

# Sharp Bounds for Sequential Federated Learning on Heterogeneous Data

**Yipeng Li**

LIYIPENG@BUPT.EDU.CN

*National Engineering Research Center for Mobile Network Technologies  
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
Beijing, 100876, China*

**Xinchen Lyu**

LVXINCHEN@BUPT.EDU.CN

*National Engineering Research Center for Mobile Network Technologies  
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
Beijing, 100876, China*

## Abstract

There are two paradigms in Federated Learning (FL): parallel FL (PFL), where models are trained in a parallel manner across clients; and sequential FL (SFL), where models are trained in a sequential manner across clients. In contrast to that of PFL, the convergence theory of SFL on heterogeneous data is still lacking. To resolve the theoretical dilemma of SFL, we establish sharp convergence guarantees for SFL on heterogeneous data with both upper and lower bounds. Specifically, we derive the upper bounds for strongly convex, general convex and non-convex objective functions, and construct the matching lower bounds for the strongly convex and general convex objective functions. Then, we compare the upper bounds of SFL with those of PFL, showing that SFL outperforms PFL (at least, when the level of heterogeneity is relatively high). Experimental results on quadratic functions and real data sets validate the counterintuitive comparison result.

**Keywords:** stochastic gradient descent, random reshuffling, parallel federated learning, sequential federated learning, convergence analysis

## 1 Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) (McMahan et al., 2017; Chang et al., 2018) is a popular distributed machine learning paradigm, where multiple clients collaborate to train a global model, while preserving data privacy and security. Commonly, FL can be categorized into two types: (i) parallel FL (PFL), where models are trained in a parallel manner across clients, with periodic aggregation, such as Federated Averaging (FedAvg) (McMahan et al., 2017) and Local SGD (Stich, 2019), and (ii) sequential FL (SFL), where models are trained in a sequential manner across clients, such as Cyclic Weight Transfer (CWT) (Chang et al., 2018) and peer-to-peer FL (Yuan et al., 2023a).

SFL has recently attracted much attention in the FL community (Lee et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2023b) with various applications in medicine (Chang et al., 2018), automated driving (Yuan et al., 2023a) and so on. SFL operates in a peer-to-peer manner, and thus eliminates the dependency on a centralized parameter server. This not only reduces communication costs but also enhances scalability and alleviates the critical challenge of securing a trusted third-party. Moreover, SFL has played a great role in Split Learning (SL) (Gupta and Raskar, 2018; Thapa et al., 2022), an emerging distributed learning technology at the edge

side, where the full model is split into client-side and server-side portions to alleviate the excessive computation overhead for resource-constrained devices.

Both PFL and SFL suffer from “data heterogeneity”, one of the most persistent problems in FL. Up to now, there have been numerous works to study the convergence of PFL on heterogeneous data (Li et al., 2019; Khaled et al., 2020; Koloskova et al., 2020; Woodworth et al., 2020b). These theoretical works not only helped understand the effect of heterogeneity, but also spawned new algorithms like SCAFFOLD (Karimireddy et al., 2020) and FedNova (Wang et al., 2020). In contrast, the convergence of SFL on heterogeneous data has not been well studied. Recent works (Cho et al., 2023; Malinovsky et al., 2023) studied the convergence of FL with cyclic client participation, which can be seen as an extension of SFL. However, its convergence analysis is still in an infancy stage, and existing works do not cover the SFL setups in this paper (see Section 2). Our early conference paper (Li and Lyu, 2023) proved the upper bounds of SFL (which is shown to be applicable to SL). However, notably, the lower bounds for SFL are still missing in existing works. The lack of theoretical study can hinder further development of SFL and even SL.

To resolve the theoretical dilemma of SFL, this paper, extending our conference paper (Li and Lyu, 2023),<sup>1</sup> aims to establish sharp convergence guarantees for SFL with both upper and lower bounds. In the case of homogeneous data, this task is trivial, as SFL is reduced to SGD (Stochastic Gradient Descent). However, in the case of heterogeneous data, it is more challenging than existing works, including PFL and SGD-RR (Random Reshuffling), primarily due to the following reasons:

- (i) Sequential and shuffling training manner across clients (vs. PFL). In PFL, the local updates at each client only depend on the randomness of the current client within each training round. However, in SFL, the local updates additionally depend on the randomness of all previous clients.
- (ii) Multiple local update steps at each client (vs. SGD-RR). In contrast to its with-replacement sibling SGD, SGD-RR samples data samples “without replacement” and then performs one step of GD (Gradient Descent) on each data sample. Similarly, SFL samples clients without replacement and then performs multiple steps of SGD at each client. In fact, SGD-RR can be regarded as a special case of SFL.

In this paper, we establish the convergence guarantees for SFL (Algorithm 1), and then compare them with those of PFL (Algorithm 2). The main contributions are as follows:

- We derive the upper bounds of SFL for the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex cases on heterogeneous data with the standard assumptions in FL in Subsection 4.2 (Theorem 1 and Corollary 2).
- We construct the lower bounds of SFL for the strongly convex and general convex cases in Subsection 4.3 (Theorem 3 and Corollary 4). They match the derived upper bounds for the large number of training rounds.

---

1. The conference paper is available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03154>. Notably, by default, we use the latest arXiv version for all the references.

- We compare the upper bounds of SFL with those of PFL in Subsections 5.1 and 5.2. In the convex cases,<sup>2</sup> the comparison results show a subtle difference under different heterogeneity assumptions. That is, under Assumption 5, the upper bounds of SFL are better than those of PFL strictly, while under Assumption 7, the upper bounds of SFL are still better unless the level of heterogeneity is very low. In the non-convex case under Assumption 6, the upper bounds of SFL are better without exception.
- The comparison results imply that SFL outperforms PFL in heterogeneous settings (at least, when the level of heterogeneity is relatively high). We then validate this counterintuitive result (Gao et al., 2021) with simulations on quadratic functions in Subsection 6.1 and experiments on real data sets in Subsection 6.2.

## 2 Related Work

The most relevant research topics are the convergence analyses of PFL and SGD-RR.

So far, there have been a wealth of works to study the upper bounds of PFL on data heterogeneity (Li et al., 2019; Khaled et al., 2020; Karimireddy et al., 2020; Koloskova et al., 2020; Woodworth et al., 2020b), system heterogeneity (Wang et al., 2020), partial client participation (Li et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2021; Wang and Ji, 2022) and other variants (Karimireddy et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Reddi et al., 2021). The lower bounds of PFL have also been studied in Woodworth et al. (2020a,b); Yun et al. (2022); Glasgow et al. (2022). In this work, we make a comparison between the upper bounds of PFL and those of SFL on heterogeneous data (see Subsections 5.1 and 5.2).

SGD-RR has been gaining significant attention as a more practical alternative to SGD. Nagaraj et al. (2019); Ahn et al. (2020); Mishchenko et al. (2020) have proved the upper bounds and Safran and Shamir (2020, 2021); Rajput et al. (2020); Cha et al. (2023) have proved the lower bounds of SGD-RR. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, Mishchenko et al. (2020) provided the tightest upper bounds and Cha et al. (2023) provided the tightest lower bounds of SGD-RR. In this work, we adopt them to exam the tightness of the convergence bounds of SFL (see Subsection 4.2).

Recently, the shuffling-based method, SGD-RR, has been applied to FL. One line of these works is Local RR (or FedRR) (Mishchenko et al., 2022; Yun et al., 2022; Horváth et al., 2022), which adopts SGD-RR (instead of SGD) as the local solver. In particular, Yun et al. (2022) provided both upper bounds and lower bounds for Local RR. Another line is FL with cyclic client participation (Cho et al., 2023; Malinovsky et al., 2023), which can be seen as an extension of SFL. However, its convergence analysis is still in an infancy stage, and existing works do not cover the SFL setups in this paper. In Cho et al. (2023), the client training order is deterministic (not random), thus their analysis is more simple than ours. In Malinovsky et al. (2023), although their bounds are slightly tighter on the optimization term with SGD-RR as the local solver, their analysis is limited to the case where the number of local steps equals the size of the local data set. Most importantly, Cho et al. (2023) considered upper bounds for PL objective functions and Malinovsky et al.

---

2. For clarity, we use the term “the convex cases” to collectively refer to both the strongly convex case and the general convex case in this paper.

(2023) considered upper bounds for strongly convex objective functions,<sup>3</sup> while we consider both upper bounds (for both convex and non-convex cases) and lower bounds. Detailed comparisons are in Li and Lyu (2023).

### 3 Setup

*Notation.* We let  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$  and  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}} := \{x_i : i \in \mathcal{S}\}$  for any set  $\mathcal{S}$ . We use  $|\mathcal{S}|$  to denote the size of any set  $\mathcal{S}$ . As done in Cha et al. (2023), we use  $\gtrsim$  to denote “greater than” up to some absolute constants and polylogarithmic factors, and  $\lesssim$  and  $\asymp$  are defined likewise. We also use the big O notations,  $\tilde{O}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}$ ,  $\Omega$ , where  $\mathcal{O}$ ,  $\Omega$  hide numerical constants,  $\tilde{O}$  hides numerical constants and polylogarithmic factors. We use  $\|\cdot\|$  to denote the standard Euclidean norm for both vectors and matrices. More notations are in Table 4.

*Problem formulation.* The basic FL problem is to minimize a global objective function:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ F(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (F_m(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{D}_m} [f_m(\mathbf{x}; \xi)]) \right\},$$

where  $F_m$  and  $f_m$  denote the local objective function and the local component function of Client  $m$  ( $m \in [M]$ ), respectively. The local objective function is the average of the local component functions,  $F_m(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_m|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_m} f_m(\mathbf{x}; \xi_m^i)$ , when the local data set  $\mathcal{D}_m$  contains a finite number of data samples.

*Update rule of SFL (Algorithm 1).* At the beginning of each training round, the indices  $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$  are sampled without replacement from  $[M]$  randomly as the clients’ training order. Within a round, each client (i) initializes its model with the latest parameters from its previous client, (ii) performs  $K$  steps of local updates over its local data set, and (iii) passes the updated parameters to the next client. This process continues until all clients finish their local training. Let  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$  denote the local parameters of the  $m$ -th client (that is, Client  $\pi_m$ ) after  $k$  local steps in the  $r$ -th round, and  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$  denote the global parameters in the  $r$ -th round. Then, choosing SGD as the local solver (with a constant learning rate  $\eta$ ), the update rule of SFL is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Local update : } \mathbf{x}_{m,k+1}^{(r)} &= \mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \eta \mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)}, \quad \text{initializing } \mathbf{x}_{m,0}^{(r)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, & m = 1 \\ \mathbf{x}_{m-1,K}^{(r)}, & m > 1 \end{cases}, \\ \text{Global model : } \mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} &= \mathbf{x}_{M,K}^{(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use  $\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)} := \nabla f_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}; \xi_{m,k}^{(r)})$  to denote the stochastic gradient generated at the  $m$ -th client for its  $k+1$ -th local update in the  $r$ -th round.

*Update rule of PFL (Algorithm 2).* Within a round, each client (i) initializes its model with the global parameters, (ii) performs  $K$  steps of local updates, and (iii) sends the updated parameters to the central server. The server will aggregate the local parameters to generate the global parameters. With the the same notations as those of SFL, the update

---

3. PL condition can be thought as a non-convex generalization of strong convexity.

rule of PFL is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Local update : } \mathbf{x}_{m,k+1}^{(r)} &= \mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \eta \mathbf{g}_{m,k}^{(r)}, \quad \text{initializing } \mathbf{x}_{m,0}^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \forall m \in [M] \\ \text{Global model : } \mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{x}_{m,K}^{(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

In this work, unless otherwise stated, we use SFL and PFL to represent the classes of algorithms that share the same update rule as Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively.

Algorithm 1: Sequential FL	Algorithm 2: Parallel FL
<b>Output:</b> $\{\mathbf{x}^{(r)}\}$ 1 <b>for</b> round $r = 0, \dots, R - 1$ <b>do</b> 2     Sample a permutation $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ 3 <b>for</b> $m = 1, \dots, M$ <b>in sequence do</b> 4 $\mathbf{x}_{m,0}^{(r)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, & m = 1 \\ \mathbf{x}_{m-1,K}^{(r)}, & m > 1 \end{cases}$ 5 <b>for</b> local step $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ <b>do</b> 6 $\mathbf{x}_{m,k+1}^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \eta \mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)}$ 7         Global model: $\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} = \mathbf{x}_{M,K}^{(r)}$	<b>Output:</b> $\{\mathbf{x}^{(r)}\}$ 1 <b>for</b> round $r = 0, \dots, R - 1$ <b>do</b> 2 <b>for</b> $m = 1, \dots, M$ <b>in parallel do</b> 3 $\mathbf{x}_{m,0}^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ 4 <b>for</b> local step $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ <b>do</b> 5 $\mathbf{x}_{m,k+1}^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \eta \mathbf{g}_{m,k}^{(r)}$ 6         Global model: $\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{x}_{m,K}^{(r)}$

## 4 Convergence Analysis of SFL

We consider three typical cases: the strongly convex case, the general convex case and the non-convex case, where all the local objective functions  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_M$  are  $\mu$ -strongly convex, general convex (Assumption 2) and non-convex, respectively.

### 4.1 Assumptions

We assume that (i)  $F$  is lower bounded by  $F^*$  for all cases and there exists a global minimizer  $\mathbf{x}^*$  such that  $F(\mathbf{x}^*) = F^*$  for the convex cases; (ii) all local objective functions are differentiable and smooth (Assumption 1). Furthermore, we need to make assumptions on the diversities: (iii) the assumptions on the stochasticity bounding the diversity of local component functions  $\{f_m(\cdot; \xi_m^i)\}_i^{|D_m|}$  with respect to  $i$  inside each client (Assumptions 3 and 4); (iv) the assumptions on the heterogeneity bounding the diversity of local objective functions  $\{F_m\}_m^M$  with respect to  $m$  across clients (Assumptions 5, 6 and 7).

**Assumption 1** *A differentiable function  $F$  is  $L$ -smooth if for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{y})\| \leq L \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|.$$

**Assumption 2** A differentiable function  $F$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex if for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{y}) - \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2.$$

If  $\mu = 0$ , we say that  $F$  is general convex.

*Assumptions on the stochasticity.* Since both Algorithms 1 and 2 use SGD (data samples are chosen with replacement) as the local solver, the stochastic gradient generated at each client is an (conditionally) unbiased estimate of the gradient of the local objective function,  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{D}_m}[\nabla f_m(\mathbf{x}; \xi) \mid \mathbf{x}] = \nabla F_m(\mathbf{x})$ . In the FL literature, there are two common assumptions, Assumptions 3 and 4, to bound the stochasticity, where  $\sigma_*$ ,  $\sigma$  measure the level of stochasticity. Assumption 3 only assumes that the stochastic gradients at the optimum are bounded, and therefore it is weaker than Assumption 4. However, if using Assumption 3, we need to assume that each local component function  $f_m(\mathbf{x}; \xi)$  is smooth, rather than merely assuming that each local objective function  $F_m(\mathbf{x})$  is smooth (Khaled et al., 2020; Koloskova et al., 2020). Besides, we mainly study the effects of heterogeneity. For these two reasons, we use Assumption 4 for all cases in this paper.

**Assumption 3** There exists a constant  $\sigma_*$  such that for the global minimizer  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{D}_m} \|\nabla f_m(\mathbf{x}^*; \xi) - \nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \leq \sigma_*^2.$$

**Assumption 4** There exists a constant  $\sigma$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{D}_m} \|\nabla f_m(\mathbf{x}; \xi) - \nabla F_m(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \sigma^2.$$

*Assumptions on the heterogeneity.* Now we make assumptions on the diversity of the local objective functions in Assumption 5, 6 and 7, also known as the heterogeneity in FL. For the convex cases, we use Assumption 5 as Koloskova et al. (2020) did, which bounds the diversity only at the optimum. Assumption 6 is made for the non-convex case, where the constants  $\beta$  and  $\zeta$  measure the heterogeneity of the local objective functions. Assumption 7, the strongest assumption, is only made in Subsection 5.2. Notably, that all the local objective functions are identical (that is, no heterogeneity) means that  $\zeta_*, \beta, \zeta, \hat{\zeta}$  equal zero in these assumptions. Yet the reverse may not be true, as they only assume the first-order relationships (Karimireddy et al., 2020).

**Assumption 5** There exists a constant  $\zeta_*^2$  such that for the global minimizer  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 = \zeta_*^2.$$

**Assumption 6** There exist constants  $\beta^2$  and  $\zeta^2$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \beta^2 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \zeta^2.$$

**Assumption 7** There exist constants  $\hat{\zeta}^2$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\max_m \|\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \hat{\zeta}^2.$$

## 4.2 Upper Bounds of SFL

**Theorem 1** *Let all the local objectives be  $L$ -smooth (Assumption 1). For SFL (Algorithm 1), there exist a constant effective learning rate  $\tilde{\eta} := \eta MK$  and weights  $\{w_r\}_{r \geq 0}$ , such that the weighted average of the global parameters  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)} := \frac{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r \mathbf{x}^{(r)}}{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r}$  satisfies the following upper bounds:*

**Strongly convex:** *Under Assumptions 4, 5, there exist  $\tilde{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{6L}$  and  $w_r = (1 - \frac{\mu\tilde{\eta}}{2})^{-(r+1)}$ , such that for  $R \geq 6\kappa$  ( $\kappa := L/\mu$ ),*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] \leq \frac{9}{2} \mu D^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\mu\tilde{\eta}R}{2} \right) + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta_*^2}{M}.$$

**General convex:** *Under Assumptions 4, 5, there exist  $\tilde{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{6L}$  and  $w_r = 1$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] \leq \frac{3D^2}{\tilde{\eta}R} + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta_*^2}{M}.$$

**Non-convex:** *Under Assumptions 4, 6, there exist  $\tilde{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{6L(1+\beta^2/M)}$  and  $w_r = 1$ , such that*

$$\min_{0 \leq r \leq R} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{10A}{\tilde{\eta}R} + \frac{20L\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{75L^2\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{4MK} + \frac{75L^2\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta^2}{4M}.$$

Here  $D := \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|$  for the convex cases and  $A := F(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - F^*$  for the non-convex case.

