

---

# Stochastic Variance-Reduced Forward-Reflected Methods for Root-Finding Problems

---

Quoc Tran-Dinh\*

Department of Statistics and Operations Research  
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
318 Hanes Hall, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC27599  
quoctd@email.unc.edu

## Abstract

We develop two novel stochastic variance-reduction methods to approximate a solution of root-finding problems applicable to both equations and inclusions. Our algorithms leverage a new combination of ideas from the forward-reflected-backward splitting method and a class of unbiased variance-reduction estimators. We construct two new stochastic estimators within this class, inspired by the well-established SVRG and SAGA estimators. These estimators differ significantly from existing approaches used for root-finding algorithms. By appropriately selecting parameters, both algorithms achieve the state-of-the-art oracle complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  for achieving an  $\epsilon$ -solution in terms of the operator residual norm, where  $n$  represents the number of summands and  $\epsilon$  signifies the desired accuracy. This complexity aligns with the best-known results in stochastic nonconvex optimization without enhancements. We test our algorithms on two numerical examples and compare them with existing methods. The results demonstrate promising improvements offered by the new methods compared to their competitors.

## 1 Introduction

**Linear and nonlinear equations and inclusions** are cornerstones of computational mathematics, finding applications in diverse fields like engineering, mechanics, economics, statistics, optimization, and machine learning, see, e.g., [9, 18, 34, 66, 72, 73]. These problems, known as *root-finding problems*, are equivalent to *fixed-point problems*. The recent revolution in deep learning and generative AI has brought renewed interest to root-finding problems. They serve as powerful tools for handling minimax models in generative machine learning, adversarial learning, and robust learning, see, e.g., [6, 35, 54, 58]. Notably, most problems arising from these applications are nonmonotone, nonsmooth, and large-scale. This paper develops new and simple stochastic algorithms with variance reduction for solving this class of problems, equipped with rigorous theoretical guarantees.

### 1.1 Problem statement and motivation

**[Non]linear inclusion.** The central problem studied in this paper is the following *[non]linear inclusion* (also called a *generalized equation* [71]):

$$\text{Find } x^* \in \text{dom}(\Psi) \text{ such that: } 0 \in \Psi x^* := Gx^* + Tx^*, \quad (\text{NI})$$

where  $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  is a given single-valued operator, possibly nonlinear, and  $T : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$  is a multivalued mapping from  $\mathbb{R}^p$  to  $2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$  (the set of all subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ). Here,  $\Psi := G + T$  is the sum of  $G$  and  $T$ , and  $\text{dom}(\Psi) := \text{dom}(G) \cap \text{dom}(T)$ , where  $\text{dom}(R)$  is the domain of  $R$ .

---

\*Personal website: <https://quoctd.web.unc.edu>

**[Non]linear equation.** If  $T = 0$ , then (NI) reduces to the following *[non]linear equation*:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in \text{dom}(G) \text{ such that: } Gx^* = 0. \quad (\text{NE})$$

Both (NI) and (NE) are called *root-finding problems*. Clearly, (NE) is a special case of (NI). However, under appropriate assumptions on  $G$  and/or  $T$  (e.g., using the resolvent of  $T$ ), one can also transform (NI) to (NE). Let  $\text{zer}(\Psi) := \{x^* \in \text{dom}(\Psi) : 0 \in \Psi x^*\}$  and  $\text{zer}(G) := \{x^* \in \text{dom}(G) : Gx^* = 0\}$  be the solution sets of (NI) and (NE), respectively, which are assumed to be nonempty.

**Variational inequality problems (VIPs).** If  $T(\cdot) = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}(\cdot)$ , the normal cone of a nonempty, closed, and convex set  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , then (NI) reduces to the following VIP as a special case:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in \mathcal{X} \text{ such that: } \langle Gx^*, x - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (\text{VIP})$$

If  $T = \partial g$ , the subdifferential of a convex function  $g$ , then (NI) reduces to a mixed VIP, denoted by MVIP. Both VIP and MVIP cover many problems in practice, see, e.g., [18, 34, 66]. Since (VIP) is a special case of (NI), our algorithms for (NI) in the sequel can be specified to solve (VIP).

**Fixed-point problem.** Problem (NE) is equivalent to the following fixed-point problem:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in \text{dom}(F) \text{ such that: } x^* = Fx^*, \quad (\text{FP})$$

where  $F := \mathbb{I} - G$  with  $\mathbb{I}$  being the identity operator. Since (FP) is equivalent to (NE), our algorithms for (NE) developed in this paper can be used to solve (FP).

**Finite-sum structure.** In this paper, we are interested in the case where  $G$  is a large finite-sum:

$$Gx := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i x, \quad (1)$$

where  $G_i : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  are given operators for all  $i \in [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $n \gg 1$ . This structure often arises from machine learning, networks, distributed systems, and data science. Note that our methods developed in this paper can be extended to tackle  $Gx = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathbb{P}}[\mathbf{G}(x, \xi)]$  as the expectation of a stochastic operator  $\mathbf{G}$  involving a random vector  $\xi$  defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \Sigma)$ .

**Motivation.** Our work is mainly motivated by the following aspects.

*Recent applications.* Both (NE) and (NI) cover minimax problems as special cases. The minimax problem, especially in nonconvex-nonconcave settings, has recently gained its popularity as it provides a powerful tool to model applications in generative machine learning [6, 35], robust and distributionally robust optimization [11, 12, 50], adversarial training [54], online optimization [14], and reinforcement learning [8, 83]. Our work is motivated by those applications.

*Optimality certification.* Existing stochastic methods often target special cases of (NI) such as (NE) and (VIP). In addition, these methods frequently rely on a monotonicity assumption, which excludes many problems of current interest (e.g., [2, 3, 13, 36, 52]). Furthermore, existing methods analyze convergence based on a [duality] **gap function** [34] or a **restricted gap function** [59]. As discussed in [19, 31], these metrics have limitations, particularly in non-monotone settings. It is important to note that standard gap functions are not applicable to our settings. Regarding oracle complexity, several works (e.g., [3, 13, 36, 52]) claim an oracle complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(n + \sqrt{n}\epsilon^{-2})$  to attain an  $\epsilon$ -solution, but this is measured using a restricted gap function. Again, as highlighted in [19, 31], this certification does not translate to the operator residual norm and is inapplicable to non-monotone settings. Therefore, a direct comparison between our results and these previous works is challenging due to these methodological discrepancies.

*New and simple algorithms.* Many existing stochastic methods for solving (VIP) and (NI) rely on established techniques. These include mirror-prox/averaging and extragradient-type schemes combined with the classic Robbin-Monro stochastic approximation [70] (e.g., [27, 42, 44, 45, 47, 81]). Some approaches utilize increasing mini-batch sizes for variance reduction (e.g., [42]). Recent works have explored alternative variance-reduced methods for (NI) and its special cases (e.g., [2, 3, 16, 20, 29]). However, these methods primarily adapt existing optimization estimators to approximate the operator  $G$  without significant modifications. Our approach departs from directly approximating  $G$ . Instead, we construct an intermediate object  $S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$  as a linear combination of two consecutive evaluations of  $G$  (i.e.  $Gx^k$  and  $Gx^{k-1}$ ). We then develop stochastic variance-reduced estimators specifically for  $S_\gamma^k$ . This idea allows us to design new and simple algorithms with a single loop for solving both (NE) and (NI) (cf. Sections 3 and 4).

## 1.2 Basic assumptions

In this paper, we consider both (NE) and (NI) covered by the following basic assumptions (see [9] for terminologies and concepts used in these assumptions).

**Assumption 1.1.** [Well-definedness]  $\text{zer}(\Psi)$  of (NI) and  $\text{zer}(G)$  of (NE) are nonempty.

**Assumption 1.2.** [Maximal monotonicity of  $T$ ]  $T$  in (NI) is maximally monotone on  $\text{dom}(T)$ .

**Assumption 1.3.** [Lipschitz continuity of  $G$ ]  $G$  in (1) is  $L$ -averaged Lipschitz continuous, i.e.:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x - G_i y\|^2 \leq L^2 \|x - y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \text{dom}(G). \quad (2)$$

**Assumption 1.4.** [Weak-Minty solution condition] There exist  $\kappa \geq 0$  and  $x^* \in \text{zer}(\Psi)$  such that  $\langle Gx + v, x - x^* \rangle \geq -\kappa \|Gx + v\|^2$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$  and  $v \in Tx$ .

While Assumption 1.1 is basic, Assumption 1.2 guarantees the single-valued and well-definiteness of the resolvent  $J_T$  of  $T$ . In fact, this assumption can be relaxed to some classes of nonmonotone operators  $T$ , but we omit this extension. The  $L$ -averaged Lipschitz continuity (2) is standard and has been used in most deterministic, randomized, and stochastic methods. It is slightly stronger than the  $L$ -Lipschitz continuity of the sum  $G$ . Note that the star-strong monotonicity used in, e.g., [47], is opposite to the star-co-hypomonotonicity in Assumption 1.4. Of course, if  $G + T$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly monotone, then it is also  $\sigma$ -star strongly monotone. Hence, the strong monotonicity is stronger than the star-strong monotonicity, and hence the latter covers a wider class of operators than the former. Note that if  $\sigma = 0$ , then  $\Psi$  is just star-monotone, i.e.  $\langle Gx + v, x - x^* \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$ .

## 1.3 Contribution and related work

Our goal in this paper is to develop a class of stochastic variance-reduction methods to solve both (NE) and (NI), their special cases such as (VIP), and equivalent problems such as (FP).

**Our contribution.** Our main contribution is stated as follows.

- (a) We introduce a new operator  $S_\gamma^k$  in (FRO) and propose a class of unbiased variance-reduced estimators  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  for  $S_\gamma^k$  satisfying our Definition 2.1.
- (b) We construct two instances of  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  by leveraging the SVRG [43] and SAGA [30] estimators, respectively that fulfill Definition 2.1. These estimators are also of independent interest.
- (c) We develop a stochastic variance-reduced forward-reflected method (VFR) to solve (NE) which requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of  $G_i$  to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -solution of (NE).
- (d) We also design a novel stochastic variance-reduced forward-reflected-backward splitting method (VFRBS) to solve (NI) that also requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of  $G_i$ .

Let us highlight the following points of our contribution. First, our intermediate operator  $S_\gamma^k$  can be viewed as a generalization of the forward-reflected-backward splitting (FRBS) operator [56] or an optimistic gradient operator [28] used in the literature. However, the chosen range  $\gamma \in (1/2, 1)$  excludes these classical methods from recovering as special cases of  $S_\gamma^k$ . Second, since our SVRG and SAGA estimators are designed specifically for  $S_\gamma^k$ , they differ from existing estimators in the literature, including recent works [2, 3, 16]. Third, both proposed algorithms are single-loop and straightforward to implement. Fourth, our algorithm for non-inclusions (NI) significantly differs from existing methods, including deterministic approaches, due to the final term  $\gamma^{-1}(2\gamma - 1)(y^k - x^k)$ . For a comprehensive survey of deterministic methods, we refer to [76]. Fifth, our oracle complexity estimates rely on metric  $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2]$  or  $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2]$  for  $v^k \in Tx^k$ , which is common in non-monotone settings. Unlike the monotone case, this metric cannot be directly converted to a gap function (see, e.g., [2, 3]). Note that our complexity bounds match the best known in stochastic nonconvex optimization using SAGA or SVRG without additional enhancements, like, e.g., [84].

**Related work.** Since both theory and solution methods for solving (NE) and (NI) are ubiquitous, see, e.g., [9, 18, 34, 66, 72, 73], especially under the monotonicity, we only highlight the most recent related works and further discussion is deferred to Supp. Doc. A.

*Weak-Minty condition.* Assumption 1.4 is known as a weak-Minty condition for both (NE) and (NI), which has been widely used in recent works, e.g., [15, 32, 49, 65, 75] for deterministic methods and, e.g., [49, 64, 77] for stochastic methods. The weak-Minty condition is slightly weaker than the co-hypomonotonicity [10], which was used earlier in proximal-point methods [25]. Diakonikolas *et al.* exploited this condition to develop an extragradient variant (called EG+) to solve (NE). Following

up works include [15, 21, 53, 65, 75]. A recent survey in [76] provided several deterministic methods that rely on this condition. The weak-Minty condition covers a class of nonmonotone operators.

*Stochastic approximation methods.* Stochastic methods for both (NE) and (NI) and their special cases have been extensively developed, see, e.g., [44, 47, 64]. Several methods exploited mirror-prox and averaging techniques such as [44, 47], while others relied on projection or extragradient schemes, e.g., [27, 42, 45, 64, 81]. Many of these algorithms use standard Robbin-Monro stochastic approximation with fixed or increasing batch sizes. Some other works generalized the analysis to a general class of algorithms such as [13, 36, 52] covers both standard stochastic approximation and variance reduction.

*Variance-reduction methods.* Variance-reduction techniques have been broadly used in optimization, where many estimators were proposed, including SAGA [30], SVRG [43], SARAH [60], and Hybrid variants [78]. Researchers have adopted these estimators to develop methods for (NE) and (NI). For example, [29] proposed a SAGA-type methods for (NE) under [quasi]-strong monotonicity. The authors in [2, 3] employed SVRG estimators and developed methods for (VIP). Other works can be found in [16, 41, 82]. All of these results are different from ours. Some recent works exploited Halpern’s fixed-point iterations and develop corresponding variance-reduced methods, see, e.g., [19, 20]. However, varying parameters must be used to achieve improved theoretical oracle complexity, but such varying parameters may be challenging to choose and implement in practice.

