. Problem Setup

We consider a classical parameter server paradigm for distributed learning that consists of M honest workers (denoted by \mathcal{M}) and a central server. Each worker holds a local dataset \mathcal{D}_m , and the goal of the workers is to minimize the finite-sum objective of the form

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(\mathbf{w}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M f_m(\mathbf{w}), \quad (1)$$

where $f_m(\mathbf{w})$ is a local loss function defined by the local dataset of worker m and the parameter vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$. More specifically, $f_m(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_m|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{D}_m} l(\mathbf{w}; s)$ where $|\mathcal{D}_m|$ is the size of worker m 's local dataset \mathcal{D}_m and $l : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the loss function that measures the loss of prediction on the data point $s \in \mathcal{D}$ made with \mathbf{w} .

3.2. Privacy Measure

Each honest worker m aims to protect the privacy of their local dataset \mathcal{D}_m from all the other participants, i.e., the server and the other workers. In this work, we adopt the well-known differential privacy as the privacy measure. We first introduce the most commonly used differential privacy measure (ϵ, δ) -DP (Dwork et al., 2006), followed by the emerging concept of f -DP (Dong et al., 2021). Particularly, compared to (ϵ, δ) -DP, f -DP enjoys the hypothesis testing interpretation and a better composition property.

(ϵ, δ) -Differential Privacy: Formally, (ϵ, δ) -DP (Dwork et al., 2006) is defined as follows.

Definition 1 ((ϵ, δ) -DP). *A randomized mechanism \mathcal{Q} is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if for all neighboring datasets S and S' and all $O \subset \mathcal{O}$ in the range of \mathcal{M} , we have $P(\mathcal{Q}(S) \in O) \leq e^\epsilon P(\mathcal{Q}(S') \in O) + \delta$, in which S and S' are neighboring datasets that differ in only one record, and $\epsilon, \delta \geq 0$ characterize the level of privacy.*

f -Differential Privacy: For two neighboring datasets S and S' , from the hypothesis testing perspective, we consider

two hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \text{the underlying dataset is } S, \\ H_1 &: \text{the underlying dataset is } S'. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Let P and Q denote the probability distribution of the outputs of the randomized mechanism $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(S')$, respectively. Consider a rejection rule $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ (i.e., rejecting H_0 with a probability of ϕ), there exists a tradeoff between the achievable type I and type II error rates defined as

$$\alpha_\phi = \mathbb{E}_P[\phi], \beta_\phi = 1 - \mathbb{E}_Q[\phi], \quad (3)$$

respectively. f -DP characterizes this tradeoff through the following tradeoff function.

Definition 2 (tradeoff function (Dong et al., 2021)). *For any two probability distributions P and Q on the same space, the tradeoff function $T(P, Q) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined as*

$$T(P, Q)(\alpha) = \inf\{\beta_\phi : \alpha_\phi \leq \alpha\}, \quad (4)$$

where the infimum is taken over all (measurable) ϕ .

Formally, f -DP (Dong et al., 2021) is defined as follows.

Definition 3 (f -DP). *Let f be a tradeoff function. A mechanism \mathcal{Q} is f -differentially private if for all neighboring datasets S and S' ,*

$$T(\mathcal{Q}(S), \mathcal{Q}(S')) \geq f, \quad (5)$$

which suggests that the attacker cannot achieve a type II error rate smaller than $f(\alpha)$ given that the type I error rate is no larger than α .

f -DP can be converted to (ϵ, δ) -DP as follows.

Lemma 1. (Dong et al., 2021) *A mechanism is $f(\alpha)$ -differentially private if and only if it is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private with*

$$f(\alpha) = \max\{0, 1 - \delta - e^\epsilon \alpha, e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta - \alpha)\}. \quad (6)$$

Finally, we introduce a special case of f -DP with $f(\alpha) = \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \mu)$, which is denoted as μ -GDP. Specifically, μ -GDP corresponds to the tradeoff function of two normal distributions with mean 0 and μ , respectively, and a variance of 1. It enjoys the following composition property.

Lemma 2. *The T -fold composition of μ_i -GDP mechanisms is $\sqrt{u_1^2 + u_2^2 + \dots + u_T^2}$ -GDP.*

3.3. Gradient Compression

In applications like FL, the workers are usually mobile devices that are equipped with limited communication capability, and gradient compression is commonly adopted to improve communication efficiency. In this work, we consider the following ternary stochastic compressor.

Definition 4 (Ternary Stochastic Compressor). *For any given $x \in [-c, c]$, the compressor ternary outputs*

$\text{ternary}(x, A, B)$, which is given by

$$\text{ternary}(x, A, B) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A+x}{2B}, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{A}{B}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A-x}{2B}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The privacy guarantee of the above ternary compressor concerning x is given by (Jin et al., 2023) as follows.

Theorem 1. (Jin et al., 2023) *The ternary compressor in Definition 4 is $f(\alpha)$ -differentially private with*

$$f(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A+c}{A-c}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A-c}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{B} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A-c}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A+c}{2B}], \\ \frac{A-c}{A+c} - \frac{A-c}{A+c}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A+c}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

3.4. Threat Model

In addition to the M normal workers, it is assumed that there exist K Byzantine attackers, and its set is denoted as \mathcal{K} . The attackers may send arbitrary information to the central server, with their identities a priori unknown.

Algorithm 1 Differentially Private, Communication Efficient, and Byzantine Resilient Distributed SGD

Initialization: The initial model weights w_0 , the differentially private compression mechanism $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$, the robust aggregator $\text{Agg}(\cdot)$, the batch size b , the clipping function $\text{Clip}(\cdot)$, the learning rate η , and the total number of communication rounds T .

for communication round $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**

Server randomly samples a subset of workers \mathcal{N}_t and sends the model weights $w^{(t)}$ to them.

for each worker $i \in \mathcal{N}_t$ **do**

if $i \in \mathcal{M}$ **then**

Sample a mini-batch $\mathcal{B}_i^{(t)}$ training examples of size b at random from \mathcal{D}_i . Then compute and clip the per-example gradients and average the mini-batch gradients:

$$\bar{g}_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_i^{(t)}} \text{Clip}(\nabla l(w^{(t)}; s)) \quad (9)$$

Apply the differentially private compression mechanism and send $Z_i^{(t)} = \mathcal{C}(\bar{g}_i^{(t)})$ back to the central server.

else if $i \in \mathcal{K}$ **then**

Send arbitrary information $Z_i^{(t)}$ to the server.

end if

end for

The central server aggregates the received gradients

$$\hat{g}^{(t)} = \text{Agg}(\{Z_i^{(t)}\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t}) \text{ and updates the model by } w^{(t+1)} = w^{(t)} - \eta \hat{g}^{(t)}. \quad (10)$$

end for

3.5. The Overall Distributed Learning Process

Algorithm 1 summarizes the overall distributed training process. During each communication round t , the server randomly samples a subset of workers and broadcasts the global model weights to the selected workers. The workers sample a mini-batch of training examples, compute and clip the corresponding per-example gradient, and send the average mini-batch clipped gradients to the server after applying the differentially private compression mechanism. Upon receiving the gradients from all the workers, the server aggregates them and updates the global model weights accordingly. We remark that the vanilla DP-SGD (Abadi et al., 2016) is a special case of Algorithm 1 with $\text{Clip}(g; C) = g \cdot \min\{1, C/\|g\|_2\}$, $\mathcal{C}(g) = g + \xi$ where ξ is the Gaussian noise, and $\text{Agg}(\{Z_i^{(t)}\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_t|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t} Z_i^{(t)}$.

4. The Proposed Mechanisms

In this section, we introduce the proposed mechanisms. During communication round t , the workers clip the per-example gradients with l_∞ norm of c and obtain $Z_i^{(t)}$ by applying the ternary stochastic compressor to each coordinate of the average mini-batch gradient independently, i.e., $Z_i^{(t)} = [\text{ternary}(\bar{g}_{i,1}^{(t)}, A, B), \dots, \text{ternary}(\bar{g}_{i,d}^{(t)}, A, B)]$. For the server, we consider two candidate aggregators:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}^{(t)} &= \text{Agg}(\{Z_i^{(t)}\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t}) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_t|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t} Z_i^{(t)}, & \text{Scheme I,} \\ \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_t|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_t} Z_i^{(t)}\right), & \text{Scheme II.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We note that the privacy guarantee in Theorem 1 assumes compressing the private data $x \in [-c, c]$ that is symmetric about 0, which means that it can be applied to the SGD scenario with gradient clipping. For mini-batch SGD, however, the results cannot be directly applied. More specifically, since the neighboring datasets differ in only one training example (denoted by s'), we have

$$\bar{g}_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{b} \underbrace{\text{Clip}(\nabla l(w^{(t)}; s'))}_{x_i} + \frac{1}{b} \underbrace{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_i^{(t)}/s'} \text{Clip}(\nabla l(w^{(t)}; s))}_{y} \quad (12)$$

Therefore, $\bar{g}_i^{(t)}$ (i.e., the data to be compressed) is symmetric about some y instead of $\mathbf{0}$ concerning the difference caused by the private y training example s' (i.e., $\bar{g}_{i,j}^{(t)} \in [\frac{y_j}{b} - \frac{c}{b}, \frac{y_j}{b} + \frac{c}{b}]$ is no longer symmetric about 0 when $y_j \neq 0$), which renders the result in Theorem 1 not applicable directly. With such consideration, in the following, we extend the result in Theorem 1 to cover the mini-batch SGD scenario.

Algorithm 2 Ternary Compressor for Vectors

Input: $c, b > 0$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = \frac{1}{b}(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{x}_i)$, in which $\mathbf{x}_{i,j} \in [-c, +c], \forall 1 \leq j \leq d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in [-(b-1)c, (b-1)c]^d$.

