

---

# Scalable Decentralized Algorithms for Online Personalized Mean Estimation

---

Franco Galante<sup>1</sup> Giovanni Neglia<sup>2</sup> Emilio Leonardi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electronics and Telecommunications at Politecnico di Torino, Italy; email: first.lastname@polito.it.

<sup>2</sup>INRIA Sophia Antipolis, France; email: giovanni.neglia@inria.fr

## Abstract

In numerous settings, agents lack sufficient data to directly learn a model. Collaborating with other agents may help, but it introduces a bias-variance trade-off, when local data distributions differ. A key challenge is for each agent to identify clients with similar distributions while learning the model, a problem that remains largely unresolved. This study focuses on a simplified version of the overarching problem, where each agent collects samples from a real-valued distribution over time to estimate its mean. Existing algorithms face impractical space and time complexities (quadratic in the number of agents  $|\mathcal{A}|$ ). To address scalability challenges, we propose a framework where agents self-organize into a graph, allowing each agent to communicate with only a selected number of peers  $r$ . We introduce two collaborative mean estimation algorithms: one draws inspiration from belief propagation, while the other employs a consensus-based approach, with complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}|)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}|)$ , respectively. We establish conditions under which both algorithms yield asymptotically optimal estimates and offer a theoretical characterization of their performance.

## 1. Introduction

Users' devices have become increasingly sophisticated and generate vast amounts of data. This wealth of data has paved the way for the development of accurate and complex models. However, it has also introduced challenges related to security, privacy, real-time processing, and resource constraints. In response, Federated Learning (FL) has emerged as a pivotal privacy-preserving methodology for collaborative model training (Kairouz et al., 2021; Li et al., 2020). Traditional FL methods focus on learning a unified model applicable to all clients. Yet, the statistical diversity observed across clients' datasets has led to the pursuit of *personalized* models. These models aim to better align with the unique data distributions of individual

clients (e.g., Ghosh et al., 2020; Fallah et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Marfoq et al., 2021; Ding & Wang, 2022).

Many personalized FL strategies involve grouping clients into homogeneous clusters to then tailor a model for each cluster (e.g., Ghosh et al., 2020; Sattler et al., 2021; Ding & Wang, 2022).. The optimal clustering would ideally group clients whose local optimal models are similar. However, the inherent challenge lies in the fact that these optimal models are unknown a priori. This dilemma results in the two tasks—model learning for the specified task and cluster identification—being deeply interconnected. Various studies have suggested empirical measures of similarity as a workaround (e.g., Ghosh et al., 2020; Sattler et al., 2021), while others rely on presumed knowledge of distances across data distributions (e.g. Ding & Wang, 2022; Even et al., 2022). Nonetheless, accurately estimating these distances, especially within a FL framework where clients may possess limited data, proves to be particularly challenging. Such estimation difficulties are well discussed in the literature (e.g., in Even et al. (2022) [Sec. 6]), underscoring the problem of identifying similar clients for collaborative model learning as a significant, yet unresolved issue.

In this paper, we narrow our focus to a fundamental aspect of the broader challenge, specifically aiming to estimate the mean of a real-valued distribution. This task holds significant practical relevance across various fields, such as smart agriculture, smart grid management, and healthcare, where multiple sensors collect private, noisy data on identical or related variables (Adi et al., 2020). Importantly, the task of personalized mean estimation serves as a foundational problem that can illuminate key aspects of personalized federated learning.

We are interested in an online decentralized version of personalized mean estimation, where at each time-slot, a client collects new samples and can exchange information with a limited number of other clients. To the best of our knowledge, the state-of-the-art method in this setting is the Collaborative Mean Estimation algorithm, COLME, by Asadi et al. (2022). Unfortunately, COLME struggles with scalability in large systems, as its space and time complexities are both quadratic in the number of clients  $|\mathcal{A}|$ .

To address these scalability challenges, we propose that clients self-organize into a network where each client communicates with at most a fixed set of  $r$  neighbors. Over time, this set of neighbors is pruned, as clients progressively exclude those that are more dissimilar. Within this context, we introduce two collaborative mean estimation algorithms: one inspired by belief propagation and the other based on consensus. The complexities of these algorithms are  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}|)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}|)$ , respectively. We demonstrate that, even though each client exchanges information with only  $r \ll |\mathcal{A}|$  clients, it is possible to achieve with high probability a speedup in the convergence time of mean estimates by a factor of  $\Omega(|\mathcal{A}|^{1/2-\phi})$ , with  $\phi$  arbitrarily close to 0.

## 2. Related Work

For an overview of the field of personalized federated learning, we refer the reader to the recent survey (Tan et al., 2023). Here, we limit to mention the most relevant approaches for this paper.

Ghosh et al. (2020) and Sattler et al. (2021) were the first to propose clustered FL algorithms, which split the clients on the basis of the similarity of their data distributions; the similarity is evaluated empirically by the Euclidean distance of the local models and by the cosine similarity of their updates. Ding & Wang (2022) study more sophisticated clustering algorithms assuming that clients can efficiently estimate some specific (pseudo)-distances across local distributions (i.e., the integral probability metrics).

Beaussart et al. (2021), Chayti et al. (2022), Grimberg et al. (2021), and Even et al. (2022) consider decentralized approaches, which allow each client to learn a personal model relying on a specific convex combination of information (gradients) from other clients. In particular, Even et al. (2022) prove that collaboration can at most speed up the convergence time linearly in the number of similar agents and provide algorithms, which, under a-priori knowledge of pairwise client distributions’ distances, achieve such speedup. The authors recognize the complexity of estimating these distances and provide practical estimation algorithms for linear regression problems which asymptotically achieve the same speedup scaling the number of clients but maintaining the number clusters fixed.

The generalization properties of personalized models obtained by convex combinations of clients’ models are studied in Mansour et al. (2020), while Donahue & Kleinberg (2021) look at the problem through the lens of game theory.

The work most similar to ours is Asadi et al. (2022), which we describe in details in the next section.

## 3. Model and Background on COLME

We consider a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of agents (computational units). Each agent  $a \in \mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$  generates at each time instant  $t$  a new sample  $x_a^t \in \mathbb{R}$  drawn i.i.d. from distribution  $D_a$  with expected value  $\mu_a = \mathbb{E}[x_a^t]$ . Expected values are not necessarily distinct across agents. Given two agents  $a$  and  $a'$ , we denote by  $\Delta_{a,a'} := |\mu_a - \mu_{a'}|$  the gap between the agents’ true means, and with  $\mathcal{C}_a$ , the group of agents with the same true mean of  $a$ , (i.e. such that  $\Delta_{a,a'} = 0$ ). In the following we will refer to  $\mathcal{C}_a$  as the ‘similarity class of  $a$ .’

The goal of each agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is to estimate  $\mu_a$ . To this purpose, the client can compute its local average estimate  $\bar{x}_{a,a}^t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_1^t x_a^t$ , but can also obtain a more accurate estimates taking advantage of information from other agents in its similarity class.

Asadi et al. (2022) proposed COLME as a collaborative algorithm for mean estimation. COLME relies on two key steps: i) trying to identify the similarity classes; ii) improving local mean estimates by sharing information with agents believed to belong to the same class.

**1) Identifying Similarity Classes.** We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$  the set of agents that agent  $a$  estimates, at time  $t$ , to be part of its own similarity class  $\mathcal{C}_a$ . Agent  $a$  decides that agent  $a'$  belongs to the same class if their local average estimates are sufficiently close, specifically, if two appropriately defined confidence intervals centered on these estimates overlap. In general, at time  $t$ , agent  $a$  will not have access to the most recent local average estimates of agent  $a'$ , but to a stale value, corresponding to the last time the two clients have exchanged information. We denote such value as  $\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t$  and the corresponding number of samples as  $n_{a,a'}^t$ .<sup>1</sup> Agent  $a$  can then estimate its true mean and the true mean of agent  $a'$  to belong to the confidence intervals

$$I_{a,a} = [\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \beta_\gamma(t), \bar{x}_{a,a}^t + \beta_\gamma(t)],$$

$$I_{a,a'} = [\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t), \bar{x}_{a,a'}^t + \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)],$$

respectively. As expected, the interval amplitude  $\beta_\gamma(n)$  depends on the number of samples  $n$  on which the empirical average is computed, and on the target level of confidence  $1 - 2\gamma$  associated to the interval. Agent  $a$  will then assume that  $a'$  belongs to its similarity class  $\mathcal{C}_a$  if the two intervals overlap, i.e.,  $I_{a,a} \cap I_{a,a'} \neq \emptyset$ , or equivalently if

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') := |\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \bar{x}_{a,a'}^t| - \beta_\gamma(t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) < 0. \quad (1)$$

In order to estimate its similarity class in the most accurate way, agent  $a$  could retrieve at each time  $t$  the most recent estimate  $\bar{x}_{a',a'}^t$  from each other agent  $a'$ . This, however, would

<sup>1</sup>Note that  $n_{a,a'}^t \leq t$  coincides with the last time-slot at which the two agents have communicated.

lead to a quadratic communication burden  $\Theta(|\mathcal{A}|^2)$ . To limit such a burden, node  $a$  cyclically queries a single node in  $\mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$  at each time instant  $t$ , according to a *Round-Robin* scheme. This leads to the following update rule for  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$ :

$$\mathcal{C}_a^t = \{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1} : d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq 0\}, \quad (2)$$

and we observe that by construction  $\mathcal{C}_a^t \subseteq \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$ . Initially, the agent sets  $\mathcal{C}_a^0 = \mathcal{A}$ , and progressively takes irreversible decisions to remove agents.

**2) Estimating the Mean.** Each node  $a$  computes an *estimate*  $\hat{\mu}_a^t$  of its true mean  $\mu_a$  by combining the available estimates according to a *simple weighting* scheme, where number of samples are taken as weights:

$$\hat{\mu}_a^t = \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} \frac{n_{a,a'}^t}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} n_{a,a'}^t} \bar{x}_{a,a'}^t$$

We observe that, both in terms of memory and per-time computations, the complexity of COLME is quadratic, i.e.,  $\Theta(|\mathcal{A}|^2)$ , since every agent  $a$  must keep in memory all local estimates  $\bar{x}_{a,a'}$  and number of samples  $n_{a,a'}^t$ . And, at every  $t$ , for every  $a'$ , it has to recompute  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$ , using the last available value for  $\bar{x}_{a,a}$  (and  $n_{a,a}^t$ ). Indeed, note that the local value of  $\bar{x}_{a,a}$  is updated at every  $t$  and this triggers a change in the optimistic distance for every  $t$ .

### 3.1. COLME's Guarantees

We provide the the two main theoretical results from [Asadi et al. \(2022\)](#) which were proved only when the distributions  $\{D_a, a \in \mathcal{A}\}$  are sub-Gaussians.<sup>2</sup>

Select the amplitude of the confidence intervals as:

$$\beta_\gamma(n) := \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln(\sqrt{(n+1)}/\gamma)} \quad (3)$$

and let  $n_\gamma^*(x)$  denote the minimum number of samples that are needed to ensure  $\beta_\gamma(n) < x$ , i.e.,  $n_\gamma^*(x) = \lceil \beta_\gamma^{-1}(x) \rceil$ . We also use  $n_\gamma^*(a, a')$  for  $n_\gamma^*(\Delta_{a,a'}/4)$  and  $n_\gamma^*(a)$  for  $n_\gamma^*(\Delta_a/4)$  where  $\Delta_a := \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{C}_a} \Delta_{a,a'}$ ; these values denote the minimum number of samples to distinguish (with confidence  $1 - 2\gamma$ ) the true mean of agent  $a$  from the true mean of agent  $a'$ , and from the true mean of any other agent, respectively.

The first result ([Theorem 3.1](#)) provides a bound on the time needed to ensure that a randomly chosen agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  correctly identifies its similarity class, i.e.  $\mathcal{C}_a^t = \mathcal{C}_a$ , with high probability.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>A distribution  $D$  is sub-gaussian with parameter  $\sigma^2$  if  $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\log \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D} \exp(\lambda(x - \mu)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \sigma^2$ .

<sup>3</sup>In this paper events that occur with a probability larger than  $1 - \delta$  are said to occur with high probability (w.h.p.).

**Theorem 3.1.** ([Asadi et al., 2022, Theorem 1](#)) Assume distributions  $\{D_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\}$  are sub-Gaussians with parameter  $\sigma^2$ . For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and with  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{4|\mathcal{A}|}$ , employing COLME, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t > \zeta_a : \mathcal{C}_a^t \neq \mathcal{C}_a) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (4)$$

with:

$$\zeta_a = n_\gamma^*(a) + |\mathcal{A}| - 1 - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{C}_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{n_\gamma^*(a) > n_\gamma^*(a,a') + |\mathcal{A}| - 1\}}.$$

[Theorem 3.1](#) shows that the time  $\zeta_a$  required by each agent  $a$  to identify (with high probability) which other agents are in the same similarity class can be bounded by the sum of two terms. The first term,  $n_\gamma^*(a)$ , is an upper-bound for the number of samples needed to conclude, with probability larger or equal than  $1 - 2\gamma$ , if the true means of two agents differ by the minimum gap  $\Delta_a$ . The additional term corresponds to the residual time required to acquire the estimates from other agents. It can be shown that  $n_\gamma^*(a, a')$  grows at most as  $\log |\mathcal{A}|$ , then  $\zeta_a \in \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|)$  and for large systems ( $|\mathcal{A}| \gg n_\gamma^*(a)$ ), the need to query all agents at least once becomes the dominant factor.

Turning our attention to the estimation error, it holds:

**Theorem 3.2.** ([Asadi et al., 2022, Theorem 2](#)) Assume distributions  $\{D_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\}$  are sub-Gaussians with parameter  $\sigma^2$ . For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and with  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{4|\mathcal{A}|}$ , employing COLME, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t > \tau_a, |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{with } \tau_a = \max \left[ \zeta_a, \frac{n_\gamma^*(\varepsilon)}{\frac{\delta}{2}} + \frac{|\mathcal{C}_a| - 1}{2} \right].$$

[Theorem 3.2](#) admits a straightforward explanation. Provided that agent  $a$  has successfully estimated its similarity class at time  $t$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}_a^t = \mathcal{C}_a$ ), the error in the mean estimation will depend only on the available number of samples of agents in  $\mathcal{C}_a$ , used for the computation of  $\hat{\mu}_a^t$ . Now, a number of samples equal to  $n_\gamma^*(\varepsilon)$  is sufficient to ensure that  $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) < \delta/2$ . For agent  $a$  such number of samples is surely available at time  $t \geq t_a^* = \frac{n_\gamma^*(\varepsilon)}{\frac{\delta}{2}} + \frac{|\mathcal{C}_a| - 1}{2}$  where the second term is needed to take into account the effect of the delay introduced by the round-robin scheme. Applying the union bound, we can claim that whenever  $t \geq \max(\zeta_a, t_a^*)$  w.p.  $1 - \delta$  both  $\mathcal{C}_a^t = \mathcal{C}_a$  and  $|\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| \leq \varepsilon$  hold.

### 3.2. Extensions

We extend [Theorem 3.1](#) and [3.2](#) to distributions which are not sub-Gaussians as far as the width of the confidence intervals  $\beta_\gamma(\cdot)$  satisfies the following assumption:

**Assumption 3.3.** There exists a function  $\beta_\gamma(\cdot) \in o(1)$  such that the true mean belongs to all (nested) intervals of amplitude  $\pm\beta_\gamma(t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  with confidence  $1 - 2\gamma$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu| < \beta_\gamma(t)) \geq 1 - 2\gamma, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (6)$$

For generic distributions  $\{D_a, a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ , it is difficult to find such function  $\beta_\gamma(\cdot)$ , but for sub-Gaussian distributions Eq. (3) satisfies indeed Assumption 3.3 (Maillard, 2019).

