

ACCELERATED VARIANCE-REDUCED FORWARD-REFLECTED METHODS FOR ROOT-FINDING PROBLEMS

QUOC TRAN-DINH*

Abstract. We propose a novel class of Nesterov’s stochastic accelerated forward-reflected-based methods with variance reduction to solve root-finding problems under $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness. Our algorithm is single-loop and leverages a new family of unbiased variance-reduced estimators specifically designed for root-finding problems. It achieves both $\mathcal{O}(L^2/k^2)$ and $o(1/k^2)$ -last-iterate convergence rates in terms of expected operator squared norm, where k denotes the iteration counter. We instantiate our framework for two prominent estimators: SVRG and SAGA. By an appropriate choice of parameters, both variants attain an oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n + Ln^{2/3}\epsilon^{-1})$ to reach an ϵ -solution, where n represents the number of summands in the finite-sum operator. Furthermore, under μ -strong quasi-monotonicity, our method achieves a linear convergence rate and an oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n + \kappa n^{2/3} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$, where $\kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}$. We extend our approach to solve a class of finite-sum monotone inclusions, demonstrating that our schemes retain the same theoretical guarantees as in the equation setting. Finally, numerical experiments validate our algorithms and demonstrate their promising performance compared to state-of-the-art methods.

Keywords: Variance reduction methods; forward-reflected methods; Nesterov’s accelerated method; co-coercive equation; finite-sum monotone inclusion.

AMS subject classifications. 90C25, 90C06, 90-08

1. Introduction. Monotone equations and inclusions are fundamental problems in computational mathematics, finding applications in diverse fields, including engineering, mechanics, economics, statistics, optimization, and machine learning, see, e.g., [10, 13, 25, 55, 57, 58]. These problems are called *root-finding problems* and 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., [5, 26, 45, 48]. This paper develops new accelerated stochastic algorithms with variance reduction for solving two classes of these problems.

1.1. Problem statements. We first state our main problem of interest and its generalization, equivalent forms, and special cases.

Co-coercive equation. Our central problem is the following *monotone equation*:

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

where $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is a single-valued, co-coercive (*cf.* Assumption 1.3), and possibly nonlinear, and $\text{dom}(G) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Gx \neq \emptyset\}$ is the domain of G .

Monotone inclusion. We are also interested in the following *monotone inclusion*:

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

where $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is as in (ME) and $T : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is a multivalued and maximally monotone 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 . Let $\text{zer}(G) := \{x^* \in \text{dom}(G) : Gx^* = 0\}$ and $\text{zer}(\Psi) := \{x^* \in \text{dom}(\Psi) : 0 \in \Psi x^*\}$ be the solution sets of (ME) and (MI), respectively. Both (MI) and (ME) are called *root-finding problems*.

Finite-sum structure. The operator G in both (ME) and (MI) is a finite-sum:

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

*Department of Statistics and Operations Research, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), 318-Hanes Hall, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599-3260, USA. Email: quoctd@email.unc.edu.

where $G_i : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ are given summands for all $i \in [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $n \gg 1$. This finite-sum structure often arises in machine learning, networks, distributed systems, and data science. Though we focus on the finite-sum case (1), our methods below 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 ξ defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \Sigma)$.

The equivalence between (ME) and (MI). Clearly, (ME) is a special case of (MI) when $T = 0$. However, if we define $\mathcal{G}_{\rho,i} := G_i \circ J_{\rho T} + \rho^{-1}(\mathbb{I} - J_{\rho T})$ and $\mathcal{G}_\rho := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{G}_{\rho,i}$, where $\rho > 0$, \mathbb{I} is the identity operator, and $J_{\rho T} := (\mathbb{I} + \rho T)^{-1}$ is the resolvent of ρT , then $J_{\rho T}(\text{zer}(\mathcal{G}_\rho)) = \text{zer}(G + T)$ (see [9, Proposition 2.4.]).

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

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

If $T = \partial g$, the subdifferential of a convex function g , then (MI) reduces to a mixed VIP, denoted by MVIP. Both VIP and MVIP cover many problems in practice, including minimax, complementarity, and Nash's equilibrium problems (e.g., [13, 25, 55]). Since (VIP) is a special case of (MI), our algorithms for (MI) can be specified to solve (VIP).

Fixed-point problem. (ME) is equivalent to the following fixed-point problem:

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

where $F := \mathbb{I} - \rho G$ with \mathbb{I} being the identity operator and $\rho > 0$. Note that G is co-coercive iff T is nonexpansive. Since (FP) is equivalent to (ME), our algorithms for (ME) developed here can be used to solve (FP) for any nonexpansive operator F .

1.2. Basic assumptions. We solve both (ME) and (MI) covered by the following assumptions (see [10] for terminologies and concepts). We do not require all assumptions to hold simultaneously, but will cite them whenever required.

ASSUMPTION 1.1. $\text{zer}(\Psi)$ of (MI) and $\text{zer}(G)$ of (ME) are nonempty.

ASSUMPTION 1.2. T in (MI) is maximally monotone.

ASSUMPTION 1.3. G given by (1) is $\frac{1}{L}$ -average co-coercive on $\text{dom}(G)$, i.e.:

$$(2) \quad \langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{nL} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x - G_i y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \text{dom}(G).$$

ASSUMPTION 1.4. G in (ME) is μ -strongly quasi-monotone, i.e. there exist $x^* \in \text{zer}(G)$ and $\mu > 0$ such that $\langle Gx, x - x^* \rangle \geq \mu \|x - x^*\|^2$ for all $x \in \text{dom}(G)$.

While Assumption 1.1 is basic, Assumption 1.2 guarantees the single-valued and well-definiteness of the resolvent $J_{\rho T}$ of ρT . It can be extended to a class of non-monotone operators, but we omit this extension. For Assumption 1.3, we have

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \|Gx - Gy\|^2 &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} \frac{1}{n^2 L} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (G_i x - G_i y) \right\|^2 \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{1}{nL} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x - G_i y\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \leq \|Gx - Gy\| \|x - y\|, \end{aligned}$$

by Young's inequality in $\textcircled{1}$. Hence, G is also $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive and hence, L -Lipschitz continuous, i.e. $\|Gx - Gy\| \leq L \|x - y\|$. However, if G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive, then it may not satisfy (2). If each G_i is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive for all $i \in [n]$, then G satisfies (2). Hence, Assumption 1.3 is stronger than the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of the finite-sum operator G , but weaker than the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of all the summands G_i . Assumption 1.4 is also called star-strongly monotone, and it is weaker than the strong monotonicity of G . It can be extended to (MI) as $\langle Gx + v, x - x^* \rangle \geq \mu \|x - x^*\|^2$ for $v \in Tx$.

1.3. Contribution and related work. Our goal in this paper is to develop a class of accelerated variance-reduction methods for solving both (ME) and (MI), and their special cases such as (VIP) and equivalent problems such as (FP). Our approach relies on a combination between new Nesterov’s accelerated methods [8, 49, 50, 65], forward-reflected-type schemes [47], and variance-reduction techniques [22, 34].

Our contribution. Our main contribution is stated as follows.

- (a) We introduce a new auxiliary operator S^k shown in (FRO) and propose a class of unbiased variance-reduced estimators \tilde{S}^k for S^k satisfying Definition 1.
- (b) We construct at least two instances of \tilde{S}^k by leveraging the SVRG [34] and SAGA [22] estimators, which fall within this class of estimators.
- (c) We develop an accelerated variance-reduced forward-reflected method (shown in AVFR) to solve (ME). This scheme achieves an $\mathcal{O}(L^2/k^2)$ last-iterate convergence rate in terms of $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2]$ under Assumption 1.3, where k is the iteration counter. We also prove an $o(1/k^2)$ rate for our method. When using either our SVRG or SAGA estimator, our method requires $\mathcal{O}(n + Ln^{2/3}\epsilon^{-1})$ evaluations of G_i to reach $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, for a given $\epsilon > 0$. This offers an $n^{1/3}$ factor improvement over deterministic accelerated methods.
- (d) Under Assumption 1.4, we establish a linear convergence rate and an oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n + \kappa n^{2/3} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ for (AVFR), where $\kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}$.
- (e) We apply our method to (MI) and obtain a new variant (30) of AVFR with the same theoretical convergence rates and oracle complexity bounds.

We first note that S^k constructed by (FRO) generalizes the forward-reflected-backward splitting (FRBS) operator [47] or the optimistic gradient operator [20]. However, since $\gamma_k \in (1/2, 1)$ and varies with k , these classical methods cannot be recovered as special cases of S^k . Second, our SVRG and SAGA estimators are designed specifically for S^k and differ from existing estimators in [2, 3, 12, 21]. Third, our algorithms are accelerated and single-loop, making them easier to implement compared to double-loop or catalyst methods [37, 67]. Fourth, our rates and oracle complexity estimates rely on the metric $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2]$, which differs from existing results that use a gap or restricted gap function. Fifth, our rate offers an $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ factor improvement over non-accelerated methods [2, 3, 21]. Finally, our complexity matches the best-known results in convex optimization using SAGA or SVRG without enhancements.

Related work. Both (ME) and (MI) are well-studied in the literature (e.g., [10, 13, 25, 55, 57, 58]). We focus on the most recent works relevant to our methods.

Accelerated methods. Nesterov’s accelerated methods have been applied to solve both (ME) and (MI) in early works [31, 39] and [8], followed by [1, 6, 7, 8, 18, 31, 38, 46, 52, 63]. Unlike convex optimization, extending these methods to monotone inclusions faces a fundamental challenge in constructing a suitable Lyapunov function. In convex optimization, the objective function serves this purpose, but it is absent in (ME) and (MI). This necessitates a different approach for (ME) and (MI) (see, e.g., [8, 46]). Our approach leverages similar ideas from dynamical systems as in [8, 46].

Alternatively, Halpern’s fixed-point iteration [29] has recently been proven to achieve a better convergence rates (see [23, 43, 59]), matching Nesterov’s schemes. Yoon and Ryu appear to be the first to extend Halpern’s method to extragradient-type schemes [68]. Many subsequent works have exploited this idea (e.g., [16, 17, 42, 52, 61, 63, 64]) for other methods. Recently, [63] establishes a connection between Nesterov’s and Halpern’s accelerations for solving (ME) with different schemes.

Stochastic approximation methods. Stochastic methods for both (ME) and (MI) and their special cases have been extensively developed, e.g., in [35, 40, 54]. Some

methods exploit mirror-prox and averaging techniques such as [35, 40]), while others rely on projection or extragradient-type schemes (e.g., [19, 33, 36, 54, 69]). Many algorithms use standard Robbins-Monro stochastic approximation with fixed or increasing batch sizes. Other works generalize the analysis to a broader class of algorithms (e.g., [11, 27, 44]), covering both standard stochastic and variance-reduction methods.

Variance-reduction methods. Variance-reduction techniques are widely used in optimization, where many estimators have been proposed, including SAGA [22], SVRG [34], SARAH [51], and Hybrid-SGD [66]. Researchers have adopted these estimators to develop methods for solving (ME) and (MI). For instance, [21] proposes a SAGA-type method for (ME) and (MI), under a co-coerciveness and strong quasimonotonicity, most relevant to our work. However, we focus on accelerated methods achieving better convergence rates and complexity. The authors in [2, 3] employed SVRG estimators for methods related to (VIP), but these are non-accelerated. Other works can be found in [12, 32, 70]. All these results differ from ours due to the construction of \tilde{S}^k and algorithm styles. Some recent works exploited Halpern's fixed-point iteration and developed corresponding variance-reduced methods (e.g., [14, 15]), tending to achieve better complexity but using biased estimators compared to ours.

Notation. We use $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(x^0, x^1, \dots, x^k)$ to denote the σ -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 [10].

Paper organization. Section 2 introduces our operator S^k and defines a class of unbiased and variance-reduced estimators for S^k . It also constructs two instances: SVRG and SAGA, and proves their key properties. Section 3 develops new algorithms for solving (ME) and establishes their convergence and oracle complexity. Section 4 derives a new variant to solve (MI) and proves its convergence. Section 5 presents two numerical experiments. Technical proofs are moved to Appendices A and B.