**Notation.** We use  $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(x^0, x^1, \dots, x^k)$  to denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $x^0, \dots, x^k$  up to the iteration  $k$ .  $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$  denotes the conditional expectation w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  is the total expectation. We also use  $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$  to characterize convergence rates and oracle complexity as usual. For an operator  $G$ ,  $\text{dom}(G) := \{x : Gx \neq \emptyset\}$  denotes its domain, and  $J_G$  denotes its resolvent.

**Paper organization.** Section 2 introduces our operator  $S_\gamma^k$  and defines a class of stochastic estimators for  $S_\gamma^k$ . It also constructs two instances: SVRG and SAGA, and proves their key properties. Section 3 develops an algorithm for solving (NE) and establishes its oracle complexity. Section 4 designs a new algorithm for solving (NI) and proves its oracle complexity. Section 5 presents two concrete numerical examples. Technical proofs and additional results are moved to Supp. Docs. A to E.

## 2 Stochastic Variance-Reduced Estimators for Operators

We propose a class of unbiased variance-reduced estimators for both (NE) and (NI). We also construct two instances relying on the two well-known estimators: SVRG from [43] and SAGA from [30]. However, any other estimator could be used if it satisfies our Definition 2.1 below.

### 2.1 Forward-reflected operator

Our methods for solving (NE) and (NI) rely on the following intermediate operator constructed from  $G$  via two consecutive iterates  $x^{k-1}$  and  $x^k$  controlled by a parameter  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ :

$$S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}. \quad (\text{FRO})$$

Here,  $\gamma$  plays a crucial role in our methods in the sequel as  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Clearly, if  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ , then we can write  $S_{1/2}^k = \frac{1}{2}Gx^k + \frac{1}{2}(Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2}[2Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}]$  used in both the forward-reflected-backward splitting (FRBS) method [56] and the optimistic gradient method [28]. In deterministic unconstrained settings (i.e. solving (NE)), see [76], FRBS is also equivalent to Popov’s past-extragradient method [67], reflected-forward-backward splitting method [22, 55], and optimistic gradient method [28]. In the deterministic constrained case, i.e. solving (NI), these methods are different. Since  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , our methods below exclude these classical schemes. However, due to a similar idea to FRBS, we still term our operator  $S_\gamma^k$  by the “**forward-reflected operator**” (FRO).

### 2.2 Stochastic unbiased variance-reduced estimators for the FR operator

Now, let us propose the following class of stochastic variance-reduced estimators  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  of  $S_\gamma^k$ . The idea of unification we use here is similar to some recent works, e.g., in [13, 33], those not the same.

**Definition 2.1.** A stochastic estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  is said to be a *stochastic unbiased variance-reduced estimator* of  $S_\gamma^k$  in (FRO) if there exist three constants  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C \geq 0$  and  $\hat{C} \geq 0$ , and a

nonnegative sequence  $\{\Delta_k\}$  such that the following three conditions hold:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}_\gamma^k] &= S_\gamma^k, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k\|^2] &\leq \Delta_k, \\ \Delta_k &\leq (1 - \rho)\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{C}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{C}}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2]. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here,  $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  are the conditional and total expectations defined earlier, respectively. The condition  $\rho > 0$  is important to achieve a variance reduction as long as  $x^k$  is close to  $x^{k-1}$  and  $x^{k-1}$  is close to  $x^{k-2}$ . Otherwise,  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  may not be a variance-reduced estimator of  $S_\gamma^k$ . Since  $S_\gamma^k$  is evaluated at both  $x^{k-1}$  and  $x^k$ , our bounds for the estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  depends on three consecutive points  $x^{k-2}$ ,  $x^{k-1}$ , and  $x^k$ , which is different from previous works, including [4, 13, 29, 33].

We now construct two estimators that satisfy Definition 2.1 using SVRG [43] and SAGA [30].

(a) **Loopless-SVRG estimator for the FR operator.** Consider a mini-batch  $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with a fixed batch size  $b := |\mathcal{B}_k|$ . Denote  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} z := \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} G_i z$  for a given  $z \in \text{dom}(G)$ . We define the following estimator for  $S_\gamma^k$  in (FRO):

$$\tilde{S}_\gamma^k := (1 - \gamma)(G w^k - G_{\mathcal{B}_k} w^k) + G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k - \gamma G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}, \quad (\text{L-SVRG})$$

where the reference or the snapshot point  $w^k$  is selected randomly as follows:

$$w^{k+1} := \begin{cases} x^k & \text{with probability } \mathbf{p} \\ w^k & \text{with probability } 1 - \mathbf{p}. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The probability  $\mathbf{p} \in (0, 1)$  will appropriately be chosen later by flipping a coin. This estimator is known as a loopless variant [48] of the SVRG estimator [43]. However, it is different from existing estimators used for root-finding problems, including [29] because we define it for  $S_\gamma^k$ , not for  $G x^k$ . In addition, the first term is also damped by a factor  $(1 - \gamma)$  to guarantee the unbiasedness of  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  to  $S_\gamma^k$ .

The following lemma shows that our estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  satisfies Definition 2.1.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $S_\gamma^k$  be given by (FRO) and  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  be generated by the SVRG estimator (L-SVRG) and*

$$\Delta_k := \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma) G_i w^k\|^2].$$

*Then,  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  satisfies Definition 2.1 with this  $\{\Delta_k\}$  sequence,  $\rho := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{4}{b\mathbf{p}}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{4\gamma^2}{b\mathbf{p}}$ .*

(b) **SAGA estimator for the FR operator.** Let  $S_\gamma^k$  be defined by (FRO) and  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k}$  be a mini-batch estimator defined as in (L-SVRG), we propose the following SAGA estimator for  $S_\gamma^k$ :

$$\tilde{S}_\gamma^k := \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k + [G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k - \gamma G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma) \hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k], \quad (\text{SAGA})$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq [n]$  is a mini-batch of size  $b$  of  $[n]$ , and  $\hat{G}_i^k$  for  $i \in [n]$  is updated as

$$\hat{G}_i^{k+1} := \begin{cases} G_i x^k & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B}_k, \\ \hat{G}_i^k & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{B}_k. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

To form  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$ , we need to store  $n$  component  $\hat{G}_i^k$  computed so far for  $i \in [n]$  in a table  $\mathcal{T}_k := [\hat{G}_1^k, \hat{G}_2^k, \dots, \hat{G}_n^k]$  initialized at  $\hat{G}_i^0 := G_i x^0$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . Clearly, the SAGA estimator requires significant memory to store  $\mathcal{T}_k$  if  $n$  and  $p$  are both large. We have the following result.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $S_\gamma^k$  be defined by (FRO) and  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  be generated by the SAGA estimator (SAGA), and*

$$\Delta_k := \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma) \hat{G}_i^k\|^2].$$

*Then,  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  satisfies Definition 2.1 with this  $\{\Delta_k\}$  sequence,  $\rho := \frac{b}{2n} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{nb}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{nb}$ .*

### 3 Variance-Reduced Forward-Reflected Method for Equation (NE)

Let us first utilize the class of stochastic estimators proposed in Definition 2.1 to develop a stochastic variance-reduced forward-reflected method for solving (NE) under Assumptions 1.3 and 1.4.

#### 3.1 The VFR method and its convergence guarantee

(a) **Variance-reduced Forward-Reflected Method (VFR).** Our method is as follows: *Starting from  $x^0 \in \text{dom}(G)$ , we set  $x^{-1} = x^{-2} := x^0$ , and at each iteration  $k \geq 0$ , we construct an estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  that satisfies Definition 2.1 with parameters  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C \geq 0$ , and  $\hat{C} \geq 0$ , and then update*

$$x^{k+1} := x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, \quad (\text{VFR})$$

where  $\eta > 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$  are given parameters determined later.

There are at least two stochastic estimators  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  satisfying Definition 2.1 can be used in (VFR):

- The *Loopless-SVRG estimator*  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  constructed by (L-SVRG).
- The *SAGA estimator*  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  constructed by (SAGA).

In terms of *per-iteration complexity*, each iteration  $k$  of VFR, the loopless SVRG instance requires three mini-batch evaluations  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} w^k$ ,  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k$ , and  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}$  of  $G$ , and occasionally computes one full evaluation  $G w^k$  of  $G$  with probability  $\mathbf{p}$ . It needs one more mini-batch evaluation  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}$  compared to SVRG-type methods for optimization. Similarly, the SAGA instance also requires two mini-batch evaluations  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k$  and  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}$ , which is one more mini-batch  $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}$  compared to SAGA-type methods in optimization, see, e.g., [68].

(b) **Convergence guarantee.** To analyze the convergence of (VFR), we introduce two functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k &:= \|x^k + \gamma \eta G x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2, \\ \mathcal{E}_k &:= \mathcal{L}_k + \frac{\eta^2(1+\mu)(1-\rho)}{\rho} \Delta_{k-1} + \frac{L^2 \eta^2 \hat{C}(1+\mu)}{\rho} \|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mu$  is a given positive parameter,  $\rho$ ,  $C$ ,  $\hat{C}$ , and  $\Delta_k$  are given in Definition 2.1, and  $x^{-2} = x^{-1} = x^0$ . Clearly, we have  $\mathcal{L}_k \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_k \geq 0$  for all  $k \geq 0$  a.s. A central lemma, Lemma C.1 in Supp. Doc. C provides a key estimate on  $\mathcal{E}_k$ , which is then used to prove the following main result of (VFR).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let us fix  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\mu := \frac{2\gamma-1}{3}$ , and define  $M = \frac{\rho\gamma(2-\gamma)+2(\gamma+1)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(2\gamma-1)}$ . Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NE) for some  $\kappa \geq 0$  such that  $L^2 \kappa^2 \leq \frac{\rho(2\gamma-1)^3}{9[2(\gamma+1)(C+\hat{C})+\rho\gamma(2-\gamma)]}$ . Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFR) using a learning rate  $\eta > 0$  such that*

$$\frac{3\kappa}{2\gamma-1} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}. \quad (7)$$

Then, the following bounds hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|G x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{2}{\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2(K+1)} \left[ (1 + L^2 \eta^2) \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2\eta^2 \Delta_0}{3\rho} \right], \\ \frac{(1-ML^2\eta^2)}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{2}{(2\gamma-1)(K+1)} \left[ (1 + L^2 \eta^2) \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2\eta^2 \Delta_0}{3\rho} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Theorem 3.1 only proves a  $\mathcal{O}(1/K)$  convergence rate of both  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|G x^{k-1}\|^2]$  and  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]$ , but does not characterize the oracle complexity of (VFR). Let us specify this theorem for two estimators we proposed earlier. In addition, it allows  $\kappa > 0$  such that  $L\kappa \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\rho})$ , which means that  $\kappa$  can be positive, but depends on  $\sqrt{\rho}$ . This condition allows us to cover a class of star-co-hypomonotone operators  $G$ , which is possibly nonmonotone.

#### 3.2 Oracle Complexity Bounds of VFR using SVRG and SAGA Estimators

Let us first apply Theorem 3.1 to the mini-batch SVRG estimator (L-SVRG) in Section 2.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NE) with  $\kappa \geq 0$  as in Theorem 3.1. Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFR) using the SVRG estimator (L-SVRG) and*

$$\frac{3\kappa}{2\gamma-1} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}, \quad \text{where } M := \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{16(1+\gamma)(1+\gamma^2)}{(2\gamma-1)b\mathbf{p}^2}. \quad (9)$$

Then, the following bound holds:

$$\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \frac{2(1+L^2\eta^2)}{\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2(K+1)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \quad (10)$$

For a given tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we choose  $\mathbf{p} := \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$  and  $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then (VFR) requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of the summands  $G_i$  to achieve  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ .

The oracle complexity  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  in Corollary 3.1 matches the one of SVRG for nonconvex optimization in, e.g., [5, 69], which improves by a factor  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1/3})$  compared to deterministic counterparts. This complexity is known to be the best for SVRG so far without any additional enhancement even for a special case of (NE):  $Gx = \nabla f(x)$  in nonconvex optimization.

Alternatively, we can apply Theorem 3.1 to the mini-batch SAGA estimator (SAGA).

**Corollary 3.2.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NE) with  $\kappa \geq 0$  as in Theorem 3.1. Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFR) using the SAGA estimator (SAGA) and*

$$\frac{3\kappa}{2\gamma-1} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}, \quad \text{where } M := \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{4(1+\gamma)[2(1+\gamma^2)(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{(2\gamma-1)b^3}. \quad (11)$$

Then, (10) remains valid. Moreover, for a given tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we choose  $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then (VFR) requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of  $G_i$  to achieve  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ .

If  $\kappa = 0$ , i.e.  $G$  reduces to a star-monotone operator, then we can choose  $\gamma := 0.75$  and  $\eta$  as:

- For SVRG:  $0 < \eta \leq \frac{\sqrt{b\mathbf{p}}}{4L}$ . If  $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$  and  $b = \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then  $\eta = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{L})$ ;
- For SAGA:  $0 < \eta \leq \frac{b^{3/2}}{3nL}$ . If  $b = \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then  $\eta = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{L})$ .

