

Distributed Event-Triggered Bandit Convex Optimization with Time-Varying Constraints

Kunpeng Zhang, Xinlei Yi, Guanghui Wen,
Ming Cao, Karl H. Johansson, Tianyou Chai, and Tao Yang

Abstract

This paper considers the distributed bandit convex optimization problem with time-varying inequality constraints over a network of agents, where the goal is to minimize network regret and cumulative constraint violation. Existing distributed online algorithms require that each agent broadcasts its decision to its neighbors at each iteration. To better utilize the limited communication resources, we propose a distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback. Under several classes of appropriately chosen decreasing parameter sequences and non-increasing event-triggered threshold sequences, we establish dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds. These bounds are comparable to the results achieved by distributed event-triggered online algorithms with full-information feedback. Finally, a numerical example is provided to verify the theoretical results.

Index Terms—Bandit convex optimization, cumulative constraint violation, distributed optimization, event-triggered algorithm, time-varying constraints.

K. Zhang, T. Chai and T. Yang are with the State Key Laboratory of Synthetical Automation for Process Industries, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China `2110343@stu.neu.edu.cn`; `{tychai; yangtao}@mail.neu.edu.cn`

X. Yi is with the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA `xinleiyi@mit.edu`

G. Wen is with the Department of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China `ghwen@seu.edu.cn`

M. Cao is with the Engineering and Technology Institute Groningen, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen, AG 9747 Groningen, The Netherlands `m.cao@rug.nl`

K. H. Johansson is with Division of Decision and Control Systems, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, and he is also affiliated with Digital Futures, 10044, Stockholm, Sweden `kallej@kth.se`

I. INTRODUCTION

Bandit convex optimization has drawn a growing attention due to its broad applications such as online routing in data networks and online advertisement placement in web search [1]. Different from online convex optimization, where the decision maker receives full-information feedback for the loss function at each iteration [2]–[8], i.e., the loss function is revealed to the decision maker at each iteration, in bandit convex optimization the decision maker receives bandit feedback for the loss function at each iteration, i.e., only the values of the loss function at some points are revealed to the decision maker at each iteration. In general, regret is a common performance metric [9], which measures the difference of the cumulative loss between the decision sequence selected by the decision maker and a comparator sequence. When each element of the comparator sequence is the offline optimal static decision, this metric is called static regret [10], [11]. When the comparator sequence is the offline optimal dynamic decision sequence, this metric is called dynamic regret.

Bandit convex optimization with time-invariant constraints is well studied. For example, the authors of [12] propose a projection-based online gradient descent algorithm with one-point bandit feedback, and establish an $\mathcal{O}(T^{3/4})$ static regret bound for convex loss functions. The authors of [13] propose a projection-based online gradient descent algorithm by introducing the notable two-point bandit feedback, and establish an $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ static regret bound for convex loss functions. The authors of [14] consider the scenarios where constraints are characterized by static inequalities, and introduce the idea of long-term constraints (i.e., inequality constraints are permitted to be violated but are fulfilled in the long run) to avoid projection operations onto the inequality constrained set due to the high computational complexity. In contrast, bandit convex optimization with time-varying constraints are studied in [15], [16], where constraints are characterized by time-varying inequalities. Different from the time-invariant constraint setting, where the decision maker knows the constrained set in advance when she makes a decision, in the time-varying constraint setting considered in [15], [16] the decision maker has no a priori knowledge of the current inequality constrained set, and the information of inequality constraint functions is revealed along with the values of the loss function after she makes a decision.

The aforementioned studies concentrate on centralized online algorithms with bandit feedback, which suffer a plethora of limitations, e.g., single point of failure, heavy communication and

computation overhead [17], [18]. To deal with these limitations, distributed online algorithms with bandit feedback are developed in [19]–[25]. Along the line of the time-invariant constraint setting, the authors of [19], [20] propose the projection-based distributed online algorithms with two-point and one-point bandit feedback. In the presence of feedback delays, the authors of [22] propose a projection-based distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback, and analyze the impact of delay size on the algorithm performance. In addition, the authors of [21], [23], [25] consider static inequality constraints, and use the idea of long-term constraints to reduce computational burden of projection operations. For the time-varying constraint setting, the authors of [24] propose a distributed online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback by using two-point stochastic subgradient approximations for both loss and constraint functions at each iteration.

Note that in the above studies on distributed online algorithms with bandit feedback, all the decision makers require to collaboratively make decisions through local information exchange with their neighbors at each iteration. However, communication resources are limited that frequent communication among the decision makers may cause network congestion. To better utilize communication resources, the authors of [26] propose a distributed event-triggered online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback, where each agent broadcasts the current local decision to its neighbors only if the norm of the difference between the current decision and its last broadcasted decision is not less than the current event-triggering threshold. Moreover, sublinear static regret is achieved when the event-triggering threshold sequence is non-increasing and converges to zero. By using one-point and two-point stochastic subgradient estimators, two distributed event-triggered online algorithms with delayed bandit feedback are developed in [27], and static regret bounds are established.

The existing studies on distributed event-triggered online algorithms with bandit feedback do not consider inequality constraints. In this context, this paper studies the distributed bandit convex optimization problem with time-varying constraints, where the decision makers receive bandit feedback for both loss and constraint functions at each iteration. The contributions are summarized as follows.

- This paper proposes a distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback by integrating event-triggered communication with the distributed online algorithm in [24]. Note that the introduction of event-triggered communication causes

nontrivial challenges for performance analysis, which will be explained in detail in Remark 2. The proposed algorithm can be viewed as a bandit version of the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8]. Their proofs are significantly different, which will be also explained in detail in Remark 2. Note that the authors in [26], [27] do not consider inequality constraints and analyze static regret, and we consider time-varying inequality constraints and analyze dynamic regret. Moreover, the proposed algorithm only uses bandit feedback for constraint functions.