2. Stochastic Variance-Reduced Estimators for FR Operator. Most variance reduction methods in the literature directly construct an estimator for G , while we depart from this idea and construct an intermediate object, which we call a *forward-reflected* (FR) operator, and then design stochastic estimators for this object. Our results could be of independent interest for designing different algorithms.

2.1. The forward-reflected operator. Given two consecutive iterates x^{k-1} and x^k and a parameter $\gamma_k \in [0, 1]$, we define

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

Here, γ_k plays a central role in our methods as it is nonzero, and has two options: constant and varying w.r.t. k . When γ is constant, it is usually used in classical methods such as Popov's past-extragradient or optimistic gradient methods [60, 62]. In contrast, γ_k varies w.r.t. k in accelerated schemes such as our methods.

As an example, if $\gamma_k = \frac{1}{2}$, then we can write $S^k = \frac{1}{2}Gx^k + \frac{1}{2}(Gx^k - Gx^{k-1})$ used in FRBS methods [47]. This instance is also used in optimistic and Popov's past-extragradient [56] and optimistic gradient [20] methods for solving (ME). Furthermore, if we view $Gx^k - Gx^{k-1} = \int_0^1 G'(x^{k-1} + \tau(x^k - x^{k-1}))(x^k - x^{k-1})d\tau$ via the mean-value theorem, then S^k can be approximated by Gx^k augmented by a second-order correction (known as a Hessian-driven damping term or a second-order dissipative term in convex optimization when $Gx = \nabla f(x)$) recently studied in dynamical systems and accelerated methods, see, e.g., [1, 8] as a few examples.

2.2. A class of stochastic variance-reduced estimators for (FRO). We now introduce the following class of stochastic variance-reduced estimators for S^k .

DEFINITION 1. A stochastic operator \tilde{S}^k is called an unbiased variance-reduced estimator of S^k in (FRO) if there exist four positive sequences $\{\lambda_k\} \subset (0, \lambda]$, $\{\rho_k\} \subset (0, 1]$, $\{\Theta_k\}$, and $\{\hat{\Theta}_k\}$, and a sequence $\{\Delta_k\}$ such that

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] &= S^k, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}^k - S^k\|^2] &\leq \lambda_k \cdot \Delta_k, \\ \frac{\Delta_k}{(1-\gamma_k)^2} &\leq (1-\rho_k) \frac{\Delta_{k-1}}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} + \frac{\Theta_k}{(1-\gamma_k)^2} \cdot U_k + \frac{\hat{\Theta}_k}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \cdot U_{k-1}, \end{cases}$$

where $U_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2]$ and λ is a given finite upper bound of λ_k .

The condition $\rho_k > 0$ 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}^k may not be a variance-reduced estimator of S^k . We note that ρ_k , Θ_k and $\hat{\Theta}_k$ can be constant for all $k \geq 0$ or vary w.r.t. k . Since S^k is evaluated at both x^{k-1} and x^k , our bounds for the estimator \tilde{S}^k depend on three consecutive points x^{k-2} , x^{k-1} , and x^k , which is different from previous works, including [4, 11, 21, 24]. In addition, λ_k in the second bound also places an important role in accelerated algorithms as it can vary w.r.t. k . In the following subsections, we will construct two estimators that satisfy Definition 1 using SVRG [34] and SAGA [22], respectively. However, any other estimator satisfying Definition 1 can be used in our methods, e.g., SEGA in [30] and JacSketch in [28].

2.3. SVRG estimator for the FR operator. Consider an i.i.d. mini-batch $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with the size $b_k := |\mathcal{B}_k|$. Let $G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x := \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} G_i x$ be a standard mini-batch estimator of Gx for given $x \in \text{dom}(G)$. We define

$$(5) \quad \tilde{S}^k := (1 - \gamma_k)(Gw^k - G_{\mathcal{B}_k} w^k) + G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k - \gamma_k G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1},$$

where the reference or snapshot point w^k is updated as follows:

$$(6) \quad w^{k+1} := \begin{cases} x^k & \text{with probability } \mathbf{p} \\ w^k & \text{with probability } 1 - \mathbf{p}. \end{cases}$$

The probability $\mathbf{p} \in (0, 1)$ can be fixed, or updated adaptively at each iteration k as $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_k$. This estimator is known as a loopless variant [41] of the SVRG estimator [34]. However, it is different from existing estimators used for root-finding problems, including [21] because we define it for S^k , not for Gx^k . In addition, the first term is also damped by a factor $(1 - \gamma_k)$ to guarantee a variance reduction of \tilde{S}^k .

Next, we state the following lemma whose proof is given in Appendix A.1.

LEMMA 2. Let $S^k := Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}$ be defined by (FRO) and \tilde{S}^k be constructed by the loopless-SVRG estimator (5). We consider the following quantity:

$$(7) \quad \tilde{\Delta}_k := \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i w^k\|^2].$$

Then, we have

$$(8) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] &= S^k \equiv Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}^k - S^k\|^2] &\leq \tilde{\Delta}_k - \frac{1}{b_k} \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) Gw^k\|^2], \\ \tilde{\Delta}_k &\leq (1 - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2}) \frac{(1-\gamma_k)^2 b_{k-1}}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2 b_k} \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1} + \frac{4}{b_k \mathbf{p}} \cdot U_k + \frac{4\gamma_{k-1}^2 (1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k \mathbf{p} (1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \cdot U_{k-1}. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, \tilde{S}^k satisfies Definition 1 with $\rho_k := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2} \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda_k := \frac{1}{b_k} \in (0, 1]$, $\Theta_k := \frac{4}{\mathbf{p}}$, $\hat{\Theta}_k := \frac{4}{\mathbf{p}}$, and $\Delta_k := b_k \tilde{\Delta}_k$.

2.4. SAGA estimator for the FR operator. Consider an i.i.d. mini-batch $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with the size $b_k := |\mathcal{B}_k|$. Let $G_{\mathcal{B}_k}x := \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} G_i x$ be a standard mini-batch estimator of Gx for given $x \in \text{dom}(G)$, and $\hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k := \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \hat{G}_i^k$ for given estimates $\{\hat{G}_i^k\}_{i=1}^n$. We define the following SAGA estimator for S^k :

$$(9) \quad \tilde{S}^k := \frac{(1-\gamma_k)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k + [G_{\mathcal{B}_k}x^k - \gamma_k G_{\mathcal{B}_k}x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma_k)\hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k],$$

where \hat{G}_i^k is initialized as $\hat{G}_i^0 := G_i x^0$ for $i \in [n]$, and then is updated as follows:

$$(10) \quad \hat{G}_i^{k+1} := \begin{cases} \hat{G}_i^k & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{B}_k, \\ G_i x^k & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B}_k. \end{cases}$$

For this SAGA estimator, we need to store all n component \hat{G}_i^k computed so far for $i \in [n]$ in a table $\mathcal{T}_k := [\hat{G}_1^k, \hat{G}_2^k, \dots, \hat{G}_n^k]$. At each iteration k , we will evaluate $G_i x^k$ for $i \in \mathcal{B}_k$, and update the table \mathcal{T}_k for all $i \in \mathcal{B}_k$. Hence, the SAGA estimator requires significant memory to store \mathcal{T}_k if n and p are both large. Similar to the SVRG estimator (5), we have the following lemma, whose proof is in Appendix A.2.

LEMMA 3. Let $S^k := Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}$ be defined by (FRO) and \tilde{S}^k be constructed by the SAGA estimator (9). We consider the following quantity:

$$(11) \quad \hat{\Delta}_k := \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1-\gamma_k)\hat{G}_i^k\|^2].$$

If we denote $\Theta_k := \frac{[2(n-b_k)(2n+b_k)+b_k^2]}{nb_k}$ and $\hat{\Theta}_k := \frac{2(n-b_k)(2n+b_k)}{nb_k}$, then

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] & = S^k \equiv Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{S}^k - S^k\|^2] & \leq \hat{\Delta}_k - \frac{1}{b_k} \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma_k)}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{G}_j^k\|^2], \\ \hat{\Delta}_k & \leq (1 - \frac{b_k}{2n}) \frac{b_{k-1}(1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \cdot \hat{\Delta}_{k-1} + \frac{\Theta_k}{b_k} \cdot U_k + \frac{\hat{\Theta}_k \gamma_{k-1}^2 (1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \cdot U_{k-1}. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, \tilde{S}^k satisfies Definition 1 with $\rho_k := \frac{b_k}{2n} \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda_k := \frac{1}{b_k} \in (0, 1]$, Θ_k and $\hat{\Theta}_k$ given above, and $\Delta_k := b_k \hat{\Delta}_k$.

3. Accelerated Variance-Reduced Forward-Reflected Methods. In this section, we explore the class of unbiased estimators constructed in Section 2 to develop Nesterov's stochastic accelerated root-finding algorithms for solving (ME).

3.1. The algorithm. We propose the following variance-reduced accelerated forward-reflected method for solving (ME): Starting from $x^0 \in \text{dom}(G)$, set $x^{-1} := x^0$ and at each iteration $k \geq 0$, we construct \tilde{S}^k satisfying Definition 1 and update

$$(AVFR) \quad x^{k+1} := x^k + \theta_k(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta_k \tilde{S}^k,$$

where $\gamma_k > 0$, $\theta_k > 0$, and $\eta_k > 0$ are given parameters, and $\tilde{S}^0 := (1-\gamma_0)Gx^0 \equiv S^0$.

Since we have not yet specified \tilde{S}^k , AVFR in fact covers a class of stochastic accelerated FR algorithms. Note that S^k can be updated using at least one of the two options in Section 2: either SVRG (5) or SAGA (9). With these choices, the per-iteration complexity of (AVFR) is $3b_k$ and $2b_k$, respectively.

3.2. Lyapunov function and descent lemma. The following lemma serves as a key step to prove the convergence of **AVFR**, whose proof is given in Appendix B.1.

LEMMA 4. *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.3 hold for (ME) and $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{L}]$ is given. Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by **AVFR** to solve (ME) using a stochastic estimator \tilde{S}^k satisfying Definition 1 with $\lambda_k := \lambda > 0$ and $\rho_k := \rho \in (0, 1)$, and*

$$(13) \quad \theta_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_{k+1}}, \quad \gamma_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_k - \mu}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := \frac{2\beta(t_k - \mu)}{t_{k+1}},$$

where $r > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ are given and $t_k \geq r + \mu$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Consider a Lyapunov function:

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_k &:= 4r\beta(t_k - \mu) [\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta \|Gx^k\|^2] + \|r(x^k - x^*) + t_{k+1}(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2 \\ &+ \mu r \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2\hat{\Theta}_{k+1}(t_k - \mu)^2}{\rho} \cdot U_k + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(1-\rho)(t_k - \mu)^2}{\rho} \cdot \Delta_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $U_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2$. Then, for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] &\geq C_k(t_k - \mu)^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[U_k] + \mu(2t_k - r - \mu) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &+ 4r\beta(t_{k-1} - t_k + r) \mathbb{E}[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2], \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda_k := 4\beta \left[\frac{(t_k - r - \mu)}{(t_k - \mu)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta\right) - \frac{\lambda\beta(\Theta_k + \hat{\Theta}_{k+1})}{\rho} \right]$.

3.3. Convergence analysis of AVFR. For simplicity of our presentation, we define the following constants:

$$(16) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{\beta} := \frac{\rho}{[\rho + \lambda(r+1)(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})]L}, & \Lambda := \frac{4\beta(\rho - [\rho + \lambda(r+1)(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})]L\beta)}{L\rho(r+1)}, \\ C_0 := r(1 + 3r + 8rL^2\beta^2), & C_1 := \frac{4r^2(r-1)L^2\beta^2}{r+2} + \left(\frac{2}{r} + \psi\right)C_0, \\ C_2 := 4r^2L^2\beta^2 + \left(\psi + \frac{2(r+2)^2}{r}\right)C_0 + \frac{4(r+2)^2C_1}{r(r-2)}, & C_3 := \frac{(r+2)^2(C_1 + C_2)}{2r^2}, \end{cases}$$

where $\psi := \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})}{\rho\Lambda}$. For a given $r > 2$, we have $C_s \leq \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $s \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

Now, we state the convergence of **AVFR** and provide the proof in Appendix B.2.