In Appendix A, we show that Assumption 3.3 is satisfied when the distributions  $\{D_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\}$  have variance upper-bounded by  $\sigma^2$ , and fourth (central) moment upper-bounded by  $\kappa\sigma^4$  (when all the variables are identically distributed  $\kappa$  can be interpreted as the kurtosis and  $\sigma$  as the standard deviation). In particular, in this case  $\beta_\gamma$  can be selected as follows:

$$\beta_\gamma(n) = \left(2 \frac{\kappa + 3\sigma^4}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{1 + \ln^2 n}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (7)$$

If the distributions  $\{D_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\}$  exhibit a larger number of bounded polynomial moments, a more favorable expression for  $\beta_\gamma(n)$  can be obtained (see Remark A.4 in Appendix A).

## 4. Scalable Algorithms over a Graph $\mathcal{G}$

The main limitations of COLME are acknowledged by Asadi et al. (2022): each agent needs to perform a number of operations and maintain a memory proportional to  $|\mathcal{A}|$ , leading to total time and space costs which are  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|^2)$  per time-slot. This is impractical in large-scale systems. Moreover, while the *Round-Robin* query scheme reduces the communication burden, it entails a significant delay in the estimation ( $\zeta_a \in \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|)$ ).

Total space and time computational complexity can be made  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(|\mathcal{A}|)$  (and then constant per node) with our *scalable* approaches: B-COLME (see Section 4.1) and C-COLME (see Section 4.2). Both approaches consider agents  $\mathcal{A}$  over a fixed graph  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  and restrict the communication to pairs of agents adjacent in  $\mathcal{G}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_a$  the maximal connected component consisting of nodes in  $\mathcal{C}_a$  to which  $a$  belongs, and by  $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_a^d$  the agents in  $\mathcal{C}_a$  which are at most  $d$  hops away from  $a$ . Similarly, let  $\mathcal{N}_a$  and  $\mathcal{N}_a^d$  denote the set of neighbours of agent  $a$  and the set of agents at distance at most  $d$  by  $a$ , respectively.

Each agent  $a$  aims to determine which nodes in its neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}_a$  belong to its similarity class  $\mathcal{C}_a$ . To this purpose, agent  $a$  receives at time  $t$  from each neighbors  $a' \in \mathcal{N}_a$  an updated version of its local mean estimate. We denote with  $\mathcal{C}_a^t \subseteq \mathcal{N}_a$  the set of neighbours that agent  $a$  deems to belong to its own similarity class at time  $t$ . At the beginning,  $\mathcal{C}_a^0 = \mathcal{N}_a$ . Similarly to COLME, at each time  $t$ , agent  $a$  first computes the distance  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  for every  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$

according to (1) and then updates  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$  according to (2). As for COLME, therefore,  $\mathcal{C}_a^t \subseteq \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$ , as soon as  $a$  removes  $a'$  from  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$ , it stops communicating with  $a'$ . Then, over time, communications occur over a pruned graph  $\mathcal{G}^t = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^t)$ , where  $\mathcal{E}^t = \{(a, a') \in \mathcal{E} : a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t\}$ .

We aim to determine the time needed to ensure that  $\mathcal{C}_a^t = \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ ,  $\forall a$ . Similar to the definitions of  $n_\gamma^*(a, a')$  and  $n_\gamma^*(a)$ , we introduce  $n_\gamma^*$  as (an upper-bound for) the minimum number of the samples necessary to differentiate the two closest true means (with confidence  $1 - 2\gamma$ ). Specifically,  $n_\gamma^* := n_\gamma^*(\Delta)$ , where  $\Delta := \min_a \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{C}_a} \Delta_{a, a'}$ .

Now we can state our first result, which can be easily derived, see Appendix A, using the same approach as in Asadi et al. (2022, Theorem 1) (reported above as Theorem 3.1):

**Theorem 4.1.** For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing either B-COLME or C-COLME we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t > \zeta_D, \exists a \in \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{C}_a^t \neq \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (8)$$

with  $\zeta_D = n_\gamma^* + 1$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|}$ .

This result provides an upper bound for the probability that at some time  $t$ , some node in the network wrongly estimates the set of neighbors belonging to its own similarity class. A similar result, which takes a system-wide perspective, can be easily obtained for the COLME algorithm:

**Corollary 4.2.** For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing COLME:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t > \zeta, \exists a \in \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{C}_a^t \neq \mathcal{C}_a) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (9)$$

with  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{4|\mathcal{A}|^2}$  and:

$$\zeta = n_\gamma^* + |\mathcal{A}| - 1 - \min_a \sum_{l \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{C}_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{n_\gamma^*(a) > n_\gamma^*(a, l) + |\mathcal{A}| - 1\}}$$

When comparing Theorem 4.1 with Corollary 4.2, we observe that, for large systems,  $\zeta \approx |\mathcal{A}| + \zeta_D$ , showing that, as expected, agents can identify much faster similar agents in their neighborhood than in the whole population  $\mathcal{A}$ .<sup>4</sup>

We now present two decentralized algorithms which allow agents to improve the estimates of their true means.

### 4.1. Message-passing B-COLME

In B-COLME algorithm, each node  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , through a continuous exchange of messages with its direct neighbors  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$ , can acquire not only their local estimates  $\{\bar{x}_{a, a'}^t, a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t\}$ , but also, in an aggregate form, estimates from further away

<sup>4</sup>For a fairer comparison, we should let COLME query  $r$  other agents at each time  $t$ , where  $r$  is the average degree of  $\mathcal{G}$ . In this case,  $\zeta \approx |\mathcal{A}|/r + \zeta_D$  and the conclusion does not change.



nodes up to distance  $d$  in the graph  $\mathcal{G}^t$  ( $d$  is a tunable parameter, the need to introduce it will be explained soon). Indeed, node  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t$  serves as a *forwarder*, providing to its neighbor  $a \in \mathcal{N}_{a'}$  access to the records it has collected from *other* neighbors  $a'' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t \setminus \{a\}$ . As far as each agent has correctly identified all similar nodes in its neighborhood, the agent has potentially access to the local estimates of all agents in  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$ .

According to our *message-passing* scheme, agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  retrieves at time  $t$  a message  $M^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  from every of its neighbors  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t$  (for a visual representation see Fig. 4 in the Appendix). Message  $M^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  is a  $d \times 2$  table whose element  $m_{h,1}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  contains a sum of samples, while  $m_{h,2}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  indicates the total number of samples contributing to the aforementioned sum. In particular, at time  $t$ , the first table entries are set as:  $m_{1,1}^{t,a' \rightarrow a} = \sum_{\tau=1}^t x_{a'}^\tau$  and  $m_{1,2}^{t,a' \rightarrow a} = t$ . The other entries are built through the following recursion:

$$m_{h,i}^{t,a' \rightarrow a} = \sum_{a'' \in \mathcal{C}_{a'}^t, a'' \neq a} m_{h-1,i}^{t-1,a'' \rightarrow a'},$$

for  $h \in \{2, \dots, d\}$  and  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .

If  $\mathcal{G}^t \cap \mathcal{N}_a^d$  is a tree, then  $m_{h,1}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  contains the sum of all samples generated within time  $t-h+1$  by agents  $a'' \in \mathcal{G}^t$  at distance  $h-1$  from  $a'$  and distance  $h$  from  $a$ , while  $m_{h,2}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$  contains the corresponding number of samples (the proof is by induction on  $h$ ).

Agent  $a$  can estimate its mean as:

$$\hat{\mu}_a^t = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t x_a^\tau + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} \sum_{h=1}^d m_{h,1}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}}{t + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} \sum_{h=1}^d m_{h,2}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}}. \quad (10)$$

and, under the local tree structure assumption, this corresponds to perform an empirical average over all the samples generated by agent  $a$  until time  $t$  and all agents in  $\mathcal{G}^t$  at distance  $1 \leq h \leq d$  until time  $t-h$ .

If  $\mathcal{G}^t \cap \mathcal{N}_a^d$  is not a tree, then the contribution of the samples collected by a given agent  $a''$  may be included in messages arriving to  $a$  through different neighbours in  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$  and then been erroneously counted multiple times in (10). The parameter  $d$  needs to be selected to prevent this eventuality (or make it very unlikely), as we discuss in Sec. 4.3.

As a consequence of previous arguments, we obtain the following two results:

**Theorem 4.3.** . *Provided that  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  is a tree, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing B-COLME, we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t > \tau'_a, |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$$

with  $\tau'_a = \max \left[ \zeta_D + d, \frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon)}{|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|} + d \right],$

---

**Algorithm 1** B-COLME over a Time Horizon  $H$ 


---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}), (D_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+, \delta \in (0, 1]$   
**Output:**  $\hat{\mu}_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$   
 $\mathcal{C}_a^0 \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$   
**for** time  $t$  in  $\{1, \dots, H\}$  **do**  
     In parallel for all nodes  $a \in \mathcal{A}$   
         Draw  $x_a^t \sim D_a$   
          $\bar{x}_a^t \leftarrow \frac{t-1}{t} \bar{x}_a^{t-1} + \frac{1}{t} x_a^t$   
         Compute  $\beta_\gamma(t)$  with Eq. (3) or Eq. (7)  
          $\mathcal{C}_a^t \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$   
         **for** neighbor  $a'$  in  $\mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$  **do**  
              $d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leftarrow |\bar{x}_a^t - \bar{x}_{a'}^{t-1}| - \beta_\gamma(t) - \beta_\gamma(t-1)$   
             **if**  $d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0$  **then**  
                  $\mathcal{C}_a^t \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_a^t \setminus \{a'\}$   
             **end if**  
         **end for**  
         **for** neighbor  $a'$  in  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$  **do**  
             Compute  $M^{t,a \rightarrow a'}$   
             Send  $M^{t,a \rightarrow a'}$  to  $a'$   
         **end for**  
         Wait for messages  $M^{t,a' \rightarrow a} \forall a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t$   
          $\hat{\mu}_a^t \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t x_a^\tau + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} \sum_{h=1}^d m_{h,1}^{t-1,a' \rightarrow a}}{t + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} \sum_{h=1}^d m_{h,2}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}}$   
     **end for**

---

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) \leq \begin{cases} \left\lceil \left[ -\frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2}} \right) \right) \right] \right\rceil & \text{sub-Gaussian,} \\ \left\lceil \frac{2(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\delta\varepsilon^4} \right\rceil & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{CC}_a^d \text{ is not a tree}) = \delta'$ , then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing B-COLME, we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t > \tau'_a : |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta - \delta'.$$

Now Theorem E.1 (in the Appendix) provides upper bounds to  $\delta'$  when  $\mathcal{G}$  is a random regular graph. In particular as long we set  $d$  as in Proposition 4.7,  $\delta'$  converges to 0 as the number of agents  $|\mathcal{A}|$  increases.

Our proofs can readily be adapted to COLME, enabling to substitute  $n_{\frac{\delta}{2}}^*(\varepsilon)$  in Theorem 3.2 with the smaller term  $\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon)$ .

## 4.2. Consensus-based C-COLME

In this section we present a second possible collaborative approach for estimating the mean, see Algorithm 2. It takes inspiration from consensus algorithms. The basic idea is that each agent maintains two metrics, namely the empirical average of its local samples  $\bar{x}_{a,a}^t$ , and the “consensus” estimate  $\hat{\mu}_a^t$ , which is updated at time  $t$  by computing a convex combination of the local empirical average and a weighted sum of the consensus estimates in its (close) neighborhood  $\{\hat{\mu}_{a'}^{t-1}, a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1} \cup \{a\}\}$ .

The dynamics of all estimates are captured by:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} = (1 - \alpha_t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} + \alpha_t W_t \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^t, \quad (12)$$

where  $(W_t)_{a,a'} = 0$  if  $a' \notin \mathcal{C}_a^t$  and  $\alpha_t \in (0, 1)$  is the memory parameter. Once the agents have discovered which neighbours belong to the same class at time  $\tau$  ( $\tau \leq \zeta_D$  with probability  $1 - \delta/2$ ), the matrix  $W_t$  does not need to change anymore, i.e.,  $W_t = W$  for any  $t \geq \tau$  with  $W_{a,a'} > 0$  if and only if  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ . In order to achieve consensus, the matrix  $W$  needs to be doubly stochastic (Xiao & Boyd, 2004) and we also require it to be symmetric.<sup>5</sup> By time  $\tau$ , the original communication graph is split in  $C$  connected components, where component  $c$  includes  $n_c$  agents. By an opportune permutation of the agents, we can write the matrix  $W$  as follows

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}W & 0_{n_1 \times n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n_1 \times n_C} \\ 0_{n_2 \times n_1} & \mathbf{2}W & \cdots & 0_{n_2 \times n_C} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0_{n_C \times n_1} & 0_{n_C \times n_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}W \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where each matrix  ${}_cW$  is an  $n_c \times n_c$  symmetric stochastic matrix. For  $t \geq \tau$ , the estimates in the different components evolve independently. We can then focus on a given component  $c$ . All agents in the same component share the same expected value, which we denote by  $\mu(c)$ . Moreover, let  ${}_c\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu(c)\mathbf{1}_c$ . We denote by  ${}_c\mathbf{x}^t$  and  ${}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^t$  the  $n_c$ -dimensional vectors containing the samples' empirical averages and the consensus estimates for the agents in component  $c$  and by  $\lambda_{2,c}$  the second largest module of the eigenvalues of  ${}_cW$ . Lemma D.5 proves that  $\lambda_{2,c} < 1$ .

To obtain deeper insights into C-COLME and to support the proof of our  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  convergence results, it is beneficial to consider an auxiliary system. In this system, the consensus matrix may be arbitrary up until time  $\zeta_D$ , after which it transitions to  $W$ .

**Theorem 4.5.** *Consider a system which evolves according to (12) with  $W_t = W$  in (13) for  $t \geq \zeta_D$ . With probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , for  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ , it holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] &\in \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \alpha^{4t} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{(1 - \alpha)^4 \cdot (1 - 1/\ln(\alpha\lambda_{2,c}))^2 \mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\mathbf{x} - {}_cP_c\mathbf{x}\|^4]}{(1 - \alpha\lambda_{2,c})^2 (t+1)^2} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( (1 - \alpha)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\ln \alpha}\right)^2 \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c\mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{(t+1)^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

<sup>5</sup>This condition can be easily obtained in a distributed way, e.g., by setting  $(W_t)_{a,a'} = (\max\{|\mathcal{C}_a^t|, |\mathcal{C}_a'^t|\} + 1)^{-1}$  for all  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t$  and  $(W_t)_{a,a} = 1 - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a^t} (W_t)_{a,a'}$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** C-COLME over a Time Horizon  $H$ 


---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ ,  $(D_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1]$   
**Output:**  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_a$ ,  $\forall a \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_a - \boldsymbol{\mu}_a| < \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$   
 $\mathcal{C}_a^0 \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$   
**for** time  $t$  in  $\{1, \dots, H\}$  **do**  
   In parallel for all nodes  $a \in \mathcal{A}$   
   Draw  $x_a^t \sim D_a$   
    $\bar{x}_a^t \leftarrow \frac{t-1}{t}\bar{x}_a^{t-1} + \frac{1}{t}x_a^t$   
   Compute  $\beta_\gamma(t)$  with Eq. (3) or Eq. (7)  
   **for** neighbor  $a'$  in  $\mathcal{N}_a \cap \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1}$  **do**  
      $d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leftarrow |\bar{x}_a^t - \bar{x}_{a'}^{t-1}| - \beta_\gamma(t) - \beta_\gamma(t-1)$   
   **end for**  
    $\mathcal{C}_a^t \leftarrow \{a' \in \mathcal{N}_a \cap \mathcal{C}_a^{t-1} \text{ s.t. } d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq 0\}$   
    $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_a^t \leftarrow (1 - \alpha_t)\bar{x}_a^t + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cup \{a\}} (W_t)_{a,a'} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{a'}^{t-1}$   
**end for**

---

and, for  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ , it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] &\in \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{(t+1)^4} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{(1 - 1/\ln \lambda_{2,c})^2 \mathbb{E} [\|{}_c\mathbf{x} - {}_cP_c\mathbf{x}\|^4]}{(1 - \lambda_{2,c})^2 (t+1)^4} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c\mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \left( \frac{1 + \ln t}{1 + t} \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The theorem demonstrates that the error, quantified through the fourth moment, can be decomposed in three terms that decrease over time. The first term depends on the estimates' error at time  $\zeta_D$ . The second term reflects the effectiveness of consensus averaging, i.e., how well the algorithm reduces the gap between local estimates  ${}_c\mathbf{x}$  and their empirical average  ${}_cP_c\mathbf{x}$ . This term is minimized when  $\lambda_2 = 0$ , i.e., when  ${}_cW = {}_cP$ , which is, as expected, the best consensus matrix. Finally, the third term represents the theoretical minimum error achievable by averaging the estimates of all agents in the component  $({}_cP_c\mathbf{x})$ .

