

# Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

Chenyi Li ✉

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Ziyu Wang ✉

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Wanyi He ✉

Yuanpei College, Peking University, China

Yuxuan Wu ✉

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Shengyang Xu ✉

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Zaiwen Wen<sup>1</sup> ✉

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, China

---

## Abstract

The convergence rate of various first-order optimization algorithms is a pivotal concern within the numerical optimization community, as it directly reflects the efficiency of these algorithms across different optimization problems. Our goal is making a significant step forward in the formal mathematical representation of optimization techniques using the Lean4 theorem prover. We first formalize the gradient for smooth functions and the subgradient for convex functions on a Hilbert space, laying the groundwork for the accurate formalization of algorithmic structures. Then, we extend our contribution by proving several properties of differentiable convex functions that have not yet been formalized in Mathlib. Finally, a comprehensive formalization of these algorithms is presented. These developments are not only noteworthy on their own but also serve as essential precursors to the formalization of a broader spectrum of numerical algorithms and their applications in machine learning as well as many other areas.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Mathematics of computing → Mathematical optimization

**Keywords and phrases** Numerical Optimization, Lean, Gradient Descent, Convex Analysis

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs...

**Supplementary Material** Our code for this paper can be found at <https://github.com/optsuite/optlib>

**Acknowledgements** We want to thank the mathlib community for useful discussion on this project. We also want to thank the students from the summer school and winter school at Peking University.

## 1 Introduction

Within the expansive domain of optimization and operational research, the analysis and application of first-order optimization algorithms emerge as a fundamental aspect, crucial for addressing diverse challenges in fields such as machine learning [8], data science, and engineering. Nevertheless, the theoretical foundations ensuring their efficacy, especially from the perspective of convergence analysis, are complicate and demand rigorous formalization. This paper is dedicated to navigating through the process of formalizing the complexity

---

<sup>1</sup> corresponding author



analysis of first-order optimization algorithms. These algorithms are not merely tools for immediate problem-solving but also the groundwork for the development and refinement of more sophisticated optimization techniques.

As far as our knowledge, few work is related to formalization of convex optimization and numerical algorithms. However, formalization of analysis has been done by lots of researchers in the past [6] using different formalize language including Coq, Isabelle [19] and Lean [11]. Kudryashov formalized the divergence theorem and the Cauchy integral formula in Lean [14]. Gouëzel done the formalization of the change of variables formula for integrals [12]. The formalization of applied mathematics in machine learning was explored in [24]. From the aspect of convex analysis and convex optimization, a formalization of lower semicontinuous functions in Isabelle by Grechuk [13] includes some properties of convex functions. Allamigeon [1] gave the formalization of convex polyhedra based on the simplex method in Coq. Verified reductions for optimization problems were explored in [5].

In this paper, building on the lean4 language and the corresponding `mathlib` 4 library [16], we formalize the complexity analysis of the first-order algorithms for convex or strongly convex functions including the gradient descent method, the subgradient method, the proximal gradient method and the Nesterov acceleration method [17]. The theoretical properties of these numerical algorithms can be found in [15], [18], [20], [3], [23], and [10]. The main contribution of this paper is listed as follows.

1) To deal with derivative calculation in optimization, we propose the formalization of the definition of gradient. In `mathlib`, differentiability of a function is formalized using the `fderiv` construct, representing the function's derivative as a continuous linear map at differentiable points. However, the type-checking mechanisms inherent in Lean pose challenges for direct computation. This limitation highlights the need for introducing a more computationally friendly representation of the gradient within `mathlib`. Using the Riesz Representation Theorem on a Hilbert space, we can transform the continuous linear map as a vector in the Hilbert space, which makes it easier to do more calculation with elements in this space.

2) We explore the formalization of the properties of the convex functions and subgradient. The formalization of complexity analysis for first-order optimization algorithms draws fundamentally on the properties of convex functions. Currently, `mathlib`'s treatment of convex functions primarily encompasses their zero-order characteristics. This focus results in a notable absence of properties that leverage the function's gradient. Thus we give the formalization of the properties such as the first order conditions in this paper. Besides, to address challenges associated with non-smooth optimization, we have extended the library by introducing the definitions of the subgradient and the proximal operator, alongside proofs of their relevant properties.

3) Whereas the majority of current formalization efforts are concentrated on theoretical mathematics, our work seeks to extend formalization into the realm of applied mathematics by formalizing numerical algorithms. This approach opens up broader possibilities for formalization across a wider range of fields. We employ the `class` structure to formalize the definitions of first-order algorithms. This approach facilitates a more generic representation. For the implementation of specific algorithm examples, the `instance` structure [2] allows for the straightforward application of these algorithms by enabling users to instantiate specific cases and subsequently prove the requisite properties associated with them.

The rest of the paper is organized as below. In section 2, the basic mathematical definition and general introduction on four kinds of first-order optimization algorithm are briefly reviewed. In section 3, we introduce relevant definitions which are already formalized by pioneers in `mathlib` community. The formalization of the definition and basic property of

gradient and subgradient is given in section 4. In section 5 and 6 respectively, we formalize the properties of convex functions and L-smooth functions in Lean. The proximal operator is formally introduced in section 7. Finally in section 8, we build the class for different first order algorithms, and prove the convergence rate of these algorithms.

## 2 Mathematical preliminaries

### 2.1 The subgradient and the proximal operator

Differentiability of a function within a Euclidean space is often characterized using the little-o notation. When dealing with functions defined on a general normed space, the complexity increases. To address this issue, the concept of the Fréchet derivative is utilized.

► **Definition 1.** Let  $E$  and  $F$  be normed vector spaces, with  $U \subseteq E$  representing an open subset. A function  $f : U \rightarrow F$  is called Fréchet differentiable at a point  $x \in U$  if there exists a bounded linear operator  $A : E \rightarrow F$  satisfying the condition:

$$\lim_{\|h\| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|f(x+h) - f(x) - Ah\|_F}{\|h\|_E} = 0. \quad (1)$$

The concept of a subgradient is introduced to deal with the points where a function may not be differentiable, yet possesses certain advantageous properties.

► **Definition 2.** For a function  $f$  mapping from a Hilbert space  $E$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  and with  $x$  in the domain of  $f$ , a vector  $v$  is called a subgradient of  $f$  at  $x$  if for all  $y \in E$ ,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle v, y - x \rangle.$$

Define the collection of all subgradients at a point  $x$  as the subderiv at that point, denoted as  $\partial f(x)$ . It is critical to understand that for convex functions, the subgradient is guaranteed to be well-defined and nonempty at every point within the domain. Notably, at points where the function is smooth, the subderiv reduces to a singleton set containing only the gradient of the function at that point, i.e.  $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$ . Building upon this conceptual framework, we introduce the proximal operator.