**Proof** We provide intuitive proof sketches of Theorem 1 as done in Karimireddy et al. (2020). Ideally, we want to update the model with the gradients of the global objective function. For any local gradient in some training round of SFL, it can be decomposed into two vectors (or estimated by Taylor formula),

$$\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) \approx (\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla^2 F_m(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x})) .$$

Then, the global update of SFL can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{SFL}} &= -\eta \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \{ \nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) \approx (\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla^2 F_m(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x})) \} \\ &= \underbrace{-\eta MK \nabla F(\mathbf{x})}_{\text{optimization vector}} \underbrace{-\eta \nabla^2 F_m(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x})}_{\text{error vector}} . \end{aligned}$$

The optimization vector is beneficial while the error vector is detrimental. Therefore, our goal is to suppress the error vector. In particular, Theorem 1 is aimed to prove that  $\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$  is bounded. Intuitively, for there are about  $mK$  update steps between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}$ , it is estimated to be  $\mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\eta \sqrt{m} K \zeta)^2 \right) = \mathcal{O} (\eta^2 M^2 K^3 \zeta^2)$ , where  $\sqrt{m}$  is because of the shuffling-based manner. This intuition is proved formally in

Appendix B. ■

The effective learning rate  $\tilde{\eta} := \eta MK$  is used in the upper bounds as done in Karimireddy et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2020). All these upper bounds consist of two parts: the optimization part (the first term) and the error part (the last three terms). Setting  $\tilde{\eta}$  larger makes the optimization part vanishes at a higher rate, yet causes the error part to be larger. This implies that we need to choose an appropriate  $\tilde{\eta}$  to achieve a balance between these two parts, which is actually done in Corollary 2. Here we choose the best learning rate with a prior knowledge of the total training rounds  $R$ , as done in Karimireddy et al. (2020).

**Corollary 2** *By choosing a appropriate learning rate for the results of Theorem 1, we can obtain the upper bounds of SFL:*

**Strongly convex:** *When choosing  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta MK \asymp \min\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{\mu R}\}$  for Theorem 1, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} + \mu D^2 \exp \left( \frac{-\mu R}{L} \right) \right).$$

**General convex:** *When choosing  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta MK \asymp \min\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{D}{c_1^{1/2} R^{1/2}}, \frac{D^{2/3}}{c_2^{1/3} R^{2/3}}\}$  with  $c_1 \asymp \frac{\sigma^2}{MK}$  and  $c_2 \asymp \frac{L\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{L\zeta^2}{M}$  for Theorem 1, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{(MK)^{1/3} R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta_*^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{M^{1/3} R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R} \right).$$

**Non-convex:** *When choosing  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta MK \asymp \min\{\frac{1}{L(1+\beta^2/M)}, \frac{A^{1/2}}{c_1^{1/2} R^{1/2}}, \frac{A^{1/3}}{c_2^{1/3} R^{2/3}}\}$  with  $c_1 \asymp \frac{L\sigma^2}{MK}$  and  $c_2 \asymp \frac{L^2\sigma^2}{MK} + \frac{L^2\zeta^2}{M}$  for Theorem 1, then*

$$\min_{0 \leq r \leq R} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{(L\sigma^2 A)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L^2\sigma^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{(MK)^{1/3} R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L^2\zeta^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{M^{1/3} R^{2/3}} + \frac{LA(1 + \frac{\beta^2}{M})}{R} \right)$$

Here  $D := \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|$  for the convex cases and  $A := F(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - F^*$  for the non-convex case.

Similar to Theorem 1, all these upper bounds consist of two parts, the optimization part (the last term), and the error part (the first three terms). Specifically, the first two terms (containing  $\sigma$ ) is called stochasticity terms, the third term (containing  $\zeta_*$ ,  $\zeta$ ) is called heterogeneity terms, the last term is called optimization terms.

Generally, for a sufficiently large number of training rounds  $R$ , the convergence rate is determined by the first term for all cases, resulting in rates of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/MKR)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{MKR})$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{MKR})$  for the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex cases, respectively.

Recall that SGD-RR can be seen as one special case of SFL, where one step of GD is performed on each local objective  $F_m$ , which implies  $K = 1$  and  $\sigma = 0$ . We now compare the upper bounds of SFL with those of SGD-RR to exam the tightness. As shown in Mishchenko et al. (2020)'s Corollaries 1, 2, 3, the upper bounds of SGD-RR are



$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{L}{\mu}\left(\frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2MR^2} + \mu D^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu \textcolor{red}{M}R}{L}\right)\right)\right), \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(L\zeta_*^2D^4)^{1/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R}\right), \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(L^2\zeta^2)^{1/3}\textcolor{blue}{A}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LA}{R}\right)$  for the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex cases, respectively. We see that our bounds almost matches that of SGD-RR in the general convex, and non-convex cases. For the strongly convex case, the bound of SGD-RR shows a modest advantage on the optimization term (marked in red). To achieve this advantage, Mishchenko et al. (2020) introduced a technique called Shuffling Variance (their Definition 2), yet it is not applicable to SFL for multiple local steps at each client.

### 4.3 Lower Bounds of SFL

**Theorem 3** *There exist a multi-dimensional global objective function, whose local objective functions satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 4 and 6, and an initialization point  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$  such that for any  $\eta > 0$  and  $R \geq 51005$ ,  $M \geq 4$ ,  $K \geq 1$ , the last-round global parameters  $\mathbf{x}^{(R)}$  satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathbf{x}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\right] = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR^2} + \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu MR^2}\right).$$

**Proof** The proofs are in Appendices C, D and E. We construct the lower bounds for stochasticity terms and heterogeneity terms, separately. For stochasticity, we let all the local objective functions be the same, that is  $F = F_1 = \dots = F_M$ , and then aim to derive the lower bound for SGD (see Appendix D). For heterogeneity, we let the local component functions be the same inside each client  $F_m = f_m(\cdot; \xi_m^1) = \dots = f_m(\cdot; \xi_m^{|\mathcal{D}_m|})$  for each  $m$ , and then aim to extend the works of SGD-RR to SFL, that is, from performing one update step to performing multiple update steps on each local objective function (see Appendix E). We use the techniques in Woodworth et al. (2020b)’s Theorem 2, Yun et al. (2022)’s Theorem 4 and Proposition 5 and Cha et al. (2023)’s Theorem 3.1.  $\blacksquare$

This lower bound matches the error terms in the strongly convex case in Corollary 2, up to a factor of  $\kappa$  and some polylogarithmic factors. Next, noting that our upper bounds are for weighted average parameter  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}$  and the best learning rate  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{LMK}\right)$ , then we can also restrict  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{LMK}\right)$  for the lower bound. With this sacrifice, we can achieve a tighter lower bound for arbitrary weighted average parameter  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}$ , and extend it for the general convex case.

**Corollary 4** *Under the same conditions in Theorem 3, there exist a multi-dimensional global objective function and an initialization point, such that for  $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{101LMK}$ , the arbitrary weighted average global parameters  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}$  satisfy the following lower bounds:*

**Strongly convex:** *If  $R \geq 51\kappa$  and  $\kappa \geq 1010$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\right] = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} + \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2}\right).$$

**General convex:** *If  $R \geq 51^3 \max\left\{\frac{\sigma}{LM^{1/2}K^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2MKD^2}{\sigma^2}, \frac{\zeta}{LM^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2MD^2}{\zeta^2}\right\}$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\right] = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2D^4)^{1/3}}{(MK)^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta^2D^4)^{1/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\right).$$

**Proof** The proofs are in Appendix C.2. We use similar techniques in Woodworth et al. (2020b); Cha et al. (2023).  $\blacksquare$

In the strongly convex case in Corollary 2, if  $R \geq 51\kappa \gtrsim \kappa$ , then the best choice

$$\tilde{\eta} \asymp \min \left\{ \frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{\mu R} \right\} \asymp \frac{1}{\mu R} \neq \frac{1}{L},$$

which yields the upper bound of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} + \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} \right)$  for SFL. It exactly matches the lower bound in Corollary 4 (ignoring polylogarithmic factors). Notably, this upper bound shows a difference with the original bound in Corollary 2, which is because the optimization term (the last term) in Corollary 2 only exists when  $\tilde{\eta}$  takes the value of  $\tilde{\eta} \asymp \frac{1}{L}$  in the convex cases (see the proofs of Li and Lyu (2023)’s Lemmas 7 and 8). Moreover, it is safe to compare the upper bounds (with  $\zeta_*$ ) and the lower bounds (with  $\zeta$ ), since Assumption 6 is stronger than Assumption 5 (Cha et al., 2023).

In the general convex case, if  $R \gtrsim \max \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{LM^{1/2}K^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2MKD^2}{\sigma^2}, \frac{\zeta}{LM^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2MD^2}{\zeta^2} \right\}$ , then the best choice  $\tilde{\eta} \neq \frac{1}{L}$ , which yields the bound of  $\mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{(MK)^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}} \right)$  for SFL. It matches the lower bound in Corollary 4.

*Key points and limitations of Subsection 4.3.* The matching lower bounds in Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 validate that our upper bounds are tight in the convex cases for the sufficiently large number of training rounds  $R$ . However, the lower bounds for small  $R$  are loose and the lower bounds for the non-convex case are still lacking, for both SGD-RR and SFL.

## 5 Comparison Between PFL and SFL

Unless otherwise stated, our comparisons are in terms of training rounds, which is also adopted in Gao et al. (2021). This comparison (running for the same number of total training rounds  $R$ ) is fair when considering the same total computation cost for both methods. We summarize the existing convergence results of PFL in Table 1.

### 5.1 Comparison under Assumption 5

**Theorem 5** *Under the same conditions as those of the strongly convex case in Theorem 1, there exist  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta K \asymp \min \left\{ \frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{\mu R} \right\}$  and  $w_r = (1 - \frac{\mu\tilde{\eta}}{2})^{-(r+1)}$ , such that for  $R \gtrsim \kappa$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 KR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp \left( \frac{-\mu R}{L} \right) \right).$$

**Proof** Applying Karimireddy et al. (2020)’s Lemma 1 instead of Koloskova et al. (2020)’s Lemma 15 to the final recursion in Koloskova et al. (2020) yields this theorem. The detailed proofs (specialized for PFL) are in Li and Lyu (2023).  $\blacksquare$

To our knowledge, the existing tightest upper bounds that uses Assumption 5 to catch the heterogeneity for PFL are introduced in Koloskova et al. (2020). Many works (Woodworth et al., 2020b; Yun et al., 2022; Glasgow et al., 2022) have constructed lower bounds to show

Method	Upper Bound
Strongly Convex	
PFL (Karimireddy et al., 2020)	$\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 KR^2} + \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu R}{L}\right)$ (1)
PFL (Koloskova et al., 2020)	$\frac{\sigma_*^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma_*^2}{\mu^2 KR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + LKD^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu R}{L}\right)$ (2)
PFL (Theorem 5)	$\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 KR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu R}{L}\right)$
PFL (Woodworth et al., 2020b)	$\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 KR^2} + \frac{L\hat{\zeta}^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu \textcolor{red}{K}R}{L}\right)$ (3)
SFL (Theorem 1)	$\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 \textcolor{red}{M}KR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 \textcolor{red}{M}R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp\left(\frac{-\mu R}{L}\right)$
Convex	
PFL (Karimireddy et al., 2020)	$\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R}$
PFL (Koloskova et al., 2020)	$\frac{\sigma_* D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma_*^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta_*^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R}$
PFL (Woodworth et al., 2020b)	$\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\hat{\zeta}^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{\textcolor{red}{K}R}$
SFL (Theorem 1)	$\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{\textcolor{red}{M}^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta_*^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{\textcolor{red}{M}^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R}$
Non-convex	
PFL (Karimireddy et al., 2020; Koloskova et al., 2020)	$\frac{(L\sigma^2 A)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L^2\sigma^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L^2\zeta^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{R^{2/3}} + \frac{LA}{R}$ (4)
SFL (Theorem 1)	$\frac{(L\sigma^2 A)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{MKR}} + \frac{(L^2\sigma^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{\textcolor{red}{M}^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L^2\zeta^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{\textcolor{red}{M}^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LA}{R}$ (5)

<sup>(1)</sup> (i) We use  $\frac{3L\eta^3 K^3 \sigma^2}{K}$  (see the last inequality of the proof of their Lemma 8) while Karimireddy et al. (2020) use  $\frac{\eta^2 K^2 \sigma^2}{2K}$  with  $\eta \leq 8LK$  (their Lemma 8), which causes the difference between their original bounds and our recovered bounds. (ii) This difference also exists in the other two cases. (iii) Their Assumption A1 is essentially equivalent to Assumption 6. For simplicity, we let  $B = 1$  in their Assumption A1 for all three cases.

<sup>(2)</sup> Even the weaker Assumption 3 is used in Koloskova et al. (2020), we do not consider it is a improvement over ours in this paper, given the discussions in Subsection 4.1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Applying Karimireddy et al. (2020)’s Lemma 1 instead of their Theorem 3 yields this bound. Notably, Woodworth et al. (2020b) assume the average of the local parameters for all iterations can be obtained, which is in fact impractical in FL. Similar assumptions are made in Khaled et al. (2020); Koloskova et al. (2020). In this paper, we omit this difference.

<sup>(4)</sup> We let  $P = 1, M = 0$  in Koloskova et al. (2020)’s Assumption 3b.

<sup>(5)</sup> We let  $\beta = 0$  in Assumption 6.

Table 1: Upper bounds of PFL and SFL with absolute constants and polylogarithmic factors omitted. We highlight the upper bounds of “PFL under Assumption 7”/“SFL” with a gray/green background. Main differences are marked in red fonts.

these bounds are almost the tightest for the convex cases. Glasgow et al. (2022) has shown that this upper bound for the general convex case is not improvable.

For the following comparisons in this subsection, we mainly focus on the strongly convex case. For fairness, we slightly improve the bound of PFL in the strongly convex case in Theorem 5 by combining the works of Karimireddy et al. (2020); Koloskova et al. (2020). Unless otherwise stated, the conclusions also hold for the other two cases.

- *The upper bounds of SFL are better than PFL on heterogeneous data.* As shown in Table 1 (Theorems 1 and 5), the upper bound of SFL is better than that of PFL, with an advantage of  $1/M$  on the second and third terms (marked in red). This benefits from its sequential and shuffling-based training manner of SFL.
- *Partial client participation.* In the more challenging cross-device settings, only a small fraction of clients participate in each training round. Following the work in Karimireddy et al. (2020); Yang et al. (2021), we provide the upper bounds for PFL and SFL with partial client participation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PFL: } \quad & \tilde{O} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu S K R} + \frac{\zeta_*^2}{\mu R} \frac{M - S}{S(M - 1)} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 K R^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp \left( \frac{-\mu R}{L} \right) \right), \\ \text{SFL: } \quad & \tilde{O} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu S K R} + \frac{\zeta_*^2}{\mu R} \frac{(M - S)}{S(M - 1)} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 \textcolor{red}{S} K R^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 \textcolor{red}{S} R^2} + \mu D^2 \exp \left( \frac{-\mu R}{L} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where a subset of clients  $\mathcal{S}$  (its size is  $|\mathcal{S}| = S$ ) are selected randomly without replacement in each training round. There are additional terms (the second terms) for both PFL and SFL, which is due to partial client participation and random sampling (Yang et al., 2021). *It can be seen that the advantage of  $1/S$  (marked in red) of SFL still exists, similar to the full client participation setup.* The results of the other two cases and the proofs are in Appendix B.

Notably, the proofs of SFL with partial client participation are nontrivial considering  $\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \frac{1}{SK} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}, k} \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) \right] \neq \frac{1}{MK} \sum_{m,k} \mathbb{E}[\nabla F_m(\mathbf{x}_{m,k})]$  (updates in different clients are not independent) and we cannot transform them into the full participation setup directly as done in PFL (Karimireddy et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021).

*Key points of Subsection 5.1.* The discussions above show that the upper bounds of SFL are better than PFL with both full client participation and partial client participation under Assumption 5 in the convex cases and under Assumption 6 in the non-convex case.

## 5.2 Comparison under Assumption 7

Since it is hard to achieve an improvement for SFL even with the stronger Assumption 7, we next compare Corollary 2 with Woodworth et al. (2020b)’s Theorem 3 (under Assumption 7) to show that PFL can outperform SFL when the heterogeneity is very small. For comparison on bounds with different heterogeneity assumptions, we note that if Assumption 7 holds, then Assumption 5 holds, and  $\zeta_* \leq \hat{\zeta}$ .

As shown in Table 1, the results of PFL under Assumption 7 are highlighted with a gray background and the results of SFL (under Assumption 5) are highlighted with a green

background. These bounds closely resembles each other, with three error terms (the first three terms containing  $\sigma, \zeta$ ) and one optimization term (the last one). To emphasize the role of heterogeneity, we let  $\sigma = 0, \mu = L = D = 1$  as done in Woodworth et al. (2020b).

In the strongly convex case, it can be seen that the upper bound of PFL shows better on its optimization term, while worse in the error terms. Consequently, to make the upper bound of PFL smaller, one sufficient (not necessary) condition is  $\frac{\hat{\zeta}^2}{R^2} \lesssim \exp(-KR)$ , or equivalently  $\hat{\zeta}^2 \lesssim R^2 \cdot \exp(-KR)$ , which implies that  $\hat{\zeta}$  should be very small, or the level of heterogeneity is very low. In this condition, the optimization terms become dominant for both PFL and SFL,

$$\frac{\zeta_*^2}{MR^2} \lesssim \frac{\hat{\zeta}^2}{R^2} \lesssim \exp(-KR) \lesssim \exp(-R) ,$$

and then the bound of PFL will be better than that of SFL. However, similarly, once  $\zeta_*^2 \gtrsim MR^2 \exp(-R)$ , the error terms will become dominant and SFL becomes better.

In the general convex case, with the same logic as the strongly convex case, the sufficient (not necessary) condition is  $\hat{\zeta}^2 \lesssim 1/(K^3 R)$ , which still implies that  $\hat{\zeta}$  should be very small.

*Key points of Subsection 5.2.* The discussions above show that the upper bounds of PFL can be better than SFL only when the heterogeneity is very small under Assumption 7 in the convex cases. However, it is unclear whether this superiority still exists under Assumption 5 in the convex cases, and in the non-convex case.

## 6 Experiments

We conduct experiments on quadratic functions (Subsection 6.1) and real data sets (Subsection 6.2) to validate our theoretical finding that SFL outperforms PFL in heterogeneous settings, at least when the level of heterogeneity is relatively high.

### 6.1 Experiments on Quadratic Functions

According to the analyses in Subsections 5.1 and 5.2, SFL outperforms PFL in heterogeneous settings (at least when the level of heterogeneity is relatively high). Here we show that the counterintuitive result (in contrast to Gao et al. (2021)) can appear even for simple one-dimensional quadratic functions (Karimireddy et al., 2020).

To further catch the heterogeneity, in addition to Assumption 5, we also consider Hessian of objective functions (Karimireddy et al., 2020; Glasgow et al., 2022; Zindari et al., 2023):

$$\max_m \|\nabla^2 F_m(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \delta .$$

Larger value of  $\delta$  means higher heterogeneity on Hessian.

$$\|\nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 F(\mathbf{y})\| \leq H \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| .$$

Larger value of  $H$  means more drastic Hessian change.

*Results of simulated experiments.* As shown in Table 2, we use ten groups of objective functions with various degrees of heterogeneity. In fact, we construct the lower bounds in Theorem 3 with similar functions. As suggested by our theory, we set the learning rate of SFL be half of that of PFL. The experimental results of Table 2 are shown in Figure 1.

Overall, SFL outperforms PFL in all settings except the settings  $\delta = 0$  and  $H = 0$  (Groups 1, 6), which coincides with our theoretical conclusion. We attribute the unexpected cases to the limitations of existing works under Assumptions 5, 6 and 7, which omit the function of the global aggregation and thus underestimate the capacity of PFL (Wang et al., 2022). More specifically, the second-order information (Hessian) is not fully studied in existing works (Zindari et al., 2023).