THEOREM 5. *Suppose that G given by (1) satisfies Assumptions 1.1 and 1.3 and $r \geq 1$ is given. Let $\bar{\beta}$, Λ , and C_s for $s \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be given in (16). Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by **AVFR** to solve (ME) using a stochastic estimator \tilde{S}^k satisfying Definition 1, $\lambda_k := \lambda > 0$, $\rho_k := \rho \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta_0 = 0$, and*

$$(17) \quad \theta_k := \frac{k}{k + r + 2}, \quad \gamma_k := \frac{k}{k + r}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := \frac{2\beta(k + r)}{k + r + 2}.$$

If we choose $0 < \beta < \bar{\beta}$, then $\Lambda > 0$, and for $K \geq 1$, we get

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K (2k + r + 1) \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq C_0 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \\ \sum_{k=1}^K (k + r)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_0}{\Lambda} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If, additionally $r > 2$, then we also have the following summable results:

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K (k + r + 1) \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_1}{r-2} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \\ \sum_{k=1}^K (2k + r + 3) \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{(r+2)^2}{2\beta^2 r^2} (C_0 + \frac{2C_1}{r-2}) \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any $k \geq 1$, the following Big- O rates hold:

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_1}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_2}{(k+r+2)^2} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_3}{\beta^2(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the following small- O rates also hold:

$$(21) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right).$$

Our **AVFR** is single-loop and covers a broad class of stochastic accelerated algorithms satisfying Definition 1 compared to [21]. Its convergence is stated in Theorem 5 showing both $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ and $o(1/k^2)$ convergence rates on $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2]$, which has an $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ improvement factor compared to non-accelerated methods, including [2, 3, 21], but requires Assumption 1.3 as opposed to [2, 3]. One can simplify the constants C_s for $s = 0, 1, 2, 3$ in (16) by choosing, e.g., $r := 3$. However, r plays an important role to adjust our implementation in Section 5, and hence, we leave it free here.

3.4. Complexity analysis for Loopless-SVRG and SAGA variants. Let us specify Theorem 5 to analyze the oracle complexity of **AVFR** using (5) and (9). The proof of the following results are deferred to Appendix B.3.

COROLLARY 6. *Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by (**AVFR**) to solve (ME) using the **SVRG estimator** (5) and the same parameters as in Theorem 5 with $r := 3$ such that $1 \leq b\mathbf{p}^2 \leq 32$. Then, under the same conditions as in Theorem 5, if we choose $\beta := \frac{b\mathbf{p}^2}{2L(b\mathbf{p}^2+64)}$, then we have $\beta \in [\frac{1}{130L}, \frac{1}{6L}]$ and*

$$(22) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_2 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{(k+r+2)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_3 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{\beta^2(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 \leq 2360$ and $C_3 \leq 3353$ are explicitly given in (16).

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

COROLLARY 7. *Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by (**AVFR**) to solve (ME) using the **SAGA estimator** (9) and the same parameters as in Theorem 5 with $r := 3$ such that $1 \leq b \leq 16n^{2/3}$. Then, under the same conditions as in Theorem 5, if we choose $\beta := \frac{b^3}{2L(b^3+64n^2)}$, then we have $\beta \in [\frac{1}{2L(1+64n^2)}, \frac{1}{4L}]$ and*

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_2 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{(k+r+2)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{C_3 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{\beta^2(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 \leq 2559$ and $C_3 \leq 3636$ are explicitly given in (16).

For a given $\epsilon > 0$, if we choose $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$, then (**AVFR**) requires $\mathcal{O}(n + Ln^{2/3}\epsilon^{-1})$ evaluations of G_i to achieve $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$.

Both C_2 and C_3 in Corollaries 6 and 7 can be refined to get smaller upper bounds. However, we do not try to numerically optimize them here. Corollaries 6 and 7 show that both the SVRG and SAGA variants have oracle complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}L\epsilon^{-1})$ under appropriate choices of the mini-batch size b and probability \mathbf{p} . This complexity is better than deterministic accelerated methods by a factor of $n^{1/3}$, and better than non-accelerated variance-reduction methods such as [2, 3, 21] by a factor of $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$. For implementation of **AVFR**, as suggested by our theory, one can choose $\beta = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{6L})$.

3.5. Linear convergence under strong quasi-monotonicity. Now, we specify (AVFR) to solve (ME) under Assumptions 1.3 and 1.4. First, we define

$$(24) \quad \kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}, \quad \Gamma := \rho + 2\lambda(\Theta + \hat{\Theta}), \quad M := 2(2\Gamma - 1)\kappa, \quad \text{and} \quad N := 3\Gamma\kappa + 2(1 - 2\rho).$$

Suppose that $N^2 + 12\rho M \geq 0$, $2\rho < 1$, and β is chosen such that

$$(25) \quad 0 < \beta \leq \bar{\beta} := \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{3}{5}, \frac{3\rho}{2(1-2\rho)}, \frac{1}{2\kappa}, \frac{6\rho}{N + \sqrt{N^2 + 12\rho M}} \right\}.$$

Next, we choose the following parameters:

$$(26) \quad \theta_k := \theta = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \gamma_k := \gamma = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := \eta = \beta \in (0, \bar{\beta}],$$

Now, applying (26) to AVFR, it reduces to the following form:

$$(27) \quad x^{k+1} := x^k + \theta(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta \tilde{S}^k,$$

where \tilde{S}^k is an estimator of S^k satisfying Definition 1 with $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{2}$ and $\tilde{S}^0 := S^0$.

Theorem 8 states a linear convergence of (27), whose proof is in Appendix B.4.

THEOREM 8. *Suppose that G given by (1) satisfies Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 such that $N^2 + 12\rho M \geq 0$ and $2\rho < 1$. Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by (27) to solve (ME) using (26). Then, with $\omega := \frac{2\bar{\beta}\mu}{3+4\bar{\beta}\mu} \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$(28) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq 4(1 + 2L^2\beta^2) \cdot (1 - \omega)^k \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2.$$

Consequently, for a given $\epsilon > 0$, (27) requires $k = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L\kappa}{\rho} \log(\epsilon^{-1})\right)$ iterations to achieve an ϵ -solution x^k such that $\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$.

Theorem 8 only states a linear convergence of (27) in terms of $\{\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2]\}$, but does not specify its oracle complexity. Similar to Theorem 5, we can specify Theorem 8 for both SVRG estimator (5) and SAGA estimator (9) to obtain the following complexity bounds, where we omit their proof as it is similar to Subsection 3.4.

COROLLARY 9. *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 hold for (ME).*

- (a) *If the SVRG estimator \tilde{S}^k from (5) is used in (27), then by choosing $\beta := \bar{\beta}$ from (25), we have $\omega := \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{b\mathbf{p}^2}{\kappa}\right)$. Consequently, if we choose $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ and $\mathbf{p} := \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$, then (27) requires $\mathcal{O}(n + \kappa n^{2/3} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ evaluations of G_i to achieve $\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$.*
- (b) *If the SAGA estimator \tilde{S}^k from (9) is used in (27), then by choosing $\beta := \bar{\beta}$ from (25), we have $\omega = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{b^3}{\kappa n^2}\right)$. Hence, if we choose $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$, then (27) requires $\mathcal{O}(n + \kappa n^{2/3} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ evaluations of G_i to reach $\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$.*

Our oracle complexity is better than existing deterministic methods by a factor of $n^{1/3}$. However, it still depends on the condition number $\kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}$ instead of $\sqrt{\kappa}$ as in convex optimization. Nevertheless, as shown in [53], this dependence has not been improved so far for root-finding algorithms. In fact, it also matches the results in [21].

4. Application to Monotone Inclusions. Let us apply AVFR to solve (MI). First, assume that G_i is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive for all $i \in [n]$. We fix $\rho > 0$ such that $L\rho < 4$ and define $J_{\rho T} := (\mathbb{I} + \rho T)^{-1}$ as the resolvent of ρT . We also define

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{G}_{\rho,i} := G_i \cdot J_{\rho T} + \rho^{-1}(\mathbb{I} - J_{\rho T}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_{\rho} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{G}_{\rho,i}.$$

Then, x^* solves $\mathcal{G}_\rho x^* = 0$ iff $y^* = J_{\rho T} x^*$ solves (MI) (see [9, Proposition 2.4.]).

Second, let \hat{S}^k be defined by (FRO) for \mathcal{G}_ρ as $\mathcal{S}_\rho^k := \mathcal{G}_\rho x^k - \gamma_k \mathcal{G}_\rho x^{k-1}$. Clearly, if we compute $y^k := J_{\rho T} x^k$, then $\mathcal{G}_\rho x^k = Gy^k + \rho^{-1}(x^k - y^k)$ and $\mathcal{S}_\rho^k = Gy^k - \gamma_k Gy^{k-1} + \rho^{-1}(x^k - y^k) - \rho^{-1}\gamma_k(x^{k-1} - y^{k-1})$. Therefore, if we define $\hat{S}^k := Gy^k - \gamma_k Gy^{k-1}$, then $\mathcal{S}_\rho^k = \hat{S}^k + \rho^{-1}(x^k - y^k) - \rho^{-1}\gamma_k(x^{k-1} - y^{k-1})$. Substituting \mathcal{S}_ρ^k into (AVFR), we get the following scheme as a variant of AVFR to solve (MI):

$$(30) \quad \begin{cases} y^k & := J_{\rho T} x^k, \\ \tilde{S}_\rho^k & := \tilde{S}^k + \rho^{-1}(x^k - y^k) - \rho^{-1}\gamma_k(x^{k-1} - y^{k-1}), \\ x^{k+1} & := x^k + \theta_k(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta_k \tilde{S}_\rho^k, \end{cases}$$

where \tilde{S}^k is an unbiased estimator of $\hat{S}^k := Gy^k - \gamma_k Gy^{k-1}$ satisfying Definition 1, $x^{-1} := x^0$, $y^{-1} := y^0 := J_{\rho T} x^0$, and $\tilde{S}^0 := \hat{S}^0 \equiv (1 - \gamma_0)Gy^0$. Again, we can choose \tilde{S}^k constructed by at least two options: SVRG in (5) or SAGA in (9).

Let us define a forward-backward residual of (MI) as $\mathcal{S}_\rho y := \rho^{-1}(y - J_{\eta T}(y - \rho Gy))$ for $\rho > 0$. Then, it is well-known [10, Proposition 26] that $\mathcal{S}_\rho y^* = 0$ iff $0 \in Gy^* + Tx^*$. Therefore, if $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{S}_\rho y^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, then we say that y^k is an ϵ -solution of (MI).

Finally, we can prove the following convergence result for (30).