► **Definition 3.** For a function  $f$  mapping from a Hilbert space to  $\mathbb{R}$ , the proximal operator is defined as:

$$\text{prox}_f(x) = \underset{u}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ f(u) + \frac{1}{2} \|u - x\|^2 \right\}.$$

For convex  $f$ , the addition of the  $\|u - x\|^2$  term transforms the optimization problem into a strongly convex one, simplifying the original problem. Due to the characteristics of convex and strongly convex functions, the proximal operator is well-defined across all points, offering a means to minimize the function  $f$  within a vicinity of the current point  $x$ . This adjustment maintains mathematical precision and avoids unnecessary complexity, while preserving the original formulas.

### 2.2 First order algorithms solving optimization problems

In this subsection, we give a brief review of the general first order algorithms solving optimization problem. We mainly focus on the unconstrained optimization problem:

$$\min f(x), \quad (2)$$

## XX:4 Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

where  $f(x)$  is a convex function. Moreover, the composite optimization problem is also considered:

$$\min f(x) + g(x), \quad (3)$$

where  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are convex, and  $f(x)$  is smooth, while  $g(x)$  may not be differentiable. The proximal gradient and Nesterov acceleration methods are particularly prevalent. The efficiency of these algorithms, often measured by their convergence rates, is a key focus within the field of numerical optimization, making the detailed analysis of these rates essential.

### ■ Gradient Descent Method

This foundational algorithm targets smooth functions in problem (2) and is notable for its simplicity and effectiveness. The update mechanism is defined by:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(x_k), \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha_k$  representing the step size for iteration  $k$ , and  $\nabla f(x_k)$  the gradient at  $x_k$ . Its convergence is characterized by  $O(1/k)$  for convex functions and  $O(\rho^k)$  for strongly convex functions, where  $\rho$  indicates the condition number.

### ■ Subgradient Descent Method

In cases where the target function in problem (2) is nonsmooth and gradient may not exist at every point, the subgradient is utilized instead. The update formula is:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k g_k, \quad g_k \in \partial f(x_k), \quad (5)$$

where  $g_k$  is the subgradient at  $x_k$ . The convergence for convex functions follows a  $O(1/\sqrt{k})$  pattern. More concrete results can be found in [9].

### ■ Proximal Gradient Method

The proximal gradient method is widely used in optimization problems with the form (3). The update date scheme of this algorithm is given as:

$$x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\alpha_k g}(x_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(x_k)), \quad (6)$$

where  $\text{prox}_{\alpha_k g}(x)$  denotes the proximal operator of the function  $g$  at the point  $x$ . This method can be viewed as an implicit version of subgradient method. The convergence rate of this algorithm is  $O(1/k)$  under the assumptions above. More concrete results are referred to [21].

### ■ Nesterov Acceleration Method

As an enhancement of the proximal gradient method, the Nesterov acceleration approach improves convergence speed. Nesterov acceleration method utilize two sequences of points,  $x_k$  and  $y_k$ , to update the point. The algorithm updates as follows:

$$\begin{cases} y_k = x_k + \frac{\gamma_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})}{\gamma_{k-1}}(x_k - x_{k-1}), \\ x_k = \text{prox}_{\alpha_k g}(y_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(y_k)). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

It achieves the convergence rate of  $O(\frac{1}{k^2})$ , assuming the hyperparameters satisfy  $\frac{(1-\gamma_n)t_n}{\gamma_n^2} \leq \frac{t_{n-1}}{\gamma_{n-1}^2}$ . This method is also called as FISTA [4] which is widely used in compressive sensing. There is also another version of Nesterov acceleration scheme known as the second version of Nesterov acceleration, which is given as:

$$\begin{cases} z_k = (1 - \gamma_k)x_{k-1} + \gamma_k y_{k-1}, \\ y_k = \text{prox}_{\frac{t_k}{\gamma_k} g}(y_{k-1} - \frac{t_k}{\gamma_k} \nabla f(z_k)), \\ x_k = (1 - \gamma_k)x_{k-1} + \gamma_k y_k. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The same convergence rate also holds, if the hyperparameters satisfy  $\frac{(1-\gamma_{n+1})t_{n+1}}{\gamma_{n+1}^2} \leq \frac{t_n}{\gamma_n^2}$ .

### 3 Lean preliminaries

#### 3.1 The differentiable structure of a normed space

The `mathlib` library, a comprehensive mathematical library for the Lean theorem prover, offers a robust framework for formalizing various concepts in calculus and analysis. Central to its calculus library is the concept of the Fréchet derivative, or `fderiv`, which facilitates the rigorous definition of the derivative for smooth functions between normed spaces.

In Lean, the `fderiv` structure is pivotal in defining the derivative of a smooth function between normed spaces. It encapsulates the derivative as a continuous linear map, adhering to the rigorous mathematical foundation Lean is renowned for. The `fderiv` structure is defined as follows:

```
structure HasFDerivAtFilter [NontriviallyNormedField k] [NormedAddCommGroup E]
  [NormedSpace k E] [NormedAddCommGroup F] [NormedSpace k F]
  (f: E → F) (f': E →L[k] F) (x: E) (L: Filter E): Prop where
of_isLittleO :: isLittleO:
  (fun x' => f x' - f x - f' (x' - x)) =o[L] fun x' => x' - x
```

The utilization of a continuous linear map to define the derivative in Lean's `mathlib` library enhances generality and mathematical precision. Spaces `E` and `F` are not limited to Euclidean spaces but can be any normed spaces over a nontrivially normed field  $\mathbb{K}$ . This broad applicability supports a wide range of mathematical and analytical discussions within the Lean environment. However, this generality introduces certain challenges in the context of numerical optimization. The abstract nature of continuous linear maps may lead to complications when devising update schemes for optimization algorithms. Precise type checks, a cornerstone of Lean's system, necessitate a reevaluation of the `fderiv` type when applied to numerical methods.

Moreover, the `mathlib` introduces the definition of `deriv` to deal with the special case that `E` is just an `NontriviallyNormedField`  $\mathbb{K}$ . In this way, the continuous linear map is just a element in the space `F`.

To address these challenges, we pivot towards the gradient or gradient in vector form within `E`. This approach aligns more closely with the practical requirements of numerical optimization, allowing for a more straightforward computation of update schemes. The transition from the Fréchet derivative to the gradient, along with the implications for numerical optimization, will be explored in detail in section 4.1.

#### 3.2 The convexity of a function

The concept of convexity plays a pivotal role in optimization, underpinning many algorithms and theoretical results.

