

A Stochastic GDA Method With Backtracking For Solving Nonconvex (Strongly) Concave Minimax Problems*

Qiushui Xu¹, Xuan Zhang¹, N. Serhat Aybat¹, and Mert Gürbüzbalaban²

¹*Department of Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering, Penn State University*

²*Department of Management Science and Information Systems, Rutgers University*

Abstract

We propose a stochastic GDA (gradient descent ascent) method with backtracking (SGDA-B) to solve nonconvex-(strongly) concave (NCC) minimax problems $\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_y \sum_{i=1}^N g_i(x_i) + f(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y)$, where h and g_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$ are closed, convex functions, f is L -smooth and μ -strongly concave in y for some $\mu \geq 0$. We consider two scenarios: (i) the deterministic setting where we assume one can compute ∇f exactly, and (ii) the stochastic setting where we have only access to ∇f through an unbiased stochastic oracle with a finite variance. While most of the existing methods assume knowledge of the Lipschitz constant L , SGDA-B is agnostic to L . Moreover, SGDA-B can support random block-coordinate updates. In the deterministic setting, SGDA-B can compute an ϵ -stationary point within $\mathcal{O}(L\kappa^2/\epsilon^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(L^3/\epsilon^4)$ gradient calls when $\mu > 0$ and $\mu = 0$, respectively, where $\kappa \triangleq L/\mu$. In the stochastic setting, for any $p \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, it can compute an ϵ -stationary point with high probability, which requires $\mathcal{O}(L\kappa^3\epsilon^{-4} \log(1/p))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L^4\epsilon^{-7} \log(1/p))$ stochastic oracle calls, with probability at least $1 - p$, when $\mu > 0$ and $\mu = 0$, respectively. To our knowledge, SGDA-B is the first GDA-type method with backtracking to solve NCC minimax problems and achieves the best complexity among the methods that are agnostic to L . We also provide numerical results for SGDA-B on a distributionally robust learning problem illustrating the potential performance gains that can be achieved by SGDA-B.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{X}_i = \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and \mathcal{Y} be finite dimensional Euclidean spaces, and define $\mathbf{x} \triangleq [x_i]_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{X}_i \triangleq \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ where $n \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} n_i$. Optimization problems with such block-coordinate structure appear in many important applications including, training support vector machines [7], layer-wise training of deep learning models [60], compressed sensing [36], regularized regression [61] and truss topology design [57]. In this paper, we study the following class of *non-convex minimax* problems:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq g(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y) \quad \text{with} \quad g(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} g_i(x_i), \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with a Lipschitz gradient, f is possibly non-convex in \mathbf{x} and (strongly) concave in y with modulus $\mu \geq 0$, $h : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $g_i : \mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ are closed convex functions. We consider two scenarios: (i) *deterministic setting*, where we assume one can compute ∇f exactly, and (ii) *stochastic setting*, where one can only access to stochastic estimates of ∇f , see Assumption 2 for details. If $\mu > 0$, then we call the minimax problem in (1) as *weakly convex-strongly concave* (WCSC), whereas for $\mu = 0$, we call it as *weakly convex-merely concave* (WCMC). Both problems arise frequently in many applications including *constrained optimization* of weakly-convex objectives based on Lagrangian duality [37], Generative Adversarial Networks [17] and distributional robust learning with weakly convex loss functions such as those arising in deep learning [19, 54]. These applications admitting the formulation in (1) often require (i) handling non-convexity in high dimensions and (ii) exploiting the block structure in the primal variable. Indeed, for these machine learning (ML) problems, the setting with larger model size compared to the number of data points has attracted significant active research, where it has been commonly observed

*The authors can be reached at the following email addresses: qjx5019@psu.edu (Q. Xu); xxz358@psu.edu (X. Zhang); nsa10@psu.edu (N. S. Aybat); and mg1366@rutgers.edu (M. Gürbüzbalaban).

that larger models can often generalize better, i.e., they perform better on unseen data [46]. In addition to the above-mentioned examples, another particular example for (1) with a block-structure would be the *distributed computation* setting for WCSC/WCMC problems [71], i.e., $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f_i(x, y)$ over a network of processing nodes represented by a connected undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ with \mathcal{N} denoting the set of computing nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ denoting the edges of \mathcal{G} through which incident nodes can communicate with each other; in case synchronous parallel processing is available, one can reformulate the problem as $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{ \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f_i(x_i, y) : x_i = x_j \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \}$, i.e., $\mathcal{X}_i = \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$; hence, $n = |\mathcal{N}|d$.

Our goals: Using first-order primal-dual (FOPD) methods have turned out to be an effective approach to tackle with (1). Majority of existing FOPD methods require the knowledge of *global Lipschitz constants*, a relatively standard assumption when deriving rate statements for first-order (FO) schemes. That being said, in many practical settings either these constants may not be readily available or using the global constants generally leads to conservative step sizes, slowing down the convergence. One avenue for removing such a requirement lies in adopting line-search or backtracking schemes to exploit *local* Lipschitz constants when determining the step sizes. For deterministic convex-concave minimax problems, backtracking methods that adjust the step size adaptively through estimating local Lipschitz constants have proven to be very effective both in theory¹ and practice, e.g., see [43, 42, 20, 25, 21, 26]. However, for *non-convex* problems such as (1), we are not aware of any *backtracking/line search* strategy with iteration complexity guarantees. In this paper, our aim is to fill this gap and develop a backtracking technique to be incorporated into a *single-loop FOPD method* for the nonconvex minimax problem in (1) as the single-loop design of an algorithm makes it suitable for solving large-scale problems efficiently –usually in methods with nested loops, inner iterations are terminated when a sufficient optimality condition holds and these conditions are usually very conservative, leading to excessive number of inner iterations. Indeed, single loop algorithms are preferable compared to multi-loop algorithms in many settings, e.g., see [67] for a discussion. Our secondary goal is to allow for block-coordinate updates within the backtracking scheme we design. Indeed, there are some practical scenarios for which adopting randomized block coordinate updates (RBC) would be beneficial, which we discuss next; hence, developing FOPD methods that can support block-coordinate updates is of key practical relevance.

Scenario I: Consider the setting with the primal dimension is very large, i.e., $n \gg 1$. Suppose that while it is impractical to work with $\nabla_x f$ at every iteration of an FOPD method, the problem has a *coordinate-friendly* structure [52], i.e., for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the amount of work to compute the partial-gradient $\nabla_{x_i} f$ is $n_i/n \approx 1/N$ fraction of the work required for the full-gradient $\nabla_x f$ computation. In this setup, randomized block updates will lead to low per-iteration cost and possibly small memory overhead, e.g., [48, 20, 15, 62].

Scenario II: In the nonconvex regime, even if the problem is not coordinate friendly, adopting random block coordinate updates might still be beneficial as it improves the generalization power of particular machine learning models, e.g., layer-by-layer training of deep neural networks is commonly used in practice for this purpose, e.g., see [45]. In this setup, randomized block updates can help with generalization in deep learning, even though the per-iteration complexity may not necessarily improve.

Therefore, our objective in this paper is to design an efficient first-order *randomized* block-coordinate primal-dual method that can generate an ϵ -stationary point (see Definition 3) of the structured non-convex minimax problem given in (1) without requiring the knowledge of the Lipschitz constant L , which is typically unknown a priori.

Challenges: In contrast to the convex setting, i.e., (strongly) convex-(strongly) concave minimax problems, the *nonconvexity* introduces significant extra challenges in designing a reasonable *backtracking condition* –which would be employed to decide whether a candidate step size should be accepted or rejected through checking the condition. Excluding the *multi-loop* methods such as [49, 40, 50, 30], in the non-convex setting the convergence guarantees for all *single-loop* FO methods that we are aware of, except for very few (see, e.g., [41, 67, 65, 64]), are provided in terms of the partial sum of gradient norms corresponding to the primal function or its Moreau envelope over the past iterations (see, e.g., [38, 2, 58, 23, 9]), rather than having guarantees involving the gradients of the coupling function f evaluated at the last iterate or at an ergodic average. Clearly, computing the gradient of the *primal function* or of the *Moreau envelope* at each iteration to check a backtracking condition would be impractical in the deterministic setting, as the former is typically not easy to compute exactly and it requires solving an optimization problem while the latter one

¹These methods relying on backtracking achieve the same complexity guarantees (up to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant) with those requiring the availability of global Lipschitz constants.

requires evaluating the proximal map of the primal function [9]. In fact, this would be impossible for the stochastic setting as we can only access to the stochastic estimates of ∇f at a given point. Thus, designing a backtracking condition that would lead to the state-of-the-art complexity guarantees for WCSC and WCMC problems and that is *easy* to check in practice requires developing new analysis techniques (different from those used for the convex setting as they do not extend to the non-convex setting) to provide guarantees for quantities that are readily available such as the *stochastic gradient map* involving the coupling function –see Definition 2 and note that the computation cost of the (stochastic) gradient mapping is significantly lower compared to the impractical computational burden associated with computing the norm of the gradient of the primal function² Another source of difficulty, maybe the main one, in the analysis of single-loop methods for the non-convex setting is the *necessity* of imposing an appropriate *time-scale separation* between the primal and dual updates in attaining convergence for the nonconvex setting [33]. For instance, in both [38, 2], the convergence is shown for dual stepsize $\eta_y = \Theta(\frac{1}{L})$ and primal stepsize $\eta_x = \Theta(\frac{1}{\kappa^2 L})$ for WCSC minimax problems where L is the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of f and $\kappa = L/\mu$, i.e., the ratio $\eta_y/\eta_x = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2)$ is needed for the convergence analysis; however, it is not clear how one can incorporate backtracking on η_y and preserve the ratio between the primal and dual step sizes with some theoretical guarantees. There are very *few* backtracking methods for the weakly convex-weakly concave (WCWC) setting under Weak MVI or negative-comonotonicity assumptions, e.g., [32, 53]; however, these conditions are not guaranteed to hold in general for the WCSC or WCMC minimax problem as in (1) –see the discussion in section 2 on existing methods for WCWC problems for more details.

Our contributions: For the case \mathcal{L} in (1) is WCSC or WCMC, the algorithm SGDA-B we propose in this paper achieves the best computational complexity for computing an ϵ -stationary point (in the sense of Definition 3) in both deterministic and stochastic settings among the existing methods that are agnostic to the global Lipschitz constant L and to the weak convexity modulus³ $m > 0$. More precisely, our main contribution is to show that without knowing/using L and m values, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, SGDA-B can compute an ϵ -stationary point of (1) with the following guarantees: for deterministic WCSC and WCMC problems, SGDA-B requires $\mathcal{O}(L\kappa^2/\epsilon^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(L^3/\epsilon^4)$ gradient calls, respectively; furthermore, we also show that for any $p \in (0, 1)$, SGDA-B can generate an ϵ -stationary point w.p. at least $1 - p$ requiring $\mathcal{O}(L\kappa^3\epsilon^{-4} \log(1/p))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L^4\epsilon^{-7} \log(1/p))$ stochastic gradient calls for stochastic WCSC and WCMC problems, respectively. To our knowledge, these are the best (stochastic) gradient complexities among all the first-order methods that are *agnostic* to L and designed for WCSC and WCMC problems of the form in (1) –see the comparison provided in Table 1 and Table 2 for stochastic and deterministic gradient oracle cases, respectively.

Outline: In Section 2, we discuss the existing work closely-related to our paper. Later in section 3, we state our assumptions and provide the algorithmic framework SGDA-B with backtracking. In section 4 and section 5, we establish the convergence properties of SGDA-B on WCSC and WCMC minimax problems, respectively. Finally, in section 6, on problems with synthetic and real data, we test SGDA-B against other methods that are agnostic to the Lipschitz constant L and compare the results against the benchmark obtained using other state-of-the-art methods which require the knowledge of L to properly fix their step sizes.

Notations. The set \mathbb{Z}_+ denotes non-negative integers, whereas $\mathbb{Z}_{++} \triangleq \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ denotes the set of positive integers. $\mathcal{U}[1, N]$ denotes the uniform distribution on the set $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Given a closed convex function $h : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, the proximal map is defined as $\mathbf{prox}_h(y') \triangleq \mathbf{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} h(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - y'\|^2$, for all $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. Throughout the text, we use “w.p. p ” as an abbreviation for “with probability p .”

2 Related work

Before we discuss the related work, we briefly list commonly adopted metrics for defining ϵ -stationarity.

- (i) When f is WCSC and $g(\cdot) = 0$ in (1), a commonly used metric for stationarity is the gradient of the primal function, i.e., \mathbf{x}_ϵ is ϵ -stationary if $\|\nabla\Phi(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$, where $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y)$; moreover, using the gradient map, one can extend ϵ -stationarity to the case with $g(\cdot) \neq 0$ using $\|\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ for some $\alpha > 0$, where $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq [\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{prox}_{\alpha g}(\mathbf{x} - \alpha\nabla\Phi(\mathbf{x}))]/\alpha$ –we call this metric as **(M1)**.

²The standard approach for computing this quantity would be based on the Danskin’s theorem; but, this would require solving an optimization problem at every time the backtracking condition is checked, which would be computationally expensive.

³The weak convexity modulus of \mathcal{L} is the smallest $m \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, y) + \frac{m}{2}\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex over $\mathbf{dom} g$ for any $y \in \mathbf{dom} h$ fixed; hence, by definition, we have $m \leq L$.

Work	Ref.	Agnostic	g	h	BCU	Complexity ($\mu > 0$)	Complexity ($\mu = 0$)
*GDA	[38]	✗	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \epsilon^{-4})$	M3: $\mathcal{O}(L^2 \ell^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \epsilon^{-8})$
*AGDA	[2]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \epsilon^{-4})$	M3: $\mathcal{O}(L^2 \ell^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \epsilon^{-8})$
†SMDA	[23]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^5 \mu^{-2} \epsilon^{-4})$	✗
†Acc-MDA	[22]	✗	$\mathbb{1}_X$	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{3.5} L^{1.5} \epsilon^{-3} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$	✗
VRLM	[44]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \epsilon^{-3})$	✗
sm-AGDA	[65]	✗	✗	✗	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 L \epsilon^{-4})$	✗
‡NeAda	[29]	✓	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^8 B^8 \epsilon^{-4} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$	✗
§TiAda	[35]	✓	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{12} B^6 \bar{L}^4 \mu^{-4} \epsilon^{-4})$	✗
¶SGDA-B	Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \log(p^{-1}) \epsilon^{-4})$	M2: $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L^4 \mathcal{D}_y^3 \log(p^{-1}) \epsilon^{-7})$

Table 1: Comparison of SGDA-B (this paper), NeAda [29] and TiAda [35] that are agnostic to L with *single-loop* methods that require L for solving *stochastic* WCSC ($\mu > 0$) and WCMC ($\mu = 0$) minimax problems. The column “Agnostic” indicates whether the method requires knowing L , and the column “BCU” indicates whether the method can use block-coordinate updates. In the columns we state complexity, we indicate the metric used for defining ϵ -stationarity; the definitions of metrics M1, M2, and M3 are provided at the beginning of section 2. All the methods listed above, except for SGDA-B, provide guarantees for these metrics in the expected sense, while SGDA-B give guarantees for M2 with high probability. In the table \mathcal{D}_y denotes the diameter of the dual domain.

Table Notes: *For the case $\mu = 0$, [38, 2] both assume that f is ℓ -Lipschitz for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. †The complexity results reported here are different than those in [23, 22]. The issues in their proofs leading to the wrong complexity results are explained in [70, Appendix I]. ‡In [29], it is assumed that there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x, y; \xi)\| \leq B$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in Y$. §In [35] it is assumed that (i) $B \in (0, \infty)$ exists as in [29]; (ii) $\nabla_{xy}^2 f$ and $\nabla_{yy}^2 f$ are \bar{L} -Lipschitz, i.e., second-order Lipschitz continuity in y for f ; (iii) the primal function is upper-bounded; and (iv) for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y^*(x) \in \text{int}(Y)$. For any $\delta > 0$, the bound for TiAda is at least $\mathcal{O}(B^{6-\frac{4\delta}{2+\delta}} \kappa^{12-\frac{6\delta}{2+\delta}} \bar{L}^{4-\frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \mu^{-4+\frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \epsilon^{-4+\frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} + B^{2+\delta} \kappa^{(2+\frac{\delta}{2})} L^{(2+\frac{\delta}{2})} \epsilon^{-(4+\delta)})$. In the table, we state the complexity for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. ¶In the complexity bounds for SGDA-B, $p \in (0, 1)$ is an algorithm parameter bounding the number of backtracking iterations, i.e., SGDA-B requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log(\kappa))$ backtracking iterations with probability at least $1 - p$.

Work	Ref.	Agnostic	g	h	BCU	Complexity ($\mu > 0$)	Complexity ($\mu = 0$)
GDA	[38]	✗	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 L \epsilon^{-2})$	M3: $\mathcal{O}(L^2 \ell^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \epsilon^{-6})$
AGDA	[2]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 L \epsilon^{-2})$	M3: $\mathcal{O}(L^2 \ell^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \epsilon^{-6})$
MDA	[23]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	✗
sm-AGDA	[65]	✗	✗	✗	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa L \epsilon^{-2})$	✗
AltGDAm	[9]	✗	✓	✓	✗	M1: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{\frac{11}{6}} L \epsilon^{-2})$	✗
AGP	[64]	✗	$\mathbb{1}_X$	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^8 L^2 \epsilon^{-2})$	M2: $\mathcal{O}(L^4 \mathcal{D}_y^4 \epsilon^{-4})$
Sm-GDA	[67]	✗	$\mathbb{1}_X$	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✓	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(L^4 \mathcal{D}_y^4 \epsilon^{-4})$
HiBSA	[41]	✗	✓	✓	✓	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^8 L^2 \epsilon^{-2})$	✗
NeAda	[29]	✓	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{4.5} L^4 \epsilon^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$	✗
TiAda	[35]	✓	✗	$\mathbb{1}_Y$	✗	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{10} \epsilon^{-2})$	✗
GDA-B	Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	M2: $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 L \epsilon^{-2})$	M2: $\mathcal{O}(L^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \epsilon^{-4})$

Table 2: Comparison of GDA-B (this paper), NeAda [29] and TiAda [35] that are agnostic to L with *single-loop* methods that require L for solving *deterministic* WCSC and WCMC minimax problems.

- (ii) ϵ -stationarity can also be defined using the coupling function f ; indeed, for any given $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$, let $G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \triangleq (\mathbf{x}_\epsilon - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon - \eta_x \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)))/\eta_x$ and $G_y(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \triangleq (\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y_\epsilon + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)) - y_\epsilon)/\eta_y$, then we call $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ ϵ -stationary in metric **(M2)** if $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$, where $G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = [G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)^\top, G_y(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)^\top]^\top$.
- (iii) An alternative definition of ϵ -stationarity when $g(\cdot) \neq 0$ is to use the Moreau envelope of the primal function, i.e., $\|\nabla F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ for $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$ –we call this metric as **(M3)**, where $F = g + \Phi$ is the primal function and $F_\lambda : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$ is the Moreau envelope of F . The relation between these different metrics are discussed in appendix C.