Theorem 4.5 also reveals that the choice of the memory parameter  $\alpha_t$  affects differently the three terms. In particular, the speedup proportional to the size of the connected component  $|\mathcal{C}_a| = n_c$ , as observed for B-COLME in Theorem 4.3, is not achieved with a constant  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ . However, it becomes attainable when  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ , as it is detailed in the subsequent theorem:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Consider a graph component  $c$  and pick uniformly at random an agent  $a$  in  $c$ , then for  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \forall t > \tau_a'', |\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_a^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_a| < \epsilon \right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

where  $\tau_a'' = \max \left\{ \zeta_D, g \left( C \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c\mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{|\mathcal{C}_a| \epsilon^4 \delta} \right) \right\}$ , and  $g(x) = x \ln^2(ex)$ .

Indeed, it can be shown that  $\tau_a'' \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon)}{|\mathcal{CC}_a|}\right)$ .

### 4.3. Parameter Settings

The choice of the graph  $G(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  significantly influences the performance of our algorithms. Desirable properties for  $G(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  include: i) connectivity for obvious reasons; ii) a local tree structure for B-COLME, as the presence of cycles can jeopardize estimates (note that Theorem 4.3 assumes  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  has a tree structure). To balance computation burden among nodes, iii) similar degrees for nodes are preferable.

For these reasons, we opt for the class of *simple* random regular graphs  $G_0(N, r)$  to support both B-COLME and C-COLME.<sup>6</sup> Random graphs in  $G_0(N, r)$  is obtained by picking uniformly at random a graph among all the  $r$ -regular *simple* graphs with  $N$  nodes (i.e. graphs in which the degree of every node is  $r$ , under the assumption that  $rN$  is even). Such graphs, for any  $r \geq 3$  turn out to be connected with a probability tending to 1, as  $n$  grows large. Moreover, they satisfy a local tree property, as better discussed in E.

Regarding the choice of  $r$ , ( $r \geq 3$  for graph connectivity), reducing it lowers the computational burden per node (since nodes interact with all their neighbors), but also diminishes the expected size of  $\mathcal{CC}_a$  and increases the probability of selecting small connected components, potentially diminishing estimation accuracy (see Theorems 4.3 and 4.6).

A last important parameter of B-COLME is the maximum distance  $d$  at which local estimates of nodes are propagated. Of course  $d$  must be set finite to prevent the ‘‘count-to-infinity’’ phenomenon induced by cycles (with local estimates recirculating indefinitely). Moreover, the validity of Theorem 4.3 depends on the assumption that  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  has a tree structure.

The choice  $d$  requires a delicate balance. On one hand, it should be sufficiently small to ensure that, for a randomly chosen  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  has a tree structure with high probability. On the other hand, selecting a value of  $d$  smaller than necessary may reduce the size of  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$ , compromising the effectiveness of the estimation process (refer to Theorem 4.3). In conclusion, the choice of  $d$  demands careful considerations.

We refer the reader to Appendix E for detailed analysis the impact of parameters  $r$  and  $d$  on the structure of  $\mathcal{N}_d^a$ , as well as on size of  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  and  $\mathcal{CC}_a$ . Here we limit ourselves to informally summarize the main results:

**Proposition 4.7.** *By selecting  $d = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \log_{r-1} \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{\log_{r-1} |\mathcal{A}|} \right\rfloor$  the number of nodes  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , whose  $d$ -neighborhood is not a tree, is  $o(|\mathcal{A}|)$  with a probability tending to 1 as  $|\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \infty$ .*

<sup>6</sup>A graph  $G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is said simple if it has neither multiple edges nor self-loops.

For values of  $r$  sufficiently large, both  $|\mathcal{CC}_a|$  and  $|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|$  (with  $d$  chosen as above) can be made  $\Omega(|\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\phi})$  for an arbitrary small  $\phi > 0$  with a probability arbitrarily close to 1.

## 5. Performance Comparison of algorithms

It is not so easy to compare directly the performance of B-COLME, C-COLME and COLME; we refer the reader to Section 6 for an experimental comparison of the performance of different algorithms. Here we wish to highlight some macroscopic differences in the behavior of COLME and our algorithms: Initially, it’s important to note that errors in identifying similarity classes in COLME do not propagate, meaning that an error in constructing  $\mathcal{C}_a^t$  by an agent  $a$  only impacts the mean estimate  $\mu_a^t$ . However, in our algorithms, errors made by an agent  $a$  can potentially negatively impact every mean estimate  $\hat{\mu}_a^t$  of agents in the same connected component  $\mathcal{CC}_a$ . This unavoidable negative side effect stems from the cooperative, distributed estimation of similarity classes and resulting components. Consequently, in Theorems 4.3 and 4.6, we necessitate  $t > \zeta_D$  to address this issue, while, in Theorem 3.2, we only require  $t > \zeta_a$  (and not the more restrictive condition  $t > \zeta$ ).

When the number of edges in the graph  $|\mathcal{E}| = \Theta(|\mathcal{A}|)$ , observe that time  $n_{a,a}^*(\frac{\delta}{4|\mathcal{A}|})$  in Theorem 3.1 scales as  $n^*(\frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|})$  in Proposition 4.1, while  $n^*(\frac{\delta}{4|\mathcal{A}|^2})$  in Corollary 4.2 scales differently (due to the quadratic dependency on  $|\mathcal{A}|$ ).

As  $|\mathcal{A}|$  grows large,  $\zeta_a$  and  $\zeta$  are significantly impacted by the delay in retrieving local averages induced by the *Round-Robin* scheme of COLME, which scales linearly with  $|\mathcal{A}|$ . Retrieval delay is limited to  $d$  in B-COLME.

In COLME, agent  $a$  can potentially access the local estimates of every agent in  $\mathcal{C}_a$  to build its average estimate  $\hat{\mu}_a^t$ . In B-COLME (C-COLME), the ‘‘local estimate sharing’’ is confined to agents  $a' \in \mathcal{CC}_a^d$  or  $a' \in (\mathcal{CC}_a)$ . However, the round-robin mechanism in COLME introduces retrieval delays, which, particularly when  $|\mathcal{C}_a|$  is large, might delete this potential advantage. For instance, it can lead to  $\frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon)}{|\mathcal{C}_a|} + \frac{|\mathcal{C}_a|-1}{2} > \frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon)}{|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|} + d$  when B-COLME is considered.

## 6. Performance Evaluation

We evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms over a  $G_0(N, r)$ , which provides the tree-like structure needed for the B-COLME and, in general, effectively models a situation where a computational node randomly connects to  $r$  other nodes. The agents can be of one of two *similarity* classes, associated with Gaussian distributions  $D_{c=1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{c=1} = 0, \sigma^2)$  and  $D_{c=2} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{c=2} = 1, \sigma^2)$ , which are uniformly assigned to each node at initialization.

As benchmarks, we take an *oracle* and a *local* estimate. In




Figure 1. Average probability of correct estimation with a 0.95 confidence interval (top), and normalized number of wrong (directed) links between nodes of different classes (bottom), evaluated over 20 realizations for the B-COLME (a) and the C-COLME (b).

the former, each node knows whether a neighbor belongs to the same class or not, i.e.,  $C_a^t = C_a \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ . In the latter, each node only considers its own *local estimate*  $\bar{x}_{a,a}^t$ .

Figure 1 presents the empirical error probability (i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}(\text{error}) = \frac{|\{a \in \mathcal{A} : |\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a| > \varepsilon\}|}{N}$ ) for B-COLME (a) and C-COLME (b), when  $|\mathcal{A}| = N = 10000$ ,  $r = 10$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.1$ ,  $\delta = 0.1$  and the  $\beta_\gamma(n)$  as per Eq. (3).

B-COLME undergoes a transient phase lasting approximately 800 iterations during which it fails to provide satisfactory predictions. This challenge arises because the nodes, as illustrated in the bottom plot of Fig. 1 (a), have not yet identified correctly their *similarity class*. In C-COLME, the error probability declines earlier, but at a slower pace, compared to B-COLME. This phenomenon stems from the distinct mechanisms employed by the two algorithms for averaging local estimates. B-COLME adopts a fast direct averaging mechanism of local estimates within a distance  $d$ , while C-COLME incorporates a more mediated and a slower convergence averaging approach, with local estimate carrying more weight during the transient phase. In Appendix F we provide additional experiments varying the system’s parameters.




Figure 2. Comparison of our algorithms and the two versions of COLME, on a  $G_0(N = 10000, r = 10)$  over 10 realizations.

We also compare the proposed algorithms with the original

versions of COLME, and a simplified version (s-COLME) in which the optimistic distance  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  is recomputed only for the  $v$  other agents that are queried at time  $t$ , achieving  $\Theta(|\mathcal{A}|)$  computational cost. For both versions, we set  $v = r = 10$  (i.e., at each communication round each node queries 10 other nodes). First, we observe that both algorithms outperform s-COLME, for which there is a sizeable delay due to the *Round-Robin* communication scheme. This issue is partially addressed by the COLME which reevaluates the *optimistic* neighbors at each step, as it computes the estimate. This makes the same-class-neighbors discovery quicker (see the bottom plot in Fig. 2) at a great computational expense ( $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|^2)$ ). We would like to stress that both our approaches are able to attain comparable (or better) results with respect to COLME, limiting the communication to only neighboring nodes, and keeping the memory and per-time complexity as  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}|)$  for the B-COLME and  $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot |\mathcal{A}|)$  for the C-COLME, making them implementable in large-scale systems.

Furthermore, we apply our algorithms in the context of federated learning, where the goal of the agents is to learn an ML model. We use a modified version of C-COLME (details in Appendix G) in a toy network with 6 nodes where there exist two communities with different (MNIST) datasets connected by a “wrong” link. We compare here the average accuracy of our ML-C-COLME against a classic consensus-based FL as baseline .

## 7. Conclusions

In this paper, we have introduced B-COLME and C-COLME, two scalable, fully distributed algorithms for the cooperative estimation of the local mean. The performance of our algorithms has been thoroughly assessed both theoretically and experimentally. Our algorithms can be generalized/adapted to expedite the process of cooperatively learning a personalized model within the context of federated learning.






Figure 3. (a) Accuracy of the ML-C-COLME compared with baseline. (b) Average cosine similarity for all links in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

## 8. Impact Statement

This paper aims to provide a better theoretical understanding of collaborative learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

## References

- Adi, E., Anwar, A., Baig, Z., and Zeadally, S. Machine learning and data analytics for the iot. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32(20):16205–16233, May 2020. ISSN 1433-3058. doi: 10.1007/s00521-020-04874-y.
- Amini, H. Bootstrap percolation and diffusion in random graphs with given vertex degrees. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 17(1), February 2010. doi: 10.37236/297.
- Asadi, M., Bellet, A., Maillard, O.-A., and Tommasi, M. Collaborative Algorithms for Online Personalized Mean Estimation. 2022. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Beaussart, M., Grimberg, F., Hartley, M.-A., and Jaggi, M. Waffle: Weighted averaging for personalized federated learning, 2021.
- Chayti, E. M., Karimireddy, S. P., Stich, S. U., Flammarion, N., and Jaggi, M. Linear speedup in personalized collaborative learning, 2022.
- Deng, L. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.
- Digital Library of Mathematical Functions. Asymptotic expansions: Exponential and logarithmic integral, 2023. [Online; accessed 23-January-2024].
- Ding, S. and Wang, W. Collaborative Learning by Detecting Collaboration Partners. 35:15629–15641, 2022.
- Donahue, K. and Kleinberg, J. Model-sharing Games: Analyzing Federated Learning Under Voluntary Participation. volume 35, pp. 5303–5311, 2021.
- Even, M., Massoulié, L., and Scaman, K. On Sample Optimality in Personalized Collaborative and Federated Learning. volume 35, pp. 212–225, 2022.
- Fallah, A., Mokhtari, A., and Ozdaglar, A. Personalized federated learning with theoretical guarantees: A model-agnostic meta-learning approach. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 3557–3568. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- Ghosh, A., Chung, J., Yin, D., and Ramchandran, K. An Efficient Framework for Clustered Federated Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 19586–19597. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- Grimberg, F., Hartley, M.-A., Karimireddy, S. P., and Jaggi, M. Optimal model averaging: Towards personalized collaborative learning, 2021.
- Janson, S. The probability that a random multigraph is simple. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 18(1-2):205–225, 2009. doi: 10.1017/S0963548308009644.
- Kairouz, P., McMahan, H. B., Avent, B., Bellet, A., Bennis, M., Nitin Bhagoji, A., Bonawitz, K., Charles, Z., Cormode, G., Cummings, R., D’Oliveira, R. G. L., Eichner, H., El Rouayheb, S., Evans, D., Gardner, J., Garrett, Z., Gascón, A., Ghazi, B., Gibbons, P. B., Gruteser, M., Harchaoui, Z., He, C., He, L., Huo, Z., Hutchinson, B., Hsu, J., Jaggi, M., Javidi, T., Joshi, G., Khodak, M., Konečný, J., Korolova, A., Koushanfar, F., Koyejo, S., Lepoint, T., Liu, Y., Mittal, P., Mohri, M., Nock, R., Özgür, A., Pagh, R., Qi, H., Ramage, D., Raskar, R., Raykova, M., Song, D., Song, W., Stich, S. U., Sun, Z., Suresh, A. T., Tramèr, F., Vepakomma, P., Wang, J., Xiong, L., Xu, Z., Yang, Q., Yu, F. X., Yu, H., and Zhao, S. Advances and Open Problems in Federated Learning. 14(1-2):1–210, 2021. ISSN 1935-8237, 1935-8245. doi: 10.1561/22000000083.
- Li, T., Sahu, A. K., Talwalkar, A., and Smith, V. Federated Learning: Challenges, Methods, and Future Directions, 2020. ISSN 1053-5888, 1558-0792. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.07873>.
- Li, T., Hu, S., Beirami, A., and Smith, V. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In Meila, M. and Zhang, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 6357–6368. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.