COROLLARY 10. *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold for (MI) and G_i is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive for all $i \in [n]$. Let $\{(x^k, y^k)\}$ be generated by (30) to solve (MI) using the same parameters as in Theorem 5 but with $L_G := \frac{4-L\rho}{4}$, provided that $L\rho < 4$. Then, the conclusions of Theorem 5 still hold for $\mathbb{E}[\|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{S}_\rho y^k\|^2]$, where $\mathcal{S}_\rho y := \rho^{-1}(y - J_{\eta T}(y - \rho Gy))$ is the forward-backward residual of $G + T$.*

Proof. First, as proven in [9, 21], we have $\text{zer}(G+T) = J_\rho(\text{zer}(\mathcal{G}_\rho))$. Hence, solving (MI) is equivalent to solving $\mathcal{G}_\rho x^* = 0$. Second, as shown in [21, Corollary 3.2], if G_i is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive, then $\mathcal{G}_{\rho, i}$ is also $\frac{1}{L_G}$ -co-coercive with $L_G := \frac{4-L\rho}{4}$, provided that $L\rho < 4$. This means that \mathcal{G}_ρ satisfies Assumption 1.3 with L_G . Third, if we apply (AVFR) to solve $\mathcal{G}_\rho x^* = 0$, then it can be expressed as (30). Therefore, the conclusions of Theorem 5 still hold for $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_\rho x^k\|^2]$. However, since $\mathbb{E}[\|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|J_{\rho T} x^{k+1} - J_{\rho T} x^k\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2]$, these conclusions still hold for $\mathbb{E}[\|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2]$. Finally, from (29), we have $\rho \mathcal{G}_\rho x^k = \rho Gy^k + x^k - y^k$, or equivalently, $x^k - \rho \mathcal{G}_\rho x^k = y^k - \rho Gy^k$. This leads to $J_{\eta T} x^k - J_{\rho T}(x^k - \rho \mathcal{G}_\rho x^k) = y^k - J_{\rho T}(y^k - \rho Gy^k)$. Hence, $\|\mathcal{S}_\rho y^k\| = \|\rho^{-1}(y^k - J_{\rho T}(y^k - \rho Gy^k))\| = \rho^{-1}\|J_{\rho T} x^k - J_{\rho T}(x^k - \rho \mathcal{G}_\rho x^k)\| \leq \|\mathcal{G}_\rho x^k\|$. We conclude that the conclusions of Theorem 5 still hold for $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{S}_\rho y^k\|^2]$. \square

Similar to (ME), if $G + T$ is additionally strongly monotone with $\mu_\Psi > 0$, then we can apply (27) to solve (MI) and achieve a linear rate as in Theorem 8. However, we omit this variant as it is similar to a combination of (30) and [21, Corollary 3.1].

5. Numerical Experiments. We verify our algorithms with two numerical examples and compare them with existing methods. All algorithms are implemented in Python and run on a MacBookPro. 2.8GHz Quad-Core Intel Core I7, 16Gb Memory.

Model. We consider the following general convex-concave minimax problem:

$$(31) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}} \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(u, v) := f(u) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i(u, v) - g(v) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i(u, v) := u^T A_i u + u^T L_i v - v^T B_i v + b_i^\top u - c_i^\top v$, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}$ and $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}$ are symmetric positive semidefinite 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. 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, G_i is an affine mapping from \mathbb{R}^p to \mathbb{R}^p , but \mathbf{G}_i is nonsymmetric. Let $Gx := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i x = \mathbf{G}x + \mathbf{g}$, 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 (31) becomes $0 \in Gx + Tx$ as in (MI).

Data generation and experiment setup. 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 $\max\{D_i^j, 0\}$. 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. We perform two sets of experiments: *Experiment 1* consists of 10 problem instances with $p = 100$ and $n = 5,000$, and *Experiment 2* is 10 problem instances with $p = 200$ and $n = 10,000$. We then report the *mean* of 10 problems in terms of $\frac{\|Gx^k\|}{\|Gx^0\|}$ for (ME) and in terms of $\frac{\|\mathcal{G}_\rho x^k\|}{\|\mathcal{G}_\rho x^0\|}$ for (MI) as stated in Corollary 10.

Competitors. We implement two variants of (AVFR) to solve (31): AVFR-Svrg – a loopless-SVRG variant using (5) and AVFR-Saga – a SAGA variant using (9). We also compare our methods with two deterministic optimistic gradient methods: OG – non-accelerated OG in [20] and AOG – accelerated OG in [63], VRFRBS – variance-reduced FRBS in [2], and VREG – variance-reduced extragradient in [3].

Parameters. For OG and AOG, we choose its stepsize $\eta := \frac{1}{2L}$, where L is the Lipschitz constant of G . For our methods, we use a stepsize $\beta := \frac{0.15}{L} \approx \frac{1}{6L}$, 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 loopless-SVRG as suggested by its theory. Since $r > 2$, we set $r = 20$, but other choices still work well. For VRFRBS, we choose its stepsize $\tau := \frac{5 \times 0.99(1 - \sqrt{1 - \mathbf{p}})}{2L}$ (5 times of its theoretical stepsize), and for VREG, we set $\tau := \frac{0.99\sqrt{1 - \alpha}}{L}$ for $\alpha := 1 - \mathbf{p}$ as suggested by their theory. 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} . 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 $b := 150$ and $\mathbf{p} := 0.062$, but if $n = 10,000$, then $b = 239$ and $\mathbf{p} = 0.0479$.

Results for the unconstrained case. In this test, we set $f = g = 0$ (i.e. without constraints) so that our model $0 \in Gx + Tx$ reduces to $Gx = 0$ as (ME). We test 6 algorithms on two sets of experiments: *Experiment 1* and *Experiment 2* designed above. Figure 1 reports the results of these experiments after 100 epochs.




FIG. 1. Performance of 6 algorithms for (31) on 2 experiments (the mean of 10 instances).

Figure 1 shows that our methods perform well and outperform their competitors. Nevertheless, AVFR-Svrg works best. Overall, through this test, we can conclude that

variance-reduced methods work better than deterministic methods even compared with accelerated schemes like AOG. This is often the case in optimization. We note that we did not try to tune the parameters for our test. However, for *Experiment 2*, we can see that $\eta \approx 0.4032$ in VREG, which is larger than $\beta \approx 0.2783$ in our methods. For VRFRBS, we have $\eta \approx 0.1113$, which is 5 times larger than its theoretical stepsize. If we increase it by 10 times, then VRFRBS occasionally diverges.

Results for the constrained case. Finally, we test two variants of our method (30) to solve (MI) and compare them with other competitors as in the first test. We test them with two sets of experiments as before and choose $f = \delta_{\Delta_{p_1}}$ and $g = \delta_{\Delta_{p_2}}$ defined above. The results are reported in Figure 2 after 100 epochs.




FIG. 2. Performance of 6 algorithms for (31) on 2 experiments (the mean of 10 instances).

From Figure 2, we see similar performance as in the unconstrained case, where our methods perform well and have a better performance than their competitors up to the level of accuracy of 10^{-16} . Under our parameter choices, both VRFRBS and VREG still work well on this test, and are only slightly behind our AVFR-Saga.

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.

Appendix A. Proof of Technical Results in Section 2. This appendix provides the full proof of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 in Section 2.

A.1. The proof of Lemma 2. By the construction of $G_{\mathcal{B}_k}$ in (5), we have $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} w^k] = Gw^k$, $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k] = Gx^k$, and $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}] = Gx^{k-1}$. Utilizing these relations, from (5), we can easily show that $\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] = S^k$, as in the first line of (8).

Next, define $X_i := G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i w^k$ for any $i \in [n]$. Then, we have $\mathbb{E}_k[X_i] = Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) Gw^k$ and $\mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|G_j x^k - \gamma_k G_j x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_j w^k\|^2$ for any $i \in [n]$. Since \mathcal{B}_k and i are in \mathcal{F}_k , we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}^k - S^k\|^2] &\stackrel{(5)}{=} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} X_i - [Gx^k + \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) Gw^k]\|^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_k[\|\frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} (X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i])\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] - \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{j=1}^n \|G_j x^k - \gamma_k G_j x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_j w^k\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{b_k} \|Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) Gw^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, ① holds since X_i are i.i.d. for all $i \in \mathcal{B}_k$ and ② holds due to $\mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] - (\mathbb{E}_k[X_i])^2$. This estimate implies the second line of (8) by taking the total expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ both sides and using (7).

Now, from (7) and (6), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Delta}_k &\stackrel{(7)}{=} \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i w^k\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} \frac{(1-\mathbf{p})}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i w^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{nb_k} \frac{(1-\gamma_k)^2}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} G_i x^{k-2} - (1 - \gamma_{k-1}) G_i w^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{cnb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma_k)}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})} (G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} G_i x^{k-2})\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \frac{(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})b_{k-1}}{b_k} \frac{(1-\gamma_k)^2}{(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1} \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})\gamma_{k-1}^2(1-\gamma_k)^2}{nb_k c(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{nb_k} [\mathbf{p} + \frac{2(1+c)(1-\mathbf{p})}{c}] \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used Young's inequality in both ① and ②. 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 from the last inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Delta}_k &\leq (1 - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2}) \frac{b_{k-1}(1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1} + \frac{4\gamma_{k-1}^2(1-\gamma_k)^2}{nb_k \mathbf{p}(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{nb_k \mathbf{p}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the last inequality of (8).

Finally, multiplying the last inequality of (8) by $\frac{b_k}{(1-\gamma_k)^2}$ and define $\Delta_k := b_k \tilde{\Delta}_k$, we can easily prove the last statement of Lemma 2 by using the fact that $\gamma_{k-1} \in (0, 1]$ to have $\frac{4\gamma_{k-1}^2}{\mathbf{p}} \leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{p}} =: \hat{\Theta}_k$. \square

A.2. The proof of Lemma 3. First, we have $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^k] = Gx^k$, $\mathbb{E}_k[G_{\mathcal{B}_k} x^{k-1}] = Gx^{k-1}$, and $\mathbb{E}_k[\hat{G}_{\mathcal{B}_k}^k] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{G}_i^k$. Using these relations and (9), we can easily show that $\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] = S^k$, which proves the first line of (12).

Next, define $X_i := G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) \hat{G}_i^k$ for any $i \in [n]$. Then, we have $\mathbb{E}_k[X_i] = Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma_k)}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{G}_j^k$ and $\mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|G_j x^k - \gamma_k G_j x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) \hat{G}_j^k\|^2$ for any $i \in [n]$. Therefore, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}^k - S^k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}_k[\|\frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} (X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i])\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i - \mathbb{E}_k[X_i]\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \mathbb{E}_k[\|X_i\|^2] - \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_k} [\mathbb{E}_k[X_i]]^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{j=1}^n \|G_j x^k - \gamma_k G_j x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) \hat{G}_j^k\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{b_k} \|Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - \frac{(1-\gamma_k)}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{G}_j^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies the second line of (12) by taking the total expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ both sides.

Now, from (11) and (10), for any $c > 0$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Delta}_k &\stackrel{(11)}{:=} \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) \widehat{G}_i^k\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(10)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) \widehat{G}_i^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{b_k}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{nb_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - (1 - \gamma_k) G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{(1+c)(1-\gamma_k)^2}{nb_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} G_i x^{k-2} - (1 - \gamma_{k-1}) \widehat{G}_i^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{(1+c)}{cnb_k} \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - \gamma_k G_i x^{k-1} - \frac{1-\gamma_k}{1-\gamma_{k-1}} (G_i x^{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} G_i x^{k-2})\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \left[\frac{1}{n^2} + \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \frac{2(1+c)}{cnb_k}\right] \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1+c)\gamma_{k-1}^2(1-\gamma_k)^2}{cnb_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{b_{k-1}(1+c)(1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{n}\right) \widehat{\Delta}_{k-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ and $\textcircled{2}$ are due to Young's inequality. If we choose $c := \frac{b_k}{2n}$, then $(1 - \frac{b_k}{n})(1 + c) = 1 - \frac{b_k}{2n} - \frac{b_k^2}{2n^2} \leq 1 - \frac{b_k}{2n}$. Hence, we can further upper bound the last inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Delta}_k &\leq \left(1 - \frac{b_k}{2n}\right) \frac{b_{k-1}(1-\gamma_k)^2}{b_k(1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \widehat{\Delta}_{k-1} + \frac{[2(n-b_k)(b_k+2n)+b_k^2]}{n^2 b_k^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{2(n-b_k)(b_k+2n)\gamma_{k-1}^2(1-\gamma_k)^2}{n^2 b_k^2 (1-\gamma_{k-1})^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^{k-1} - G_i x^{k-2}\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the last inequality of (12).