Clearly, in the star-monotone case ( $\kappa = 0$ ), our choice of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $b$  in SVRG is different from [3, 4].

## 4 Variance-Reduced Forward-Reflected-Backward Splitting Method

In this section, we develop a new stochastic variance-reduced forward-reflected-backward splitting (FRBS) method to solve (NI) under Assumptions 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4.

### 4.1 The algorithm and its convergence

(a) **The variance-reduced FRBS method (VFRBS).** Our scheme for solving (NI) is as follows: Starting from  $x^0 \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$ , we set  $x^{-1} = x^{-2} := x^0$ , and at each iteration  $k \geq 0$ , we generate an estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  that satisfies Definition 2.1 with  $\rho \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C \geq 0$ , and  $\hat{C} \geq 0$  and update

$$x^{k+1} := x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k - \eta(\gamma v^{k+1} - (2\gamma - 1)v^k), \quad (\text{VFRBS})$$

where  $\eta > 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$  are given parameters determined later, and  $v^k \in Tx^k$ .

(b) **Implementable version.** Since  $v^{k+1} \in Tx^{k+1}$  appears on the right-hand side of (VFRBS), using the resolvent  $J_{\gamma\eta T}(\cdot) := (\mathbb{I} + \gamma\eta T)^{-1}(\cdot)$  of  $T$ , we can rewrite (VFRBS) equivalently to

$$\begin{cases} y^{k+1} := x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k + \frac{(2\gamma-1)}{\gamma}(y^k - x^k), \\ x^{k+1} := J_{\gamma\eta T}(y^{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Here,  $y^0 \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$  is given, and  $x^0 = x^{-1} := J_{\gamma\eta T}(y^0)$ . This is an implementable variant of (VFRBS) using resolvent  $J_{\gamma\eta T}$ . Clearly, if  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ , then (12) reduces to  $x^{k+1} := J_{(\eta/2)T}(x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_{1/2}^k)$ , which can be viewed as a stochastic forward-reflected-backward splitting scheme. However, our  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , making (12) different from existing methods, even in the deterministic case.

Compared to [3], (12) requires only one  $J_{\gamma\eta T}$  as in [2], while [3] needs two evaluations. Moreover, our estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  is also different from the one in [3]. Compared to [13] and also [2], the term  $\gamma^{-1}(2\gamma - 1)(y^k - x^k)$  makes it different from SGDA in [13] and [2], even in the deterministic case.

(c) **Approximate solution certification.** To certify an approximate solution of (NI), we note that its exact solution  $x^* \in \text{zer}(\Psi)$  satisfies  $\|Gx^* + v^*\|^2 = 0$  for some  $v^* \in Tx^*$ . Therefore, if  $(x^k, v^k)$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$  for some  $v^k \in Tx^k$ , then we can say that  $x^k$  is an  $\epsilon$ -solution of (NI). Alternatively, we can define a forward-backward splitting (FBS) residual for (NI)

as  $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma\eta}x := (\gamma\eta)^{-1}(x - J_{\gamma\eta}(x - \gamma\eta Gx))$ . It is well-known that  $x^* \in \text{zer}(\Psi)$  iff  $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma\eta}x^* = 0$ . Hence, if  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\gamma\eta}x^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , then  $x^k$  is also called an  $\epsilon$ -solution of (NI). One can easily prove that  $\|\mathcal{G}_{\gamma\eta}x^k\| \leq \|Gx^k + v^k\|$  for any  $v^k \in Tx^k$ . Clearly, the former metric implies the latter one. Therefore, it is sufficient to only certify  $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , which implies  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\gamma\eta}x^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ .

(d) **Convergence analysis.** One key step to analyze the convergence of (VFRBS) is to build an appropriate potential function, which is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_k := \|x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k) - x^*\|^2 + \mu\|x^k - x^{k-1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k)\|^2. \quad (13)$$

where  $\mu > 0$  is a given parameter and  $v^k \in Tx^k$  is given. This function is then combined with  $\mathcal{E}_k$  from (6) to establish our key lemma, Lemma D.1 for proving our second main result: Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let us fix  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\mu := \frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma-1}$ , and define  $M := 4\gamma^2 + \frac{4\gamma(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(1-\gamma)}$ . Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NI) for some  $\kappa \geq 0$  such that  $L\kappa < \frac{\gamma(2\gamma-1)}{(3\gamma-1)\sqrt{M}}$ . Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFRBS) using a learning rate  $\eta$  such that*

$$\frac{(3\gamma-1)\kappa}{\gamma(2\gamma-1)} < \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}. \quad (14)$$

Then, for  $\Theta(\eta) := \frac{(3\gamma-1)}{(1-\gamma)[\gamma(2\gamma-1)\eta - (3\gamma-1)\kappa]} > 0$ , the following bounds hold

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{\Theta(\eta)}{\eta(K+1)} \left[ (1 + L^2\eta^2) \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2\eta^2\Delta_0}{\rho} \right], \\ \frac{(1-ML^2\eta^2)}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{4(3\gamma-1)}{(1-\gamma)(K+1)} \left[ (1 + L^2\eta^2) \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2\eta^2\Delta_0}{\rho} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The bounds in Theorem 4.1 is similar to the ones in Theorem 3.1, but their proof relies on the new function  $\mathcal{L}_k$  defined by (13). Note that the condition on  $L^2\kappa^2$  still depends on  $\rho$  as  $L\kappa \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\rho})$ . If we choose  $\gamma \approx \frac{1}{2}$  or  $\gamma \approx 1$ , the  $\kappa$  has a larger range than when  $\gamma \approx \frac{3}{4}$ .

## 4.2 Oracle Complexity Bounds of VFRBS using SVRG and SAGA Estimators

Similar to Section 3, we can apply Theorem 4.1 for the mini-batch SVRG estimator in Section 2.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NI) with  $\kappa \geq 0$  as in Theorem 4.1. Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFRBS) using the SVRG estimator (L-SVRG) and  $\eta$  as in Theorem 4.1 but with  $M := 4\gamma^2 + \frac{32\gamma(1+\gamma^2)}{b\mathbf{p}^2(1-\gamma)}$ . Then, the following bound holds:*

$$\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \leq \frac{\Theta(\eta)(1+L^2\eta^2)}{\eta(K+1)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \quad (16)$$

For a given tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we choose  $\mathbf{p} := \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$  and  $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then (VFRBS) requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of  $G_i$  and  $J_{\gamma\eta T}$  to achieve  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ .

Alternatively, we can apply Theorem 4.1 to the mini-batch SAGA estimator (SAGA) in Section 2.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (NI) with  $\kappa \geq 0$  as in Theorem 4.1. Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFRBS) using the SAGA estimator (SAGA) and  $\eta$  as in Theorem 4.1, but with  $M := 4\gamma^2 + \frac{8\gamma[2(n-b)(2n+b)(1+\gamma^2)+b^2]}{(1-\gamma)b^3}$ . Then, (16) remains valid. Moreover, for a given  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we choose  $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then (VFRBS) requires  $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}\epsilon^{-2})$  evaluations of  $G_i$  and  $J_{\gamma\eta T}$  to achieve  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ .*

## 5 Numerical Experiments

We provide two examples to illustrate (VFR) and (VFRBS) and compare them with other methods.

**Example 1.** We consider a synthetic example in [28] built up on WGAN from [6]. This model is eventually formulated into the following bilinear minimax problem (see Supp. Doc. E for details):

$$\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\langle \beta, u_i - v_i - \theta \rangle] \right\}. \quad (17)$$

If we define  $x := [\theta, \beta]$  and  $Gx := [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta), -\nabla_{\beta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta)] = -[\beta, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - v_i - \theta)]$ , then the optimality condition of (17) becomes  $Gx = 0$ , which is a special case of **equation (NE)**.



We implement three variants of (VFR) to solve (17): VR-FR (double-loop SVRG), LVR-FR (loopless SVRG), SAGA-FR (using SAGA estimator) in Python. We also compare our methods with the deterministic optimistic gradient (OG) in [28], variance-reduced FRBS (VR-FRBS) in [2], and variance-reduced extragradient (VR-EG) in [3]. We use the parameters as suggested by our theory, while trying to choose appropriate parameters for OG, VR-FRBS, and VR-EG. The details of this experiment, including generating data and specific choice of parameters, is given in Supp. Doc. E, and the results are revealed in Figure 1 for the average of 10 problem instances.




Figure 1: Comparison of 6 algorithms to solve (17) on 2 experiments (The average of 10 runs). For these particular experiments, our methods superiorly outperform OG, VR-FRBS, and VR-EG. Note that by varying the parameters, we still observe some promising performance of our methods over their competitors as we show in Supp. Doc. E.

**Example 2.** We consider the following constrained nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problem:

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}} \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(u, v) := f(u) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [u^T A_i u + u^T L_i v - v^T B_i v + b_i^T u - c_i^T v] - g(v) \right\}, \quad (18)$$

where  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}$  and  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}$  are symmetric matrices,  $L_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ ,  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ ,  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ , and  $f = \delta_{\Delta_{p_1}}$  and  $g = \delta_{\Delta_{p_2}}$  are the indicator of standard simplexes in  $\mathbb{R}^{p_1}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ , respectively. Here, if  $A_i$  and/or  $B_i$  are not positive semidefinite, then (18) possibly covers nonconvex-nonconcave minimax instances. The optimality of (18) falls into **inclusion** (NI) (see Supp. Doc. E for details.)

We generate  $A_i = Q_i D_i Q_i^T$  for a given orthonormal matrix  $Q_i$  and a diagonal matrix  $D_i$ , where its elements  $D_i^j$  are generated from standard normal distribution and clipped as  $\max\{D_i^j, -0.01\}$ . The matrix  $B_i$  is also generated by the same way, while  $L_i$ ,  $b_i$ , and  $c_i$  are generated from standard normal distribution. By this way,  $\mathbf{G}$  in (NI) is not symmetric and possibly not positive semidefinite.

Again, we run 6 algorithms using the same parameters as in **Example 1** (see Supp. Doc. E for details). We report the relative norm of the FBS residual  $\|\mathcal{G}_\eta x^k\|/\|\mathcal{G}_\eta x^0\|$  against the number of epochs. The results are revealed in Figure 2 for two datasets  $(p, n) = (100, 5000)$  and  $(p, n) = (200, 10000)$ .




Figure 2: Comparison of 6 algorithms to solve (18) on 2 experiments (The average of 10 runs).

Clearly, with these experiments, both SVRG variants of our method (VFRBS) work well and significantly outperform other competitors. The loopless SVRG variant (VR-FR) of (VFRBS) seems to work best, while VR-FRBS tends to have a similar performance with OG.

## 6 Conclusions

This work introduces two innovative variance-reduced algorithms based on the forward-reflected-backward splitting method to tackle equations (NE) and inclusions (NI). These methods encompass

both SVRG and SAGA estimators as special cases. By carefully selecting parameters, our algorithms achieve the state-of-the-art oracle complexity for reaching an  $\epsilon$ -solution, matching the performance observed in nonconvex optimization methods. While the first scheme resembles a stochastic variant of the optimistic gradient method, the second algorithm is entirely novel and distinct from existing approaches, even their deterministic counterparts. We have validated our methods through numerical examples, and the results demonstrate promising performance compared to existing techniques under identical parameter settings.

**Acknowledgments.** This work was partly supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF): NSF-RTG grant No. NSF DMS-2134107 and the Office of Naval Research (ONR), grant No. N00014-23-1-2588.

## A Appendix – Further discussion of related work

As we already discussed in the introduction of the main text, both standard stochastic approximation and variance-reduction methods have been broadly studied for (NE) and (NI), including [44, 47, 64]. In this section, we further discuss some other related work to (NE) and (NI), and their special cases.

**Beyond monotonicity.** Classical methods such as extragradient or prox-mirror methods often relax the monotonicity to star-monotonicity, and other forms such as pseudo-monotonicity and quasi-monotonicity [46, 61, 62, 79]. These assumptions are certainly weaker than the monotonicity and can cover some wider classes of problems, including some nonmonotone subclasses. Another extension of monotonicity is the weak-Minty solution condition in Assumption 1.4, which was proposed in early work, perhaps [32], as an extension of the star-monotonicity and star-weak-monotonicity assumptions. Other following works include [15, 37, 53]. A comprehensive survey for extragradient-type methods using the weak-Minty solution condition can be found in [76]. The monotonicity has also been extended to a weak monotonicity, or related, prox-regularity [71] (in particular, weak-convexity). Other types of hypo-monotonicity or co-monotonicity concepts can be found, e.g., in [10]. These concepts have been exploited to design algorithms for solving (NE) and (NI) and their special cases. For stochastic methods, extensions beyond monotonicity have been also extensively explored. For instance, some further structures beyond monotonicity such as weak solution were exploited for MVIs in [74], a pseudo-monotonicity was used in [17, 45] for stochastic VIPs, a two-sided Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition was extended to VIP in [80] to tackle a class on nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems, an expected co-coercivity was used [52], and a strongly star-monotone was further exploited in [36].