In the `mathlib` library, the definition of a convex function is articulated through below:

```
def ConvexOn (K: Type u_1) [OrderedSemiring K] [AddCommMonoid E]
  [OrderedAddCommMonoid β] [SMul K E] [SMul K β] (s: Set E) (f: E → β):
  Prop :=
Convex K s ^ ∀ {x}, x ∈ s → ∀ {y}, y ∈ s → ∀ {a b: K}, 0 ≤ a → 0 ≤ b →
  a + b = 1 → f (a · x + b · y) ≤ a · f x + b · f y
```

It is worthy to notice that the condition on the input space and output space is mild. They can even not be normedspaces. While in this paper, we mainly focus on the convex function from a Hilbert space to the  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is a special case of this definition as `ConvexOn`  $\mathbb{R}$  `s` `f`. The formalization of convexity within `mathlib` provides a solid foundation for discussing

and proving various properties of convex functions, particularly those with differentiable characteristics. While `mathlib`'s current formalization encompasses the core concept of convexity and part of the differentiable properties only concerning the single variable convex function, there is ongoing work to enrich the library with additional properties related to differentiable convex functions with multi-variable, or generally on normed space or Hilbert space. These properties are crucial for analyzing the behavior of optimization algorithms, especially in proving their convergence. The discussion on these extensions and their implications for algorithmic analysis will be elaborated upon in section 5.

## 4 Gradient and Subgradient in Lean

### 4.1 Gradient

The earlier discussion highlights that while `Fderiv` broadly defines derivatives within normed spaces, our interest in numerical optimization primarily lies with Hilbert spaces, which offer more intricate structures compared to normed spaces. Specifically, for functions mapping from a Hilbert space to the fields  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ —collectively referred to as  $\mathbb{K}$ —the formal type of their Frechet derivative (`fderiv`) is denoted as  $E \rightarrow L[K] K$ . In the process of formalizing the gradient descent algorithm, the objective is to compute the update step, which involves applying the formula  $x - \alpha \nabla f(x)$ . This computation requires additive and scalar multiplicative operations between the point  $x$  and its derivative  $\nabla f(x)$ .

However, using type of a continuous linear map from a Hilbert space to  $\mathbb{K}$  does not directly support these operations. Consequently, a conversion of the continuous linear map into a vector in the Hilbert space, becomes crucial. This is precisely where the definition of the gradient becomes relevant and useful, as it is inherently designed to facilitate such operations by converting the abstract derivative into a tangible vector in the Hilbert space, thereby enabling the additive and scalar multiplicative operations necessary for the gradient descent update formula.

► **Definition 4.** *Let  $E$  be a Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , while  $U \subseteq E$  representing an open subset. A function  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  owns a gradient at a point  $x \in U$  if there exists a vector  $g \in E$  satisfying the condition:*

$$\lim_{\|h\| \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x) - \langle g, h \rangle}{\|h\|_E} = 0.$$

Leveraging the definition of the Frechet derivative, and utilizing the Riesz Representation Theorem on a Hilbert space, it becomes evident that the continuous linear operator  $A$ , integral to the formulation of the Frechet derivative (1), can be represented as

$$Ah = \langle g, h \rangle \quad \forall h \in E.$$

In lean, we can define the gradient as follows:

```
def HasGradientAtFilter [IsROrC K] [NormedAddCommGroup F] [InnerProductSpace
  K F] [CompleteSpace F] (f : F → K) (f' x : F) (L : Filter F) :=
  HasFDerivAtFilter f (toDual K F f') x L
```

The segment `toDual K F f'` is to convert an element from the space  $F$  into an element within the dual space  $F \rightarrow L[K] K$ . This conversion is facilitated by a canonical mapping that links a Hilbert space to its corresponding dual space. Based on this definition, it enables the extension to more nuanced definitions such as `HasGradientWithinAt` and `HasGradientAt`, which are more frequently used in the formalization of optimization algorithms.

It is crucial to distinguish the spaces within which the gradient and the Frechet derivative are defined. Specifically, the gradient is defined within a complete inner product space, and this specification is necessary to leverage the Riesz Representation Theorem. In contrast, the Frechet derivative is applicable to a broader category of normed spaces. It is obvious that for general normed space, we can not define the gradient as above there.

## 4.2 Subgradient

To the best of our current knowledge, there has not yet been a formalization of the subgradient definition within the `mathlib` library. The subgradient concept serves as an extension of the gradient to accommodate non-smooth functions. The precise definition of the subgradient of a convex function is articulated as follows:

```
def HasSubgradientWithinAt (f: E → ℝ) (g: E) (s: Set E)
  (x: E): Prop := ∀ y ∈ s, f y ≥ f x + ⟨g, y - x⟩

def SubderivWithinAt (f: E → ℝ) (s: Set E) (x: E): Set E :=
  {g: E | HasSubgradientWithinAt f g s x}
```

A core theorem related to the subgradient is the existence of the subgradient at the interior point of the domain. For simplicity, we only consider the case when the function is convex. More related theorems will be added by the further work.

```
theorem SubderivWithinAt.Nonempty [NormedAddCommGroup E] [InnerProductSpace ℝ
  E] [CompleteSpace E] {f: E → ℝ} (hf: ConvexOn ℝ s f) (hc: ContinuousOn f
  (interior s)):
  ∀ x ∈ interior s, (SubderivWithinAt f s x).Nonempty :=
```

In this theorem, we assume that the function is continuous within the interior of the domain  $s$ . This is a technique assumption since only mild assumptions are added to the space  $E$ . However, in fact, if the input space  $E$  is finite dimensional, it is a result that the convex function is continuous within the interior of the domain, or equivalently the possible discontinuity of the convex function only occurs at the frontier point. In the proof of the theorem, the most important thing is a lemma stating that the supporting hyperplane theorem. Viewed as a geometric version of the Hahn-Banach theorem, we utilize the theorem `geometric_hahn_banach_open` in `mathlib`, which states that given disjoint convex sets  $s, t$ , where  $s$  is open, there is a continuous linear functional which separates them.

Another important property is the equivalence of the subgradient and the gradient at the point where the function is smooth, which underscores that the subgradient is a more general definition of gradient for non-smooth convex functions.

```
theorem SubderivWithinAt_eq_gradient {f'x: E} (hx: x ∈ interior s) (hf:
  ConvexOn ℝ s f) (h: HasGradientAt f (f'x) x) :
  SubderivWithinAt f s x = {f'x} := by
```

Furthermore, the computation of the subgradient for two convex functions holds significant importance. In this context, we refer to the Moreau-Rockafellar theorem, which is instrumental for subsequent proofs involving the proximal operator. The underlying intuition behind this theorem is direct, but needs a novel construction in the proof.