Finally, multiplying the last inequality of (12) by $\frac{b_k}{(1-\gamma_k)^2}$ and define $\Delta_k := b_k \widehat{\Delta}_k$, we obtain the last statement of Lemma 3 due to the fact that $\frac{2(n-b_k)(2n+b_k)\gamma_{k-1}^2}{nb_k} \leq \frac{2(n-b_k)(2n+b_k)}{nb_k} =: \widehat{\Theta}_k$ and $U_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2]$. \square

Appendix B. Proof of Theoretical Results for AVFR in Section 3. This appendix provides the full proof of Lemma 4, Theorem 5, and Theorem 8.

B.1. The proof of Lemma 4. We first introduce the following two functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
(32) \quad \mathcal{Q}_k &:= \|r(x^k - x^*) + t_{k+1}(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2 + \mu r \|x^k - x^*\|^2, \\
\mathcal{L}_k &:= 4r\beta(t_k - \mu) [\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta \|Gx^k\|^2] + \mathcal{Q}_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we can easily show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= \|r(x^{k-1} - x^*) + t_k(x^k - x^{k-1})\|^2 = \|r(x^k - x^*) + (t_k - r)(x^k - x^{k-1})\|^2 \\
&= r^2 \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + (t_k - r)^2 \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + 2r(t_k - r) \langle x^k - x^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, using (AVFR), we can expand

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{[2]} &:= \|r(x^k - x^*) + t_{k+1}(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{(AVFR)}}{=} \|r(x^k - x^*) + t_{k+1}\theta_k(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta_k t_{k+1} \widetilde{S}^k\|^2 \\
&= r^2 \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + \eta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \|\widetilde{S}^k\|^2 - 2r\eta_k t_{k+1} \langle \widetilde{S}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \\
&\quad + 2rt_{k+1}\theta_k \langle x^k - x^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle - 2\eta_k t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k \langle \widetilde{S}^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $\mu > 0$, we also have

$$\mu r \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 - \mu r \|x^k - x^*\|^2 = \mu r \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 2\mu r \langle x^k - x^*, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle.$$

Combining three last expressions, and using \mathcal{Q}_k from (32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{Q}_k &:= [(t_k - r)^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 + \mu r] \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \|\tilde{S}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2r(t_k - r - t_{k+1} \theta_k - \mu) \langle x^k - x^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2r\eta_k t_{k+1} \langle \tilde{S}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + 2\eta_k t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k \langle \tilde{S}^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{Q}_k] &:= [(t_k - r)^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 + \mu r] \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2r(t_k - r - t_{k+1} \theta_k - \mu) \langle x^k - x^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2r\eta_k t_{k+1} \mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] + 2\eta_k t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k \mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $S^k = Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}$ and $e^k := \tilde{S}^k - S^k$, we have $\tilde{S}^k := S^k + e^k$ and $\mathbb{E}_k[e^k] = 0$ as \tilde{S}^k is an unbiased estimator of S^k stated in (4). Therefore, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\langle \tilde{S}^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] &= \langle S^k, x^k - x^* \rangle + \langle \mathbb{E}_k[e^k], x^k - x^* \rangle = \langle S^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &= \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \gamma_k \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &= \langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \gamma_k \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \gamma_k \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can also derive that

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

Again, since \tilde{S}^k is an unbiased estimator of S^k as stated in (4), and $e^k := \tilde{S}^k - S^k$, we have $\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}^k\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|S^k + e^k\|^2] = \|S^k\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_k[\langle e^k, S^k \rangle] + \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] + \|S^k\|^2$. Therefore, we can easily show that

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

Substituting the last three expressions into (33), we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{Q}_k] &= [(t_k - r)^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 + \mu r] \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - \eta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2r\eta_k t_{k+1} [\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta \|Gx^k\|^2] \\ &\quad - 2r\gamma_k \eta_k t_{k+1} [\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2\eta_k t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k \langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle - \gamma_k \eta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2r\eta_k t_{k+1} [\beta - \frac{(1-\gamma_k)\eta_k t_{k+1}}{2r}] \|Gx^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2r\gamma_k \eta_k t_{k+1} [\frac{(1-\gamma_k)\eta_k t_{k+1}}{2r} - \beta] \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2r(t_k - r - t_{k+1} \theta_k - \mu) \langle x^k - x^{k-1}, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\eta_k t_{k+1} [(1 - \gamma_k) t_{k+1} \theta_k - r\gamma_k] \langle Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose parameters θ_k , γ_k , and β such that

$$(34) \quad t_k - r - t_{k+1}\theta_k - \mu = 0 \quad (1 - \gamma_k)t_{k+1}\theta_k - r\gamma_k = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{\eta_k t_{k+1}}{2(t_k - \mu)}.$$

This condition allows us to update $\theta_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_{k+1}}$, $\gamma_k := \frac{t_{k+1}\theta_k}{t_{k+1}\theta_k + r} = \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_k - \mu}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{2\beta(t_k - \mu)}{t_{k+1}}$ as stated in (13). Hence, we can simplify the last estimate as follows:

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{Q}_k] &= \mu(2t_k - r - \mu)\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 4\beta(t_k - \mu)^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4r\beta(t_k - \mu)[\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^k\|^2] \\ &\quad - 4r\beta(t_k - r - \mu)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(t_k - \mu)(t_k - r - \mu)\langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle \\ &\quad - 4\beta^2(t_k - \mu)(t_k - r - \mu)\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing \mathcal{L}_k from (32), we can rearrange (35) and take full expectation to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] &= \mu(2t_k - r - \mu)\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 4\beta^2(t_k - \mu)^2\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4r\beta(t_{k-1} - t_k + r)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(t_k - \mu)(t_k - r - \mu)\mathbb{E}[\langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle] \\ &\quad - 4\beta^2(t_k - \mu)(t_k - r - \mu)\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Define $U_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2]$. By Assumption 1.3 and (3), we have

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle &\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \frac{1}{nL} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2 = \frac{1}{L} U_k, \\ U_k &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2 \stackrel{(3)}{\geq} \|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using both inequalities of (36), we can upper bound

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] &\geq \mu(2t_k - r - \mu)\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] - 4\beta^2(t_k - \mu)^2\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4r\beta(t_{k-1} - t_k + r)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(t_k - \mu)(t_k - r - \mu)\left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta\right) \cdot U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_k - \mu}$, we have $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 = \frac{r^2}{(t_k - \mu)^2}$. From (4), using $\lambda_k := \lambda > 0$ and $\rho_k := \rho \in (0, 1)$, the definition of U_k , and the last expression, we can show that

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] &\leq \lambda \cdot \Delta_k, \\ (t_k - \mu)^2 \Delta_k &\leq \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} [(t_{k-1} - \mu)^2 \Delta_{k-1} - (t_k - \mu)^2 \Delta_k] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho} [\hat{\Theta}_k(t_{k-1} - \mu)^2 U_{k-1} - \hat{\Theta}_{k+1}(t_k - \mu)^2 U_k] \\ &\quad + 4r\beta(t_{k-1} - t_k + r)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{(\Theta_k + \hat{\Theta}_{k+1})(t_k - \mu)^2}{\rho} \cdot U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the two expressions from (38) into (37), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_k] &\geq \mu(2t_k - r - \mu)\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(t_k - \mu)^2 \left[\frac{(t_k - r - \mu)}{(t_k - \mu)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta\right) - \frac{\lambda\beta(\Theta_k + \hat{\Theta}_{k+1})}{\rho} \right] \cdot U_k \\ &\quad - \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(1-\rho)}{\rho} [(t_{k-1} - \mu)^2 \Delta_{k-1} - (t_k - \mu)^2 \Delta_k] \\ &\quad - \frac{4\lambda\beta^2}{\rho} \cdot [\hat{\Theta}_k(t_{k-1} - \mu)^2 U_{k-1} - \hat{\Theta}_{k+1}(t_k - \mu)^2 U_k]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality, and using \mathcal{E}_k from (14), we ultimately get (15). \square

B.2. The proof of Theorem 5. For simplicity, we choose $\mu := 1$ and $t_k := k + r + \mu = k + r + 1$. Since $t_k = k + r + 1$ and $\mu = 1$, from (13), we get

$$\theta_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_{k+1}} = \frac{k}{k+r+2}, \quad \gamma_k := \frac{t_k - r - \mu}{t_k - \mu} = \frac{k}{k+r}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := \frac{2\beta(t_k - \mu)}{t_{k+1}} = \frac{2\beta(k+r)}{k+r+2},$$

which are the updates in (17).

Now, we divide the proof of this theorem into several steps as follows.

Step 1. *Upper bounding \mathcal{E}_0 .* Since $x^{-1} = x^0$, $\eta_0 = \frac{2r\beta}{r+2}$, $\gamma_0 = 0$, $\Delta_0 = 0$, and $t_1 = r + 2$, it follows from (14) that

$$\mathcal{E}_0 := 4r^2\beta[\langle Gx^0, x^0 - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^0\|^2] + \|r(x^0 - x^*) + (r+2)(x^1 - x^0)\|^2 + r\|x^0 - x^*\|^2.$$

From (AVFR), $x^{-1} = x^0$, and $\tilde{S}^0 := (1 - \gamma_0)Gx^0$, we also have $x^1 - x^0 = \theta_0(x^0 - x^{-1}) - \eta_0\tilde{S}^0 = -\frac{2r\beta}{r+2}Gx^0$. By Young's inequality and $\|Gx^0\|^2 = \|Gx^0 - Gx^*\|^2 \leq L^2\|x^0 - x^*\|^2$ (by the L -Lipschitz continuity of G from (3) and $Gx^* = 0$), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|r(x^0 - x^*) + (r+2)(x^1 - x^0)\|^2 &\leq 2r^2\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + 2(r+2)^2\|x^1 - x^0\|^2 \\ &= 2r^2\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + 8r^2\beta^2\|Gx^0\|^2 \\ &\leq 2r^2(1 + 4L^2\beta^2)\|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Young's inequality, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Gx^0, x^0 - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^0\|^2 &\leq \|Gx^0\|\|x^0 - x^*\| - \beta\|Gx^0\|^2 \\ &\leq \beta\|Gx^0\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\beta}\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 - \beta\|Gx^0\|^2 = \frac{1}{4\beta}\|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last three expressions, we can show that

$$(39) \quad \mathcal{E}_0 \leq r(1 + 3r + 8rL^2\beta^2)\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 = C_0 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2,$$

where $C_0 := r(1 + 3r + 8rL^2\beta^2)$ as defined in (16).

Step 2. *The summable results in (18).* Since $\Theta_k := \Theta$ and $\hat{\Theta}_k := \hat{\Theta}$ are fixed and $k \geq 1$, the constant Λ_k in Lemma 4 is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_k &:= 4\beta \left[\frac{(t_k - r - \mu)}{(t_k - \mu)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta \right) - \frac{\lambda\beta(\Theta_k + \hat{\Theta}_{k+1})}{\rho} \right] = 4\beta \left[\frac{k}{k+r} \left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta \right) - \frac{\beta\lambda(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})}{\rho} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{4\beta}{r+1} \left[\frac{1}{L} - \frac{[\rho + \lambda(r+1)(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})]}{\rho} \cdot \beta \right] = \frac{4\beta(\rho - [\rho + \lambda(r+1)(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})] \cdot L\beta)}{L\rho(r+1)} \equiv \Lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where Λ is defined by (16). Clearly, for $\bar{\beta}$ given by (16), if we choose $0 < \beta < \bar{\beta}$, then the above inequality shows that $\Lambda_k \geq \Lambda > 0$.

Substituting the lower bound Λ of Λ_k and $t_k - \mu = k + r$ into (15), and noting that $t_{k-1} - t_k + r = r - 1 \geq 0$ (since $r \geq 1$), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] \geq \Lambda(k+r)^2 U_k + (2k+r+1)\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2].$$

Summing up this inequality from $k = 1$ to K , and then using (39), and noting that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_K] \geq 0$, we obtain the first two summable inequalities in (18).