**Further discussion on stochastic methods.** Under monotonicity, several authors have exploited the stochastic approximation approach [70] to develop stochastic variants for solving (NE) and (NI) and their special cases. For example, a stochastic Mirror-Prox was proposed in [44], which has convergence on a gap function, but requires a bounded domain assumption. This approach was later extended to the extragradient method under additional assumptions in [57]. In [40], the authors discussed several methods for solving MVIs, a special case of (NI), including stochastic methods. They experimented on numerical examples and showed that the norm of the operator can asymptotically converge for unconstrained MVIs with a double learning rate. In the last few years, there were many works focusing on developing stochastic methods for solving (NE) and (NI), and their special cases using different techniques such as single-call stochastic schemes in [40], non-accelerated and accelerated variance reduction with Halpern-type iterations in [19, 20], co-coercive structures in [13], and bilinear game models in [51].

**Randomized coordinate and cyclic coordinate methods for (NE) and (NI).** Together with stochastic algorithms for solving (NE) and (NI) and their special cases, randomized coordinate methods have also been proposed to solve these problems, including [24, 26, 63]. Recent works on randomized coordinate and cyclic coordinate methods can be found, e.g., in [23, 27, 38, 77, 81]. These methods are not directly related to our work, but they can be considered as a dual form of stochastic methods in certain settings such as convex-concave minimax problems.

## B Appendix – The Proof of Technical Results in Section 2

This supplementary section provides the full proof of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

**Further discussion of FR operator.** Let us recall our intermediate operator  $S_\gamma^k$  defined by (FRO) as

$$S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}. \quad (\text{FRO})$$

As we mentioned,  $\gamma$  plays a crucial role in our methods in the sequel as  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . If  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ , then we can write  $S_{1/2}^k = \frac{1}{2}Gx^k + \frac{1}{2}(Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2}[2Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}]$  used in both the forward-reflected-backward splitting (FRBS) method [56] and the optimistic gradient method [28].

Note that if we view  $Gx^k - Gx^{k-1} = \hat{J}_G(x^k)(x^k - x^{k-1})$  by the Mean-Value Theorem, where  $\hat{J}_G(x^k) := \int_0^1 \nabla G(x^{k-1} + \tau(x^k - x^{k-1}))d\tau$ , then  $S_\gamma^k = (1 - \gamma)G(x^k) + \gamma\hat{J}_G(x^k)(x^k - x^{k-1})$ . Clearly, if  $\gamma$  is small, then  $S_\gamma^k$  can be considered as an approximation of  $Gx^k$  augmented by a second-order correction  $\gamma\hat{J}_G(x^k)(x^k - x^{k-1})$  (called Hessian-driven damping term or second-order dissipative term) widely used in dynamical systems for convex optimization, see, e.g., [1, 7]. These two viewpoints motivate the use of our new operator  $S_\gamma^k$ , not only in our (VFR) and (VFRBS) below, but for other methods such as accelerated algorithms in our forthcoming works. Thus the results in Section 2 are of independent interest.

**Other possible stochastic estimators for  $S_\gamma^k$ .** One natural idea to construct an unbiased estimator for  $S^k$  is to use an increasing mini-batch stochastic estimator as  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k := \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} [G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1}]$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_k$  is an increasing mini-batch in  $[n]$ , with  $b_k := |\mathcal{B}_k| \geq \frac{b_{k-1}}{1-\rho_k} \geq b_{k-1}$ , see, e.g., [42]. While this idea may work well for the general expectation case  $Gx = \mathbb{E}_\xi [G(x, \xi)]$ , it may not be an ideal choice for finite-sum operator (1) as  $b_k \leq n$ , which requires to stop increasing after finite iterations (i.e.  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln(n)}{-\ln(1-\rho)}\right)$  iterations). Other stochastic approximations may also be applicable such as quantized or compressed estimators, see, e.g., [39].

### B.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1: Loopless-SVRG Estimator

Let us further expand Lemma 2.1 in detail as follows and then provide its full proof.

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$  be defined by (FRO) and  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  be generated by (L-SVRG). We consider the following quantity:*

$$\Delta_k := \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)G_i w^k\|^2]. \quad (19)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}_\gamma^k] &= S_\gamma^k \equiv Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k\|^2] &\leq \Delta_k - \frac{1}{b} \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)Gw^k\|^2] \leq \Delta_k, \\ \Delta_k &\leq (1 - \frac{\rho}{2})\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{4}{nb\rho} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\gamma^2}{nb\rho} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Consequently, the SVRG estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  constructed by (L-SVRG) satisfies Definition 2.1 with  $\Delta_k$  in (19),  $\rho := \frac{\rho}{2} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{4}{b\rho}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{4\gamma^2}{b\rho}$ .

*Proof.* It is well-known, see, e.g., [43], that  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  is an unbiased estimator of  $S^k$  conditioned on  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}_\gamma^k] = S_\gamma^k$ .

Next, let  $X_i := G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)G_i w^k$  for any  $i \in [n]$ . Then, we have  $\mathbb{E}_k[X_i] = Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)Gw^k$  for any  $i \in [n]$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}_k$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , using the property of expectation, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k\|^2] &\stackrel{(\text{L-SVRG})}{=} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} X_i - [Gx^k + \gamma Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)Gw^k]\|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k[\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} [X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]\|^2] \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} \frac{1}{b^2} \mathbb{E}_k[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \|X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\|^2] \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{=} \frac{1}{b^2} \mathbb{E}_k[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)G_i w^k\|^2] - \frac{1}{b} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma)G_i w^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{b} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\textcircled{1}$  holds due to the i.i.d. property of  $\mathcal{B}_k$ , and  $\textcircled{2}$  holds since  $\mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] - (\mathbb{E}_k[X_i])^2$ . This estimate implies the second line of (20) by taking the total expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  both sides and the definition of  $\Delta_k$  from (19).

Now, from (4) and (19), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k &\stackrel{(19)}{:=} \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)G_i w^k\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{=} \frac{(1-\mathbf{p})}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)G_i w^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma G_i x^{k-2} - (1-\gamma)G_i w^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{cnb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - [G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma G_i x^{k-2}]\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma G_i x^{k-2} - (1-\gamma)G_i w^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})\gamma^2}{nbc} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{nb} [\mathbf{p} + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{c}] \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&= (1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})\gamma^2}{nbc} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{nb} [\mathbf{p} + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{c}] \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in both inequalities  $\textcircled{1}$  and  $\textcircled{2}$ , we have used Young's inequality twice. If we choose  $c := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2(1-\mathbf{p})}$ , then  $(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p}) = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2}$ ,  $\frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{c} = (1-\mathbf{p})(1 + \frac{2(1-\mathbf{p})}{\mathbf{p}}) = \frac{(2-\mathbf{p})(1-\mathbf{p})}{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{2-3\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p}^2}{\mathbf{p}} \leq \frac{2}{\mathbf{p}}$ , and  $\frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{c} + \mathbf{p} = \frac{4-6\mathbf{p}+3\mathbf{p}^2}{\mathbf{p}} \leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{p}}$ . Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k &\leq (1 - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2})\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{4\gamma^2}{nb\mathbf{p}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{nb\mathbf{p}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the last inequality of (20).  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Lemma 2.2: SAGA estimator

Similarly, we also further expand Lemma 2.2 in detail as follows and then provide its full proof.

**Lemma B.2.** Let  $S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$  be defined by (FRO) and  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  be generated by the SAGA estimator (SAGA), and  $e^k := \tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k$ . We consider the following quantity:

$$\Delta_k := \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2]. \quad (21)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}_\gamma^k] &= S_\gamma^k \equiv Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}, \\
\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k\|^2] &\leq \Delta_k - \frac{1}{b} \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k\|^2] \leq \Delta_k, \\
\Delta_k &\leq (1 - \frac{b}{2n})\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{n^2 b^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{n^2 b^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2].
\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Consequently, the SAGA estimator  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  constructed by (SAGA) satisfies Definition 2.1 with  $\Delta_k$  in (21),  $\rho := \frac{b}{2n} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{nb^2}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{nb^2}$ .

*Proof.* It is well-known, see, e.g., [30], that  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  defined by (SAGA) is an unbiased estimator of  $S^k$ . Indeed, we have  $\mathbb{E}_k[\hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k] = Gx^k$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}] = Gx^{k-1}$ .

Using these relations and the definition of  $\tilde{S}^k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] &= \mathbb{E}_k\left[\frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k\right] - (1-\gamma)\mathbb{E}_k[\hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k] + \mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k] - \gamma\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}] \\
&= \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k + Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} \\
&= Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} \\
&= S^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\tilde{S}^k$  is an unbiased estimator of  $S^k$ .

Next, let  $X_i := G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k$  for any  $i \in [n]$ . Then, we have  $\mathbb{E}_k[X_i] = Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k$  for any  $i \in [n]$ . Therefore, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}_k\left[\left\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} X_i - \left[Gx^k + \gamma Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k\right]\right\|^2\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_k\left[\left\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\right\|^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{b^2} \mathbb{E}_k\left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \|X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\|^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{b^2} \mathbb{E}_k\left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2\right] - \frac{1}{b} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{b} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies the second line of (22) by taking the total expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  both sides.

Now, from (5) and (21) and the rule (5), for any  $c > 0$ , by Young's inequality, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k &\stackrel{(21)}{:=} \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{b}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma)G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{(1+c)}{nb} \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma G_i x^{k-2} - (1-\gamma)\hat{G}_i^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{(1+c)}{cnb} \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma G_i x^{k-1} - (G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma G_i x^{k-2})\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\leq (1+c) \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \Delta_{k-1} + \left[\frac{1}{n^2} + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \frac{2(1+c)}{cnb}\right] \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1+c)\gamma^2}{cnb} \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose  $c := \frac{b}{2n} \in (0, 1)$ , then  $(1 - \frac{b}{n})(1+c) = 1 - \frac{b}{2n} - \frac{b^2}{2n^2} \leq 1 - \frac{b}{2n}$ . Hence, we can further upper bound the last inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k &\leq \left(1 - \frac{b}{2n}\right) \Delta_{k-1} + \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{n^2 b^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{n^2 b^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the last inequality of (22).  $\square$

## C Appendix – Convergence Analysis of VFR for (NE): Technical Proofs

One key step to analyze the convergence of (VFR) is to prove a descent property of  $\mathcal{E}_k$  defined by (6). The following lemma provides such a key estimate to prove the convergence of (VFR).

**Lemma C.1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1.3 and 1.4 hold for (NE). Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFR) and  $\mathcal{E}_k$  be defined by (6) for any  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ . Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k+1}] &\geq \mu \left(1 - \frac{\rho\gamma(1+\mu-\gamma)+(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho\mu}\right) \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \eta(1-\gamma)[\eta(2\gamma-1-\mu) - 2\kappa] \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \\
&\quad + \eta^2\gamma(1-\gamma)(1+\mu) \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2].
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

*Proof.* First, using  $x^{k+1} := x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  from (VFR), we can expand

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} + \gamma\eta Gx^k - x^*\|^2 &\stackrel{\text{(VFR)}}{=} \|x^k - x^* + \gamma\eta Gx^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\eta \langle \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2\gamma\eta^2 \langle Gx^k, \tilde{S}_\gamma^k \rangle + \eta^2 \|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Second, it is obvious to show that

$$\|x^k + \gamma\eta Gx^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 = \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle + \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2.$$

Third, using again  $x^{k+1} := x^k - \eta \tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  from (VFR), we can show that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 = \eta^2 \|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2.$$

Combining three expressions above, and using  $\mathcal{L}_k$  from (6), we can establish that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} &= \|x^k + \gamma\eta Gx^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} + \gamma\eta Gx^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \mu \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &= 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^k\|^2 + 2\eta \langle \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + 2\gamma\eta^2 \langle Gx^k, \tilde{S}_\gamma^k \rangle \\ &\quad + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta^2 (1 + \mu) \|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Next, since  $\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}_\gamma^k] = S_\gamma^k \equiv Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$  as shown in the first line of (3) of Definition 2.1. Moreover, since  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  is conditionally independent of  $x^k - x^*$  and  $Gx^k$  w.r.t. the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] &= \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \gamma \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle, \\ 2\mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, Gx^k \rangle] &= 2\|Gx^k\|^2 - 2\gamma \langle Gx^{k-1}, Gx^k \rangle \\ &= (2 - \gamma)\|Gx^k\|^2 - \gamma\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \gamma\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$  both sides of (24) and using the last two expressions, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &= 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2\gamma\eta \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^k\|^2 + 2\eta \mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}_\gamma^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] + 2\gamma\eta^2 \mathbb{E}_k[\langle Gx^k, \tilde{S}_\gamma^k \rangle] \\ &\quad - \eta^2 (1 + \mu) \mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2] + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &= 2\eta(1 - \gamma) \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + 2\gamma(1 - \gamma) \eta^2 \|Gx^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \eta^2 \|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta^2 (1 + \mu) \mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2] + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k$  is an unbiased estimator of  $S_\gamma^k$ , if we denote  $e^k := \tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k$ , then we have  $\mathbb{E}_k[e^k] = 0$ . Hence, we can show that  $\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|S_\gamma^k + e^k\|^2] = \|S_\gamma^k\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_k[\langle e^k, S_\gamma^k \rangle] + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] + \|S_\gamma^k\|^2$ . Using this relation and  $S_\gamma^k = Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$ , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}_\gamma^k\|^2] &= \|S_\gamma^k\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] = \|Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &= \|Gx^k\|^2 - 2\gamma \langle Gx^k, Gx^{k-1} \rangle + \gamma^2 \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &= (1 - \gamma)\|Gx^k\|^2 - \gamma(1 - \gamma)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \gamma\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this expression into the last estimate, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &= 2\eta(1 - \gamma) \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \eta^2 (1 - \gamma) (2\gamma - 1 - \mu) \|Gx^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \eta^2 \gamma (1 - \gamma) (1 + \mu) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 - \gamma \eta^2 (1 + \mu - \gamma) \|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \eta^2 (1 + \mu) \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] + \mu \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the total expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  both sides of this expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &= 2(1-\gamma)\eta\mathbb{E}[\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] + \eta^2\gamma(1-\gamma)(1+\mu)\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \eta^2(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1-\mu)\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] + \mu\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad - \gamma\eta^2(1+\mu-\gamma)\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2] - \eta^2(1+\mu)\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2].\end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality in ① and (2) of Assumption 1.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 &= \|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n[G_ix^k - G_ix^{i-1}]\|^2 \stackrel{\text{①}}{\leq} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\|G_ix^k - G_ix^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} L^2\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