- When the step-size sequence of local primal variables is appropriately designed based on the event-triggering threshold sequence, this paper establishes dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds for the proposed algorithm under a non-increasing event-triggered threshold sequence (see Theorem 1). The bounds would be sublinear if the path-length of the comparator sequence (i.e., the accumulated dynamic variation of the comparator sequence) grows sublinearly and the event-triggering threshold sequence converges to zero. In addition, this paper also establishes dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds under the event-triggering threshold sequence produced by $\{1/t^\theta\}$ with $\theta > 0$ (see Corollary 1) and the event-triggering threshold sequence produced by $\{1/c^t\}$ with $c > 1$ (see Corollary 2). These bounds are the same as the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8]. When event-triggered communication is not considered, these bounds recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [16]. When inequality constraints are not considered, these dynamic network regret bounds recover the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithms with two-point bandit feedback in [26], [27]. When both event-triggered communication and inequality constraints are not considered, these dynamic network regret bounds recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [13] and the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [19].
- When the step-size sequence of local primal variables is independently designed, this paper establishes dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds (see Theorem 2). These bounds are the same as the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8]. When event-triggered communication is not considered, these bounds recover the results achieved by the distributed

TABLE I: Comparison of this paper to related works on bandit convex optimization.

Reference	Problem type	Constraint type	Information feedback	Event-triggering	Regret type
[13]	Centralized	$g_t(x) \equiv \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t	No	Static regret
[15]	Centralized	$g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$ and Slater's condition	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t , and ∇g_t	No	Dynamic regret
[16]	Centralized	$g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t and g_t	No	Dynamic regret
[19]	Distributed	$g_t(x) \equiv \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t	No	Static regret
[24]	Distributed	$g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t and g_t	No	Dynamic regret
[26]	Distributed	$g_t(x) \equiv \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t	Yes	Static regret
[27]	Distributed	$g_t(x) \equiv \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t	Yes	Static regret
This paper	Distributed	$g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$	Two-point bandit feedback for f_t and g_t	Yes	Dynamic regret

online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24]. Note that this paper is among the first to establish dynamic network regret bounds (and network cumulative constraint violation bounds) for distributed event-triggered bandit convex optimization (with time-varying constraints).

The detailed comparison of this paper to related studies is summarized in TABLE I.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section II presents the problem formulation and motivation. Section III proposes the distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback, and analyzes its performance. Section IV demonstrates a numerical simulation to verify the theoretical results. Finally, Section V concludes this paper. All proofs are given in Appendix.

Notations: \mathbb{N}_+ , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}_+^p denote the sets of all positive integers, real numbers, p -dimensional and nonnegative vectors, respectively. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $[m]$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Given vectors x and y , x^T denotes the transpose of the vector x , and $\langle x, y \rangle$ and $x \otimes y$ denote the standard inner and Kronecker product of the vectors x and y , respectively. $\mathbf{0}_m$ denotes the m -dimensional column vector whose components are all 0. $\text{col}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$ denotes the concatenated

column vector of $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ for $i \in [n]$. \mathbb{B}^p and \mathbb{S}^p denote the unit ball and sphere centered around the origin in \mathbb{R}^p under Euclidean norm, respectively. \mathbf{E} denotes the expectation. For a set $\mathbb{K} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(x)$ denotes the projection of the vector x onto the set \mathbb{K} , i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{K}} \|x - y\|^2$, and $[x]_+$ denotes $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}(x)$. For a function f and a vector x , $\partial f(x)$ denotes the subgradient of f at x .

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND MOTIVATION

Consider the distributed bandit convex optimization problem with time-varying constraints. At iteration t , a network of n agents is modeled by a time-varying directed graph $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_t)$ with the agent set $\mathcal{V} = [n]$ and the edge set $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$. $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_t$ indicates that agent i can receive information from agent j . The sets of in- and out-neighbors of agent i are $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}(\mathcal{G}_t) = \{j \in [n] | (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_t\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}(\mathcal{G}_t) = \{j \in [n] | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_t\}$, respectively. An adversary first erratically selects n local convex loss functions $\{f_{i,t} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ and n local convex constraint functions $\{g_{i,t} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_i}\}$ for $i \in [n]$, where $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a known set, and both m_i and p are positive integers. Then, the agents collaborate to select their local decisions $\{x_{i,t} \in \mathbb{X}\}$ without prior access to $\{f_{i,t}\}$ and $\{g_{i,t}\}$. At the same time, the values of $f_{i,t}$ and $g_{i,t}$ at the point $x_{i,t}$ as well as at other potential points are privately revealed to agent i . The goal of the network is to choose the decision sequence $\{x_{i,t}\}$ for $i \in [n]$ and $t \in [T]$ such that both network regret

$$\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_{i,t}) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(y_t), \quad (1)$$

and network cumulative constraint violation

$$\text{Net-CCV}(\{x_{i,t}\}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T \|[g_t(x_{i,t})]_+\|, \quad (2)$$

increase sublinearly, where $y_{[T]} = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$ is a comparator sequence, $f_t(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f_{j,t}(x)$ and $g_t(x) = \text{col}(g_{1,t}(x), \dots, g_{n,t}(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the global loss and constraint functions of the network at iteration t , respectively, and $m = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$.

Note that network regret (1) measures the difference of the network-wide cumulative loss between the decision sequence $\{x_{i,t}\}$ and the comparator sequence $y_{[T]}$, which is also used in [8], [24]. This regret is different with the used regrets in [19], [26], [27] that measure the difference of the cumulative loss between the decision sequence $\{x_{i,t}\}$ of a single agent and the comparator sequence $y_{[T]}$. Because the established bounds of the used regrets in [19], [26], [27]

are uniform bounds for all the agents, we can compare the established bounds of network regret in this paper with those in [19], [26], [27].

In the literature, there are two commonly used comparator sequences. One is the offline optimal dynamic decision sequence $\check{x}_{[T]}^* = (\check{x}_1^*, \dots, \check{x}_T^*)$, where $\check{x}_t^* \in \mathbb{X}$ is the minimizer of $f_t(x)$ subject to $g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$. To guarantee that the offline optimal dynamic decision sequence $\check{x}_{[T]}^*$ always exists, we assume that for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the set of all the feasible decision sequences

$$\check{\mathcal{X}}_T = \{(x_1, \dots, x_T) : x_t \in \mathbb{X}, g_t(x_t) \leq \mathbf{0}_m, \forall t \in [T]\}, \quad (3)$$

is non-empty. In this case, $\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, \check{x}_{[T]}^*)$ is called the dynamic network regret. Another comparator sequence is the offline optimal static decision sequence $\hat{x}_{[T]}^* = (\hat{x}^*, \dots, \hat{x}^*)$, where $\hat{x}^* \in \mathbb{X}$ is the minimizer of $\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x)$ subject to $g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$ for all $t \in [T]$. To guarantee that the offline optimal static decision sequence always exists, we assume that for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the set of all the feasible static decision sequences

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_T = \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in \mathbb{X}, g_t(x) \leq \mathbf{0}_m, \forall t \in [T]\}, \quad (4)$$

is non-empty. In this case, $\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, \hat{x}_{[T]}^*)$ is called the static network regret.