Privatization:

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \triangleq [\text{ternary}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i,1}, A, B), \dots, \text{ternary}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i,d}, A, B)].$$

4.1. Privacy of the Ternary Compressor

In this subsection, we first present the privacy guarantee of Algorithm 2 for the scalar case (i.e., $d = 1$). Specifically, we extend the differential privacy guarantees of the ternary compressor in Theorem 1 to a more general case, in which the input to the ternary compressor is a linear combination of another (unknown) variable y and the private data x_i as shown in Algorithm 2. For mini-batch SGD, b in Algorithm 2 corresponds to the mini-batch size, while x_i and y correspond to the gradients of the training example of interest and the remaining training examples.

Theorem 2. Assuming that $B > A + c$, the ternary compressor is $f(\alpha)$ -DP for the scalar x_i with

$$f(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{Ab-(b-2)c}{(A-c)b} \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A-c}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A-c}{2B}, 1 - \frac{Ab-(b-2)c}{2Bb}], \\ \frac{(A-c)b}{Ab-(b-2)c}(1-\alpha), & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{Ab-(b-2)c}{2Bb}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

In the following, we extend the result to the vector case by utilizing the central limit theorem in (Dong et al., 2021).

Theorem 3. Assuming that $B > A + c$, the ternary compressor is $f(\alpha)$ -DP for the vector \mathbf{x}_i with

$$G_\mu(\alpha + \gamma) - \gamma \leq f(\alpha) \leq G_\mu(\alpha - \gamma) + \gamma, \quad (14)$$

in which

$$\mu = \frac{2\sqrt{dc}}{\sqrt{(A-c)Bb^2 + Bbc - c^2}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{0.56 \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \left| 1 + \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \frac{Ab-(b-2)c}{2Bb} \left| 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right]}{\left(\frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2} \right)^{3/2} d^{1/2}} \quad (16)$$

$$+ \frac{0.56 \left[\left(1 - \frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} \right) \left| \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right]}{\left(\frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2} \right)^{3/2} d^{1/2}}.$$

Remark 1 (Privacy Improvement via Mini-batch Sampling). Similar to the classic Gaussian mechanism in which mini-batch SGD reduces the global sensitivity (and therefore improves the privacy) compared to SGD, Theorem 3 implies that the privacy guarantee of the ternary compressor also improves (i.e., μ decreases) as b increases. When $b = 1$, it recovers the result in (Jin et al., 2023). Besides, instead of distributed mean estimation, we focus on distributed learning with analyses on convergence and Byzantine resilience.

Remark 2. (Xiang & Su, 2023) proves that the stochastic-sign compressor, which is a special case of the ternary

compressor with $A = B$, is $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP with $\epsilon = d \log(\frac{B+c}{B-c})$, which has a linear dependency on d . Besides showing the privacy amplification effect of mini-batch sampling, Theorem 3 implies that the privacy guarantee $\mu = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$.

4.2. Convergence Results in the Absence of Attackers

To facilitate the convergence analysis for Algorithm 1, we make the following commonly adopted assumptions.

Assumption 1. (Lower bound). For all \mathbf{x} and some constant F^* , we have objective value $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F^*$.

Assumption 2. (Smoothness). $\forall \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}$, we require for some non-negative constant L ,

$$F(\mathbf{y}) \leq F(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2, \quad (17)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product.

Assumption 3. (Variance bound). For any worker m , the stochastic gradient oracle gives an independent unbiased estimate \mathbf{g}_m that has coordinate bounded variance:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_m] = \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}), \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{g}_{m,i} - \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}))^2] \leq \sigma_i^2, \quad (18)$$

for a vector of non-negative constants $\bar{\sigma} = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d]$.

Assumption 4. (Gradient bound). For any worker m , the stochastic gradient satisfies $\mathbf{g}_{m,i} \leq c, \forall 1 \leq i \leq d$.

We note that in the implementation of differentially private SGD algorithms, clipping is usually applied to ensure bounded gradients (Abadi et al., 2016). In this work, we follow the literature (e.g., (Xiang & Su, 2023)) and adopt the bounded gradient assumption, i.e., Assumption 4, for convergence analysis. The impact of gradient clipping has also been studied in the literature, e.g., (Zhang et al., 2022), which is left for future work. In the following results, we consider $\mathcal{C}(\cdot) = \text{ternary}(\cdot, A, B)$ in which $B \geq 2A \geq 2c$ and $\mathcal{N}_i = \mathcal{M}, \forall i$ in Algorithm 1. Moreover, we term Algorithm 1 with the scheme I aggregator and the scheme II aggregator *TernaryMean* and *TernaryVote*, respectively.

Theorem 4 (Convergence of TernaryMean). Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, then by running Algorithm 1 with *TernaryMean* for T iterations, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*}{T \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \right]. \quad (19)$$

Remark 3. When $\eta \leq \frac{B}{L}$, we have $\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \geq \frac{\eta}{2B}$. Setting $\eta = \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ gives $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{A}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}\|_2^2}{B\sqrt{MT}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{MT}}\right)$, which matches that of distributed SGD (Jiang & Agrawal, 2018).

Theorem 5 (Convergence of TernaryVote). Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, and the learning rate is set as $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with *TernaryVote*

for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 &\leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1}\right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{B}{\sqrt{M}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Remark 4. We note that taking the majority vote during aggregation (assuming $\text{sign}(0) = 0$) enables downlink compression since the model updates are also ternary. The convergence rate derived in Theorem 5 matches that of StoSign in (Xiang & Su, 2023). It is possible to improve the convergence rate to $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T} + B/M)$ for full-batch gradient descent (c.f. Appendix C).

It is worth mentioning that Theorem 5 implies a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T} + B/\sqrt{T})$ when $M \geq T$ and B is some finite constant, which echoes the results in (Jin et al., 2020; Xiang & Su, 2023) that the convergence of the sign-based SGD methods approaches that of the vanilla SGD for a large enough M . However, when M is small, setting a large B seems to ruin its convergence, while Theorem 3 implies that increasing B yields better privacy preservation. We address this dilemma with the following theorem.

Theorem 6 (Convergence of TernaryVote). Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, $B \geq 2A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} M/\sqrt{T} = 0$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote and the learning rate $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} \times \\ &\left[\frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} \right. \\ &+ \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] Qd \Big] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

in which

$$\mathcal{I}(A, B, M) = \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} M A^{n-1} \binom{M-1}{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \right].$$

Remark 5. We note that Theorem 3 characterizes μ -GDP guarantees of the ternary compressor for one iteration. The composition of μ -GDP mechanisms in Lemma 2 gives an overall privacy guarantee $\mu_T = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T}/\sqrt{AB})$. By setting a fixed sparsity ratio $\frac{A}{B}$ and $A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T}/\mu_T)$, we obtain $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(1/\mu_T) + \mathcal{O}(\mu_T/\sqrt{T})$, which matches that of the classic DP-SGD with the Gaussian mechanism. Note that DP-SGD has a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\delta)/\epsilon)$ for (ϵ, δ) -DP (Fang et al., 2022), which

is equivalent to $\mathcal{O}(1/\mu)$ for μ -GDP.

The Impact of Worker Sampling: Theorems 4-6 assume that all the workers are sampled for training during each communication round. However, the proofs can be readily extended to incorporate worker sampling. For example, suppose that each worker is sampled independently with a probability p_s (Yang et al., 2021). Combining worker sampling with the ternary stochastic compressor yields

$$\mathcal{C}(x, A, B, p_s) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A+x}{2B} p_s, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{A}{B} p_s, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A-x}{2B} p_s, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

which implies that incorporating the uniform worker sampling strategy is equivalent to increasing the parameter B by a factor of $1/p_s$.

5. Byzantine Resilience

In this section, we investigate the Byzantine resilience of TernaryVote, i.e., Algorithm 1 with the Scheme II aggregator. Since each normal worker $m \in \mathcal{M}$ only shares a ternary vector $\mathbf{Z}_m \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$, the Byzantine attackers will be easily identified if it shares anything other than a ternary vector. Therefore, we assume that each Byzantine attacker $k \in \mathcal{K}$ first obtains a gradient estimate $\mathbf{g}_k^{(t)}$, and then shares $\mathbf{Z}_k^{(t)} = [\text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{k,1}^{(t)}, A, B), \dots, \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{k,d}^{(t)}, A, B)]$ with the server, in which $\mathbf{g}_k^{(t)} \in [-c, c]^d$ can be arbitrary.

Theorem 7. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, and the learning rate is set as $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$, then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote and $\mathcal{N}_t = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{K}$ for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 &\leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4K(Q+A)d}{M+K} + \frac{4\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} \\ &+ \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1}\right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{B}{\sqrt{M+K}} + \frac{\sqrt{M+K}}{M+K}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Remark 6. Compared to Theorem 5, there is an additional term $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\sqrt{M+K}}{M+K})$ in Theorem 7. If $K = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{M})$, then the last two terms in (23) scale in M with order $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}})$, which means that when $M = \mathcal{O}(T)$, the proposed TernaryVote algorithm can tolerate $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{M})$ Byzantine attackers.