- Maillard, O.-A. *Mathematics of Statistical Sequential Decision Making*. Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université de Lille Nord de France, February 2019.
- Mansour, Y., Mohri, M., Ro, J., and Suresh, A. T. Three Approaches for Personalization with Applications to Federated Learning, 2020.
- Marfoq, O., Neglia, G., Bellet, A., Kameni, L., and Vidal, R. Federated multi-task learning under a mixture of distributions. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- McKay, B. D. and Wormald, N. C. Uniform generation of random regular graphs of moderate degree. *Journal of Algorithms*, 11(1):52–67, 1990. ISSN 0196-6774. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0196-6774\(90\)90029-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0196-6774(90)90029-E).
- Meyer, C. D. *Matrix Analysis and Applied Linear Algebra*. SIAM, 2001.
- Rossi, W. S., Como, G., and Fagnani, F. Threshold models of cascades in large-scale networks. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, 6(2):158–172, 2019. doi: 10.1109/TNSE.2017.2777941.
- Sattler, F., Müller, K.-R., and Samek, W. Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 32(8):3710–3722, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2020.3015958.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Ben-David, S. *Understanding Machine Learning - From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. ISBN 978-1-10-705713-5.
- Tan, A. Z., Yu, H., Cui, L., and Yang, Q. Towards Personalized Federated Learning. 34(12):9587–9603, 2023. ISSN 2162-237X, 2162-2388. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3160699.
- Vershynin, R. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Xiao, L. and Boyd, S. Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging. *Systems & Control Letters*, 53(1):65–78, 2004. ISSN 0167-6911. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2004.02.022>.

## A. Appendix - Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this Appendix we provide the proof of Theorem 4.1 and, as side result we derive of (7). For the sake of clarity, we repeat the statement of the theorems. The proof of the results in Section 3.1 can be found in (Asadi et al., 2022).

The first theoretical result provides a bound on the probability that the nodes of the graph misidentify their *true* neighbors  $\mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ . We remark that, unlike COLME, the *goodness* of an estimate of our *scalable* algorithms depends not only on the ability of a given node to correctly identify its neighborhood but also on the neighborhood estimates of all other nodes. Communication between nodes (i.e., message passing or consensus mechanism) allows for error propagation within a connected component. Therefore, when bounding the probability of incorrect neighborhood estimation we have to take a network perspective, which influences the choice of  $\gamma$ .

**Theorem A.1** (Incorrect neighborhood estimation). *For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing B-COLME or C-COLME we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t > \zeta_D, \exists a \in \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{C}_a^t \neq \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a) \leq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

with  $\zeta_D = n^*(\gamma) + 1$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|}$ .

*Proof.* The proof involves establishing a series of intermediate results that finally enable us to prove the theorem. We outline the steps of the proof below:

- First, we show that under the two proposed confidence interval parametrizations  $\beta_\gamma(n)$  (Eq. (3) and (7)) the probability that the *true* mean  $\mu$ , computed over  $n$  samples, falls within the confidence interval  $[\bar{x} - \beta_\gamma(n), \bar{x} + \beta_\gamma(n)]$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , is at least  $1 - 2\gamma$ . This is completely equivalent to saying that the probability that the *true* mean value is outside the confidence interval for some  $n \in \mathcal{N}$  is bounded above by  $2\gamma$  (Lemma A.2).
- Second, we remark that Lemma A.2 considers a *local* perspective, taking one particular estimate  $\bar{x}$  (i.e.,  $\bar{x}_{a,a'}$ ), together with its number of samples  $n$  (i.e.,  $n_{a,a'}$ ). We extend this result by proving that the true mean falls within the confidence interval  $I_{a,a'}$  (with high probability) for all the nodes  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , for all records retrieved locally from the neighbors ( $a' \in \mathcal{N}_a$ ), and for every time instant  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  (Lemma A.5). We will refer to this event as  $E$ . This result provides a *global* perspective of the entire collaborative network. It is important to observe that only when the *true* value is in  $I_{a,a'}$ , we can provide guarantees about the correct estimation of the similarity class.
- Then, we consider the *optimistic distance*  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  for which we show that, conditionally over  $E$ , whenever it assumes strictly positive values (i.e.,  $d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0$ ), the neighbor  $a'$  does not belong to the same similarity class  $\mathcal{C}_a$  as agent  $a$  (Lemma A.6). As a byproduct, we also derive the minimal number of samples  $n^*(\gamma)$  needed to correctly decide whether a neighboring node belongs to the same equivalence class.
- At last, combining previous results we can easily obtain the claim.

**Lemma A.2** (Interval parametrization). *For any  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , setting  $\beta_\gamma(n) = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\gamma}}$  (if the random variables  $x_t$  are sub-Gaussian with parameter  $\sigma$ ) or  $\beta_\gamma(n) = Hn^{-\alpha}$ , with  $\alpha < \frac{1}{4}$  and  $H = \sqrt[4]{\frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4\zeta(2-4\alpha)}{\gamma}}$  (if  $x_t$  have the first 4 polynomial moments bounded), it holds:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| \geq \beta_\gamma(n)) \leq 2\gamma \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* ( $\sigma$ -sub-Gaussian  $x_t$ ) We start from the theoretical guarantees on the parametrization (Eq. 3) of the confidence intervals from (Maillard, 2019) [Lemma 2.7]: Let  $\{x_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of independent real-valued random variables, where for each  $t$ ,  $x_t$  has mean  $\mu_t$  and is  $\sigma_t$ -sub-Gaussian. Then, for all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \sum_{t=1}^n (x_t - \mu_t) \geq \sqrt{2 \sum_{t=1}^n \sigma_t^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\gamma}}\right) &\leq \gamma \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \sum_{t=1}^n (\mu_t - x_t) \geq \sqrt{2 \sum_{t=1}^n \sigma_t^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\gamma}}\right) &\leq \gamma \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Our sequence of random variables can i) either correspond to the samples  $x_t$  each node  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  generates at each discrete time instant  $t$ , which is i.i.d., with mean  $\mu_a$  and  $\sigma$ -sub-Gaussian (by assumption), or ii) the truncated sequence up to  $n_{a,a'}$  the node learns by querying its neighbors, possessing the same properties. Indeed, recall that for each *locally* available estimate  $\bar{x}_{a,a'}$ , each node keeps also the number of samples over which that estimate has been computed  $n_{a,a'}^t$ . For ease of notation we will drop the subscripts and superscripts, which for the sake of the lemma are superfluous. Being  $\mu_{n'} = \mu$  and  $\sigma_{n'} = \sigma$  constant in our case, it is immediate to write (considering just the first inequality for compactness):

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \sum_{t=1}^n (x_t) - n\mu \geq \sqrt{2n\sigma^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\gamma}} \right) \leq \gamma$$

Dividing by  $n$  both sides we obtain the sample mean  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n x_t$  (in place of the summation) and the parametrization of confidence interval  $\beta_\gamma(n)$ , as we have introduced in Section 3 (which we restate here for completeness):

$$\beta_\gamma(n) := \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\gamma}} \quad (18)$$

By a simple substitution, we get:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \bar{x} - \mu \geq \beta_\gamma(n)) \leq \gamma \quad (19)$$

Lastly, recall we are interested in the probability of the true mean being in the bilateral interval bounded by the given parametrization  $\beta_\gamma$ . Hence we can bound this probability with  $2\gamma$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| \geq \beta_\gamma(n)) \leq 2\gamma$$

This proves the first part of the lemma. Moreover, considering the complementary event and noting that  $\mathbb{P}(e) \leq 2\gamma \iff \mathbb{P}(e^c) \geq 1 - 2\gamma$ , where  $e$  is a generic event and  $e^c$  its complementary, it is immediate to obtain the lower bound (complementary to Eq. 16):

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| < \beta_\gamma(n)) \geq 1 - 2\gamma \quad (20)$$

Note also that the probabilistic confidence level  $\gamma$  can be considered as a function of  $\delta$ . By choosing appropriately the function  $\gamma = f(\delta)$  it is possible to provide the desired level  $\delta$  for the PAC-convergence of a given algorithm.

**( $x^t$  with the first 4 bounded polynomial moments).** Now we release the assumption that  $x_t$  are extracted from sub-Gaussians distributions. We only assume that  $\mathbb{E}[(x_a^t - \mu_a)^4] \leq \mu_4$  for any  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ .

We start recalling the class of concentration inequalities which generalize the classical Chebyshev inequality:

**Proposition A.3.** *Given a random variable  $X$  with average  $\mu < \infty$  and finite  $2i$ -central moment  $\mathbb{E}[(X - \mu)^{2i}] = \mu_{(2i)}(X)$  for any  $b > 0$  we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mu| > b) < \frac{\mu_{(2i)}(X)}{(b)^{2i}}$$

Applying previous inequality to our estimate  $\bar{x} = \sum_{t=1}^n x^t$  for the case  $i = 2$  we get:

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta(n)) < \frac{\mu_{(4)}(\bar{x})}{(\beta(n))^4}.$$



Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{(4)}(\bar{x}) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t=1}^n (x^t - \mu) \sum_{\tau=1}^n (x^\tau - \mu) \sum_{\theta=1}^n (x^\theta - \mu) \sum_{\phi=1}^n (x^\phi - \mu) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\tau=1}^n \sum_{\theta=1}^n \sum_{\phi=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(x^t - \mu)(x^\tau - \mu)(x^\theta - \mu)(x^\phi - \mu)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^4} [n\kappa\sigma^4 + 3n(n-1)\sigma^4]\end{aligned}$$

observe, indeed, that from the independence of samples descends that whenever  $t \notin \{\tau, \theta, \phi\}$

$$\mathbb{E}[(x^t - \mu)(x^\tau - \mu)(x^\theta - \mu)(x^\phi - \mu)] = \mathbb{E}[(x^t - \mu)]\mathbb{E}[(x^\tau - \mu)(x^\theta - \mu)(x^\phi - \mu)] = 0$$

while whenever  $t = \tau \neq \theta = \phi$

$$\mathbb{E}[(x^t - \mu)(x^\tau - \mu)(x^\theta - \mu)(x^\phi - \mu)] = \mathbb{E}[(x^t - \mu)^2]\mathbb{E}[(x^\theta - \mu)^2] \leq \sigma^4.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta(n)) < \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{(n^3\beta(n))^4} + \frac{3\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4}.$$

Now by sub-additivity of probability we get:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta(n)) = \mathbb{P}(\cup_n \{|\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta(n)\}) < \sum_n \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{n^3(\beta(n))^4} + \sum_n \frac{3\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4}.$$

Now observe that  $\{\beta(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  on the one hand should be chosen as small as possible and in particular we should enforce  $\beta(n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n$  grows large; on the other hand, however the choice of  $\{\beta(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  must guarantee that:

$$\sum_n \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{n^3(\beta(n))^4} + \sum_n \frac{\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4} \leq 2\gamma$$

This is possible if by choosing  $\beta(n) = Hn^{-\alpha}$  for an  $\alpha < \frac{1}{4}$  arbitrarily close to  $1/4$  and a properly chosen  $H$ . Indeed with this choice of  $\beta(n)$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_n \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{n^3(\beta(n))^4} + \sum_n \frac{3\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4} &= \sum_n \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{H^4 n^{3-4\alpha}} + \sum_n \frac{3\sigma^4}{H^4 n^{2-4\alpha}} = \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H^4} \sum_n \frac{1}{n^{2-4\alpha}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H^4} \sum_n \frac{1}{n^{2-4\alpha}} = \frac{2(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H^4} \zeta(2-4\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta(z) := \sum_n \frac{1}{n^z}$ , with  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , denotes the  $\zeta$ -Riemann function. We recall that  $\zeta(x) < \infty$  for any real  $x > 1$ . Therefore by selecting

$$\beta_\gamma(n) = Hn^{-\alpha} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha < \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \sqrt[4]{\frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4\zeta(2-4\alpha)}{\gamma}}$$

we guarantee that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta_\gamma(n)) < 2\gamma.$$

A tighter expression can be obtained as follows. Set  $\beta(n) = \left(\frac{H(1+\ln^2 n)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa\sigma^4}{n^3(\beta(n))^4} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{3\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4} &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{n^2(\beta(n))^4} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{n(1+\ln^2 n)} \\
 &\leq \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H} \left(1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(1+\ln^2 n)}\right) \\
 &\leq \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H} \left(1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n\ln^2 n}\right) \\
 &\leq \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\ln^2 2} + \int_2^{\infty} \frac{1}{x\ln^2 x} dx\right) \\
 &= \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\ln^2 2} + \frac{1}{\ln 2}\right) \\
 &\leq 4 \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{H}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Imposing that this is smaller than  $2\gamma$ , we can concluded that by selecting

$$\beta_\gamma(n) = \left(2 \frac{\kappa+3\sigma^4}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{1+\ln^2 n}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

we guarantee that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta_\gamma(n)) < 2\gamma.$$

*Remark A.4.* When  $x^t$  exhibits a larger number of finite moments we can refine our approach by employing Proposition (A.3) for a different (larger) choice of  $i$ . So doing we obtain a more favorable behavior for  $\beta_\gamma(n)$ . In particular we will get that

$$\beta_\gamma(n) = O(n^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha < \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{i}\right)$$

At last we wish to emphasize that  $\beta_\gamma(n)$  can not be properly defined when distribution  $D_a$  exhibit less than four bounded polynomial moments. The application of Chebyshev inequality ( $i = 1$ ), indeed, would lead to a too the following weak upper bound:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| > \beta(n)) < \sum_n \frac{\sigma^2}{n(\beta(n))^2}.$$

Observe, indeed, that since  $\zeta(1) = \sum_n \frac{1}{n}$  diverges, it is impossible the find of suitable expression for  $\{\beta(n)\}$  which jointly satisfy:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(n) = 0$  and  $\sum_n \frac{\sigma^2}{n(\beta(n))^2} < \infty$ .

□

This result is the first fundamental building block to define a notion of distance (which uses the estimates  $\bar{x}$  and the parametrization  $\beta_\gamma$ ) for which it is possible to provide guarantees about the class membership.

We have bounded the probability of not having the *true* mean within the  $\beta_\gamma$  confidence interval given a certain estimate  $\bar{x}$  and the corresponding number of samples  $n$ . We now have to take a global perspective, so we consider the event  $E := \{\forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall a' \in \mathcal{N}_a, |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| < \beta_\gamma(n)\}$ , which is equivalent to say that, for every node  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  in the network and for every instant  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , the *true* mean value of each of  $a$ 's neighbors  $a'$ , given the info  $a$  is able to collect (neighbor's sample mean and number of samples), is within the confidence interval  $I_{a,a'}$ . We show that this holds with high probability with an appropriate choice of  $\gamma$ :

**Lemma A.5** (Confidence of  $\beta_\gamma$  interval). *Considering the interval parametrization  $\beta_\gamma(n)$ , setting  $\gamma(\delta) = \frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|}$ , it holds:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall a' \in \mathcal{N}_a, |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| < \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* We have introduced the event  $E = \{\forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall a' \in \mathcal{N}_a, |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| < \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)\}$ , it is more convenient to use the complementary event:

$$\mathbb{P}(E) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(E^c) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\exists a \in \mathcal{A}, \exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists a' \in \mathcal{N}_a : |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| > \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t))$$

Applying a union bound with respect to the nodes  $a$  and neighbors  $a'$ , and using Lemma A.2 ( $\mathbb{P}(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, |\bar{x} - \mu| \leq \beta_\gamma) \geq 2\gamma$ ), we can immediately obtain a lower bound on the probability of the event  $E$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E) &\geq 1 - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{N}_a} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| \geq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)) \\ &\geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{E}|(2\gamma) = 1 - 4|\mathcal{E}|\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Now, we set  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|}$  and thus we immediately obtain  $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ . This explains the value of the constant  $\gamma$  in the theorem. The above bound would then be used in the  $(\varepsilon - \delta)$ -convergence of the B-COLME and C-COLME algorithm.  $\square$

This result provides a probabilistic bound for the situation in which the true value is not within the confidence interval and for which we cannot provide theoretical guarantees.

At this point, assuming that event  $E$  holds (with high probability due to Lemma A.5), we need to show that the *optimistic* distance  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  allows an agent to discriminate whether one of its neighbors belongs to the same similarity class  $\mathcal{C}_a$ .