Utilizing this inequality,  $\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \geq -\kappa\|Gx^k\|^2$  from Assumption 1.4 with  $T = 0$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \leq \Delta_k$  from (3), we can bound the last expression as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq [\mu - L^2\eta^2\gamma(1+\mu-\gamma)]\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + (1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \eta(1-\gamma)[\eta(2\gamma-1-\mu) - 2\kappa]\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] - \eta^2(1+\mu)\Delta_k.\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

By the third line of (3) in Definition 2.1 and again (2), we have

$$\Delta_k \leq (1-\rho)\Delta_{k-1} + CL^2\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + \hat{C}L^2\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2].$$

Rearranging this inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_k &\leq \left(\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\right)(\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k) + \frac{\hat{C}L^2}{\rho}[\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]] \\ &\quad + \frac{(C+\hat{C})L^2}{\rho}\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2].\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this inequality into (26), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq \left[\mu - L^2\eta^2\gamma(1+\mu-\gamma) - \frac{L^2\eta^2(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho}\right]\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \eta(1-\gamma)[\eta(2\gamma-1-\mu) - 2\kappa]\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + (1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad - \frac{L^2\eta^2\hat{C}(1+\mu)}{\rho}[\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]] \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta^2(1+\mu)(1-\rho)}{\rho}(\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k).\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality and using  $\mathcal{E}_k$  from (6), we obtain (23).  $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove our first main result, Theorem 3.1 in the main text.

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Let us denote by  $M := \frac{\rho\gamma(1+\mu-\gamma)+(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho\mu}$ . Then, to keep the right-hand side of (23) positive, we need to choose the parameters such that  $L^2\eta^2 \leq \frac{1}{M}$  and  $\eta \geq \frac{2\kappa}{2\gamma-\mu-1}$ . These two conditions lead to  $\frac{4L^2\kappa^2}{(2\gamma-\mu-1)^2} \leq L^2\eta^2 \leq \frac{\rho\mu}{\rho\gamma(1+\mu-\gamma)+(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}$ . Let us choose  $\mu := \frac{2\gamma-1}{4}$  for some  $\gamma \in (0.5, 1)$ . Then, we require  $L^2\kappa^2 \leq \frac{\rho(2\gamma-1)^3}{9[2(\gamma+1)(C+\hat{C})+\rho\gamma(2-\gamma)]}$  as stated in Theorem 3.1. In this case, we have  $M = \frac{\rho\gamma(2-\gamma)+2(\gamma+1)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(2\gamma-1)}$ . Hence, we can choose  $\frac{3\kappa}{2\gamma-1} \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}$ . Then, using the fact that  $\mu+1 = \frac{2\gamma+2}{3} \geq 1$ , (23) reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k+1}] \geq (2\gamma-1)(1-M \cdot L^2\eta^2)\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + \gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2].$$

Averaging this inequality from  $k := 0$  to  $k := K$ , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{K+1}\sum_{k=0}^K\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0]}{\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2(K+1)}, \\ \frac{(1-ML^2\eta^2)}{K+1}\sum_{k=0}^K\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0]}{(2\gamma-1)(K+1)}. \end{cases}$$

Finally, since  $x^{-1} = x^{-2} = x^0$ ,  $\Delta_{-1} = \Delta_0$ ,  $\rho \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\gamma < 1$ , and  $\mu + 1 = \frac{2\gamma+2}{3} \leq \frac{4}{3}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0] &= \mathbb{E}[\|x^0 + \eta\gamma G(x^0) - x^*\|^2] + \frac{\eta^2(1+\mu)(1-\rho)}{\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|x^0 - x^*\|^2] + 2\eta^2\gamma^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^0\|^2] + \frac{4\eta^2}{3\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2(1 + L^2\eta^2\gamma^2)\mathbb{E}[\|x^0 - x^*\|^2] + \frac{4\eta^2}{3\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2(1 + L^2\eta^2)\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{4\eta^2}{3\rho} \Delta_0.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this upper bound into the above estimates, we get (8).  $\square$

Finally, we provide the proof of Corollary (3.1) and Corollary 3.2.

**Proof of Corollary 3.1.** For the SVRG estimator (L-SVRG), by Lemma 2.1, we have  $\rho := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{4}{b\mathbf{p}}$ ,  $\hat{C} := \frac{4\gamma^2}{b\mathbf{p}}$ , and  $\Delta_0 = 0$  due to (19) and  $x^0 = x^{-1} = w^0$ . In this case,  $M$  in Theorem 3.1 reduces to  $M := \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{2(1+\gamma)(C+\hat{C})}{(2\gamma-1)\rho} = \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{16(1+\gamma)(1+\gamma^2)}{(2\gamma-1)b\mathbf{p}^2}$ . Hence, our bound (10) follows from the first line of (8). In addition, we have  $M = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{b\mathbf{p}^2}\right)$ .

If we choose  $\eta$  satisfying (9), then we have  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{b\mathbf{p}}}{L}\right)$ . With the choice of  $b = \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\right)$ , we get  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ . Hence, the right-hand side of (10) becomes  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K+1}\right)$ . To guarantee  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , we have to impose  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K+1}\right) \leq \epsilon^2$ , leading to  $K = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2R_0^2}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ , where  $R_0 := \|x^0 - x^*\|$ .

Finally, we can estimate the oracle complexity of (VFR). In fact, (VFR) requires  $(n\mathbf{p} + 3b)K = \left(n \cdot \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} + 3n^{2/3}\right) \cdot \frac{L^2R_0^2}{\epsilon^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^{2/3}}{\epsilon^2}\right)$  evaluations of  $G_i$ . Combining this quantity and the cost of the first epoch  $k = 0$ , we obtain  $\mathcal{O}\left(n + \frac{n^{2/3}}{\epsilon^2}\right)$  as our total oracle complexity.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 3.2.** Since we use the SAGA estimator (SAGA), we have  $\rho := \frac{b}{2n} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{nb^2}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{nb^2}$ . Moreover, since we initialize  $\hat{G}_i^0 = G_i x^0$  for all  $i \in [n]$  and  $x^{-1} = x^0$ , we can easily show from (21) that  $\Delta_0 = 0$ . In this case,  $M$  in Theorem 3.1 reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}M &:= \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{2(1+\gamma)(C+\hat{C})}{(2\gamma-1)\rho} = \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{4(1+\gamma)[2(1+\gamma^2)(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{(2\gamma-1)b^3} \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{4(1+\gamma)(1+\gamma^2)n^2}{(2\gamma-1)b^3} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2}{b^3}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can set  $M := \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{4(1+\gamma)[2(1+\gamma^2)(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{(2\gamma-1)b^3}$  as in (11). In this case, we obtain (10) from the first line of (8).

From the condition (8) of  $\eta$ , we can see that  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{b^{3/2}}{nL}\right)$ . Since  $M \geq \mathcal{O}(1)$ , we must have  $\eta \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ , leading to  $b \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ . In this case, we can estimate the right hand side bound of (10) as  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3K}\right)$ , where  $R_0 := \|x^0 - x^*\|$ . To guarantee  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , we have to impose  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3K}\right) \leq \epsilon^2$ . Hence, the number of iterations required is  $K := \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3\epsilon^2}\right)$ .

Finally, we can estimate the oracle complexity of (VFR) for the SAGA estimator. For the first iteration  $k = 0$ , we need  $n$  evaluations of  $G_i$ . For other iterations  $k \geq 1$ , we need 3 mini-batches of size  $b$  per iteration, leading to  $3b$  evaluations of  $G_i$ . Hence, the total evaluations of  $G_i$  is  $n + 3bK = \mathcal{O}\left(n + \frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^2\epsilon^2}\right)$ . If we choose  $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ , then we obtain  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ , and thus the total complexity of (VFR) in this case is  $\mathcal{O}\left(n + \frac{n^{2/3}}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ .  $\square$



## D Appendix – Convergence Analysis of VFRBS for (NI): Technical Proofs

Let us first prove the following lemma, which provides a key estimate for our convergence analysis of (VFRBS) in Theorem 4.1.

**Lemma D.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 1.3 holds for (NI). Let  $\{x^k\}$  be generated by (VFRBS),  $\mathcal{L}_k$  be defined by (13), and  $\mathcal{E}_k$  be defined by (6). Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle Gx^k + v^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + (1+\mu)(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma[1-\gamma-\mu(3\gamma-1)]\eta^2\|Gx^{k-1} + v^k\|^2 - (1+\mu)\eta^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}[\mu - 2(1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)L^2\eta^2]\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

If, additionally, Assumption 1.4 holds for (NI), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k+1}] &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left[\mu - 2(1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)L^2\eta^2 - \frac{2L^2\eta^2(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho}\right]\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \gamma[1-\gamma-\mu(3\gamma-1)]\eta^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1} + v^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + (1-\gamma)\eta[(1+\mu)(2\gamma-1)\eta - 2\kappa]\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

*Proof.* Let us introduce two notations  $w^k := Gx^k + v^k$  and  $\hat{w}^k := Gx^{k-1} + v^k$ , where  $v^k \in Tx^k$ . We also recall  $S_\gamma^k := Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1}$  and  $e^k := \tilde{S}_\gamma^k - S_\gamma^k$  from (FRO). Then, it is obvious that  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k = S_\gamma^k + e^k = Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} + e^k$ .

Now, using  $\tilde{S}_\gamma^k = Gx^k - \gamma Gx^{k-1} + e^k$ , it follows from (VFRBS) that

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= x^k - \eta\tilde{S}_\gamma^k - \gamma\eta v^{k+1} - (2\gamma-1)\eta v^k \\ &= x^k - \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1}) - (1-\gamma)\eta(Gx^k + v^k) + \eta\gamma(Gx^{k-1} + v^k) - \eta e^k \\ &= x^k - \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1} - (1-\gamma)\eta w^k + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^k - \eta e^k. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Then, using (29) and  $\hat{w}^{k+1} = Gx^k + v^{k+1}$ , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= \|x^{k+1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1}) - x^*\|^2 = \|x^{k+1} - x^* + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(29)}{=} \|x^k - \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1} - (1-\gamma)\eta w^k + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^k - \eta e^k - x^* + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + 2\gamma\eta\langle \hat{w}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \eta^2\|e^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + (1-\gamma)^2\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 - 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle w^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle + \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\eta\langle e^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle - 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, using  $\hat{w}^k = Gx^{k-1} + v^k$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[2]} &:= \|x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k) - x^*\|^2 = \|x^k - x^* + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + 2\gamma\eta\langle \hat{w}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting  $\mathcal{T}_{[1]}$  from  $\mathcal{T}_{[2]}$ , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[3]} &:= \|x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k) - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1}) - x^*\|^2 \\ &= 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - (1-\gamma)^2\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 + 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle w^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\eta\langle e^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle + 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle - \eta^2\|e^k\|^2 \\ &= 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + (1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 - \gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\eta\langle e^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle + 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle - \eta^2\|e^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Next, using again  $\hat{w}^{k+1} = Gx^k + v^{k+1}$  and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{[4]} &:= \|x^{k+1} - x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1})\|^2 = \|x^{k+1} - x^k + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(29)}{=} \eta^2 \|(1-\gamma)w^k - \gamma\hat{w}^k + e^k\|^2 \\
&= (1-\gamma)^2\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 - 2\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle w^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle + \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \eta^2\|e^k\|^2 + 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle - 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle \\
&= -(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 + \gamma(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 + \gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \eta^2\|e^k\|^2 + 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle - 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in  $\textcircled{1}$  and Young's inequality in  $\textcircled{2}$ , we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^k - x^{k-1} + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^k\|^2 &= \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma\eta\langle \hat{w}^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle + \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\geq} \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 2\gamma\eta\|\hat{w}^k\|\|x^k - x^{k-1}\| + \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} \frac{1}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \gamma^2\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two expressions, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{[5]} &:= \|x^k - x^{k-1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k)\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1})\|^2 \\
&= \|x^k - x^{k-1} + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^k\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^k + \gamma\eta\hat{w}^{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + (1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 - \gamma(3\gamma-1)\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad - \gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 - \eta^2\|e^k\|^2 - 2(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle + 2\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying  $\mathcal{T}_{[5]}$  by  $\mu > 0$ , and adding the result to (30), and using  $\mathcal{L}_k$  from (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} &= \|x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k) - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1}) - x^*\|^2 \\
&\quad + \mu\|x^k - x^{k-1} + \gamma\eta(Gx^{k-1} + v^k)\|^2 - \mu\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \gamma\eta(Gx^k + v^{k+1})\|^2 \\
&\geq 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + (1+\mu)(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma[(1-\gamma) - \mu(3\gamma-1)]\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 - (1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\eta\langle e^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2(1+\mu)(1-\gamma)\eta^2\langle e^k, w^k \rangle \\
&\quad + 2(1+\mu)\gamma\eta^2\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle - (1+\mu)\eta^2\|e^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$  both sides of this expression, and noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\langle e^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] &= \langle \mathbb{E}_k[e^k], x^k - x^* \rangle = 0, \\
\mathbb{E}_k[\langle e^k, w^k \rangle] &= \langle \mathbb{E}_k[e^k], w^k \rangle = 0, \\
\mathbb{E}_k[\langle e^k, \hat{w}^k \rangle] &= \langle \mathbb{E}_k[e^k], \hat{w}^k \rangle = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + (1+\mu)(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma[(1-\gamma) - \mu(3\gamma-1)]\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 - (1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)\eta^2\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad - (1+\mu)\eta^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by the  $L$ -Lipschitz continuity of  $G$  from (2) of Assumption 1.3, we have  $\|w^k - \hat{w}^k\|^2 = \|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \leq L^2\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2$  as shown in (25). Using this inequality into the last estimate, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq 2(1-\gamma)\eta\langle w^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + (1+\mu)(1-\gamma)(2\gamma-1)\eta^2\|w^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma[1-\gamma - \mu(3\gamma-1)]\eta^2\|\hat{w}^k\|^2 - (1+\mu)\eta^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}[\mu - 2(1+\mu)\gamma(1-\gamma)L^2\eta^2]\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (27) by recalling  $w^k := Gx^k + v^k$  and  $\hat{w}^k := Gx^{k-1} + v^k$ .