Theorem 8. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, $B \geq 2A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (M+K)/\sqrt{T} = 0$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote, $\mathcal{N}_t = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{K}$, and the learning rate

Table 1. Test Accuracy on MNIST with $A/B = 0.01$ (200 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.5	1	2
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	24.68 \pm 1.63%	66.57 \pm 1.35%	76.40 \pm 1.97%	84.19 \pm 0.24%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	54.62 \pm 2.68%	79.60 \pm 0.45%	84.07 \pm 0.15%	85.33 \pm 0.47%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	55.25 \pm 3.26%	80.93 \pm 0.89%	84.18 \pm 0.94%	85.53 \pm 0.64%

Table 2. Test Accuracy on Fashion-MNIST with $A/B = 0.01$ (200 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.5	1	2
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	32.79 \pm 4.57%	66.66 \pm 1.39%	71.55 \pm 0.49%	74.88 \pm 0.81%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	60.77 \pm 0.84%	74.09 \pm 0.65%	75.89 \pm 0.78%	76.31 \pm 0.62%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	61.42 \pm 1.58%	74.89 \pm 0.35%	76.63 \pm 0.21%	76.98 \pm 0.78%

$\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \left(M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| - \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right| \right) |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Remark 7 (Robustness against Blind Attackers).

Theorem 8 implies that the convergence of the proposed TernaryVote algorithm is guaranteed as long as $M|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| - |\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)}| > 0$. For instance, if the attackers have access to the true gradients $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})$ and adopt $\mathcal{C}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})) = \text{ternary}(-\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), A, B)$ (i.e., blind attackers as in (Bernstein et al., 2019)), we have $|\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)}| = K|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i|$. Then, the proposed TernaryVote algorithm can tolerate $K = M - 1$ Byzantine attackers, which is the same as SIGNSGD with majority vote with homogeneous data distribution across workers (Bernstein et al., 2019). Note that SIGNSGD fails to converge in the presence of data heterogeneity (Jin et al., 2020), while we do not make assumptions on the data distribution.

6. Experimental Results

In this section, we examine the performance of the proposed methods with a three-layer fully connected neural network on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, and a CNN with four convolutional layers on CIFAR-10. In the absence of attackers, we compare the proposed algorithm with the combination of the Gaussian mechanism (Abadi et al., 2016) and random sparsification (Zhu & Blaschko, 2023) to ensure the same sparsity as the ternary compressor. For the selection of A and B , we fix the sparsity ratio A/B and the privacy guarantee μ , and then find the corresponding A and B such that (15) is satisfied. We use a batch size of 128 in our experiments and clip the per-example gradient by L_2 norm with

a threshold of $C = 2$ (Abadi et al., 2016) for the baseline algorithm and by magnitude with a threshold of $c = 0.0003$ for the proposed algorithm. In the presence of attackers, we further incorporate Multi-Krum (Blanchard et al., 2017) and the recently proposed centered clipping (Karimireddy et al., 2021) into the baseline algorithm. We note that in the high-sparsity regime, the median-based and trimmed mean-based methods may fail since the results will be 0 with a high probability. We run all the algorithms for 5 repeats and present the results for high-sparsity and high-privacy scenarios, which are of more practical interest. More results for lower sparsity scenarios and implementation details can be found in Appendix A and Appendix D, respectively.

6.1. Accuracy in the Absence of Attackers

Tables 1-4 compare the test accuracy of the proposed methods with the baseline algorithm that combines the Gaussian mechanism and random sparsification. For MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, we consider a scenario of $M = 100$ normal workers with the training data on each worker drawn independently with class labels following a Dirichlet distribution $Dir(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = 0.1$, and 50 workers are sampled uniformly at random for training during each round. For CIFAR-10, we consider a scenario of $M = 300$ normal workers with $\alpha = 3$, and 90 workers are sampled uniformly at random for training during each communication round. It can be observed that TernaryMean outperforms the baseline algorithm for all the examined scenarios, while TernaryVote achieves a comparable performance to TernaryMean. We note that despite the same sparsity, both TernaryMean and TernaryVote require only 1 bit to represent the value of each nonzero coordinate, while the baseline algorithm uses 32 bits (assuming that 32 bits are used to represent a float number). In this sense, the proposed methods achieve higher test accuracy while reducing the communication overhead from the workers to the parameter server. In addition, by taking the majority vote on the server side, TernaryVote further

Table 3. Test Accuracy on CIFAR-10 with $A/B = 0.01$ (500 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.5	1	2
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	13.03 \pm 1.24%	26.80 \pm 0.85%	30.84 \pm 0.37%	35.17 \pm 0.42%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	21.71 \pm 1.19%	32.29 \pm 1.32%	37.35 \pm 1.13%	43.21 \pm 0.44%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	23.15 \pm 1.21%	31.04 \pm 1.53%	36.08 \pm 1.52%	37.66 \pm 0.73%

Table 4. Test Accuracy on CIFAR-10 with $A/B = 0.05$ (500 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.5	1	2
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	20.27 \pm 1.46%	31.52 \pm 0.95%	33.66 \pm 0.59%	40.31 \pm 0.60%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	24.87 \pm 0.65%	32.62 \pm 1.04%	38.25 \pm 1.15%	41.95 \pm 0.96%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	22.98 \pm 1.68%	31.76 \pm 0.73%	37.44 \pm 1.47%	41.43 \pm 0.98%




Figure 1. Left, middle, and right figures compare *TernaryVote* with Centered-Clipping (CC) and Multi-Krum under the flip sign (FS), the fall of empire (FoE), and the little is enough (LIE) attacks, respectively, on Fashion-MNIST given the same setting as that in Section 6.1.

reduces the communication overhead from the server to the workers compared to *TernaryMean*.

6.2. Accuracy in the Presence of Attackers

In this subsection, we consider three types of attackers with the same data distribution as normal workers. The flip sign (FS) attackers flip the signs of gradients (Bernstein et al., 2019) before applying random sparsification or the ternary compressor, the little is enough (LIE) attackers follow the method in (Baruch et al., 2019) to generate the perturbed gradients before applying compression, while the fall of empire (FoE) attackers (Xie et al., 2020) flip the signs of the average gradients of the normal workers before applying compression. We assume that the attackers do not add noise (for the baseline algorithm) or set $A = c$ (for *TernaryVote*) since they do not have any privacy concerns. We consider two different Byzantine robust aggregators for the baseline algorithm: the multi-krum aggregator (Blanchard et al., 2017), and the centered-clipping mechanism (Karimireddy et al., 2021). Fig. 1 compares *TernaryVote* with the baselines under the above three types of attackers with $\mu = 0.5$ on Fashion-MNIST. It can be observed that *TernaryVote* with $A/B = 0.001$ outperforms the baseline algorithms with $A/B = 0.01$ and $A/B = 0.001$ in the presence of up to 20 attackers, which corroborates its effectiveness.




Figure 2. Reconstructed images using the ROG attack for $\mu = 1$.

6.3. Protection Against Data Reconstruction Attacks

Finally, we examine the privacy preservation capability of the proposed method against the reconstruction with obfuscated gradient (ROG) attack (Yue et al., 2023), which is proposed for training data reconstruction based on compressed gradients. We consider training the LeNet (Zhu et al., 2019) using the validation dataset of ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009) with a mini-batch size of 32 and $A/B = 0.05$. LPIPS is adopted to measure the data reconstruction quality, and a larger LPIPS value indicates better privacy protection against the attack (Yue et al., 2023). Overall, we obtain

average (over the entire batch) LPIPS values of 0.365 and 0.446 for the baseline algorithm (i.e., the combination of the Gaussian mechanism and random sparsification) and the ternary compressor, respectively. Four exemplary images and their average LPIPS values are presented in Fig. 2, which validate the effectiveness of the proposed method.

7. Limitation

We note that, in this paper, the privacy guarantee μ is computed for each communication round, and the results in Theorem 3 asymptotically approximate that of the Gaussian mechanism. While it can be readily extended to accumulate privacy across communication rounds, the privacy amplification due to subsampling has not been accounted for, which will be an interesting and important future direction.

8. Conclusion

In this work, we propose a ternary compressor-based algorithm that is differentially private, communication efficient, and Byzantine resilient. Both the privacy guarantees and Byzantine resilience are theoretically quantified, and the convergence is established. It is expected that the proposed methods can find wide applications in areas such as federated learning where privacy, communication efficiency, and robustness are major bottlenecks. Further incorporating error feedback and momentum to reduce compression error and gradient variance remains interesting future works.

References

- Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 308–318, 2016.
- Agarwal, N., Suresh, A. T., Yu, F. X. X., Kumar, S., and McMahan, B. cpSGD: Communication-efficient and differentially-private distributed SGD. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 7564–7575, 2018.
- Agarwal, N., Kairouz, P., and Liu, Z. The skellam mechanism for differentially private federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 5052–5064, 2021.
- Alistarh, D., Grubic, D., Li, J., Tomioka, R., and Vojnovic, M. QSGD: Communication-efficient SGD via gradient quantization and encoding. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1709–1720, 2017.
- Allouah, Y., Farhadkhani, S., Guerraoui, R., Gupta, N., Pinot, R., and Stephan, J. Fixing by mixing: A recipe for optimal byzantine ml under heterogeneity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1232–1300. PMLR, 2023a.
- Allouah, Y., Guerraoui, R., Gupta, N., Pinot, R., and Stephan, J. On the privacy-robustness-utility trilemma in distributed learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023b.
- Baruch, G., Baruch, M., and Goldberg, Y. A little is enough: Circumventing defenses for distributed learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, volume 32, pp. 8635–8645, 2019.
- Batir, N. Sharp inequalities for factorial n. *Proyecciones (Antofagasta)*, 27(1):97–102, 2008.
- Bernstein, J., Wang, Y.-X., Azizzadenesheli, K., and Anandkumar, A. signSGD: Compressed optimisation for non-convex problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 560–569, 2018.
- Bernstein, J., Zhao, J., Azizzadenesheli, K., and Anandkumar, A. signSGD with majority vote is communication efficient and byzantine fault tolerant. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Bertsekas, D. and Tsitsiklis, J. *Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods*. Athena Scientific, 2015.
- Blanchard, P., Guerraoui, R., Stainer, J., et al. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 119–129, 2017.
- Canonne, C. L., Kamath, G., and Steinke, T. The discrete gaussian for differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15676–15688, 2020.
- Chaudhuri, K., Guo, C., and Rabbat, M. Privacy-aware compression for federated data analysis. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 296–306. PMLR, 2022.
- Chen, W.-N., Kairouz, P., and Ozgur, A. Breaking the communication-privacy-accuracy trilemma. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3312–3324, 2020a.
- Chen, W.-N., Ozgur, A., and Kairouz, P. The poisson binomial mechanism for unbiased federated learning with secure aggregation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3490–3506. PMLR, 2022.
- Chen, W.-N., Song, D., Ozgur, A., and Kairouz, P. Privacy amplification via compression: Achieving the optimal privacy-accuracy-communication trade-off in distributed mean estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01541*, 2023.