Our objective in this paper is to incorporate a step size search within the (proximal) GDA method, analyzed in [38, 2], to make it agnostic to L . For the reasons discussed above in the introduction, we would like to design a backtracking condition based on the (stochastic) gradient of the coupling function f and provide some guarantees in terms of metric **(M2)** for the new method. In general, compared to **(M1)** and **(M3)**, providing guarantees in **(M2)** requires checking a *simpler* backtracking condition depending on the stochastic gradient map which can be easily calculated in practice; moreover, ϵ -stationarity in **(M2)** also implies $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationarity with respect to **(M1)** and **(M3)** metrics –see appendix C. Since we are building on the (proximal) GDA method, our main goal is to design the new backtracking framework that can obtain the same complexity bounds with those established in [38, 2] (where it is assumed that L is known) –see Tables 1 and 2, and we aim to achieve this goal without deteriorating their $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants, especially the κ dependency for the WCSC case. We choose the proximal GDA method to incorporate backtracking due to its simplicity and its decent complexity bounds with a reasonable $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant for the case L is known; that said, one can also consider designing backtracking for other classes of single-loop methods, e.g., [64, 65]. To put our work into context, we first briefly mention the two recent papers [64, 65] that also provide guarantees involving the coupling function f –both methods require that the global Lipschitz constant be known (to properly initialize the step sizes). Assuming g and h are indicator functions of some convex compact sets, X and Y , respectively; the paper [64] studies (1) in the *deterministic* WCSC and WSMC settings with number of blocks $N = 1$, and it does not consider the stochastic setting. The method in [64] can compute $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^8 L^2 \epsilon^{-2})$ and $\mathcal{O}(L^4 \mathcal{D}_y^4 \epsilon^{-4})$ gradient calls when $\mu > 0$ and $\mu = 0$, respectively. For the deterministic scenario, a backtracking technique similar to the one proposed in our paper, i.e., searching for an admissible dual stepsize while imposing an appropriate time-scale separation between the primal and dual step sizes, may potentially be designed/implemented for [64] (as it provides guarantees for both $\nabla_x f$ and $\nabla_y f$ –hence, easy to check in practice); however, the complexity guarantee in [64] is already worse than those in [38] and [2] in terms of its dependence on the condition number κ . On the other hand, for the stochastic WCSC setting, the Smoothed AGDA (**sm-AGDA**) method proposed in [65] provides the best known guarantees for the **(M2)** metric, i.e., in terms of ∇f ; however, these results are only valid for the smooth case, i.e., $h(\cdot) = g(\cdot) = 0$, and it is not trivial to extend the proof in [65] to the more general setup we considered in (1) involving g and h . It is worth emphasizing that the existence of closed convex functions g, h complicates the backtracking analysis even in the deterministic setting, and dealing with these non-smooth terms in the stochastic setting is inherently more difficult; indeed, due to use of proximal operation for g and h , the effect of noise (as a result of noisy gradients) showing up in the error bound for stationarity, which we call the *variance term*, cannot be directly controlled through choosing a *small* step size –this issue can also be observed in existing papers: compare the variance term of the error bound in [38], which assumes $g(\cdot) = 0$, with that in [2], which also considers nonzero g and h . Indeed, according to [38, Eq. (C.12)] (which is a result of the second inequality in [38, Lemma C5]) the variance term can be controlled by adopting small step size $\eta_x > 0$ –as the variance term scales with $\eta_x \sigma^2$, while [2, Proof of Thm 4.2] shows that $\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E}[\|w_k\|^2] = \mathcal{O}(K\sigma^2/M)$ is *independent* of η_x , where w_k denotes a subgradient of the primal function $g(\cdot) + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\cdot, y) - h(y)$, and M is the batch size. Finally, for the stochastic setting, even if we consider the smooth case, i.e., $g(\cdot) = h(\cdot) = 0$, it is not trivial to extend [65] to use backtracking as the guarantees given in the paper are on exact gradients of the coupling function ∇f rather than its stochastic estimate $\tilde{\nabla} f$; therefore, one cannot directly use those guarantees on ∇f to accept or reject step sizes within a backtracking scheme as they cannot be verified in practice.

In this work, we show that a simple backtracking technique can be incorporated into the proximal GDA algorithm with complexity guarantees matching (up to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant) the results given in [38, 2]; unlike

[38, 2, 64, 65] discussed above, our results do not require knowing the Lipschitz constant L . In summary, our results provide us with guarantees for WCMC and WCSC minimax problems⁴ with possibly non-smooth closed convex h and g as in (1), and SGDA-B algorithm proposed in this paper achieves the best known complexity in terms of ϵ having the same κ -dependence as in [38] and [2] without requiring any prior knowledge on neither the Lipschitz constant of ∇f nor on the weak convexity modulus. Next, we briefly mention some existing work that are closely related to ours.

Existing work for the deterministic setting: WCSC and WCMC minimax problems. For the case the global Lipschitz constant L is *known*, there are many theoretically efficient methods in the literature, e.g., see [40, 50, 30] and references therein. When L is known, both Lin *et al.* [40] and Ostrovskii *et al.* [50] show an iteration complexity of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L\kappa^{1/2}\epsilon^{-2})$ for finding an ϵ -stationary point in terms of metric **(M2)** for deterministic WCSC problems –both algorithms have *three nested loops* and impose restrictions on the closed convex functions, i.e., g and h can only be the indicator functions of some convex sets. Furthermore, both [40] and [50] establish an iteration complexity of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-2.5})$ for deterministic WCMC problems, which is later improved to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2.5})$ in [30]. Due to huge amount of recent work in this area, to limit the discussion in table 2, we only list some closely related *single-loop* methods that require L for solving *deterministic* WCSC and WCMC minimax problems.

Although there are many methods for the deterministic setting, to the best of our knowledge, there are *very few* FOPD algorithms that are *agnostic* to L and m , i.e., the Lipschitz constant of ∇f and weak-convexity modulus (see footnote 3), and that use adaptive step sizes for solving minimax problems in the nonconvex setting [14, 29, 35, 32, 53]. For a special case of (1) with $h(\cdot) = 0$ and *bilinear* coupling $f(x, y) = -r(y) + \langle Ax, y \rangle$ such that r is smooth and strongly convex, the work [14] proposes a triple-loop method where in the outer loop, primal iterate x^k is updated using the step sizes satisfying a backtracking condition based on the primal function, one searches for an admissible primal step size using the middle loop which repeats until the backtracking condition holds, and for each backtracking iteration, the inner maximization problem $\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x^k, y)$ is solved inexactly using the inner loop; the gradient complexity of the proposed method is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L\kappa^{1.5}\epsilon^{-2})$ for computing an ϵ -stationary point in terms of metric **(M1)**. For the more general case of WCSC minimax problems when the coupling function f is not bilinear, Nested Adaptive (**NeAda**) [29] and Time-Scale Adaptive [35] (**TiAda**) algorithms are recently proposed, both of which are based on variants of AdaGrad step sizes [13]; hence, these methods do not use backtracking. **NeAda**, similar to [14], is a double-loop method for solving (1) with $g(\cdot) = 0$ and $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$, i.e., the indicator function of a closed convex set Y ; in the inner loop, a strongly concave problem is inexactly solved using the AdaGrad method, of which solution is then used to compute an inexact gradient for the primal objective function; finally, a primal step is taken along the inexact gradient using AdaGrad stepsize. **NeAda** can compute (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) such that $\|\nabla_x f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ and $\|y_\epsilon - y_*(x_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ within $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{4.5}L^4\epsilon^{-2} \log(1/\epsilon))$ gradient complexity, where $y_*(\cdot) = \mathbf{argmax}_{y \in Y} f(\cdot, y)$. On the other hand, **TiAda** [35] is a single-loop scheme that can be considered as an extension of AdaGrad to solve minimax problems in a similar spirit to two-time scale GDA algorithms. **TiAda** can compute (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) such that $\|\nabla f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ within $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{10}\epsilon^{-2})$ gradient calls. The complexity for **NeAda** and **TiAda** in the deterministic case are provided in Table 2; see appendix B for the derivation of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants. The analyses of these algorithms are given for *smooth* WCSC problems with $g(\cdot) = 0$ and $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$. In our set of numerical tests (see Figures 1 and 2), the practical performance of **NeAda** and **TiAda** did not match their nice theoretical complexity bounds –this may be due to large $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants of their bounds with *high* powers of κ ; indeed, both of them adopt AdaGrad-like step size sequences, and while this choice makes the algorithm agnostic to L and μ , it also potentially causes issues in practice: since initial iterates are potentially far from stationarity (with gradient norms *not* close to 0), in the initial transient phase of the algorithm the step sizes decrease very quickly, as they are inversely proportional to the partial sum of gradient norms over all past iterations. These quickly decaying step sizes cause slow convergence in practice (see Figures 1 and 2). Finally, for smooth WCWC problems, extragradient (EG) methods with backtracking are proposed in [32, 53]; but, they make additional assumptions (*stronger* than smoothness of f) that in general do not hold for WCSC and WCMC problems we consider as in (1). To make the discussion complete, next we provide a brief discussion on the state-of-the-art results for FOPD methods to solve WCWC minimax problems.

⁴Although there are results for WCWC problems with $g = h = 0$ under further assumptions, such as negative comonotonicity or existence of a solution to a weak Minty variational inequality, to the best of our knowledge, there are no backtracking results for WCSC and WCMC problems in the form of (1).

Existing work for the deterministic setting: smooth WCWC minimax problems. Consider the smooth WCWC case corresponding to the formulation in (1) with $g = h = 0$ and f is L -smooth, i.e., ∇f is Lipschitz with constant L , and let $\mathcal{M}(x, y) \triangleq [\nabla_x f(x, y)^\top - \nabla_y f(x, y)^\top]^\top$. For this setting, Lee and Kim [32] incorporated backtracking within a variant of EG method; under the additional assumption that \mathcal{M} is a ρ -comonotone operator for some $\rho < 0$, the authors established $\|\nabla f(x_k, y_k)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ –this result extends the $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate shown in [66] for the merely convex-merely concave minimax problems, i.e., the authors extend the monotone operator case (which corresponds to $\rho = 0$) to negative-comonotone operators⁵ (which corresponds to $\rho < 0$). In a separate body of work, the WCWC case (with $g = h = 0$ and f is L -smooth) is analyzed under the additional assumption that Minty VI (MVI) corresponding to the operator \mathcal{M} has a solution⁶; $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ rate has been shown [11, 59, 12] for $\|\nabla f\|^2$. The conditions “ \mathcal{M} being negative-comonotone” and “MVI corresponding to \mathcal{M} having a solution” are not equivalent, and neither one implies the other. Later, Diakonikolas et al. [12] introduced a weaker condition compared to the other two: “the *weak* MVI corresponding to \mathcal{M} has a nonempty solution set,” i.e., this condition holds whenever \mathcal{M} is negative comonotone [12, 32] or whenever a solution to the MVI exists [11, 59].

Recently, Pethick et al. [53] have proposed an extragradient-type algorithm with adaptive stepsizes (using backtracking on the unknown Lipschitz constant) for (1) assuming that g, h are closed convex and f is L -smooth such that the corresponding weak MVI has a solution; and they show that the limit points of the iterate sequence belongs to the zero-set of the operator defining the weak MVI *without* providing any complexity guarantee for the adaptive algorithm that uses backtracking.⁷ It is crucial to emphasize that since \mathcal{M} is non-monotone, assuming ∇f is L -Lipschitz does not imply that the corresponding weak MVI has a solution. Therefore, the existing methods developed for smooth WCWC minimax problems do not apply to the WCSC and WCMC settings we consider since the corresponding weak MVIs may not have a solution. In other words, all of these conditions, i.e., \mathcal{M} being negative comonotone, existence of a solution to MVI or even to its weaker version (weak MVI) corresponding to \mathcal{M} are both stronger than the standard assumption of ∇f being Lipschitz, and do not necessarily hold even if we further assume f is (strongly) concave in y . Indeed, negative comonotonicity of \mathcal{M} , leading to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ complexity [32], is a strong assumption; because the standard lower complexity bounds established for FO methods to compute an ϵ -stationary point for general non-convex smooth optimization problems imply that at least $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2})$ gradient evaluations are required [5].⁸

Existing work for the stochastic setting. To the best of our knowledge, efficient *stochastic backtracking* (SB) step-size search techniques that can exploit the structure of minimax problems are still missing in the literature even for the convex-concave minimax problems. Although there are some recent developments on SB for stochastic optimization (see, e.g., [27, 51, 28]), these methods do not extend to more general minimax problems. There are also methods developed for stochastic monotone variational inequalities (VI) –see, e.g., [24, 1], such methods are applicable to convex-concave problems in theory –since every convex-concave minimax problem can be written as a monotone VI; however, they do not exploit the special structure of minimax problems –indeed, through utilizing further properties of minimax problems such as adopting different step sizes for primal and dual blocks, and exploiting the local *block Lipschitz* constants when determining primal and dual step sizes in an adaptive manner, more efficient SB techniques for minimax problems can be designed. Furthermore, for WCSC and WCMC minimax problems, the corresponding VI is *not* monotone anymore, and we are not aware of any stochastic VI methods that can deal with such problems using adaptive stepsizes.

For solving *stochastic* WCSC minimax problems, the only FOPD algorithms that are *agnostic* to L and m , and that use adaptive step sizes are **NeAda** [29] (double-loop) and **TiAda** [35] (single loop) methods, which we discuss above also for the deterministic setting –they are both based on AdaGrad stepsizes [13] and these methods do not use backtracking step-size search. The analyses of these algorithms are given for smooth

⁵Given a coupling function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is WCWC and twice continuously differentiable, the corresponding map \mathcal{M} is negative-comonotone if $\nabla_{xy}^2 f$ dominates any negative curvature in block Hessians $\nabla_{xx}^2 f$ and $-\nabla_{yy}^2 f$ –see [18].

⁶MVIs corresponding to quasiconvex-concave and starconvex-concave problems have a solution; however, since there are smooth functions that are neither quasiconvex nor star-convex, there are WCWC minimax problem corresponding to a smooth coupling function f for which the corresponding MVI does not necessarily have a solution.

⁷In contrast, we would like to design backtracking methods for WCMC and WCSC problems with complexity guarantees.

⁸This complexity bound also applies to computing (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) such that $\|\nabla f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ when f in (1) is WCWC and $g = h = 0$. Furthermore, let $\Phi(\cdot) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\cdot, y)$ denote the primal function corresponding to the smooth WCSC problem $(P_s) : \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x, y)$; for deterministic FOPD methods to solve (P_s) , Zhang et al. [68] (see also [34]) have shown that a lower bound for finding an ϵ -stationary point of Φ , i.e., $x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\|\nabla \Phi(x_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$, is $\Omega\left(L\sqrt{\kappa}/\epsilon^2\right)$.

WCSC problems with $g(\cdot) = 0$ and $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$, i.e., the indicator function of a closed convex set Y ⁹. In [35] it is shown that **TiAda** can compute (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) such that $\mathbf{E}[\|\nabla f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ with at most $C_{\epsilon, \kappa}^{\text{TiAda}} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-(4+\delta)})$ oracle complexity for any $\delta > 0$ —however, how $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant depends on κ is not discussed in [35]; indeed, in appendix B, we argue that for any given $\delta > 0$, $C_{\epsilon, \kappa}^{\text{TiAda}} = \Omega(\kappa^{2+\frac{\delta}{2}}\epsilon^{-(4+\delta)} + \kappa^{12-\frac{6\delta}{2+\delta}}\epsilon^{-4+\frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}})$. In [29], it is shown that the oracle complexity of **NeAda** can be bounded by $C_{\epsilon, \kappa}^{\text{NeAda}} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4}\log(1/\epsilon))$ to compute (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) such that $\mathbf{E}[\|\nabla_x f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\|] \leq \epsilon$ and $\mathbf{E}[\|y_\epsilon - y^*(x_\epsilon)\|] \leq \epsilon$; in appendix B, we argue that $C_{\epsilon, \kappa}^{\text{NeAda}} = \Omega(\kappa^8\epsilon^{-4}\log(1/\epsilon))$. While the single-loop method **TiAda** is agnostic to the strong concavity modulus μ and to the stochastic oracle variance bound σ^2 , its convergence analysis is given under some strong assumptions: (i) the coupling function f is twice differentiable in y such that $\nabla_{xy}^2 f$ and $\nabla_{yy}^2 f$ are Lipschitz; (ii) stochastic gradients are uniformly bounded, i.e., $\exists B > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x, y)\| \leq B$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, which clearly does not hold even for additive Gaussian noise structure; and (iii) the primal function $\Phi(\cdot) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\cdot, y)$ is bounded above, i.e., $\exists B_\Phi > 0$ such that $\Phi(x) \leq B_\Phi$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, which is a strong assumption considering that Φ is weakly convex.

3 Assumptions and Algorithmic Framework

Assumption 1. Let $g_i : \mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $h : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that

1. g_i , for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and h are closed convex functions;
2. f is differentiable on an open set containing $\mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$ such that ∇f is L -Lipschitz on $\mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$; furthermore, $f(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is (strongly) concave with modulus μ for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{dom} g$ for some $\mu \geq 0$;
3. $-\infty < F^* \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathbf{x})$, where $F \triangleq g + \Phi$ for $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Phi(\cdot) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\cdot, y) - h(y)$. Suppose we are given $\bar{F} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{F} \leq F^*$.

Definition 1. Define $y_* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that $y_*(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbf{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y)$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{dom} g$.

In many practical settings partial gradients $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f$ and $\nabla_y f$ may not be available or computing them may be very costly; but, rather we have access to their noisy unbiased stochastic estimates at a given point (\mathbf{x}, y) through a stochastic oracle. This would be the natural setting in machine learning applications where the gradients are estimated from randomly sampled subsets (batches) of data [3]. We make the following assumption on the stochastic oracles which is also commonly adopted in the literature [70, 69].

Assumption 2. Let $\{\tilde{\nabla}_{x_i} f\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_y f$ denote stochastic oracles for $\{\nabla_{x_i} f\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ and $\nabla_y f$, respectively, satisfying the following assumptions for all $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$:

- (i) $\mathbf{E}_\omega[\tilde{\nabla}_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y; \omega) | \mathbf{x}, y] = \nabla_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y)$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{E}_\zeta[\tilde{\nabla}_y f(\mathbf{x}, y; \zeta) | \mathbf{x}, y] = \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, y)$;
- (iii) $\exists \sigma_x \geq 0 : \mathbf{E}_\omega[\|\tilde{\nabla}_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y; \omega) - \nabla_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|^2 | \mathbf{x}, y] \leq \sigma_x^2/N$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$;
- (iv) $\exists \sigma_y \geq 0 : \mathbf{E}_\zeta[\|\tilde{\nabla}_y f(\mathbf{x}, y; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|^2 | \mathbf{x}, y] \leq \sigma_y^2$.

Here, we consider the setting where we are allowed to call the stochastic oracles in batches of size $M \geq 1$. Although the result in [39], assuming $g(\cdot) = 0$ and $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$ in (1) for some closed convex set Y , can be extended to cover purely stochastic case of $M = 1$, this would degrade the complexity from $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ for $M = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$ for $M = \mathcal{O}(1)$. The **sm-AGDA** method proposed in [65] has $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ complexity guarantee for $M = \mathcal{O}(1)$; however, this requires setting $\eta_x = \eta_y = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\sigma^2 L \kappa})$ and this result is only valid for the smooth case, i.e., $h(\cdot) = g(\cdot) = 0$; furthermore, it is not trivial to extend the proof in [65], showing the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ complexity result with $M = 1$, to the more general setup we considered in (1) involving possibly nonsmooth

⁹In [35], it is assumed that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y_*(x)$ is in the interior of Y ; that is why they adopt the stationarity measure $\|\nabla f\|^2$. This is a restrictive assumption.

closed convex functions g, h . There are only very few *single-loop* methods that can handle *stochastic* WCSC problem in (1) with arbitrary closed convex functions g and h ; indeed, [2, 44, 23] are the only ones we are aware of. The methods in [2, 23] both can guarantee computing an ϵ -stationary point with $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ complexity and using batch size $M = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ – [2] requires setting $\eta_y = 1/L$, $\eta_x = \frac{1}{L\kappa^2}$, $M = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2\sigma^2\epsilon^{-2})$, and SMDA in [23] requires $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L}$, $\eta_x = \frac{1}{\kappa^3}$ and $M = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa^2\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^2})$; on the other hand, using variance reduction [23, 44] can achieve $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ complexity – [44] requires batch size $M = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and step sizes $\eta_y = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma L\kappa})$ and $\eta_x = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma L\kappa^3})$, and VR-SMDA in [23] requires setting $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L\kappa}$, $\eta_x = \frac{1}{\kappa^4}$, and sampling large batch size of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa^2\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^2})$ once in every $q = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa}{\mu\epsilon})$ iterations which all use small batch size of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa}{\mu\epsilon})$. That being said, [2, 44, 23] all define ϵ -stationarity using the gradient of the primal function, i.e., using metric **(M1)**; therefore, these methods are not suitable for backtracking and they require knowledge of L . Indeed, we are not aware of any work that can provide *direct* guarantees in terms of the gradients of the *coupling function* (which is desirable for being able to implement backtracking on the dual step size) achieving $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ complexity with $M = \mathcal{O}(1)$ when there are arbitrary closed convex functions g and h as in (1). In the rest of this paper, we restrict the discussion to a method that does not require a bound on L , i.e., agnostic to L , and still achieving $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ complexity with batch size of $M = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$.

We next introduce the stochastic gradient estimates $s_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $s_{\mathbf{y}}$ that are obtained based on $M_x, M_y \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ calls to the stochastic oracle and the corresponding stochastic gradient maps $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{y}}$, which arise frequently in the study of proximal-gradient methods [9, 64, 41].