**Lemma A.6** (Class membership rule). *Conditionally over the event  $E$ , we have*

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0 \iff a' \notin \mathcal{N}_a \cap \mathcal{C}_a \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Defined the *optimistic* distance as  $d_\gamma^t(a, a') := |\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \bar{x}_{a,a'}^t| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$  and denoted with  $\Delta_{a,a'} = |\mu_a - \mu_{a'}|$  the gaps between the *true* mean of agents belonging to different similarity classes, by summing and subtracting  $(\mu_a - \mu_{a'})$  inside the absolute value, it is immediate to obtain:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') = |(\mu_a - \mu_{a'}) + (\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a) - (\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'})| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) \quad (23)$$

Now, we show that conditionally over the event  $E$ ,  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  satisfies two inequalities which allow us to determine whether two nodes belong to the same similarity class by looking at the sign of  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$ .

**(Forward implication)** First, let us apply the triangular inequality on the absolute value in Eq. (23) and bound it with the sum of the absolute values of the addends:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq \Delta_{a,a'} + |\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a| + |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$$

Now, conditionally over  $E$ , we have that  $|\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a| \leq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t)$  and  $|\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| \leq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$ . Therefore whenever  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_{a,a'} = 0$ , we have:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq |\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) + |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) \leq 0$$

So, conditionally over  $E$ , and if  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a$  the optimistic distance  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  is smaller or equal than 0, i.e.,  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a \implies d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq 0$ . Considering the contrapositive statement, we immediately prove the **forward implication** of the lemma, namely:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0 \implies a' \notin \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a.$$

**(Backward implication)** At this point, we need to show that conditionally over the event  $E$ , whenever two nodes do not belong to the same similarity class, then the optimistic distance is positive (i.e.,  $a' \notin \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a \implies d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0$ ). To do so, we start from Eq. (23), aiming at deriving a lower bound for  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$ . By applying the reverse triangular inequality ( $|a - b| > ||a| - |b|| \implies |a| - |b| \leq |a - b|$ ):

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') \geq |\Delta_{a,a'} + (\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a)| - |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$$

And then recalling that  $|a + b| \geq |a| - |b|$ , we get:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') \geq \Delta_{a,a'} - |(\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a)| - |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$$

Again, conditionally over  $E$ , and we have  $|\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a| \leq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t)$  and  $|\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| \leq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$ . Therefore we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} d_\gamma^t(a, a') &\geq \Delta_{a,a'} - |(\bar{x}_{a,a}^t - \mu_a)| - |\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t - \mu_{a'}| - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) \\ &\geq \Delta_{a,a'} - 2\beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) - 2\beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, consider that by definition<sup>7</sup> we have  $n_{a,a}^t \geq n_{a,a'}^t$ , thus  $\beta_\gamma(n_{a,a}^t) \leq \beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$ , so we can write:

$$d_\gamma^t(a, a') \geq \Delta_{a,a'} - 4\beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t)$$

Now we need to observe that, whereas conditionally over  $E$  in the previous case ( $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a$ ) the optimistic distance always keeps negative (simply take in mind that by definition  $\beta_\gamma(0) = +\infty$ ). When neighbor  $a'$  belongs to a different similarity class of  $a$  (i.e.,  $a' \notin \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a$ ), the optimistic distance  $d_\gamma^t(a, a')$  will become positive (thus signaling  $a$  and  $a'$  belong to different similarity classes), as soon as the collected number of samples  $n_{a,a'}^t$  becomes sufficiently large to guarantee  $\beta_\gamma(n_{a,a'}^t) < \frac{\Delta_{a,a'}}{4}$ .

Now denoted with  $\beta_\gamma^{-1}(x)$  the inverse function of  $\beta_\gamma(n)$ , and defined:

$$n_{a,a'}^* = \left\lceil \beta_\gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta_{a,a'}}{4} \right) \right\rceil, \quad (24)$$

conditionally over  $E$ ,  $\forall n_{a,a'} \geq n_{a,a'}^*$ , we have  $a' \notin \mathcal{C}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_a \implies d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0$ . And this proves the **backward** implication, which concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

To conclude our proof, observe that according to our scalable algorithms, at each time instant  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  each node  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  queries all the nodes that were in its *estimated* similarity class at the previous step (for  $t = 0$  all the neighbors  $a' \in \mathcal{N}_a$  are contacted). Therefore, all received estimates  $\bar{x}_{a,a'}^t$  suffer for a delay of 1 time instant, i.e.,  $n_{a,a'} = t - 1$ . Now, Lemma A.5 ensures that, by choosing  $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{8|\mathcal{E}|}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Moreover, defined:

$$n^* = \left\lceil \beta_\gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta}{4} \right) \right\rceil \quad (25)$$

where  $\Delta = \min_a \min_{a' \in \mathcal{N}_a \setminus \mathcal{N}_a \cap \mathcal{C}_a} \Delta_{a,a'}$ ; by Lemma A.6 we have that, conditionally over  $E$ , as soon as  $t - 1 \geq n^*$ ,  $d_\gamma^t(a, a') > 0$  for all pairs of neighboring nodes  $(a, a')$  belonging to different similarity classes, while  $d_\gamma^t(a, a') \leq 0$  for all pairs of neighboring nodes  $(a, a')$  belonging to the same similarity class.  $\square$

## B. Appendix - Schematic Representation for B-COLME

We provide a sketch for the functioning of the B-COLME which, together with Algorithm 1 provides a detailed explanation of the proposed algorithm.

<sup>7</sup>As a matter of fact, for our scalable algorithms, the inequality is always strict as  $n_{a,a}^t = t$  and  $n_{a,a'}^t = t - 1$ .






Figure 4. Simplified illustration of the functioning of the B-COLME algorithm from the point of view of node  $a$  (all the quantities are already aggregated in the messages  $m_{h,i}^{t,a' \rightarrow a}$ , so that to exclude the “self” info sent by  $a$ ).

### C. Appendix - Proof for B-COLME - Theorem 4.3

First, we recall the notion of  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -convergence (also referred to as PAC-convergence), that we use to assess theoretically the performance of the estimation algorithms. The definition is as follows:

**Definition C.1** (PAC-convergence). An estimation procedure for agent  $a$  is called  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -convergent if there exist  $\tau_a \in \mathbb{N}$  such that:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t > \tau_a, |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| \leq \varepsilon) > 1 - \delta$$

Here we provide a convergence result in the sense of the above definition for B-COLME, we will derive a similar result for C-COLME in Appendix D.

**Theorem C.2.** Provided that  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  has a tree structure, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , employing B-COLME( $d$ ), we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall t > \tau'_a, |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$$

$$\text{with } \tau'_a = \max \left[ \zeta_D + d, \frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|} + d \right]$$

where

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) := \begin{cases} \min_n \left\{ n : \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} 2Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma} \right) < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} & \text{Gaussian distributions} \\ \min_n \left\{ n : \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} 2 \exp \left( -\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} & \text{sub-Gaussian distributions} \\ \min_n \left\{ n : \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_4 + 2(\sigma^2)^2}{(\varepsilon n)^2} < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} & \text{distrib. with bounded fourth moment} \end{cases}$$

with

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) \leq \begin{cases} \left\lceil \left[ -\frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2}} \right) \right) \right] \right\rceil & \text{Gaussian distributions} \\ \left\lceil \left[ -\frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\varepsilon\delta}{2\sigma} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2}} \right) \right) \right] \right\rceil & \text{sub-Gaussian distributions} \\ \left\lceil \frac{2(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\delta\varepsilon^4} \right\rceil & \text{distrib. with bounded fourth moment} \end{cases}$$

where we recall that Gaussian distributions belong to the class of sub-Gaussians, and therefore the bound derived for sub-Gaussian distributions, can be applied also to Gaussian.

*Proof.* We start considering the case in which the distribution of samples for every agent  $a$  is Gaussian (normal) with the same standard deviation  $\sigma$ , i.e.  $D_a = \mathcal{N}(\mu_a, \sigma)$ ,  $\forall a$ . In such a case, if we consider an empirical average  $\bar{x}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n x_t$  where  $x_t$  are i.i.d extracted from  $D_a$ , for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) = 2Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right)$$

indeed observe that  $\bar{x}(n)$ , as immediate consequence of the elementary properties of normal random variables, is distributed as a Gaussian, with zero mean and standard deviation equal to  $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$ .

Then given an arbitrary  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n > n_0 : |\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) = \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} 2Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right)$$

Observe that  $\sum_1^{\infty} 2Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right)$  converges, therefore we can safely define

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) := \min_{n_0} \left\{ n_0 : \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} 2Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right) < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}.$$

Now, to conclude the proof, observe that conditionally over the fact that  $\mathcal{C}_a^t = \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a$  for every time  $t \geq t_0 - d$ , agent  $a$  computes its average  $\hat{\mu}_a$  as an average of samples collected by all agents in  $\mathcal{C}_a^d$ . Such samples are i.i.d. and follows  $D_a$ ; moreover its number easily lower bounded by  $|\mathcal{C}_a^d|(t_0 - d)$ . Therefore whenever  $|\mathcal{C}_a^d|(t_0 - d) \geq \tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$  by the definition of  $\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists t > t_0 : |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| > \varepsilon \mid |\mathcal{C}_a^d|(t_0 - d) \geq \tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}, \mathcal{C}_a^{t_0-d} = \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

The claim descends from the definition of  $\zeta_D$  in Theorem 4.1.

Now consider the more general case in which the distribution of samples at nodes are Gaussian with possibly different standard deviations, uniformly bounded by  $\sigma$ , i.e.,  $D_a = \mathcal{N}(\mu_a, \sigma_a)$  with  $\sigma_a \leq \sigma$ ,  $\forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ . In such a case if we consider an empirical average  $\bar{x}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n x_t$  of independent samples  $x_t$  extracted from Gaussian distributions with the same average  $\mu_a$ , but with possibly different standard deviations  $\sigma_a \leq \sigma$ , we have that  $\bar{x}(n)$  is distributed as a Gaussian with zero mean and standard deviation smaller or equal than  $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$ . Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) \leq 2Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right)$$

and we can proceed exactly as in the previous case.

Now previous approach rather immediately extends to the case in which  $D_a$  are sub-Gaussian with parameter  $\sigma$ , since in this case  $\bar{x}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n x_t$  of independent samples  $x_t$  extracted from sub-Gaussian distributions with parameter  $\sigma$  having the same average  $\mu_a$  is sub-Gaussian with parameter  $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$  and zero mean, and therefore by definition of sub-Gaussian (see (Vershynin, 2018) for a discussion about sub-Gaussian distributions and their properties):

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

Now since  $\sum_1^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  is a converging geometrical series, we can safely define

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) := \min_{n_0} \left\{ n_0 : \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}.$$

and proceed as in the previous case.

At last consider the case in which  $\mu_a$  have a fourth central moment uniformly bounded by  $\mu_4$ , and a variance uniformly bounded by  $\sigma^2$ . In this case considering the empirical  $\bar{x}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n x_t$  of independent samples  $x_t$  extracted from arbitrary distributions with the same average  $\mu_a$ , following the same approach as in the proof of Proposition A.3 we can bound its fourth moment as:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a)^4] \leq \frac{1}{n^4} [n\kappa + 3n(n-1)]\sigma^4$$

Therefore applying Chebyshev inequality (see Proposition A.3) we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| \geq \varepsilon) < \frac{\mathbb{E}[(\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a)^4]}{\varepsilon^4} \leq \frac{1}{(\varepsilon n)^4} [n\kappa + 3n(n-1)]\sigma^4$$

Then given an arbitrary  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n > n_0, |\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{x}(n) - \mu_a| > \varepsilon) = \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\varepsilon n)^4} [n\kappa + 3n(n-1)]\sigma^4 \leq \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{(\varepsilon^4 n^2)}$$

again  $\sum_1^{\infty} \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^4 n^2}$  converges, therefore we can define

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\varepsilon) = \min_{n_0} \left\{ n_0 : \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^4 n^2} < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}$$

Then we can proceed exactly as in previous cases.

As last step, now we derive easy upper bounds for  $\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ . We start from the last case. We have

$$\sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \int_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(x-1)^2} dx = \frac{1}{n_0}$$

and

$$\sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^4 n^2} \leq \frac{(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\varepsilon^4 n_0} \quad n_0 > 1$$

From which we obtain that:

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq \left\lceil \frac{2(\kappa+3)\sigma^4}{\delta\varepsilon^4} \right\rceil$$

Now considering the Gaussian case, in this case we can exploit the following well known bounds for  $Q(x)$ :

$$\frac{x}{1+x^2}\theta(x) < Q(x) < \frac{1}{x}\theta(x) \quad \forall x \geq 0$$

with  $\theta(x) = \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ . Therefore

$$\sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right) \leq \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi n}\varepsilon} \leq \sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\varepsilon} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi}\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{n_0\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}$$

with

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}}$$

Therefore imposing

$$\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi}\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}} \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$$

we obtain the following upper bound on  $\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq \left\lceil -\frac{2\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\varepsilon\delta}{2\sigma} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right) \right) \right\rceil$$

At last consider the sub-Gaussian case:

$$\sum_{n_0+1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{n_0\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{n_0\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}$$

from which we obtain:

$$\tilde{n}_{\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq \left\lceil -\frac{2\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right) \right) \right\rceil$$

□



## D. Appendix - Proofs for C-COLME - Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.6

It is convenient to consider an auxiliary system for which the consensus matrix can be arbitrary until time  $\zeta_d$  and then switches to a situation where agents only communicate with their neighbours belonging to the same class, i.e.,  $W_t = W$  for any  $t \geq \zeta_d$  and  $W_{a,a'} > 0$  if and only if  $a' \in \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ .

We will derive some bounds for the auxiliary system for any choice of the matrices  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\gamma_D}$ . With probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$  these bounds apply also to the original system under study, because with such probability each agent correctly detects the neighbours in the same class for any  $t > \zeta_D$ . From now on, we refer then to the auxiliary system.

### D.1. Preliminaries

After time  $\zeta_D$  the original graph has been then split in  $C$  connected components, where component  $c$  includes  $n_c$  agents. By an opportune permutation of the agents, we can write the matrix  $W$  as follows

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} {}_1W & 0_{n_1 \times n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n_1 \times n_C} \\ 0_{n_2 \times n_1} & {}_2W & \cdots & 0_{n_2 \times n_C} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0_{n_C \times n_1} & 0_{n_C \times n_2} & \cdots & {}_CW \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $0_{n \times m}$  denotes an  $n \times m$  matrix with 0 elements.

We focus on a given component  $c$  with  $n_c$  agents. All agents in the same component share the same expected value, which we denote by  $\mu(c)$ . Moreover, let  ${}_c\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu(c)\mathbf{1}_c$ . We denote by  ${}_c\mathbf{x}^t$  and  ${}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^t$  the  $n_c$ -dimensional vectors containing the samples' empirical averages and the estimates for the agents in component  $c$ .

For  $t > \zeta_D$ , the estimates in component  $c$  evolves independently from the other components and we can write:

$${}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} = (1 - \alpha_t) {}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} + \alpha_t {}_cW {}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^t(c).$$

It is then easy to prove by recurrence that

$${}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu} = \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} {}_cW^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D}(c) - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) + \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} {}_cW^{t-\tau} ({}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (26)$$

where  $\alpha_{i,j} \triangleq \prod_{\ell=i}^j \alpha_\ell$ , with the usual convention that  $\alpha_{i,j} = 1$  if  $j < i$ .