► **Theorem 5.** *Assume  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are two convex functions define on  $E$ , then we have for any  $x \in E$*

$$\partial f_1(x) + \partial f_2(x) = \partial(f_1 + f_2)(x).$$

The theorem is formalized as:

```
theorem SubderivAt.add {f1 f2: E → ℝ} (h1: ConvexOn ℝ univ f1) (h2: ConvexOn
  ℝ univ f2)(hcon: ContinuousOn f1 univ):
  ∀ (x: E), SubderivAt f1 x + SubderivAt f2 x = SubderivAt (f1 + f2) x := by
```

We focus on proving a more stringent variant of the original Moreau-Rockafellar theorem, imposing stricter conditions on the convex function’s domain. To avoid the complexities associated with analyzing the interior points of the function’s domain, we adopt the assumption that the function is convex across the entire space. A more comprehensive formulation of the theorem would require exploring the continuity of convex functions within the domain’s interior, an endeavor reserved for future investigation. Also, for general nonconvex functions, we can also define the Fréchet differentiability as [7], which is a harder work since at least the definition in natural language is more complicate.

## 5 Properties of Convex Functions in Lean

Throughout the discussion from this section to the concluding section, except in specific case, we uniformly assume that the input space  $E$  constitutes a Hilbert space, and  $f$  represents a function mapping from  $E$  to  $E$ . Consequently, the gradient of  $f$  is as a function of  $E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In certain scenarios, we will consider the domain of the function as a subset within  $E$ , designated as  $s$ . These parameters are specified as follows:

```
variable [NormedAddCommGroup E] [InnerProductSpace ℝ E] [CompleteSpace E]
variable {f: E → ℝ} {f': E → E} {s: Set E}
```

### 5.1 General Properties

For convex functions, certain properties are crucial for establishing the convergence of algorithms. These properties are encapsulated in the following theorem:

► **Theorem 6.** *Let  $f$  be a smooth function defined on a convex set  $s$ . The statements below are equivalent:*

- (a)  $f$  is convex on  $s$ .
- (b) For all  $x, y \in s$ , the function satisfies the first-order condition:  $f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top (y - x)$ .
- (c) For all  $x, y \in s$ , the gradient of  $f$  is monotonic:  $(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y))^\top (x - y) \geq 0$ .

This collection of theorems has been formalized in the `Convex_Function.lean` file as:

```
theorem Convex_first_order_condition_iff' (h1: Convex ℝ s) (h: ∀ x ∈ s,
  HasGradientAt f (f' x) x): ConvexOn ℝ s f
  ↔ ∀ x, x ∈ s → ∀ y, y ∈ s → f x + inner (f' x) (y - x) ≤ f y :=
theorem monotone_gradient_iff_convex' (h1: Convex ℝ s) (hf: ∀ x ∈ s,
  HasGradientAt f (f' x) x):
  ConvexOn ℝ s f ↔ ∀ x ∈ s, ∀ y ∈ s, inner (f' x - f' y) (x - y) ≥ (0: ℝ) :=
```

In these theorems, it is worth noting that the usage of `gradient` definition is not strictly necessary, as the term  $\nabla f(x)^\top (y - x)$  is interpreted as the continuous linear map at  $x$ , evaluated at  $y - x$ , producing a real number. To provide a comprehensive formalization, for each theorem, we present statements in both `fderiv` and `gradient` forms. For simplicity, here we showed only the version utilizing the gradient above. These theorems introduce a practical method for checking the convexity of a function through gradient information. More automatic ways of checking the convexity of a function can be done in the future work.



## 5.2 Strongly Convex Functions

While gradient descent enjoys sublinear convergence rate for convex functions, it is capable of achieving a linear convergence rate for strongly convex functions. The formalization of strongly convex functions represents a pivotal advancement towards accurately formalizing the convergence rate of gradient descent across various function types. The definitions for uniform convexity and strong convexity are delineated as follows:

```
def UniformConvexOn (s: Set E) (ϕ: ℝ → ℝ) (f: E → ℝ): Prop :=
  Convex ℝ s ∧ ∀ {x}, x ∈ s → ∀ {y}, y ∈ s → ∀ {a b: ℝ}, 0 ≤ a → 0 ≤ b
    → a + b = 1 → f (a · x + b · y) ≤ a · f x + b · f y - a * b * ϕ ‖ x - y ‖
def StrongConvexOn (s: Set E) (m: ℝ): (E → ℝ) → Prop :=
  UniformConvexOn s fun r ↦ m / (2: ℝ) * r ^ 2
```

It is essential to clarify that the concept of uniform convexity can be applied within the framework of general normed spaces. However, strong convexity necessitates a definition within a Hilbert space. This requirement stems from the necessity of utilizing the inner product to decompose the expression  $\|x - y\|^2$ . Following the establishment of the definition, it is imperative to elucidate the properties of strongly convex functions, leveraging derivative information. We can formalize the following theorem of the strongly convex function.

► **Theorem 7.** *Let  $f$  be a function defined on a convex set  $s$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $f$  exhibits  $m$ -strong convexity on  $s$ .
- (b) The function  $g(x) = f(x) - \frac{m}{2}\|x\|^2$  is convex on  $s$ .
- (c) For differentiable  $f$ , for all  $x, y \in s$ , it holds that  $f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top(y - x) + \frac{m}{2}\|y - x\|^2$ .
- (d) For differentiable  $f$ , for all  $x, y \in s$ , it holds that  $(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y))^\top(x - y) \geq m\|x - y\|^2$ .

We only list the most important part of the formalization of the theorem here, while more detailed description can be found in the file `Strong_Convex.lean`.

```
theorem Strong_Convex_iff_lower (hf: ∀ x ∈ s, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x) (hs:
  Convex ℝ s) :
  StrongConvexOn s m f ↔ ∀ x ∈ s, ∀ y ∈ s, inner (f' x - f' y) (x - y) ≥ m *
    ‖ x - y ‖ ^ 2 :=
```

## 6 Properties of Lipschitz Smooth Functions in Lean

Another significant class of function is the Lipschitz smooth function. The concept of Lipschitz smoothness serves to quantify a function's degree of smoothness. This property is formalized through the notion of Lipschitz continuity for a function over a specific set, which is defined in the `mathlib` library as follows:

```
def LipschitzOnWith [PseudoEMetricSpace α] [PseudoEMetricSpace β] (K: ℝ≥0)
  (f: α → β) (s: Set α) :=
  ∀ {x}, x ∈ s → ∀ {y}, y ∈ s → edist (f x) (f y) ≤ K * edist x y
```

A central theorem regarding Lipschitz smooth functions pertains to their upper bound. The lemma is articulated as follows:

► **Lemma 8.** *Let  $f$  be a  $l$ -Lipschitz smooth function defined on a set  $s$ , then it holds*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top(y - x) + \frac{l}{2}\|y - x\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in s.$$

## XX:10 Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

Within the formalized framework, we provide both the Frechet derivative and the gradient formulations of this theorem. For the sake of brevity, here we present only the fderiv formulation as:

```
theorem lipschitz_continuous_upper_bound [NormedAddCommGroup E] [NormedSpace ℝ
  E] {f: E → ℝ} {f': E → E →L[ℝ] ℝ} {l: NNReal} (h1: ∀ x1: E,
  HasFDerivAt f (f' x1) x1) (h2: LipschitzWith l f') :
  ∀ (x y: E), f y ≤ f x + (f' x) (y - x) + l / 2 * ‖y - x‖ ^ 2 := by
```

In this proof, we use the auxiliary function  $g(t) = f(x + t(y - x))$  as a function from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Using this function, we can transform the original problem to a one-variable problem, and then utilize the mean-value theorem `image_le_of_deriv_right_le_deriv_boundary` to get the result.