Definition 2. Given $M_x, M_y \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and stepsizes $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$, define $s_{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $s_{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{G}_{\mathbf{y}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that $s_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) = [s_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega})]_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) = [\tilde{G}_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega})]_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{X}$, where

$$s_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \triangleq \frac{1}{M_x} \sum_{j=1}^{M_x} \tilde{\nabla}_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y; \omega_j), \quad \tilde{G}_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \triangleq \left[x_i - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g_i} \left(x_i - \eta_x s_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \right) \right] / \eta_x, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N},$$

$$s_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) \triangleq \frac{1}{M_y} \sum_{j=1}^{M_y} \tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, y; \zeta_j), \quad \tilde{G}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) \triangleq \left[\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y + \eta_y s_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) \right) - y \right] / \eta_y,$$

are defined for all $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbf{dom} f \times \mathbf{dom} g$, and $\boldsymbol{\omega} \triangleq [\omega_j]_{j=1}^{M_x}$, $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \triangleq [\zeta_j]_{j=1}^{M_y}$ such that both $\{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ and $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^{M_y}$ are i.i.d. corresponding to the randomness generated by the stochastic oracle and satisfy Assumption 2. For notational simplicity, let $\boldsymbol{\xi} \triangleq [\boldsymbol{\omega}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top]^\top$, and we define $s(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) \triangleq [s_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega})^\top s_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta})^\top]^\top$ and $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) \triangleq [\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega})^\top \tilde{G}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta})^\top]^\top$.

Let G_{x_i} for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $G_{\mathbf{y}}$ denote the deterministic gradient maps, i.e., for any $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$,

$$G_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq \left[x_i - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g_i} \left(x_i - \eta_x \nabla_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}, y) \right) \right] / \eta_x \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad G_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq \left[\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y + \eta_y \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, y) \right) - y \right] / \eta_y.$$

Finally, let $G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq [G_{x_i}(\mathbf{x}, y)]_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{X}$, and we define $G(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq [G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y)^\top G_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y)^\top]^\top$.

Remark 1. By the i.i.d. nature of $\{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ and $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^{M_y}$, it follows from Assumption 2 that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|s_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x}, \quad \mathbf{E} \left[\|s_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}. \quad (2)$$

Definition 3. Given $\epsilon > 0$, $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$ is an ϵ -stationary point if $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$.

Next, we state Stochastic GDA with Backtracking (SGDA-B) in algorithm 1. SGDA-B takes $\epsilon, \tilde{\epsilon}, \mu > 0$, $p, \gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{F} \in \mathbb{R}$ as input. We next briefly discuss these parameters: ϵ is the tolerance, i.e., SGDA-B is guaranteed to stop w.p. 1 and when it terminates, it generates an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ with high probability – see Theorem 2; $\tilde{\epsilon}$ controls the optimality precision of the initial point y^0 , as stated in line 3; and the input \bar{F} is a lower bound on $F^* = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathbf{x})$ – in many ML problems, the primal objective is to minimize a loss function for which $F^* \geq 0$; $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is the backtracking parameter, every time the backtracking condition in line 12 fails, Lipschitz constant estimate \tilde{L} is updated according to $\tilde{L} \leftarrow \tilde{L} / \gamma$ in line 16 of

algorithm 1; finally, the algorithm parameter $p \in (0, 1)$ bounds the number of backtracking iterations, i.e., SGDA-B requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log(\kappa))$ backtracking iterations with probability at least $1 - p$, requiring $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \log(1/p) \epsilon^{-4})$ stochastic oracle calls for the stochastic WCSC setting. As the estimate \tilde{L} is varied in the outer loop, SGDA-B makes $T = \lceil \log_2(1/p) \rceil$ parallel calls to the randomized block stochastic gradient descent ascent method (RB-SGDA) which will be elaborated further in section 4.1. For the deterministic case with $\sigma_x = \sigma_y = 0$, p is set to 0 leading to the initialization $T = 1 = \lim_{p \searrow 0} \lceil \log_2(1/p) \rceil$.

Remark 2. Given input parameters $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{dom } g$, SGDA-B requires computing $y^0 \in \text{dom } h$ such that $\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y) - \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0)] \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$. For $\mu > 0$, computing such y^0 requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\kappa} \log(1/\tilde{\epsilon}))$ gradient calls for the case $\sigma_y = 0$, and $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_y^2/(\mu\tilde{\epsilon}))$ stochastic oracle calls for the case $\sigma_y > 0$.

Algorithm 1 SGDA with Backtracking (SGDA-B)

```

1: Input:  $\epsilon, \tilde{\epsilon}, \mu > 0, p \in (0, 1), \gamma \in (0, 1), \mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{dom } g, \bar{F} \in \mathbb{R}$ 
2: Initialize:  $\tilde{L} \leftarrow \mu/\gamma, \rho \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{1+12/N}-1}{24}, T \leftarrow \lceil \log_2(1/p) \rceil$ 
3: Compute:  $y^0$  s.t.  $\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y) - \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0)] \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$ 
4: for  $\ell = 1, \dots$  do
5:    $\eta_y \leftarrow 1/\tilde{L}, \eta_x \leftarrow N\rho\mu^2\eta_y^3$ 
6:    $K \leftarrow \lceil \frac{64N}{\epsilon^2\eta_x} (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\tilde{\epsilon}) \rceil, M_x \leftarrow \lceil \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_x^2 + 1 \rceil, M_y \leftarrow \lceil (1 + \frac{6}{\mu\eta_y} \frac{2-\mu\eta_y}{1-\mu\eta_y}) \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_y^2 + 1 \rceil$ 
7:   for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  do ▷  $T$  independent, parallel RB-SGDAruns
8:      $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(t,\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(t,\ell)}, \tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(t,\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(t,\ell)}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(t,\ell)})) \leftarrow \text{RB-SGDA}(\eta_x, \eta_y, M_x, M_y, N, K, \mathbf{x}^0, y^0)$ 
9:   end for
10:   $\tilde{S}_{(t,\ell)} \leftarrow \|\tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(t,\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(t,\ell)}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(t,\ell)})\|^2$ 
11:   $t^* \leftarrow \text{argmin}\{\tilde{S}_{(t,\ell)} : t = 1, \dots, T\}$ 
12:  if  $\tilde{S}_{(t^*,\ell)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}$  then
13:     $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \leftarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(t^*,\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(t^*,\ell)}), \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon \leftarrow \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(t^*,\ell)}$ 
14:    return  $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ 
15:  else
16:     $\tilde{L} \leftarrow \tilde{L}/\gamma$ 
17:  end if
18: end for

```

Algorithm 2 $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{G}) = \text{RB-SGDA}(\eta_x, \eta_y, M_x, M_y, N, K, \mathbf{x}^0, y^0)$

```

1: for  $k = 0, 2, \dots, K - 1$  do
2:    $i_k \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[1, N]$  ▷  $i_k$  is distributed uniformly on  $\{1, \dots, N\}$ 
3:    $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^k$ 
4:    $x_{i_k}^{k+1} \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta_x g_{i_k}}(x_{i_k}^k - \eta_x s_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k))$ 
5:    $y^{k+1} \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k))$ 
6: end for
7:  $\tilde{k} \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[0, K - 1], (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}) \leftarrow (\mathbf{x}^{\tilde{k}}, y^{\tilde{k}}), \tilde{G} \leftarrow \tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^{\tilde{k}}, y^{\tilde{k}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}^{\tilde{k}})$ 
8: return  $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{G})$ 

```

SGDA-B, using the batch size of $M_x = \mathcal{O}(1 + \sigma_x^2/\epsilon^2)$ and $M_y = \mathcal{O}(1 + \sigma_y^2/\epsilon^2)$, terminates w.p. 1 –see Lemma 9, and at the termination it generates $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi})\| \leq \epsilon$ w.p. 1. Next, we show that the deterministic gradient map $G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ is close to its stochastic estimate $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ in a probabilistic sense with this batchsize selection, implying that the output $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ has a small deterministic gradient map.

Lemma 1. For any given $\epsilon > 0$, let M_x, M_y be chosen as in line 6 of SGDA-B, displayed in Algorithm 1. Then, for any $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \text{dom } f \times \text{dom } g$ and any scalar $r > 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - G(\mathbf{x}, y)\| > r \frac{\epsilon}{8} \right) \leq \frac{1}{r^2}. \quad (3)$$

Proof. Note that $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y) = [\text{prox}_{\eta_x g}(\mathbf{x} - \eta_x s_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega})) - \text{prox}_{\eta_x g}(\mathbf{x} - \eta_x \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, y))] / \eta_x$; thus, non-expansiveness of the proximal map implies that

$$\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - G_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y)\| \leq \|s_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|. \quad (4)$$

The same argument also gives us $\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) - G_y(\mathbf{x}, y)\| \leq \|s_y(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|$; hence, combining the two we get $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - G(\mathbf{x}, y)\| \leq \|s(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|$. By the definitions of M_x and M_y , we have $M_x \geq \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_x^2$ and $M_y \geq \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_y^2$, and we have $\mathbf{E}[s(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi})] = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, y)$ as well as $\mathbf{E}[\|s(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, y)\|^2] \leq \sigma_x^2/M_x + \sigma_y^2/M_y$ from eq. (2). Then, applying the Chebyshev's inequality leads to the desired result. Indeed,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - G(\mathbf{x}, y)\| > r \frac{\epsilon}{8} \right) \leq \mathbf{P} \left(\|s(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, y)\| > r \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}} \right) \leq 1/r^2,$$

as desired which completes the proof. \square

4 Weakly Convex-Strongly Concave (WCSC) Setting

In the next section, we consider RB-SGDA using Jacobi-type updates. In appendix A, we also considered RB-SGDA with Gauss-Seidel updates.

4.1 RB-SGDA with Jacobi Updates

Let $\{i_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a random sequence with elements i.i.d. following $\mathcal{U}[1, N]$. For $k \geq 0$, consider the following proximal GDA algorithm with Jacobi-type block updates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{i_k}^{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\eta_x g_{i_k}} \left(\mathbf{x}_{i_k}^k - \eta_x s_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k) \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_i^k \quad \text{if} \quad i \neq i_k, \\ y^{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

where the source of randomness ($\boldsymbol{\omega}^k$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^k$) is due to the stochastic oracle satisfying Assumption 2, and is independent from the iterates (\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) . Here, only the randomly chosen primal block i_k is updated; therefore, we call this method random block stochastic GDA (RB-SGDA). We next define the natural filtration generated by the iterate sequence.

Definition 4. Let $\mathcal{F}^k \triangleq \sigma(\{\mathbf{z}^k\})$ denote the σ -algebra generated by $\mathbf{z}^k = (\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)$ for $k \geq 0$.

The following lemma, conditioned on \mathcal{F}^k , provides us with the useful identities in (5a) and (5b), and it controls the variance of the stochastic gradients based on sample sizes M_x and M_y .

Lemma 2. For all $k \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right], \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|\nabla_{x_{i_k}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \nabla_{x_{i_k}} \Phi(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] = \frac{1}{N} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2, \quad (5b)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|s_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k) - \nabla_{x_{i_k}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x}, \quad (5c)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}. \quad (5d)$$

Proof. The results trivially follow from the tower law of expectation. \square

We next show that after a proximal gradient block update for any given block $i^* \in \mathcal{N}$, the stochastic gradient map corresponding to the chosen block, i.e., $\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}$, can be controlled by three terms: (i) change in the primal function, (ii) the variance of the stochastic gradients, and (iii) a term related to the difference between $\nabla_{x_{i^*}} f$ and $\nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi$.

Lemma 3. *Given $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$ and $i^* \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+ \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $\bar{x}_i^+ = \bar{x}_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i^*\}$, and $\bar{x}_{i^*}^+ = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g_{i^*}}(\bar{x}_{i^*} - \eta_x s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}))$, where $\boldsymbol{\omega} = [\omega_j]_{j=1}^{M_x}$ and $\{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ are i.i.d. random variables such that $\{\tilde{\nabla}_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \omega_j)\}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ satisfy Assumption 2. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\eta_x}{2} - \eta_x^2 L\kappa \right) \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} [\|\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2] \\ & \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+) + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \left[\|s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y})\|^2 \right] + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \|\nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proof. Since Φ is $L(1 + \kappa)$ -smooth from [49, Lemma A.5], the definition $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+) & \leq \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \langle \nabla \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \bar{\mathbf{x}}^+ - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + L\kappa \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+ - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \\ & = \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \langle \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*} \rangle + L\kappa \|\bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where we used $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+ - \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*}$ and $\kappa \geq 1$. The definition of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+$ also implies that $\frac{1}{\eta_x}(\bar{x}_{i^*} - \bar{x}_{i^*}^+) - s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \in \partial g_{i^*}(\bar{x}_{i^*}^+)$ and $g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+) - g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = g_{i^*}(\bar{x}_{i^*}^+) - g_{i^*}(\bar{x}_{i^*})$; therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+) & \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \langle \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*} \rangle + L\kappa \|\bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*}\|^2 + \left\langle \frac{1}{\eta_x}(\bar{x}_{i^*} - \bar{x}_{i^*}^+) - s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}), \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*} \right\rangle \\ & = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \left\langle \tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}), \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*} \right\rangle + L\kappa \|\bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*}\|^2 + \langle \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}), \bar{x}_{i^*}^+ - \bar{x}_{i^*} \rangle \\ & = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \left(\eta_x - \eta_x^2 L\kappa \right) \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 + \eta_x \left\langle s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \right\rangle \\ & \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \left(\eta_x - \eta_x^2 L\kappa \right) \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \|s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \\ & = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \left(\frac{\eta_x}{2} - \eta_x^2 L\kappa \right) \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \|s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \|\nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \eta_x \langle s_{x_{i^*}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \nabla_{x_{i^*}} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \nabla_{x_{i^*}} \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the first inequality follows from (7) and using convexity of g , the equalities follow from the definition of $\tilde{G}_x(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\omega})$, and the last inequality follows from Young's inequality. Rearranging terms and then taking the expectation of both sides of the inequality give the desired result. \square

In the following lemma, we consider the effect of the proximal gradient ascent step in the dual, and provide a fundamental inequality for proving the convergence result.

Theorem 1. *For any given $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbf{dom} g$, let $H : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that $H(y) \triangleq h(y) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, for any given $\bar{y} \in \mathbf{dom} h$,*

$$\begin{aligned} H(y) & \geq H(\bar{y}^+) - \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}), y - \bar{y} \right\rangle + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), y - \bar{y}^+ \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\eta_y}{2} (2 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\zeta})\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

holds for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where $\bar{y}^+ = \mathbf{prox}_{\sigma h}(\bar{y} + \eta_y s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}))$ for $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = [\zeta_j]_{j=1}^{M_y}$ such that $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^{M_y}$ are i.i.d. random variables and $\{\tilde{\nabla}_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta_j)\}_{j=1}^{M_y}$ satisfy Assumption 2.

Proof. Define $\tilde{H} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that $\tilde{H}(y) \triangleq h(y) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta_y} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Clearly, $\bar{y}^+ = \mathbf{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{H}(y)$. The first-order optimality condition implies that

$$s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) = s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) + \frac{1}{\eta_y} (\bar{y} - \bar{y}^+) \in \partial h(\bar{y}^+);$$

therefore, using the convexity of h , for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) &\geq h(\bar{y}^+) + \left\langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y}^+ \right\rangle \\ &= h(\bar{y}^+) + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y} \rangle + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), \bar{y} - \bar{y}^+ \rangle - \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y}^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Moreover, since $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \cdot)$ is μ -strongly concave, for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$-f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, y) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2 \geq -f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \langle \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), y - \bar{y} \rangle. \quad (11)$$

Next, summing (10) and (11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} H(y) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2 &\geq \tilde{H}(\bar{y}^+) - \frac{1}{2\eta_y} \|\bar{y}^+ - \bar{y}\|^2 - \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y}^+ \right\rangle + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), y - \bar{y} \rangle \\ &= \tilde{H}(\bar{y}^+) + \frac{\eta_y}{2} \|\tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta)\|^2 - \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), y - \bar{y} \right\rangle + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), y - \bar{y} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since ∇f is L -Lipschitz,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}(\bar{y}^+) &= h(\bar{y}^+) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) - \langle \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \bar{y}^+ - \bar{y} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{y}^+ - \bar{y}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \bar{y} - \bar{y}^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_y} - L \right) \|\bar{y}^+ - \bar{y}\|^2 \\ &\geq H(\bar{y}^+) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_y} - L \right) \|\bar{y}^+ - \bar{y}\|^2 + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \bar{y} - \bar{y}^+ \rangle \\ &= H(\bar{y}^+) + \frac{\eta_y}{2} (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta)\|^2 + \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \bar{y} - \bar{y}^+ \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thus, (12) and (13) together imply the desired inequality in (9). \square

Corollary 1. *For any given $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$ and $\eta_y > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &2\eta_y \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta), \bar{y} - y_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\rangle + \eta_y^2 \|\tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta)\|^2 \\ &\leq -\eta_y \mu \|\bar{y} - y_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 - \eta_y^2 (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta)\|^2 + 2\eta_y \langle s_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \zeta) - \nabla_y f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}), \bar{y}^+ - y_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Proof. From the definition of $y_*(\cdot)$, we have $H(y_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \leq H(\bar{y}^+)$; therefore, substituting $y = y_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ in (9), rearranging the terms and multiplying both sides by $2\eta_y$ immediately implies the desired inequality. \square

In the next result, we bound the average squared norm of stochastic gradient maps over past iterations in expectation by a sum of three terms: (i) expected primal suboptimality, i.e., $\frac{1}{K} \mathbf{E} [F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)]$, (ii) average dual suboptimality, i.e., $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} [\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^k) - y^k\|^2]$, and (iii) a constant noise term, i.e., $\frac{\delta_x^2}{M_x} + \frac{\delta_y^2}{M_y}$.

Lemma 4. *For any $K \geq 1$ and $\eta_x > 0$, the RB-SGDA iterate sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k, y^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x L\kappa \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \omega^k)\|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \zeta^k)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K) \right) \right] + \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \delta^k + K \left(\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\delta^k \triangleq \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ and $y_*^k \triangleq y_*(\mathbf{x}^k)$ for $k \geq 0$.

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$, since $(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$, we can invoke Lemma 3 with $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) = (\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)$ and $i^* = i_k$, implying $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^+ = \mathbf{x}^{k+1}$; thus, it follows from (6) and (5c) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\eta_x}{2} - \eta_x^2 L \kappa \right) \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\ & \leq F(\mathbf{x}^k) - \mathbf{E} \left[F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] + \frac{\eta_x}{2M_x N} \sigma_x^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\nabla_{x_{i_k}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \nabla_{x_{i_k}} \Phi(\mathbf{x}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Thus, using Lemma 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{\eta_x}{2} - \eta_x^2 L \kappa \right) \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\ & \leq F(\mathbf{x}^k) - \mathbf{E} \left[F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] + \frac{\eta_x}{2M_x N} \sigma_x^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2N} \|\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 \\ & \leq F(\mathbf{x}^k) - \mathbf{E} \left[F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] + \frac{\eta_x}{2M_x N} \sigma_x^2 + \frac{\eta_x}{2N} L^2 \delta^k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use L -Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, \cdot)$, the definition of δ^k , and the identity $\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^k) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k)$. Thus, dividing both sides by $\frac{\eta_x}{N}$ and taking the total expectation, we get

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x L \kappa \right) \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \right] \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^k) - F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \right) + \frac{1}{2} L^2 \delta^k \right] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x}. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, $y_*^k \triangleq y_*(\mathbf{x}^k)$ implies that $G_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k) = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $y_*^k = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y_*^k + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k) \right)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \left(y_*^k - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y_*^k + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k) \right) \right) / \eta_y\|^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{4\eta_y^2} \|\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) \right) - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left(y_*^k + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k) \right) + y_*^k - y^k\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4\eta_y^2} \left(2\|y^k - y_*^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k)\|^2 + 2\|y_*^k - y^k\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4\eta_y^2} \left(4\|y^k - y_*^k + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k)\|^2 + 4\eta_y^2 \|s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 + 2\|y_*^k - y^k\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \|s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 + \left(L^2 + \frac{3}{2\eta_y^2} \right) \delta^k, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we used non-expansivity of the proximal map, concavity of $f(\mathbf{x}_k, \cdot)$ (which implies that $\|y^k - y_*^k + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k)\|^2 \leq \|y^k - y_*^k\|^2 + \eta_y^2 \|\nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y_*^k)\|^2$), L -Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}_k, \cdot)$, the definition of δ_k , and the triangular inequality. Then by taking the conditional expectation of both sides, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] \\ & \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\|s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^k \right] + \left(L^2 + \frac{3}{2\eta_y^2} \right) \delta^k \leq \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} + \left(L^2 + \frac{3}{2\eta_y^2} \right) \delta^k. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Next, combining (17) and the total expectation of (19), then summing the resulting inequality from $k = 0$ to $K - 1$, will lead to the desired inequality. \square

In the next result, we investigate the decay properties of the dual error $\delta^k \triangleq \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ in expectation.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $\eta_y \in (0, 1/\mu)$. Then, $\delta^k = \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ admits the following bound for all $k \geq 1$:*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\delta^k \right] \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\delta^0 C_1^k + \sum_{i=1}^k C_1^{k-i} \left(C_2 \|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{i-1})\|^2 / N - C_3 \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{i-1})\|^2 \right) \right] + C_4 \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_1^i, \quad (20)$$

where $C_1 \triangleq (1+a)(1-\mu\eta_y) < 1$, $C_2 \triangleq \frac{2\kappa^2 \eta_x^2}{\mu \eta_y}$, $C_3 \triangleq (1+a)\eta_y^2(1-L\eta_y)$, $C_4 \triangleq 2(1+a)\eta_y^2$ and $a = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\eta_y}{1-\mu\eta_y}$.