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
$\begin{cases} F_1 = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + x \\ F_2 = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = \frac{3}{4}x^2 + x \\ F_2 = \frac{1}{4}x^2 - x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = x^2 + x \\ F_2 = -x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = (\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 + x \\ F_2 = (\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 - x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = (11\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 + x \\ F_2 = (11\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 - x \end{cases}$
$\zeta_* = 1, \delta = 0, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 1, \delta = \frac{1}{2}, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 1, \delta = 1, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 1, \delta = 0, H = \frac{1}{2}$	$\zeta_* = 1, \delta = 0, H = 1$
Group 6	Group 7	Group 8	Group 9	Group 10
$\begin{cases} F_1 = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + 10x \\ F_2 = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - 10x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = \frac{3}{4}x^2 + 10x \\ F_2 = \frac{1}{4}x^2 - 10x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = x^2 + 10x \\ F_2 = -10x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = (\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 + 10x \\ F_2 = (\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 - 10x \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} F_1 = (11\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 + 10x \\ F_2 = (11\mathbb{1}_{x<0} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{x\geq 0})x^2 - 10x \end{cases}$
$\zeta_* = 10, \delta = 0, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 10, \delta = \frac{1}{2}, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 10, \delta = 1, H = 0$	$\zeta_* = 10, \delta = 0, H = \frac{1}{2}$	$\zeta_* = 10, \delta = 0, H = 1$

Table 2: Settings of simulated experiments. Each group has two local objectives ( $M = 2$ ). Strictly speaking, the functions in Groups 4, 5, 9, 10 are not quadratic functions.




Figure 1: Simulations on quadratic functions ( $K = 10$  for all settings). It displays the experimental results of ten groups in Table 2. The top (bottom) row shows the first (last) five groups from left to right. Shaded areas show the min-max values.

## 6.2 Experiments on Real Data Sets

We next validate the theory *in cross-device settings* (Kairouz et al., 2021) where there are a very large number of clients, each with a relatively small number of data samples.

*Setup.* We consider the common CV tasks, with data sets including Fashion-MNIST (Xiao et al., 2017), CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009), CINIC-10 (Darlow et al., 2018). Specifically, we train a CNN model from Wang and Ji (2022) on Fashion-MNIST and a VGG-

9 model (Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014) from Lin et al. (2020) on CIFAR-10 and CINIC-10. We partition the training sets of Fashion-MNIST/CIFAR-10/CINIC-10 into 500/500/1000 clients by Extended Dirichlet strategy (Li and Lyu, 2023), with each client containing data samples from  $C = 1, 2, 5$  labels. Larger value of  $C$  means higher data heterogeneity. We spare the original test sets for computing test accuracy. We fix the number of participating clients per round to  $S = 10$ . We fix the number of local update steps to  $K = 5$  and the mini-batch size to 20 (about one single pass over the local data for each client) (Reddi et al., 2021). The local solver is SGD with learning rate being constant, momentum being 0 and weight decay being 0. We apply gradient clipping to both algorithms and tune the learning rate by grid search with a grid of  $\{10^{-2.5}, 10^{-2.0}, 10^{-1.5}, 10^{-1.0}, 10^{-0.5}\}$ .




Figure 2: Test accuracy curves on CIFAR-10 with various degrees of heterogeneity. For visualization, we apply moving average over a window length of 5 data points. The shaded areas show the standard deviation across 3 random seeds.

*SFL outperforms PFL on heterogeneous data.* The accuracy results on training data and test data for various tasks are collected in Table 3. In particular, the test accuracy curves on CIFAR-10 are shown in Figure 2. It can be observed (i) that when the level of heterogeneity is high (for example,  $C = 1, 2$ ) the performance of SFL is much better than that of PFL, and (ii) that when the level of heterogeneity is relatively low, the performances of both are close to each other. This is consistent with analyses in Subsections 5.1 and 5.2. Besides, on the more complex data set CINIC-10, the advantage of SFL seems to be even greater, which may be due to higher heterogeneity.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have derived the upper bounds of SFL for the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex objective functions on heterogeneous data. We validate that the upper bounds of SFL are tight by constructing the corresponding lower bounds of SFL in the strongly convex and general convex cases. We also make comparisons between the upper bounds of SFL and those of PFL. In the convex cases, the comparison results show a subtle difference under different heterogeneity assumptions. That is, under Assumption 5, the upper bounds of SFL are better than those of PFL strictly, while under Assumption 7, the upper bounds of SFL are still better unless the level of heterogeneity is very low. In the non-convex case under Assumption 6, the upper bounds of SFL are better without

Dataset	Method	$C = 1$		$C = 2$		$C = 5$	
		Train	Test	Train	Test	Train	Test
Fashion-MNIST	PFL	86.71 $\pm$ 1.87	85.77 $\pm$ 1.96	89.73 $\pm$ 1.23	88.55 $\pm$ 1.19	92.27 $\pm$ 0.57	90.70 $\pm$ 0.50
	SFL	88.86 $\pm$ 1.60	87.60 $\pm$ 1.56	91.33 $\pm$ 1.49	89.66 $\pm$ 1.41	92.83 $\pm$ 0.69	90.92 $\pm$ 0.64
CIFAR-10	PFL	76.48 $\pm$ 2.03	73.84 $\pm$ 1.90	85.92 $\pm$ 1.77	78.99 $\pm$ 1.43	94.55 $\pm$ 0.36	83.47 $\pm$ 0.48
	SFL	89.60 $\pm$ 2.29	81.05 $\pm$ 1.78	94.01 $\pm$ 0.97	83.34 $\pm$ 0.68	96.72 $\pm$ 0.50	84.73 $\pm$ 0.44
CINIC-10	PFL	53.36 $\pm$ 3.80	52.27 $\pm$ 3.61	65.38 $\pm$ 2.01	61.96 $\pm$ 1.81	74.97 $\pm$ 0.95	68.45 $\pm$ 0.81
	SFL	65.40 $\pm$ 3.57	61.52 $\pm$ 3.14	73.58 $\pm$ 2.32	67.31 $\pm$ 1.87	79.58 $\pm$ 1.42	70.82 $\pm$ 1.05

Table 3: Training and Test accuracy results with various degrees of heterogeneity in cross-device settings. We run PFL and SFL for 2000/5000/5000 training rounds on Fashion-MNIST/CIFAR-10/CINIC-10. Results are computed across three random seeds and the last 100 training rounds.

exception. Simulations on quadratic functions and experiments on real datasets validate that SFL outperforms PFL, at least, when the level of heterogeneity is relatively high.

Although this work has proved that SFL outperforms PFL on heterogeneous data with the standard assumptions, we believe the comparisons are still open. Are there any other conditions to overturn this conclusion? For example, new assumptions beyond the standard assumptions, new factors beyond data heterogeneity, new algorithms beyond vanilla PFL and SFL. One possible future direction is the convergence of PFL and SFL under Hessian assumptions to explain the unexpected results (Groups 1, 6) in Subsection 6.1.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2021YFB2900302, in part by the National Science Foundation of China under Grant 62001048, and in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grant 2242022k60006.

We thank the reviewers in NeurIPS 2023 for the insightful suggestions. We thank Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Ahmed Khaled, Shiqiang Wang for their kind help on the upper bounds. We thank Blake Woodworth, Shashank Rajput, Jaeyoung Cha, Jaewook Lee, Chulhee Yun for their kind help on the lower bounds.



# Appendix

---

<b>A</b>	<b>Notations</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Proofs of Theorem 1</b>	<b>19</b>
B.1	Strongly convex case . . . . .	19
B.1.1	Finding the Recursion . . . . .	20
B.1.2	Bounding the client drift with Assumption 5 . . . . .	21
B.1.3	Proof of strongly convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 . . . . .	23
B.2	General convex case . . . . .	24
B.2.1	Proof of general convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 . . . . .	24
B.3	Non-convex case . . . . .	24
B.3.1	Finding the recursion . . . . .	25
B.3.2	Bounding the client drift with Assumption 6 . . . . .	26
B.3.3	Proof of non-convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 . . . . .	28
B.4	Helpful Lemmas for Upper Bounds . . . . .	28
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 4</b>	<b>31</b>
C.1	Proof of Theorem 3 . . . . .	31
C.2	Proof of Corollary 4 . . . . .	31
C.2.1	Strongly Convex Case . . . . .	32
C.2.2	General Convex Case . . . . .	32
<b>D</b>	<b>Proof of Stochasticity Terms in Theorem 3</b>	<b>34</b>
D.1	Lower Bounds for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ and $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . . . . .	34
D.1.1	Lower Bound for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ . . . . .	34
D.1.2	Lower Bound for $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . . . . .	34
D.2	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$ . . . . .	35
D.2.1	Lower Bound of $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$ . . . . .	35
D.2.2	Lower Bound of $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$ . . . . .	36
D.2.3	Relationship Between $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)}) \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)}) < 0$ . . . . .	36
D.2.4	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$ . . . . .	37
D.3	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{101\lambda N} \leq \eta < \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . . . . .	37
D.4	Helpful Lemmas for Stochasticity Terms . . . . .	38
<b>E</b>	<b>Proof of Heterogeneity Terms in Theorem 3</b>	<b>40</b>
E.1	Lower Bounds for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$ and $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . . . . .	40
E.1.1	Lower Bound for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$ . . . . .	40

E.1.2	Lower Bound for $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	41
E.2	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$	41
E.2.1	Lower Bound of $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$	42
E.2.2	Lower Bound of $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0]$	46
E.2.3	Relationship Between $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} \geq 0)$ and $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} < 0)$	47
E.2.4	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$	48
E.3	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{101\lambda MK} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda K}$ and $\frac{1}{\lambda K} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	49
E.3.1	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{101\lambda MK} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda K}$	52
E.3.2	Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{\lambda K} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	52
E.4	Helpful Lemmas for Heterogeneity Terms	53

---

## Appendix A. Notations

Table 4 summarizes the notations appearing in this paper.

Symbol	Description
$R, r$	number, index of training rounds
$M, m$	number, index of clients
$K, k$	number, index of local update steps
$\mathcal{S}, S$	the set of participating clients and its size
$\pi$	$\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M\}$ is a permutation of $[M]$
$\eta, \tilde{\eta}$	learning rate, effective learning rate ( $\eta_{\text{SFL}} := \eta MK$ and $\eta_{\text{PFL}} := \eta K$ )
$L, \mu, \kappa$	constants in Asm. 1 and Asm. 2; conditional number $\kappa := L/\mu$
$\sigma_*, \sigma$	constants in Asm. 3 and Asm. 4 for stochasticity
$\zeta_*, \zeta(\beta), \hat{\zeta}$	constants in Asm. 5, Asm. 6 and Asm. 7 for heterogeneity
$\delta, H$	constants in Subsection 6.1 for Hessian
$F, F_m, f_m$	global objective, local objective and local component function
$\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$	global model parameters in the $r$ -th round
$\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$	local model parameters of the $m$ -th client after $k$ local steps in the $r$ -th round
$\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)}$	$\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)} := \nabla f_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}; \xi_{m,k}^{(r)})$ is the stochastic gradients of $F_{\pi_m}$ regarding $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$
$C$	each client containing data samples from $C$ labels (Subsec. 6.2)

Table 4: Summary of key notations.

*Bregman Divergence* associated with function  $h$  and arbitrary  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  is denoted as

$$D_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{y}) - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle .$$

When the function  $h$  is convex, the divergence is strictly non-negative.

For clarity, we will use “Term <sub>$n$</sub> ” to denote the  $n$ -th term on the right hand side in some equation in the following proofs.

## Appendix B. Proofs of Theorem 1

In this section, we provide the proofs of Theorem 1 for the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex cases in Subsections B.1, B.2 and B.3, respectively.

In the following proofs, we consider the partial client participation setting. So we assume that  $\pi = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M\}$  is a permutation of  $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  in a certain training round and only the first  $S$  selected clients  $\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_S\}$  will participate in this round. Unless otherwise stated, we use  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  to represent the expectation with respect to both types of randomness (i.e., sampling data samples  $\xi$  and sampling clients  $\pi$ ).

### B.1 Strongly convex case

In this subsection, we provide the proof of the strongly convex case of Theorem 1.

## B.1.1 FINDING THE RECURSION

**Lemma 6** *Let Assumptions 1, 4, 5 hold and assume that all the local objectives are  $\mu$ -strongly convex. If the learning rate satisfies  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right] &\leq \left( 1 - \frac{\mu\eta SK}{2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right] + 4SK\eta^2\sigma^2 + 4S^2K^2\eta^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta_*^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{3}SK\eta \mathbb{E} \left[ D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*) \right] + \frac{8}{3}L\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)}\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** According to Algorithm 1, the overall updates of SFL after one complete training round (with  $S$  clients selected for training) are

$$\Delta \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)} = -\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k}^{(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} [\Delta \mathbf{x}] = -\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}) \right].$$

In the following, we focus on a single training round, and hence we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while. For example, use  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}$  to replace  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$ . Specially, we would like to use  $\mathbf{x}$  to replace  $\mathbf{x}_{1,0}^{(r)}$ . Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ .

We start from the following equation:

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*, \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle] + \mathbb{E} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

By substituting the overall updates  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &2\mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*, \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle] \\ &= -2\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle] \\ &\leq -2\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}) - F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - L \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq -2SK\eta D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\mu SK\eta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + 2L\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Lemma 11 with  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{m,k}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}$  and  $h = F_{\pi_m}$  for the first inequality;

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\ &\leq 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k} - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k})) \right\|^2 + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}^*)) \right\|^2 + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}^*) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Next, let us bound the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (1) one by one:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Term}_1 \text{ in (1)} &= 4\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m, k} - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m, k})\|^2 & (\because \text{Lem. 10}) \\
 &\leq 4\eta^2 SK\sigma^2, & (\because \text{Asm. 4}) \\
 \text{Term}_2 \text{ in (1)} &\leq 4\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m, k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\
 &\leq 4L^2\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m, k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2, & (\because \text{Asm. 1}) \\
 \text{Term}_3 \text{ in (1)} &\leq 4\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\
 &\leq 8L\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} [D_{F_{\pi_m}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*)] & (\because \text{Asm. 1}) \\
 &= 8L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*), \\
 \text{Term}_4 \text{ in (1)} &\leq 4\eta^2 S^2 K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta_*^2. & (\because \text{Lem. 12})
 \end{aligned}$$

With the bounds for the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 &\leq 4\eta^2 SK\sigma^2 + 4\eta^2 S^2 K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta_*^2 \\
 &\quad + 8L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) + 4L^2\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}_{m, k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging back the bounds of  $2\mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*, \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle]$  and  $\mathbb{E} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2$  and using  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK}$  yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu\eta SK}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + 4SK\eta^2\sigma^2 + 4S^2K^2\eta^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta_*^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{2}{3}SK\eta D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{8}{3}L\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}_{m, k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows after recovering the superscripts and taking unconditional expectations.  $\blacksquare$

### B.1.2 BOUNDING THE CLIENT DRIFT WITH ASSUMPTION 5

Similar to the “client drift” in PFL (Karimireddy et al., 2020), the client drift in SFL is

$$E_r := \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}_{m, k}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)}\|^2]. \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 7** *Let Assumptions 1, 4, 5 hold and assume that all the local objectives are  $\mu$ -strongly convex. If the learning rate satisfies  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK}$ , then the client drift is bounded:*

$$E_r \leq \frac{9}{4}S^2K^2\eta^2\sigma^2 + \frac{9}{4}S^2K^3\eta^2\zeta_*^2 + 3LS^3K^3\eta^2\mathbb{E}\left[D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)\right].$$

**Proof** According to Algorithm 1, the overall updates of SFL from  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$  to  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$  are

$$\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)} = -\eta \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbf{g}_{\pi_i,j}^{(r)} \quad \text{with} \quad b_{m,k}(i) := \begin{cases} K-1, & i \leq m-1 \\ k-1, & i = m \end{cases}.$$

As done in Lemma 6, we focus on a single training round, and hence we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while. Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ .

Similar to what we have done for Ineq. (1), we can bound  $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$  with

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\ & \leq 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\mathbf{g}_{\pi_i,j} - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})) \right\|^2 + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2 \\ & \quad + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}^*)) \right\|^2 + 4\eta^2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}^*) \right\|^2}_{T_{m,k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Similarly, we bound the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (3):

$$\text{Term}_1 \text{ in (3)} \leq 4\eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{g}_{\pi_i,j} - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})\|^2 \leq 4\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sigma^2, \quad (\because \text{Lem. 10, Asm. 4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_2 \text{ in (3)} & \leq 4\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\ & \leq 4L^2\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\because \text{Asm. 1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_3 \text{ in (3)} & \leq 4\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\ & \leq 8L\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_{F_{\pi_i}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) \right] \quad (\because \text{Asm. 1}) \\ & \leq 8L\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2 D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*), \quad (\because \text{sampling}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_{m,k} := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}^{(i)}} 1 = (m-1)K+k$ . Then, plugging the bounds of  $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$  back into  $E_r$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} E_r &\leq 4\eta^2 \sigma^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} + 4L^2 \eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}^{(i)}} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 8L\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2 D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) + 4\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T_{m,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that the last term can be bounded by Lemma 13 with  $\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i} = \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}^*)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$  and using  $\sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \frac{1}{2}S^2K^2$  and  $\sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}S^3K^3$ , we can simplify the preceding inequality as

$$E_r \leq 2S^2K^2\eta^2\sigma^2 + 2L^2S^2K^2\eta^2E_r + \frac{8}{3}LS^3K^3\eta^2D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*) + 2S^2K^3\eta^2\zeta_*^2.$$

After rearranging the preceding inequality and using the condition  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK}$ , we get

$$E_r \leq \frac{9}{4}S^2K^2\eta^2\sigma^2 + \frac{9}{4}S^2K^3\eta^2\zeta_*^2 + 3LS^3K^3\eta^2D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*).$$

The claim follows after recovering the superscripts and taking unconditional expectations. ■

### B.1.3 PROOF OF STRONGLY CONVEX CASE OF THEOREM 1 AND COROLLARY 2

**Proof** Using Lemmas 6, 7 and  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK}$ , we can simplify the recursion as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu SK \eta}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] - \frac{1}{3}SK\eta \mathbb{E} [D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\ &\quad + 4SK\eta^2\sigma^2 + 4S^2K^2\eta^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)}\zeta_*^2 + 6LS^2K^2\eta^3\sigma^2 + 6LS^2K^3\eta^3\zeta_*^2. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta SK$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu \tilde{\eta}}{2}\right) \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] - \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{3} \mathbb{E} [D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{4\tilde{\eta}^2(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)} + \frac{6L\tilde{\eta}^3\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{6L\tilde{\eta}^3\zeta_*^2}{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Applying Lemma 14 with  $t = r$  ( $T = R$ ),  $\gamma = \tilde{\eta}$ ,  $r_t = \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2]$ ,  $a = \frac{\mu}{2}$ ,  $b = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $s_t = \mathbb{E} [D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)]$ ,  $w_t = (1 - \frac{\mu \tilde{\eta}}{2})^{-(r+1)}$ ,  $c_1 = \frac{4\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{4(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)}$ ,  $c_2 = \frac{6L\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{6L\zeta_*^2}{S}$  and  $\frac{1}{d} = \frac{1}{6L}$  ( $\tilde{\eta} = MK\eta \leq \frac{1}{6L}$ ), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \\ &\leq \frac{9}{2}\mu \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mu \tilde{\eta} R) + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta_*^2}{S}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)} = \frac{1}{W_R} \sum_{r=0}^R w_r \mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ . Note that there are no terms containing  $\gamma^3$  in Lemma 14. As the terms containing  $\gamma^3$  is not the determinant factor for the convergence rate, Lemma 14 can also be applied to this case (Koloskova et al., 2020). Thus, when  $\tilde{\eta} \asymp \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{\mu R}\right\}$  and  $R \geq 6\kappa$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)]$  is upper bounded by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\mu D^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\mu R}{12L}\right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu SKR} + \frac{(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{\mu SR(M-1)} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 SKR^2} + \frac{L\zeta_*^2}{\mu^2 SR^2}\right), \quad (6)$$

where  $D := \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|$ . Ineqs. (5), (6) are the bounds with partial participation. When  $S = M$ , we get the claim of the strongly convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2.  $\blacksquare$

## B.2 General convex case

In this subsection, we provide the proof of the general convex case of Theorem 1.