When it comes to convex Lipschitz smooth function, we can derive more properties of the function considering the convexity of the function. We state the theorem as:

► **Theorem 9.** *Let  $f$  be a differentiable convex function defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then the following statement is equivalent*

(a)  $f$  is  $l$ -Lipschitz smooth on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(b)  $g(x) = \frac{l}{2}\|x\|^2 - f(x)$  is convex.

(c)  $(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y))^T(x - y) \geq \frac{1}{l}\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Note that sometimes the natural language statement would hide some of the assumptions which human would think as trivial, but in formalization, such assumptions need to be stated explicitly. We can state the formalization of the above theorem as :

```
variable [ProperSpace E] {l: ℝ}

theorem lower_iff_lipschitz (h1: ∀ x, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x) (hfun:
  ConvexOn ℝ Set.univ f) (hl: l > 0): LipschitzWith l f'
  ↔ ∀ x y, inner (f' x - f' y) (x - y) ≥ l / l * ‖f' x - f' y‖ ^ 2 :=

theorem lipschitz_iff_lnorm_sub_convex (h1: ∀ x, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x)
  (hfun: ConvexOn ℝ Set.univ f) (hl: l > 0) :
  LipschitzWith l f' ↔ ConvexOn ℝ univ (fun x ↦ l / 2 * ‖x‖ ^ 2 - f x) :=
```

For functions that are both strongly convex and have a Lipschitz continuous gradient, we can propose an enhanced estimation, specifically formulated in the following theorem:

► **Lemma 10.** *Let  $f$  be a  $l$ -Lipschitz smooth and  $m$ -strongly convex function defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then the following inequality holds,*

$$(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y))^T(x - y) \geq \frac{ml}{m+l}\|x - y\|^2 + \frac{1}{m+l}\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The formalized theorem is stated as:

```
theorem Strong_convex_Lipschitz_smooth (hsc: StrongConvexOn univ m f) (hf: ∀
  x, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x) (h2: LipschitzWith l f') (hl: l > (0: ℝ)):
  inner (f' x - f' y) (x - y) ≥ m * l / (m + 1) * ‖x - y‖ ^ 2 + 1 / (m +
  1) * ‖f' x - f' y‖ ^ 2 := by
```

## 7 Proximal Operator in Lean

In this section, we need to add one more assumption on the space  $E$ , as `[CompleteSpace E]`. The reason will be stated later. To define the proximal operator in lean, we need to take a few

steps to circumvent the usage of `argmin` in the natural language. Since the operator `argmin` needs to be clarified whether the target function can reach the minima at the finite point, so directly defining this is not that straightforward. Instead, we can define the proximal property and then get the set of points which satisfy this property. If we can prove that it is non-empty, then we can choose one of them as the proximal point.

Firstly, we can define the proximal property as:

```
def prox_prop (f: E → ℝ) (x: E) (xm: E): Prop :=
  IsMinOn (fun u ↦ f u + || u - x || ^ 2 / 2) univ xm
```

Then we define the proximal set as all the points that satisfies the proximal property. This set is unique when function  $f$  has some good property, and may be empty when  $f$  is not continuous or convex.

```
def prox_set (f: E → ℝ) (x: E): Set E := {u | prox_prop f x u}
```

For the proximal point, assuming that the proximal set is nonempty, we just need to choose one of them. Here, we use the function `Classical.choose` for an nonempty set to choose one member from this set.

```
def prox_point (f: E → ℝ) (x: E) (h: ∃ y, prox_set f x y): E :=
  Classical.choose h
```

After defining the proximal operator, we need to prove the wellposedness of the proximal operator. Generally speaking, we have the following theorem.

► **Theorem 11.** *The proximal set of each point is nonempty and compact, when  $f$  satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- (a)  $f$  is lower semicontinuous and has lower bound over the whole space.
- (b)  $f$  is a continuous convex function, in this case, the proximal set is unique.

In this theorem, we would utilize that the criteria whether the minima of the function can be obtained. For this reason, we need to use the relation between the closed set and the compact set. We need to force that any bounded closed set is compact. This is straightforward in Euclidean space, but not really true for general infinite dimensional Hilbert space. This is equivalent with the Hilbert space is a finite dimension one. In `mathlib`, we use the definition of proper space which is just to state a space in which bounded closed set is compact. It is straightforward to see that there exists some Hilbert space which is not a proper space, for example  $L^2([0,1])$ . We can see that an example of proper space is the Euclidean space. When formalizing, it requires us to loose the conditions the theorem needs, since here we are doing it not in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , but in a more abstract space  $E$ . In this way, we can see that we are using indeed what properties  $\mathbb{R}^n$  holds. Finally we have the following formalized theorem:

```
theorem prox_set_compact_of_lowersemi (f: E → ℝ) (hc: LowerSemicontinuous f)
  (lbdf: BddBelow (f '' univ)) :
  ∀ x, Nonempty (prox_set f x) ∧ IsCompact (prox_set f x) := by

theorem prox_set_compact_of_convex (f: E → ℝ) (hc: ContinuousOn f univ)
  (hconv: ConvexOn ℝ univ f) :
  ∀ x, Nonempty (prox_set f x) ∧ IsCompact (prox_set f x) := by

theorem prox_unique_of_convex (f: E → ℝ) (x: E) (hfun: ConvexOn ℝ univ f)
  (h1: prox_prop f x y1) (h2: prox_prop f x y2): y1 = y2 := by
```

We can derive more properties of the proximal operator especially the connection between the proximal operator and the subgradient. It is easy to find out the following statement from the optimality condition of the unconstrained optimization problem.