Proof. Indeed, for all $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^k &= \|y_*(\mathbf{x}^k) - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) + y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 \\
&\leq (1+a)\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^k) - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\leq (1+a)\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\kappa^2\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1}\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the second inequality is due to $y_*(\cdot)$ being κ -Lipschitz from [49, Lemma A.3]. Next, using the fact that $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1}\|^2 = \eta_x^2 \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2$ for $k \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\delta^k \leq (1+a)\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\kappa^2\eta_x^2 \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, since $y^k = y^{k-1} + \eta_y \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})$ for $k \geq 1$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 &= \|y^{k-1} + \eta_y \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})\|^2 \\
&= \delta^{k-1} + 2\eta_y \left\langle \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}), y^{k-1} - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \right\rangle + \eta_y^2 \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, invoking Corollary 1 with $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) = (\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1})$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - y^k\|^2 &\leq (1 - \mu\eta_y)\delta^{k-1} - \eta_y^2(1 - \eta_y L) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\eta_y \left\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^k &\leq (1+a)(1 - \mu\eta_y)\delta^{k-1} - (1+a)\eta_y^2(1 - \eta_y L) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(1+a)\eta_y \left\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\kappa^2\eta_x^2 \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Let $a = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\eta_y}{1 - \mu\eta_y}$ –we have $a > 0$ since $\eta_y < \frac{1}{\mu}$. This choice implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\delta^k \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}] &\leq C_1\delta^{k-1} + \mathbf{E}\left[C_2\|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2 - C_3\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\eta_y} C_4 \mathbf{E}\left[\left\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \right\rangle \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Let $\hat{y}^k \triangleq \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y^{k-1} + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}))$; we can bound the inner product in eq. (24) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left[\left\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \right\rangle \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[\left\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}), y^k - \hat{y}^k \right\rangle \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}\right] \\
&\leq \eta_y \mathbf{E}\left[\|s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}\right] \leq \eta_y \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y},
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where in the first equality we used the fact that $\mathbf{E}[s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-1}] = \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1})$ and $\hat{y}^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})$ is \mathcal{F}^{k-1} -measurable; in the first inequality, we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the non-expansivity of the proximal map; and the final inequality follows from Assumption 2. Therefore, eq. (24) and eq. (25) together with eq. (5a) imply that

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta^k] \leq \mathbf{E}\left[C_1\delta^{k-1} + C_2\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2/N - C_3\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2\right] + C_4 \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}. \tag{26}$$

Thus, eq. (26) implies the desired result in eq. (20) for all $k \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 6. Let $\eta_x > 0$ and $\eta_y \in (0, 1/\mu)$. Then, for any $K > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{K-1}, y^{K-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{K-1})\|^2 + \left(2 - 4\eta_x \kappa L\right) \|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^{K-1}, y^{K-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{K-1})\|^2 \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \left(1 + 6C_3 \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k}\right) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad \left. + 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x \kappa L - \frac{3}{2N} C_2 \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k}\right) \|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \right] \\
& \leq 4\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)\right) + \delta_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) C_1^k \right] \\
& \quad + 4K \left(\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \frac{3\eta_y}{\mu} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \frac{2 - \eta_y \mu}{1 - \eta_y \mu}\right) \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Proof. By using eq. (15) and Lemma 5, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x \kappa L\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)\right) + \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \delta^k \right] + K \left(\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \right) \\
& \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)\right) + \delta^0 \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k \right. \\
& \quad + C_2 \frac{3}{2N} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{i-1})\|^2 C_1^{k-i} \right) \\
& \quad \left. - C_3 \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{i-1})\|^2 C_1^{k-i} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + K \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + K \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) C_4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k \right) \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y},
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3 and C_4 are defined in Lemma 5; and we use the fact $\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_1^i \leq K \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k$. Furthermore, by rearranging terms, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{i-1})\|^2 C_1^{k-i} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k}, \tag{29}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{i-1})\|^2 C_1^{k-i} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k}. \tag{30}$$

Next, using the bound $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k \leq \frac{1}{1-C_1}$ and substituting the values of C_1 and C_4 , we get

$$1 + \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) C_4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k \leq 1 + \frac{3\eta_y}{\mu} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right) \frac{2 - \eta_y \mu}{1 - \eta_y \mu}. \tag{31}$$

By plugging (29), (30) and (31) into (28), and then multiplying both sides by 4, we obtain the desired inequality. \square

Having established a bound on the stochastic gradient map for RB-SGDA iterate sequence in Lemma 6, we are now ready to study SGDA-B. Both sides of error bound in (27) depend on η_x, η_y and unknown problem constants L, κ in a very complicated way; therefore, in the next section we focus on designing a practical backtracking condition that allows us to select η_x and η_y without knowing L (hence, κ) and that will lead to desirable theoretical guarantees.

4.2 A method backtracking the dual step-size: SGDA-B

In the next lemma below, we show that when η_y is sufficiently small, i.e., $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$ and when the batchsizes M_x, M_y are sufficiently large, we can control the stochastic gradient map in expectation. This is one of our main results helping us to derive a backtracking condition with a guarantee to eventually hold due to backtracking on η_y . Another important result of this lemma is that it prescribes us how to select η_x in practice depending on η_y and other *known* constants while still ensuring the necessary *time-scale separation*.

Lemma 7. *Given some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, suppose $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$ satisfy $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$ and $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3 \mu^2$ for $\rho = \frac{\sqrt{1+\frac{12}{N}}-1}{24} \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k, y^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by RB-SGDA. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \xi^k)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{4N}{\eta_x K} \mathbf{E} \left[F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K) + 12\rho\tilde{\epsilon} \right] + \frac{4\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \frac{6}{\eta_y \mu} \cdot \frac{2 - \eta_y \mu}{1 - \eta_y \mu} \right) \frac{4\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \quad (32)$$

holds for all $K \geq 1$, where $\tilde{G}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \bar{\xi}) \triangleq [\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \bar{\omega})^\top \tilde{G}_y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}; \bar{\zeta})^\top]^\top$ for all $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$.

Proof. We first observe that $\eta_y \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$ implies that $C_1, C_3 \geq 0$. Thus, the sum of all terms related to $\tilde{G}_y(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ on the left-hand side of eq. (27) can be lower bounded by $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \zeta^k)\|^2$. Next, we provide a lower bound for the sum of all terms related to $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ on the left-hand side of eq. (27). Since $C_1 \geq 0$, we have $\sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_1^k = \frac{2}{\mu \eta_y}$. Therefore, using $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3 \mu^2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} - \eta_x \kappa L - C_2 \frac{3}{2N} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} - \eta_x \kappa L - \frac{1}{N} \frac{3\kappa^2}{\mu} \frac{\eta_x^2}{\eta_y} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \frac{2}{\eta_y \mu} \\ & = \frac{1}{2} - N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3 \mu L^2 - 6N\rho^2 L^2 \eta_y^4 \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} - N\rho \cdot \eta_y \mu - 6N\rho^2 \eta_y^2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta_y^2} + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} - N\rho - 12N\rho^2 = \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where the first inequality follows from $\sum_{i=k}^{K-2} C_1^{i-k} \leq \frac{2}{\eta_y \mu}$; the second inequality follows from $L \leq \frac{1}{\eta_y}$; in the third inequality we used the fact that $\eta_y \mu \leq 1$; and in the last equality follows from our choice of ρ , i.e., $\rho = \frac{\sqrt{1+\frac{12}{N}}-1}{24} \in (0, 1)$. The definition of ρ implies that $N\rho = \frac{1}{4} - 12N\rho^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$; hence, using $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$, we get $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3 \mu^2 < \frac{1}{4L\kappa^2} \leq \frac{1}{4L\kappa}$ since $\kappa \geq 1$. Thus, the sum of all terms related to $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ on the left-hand side of eq. (27) can be lower bounded by $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \omega^k)\|^2$.

Next, we provide a bound for the noise term on the right-hand side of eq. (27) related to σ_y^2 , i.e.,

$$1 + \frac{3\eta_y}{\mu} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \frac{2 - \eta_y \mu}{1 - \eta_y \mu} \leq 1 + \frac{6}{\eta_y \mu} \cdot \frac{2 - \eta_y \mu}{1 - \eta_y \mu}, \quad (34)$$

which follows from $L \leq \frac{1}{\eta_y}$. Finally, using the same arguments we have used so far for bounding the other terms, we can bound the term on the right-hand side of eq. (27) related to δ^0 , i.e.,

$$\delta^0 \frac{3\eta_x}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} C_1^k \leq \delta^0 \frac{3N\rho\eta_y^3 \mu^2}{2} \frac{2}{\eta_y^2} \frac{2}{\mu \eta_y} = 6\delta^0 N\rho \mu. \quad (35)$$

Since $\delta^0 = \|y^0 - y^*(\mathbf{x}^0)\|^2$ and $f(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) - h(\cdot)$ is μ -strongly concave for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{dom} g$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta^0] = \mathbf{E}[\|y^0 - y^*(\mathbf{x}^0)\|^2] \leq \frac{2}{\mu} \mathbf{E} \left[h(y^0) - f(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) - h(y^*(\mathbf{x}^0)) + f(\mathbf{x}^0, y^*(\mathbf{x}^0)) \right] \leq \frac{2}{\mu} \tilde{\epsilon}, \quad (36)$$

where the first inequality follows from $y^*(\mathbf{x}^0) = \mathbf{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\mathbf{x}^0, y) - h(y)$, and the last inequality follows from our choice of y^0 , i.e., $\max_y \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y) - \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0)] \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$. The desired inequality follows from combining all these bounds with eq. (27), and then dividing both sides by K . \square

In the next lemma, we argue that for any given a failure probability $p \in (0, 1)$, by executing $\log_2(1/p)$ RB-SGDA runs in parallel using $\eta_y \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$, one can generate $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y})$ such that $\|\tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}})\| \leq \epsilon$ w.p. $1 - p$.

Lemma 8. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Given any $(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$, $\epsilon > 0$ and failure probability $p \in (0, 1)$, let $\{\mathbf{z}_{(t)}^k\}_{k=0}^K$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ be $T \triangleq \lceil \log_2(1/p) \rceil$ independent RB-SGDA runs all starting from $(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$ corresponding to parameters η_y, η_x, K and M_x, M_y such that $\eta_y \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$, $\eta_x = N\rho\mu^2\eta_y^3$, and K, M_x, M_y are set as in algorithm 1, where $\mathbf{z}_{(t)}^k = (\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^k, y_{(t)}^k)$. Let $\tilde{k}_{(t)}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ be i.i.d. with a uniform distribution on $\{0, \dots, K-1\}$. Then $\min_{t=1, \dots, T} \tilde{S}_{(t)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}$ holds with probability at least $1 - p$, with $\tilde{S}_{(t)} \triangleq \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^{\tilde{k}_{(t)}}, y_{(t)}^{\tilde{k}_{(t)}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t)}^{\tilde{k}_{(t)}})\|^2$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ where we dropped the subscript in $\tilde{k}_{(t)}$ for notational simplicity.*

Proof. For every $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ fixed, $\{\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^k, y_{(t)}^k\}$ are i.i.d. sequences for $t = 1, \dots, T$. Consequently, we also have $\{\tilde{S}_{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T$ are i.i.d.; hence,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\min_{t=1, \dots, T} \tilde{S}_{(t)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right) = 1 - \mathbf{P} \left(\min_{t=1, \dots, T} \tilde{S}_{(t)} > \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right) = 1 - \prod_{t=1}^T \mathbf{P} \left(\tilde{S}_{(t)} > \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right). \quad (37)$$

For any $t = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\tilde{S}_{(t)} > \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right) \leq \frac{4}{\epsilon^2} \mathbf{E}[\tilde{S}_{(t)}] \leq \frac{16N}{K\eta_x\epsilon^2} \mathbf{E} \left[F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^K) + 12\rho\tilde{\epsilon} \right] + \frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \frac{6}{\eta_y\mu} \frac{2 - \eta_y\mu}{1 - \eta_y\mu} \right) \frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y},$$

where in the first inequality we use Markov's inequality, and the second inequality follows from Lemma 7 and $\mathbf{E}[\tilde{S}_{(t)}] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^k, y_{(t)}^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t)}^k)\|^2 \right]$ –which is implied by $\tilde{k}_{(t)} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, K-1]$. Furthermore, since $F(\mathbf{x}_{(t)}^K) \geq F^* \geq \bar{F}$, the choice of K and M_x, M_y in SGDA-B implies that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\tilde{S}_{(t)} > \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \implies \mathbf{P} \left(\min_{t=1, \dots, T} \tilde{S}_{(t)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \right) \geq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^T \geq 1 - p. \quad \square$$

Remark 3. *For the special case $N = 1$, Line 7 in algorithm 2 can be replaced with the following: $\tilde{k} \leftarrow \mathbf{argmin} \{ \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k)\| : k = 0, \dots, K-1 \}$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}) \leftarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{\tilde{k}}, \tilde{y}^{\tilde{k}})$, and $\tilde{S} \leftarrow \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k)\|^2$. All the theoretical guarantees we show SGDA-B also hold for this variant of SGDA-B as well.*

All the discussion in this section until this point was about various properties of RB-SGDA. In the rest of this section, we establish the theoretical guarantees of SGDA-B based on these results. More precisely, in the next lemma we argue that SGDA-B stops w.p. 1 and that the number of backtracking iterations is $\mathcal{O}(\log(\kappa))$ w.p. at least $1 - p$. After presenting this lemma, in Theorem 2 we show that the output $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary according to Definition 3, i.e., $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, with high probability. Finally, Theorem 3 is our main result on SGDA-B establishing its oracle complexity.

Lemma 9. *The algorithm SGDA-B stops w.p. 1, and the probability that the stopping condition in line 12 holds within at most $\bar{\ell} \triangleq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$ backtracking iterations, i.e., for some $\ell \leq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$, is at least $1 - p$.*

Proof. Recall that within SGDA-B, η_y is initialized to γ/μ , and during the ℓ -th backtracking iteration $\eta_y = \gamma^\ell/\mu$. Next we define the probability of SGDA-B stopping at ℓ -th backtracking iteration –with initial point (\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) fixed, this probability is a function of $\eta_y = \gamma^\ell/\mu$. For any $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, consider

$\tilde{S}_{(t^*, \ell)} \triangleq \min_{t=1, \dots, T} \tilde{S}_{(t, \ell)}$ and define $q(\ell) \triangleq \mathbf{P}\left(\tilde{S}_{(t^*, \ell)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\right)$. Let $I \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ denote the random stopping time of SGDA-B, i.e., $\mathbf{P}(I = 1) = q(1)$ and $\mathbf{P}(I = \ell) = q(\ell) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - q(i))$ for $\ell \geq 2$. Note that $\eta_y = \gamma^\ell / \mu \leq \frac{1}{L}$ for all $\ell \geq \bar{\ell} = \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$; therefore, Lemma 8 implies that $q(\ell) \geq 1 - p$ for $\ell \geq \bar{\ell}$. Since $\{\tilde{S}_{(t^*, \ell)}\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ are independent and $q(\ell) \geq 1 - p$ for $\ell \geq \bar{\ell}$, we can conclude that $\mathbf{P}(I < \infty) = 1$, i.e., SGDA-B stops with probability 1. Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(I \leq \bar{\ell}) &= q(1) + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\bar{\ell}} q(\ell) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - q(i)) \\ &\geq \inf\left\{\alpha_1 + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\bar{\ell}-1} \alpha_\ell \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - \alpha_i) + (1 - p) \prod_{i=1}^{\bar{\ell}-1} (1 - \alpha_i) : \alpha_i \in [0, 1], i = 1, \dots, \bar{\ell} - 1\right\} \geq 1 - p, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately follows from a simple induction argument. \square

Next, we show that SGDA-B output $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary with probability satisfying (38), which is true for any positive $r = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Indeed, setting $r = 12$ implies that $\mathbf{P}(\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq 2\epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{144} \approx 0.993$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $\sigma_x^2, \sigma_y^2 > 0$. Given any $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \text{dom } g$, $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and all other parameters chosen as in the input line of algorithm 1, SGDA-B stops w.p.1 returning $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}, \quad \forall r > 0; \quad (38)$$

moreover, $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ holds w.p.1.

Proof. According to Lemma 9, SGDA-B stops w.p.1; therefore, it follows from the definition of $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ holds w.p.1. Next, we show the probability bound in (38).

Given the backtracking iteration counter $\ell \geq 1$, the dual step size is set to $\eta_y = \gamma^\ell / \mu$ –note that η_x, K and M_x, M_y are all functions of η_y and also of other fixed problem and algorithm parameters, i.e., $\mu, \sigma_x, \sigma_y, \bar{F}, N$ and $\mathbf{x}^0, \bar{\epsilon}, \epsilon, p, \gamma$, respectively. In the rest, for the ease of notation, we suppress the dependency of η_x, K, M_x, M_y on η_y and other parameters. Let $\{(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k)\}_{k=0}^{K-1}$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ denote the RB-SGDA iterate sequences for T independent runs, all initialized from (\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) and using $\eta_y, \eta_x, K, M_x, M_y$ corresponding to given backtracking iteration counter $\ell \geq 1$. Given $\ell \geq 1$, denoting $\nu_{(t, \ell)}^k$ as the probability law corresponding to the joint distribution of $(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k)$, it holds for any $r > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t, \ell)}^k) - G(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k)\| \leq r \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \\ &= \int_{\text{dom } g \times \text{dom } h} \mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t, \ell)}^k) - G(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k)\| \leq r \frac{\epsilon}{8} \mid (\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^k, y_{(t, \ell)}^k) = (\mathbf{x}, y)\right) d\nu_{(t, \ell)}^k(\mathbf{x}, y) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$, where in the last step we used the fact that (3) in Lemma 1 holds for any $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \text{dom } g \times \text{dom } h$ and that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t, \ell)}^k \sim \boldsymbol{\xi}$ for all t and k , which is defined in Definition 2. For any given $\ell \geq 1$ and $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, let $\tilde{k} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, K - 1]$, which implies that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}) - G(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}})\| \leq r \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}. \quad (39)$$

According to SGDA-B, for $\ell \geq 1$, we have $\tilde{S}_{(t, \ell)} = \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}})\|^2$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$ –here, \tilde{k} is sampled for each ℓ and t in an i.i.d. fashion. Moreover, for any $\ell \geq 1$, define $t^* = \mathbf{argmin}\{\tilde{S}_{(t, \ell)} : t = 1, \dots, T\}$ and set $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(\ell)}) = (\mathbf{x}_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}})$. Due to symmetry, t^* is uniformly distributed on the support $\{1, \dots, T\}$ since $\{\tilde{S}_{(t, \ell)}\}_{t=1}^T$ are i.i.d. random variables for each fixed $\ell \geq 1$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(\ell)}) - G(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)})\| \leq r \frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}. \quad (40)$$

As we also defined in the proof of Lemma 9, let $q(\ell) \triangleq \mathbf{P}\left(\min_{t=1,\dots,T} \tilde{S}_{(t,\ell)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\right)$ for $\ell \geq 1$; hence, $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)})$ with probability $q(\ell)$, i.e., $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ holds for $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon) = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(\ell)})$ with probability $q(\ell)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon) - G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq r\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{(\ell)}) - G(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{(\ell)}, \tilde{y}_{(\ell)})\| \leq r\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right) q(\ell) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - q(i)) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{r^2}\right) \sum_{\ell \geq 1} q(\ell) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - q(i)) = 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the inequality we used (40), and in the last equality we used the fact SGDA-B stops w.p. 1, i.e., $\sum_{\ell \geq 1} q(\ell) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (1 - q(i)) = 1$. Finally, as $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon/2$ holds w.p. 1 according to the definition of $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$, we get $\mathbf{P}\left(\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon) - G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq r\epsilon/8, \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon/2\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}$; thus, triangle inequality implies the desired result in (38). \square

Finally, in Theorem 3 we state our main result on the oracle complexity of SGDA-B. In appendix A, we consider a variant of SGDA-B calling RB-SGDA with Gauss-Seidel (GS) updates, and we show that all the results shown for Jacobi-type updates continue to hold for the GS variant as well.