Let  ${}_cP \triangleq \frac{1}{n_c} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$ . It is easy to check that the doubly-stochasticity of  $W$  implies that  $({}_cW - {}_cP)^t = {}_cW^t - P$ . From which it follows

$${}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu} = \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} {}_cW^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D}(c) - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) + \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} {}_cW^{t-\tau} ({}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} {}_cW^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D}(c) - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} {}_cW^{t-\tau} ({}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_cP {}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} ({}_cP {}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} {}_cW^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D}(c) - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} {}_cW^{t-\tau} ({}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_cP {}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} ({}_cP {}_c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} W^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D}(c) - c\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} (cW - cP)^{t-\tau} (c\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - cP_c \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} (cP_c \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}). \tag{30}
 \end{aligned}$$

## D.2. Technical Results

**Lemma D.1.** For  $0 < \beta < 1$

$$\sum_{\tau=t_0}^t \frac{\beta^{t-\tau}}{\tau+1} \in \mathcal{O} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \frac{1}{t+1} \right) \tag{31}$$

*Proof.*

$$\sum_{\tau=t_0}^t \frac{\beta^{t-\tau}}{\tau+1} = \beta^{t+1} \sum_{\tau=t_0+1}^{t+1} \frac{\beta^{-\tau}}{\tau} \tag{32}$$

Let  $t' = \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \right\rceil, t_0 + 1 \right\}$ . For  $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1 \geq t'$ ,  $\frac{\beta^{-\tau_1}}{\tau_1} \leq \frac{\beta^{-\tau_2}}{\tau_2}$ .

$$\sum_{\tau=t_0+1}^{t+1} \frac{\beta^{-\tau}}{\tau} = \underbrace{\sum_{\tau=t_0}^{t'-1} \frac{\beta^{-\tau}}{\tau}}_C + \sum_{\tau=t'}^t \frac{\beta^{-\tau}}{\tau} + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} \tag{33}$$

$$\leq C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \int_{t'}^{t+1} \frac{\beta^{-\tau}}{\tau} d\tau \tag{34}$$

$$= C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \int_{t'}^{t+1} \frac{e^{\ln \frac{1}{\beta} \tau}}{\tau} d\tau \tag{35}$$

$$= C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \int_{t' \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}^{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \frac{e^x}{x} dx \tag{36}$$

$$\leq C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \text{Ei} \left( (t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta} \right) - \text{Ei} \left( t' \ln \frac{1}{\beta} \right) \tag{37}$$

$$\leq C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \text{Ei} \left( (t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta} \right) \tag{38}$$

$$\leq C + \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1} + \frac{e^{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}}{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \left( 1 + \frac{3}{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \tag{39}$$

$$= C + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta}} + \frac{3}{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \frac{\beta^{-t-1}}{t+1}, \tag{40}$$

where  $\text{Ei}(t) \triangleq \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{e^x}{x} dx$  is the exponential integral. The third inequality follows from the series representation

$$\text{Ei}(t) = \frac{e^t}{t} \left( \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{k!}{t^k} + e_n(t) \right),$$

where  $e_n(t) \triangleq (n+1)! t e^{-t} \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{e^x}{x^{n+2}} dx$  for  $n = 0$ . The remainder  $e_n(t)$  can be bounded by the  $n+1$ -th term times the factor  $1 + \sqrt{\pi} \frac{\Gamma(n/2+3/2)}{\Gamma(n/2+1)}$  ([Digital Library of Mathematical Functions, 2023](#)). This factor is smaller than 3 for  $n = 0$ .

Finally, from (32) and (40), we obtain

$$\sum_{\tau=t_0}^t \frac{\beta^{t-\tau}}{\tau+1} \leq \beta^{t+1} C + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta}} + \frac{3}{(t+1) \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}\right) \frac{1}{t+1} \in \mathcal{O} \left( \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta}}\right) \frac{1}{t+1} \right). \quad (41)$$

□

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_t, \dots)$  be a sequence of i.i.d. vectorial random variables in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with expected value  $\mathbf{0}$  and finite 4-th moment  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{z}_i\|^4]$ , and  $\{A(t_1, t_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2\}$  a set of  $n \times n$  matrices with bounded norms. Let  $\mathbf{b}_\tau \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{t=1}^\tau \mathbf{z}_t$ . It holds:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \leq 2 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \left( \frac{\|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\|}{\tau_2 \tau_3} + \frac{\|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\|}{\tau_2 \tau_4} \right) \quad (42)$$

*Proof.* We will omit the indices when they run from 1 to  $t$  and denote by  $\mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{z}'$  two generic independent random variables distributed as  $\mathbf{z}_\tau$ .

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \quad (43)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1=1}^{\tau_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{\tau_2} \sum_{t_3=1}^{\tau_3} \sum_{t_4=1}^{\tau_4} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \quad (44)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1} \mathbb{1}_{t_2 \leq \tau_2} \mathbb{1}_{t_3 \leq \tau_3} \mathbb{1}_{t_4 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_2 \leq \tau_2, t_3 \leq \tau_3, t_4 \leq \tau_4} \times \left( \mathbb{1}_{t_1=t_2=t_3=t_4} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \right. \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{t_1=t_2, t_3=t_4, t_1 \neq t_3} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{t_1=t_3, t_2=t_4, t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{1}_{t_1=t_4, t_2=t_3, t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_4}] \right) \quad (46) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_1 \leq \tau_2, t_1 \leq \tau_3, t_1 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_1} \mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_1}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_3} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_1 \leq \tau_2, t_3 \leq \tau_3, t_3 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_3} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_1} \mathbf{z}_{t_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_3}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_2 \leq \tau_2, t_1 \leq \tau_3, t_2 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_2}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_2 \leq \tau_2, t_2 \leq \tau_3, t_1 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_{t_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}_{t_2} \mathbf{z}_{t_2}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}_{t_1}] \quad (47) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_1 \leq \tau_2, t_1 \leq \tau_3, t_1 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_3} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_1 \leq \tau_2, t_3 \leq \tau_3, t_3 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_3} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}] \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}'] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_2 \leq \tau_2, t_1 \leq \tau_3, t_2 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}' \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \sum_{t_1, t_2} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \leq \tau_1, t_2 \leq \tau_2, t_2 \leq \tau_3, t_1 \leq \tau_4} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 \neq t_2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z} \right] \tag{48}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & = \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{\min\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4\}}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z} \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{\min\{\tau_1, \tau_2\}(\min\{\tau_3, \tau_4\} - 1)}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}' \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{\min\{\tau_1, \tau_3\}(\min\{\tau_2, \tau_4\} - 1)}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}' \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{\min\{\tau_1, \tau_4\}(\min\{\tau_2, \tau_3\} - 1)}{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' (\mathbf{z}')^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z} \right], \tag{49}
 \end{aligned}$$

where (46) follows from the independence of the variables  $\{\mathbf{z}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the fact that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_t] = \mathbf{0}$  for any  $t$ .

Now we can upperbound the three terms in (49).

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \tag{50}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \leq \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z} \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}' \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z}' \right] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{z}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{z}' \mathbf{z}'^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{z} \right] \tag{51}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \leq \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3 \tau_4} \|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\| \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3} \|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\| \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^2]^2 \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_3} \|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\| \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}'\|^2] \\
 & + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \frac{1}{\tau_2 \tau_4} \|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\| \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}'\|^2] \tag{52} \\
 & \leq 2 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = t_0}^t \left( \frac{\|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\|}{\tau_2 \tau_3} + \frac{\|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| \cdot \|A(\tau_3, \tau_4)\|}{\tau_2 \tau_4} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

We now particularize the result of Lemma D.2 to the two cases of interest for what follows.

**Corollary D.3.** Let  $(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_t, \dots)$  be a sequence of i.i.d. vectorial random variables in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with expected value  $\mathbf{0}$  and finite 4-th moment  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{z}_i\|^4]$  and  $\{A(t_1, t_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2\}$  a set of  $n \times n$  symmetric stochastic matrices. Let  $\mathbf{b}_\tau \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{t=1}^\tau \mathbf{z}_t$ . It holds:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \leq 4 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] t^2 (1 + \ln t)^2.$$

*Proof.* It is sufficient to observe that  $\|A(\tau_1, \tau_2)\| = 1$  and that  $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{1}{\tau} \leq 1 + \ln t$ .  $\square$

**Corollary D.4.** Let  $(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_t, \dots)$  be a sequence of i.i.d. vectorial random variables in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with expected value  $\mathbf{0}$  and finite 4-th moment  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{z}_i\|^4]$  and  $\{A(t_1, t_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2\} = \beta^{2t-t_1-t_2} B^{2t-t_1-t_2}$ , where  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ ,  $B$  a symmetric matrix. Let  $\rho(B)$  denote the spectral norm of  $B$  and  $\mathbf{b}_\tau \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{t=1}^\tau \mathbf{z}_t$ . If  $\beta \rho(B) < 1$ , then it holds:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \in \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \frac{1}{(1 - \beta \rho(B))^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta \rho(B)}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right).$$

*Proof.* As  $B$  is symmetric, then  $\|B\| = \rho(B)$ . From Lemma D.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=t_0}^t \mathbf{b}_{\tau_1}^\top A(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_2} \mathbf{b}_{\tau_3}^\top A(\tau_3, \tau_4) \mathbf{b}_{\tau_4} \right] \\ & \leq 2 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \left( \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=1}^t \frac{(\beta \lambda_2(B))^{4t-\tau_1-\tau_2-\tau_3-\tau_4}}{\tau_2 \tau_3} + \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=1}^t \frac{(\beta \lambda_2(B))^{4t-\tau_1-\tau_2-\tau_3-\tau_4}}{\tau_2 \tau_4} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$= 4 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=1}^t \frac{(\beta \lambda_2(B))^{4t-\tau_1-\tau_2-\tau_3-\tau_4}}{\tau_2 \tau_3} \quad (54)$$

$$= 4 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \left( \sum_{\tau_1=1}^t (\beta \lambda_2(B))^{t-\tau_1} \right)^2 \left( \sum_{\tau_2=1}^t \frac{(\beta \lambda_2(B))^{t-\tau_2}}{\tau_2} \right)^2 \quad (55)$$

$$\leq 4 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \frac{1}{(1 - \beta \lambda_2(B))^2} \left( \sum_{\tau_2=1}^t \frac{(\beta \lambda_2(B))^{t-\tau_2}}{\tau_2} \right)^2 \quad (56)$$

$$\in \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^4] \frac{1}{(1 - \beta \lambda_2(B))^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\beta \lambda_2(B)}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right), \quad (57)$$

where in the last step we used Lemma D.1.  $\square$

**Lemma D.5.** Let  $W$  be an  $n \times n$  symmetric, stochastic, and irreducible matrix and  $P = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector whose elements are all equal to 1, then  $\rho(W - P) = \lambda_2(W) < 1$ .

*Proof.* As  $W$  is symmetric and stochastic, then the module of its largest eigenvalue is equal to 1. The vector  $\mathbf{1}_n$  is both a left and right eigenvector of  $W$  relative to the simple eigenvalue 1. Then,  $P$  is the projector onto the null space of  $W - I$  along the range of  $W - I$  (Meyer, 2001)[p.518]. The spectral theorem leads us to conclude that the eigenvalues of  $W - P$  (counted with their multiplicity) are then all eigenvalues of  $W$  except 1 and with the addition of 0. We can then conclude that  $\|W - P\| = \rho(W - P) = \lambda_2(W)$ .  $W$  is irreducible with non-negative elements on the diagonal, then it is primitive (Meyer, 2001)[Example 8.3.3], i.e., 1 is the only eigenvalue on the unit circle.  $\square$

**Lemma D.6.** For any  $a > 0$ , if  $x \geq \max\{a \ln^2 a, 1\}$  then  $x \geq \frac{a}{4} \ln^2 x$ .

*Proof.* We consider first  $a \geq 1$ .

$$x \geq a \ln^2 a \implies \sqrt{x} \geq \sqrt{a} |\ln a| \stackrel{a \geq 1}{=} \sqrt{a} \ln a \quad (58)$$

$$\implies \sqrt{x} \geq \sqrt{a} \ln \sqrt{x} = \frac{\sqrt{a}}{2} \ln x \quad (59)$$

$$\implies x \geq \frac{a}{4} \ln^2 x, \quad (60)$$

where (59) follows from Lemma A.1 in (Shalev-Shwartz & Ben-David, 2014). For  $a < 1$ , it is easy to check that for  $x \geq 1$ ,  $x \geq \frac{a}{4} \ln^2 x$  holds unconditionally.  $\square$

### D.3. Bounding the 4-th Moment of the Estimation Error.

For convenience, we omit from now on the dependence on the specific clustered component  $c$ .

**Theorem D.7.** *Let  $\lambda_2(W)$  denote the module of the second largest eigenvalue in module of  $W$ . It holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] &\in \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \alpha^{4t} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{(1-\alpha)^4}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|P\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] (1-\alpha)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right), \quad \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] &\in \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{1}{(t+1)^4} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{1}{(1-\lambda_2(W))^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\lambda_2(W)}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^4} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|P\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \left(\frac{1+\ln t}{1+t}\right)^2 \right), \quad \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

*Proof.*  $W$  is irreducible (the graph component is connected and  $W_{i,j} > 0$  for each link), then by Lemma D.5,  $\lambda_2(W) < 1$ . For  $\alpha_t = \alpha < 1$ , it would be sufficient to observe that  $\lambda_2(W) \leq \rho(W) = 1$ , but for  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ , we need the strict inequality.

Our starting point is (30), which we repeat here (omitting the dependence on the specific clustered component  $c$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu} &= \alpha_{\zeta_D, t} W^{t+1-\zeta_D} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1-\alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} (W-P)^{t-\tau} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1-\alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Applying twice  $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$  with  $n = 3$ , and applying the expectation we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] &\leq 27 \cdot \alpha_{\zeta_D, t}^4 \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|W\|^{4(t+1-\zeta_D)} \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \\ &+ 27 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1-\alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1, t} (W-P)^{t-\tau} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \right\|^4 \right] \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 & + 27 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1,t} (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right\|^4 \right] \\
 & \leq 27 \cdot \underbrace{\alpha_{\zeta_D,t}^4 \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}_{C_1}
 \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + 27 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1,t} (W - P)^{t-\tau} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1}) \right\|^4 \right] \\
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{C_2} \\
 & + 27 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{\tau=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_\tau) \alpha_{\tau+1,t} (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right\|^4 \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where in the last step we took advantage of the fact that  $W$  is doubly stochastic and symmetric and then  $\|W\| = 1$ .

We now move to bound the three terms  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$ , and  $C_3$ . We observe that

$$\alpha_{t_0+1,t} = \begin{cases} \alpha^{t-t_0}, & \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \\ \frac{t_0+1}{t} & \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}, \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

and

$$(1 - \alpha_{t_0}) \alpha_{t_0+1,t} = \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha) \alpha^{t-t_0}, & \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \\ \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}, \end{cases} \tag{67}$$

$$C_1 \leq \alpha_{\zeta_D,t}^4 \sup_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \alpha^{4t} \right), & \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \\ \mathcal{O} \left( \sup_{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{\zeta_D}} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\zeta_D} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{1}{t^4} \right) & \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}. \end{cases} \tag{68}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_2 & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{\tau_1=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_1}) \alpha_{\tau_1+1,t} (W - P)^{t-\tau_1} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1}) \right)^\top \right. \\
 & \quad \left( \sum_{\tau_2=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_2}) \alpha_{\tau_2+1,t} (W - P)^{t-\tau_2} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_2+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_2+1}) \right) \\
 & \quad \left( \sum_{\tau_3=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_3}) \alpha_{\tau_3+1,t} (W - P)^{t-\tau_3} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_3+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_3+1}) \right)^\top \\
 & \quad \left. \left( \sum_{\tau_4=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_4}) \alpha_{\tau_4+1,t} (W - P)^{t-\tau_4} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_4+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_4+1}) \right) \right] \\
 & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4=\zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_1}) \alpha_{\tau_1+1,t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_2}) \alpha_{\tau_2+1,t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_3}) \alpha_{\tau_3+1,t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_4}) \alpha_{\tau_4+1,t} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1})^\top (W - P)^{2t-\tau_1-\tau_2} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1}) \right]
 \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left[ (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_3+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_3+1})^\top (W - P)^{2t-\tau_3-\tau_4} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_4+1} - P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_4+1}) \right] \\
 \in & \begin{cases} \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{(1-\alpha)^4}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right), & \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \\ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \frac{1}{(1-\lambda_2(W))^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\lambda_2(W)}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^4} \right), & \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}, \end{cases} \quad (70)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last result follows from observing that  $\rho(W - P) = \lambda_2(W) < 1$  and  $\|\mathbf{x} - P\mathbf{x}\|^4 \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4$  and then applying Corollary D.4 with  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} - P\mathbf{x}$ ,  $B = W - P$  and 1)  $\beta = \alpha$  for  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ , 2)  $\beta = 1$  for  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ .

The calculations to bound  $C_3$  are similar:

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_3 = & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4 = \zeta_D}^t (1 - \alpha_{\tau_1}) \alpha_{\tau_1+1, t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_2}) \alpha_{\tau_2+1, t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_3}) \alpha_{\tau_3+1, t} (1 - \alpha_{\tau_4}) \alpha_{\tau_4+1, t} \right. \\
 & \left. (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_1+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_3+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top (P\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\tau_4+1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right] \\
 \in & \begin{cases} \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|P\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] (1 - \alpha)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \right), & \text{if } \alpha_t = \alpha, \\ \mathcal{O} \left( \mathbb{E} [\|P\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \left(\frac{1+\ln t}{1+t}\right)^2 \right), & \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}. \end{cases} \quad (71)
 \end{aligned}$$

In this case, we apply 1) Corollary D.4 with  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} - P\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\beta = \alpha$ , and  $B = I$ , for  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ , and 2) Corollary D.3 with  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} - P\mathbf{x}$  and  $A(t_1, t_2) = I$ ,  $\forall (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ , for  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ .

The result follows by simply aggregating the three bounds. □

*Remark D.8.* We observe that

$$\mathbb{E} [\|_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] = n_c \kappa \sigma^4 + n_c (n_c - 1) \sigma^4, \quad (72)$$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c P {}_c \mathbf{x}\|^4] = \left( n_c - 2 + \frac{1}{n_c} \right) \kappa \sigma^4 + (n_c - 1) \left( n_c - 2 + \frac{3}{n_c} \right) \sigma^4, \quad (73)$$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|_c P {}_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] = \frac{1}{n_c} \kappa \sigma^4 + 3 \frac{n_c - 1}{n_c} \sigma^4, \quad (74)$$

where  $\kappa$  is the kurtosis index (and then  $\kappa \sigma^4$  is the fourth moment). Then, for  $n_c \leq 2$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|_c P {}_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \leq \frac{3}{n_c^2} \mathbb{E} [\|_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c P {}_c \mathbf{x}\|^4] \leq \frac{3}{n_c^2} \mathbb{E} [\|_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4], \quad (75)$$

showing the advantage of averaging the estimates across all agents in the same connected components.

#### D.4. $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Bounds: Proof of Theorem 4.6

We prove this theorem whose scope is larger.

**Theorem D.9.** Consider a graph component  $c$  and pick uniformly at random an agent  $a$  in  $c$ , then

$$\mathbb{P} (\forall t > \tau_a^C, |\hat{\mu}_a^t - \mu_a| < \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$$

where

$${}_c \tau^C = \max \left\{ \zeta_D, C' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_c^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^2 \right) \right\}$$

for  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ , and

$${}_{c\tau}C \triangleq \max \left\{ \zeta_D, C'' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \ln^2 \left( e^{C'' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta}} \right) \right\}.$$

for  $\alpha_t = t/(t+1)$ .

*Proof.* We start considering the auxiliary system studied in the previous sections: consensus matrices can be arbitrary until time  $\zeta_D$  and then agents acquire perfect knowledge about which neighbours belong to the same class and simply rely on information arriving through these links.

$$\mathbb{P} (|\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a| \geq \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P} \left( (\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a)^4 \geq \varepsilon^4 \right) \quad (76)$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a)^4 \right]}{\varepsilon^4} \quad (77)$$

$$= \frac{\frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{a'=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a)^4 \right]}{\varepsilon^4} \quad (78)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4 \right]}{n_c \varepsilon^4} \quad (79)$$

Applying the union bound, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P} (\exists t \geq t' : |\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{t=t'}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4 \right]}{n_c \varepsilon^4}. \quad (80)$$

When  $\alpha_t = \alpha$ , considering the dominant term in (61) and (75) leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4 \right] \leq \frac{C'}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{(t+1)^2} \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_c^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^2 \right) \quad (81)$$

We observe that

$$\sum_{t=t'}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \leq \int_{t'}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t^2} dt = \frac{1}{t'}, \quad (82)$$

from which we conclude:

$$\mathbb{P} (\exists t \geq t' : |\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C'}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 t} \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_c^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^2 \right). \quad (83)$$

This probability is then smaller than  $\delta/2$  for

$$t' \geq {}_{c\tau}C = \max \left\{ \zeta_D, C' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\alpha\lambda_2(W))^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda_2(W)}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_c^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^2 \right) \right\}. \quad (84)$$

Similarly, when  $\alpha_t = \frac{t}{t+1}$ , considering the dominant term in (62) leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|{}_c\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{t+1} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4 \right] \leq \frac{C''}{16} \mathbb{E} [\|{}_cP_c \mathbf{x} - {}_c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4] \left( \frac{\ln(1+t)}{1+t} \right)^2. \quad (85)$$

We observe that

$$\sum_{t=t'}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\ln(1+t)}{t+1} \right)^2 \leq \int_{t'}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\ln t}{t} \right)^2 dt \quad (86)$$

$$= \int_{\ln t'}^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x} dx \quad (87)$$

$$= \left( e^{-x} (x^2 + 2x + 2) \right) \Big|_{\infty}^{\ln t'} \quad (88)$$

$$= \frac{(\ln t')^2 + 2 \ln t' + 2}{t'}, \quad (89)$$

$$= \frac{(\ln t' + 1)^2 + 1}{t'}, \quad (90)$$

$$\leq 2 \frac{(\ln t' + 1)^2}{t'}, \quad (91)$$

$$= 2 \frac{\ln^2(et')}{t'} \quad (92)$$

from which we conclude:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq t' : |\hat{\mu}_a^{t+1} - \mu_a| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C'' \mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{8 n_c \varepsilon^4} \frac{\ln^2(et')}{t'}. \quad (93)$$

This probability is then smaller than  $\delta/2$  for

$$t' \geq \frac{C'' \mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{4 n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \ln^2(et'), \quad (94)$$

and by applying Lemma D.6 with  $x = t'e$ , we obtain that a sufficient condition is

$$t' \geq C''' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \ln^2 \left( e C''' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \right). \quad (95)$$

Let then define

$${}_c\tau^C \triangleq \max \left\{ \zeta_D, C''' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \ln^2 \left( e C''' \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|cP c\mathbf{x} - c\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4]}{n_c \varepsilon^4 \delta} \right) \right\}. \quad (96)$$

Finally, let us consider the system of interest. With probability  $1 - \delta/2$  the agents will have identified the correct links by time  $\zeta_D$ . The corresponding trajectories coincide with trajectories of the auxiliary system we studied. For the auxiliary system, the estimates have the required precision after time  ${}_c\tau^C$  with probability  $1 - \delta/2$ . It follows that the probability that the estimates in the stochastic have not the required precision after time  ${}_c\tau^C$  is at most  $\delta$ .  $\square$

## E. Appendix - On the Structure of $G(N, r)$ and its Impact on Performance of our Algorithms

### E.1. On the local tree structure of $G(N, r)$

Let  $\mathcal{N} = G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  be a network sampled from the class of random regular graphs  $G(N, r)$  with fixed degree  $r$ .<sup>8</sup> Here and in the following we fix  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{A}$  and  $n = |\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ . We are interested to investigate the structure of the  $d$ -deep neighborhood,  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)}$ , of a generic node  $v$  (i.e. the sub-graph inter-connecting nodes at distance smaller or equal than  $dv$  from  $v$ ). Observe that as  $n$  grows large, for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we should expect that  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)}$  is likely equal to  $\mathcal{T}_d$ , a perfectly balanced tree of depth  $d$ , in which the root has  $r$  children, and all the other nodes have  $r - 1$  children.

To this end using an approach inspired by Lemma 5 in (Rossi et al., 2019) (which applies to directed graphs), we can claim that:

**Theorem E.1.** -Whenever  $v_0$  is chosen uniformly at random, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_d^{(v_0)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d) \leq \frac{(H+1)H}{2N}$$

where  $H = 1 + \sum_{d'=1}^d r(r-1)^{d'-1}$ .

*Proof* First observe that realizations of  $G(N, r)$  graphs are typically obtained through the following standard procedure: every node is initially connected to  $r \geq 2$  stubs; then stubs then are sequentially randomly matched/paired to form edges, as follows: at each stage, an arbitrarily selected free/unpaired stub is selected and paired with a different stub picked uniformly at random among the still unpaired stubs.

We identify every stub with different number in  $[1, rN]$  (we assume  $rN$  to be even). Now, let  $\nu(i)$  for  $i \in [1, rN]$  be the function that returns the identity of the node to which the stub is connected. See fig. E.1




Figure 5. Random matching of stubs,  $r = 3$

Our procedure explores the  $d$ -neighborhood of a node  $v_0$ , taken at random, by sequentially unveiling stub-pairings, according to a bread-first approach. At every step the procedure checks whether the already explored-portion of  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v_0)}$ ,  $G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , has a tree structure.

The procedure initializes  $\mathcal{V}^{(0)} = v_0$  and  $\mathcal{E}^{(0)} = \emptyset$ .

At step 1, our procedure takes a stub  $k_1$  connected to  $v_0$  (i.e. such that  $\nu(k_1) = v_0$ ) and matches it, uniformly at random with another stub  $r(k_1) \neq k_1$ . Let  $v_1 := \nu(r(k_1))$ . Then the procedure updates sets  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  according to the rule:  $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} = \mathcal{V}^{(0)} \cup \{v_1\}$  and  $\mathcal{E}^{(1)} = \mathcal{E}^{(0)} \cup \{(v_0, v_1)\}$ . At this stage  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}, \mathcal{E}^{(1)})$  is a tree only provided that  $v_1 \notin \mathcal{V}^{(0)}$ . This happens with a probability:

$$p_1 := \mathbb{P}(v_1 := \nu(r(k_1)) \notin \{v_0\}) = 1 - \frac{r-1}{Nr-1}.$$

In case  $v_1 \neq v_0$  the algorithm proceeds, otherwise it prematurely terminates providing  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}, \mathcal{E}^{(1)})$ . At step 2, our procedure takes a new unmatched stub  $k_2$  (connected again to  $v_0$ ).  $k_2$  is matched uniformly at random with another free (i.e. still unmatched) stub  $r(k_2) \notin \{k_1, r(k_1), k_2\}$ , let  $v_2 := \nu(r(k_2))$ . Then sets  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  are updated:  $\mathcal{V}^{(2)} = \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cup \{v_2\}$  and

<sup>8</sup>observe that graphs in  $G(N, r)$  are not necessarily simple

$\mathcal{E}^{(2)} = \mathcal{E}^{(2)} \cup \{(v_0, v_2)\}$ .  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(2)}, \mathcal{E}^{(2)})$  is a tree only under the condition that  $v_2 := \nu(r(k_2)) \notin \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ . This happens with a probability:

$$p_2 := \mathbb{P}(v_2 := \nu(r(k_2)) \notin \{v_0, v_1\} \mid v_0 \neq v_1) = 1 - \frac{2r - 2}{Nr - 3}$$

again if  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(2)}, \mathcal{E}^{(2)})$  is a tree the algorithm proceeds, otherwise it prematurely terminates, providing  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(2)}, \mathcal{E}^{(2)})$ . At a generic step  $h$ , our procedure takes a free stub  $k_h$ , connected to vertex  $v_{\lfloor (h-1)/r \rfloor} \in \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{h-1}\}$ , (recall that we explore nodes/edges according to a breadth-first approach), and matches it with a randomly chosen (still unmatched) stub  $r(k_h)$ . Let  $v_h = r(k_h)$ . Then sets  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  are updated as follows:  $\mathcal{V}^{(h)} = \mathcal{V}^{(h-1)} \cup \{v_h\}$  and  $\mathcal{E}^{(h)} = \mathcal{E}^{(h-1)} \cup \{(v_{\lfloor (h-1)/r \rfloor}, v_h)\}$ . Again  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(h)}, \mathcal{E}^{(h)})$  is a tree only if  $v_h \notin \mathcal{V}^{(h-1)}$ , and this happens with a probability

$$\begin{aligned} p_h &:= \mathbb{P}(\nu(r(k_h)) \notin \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{h-1}\} \\ &\quad \mid \{v_0 = v_1 = \dots = v_{h-1}\}) \\ &= 1 - \frac{hr - (2h - 1)}{Nr - 2(h - 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

in such a case the algorithm proceeds, otherwise it prematurely terminates, providing  $G(\mathcal{V}^{(h)}, \mathcal{E}^{(h)})$  in output.

The algorithm naturally terminates (providing a tree) when all the nodes in  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v_0)}$  have been unveiled (i.e., placed in  $\mathcal{V}$ ) and the corresponding unveiled graph  $G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is a tree. This happens at step  $H$ . The probability that the algorithm terminates providing a tree is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_d^{(V)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d) &= 1 - \prod_{h=1}^H p_h \leq \sum_h (1 - p_h) \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{hr - (2h - 1)}{Nr - 2(h - 1)} \\ &\leq \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{h}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_1^H h = \frac{(H + 1)H}{2N} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now denoting with  $M$  the number of vertices  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  for which  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d$ , we have that

$$M = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d\}}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M] &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d\}}] = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d) \\ &= N \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_d^{(v_0)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d) \leq \frac{(H + 1)H}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $v_0$  is uniformly taken at random. By assuming  $(H + 1)H = o(N)$ , and applying Markov inequality we can claim that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  arbitrarily slowly:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{M}{N} > \varepsilon\right) \downarrow 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \quad (97)$$

i.e. the fraction of nodes  $v$  for which  $\mathcal{N}_d^{(v)} \neq \mathcal{T}_d$  is negligible with a probability tending to 1.

At last we would like to highlight that (97) can be transferred to the class  $G_0(N, r)$  of uniformly chosen *simple* regular graphs thanks to:

**Proposition E.2** ((Amini, 2010)). *Any sequence of event  $E_n$  occurring with a probability tending to 1 (0) in  $G(N, r)$  occurs well in  $G_0(N, r)$  with a probability tending to 1 (0).*



Moreover, recalling that by construction  $\frac{M}{N} \leq 1$ , from (97) we can immediately deduce that  $\mathbb{E}[M]/N \rightarrow 0$  on  $G_0((N, r))$ .

At last we would like to mention the following result, from which Proposition E.2 rather immediately descends.

**Theorem E.3** ((Janson, 2009)).

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(G((N, r) \text{ is simple}) > 0$$

Observe Theorem E.3 provides a theoretical foundation to the to design a simple algorithm for the generation of a graph in class  $G_0((N, r))$ , based on the superposition of an acceptance/rejection procedure to the generation of graphs in  $G(N, r)$ . More efficient algorithms are, however, well known in literature (McKay & Wormald, 1990).