## XX:12 Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

► **Theorem 12.** *If  $f$  is a closed and convex function, then we have*

$$u = \text{prox}_f(x) \iff x - u \in \partial f(u).$$

In lean, we state the theorem as:

```
theorem prox_iff_subderiv (f : E → ℝ) (hfun : ConvexOn ℝ univ f) :
  ∀ u : E, prox_prop f x u ↔ x - u ∈ SubderivAt f u := by
```

## 8 Convergence of First Order Algorithms in Lean

In this section, we give the formalization of first order algorithms in lean using `class` structure. From the perspective that the `class` structure in lean is easy to generalize for different target functions. For specialized problem, such as the LASSO problem in compressive sensing with target function  $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2$  and  $g(x) = \|x\|_1$ , we can use the `instance` structure to formalize the algorithm for this specific problem. For each algorithm, under different assumptions on the stepsize, we will get the convergence theorem. In this section, we assume that  $E$  is a Hilbert space and  $f$  is a function defined on  $E$ .  $x_m$  is a point in  $E$  and denotes for the minima of the function, and  $x_0$  denotes the initial point we put into the algorithm. Generally speaking, an algorithm contains the following parts.

- **Update scheme:** we will take track of the update points in the algorithm.
- **Information on the target function:** we need information for the target function, like the gradient, and the Lipschitz continuous information on the gradient.
- **Step size constraint:** only suitable stepsize choice is admissible for the corresponding algorithm.

### 8.1 Gradient Descent Method

For general definition of gradient descent method in lean, we use the `class` type to define what a numerical optimization method is in lean. In this class we have the function  $f$ , the gradient  $f'$ , and the initial point as the input, and contains the necessary information with the optimization problem.

```
class GradientDescent (f : E → ℝ) (f' : E → E) (initial_x : E) :=
  (x : ℕ → E) (a : ℕ → ℝ) (l : NNReal)
  (diff : ∀ x₁, HasGradientAt f (f' x₁) x₁) (smooth : LipschitzWith l f')
  (update : ∀ k : ℕ, x (k + 1) = x k - a k · f' (x k))
  (hl : l > 0) (step₁ : ∀ k, a k > 0) (initial : x 0 = initial_x)
```

```
class GradientDescent_fix_stepsize (f : E → ℝ) (f' : E → E)
  (initial_x : E) :=
  (x : ℕ → E) (a : ℝ) (l : NNReal)
  (diff : ∀ x₁, HasGradientAt f (f' x₁) x₁) (smooth : LipschitzWith l f')
  (update : ∀ k : ℕ, x (k + 1) = x k - a · f' (x k))
  (hl : l > (0 : ℝ)) (step₁ : a > 0) (initial : x 0 = initial_x)
```

We can also define the gradient descent with fixed step size as a special instance of the general gradient descent method. In this paper, we mainly focus on the fixed step size version of the gradient descent method, but more general version can be added easily based on this work.

```
instance {f : E → ℝ} {f' : E → E} {x₀ : E}
  [p : GradientDescent_fix_stepsize f f' x₀] :
  GradientDescent f f' x₀ where
```

It is straightforward to see that the gradient descent method with fixed stepsize is a special case of the gradient descent method, hence we can get the `instance` structure as above.

The convergence rate of the fixed step size gradient method is give by the following theorem:

► **Theorem 13.** *For unconstrained optimization problem (2),  $f(x)$  is  $L$ -smooth. Let  $f^* = f(x^*) = \inf_x f(x)$  be the optimal value.*

(a) *If  $f(x)$  is convex, then for any step size  $\alpha$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{L}$ , the gradient descent algorithm (4) generates a sequence of points  $\{x_k\}$  whose function values satisfy the inequality*

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha k} \|x_0 - x^*\|^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(b) *If  $f(x)$  is  $m$ -strongly convex, then for any step size  $\alpha$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{m+L}$ , the gradient descent algorithm (4) generates a sequence of points  $\{x_k\}$  whose function values satisfy the inequality*

$$\|x_k - x^*\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \alpha \frac{2mL}{m+L}\right)^k \|x_0 - x^*\|^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To prove the convergence rate of the fixed step size gradient descent method, we need to prepare for a bunch of theorems ahead, including the one iteration property of the method and the sum up property of the monotonic sequences. Finally we can prove the convergence rate of the gradient descent method for Lipschitz smooth function.

```
theorem gradient_method_fix_stepsize
  {alg: GradientDescent_fix_stepsize f f' x_0}
  (hfun: ConvexOn ℝ Set.univ f) (step2: alg.a ≤ 1 / alg.l) :
  ∀ k: ℕ, f (alg.x (k + 1)) - f xm ≤ 1 / (2 * (k + 1) * alg.a)
  * || x_0 - xm || ^ 2 := by
```

It is interesting to find out from the proof that there is no assumptions on `xm` here. In general setting, we use the case which `xm` is the minima, but in the proof, we can see that the proof is valid for any point `xm`. So doing formalized proof can let us know the direct connection between the assumptions and the theorem.

```
theorem gradient_method_strong_convex_fix_stepsize {alg:
  GradientDescent_fix_stepsize f f' x_0} (hsc: StrongConvexOn univ m f) (hm:
  m > 0) (min: IsMinOn f univ xm) (step2: alg.a ≤ 2 / (m + alg.l)):
  ∀ k: ℕ, || alg.x k - xm || ^ 2 ≤ (1 - alg.a *
  (2 * m * alg.l / (m + alg.l))) ^ k * || x_0 - xm || ^ 2 := by
```

## 8.2 Subgradient Descent Method

In this subsection, we focus on the subgradient descent method. For subgradient descent method, our assumption is given as:

► **Assumption 1.** *Considering the unconstrained optimization problem (2), we assume*

(a)  *$f$  is convex on  $s$ .*

(b) *there exists at least one minima  $x^*$  and  $f(x^*) > -\infty$ .*

(c)  *$f$  is Lipschitz continuous, i.e.  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq G\|x - y\|$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $G > 0$ .*

Note that the assumption (c) is equivalent with assuming that the subgradient of the target function  $f$  is bounded by  $G$ . The subgradient descent method is defined as follows:

```
class subgradient_method (f: E → ℝ) (x₀: E) :=
  (x g: ℕ → E) (a: ℕ → ℝ) (ha: ∀ n, a n > 0)
  (G: NNReal) (lipschitz: LipschitzWith G f)
  (initial: x 0 = x₀)
  (update: ∀ k, (x (k + 1)) = x k - a k · (g k))
  (hg: ∀ n, g n ∈ SubderivAt f (x n))
```

Many different results can be derived with different kinds of step size. For simplicity, we only show theorem for the diminishing step size in this paper, while more relevant results such as the convergence rate of fixed step size can be found in the code.