In this paper, the following assumptions are made, which are commonly adopted in distributed online convex optimization, see [24], [26]–[29], and recent survey paper [18] and references therein.

Assumption 1. (i) *The set \mathbb{X} is convex and closed. Moreover, the convex set \mathbb{X} contains the ball of radius $r(\mathbb{X})$ and is contained in the ball of radius $R(\mathbb{X})$, i.e.,*

$$r(\mathbb{X})\mathbb{B}^p \subseteq \mathbb{X} \subseteq R(\mathbb{X})\mathbb{B}^p. \quad (5)$$

(ii) *For all $i \in [n]$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the local loss functions $f_{i,t}$ and constraint functions $g_{i,t}$ are convex, and there exists a constant F_1 such that*

$$|f_{i,t}(x) - f_{i,t}(y)| \leq F_1, \quad (6a)$$

$$\|g_{i,t}(x)\| \leq F_1, x, y \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (6b)$$

(iii) *For all $i \in [n]$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the subgradients $\partial f_{i,t}(x)$ and $\partial g_{i,t}(x)$ exist, and there exists a constant F_2 such that*

$$\|\partial f_{i,t}(x)\| \leq F_2, \quad (7a)$$

$$\|\partial g_{i,t}(x)\| \leq F_2, x \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (7b)$$

Assumption 2. For $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the time-varying directed graph \mathcal{G}_t satisfies that

- (i) There exists a constant $w \in (0, 1)$ such that $[W_t]_{ij} \geq w$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_t$ or $i = j$, and $[W_t]_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.
- (ii) The mixing matrix W_t is doubly stochastic, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = 1, \forall i, j \in [n]$.
- (iii) There exists an integer $B > 0$ such that the time-varying directed graph $(\mathcal{V}, \cup_{l=0}^{B-1} \mathcal{E}_{t+l})$ is strongly connected.

Assumption 1 implies that the local loss functions $f_{i,t}$ and constraint functions $g_{i,t}$ are convex and Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{X} . Assumption 2 implies that the time-varying directed graph \mathcal{G}_t need not be connected at each iteration.

The considered problem is studied in [24], where the authors propose a distributed online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback. Note that the algorithm requires that each agent broadcasts the current decision to its neighbors through the communication network at each iteration. However, communication resources are limited that frequent communication between the agents may cause network congestion in many practical applications, e.g., sensor networks comprised of cheap sensors with small battery capacity [26]. To better utilize the limited communication resources, this paper proposes a distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback by integrating event-triggered communication with the algorithm in [24], and establishes network regret and cumulative constraint violation bounds for the proposed algorithm. Based on these bounds, this paper also discusses the impact of event-triggered threshold on the algorithm performance.

III. DISTRIBUTED EVENT-TRIGGERED ONLINE PRIMAL–DUAL ALGORITHM WITH TWO-POINT BANDIT FEEDBACK

This section proposes the distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback. The proposed algorithm can be viewed as an event-triggered version of the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24], or a bandit version of the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8]. This section also establishes network regret and cumulative constraint violation bounds for the proposed algorithm.

A. Algorithm Description

This proposed algorithm is presented in pseudo-code as Algorithm 1, and its architecture is shown in Fig. 1. For $t \in [T]$ with $t \geq 2$ and $i \in [n]$, same as the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24], Algorithm 1 uses the distributed consensus protocol (8) to compute $z_{i,t} \in \mathbb{X}$ for agent i via the time-varying directed graph \mathcal{G}_t , which estimates the average value of the local decisions of all agents $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,t}$. Then, Algorithm 1 uses the primal–dual protocol (9a)–(9c) to update the local primal variable $x_{i,t} \in \mathbb{X}$ and dual variable $q_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m_i}$, where $\hat{w}_{i,t}$ is the updating direction of the local primal variable $x_{i,t}$, α_t and β_t are the step-sizes of the local primal variable $x_{i,t}$ and the local dual variable $q_{i,t}$, respectively, and γ_t is the regularization parameter used to influence the structure of the local decisions. Different from the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24], Algorithm 1 uses the event-triggering check such that agent i broadcasts its current local decision $x_{i,t}$ to its neighbors only if the norm of the difference between the current decision and its last broadcasted decision $x_{i,t-1}$ is not less than the current event-triggering threshold τ_t .

Note that different from the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8], Algorithm 1 uses the values of the local loss function $f_{i,t}$ at $x_{i,t}$ and $x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t}$ to estimate the subgradient $\partial f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})$, and uses the values of the local constraint function $g_{i,t}$ at $x_{i,t}$ and $x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t}$ to estimate the subgradient $\partial [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+$ as the subgradients are unavailable in bandit setting. The subgradient approximations follow the two-point stochastic subgradient estimator proposed in [13], which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\partial} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) &= \frac{p}{\delta_t} (f_{i,t}(x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t}) - f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})) u_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \\ \hat{\partial} [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ &= \frac{p}{\delta_t} ([g_{i,t}(x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t})]_+ - [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+)^T \otimes u_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_t \in (0, r(\mathbb{X})\xi_t]$ is an exploration parameter, $r(\mathbb{X})$ is a constant given in Assumption 1, $\xi_t \in (0, 1)$ is a shrinkage coefficient, and $u_{i,t} \in \mathbb{S}^p$ is a uniformly distributed random vector.

B. Performance Analysis

We first appropriately design the parameter sequences for Algorithm 1, and establish dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds in the following theorem.