Step 3. *The first summable result in (19).* Since $\tilde{S}^k = S^k + e^k = Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} + e^k$ for $e^k := \tilde{S}^k - S^k$, we obtain from (AVFR) that $x^{k+1} = x^k + \theta_k(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta_k Gx^k +$

$\eta_k \gamma_k Gx^{k-1} - \eta_k e^k$. If we denote $v^k := x^{k+1} - x^k$ and $s_k := \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k}{\eta_{k-1}}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^k + \eta_k Gx^k &= \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k}{\eta_{k-1}} (v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}) + (\theta_k - \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k}{\eta_{k-1}}) v^{k-1} - \eta_k e^k \\ &= s_k (v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}) + (1 - s_k) \frac{\theta_k - s_k}{1 - s_k} v^{k-1} - \eta_k e^k. \end{aligned}$$

Leveraging (17), we can easily check that $s_k = \frac{(k+r+1)k}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \in (0, 1)$ and $\frac{(\theta_k - s_k)^2}{1 - s_k} = \frac{4k^2}{[rk + (r-1)(r+2)](k+r-1)(k+r+2)}$. Utilizing these expressions, the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$, $\mathbb{E}_k[e^k] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \leq \lambda \cdot \Delta_k$, and η_k from (13), we get from the last expression that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|v^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\|s_k (v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}) + (1 - s_k) \frac{\theta_k - s_k}{1 - s_k} v^{k-1}\|^2] + \eta_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\leq s_k \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{(\theta_k - s_k)^2}{(1 - s_k)^2} \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1}\|^2] + \lambda \eta_k^2 \Delta_k \\ &= \frac{(k+r+1)k}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(k+r)^2}{(k+r+2)^2} \cdot \Delta_k \\ &\quad + \frac{4k^2}{[rk + (r-1)(r+2)](k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{(k+r+1)k}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(k+r)^2}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \Delta_k \\ &\quad + \frac{2(2k+r+1)}{r(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used $k+r-1 \leq k+r+2$ and $4rk^2 \leq 2(2k+r+1)[rk + (r-1)(r+2)]$ in the last inequality. Multiplying this inequality by $(k+r-1)(k+r+2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (k+r-1)(k+r+2) \mathbb{E}[\|v^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] &\leq (k+r+1)(k+r-2) \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad - (r-2)(k+r+1) \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] + 4\lambda\beta^2(k+r)^2 \Delta_k \\ &\quad + \frac{2(2k+r+1)}{r} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up this inequality from $k := 1$ to $k := K$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= (K+r-1)(K+r+2) \mathbb{E}[\|v^K + \eta_K Gx^K\|^2] \\ (40) \quad &\leq (r-1)(r+2) \mathbb{E}[\|v^0 + \eta_0 Gx^0\|^2] + 4\lambda\beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 \Delta_k \\ &\quad - (r-2) \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r+1) \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{r} \sum_{k=1}^K (2k+r+1) \mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, recalling (38) from the proof of Lemma 4 with $t_k - \mu = k+r$, $\hat{\Theta}_k := \hat{\Theta}$, and $\Theta_k := \Theta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (k+r)^2 \Delta_k &\leq \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} [(k+r-1)^2 \Delta_{k-1} - (k+r)^2 \Delta_k] \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{\Theta}}{\rho} [(k+r-1)^2 U_{k-1} - (k+r)^2 U_k] + \frac{(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})(k+r)^2}{\rho} \cdot U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up this inequality from $k := 1$ to $k := K$, and noting that $U_0 = 0$ since $x^{-1} = x^0$, $\Delta_0 = 0$, $\Delta_K \geq 0$, and $U_K \geq 0$, we get

$$(41) \quad \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 \Delta_k \leq \frac{\hat{\Theta} r^2}{\rho} U_0 + \frac{(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})}{\rho} \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 U_k = \frac{(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})}{\rho} \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 U_k.$$

Substituting (41) into (40), and having $\|v^0 + \eta_0 Gx^0\|^2 = \eta_0^2 \|Gx^0\|^2 \leq L^2 \eta_0^2 \|x^0 -$

$x^*\|^2 = \frac{4L^2\beta^2r^2}{(r+2)^2}\|x^0 - x^*\|^2$ and $v^{k-1} = x^k - x^{k-1}$, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= (K+r-1)(K+r+2)\mathbb{E}[\|v^K + \eta_K Gx^K\|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{4L^2\beta^2r^2(r-1)}{(r+2)^2}\mathbb{E}[\|x^0 - x^*\|^2] - (r-2)\sum_{k=1}^K(k+r+1)\mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1}Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{r}\sum_{k=1}^K(2k+r+1)\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})}{\rho}\sum_{k=1}^K(k+r)^2U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality and the first two summable inequalities from (18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[2]} &:= (K+r-1)(K+r+2)\mathbb{E}[\|v^K + \eta_K Gx^K\|^2] \\ (42) \quad &+ (r-2)\sum_{k=1}^K(k+r+1)\mathbb{E}[\|v^{k-1} + \eta_{k-1}Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\leq \left[\frac{4r^2(r-1)L^2\beta^2}{r+2} + \frac{2C_0}{r} + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})C_0}{\rho\Lambda} \right] \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 = C_1 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 := \frac{4r^2(r-1)L^2\beta^2}{r+2} + \frac{2C_0}{r} + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})C_0}{\rho\Lambda}$ as in (16). As a result, we obtain the first summable inequality of (19) from the last inequality $\mathcal{T}_{[2]}$ in (42).

Step 4. *The second summable result of (19).* By the choice of $\eta_k = \frac{2\beta(k+r)}{k+r+2}$ from (17), we have $\eta_k \geq \frac{2\beta r}{r+2}$. Applying this inequality and Young's inequality, we have

$$(43) \quad \frac{2\beta^2r^2}{(r+2)^2}\|Gx^k\|^2 \leq \frac{\eta_k^2}{2}\|Gx^k\|^2 \leq \|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Combining (43) and the first bound of (18) and the first bound of (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\beta^2r^2}{(r+2)^2}\sum_{k=1}^K(2k+r+3)\|Gx^k\|^2 &\leq 2\sum_{k=1}^K(k+r+2)\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K(2k+r+3)\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(C_0 + \frac{2C_1}{r-2} \right) \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the second summable bound of (19).

Step 5. *The Big-O and small-O rates of $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2]$.* The bound (42) implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] \leq \frac{C_1}{(k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2$ as in the first line of (20). The bound (42) also leads to $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (k+r-1)(k+r+2)\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] = 0$, which means that $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta_k Gx^k\|^2] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$.

Step 6. *The Big-O and small-O rates of $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2]$.* Since $x^{k+1} - x^k = \theta_k(x^k - x^{k-1}) - \eta_k \tilde{S}^k$ from (AVFR) and $\mathbb{E}_k[\tilde{S}^k] = S^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &= \theta_k^2\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 2\theta_k\eta_k\langle S^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle + \eta_k^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|\tilde{S}^k\|^2] \\ &= \theta_k^2\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 2\theta_k\eta_k\langle Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle \\ &\quad + \eta_k^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|S^k\|^2] + \eta_k^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &= \theta_k^2\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - 2\theta_k\eta_k\gamma_k\langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\theta_k\eta_k(1-\gamma_k)\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle + \eta_k^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|S^k\|^2] + \eta_k^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} -2\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle &\stackrel{\text{①}}{\leq} 2\beta\|Gx^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2, \\ \langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle &\stackrel{\text{②}}{\geq} \frac{1}{nL}\sum_{i=1}^n\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2 = \frac{1}{L}U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\|S^k\|^2 &= \|Gx^k - \gamma_k Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \gamma_k)\|Gx^k\|^2 - \gamma_k(1 - \gamma_k)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \gamma_k\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} (1 - \gamma_k)\|Gx^k\|^2 - \gamma_k(1 - \gamma_k)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \gamma_k U_k.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last four expressions, taking the full expectation of both sides of the result, and then using $\mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \leq \lambda \cdot \Delta_k$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &\leq \left[\theta_k^2 + \frac{\theta_k \eta_k (1 - \gamma_k)}{2\beta}\right] \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \eta_k(1 - \gamma_k)(2\beta\theta_k + \eta_k)\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] - \gamma_k(1 - \gamma_k)\eta_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad - \gamma_k \eta_k \left(\frac{2\theta_k}{L} - \eta_k\right) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2] + \lambda \eta_k^2 \Delta_k.\end{aligned}$$

Next, from the update rule (17), we can easily check that $\theta_k^2 + \frac{\theta_k \eta_k (1 - \gamma_k)}{2\beta} = \frac{k(k+r)}{(k+r+2)^2}$, $\eta_k(1 - \gamma_k)(2\beta\theta_k + \eta_k) = \frac{4\beta^2 r(2k+r)}{(k+r+2)^2}$, $\gamma_k(1 - \gamma_k)\eta_k^2 = \frac{4\beta^2 r k}{(k+r+2)^2} > 0$, and $\frac{2\theta_k}{L} - \eta_k = \frac{2k}{(k+r+2)L} \left(1 - \frac{(k+r)L\beta}{k}\right) \geq \frac{2k}{(k+r+2)L} (1 - (r+1)L\beta) > 0$. Using these relations, we can derive from the last inequality that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] \leq \frac{k(k+r)}{(k+r+2)^2} \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{4\beta^2 r(2k+r)}{(k+r+2)^2} \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(k+r)^2}{(k+r+2)^2} \cdot \Delta_k.$$

Multiplying this inequality by $(k+r+2)^2$ and noting that $k(k+r) \leq (k+r+1)^2$ and $2k+r \leq 2k+r+3$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}(k+r+2)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] &\leq (k+r+1)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2] + 4\lambda\beta^2(k+r)^2 \Delta_k \\ &\quad + 4r\beta^2(2k+r+3) \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2].\end{aligned}$$

Summing up this inequality from $k=1$ to K , and using $\|x^1 - x^0\|^2 \leq \frac{4r^2 L^2 \beta^2}{(r+2)^2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2$, and the second summable result in (19) and then (41), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{[3]} &:= (K+r+2)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|x^{K+1} - x^K\|^2] \\ &\leq 4r^2 L^2 \beta^2 \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + 4r\beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K (2k+r+3) \mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] + 4\lambda\beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 \Delta_k \\ &\stackrel{(19)}{\leq} \left[4r^2 L^2 \beta^2 + \frac{2(r+2)^2}{r} \left[C_0 + \frac{2C_1}{r-2}\right]\right] \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})}{\rho} \sum_{k=1}^K (k+r)^2 U_k \\ &\stackrel{(41)}{\leq} \left[4r^2 L^2 \beta^2 + \frac{2(r+2)^2}{r} \left[C_0 + \frac{2C_1}{r-2}\right] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})C_0}{\rho\Lambda}\right] \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\ &= C_2 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 := 4r^2 L^2 \beta^2 + \frac{2(r+2)^2}{r} \left[C_0 + \frac{2C_1}{r-2}\right] + \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})C_0}{\rho\Lambda}$ as in (16).

The last inequality $\mathcal{T}_{[3]}$ also shows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (k+r+2)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2]$ exists. Combining this limit and the first summable result in (18), we obtain $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (k+r+2)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] = 0$, leading to the second small-O rate in (21). Moreover, we also obtain from $\mathcal{T}_{[3]}$ that $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2] \leq \frac{C_2}{(k+r+2)^2} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2$ as in (20).

Step 7. *The Big-O and small-O rates of $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2]$.* Finally, combining (43) and the first two bounds of (20), and noting that $k+r-1 \leq k+r+2$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] &\leq \frac{(r+2)^2 C_1 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{2\beta^2 r^2 (k+r-1)(k+r+2)} + \frac{(r+2)^2 C_2 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{2\beta^2 r^2 (k+r+2)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{(r+2)^2 (C_1 + C_2)}{2\beta^2 r^2 (k+r-1)(k+r+2)} \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 = \frac{A_3 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{\beta^2 (k+r-1)(k+r+2)},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_3 := \frac{(r+2)^2(C_1+C_2)}{2r^2}$ as in (16). This exactly proves the last line of (20). The last small-O rate in (21) is a consequence of (43) and the first small-O rate in (21) and the small-O rate at **Step 5**. \square

B.3. The proof of Corollaries 6 and 7. We have the following proofs.