### B.2.1 PROOF OF GENERAL CONVEX CASE OF THEOREM 1 AND COROLLARY 2

**Proof** Letting  $\mu = 0$  in Ineq. (4), we get the recursion of the general convex case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2\right] - \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{3} \mathbb{E}\left[D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{4\tilde{\eta}^2(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)} + \frac{6L\tilde{\eta}^3\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{6L\tilde{\eta}^3\zeta_*^2}{S}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 15 with  $t = r$  ( $T = R$ ),  $\gamma = \tilde{\eta}$ ,  $r_t = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2]$ ,  $b = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $s_t = \mathbb{E}[D_F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{x}^*)]$ ,  $w_t = 1$ ,  $c_1 = \frac{4\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{4(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)}$ ,  $c_2 = \frac{6L\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{6L\zeta_*^2}{S}$  and  $\frac{1}{d} = \frac{1}{6L}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\right] \\ &\leq \frac{3\|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{\tilde{\eta}R} + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{12\tilde{\eta}(M-S)\zeta_*^2}{S(M-1)} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{18L\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta_*^2}{S}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)} = \frac{1}{W_R} \sum_{r=0}^R w_r \mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ . When  $\tilde{\eta} \asymp \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{D}{c_1^{1/2}R^{1/2}}, \frac{D^{2/3}}{c_2^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\right\}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)]$  is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{SKR}} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{S}{M}} \cdot \frac{\zeta_* D}{\sqrt{SR}} + \frac{(L\sigma^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{(SK)^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L\zeta_*^2 D^4)^{1/3}}{S^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LD^2}{R}\right), \quad (8)$$

where  $D := \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|$ . Ineqs. (7), (8) are the bounds with partial participation. When  $S = M$ , we get the claim of the general convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2.  $\blacksquare$

## B.3 Non-convex case

In this subsection, we provide the proof of the non-convex case of Theorem 1.



## B.3.1 FINDING THE RECURSION

**Lemma 8** *Let Assumptions 1, 4, 5 hold. If  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK(1+\beta^2/S)}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}) \right] &\leq -\frac{1}{6}SK\eta \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] + 2L\eta^2SK\sigma^2 + 2L\eta^2S^2K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)}\zeta^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{5}{6}L^2\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)}\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** In the following, we focus on a single training round, and hence we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while. Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ .

Since  $F$  is  $L$ -smooth, we start from the following equation:

$$\mathbb{E} [F(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x})] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \Delta\mathbf{x} \rangle] + \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

By substituting the overall updates  $\Delta\mathbf{x}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \Delta\mathbf{x} \rangle] \\ &= -\eta SK \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \frac{1}{S} \sum_{m=1}^S \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})) \right\rangle \right] \\ &\leq -\eta SK \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\eta SK \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\eta SK \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}L^2\eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2; \quad (\because \text{Asm. 1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}L\mathbb{E} \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2L\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m,k} - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k})) \right\|^2 + 2L\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2L\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2 + 2L\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2. \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us bound the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (9) one by one:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_1 \text{ in (9)} &= 2L\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{g}_{\pi_m, k} - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k})\|^2 & (\because \text{Lem. 10}) \\ &\leq 2L\eta^2 SK\sigma^2, & (\because \text{Asm. 4}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_2 \text{ in (9)} &\leq 2L\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x}_{m,k}) - \nabla F_{\pi_m}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\ &\leq 2L^3\eta^2 SK \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2, & (\because \text{Asm. 1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Term}_3 + \text{Term}_4 \text{ in (9)} \leq 2L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta^2 + 2L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 (1 + \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)}) \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2,$$

where we use Lemma 12 and Assumption 6 for the last inequality. Then, Plugging back the bounds of  $\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle]$  and  $\frac{1}{2} L \mathbb{E} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2$  and using  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK(1+\beta^2/S)}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [F(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x})] \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{6} SK\eta \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2L\eta^2 SK\sigma^2 + 2L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta^2 + \frac{5}{6} L^2 \eta \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows after recovering the superscripts and taking unconditional expectations. ■

### B.3.2 BOUNDING THE CLIENT DRIFT WITH ASSUMPTION 6

Next, we use Assumption 6 to bound the client drift (defined in Eq. (2)).

**Lemma 9** *Let Assumptions 1, 4, 6 hold. If  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK(1+\beta^2/S)}$ , then*

$$E_r \leq \frac{9}{4} S^2 K^2 \eta^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{9}{4} S^2 K^3 \eta^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{9}{4} (\beta^2/S + 1) S^3 K^3 \eta^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2].$$

**Proof** According to Algorithm 1, the overall updates of SFL from  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$  to  $\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)}$  are

$$\mathbf{x}_{m,k}^{(r)} - \mathbf{x}^{(r)} = -\eta \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbf{g}_{\pi_i, j}^{(r)} \quad \text{with} \quad b_{m,k}(i) := \begin{cases} K-1, & i \leq m-1 \\ k-1, & i = m \end{cases}.$$

We focus on a single training round, and hence we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while. Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ .

Similar to Lemma 7, we can bound  $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\
 & \leq 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\mathbf{g}_{\pi_i,j} - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})) \right\|^2 + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2 \\
 & \quad + 4\eta^2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})) \right\|^2}_{T_{m,k}} + 4\eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2. \tag{10}
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we bound the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (10):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Term}_1 \text{ in (10)} & \leq 4\eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{g}_{\pi_i,j} - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})\|^2 \leq 4\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sigma^2, \quad (\because \text{Lem. 10, Asm. 4}) \\
 \text{Term}_2 \text{ in (10)} & \leq 4\eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) - \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\
 & \leq 4L^2 \eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}\|, \quad (\because \text{Asm. 1})
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_{m,k} := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} 1 = (m-1)K + k$ . Then, plugging the bounds of  $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{m,k} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$  back into  $E_r$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_r & \leq 4\eta^2 \sigma^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} + 4L^2 \eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\
 & \quad + 4\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T_{m,k} + 4\eta^2 \sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Noting that the third term can be bounded by Lemma 13 with  $\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i} = \nabla F_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$  and using  $\sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \frac{1}{2} S^2 K^2$  and  $\sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3} S^3 K^3$ , we can simplify the preceding inequality as

$$E_r \leq 2S^2 K^2 \eta^2 \sigma^2 + 2L^2 S^2 K^2 \eta^2 E_r + 2S^2 K^3 \eta^2 \zeta^2 + 2(\beta^2/S + 1) S^3 K^3 \eta^2 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2.$$

After rearranging the preceding inequality and using  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK(1+\beta^2/S)}$ , we get

$$E_r \leq \frac{9}{4} S^2 K^2 \eta^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{9}{4} S^2 K^3 \eta^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{9}{4} (\beta^2/S + 1) S^3 K^3 \eta^2 \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|^2.$$

The claim follows after recovering the superscripts and taking unconditional expectations.  $\blacksquare$

## B.3.3 PROOF OF NON-CONVEX CASE OF THEOREM 1 AND COROLLARY 2

**Proof** Using Lemma 8, 9 and  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6LSK(1+\beta^2/S)}$ , we can simplify the recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}) \right] &\leq -\frac{1}{10} SK \eta \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] + 2L\eta^2 SK \sigma^2 + 2L\eta^2 S^2 K^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{15}{8} L^2 \eta^3 S^2 K^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{15}{8} L^2 \eta^3 S^2 K^3 \zeta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\tilde{\eta} := SK\eta$ , subtracting  $F^*$  from both sides and then rearranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathbf{x}^{(r+1)}) - F^* \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}) - F^* \right] - \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{10} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{2L\tilde{\eta}^2 \sigma^2}{SK} + 2L\tilde{\eta}^2 \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta^2 + \frac{15}{8} \frac{L^2 \tilde{\eta}^3 \sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{15}{8} \frac{L^2 \tilde{\eta}^3 \zeta^2}{S}. \end{aligned}$$

Then applying Lemma 15 with  $t = r$  ( $T = R$ ),  $\gamma = \tilde{\eta}$ ,  $r_t = \mathbb{E} [F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)}) - F^*]$ ,  $b = \frac{1}{10}$ ,  $s_t = \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2]$ ,  $w_t = 1$ ,  $c_1 = \frac{2L\sigma^2}{SK} + 2L \frac{M-S}{S(M-1)} \zeta^2$ ,  $c_2 = \frac{15}{8} \frac{L^2 \sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{15}{8} \frac{L^2 \zeta^2}{S}$  and  $\frac{1}{d} = \frac{1}{6L(1+\beta^2/S)}$  ( $\tilde{\eta} = \eta SK \leq \frac{1}{6L(1+\beta^2/S)}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{0 \leq r \leq R} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{10(F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F^*)}{\tilde{\eta}R} + \frac{20L\tilde{\eta}\sigma^2}{SK} + \frac{20L\tilde{\eta}\zeta^2(M-S)}{S(M-1)} + \frac{75L^2\tilde{\eta}^2\sigma^2}{4SK} + \frac{75L^2\tilde{\eta}^2\zeta^2}{4S}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

When  $\tilde{\eta} \asymp \min\{\frac{1}{L(1+\beta^2/S)}, \frac{A^{1/2}}{c_1^{1/2}R^{1/2}}, \frac{A^{1/3}}{c_2^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\}$ ,  $\min_{0 \leq r \leq R} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{(r)})\|^2]$  is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \frac{(L\sigma^2 A)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{SKR}} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{S}{M}} \cdot \frac{(L\zeta^2 A)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{SR}} + \frac{(L^2\sigma^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{(SK)^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{(L^2\zeta^2 A^2)^{1/3}}{S^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{LA(1+\beta^2/S)}{R} \right) \quad (12)$$

where  $A := F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F^*$ . Ineqs. (11), (12) are the bounds with partial participation. When  $S = M$ , we get the claim of the non-convex case of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2.  $\blacksquare$

## B.4 Helpful Lemmas for Upper Bounds

**Lemma 10 (Karimireddy et al. (2020))** *Let  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a sequence of random variables. And the random sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  satisfy that  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is a function of  $\xi_i, \xi_{i-1}, \dots, \xi_1$  for all  $i$ . Suppose that the conditional expectation is  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} [\mathbf{x}_i | \xi_{i-1}, \dots, \xi_1] = \mathbf{e}_i$  (i.e., the vectors  $\{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}_i\}$  form a martingale difference sequence with respect to  $\{\xi_i\}$ ), and the variance is bounded by  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} [\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}_i\|^2 | \xi_{i-1}, \dots, \xi_1] \leq \sigma^2$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}_i) \right\|^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}_i\|^2] \leq n\sigma^2.$$

**Proof** This lemma has appeared in Stich and Karimireddy (2019)’s Lemma 15, Karimireddy et al. (2020)’s Lemma 4 (separating mean and variance) and Wang et al. (2020)’s Lemma 2. It is useful for bounding the stochasticity. The proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

**Lemma 11 (Karimireddy et al. (2020))** *The following holds for any  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly convex function  $h$ , and any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  in the domain of  $h$ ,*

$$\langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y} \rangle \geq h(\mathbf{z}) - h(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 - L \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

**Proof** This is Karimireddy et al. (2020)’s Lemma 5. The proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

**Lemma 12 (Simple Random Sampling)** *Let  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  be fixed units (e.g., vectors). The population mean and population variance are give as*

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \quad \zeta^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2$$

Draw  $s \in [n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  random units  $\mathbf{x}_{\pi_1}, \mathbf{x}_{\pi_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\pi_s}$  randomly from the population. There are two possible ways of simple random sampling, well known as “sampling with replacement (SWR)” and “sampling without replacement (SWOR)”. For these two ways, the expectation and variance of the sample mean  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\pi := \frac{1}{s} \sum_{p=1}^s \mathbf{x}_{\pi_p}$  satisfies

$$\text{SWR} : \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\pi] = \bar{\mathbf{x}} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\pi - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2] = \frac{\zeta^2}{s} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{SWOR} : \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\pi] = \bar{\mathbf{x}} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\pi - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2] = \frac{n-s}{s(n-1)} \zeta^2 \quad (14)$$

**Proof** It consists of Mishchenko et al. (2020)’s Lemma 1 and Wang et al. (2020)’s Appendix G (Extension: Incorporating Client Sampling). The proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

**Lemma 13** *Under the same conditions of Lemma 12, use the way “sampling without replacement” and let  $b_{m,k}(i) = \begin{cases} K-1, & i \leq m-1 \\ k-1, & i = m \end{cases}$ . Then for  $S \leq M$  ( $M \geq 2$ ),*

$$\sum_{m=1}^S \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{b_{m,k}(i)} (\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} S^2 K^3 \zeta^2.$$

**Proof** It is a consequence of Lemma 12. The detailed proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

**Lemma 14 (Karimireddy et al. (2020))** *We consider two non-negative sequences  $\{r_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ ,  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , which satisfies the relation*

$$r_{t+1} \leq (1 - a\gamma)r_t - b\gamma s_t + c\gamma^2, \quad (15)$$

*for all  $t \geq 0$  and for parameters  $b > 0$ ,  $a, c \geq 0$  and the learning rate  $\gamma$  with  $0 \leq \gamma \leq \frac{1}{d}$ , for a parameter  $d > a$ .*

*Then there exists a constant learning rate  $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{d}$  and the weights  $w_t = (1 - a\gamma)^{-(t+1)}$  and  $W_T := \sum_{t=0}^T w_t$  such that*

$$\Psi_T := \frac{1}{W_T} \sum_{t=0}^T s_t w_t \leq \frac{3ar_0}{b}(1 - a\gamma)^{T+1} + \frac{c\gamma}{b} \leq \frac{3ar_0}{b} \exp(-a\gamma(T+1)) + \frac{c\gamma}{b}.$$

*By choosing  $\gamma = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, \frac{\ln(\max\{2, a^2 r_0 T / c\})}{aT} \right\}$ , for  $T \geq \frac{d}{2a}$ , we have*

$$\Psi_T = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( ar_0 \exp \left( -\frac{aT}{d} \right) + \frac{c}{aT} \right).$$

**Proof** This is Karimireddy et al. (2020)'s Lemma 1. The proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

**Lemma 15 (Koloskova et al. (2020))** *We consider two non-negative sequences  $\{r_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ ,  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , which satisfies the relation*

$$r_{t+1} \leq r_t - b\gamma s_t + c_1\gamma^2 + c_2\gamma^3, \quad (16)$$

*for all  $t \geq 0$  and for parameters  $b > 0$ ,  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$  and the learning rate  $\gamma$  with  $0 \leq \gamma \leq \frac{1}{d}$ .*

*Then there exists a constant learning rate  $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{d}$  and the weights  $w_t = 1$  and  $W_T := \sum_{t=0}^T w_t$  such that*

$$\Psi_T := \frac{1}{W_T} \sum_{t=0}^T s_t w_t \leq \frac{r_0}{b\gamma(T+1)} + \frac{c_1\gamma}{b} + \frac{c_2\gamma^2}{b}. \quad (17)$$

*By choosing  $\gamma = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{r_0}{c_1 T} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \left( \frac{r_0}{c_2 T} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{1}{d} \right\}$ , we have*

$$\Psi_T = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{dr_0}{T} + \frac{c_1^{\frac{1}{2}} r_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}{T^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{c_2^{\frac{1}{3}} r_0^{\frac{2}{3}}}{T^{\frac{2}{3}}} \right).$$

**Proof** This is Koloskova et al. (2020)'s Lemma 17. The proof is in Li and Lyu (2023). ■

## Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 4

In this section, we use the results in Appendices D and E to compose the final lower bounds.

For clarity, we have summarized the lower bounds and the corresponding setups for these regimes in Tables 5 and 6. Since we use the typical objective functions in Appendices D and E, we omit the step to verify that these functions satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 3 (see the proofs of Cha et al. (2023)'s Theorem 3.1 about this step if needed).

### C.1 Proof of Theorem 3

**Proof** For the stochasticity terms, we let  $\lambda = \mu/1010$  for  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ ,  $\lambda = \mu/1010$  and  $\lambda_0 = \mu$  for  $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$ ,  $\lambda = \mu$  for the other regimes. Then when initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[ \frac{\sigma}{\mu}, \frac{1}{160} \frac{\sigma}{\mu N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}, 0, \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right]^\top$ , for  $R \geq 51005$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}, \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu NR^2}, \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu N}, \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu NR^2} \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^{(R)} = [x_1^{(R)}, x_2^{(R)}, x_3^{(R)}, x_4^{(R)}]^\top$  and  $\mathbf{x}^* = [0, 0, 0, 0]^\top$ . Notably, these dimensions are orthogonal. For one single round in SFL, with  $N = MK$ , the lower bound is  $\Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR^2} \right)$ . It is well known that any first-order method which accesses at most  $MKR$  stochastic gradients with variance  $\sigma^2$  for a  $\mu$ -strongly convex objective will suffer error at least  $\mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} \right)$  in the worst case (Nemirovskij and Yudin, 1983; Woodworth et al., 2020a,b). Therefore, we get the lower bound of  $\Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR^2} \right)$  for stochasticity terms.

we let  $\lambda = \mu/1010$  for  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ ,  $\lambda = \mu/1010$  and  $\lambda_0 = \mu$  for  $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$ ,  $\lambda = \mu$  for the other regimes. With the same logic, when initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[ \frac{\zeta}{\mu}, \frac{1}{1600} \frac{\zeta}{\mu M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}, 0, 0, \frac{\zeta}{\mu} \right]^\top$ , for  $R \geq 51005$ , we can obtain the lower bound for heterogeneity terms,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu}, \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu MR^2}, \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu M}, \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu}, \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu MR^2} \right).$$

Combining these cases, we get the final lower bound of  $\Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR^2} + \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu MR^2} \right)$ . ■

### C.2 Proof of Corollary 4

**Proof** In this corollary, by using the small  $\eta = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{LMK} \right)$ , we can extend the lower bound in Theorem 3 to arbitrary weighted average global parameters  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)} = \frac{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r \mathbf{x}^{(r)}}{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r}$ , and even the general convex case.