- Chen, X., Chen, T., Sun, H., Wu, S. Z., and Hong, M. Distributed training with heterogeneous data: Bridging median- and mean-based algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 21616–21626, 2020b.
- Dean, J., Corrado, G., Monga, R., Chen, K., Devin, M., Mao, M., Senior, A., Tucker, P., Yang, K., Le, Q. V., et al. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1223–1231, 2012.
- Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L.-J., Li, K., and Fei-Fei, L. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- Dong, J., Roth, A., and Su, W. Gaussian differential privacy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 2021.
- Dwork, C., Kenthapadi, K., McSherry, F., Mironov, I., and Naor, M. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *Annual international conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*, pp. 486–503. Springer, 2006.
- Fang, H., Li, X., Fan, C., and Li, P. Improved convergence of differential private sgd with gradient clipping. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Farhadkhani, S., Guerraoui, R., Gupta, N., Pinot, R., and Stephan, J. Byzantine machine learning made easy by resilient averaging of momentums. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6246–6283. PMLR, 2022.
- Guerraoui, R., Gupta, N., Pinot, R., Rouault, S., and Stephan, J. Differential privacy and byzantine resilience in SGD: Do they add up? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08166*, 2021.
- Guo, C., Chaudhuri, K., Stock, P., and Rabbat, M. Privacy-aware compression for federated learning through numerical mechanism design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11888–11904. PMLR, 2023.
- Haddadpour, F., Kamani, M. M., Mokhtari, A., and Mahdavi, M. Federated learning with compression: Unified analysis and sharp guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01154*, 2020.
- Jiang, P. and Agrawal, G. A linear speedup analysis of distributed deep learning with sparse and quantized communication. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2525–2536, 2018.
- Jin, R., Huang, Y., He, X., Dai, H., and Wu, T. Stochastic-Sign SGD for federated learning with theoretical guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10940*, 2020.
- Jin, R., Su, Z., Zhong, C., Zhang, Z., Quek, T., and Dai, H. Breaking the communication-privacy-accuracy tradeoff with f -differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Jin, R., Liu, Y., Huang, Y., He, X., Wu, T., and Dai, H. Sign-based gradient descent with heterogeneous data: Convergence and byzantine resilience. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- Jorgensen, S., Chen, R. H., Milam, M. B., and Pavone, M. The team surviving orienteers problem: routing teams of robots in uncertain environments with survival constraints. *Autonomous Robots*, 42:927–952, 2018.
- Kairouz, P., Liu, Z., and Steinke, T. The distributed discrete gaussian mechanism for federated learning with secure aggregation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5201–5212. PMLR, 2021a.
- Kairouz, P., McMahan, H. B., Avent, B., Bellet, A., Bennis, M., Bhagoji, A. N., Bonawitz, K., Charles, Z., Cormode, G., Cummings, R., et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 14(1), 2021b.
- Karimireddy, S. P., Rebjock, Q., Stich, S., and Jaggi, M. Error feedback fixes signSGD and other gradient compression schemes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3252–3261, 2019.
- Karimireddy, S. P., He, L., and Jaggi, M. Learning from history for byzantine robust optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5311–5319. PMLR, 2021.
- Karimireddy, S. P., He, L., and Jaggi, M. Byzantine-robust learning on heterogeneous datasets via bucketing. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Li, L., Xu, W., Chen, T., Giannakis, G. B., and Ling, Q. RSA: Byzantine-robust stochastic aggregation methods for distributed learning from heterogeneous datasets. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pp. 1544–1551, 2019.
- Mhamdi, E. M. E., Guerraoui, R., and Rouault, S. The hidden vulnerability of distributed learning in byzantium. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3521–3530, 2018.
- Naseri, M., Hayes, J., and De Cristofaro, E. Local and central differential privacy for robustness and privacy in

- federated learning. In *Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2022.
- Nguyen, T. D., Rieger, P., De Viti, R., Chen, H., Brandenburg, B. B., Yalame, H., Möllering, H., Fereidooni, H., Marchal, S., Miettinen, M., et al. FLAME: Taming backdoors in federated learning. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pp. 1415–1432, 2022.
- Rieke, N., Hancox, J., Li, W., Milletari, F., Roth, H. R., Albarqouni, S., Bakas, S., Galtier, M. N., Landman, B. A., Maier-Hein, K., et al. The future of digital health with federated learning. *NPJ digital medicine*, 3(1):1–7, 2020.
- Safaryan, M. and Richtárik, P. Stochastic sign descent methods: New algorithms and better theory. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9224–9234. PMLR, 2021.
- Samuels, S. M. On the number of successes in independent trials. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 1272–1278, 1965.
- Stich, S. U., Cordonnier, J. B., and Jaggi, M. Sparsified SGD with memory. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4447–4458, 2018.
- Sun, Z., Kairouz, P., Suresh, A. T., and McMahan, H. B. Can you really backdoor federated learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07963*, 2019.
- Xiang, M. and Su, L. Distributed non-convex optimization with one-bit compressors on heterogeneous data: Efficient and resilient algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00665v2*, 2023.
- Xie, C., Koyejo, O., and Gupta, I. Generalized byzantine-tolerant SGD. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10116*, 2018.
- Xie, C., Koyejo, O., and Gupta, I. SLSGD: Secure and efficient distributed on-device machine learning. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 213–228. Springer, 2019.
- Xie, C., Koyejo, O., and Gupta, I. Fall of empires: Breaking byzantine-tolerant sgd by inner product manipulation. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 261–270. PMLR, 2020.
- Yang, H., Fang, M., and Liu, J. Achieving linear speedup with partial worker participation in non-IID federated learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Yin, D., Chen, Y., Kannan, R., and Bartlett, P. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5650–5659, 2018.
- Yue, K., Jin, R., Wong, C.-W., Baron, D., and Dai, H. Gradient obfuscation gives a false sense of security in federated learning. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pp. 6381–6398, 2023.
- Zhang, X., Chen, X., Hong, M., Wu, Z. S., and Yi, J. Understanding clipping for federated learning: Convergence and client-level differential privacy. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022*, 2022.
- Zhang, Z. and Hu, R. Byzantine-robust federated learning with variance reduction and differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03437*, 2023.
- Zhu, B., Wang, L., Pang, Q., Wang, S., Jiao, J., Song, D., and Jordan, M. I. Byzantine-robust federated learning with optimal statistical rates. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 3151–3178. PMLR, 2023.
- Zhu, H. and Ling, Q. Bridging differential privacy and byzantine-robustness via model aggregation. *International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Zhu, J. and Blaschko, M. B. Improving differentially private sgd via randomly sparsified gradients. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- Zhu, L., Liu, Z., and Han, S. Deep leakage from gradients. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.

A. Additional Experimental Results

 Table 5. Test Accuracy on MNIST with $A/B = 0.1$ (200 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	1
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	53.22 \pm 1.91%	69.21 \pm 1.23%	75.08 \pm 0.89%	80.14 \pm 1.29%	87.41 \pm 0.31%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	56.34 \pm 1.99%	69.73 \pm 1.17%	76.74 \pm 1.03%	82.84 \pm 0.84%	86.99 \pm 0.78%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	55.57 \pm 1.50%	69.91 \pm 1.69%	76.19 \pm 0.83%	81.38 \pm 0.42%	86.43 \pm 0.44%

 Table 6. Test Accuracy on Fashion-MNIST with $A/B = 0.1$ (200 communication rounds)

μ	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	1
GAUSSIAN NOISE & RANDOM SPARSIFICATION	50.79 \pm 3.48%	67.43 \pm 0.99%	70.32 \pm 1.12%	73.13 \pm 0.47%	76.24 \pm 0.14%
<i>TernaryMean</i>	57.53 \pm 2.17%	69.26 \pm 0.75%	72.77 \pm 0.97%	73.38 \pm 0.55%	76.07 \pm 0.83%
<i>TernaryVote</i>	57.80 \pm 3.23%	68.91 \pm 1.16%	71.50 \pm 0.76%	74.58 \pm 0.51%	77.00 \pm 0.27%

Table 5 and Table 6 compare *TernaryMean* and *TernaryVote* with the baseline algorithm on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, respectively, given $A/B = 0.1$. It can be observed that *TernaryMean* and *TernaryVote* outperform the baseline in the high-privacy scenario (i.e., small μ). As μ increases (i.e., the privacy requirement becomes less stringent), *TernaryMean* and *TernaryVote* do not necessarily outperform the baseline. For instance, when $\mu = 1$, the baseline algorithm achieves a higher test accuracy than *TernaryMean*. We note that the ternary compressor is a combination of the one-bit compressor (Jin et al., 2020; Xiang & Su, 2023) and random sparsification. When privacy is less of a concern, the bias introduced by one-bit compression may be larger than that of the Gaussian noise (for the coordinates that are not zeroed out), which leads to performance degradation. In this case, however, the proposed *TernaryMean* and *TernaryVote* still enjoy savings in communication overhead.