Proof of Corollary 6. Since \tilde{S}^k is constructed by (5), by Lemma 2, we have $\rho := \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2}$, $\lambda := \frac{1}{b}$, and $\Theta = \hat{\Theta} = \frac{4}{\mathbf{p}}$. Hence, with $r := 3$, we can show that $\beta := \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{2} = \frac{\rho}{2L[\rho+4\lambda(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})]} = \frac{b\mathbf{p}^2}{2L(b\mathbf{p}^2+64)}$, and $\Lambda := \frac{\beta}{2L} = \frac{b\mathbf{p}^2}{4L^2(b\mathbf{p}^2+64)}$. Suppose that $1 \leq b\mathbf{p}^2 \leq 32$, then we have $\frac{1}{130L} \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{6L}$ and $\psi := \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})}{\rho\Lambda} = \frac{64}{64+b\mathbf{p}^2} \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$.

Using the bounds of β and ψ , and $r := 3$ we can show from (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &:= 3(10 + 24L^2\beta^2) \leq 32, & C_1 &:= \frac{72L^2\beta^2}{5} + (\frac{2}{3} + \psi)C_0 \leq 53.8, \\ C_2 &:= 36L^2\beta^2 + (\frac{50}{3} + \psi)C_0 + \frac{100C_1}{3} \leq 2360, & C_3 &:= \frac{25(C_1+C_2)}{18} \leq 3353. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain (22) from (20) and (21).

Finally, since $C_3 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\beta = \mathcal{O}(\frac{b\mathbf{p}^2}{L})$, from (22), to guarantee $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, we can impose $\frac{C_3L^2}{b^2\mathbf{p}^4(k+2)^2}\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$. This leads to $k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{L}{b\mathbf{p}^2\epsilon})$. Hence, the number of evaluations of G_i is $\mathcal{T}_{G_i} := n + (\mathbf{p}n + 3b)k = \mathcal{O}(n + \frac{L}{\epsilon}(\frac{n}{b\mathbf{p}} + \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}^2}))$. Clearly, if we choose $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ and $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$, then $\mathcal{T}_{G_i} = \mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}L\epsilon^{-1})$. \square

Proof of Corollary 7. Since \tilde{S}^k is constructed by (9), by Lemma 3, we have $\rho := \frac{b}{2n}$, $\lambda := \frac{1}{b}$, $\Theta_k \leq \Theta = \frac{4n}{b}$, and $\hat{\Theta}_k \leq \hat{\Theta} = \frac{4n}{b}$. Hence, for $r := 3$, we can show that $\beta := \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{2} = \frac{\rho}{2L[\rho+4\lambda(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})]} = \frac{b^3}{2L(b^3+64n^2)}$. If $1 \leq b \leq 16n^{2/3}$, then we have $\frac{1}{2L(1+64n^2)} \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{4L}$ and $\Lambda := \frac{\beta}{2L} = \mathcal{O}(\frac{b^3}{L^2n^2}) \in [\frac{1}{4L^2(1+64n^2)}, \frac{1}{4L^2}]$. Hence, it is easy to check that $L\beta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $\psi := \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})}{\rho\Lambda} = \frac{64n^2}{(64n^2+b^3)} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Using the bounds of β and ψ , and $r := 3$ we can show from (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &:= 3(10 + 24L^2\beta^2) \leq 34.5, & C_1 &:= \frac{72L^2\beta^2}{5} + (\frac{2}{3} + \psi)C_0 \leq 58.4, \\ C_2 &:= 36L^2\beta^2 + (\frac{50}{3} + \psi)C_0 + \frac{100C_1}{3} \leq 2559, & C_3 &:= \frac{25(C_1+C_2)}{18} \leq 3636. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (23) from (20) and (21).

Finally, since $C_3 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\beta = \mathcal{O}(\frac{b^3}{Ln^2})$, from (22), to guarantee $\mathbb{E}[\|Gx^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, we can impose $\frac{C_3L^2n^4}{b^6(k+2)^2} \leq \epsilon^2$. This leads to $k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{Ln^2}{b^3\epsilon})$. Hence, the number of evaluations of G_i is $\mathcal{T}_{G_i} := n + 2bk = \mathcal{O}(n + \frac{Ln^2}{b^2\epsilon})$. Clearly, if we choose $b := \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$, then $\mathcal{T}_{G_i} = \mathcal{O}(n + n^{2/3}L\epsilon^{-1})$. \square

B.4. The proof of Theorem 8. First, we prove the following key lemma.

LEMMA 11. Suppose that G given by (1) satisfies Assumptions 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4. Given s, r and β such that $r > (s-1)\rho$ and $4rs^2 > 2(s-1)(2s-r-1)$, and

$$(44) \quad 0 < \beta\mu \leq \frac{(2r+1)(2s-r-1)}{4rs^2-2(s-1)(2s-r-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \beta\mu < \frac{(2r+1)\rho}{2[r-\rho(s-1)]}.$$

Let $\{x^k\}$ be generated by (AVFR) to solve (ME) using:

$$(45) \quad \theta_k := \theta = \frac{s-r-1}{s}, \quad \gamma_k := \gamma = \frac{s-r-1}{s-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := \eta = \frac{2\beta(s-1)}{s}.$$

For $\omega := \frac{2r\beta\mu}{r(2r+1)+2\beta\mu(s-1)}$, consider the following potential function:

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_k &:= 4\beta(s-1)[\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^k\|^2] + \|r(x^k - x^*) + s(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + r\|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{4(s-1)^2\lambda\beta^2(1-\rho)}{\rho-\omega} \cdot \Delta_k + \frac{4(s-1)^2\lambda\beta^2\hat{\Theta}}{\rho-\omega} \cdot U_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $U_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2$. Then, for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$(47) \quad (1-\omega)\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{E}_k] \geq \frac{4\beta r^2(2r+1)}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)} \left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \alpha \cdot U_k,$$

where $\alpha := 4\beta(s-1)(s-r-1) \left[\frac{1}{L} - \left(1 + \frac{\lambda(s-1)(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})}{(s-r-1)(\rho-\omega)}\right) \cdot \beta \right]$.

Proof. For given $s > 0$, $r > 0$, and $\beta > 0$, we introduce the following function:

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k &:= 4r\beta(s-1)[\langle Gx^k, x^k - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^k\|^2] + r\|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \|r(x^k - x^*) + s(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using (AVFR) with $\theta_k := \theta = \frac{s-r-1}{s}$, $\gamma := \frac{s-r-1}{s-1}$, and $\eta := \frac{2\beta(s-1)}{s}$, as in (45), with a similar proof as in Lemma 4, we can show that

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_k] &= (2s-r-1)\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 - s^2\eta^2\mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta r^2[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(s-1)(s-r-1)\langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle \\ &\quad - 4\beta^2(s-1)(s-r-1)\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3) with $Gx^* = 0$ from Assumption 1.3 and Assumption 1.4, we have

$$\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2.$$

From this inequality and Young's inequality, for any $c \in [0, 1]$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= 4\beta r^2[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\geq \frac{(1-c)r}{s-1} \cdot 4r\beta(s-1)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4c\beta r^2 \left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + 2c\beta\mu r^2 \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{(1-c)r}{s-1} \cdot 4r\beta(s-1)[\langle Gx^{k-1}, x^{k-1} - x^* \rangle - \beta\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{(1-c)r}{s-1} [\|r(x^{k-1} - x^*) + s(x^k - x^{k-1})\|^2 + r\|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4c\beta r^2 \left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 + r^2 \left[2c\beta\mu - \frac{(1-c)(2r+1)}{s-1}\right] \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2rs^2(1-c)}{s-1} \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(48)}{=} \frac{(1-c)r}{s-1} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{k-1} + 4c\beta r^2 \left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right) \|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 - \frac{2r^2s^2(1-c)}{s-1} \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + r^2 \left[2c\beta\mu - \frac{(1-c)(2r+1)}{s-1}\right] \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from (2) and (3) of Assumptions 1.3, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}, x^k - x^{k-1} \rangle &\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \frac{1}{Ln} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2 = \frac{1}{L} U_k, \\ -\|Gx^k - Gx^{k-1}\|^2 &\stackrel{(3)}{\geq} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|G_i x^k - G_i x^{k-1}\|^2 = -U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\mathcal{T}_{[1]}$ and the last two inequalities into (49), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_k] &\geq \frac{(1-c)r^2}{s-1} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{k-1} + \left[2s - r - 1 - \frac{2rs^2(1-c)}{s-1}\right] \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + r^2 \left[2c\beta\mu - \frac{(1-c)(2r+1)}{s-1}\right] \|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^2 - s^2\eta^2 \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(s-1)(s-r-1)\left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta\right)U_k + 4c\beta r^2\left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now impose the following two conditions:

$$(50) \quad (s-1)(2s-r-1) - 2rs^2(1-c) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad 2c\beta\mu(s-1) - (1-c)(2r+1) \geq 0.$$

Clearly, if we choose $c := \frac{2r+1}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)}$, then the second condition of (50) holds with equality, while the first one becomes

$$\beta\mu \leq \frac{(2r+1)(2s-r-1)}{4rs^2 - 2(s-1)(2s-r-1)},$$

provided that $2rs^2 - (s-1)(2s-r-1) > 0$. This is the first condition of (44).

Under the condition (44), if we denote $\omega := \frac{(1-c)r}{s-1} = \frac{2r\beta\mu}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)}$, then the last inequality reduces to

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} (1-\omega)\mathcal{L}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_k] &\geq 4\beta(s-1)(s-r-1)\left(\frac{1}{L} - \beta\right)U_k - 4\beta^2(s-1)^2 \mathbb{E}_k[\|e^k\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\beta r^2(2r+1)}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)}\left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, from the second condition of (44), we have $0 < \omega < \rho$. Then, from (4), using $\lambda_k := \lambda > 0$, $\gamma_k := \gamma > 0$, and $\rho_k := \rho \in (0, 1)$, we can show that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[\|e^k\|^2] \leq \lambda \cdot \Delta_k, \\ \Delta_k \leq \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho-\omega} [(1-\omega)\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k] + \frac{\hat{\Theta}}{\rho-\omega} [(1-\omega)U_{k-1} - U_k] + \frac{[(1-\omega)\Theta + \hat{\Theta}]}{\rho-\omega} \cdot U_k. \end{cases}$$

Substituting these inequalities into (51), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1-\omega)\mathcal{L}_{k-1} - \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{L}_k] &\geq \frac{4\beta r^2(2r+1)}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)}\left(\frac{1}{2L} - \beta\right)\|Gx^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(s-1)^2(1-\rho)}{\rho-\omega} [(1-\omega)\Delta_{k-1} - \Delta_k] \\ &\quad - \frac{4\lambda\beta^2(s-1)^2\hat{\Theta}}{\rho-\omega} [(1-\omega)U_{k-1} - U_k] \\ &\quad + 4\beta(s-1)(s-r-1)\left[\frac{1}{L} - \left(1 + \frac{\lambda(s-1)[(1-\omega)\Theta + \hat{\Theta}]}{(s-r-1)(\rho-\omega)}\right) \cdot \beta\right] \cdot U_k. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality, and using \mathcal{E}_k from (46) and $\omega \in (0, 1)$, we obtain (47). \square

Proof of Theorem 8. We first choose $r := 1$ and $s := 3$ in Lemma 11. Then, the update rule (45) reduces to (26), and $\omega := \frac{2r\beta\mu}{2r+1+2\beta\mu(s-1)} = \frac{2\beta\mu}{3+4\beta\mu} \in (0, 1/2)$.