Algorithm 1 Distributed Event-Triggered Online Primal–Dual Algorithm with Two-Point Bandit Feedback

Input: constant $r(\mathbb{X})$, non-increasing sequences $\{\alpha_t\} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$, $\{\beta_t\} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$, $\{\gamma_t\} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$, $\{\tau_t\} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$, $\{\xi_t\} \subseteq (0, 1)$, and $\{\delta_t\} \subseteq (0, r(\mathbb{X})\xi_t]$.

Initialize: $x_{i,1} \in (1 - \xi_1)\mathbb{X}$, $\hat{x}_{i,1} = x_{i,1}$ and $q_{i,1} = \mathbf{0}_{m_i}$.

Broadcast $\hat{x}_{i,1}$ to $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ and receive $\hat{x}_{j,1}$ from $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ for $i \in [n]$.

for $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$ **do**

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **in parallel do**

Select vector $u_{i,t} \in \mathbb{S}^p$ independently and uniformly at random.

Observe $f_{i,t}(x_{i,t})$, $f_{i,t}(x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t})$, $[g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+$, and $[g_{i,t}(x_{i,t} + \delta_t u_{i,t})]_+$.

Distributed consensus protocol:

$$z_{i,t+1} = \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} \hat{x}_{j,t}. \quad (8)$$

Primal–dual protocol:

$$\hat{\omega}_{i,t+1} = \hat{\partial} f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) + \hat{\partial} [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ q_{i,t}, \quad (9a)$$

$$x_{i,t+1} = \mathcal{P}_{(1-\xi_{t+1})\mathbb{X}}(z_{i,t+1} - \alpha_{t+1} \hat{\omega}_{i,t+1}), \quad (9b)$$

$$q_{i,t+1} = \left[(1 - \beta_{t+1} \gamma_{t+1}) q_{i,t} + \gamma_{t+1} \left([g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ + (\hat{\partial} [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+)^T (x_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t}) \right) \right]_+. \quad (9c)$$

Event-triggering check:

if $\|x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t}\| \geq \tau_{t+1}$ **then**

Set $\hat{x}_{i,t+1} = x_{i,t+1}$, and broadcast $\hat{x}_{i,t+1}$ to $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}(\mathcal{G}_{t+1})$.

else

Set $\hat{x}_{i,t+1} = \hat{x}_{i,t}$, and do not broadcast.

end if

end for

end for

Output: $\{x_{i,t}\}$.




Fig. 1: Architecture of the distributed event-triggered online primal-dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\{x_{i,t}\}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 with*

$$\alpha_t = \sqrt{\frac{\Psi_t}{t}}, \beta_t = \frac{1}{t^\kappa}, \gamma_t = \frac{1}{t^{1-\kappa}}, \xi_t = \frac{1}{t+1}, \delta_t = \frac{r(\mathbb{X})}{t+1}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_+, \quad (10)$$

where $\Psi_t = \sum_{k=1}^t \tau_k$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ are constants. Then, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and any comparator sequence $y_{[T]} \in \mathcal{X}_T$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] = \mathcal{O}(T^\kappa + \sqrt{\Psi_T T} + \sqrt{\Psi_T^{-1} T P_T}), \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-CCV}(\{x_{i,t}\})] = \mathcal{O}(T^{1-\kappa/2} + \Psi_T^{1/4} T^{3/4}). \quad (12)$$

where $P_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\|$ is the path-length of the comparator sequence $y_{[T]}$.

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix B. ■

Remark 1. *Sublinear dynamic network regret bound (11) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (12) would be established if the path-length of the comparator sequence grows sublinearly and the event-triggering threshold τ_t converges to zero, i.e., $\sum_{k=1}^t \tau_k$ grows sublinearly. The bounds provided in (11) and (12) characterize the impact of event-triggered threshold τ_t on dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation through Ψ_T . The larger the event-triggering threshold τ_t , the larger the static part of the bound (11) (i.e., $T^\kappa + \sqrt{\Psi_T T}$) and the bound (12), and the smaller the dynamic part (i.e., $\sqrt{\Psi_T^{-1} T P_T}$) of the bound (11). The dynamic network regret bound (11) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (12)*

are the same as the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8]. When event-triggered communication is not considered, i.e., $\tau_1 = 1$, $\tau_t = 0$ for $t \in [2, T]$, these bounds recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [16]. When inequality constraints are not considered, i.e., given any $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $g_{i,t}(x) \equiv \mathbf{0}_{m_i}$ for $i \in [n]$ and $t \in [T]$, the dynamic network regret bound (11) would recover the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithms with two-point bandit feedback in [26], [27] if the path-length of the comparator sequence is zero for any T , i.e., $P_T \equiv 0$ for any T . When both event-triggered communication and inequality constraints are not considered, the dynamic network regret bound (11) would recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [13] and the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [19] if the path-length of the comparator sequence is zero for any T . Note that we analyze dynamic regret, while the authors of [13], [19], [26], [27] analyze static regret. However, When event-triggered communication is not considered, the network cumulative constraint violation bound (12) is larger than that achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [15]. This is reasonable since the authors of [15] consider Slater's condition for constraint functions (i.e., there is a point that strictly satisfies inequality constraints), which is a sufficient condition for strong duality to hold [30], moreover, the algorithm in [15] uses full-information feedback for constraint functions. In addition, the dynamic network regret bound (11) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (12) do not recover the results achieved by the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24] since the step-size α_t of the local primal variable is only a special case of that in [24]. If choosing $\alpha_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$ for the algorithm in [24], these bounds would recover the results achieved by the algorithm in [24].

Remark 2. The proof of Theorem 1 has substantial differences compared to that of Theorem 3 in [24]. More specifically, in our Algorithm 1, the agents would not broadcast the current local decisions if the event-triggering condition is not satisfied. The resulting local decision sequences are different with those produced by the distributed online algorithm without event-triggered communication in [24] although the updating rules are similar. This critical difference leads to challenges in theoretical proof because we need to reanalyse the local decisions at each iteration. To tackle these challenges, we analyse the difference between the produced local decision $x_{i,t}$

and the stored local decision $\hat{x}_{i,t}$ for running distributed consensus protocol at each iteration for agent i , $i \in [n]$ in the proof of Lemma 4. The analysis shows that the norm of the difference can be bounded by the current event-triggering threshold regardless of whether the event-triggering condition is satisfied or not. The dynamic network regret bound (11) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (12) are established in this way, and are thus subject to event-triggering threshold. In addition, the proof of Theorem 1 has significant differences compared to that of Theorem 1 in [8]. Note that the subgradients of local loss and constraint functions are unavailable in bandit setting. Our Algorithm 1 uses two-point stochastic subgradient estimators for the subgradients. However, there exist gaps between the estimators and the real subgradients as the estimators are unbiased subgradients of the uniformly smoothed versions of local loss and constraint functions. By utilizing the property of local loss and constraint functions, e.g., boundedness, convexity and Lipschitz continuity, the relationship between the smooth functions and their original functions can be established, see Lemma 1. Based on Lemma 1, we reanalyse dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds.