Theorem 3. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Given any $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathbf{dom} g$, $\epsilon, \tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ and $\gamma, p \in (0, 1)$, SGDA-B, displayed in algorithm 1, stops w.p.1 returning $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ satisfying (38) and such that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ holds w.p.1. Moreover, with probability at least $1 - p$, SGDA-B stops within $\bar{\ell} \triangleq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$ backtracking iterations which require $\mathcal{O}\left(L\kappa^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ RB-SGDA iterations and the oracle complexity is*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L\kappa^2}{\epsilon^4} \left(F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \bar{F}\right) + \tilde{\epsilon}\right) (\sigma_x^2 + \kappa\sigma_y^2) \log\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

For the special case of $\sigma_x^2, \sigma_y^2 = 0$ and $N = 1$, i.e., deterministic case, after setting $M_x, M_y = 1$ and $T = 1$, SGDA-B can generate $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ with gradient complexity of $\mathcal{O}\left(L\kappa^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)$.

Proof. Since η_y is initialized at $1/\mu$, and η_y is decreasing monotonically every time the backtracking condition in line 12 of SGDA-B does not hold, we have $\eta_y \leq 1/\mu$ throughout the algorithm. Now suppose the condition in line 12 holds for some $\ell \geq 1$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{S}_{(t^*, \ell)} \triangleq \min_{t=1,\dots,T} \tilde{S}_{(t,\ell)} \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}, \quad (41)$$

where $t^* \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ is the index achieving the minimum and $\tilde{S}_{(t,\ell)} \triangleq \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_{(t,\ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t,\ell)}^{\tilde{k}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t,\ell)}^{\tilde{k}})\|^2$ for \tilde{k} chosen uniformly at random¹⁰ from $\{0, \dots, K-1\}$ for each $t = 1, \dots, T$. Thus, for $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon) \triangleq (\mathbf{x}_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}, y_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}}; \boldsymbol{\xi}_{(t^*, \ell)}^{\tilde{k}})$, we have $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. According to Lemma 9, SGDA-B stops within $\bar{\ell} \triangleq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$ backtracking iterations with probability at least $1 - p$, i.e., $\mathbf{P}(I \leq \bar{\ell}) \geq 1 - p$, where $I \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ denotes the random stopping time of SGDA-B –for details, see Lemma 9. Under the event $I \leq \bar{\ell}$, consider the worst-case scenario in terms of the oracle complexity, i.e., the backtracking condition in line 12 of SGDA-B does not hold for $\ell < \bar{\ell}$ and it holds when $\ell = \bar{\ell}$. Note that for $\ell = \bar{\ell}$, we would have $\eta_y = \gamma^{\bar{\ell}}/\mu \in (\frac{\gamma}{L}, \frac{1}{L}]$. Thus, under the event $I \leq \bar{\ell}$, which holds with probability at least $1 - p$, SGDA-B can generate $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon/2$, and the worst-case oracle complexity bound for the SGDA-B is given by $C_\epsilon \triangleq T \sum_{\ell=1}^{\bar{\ell}} K^{(\ell)} (M_x^{(\ell)} + M_y^{(\ell)})$, i.e., under the event $I \leq \bar{\ell}$, SGDA-B requires at most $\bar{\ell}$ backtracking iterations and for each $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \bar{\ell}\}$, T independent RB-SGDA runs are executed in parallel for $K^{(\ell)} \triangleq \lceil \frac{64}{\epsilon^2} ((\eta_y^{(\ell)})^3 \mu^2 \rho)^{-1} (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\tilde{\epsilon}) \rceil$ iterations with dual step size $\eta_y^{(\ell)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\mu} \gamma^\ell$, and in each one of these RB-SGDA iterations $M_x^{(\ell)} + M_y^{(\ell)}$ stochastic oracles are called, where

¹⁰The random index \tilde{k} is sampled for each $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$; that said, for the sake of notational simplicity, we do not explicitly state dependence of \tilde{k} on t .

$M_x^{(\ell)} \triangleq \lceil \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_x^2 + 1 \rceil \leq \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_x^2 + 2$ and $M_y^{(\ell)} \triangleq \lceil \left(1 + \frac{6}{\mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}} \frac{2 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}{1 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}\right) \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_y^2 + 1 \rceil \leq \left(1 + \frac{6}{\mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}} \frac{2 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}{1 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}\right) \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_y^2 + 2$. Therefore, using the fact that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) \leq F(\mathbf{x}^0)$ w.p. 1, the worst case complexity C_ϵ under the event $I \leq \bar{\ell}$ can be further bounded above as follows:

$$C_\epsilon \leq T \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil} \frac{64}{\epsilon^2} \frac{1}{(\eta_y^{(\ell)})^3 \mu^2 \rho} (F(\mathbf{x}^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\tilde{\epsilon}) \cdot \left(\frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \left(\sigma_x^2 + \left(1 + \frac{6}{\mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}} \frac{2 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}{1 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}\right) \sigma_y^2 \right) + 4 \right). \quad (42)$$

For each $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \bar{\ell}\}$, since $\mu\eta_y^{(\ell)} \leq \gamma$, we have $\frac{2 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}}{1 - \mu\eta_y^{(\ell)}} \leq \frac{2 - \gamma}{1 - \gamma}$. Therefore, using the lower bound $\eta_y^{(\ell)} \geq \frac{\gamma}{L}$ and the fact $T = \lceil \log_2(\frac{1}{p}) \rceil$, we can bound the complexity as follows:

$$C_\epsilon = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^3} \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{p} \right) \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \frac{L\kappa^2}{\epsilon^4} \left(\frac{F(\mathbf{x}^0) - \bar{F}}{\rho} + 12\tilde{\epsilon} \right) \left(\sigma_x^2 + \kappa \frac{2 - \gamma}{\gamma(1 - \gamma)} \sigma_y^2 \right) \right),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4. For the case $\sigma_y > 0$, the oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \log(1/p)\epsilon^{-4})$ for SGDA-B established in Theorem 3 is valid for any $\tilde{\epsilon} \geq \epsilon^4$. Moreover, for the case $\sigma_x > 0$ and $\sigma_y = 0$, the worst-case complexity improves from $\mathcal{O}(\frac{L\kappa^3}{\epsilon^4} \log(\frac{1}{p}))$ to $\mathcal{O}(\frac{L\kappa^2}{\epsilon^4} \log(\frac{1}{p}))$, i.e., a κ -factor improvement.

5 Weakly Convex-Merely Concave (WCMC) Setting

In this section, we consider the scenario with $\mu = 0$, i.e., $f(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is merely concave for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{dom} g$, under the bounded dual domain assumption.

Assumption 3. For the case $\mu = 0$, we assume that $\mathcal{D}_y \triangleq \sup_{y_1, y_2 \in \mathbf{dom} g} \|y_1 - y_2\| < \infty$.

To give a complexity result for the WCMC case, we approximate (1) with the following WCSC problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq g(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y), \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq f(\mathbf{x}, y) - \frac{\hat{\mu}}{2} \|y - \hat{y}\|^2, \quad (43)$$

and $\hat{y} \in \mathbf{dom} g$ is an arbitrary given point.

Theorem 4. Suppose $\mu = 0$ and Assumptions 1 to 3 hold. Given any $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathbf{dom} g$, $\epsilon, \tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ and $\gamma, p \in (0, 1)$, SGDA-B, applied to eq. (43) with $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\epsilon}{2\mathcal{D}_y}$, stops w.p.1 returning $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(2 + \frac{r}{4} \right) \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}, \quad \forall r > 0;$$

and that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ holds w.p.1. Moreover, with probability at least $1 - p$, SGDA-B stops within $\bar{\ell} \triangleq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(2L\mathcal{D}_y/\epsilon) \rceil$ backtracking iterations which require $\mathcal{O}\left(L^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ RB-SGDA iterations with oracle complexity

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2}{\epsilon^6} \left(F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \bar{F} + \tilde{\epsilon}\right) \left(\sigma_x^2 + \frac{L\mathcal{D}_y}{\epsilon} \sigma_y^2\right) \log\left(\frac{L\mathcal{D}_y}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{p}\right)\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(L^4 \mathcal{D}_y^3 \epsilon^{-7}\right).$$

For the special case with $\sigma_x^2, \sigma_y^2 = 0$ and $N = 1$, after setting $M_x, M_y = 1$ and $T = 1$, SGDA-B can generate $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ with gradient complexity of $\mathcal{O}\left(L^3 \mathcal{D}_y^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon^4}\right)$.

Proof. Consider the gradient map of the regularized function \hat{f} , i.e., $G^r(\cdot) \triangleq [G_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)^\top G_y^r(\cdot)^\top]^\top$ such that $G_y^r(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq \left[\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y + \eta_y \nabla_y \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, y)) - y \right] / \eta_y$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbf{dom} g \times \mathbf{dom} h$. From Theorem 3, it follows that SGDA-B, displayed in algorithm 1, when applied to (43), stops w.p. 1 returning $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that

$\mathbf{P}\left(\|G^r(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}$ for all $r > 0$. Therefore, it follows from $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\epsilon}{2\mathcal{D}_y}$ that $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ also satisfies the following bound with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{r^2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| &\leq \|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - G^r(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| + \|G^r(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \\
&= \|G_y(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - G_y^r(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| + \|G^r(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\eta_y} \|\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y_\epsilon + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)) - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y_\epsilon + \eta_y \nabla_y \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon))\| + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right) \\
&\leq \|\nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - \nabla_y \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right) \\
&\leq \hat{\mu} \mathcal{D}_y + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(1 + \frac{r}{4}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where the third inequality is due to $\nabla \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - \hat{\mu}(y_\epsilon - \hat{y})$. Hence, we have $\mathbf{P}\left(\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\left(2 + \frac{r}{4}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{r^2}$ for all $r > 0$. Moreover, letting $\hat{L} = L + \hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\kappa} \triangleq \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\mu}$, following a similar argument in the proof of Theorem 3 yields that with probability at least $1 - p$, SGDA-B stops within $\bar{\ell} \triangleq \lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\hat{\kappa}) \rceil = \mathcal{O}(\log(L\mathcal{D}_y/\epsilon))$ backtracking iterations which require $\mathcal{O}\left(\hat{L}\hat{\kappa}^2\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ RB-SGDA iterations and the oracle complexity is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\hat{L}\hat{\kappa}^2}{\epsilon^4}\left((F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \bar{F}) + \tilde{\epsilon}\right)(\sigma_x^2 + \hat{\kappa}\sigma_y^2) \log\left(\hat{\kappa} + \frac{1}{p}\right)\right)$ since $F(\mathbf{x}^0) \geq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{x}^0, y)$. Moreover, for the special case with $\sigma_x^2, \sigma_y^2 = 0$ and $N = 1$, after setting $M_x, M_y = 1$ and $T = 1$, SGDA-B can generate $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that $\|G(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ with oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}\left(\hat{L}\hat{\kappa}^2\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)$. Substituting $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\epsilon}{2\mathcal{D}_y}$ and $\hat{\kappa} \triangleq \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\mu} = 1 + 2\mathcal{D}_y\frac{L}{\epsilon}$ in the bounds above completes the proof. Finally, with arguments similar to those used for (44), it can be shown that $\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$ w.p.1. \square

6 Numerical Experiments

In our tests, we compare SGDA-B, displayed in algorithm 1, with the adaptive method TiAda [35] and also with other state-of-the-art algorithms for solving WSCS minimax problems that are not agnostic to L : GDA [38], AGDA [2], sm-AGDA [65] and VRLM [44] as benchmark. In our tests, TiAda has constantly performed better than NeAda –similar to the comparison results in [35]; this is why we only report results for TiAda, which is the main competitor of SGDA-B as a parameter agnostic algorithm for WSCS minimax problems. The experiments are conducted on a PC with 3.6 GHz Intel Core i7 CPU and NVIDIA RTX2070 GPU.

Parameter settings. To have a fair comparison, for each method we test, we adopt step sizes with theoretical guarantees for that method. Indeed, according to [38, 2], we set $\tau = \Theta(1/\kappa^2 L)$, $\sigma = \Theta(1/L)$ for both GDA and AGDA. For TiAda, we set $\alpha = 0.6$ and $\beta = 0.4$ as recommended in [35], and tune the initial step sizes τ_0 and σ_0 from $\{100, 10, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and set $v_0^x = v_0^y = 1$. Indeed, the step size rule for TiAda is

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0 / (v_{t+1}^y)^\beta, \quad \tau_t = \tau_0 / (\max\{v_{t+1}^x, v_{t+1}^y\})^\alpha, \tag{45}$$

where $v_{t+1}^x = v_t^x + \|\nabla_x \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_t, y_t; \omega)\|^2$ and $v_{t+1}^y = v_t^y + \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}_t, y_t; \omega)\|^2$ –see Definition 2 for \tilde{G}_y . For sm-AGDA, we set their parameters according to in [65, Theorem 4.1]. For VRLM, we set their parameters according to in [44, Lemma 3.10] and use it with STROM type variance reduction, i.e., we set VR-tag=STORM. For SGDA-B, we set $\tilde{\epsilon} = 10^{-4}$, $\gamma = 0.9$ and $p = 0.125$ (hence, $T = 3$). Furthermore, since we fix iteration budget K and batch size M , i.e., $K^{(\ell)} = K$ and $M_x^{(\ell)} = M_y^{(\ell)} = M$ for all backtracking iterations $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, this corresponds picking tolerance $\epsilon^{(\ell)} > 0$ for the ℓ -th backtracking iteration, where

$$\epsilon^{(\ell)} = 4\sqrt{2} \left(\frac{N}{\eta_x^{(\ell)} K} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\tilde{\epsilon} \right) + \frac{\sigma_x^2}{M} + \left(1 + \frac{6}{\eta_y^{(\ell)} \mu} \frac{2 - \eta_y^{(\ell)} \mu}{1 - \eta_y^{(\ell)} \mu} \right) \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{46}$$

$\eta_y^{(\ell)} = \gamma^\ell / \mu$ and $\eta_x^{(\ell)} = N\rho\mu^2(\eta_y^{(\ell)})^3$ are the step size values for the ℓ -th backtracking iteration. In this slightly different implementation of SGDA-B, we ignore line 6 and use constant M_x, M_y and K for all $\ell \geq 1$,




Figure 1: Comparison of SGDA-B against other algorithms, GDA [38], AGDA [2], TiAda [35], sm-AGDA [65] and VRLM [44] on synthetic-data for solving eq. (47) with 10 times simulation.

and the stopping condition in line 12 is replaced with $\tilde{S}_{(t^*, \ell)} \leq \frac{(\epsilon^{(\ell)})^2}{4}$. Based on the arguments in the proof of Lemma 9, we can still conclude that SGDA-B stops within at most $\lceil \log_{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(\kappa) \rceil$ backtracking iterations with probability at least $1 - p$; thus, under this event, the dual step size at the time algorithms stops satisfies $\eta_y \geq \frac{\gamma}{L}$; therefore, we can conclude that SGDA-B returns $(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\left\| \tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, y_\epsilon; \xi_\epsilon) \right\|^2 \leq \frac{8\kappa^2}{K} \frac{L}{\rho\gamma^3} (F(\mathbf{x}^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\tilde{\epsilon}) + \frac{8\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \kappa \frac{6}{\gamma} \frac{2 - \gamma}{1 - \gamma}\right) \frac{8\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \right) \geq 1 - p,$$

where we used the fact that $\{\epsilon^{(\ell)}\}$ is an increasing sequence as $\{\eta_y^{(\ell)}\}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence.

Regularized Bilinear Problem with Synthetic Data. We first test on the regularized WCSC bilinear SP problem of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^\top Q \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^\top A \mathbf{y} - \frac{\mu_y}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad (47)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $\mu_y > 0$. This class of problems include *Polyak-Lojasiewicz game* [8, 71], *image processing* [6], and *robust regression* [63].

In our experiments, we set $m = n = 30$, $\mu_y = 1$ and randomly generate A and Q such that $A = V \Lambda_A V^{-1}$ and $Q = V \Lambda_Q V^{-1}$, where $V \in \mathbb{R}^{30 \times 30}$ is an orthogonal matrix¹¹, Λ_A and Λ_Q are diagonal matrices. We set $\Lambda_Q = \frac{\Lambda_Q^0}{\|\Lambda_Q^0\|_2} \cdot L$ for $L \in \{5, 10, 50\}$, where Λ_Q^0 is a random diagonal matrix with diagonal elements being sampled uniformly at random from the interval $[-1, 1]$. We choose Λ_A such that $\Lambda_Q + \frac{1}{\mu_y} \Lambda_A^2 \succeq 0$ and $\|\Lambda_Q\|_2 \geq \|\Lambda_A\|_2$. Those conditions imply that \mathcal{L} is WSCS and L -smooth. Moreover, given \mathbf{x} , we can compute $y_*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\mu_y} A^\top \mathbf{x}$. Consequently, the primal function $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top (Q + \frac{1}{\mu_y} A A^\top) \mathbf{x}$ and it is lower bounded by zero, i.e., $\bar{F} = 0$. We consider the additive noise setting, the unbiased stochastic oracle $\tilde{\nabla} \mathcal{L}$ is given by $\nabla \mathcal{L} + n$ where $n \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ is Gaussian with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and $\sigma = 1$. We set $M = 1$ for VRLM with STORM-type variance reduction, and $M = 10$ for other algorithms in this experiment. In particular, the special batchsize M_0 of VRLM at iteration 0 is set according to [44, Corollary 2]. Moreover, we set $K = 10000$ for SGDA-B. In fig. 1, we plot $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}\|^2$ against the number of stochastic oracle calls in the x-axis. The results plotted are obtained for 10 simulations, all starting from the same initial point. We observe that SGDA-B performs well on this test as it can effectively take larger steps with convergence guarantees.

Distributed Robust Optimization with Neural Network. Next, we test SGDA-B on the distributionally robust optimization problem from [47], i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \ell_i(q(\mathbf{a}_i; \mathbf{x})) - h(y) : \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = 1, y_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \quad (48)$$

¹¹We first generate a random matrix \mathcal{M} with entries i.i.d. and uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and then set V as the orthogonal matrix in the QR decomposition of \mathcal{M} .




Figure 2: Comparison of SGDA-B against other algorithms, GDA [38], AGDA [2], TiAda [35], and VRLM [44] on real data for solving eq. (48) with 10 times simulation. “Train error” denotes the fraction of wrong prediction, and “loss” denotes $F(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y)$. One epoch means one complete pass of the data set.

where $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b_i \in \{1, -1\}$ denote the feature vector and the label corresponding to data point $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ belonging to training data for binary classification; the function $q : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents three-layer perceptron neural network with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denoting the parameters of the network with $m = 610, 369$; and in this experiment we use the binary logistic loss function, i.e., $\ell_i(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(-b_i z))$ for all i . The regularizer $h(y) = \frac{\mu y}{2} \|y - \mathbf{1}/n\|^2$ makes sure that the worst-case distribution will not be too far from the uniform distribution—here, $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the vector with all entries equal to one, and we set $\mu = 0.01$. Since $\ell_i(\cdot) \geq 0$ for all i , we have $\bar{F} = 0$ for this experiment as well. We conducted the experiment on the data set `gisette` with $n = 6000$ and $d = 5000$, which can be downloaded from LIBSVM repository¹². We normalized the dataset by $\mathbf{a}_i \leftarrow \frac{\mathbf{a}_i - \min_j a_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{1}}{\max_j a_{ij} - \min_j a_{ij}}$, where $\mathbf{a}_i = [a_{ij}]_{j=1}^d$ is the feature vector of the i -th data point.