B. Proofs of Theoretical Results

B.1. Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2. Assuming that $B > A + c$, the ternary compressor is $f(\alpha)$ -DP for the scalar x_i with

$$f(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{Ab - (b-2)c}{(A-c)b} \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A-c}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A-c}{2B}, 1 - \frac{Ab - (b-2)c}{2Bb}], \\ \frac{(A-c)b}{Ab - (b-2)c} (1 - \alpha), & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{Ab - (b-2)c}{2Bb}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

The proof of Theorem 2 utilizes the following lemma from (Jin et al., 2023).

Lemma 3 ((Jin et al., 2023)). For two neighboring datasets S and S' , suppose that the range of the randomized mechanism $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}(S)) \cup \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}(S')) = \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}^U = [\mathcal{Z}_L^U, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^U] \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}(S)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}(S')) = \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}^I = [\mathcal{Z}_L^I, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^I] \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Let $X = \mathcal{M}(S)$ and $Y = \mathcal{M}(S')$. Then,

Case (1) If $\mathcal{M}(S) \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^I, \mathcal{Z}_L^I + 1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^U]$, $\mathcal{M}(S') \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^U, \mathcal{Z}_L^U + 1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^I]$, and $\frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)}$ is a decreasing function of k for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}^I$, the tradeoff function in Definition 2 is given by

$$\beta_{\phi}^+(\alpha) = \begin{cases} P(Y \geq k) + \frac{P(Y=k)P(X < k)}{P(X=k)} - \frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)} \alpha, & \text{if } \alpha \in (P(X < k), P(X \leq k)], k \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^I, \mathcal{Z}_R^I]. \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha \in (P(X < \mathcal{Z}_L^I + 1), 1]. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Case (2) If $\mathcal{M}(S) \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^U, \mathcal{Z}_L^U + 1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^I]$, $\mathcal{M}(S') \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^I, \mathcal{Z}_L^I + 1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_R^U]$, and $\frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)}$ is an increasing function of k for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}^I$, the tradeoff function in Definition 2 is given by

$$\beta_{\phi}^-(\alpha) = \begin{cases} P(Y \leq k) + \frac{P(Y=k)P(X > k)}{P(X=k)} - \frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)} \alpha, & \text{if } \alpha \in (P(X > k), P(X \geq k)], k \in [\mathcal{Z}_L^I, \mathcal{Z}_R^I]. \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha \in (P(X > \mathcal{Z}_L^I - 1), 1]. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Given Lemma 3, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof. Let $Y = \text{ternary}(\frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i), A, B)$ and $X = \text{ternary}(\frac{1}{b}(y + x_i), A, B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(Y = -1)}{P(X = -1)} &= \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}, \\ \frac{P(Y = 0)}{P(X = 0)} &= 1, \\ \frac{P(Y = 1)}{P(X = 1)} &= \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

When $x_i > x'_i$, we have $\frac{1}{b}(y + x_i) > \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)$. It can be observed that $\frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)}$ is a decreasing function of k . According to Lemma 3, we have

$$\beta_{\phi}^{+}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}], \\ 1 + \frac{x'_i - x_i}{2Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)} - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

When $x_i < x'_i$, we have $\frac{1}{b}(y + x_i) < \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)$. It can be observed that $\frac{P(Y=k)}{P(X=k)}$ is an increasing function of k . According to Lemma 3, we have

$$\beta_{\phi}^{-}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{x'_i - x_i}{2Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)} - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x'_i)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + x_i)}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

For any given y , the infimum of $\beta_{\phi}^{+}(\alpha)$ is attained when $x_i = c$ and $x'_i = -c$, while the infimum of $\beta_{\phi}^{-}(\alpha)$ is attained when $x_i = -c$ and $x'_i = c$. As a result, we have

$$\beta_{\phi, \text{inf}}^{+}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)} - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}, 1], \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

and

$$\beta_{\phi, \text{inf}}^{-}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)} - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Assume that $B > A + c$, we have $[\frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}] \cap [\frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}] \neq \emptyset$. In this case, when $y > 0$,

$$\min\{\beta_{\phi, \text{inf}}^{+}(\alpha), \beta_{\phi, \text{inf}}^{-}(\alpha) | y > 0\} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)} - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y + c)}{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A - \frac{1}{b}(y - c)}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

When $y < 0$,

$$\min\{\beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^+(\alpha), \beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^-(\alpha) | y < 0\} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y+c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y-c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y-c)}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y-c)}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y+c)}{2B}], \\ \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y-c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y+c)} - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y-c)}{A + \frac{1}{b}(y+c)}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A + \frac{1}{b}(y+c)}{2B}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

It can be verified that $\min\{\beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^+(\alpha), \beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^-(\alpha) | y > 0\}$ and $\min\{\beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^+(\alpha), \beta_{\phi,\text{inf}}^-(\alpha) | y < 0\}$ are minimized when $y = (b-1)c$ and $y = -(b-1)c$, respectively. As a result,

$$f(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{A - \frac{(b-2)c}{b}}{A-c}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [0, \frac{A-c}{2B}], \\ 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} - \alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [\frac{A-c}{2B}, 1 - \frac{A - \frac{(b-2)c}{b}}{2B}], \\ \frac{A-c}{A - \frac{(b-2)c}{b}} - \frac{A-c}{A - \frac{(b-2)c}{b}}\alpha, & \text{for } \alpha \in [1 - \frac{A - \frac{(b-2)c}{b}}{2B}, 1], \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.2. Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3. Assuming that $B > A + c$, the ternary compressor is $f(\alpha)$ -DP for the vector \mathbf{x}_i with

$$G_\mu(\alpha + \gamma) - \gamma \leq f(\alpha) \leq G_\mu(\alpha - \gamma) + \gamma, \quad (36)$$

in which

$$\mu = \frac{2\sqrt{dc}}{\sqrt{(A-c)Bb^2 + Bbc - c^2}}, \quad (37)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{0.56 \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \left| 1 + \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \frac{Ab - (b-2)c}{2Bb} \left| 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right]}{\left(\frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2} \right)^{3/2} d^{1/2}} + \frac{0.56 \left[\left(1 - \frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} \right) \left| \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right]}{\left(\frac{(A-c)b+c}{Bb} - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2} \right)^{3/2} d^{1/2}}. \quad (38)$$

Before proving Theorem 3, we first define the following functions as in (Dong et al., 2021),

$$\text{kl}(f) = - \int_0^1 \log |f'(x)| dx, \quad (39)$$

$$\kappa_2(f) = \int_0^1 \log^2 |f'(x)| dx, \quad (40)$$

$$\kappa_3(f) = \int_0^1 |\log |f'(x)||^3 dx, \quad (41)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_3(f) = \int_0^1 |\log |f'(x)| + \text{kl}(f)|^3 dx. \quad (42)$$

The central limit theorem for f -DP is formally introduced as follows.

Lemma 4 ((Dong et al., 2021)). Let f_1, \dots, f_n be symmetric trade-off functions such that $\kappa_3(f_i) < \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Denote

$$\mu = \frac{2\|kl\|_1}{\sqrt{\|\kappa_2\|_1 - \|kl\|_2^2}}, \text{ and } \gamma = \frac{0.56\|\bar{\kappa}_3\|_1}{(\|\kappa_2\|_1 - \|kl\|_2^2)^{3/2}},$$

and assume $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for all $\alpha \in [\gamma, 1 - \gamma]$, we have

$$G_\mu(\alpha + \gamma) - \gamma \leq f_1 \otimes f_2 \otimes \dots \otimes f_d(\alpha) \leq G_\mu(\alpha - \gamma) + \gamma. \quad (43)$$

Given Lemma 4, we are ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof. Given $f_i(\alpha)$ in (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{kl}(f) &= - \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) + \frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} \log \left(\frac{A-c}{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}} \right) \right] \\ &= \left[\frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} - \frac{A-c}{2B} \right] \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) \\ &= \frac{c}{Bb} \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$\kappa_2(f) = \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \log^2 \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) + \frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} \log^2 \left(\frac{A-c}{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}} \right) \right] = \frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B} \log^2 \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right), \quad (45)$$

$$\kappa_3(f) = \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \left| \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) \right|^3 + \frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} \left| \log \left(\frac{A-c}{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}} \right) \right|^3 \right] = \frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B} \left| \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) \right|^3, \quad (46)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_3(f) = \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \left| 1 + \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} \left| 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \left(1 - \frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B} \right) \left| \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right] \left| \log \left(\frac{A-c+\frac{2c}{b}}{A-c} \right) \right|^3. \quad (47)$$

The corresponding μ and γ are given as follows

$$\mu = \frac{2d\frac{c}{Bb}}{\sqrt{\frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B}d - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2}d}} = \frac{2\sqrt{dc}}{\sqrt{(A-c+\frac{c}{b})Bb^2 - c^2}}, \quad (48)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{0.56 \left[\frac{A-c}{2B} \left| 1 + \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \frac{A-\frac{b-2}{b}c}{2B} \left| 1 - \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 + \left(1 - \frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B} \right) \left| \frac{c}{Bb} \right|^3 \right]}{\left(\frac{A-c+\frac{c}{b}}{B} - \frac{c^2}{B^2b^2} \right)^{3/2} d^{1/2}}, \quad (49)$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.3. Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 4 (Convergence of TernaryMean). *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryMean for T iterations, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*}{T \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \right]. \quad (50)$$

The proof of Theorem 4 follows the well-known strategy of relating the norm of the gradient to the expected improvement of the global objective in a single iteration. Then accumulating the improvement over the iterations yields the convergence rate of the algorithm.