## E.2. The structure of $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$ and $\mathcal{CC}_a$

Now we investigate on the structure of  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$ . We assume that agents  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  are partitioned into a finite number  $K$  of similarity classes. Agents are assigned to similarity classes independently. We indicate with  $p_k$  the probability according to which agent  $a$  is assigned to class  $k$ . Note that by construction  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_k = 1$ . We denote with  $k_a$  the similarity class to which  $a$  is assigned. In this scenario the structure of  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  can be rather easily analyzed, it turns out that:

**Theorem E.4.** *Conditionally over the event  $\{\mathcal{N}_a^d \text{ is a tree}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  has the structure of a Branching process originating from a unique ancestor, obeying to the following properties:*

- the number of off-springs of different nodes are independent.
- the number of off-spring of the ancestor (generation 0 node) is distributed as a  $\text{Bin}(r, p_{k_a})$ ;
- while the number of off-springs of any generation  $i$  node (with  $1 \leq i < d$ ) is distributed as  $\text{Bin}(r - 1, p_{k_a})$ .
- generation- $d$  nodes have no off-springs.

*Proof*

The proof is rather immediate. Consider  $a$  and explore  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d$  according to a breath-first exploration process that stops at depth- $d$ . The number of off-springs of  $a$ ,  $O_a$ , by construction, equals the number of nodes in  $\mathcal{N}_a$  that belongs to class  $k_a$ . This number  $O_a$  is distributed as:  $O_a \stackrel{L}{=} \text{Bin}(r, p_{k_a})$ . Consider, now, any other explored node  $a'$ , at distance  $i < d$  from the ancestor, this node, by construction, will have a unique parent node  $p_{a'}$ . Off-springs of  $a'$ ,  $O_{a'}$  will be given by all nodes in  $\mathcal{N}_{a'} \setminus \{p_{a'}\}$  that belong to class  $k_a$ . Their number,  $O_{a'}$ , is distributed as:  $O_{a'} \stackrel{L}{=} \text{Bin}(r, p_{k_{a'}})$ . See fig. E.2. When the exploration reaches a  $d$ -depth node, it stops, therefore the number of off-springs for every  $d$ -depth nodes is zero. A last, since the sets  $\mathcal{N}_{a'} \setminus \{p_{a'}\}$  are disjoint (as immediate consequence of the fact that  $\mathcal{N}_a^d$  is a tree), the variables in  $\{O_{a'}\}_{a' \in \mathcal{CC}_a^d}$  are independent.




Figure 6. Structure  $|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|$ : an example for  $r = 3$ ,  $d = 2$ ; green nodes belong to  $|\mathcal{CC}_a^d|$ .

We can now recall and adapt a few standard results asymptotic results on Galton-Watson (GW) Processes (in a standard GW process all nodes in the tree give origin to number of off-springs, which are identically distributed and independent). First observe that, in our case, as  $|\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \infty$  we can assume that  $d \rightarrow \infty$  as well, for example choosing  $d$  as in Proposition 4.7.

	$p_{k_a} = 1/2$	$p_{k_a} = 1/4$	$p_{k_a} = 1/8$
$r = 4$	0.146	1	1
$r = 8$	$4.17 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.176	1
$r = 16$	$1.52 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.08 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.190
$r = 32$	$2.32 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$1.01 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.51 \cdot 10^{-2}$

Table 1. extinction probability,  $q_{2BP}$ , for different values of  $r$  and  $p_{k_a}$ .

We say that a standard GW process is super-critical if the average number off-springs of every node  $\mathbb{E}[O_a] := m > 1$  Now for a standard supercritical GW process, denoted with  $Z_i$  the number of nodes belonging to generation  $i$ , we have:

**Theorem E.5** (extinction-explosion principle). *For every super-critical nontrivial<sup>9</sup> GW process  $\{Z_i\}_i$  is bound to either extinction or explosion, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_i = 0 \text{ eventually}) + \mathbb{P}\left(\lim \frac{Z_i}{m^i} > 0\right) = 1.$$

Previous result can immediately extended to our two stages branching process as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ . Denoted with  $m_0 = rp_{k_a}$  and  $m := (r-1)p_{k_a}$ , under the assumption that  $m > 1$  we obtain that:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_i = 0 \text{ eventually}) + \mathbb{P}\left(\lim \frac{Z_i}{m_0 m^{i-1}} > 0\right) = 1. \quad (98)$$

Indeed the distribution of off-springs at the root, has not impact on structural properties of the process.

Now we focus on the extinction probability  $q_{2BP} := \mathbb{P}(Z_i = 0 \text{ eventually})$  in a two-stages branching process, as our process. To compute it, we can adapt classical results on GW. It turns out that:

**Theorem E.6.** *Consider a two-stages branching process, in which the number of offspring of the root is  $\text{Bin}(p_k, r)$  while the off-spring of every other node  $\text{Bin}(p_k, r-1)$ . Its extinction probability  $q_{2BP}$  is given by*

$$q_{2BP} = \sum_{h=0}^r \binom{r}{h} p_k^h (1-p_k)^{r-h} q_{GW}^h = [(1-p_k) + p_k q_{GW}]^r$$

where  $q_{GW}$  is the extinction probability of a standard GW, with distribution of off-springs given by  $\text{Bin}(r-1, p_k)$ .  $q_{GW}$  can be easily computed as the only solution in  $(0, 1)$  of equation:

$$t = [(1-p_k) + p_k t]^{r-1}$$

*Proof*

The proof is immediate, considering that: i) every sub-tree originated by an offspring of the ancestor has the same structure of a standard GW. The event  $\{Z_i = 0\}$  is equivalent to event  $\{\text{every sub-tree originated by every offspring of the ancestor is extincted within } i-1 \text{ generations}\}$ . Then conditioning on the number of off-springs of the ancestor we get the claim. Of course previously computed asymptotic extinction probability  $q_{2BP}$  provides an upper-bound to the probability of early extinction of a  $d$ -depth truncated two-stages Branching process.

At last observe that, choosing  $d$  as in Proposition 4.7, we have  $m_0 m^{d-1} = \tilde{\Theta}(|\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\log_{r-1} p_{k_a})})$ , therefore, recalling that by construction  $|\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_a^d| > Z_d$ , by (98), we can always select  $f(|\mathcal{A}|)$  that satisfies jointly  $f(|\mathcal{A}|) = o(m_0 m^{d-1})$  and  $f(|\mathcal{A}|) = \tilde{\Theta}(|\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\log_{r-1} p_{k_a})})$ , such that:

$$\lim_{|\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_a^d| > f(n)) = 1 - q_{2BP}.$$

Moreover, note that the extinction probability  $q_{2BP}$  is actually a function of its two parameters  $(r, p_{k_a})$ , its is rather immediate to show that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} q_{2BP}(r, p_{k_a}) = 0 \quad \forall p_{k_a} > 0$$

<sup>9</sup>a GW process is non trivial if  $\mathbb{P}(O_a = 0) > 0$

Therefore choosing  $r$  sufficiently large we can make  $q_{2BP}(r, p_{k_a})$  arbitrarily small and at the same time guarantee  $|\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\log_{r-1} p_{k_a})} > |\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\phi}$  for an arbitrarily small  $\phi > 0$ .

At last observe that if we turn our attention to  $\mathcal{CC}_a$ , since by construction we have  $\mathcal{CC}_a^d \subseteq \mathcal{CC}_a \forall d, a$ , rather immediately we have:

$$\lim_{|\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{CC}_a| > g(n)) = 1 - q_{2BP}.$$

for any  $g(n) = o(|\mathcal{A}|^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\log_r p_{k_a})})$ .

## F. Appendix - Additional Performance Evaluation of the B-COLME and C-COLME

In this Appendix, we report further results on the performance of B-COLME and C-COLME, as a function of the underlying graph structure and characterizing parameters.




Figure 7. All approaches compared considering a smaller  $r$  compared to Figure 2 ( $r = 5$ ), this shows that  $r$  needs to be chosen appropriately (large enough).

### F.1. Over a $G_0(N, r)$ varying $r$

Here, we explore the performance of the two proposed *scalable* algorithms as a function of the number of neighbors they are allowed to contact during the dynamics, i.e., the parameter  $r$  of the  $G_0(N, r)$  graph.




Figure 8. Performance comparison as a function of the parameter  $r$  of  $G_0(N, r)$  for B-COLME and C-COLME. Dashed line is used for the *oracle* while solid line for the algorithm.

### F.2. B-COLME as a Function of the Depth of Information Kept

In the B-COLME algorithm, many cycles in the graph can degrade the performance of the algorithm (hence the need for a tree-like local structure). Here we study the performance of the algorithm as a function of the depth  $d$  of the neighborhood that receives the estimate of a given node, and we find that a high value of this parameter eventually degrades the performance of the algorithm.




Figure 9. Performance comparison of B-COLME as a function of the *depth*  $\kappa$  of the info kept. Dashed line is used for the *oracle* while solid line for the algorithm.

### F.3. C-COLME (Constant $\alpha$ ) as a Function of the Weight $\alpha$

We report some experiments considering  $\alpha$  constant, as opposed as  $\alpha = \frac{t}{t+1}$  (refreshed at each topology modification), and explore the impact of the parameter on the probability of error.




Figure 10. Performance comparison of C-COLME as a function of the weight  $\alpha$  when it is considered as constant. Dashed line is used for the *oracle* while solid line for the algorithm.

## G. Appendix - Additional Details on ML-C-COLME

B-COLME and C-COLME are useful, for example, in contexts where nodes want to learn users' preferences by using information from other peers in addition to local data, or when sensor data collaboratively aims to estimate certain quantities in a very heterogeneous environment (e.g., smart farming). However, it is also of great interest to apply these techniques in the context of distributed personalized federated learning, where the goal of the nodes is to learn a machine learning model on a given local dataset  $S_a$ , and collaborating with each other, assuming that the agents can be partitioned into one of  $C$  possible classes, each characterized by a distribution  $D_c$ . We propose ML-C-COLME and we compare it with a classic consensus-based FL algorithm.

---

### Algorithm 3 ML-C-COLME Training for $E$ Epochs

---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ ,  $D_a \in \{D_c\}_{c=1}^C, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\theta_0$   
**Output:** collaborative model  $\theta_a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$   
 $\theta_a^0 \leftarrow \theta_0, \mathcal{C}_a^0 \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_a^t \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$   
 $\theta_l^0 \leftarrow \theta_0 \quad \forall l \in \mathcal{E}$   
**for** epoch  $e$  in  $\{1, \dots, E\}$  **do**  
   **for** minibatch  $S^t$  in  $\{1, \dots, M\}$  **do**  
     **for** node  $a$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  **do**  
        $\theta_a^{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_a^t + \text{SGD}(\theta_a^t, S_a^t)$   
       **for** neighbor  $a'$  in  $\mathcal{N}_a \cap \mathcal{C}_a^t$  **do**  
          $\theta_{a,a'}^{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_{a,a'}^t + \text{SDG}(\theta_{a,a'}^t, S_a^t)$   
       **end for**  
     **end for**  
     **for** undirected link  $\{a, a'\}$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  **do**  
        $\Delta\theta_{a,a'}^{t+1} = \theta_{a,a'}^{t+1} - \theta_{a,a'}^t$   
        $\Delta\theta_{a',a}^{t+1} = \theta_{a',a}^{t+1} - \theta_{a',a}^t$   
       **if**  $\|\Delta\theta_{a,a'}^{t+1}\| > \varepsilon_2$  and  $\|\Delta\theta_{a',a}^{t+1}\| > \varepsilon_2$  **then**  
          $\omega_{\{a,a'\}}^{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{t+1} \frac{\langle \Delta\theta_{a,a'}^{t+1}, \Delta\theta_{a',a}^{t+1} \rangle}{\|\Delta\theta_{a,a'}^{t+1}\| \|\Delta\theta_{a',a}^{t+1}\|} + \frac{t}{t+1} \kappa_{\{a,a'\}}^t$   
         **if**  $\kappa_{a,a'}^{t+1} < \varepsilon_1$  **then**  
            $\mathcal{C}_a^{t+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_a^t \setminus a'; \mathcal{C}_{a'}^{t+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_{a'}^t \setminus a$   
         **end if**  
       **end if**  
     **end for**  
     **for** node  $a$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  **do**  
        $\theta_a^{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_a^{t+1}|+1} \theta_a^{t+1}$   
       **for** opt neighbor  $a'$  in  $\mathcal{C}_a^{t+1}$  **do**  
          $\theta_a^{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_a^{t+1} + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_a^{t+1}|+1} \theta_{a'}^{t+1}$   
       **end for**  
     **end for**  
     **for** undirected link  $\{a, a'\}$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  **do**  
        $\theta_{\{a,a'\}}^{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{\theta_a^{t+1} + \theta_{a'}^{t+1}}{2}$   
     **end for**  
      $t \leftarrow t + 1$   
   **end for**  
**end for**

---

We focus on the case  $C = 2$  and use the MNIST dataset (Deng, 2012). To obtain two different distributions from the database, we simply swap two labels (“3” and “5” as well as “1” and “7”). Each node has the task of recognizing handwritten digits from its local data and collaborating with neighboring nodes over  $\mathcal{G}$ . We use a very simple neural network model whose structure is the same for all nodes. It consists of the input layer, a hidden layer with 100 nodes and the output layer.



As an illustrative example, let us take a toy network  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| = 6$  nodes, which consists of two fully connected communities and has a “wrong” link connecting the two communities. Each node is assigned an equally sized random partition of the original MNIST (community 1) or the “swapped” MNIST (community 2). We consider minibatches of size 300 images and consider 10 training epochs.

Differently from the B-COLME and C-COLME mean estimation algorithms we have to modify the *discovery* phase to a large extent, since the task of mean estimation and model training are fundamentally different. In (Sattler et al., 2021) it was shown that it is possible to partition the agents in a federated learning framework by taking into account the cosine similarity of the gradient updates of the considered agents. Note that values of the cosine similarity close to 1 indicate similar models/agents, while lower or values indicate progressively different agents. This can be intuitively understood observing that two nodes with different data distributions are optimizing different loss function, and, if we constrain the starting point of the optimization to be the same for both agents, we will observe a progressive increase in the angle between the vectors corresponding to the gradient updates (see Figure 2 in (Sattler et al., 2021) for an illustrative example). Subject to some regularity assumptions, it is possible to use the cosine similarity of the parameter updates instead of gradients. Let us denote the updates as  $\Delta\theta^t = \theta^{t+1} - \theta^t$ .

We define  $\theta_{a,a'}^t$  as a model associated with a certain (ordered) neighbors pair  $(a, a')$ . Indeed, every node  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  keeps a model (characterized by its parameters  $\theta$ ) for each of its neighbors  $a' \in \mathcal{N}_a$ . Then, for each minibatch, node  $a$  trains the model  $\theta_{a,a'}^t$  on its local minibatch  $D_a^t$ , and similarly does its neighbor  $a'$ , i.e., training the model  $\theta_{a',a}^t$ . After all nodes have performed such phase, neighboring pairs of nodes average their weights update so that to be able to start from the same model in the next minibatch step of stochastic gradient descent, we denote this model as  $\theta_{\{a,a'\}}^{t+1} = \theta_{\{a,a'\}}^t + \frac{\Delta\theta_{a,a'}^t + \Delta\theta_{a',a}^t}{2}$ .

The *similarity* metric between the models, which allows the nodes to determine whether to collaborate with a neighbor or not, can be defined as follows:

$$\omega_{\{a,a'\}}^t = \frac{\langle \Delta\theta_{a,a'}^t, \Delta\theta_{a',a}^t \rangle}{\|\Delta\theta_{a,a'}^t\| \cdot \|\Delta\theta_{a',a}^t\|} \quad (99)$$

This metric is updated for each node pair in the network by making an average with the previous value and whenever it goes below the threshold  $\varepsilon_1$ , the corresponding link is deemed to be connecting two nodes of different classes and it is removed. We report the same plots we presented in the main text which represent the accuracy of the proposed ML-C-COLME and a collaborative approach which simply averages the parameters updates coming from its neighbors; and the cosine similarity for every link in our toy network  $\mathcal{G}$ .




Figure 11. (a) Accuracy of the ML-C-COLME compared with our baseline. (b) Average cosine similarity for all links in  $\mathcal{G}$ .