Then, we consider two classes of explicit expressions for the event-triggering threshold τ_t . Firstly, we select the event-triggering threshold sequence produced by $\tau_t = 1/t^\theta$, which is also adopted by the distributed online algorithms in [26]–[29]. We establish dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 1 with $\tau_t = 1/t^\theta$ and $\theta > 0$, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and any comparator sequence $y_{[T]} \in \mathcal{X}_T$, it holds that*

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{\kappa, 1-\theta/2\}} + T^{\theta/2} P_T), & \text{if } 0 < \theta < 1, \\ \mathcal{O}(T^\kappa + \sqrt{T \log(T)} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\log(T)}} P_T), & \text{if } \theta = 1, \\ \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{\kappa, 1/2\}} + \sqrt{T} P_T), & \text{if } \theta > 1, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-CCV}(\{x_{i,t}\})] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{1-\kappa/2, 1-\theta/4\}}), & \text{if } 0 < \theta < 1, \\ \mathcal{O}(T^{1-\kappa/2} + T^{3/4} \log(T)^{1/4}), & \text{if } \theta = 1, \\ \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{1-\kappa/2, 3/4\}}), & \text{if } \theta > 1. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Remark 3. *The dynamic network regret bound (13) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (14) would be sublinear if the path-length P_T grows sublinearly. Moreover, the larger θ , the smaller the static part of the bound (13) and the bound (14), and the larger the dynamic*

part of the bound (13). When $\theta > 1$, these bounds recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [16]. In addition, when inequality constraints are not considered, the dynamic network regret bound (13) would recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [13], the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [19], and the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [26], [27] if the path-length of the comparator sequence is zero for any T . In addition, we consider time-varying inequality constraints, while the authors of [13], [26], [27] do not consider inequality constraints.

Secondly, we choose the event-triggering threshold sequence produced by $\tau_t = 1/c^t$, which is also adopted in distributed optimization with event-triggered communication, see, e.g., [31]–[35]. We establish dynamic network regret and network cumulative constraint violation bounds in the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 1 with $\tau_t = 1/c^t$ and $c > 1$, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and any comparator sequence $y_{[T]} \in \mathcal{X}_T$, it holds that*

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{\kappa, 1/2\}} + \sqrt{TP_T}), \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-CCV}(\{x_{i,t}\})] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{1-\kappa/2, 3/4\}}). \quad (16)$$

Remark 4. *The dynamic network regret bound (15) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (16) recover the results in Corollary 1 with $\theta > 1$ and achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [16]. Moreover, when inequality constraints are not considered, the dynamic network regret bound (15) recovers the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [13], the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [19], and the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [26], [27] if the path-length of the comparator sequence is zero for any T .*

Note that the event-triggering threshold τ_t in (10) affects the step-size α_t of the local primal variable. To avoid that, we next show how to independently design α_t in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\{x_{i,t}\}$ be the sequences generated by*

Algorithm 1 with

$$\alpha_t = \frac{\alpha_0}{t^{\theta_1}}, \beta_t = \frac{1}{t^{\theta_2}}, \gamma_t = \frac{1}{t^{1-\theta_2}}, \xi_t = \frac{1}{t+1}, \delta_t = \frac{r(\mathbb{X})}{t+1}, \tau_t = \frac{\tau_0}{t^{\theta_3}}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_+, \quad (17)$$

where $\alpha_0, \theta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\theta_2 \in (0, 1)$, and θ_3 are positive constants, and τ_0 is a non-negative constant. Then, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and any comparator sequence $y_{[T]} \in \mathcal{X}_T$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1} + T^{\theta_2} + \frac{\tau_0}{\alpha_0} T^{1+\theta_1-\theta_3} + \frac{T^{\theta_1}(1+P_T)}{\alpha_0}\right), & \text{if } \theta_1 < \theta_3 < 1 + \theta_1, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1} + T^{\theta_2} + \frac{\tau_0}{\alpha_0} \log(T) + \frac{T^{\theta_1}(1+P_T)}{\alpha_0}\right), & \text{if } \theta_3 = 1 + \theta_1, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1} + T^{\theta_2} + \frac{\tau_0}{\alpha_0} + \frac{T^{\theta_1}(1+P_T)}{\alpha_0}\right), & \text{if } \theta_3 > 1 + \theta_1, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-CCV}(\{x_{i,t}\})] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\alpha_0} T^{1-\theta_1/2} + T^{1-\theta_2/2} + \sqrt{\tau_0} T^{1-\theta_3/2}\right), & \text{if } \theta_1 < \theta_3 < 1, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\alpha_0} T^{1-\theta_1/2} + T^{1-\theta_2/2} + \sqrt{\tau_0 T \log(T)}\right), & \text{if } \theta_3 = 1, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\alpha_0} T^{1-\theta_1/2} + T^{1-\theta_2/2} + \sqrt{\tau_0 T}\right), & \text{if } \theta_3 > 1. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix C. ■

Remark 5. The dynamic network regret bound (18) and network cumulative constraint violation bound (19) are the same as the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information feedback in [8], that is, in an average sense, our Algorithm 1 is as efficient as its full-information feedback version. When event-triggered communication is not considered, i.e., $\tau_0 = 0$, these bounds would recover the results achieved by the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24] if $\theta_1 = \theta_2$.