Proof. According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) \\ &\leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\ &= -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Noticing that $\mathbb{E}[B\text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)] = \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M B\text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M B\text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[ABd - \|\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\leq \frac{ABd}{M} + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)} - \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right] + \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|^2 \\
 &\leq \frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} + \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Therefore, taking expectations on both sides of (51) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[-\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right\rangle \right] + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} + \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|^2 \right] \\
 &= -\frac{\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2}{B} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} + \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|^2 \right] \\
 &= -\left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right) \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} \right]
 \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right) \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} \right]. \tag{54}$$

Dividing both sides by $\left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} \right] \\
 &\leq \frac{F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*}{T \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} + \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{B} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2B^2} \right)} \left[\frac{ABd}{M} + \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_2^2}{M} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.4. Proof of Theorem 5

Theorem 5 (Convergence of TernaryVote). Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, and the learning rate is set as $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 &\leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \\
 &\leq \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T}) + \mathcal{O}(B/\sqrt{M}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Before proving Theorem 5, we first present the following lemma from (Jin et al., 2024) and extend it to the ternary stochastic compressor in Lemma 6.

Lemma 5 (Probability of Wrong Aggregation for Generic Sign-based Compressor (Jin et al., 2024)). Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_M be M known and fixed real numbers and consider binary random variables \hat{u}_m , $1 \leq m \leq M$. Sup-

pose $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right) \neq \hat{u}_m\right) < \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) \leq [4\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})]^{\frac{M}{2}}. \quad (57)$$

Lemma 6 (Probability of Wrong Aggregation for ternary). Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_M be M known and fixed real numbers and consider binary random variables \hat{u}_m , $1 \leq m \leq M$, which is given by

$$\hat{u}_m = \text{ternary}(u_m, A, B) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A+u_m}{2B}, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{A}{B}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A-u_m}{2B}, \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

Suppose $B \geq 2A$, then

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{|\sum_{m=1}^M u_m|^2}{B^2}\right)^{\frac{M}{2}}. \quad (59)$$

Proof. For each u_m , we construct the following two random variables

$$\hat{u}_{m,1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{u_m}{2B} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{u_m}{2B} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

$$\hat{u}_{m,2} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{u_m}{2B} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{u_m}{2B} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

It can be observed that $\frac{\hat{u}_{m,1} + \hat{u}_{m,2}}{2}$ follows the same distribution as \hat{u}_m , which means that

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) = P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^M [\hat{u}_{m,1} + \hat{u}_{m,2}]\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right). \quad (62)$$

In this case, $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left[P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right) \neq \hat{u}_{m,1}\right) + P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right) \neq \hat{u}_{m,2}\right) \right] = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m|}{2B}$. Invoking Lemma 5 completes the proof. \square

Given Lemma 6 at hand, we are ready to prove Theorem 5.

Proof. According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) \\ & \leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\ & = -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \eta \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\rangle + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} \\ & = -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \times \mathbb{1}_{\text{sign}(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B)) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i$ is the i -th entry of the vector $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})$ and η is the learning rate. Taking expectations on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \left[P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \neq \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \right) \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \right] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \left(1 - \frac{|\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \right] \\
 & \quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \left(1 - \frac{|\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \right] \\
 & \quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \left(1 - \frac{|\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \right] \\
 & \quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} [|\nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}|^2]} \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_i^2}{M}} = \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right) \neq \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \geq \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \right]}{\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right|} \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 \right]}}{\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right|} \leq \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Moreover, for a function $h(x) = x(1 - \frac{x^2}{B^2})^{\frac{M}{2}}$, it can be derived that $h'(x) = (1 - \frac{x^2}{B^2})^{\frac{M}{2}-1}[1 - \frac{(M+1)x^2}{B^2}]$. Since $B \geq 2A > x$, we can conclude that $h(x)$ attains the maximum when $x = \frac{B}{\sqrt{M+1}}$. As a result, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \left(1 - \frac{\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \right] \leq \frac{B}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}}. \quad (67)$$

Plugging (65) and (67) into (64) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 4\eta \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2\eta Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}}. \quad (68)$$

Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 4\eta \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2\eta Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}}. \quad (69)$$

Letting $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{LTd}}$ and dividing both sides by η gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1} \right)^{\frac{M}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.5. Proof of Theorem 6

Theorem 6 (Convergence of TernaryVote). *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, $B \geq 2A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} M/\sqrt{T} = 0$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote and the learning rate $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{LTd}}$ for T iterations, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} \left[\frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] Qd \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

in which

$$\mathcal{I}(A, B, M) = \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} M A^{n-1} \binom{M-1}{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \right].$$

Remark 8. *Since $\frac{n^{n+1}e^{-n}\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq n! < \frac{n^{n+1}e^{-n}\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{n-1}}$ (Batir, 2008), we can readily show that $\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} / 2^{n-1} \geq 2(n-1) / [\sqrt{2\pi}(n-1)^{3/2}] = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, utilizing the fact that $M/\sqrt{n} \geq \sqrt{M}$, we have $\mathcal{I}(A, B, M) \geq \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \frac{A^{n-1}}{B^{n-1}} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{M}}{B}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{M}}{B}\right)$, which measures the impact of M .*

Before proving Theorem 6, we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_M be M known and fixed real numbers with $|u_m| < c, \forall m$, and consider $\hat{u}_m = \text{ternary}(u_m, A, B)$, $1 \leq m \leq M$. Suppose that $B \geq 2A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M}{\sqrt{T}} = 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) = -1\right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m \right] + \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Proof. According to the definition of the *ternary* compressor, we have

$$\hat{u}_m = \text{ternary}(x, A, B) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A+u_m}{2B}, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{A}{B}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A-u_m}{2B}, \end{cases} \quad (73)$$

Suppose that $n \geq 2$ of the \hat{u}_m 's are non-zero and denote the set by $\mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n$. In this case, $\text{sign}(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m) = \text{sign}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i)$. Let $\hat{Z} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\hat{u}_i=1}$, then

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) = P\left(\hat{Z} > \frac{n}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2}P\left(\hat{Z} = \frac{n}{2}\right), \quad (74)$$

in which we break the tie randomly. Particularly, there are two possible cases.

Case 1: n is odd. In this case, $P(\hat{Z} = \frac{n}{2}) = 0$, and $P(\hat{Z} > \frac{n}{2}) = \sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n P(\hat{Z} = H)$, where

$$P(\hat{Z} = H) = \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_H} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} (A + u_k) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}} (A - u_j)}{(2B)^n} = \frac{a_{n,H} A^n + a_{n-1,H} A^{n-1} + \dots + a_{0,H} A^0}{(2B)^n}, \quad (75)$$

and

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n P(\hat{Z} = H) = \frac{\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n,H} A^n}{(2B)^n} + \frac{\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n-1,H} A^{n-1}}{(2B)^n} + \dots + \frac{\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{0,H} A^0}{(2B)^n}, \quad (76)$$

in which \mathcal{F}_H is the set of all subsets of H integers that can be selected from $\mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n$; $a_{i,H}, \forall 0 \leq i \leq n$ is some constant. It can be easily verified that $a_{n,H} = \binom{n}{H}$.

In particular, $\forall i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_H} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} (A + u_k) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}} (A - u_j) \\ &= (A + u_i) \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_H, i \in \mathcal{A}} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{i\}} (A + u_k) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}} (A - u_j) + (A - u_i) \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_H, i \notin \mathcal{A}} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} (A + u_k) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}, \{i\}} (A - u_j). \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

As a result, when $1 \leq H \leq n-1$, the u_i related term in $a_{n-1,H}$ is given by

$$\left[\binom{n-1}{H-1} - \binom{n-1}{H} \right] u_i. \quad (78)$$

When $H = n$, the u_i related term in $a_{n-1,H}$ is given by

$$\left[\binom{n-1}{H-1} \right] u_i. \quad (79)$$

When $H = 0$, the u_i related term in $a_{n-1,H}$ is given by

$$\left[\binom{n-1}{H} \right] u_i. \quad (80)$$

By summing over i , we have

$$a_{n-1,H} = \left[\binom{n-1}{H-1} - \binom{n-1}{H} \right] \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i, \quad \text{if } 1 \leq H \leq n-1, \quad (81)$$

$$a_{n-1,H} = \left[\binom{n-1}{H-1} \right] \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i, \quad \text{if } H = n, \quad (82)$$

and

$$a_{n-1,H} = - \left[\binom{n-1}{H} \right] \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i, \quad \text{if } H = 0. \quad (83)$$

By summing over H , we have

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n,H} = \sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n \binom{n}{H} = 2^{n-1}, \quad (84)$$

$$\sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} a_{n,H} = \sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \binom{n}{H} = 2^{n-1}, \quad (85)$$

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n-1,H} = \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i, \quad (86)$$

and

$$\sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} a_{n-1,H} = - \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i. \quad (87)$$

Following the same procedure, it can be shown that

$$a_{n-v,H} = \left[\sum_{i=0}^v \binom{v}{v-i} \binom{n-v}{H-v+i} (-1)^i \right] \sum_{F_v} \prod_{j \in F_v} u_j, \quad (88)$$

in which F_v is the set of all subsets of v integers that can be selected from $\mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n$ and $\binom{M-v}{H-v+i} = 0$ if $H-v+i > M-v$. For $v > 0$, summing over H yields

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n-v,H} = \left[\sum_{i=0}^{v-1} \left[\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{v}{j} (-1)^j \right] \binom{n-v}{\frac{n+1}{2}-v+i} \right] \sum_{F_v} \prod_{j \in F_v} u_j. \quad (89)$$