When choosing the small  $\eta = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{LMK} \right)$ , we only need to consider the first two regimes  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$  and  $\frac{1}{2\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda MK}$  for both stochasticity terms and heterogeneity terms. Taking the stochasticity terms as an example, in these two regimes, we can lower bound  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r)}]$ , that is,  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r)}] \geq \frac{\lambda}{16} D_1^2$  ( $D_1 = |x^{(0)} - x^*|$  is the initial distance for the first

dimension.) for  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r)}] \geq \frac{\sigma}{160\lambda_0 M^{1/2}R}$  for  $\frac{1}{2\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda MK}$ . With these lower bounds, the arbitrary weighted average parameters  $\hat{x}^{(R)}$  can also be bounded readily

$$\hat{x}^{(R)} = \frac{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r x^{(r)}}{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r} \geq \frac{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r c}{\sum_{r=0}^R w_r} \geq c,$$

where  $c = \frac{\lambda}{16} D_1^2$  for  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$  and  $c = \frac{\sigma}{160\lambda_0 M^{1/2}R}$  for  $\frac{1}{2\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda MK}$ . The heterogeneity terms are similar and thus be omitted here (see the proofs of Cha et al. (2023)'s Theorem 3.3 for details if needed). In summary, we can get the same lower bound for  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}$  and  $\mathbf{x}^{(R)}$  in the first two regimes for stochasticity and heterogeneity.

### C.2.1 STRONGLY CONVEX CASE

For the stochasticity terms, we let  $\lambda = \mu$ ,  $\lambda_0 = L$  for these two regimes (with  $N = MK$ ), then when initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[ \frac{\sigma}{\mu}, \frac{1}{160} \frac{\sigma}{\mu M^{\frac{1}{2}} K^{\frac{1}{2}} R} \right]^T$ , for  $R \geq 51\kappa$ ,  $\kappa \geq 1010$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}, \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left( \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} \right).$$

Therefore, with the same logic in the proof of Theorem 3, we get the lower bound of  $\Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} \right)$  for stochasticity terms.

For heterogeneity terms, we let  $\lambda = \mu$ ,  $\lambda_0 = L$  for these two regimes, then when initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[ \frac{\zeta}{\mu}, \frac{1}{1600} \frac{\zeta}{\mu M^{\frac{1}{2}} R} \right]^T$ , for  $R \geq 51\kappa$  and  $\kappa \geq 1010$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{\zeta^2}{\mu}, \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left( \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} \right).$$

Therefore, we get the lower bound of  $\Omega \left( \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} \right)$  for heterogeneity terms.

Combining them, we get the lower bound of  $\Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu MKR} + \frac{L\sigma^2}{\mu^2 MKR^2} + \frac{L\zeta^2}{\mu^2 MR^2} \right)$ .

### C.2.2 GENERAL CONVEX CASE

As done in Woodworth et al. (2020b)'s Theorem 2 and Cha et al. (2023)'s Corollary 3.5, we need to choose  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0$  more carefully for the general convex case.

For the stochasticity terms, we let  $\lambda = \frac{L^{1/3}\sigma^{2/3}}{M^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}D^{2/3}}$ ,  $\lambda_0 = L$  for these two regimes. Here  $D^2 = D_1^2 + D_2^2$  is the initial distance (the distance to the optimum point  $[0, 0]^T$  here), and  $D_1$ ,  $D_2$  are the initial distance for the first, second dimensions. When initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[ D_1, \frac{1}{160} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda M^{\frac{1}{2}} K^{\frac{1}{2}} R} \right]^T$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \lambda D_1^2, \frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2} \right\} \right).$$

Since  $\lambda = \frac{L^{1/3}\sigma^{2/3}}{M^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}D^{2/3}}$ ,  $D^2 = D_1^2 + D_2^2$  and  $D_2^2 = \frac{1}{160^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2}$  imply

$$D_1^2 = D^2 - D_2^2 = \frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^3 MKR^2} - \frac{1}{160^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{160^2} \right) \frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2},$$



we can get

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega\left(\frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{L^{1/3}\sigma^{2/3}D^{4/3}}{M^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\right).$$

Besides, we need to consider the conditions, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010 &\implies R \geq 1010^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{LM^{1/2}K^{1/2}D}, \\ R \geq 51\lambda_0/\lambda &\implies R \geq 51^3 \cdot \frac{L^2 MKD^2}{\sigma^2}.\end{aligned}$$

For convenience, we can use a stronger condition  $R \geq 51^3 \max\left\{\frac{\sigma}{LM^{1/2}K^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2 MKD^2}{\sigma^2}\right\}$ .

For the heterogeneity terms, we let  $\lambda = \frac{L^{1/3}\zeta^{2/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}D^{2/3}}$ ,  $\lambda_0 = L$  for these two regimes. With the same logic as the above analysis, when initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[D_1, \frac{1}{1600} \frac{\zeta}{\lambda M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}\right]^\top$ , then for  $R \geq 51^3 \max\left\{\frac{\zeta}{LM^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2 MD^2}{\zeta^2}\right\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega\left(\frac{L^{1/3}\zeta^{2/3}D^{4/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\right).$$

Now, let use consider stochasticity and heterogeneity together. When initializing at  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \left[D_1, \frac{1}{160} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda M^{\frac{1}{2}} K^{\frac{1}{2}} R}, D_1, \frac{1}{1600} \frac{\zeta}{\lambda M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}\right]^\top$ , then for

$$R \geq 51^3 \max\left\{\frac{\sigma}{LM^{1/2}K^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2 MKD^2}{\sigma^2}, \frac{\zeta}{LM^{1/2}D}, \frac{L^2 MD^2}{\zeta^2}\right\},$$

it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \Omega\left(\frac{L^{1/3}\sigma^{2/3}D^{4/3}}{M^{1/3}K^{1/3}R^{2/3}} + \frac{L^{1/3}\zeta^{2/3}D^{4/3}}{M^{1/3}R^{2/3}}\right).$$

Adding the classic bound  $\Omega\left(\frac{\sigma D}{\sqrt{MKR}}\right)$  for the general convex case (Woodworth et al., 2020a,b) yields the final result. Notably,  $D$  is affected by stochasticity and heterogeneity, so we let the initialization points of the first and third dimensions are both  $D_1$ . For example, when dealing with stochasticity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}2D_1^2 &= D^2 - D_2^2 - D_4^2 \\ &= \max\left\{\frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2}, \frac{L\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 MR^2}\right\} - \frac{1}{160^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2} - \frac{1}{1600^2} \cdot \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{160^2}\right) \frac{L\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 MKR^2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{1600^2}\right) \frac{L\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 MR^2}.\end{aligned}$$

■

### Appendix D. Proof of Stochasticity Terms in Theorem 3

**Proof** We assume  $F_1 = F_2 = \dots = F_M = F$ , and then the task is to construct the lower bound of vanilla SGD, where one objective function is sampled with replacement for updates in each step:  $x_{n+1} = x_n - \eta \nabla f_{\pi_n}(x_n)$ . The results are summarized in Table 5. Notably,  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0$  in different regimes can be different.

Bound	Regime	Objective functions	Initialization
$\frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}$	$\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$	$f_{\pi_m}(x) = \lambda x^2$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{\sigma}{\lambda}$
$\frac{\lambda_0 \sigma^2}{\lambda^2 NR^2}$	$\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$	$f_{\pi_m}(x) = (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} + \sigma \tau_n x$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{1}{160} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$
$\frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda N}$	$\frac{1}{101\lambda N} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	$f_{\pi_m}(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2} x^2 + \sigma \tau_n x$	$x^{(0)} = 0$
$\frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}$	$\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	$f_{\pi_m}(x) = \lambda x^2$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{\sigma}{\lambda}$

Table 5: Lower bounds of SFL for stochasticity terms. It requires that  $R \geq 50.5\lambda_0/\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  in the regime  $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$ . We set  $N = MK$  in SFL.

#### D.1 Lower Bounds for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ and $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$

In this regime, we consider the following objective functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\pi_n}(x) &= \lambda x^2 \\ f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[f_{\pi_n}(x)] = \lambda x^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can soon build the relationship between  $x^{(R)}$  and  $x^{(0)}$ :  $x^{(R)} = (1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{NR} x^{(0)}$ .

##### D.1.1 LOWER BOUND FOR $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$

Since  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda NR}$  and  $(1 - \frac{1}{x})^x$  monotonically increasing when  $x \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(R)} &= (1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{NR} x^{(0)} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{NR})^{NR} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 x^{(0)} \geq \frac{1}{4} x^{(0)} \quad (\because N \geq 2) \\ F(x^{(R)}) &= \lambda \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 \geq \frac{\lambda}{16} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

If initializing  $x^{(0)} = \frac{\sigma}{\lambda}$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F(x^{(R)}) - F^*\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[F(x^{(R)})\right] \geq \frac{\lambda}{16} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{16} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda} = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}\right).$$

##### D.1.2 LOWER BOUND FOR $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$

Since  $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$  implies that  $(1 - 2\lambda\eta)^2 \geq 1$ , we have

$$F(x^{(R)}) = \lambda \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 = \lambda (1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{2NR} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 \geq \lambda \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2.$$

If initializing  $x^{(0)} = \frac{\sigma}{\lambda}$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E} [F(x^{(R)}) - F^*] = \mathbb{E} [F(x^{(R)})] \geq \lambda (x^{(0)})^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda} = \Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda} \right).$$

## D.2 Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$

In this regime, we consider the following functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\pi_n}(x) &= (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} + \tau_n \sigma x \\ f(x) &= \mathbb{E} [f_{\pi_n}(x)] = (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} \quad (\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_n$  is a random variable with equal probabilities of being either “+1” or “−1”. Next, we focus on a single round  $r$ , including  $N$  local steps in total, and thus we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while, for example, replacing  $x_n^{(r)}$  with  $x_n$ . Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $x_0$  when considering one single round.

The relationship between the current parameter  $x_n$  and the initial parameter  $x_0$  satisfies

$$x_n = x_0 - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_i < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_i \geq 0}) x_i - \eta \sigma \mathcal{E}_n. \quad (18)$$

### D.2.1 LOWER BOUND OF $\mathbb{E} [x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$

We first give an upper bound for  $\mathbb{E} [(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0}) x_n]$ , and then give the lower bound of  $\mathbb{E} [x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$  with it.

Since  $(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) x \leq \lambda_0 x$  and  $(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) x \leq \lambda x$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0}) x_n] &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) \mathbb{E} [(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0}) x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n \leq 0) \mathbb{E} [(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0}) x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n \leq 0] \\ &\leq \lambda_0 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) \mathbb{E} [x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] + \lambda \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n \leq 0) \mathbb{E} [x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n \leq 0]. \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

According to Eq. (18), we can bound  $\mathbb{E} [x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0]$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ x_0 - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_i < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_i \geq 0}) x_i - \eta \sigma \mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0 \right] \\ &\leq (1 - \lambda \eta) x_0 + \lambda_0 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} [|x_i - x_0| \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] - \eta \sigma \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0]. \end{aligned}$$

Then using  $\mathbb{E} [|x_i - x_0|] \geq \mathbb{E} [|x_i - x_0| \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0)$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) \geq \frac{1}{4}$  for the second term, and  $\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_n|] = 2\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_n > 0 \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0)$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n > 0] &\leq x_0 + 4\lambda_0 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} [|x_i - x_0|] - \frac{1}{2} \eta \sigma \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_n|] \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2525}\right) x_0 - \frac{6}{100} \eta \sigma \sqrt{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where Lemmas 18, 16 and the condition  $\lambda_0 \eta N \leq \frac{1}{101}$  is applied in the last inequality.

We bound  $\mathbb{E}[x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n \leq 0]$  with a looser bound as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x_n \mid \mathcal{E}_n \leq 0] &\leq x_0 + \mathbb{E}[|x_n - x_0| \mid \mathcal{E}_n \leq 0] \\ &\leq x_0 + 2\mathbb{E}[|x_n - x_0|] \quad (\because \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n \leq 0) \geq \tfrac{1}{2}) \\ &\leq \frac{51}{50}\lambda_0 x_0 + \frac{101}{50}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n} \end{aligned}$$

Then, back to Ineq. (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0})x_n] &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 \left( \left(1 + \frac{1}{2525}\right)x_0 - \frac{6}{100}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n} \right) + \frac{3}{4}\lambda \left( \frac{51}{50}x_0 + \frac{101}{50}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{253}{505}x_0 - \frac{1}{40}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x_N] &= x_0 - \eta \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_n < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_n \geq 0})x_n \quad (\because \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_N] = 0) \\ &\geq x_0 - \eta \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \frac{253}{505}\lambda_0 x_0 - \frac{1}{40}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n} \right) \\ &\geq \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 \eta N \right) x_0 + \frac{1}{60}\eta N^{\frac{3}{2}}\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 N \eta \right) \mathbb{E}[x^{(r)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0] + \frac{1}{60}\eta N^{\frac{3}{2}}\sigma.$$

#### D.2.2 LOWER BOUND OF $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$

With similar analyses in Subsubsection E.2.2 and Cha et al. (2023)' Lemma B.4, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 N \eta \right) \mathbb{E}[x^{(r)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0].$$

#### D.2.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} \geq 0)$ AND $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} < 0)$ .

With similar analyses in Subsubsection E.2.3 and Cha et al. (2023)' Lemma B.4, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} \geq 0) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

when starting from  $x^{(0)} \geq 0$ .

#### D.2.4 LOWER BOUND FOR $\frac{1}{2\lambda NR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 N}$

With the above bounds for  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)}] &= \mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0] \mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} \geq 0) + \mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0] \mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} < 0) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 N \eta\right) x^{(r)} + \frac{1}{120}\lambda_0 N^{\frac{3}{2}}\eta^2 \sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (\because \mathbb{P}(x^{(r)} \geq 0) \geq \frac{1}{2})$$

If  $x^{(r)} \geq \frac{1}{160} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{\lambda N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ , then using  $\eta \geq \frac{1}{2\lambda NR}$ , we have

$$x^{(r+1)} \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 N \eta\right) x^{(r)} + \frac{1}{120}\lambda_0 N^{\frac{3}{2}}\eta^2 \sigma \geq \frac{1}{160} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{\lambda N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}.$$

Therefore, if we set  $x^{(0)} \geq \frac{1}{160} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{\lambda N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ , then the final parameters will also maintain  $x^{(R)} \geq \frac{1}{160} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{\lambda N^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(x^{(R)}) - F(x^*)] = \mathbb{E}[F(x^{(R)})] \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_0}{1010} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(x^{(R)}\right)^2\right] = \Omega\left(\frac{\lambda_0 \sigma^2}{\lambda^2 N R^2}\right).$$

#### D.3 Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{101\lambda N} \leq \eta < \frac{1}{\lambda}$

In this regime, we consider the following functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\pi_n}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda x^2 + \tau_n \sigma x \\ f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[f_{\pi_n}(x)] = \frac{1}{2}\lambda x^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_n$  is a random variable with equal probabilities of being either “+1” or “−1”.

According to the result in Cha et al. (2023)’s Appendix B.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_N &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^N x_0 - \eta\sigma \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{N-n} \tau_n \\ \mathbb{E}[x_N^2] &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2N} x_0^2 + \eta^2 \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{N-n} \tau_n\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to Safran and Shamir (2020)’s Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{N-n} \tau_n\right)^2 &= \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2(N-n)} \mathbb{E}[\tau_n^2] + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i \neq n}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2N-n-i} \mathbb{E}[\tau_n \tau_i] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2(N-n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\because \mathbb{E}[\sigma_n \sigma_i] = \mathbb{E}[\sigma_n] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i] = 0)$$

Thus, we get

$$\eta^2 \sigma^2 \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2(N-n)} = \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2N}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^2} \eta^2 \sigma^2 \geq \frac{1 - \exp(-2\lambda\eta N)}{\lambda\eta(2 - \lambda\eta)} \eta^2 \sigma^2 \geq 0.009 \frac{\eta \sigma^2}{\lambda},$$

where we use  $\frac{1}{101\lambda N} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( x^{(R)} \right)^2 \right] &\geq (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2NR} \left( x^{(0)} \right)^2 + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2Nr} 0.009 \frac{\eta \sigma^2}{\lambda} \geq 0.009 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2 N}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) - F^* \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) \right] = \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( x^{(R)} \right)^2 \right] = \Omega \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda N} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we complete the proofs for all regimes for Stochasticity Terms in Theorem 3. The setups and final results are summarized in Table 5.  $\blacksquare$

#### D.4 Helpful Lemmas for Stochasticity Terms

**Lemma 16** *Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$  be independent random variables, each with equal probabilities of being either “+1” or “−1”. Let  $\mathcal{E}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i$  (with  $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0$ ). Then for any  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{5} \leq \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_n| \leq \sqrt{n}.$$

**Proof** For the upper bound, similar to Rajput et al. (2020)’s Lemma 12 and Cha et al. (2023)’s Lemma B.5, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_n| = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i \right| \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i \right)^2 \right]} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\tau_i)^2] + 2 \sum_{i < j \leq n-1} \mathbb{E}[\tau_i \tau_j]} = \sqrt{n}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_i \tau_j] = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ , due to independence.

For the lower bound, similar to Rajput et al. (2020)’s Lemma 12, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_n| = \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_{n-1}| + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} \tau_n = 0) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} \tau_n > 0) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} \tau_n < 0).$$

It can be seen that the last two terms can be canceled out,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} \tau_n > 0) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} > 0, \tau_n > 0) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} < 0, \tau_n < 0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} > 0) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tau_n > 0) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} < 0) \mathbb{P}(\tau_n < 0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} > 0) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} < 0). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} \tau_n = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n-1} = 0) = \mathbb{1}_{n-1 \text{ is even } \frac{\binom{n-1}{n-1/2}}{2^{n-1}}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_n| = \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{E}_{n-1}| + \mathbb{1}_{n-1 \text{ is even } \frac{\binom{n-1}{n-1/2}}{2^{n-1}}}.$$

According to Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.8,  $\binom{n}{n/2}$  can be estimated as  $2^n \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2n+\alpha_n}}{\sqrt{\pi(n+\alpha_{n/2})}}$  with  $0.333 \leq \alpha_{n/2}, \alpha_n \leq 0.354$  (Mortici), so we can get  $\binom{n}{n/2}/2^n \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}$ .