Taking the full expectation of (27) and using  $\langle Gx^k + v^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \geq -\kappa \|Gx^k + v^k\|^2$  from Assumption 1.4 and  $\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \leq \Delta_k$  from (3), we can bound it as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq \frac{1}{2} [\mu - 2(1 + \mu)\gamma(1 - \gamma)L^2\eta^2] \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] - (1 + \mu)\eta^2 \Delta_k \\ &\quad + \gamma[1 - \gamma - \mu(3\gamma - 1)]\eta^2 \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1} + v^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma)\eta[(1 + \mu)(2\gamma - 1)\eta - 2\kappa] \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

By the third line of (3) in Definition 2.1 and utilizing again (2), we have

$$\Delta_k \leq (1 - \rho)\Delta_{k-1} + CL^2\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + \hat{C}L^2\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2].$$

Rearranging this inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k &\leq \left(\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\right)(\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k) + \frac{\hat{C}L^2}{\rho} [\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]] \\ &\quad + \frac{(C+\hat{C})L^2}{\rho} \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this inequality into (31), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[ \mu - 2(1 + \mu)\gamma(1 - \gamma)L^2\eta^2 - \frac{2L^2\eta^2(1+\mu)(C+\hat{C})}{\rho} \right] \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \gamma[1 - \gamma - \mu(3\gamma - 1)]\eta^2 \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1} + v^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma)\eta[(1 + \mu)(2\gamma - 1)\eta - 2\kappa] \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] \\ &\quad - \frac{L^2\eta^2\hat{C}(1+\mu)}{\rho} [\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k-1} - x^{k-2}\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2]] \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta^2(1+\mu)(1-\rho)}{\rho} (\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality and using  $\mathcal{E}_k$  from (6), we obtain (28).  $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove our second main result, Theorem 4.1 in the main text.

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Since we fix  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\mu := \frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma-1}$ , we have  $\mu > 0$  and  $1 + \mu = \frac{2\gamma}{3\gamma-1}$ .

Let us denote by  $M := 4\gamma^2 + \frac{4\gamma(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(1-\gamma)}$  as in Theorem 4.1. Then, (28) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k+1}] &\geq \frac{(1-\gamma)(1-M \cdot L^2\eta^2)}{2(3\gamma-1)} \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2(1 - \gamma)\eta \left[ \frac{\gamma(2\gamma-1)\eta}{3\gamma-1} - \kappa \right] \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let us choose  $\eta > 0$  such that  $\frac{\gamma(2\gamma-1)\eta}{3\gamma-1} - \kappa > 0$  and  $1 - M \cdot L^2\eta^2 \geq 0$ . These two conditions lead to  $\frac{(3\gamma-1)\kappa}{\gamma(2\gamma-1)} < \eta \leq \frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}$  as stated in (14). However, this condition holds if  $L^2\kappa^2 < \frac{\gamma^2(2\gamma-1)^2}{M(3\gamma-1)^2}$  as our condition in Theorem 4.1.

Averaging (32) from  $k = 0$  to  $K$  and noting that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] \geq 0$  for all  $k \geq 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k + v^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{(3\gamma-1) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0]}{2(1-\gamma)[\gamma(2\gamma-1)\eta - (3\gamma-1)\kappa]\eta(K+1)}, \\ \frac{(1-M \cdot L^2\eta^2)}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{2(3\gamma-1) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0]}{(1-\gamma)(K+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since  $x^{-1} = x^{-2} = x^0$ , we have  $\Delta_{-1} = \Delta_0$ . Moreover, we also have  $\rho \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\gamma < 1$ , and  $1 + \mu = \frac{2\gamma}{3\gamma-1} \leq 4$ . Using these relations, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0] &= \mathbb{E}[\|x^0 + \gamma\eta(Gx^0 + v^0) - x^*\|^2] + \frac{\eta^2(1+\mu)(1-\rho)}{\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|x^0 - x^*\|^2] + 2\gamma^2\eta^2\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^0 + v^0\|^2] + \frac{4\eta^2}{\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2(1 + \gamma^2L^2\eta^2)\mathbb{E}[\|x^0 - x^*\|^2] + \frac{4\eta^2}{\rho} \Delta_0 \\ &\leq 2(1 + L^2\eta^2)\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{4\eta^2}{\rho} \Delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this upper bound into the above estimates, we get (15).  $\square$

Finally, we prove Corollaries 4.1 and 4.2.

**Proof of Corollary 4.1.** For the SVRG estimator (L-SVRG), we have  $\rho := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{4}{b\mathbf{p}}$ ,  $\hat{C} := \frac{4\gamma^2}{b\mathbf{p}}$ , and  $\Delta_0 = 0$  due to (19) and  $x^0 = x^{-1} = w^0$ . In this case,  $M$  in Theorem 4.1 reduces to  $M := 4\gamma^2 + \frac{4\gamma(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(1-\gamma)} = 4\gamma^2 + \frac{32(1+\gamma^2)}{b\mathbf{p}^2(1-\gamma)^3}$ . Hence, (16) follows from the first line of (15).

If we choose  $\eta$  satisfying (14), then we have  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{b\mathbf{p}}}{L}\right)$ . With the choice of  $b = \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/3}}\right)$ , we get  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ . Hence, the right-hand side of (16) becomes  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2\|x^0-x^*\|^2}{K+1}\right)$ . To guarantee  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , we have to impose  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2\|x^0-x^*\|^2}{K+1}\right) \leq \epsilon^2$ , leading to  $K = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2R_0^2}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ , where  $R_0 := \|x^0 - x^*\|$ . The remaining conclusion of Corollary 4.1 is proven similarly to Corollary 3.1, and thus omitted.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 4.2.** Since we use the SAGA estimator (SAGA), we have  $\rho := \frac{b}{2n} \in (0, 1]$ ,  $C := \frac{[2(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{nb^2}$ , and  $\hat{C} := \frac{2(n-b)(2n+b)\gamma^2}{nb^2}$ . Moreover, since we initialize  $\hat{G}_i^0 = G_i x^0$  for all  $i \in [n]$  and  $x^{-1} = x^0$ , we can easily show from (21) that  $\Delta_0 = 0$ . In this case,  $M$  in Theorem 4.1 reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= 4\gamma^2 + \frac{4\gamma(C+\hat{C})}{\rho(1-\gamma)} = 4\gamma^2 + \frac{8\gamma[2(1+\gamma^2)(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{(1-\gamma)b^3} \\ &\leq 4\gamma^2 + \frac{8\gamma(1+\gamma^2)n^2}{(1-\gamma)b^3} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2}{b^3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can set  $M := \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma-1} + \frac{4(1+\gamma)[2(1+\gamma^2)(n-b)(2n+b)+b^2]}{(2\gamma-1)b^3}$  as in Corollary 4.2. In this case, (16) follows from the first line of (15).

From the condition (14) of  $\eta$ , we can see that  $\eta = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L\sqrt{M}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{b^{3/2}}{nL}\right)$ . Since  $M \geq \mathcal{O}(1)$ , we must have  $\eta \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ , leading to  $b \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ . In this case, we can estimate the right hand side bound of (16) as  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3K}\right)$ , where  $R_0 := \|x^0 - x^*\|$ . To guarantee  $\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$ , we have to impose  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3K}\right) \leq \epsilon^2$ . Hence, we get  $K := \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2L^2R_0^2}{b^3\epsilon^2}\right)$ . The remaining conclusion of Corollary 4.2 is proven similarly to Corollary 3.2, and thus omitted.  $\square$

## E Appendix – Details of Experiments and Additional Experiments

Due to space limit, we do not provide the details of experiments in Section 5. In this Supp. Doc., we provide the details of our implementation and experiments. We also add more examples to illustrate our algorithms and compare to existing methods. All algorithms are implemented in Python, and all the experiments are run on a MacBookPro. 2.8GHz Quad-Core Intel Core I7, 16Gb Memory.

### E.1 Details of Example 1 in Section 5

Let us extend the synthetic WGAN example in Section 5 of our main text to a more general form. In fact, we modify the synthetic WGAN model from [28], which was built up from a WGAN model from [6] as follows.

(a) **Extension of the model** (17). Suppose that the generator is a simple additive model  $G_\theta(v) = \theta + v$  with the noise input  $v$  generated from a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I})$ , and the discriminator is also a linear function  $D_\beta(u) = \langle K\beta, u \rangle$  for a given matrix  $K$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ , and  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$  is a given matrix. The goal of the generator is to find a true distribution  $\theta = \theta^*$ , leading to the following loss:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta) := \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^*, \mathbb{I})} [\langle K\beta, u \rangle] - \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I})} [\langle K\beta, \theta + z \rangle].$$

Suppose that we have  $n$  samples for both  $u$  and  $v$  leading to the following bilinear minimax problem:

$$\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}} \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta) := f(\theta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\langle K\beta, u_i - v_i - \theta \rangle] - g(\beta) \right\}. \quad (33)$$

Here, we add two terms  $f(\theta)$  and  $g(\beta)$  to possibly handle constraints or regularizers associated with  $\theta$  and  $\beta$ , respectively.

If we define  $x := [\theta, \beta] \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1+p_2}$ ,  $Gx = [\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta), -\nabla_{\beta}\mathcal{L}(\theta, \beta)] := -[K\beta, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K^{\top}(u_i - v_i - \theta)]$ , and  $T := [\partial f(\theta), \partial g(\beta)]$ , then the optimality condition of this minimax problem becomes  $0 \in Gx + Tx$ , which is a special case of (NI) with  $Gx$  being linear. The model (33) is different from the one in [28] at two points:

- It involves a linear operator  $K$ , making it more general than (17) in [28].
- It has two additional terms  $f$  and  $g$ , making it broader to also cover constraints or non-smooth regularizers.

In our experiment below, we assume that  $\theta$  and  $\beta$  stays on an  $\ell_{\infty}$ -unit ball, leading to  $f(\theta) := \delta_{[-1,1]^{p_1}}(\theta)$  and  $g(\beta) := \delta_{[-1,1]^{p_2}}(\beta)$ , the indicator of  $\ell_{\infty}$ -unit balls.

(b) **Input data.** For the results revealed in Figure 1, where we solve (NE), we generate a vector  $\theta^*$  from standard normal distribution as our true mean in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Then, we generate i.i.d. samples  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  from normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\theta^*, \mathbb{I})$  and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I})$ , respectively for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . We perform two experiments: **Experiment 1** with  $n = 5,000$  and  $p = 100$ , and **Experiment 2** with  $n = 10,000$  and  $p = 200$ . For each experiment, we run 10 times up to 100 epochs, corresponding to 10 problem instances, using the same setting, but different input data  $(u_i, v_i)$ , and then compute the mean of the relative operator norm  $\frac{\|Gx^k\|}{\|Gx^0\|}$ . This mean is plotted in Figure 1.

(c) **Parameters.** For the optimistic gradient method (OG), we choose its learning rate  $\eta := \frac{1}{2L}$ , where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $G$ , though its theoretical rate is possibly smaller.

For our algorithm, (VFR), we implement two variants.