Remark 6. By replacing the comparator sequence $y_{[T]}$ with the offline optimal static decision sequence $\hat{x}_{[T]}^*$, we have $P_T \equiv 0$ for any T , and then the static network regret and cumulative constraint violation bounds for Algorithm 1 with corresponding parameter and event-triggered threshold sequences can be easily established based on the results in Theorems 1, 2, Corollaries 1 and 2, respectively. These bounds are the same as (11)–(16), (18), and (19) with $P_T = 0$,

respectively. When inequality constraints are not considered, these static network regret bounds recover the results achieved by the distributed event-triggered online algorithms with two-point bandit feedback in [26], [27]. When both event-triggered communication and inequality constraints are not considered, these static network regret bounds recover the results achieved by the centralized online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [13] and the distributed online algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [19].

IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

To evaluate the performance of Algorithm 1, we consider a distributed online linear regression problem with time-varying linear inequality constraints over a network of n agents. At iteration t , the local loss and constraint functions are $f_{i,t}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(A_{i,t}x - \vartheta_{i,t})^2$ and $g_{i,t}(x) = B_{i,t}x - b_{i,t}$, respectively, where each component of $A_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i \times p}$ is randomly generated from the uniform distribution in the interval $[-1, 1]$, $\vartheta_{i,t} = A_{i,t}\mathbf{1}_p + \zeta_{i,t}$ with $\vartheta_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$ and $\zeta_{i,t}$ being a standard normal random vector, and each component of $B_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times p}$ and $b_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is randomly generated from the uniform distribution in the interval $[0, 2]$ and $[0, 1]$, respectively. We set $n = 100$, $q_i = 4$, $p = 10$, $m_i = 2$, $\mathbb{X} = [-5, 5]^p$. We use a time-varying undirected graph to model the communication topology. Specifically, at each iteration t , the graph is first randomly generated where the probability of any two agents being connected is 0.1. Then, to make sure that Assumption 2 is satisfied, we add edges $(i, i + 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 24$ when $t \in \{4c + 1\}$, edges $(i, i + 1)$ for $i = 25, \dots, 49$ when $t \in \{4c + 2\}$, edges $(i, i + 1)$ for $i = 50, \dots, 74$ when $t \in \{4c + 3\}$, edges $(i, i + 1)$ for $i = 75, \dots, 99$ when $t \in \{4c + 4\}$ with c being a nonnegative integer. Moreover, let $[W_t]_{ij} = \frac{1}{n}$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_t$ and $[W_t]_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij}$.

Note that there are no other distributed event-triggered online algorithms with bandit feedback to solve the considered problem due to the time-varying constraints. We compare our Algorithm 1 with the distributed event-triggered online algorithm with full-information in [8].

Set $\alpha_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$, $\beta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$, $\gamma_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$, and $\tau_t = \tau_0/t$ for our Algorithm 1 and the distributed event-triggered online algorithm in [8]. To explore the impact of different event-triggering threshold sequences on network regret and cumulative constraint violation, we select $\tau_0 = 0$, $\tau_0 = 400$, and $\tau_0 = 800$, respectively. With different values of τ_0 , Figs. 2–4 illustrate the evolutions of the average cumulative loss $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_{i,t})/T$, the average cumulative constraint violation $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T \|[g_t(x_{i,t})]_+\|/T$ and total number of triggers, respectively. The




Fig. 2: Evolutions of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_{i,t})/T$.




Fig. 3: Evolutions of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T \|[g_t(x_{i,t})]_+\|/T$.

results show that as τ_0 increases, the average cumulative loss and the average cumulative constraint violation increase, while the total number of triggers decreases, which are consistent with Theorem 2. In addition, Figs. 2 and 3 also show that our proposed algorithm has larger average cumulative loss and constraint violation than the algorithm in [8] under the same τ_0 . However, the disadvantages gradually weaken as τ_0 increases, and our Algorithm 1 has smaller average cumulative loss when $\tau_0 = 800$.




Fig. 4: Evolutions of total number of triggers.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper considered the distributed bandit convex optimization problem with time-varying inequality constraints. To better utilize communication resources, we proposed the distributed event-triggered online primal–dual algorithm with two-point bandit feedback. We analyzed the network regret and cumulative constraint violation for the proposed algorithm under several classes of appropriately chosen decreasing parameter sequences and non-increasing event-triggered threshold sequences. Our theoretical results were comparable to the results achieved by distributed event-triggered online algorithms with full-information feedback. In brief, this paper broadened the applicability of distributed event-triggered online convex optimization to the regime with time-varying constraints.

The future direction is to investigate new distributed online algorithms with two-point bandit feedback such that the network regret bound can be reduced under the strongly convex condition and the network cumulative constraint violation bound can be reduced when the global constraint function satisfies Slater’s condition. Moreover, we will also investigate compressed communication to reduce communication overhead at each iteration.

APPENDIX

A. Useful Lemmas

Some preliminary results are given in this section.

Lemma 1. (Lemma 8 in [24]) *If Assumption 1 holds. Then, $\hat{f}_{i,t}(x)$ and $[\hat{g}_{i,t}(x)]_+$ are convex on $(1 - \xi_t)\mathbb{X}$, and for any $i \in [n]$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $x \in (1 - \xi_t)\mathbb{X}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m_i}$,*

$$\partial \hat{f}_{i,t}(x) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t}[\hat{\partial} f_{i,t}(x)], \quad (20a)$$

$$f_{i,t}(x) \leq \hat{f}_{i,t}(x) \leq f_{i,t}(x) + F_2 \delta_t, \quad (20b)$$

$$\|\hat{\partial} f_{i,t}(x)\| \leq pF_2, \quad (20c)$$

$$\partial [\hat{g}_{i,t}(x)]_+ = \mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t}[\partial [g_{i,t}(x)]_+], \quad (20d)$$

$$q^T [g_{i,t}(x)]_+ \leq q^T [\hat{g}_{i,t}(x)]_+ \leq q^T [g_{i,t}(x)]_+ + F_2 \delta_t \|q\|, \quad (20e)$$

$$\|\hat{\partial} [g_{i,t}(x)]_+\| \leq pF_2, \quad (20f)$$

$$\|[\hat{g}_{i,t}(x)]_+\| \leq F_1, \quad (20g)$$

where $\hat{f}_{i,t}(x) = \mathbf{E}_{v \in \mathbb{B}^p} [f_{i,t}(x + \delta_t v)]$ and $[\hat{g}_{i,t}(x)]_+ = \mathbf{E}_{v \in \mathbb{B}^p} [[g_{i,t}(x + \delta_t v)]_+]$ with v being chosen uniformly at random, and \mathfrak{A}_t is the σ -algebra induced by the independent and identically distributed variables $u_{1,t}, \dots, u_{n,t}$.