When  $n \geq 2$  is an even integer,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_n| &= \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_{n-1}| + \mathbb{1}_{n-1 \text{ is even}} \frac{\binom{n-1}{(n-1)/2}}{2^{n-1}} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_{n-2}| + \mathbb{1}_{n-2 \text{ is even}} \frac{\binom{n-1}{(n-1)/2}}{2^{n-1}} \\
 &\vdots \\
 &= \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_2| + \sum_{p=1}^{n/2-1} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n-2p}} \quad (\because \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_2| = 1) \\
 &\geq \frac{n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{5}.
 \end{aligned}$$

When  $n \geq 1$  is an odd integer,

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_{n+1}| = \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_n| + \mathbb{1}_{n \text{ is even}} \frac{\binom{n}{n/2}}{2^n} \implies \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_n| = \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_{n+1}| \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{5}.$$

Now we complete the proof of the bounds of  $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}_n|$  for any  $n \geq 0$ . ■

**Lemma 17** *Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$  be independent random variables, each with equal probabilities of being either “+1” or “−1”. Let  $\mathcal{E}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i$  (with  $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0$ ). Then, for any  $n \geq 0$ , the probability distribution of  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is symmetric with respect 0, and for any  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{4} \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n < 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

**Proof** When  $n = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n < 0) = 0$ . The distribution is symmetric trivially.

When  $n > 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = p) = \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{n}{(n+p)/2}}{2^n} = \frac{\binom{n}{(n-p)/2}}{2^n}, & n+p \bmod 2 = 0 \\ 0, & n+p \bmod 2 \neq 0 \end{cases}$  where the integer  $p$

satisfies  $-n \leq p \leq n$ . Thus, the distribution is symmetric with respect to 0.

When any integer  $n > 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 0) = \mathbb{1}_{n \text{ is even}} \frac{\binom{n}{n/2}}{2^n}$ . Letting  $g(n) = \frac{\binom{n}{n/2}}{2^n}$ , it can be validated that  $\frac{g(n+2)}{g(n)} = \frac{n+1}{n+2} < 1$ , so  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 0) = g(n) \leq g(n-2) \leq \dots \leq g(2) = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $n$  is even. Therefore,  $\frac{1}{2} \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n < 0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 0)) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ . ■

**Lemma 18** *Suppose that  $x_0 \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  and  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda N}$ . Then for  $0 \leq n \leq N$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}|x_n - x_0| \leq \frac{1}{100}x_{1,0} + \frac{101}{100}\eta\sigma\sqrt{n}$$

**Proof** With result of Lemma 16, the proof is identical to Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.7, except the numerical factors, to be consistent with the constants used in Appendix E. ■

### Appendix E. Proof of Heterogeneity Terms in Theorem 3

**Proof** We assume  $F_m = f_m(\cdot; \xi_m^1) = \dots = f_m(\cdot; \xi_m^{|\mathcal{D}_m|})$  for each  $m$ , and then extend the works of SGD-RR to SFL, from performing one update step to performing multiple update steps on each local objective function. The results are summarized in Table 6. Notably,  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0$  in different regimes can be different.

Bound	Regime	Objective functions	Initialization
$\frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda}$	$\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$	$F_m(x) = \lambda x^2$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{\zeta}{\lambda}$
$\frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda MR^2}$	$\frac{1}{2\lambda MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$	$F_m(x) = \begin{cases} (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{1}{1600} \frac{\zeta}{\lambda M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$
$\frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda M}$	$\frac{1}{101\lambda MK} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda K}$	$F_m(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{2} x^2 + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ \frac{\lambda}{2} x^2 - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$x^{(0)} = 0$
$\frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda}$	$\frac{1}{\lambda K} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	$F_m(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{2} x^2 + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ \frac{\lambda}{2} x^2 - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$x^{(0)} = 0$
$\frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda}$	$\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$	$F_m(x) = \lambda x^2$	$x^{(0)} = \frac{\zeta}{\lambda}$

Table 6: Lower bounds of SFL for heterogeneity terms. It requires that  $R \geq 50.5\lambda_0/\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  in the regime  $\frac{1}{2\lambda MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$ .

#### E.1 Lower Bounds for $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$ and $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$

In this regime, we consider the following objective functions

$$F_m(x) = \lambda x^2$$

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M F_m(x) = \lambda x^2.$$

We can soon build the relationship between  $x^{(R)}$  and  $x^{(0)}$ ,  $x^{(R)} = (1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{MKR} x^{(0)}$ .

##### E.1.1 LOWER BOUND FOR $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$

Since  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda MKR}$  and  $(1 - \frac{1}{x})^x$  monotonically increasing when  $x \geq 1$ , we have

$$x^{(R)} = (1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{MKR} x^{(0)} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{MKR}\right)^{MKR} x^{(0)} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 x^{(0)} \geq \frac{1}{4} x^{(0)} \quad (\because M \geq 2)$$

$$F(x^{(R)}) = \lambda \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 \geq \frac{\lambda}{16} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2.$$

If initializing  $x^{(0)} = \frac{\zeta}{\lambda}$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) - F^* \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) \right] \geq \frac{\lambda}{16} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{16} \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda} = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda} \right).$$



### E.1.2 LOWER BOUND FOR $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$

Since  $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}$  implies that  $(1 - 2\lambda\eta)^2 \geq 1$ , we have

$$F(x^{(R)}) = \lambda \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 = \lambda(1 - 2\lambda\eta)^{2MKR} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 \geq \lambda \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2.$$

If initializing  $x^{(0)} = \frac{\zeta}{\lambda}$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) - F^* \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) \right] \geq \lambda \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 = \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda} = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda} \right).$$

### E.2 Lower Bound for $\frac{1}{\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$

In this regime, we consider the following functions

$$F_m(x) = \begin{cases} (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M F_m(x) = (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} \quad (\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010).$$

Next, we focus on a single round  $r$ , and thus we drop the superscripts  $r$  for a while, e.g., replacing  $x_{m,k}^{(r)}$  with  $x_{m,k}$ . Unless otherwise stated, the expectation is conditioned on  $x_{1,0}$  when considering one single round. The proofs in this regime have a similar structure as Cha et al. (2023)'s Theorem 3.1, however, are more complex than theirs.

In each training round, we sample a random permutation  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M)$  ( $\pi_m$  is its  $m$ -th element) from  $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  as the clients' training order. Then, we can denote  $F_{\pi_m}$  for  $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  as  $F_{\pi_m}(x) = (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \frac{x^2}{2} + \zeta \tau_m x$ , where  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_M)$  ( $\tau_m$  is its  $m$ -th element) is a random permutation of  $\frac{M}{2} + 1$ 's and  $\frac{M}{2} - 1$ 's. For example, assuming that  $\pi = (4, 2, 3, 1)$  (with  $M = 4$ ), we can get the corresponding coefficients  $\tau = (-1, +1, -1, +1)$ .

Then, the relationship between the current parameter  $x_{m,k}$  and the initial parameter of the first client  $x_{1,0}$  satisfies

$$x_{m,k} = x_{1,0} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} ((\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{i,j} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{i,j} \geq 0}) x_{i,j}) - K\zeta \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tau_i$$

$$- \eta \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} ((\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{i,j} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{i,j} \geq 0}) x_{m,j}) - k\zeta \tau_m.$$

For convenience, we write it as

$$x_{m,k} = x_{1,0} - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \left( (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \geq 0}) x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \right) - K\eta\zeta \mathcal{A}_{m,k}, \quad (20)$$

where  $b_1(i) := \lfloor \frac{i}{K} \rfloor + 1$ ,  $b_2(i) := i - K \lfloor \frac{i}{K} \rfloor$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} := \mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m = \tau_1 + \tau_2 \cdots + a_k \tau_m$  ( $\mathcal{E}_m := \tau_1 + \tau_2 \cdots + \tau_m$  and  $a_k := k/K$ ) and  $\mathcal{B}_{m,k} = \sum_{i=0}^{(m-1)K+k-1} 1 = (m-1)K + k$ . In particular, when  $m = M+1$  and  $k = 0$ , it follows that

$$x_{M+1,0} = x_{1,0} - \eta \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} ((\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0}) x_{m,k}) . \quad (21)$$

Notably, the following notations  $x_{m+1,0}$  and  $x_{m,K}$  are equivalent. In this paper, we would like to use  $x_{m+1,0}$  instead of  $x_{m,K}$ .

### E.2.1 LOWER BOUND OF $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0]$ .

We first give a stricter upper bound of  $\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0}) x_{m,k}]$  for  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$ , and then give a general upper bound for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ . These two upper bounds are then plugged into Eq. (21), yielding the targeted lower bound of  $\mathbb{E}[x_{M+1,0} \mid x_{1,0} \geq 0]$ .

Since  $(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0})x \leq \lambda_0 x$  and  $(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0})x \leq \lambda x$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0}) x_{m,k}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0}) x_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0}) x_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0) \\ &\leq \lambda_0 \mathbb{E}[x_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) + \lambda \mathbb{E}[x_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Intuitively, this is a trick, using  $\lambda_0$  for the former term and  $\lambda$  for the latter term, so we can make the former term (which has a stricter bound) dominant by controlling the value of  $\lambda_0/\lambda$ . Next, we bound the terms on the right hand side in Ineq. (22). For the first term in Ineq. (22), according to Ineq. (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[x_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ x_{1,0} - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} ((\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \geq 0}) x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)}) - K\eta\zeta \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0 \right] \\ &= x_{1,0} + \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \geq 0}) |x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \\ & \quad - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \geq 0}) x_{1,0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] - K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \\ &\leq x_{1,0} + \lambda_0 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] - K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] , \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\lambda \leq (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0}) \leq \lambda_0$  and  $x_{1,0} \geq 0$  in the last inequality. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_1 \text{ in (22)} &\leq \lambda_0 x_{1,0} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) + \lambda_0^2 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \\ &\quad - \lambda_0 K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) . \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0)$  are non-negative, the term  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0)$  appearing in the second term in the preceding inequality can be bounded by  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}|]$  for any integers  $i, j$ . Since the probability distribution of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$  is symmetric with respect to 0 (Lemma 22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) + \mathbb{E}[-\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) + \mathbb{E}[-\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid -\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(-\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by symmetry})$$

After using  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  by symmetry,  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \leq \mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}|]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] = 2\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0)$  for the first, the second and the last terms on the right hand side, respectively, we have

$$\text{Term}_1 \text{ in (22)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \lambda_0^2 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|]. \quad (23)$$

For the second term on the right hand side in Ineq. (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_2 \text{ in (22)} &\leq \lambda \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}| \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0) + \lambda \mathbb{E}[x_{1,0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0] \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} \leq 0) \\ &\leq \lambda \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] + \frac{5}{6}\lambda x_{1,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we use  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) \geq \frac{1}{6}$  (Lemma 22) for the second term on the right hand side in the last inequality. Plugging Ineq. (23) and Ineq. (24) into Ineq. (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \lambda_0^2 \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] + \lambda \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] + \frac{5}{6}\lambda x_{1,0}. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}|] \leq \frac{1}{100}x_{1,0} + \frac{101}{100}K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}$  for  $(i-1)K+j \leq (m-1)K+k$  (Lemma 23),  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \geq \frac{1}{20}\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}$  (Lemma 21) and  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  and  $\lambda_0\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \lambda_0 MK\eta \leq \frac{1}{101}$ , we can simplify it as

$$\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] \leq \frac{501}{1000}\lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \frac{14}{1000}\lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}. \quad (25)$$

Ineq. (25) holds for  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$  ( $M \geq 4$ ) and  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , due to the constraints of Lemmas 21, 22 and 23. Even though the constraint of Lemma 22 excludes the case  $m=1, k=0$ , we can verify  $\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{1,0} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{1,0} \geq 0})x_{1,0}] = \lambda x_{1,0} \leq \frac{1}{1010}\lambda_0 x_{1,0}$  ( $x_{1,0} \geq 0$ ).

Details of Ineq. (25).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 + \frac{\lambda_0^3 \eta^2 \mathcal{B}_{m,k}^2}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} + \frac{\lambda \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} + \frac{5}{6}\lambda \right) x_{1,0} \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{40} - \frac{\lambda_0^2 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} - \frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \right) K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  and  $\lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \lambda_0 M K \eta \leq \frac{1}{101}$  (it implies  $\frac{\lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \leq \frac{1}{100}$  and  $\frac{1}{1 - \lambda_0 \eta \mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \leq \frac{101}{100}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{10100} + \frac{1}{101000} + \frac{5}{6060} \right) \lambda_0 x_{1,0} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{40} - \frac{1}{100} - \frac{1}{1000} \right) \lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2} \\ &\leq \frac{501}{1000} \lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \frac{14}{1000} \lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we note  $\frac{1}{10100} + \frac{1}{101000} + \frac{5}{6060} \leq \frac{1}{1010} \left( \frac{1}{10} + \frac{1}{100} + \frac{5}{6} \right) \leq \frac{1}{1010} \leq \frac{1}{1000}$ .

Next, we give a general upper bound of  $\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}]$  for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\lambda x_{m,k}] \quad (\because (\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0})x \leq \lambda x \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}) \\ &\leq \lambda \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] + \lambda x_{1,0} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1000} \lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \frac{1}{1000} \lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where we use Lemma 23 and  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  in the last inequality. Notably, this inequality holds for  $1 \leq m \leq M$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$  ( $\because$  Lemma 23).

Recalling Eq. (21), we first separate the sum of  $\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}]$  into two parts, and then use the tighter bound, Ineq. (25), for  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$  (the first part) and the general bound, Ineq. (26), for  $\frac{M}{2} + 2 \leq m \leq M$  (the second part).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x_{M+1,0} - x_{1,0}] &= -\eta \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} < 0} + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{m,k} \geq 0})x_{m,k}] \\ &\geq -\eta \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( \frac{501}{1000} \lambda_0 x_{1,0} - \frac{14}{1000} \lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left( \frac{1}{1000} \lambda_0 x_{1,0} + \frac{1}{1000} \lambda_0 K \eta \zeta \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, after simplifying the preceding inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[x_{M+1,0}] \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 MK\eta\right) x_{1,0} + \frac{1}{600}\lambda_0 M^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \eta^2 \zeta.$$

Taking unconditional expectations and putting back the superscripts, we can get

$$\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0] \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 MK\eta\right) \mathbb{E}[x^{(r)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0] + \frac{1}{600}\lambda_0 M^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \eta^2 \zeta. \quad (27)$$

where we note that the following notations are interchangeable:  $x_{1,0}^{(r)}$  and  $x^{(r)}$ ,  $x_{M+1,0}^{(r)}$  and  $x^{(r+1)}$ . Notably, Ineq. (27) holds for  $M \geq 4$ , because of the constraints of Ineq. (25).

Details of Ineq. (27).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x_{M+1,0} - x_{1,0}] &\geq -\lambda_0 \eta x_{1,0} \underbrace{\left( \frac{501}{1000} \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 1 + \frac{1}{1000} \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 1 \right)}_{T_1} \\ &\quad + \lambda_0 K \eta^2 \zeta \underbrace{\left( \frac{14}{1000} \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2} - \frac{1}{1000} \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2} \right)}_{T_2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the terms containing  $\lambda_0 \eta x_{1,0}$ , we have

$$T_1 = \frac{501}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} + 1 \right) K + \frac{1}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} - 1 \right) K \leq \left( \frac{251}{1000} M + \frac{500}{1000} \right) K \leq \frac{2}{3} MK. \quad (\because M \geq 2)$$

For the terms containing  $\lambda_0 K \eta^2 \zeta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\sqrt{m-1} + a_k) - \frac{1}{1000} \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\sqrt{m-1} + a_k) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} K \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} - \frac{1}{1000} K \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sqrt{m-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} + 1 \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} a_k - \frac{1}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} - 1 \right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} a_k. \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x+y) \leq \sqrt{x^2+y^2} \leq x+y$  for  $x \geq 0, y \geq 0$  with  $x = \sqrt{m-1} \geq 0$  and  $y = a_k \geq 0$  in the first inequality. In the preceding inequality, for the last two terms, we note that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} + 1 \right) - \frac{1}{1000} \left( \frac{M}{2} - 1 \right) > 0$ ; for the first two terms, since  $\sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} = \sum_{m=2}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} \geq$

$\int_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} dm$  and  $\sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sqrt{m-1} \leq \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+1}^M \sqrt{m-1} \leq \int_{m=\frac{M}{2}+1}^{M+1} \sqrt{m-1} dm$ , then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_2 &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} K \sum_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} - \frac{1}{1000} K \sum_{m=\frac{M}{2}+2}^M \sqrt{m-1} \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{14}{1000} K \int_{m=1}^{\frac{M}{2}+1} \sqrt{m-1} dm - \frac{1}{1000} K \int_{m=\frac{M}{2}+1}^{M+1} \sqrt{m-1} dm \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{14}{1000} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{M}{2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} K - \frac{1}{1000} \left( \frac{2}{3} M^{\frac{3}{2}} - \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{M}{2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) K \\
 &= \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{14}{1000} M^{\frac{3}{2}} K - \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{1000} \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \right) M^{\frac{3}{2}} K \\
 &\geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \left( \frac{14/4}{1000} - \frac{1}{1000} \right) M^{\frac{3}{2}} K \\
 &= \frac{1}{600} M^{\frac{3}{2}} K.
 \end{aligned}$$

E.2.2 LOWER BOUND OF  $\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0]$ .

We introduce a new function  $H(x)$  (see Subsection E.3 for details) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_m(x) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda_0}{2} x^2 + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ \frac{\lambda_0}{2} x^2 - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 H(x) &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M H_m(x) = \frac{\lambda_0}{2} x^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let Algorithm 1 run on the two functions  $F(x)$  and  $H(x)$ , where both algorithms start from the same initial point and share the same random variables  $\{\tau_{m,k}^{(r)}\}_{k,m,r}$  for all training rounds. Then, according to Part 1 of Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.4, the model parameters generated on  $F(x)$  and  $H(x)$  satisfy  $(x_{m,k})_F \geq (x_{m,k})_H$ . Here, we let both cases share the same initial point  $x_{1,0}$  and the same random variables  $\pi$  (accordingly, the same  $\tau$ ).