In the experiments, we set the batch size $M = 200$. Since L is unknown and one needs L to set the step sizes for GDA, AGDA, and sm-AGDA. We estimated L deriving a lower bound for it; indeed, since $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{y} \partial \mathbf{x}} = \left[-\frac{b_i \exp(-b_i h(\mathbf{a}_i; \mathbf{x}))}{1 + \exp(-b_i h(\mathbf{a}_i; \mathbf{x}))} \frac{\partial h(\mathbf{a}_i; \mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right]_{i=1}^n$, we have $L \geq \tilde{L} = \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{y} \partial \mathbf{x}} \Big|_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0)} \right\|_2$, where \mathbf{x}^0 is generated by the Xavier method for initializing deep neural networks [16] and $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{1}/n$. Since L is unknown, we used \tilde{L} to set the step sizes for GDA, AGDA, sm-AGDA, and VRLM. Indeed, we obtain $\tilde{L} \approx 0.0532$, thus $\kappa \approx 5.32$. GDA, AGDA, and VRLM worked well with \tilde{L} ; however, sm-AGDA sequence diverged so we removed it from the comparison. Moreover, given batch size M , we estimated σ_x, σ_y by random sampling at $y = \mathbf{1}/n$ and set \mathbf{x} from 100 randomly initialized points generated by Xavier method, and we obtain $\sigma_x \approx 0.44$, $\sigma_y \approx 53$. We observe that SGDA-B outperforms the others on this test as it can efficiently search the local Lipschitz constants leading to larger step sizes.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we considered nonconvex-(strongly) concave minimax problems $\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_y \sum_{i=1}^N g_i(x_i) + f(\mathbf{x}, y) - h(y)$ where h and g_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$ are closed convex, f is smooth with L -Lipschitz gradients and μ -strongly concave in y for some $\mu \geq 0$. We proposed a new method SGDA-B with backtracking for WCWC problems that supports random block-coordinate updates in the primal variable. We then show that it achieves the best computational complexity $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 L \epsilon^{-2})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 L \log(p^{-1}) \epsilon^{-4})$ in both deterministic and stochastic settings respectively among the existing methods that are agnostic to Lipschitz constant L . In addition, we showed that our method can support Gauss-Seidel-type updates and can handle WCMC settings with guaranteed complexity.

References

- [1] Kimon Antonakopoulos, Thomas Pethick, Ali Kavis, Panayotis Mertikopoulos, and Volkan Cevher. Sifting through the noise: Universal first-order methods for stochastic variational inequalities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:13099–13111, 2021.

¹²<https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/binary.html>

- [2] Radu Ioan Boț and Axel Böhm. Alternating proximal-gradient steps for (stochastic) nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13605*, 2020.
- [3] Léon Bottou, Frank E Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *Siam Review*, 60(2):223–311, 2018.
- [4] Luca Calatroni and Antonin Chambolle. Backtracking strategies for accelerated descent methods with smooth composite objectives. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(3):1772–1798, 2019.
- [5] Yair Carmon, John C Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points i. *Mathematical Programming*, 184(1-2):71–120, 2020.
- [6] Antonin Chambolle and Thomas Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *Journal of Math. Imaging and Vision*, 40(1):120–145, 2011.
- [7] Kai-Wei Chang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Chih-Jen Lin. Coordinate descent method for large-scale l2-loss linear support vector machines. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(7), 2008.
- [8] Lesi Chen, Boyuan Yao, and Luo Luo. Faster stochastic algorithms for minimax optimization under polyak- $\{L\}$ ojasiewicz condition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:13921–13932, 2022.
- [9] Ziyi Chen, Shaocong Ma, and Yi Zhou. Accelerated proximal alternating gradient-descent-ascent for nonconvex minimax machine learning. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 672–677. IEEE, 2022.
- [10] Ashok Cutkosky and Kwabena A Boahen. Stochastic and adversarial online learning without hyperparameters. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- [11] Cong D Dang and Guanghui Lan. On the convergence properties of non-euclidean extragradient methods for variational inequalities with generalized monotone operators. *Computational Optimization and applications*, 60(2):277–310, 2015.
- [12] Jelena Diakonikolas, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Michael I Jordan. Efficient methods for structured nonconvex-nonconcave min-max optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2746–2754. PMLR, 2021.
- [13] John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.
- [14] Pavel Dvurechensky. Gradient method with inexact oracle for composite non-convex optimization, 2017.
- [15] Olivier Fercoq and Pascal Bianchi. A coordinate-descent primal-dual algorithm with large step size and possibly nonseparable functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):100–134, 2019.
- [16] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.
- [17] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [18] Benjamin Grimmer, Haihao Lu, Pratik Worah, and Vahab Mirrokni. The landscape of the proximal point method for nonconvex–nonconcave minimax optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–35, 2022.
- [19] Mert Gürbüzbalaban, Andrzej Ruszczyński, and Landi Zhu. A stochastic subgradient method for distributionally robust non-convex learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04873*, 2020.

- [20] E Yazdandoost Hamedani, A Jalilzadeh, and NS Aybat. Randomized primal-dual methods with adaptive step sizes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.04118*, accepted to *AISTATS 2023*, 2022.
- [21] Erfan Yazdandoost Hamedani and Necdet Serhat Aybat. A primal-dual algorithm with line search for general convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(2):1299–1329, 2021.
- [22] Feihu Huang, Shangqian Gao, Jian Pei, and Heng Huang. Accelerated zeroth-order and first-order momentum methods from mini to minimax optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(36):1–70, 2022.
- [23] Feihu Huang, Xidong Wu, and Heng Huang. Efficient mirror descent ascent methods for nonsmooth minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [24] Alfredo N Iusem, Alejandro Jofré, Roberto I Oliveira, and Philip Thompson. Variance-based extragradient methods with line search for stochastic variational inequalities. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):175–206, 2019.
- [25] Afrooz Jalilzadeh, Erfan Yazdandoost Hamedani, and Necdet S Aybat. A doubly-randomized block-coordinate primal-dual method for large-scale saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03886*, 2019.
- [26] Ruichen Jiang and Aryan Mokhtari. Generalized optimistic methods for convex-concave saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09674*, 2022.
- [27] Billy Jin, Katya Scheinberg, and Miaolan Xie. High probability complexity bounds for line search based on stochastic oracles. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:9193–9203, 2021.
- [28] Billy Jin, Katya Scheinberg, and Miaolan Xie. Sample complexity analysis for adaptive optimization algorithms with stochastic oracles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06838*, 2023.
- [29] YANG Junchi, Xiang Li, and Niao He. Nest your adaptive algorithm for parameter-agnostic nonconvex minimax optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [30] Weiwei Kong and Renato DC Monteiro. An accelerated inexact proximal point method for solving nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2558–2585, 2021.
- [31] Simon Lacoste-Julien, Mark Schmidt, and Francis Bach. A simpler approach to obtaining an $o(1/t)$ convergence rate for the projected stochastic subgradient method, 2012.
- [32] Sucheol Lee and Donghwan Kim. Fast extra gradient methods for smooth structured nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [33] Haochuan Li, Farzan Farnia, Subhro Das, and Ali Jadbabaie. On convergence of gradient descent ascent: A tight local analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12717–12740. PMLR, 2022.
- [34] Haochuan Li, Yi Tian, Jingzhao Zhang, and Ali Jadbabaie. Complexity lower bounds for nonconvex-strongly-concave min-max optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08708*, 2021.
- [35] Xiang Li, Junchi Yang, and Niao He. Tiada: A time-scale adaptive algorithm for nonconvex minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17478*, 2022.
- [36] Yingying Li and Stanley Osher. Coordinate descent optimization for l_1 minimization with application to compressed sensing; a greedy algorithm. *Inverse Problems and Imaging*, 3(3):487–503, 2009.
- [37] Zichong Li and Yangyang Xu. Augmented lagrangian-based first-order methods for convex-constrained programs with weakly convex objective. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 3(4):373–397, 2021.
- [38] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020.

- [39] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael I Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00331*, 2019.
- [40] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael I Jordan. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2738–2779. PMLR, 2020.
- [41] Songtao Lu, Ioannis Tsaknakis, Mingyi Hong, and Yongxin Chen. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:3676–3691, 2020.
- [42] Yu Malitsky. Proximal extrapolated gradient methods for variational inequalities. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 33(1):140–164, 2018.
- [43] Yura Malitsky and Thomas Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm with linesearch. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(1):411–432, 2018.
- [44] Gabriel Mancino-Ball and Yangyang Xu. Variance-reduced accelerated methods for decentralized stochastic double-regularized nonconvex strongly-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07113*, 2023.
- [45] Kensuke Nakamura, Stefano Soatto, and Byung-Woo Hong. Block-cyclic stochastic coordinate descent for deep neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 139:348–357, 2021.
- [46] Preetum Nakkiran, Gal Kaplun, Yamini Bansal, Tristan Yang, Boaz Barak, and Ilya Sutskever. Deep double descent: Where bigger models and more data hurt. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2021(12):124003, 2021.
- [47] Hongseok Namkoong and John C Duchi. Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f-divergences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2208–2216, 2016.
- [48] Yu Nesterov. Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):341–362, 2012.
- [49] Maher Nouiehed, Maziar Sanjabi, Tianjian Huang, Jason D Lee, and Meisam Razaviyayn. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [50] Dmitrii M Ostrovskii, Andrew Lowy, and Meisam Razaviyayn. Efficient search of first-order nash equilibria in nonconvex-concave smooth min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2508–2538, 2021.
- [51] Courtney Paquette and Katya Scheinberg. A stochastic line search method with convergence rate analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07994*, 2018.
- [52] Zhimin Peng, Tianyu Wu, Yangyang Xu, Ming Yan, and Wotao Yin. Coordinate friendly structures, algorithms and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.00863*, 2016.
- [53] Thomas Pethick, Puya Latafat, Panagiotis Patrinos, Olivier Fercoq, and Volkan Cevher. Escaping limit cycles: Global convergence for constrained nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09831*, 2023.
- [54] H Rafique, M Liu, Q Lin, and T Yang. Non-convex min-max optimization: provable algorithms and applications in machine learning (2018). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02060*, 1810.
- [55] Alexander Rakhlin, Ohad Shamir, and Karthik Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization, 2012.
- [56] Simone Rebegoldi and Luca Calatroni. Scaled, inexact, and adaptive generalized fista for strongly convex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(3):2428–2459, 2022.

- [57] Peter Richtárik and Martin Takáč. Efficient serial and parallel coordinate descent methods for huge-scale truss topology design. In *Operations Research Proceedings 2011: Selected Papers of the International Conference on Operations Research (OR 2011), August 30-September 2, 2011, Zurich, Switzerland*, pages 27–32. Springer, 2012.
- [58] Othmane Sebbouh, Marco Cuturi, and Gabriel Peyré. Randomized stochastic gradient descent ascent. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2941–2969. PMLR, 2022.
- [59] Chaobing Song, Zhengyuan Zhou, Yichao Zhou, Yong Jiang, and Yi Ma. Optimistic dual extrapolation for coherent non-monotone variational inequalities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:14303–14314, 2020.
- [60] Wei Sun, AoJun Zhou, Sander Stuijk, Rob Wijnhoven, Andrew Oakleigh Nelson, hongsheng Li, and Henk Corporaal. Dominosearch: Find layer-wise fine-grained n:m sparse schemes from dense neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 20721–20732, 2021.
- [61] Tong Tong Wu and Kenneth Lange. Coordinate descent algorithms for lasso penalized regression. 2008.
- [62] Lin Xiao, Adams Wei Yu, Qihang Lin, and Weizhu Chen. Dscovr: Randomized primal-dual block coordinate algorithms for asynchronous distributed optimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20:43–1, 2019.
- [63] Huan Xu, Constantine Caramanis, and Shie Mannor. Robust regression and lasso. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 21, 2008.
- [64] Zi Xu, Huiling Zhang, Yang Xu, and Guanghui Lan. A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex–concave and convex–nonconcave minimax problems. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–72, 2023.
- [65] Junchi Yang, Antonio Orvieto, Aurelien Lucchi, and Niao He. Faster single-loop algorithms for minimax optimization without strong concavity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5485–5517. PMLR, 2022.
- [66] TaeHo Yoon and Ernest K Ryu. Accelerated algorithms for smooth convex-concave minimax problems with $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on squared gradient norm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12098–12109. PMLR, 2021.
- [67] Jiawei Zhang, Peijun Xiao, Ruoyu Sun, and Zhiquan Luo. A single-loop smoothed gradient descent-ascent algorithm for nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7377–7389, 2020.
- [68] Siqu Zhang, Junchi Yang, Cristóbal Guzmán, Negar Kiyavash, and Niao He. The complexity of nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 482–492. PMLR, 2021.
- [69] Xuan Zhang, Necdet Serhat Aybat, and Mert Gürbüzbalaban. Robust accelerated primal-dual methods for computing saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.12743*, 2021.
- [70] Xuan Zhang, Necdet Serhat Aybat, and Mert Gurbuzbalaban. Sapd+: An accelerated stochastic method for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15084*, 2022.
- [71] Xuan Zhang, Gabriel Mancino-Ball, Necdet Serhat Aybat, and Yangyang Xu. Jointly improving the sample and communication complexities in decentralized stochastic minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09421*, 2023.

A SGDA-B with Gauss-Seidel Updates

In this section, we extend our results to SGDA-B with Gauss-Seidel updates, i.e., in line 8 of SGDA-B, displayed in algorithm 3, instead of calling RB-SGDA, we call RB-SAGDA, which is stated below in algorithm 3, and we use a slightly different choice of M_y . More precisely, we replace line 6 of SGDA-B with the following choice of K , M_x and M_y :

$$K \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{64N}{\epsilon^2 \eta_x} (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^0, y^0) - \bar{F} + (12\rho + 1)\epsilon) \right\rceil, \quad M_x \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_x^2 + 1 \right\rceil, \quad M_y \leftarrow \left\lceil \left(1 + \frac{12}{\mu \eta_y}\right) \frac{128}{\epsilon^2} \sigma_y^2 + 1 \right\rceil. \quad (49)$$

In this Gauss-Seidel variant, the analysis for the primal updates follows the same arguments used for analyzing the Jacobi updates, and for the new variant of SGDA-B, we only need to analyze the dual updates, i.e., to update y^{k+1} instead of using \mathbf{x}^k as in RB-SGDA, we now use \mathbf{x}^{k+1} –see line 5 of RB-SAGDA.

Algorithm 3 $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{G}) = \text{RB-SAGDA}(\eta_x, \eta_y, M_x, M_y, N, K, \mathbf{x}^0, y^0)$

```

1: for  $k = 0, 2, \dots, K - 1$  do
2:    $i_k \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[1, N]$   $\triangleright i_k$  is distributed uniformly on  $\{1, \dots, N\}$ 
3:    $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^k$ 
4:    $x_{i_k}^{k+1} \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta_x g_{i_k}} \left( x_{i_k}^k - \eta_x s_{x_{i_k}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k) \right)$ 
5:    $y^{k+1} \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left( y^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k) \right)$ 
6:    $\tilde{G}_x^k \leftarrow \tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)$ 
7:    $\tilde{G}_y^k \leftarrow \left[ \text{prox}_{\eta_y h} \left( y^k + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\psi}^k) \right) - y^k \right] / \eta_y$   $\triangleright \boldsymbol{\psi}^k \sim \boldsymbol{\zeta}$  –for distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ , see Definition 2
8: end for
9:  $\tilde{k} \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[0, K - 1]$ ,  $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}) \leftarrow (\mathbf{x}^{\tilde{k}}, y^{\tilde{k}})$ ,  $\tilde{G} \leftarrow [\tilde{G}_x^{\tilde{k}}, \tilde{G}_y^{\tilde{k}}]$ 
10: return  $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{G})$ 
11: # In practice line 6 and line 7 are not computed, this computation is done once in
    line 9 #

```

Because of the alternating updates, for the analysis of RB-SAGDA, we next define a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F}^{k+1} , which given in Definition 4.

Definition 5. Let $\mathcal{F}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \sigma(\{\mathbf{z}^k, \mathbf{x}^{k+1}\})$ denote the σ -algebra generated by $\mathbf{z}^k = (\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)$ for $k \geq 0$ and \mathbf{x}^{k+1} follows the update rule in line 4 of the RB-SAGDA algorithm.

In the next result, we bound the average squared norm of stochastic gradient maps over past iterations in expectation. This result is a slight modification of Lemma 4.

Lemma 10. For any $K \geq 1$ and $\eta_x > 0$, the RB-SAGDA iterate sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k, y^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x L \kappa \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_x(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\psi}^k)\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{N}{\eta_x} (F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)) \right] + \frac{3}{2} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \delta^k + K \left(\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where $\delta^k \triangleq \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ and $y_*^k \triangleq y_*(\mathbf{x}^k)$ for $k \geq 0$.

Proof. The proof is the same with the proof of Lemma 4 with the exception that we use $\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\psi}^k)$ for RB-SAGDA rather than $\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)$ we used for RB-SGDA. \square

For RB-SGDA dual iterate sequence $\{y^k\}$, the bound on $\delta^k \triangleq \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ given in Lemma 5 does not hold for RB-SAGDA, where $y_*^k \triangleq y_*(\mathbf{x}^k)$ and $y_*(\cdot)$ is given in Definition 1. Next, we provide a bound on δ^k for $\{y^k\}$ generated by RB-SAGDA.

Lemma 11. Suppose $\eta_y \in (0, 1/\mu)$ and consider $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k)\}_k$ generated by RB-SAGDA, displayed in algorithm 3. Then, $\delta^k = \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2$ admits the following bound for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta^k] \leq \mathbf{E}\left[\delta^0 R_1^k + \sum_{i=1}^k R_1^{k-i} \left(R_2 \|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{i-1}, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{i-1})\|^2/N - R_3 \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^i, y^{i-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{i-1})\|^2\right)\right] + R_4 \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} R_1^i,$$

where $R_1 \triangleq (1+a)(1-\mu\eta_y) < 1$, $R_2 \triangleq \frac{(1-\eta_y\mu)(2-\eta_y\mu)}{\eta_y\mu} \kappa^2 \eta_x^2$, $R_3 \triangleq \eta_y^2(1-\eta_y L)$ and $R_4 \triangleq 2\eta_y^2$, and $a = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\eta_y}{1-\mu\eta_y}$.