Lemma 2. (Lemma 4 in [24]) *If Assumption 2 holds. For all $i \in [n]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\hat{x}_{i,t}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| \leq \tau \lambda^{t-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{x}_{j,1}\| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t-1}^x\| + \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t-1}^x\| + \tau \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{j,s}^x\|, \quad (21)$$

where $\bar{x}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{x}_{j,t}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t-1}^x = \hat{x}_{i,t} - z_{i,t}$.

Lemma 3. (Lemma 9 in [24]) *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and $\gamma_t \beta_t \leq 1$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$. For all $i \in [n]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the sequences $q_{i,t}$ generated by Algorithm 2 satisfy*

$$\|\beta_t q_{i,t}\| \leq \hat{\omega}_1, \quad (22)$$

$$\Delta_{i,t}(\mu_i) \leq 2\hat{\omega}_1^2 \gamma_t + q_{i,t-1}^T \hat{b}_{i,t} - \mu_i^T [g_{i,t-1}(x_{i,t-1})]_+ + \frac{1}{2} \beta_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + pF_2 \|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1}\|, \quad (23)$$

where $\hat{\omega}_1 = F_1 + 2pF_2R(\mathbb{X})$, and $\hat{b}_{i,t} = [g_{i,t-1}(x_{i,t-1})]_+ + (\hat{\partial} [g_{i,t-1}(x_{i,t-1})]_+)^T (x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1})$.

Next, we present network regret bound at one iteration.

Note that since there exists the event-triggering check in our Algorithm 1, the local decisions and corresponding losses of the agents may be different with those of the distributed online

algorithm with two-point bandit feedback in [24] although the updating rules are similar. We give a new bound for the average of network-wide loss at one iteration based on the behavior of Algorithm 1 under event-triggering check in the proof of the following lemma, which is critical to re-derive network regret bound at one iteration.

Lemma 4. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. For all $i \in [n]$, let $\{x_{i,t}\}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 2 and $\{y_t\}$ be an arbitrary sequence in \mathbb{X} , then*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(y_t) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_{i,t}^T ([g_{i,t}(y_t)]_+ - \mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t}[\hat{b}_{i,t+1}]) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_2(2\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + p\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t}[\|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\|]) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2n\alpha_{t+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t} [\|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - z_{i,t+2}\|^2 + \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_t - x_{i,t+1}\|^2] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_2(R(\mathbb{X})\xi_t + \delta_t)(\|q_{i,t}\| + 1) + 2F_2\tau_t - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{A}_t}[\|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2]}{2\alpha_{t+1}}, \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{A}_t is the σ -algebra induced by the independent and identically distributed variables $u_{1,t}, \dots, u_{n,t}$.

Proof. We first analyze the behavior of Algorithm 1 under event-triggering check.

In Algorithm 1, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, if $\|x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t}\| \geq \tau_{t+1}$, then $\|\hat{x}_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t+1}\| \leq \tau_{t+1}$. If $\|x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t}\| < \tau_{t+1}$, then $\hat{x}_{i,t+1} = \hat{x}_{i,t}$ and we still have $\|\hat{x}_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t+1}\| \leq \tau_{t+1}$. Therefore, we always have $\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t}\| \leq \tau_t$ for any $t \geq 2, i \in [n]$. Recall that $\hat{x}_{i,1} = x_{i,1}$. Thus, $\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t}\| \leq \tau_t$ for any $t \geq 1, i \in [n]$.

Next, we give the bound for the average of network-wide loss at one iteration.

From Assumption 1, for $i \in [n], t \in \mathbb{N}_+, x, y \in \mathbb{X}$, we have

$$|f_{i,t}(x) - f_{i,t}(y)| \leq F_2\|x - y\|, \tag{25a}$$

$$\|g_{i,t}(x) - g_{i,t}(y)\| \leq F_2\|x - y\|. \tag{25b}$$

From (20b), (25a) and $\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t}\| \leq \tau_t$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_t(x_{i,t})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (f_{j,t}(x_{i,t}) - f_{j,t}(x_{j,t})) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) + \frac{F_2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_{i,t} - x_{j,t}\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) + \frac{2F_2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + 2F_2\tau_t \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{f}_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) + \frac{2F_2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + 2F_2\tau_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

It then follows from the proof of Lemma 10 of [24] that (24) holds. \blacksquare

Lemma 5. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and $\gamma_t\beta_t \leq 1$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$. For all $i \in [n]$, let $\{x_{i,t}\}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 2. Then, for any comparator sequence $y_{[T]} \in \mathcal{X}_T$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\
&\leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + 2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t + 10\hat{\varpi}_3 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t + F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 2R(\mathbb{X}) \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2}{\alpha_{T+1}} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})}{\alpha_T} P_T + \sum_{t=1}^T F_2(R(\mathbb{X})\xi_t + \delta_t) \left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1}{\beta_t} + 1\right) + 2R(\mathbb{X})^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\xi_t - \xi_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_t} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{t+1}} + \beta_{t+1}\right) \mathbf{E}[\|q_{i,t}\|^2],
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2\right] \\
&\leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 2nF_1F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)T \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 2\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{t=1}^T (\beta_t + 40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_t)\right)(nF_1T \\
&\quad + 2(p+1)nF_2\varpi_2 + 2n\hat{\varpi}_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t + 20n\hat{\varpi}_3 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t + nF_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 2nR(\mathbb{X}) \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{2nR(\mathbb{X})^2}{\alpha_{T+1}} + 2nR(\mathbb{X})^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\xi_t - \xi_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \sum_{t=1}^T nF_2(R(\mathbb{X})\xi_t + \delta_t) \left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1}{\beta_t} + 1\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_t} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{t+1}} + \beta_{t+1}\right) \|q_{i,t} - \hat{\mu}_{ij}^0\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $\hat{\varpi}_2 = 2\varpi_4 + 2p\varpi_4 + p$, $\hat{\varpi}_3 = 2F_2\varpi_3 + p^2\varpi_5$, and $\hat{\mu}_{ij}^0 = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+}{\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{t=1}^T (\beta_t + 40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_t)}$.