The relationship between  $(x_{M+1,0})_H$  and  $x_{1,0}$  satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[(x_{M+1,0})_H] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{MK} x_{1,0} - \eta \zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^k \right] \\
 &= (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{MK} x_{1,0} - \eta \zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{mK} \mathbb{E}[\tau_{M-m}] \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^k \\
 &= (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{MK} x_{1,0}. \quad (\because \mathbb{E}[\tau_{M-m}] = 0)
 \end{aligned}$$

Then since  $(1 - z)^K \leq 1 - Kz + K^2 z^2$ ,  $\forall z \in [0, 1]$ , we can get

$$(1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{MK} \leq 1 - \lambda_0 MK \eta + \lambda_0^2 M^2 K^2 \eta^2 \leq 1 - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_0 MK \eta. \quad (\because \lambda_0 MK \eta \leq \frac{1}{101})$$

Then using  $(x_{m,k})_F \geq (x_{m,k})_H$  and  $x_{1,0} < 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(x_{M+1,0})_F] \geq \mathbb{E}[(x_{M+1,0})_H] = (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} x_{1,0} \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 MK\eta\right) x_{1,0}.$$

Taking unconditional expectations and putting back the superscripts, we can get

$$\mathbb{E}[x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0] \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\lambda_0 MK\eta\right) \mathbb{E}[x^{(r)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0]. \quad (28)$$

### E.2.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)}) \geq 0$ AND $\mathbb{P}(x^{(r)}) < 0$ .

We still use the function  $H(x)$  for comparison. This time, we let both cases share the same initial point  $x^{(0)}$  and the same  $\tau^{(0)}, \tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(r-1)}$  for the first  $r$  rounds. For any round  $r$ , we can build the relationship of  $(x^{(r)})_H$  with  $x^{(0)}$ :

$$(x^{(r)})_H = (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)} - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{sMK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1-s)}.$$

Details of finding the relationship between  $(x^{(r)})_H$  and  $x^{(0)}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} (x^{(r)})_H &= (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} (x^{(r-1)})_H - \eta\zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1)} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \\ &= (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} (x^{(r-1)})_H - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1)} \\ &= (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} \left( (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} (x^{(r-2)})_H - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-2)} \right) \\ &\quad - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1)} \\ &= (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{2MK} (x^{(r-2)})_H - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{MK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-2)} \\ &\quad - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1)} \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &= (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)} - \eta\zeta \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{mK} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} (1 - \lambda_0\eta)^{sMK} \tau_{M-m}^{(r-1-s)} \end{aligned}$$

For all possible permutations  $\tau^{(0)}, \tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(r-1)}$ , we can find the corresponding permutations  $(\tau^{(0)})', (\tau^{(1)})', \dots, (\tau^{(r-1)})'$  satisfy  $\tau_m^{(s)} = -(\tau_m^{(s)})'$  for all  $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  and  $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ . Denoting the parameters obtained with  $\tau^{(0)}, \tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(r-1)}$  and

$(\tau^{(0)})', (\tau^{(1)})', \dots, (\tau^{(r-1)})'$  as  $(x^{(r)})_H$  and  $(x^{(r)})'_H$ , respectively, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( (x^{(r)})_H + (x^{(r)})'_H \right) = (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)}.$$

where the second terms of  $(x^{(r)})_H$  and  $(x^{(r)})'_H$  are canceled out,  $\frac{\tau_{M-m}^{(r-1-s)} + (\tau_{M-m}^{(r-1-s)})'}{2} = 0$ . This means that for any possible parameter  $(x^{(r)})_H$ , there exists one corresponding parameter  $(x^{(r)})'_H$  to make their average be  $(1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)}$ , and further implies

$$\mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_H \geq (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then, for the same initial point  $x^{(0)} \geq 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_F \geq 0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_H \geq 0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_H \geq (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Intuitively, the total possible number of events (the permutations) are identical for both  $F$  and  $H$ . Since  $(x^{(r)})_F \geq (x^{(r)})_H$  for the same permutations, the permutations that make  $(x^{(r)})_H \geq 0$  always make  $(x^{(r)})_F \geq 0$ , causing  $\mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_F \geq 0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left( (x^{(r)})_H \geq 0 \right)$ . Similar for the second inequality, the permutations that make  $(x^{(r)})_H \geq (1 - \lambda_0 \eta)^{rMK} x^{(0)}$  always make  $(x^{(r)})_H \geq 0$  for  $x^{(0)} \geq 0$ .

#### E.2.4 LOWER BOUND FOR $\frac{1}{\lambda_0 MKR} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda_0 MK}$

Using Ineq. (27), Ineq. (28) and  $\mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} \geq 0 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$  (when  $x^{(0)} \geq 0$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ x^{(r+1)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} \geq 0 \right] \mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} \geq 0 \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[ x^{(r+1)} \mid x^{(r)} < 0 \right] \mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} < 0 \right) \\ &\geq \left( \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_0 MK \eta \right) x^{(r)} + \frac{1}{600} \lambda_0 M^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \eta^2 \zeta \right) \mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} \geq 0 \right) \\ &\quad + \left( \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_0 MK \eta \right) x^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} < 0 \right) \\ &\geq \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_0 MK \eta \right) x^{(r)} + \frac{1}{1200} \lambda_0 M^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \eta^2 \zeta. \quad (\because \mathbb{P} \left( x^{(r)} \geq 0 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

If  $x^{(r)} \geq \frac{1}{1600} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_0 M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ , then using  $\eta \geq \frac{1}{2\lambda_0 MKR}$ , we have

$$x^{(r+1)} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_0 MK \eta \right) x^{(r)} + \frac{1}{1200} \lambda_0 M^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \eta^2 \zeta \geq \frac{1}{1600} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_0 M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}.$$

Therefore, if we set  $x^{(0)} \geq \frac{1}{1600} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_0 M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ , then the final parameters will also maintain  $x^{(R)} \geq \frac{1}{1600} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_0 M^{\frac{1}{2}} R}$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^R) - F(x^*) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^R) \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_0}{1010} \mathbb{E} \left[ (x^R)^2 \right] = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda_0 MR^2} \right).$$

Notably, this inequality holds for  $M \geq 4$  (see Ineq. (27)).



**E.3 Lower Bound for  $\frac{1}{101\lambda MK} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda K}$  and  $\frac{1}{\lambda K} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$** 

In these two regimes, we consider the following functions

$$F_m(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{2}x^2 + \zeta x, & \text{if } m \leq \frac{M}{2} \\ \frac{\lambda}{2}x^2 - \zeta x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M F_m(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2}x^2.$$

In each training round, we sample a random permutation  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M)$  ( $\pi_m$  is its  $m$ -th element) from  $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  as the clients' training order. Thus, we can denote  $F_{\pi_m}$  for  $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  as  $F_{\pi_m}(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2}x^2 + \zeta\tau_m x$ , where  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_M)$  is a random permutation of  $\frac{M}{2} + 1$ 's and  $\frac{M}{2} - 1$ 's.

For a single training round, we can get

$$x^{(r)} = (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK} x^{(r-1)} - \eta\zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k.$$

The relationship between  $x_{m,k}$  between  $x_{1,0}$  satisfies

$$x_{m,k} = x_{m,k-1} - \eta \nabla F_{\pi_m}(x_{m,k-1}) = x_{m,k-1} - \eta(\lambda x_{m,k-1} + \tau_m \zeta) = (1 - \lambda\eta)x_{m,k-1} - \eta\zeta\tau_m.$$

The relationship between  $x_{m+1,0}$  and  $x_{m,0}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} x_{m+1,0} &= x_{m,K} = (1 - \lambda\eta)x_{m,K-1} - \eta\zeta\tau_m \\ &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^2 x_{m,K-2} - (1 - \lambda\eta)\eta\zeta\tau_m - \eta\zeta\tau_m \\ &\vdots \\ &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^K x_{m,0} - \eta\zeta\tau_m \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \end{aligned}$$

The relationship between  $x_{M+1,0}$  and  $x_{1,0}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} x_{M+1,0} &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^K x_{M,0} - \eta\zeta\tau_M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \\ &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2K} x_{M-1,0} - \eta\zeta\tau_{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^K \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k - \eta\zeta\tau_M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \\ &\vdots \\ &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK} x_{1,0} - \eta\zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \end{aligned}$$

For clarity, we recover the superscripts  $r$  for  $x_{M+1,0}$  and  $x_{1,0}$ , i.e., replacing  $x_{M+1,0}$  with  $x^r$ , and replacing  $x_{1,0}$  with  $x^{(r-1)}$ . However, we still focus on one single training round.

Taking expectation conditional on  $x^{(r-1)}$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK} x^{(r-1)} - \eta\zeta \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_{M-m} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \right)^2 \right] \\ &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + \eta^2 \zeta^2 \left( \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^k \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m \right)^2 \right]\end{aligned}$$

where we note that the cross terms on the right hand side equal zero since  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{M-m}] = 0$ . Following Safran and Shamir (2020)'s Lemma 1, we first focus on the term

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} \mathbb{E} [\tau_m^2] + \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{(i+j)K} \mathbb{E} [\langle \tau_i, \tau_j \rangle].$$

Since  $\tau_m^2 = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E} [\langle \tau_i, \tau_j \rangle] = -\frac{1}{M-1}$  (see Safran and Shamir (2020)'s Lemma 2), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m \right)^2 \right] &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} - \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{(i+j)K} \\ &= \left( 1 + \frac{1}{M-1} \right) \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} - \frac{1}{M-1} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

Returning back to  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 \right]$  and using  $\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} = \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K}$  and  $\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mk} = \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2K}}$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 &= (1 - d)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1}{d^2} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - d)^K}{1 + (1 - d)^K} \cdot (1 - (1 - d)^{MK}) T(d), \quad (29)\end{aligned}$$

where we define  $d = \lambda\eta$  and  $T(d) = 1 + (1 - d)^{MK} - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1 + (1 - d)^K}{1 - (1 - d)^K} \cdot (1 - (1 - d)^{MK})$ . For convenience, we also define an intermediate variable  $t = 1 - (1 - d)^K$ , then

$$T(t) = \left( 1 - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t} \right) + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t} \right) (1 - t)^M. \quad (30)$$

According to Lemma 20,  $T(t)$  is monotonically increasing on the interval  $0 < t < 1$ , and  $T(d)$  is monotonically increasing on the interval  $0 < d < 1$ .

Details of Eq. (29).

Letting  $T_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m \right)^2 \right]$  for convenience, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} ((1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m)^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} \langle (1 - \lambda\eta)^{iK} \tau_i, (1 - \lambda\eta)^{jK} \tau_j \rangle \right] \\
 &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \tau_m)^2 \right] + \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} [\langle (1 - \lambda\eta)^{iK} \tau_i, (1 - \lambda\eta)^{jK} \tau_j \rangle] \\
 &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} \mathbb{E} [\tau_m^2] + \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{(i+j)K} \mathbb{E} [\langle \tau_i, \tau_j \rangle]
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tau_m^2 = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E} [\langle \tau_i, \tau_j \rangle] = -\frac{1}{M-1}$  (see Safran and Shamir (2020)'s Lemma 2), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_1 &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} - \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{(i+j)K} \\
 &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} - \frac{1}{M-1} \left( \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \right)^2 - \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} \right) \\
 &= \left( 1 + \frac{1}{M-1} \right) \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mK} - \frac{1}{M-1} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} \right)^2
 \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{mK} = \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K}$  and  $\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2mk} = \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2K}}$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_1 &= \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \cdot \left( \frac{1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \right) \\
 &= \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \\
 &\quad \cdot \underbrace{\left( 1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK} - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^K}{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \cdot (1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}) \right)}_{T(\lambda\eta)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E} \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 \\
 &= (1 - \lambda\eta)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1}{(\lambda\eta)^2} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^K}{1 + (1 - \lambda\eta)^K} \cdot (1 - (1 - \lambda\eta)^{MK}) \cdot T(\lambda\eta)
 \end{aligned}$$

For clarity, letting  $d = \lambda\eta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 = (1 - d)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1}{d^2} \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - d)^K}{1 + (1 - d)^K} \cdot (1 - (1 - d)^{MK}) \cdot T(d)$$

### E.3.1 LOWER BOUND FOR $\frac{1}{101\lambda MK} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda K}$

In this regime,  $T(d)$  is lower bounded by  $T(\frac{1}{101MK})$  for  $d \in [\frac{1}{101MK}, \frac{1}{K}]$ . Here, we first lower bound  $t(d)$ , and then lower bound  $T(d)$ . According to the fact  $(1-x)^n \leq 1-nx + \frac{1}{2}n^2x^2$  when  $x \in (0, 1)$  (it can be proved with Taylor expansion of  $(1-x)^n$  at  $x=0$ ), we get

$$t \geq 1 - (1-d)^K \geq 1 - (1-dK + \frac{1}{2}d^2K^2) \geq dK - \frac{1}{2}d^2K^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}dK \geq \frac{1}{202M}$$

Then following the proofs of Safran and Shamir (2020)'s Lemma 1, we deal with the lower bound of  $T(t)$  on  $t \in [\frac{1}{202M}, 1]$ ,

$$T = 405 \left(1 - \frac{1}{202M}\right)^M - 403 + \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{202M}\right)^M\right) \cdot \frac{1}{M}$$

Since the first two terms are increasing as  $M$  increases and the third term is positive,  $T$  is lower bounded by one numerical constant, as long as there exists  $M_0$  such that  $405 \left(1 - \frac{1}{202M_0}\right)^{M_0} - 403 > 0$  and  $T(t) > 0$  for all  $2 \leq t \leq M_0$  (This can be done by a simple code). We get that  $405 \left(1 - \frac{1}{202 \cdot 1212}\right)^{1212} - 403 > 1.3 \cdot 10^{-11}$  when  $M_0 = 1212$ . Hence,  $T$  is lower bounded by some numerical constant  $c$ . Returning to  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left(x^{(r)}\right)^2 \right]$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left(x^{(r)}\right)^2 \right] &\geq (1-d)^{2MK} \left(x^{(r-1)}\right)^2 + c \cdot \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1}{d^2} \cdot \frac{1 - (1-d)^K}{1 + (1-d)^K} \cdot (1 - (1-d)^{MK}) \\ &\geq (1-d)^{2MK} \left(x^{(r-1)}\right)^2 + \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{101}\right)\right) \frac{c}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{202M} \cdot \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{1}{d^2} \\ &\geq (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MK} \left(x^{(r-1)}\right)^2 + \frac{(1 - \exp(-1/101))c}{404} \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 M} \\ &\geq (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MK} \left(x^{(r-1)}\right)^2 + c' \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 M}, \end{aligned} \quad (c' = \frac{(1 - \exp(-1/101))}{404} \cdot c)$$

where we use  $\frac{M}{M-1} \geq 1$ ,  $1 - (1-d)^{MK} \geq 1 - \exp(-dMK) \geq 1 - \exp(-1/101)$ ,  $\frac{1}{1+(1-d)^K} \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $1 - (1-d)^K \geq \frac{1}{202M}$  in the second inequality. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 \right] &\geq (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MKR} \left(x^{(0)}\right)^2 + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MKr} c' \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 M} \geq c' \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2 M}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) - F^* \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) \right] = \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left(x^{(R)}\right)^2 \right] \geq \frac{c'}{2} \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda M} = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda M} \right). \end{aligned}$$

### E.3.2 LOWER BOUND FOR $\frac{1}{\lambda K} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$

We still start from Eq. (29) and Eq. (30). For  $d = \lambda\eta = 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left(x^{(r)}\right)^2 \right] = \eta^2 \zeta^2 = \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2}$ . For  $\frac{1}{K} \leq d < 1$ , we have  $t = 1 - (1-d)^K \geq 1 - \exp(-dK) \geq 1 - \exp(-1) \approx 0.63 > 0.5$ . Then we can get the lower bound of  $T(t)$  on  $\frac{1}{2} < t < 1$ ,

$$T \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - \frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - \frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right)^M \geq \left(1 - \frac{3}{M}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{3}{M}\right) \frac{1}{2^M}.$$

It can be seen that  $T > 1 - \frac{3}{M} \geq \frac{1}{4}$  when  $M \geq 4$ ,  $T = \frac{1}{4}$  when  $M = 3$ , and  $T = \frac{1}{8}$  when  $M = 2$ . Thus, we can obtain that  $T \geq c$  for some numerical constant  $c$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( x^{(r)} \right)^2 &\geq (1-d)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + c \cdot \eta^2 \zeta^2 \frac{M}{M-1} \cdot \frac{1}{d^2} \cdot \frac{1-(1-d)^K}{1+(1-d)^K} \cdot (1-(1-d)^{MK}) \\ &\geq (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MK} \left( x^{(r-1)} \right)^2 + \frac{c}{8} \cdot \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2}. \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\frac{M}{M-1} \geq 1$ ,  $1 - (1-d)^{MK} \geq 1 - (1-d)^K \geq 1 - \exp(-dK) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{1+(1-d)^K} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then, for  $\frac{1}{K} \leq d = \lambda\eta < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( x^{(R)} \right)^2 \right] &\geq (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MKR} \left( x^{(0)} \right)^2 + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} (1-\lambda\eta)^{2MKr} \frac{c}{8} \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2} \geq \frac{c}{8} \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda^2} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) - F^* \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ F(x^{(R)}) \right] = \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( x^{(R)} \right)^2 \right] = \Omega \left( \frac{\zeta^2}{\lambda} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we complete the proofs of Theorem 3 and summarize the final results in Table 6. ■

#### E.4 Helpful Lemmas for Heterogeneity Terms

**Lemma 19** *For any  $x \in [0, 1]$  we have*

$$(1-x)^n \leq 1 - nx + \frac{1}{2}n^2x^2,$$

where  $n \geq 0$  is a integer.

**Proof** First, we assume that  $0 < x < 1$  and  $n \geq 2$ . The Taylor expansion of  $(1-x)^n$  at  $x = 0$  is

$$(1-x)^n = 1 - nx + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)x^2 - \frac{1}{6}n(n-1)(n-2)x^3(1-\xi)^{n-3},$$

where  $\xi$  is between 0 and  $x$ . Thus, noting that the term  $\frac{1}{6}n(n-1)(n-2)x^3(1-\xi)^{n-3} \geq 0$  for  $n \geq 2$ , so we have

$$(1-x)^n \leq 1 - nx + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)x^2 \leq 1 - nx + \frac{1}{2}n^2x^2$$

Next, we can verify that when  $n = 0$ ,  $(1-x)^0 = 1 \leq 1$ , and when  $n = 1$ ,  $(1-x)^n = 1 - x \leq 1 - x + x^2$ . Finally, we can verify that when  $x = 0$ ,  $(1-x)^n = 1 \leq 1$ , and when  $x = 1$ ,  $(1-x)^n = 0 \leq 1 - n + n^2 = \left(n - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{3}{4}$ . ■

**Lemma 20** *The function  $T(d)$  defined below is monotonically increasing on the interval  $0 < d < 1$ , for integers  $M \geq 2$  and  $K \geq 1$ .*

$$T(d) = 1 + (1-d)^{MK} - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1+(1-d)^K}{1-(1-d)^K} \cdot (1-(1-d)^{MK}).$$

**Proof** Here we introduce an intermediate variable  $t = 1 - (1 - d)^K$  (it implies that  $(1 - d)^K = 1 - t$ ,  $(1 - d)^{MK} = (1 - t)^M$ ) and analyze the function  $T(t)$  on  $0 < t < 1$  at first.

$$\begin{aligned} T &= 1 + (1 - t)^M - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t} \cdot (1 - (1 - t)^M) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t}\right) (1 - t)^M. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we follow a similar way to the proof of Lemma 1 in Safran and Shamir (2020) to prove  $T(t)$  is increasing. The derivative of the function  $T(t)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} T(t)' &= \frac{2}{Mt^2} - \frac{2}{Mt^2} (1 - t)^M - \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{2 - t}{t}\right) \cdot M(1 - t)^{M-1} \\ &= \frac{2}{Mt^2} \left(1 - (1 - t)^{M-1} \cdot \left(1 + (M - 1)t + \frac{1}{2}M(M - 1)t^2\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The derivatives of  $((1 - t)^{1-M})$  are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} ((1 - t)^{1-M})' &= (M - 1)(1 - t)^{-M}, \\ ((1 - t)^{1-M})'' &= M(M - 1)(1 - t)^{-M-1}, \\ ((1 - t)^{1-M})''' &= (M + 1)M(M - 1)(1 - t)^{-M-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The Taylor expansion of  $((1 - t)^{1-M})$  at  $t = 0$  is

$$(1 - t)^{1-M} = 1 + (M - 1)t + \frac{1}{2}M(M - 1)t^2 + \frac{1}{3!}(M + 1)M(M - 1)(1 - \xi)^{-M-2}t^3,$$

where  $\xi \in [0, t]$ . When  $0 < t < 1$ , the remainder  $\frac{1}{3!}(M + 1)M(M - 1)(1 - \xi)^{-M-2}t^3 > 0$  for  $M \geq 2$ . So we can get  $(1 - t)^{1-M} > 1 + (M - 1)t + \frac{1}{2}M(M - 1)t^2$ . It follows that

$$T' > \frac{2}{Mt^2}(1 - (1 - t)^{M-1} \cdot (1 - t)^{1-M}) = 0.$$

Thus,  $T(t)$  is monotonically increasing on  $0 < t < 1$ . Since  $t = 1 - (1 - d)^K$  is monotonically increasing on  $0 < d < 1$ , we can get that  $T(d)$  is monotonically increasing on  $0 < d < 1$ . ■

**Lemma 21** Let  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_M)$  be a random permutation of  $\frac{M}{2} + 1$ 's and  $\frac{M}{2} - 1$ 's. Let  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} := \mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_{m-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tau_i$  and  $a_k = k/K$  ( $0 \leq k \leq K - 1$ ). Then,

$$\frac{1}{20} \sqrt{m - 1 + a_k^2} \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \leq \sqrt{m - 1 + a_k^2}.$$

Notably, the lower bound holds for  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$  ( $M \geq 4$ ) and the upper bound holds for  $1 \leq m \leq M$  ( $M \geq 2$ ).