► **Theorem 14.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied, and the step size sequence  $\alpha_k > 0$  for all  $k$ ,  $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = +\infty$ , then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by subgradient method (5) converges to the optimal solution  $x^*$ , and for all  $k \geq 0$  with the rate*

$$\hat{f}^k - f^* \leq \frac{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + G^2 \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i^2}{2 \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i}, \quad (9)$$

where  $f^* = f(x^*)$ , and  $\hat{f}^k$  is the minimum value of  $f(x)$  up to the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration of  $f(x)$ 's values, i.e.,  $\hat{f}^k = \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} f(x^i)$ .

Then we have the formalized version of theorem (14) as:

```
theorem subgradient_method_converge:
  ∀ k, 2 * ((Finset.range (k + 1)).sum alg.a) *
  (sInf {x | ∃ i ∈ Finset.range (k + 1), f (alg.x i) = x} - f xm)
  ≤ ‖x₀ - xm‖ ^ 2 + alg.G ^ 2 * (Finset.range (k + 1)).sum (fun i =>
  alg.a i ^ 2) :=
```

Moreover we can have the convergence result as:

```
theorem subgradient_method_diminishing_step_size
  (ha' : Tendsto alg.a atTop (nhds 0))
  (ha'' : Tendsto (fun (k : ℕ) => (Finset.range (k + 1)).sum alg.a) atTop
  atTop) :
  Tendsto (fun k => sInf {f (alg.x i) | i ∈ Finset.range (k + 1)}) atTop
  (nhds (f xm)) := by
```

### 8.3 Proximal Gradient Method

From this subsection to the end of the paper, for the usage of the proximal operator, we need to require the space  $E$  satisfying `[ProperSpace E]`. Considering the composite optimization problem (3). Using the proximal property we defined and formalized in section 7, we can give the formalization of the proximal gradient method (6) in lean. In this method, we use the definition `prox_prop` rather `prox_point` since for general function, the proximal set is not unique. We have that any point in the proximal set satisfying the proximal property is admissible for proximal gradient method. Similar to the first order algorithms above, we also define a class for proximal gradient method.

```
class proximal_gradient_method (f h: E → ℝ) (f': E → E) (x₀: E) :=
  (xm: E) (t: ℝ) (x: ℕ → E) (L: NNReal)
  (fconv: ConvexOn ℝ univ f) (hconv: ConvexOn ℝ univ h)
  (h₁: ∀ x₁: E, HasGradientAt f (f' x₁) x₁) (h₂: LipschitzWith L f')
  (h₃: ContinuousOn h univ) (minphi: IsMinOn (f + h) Set.univ xm)
  (tpos: 0 < t) (step: t ≤ 1 / L) (ori: x 0 = x₀) (hL: L > (0: ℝ))
  (update: ∀ (k: ℕ), prox_prop (t · h) (x k - t · f' (x k)) (x (k + 1)))
```

First we need to give the basic assumptions for this problem.

► **Assumption 2.** For composite optimization problem (3), we have assumptions below:

1.  $f$  is a differentiable convex function with  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient.
2. The function  $h$  is continuous convex function (which means the proximal operator is well defined here);
3. The minima of function  $\phi$  is attainable at the finite point  $x^*$ , with the minimal value  $\phi(x^*) > -\infty$ .

We can get the convergence rate for proximal gradient as the theorem below:

► **Theorem 15.** Suppose that Assumption 2 is satisfied and the fixed step size  $t_k = t \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$ , then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by (6) satisfies

$$\psi(x^k) - \psi^* \leq \frac{1}{2kt} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2.$$

The formalized convergence rate is given as:

```
theorem proximal_gradient_method_converge
  {alg: proximal_gradient_method f h f' x_0} :
  ∀ (k: ℕ+), (f (alg.x k) + h (alg.x k) - f alg.xm - h alg.xm) ≤ 1 / (2 * k *
  alg.t) * || x_0 - alg.x || ^ 2 := by
```

## 8.4 Nesterov Acceleration Method

In this section, we mainly focus on the formalization of the Nesterov's acceleration method used on composite optimization. Since there are a few forms of the Nesterov's acceleration method, we only choose two of them which are formalized in two relevant files

`Nesterov_Acceleration_first.lean` and `Nesterov_Acceleration_second.lean`. Although having differences in the update scheme, they enjoy the same acceleration convergence rate.

In this paper, we also use the `instance` structure to do the definition. Firstly, we define the general method with abstract hyperparameter  $\gamma$  and stepsize  $t$ , and then use the instance structure to connect the definition with the fixed stepsize ones. For the first form of the Nesterov's acceleration method, which is also called as FISTA method, we can formalize the fix stepsize version of the algorithm as:

```
class Nesterov_first_fix_stepsize (f h: E → ℝ) (f' : E → E) (x0 : E) :=
  (l : NNReal) (hl : l > (0 : ℝ))
  (h1 : ∀ x : E, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x) (convf: ConvexOn ℝ univ f)
  (h2 : LipschitzWith l f') (convh : ConvexOn ℝ univ h)
  (x y : ℕ → E) (t γ : ℕ → ℝ) (oriy : y 0 = x 0) (initial : x 0 = x0)
  (teq : ∀ n : ℕ, t n = 1 / l) (γeq : ∀ n : ℕ, γ n = 2 / (2 + n))
  (update1 : ∀ (k : ℕ+), y k = x k + (γ k * (1 - γ (k - 1)) / (γ (k - 1))) *
    (x k - x (k - 1)))
  (update2 : ∀ k, prox_prop (t k · h) (y k - t k · (f' (y k))) (x (k + 1)))
```

The convergence theorem is stated as:

► **Theorem 16.** Suppose that Assumption 2 is satisfied, the fixed step size  $t_k = t \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$ , and the hyperparameters  $\gamma_k = \frac{2}{2+k}$ , then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by (7) satisfies

$$\psi(x^k) - \psi^* \leq \frac{2L}{(k+1)^2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \quad (10)$$

## XX:16 Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

We can prove the convergence rate for the Nesterov acceleration method stated by the theorem above by complicate calculation in Lean4. The formalized version of the convergence rate for the fixed stepsize is given as:

```
theorem Nesterov_first_fix_stepsize_converge {alg: Nesterov_first f h f' x0}
  {xm : E} (minϕ : IsMinOn (f + h) univ xm) :
  ∀ k, f (alg.x (k + 1)) + h (alg.x (k + 1)) - f alg.xm - h alg.xm ≤ 2 *
  alg.l / (k + 2) ^ 2 * ||x0 - alg.xm || ^ 2 := by
```