In particular,

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n-2,H} = \left[\binom{n-2}{\frac{n+1}{2}-2} - \binom{n-2}{\frac{n+1}{2}-1} \right] \sum_{F_2} \prod_{j \in F_2} u_j = 0, \quad (90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n a_{n-v,H} \right| &= \left| \left[\sum_{i=0}^{v-1} \left[\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{v}{j} (-1)^j \right] \binom{n-v}{\frac{n+1}{2}-v+i} \right] \sum_{F_v} \prod_{k \in F_v} u_j \right| \\ &\leq \left| \left[\sum_{i=0}^{v-1} \left[\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{v}{j} (-1)^j \right] \binom{n-v}{\frac{n+1}{2}-v+i} \right] \binom{n}{v} c^v \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Since $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\sqrt{T}} = 0$, $\sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n P(\hat{Z} = H)$ is dominated by the first two terms in (76) when T is large enough. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) &= P\left(\hat{Z} > \frac{n}{2}\right) = \sum_{H=\frac{n+1}{2}}^n P(\hat{Z} = H) \\ &= \frac{2^{n-1} A^n + \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i A^{n-1}}{(2B)^n} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \\ &= \frac{A^n}{2B^n} + \frac{\binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} A^{n-1}}{2^n B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = -1\right) &= P\left(\hat{Z} < \frac{n}{2}\right) = \sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} P(\hat{Z} = H) \\ &= \frac{2^{n-1} A^n - \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i A^{n-1}}{(2B)^n} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \\ &= \frac{A^n}{2B^n} - \frac{\binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} A^{n-1}}{2^n B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Therefore,

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = -1\right) = \frac{\binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \quad (94)$$

Case 2: n is even. In this case, $P(\text{sign}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i) = 1) - P(\text{sign}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i) = -1) = P(\hat{Z} > \frac{n}{2}) - P(\hat{Z} < \frac{n}{2})$. Similarly,

$$P(\hat{Z} = H) = \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_H} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} (A + u_k) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}} (A - u_j)}{(2B)^n} = \frac{a_{n,H} A^n + a_{n-1,H} A^{n-1} + \dots + a_{0,H} A^0}{(2B)^n}, \quad (95)$$

and

$$\sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} a_{n,H} = \sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \binom{n}{H} = \sum_{H=\frac{n}{2}+1}^n \binom{n}{H} = \sum_{H=\frac{n}{2}+1}^n a_{n,H}, \quad (96)$$

$$\sum_{H=\frac{n}{2}+1}^n a_{n-1,H} = \binom{n-1}{\frac{n}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i, \quad (97)$$

$$\sum_{H=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} a_{n-1,H} = -\binom{n-1}{\frac{n}{2}-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i = -\binom{n-1}{\frac{n}{2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i. \quad (98)$$

Following the same procedure as that when n is odd, it can be shown that

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = -1\right) = \frac{\binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \quad (99)$$

Overall, we have

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i\right) = -1\right) = \frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \quad (100)$$

Then we consider the scenario $n < 2$. It is obvious that $P(\text{sign}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i) = 1) - P(\text{sign}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \hat{u}_i) = -1) = 0$ when $n = 0$. In addition, when $n = 1$, we have

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^1} \hat{u}_i\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^1} \hat{u}_i\right) = -1\right) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^1} \frac{u_i}{B}. \quad (101)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) = -1\right) \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \sum_{\mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^n} u_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] + \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-1} \sum_{\mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^1} \left[\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_{\neq 0}^1} u_i \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m + \binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] + \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-1} \left[\frac{1}{B} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m \right] + \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M-n} \binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

which completes the proof. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 6.

Proof. According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) \\
 & \leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\
 & = -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \eta \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \right\rangle + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

where η is the learning rate. Taking expectations on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \\
 & \leq \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \times \\
 & \mathbb{E} \left[P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) = 1 \right) - P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) = -1 \right) \right] \\
 & = \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right] \\
 & \quad - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \\
 & = \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} M A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \right] \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + \eta \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} M A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M-1}{n-1} \right] \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \frac{\eta}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \right] \\
 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \eta \sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \right] Qd.
 \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

Let $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{LTd}}$ and $\mathcal{I}(A, B, M) = \sum_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} M A^{n-1} \binom{M-1}{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \right]$. Dividing both sides by $\mathcal{I}(A, B, M)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_2^2 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})] \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} + \frac{\sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \right] Qd}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} \\
 & \leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*) \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} + \frac{\sum_{n=2}^M \left(1 - \frac{A}{B} \right)^{M-n} \left[\binom{M}{n} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n} \right) \right] Qd}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M)} \\
 & \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{B} \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.6. Proof of Theorem 7

Theorem 7. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, and the learning rate is set as $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$, then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote and $\mathcal{N}_t = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{K}$ for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 &\leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_1}{M+K} \\ &\quad + \frac{4K(Q+A)d}{M+K} + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1}\right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{M+K}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{M}+K}{M+K}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Proof. Let $\frac{1}{M+K} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} (\mathbf{g}_k^{(t)}) \right] = \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}$ and

$$\frac{1}{M+K} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{byzantine}(\mathbf{g}_k^{(t)}, A, B) \right] = \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}.$$

According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) &\leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\ &= -\eta \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \eta \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq -\eta \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}) \rangle + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} \\ &= -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \times \mathbb{1}_{\text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i$ is the i -th entry of $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})$ and η is the learning rate. Taking expectations on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \\ &\leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \\ &\leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \left[P \left(\text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + P \left(\text{sign}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \right] \\ &\leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \left(1 - \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \\ &\leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}| \left(1 - \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}| \left(1 - \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign}(\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)} \right| \right] \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{M}{M+K} \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \right] + \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{K}{M+K} \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right| \right] \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{M}{M+K} \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{M}{M+K} \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \tag{110} \\
 & = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \frac{1}{M+K} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right|^2 \right]} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \\
 & = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{1}{(M+K)^2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} [|\nabla f_m(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}|^2]} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\sqrt{M\sigma_i^2}}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} = \frac{\sqrt{M}\|\sigma\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K}.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right) \neq \text{sign} \left(\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)} \right) \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| P \left(\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)} \right| \geq \left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \frac{\mathbb{E} [|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|]}{\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right|} \tag{111} \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} [|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|] \\
 & \leq \frac{\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (67), we can readily show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)} \right| \left(1 - \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}|^2}{B^2} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \right] \leq \frac{B}{M+K+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}}. \tag{112}$$

Plugging (110), (111), and (112) into (109) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 4\eta \left[\frac{\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \right] \\
 & \quad + \frac{2\eta Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}}. \tag{113}
 \end{aligned}$$

Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 4\eta \left[\frac{\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \right] \\
 & \quad + \frac{2\eta Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1} \right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}}. \tag{114}
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ and dividing both sides by η gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 \\
 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + 4 \left[\frac{\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \right] + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1}\right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}} \\
 & \leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*)\sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + 4 \left[\frac{\sqrt{M}\|\bar{\sigma}\|_1}{M+K} + \frac{K(Q+A)d}{M+K} \right] + \frac{2Bd}{\sqrt{M+K+1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+K+1}\right)^{\frac{M+K}{2}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.7. Proof of Theorem 8

Theorem 8. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, $|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| < Q, \forall i, t$, $B \geq 2A = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M+K}{\sqrt{T}} = 0$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote, $\mathcal{N}_t = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{K}$, and the learning rate $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ for T iterations, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \left(M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| - \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right| \right) |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right). \tag{116}$$

Proof. Let $\frac{1}{M+K} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{byzantine}(\mathbf{g}_k^{(t)}, A, B) \right] = \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}$ and $\frac{1}{M+K} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_m^{(t)} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_k^{(t)} \right] = \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}$. According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) & \leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\
 & = -\eta \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \eta \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
 & \leq -\eta \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K}}^{(t)}) \rangle + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

where η is the learning rate. Taking expectations on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \\
 & \leq \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \mathbb{E} \left[P\left(\text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) = 1\right) - P\left(\text{sign}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{K},i}^{(t)}) = -1\right) \right] \\
 & = \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M+K-1}{n-1} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] \\
 & = \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M+K-1}{n-1} \left[M \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] \\
 & = \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} - \eta \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K) \left[\sum_{i=1}^d M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i|^2 + \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right] \\
 & \quad + \eta \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

in which $\mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K) = \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\frac{\binom{n-1}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} A^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} B^n} \binom{M+K-1}{n-1} \right]$. Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K) \left[\sum_{i=1}^d M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i|^2 + \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \frac{\eta}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \eta \sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] Qd. \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

Let $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$ and dividing both sides by $\eta \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\sum_{i=1}^d M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i|^2 + \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})] \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} + \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] Qd}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} \\ & \leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*) \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T} \mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} + \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{M+K} \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right)^{M+K-n} \left[\binom{M+K}{n} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A^{n-2}}{B^n}\right) \right] Qd}{\mathcal{I}(A, B, M, K)} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

Since

$$M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i|^2 + \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \geq |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \left(M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| - \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right| \right), \quad (121)$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \left(M |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| - \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}^{(t)} \right| \right) |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{\sqrt{T}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{B}\right), \quad (122)$$

which completes the proof. \square

C. Convergence of Algorithm 1 with Full-Batch Gradient

Theorem 9. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied, and the learning rate is set as $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TLd}}$. Then by running Algorithm 1 with TernaryVote for T iterations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})] \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2Bd}{M} \\ & \leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*) \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2Bd}{M}, \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

where $0 < c_0 < 1$ is some positive constant.

Before proving Theorem 9, we first introduce the following lemmas.

Lemma 8. Let X_i denote a Bernoulli random variable with a successful probability of p_i and $S_{X_{1:M}} = \sum_{i=1}^M X_i$. Without loss of generality, suppose $0 < p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_M < 1$. Then $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < \frac{1}{2}$ for $k \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$.