**Proof** We consider the upper and lower bounds as follows. For the upper bound, similar to Rajput et al. (2020)'s Lemma 12 and Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tau_i + a_k \tau_m\right|\right] \\
 &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tau_i + a_k \tau_m\right)^2\right]} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[(\tau_i)^2] + 2 \sum_{i < j \leq m-1} \mathbb{E}[\tau_i \tau_j] + a_k^2 + 2a_k \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}(\tau_i \tau_m)} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{m-1 + a_k^2}. \quad (\because \mathbb{E}[\tau_i \tau_j] < 0, \forall i \neq j)
 \end{aligned}$$

For the lower bound, suppose that  $3 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$  (i.e.,  $2 \leq m-1 \leq \frac{M}{2}$  and  $M \geq 4$ ). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m|] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m| \mid \mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m| \mid \mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| \mid \mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0) + a_k \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| \mid \mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0) - a_k \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m \geq 0) - a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m = 0) + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m > 0) - a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m = 0) \\
 &\quad + a_k \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m > 0 \mid |\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) \\
 &\quad - a_k \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0 \mid |\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m > 0 \mid |\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) = \frac{(M-m+1-i)/2}{M-m+1}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m < 0 \mid |\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) = \frac{(M-m+1+i)/2}{M-m+1}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m = 0) - a_k \cdot \frac{1}{M-m+1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \cdot \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i) \\
 &= \left(1 - \frac{a_k}{M-m+1}\right) \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] + a_k \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{m-1} \tau_m = 0) \\
 &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{M-m+1}\right) \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] \quad (\because 0 \leq a_k < 1) \\
 &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{M}\right) \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] \quad (\because m-1 \leq \frac{M}{2}) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|], \quad (\because M \geq 4)
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \cdot \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}| = i)$  in the second equality.

For the convenience of subsequent proofs, we need a tighter lower bound for  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|]$ , which can be achieved with a few modifications to Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5.

Let us start from Ineq. (21) in Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5.

For the even integers  $m \geq 4$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_m|] &\geq \left( \frac{M-2}{M-1} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{m-2}} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{M}{M+2m} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{\sqrt{m}}{5} \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{M-2}{M-1} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{m-1}}{\sqrt{m-2}} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{M}{M+2m} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{\sqrt{m+1}}{5} \right) \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that  $\frac{M-2}{M-1} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{m-1}}{\sqrt{m-2}} \geq 1 \iff (2M-3)m \leq M^2-2$ . Since  $m \leq \frac{M}{2}$  (Note that the constraint  $m \leq \frac{M}{2}$  is for  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_m|]$  in Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5), it follows that  $(2M-3)m \leq M^2 - \frac{3}{2}M \leq M^2-2$  when  $M \geq 8$ . Then, we can get  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_m|] \geq \frac{\sqrt{m+1}}{10}$  for  $4 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2}$ .

For the even integers  $m = 2$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_2|] = 1 - \frac{1}{M-1} \geq \frac{2}{3} \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{10}$  ( $M \geq 2m \geq 4$ ). Now, we complete the proof for the even cases  $2 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2}$ .

In fact, the lower bound holds in odd cases  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2}$  in Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5 without any modification (see their last inequality  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_m|] \geq \frac{M-m}{M-m-1} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{m+1}}{10} \geq \frac{\sqrt{m+1}}{10}$ ). We can also prove it with the same steps as Cha et al. (2023)'s Lemma B.5.

Note that the lower bound does not hold in the last case  $m = 0$ .

As a summary, we can get a tighter bound  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_m|] \geq \frac{\sqrt{m+1}}{10}$  for  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{M}{2}$ .

Returning to  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|]$  and using the tighter lower bound for  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{m-1}|] \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{20}.$$

The above lower bound does not hold for  $m = 1$  since it requires the false argument  $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0 \geq \frac{\sqrt{1}}{10}$ . To incorporate the case where  $m = 1$ , we consider a looser bound

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{20} \geq \frac{1}{20} \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}.$$

At last, let us verify whether this lower bound holds for the remaining cases where  $m = 1, 2$ . When  $m = 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{1,k}|] = a_k \geq \frac{a_k}{20\sqrt{2}}$ . When  $m = 2$  ( $M \geq 2m \geq 4$ ), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{2,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}[|\tau_1 + a_k \tau_2|] = (1+a_k)\mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \tau_2 = +1) + (1-a_k)\mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \tau_2 = -1) \\ &= (1+a_k) \cdot \frac{2 \cdot \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{2}}{\binom{M}{2}} + (1-a_k) \cdot \frac{\binom{\frac{M}{2}}{1} \cdot \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{1}}{\binom{M}{2}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{a_k}{M-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we adopt  $M \geq 4$  for  $m = 2$ , and then  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{2,k}|] = 1 - \frac{a_k}{M-1} \geq 1 - \frac{a_k}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1+1^2} \geq \frac{1}{20} \sqrt{1+a_k^2}$ . Now we complete the proof of the lower bound of  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{2,k}|]$ ,



which holds for  $1 < m \leq \frac{M}{2} + 1$  and  $M \geq 4$ . ■

**Lemma 22** *Let  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_M)$  be a random permutation of  $\frac{M}{2} + 1$ 's and  $\frac{M}{2} - 1$ 's. Let  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} := \mathcal{E}_{m-1} + a_k \tau_m$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_{m-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tau_i$  and  $a_k = k/K$  ( $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ ). The probability distribution of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$  is symmetric with respect to 0. And For  $1 \leq m \leq M$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$  (excluding the case  $m=1, k=0$ ), it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{6} \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

**Proof** When  $m=1$  and  $k=0$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{1,0} = \mathcal{E}_0 = 0$  (defined). When  $m=M+1$  and  $k=0$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{M+1,0} = 0$ . In these two cases,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = 0) = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = 0$ .

When  $2 \leq m \leq M$  and  $k=0$ , we get  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) \geq \frac{1}{6}$  according to Yun et al. (2022)' Lemma 14.

When  $1 \leq m \leq M$  and  $0 < k \leq K-1$ , similarly, we can first prove that  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$  is symmetric and then compute  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = 0)$ . As shown in Table 7, we conclude all cases into four categories  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = -p - a_k$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = -p + a_k$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = p - a_k$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = p + a_k$ . We can get that the probability distribution of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$  is symmetric. Furthermore, since  $0 < a_k < 1$ , we can get that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} = 0) = 0$ , and thus  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) = \frac{1}{2}$ . In summary,

Value	$-p - a_k$	$-p + a_k$	$p - a_k$	$p + a_k$
Probability	$\frac{\binom{\frac{M}{2}-1-p}{\frac{M}{2}} \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{\frac{M}{2}}}{\binom{M}{m-1}} \cdot \frac{M-m+1-p}{M-m+1}$	$\frac{\binom{\frac{M}{2}-1-p}{\frac{M}{2}} \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{\frac{M}{2}}}{\binom{M}{m-1}} \cdot \frac{M-m+1+p}{M-m+1}$	$\frac{\binom{\frac{M}{2}-1-p}{\frac{M}{2}} \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{\frac{M}{2}}}{\binom{M}{m-1}} \cdot \frac{M-m+1-p}{M-m+1}$	$\frac{\binom{\frac{M}{2}-1-p}{\frac{M}{2}} \binom{\frac{M}{2}}{\frac{M}{2}}}{\binom{M}{m-1}} \cdot \frac{M-m+1+p}{M-m+1}$

Table 7: Probability distribution table of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$ .

we have proved that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) \geq \frac{1}{6}$  for  $1 \leq m \leq M$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$  (except the case  $m=1, k=0$ ). Note that for all cases, the probability distribution is symmetric, we can get  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{m,k} < 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . ■

**Lemma 23** *Supposing that  $x_{1,0} \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  and  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{101\lambda MK}$ , then for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] \leq \frac{1}{100}x_{1,0} + \frac{101}{100}K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}$$

**Proof** According to Eq. (20),

$$x_{m,k} = x_{1,0} - \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \left( (\lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \geq 0}) x_{b_1(i), b_2(i)} \right) - K\eta\zeta\mathcal{A}_{m,k}$$

(we have dropped the superscript  $r$ ), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] &\leq \eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| (\lambda \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} < 0} + \lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} \geq 0}) x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} \right| \right] + K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \\
 &\leq \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)}|] + K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \quad (\because \lambda_0 \leq \lambda) \\
 &\leq \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] + K\eta\zeta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|].
 \end{aligned}$$

For any integers  $m \geq 1, k \geq 0$  satisfying  $(m-1)K + k \leq MK$ , using Lemma 21,  $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{m,k}|] \leq \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] \leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}.$$

Let  $h_{m,k} := \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} h_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}$  and  $h_{1,0} = 0$ . It can be verified that the sequence  $h_{1,0}, \dots, h_{m,0}, h_{m,1}, h_{m,2}, \dots, h_{m,K-1}, h_{m+1,0}, \dots, h_{M+1,0}$  is monotonically increasing. When  $k = 0$ , then

$$h_{m,0} - h_{m-1,K-1} = \lambda\eta\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta h_{m-1,K-1} + K\eta\zeta \left( \sqrt{m-1} - \sqrt{m-2+a_{K-1}^2} \right) > 0.$$

When  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$ , then

$$h_{m,k} - h_{m,k-1} = \lambda\eta\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta h_{m,k-1} + K\eta\zeta \left( \sqrt{m-1+a_k^2} - \sqrt{m-1+a_{k-1}^2} \right) > 0.$$

This means that  $h_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} < h_{m,k}$  for any integer  $i < \mathcal{B}_{m,k}$ . So we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 h_{m,k} &\leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}h_{m,k} + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2} \\
 \implies h_{m,k} &\leq \frac{\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}]}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}} + \frac{K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \quad (\because \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{M,K} = \lambda MK\eta \leq \frac{1}{101})
 \end{aligned}$$

By mathematical induction, we can get  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] \leq h_{m,k} \leq \frac{\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}x_{1,0}}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}} + \frac{K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1+a_k^2}}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}}$ .

When  $m = 1$  and  $k = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{1,0} - x_{1,0}|] = h_{1,0} = 0$ . Then, suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{i,j} - x_{1,0}|] \leq h_{i,j}$  for all  $i, j$  satisfying  $i(K-1) + j \leq m(K-1) + k$ .

- When  $k = 0$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,0} - x_{1,0}|] &\leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,0}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,0}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1} \\
 &\leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,0}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,0}-1} h_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m-1} \leq h_{m,0}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- When  $1 \leq k \leq K - 1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] &\leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} \mathbb{E}[|x_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} - x_{1,0}|] + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m + a_k^2} \\ &\leq \lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}\mathbb{E}[x_{1,0}] + \lambda\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{B}_{m,k}-1} h_{b_1(i),b_2(i)} + K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m + a_k^2} \leq h_{m,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then considering that  $\lambda_0/\lambda \geq 1010$  and  $\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k} \leq \lambda MK\eta \leq \frac{1}{101}$  (it implies  $\frac{\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \leq \frac{1}{100}$  and that  $\frac{1}{1-\lambda\eta\mathcal{B}_{m,k}} \leq \frac{101}{100}$ ), we get  $\mathbb{E}[|x_{m,k} - x_{1,0}|] \leq \frac{1}{100}x_{1,0} + \frac{101}{100}K\eta\zeta\sqrt{m - 1 + a_k^2}$ . ■

## References

- Kwangjun Ahn, Chulhee Yun, and Suvrit Sra. Sgd with shuffling: optimal rates without component convexity and large epoch requirements. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17526–17535, 2020.
- Jaeyoung Cha, Jaewook Lee, and Chulhee Yun. Tighter lower bounds for shuffling sgd: Random permutations and beyond. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3855–3912. PMLR, 2023.
- Ken Chang, Niranjana Balachandar, Carson Lam, Darvin Yi, James Brown, Andrew Beers, Bruce Rosen, Daniel L Rubin, and Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer. Distributed deep learning networks among institutions for medical imaging. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(8):945–954, 2018.
- Yae Jee Cho, Pranay Sharma, Gauri Joshi, Zheng Xu, Satyen Kale, and Tong Zhang. On the convergence of federated averaging with cyclic client participation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5677–5721. PMLR, 2023.
- Luke N Darlow, Elliot J Crowley, Antreas Antoniou, and Amos J Storkey. Cinic-10 is not imagenet or cifar-10. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03505*, 2018.
- Yansong Gao, Minki Kim, Chandra Thapa, Sharif Abuadbbba, Zhi Zhang, Seyit Camtepe, Hyounghick Kim, and Surya Nepal. Evaluation and optimization of distributed machine learning techniques for internet of things. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 2021.
- Margalit R Glasgow, Honglin Yuan, and Tengyu Ma. Sharp bounds for federated averaging (local sgd) and continuous perspective. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 9050–9090. PMLR, 2022.
- Otkrist Gupta and Ramesh Raskar. Distributed learning of deep neural network over multiple agents. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 116:1–8, 2018.
- Samuel Horváth, Maziar Sanjabi, Lin Xiao, Peter Richtárik, and Michael Rabbat. Fedshuffle: Recipes for better use of local work in federated learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.

- Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 14(1–2):1–210, 2021.
- Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5132–5143. PMLR, 2020.
- Ahmed Khaled, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtárik. Tighter theory for local sgd on identical and heterogeneous data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4519–4529. PMLR, 2020.
- Anastasia Koloskova, Nicolas Loizou, Sadra Boreiri, Martin Jaggi, and Sebastian Stich. A unified theory of decentralized sgd with changing topology and local updates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5381–5393. PMLR, 2020.
- Alex Krizhevsky et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Technical report*, 2009.
- Jin-woo Lee, Jaehoon Oh, Sungsu Lim, Se-Young Yun, and Jae-Gil Lee. Tornadoaggregate: Accurate and scalable federated learning via the ring-based architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.03214*, 2020.
- Xiang Li, Kaixuan Huang, Wenhao Yang, Shusen Wang, and Zhihua Zhang. On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Yipeng Li and Xinchun Lyu. Convergence analysis of sequential federated learning on heterogeneous data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:56700–56755, 2023.
- Tao Lin, Lingjing Kong, Sebastian U Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Ensemble distillation for robust model fusion in federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2351–2363, 2020.
- Grigory Malinovsky, Samuel Horváth, Konstantin Pavlovich Burlachenko, and Peter Richtárik. Federated learning with regularized client participation. In *Federated Learning and Analytics in Practice: Algorithms, Systems, Applications, and Opportunities*, 2023.
- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Konstantin Mishchenko, Ahmed Khaled, and Peter Richtárik. Random reshuffling: Simple analysis with vast improvements. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17309–17320, 2020.

- Konstantin Mishchenko, Ahmed Khaled, and Peter Richtárik. Proximal and federated random reshuffling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15718–15749. PMLR, 2022.
- Cristinel Mortici. On gspers formula for the gamma function.
- Dheeraj Nagaraj, Prateek Jain, and Praneeth Netrapalli. Sgd without replacement: Sharper rates for general smooth convex functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4703–4711. PMLR, 2019.
- Arkadij Semenovič Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983.
- Shashank Rajput, Anant Gupta, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Closing the convergence gap of sgd without replacement. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7964–7973. PMLR, 2020.
- Sashank J. Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and Hugh Brendan McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. How good is sgd with random shuffling? In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3250–3284. PMLR, 2020.
- Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. Random shuffling beats sgd only after many epochs on ill-conditioned problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15151–15161, 2021.
- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- Sebastian U. Stich. Local SGD converges fast and communicates little. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Sebastian U Stich and Sai Praneeth Karimireddy. The error-feedback framework: Better rates for sgd with delayed gradients and compressed communication. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05350*, 2019.
- Chandra Thapa, Pathum Chamikara Mahawaga Arachchige, Seyit Camtepe, and Lichao Sun. Splitfed: When federated learning meets split learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 8485–8493, 2022.
- Jianyu Wang, Qinghua Liu, Hao Liang, Gauri Joshi, and H Vincent Poor. Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7611–7623, 2020.
- Jianyu Wang, Rudrajit Das, Gauri Joshi, Satyen Kale, Zheng Xu, and Tong Zhang. On the unreasonable effectiveness of federated averaging with heterogeneous data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04723*, 2022.

- Shiqiang Wang and Mingyue Ji. A unified analysis of federated learning with arbitrary client participation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19124–19137, 2022.
- Blake Woodworth, Kumar Kshitij Patel, Sebastian Stich, Zhen Dai, Brian Bullins, Brendan McMahan, Ohad Shamir, and Nathan Srebro. Is local sgd better than minibatch sgd? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10334–10343. PMLR, 2020a.
- Blake E Woodworth, Kumar Kshitij Patel, and Nati Srebro. Minibatch vs local sgd for heterogeneous distributed learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6281–6292, 2020b.
- Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- Haibo Yang, Minghong Fang, and Jia Liu. Achieving linear speedup with partial worker participation in non-IID federated learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Liangqi Yuan, Yunsheng Ma, Lu Su, and Ziran Wang. Peer-to-peer federated continual learning for naturalistic driving action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5249–5258, 2023a.
- Liangqi Yuan, Lichao Sun, Philip S Yu, and Ziran Wang. Decentralized federated learning: A survey and perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01603*, 2023b.
- Chulhee Yun, Shashank Rajput, and Suvrit Sra. Minibatch vs local SGD with shuffling: Tight convergence bounds and beyond. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Ali Zindari, Ruichen Luo, and Sebastian U Stich. On the convergence of local sgd under third-order smoothness and hessian similarity. In *OPT 2023: Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2023.