- The first variant is using a double-loop SVRG strategy (called VR-FR), where the full operator  $Gw^s$  at a snapshot point  $w^s$  is computed at the beginning of each epoch  $s$ . Then, we perform  $\lfloor n/b \rfloor$  iterations  $k$  to update  $x^k$  using (VFR), where  $b$  is the mini-batch size. Finally, we set the next snapshot point  $w^{s+1} := x^{k+1}$  after finishing the inner loop.
- The second variant is called a loopless one, LVR-FR, where we implement exactly the same scheme (VFR) as in this paper.

Here, we use a learning rate  $\eta := \frac{1}{2L}$  for two variants, and choose a mini-batch of size  $b := \lfloor 0.5n^{2/3} \rfloor$ , and a probability  $\mathbf{p} := \frac{1}{n^{1/3}}$  for the loopless variant to update  $w^k$ . These choices are guided by our theoretical results presented in Section 3.

For our SAGA variant (SAGA-FR) of (VFR), we choose the same learning rate  $\eta := \frac{1}{2L}$  and same mini-batch size  $b := 0.5n^{2/3}$  as in our SVRG variants.

For the forward-reflected-backward splitting method with variance reduction (VR-FRBS) in [2], we choose its learning rate  $\eta := \frac{0.95(1-\sqrt{1-\mathbf{p}})}{2L}$  as guided by the theory. For the variance reduction extragradient method (VR-EG) in [3], we choose its learning rate  $\eta := \frac{0.95\sqrt{1-\alpha}}{L}$  for  $\alpha := 1 - \mathbf{p}$  as suggested by the theory. To be fair, we also choose  $\mathbf{p} := \frac{1}{n^{1/3}}$  in both algorithms, which is the same as ours, though their theoretical results suggest smaller values of  $\mathbf{p}$  (e.g.,  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n}$ ). We also choose the same mini-batch size  $b := \lfloor 0.5n^{2/3} \rfloor$  in these algorithms.

Note that if  $n = 5,000$ , then the batch size  $b := 150$  and the probability  $\mathbf{p} := 0.062$ , but if  $n = 10,000$ , then  $b = 239$  and  $\mathbf{p} = 0.0479$ . These values are used in our experiments, and the results are plotted in Figure 1.

(d) **Experiments for  $K \neq \mathbb{I}$ .** Now, we test these 6 algorithms for  $K \neq \mathbb{I}$  in our extended model (33), where  $K$  is generated randomly from standard normal distribution. Then, we normalize  $K$  as  $K/\|K\|$  to get a unit Lipschitz constant  $L = 1$ .

Again, we use the same setting as in Figure 1 and also run our experiments on 10 problems and report the mean results. We perform two experiments: Experiment 1 with  $n = 2,500$  and  $p_1 = p_2 = p = 50$ , and Experiment 2 with  $n = 5,000$  and  $p_1 = p_2 = p = 100$ . The results are reported in Figure 3.

We still observe that our algorithms work well, and outperform their competitors. However, after 100 epochs, these methods can reach a  $10^{-2}$  accuracy level for an approximate solution.

(d) **Other choices of parameters.** We can certainly tune the parameters to make our competitors (VR-FRBS) and (VR-EG) work better. However, such parameter configurations may not satisfy




Figure 3: Performance of 6 algorithms to solve (33) on 2 experiments when  $K \neq \mathbb{I}$ .

the conditions for theoretical results to hold. For example, if we set  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{20}{\sqrt{n}}$ , then both VR-FRBS and VR-EG work better. Nevertheless, if  $n = 5000$ , then  $\mathbf{p} = 0.28$ , which is too large to gain an improvement in terms of oracle complexity.

Let us further experiment other choices of parameters (i.e. the mini-batch size  $b$  and the probability  $\mathbf{p}$  of flipping a coin) to observe the performance of these algorithms.

Figure 4 reveals the performance of these algorithms when we set the mini-batch size of all stochastic schemes to  $b = \lfloor 0.1n \rfloor$ , while keeping the probability  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/3}}$  for solving (17) for the unconstrained case with  $f = 0$  and  $g = 0$ .




Figure 4: Performance of 6 algorithms when  $b = \lfloor 0.1n \rfloor$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/3}}$ .

Note that for  $n = 5,000$ , we have  $b = 500$  and  $\mathbf{p} = 0.058$ , and for  $n = 10,000$ , we have  $b = 1,000$  and  $\mathbf{p} = 0.046$ . With these large mini-batches, our algorithms still outperform other methods, while VR-FRBS and VR-EG are significantly slowed down. The double-loop variant of (VFR) with SVRG performs best.

Next, we decrease the batch size to  $b = \lfloor 0.05n \rfloor$  (corresponding to  $b = 250$  for  $n = 5,000$  and  $b = 500$  for  $n = 10,000$ ) and increase  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/4}}$  (corresponding to  $\mathbf{p} = 0.119$  for  $n = 5,000$  and  $\mathbf{p} = 0.1$  for  $n = 10,000$ ). Then, the results are shown in Figure 5.

Again, three variants of our method (VFR) still perform well, and VR-EG significantly improves its performance, while VR-FRBS also improves performance compared to a smaller  $\mathbf{p}$ . Note that this large probability may not help VR-FRBS and VR-EG gain any improvement in terms of complexity.

To see the effect of  $\mathbf{p}$  on our competitors: VR-FRBS and VR-EG, as suggested by their theory, we decrease  $\mathbf{p}$  to  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}}$  (corresponding to  $\mathbf{p} = 0.014$  for  $n = 5,000$  and  $\mathbf{p} = 0.01$  for  $n = 10,000$ ) and still set  $b = \lfloor 0.1n \rfloor$ , and the results are plotted in Figure 6.

As we can observed from Figure 6, our methods highly outperform VR-FRBS and VR-EG, suggesting that these competitors require a larger probability to select the snap-shot point  $w^k$  for full-batch evaluation. This is certainly not suggested in their theoretical results.




Figure 5: Performance of 6 algorithms when  $b = [0.05n]$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/4}}$ .




Figure 6: Performance of 6 algorithms when  $b = [0.1n]$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}}$ .

(d) **Inclusions.** Next, we choose  $f(\theta) = \delta_{[-1,1]^{p_1}}(\theta)$  and  $g(\beta) := \delta_{[-1,1]^{p_2}}(\beta)$  as the indicators of the  $\ell_\infty$ -unit balls, respectively. In this case, we implement three variants of (VFRBS): the double-loop (VR-FR), the loopless (LVR-FR), and the SAGA (SAGA-FR) variants, to solve (NI) and compare against 3 algorithms as in Figure 1.

Using the same data generating procedure as in Figure 1, we obtain the results as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Comparison of 6 algorithms to solve (17) on 2 experiments (The average of 10 runs).

As we can observe, the two SVRG variants of our (VFRBS) as well as our SAGA-FR variant remain working well compared to other methods though they are not significantly superior as in Figure 1.

## E.2 Details of Example 2 in Section 5

We recall the nonconvex-nonconcave bilinear minimax optimization problem from (18) as

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}} \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(u, v) := f(u) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [u^T A_i u + u^T L_i v - v^T B_i v + b_i^T u - c_i^T v] - g(v) \right\}, \quad (34)$$

where  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}$  and  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}$  are symmetric matrices,  $L_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ ,  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ ,  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$  are given, and  $f$  and  $g$  are proper, closed, and convex functions.

Let us first define  $x := [u, v] \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , where  $p := p_1 + p_2$ . Next, we define

$$G_i x = \mathbf{G}_i x + \mathbf{g}_i := \begin{bmatrix} A_i & L_i \\ -L_i & B_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b_i \\ c_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_i u + L_i v + b_i \\ -L_i u + B_i v + c_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad T := \begin{bmatrix} \partial f \\ \partial g \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we denote  $\mathbf{G}_i := \begin{bmatrix} A_i & L_i \\ -L_i & B_i \end{bmatrix}$ , and  $\mathbf{g}_i := \begin{bmatrix} b_i \\ c_i \end{bmatrix}$ . Clearly,  $G_i(\cdot)$  is an affine mapping from  $\mathbb{R}^p$  to  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , but  $\mathbf{G}_i$  is nonsymmetric. Let  $Gx := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i x = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i\right)x + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i = \mathbf{G}x + \mathbf{g}$ , where  $\mathbf{G} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_i$  and  $\mathbf{g} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i$ . Then, the optimality condition of (18) becomes  $0 \in Gx + Tx$ , which is exactly in the form (NI). Clearly, if  $A_i$  and/or  $B_i$  are not positive semidefinite, then (18) possibly covers nonconvex-nonconcave minimax optimization instances.

### E.2.1 The unconstrained case

We consider the case  $f = 0$  and  $g = 0$ , leading to an unconstrained setting of (18), i.e.  $T = 0$ . Hence, the optimality condition of (18) reduces to  $Gx = 0$ , which is of the form (NE).

(a) **How to generate data?** To run our experiments, we generate synthetic data as follows. First, we fix the dimensions  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  and the number of components  $n$ . We generate  $A_i = Q_i D_i Q_i^T$  for a given orthonormal matrix  $Q_i$  and a diagonal matrix  $D_i = \text{diag}(D_i^1, \dots, D_i^{p_1})$ , where its elements are generated from standard normal distribution and clipped its negative entries as  $\max\{D_i^j, -0.01\}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p_1$ . This choice of  $A_i$  guarantees that  $A_i$  is symmetric, but possibly not positive semidefinite. The matrix  $B_i$  is also generated by the same way. The pay-off matrix  $L_i$  is a  $p_1 \times p_2$  matrix, which is also generated from standard normal distribution for all  $i \in [n]$ . The vectors  $b_i$  and  $c_i$  are generated from standard normal distribution for  $i \in [n]$ . With this data generating procedure,  $\mathbf{G}_i$  is not symmetric and possibly not positive semidefinite.

(b) **Algorithms and parameters.** We again test 6 algorithms: two variants (double-loop SVRG – VR-FR) and (loopless SVRG – LVR-FR) of (VFR), our (VFR) with SAGA estimator (SAGA-FR), VR-FRBS from [2], VR-EG from [3], and OG (the standard optimistic gradient method), e.g., from [28]. We choose the parameters for these algorithms as in Subsection E.1.

(c) **Results and discussion.** The 6 algorithms are run on 2 experiments. The first experiment is with  $n = 5,000$  and  $p_1 = p_2 = 50$ , while the second one is with  $n = 10,000$  and  $p_1 = p_2 = 100$ . These experiments are run 10 times, corresponding to 10 problem instances, and the average results are reported in Figure 8 in terms of relative operator norm  $\|Gx^k\|/\|Gx^0\|$  against the number of epochs.




Figure 8: Comparison of 6 algorithms to solve (18) on 2 experiments (The average of 10 runs).

Clearly, under this configuration, both variants of our methods work well and significantly outperform other competitors. The loopless SVRG variant (VR-FR) of (VFR) seems to work best, while VR-FRBS seems to have a similar performance with OG.

To improve the performance of these competitors, especially, VR-FRBS and VR-EG, one can tune their parameters as in Subsection E.1, where the probability  $\mathbf{p}$  of updating the snapshot point  $w^k$  is increased. However, with such a choice of  $\mathbf{p}$ , its value is often greater or equal to 0.5, making these methods to be closed to deterministic variants. Hence, their theoretical complexity bounds are no longer improved over the deterministic counterparts.



(d) **Small mini-batch experiments.** To see the effect of mini-batch sizes on the performance of the six algorithms, we choose  $b = \lfloor 0.01n \rfloor$ , corresponding to  $b = 50$  if  $n = 5,000$  and  $b = 100$  if  $n = 10,000$ . In this experiment, we still choose  $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{n^{1/3}}$  for all methods, but we set the learning rate for our methods to be  $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{bL}}$ , while keeping the same learning rates for other competitors as before. Our results are shown in Figure 9.




Figure 9: The performance of 6 algorithms to solve (18) using a small mini-batch.

We observe that our loopless SVRG variant of (VFR) still performs best, while the double-loop SVRG and SAGA variants significantly slow down. This is due to the effect of some parameters which we set the same for all algorithms, while they require a specific attention. The VR-EG scheme performs quite well in both experiments, and outperforms our double-loop SVRG and SAGA variants in the first experiment. In the second experiment, it is comparable to our double-loop SVRG variant.

### E.2.2 The constrained case

We now adding two simplex constraints  $u \in \Delta_{p_1}$  and  $v \in \Delta_{p_2}$  to (18) as in our experiments in Figure 2, where  $\Delta_p := \{u \in \mathbb{R}_+^p : \sum_{i=1}^p u_i = 1\}$  is the standard simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . These constraints are common in bilinear games. To handle these constraints, we set  $f(u) := \delta_{\Delta_{p_1}}(u)$  and  $g(v) := \delta_{\Delta_{p_2}}(v)$  as the indicators of  $\Delta_{p_1}$  and  $\Delta_{p_2}$ , respectively. Under this setting, the optimality conditions of (18) becomes (NI), where  $T := [\partial f, \partial g] = [\mathcal{N}_{\Delta_{p_1}}, \mathcal{N}_{\Delta_{p_2}}]$  with  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  being the normal cone of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Hence, the resolvent  $J_{\gamma\eta T}$  reduces to the projections on the simplex product  $\Delta_{p_1} \times \Delta_{p_2}$ .