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$. Since $y^k = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y^{k-1} + \eta_y s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}))$ and $\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) = (y^k - y^{k-1})/\eta_y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^k &= \|y_*^k - y^k\|^2 \\ &= \|y_*^k - y^{k-1} - \eta_y \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &= \|y_*^k - y^{k-1}\|^2 + 2\eta_y \langle \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}), y^{k-1} - y_*^k \rangle + \eta_y^2 \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Since $y_*^k = \mathbf{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\mathbf{x}^k, y) - h(y)$, corollary 1 with $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}^k$, $\bar{y} = y^{k-1}$ and $\bar{y}^+ = y^k$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &2\eta_y \langle \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}), y^{k-1} - y_*^k \rangle + \eta_y^2 \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\leq -\eta_y \mu \|y^{k-1} - y_*^k\|^2 - \eta_y^2 (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\eta_y \langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*^k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

By plugging eq. (52) into eq. (51), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^k &\leq (1 - \eta_y \mu) \|y_*^k - y^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta_y^2 (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\eta_y \langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*^k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Next, $\|y_*^k - y^{k-1}\|^2$ can be bounded as follows:

$$\|y_*^k - y^{k-1}\|^2 = \|y_*^k - y_*^{k-1} + y_*^{k-1} - y^{k-1}\|^2 \leq (1 + \frac{1}{a}) \kappa^2 \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1}\|^2 + (1 + a) \delta^{k-1}, \quad (54)$$

for any $a > 0$, where we use Young's inequality and the fact that $y_*(\cdot)$ is κ -Lipschitz from [49, Lemma A.3]. Then, using (54) within (53), it follows from $\|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\| = \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1}\|/\eta_x$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^k &\leq (1 - \eta_y \mu)(1 + \alpha) \delta^{k-1} + (1 - \eta_y \mu) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \kappa^2 \eta_x^2 \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad - \eta_y^2 (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 + 2\eta_y \langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*^k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Let $a = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\eta_y}{1-\mu\eta_y}$ -we have $a > 0$ since $\eta_y < \frac{1}{\mu}$ for all $k \geq 0$. This choice implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^k &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_y \mu\right) \delta^{k-1} + \frac{(1 - \eta_y \mu)(2 - \eta_y \mu)}{\eta_y \mu} \kappa^2 \eta_x^2 \|\tilde{G}_{x_{i_{k-1}}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad - \eta_y^2 (1 - L\eta_y) \|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2 + 2\eta_y \langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*^k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Let $\hat{y}^k \triangleq \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y^{k-1} + \eta_y \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}))$. We can bound the inner product term in eq. (56) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\left[\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^k) \rangle \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\langle s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}), y^k - \hat{y}^k \rangle \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ &\leq \eta_y \mathbf{E}\left[\|s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) - \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1})\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\right] \leq \eta_y \frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where in the first equality we used the fact that $\mathbf{E}\left[s_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1}) \mid \mathcal{F}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}\right] = \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1})$ and $\hat{y}^k - y_*(\mathbf{x}^k)$ is $\mathcal{F}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}$ -measurable; in the first inequality, we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the nonexpansivity of the proximal map; and the final inequality follows from Assumption 2. Therefore, eq. (56) and eq. (57) together with eq. (5a) imply that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\delta^k\right] \leq \mathbf{E}\left[R_1\delta^{k-1} + R_2\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-1})\|^2/N - R_3\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^{k-1}; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{k-1})\|^2\right] + R_4\frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}. \quad (58)$$

Thus, eq. (58) implies the desired result. Indeed, $R_1 = C_1 < 1$, where C_1 is defined in Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 12. *Let $\eta_x > 0$ and $\eta_y \in (0, 1/\mu)$. Then, for any $K > 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}\left[\left(2 - 4\eta_x\kappa L\right)\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{K-1}, y^{K-1}; \boldsymbol{\omega}^K)\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\psi}^k)\|^2\right. \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2}6R_3\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\sum_{i=k}^{K-2}R_1^{i-k}\|\tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, y^k; \boldsymbol{\zeta}^k)\|^2 \\ & \quad \left. + 4\sum_{k=0}^{K-2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_x\kappa L - \frac{3}{2N}R_2\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\sum_{i=k}^{K-2}R_1^{i-k}\right)\|\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2\right] \\ & \leq 4\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{N}{\eta_x}\left(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K)\right) + \delta^0\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\frac{3}{2}\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)R_1^k\right] \\ & \quad + 4K\left(\frac{\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \frac{6\eta_y}{\mu}\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\right)\frac{\sigma_y^2}{M_y}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Proof. The proof of this result follows from Lemma 10, Lemma 11 and from the same arguments used in the proof of Lemma 6. \square

Lemma 13. *Given some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, suppose $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$ satisfy $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$ and $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3\mu^2$ for $\rho = \frac{\sqrt{1+\frac{12}{N}}-1}{24} \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k, y^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by RB-SAGDA. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{E}\left[\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k)\|^2\right] \leq \frac{4N}{\eta_x K}\mathbf{E}\left[F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K) + 12\rho\tilde{\epsilon}\right] + \frac{4\sigma_x^2}{M_x} + \left(1 + \frac{12}{\eta_y\mu}\right)\frac{4\sigma_y^2}{M_y} \quad (60)$$

holds for all $K \geq 1$, where $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k) \triangleq [\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)^\top \tilde{G}_y(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\psi}^k)^\top]^\top$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 7. Since $\bar{R}_1 = C_1$ and $R_2 = \frac{(1-\eta_y\mu)(2-\eta_y\mu)}{2}C_2 \leq C_2$, where C_1 and C_2 are defined in Lemma 5, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} - \eta_x\kappa L - R_2\frac{3}{2N}\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\sum_{i=k}^{K-2}R_1^{i-k} \\ & = \frac{1}{2} - \eta_x\kappa L - \frac{(1-\eta_y\mu)(2-\eta_y\mu)}{2}C_2\frac{3}{2N}\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\sum_{i=k}^{K-2}C_1^{i-k} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} - \eta_x\kappa L - C_2\frac{3}{2N}\left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2}\right)\sum_{i=k}^{K-2}C_1^{i-k} \geq \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where the last inequality follows from $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3\mu^2$ and (33). The definition of ρ implies that $N\rho = \frac{1}{4} - 12N\rho^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$; hence, using $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$, we get $\eta_x = N\rho \cdot \eta_y^3\mu^2 < \frac{1}{4L\kappa^2} \leq \frac{1}{4L\kappa}$ since $\kappa \geq 1$. Moreover, since $\eta_x \leq \frac{1}{4L\kappa}$, all the $\tilde{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ terms on the left-hand side of (59) can be lower bounded by $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k)\|^2$.

Finally, $\eta_y \leq \frac{1}{L}$ implies that $R_3 \geq 0$; thus, $\mathbf{E}[\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\tilde{G}(\mathbf{x}^k, y^k; \boldsymbol{\xi}^k)\|^2]$ is a lower bound for the left-hand side of (59). Next, we provide an upper bound for the right-hand side of (59). Note that since $L \leq \frac{1}{\eta_y}$,

$$1 + \frac{6\eta_y}{\mu} \left(L^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_y^2} \right) \leq 1 + \frac{12}{\eta_y \mu}. \quad (62)$$

The desired inequality follows from combining all these bounds with (35) and (36), and finally dividing both sides by K . \square

The results given in Lemmas 8 and 9 and Theorems 2 and 3 continue to hold for the Gauss-Seidel variant of SGDA-B with M_x, M_y and K chosen as in (49).

B Derivation of Computational Complexities in Tables 1 and 2

B.1 Derivation of complexity in [29]

The nested adaptive (**NeAda**) algorithm in [29] is a double-loop method, where the inner loop is to inexactly maximize the coupling function for a given primal iterate and in the outer loop, the primal variable is updated using a (stochastic) gradient computed at the current primal iterate and an inexact dual maximizer. For WCSC minimax problems, **NeAda** with adaptive stepsizes can achieve the near-optimal $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-2})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-4})$ gradient complexities respectively in the deterministic and stochastic settings. However, the dependence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant on κ and L is not explicitly stated in [29]; and in the rest of this section, we compute the important terms within the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant.

According to the proof of [29, Theorem 3.2], **NeAda** in the deterministic setting can compute

$$\|\nabla_x f(x^K, y^K)\|^2 + \|G_y(x^K, y^K)\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$$

for $K \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\left((A + \mathcal{E})^2 + \sqrt{v_0}(A + \mathcal{E})\right)\epsilon^{-2}\right)$ with $A + \mathcal{E} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\Phi(x_0) - \min_x \Phi(x)}{\eta} + 2\sigma + \kappa L\eta + \frac{\kappa^2(L+1)^2}{\sqrt{v_0}}\right)$ for some $v_0, \eta > 0$ –see [29, Theorem B.1] in the appendix of the paper for the details; moreover, for each outer iteration $k = 1, \dots, K$, subroutine \mathcal{A} to inexact solve $\max_{y \in Y} f(x^k, y)$ requires $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a_2} \log(k)\right)$ gradient calls for some $a_2 \in (0, 1)$ constant specific to the subroutine \mathcal{A} that depend on structural properties of $f(x, \cdot)$ uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such as L and μ . Since $\sigma = 0$, if one uses accelerated backtracking method for solving strongly convex problems [4, 56] as the subroutine \mathcal{A} , then $a_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$. Therefore, the total gradient complexity for **NeAda** in the deterministic case is at least $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\left((A + \mathcal{E})^2 + \sqrt{v_0}(A + \mathcal{E})\right)\epsilon^{-2}/a_2\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{4.5} L^4 \epsilon^{-2})$.

The stochastic case $\sigma > 0$ is considered in [29, Theorem 3.3], and according to this result, stochastic **NeAda** can compute

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\|\nabla_x f(x^K, y^K)\|^2 + \|y^K - y_*(x^K)\|^2\right] \leq \epsilon^2$$

for some $K = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\left((A + \mathcal{E})^2 + \sqrt{v_0}(A + \mathcal{E})(1 + \sigma) + b_3 + (b_3 + \delta^0)e^{2b_1}\right)\epsilon^{-2}\right)$ with $A = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\Phi(x_0) - \min_x \Phi(x)}{\eta} + \left(\frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{M}} + \kappa L\eta\right)(1 + b_1)\right)$, $\mathcal{E} = \frac{L^2}{2\sqrt{v_0}}[b_3(1 + \log K) + b_3 e^{2b_1} + \delta^0 e^{2b_1}]$, $\delta^0 = \|y^0 - y_*(x^0)\|^2$ and $b_3 = 2\kappa^2 \eta^2 b_1 + b_2$, where $v_0, \eta, b_1, b_2 > 0$ are some constants, and b_1, b_2 can depend on problem parameters such as μ, L and κ .

Indeed, it is assumed that there exists a subroutine \mathcal{A} such that for any given smooth strongly concave function h , after $T = t \log^p(t) + 1$ iterations, it guarantees that $\mathbf{E}\left[\|y^T - y^*\|^2\right] \leq \frac{b_1 \|y^0 - y^*\|^2 + b_2}{T}$ where $y^* = \mathbf{argmax} h(y)$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In [29, Remarks 5 and 8], they cited some parameter-agnostic algorithms [10, 31, 55] that can be used as \mathcal{A} for solving the inner max problems with a sub-linear rate. All these three methods need some extra assumptions, e.g., the stochastic gradients are bounded, i.e., $\max\{\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x, y)\| : x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in Y\} \leq G$ for some $G > 0$, and in [31, 55], strongly concavity modulus μ is assumed to be known; under these assumptions, these methods satisfy $b_1 = 0$ and $b_2 = \frac{G^2}{\mu^2}$. FreeRexMomentum [10] is the only algorithm which is agnostic to both μ and G , and it satisfies the conditions of subroutine \mathcal{A} with $b_1 = 0$, $b_2 = \frac{G^2}{\mu^2}$ and $p = 2$ –see [29, Footnote 4]. Since the batch size $M = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$, the oracle complexity for $\tilde{\nabla}_x f$ is $KM = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(G^4 \kappa^4 \epsilon^{-4})$ and the oracle complexity for $\tilde{\nabla}_y f$ is $K^2 \log^2 K + K = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(G^8 \kappa^8 \epsilon^{-4})$. Hence, the total oracle complexity for stochastic **NeAda** is at least $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(G^8 \kappa^8 \epsilon^{-4})$.

B.2 Derivation of complexity in [35]

To get the near-optimal complexities, their theoretical analysis requires $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} > \beta$. To come up with explicit κ and L dependence of their $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, we will use this as well.

The complexity for the deterministic case is discussed in [35, Theorem C.1], and they show that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_x f(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq \max\{5C_1, 2C_2\} \triangleq C, \quad (63)$$

for some constants C_1 and C_2 , which we will analyze next. Indeed, both C_1 and C_2 are explicitly defined in the statement of Theorem C.1 depending on some other positive constants, i.e., $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ and $c_5 > 0$, which are defined as follows¹³:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \frac{\eta_x \kappa^2}{\eta_y (v_0^y)^{\alpha-\beta}}, \quad c_2 = \max\left\{\frac{4\eta_y \mu L}{\mu + L}, \eta_y (\mu + L)\right\}, \quad c_3 = 4(\mu + L) \left(\frac{1}{\mu^2} + \frac{\eta_y}{(v_0^y)^\beta}\right) c_2^{1/\beta}, \\ c_4 &= (\mu + L) \left(\frac{2\kappa^2}{(v_0^y)^\alpha} + \frac{(\mu + L)\kappa^2}{\eta_y \mu L}\right), \quad c_5 = c_3 + \frac{\eta_y v_0^y}{(v_0^y)^\beta} + \frac{\eta_y c_2^{\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}}}{1-\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Because C_1 and C_2 are monotonically increasing in $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^5$ and they have complicated forms to compute exact quantities, we compute a lower bound for each c_i , $i = 1, \dots, 5$ and use these bounds to further bound C_1 and C_2 from below. This will allow us to provide a lower bound on **TiAda** complexity results in terms of its dependence on L, μ and κ . Initialization of **TiAda** requires setting six parameters: $\eta_x, \eta_y, v_0^x, v_0^y > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\alpha > \beta$. Since the problem parameters L, μ and κ are unknown, we treat all these parameters as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants. Indeed,

- (i) consider c_1 , treating $\frac{\eta_x}{\eta_y (v_0^y)^{\alpha-\beta}}$ as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, we have $c_1 = \Theta(\kappa^2)$;
- (ii) for c_2 , we similarly treat η_y as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, and get $c_2 = \Theta(L)$;
- (iii) for c_3 , since $c_2 = \Theta(L)$ and we treat $\frac{\eta_y}{(v_0^y)^\beta}$ as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, we get $c_3 = \Theta\left(\frac{\kappa L^{1/\beta}}{\mu}\right)$;
- (iv) similarly, we have the bounds: $c_4 = \Theta(\kappa^3)$ and $c_5 = \Theta\left(\frac{\kappa L^{1/\beta}}{\mu}\right)$.

Next, we derive lower bound for C_1 and C_2 in terms of L, μ and κ . We first focus on C_1 . Indeed, it follows from the definition of C_1 in [35, Theorem C.1] that

$$C_1 = \Omega\left((c_1 c_4)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-\beta}} \mathbf{1}_{2\alpha-\beta < 1} + (c_1 c_4)^{\frac{2}{1-\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{2\alpha-\beta \geq 1}\right) \quad (65)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{2\alpha-\beta < 1} = 1$ if $2\alpha - \beta < 1$; otherwise, it is 0, and we define $\mathbf{1}_{2\alpha-\beta \geq 1} = 1 - \mathbf{1}_{2\alpha-\beta < 1}$. Although $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, it is necessary to consider their effects when they appear as exponents. Therefore, we consider the following two cases:

1. when $2\alpha - \beta \geq 1$, since $\beta > 0$, we can conclude that $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$. As a result, $(c_1 c_4)^{\frac{2}{1-\alpha}} \geq (c_1 c_4)^4 = \Theta(\kappa^{20})$; therefore,

$$C_1 = \Omega\left(\kappa^{20}\right);$$

2. when $2\alpha - \beta < 1$, it implies $\alpha - \beta < \frac{1-\beta}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$. As a result, we can bound C_1 from below as follows: $(c_1 c_4)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-\beta}} \geq (c_1 c_2)^2 = \Theta(\kappa^{10})$; therefore,

$$C_1 = \Omega\left(\kappa^{10}\right).$$

¹³In [35], there are typos in the definition of c_1 and c_3 ; $v_{t_0}^y$ appearing in c_1 and c_3 should be v_0^y .

Therefore, using (63) and $C \geq C_1$, we can conclude that for any $\epsilon > 0$, the gradient complexity of **TiAda** for $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_x f(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$ to hold is at least $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{10}\epsilon^{-2})$. Therefore, for the deterministic WCSC minimax problems, the gradient complexity of **TiAda** to compute an ϵ -stationary point in terms of metric **(M2)** is at least $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{10}\epsilon^{-2})$.

Next, we will analyze the oracle complexity of **TiAda** for the stochastic case. Indeed, the analysis in [35, Theorem C.2] implies that $\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_x f(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \right] \leq \tilde{C}_x(K)$ holds for all $K \geq 1$, where $\tilde{C}_x(K)$ is a monotonically decreasing function of K such that

$$\tilde{C}_x(K) \geq \frac{\hat{L}^2 G^2(\eta_x)^2}{\mu \eta_y (v_0^y)^{2\alpha-\beta}} \frac{2L\kappa(\eta_x)^2}{(1-\alpha)\eta_y (v_0^y)^{\alpha-\beta}} \frac{G^{2(1-\alpha)}}{K^\alpha} + \frac{2L\kappa\eta_y G^{2(1-\beta)}}{(1-\beta)K^\beta}, \quad (66)$$

where $\hat{L} = \frac{\bar{L} + \bar{L}\kappa}{\mu} + \frac{L(\bar{L} + \bar{L}\kappa)}{\mu^2} = \Theta\left(\frac{\kappa^2 \bar{L}}{\mu}\right)$, and it is assumed that there exists a constant $\bar{L} > 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y_1, y_2 \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{xy}^2 f(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_{xy}^2 f(x_2, y_2)\| &\leq \bar{L}(\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|), \\ \|\nabla_{yy}^2 f(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_{yy}^2 f(x_2, y_2)\| &\leq \bar{L}(\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|). \end{aligned}$$

The bound in eq. (66) implies that for $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_x f(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$ to hold, it is necessary that

$$\begin{aligned} K &\geq \left(\frac{\hat{L}^2 G^2(\eta_x)^2}{\mu \eta_y (v_0^y)^{2\alpha-\beta}} \frac{4L\kappa(\eta_x)^2}{(1-\alpha)\eta_y (v_0^y)^{\alpha-\beta}} \frac{G^{2(1-\alpha)}}{\epsilon^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \left(\frac{4L\kappa\eta_y G^{2(1-\beta)}}{(1-\beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &= \Omega\left((\kappa^6 \bar{L}^2 G^{2(2-\alpha)} \mu^{-2} \epsilon^{-2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (\kappa L G^{2(1-\beta)} \epsilon^{-2})^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

As explained in [35], the best oracle complexity of **TiAda** in terms of ϵ dependence is $\mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^{-(4+\delta)}\right)$, which holds for any small $\delta > 0$. To achieve this complexity under the condition $\alpha > \beta$, one has to choose α and β as follows: $\alpha = 0.5 + \delta/(8 + 2\delta)$ and $\beta = 0.5 - \delta/(8 + 2\delta)$. As a result, eq. (67) implies that

$$K = \Omega\left(G^{6 - \frac{4\delta}{2+\delta}} \kappa^{12 - \frac{6\delta}{2+\delta}} \bar{L}^{4 - \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \mu^{-4 + \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \epsilon^{-4 + \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} + G^{2+\delta} \kappa^{(2+\frac{\delta}{2})} L^{(2+\frac{\delta}{2})} \epsilon^{-(4+\delta)} \right). \quad (68)$$

Furthermore, [35, Theorem C.2] also implies that $\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \right] \leq \tilde{C}_y(K)$ holds for all $K \geq 1$, $\tilde{C}_y(K)$ is a monotonically decreasing function of K , which can be bounded from below as follows:

$$\tilde{C}_y(K) \geq \frac{\hat{L}^2 G^2(\eta_x)^2}{\mu \eta_y (v_0^y)^{2\alpha-\beta}} \frac{L(\eta_x)^2 G^{2-2\alpha}}{(1-\alpha)\eta_y (v_0^y)^{\alpha-\beta} T^\alpha} \geq \Theta\left(\frac{\kappa^5 \bar{L}^2}{\mu^2 T^\alpha}\right);$$

hence, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, in order for $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla_y f(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$ to hold, it is necessary to have

$$K = \Omega\left(G^{6 - \frac{4\delta}{2+\delta}} \kappa^{10 - \frac{5\delta}{2+\delta}} \bar{L}^{4 - \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \mu^{-4 + \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \epsilon^{-4 + \frac{2\delta}{2+\delta}} \right).$$

Therefore, we can conclude that to guarantee an ϵ -stationary point in metric **M2**, the oracle complexity of **TiAda** for computing is $\Omega(G^6 \bar{L}^4 \kappa^{12} \mu^{-4} \epsilon^{-4})$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

B.3 Derivation of complexity in [41]

The hybrid successive approximation (**HiBSA**) algorithm is a single-loop proximal alternating algorithm for solving deterministic nonconvex minimax problems $\min_{\mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y)$, where \mathcal{L} has the same form in (1). **HiBSA** uses block coordinate updates for the primal variable that has $N \geq 1$ blocks. Moreover, it employs constant step sizes for primal and dual updates, and to set these step sizes one needs to know the Lipschitz constant L and strongly concavity modulus μ . Convergence results provided in the paper are in terms of **(M2)** metric.