Next, α in Lemma 11 becomes $\alpha = 8\beta\left[\frac{1}{L} - \left(1 + \frac{2\lambda(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})}{\rho-\omega}\right)\beta\right]$. Therefore, if

$$\frac{1}{\kappa\beta\mu} = \frac{1}{L\beta} \geq \frac{\rho+2\lambda(\Theta+\hat{\Theta})-\omega}{\rho-\omega} = \frac{\Gamma-\omega}{\rho-\omega} = \frac{3\Gamma+2(2\Gamma-1)\beta\mu}{3\rho-2(1-2\rho)\beta\mu},$$

then $\alpha \geq 0$, where $\kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}$ and $\Gamma := \rho + 2\lambda(\Theta + \hat{\Theta})$ are from (24). The above condition holds if $2(2\Gamma - 1)\kappa\beta^2\mu^2 + [3\Gamma\kappa + 2(1 - 2\rho)]\beta\mu - 3\rho \leq 0$. Using $M := 2(2\Gamma - 1)\kappa$ and $N := 3\Gamma\kappa + 2(1 - 2\rho)$ from (24), this inequality becomes $M(\beta\mu)^2 + N\beta\mu - 3\rho \leq 0$,

leading to $\beta\mu \leq \frac{6\rho}{N+\sqrt{N^2+12\rho M}}$ provided that $N^2 + 12\rho M \geq 0$. Combining this condition, $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2L} = \frac{\mu}{2\kappa}$, and (44), we obtain (25).

Now, since $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{2L} - \beta \geq 0$, it follows from (47) that $(1 - \omega)\mathcal{E}_{k-1} \geq \mathbb{E}_k[\mathcal{E}_k]$. Taking the full expectation of this inequality and by induction, we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] \leq (1 - \omega)^k \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_0]$. Similar to the proof of (39) in Theorem 5, we can show that $\mathcal{E}_0 \leq 4(1 + 2L^2\beta^2) \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2$. Alternatively, from (46), we also have $\mathcal{E}_k \geq \|x^k - x^*\|^2$ as $r = 1$. Therefore, combining these three results, we finally get

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_k] \leq 4(1 + 2L^2\beta^2) \cdot (1 - \omega)^k \|x^0 - x^*\|^2,$$

which proves (28).

Finally, for a given $\epsilon > 0$, to achieve $\mathbb{E}[\|x^k - x^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, we impose $(1 - \omega)^k C_0 \cdot \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$. Since $-\log(1 - \omega) \geq \omega$ for $\omega \in (0, 1)$, the last condition leads to $k \geq \omega^{-1} [\log(\epsilon^{-1}) - \log(C_0)]$. Therefore, we can choose $k := \mathcal{O}(\omega^{-1} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$. However, from (25), we can show that $\omega = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\rho}{\Gamma\kappa})$. Thus we obtain $k = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\Gamma\kappa}{\rho} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. ADLY AND H. ATTOUCH, *First-order inertial algorithms involving dry friction damping*, Math. Program., (2021), pp. 1–41.
- [2] A. ALACAUGLU, A. BÖHM, AND Y. MALITSKY, *Beyond the golden ratio for variational inequality algorithms*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.13955, (2022).
- [3] A. ALACAUGLU AND Y. MALITSKY, *Stochastic variance reduction for variational inequality methods*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08352, (2021).
- [4] A. ALACAUGLU, Y. MALITSKY, AND V. CEVHER, *Forward-reflected-backward method with variance reduction*, Comput. Optim. Appl., 80 (2021), pp. 321–346.
- [5] M. ARJOVSKY, S. CHINTALA, AND L. BOTTOU, *Wasserstein generative adversarial networks*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, 2017, pp. 214–223.
- [6] H. ATTOUCH AND A. CABOT, *Convergence of a relaxed inertial proximal algorithm for maximally monotone operators*, Math. Program., 184 (2020), pp. 243–287.
- [7] H. ATTOUCH AND J. FADILI, *From the Ravine method to the Nesterov method and vice versa: A dynamical system perspective*, SIAM J. Optim., 32 (2022), pp. 2074–2101.
- [8] H. ATTOUCH AND J. PEYPOUQUET, *Convergence of inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximally monotone operators*, Math. Program., 174 (2019), pp. 391–432.
- [9] H. ATTOUCH, J. PEYPOUQUET, AND P. REDONT, *Backward-forward algorithms for structured monotone inclusions in Hilbert spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 457 (2018), pp. 1095–1117.
- [10] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND P. COMBETTES, *Convex analysis and monotone operators theory in Hilbert spaces*, Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed., 2017.
- [11] A. BEZNOSEKOV, 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, PMLR, 2023, pp. 172–235.
- [12] 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).
- [13] R. S. BURACHIK AND A. IUSEM, *Set-Valued Mappings and Enlargements of Monotone Operators*, New York: Springer, 2008.
- [14] X. CAI, A. ALACAUGLU, AND J. DIAKONIKOLAS, *Variance reduced Halpern iteration for finite-sum monotone inclusions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02987, (2023).
- [15] 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).
- [16] Y. CAI, A. OIKONOMOU, AND W. ZHENG, *Accelerated algorithms for monotone inclusions and constrained nonconvex-nonconcave min-max optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.05248, (2022).
- [17] Y. CAI AND W. ZHENG, *Accelerated single-call methods for constrained min-max optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03096, (2022).

- [18] Y. CHEN, G. LAN, AND Y. OUYANG, *Accelerated schemes for a class of variational inequalities*, Math. Program., 165 (2017), pp. 113–149.
- [19] S. CUI AND U. 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 (2021), pp. 453–499.
- [20] C. DASKALAKIS, A. ILYAS, V. SYRGKANIS, AND H. ZENG, *Training GANs with Optimism*, in International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2018), 2018.
- [21] D. DAVIS, *Variance reduction for root-finding problems*, Math. Program., (2022), pp. 1–36.
- [22] 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), 2014, pp. 1646–1654.
- [23] J. DIAKONIKOLAS, *Halpern iteration for near-optimal and parameter-free monotone inclusion and strong solutions to variational inequalities*, in Conference on Learning Theory, PMLR, 2020, pp. 1428–1451.
- [24] D. DRIGGS, M. J. EHRHARDT, AND C.-B. SCHÖNLIEB, *Accelerating variance-reduced stochastic gradient methods*, Math. Program., (online first) (2020).
- [25] F. FACCHINEI AND J.-S. PANG, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*, vol. 1-2, Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [26] 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, 2014, pp. 2672–2680.
- [27] E. GORBUNOV, H. BERARD, G. GIDEL, AND N. LOIZOU, *Stochastic extragradient: General analysis and improved rates*, in International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2022, pp. 7865–7901.
- [28] R. M. GOWER, P. RICHTÁRIK, AND F. BACH, *Stochastic quasi-gradient methods: Variance reduction via Jacobian sketching*, Math. Program., 188 (2021), pp. 135–192.
- [29] B. HALPERN, *Fixed points of nonexpanding maps*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., 73 (1967), pp. 957–961.
- [30] F. HANZELY, K. MISHCHENKO, AND P. RICHTÁRIK, *SEGA: Variance reduction via gradient sketching*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2018, pp. 2082–2093.
- [31] Y. HE AND R.-D. MONTEIRO, *An accelerated HPE-type algorithm for a class of composite convex-concave saddle-point problems*, SIAM J. Optim., 26 (2016), pp. 29–56.
- [32] 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).
- [33] A. N. IUSEM, A. JOFRÉ, R. I. OLIVEIRA, AND P. THOMPSON, *Extragradient method with variance reduction for stochastic variational inequalities*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 686–724.
- [34] R. JOHNSON AND T. ZHANG, *Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction*, in NIPS, 2013, pp. 315–323.
- [35] A. JUDITSKY, A. NEMIROVSKI, AND C. TAUVEL, *Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm*, Stochastic Systems, 1 (2011), pp. 17–58.
- [36] A. KANNAN AND U. V. SHANBHAG, *Optimal stochastic extragradient schemes for pseudomonotone stochastic variational inequality problems and their variants*, Comput. Optim. Appl., 74 (2019), pp. 779–820.
- [37] M. KHALAFI AND D. BOOB, *Accelerated primal-dual methods for convex-strongly-concave saddle point problems*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2023, pp. 16250–16270.
- [38] D. KIM, *Accelerated proximal point method for maximally monotone operators*, Math. Program., (2021), pp. 1–31.
- [39] O. KOLOSSOSKI AND R. D. MONTEIRO, *An accelerated non-Euclidean hybrid proximal extragradient-type algorithm for convex-concave saddle-point problems*, Optim. Meth. Soft., 32 (2017), pp. 1244–1272.
- [40] G. KOTSALIS, G. LAN, AND T. LI, *Simple and optimal methods for stochastic variational inequalities, i: operator extrapolation*, SIAM J. Optim., 32 (2022), pp. 2041–2073.
- [41] 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, PMLR, 2020, pp. 451–467.
- [42] 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).
- [43] F. LIEDER, *On the convergence rate of the halpern-iteration*, Optim. Letters, 15 (2021), pp. 405–418.
- [44] 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 (2021), pp. 19095–19108.
- [45] 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.
- [46] P.-E. MAINGÉ, *Accelerated proximal algorithms with a correction term for monotone inclusions*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 84 (2021), pp. 2027–2061.
- [47] Y. MALITSKY AND M. K. TAM, *A forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions without cocoercivity*, SIAM J. Optim., 30 (2020), pp. 1451–1472.
- [48] H. NAMKOONG AND J. DUCHI, *Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f -divergences*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 29 (2016).
- [49] Y. NESTEROV, *A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$* , Doklady AN SSSR, 269 (1983), pp. 543–547. Translated as Soviet Math. Dokl.
- [50] Y. NESTEROV, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, vol. 87 of Applied Optimization, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [51] 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, 2017, pp. 2613–2621.
- [52] J. PARK AND E. K. RYU, *Exact optimal accelerated complexity for fixed-point iterations*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2022, pp. 17420–17457.
- [53] J. PARK AND E. K. RYU, *Exact optimal accelerated complexity for fixed-point iterations*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2201.11413.pdf>, (2022).
- [54] 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).
- [55] R. R. PHELPS, *Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability*, vol. 1364, Springer, 2009.
- [56] 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 (1980), pp. 845–848.
- [57] E. RYU AND W. YIN, *Large-scale convex optimization: Algorithms & analyses via monotone operators*, Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [58] E. K. RYU AND S. BOYD, *Primer on monotone operator methods*, Appl. Comput. Math, 15 (2016), pp. 3–43.
- [59] S. SABACH AND S. SHTERN, *A first order method for solving convex bilevel optimization problems*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 640–660.
- [60] Q. TRAN-DINH, *Stochastic variance-reduced forward-reflected methods for root-finding problems*, UNC-STOR-06.2024.
- [61] Q. TRAN-DINH, *Extragradient-Type Methods with $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ -Convergence Rates for Co-Hypomonotone Inclusions*, J. Global Optim., (2023), pp. 1–25.
- [62] Q. TRAN-DINH, *Sublinear Convergence Rates of Extragradient-Type Methods: A Survey on Classical and Recent Developments*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17192, (2023).
- [63] Q. TRAN-DINH, *From Halpern’s fixed-point iterations to Nesterov’s accelerated interpretations for root-finding problems*, Comput. Optim. Appl., 87 (2024), pp. 181–218.
- [64] Q. TRAN-DINH AND Y. LUO, *Halpern-type accelerated and splitting algorithms for monotone inclusions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08150, (2021).
- [65] Q. TRAN-DINH AND Y. LUO, *Randomized block-coordinate optimistic gradient algorithms for root-finding problems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03113, (2023).
- [66] 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 (2022), pp. 1005–1071.
- [67] J. YANG, S. ZHANG, N. KIYAVASH, AND N. HE, *A catalyst framework for minimax optimization*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33 (2020).
- [68] T. YOON AND E. K. RYU, *Accelerated algorithms for smooth convex-concave minimax problems with $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on squared gradient norm*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2021, pp. 12098–12109.
- [69] 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 (2018), pp. 789–819.
- [70] 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, PMLR, 2022, pp. 1219–1250.