For the second version of Nesterov's acceleration algorithm (8), we can formalized as:

```
class Nesterov_second_fix_stepsize (f h: E → ℝ) (f' : E → E) (x0 : E) :=
  (l : NNReal) (hl : l > (0 : ℝ)) (x y : ℕ → E) (z : ℕ+ → E) (t γ : ℕ → ℝ)
  (h1 : ∀ x : E, HasGradientAt f (f' x) x) (convf: ConvexOn ℝ Set.univ f)
  (h2 : LipschitzWith l f') (convh : ConvexOn ℝ univ h)
  (oriy : y 0 = x 0) (oriγ : γ 1 = 1) (initial : x0 = x 0)
  (teq : ∀ n : ℕ, t n = 1 / l)
  (γeq : ∀ n : ℕ, γ n = if n = 0 then (1 / (2 : ℝ)) else (2 : ℝ) / (1 + n))
  (update1 : ∀ (k : ℕ+), z k = (1 - γ k) · (x (k - 1)) + γ k · (y (k - 1)))
  (update2 : ∀ (k : ℕ+), prox_prop ((t k / γ k) · h) (y (k - 1) - (t k / γ k)
  · (f' (z k))) (y k))
  (update3 : ∀ (k : ℕ+), x k = (1 - γ k) · (x (k - 1)) + γ k · y k)
```

For this method, we also have the  $O(\frac{1}{k^2})$  rate as:

► **Theorem 17.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 is satisfied, the fixed step size  $t_k = t \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$ , and the hyperparameters  $\gamma_k = \frac{2}{1+k}$ , then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by (7) satisfies*

$$\psi(x^k) - \psi^* \leq \frac{2L}{(k+1)^2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \quad (11)$$

The formalize version of the theorem is given as:

```
theorem Nesterov_second_fix_stepsize_converge {alg: Nesterov_second f h f' x0}
  {xm : E} (minϕ : IsMinOn (f + h) univ xm) :
  ∀ (k : ℕ), f (alg.x (k + 1)) + h (alg.x (k + 1)) - f xm - h xm ≤ 2 *
  alg.l / (k + 2) ^ 2 * ||x0 - xm || ^ 2 := by
```

## 9 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we mainly discuss the formalization of the first order algorithm in convex optimization. Firstly, to demonstrate the derivative first order information of the convex function conveniently, we define the gradient and subgradient in lean. Taking advantage of these definitions, we can go into the properties of convex functions and Lipschitz smooth functions. Then we define the proximal operator which is widely used in non-smooth optimization. Putting these tools together, we describe the class of the first order algorithm and prove the convergence rate for four widely used algorithm, which found the base and offer experience of proving more complicate algorithms such as ADMM [25] and BCD [22] in the near future. Future work would include the definition of Fréchet sub-differentiability of general functions and the KL property, respectively. The discussion of the optimality conditions of constrained optimization problems is also of vital importance. We hope that, based on this work, we can train the large language model step by step to do formalization automatically. Since part of our codes has not been merged to mathlib, we will continue to refine them in a very high standard.



---

**References**

---

- 1 Xavier Allamigeon and Ricardo D. Katz. A formalization of convex polyhedra based on the simplex method. *J. Automat. Reason.*, 63(2):323–345, 2019. doi:10.1007/s10817-018-9477-1.
- 2 Anne Baanen. Use and abuse of instance parameters in the lean mathematical library. In *13th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving*, volume 237 of *LIPICs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 4, 20. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2022. doi:10.4230/lipics.itp.2022.4.
- 3 Amir Beck. *First-order methods in optimization*. SIAM, 2017.
- 4 Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM journal on imaging sciences*, 2(1):183–202, 2009.
- 5 Alexander Bentkamp, Ramon Fernández Mir, and Jeremy Avigad. Verified reductions for optimization. In Sriram Sankaranarayanan and Natasha Sharygina, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 74–92, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- 6 Sylvie Boldo, Catherine Lelay, and Guillaume Melquiond. Formalization of real analysis: A survey of proof assistants and libraries. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 26(7):1196–1233, 2016.
- 7 Jérôme Bolte, Shoham Sabach, and Marc Teboulle. Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1-2):459–494, 2014.
- 8 Léon Bottou, Frank E Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *SIAM review*, 60(2):223–311, 2018.
- 9 Stephen Boyd, Lin Xiao, and Almir Mutapcic. Subgradient methods. *lecture notes of EE392o, Stanford University, Autumn Quarter*, 2004(01), 2003.
- 10 Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- 11 Leonardo de Moura, Soonho Kong, Jeremy Avigad, Floris van Doorn, and Jakob von Raumer. The lean theorem prover (system description). In *Automated deduction—CADE 25*, volume 9195 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 378–388. Springer, Cham, 2015. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21401-6\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21401-6_26), doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21401-6\_26.
- 12 Sébastien Gouëzel. A formalization of the change of variables formula for integrals in mathlib. In *International Conference on Intelligent Computer Mathematics*, pages 3–18. Springer, 2022.
- 13 Bogdan Grechuk. Lower semicontinuous functions. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, January 2011. [https://isa-afp.org/entries/Lower\\_Semicontinuous.html](https://isa-afp.org/entries/Lower_Semicontinuous.html), Formal proof development.
- 14 Yury Kudryashov. Formalizing the divergence theorem and the Cauchy integral formula in Lean. In *13th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving*, volume 237 of *LIPICs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 23, 19. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2022. doi:10.4230/lipics.itp.2022.23.
- 15 Haoyang Liu, Jiang Hu, Yongfeng Li, and Zaiwen Wen. *Optimization: Modeling, Algorithm and Theory*. higher education press, 2020.
- 16 The mathlib Community. The lean mathematical library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP 2020, page 367–381, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3372885.3373824.
- 17 Yurii Nesterov. A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate  $o(1/k^{**2})$ . *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 269(3):543, 1983.
- 18 Yurii Nesterov et al. *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer, 2018.
- 19 Tobias Nipkow, Lawrence Charles Paulson, and Markus Wenzel. A proof assistant for higher-order logic. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2002. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59771319>.
- 20 Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer, 1999.

## XX:18 Formalization of Complexity Analysis of the First-order Optimization Algorithms

- 21 Neal Parikh, Stephen Boyd, et al. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and trends® in Optimization*, 1(3):127–239, 2014.
- 22 Meisam Razaviyayn, Mingyi Hong, and Zhi-Quan Luo. A unified convergence analysis of block successive minimization methods for nonsmooth optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(2):1126–1153, 2013. doi:10.1137/120891009.
- 23 Wenyu Sun and Ya-Xiang Yuan. *Optimization theory and methods: nonlinear programming*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- 24 Joseph Tassarotti, Koundinya Vajjha, Anindya Banerjee, and Jean-Baptiste Tristan. A formal proof of pac learnability for decision stumps. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 5–17, 2021.
- 25 Yu Wang, Wotao Yin, and Jinshan Zeng. Global convergence of admm in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 78:29–63, 2019.