For the WCSC setting, according to [41, Lemma 3], whenever dual step size ρ and primal step size $\frac{1}{\beta}$ are chosen satisfying the following two conditions: $0 < \rho < \frac{\mu}{4L^2}$ and $\beta > L^2(\frac{2}{\mu^2\rho} + \frac{\rho}{2}) + \frac{L}{2} - L$, it is guaranteed that the HiBSA iterate sequence satisfies the following bound for all $k \geq 0$:

$$c_1 \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 + c_2 \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k\|^2 \leq \mathcal{P}^k - \mathcal{P}^{k+1}, \quad (69)$$

where $c_1 \triangleq 4(\frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{L^2}{2\mu}) - \frac{7}{2\rho} > 0$ and $c_2 \triangleq \beta + L - \frac{L}{2} - L^2(\frac{2}{\mu^2\rho} + \frac{\rho}{2}) > 0$, and $\mathcal{P}^k \triangleq \mathcal{L}(x^k, y^k) + (\frac{2}{\rho^2\mu} + \frac{1}{2\rho} - 4(\frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{L^2}{2\mu})) \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|^2$, which is the value of the potential function at iteration $k \geq 0$ —here, $c_1, c_2 > 0$ follows from the conditions on ρ and β . Furthermore, from the proof of [41, Theorem 1], for all $k \geq 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_{x_i}(x^k, y^k)\| &\leq (\beta + 2L) \|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k\|, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \|G_y(x^k, y^k)\| &\leq L \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \frac{1}{\rho} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

which immediately implies that

$$\|G(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq ((\beta + 2L)^2 + 2L^2) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{2}{\rho^2} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \leq \frac{\mathcal{P}^k - \mathcal{P}^{k+1}}{d_1}, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (71)$$

where $d_1 \triangleq \min\{4(\frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{L^2}{2\mu}) - \frac{7}{2\rho}, \beta + L - \frac{L}{2} - L^2(\frac{2}{\mu^2\rho} + \frac{\rho}{2})\} / \max\{\frac{2}{\rho^2}, (\beta + 2L)^2 + 2L^2\}$ —note that $d_1 > 0$ due to conditions on ρ and β . Therefore, for any $K \geq 1$, one has

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|G(x^k, y^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{K} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{P}^1 - \underline{\mathcal{L}}}{d_1} \leq \frac{1}{K} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{L}(x^1, y^1) - \underline{\mathcal{L}} + c_3 \mathcal{D}_y^2}{d_1}, \quad (72)$$

where $c_3 \triangleq \frac{2}{\rho^2\mu} + \frac{1}{2\rho} - 4(\frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{L^2}{2\mu})$, \mathcal{D}_y is the diameter of the dual domain, and it is assumed that there exists $\underline{\mathcal{L}} > -\infty$ such that $\mathcal{L}(x, y) \geq \underline{\mathcal{L}}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Note that $c_3 > \frac{2}{\rho^2\mu} > 32L\kappa^3$, where we used $0 < \rho < \frac{\mu}{4L^2}$; moreover, we also have $\beta > \frac{2L^2}{\mu^2\rho} - \frac{L}{2} > \frac{2\kappa^2}{\rho} - L$; therefore,

$$\frac{1}{d_1} \geq \frac{(\beta + 2L)^2 + 2L^2}{4(\frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{L^2}{2\mu})} \geq \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \cdot \frac{\beta^2}{\frac{2\kappa^2}{\rho} - L\kappa^3} \geq \frac{\kappa^2\beta}{2} \cdot \frac{\frac{2\kappa^2}{\rho} - L}{\frac{2\kappa^2}{\rho} - L\kappa^3} \geq \frac{\kappa^2\beta}{2} \geq \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \left(\frac{2\kappa^2}{\rho} - L \right) \geq \kappa^2 \left(4\kappa^3 L - \frac{L}{2} \right) = \Omega(L\kappa^5).$$

Thus, combining this bound with (72) and using $c_3 > 32L\kappa^3$, we get $\frac{\mathcal{L}(x^1, y^1) - \underline{\mathcal{L}} + c_3 \mathcal{D}_y^2}{d_1} = \Omega(L^2\kappa^8 \mathcal{D}_y^2)$. This result implies that the total complexity of HiBSA to compute an ϵ -stationary point for WCSC minimax problems is at least $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^8 L^2 \epsilon^{-2})$.

B.4 Derivation of complexity in [67]

In this paper, the objective function is defined as $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} g(x) + f(x, y) - h(y)$, where $g(\cdot) \triangleq \mathbb{1}_X(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot) \triangleq \mathbb{1}_Y(\cdot)$ denote the indicator functions of the closed convex sets $X \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \subset \mathcal{Y}$. The paper [67] adopts the metric **(M4)** for characterizing ϵ -stationarity; the metric **(M4)** and its connections to some other convergence metrics is discussed in Section C. Basically, for given $\epsilon > 0$, (x_ϵ, y_ϵ) is ϵ -stationary (in the sense of the **(M4)** metric) if

$$\exists u \in \nabla_x f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) + \partial g(x_\epsilon), \quad \exists v \in -\nabla_y f(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) + \partial h(y_\epsilon) : \quad \max\{\|u\|, \|v\|\} \leq \epsilon. \quad (73)$$

For convenience of the reader, in this section we use the notation from [67]. Following the parameter conditions in [67, Theorem 3.4], we consider selecting the algorithm parameters p and c such that $p = 4L$ and $c = \frac{1}{6L}$, where L denotes the Lipschitz constant of ∇f . This choice implies the following bounds on other parameters showing up in the proof of [67, Theorem 3.4]:

1. [67, Theorem 3.4], $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1/L)$, $\beta = \mathcal{O}\left(\min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}, \frac{1}{L}\right\}\right)$ –see also [67, page 29];
2. [67, Lemma B.2, page 19], $\sigma_1 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, $\sigma_2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, $\sigma_3 = \mathcal{O}(1)$;
3. [67, Lemma B.9, page 23], $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(1)$;¹⁴
4. [67, Lemma B.11, page 26], $\bar{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(L)$;
5. [67, eq. (B.63), page 29], $\lambda_1 = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{D}_y)$, $\lambda_2 = \mathcal{O}(L\mathcal{D}_y^2)$, $\lambda_3 = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{D}_y^2)$.

For any given $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, the proof of [67, Theorem 3.4, page 29] considers two exhaustive cases where β is set to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$: if **case 1** holds, then the bound,

$$\max\left\{\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2, \|y^k - y_+^k(z^k)\|^2, \|z^k - x^{k+1}\|^2\right\} \leq \max\{\lambda_2\beta^2, \lambda_1^2\beta^2, \lambda_3\beta\} \leq B_1$$

holds for some $k_* \leq K$, where $B_1 = \mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{D}_y^2 \cdot \frac{\max\{L, 1\}}{K}\right)$. Furthermore, according to [67, Lemma B.11, page 26], this point (x^{k_*}, y^{k_*}) is an $\bar{\lambda}\sqrt{B_1}$ -stationary; hence, (x^{k_*}, y^{k_*}) is $\mathcal{O}\left(L\mathcal{D}_y \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{L, 1\}}{K}}\right)$ -stationary since $\bar{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(L)$. Therefore, $K \geq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^4\mathcal{D}_y^4}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ iterations is required to guarantee ϵ -stationary point for this case. On the other hand, if **case 2** holds, then there exists $k_* \leq K$ such that (x^{k_*}, y^{k_*}) is $\sqrt{(\phi_0 - \underline{f})/(K\beta)}$ -stationary; hence, (x^{k_*}, y^{k_*}) is $\sqrt{(\phi_0 - \underline{f})/\sqrt{K}}$ -stationary since $\beta = 1/\sqrt{K}$, where $\underline{f} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\underline{f} \leq \max_{y \in Y} f(x, y)$ for all x , and $\phi^0 = F(x^0, z^0; y^0) - 2d(y^0, z^0) + 2P(z^0)$ for $F(x, z; y) \triangleq f(x, y) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|x - z\|^2$, $d(y, z) \triangleq \min_{x \in X} F(x, z; y)$ and $P(z) = \min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} F(x, z; y)$. Therefore, $K \geq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\phi_0 - \underline{f})^2}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ is required to guarantee ϵ -stationary point for this case. Thus, combining the two exhaustive cases, we conclude that $K \geq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^4\mathcal{D}_y^4 + (\phi_0 - \underline{f})^2}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ to ensure that the algorithm can compute an ϵ -stationary point within K iterations.

B.5 Derivation of complexity in [14]

In this paper, a special case of (1) is considered when $h(\cdot) = 0$ and the primal-dual coupling is *bilinear* of the form $f(x, y) = -r(y) + \langle Ax, y \rangle$ such that r is L_r -smooth and μ -strongly convex. An adaptive triple-loop method is proposed; in the outer loop the method takes inexact proximal gradient steps for the primal function using the inexact oracle values satisfying the backtracking condition, in the middle loop backtracking steps are implemented for the primal function, and each backtracking step and checking the backtracking condition require solving $\max_{y \in Y} f(x^k, y)$ inexactly. Let $F(\cdot) = g(\cdot) + \Phi(\cdot)$ denote the primal function, where $\Phi(\cdot) = \max_{y \in Y} f(\cdot, y)$, and $F^* = \min_{x \in X} F(x)$. From the discussion in [14, Corollary 2], the number of times the backtracking condition checked is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(L_\nu(F(x^0) - F^*)\epsilon^{-2})$, where $L_\nu = \frac{\|A\|^2}{\mu}$. Furthermore, according to [14, Algorithm 1] and the discussion in [14, eq.(21)-(32)], given x^k corresponding to the k -th outer iteration, computing the inexact oracle for the pair $(\Phi(x^k), \nabla\Phi(x^k))$, in the sense of [14, Definition 1 on page 4], which is $(f(x^k, \tilde{y}^k), A^\top \tilde{y}^k)$. This step requires to compute \tilde{y}^k such that

$$\Phi(x^k) - f(x^k, \tilde{y}^k) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2/M_k), \quad (74)$$

which requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_r/\mu} \log(L_\nu/\epsilon^2))$ projected gradient iterations (that involve computing $\nabla_y f(x_k, \cdot)$ and projecting onto Y) by employing an accelerated backtracking method for strongly convex problems [4, 56], where M_k is an estimate of L_ν , and according to [14, Corollary 2], $M_k \leq 2L_\nu$ for all $k \geq 0$. After each computation of \tilde{y}^k , a projected inexact gradient step using the inexact oracle is computed from the point x^k to compute a candidate primal point w^k , and the backtracking condition is checked. If it holds for w^k , then $x^{k+1} \leftarrow w^k$; otherwise, $M_k \leftarrow 2M_k$ and \tilde{y}^k is computed again. Thus, the total gradient complexity, i.e., number of times ∇f is computed, to compute an ϵ -stationary point in the sense of metric **(M1)** is $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{L_r}{\mu}} \frac{\|A\|^2}{\mu} (F(x^0) - F^*)\epsilon^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1})\right)$. Indeed, since the Lipschitz constant of ∇f satisfies $L \geq \max\{L_r, \|A\|\}$, the total gradient complexity can be simplified as $\mathcal{O}(L\kappa^{1.5}\epsilon^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$.

¹⁴Unlike the notation in our paper, κ does not denote the condition number L/μ in [67], it is just some $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant.

C Discussion on the Convergence Metrics

In this paper we adopt **(M2)**, defined in definition 3, as our primary measure of convergence for both the WCSC and WCMC cases. This choice is motivated by the fact that **(M2)** is easy to check in practice. Also note that in the absence of closed convex functions g and h , $\|G(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon$ reduces to $\|\nabla f(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon$. Prior to discussing various forms of stationarity and their connection with each other, we give some preliminary definitions and notation. We first recall that $\Phi(x) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x, y) - h(y)$, and the primal function is given by $F(\cdot) \triangleq g(\cdot) + \Phi(\cdot)$. Next, we provide the definition of the Moreau envelope of a real-valued function.

Definition 1. Let $r : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be L -weakly convex. Then, for any $\lambda \in (0, L^{-1})$, the Moreau envelope of r is defined as the function $r_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $r_\lambda(x) \triangleq \min_{w \in \mathcal{X}} r(w) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|w - x\|^2$.

In the rest of this section, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4. There exists $m \geq 0$ such that for all $y \in \text{dom } h$, the function $f(\cdot, y)$ is m -weakly convex, i.e., $f(\cdot, y) + \frac{m}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ is convex.

Remark 5. Under Assumption 1, $f(\cdot, y)$ is naturally L -weakly convex; that said, it is possible that f satisfies Assumption 4 with $m \ll L$.

Under Assumption 4, the primal function F is m -weakly convex; hence, for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/m)$, F_λ is well-defined for both WCSC and WCMC cases and it is differentiable with $\nabla F_\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda}(x - \mathbf{prox}_{\lambda F}(x))$ —this is a standard result, for details see, e.g., [70, Lemma 2]. Finally, we recall the gradient map.

Definition 2. For given $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$, the gradient map $G(x, y) = [G_x(x, y)^\top, G_y(x, y)^\top]^\top$, and $G_x(x, y) \triangleq (x - \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g}(x - \eta_x \nabla_x f(x, y)))/\eta_x$ and $G_y(x, y) \triangleq (\mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y + \eta_y \nabla_y f(x, y)) - y)/\eta_y$.

Now, we are ready to state various important types of stationarity adopted in the literature on nonconvex minimax problems.

Definition 3. Given $\epsilon > 0$, consider the minimax problem in (1).

(M1): $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M1)** if $\|\mathcal{G}(x)\| \leq \epsilon$ for some $\alpha > 0$, where $\mathcal{G}(x) = (x - \mathbf{prox}_{\alpha g}(x - \alpha \nabla \Phi(x)))/\alpha$.

(M2): $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M2)** if $\|G(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon$ for some $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$.

(M3): $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M3)** if $\|\nabla F_\lambda(x)\| \leq \epsilon$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1/m)$.

(M4): $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is (ϵ_x, ϵ_y) -stationary in **(M4)** if $\exists u \in \nabla_x f(x, y) + \partial g(x)$ and $\exists v \in \nabla_y f(x, y) - \partial h(y)$ such that $\|u\| \leq \epsilon_x$ and $\|v\| \leq \epsilon_y$.

(M5): $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M5)** if $\exists \hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\inf_{\|d\| \leq 1} F'(\hat{x}; d) \geq -\epsilon$ and $\|\hat{x} - x\| \leq \epsilon$, where $F'(\hat{x}; d) \triangleq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(\hat{x} + td) - F(\hat{x})}{t}$.

(M6): for the case $g(\cdot) = 0$, $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M6)** if for some $\eta_y > 0$, $\|\nabla_x f(x, \hat{y})\| \leq \epsilon$ and $\|G_y(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon$ where $\hat{y} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y + \eta_y \nabla_y f(x, y))$.

Remark 6. The metric **(M1)** requires differentiability of Φ , which holds when $f(x, \cdot)$ is strongly concave for any given $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, this metric applies to WCSC setting, but not to WCMC setting. Moreover, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, **(M2)** and **(M4)** are equivalent when $g(\cdot) = h(\cdot) = 0$ and $\epsilon_x = \epsilon_y = \epsilon$.

Our next result shows that the guarantees in the metric **(M2)** can be converted into guarantees in **(M4)**.

Theorem 5. Suppose Assumption 1 holds and (x, y) is ϵ -stationary in **(M2)** for some $\eta_x, \eta_y > 0$, then (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) is (ϵ_x, ϵ_y) -stationary in **(M4)**, where $\hat{x} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_x g}(x - \eta_x \nabla_x f(x, y))$ and $\hat{y} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_y h}(y + \eta_y \nabla_y f(x, y))$ for $\epsilon_x = \epsilon_y = (1 + (\eta_x + \eta_y)L)\epsilon$.

Proof. Note that by the optimality conditions corresponding to the proximal operator, we have

$$G_x(x, y) = (x - \hat{x})/\eta_x \in \nabla_x f(x, y) + \partial g(\hat{x}), \quad G_y(x, y) = (\hat{y} - y)/\eta_y \in \nabla_y f(x, y) - \partial h(\hat{y}). \quad (75)$$

Since (x, y) is ϵ -stationary in **(M2)**, (75) implies that $\exists u' \in \nabla_x f(x, y) + \partial g(\hat{x})$ and $\exists v' \in \nabla_y f(x, y) - \partial h(\hat{y})$ such that $\max\{\|u'\|, \|v'\|\} \leq \epsilon$. Let $\hat{u} \triangleq u' + \nabla_x f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - \nabla_x f(x, y)$ and $\hat{v} \triangleq v' + \nabla_y f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - \nabla_y f(x, y)$. Then, it follows from the smoothness of f that

$$\|\hat{u}\| \leq \|u'\| + \|\nabla_x f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - \nabla_x f(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon + L\|\hat{x} - x\| + L\|\hat{y} - y\| \leq (1 + \eta_x L + \eta_y L)\epsilon.$$

In a similar manner, we can show that $\|\hat{v}\| \leq (1 + (\eta_x + \eta_y)L)\epsilon$, which established the result. \square

Next we provide some results from the literature describing how guarantees in different ϵ -stationarity metrics can be transferred from one to another. In particular, our results in **(M2)**, can be transferred to any of the other metrics mentioned in Def. 3 besides the **(M4)** metric we studied in Theorem 5.

Theorem 6. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 4 hold.*

- i.* [70, Theorem 2] *Given $\lambda \in (0, 1/m)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, under Assumption 2, if $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in expectation with respect to **(M3)**, i.e., $\mathbf{E}[\|\nabla F_\lambda(x)\|] \leq \epsilon$, then an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ in **(M1)** with $\alpha = \lambda$ can be computed within $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-2})$ stochastic oracle calls.*
- ii.* [30, Proposition 1] *If $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is (ϵ_x, ϵ_y) -stationary in **(M4)**, then $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ is $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary in **(M5)** for $\hat{\epsilon} = \max\left\{\epsilon_x + 2\sqrt{2m\mathcal{D}_y\epsilon_y}, \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{D}_y\epsilon_y}{m}}\right\}$.*
- iii.* [30, Proposition 2] *Given $\lambda \in (0, 1/m)$, $\epsilon, \hat{\epsilon} > 0$ such that $\hat{\epsilon} \leq \frac{\lambda^3\epsilon}{\lambda^2 + 2(1-\lambda m)(1+\lambda)}$, if x is $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary in **(M5)**, then x is ϵ -stationary in **(M3)**.*
- iv.* [30, Proposition 2] *Given $\lambda \in (0, 1/m)$, $\epsilon, \hat{\epsilon} > 0$ such that $\epsilon \leq \hat{\epsilon} \cdot \min\{1, 1/\lambda\}$, if x is ϵ -stationary in **(M3)**, then x is $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary in **(M5)** with $\hat{x} = x_\lambda$, where $x_\lambda = \mathbf{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{X}} F(u) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|u - x\|$.*
- v.* [38, Proposition 4.11] *Consider (1) with $g(\cdot) = 0$, $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$ for some convex set $Y \subset \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_y < \infty$, and $\mu > 0$. If a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M1)**, i.e., $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\| \leq \epsilon$, then in the sense of **(M6)** with $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L}$, an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ oracle calls for the deterministic setting, and an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point in expectation can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ oracle calls for the stochastic setting under Assumption 2. Conversely, if a point $(x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is $\frac{\epsilon}{\kappa}$ -stationary in **(M6)** with $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L}$, then x' is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary in **(M1)**.*
- vi.* [38, Proposition 4.12] *Consider (1) with $g(\cdot) = 0$, $h(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_Y(\cdot)$ for some convex set $Y \subset \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_y < \infty$, and $\mu = 0$. If a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M3)** with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2L}$, then in the sense of **(M6)** with $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L}$, an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ oracle calls for the deterministic setting, and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point in expectation can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ oracle calls for the stochastic setting under Assumption 2. Conversely, if a point $(x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is $\frac{\epsilon^2}{L\mathcal{D}_y}$ -stationary in **(M6)** with $\eta_y = \frac{1}{L}$, then x' is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary in **(M3)** with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2L}$.*
- vii.* [65, Proposition 2.1] *Consider (1) with $g(\cdot) = h(\cdot) = 0$ and $\mu > 0$. If a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is ϵ -stationary in **(M1)**, i.e., $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\| \leq \epsilon$, and $\|\nabla_y f(x, \tilde{y})\| \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$ for some $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, then an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point (x, y) in **(M2)**, i.e., $\|\nabla f(x, y)\| \leq \epsilon$, can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log(\frac{\kappa\tilde{\epsilon}}{\epsilon}))$ oracle calls for the deterministic setting, and an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary point (x, y) in **(M2)** (in expectation) can be computed within $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa + \kappa^3\sigma^2\epsilon^{-2})$ stochastic oracle calls under Assumption 2. Conversely, if a point (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) satisfies $\|\nabla_x f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\| \leq \epsilon$ and $\|\nabla_y f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\| \leq \epsilon/\sqrt{\kappa}$, then a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ which is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -stationary in **(M1)**, i.e., $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\| \leq \epsilon$, can be computed within $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log(\kappa))$ oracle calls for the deterministic setting, and within $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa + \kappa^5\sigma^2\epsilon^{-2})$ oracle calls for the stochastic setting under Assumption 2.*