**More experiments on the nonconvex-nonconcave case.** We generate input data as in the unconstrained case in (a) for Figure 2. However, now we clip  $D_i^j$  as  $\max\{D_i^j, -0.5\}$ , making  $u^\top A_i u$  and  $v^\top B_i v$  to be more nonconvex compared to Figure 2. We again run 6 algorithms and report the relative norm  $\|\mathcal{G}_\eta x^k\| / \|\mathcal{G}_\eta x^0\|$  against the number of epochs. The results are revealed in Figure 10 for two experiments with  $(p = 100, n = 5000)$  and  $(p = 200, n = 10000)$ , respectively.




Figure 10: The performance of 6 algorithms when  $\lambda_{\min}(A_i) \geq -0.5$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(B_i) \geq -0.5$ .

We can again see that our algorithms remain outperform other methods under the same configuration, but with a new input data. Both double-loop and loopless SVRG schemes have the best performance, where the loopless one is slightly better than the double-loop variant.

## References

- [1] S. Adly and H. Attouch. First-order inertial algorithms involving dry friction damping. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–41, 2021.
- [2] A. Alacaoglu, A. Böhm, and Y. Malitsky. Beyond the golden ratio for variational inequality algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.13955*, 2022.
- [3] A. Alacaoglu and Y. Malitsky. Stochastic variance reduction for variational inequality methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08352*, 2021.
- [4] A. Alacaoglu, Y. Malitsky, and V. Cevher. Forward-reflected-backward method with variance reduction. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 80(2):321–346, 2021.
- [5] Z. Allen-Zhu and E. Hazan. Variance reduction for faster non-convex optimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 699–707. PMLR, 2016.
- [6] M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223, 2017.
- [7] H. Attouch and A. Cabot. Convergence of a relaxed inertial proximal algorithm for maximally monotone operators. *Math. Program.*, 184(1):243–287, 2020.
- [8] M. G. Azar, I. Osband, and R. Munos. Minimax regret bounds for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 263–272. PMLR, 2017.
- [9] H. H. Bauschke and P. Combettes. *Convex analysis and monotone operators theory in Hilbert spaces*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd edition, 2017.
- [10] H. H. Bauschke, W. M. Moursi, and X. Wang. Generalized monotone operators and their averaged resolvents. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–20, 2020.
- [11] A. Ben-Tal, L. El Ghaoui, and A. Nemirovski. *Robust optimization*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [12] D.B. Bertsimas, D. Brown and C. Caramanis. Theory and Applications of Robust Optimization. *SIAM Review*, 53(3):464–501, 2011.
- [13] A. Beznosikov, E. Gorbunov, H. Berard, and N. Loizou. Stochastic gradient descent-ascent: Unified theory and new efficient methods. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 172–235. PMLR, 2023.
- [14] K. Bhatia and K. Sridharan. Online learning with dynamics: A minimax perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15020–15030, 2020.
- [15] A. Böhm. Solving nonconvex-nonconcave min-max problems exhibiting weak Minty solutions. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [16] R. I. Bot, P. Mertikopoulos, M. Staudigl, and P. T. Vuong. Forward-backward-forward methods with variance reduction for stochastic variational inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03355*, 2019.
- [17] R. I. Bot, P. Mertikopoulos, M. Staudigl, and P. T. Vuong. Minibatch forward-backward-forward methods for solving stochastic variational inequalities. *Stochastic Systems*, 11(2):112–139, 2021.
- [18] R. S. Burachik and A. Iusem. *Set-Valued Mappings and Enlargements of Monotone Operators*. New York: Springer, 2008.
- [19] X. Cai, A. Alacaoglu, and J. Diakonikolas. Variance reduced Halpern iteration for finite-sum monotone inclusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02987*, 2023.
- [20] X. Cai, C. Song, C. Guzmán, and J. Diakonikolas. A stochastic halpern iteration with variance reduction for stochastic monotone inclusion problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09436*, 2022.

- [21] Y. Cai and W. Zheng. Accelerated single-call methods for constrained min-max optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03096*, 2022.
- [22] V. Cevher and B.C. Vũ. A reflected forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions involving Lipschitzian operators. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 29(1):163–174, 2021.
- [23] D. Chakrabarti, J. Diakonikolas, and C. Kroer. Block-coordinate methods and restarting for solving extensive-form games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [24] P. L. Combettes and J. Eckstein. Asynchronous block-iterative primal-dual decomposition methods for monotone inclusions. *Math. Program.*, 168(1):645–672, 2018.
- [25] P. L. Combettes and T. Pennanen. Proximal methods for cohypomonotone operators. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 43(2):731–742, 2004.
- [26] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet. Stochastic quasi-Fejér block-coordinate fixed point iterations with random sweeping. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(2):1221–1248, 2015.
- [27] S. Cui and U.V. Shanbhag. On the analysis of variance-reduced and randomized projection variants of single projection schemes for monotone stochastic variational inequality problems. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 29(2):453–499, 2021.
- [28] C. Daskalakis, A. Ilyas, V. Syrgkanis, and H. Zeng. Training GANs with Optimism. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2018)*, 2018.
- [29] D. Davis. Variance reduction for root-finding problems. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–36, 2022.
- [30] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien. SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 1646–1654, 2014.
- [31] J. Diakonikolas. Halpern iteration for near-optimal and parameter-free monotone inclusion and strong solutions to variational inequalities. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1428–1451. PMLR, 2020.
- [32] J. Diakonikolas, C. Daskalakis, and M. Jordan. Efficient methods for structured nonconvex-nonconcave min-max optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2746–2754. PMLR, 2021.
- [33] D. Driggs, M. J. Ehrhardt, and C.-B. Schönlieb. Accelerating variance-reduced stochastic gradient methods. *Math. Program.*, (online first), 2020.
- [34] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*, volume 1-2. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [35] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [36] E. Gorbunov, H. Berard, G. Gidel, and N. Loizou. Stochastic extragradient: General analysis and improved rates. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 7865–7901. PMLR, 2022.
- [37] E. Gorbunov, N. Loizou, and G. Gidel. Extragradient method:  $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$  last-iterate convergence for monotone variational inequalities and connections with cocoercivity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 366–402. PMLR, 2022.
- [38] E. Y. Hamedani, A. Jalilzadeh, N. S. Aybat, and U. V. Shanbhag. Iteration complexity of randomized primal-dual methods for convex-concave saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.04118*, 2018.
- [39] S. Horváth, D. Kovalev, K. Mishchenko, P. Richtárik, and S. Stich. Stochastic distributed learning with gradient quantization and double-variance reduction. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 38(1):91–106, 2023.

- [40] Y.-G. Hsieh, F. Iutzeler, J. Malick, and P. Mertikopoulos. On the convergence of single-call stochastic extra-gradient methods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6938–6948, 2019.
- [41] K. Huang, N. Wang, and S. Zhang. An accelerated variance reduced extra-point approach to finite-sum vi and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.03269*, 2022.
- [42] A. N. Iusem, A. Jofré, R. I. Oliveira, and P. Thompson. Extragradient method with variance reduction for stochastic variational inequalities. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 27(2):686–724, 2017.
- [43] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *NIPS*, pages 315–323, 2013.
- [44] A. Juditsky, A. Nemirovski, and C. Tauvel. Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm. *Stochastic Systems*, 1(1):17–58, 2011.
- [45] A. Kannan and U. V. Shanbhag. Optimal stochastic extragradient schemes for pseudomonotone stochastic variational inequality problems and their variants. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 74(3):779–820, 2019.
- [46] I.V. Konnov. *Combined relaxation methods for variational inequalities*. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [47] G. Kotsalis, G. Lan, and T. Li. Simple and optimal methods for stochastic variational inequalities, i: operator extrapolation. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 32(3):2041–2073, 2022.
- [48] D. Kovalev, S. Horvath, and P. Richtarik. Don’t jump through hoops and remove those loops: SVRG and Katyusha are better without the outer loop. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 451–467. PMLR, 2020.
- [49] S. Lee and D. Kim. Fast extra gradient methods for smooth structured nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS2021)*, 2021.
- [50] D. Levy, Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, and A. Sidford. Large-scale methods for distributionally robust optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:8847–8860, 2020.
- [51] C. J. Li, Y. Yu, N. Loizou, G. Gidel, Y. Ma, N. Le Roux, and M. Jordan. On the convergence of stochastic extragradient for bilinear games using restarted iteration averaging. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 9793–9826. PMLR, 2022.
- [52] N. Loizou, H. Berard, G. Gidel, I. Mitliagkas, and S. Lacoste-Julien. Stochastic gradient descent-ascent and consensus optimization for smooth games: Convergence analysis under expected co-coercivity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:19095–19108, 2021.
- [53] Y. Luo and Q. Tran-Dinh. Extragradient-type methods for co-monotone root-finding problems. (*Manuscript*), 2022.
- [54] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [55] Y. Malitsky. Projected reflected gradient methods for monotone variational inequalities. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(1):502–520, 2015.
- [56] Y. Malitsky and M. K. Tam. A forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions without cocoercivity. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30(2):1451–1472, 2020.
- [57] K. Mishchenko, D. Kovalev, E. Shulgin, P. Richtárik, and Y. Malitsky. Revisiting stochastic extragradient. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4573–4582. PMLR, 2020.
- [58] H. Namkoong and J. Duchi. Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f-divergences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.

- [59] Y. Nesterov. Dual extrapolation and its applications to solving variational inequalities and related problems. *Math. Program.*, 109(2–3):319–344, 2007.
- [60] L. M. Nguyen, J. Liu, K. Scheinberg, and M. Takáč. SARAH: A novel method for machine learning problems using stochastic recursive gradient. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2613–2621, 2017.
- [61] M. A. Noor. Extragradient methods for pseudomonotone variational inequalities. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 117(3):475–488, 2003.
- [62] M. A. Noor and E.A. Al-Said. Wiener–Hopf equations technique for quasimonotone variational inequalities. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 103:705–714, 1999.
- [63] Z. Peng, Y. Xu, M. Yan, and W. Yin. ARock: an algorithmic framework for asynchronous parallel coordinate updates. *SIAM J. Scientific Comput.*, 38(5):2851–2879, 2016.
- [64] T. Pethick, O. Fercoq, P. Latafat, P. Patrinos, and V. Cevher. Solving stochastic weak Minty variational inequalities without increasing batch size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09029*, 2023.
- [65] T. Pethick, P. Patrinos, O. Fercoq, and V. Cevher. Escaping limit cycles: Global convergence for constrained nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [66] R. R. Phelps. *Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability*, volume 1364. Springer, 2009.
- [67] L. D. Popov. A modification of the Arrow–Hurwicz method for search of saddle points. *Math. notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 28(5):845–848, 1980.
- [68] S. J. Reddi, S. Sra, B. Póczos, and A. Smola. Fast incremental method for smooth nonconvex optimization. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1971–1977. IEEE, 2016.
- [69] Sashank J. Reddi, Ahmed Hefny, Suvrit Sra, Barnabás Póczos, and Alexander J. Smola. Stochastic variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. In *ICML*, pages 314–323, 2016.
- [70] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(3):400–407, 1951.
- [71] R.T. Rockafellar and R. J-B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [72] E. Ryu and W. Yin. *Large-scale convex optimization: Algorithms & analyses via monotone operators*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [73] E. K. Ryu and S. Boyd. Primer on monotone operator methods. *Appl. Comput. Math.*, 15(1):3–43, 2016.
- [74] C. Song, Z. Zhou, Y. Zhou, Y. Jiang, and Y. Ma. Optimistic dual extrapolation for coherent non-monotone variational inequalities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:14303–14314, 2020.
- [75] Q. Tran-Dinh. Extragradient-Type Methods with  $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ -Convergence Rates for Co-Hypomonotone Inclusions. *J. Global Optim.*, pages 1–25, 2023.
- [76] Q. Tran-Dinh. Sublinear Convergence Rates of Extragradient-Type Methods: A Survey on Classical and Recent Developments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17192*, 2023.
- [77] Q. Tran-Dinh and Y. Luo. Randomized block-coordinate optimistic gradient algorithms for root-finding problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03113*, 2023.
- [78] Q. Tran-Dinh, N. H. Pham, D. T. Phan, and L. M. Nguyen. A hybrid stochastic optimization framework for stochastic composite nonconvex optimization. *Math. Program.*, 191:1005–1071, 2022.

- [79] V. Phan Tu. On the weak convergence of the extragradient method for solving pseudo-monotone variational inequalities. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 176(2):399–409, 2018.
- [80] J. Yang, N. Kiyavash, and N. He. Global convergence and variance-reduced optimization for a class of nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09621*, 2020.
- [81] F. Yousefian, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag. On stochastic mirror-prox algorithms for stochastic cartesian variational inequalities: Randomized block coordinate and optimal averaging schemes. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 26:789–819, 2018.
- [82] Y. Yu, T. Lin, E. V. Mazumdar, and M. Jordan. Fast distributionally robust learning with variance-reduced min-max optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1219–1250. PMLR, 2022.
- [83] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and T. Başar. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms. *Handbook of reinforcement learning and control*, pages 321–384, 2021.
- [84] D. Zhou, P. Xu, and Q. Gu. Stochastic nested variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3925–3936. Curran Associates Inc., 2018.