The following proof of Lemma 8 is inspired by the method in (Jorgensen et al., 2018).

Proof. Decomposing $S_{X_{1:M}}$ as $S_{X_{2:M-1}} + X_1 + X_M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) &= p_1 p_M P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) + [p_1(1-p_M) + p_M(1-p_1)]P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) \\ &\quad + (1-p_1)(1-p_M)P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k) \\ &= p_1 p_M [P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) - 2P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) + P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] \\ &\quad + (p_1 + p_M)[P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) - P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] + P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k). \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

Further, define another set of Bernoulli random variables Y_i with a successful probability of q_i . If $q_1 = q_M = \frac{p_1+p_M}{2}$ and $q_i = p_i \forall i \in \{2, 3, \dots, M-1\}$, similarly, if we decompose $S_{Y_{1:M}}$ as $S_{Y_{2:M-1}} + Y_1 + Y_M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_{Y_{1:M}} \geq k) &= q_1 q_M P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) + [q_1(1-q_M) + q_M(1-q_1)]P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) \\ &\quad + (1-q_1)(1-q_M)P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k) \\ &= q_1 q_M [P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) - 2P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) + P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] \\ &\quad + (q_1 + q_M)[P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) - P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] + P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k). \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

Since $q_1 + q_M = p_1 + p_M$ and $P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k) = P(S_{Y_{2:M-1}} \geq k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_{Y_{1:M}} \geq k) - P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) &= (q_1 q_M - p_1 p_M)[P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) - 2P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) + P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] \\ &= \left(\frac{p_1 - p_M}{2}\right)^2 [P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-2) - 2P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k-1) + P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} \geq k)] \\ &= \left(\frac{p_1 - p_M}{2}\right)^2 [P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-2) - P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-1)]. \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

Therefore, $P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-2) > P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-1)$ is a sufficient condition for $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < P(S_{Y_{1:M}} \geq k)$. According to Theorem 1 in (Samuels, 1965), if $p_M + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i < k+1$, then $P(S_{X_{1:M}} = k) > P(S_{X_{1:M}} = k+1)$. Similarly, if $p_{M-1} + \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} p_i < k-1$, then $P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-2) > P(S_{X_{2:M-1}} = k-1)$. Therefore, given that $k \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$, we have $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < P(S_{Y_{1:M}} \geq k)$.

Applying the techniques above repeatedly, we will finally obtain $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < P(S_{\hat{X}_{1:M}} \geq k)$ for $k \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$, where $\{\hat{X}_i\}_{i=1}^M$'s are Bernoulli random variables with a successful probability of $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$. Therefore, $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < P(\hat{S}_M \geq k)$, where $\hat{S}_M \sim \text{BIN}(M, \bar{p})$.

Now, define another Poisson Binomial random variable $S_{M+2} = 0 + \hat{S}_M + 1$. Note that the constants 0 and 1 correspond to Bernoulli trials with success probabilities of 0 and 1, respectively. Then, we have

$$P(\hat{S}_M \geq k) = P(S_{M+2} \geq k+1) < P(\hat{S}_{M+2} \geq k+1), \quad (127)$$

where $\hat{S}_{M+2} \sim \text{BIN}(M+2, p_{M+2})$ with $(M+2)p_{M+2} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$. By applying the same argument repeatedly, we can obtain a sequence of Binomial random variables $\hat{S}_{M+2j} \sim \text{BIN}(M+2j, p_{M+2j})$, where $(M+2j)p_{M+2j} = j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$. Particularly, $P(\hat{S}_{M+2j} \geq k+j)$ increases as j increases.

Notice that the success probability $p_{M+2j} = \frac{j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i}{M+2j}$ approaches $\frac{1}{2}$ as j increases, while the variance grows and approaches ∞ . Invoking the central limit theorem implies that the probability distribution of \hat{S}_{M+2j} approaches normal distribution with mean $j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$ and variance $\sigma_{M+2j}^2 = (j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i)(1 - \frac{j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i}{M+2j})$. Therefore, $P(\hat{S}_{M+2j} \geq k+j) = P(\frac{\hat{S}_{M+2j} - (j + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i)}{\sigma_{M+2j}} \geq \frac{k - \sum_{i=1}^M p_i}{\sigma_{M+2j}})$ approaches $\frac{1}{2}$ as j increases. As a result, we have $P(S_{X_{1:M}} \geq k) < \frac{1}{2}$ for $k \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^M p_i$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 9. Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_M be M known and fixed real numbers and consider binary random variables \hat{u}_m , $1 \leq m \leq M$, which is given by

$$\hat{u}_m = \text{ternary}(u_m, A, B) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A+u_m}{2B}, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{A}{B}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{A-u_m}{2B}, \end{cases} \quad (128)$$

Suppose $B \geq 2A$ and $|\bar{u}| = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M u_M \geq \frac{B}{M}$, then there exists some positive constant c_0 such that

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) \leq \frac{1-c_0}{2}. \quad (129)$$

Proof. For each u_m , we construct the following two random variables

$$\hat{u}_{m,1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{u_m}{2B} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{u_m}{2B} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \end{cases} \quad (130)$$

$$\hat{u}_{m,2} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{u_m}{2B} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{u_m}{2B} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|u_m|^2}{4B^2} - \frac{A}{2B}}, \end{cases} \quad (131)$$

It can be observed that $\frac{\hat{u}_{m,1} + \hat{u}_{m,2}}{2}$ follows the same distribution as \hat{u}_m , which means that

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{u}_m\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) = P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^M [\hat{u}_{m,1} + \hat{u}_{m,2}]\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right). \quad (132)$$

Denote $p_{m,j} = P(\hat{u}_{m,j} \neq \text{sign}(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m))$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2\}$, it can be shown that $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^M [p_{m,1} + p_{m,2}] = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\bar{u}|}{2B}$. Then, let $X_{m,j}$ denote a Bernoulli random variable with a success probability of $p_{m,j}$, we have

$$P\left(\text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^M [\hat{u}_{m,1} + \hat{u}_{m,2}]\right) \neq \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M u_m\right)\right) \leq P\left(\sum_{m=1}^M X_{m,1} + X_{m,2} \geq M\right). \quad (133)$$

Lemma 8 implies that $P(\sum_{m=1}^M X_{m,1} + X_{m,2} \geq M) < \frac{1}{2}$ as long as $M \geq 1 + 2M\bar{p} = 1 + M - \frac{M|\bar{u}|}{B}$, which is equivalent to $|\bar{u}| \geq \frac{B}{M}$. This essentially means that there exists some constant c_0 such that $P(\sum_{m=1}^M X_{m,1} + X_{m,2} \geq M) \leq \frac{1-c_0}{2}$, which completes the proof of Lemma 9. \square

Given Lemma 9 at hand, we are ready to prove Theorem 9.

Proof. According to Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) \\ & \leq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}\|_2^2 \\ & = -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq -\eta \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}), \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)\right) \right\rangle + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} \\ & = -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i| \times \mathbf{1}_{\text{sign}(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_m^{(t)}, A, B)) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

where $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i$ is the i -th entry of the vector $\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})$ and η is the learning rate. Taking expectations on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \neq \text{sign}(\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i) \right) \right] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} \\
 & + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \neq \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| \geq \frac{B}{M}} \right) \right] \\
 & + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| P \left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \text{ternary}(\mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)}, A, B) \right) \neq \text{sign} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_{m,i}^{(t)} \right| < \frac{B}{M}} \right) \right] \\
 & \leq -\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-c_0}{2} \left| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})_i \right| \right] + 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{B}{M} \\
 & \leq -c_0\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \frac{2\eta Bd}{M}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

Adjusting the above inequality and averaging both sides over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})]}{T} + \frac{Ld\eta^2}{2} + \frac{2\eta Bd}{M}. \tag{136}$$

Letting $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{LTd}}$ and dividing both sides by η gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})\|_1 & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)})] \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2Bd}{M} \\
 & \leq \frac{(F(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) - F^*) \sqrt{Ld}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{Ld}}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2Bd}{M},
 \end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

which completes the proof. \square

D. Details of the Implementation

Our experiments are mainly implemented using Python 3.8 with packages Numpy 1.19.2 and Pytorch 1.10.1.

D.1. Dataset and Pre-processing

We perform experiments on the standard MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and CIFAR-10 datasets. The MNIST dataset is for handwritten digit recognition consisting of 60,000 training samples and 10,000 testing samples. Each sample is a 28×28 size gray-level image. The Fashion-MNIST dataset shares the same image size, data format and the structure of training and testing splits as the MNIST dataset. We normalize the data by dividing it by the max RGB value (i.e., 255.0). The CIFAR-10 dataset contains 50,000 training samples and 10,000 testing samples. Each sample is a 32×32 color image. The data are normalized with a zero-centered mean.

D.2. Neural Network Setting

For MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, we implement a three-layer fully connected neural network with softmax of classes with cross-entropy loss. The two hidden layers have 512 and 256 hidden ReLU units, respectively. For CIFAR-10, we implement a simple convolutional neural network with 4 convolution layers. It has two contiguous blocks of two convolution layers with 64 and 128 channels, respectively, followed by a max-pooling, and then it has one dense layer with 256 hidden units.

D.3. Learning Rate Tuning

For all the algorithms, we tune the initial learning rates from the set $\{0.00001, 0.00002, 0.00005, 0.0001, 0.0002, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.002, 0.005, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 5.0, 10.0, 20.0, 50.0, 100.0\}$. For MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, we use a fixed learning rate, while for CIFAR-10, we decrease the learning rate by a factor of 10 after 250 communication rounds.