Proof. From (5) and $\hat{y}_t = (1 - \xi_t) y_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_t - x_{i,t+1}\|^2 \\
&= \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1} + \hat{y}_t - x_{i,t+1}\| \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{y}_t + x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{y}_t + x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{y}_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|x_{i,t+1} - \hat{x}_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - \hat{y}_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1} \\
&= 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|(1 - \xi_{t+1})y_{t+1} - (1 - \xi_t)y_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1} \\
&= 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|(1 - \xi_{t+1})y_{t+1} - (1 - \xi_{t+1})y_t + (1 - \xi_{t+1})y_t - (1 - \xi_t)y_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1} \\
&= 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|(1 - \xi_{t+1})(y_{t+1} - y_t) + (\xi_t - \xi_{t+1})y_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1} \\
&\leq 4R(\mathbb{X}) \|y_{t+1} - y_t\| + 4R(\mathbb{X})^2 (\xi_t - \xi_{t+1}) + 4R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1}. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

From (23), (24) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) + \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ - \frac{1}{2} \beta_{t+1} \|\mu_i\|^2) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_t(x_{i,t}) - f_t(y_t) \\
&\leq 2\hat{\omega}_1^2 \gamma_{t+1} + 2F_2 \tau_t + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) + \frac{1}{2n\alpha_{t+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - z_{i,t+2}\|^2) \\
&\quad + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})}{\alpha_{t+1}} \|y_{t+1} - y_t\| + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2 (\xi_t - \xi_{t+1})}{\alpha_{t+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_2 (R(\mathbb{X}) \xi_t + \delta_t) (\|q_{i,t}\| + 1), \tag{30}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) = pF_2 (\|\mu_i\| + 1) \|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\| + 2F_2 \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| - \frac{1}{2\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2.$$

From (5) and $\{\alpha_t\}$ is non-increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} (\|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - z_{i,t+2}\|^2) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_t} \|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - z_{i,t+2}\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} - \frac{1}{\alpha_t} \right) \|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \|\hat{y}_1 - z_{i,2}\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha_{T+1}} \|\hat{y}_{T+1} - z_{i,T+2}\|^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} - \frac{1}{\alpha_t} \right) 4R(\mathbb{X})^2 \leq \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2}{\alpha_{T+1}}. \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

From (31) and $\{\alpha_t\}$ is non-increasing, setting $y_{T+1} = y_T$ and $\mu_i = \mathbf{0}_{m_i}$, summing (30) over $t \in [T]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{0}_{m_i}) \\ & \leq 2\hat{\omega}_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_{t+1} + \sum_{t=1}^T 2F_2\tau_t + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{0}_{m_i}) + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2}{\alpha_{T+1}} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})}{\alpha_T} P_T \\ & + 2R(\mathbb{X})^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\xi_t - \xi_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \sum_{t=1}^T F_2(R(\mathbb{X})\xi_t + \delta_t) \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1}{\beta_t} + 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We then establish a lower bound for network regret.

For any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_t} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{t+1}} + \beta_{t+1} \right) \|q_{i,t} - \mu_i\|^2 + \frac{\|q_{i,T+1} - \mu_i\|^2}{2\gamma_{T+1}} - \frac{\|\mu_i\|^2}{2\gamma_1}. \quad (33)$$

Substituting $\mu_i = \mathbf{0}_{m_i}$ into (33) yields

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{0}_{m_i}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_t} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{t+1}} + \beta_{t+1} \right) \|q_{i,t}\|^2. \quad (34)$$

We have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{j,s}^x\| = \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t}^x\| \sum_{s=0}^{T-t-2} \lambda^s \leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{\varepsilon}_{j,t}^x\|, \quad (35)$$

and

$$\|\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t-1}^x\| = \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t} + x_{i,t} - z_{i,t}\| \leq \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\| + \tau_t, \quad (36)$$

where $\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x = x_{i,t} - z_{i,t}$.

From (21), (35) and (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| & \leq \varpi_2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \|\varepsilon_{j,t-1}^x\| + \sum_{t=1}^T \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\| + 2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t \\ & + \frac{\tau}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\varepsilon_{j,t}^x\| + \frac{n\tau}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \tau_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

For any $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ and $a > 0$, it follows from (37) that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{4apF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + apF_2\alpha_t \|\mu_j\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{4apF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + apF_2\alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2anpF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + \frac{anpF_2\tau^2\alpha_t}{2(1-\lambda)^2} \|\mu_j\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n 2\tau_t \|\mu_i\| + \frac{n\tau}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\| \\
&\leq \varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{apF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n ap\varpi_3\alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + \varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\|. \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

For any $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ and $a > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq \|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - z_{i,t+1}\| + \|\mu_i\| \|z_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq \|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - z_{i,t+1}\| + \frac{1}{apF_2\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2 + \frac{apF_2\alpha_{t+1}}{4} \|\mu_i\|^2. \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

From (8) and $\sum_{i=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,t} - z_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (\|x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \|\bar{x}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (\|x_{i,t} - \hat{x}_{i,t} + \hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \|\bar{x}_t - \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} \hat{x}_{j,t}\|) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (\|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t}\| + \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\|) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n [W_t]_{ij} \|\bar{x}_t - \hat{x}_{j,t}\| \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t. \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

From (38)–(40), for any $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ and $a > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n pF_2 \|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\| \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n 2pF_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + pF_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{ap^2 F_2^2 \alpha_{t+1}}{4} \|\mu_i\|^2 \\
& \leq 2pF_2\varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + (2\varpi_4 + 1)pF_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n ap^2 \varpi_5 \alpha_{t+1} \|\mu_i\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{3}{a\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2. \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\|\mu_i\| = 1$ in (38) and (41) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n 2F_2 \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| \\
& \leq 2nF_2\varpi_2 + 2nF_2\varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \left(2aF_2\varpi_3\alpha_t + \frac{2}{a\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 \right), \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n pF_2 \|x_{i,t} - x_{i,t+1}\| \\
& \leq 2npF_2\varpi_2 + (2\varpi_4 + 1)npF_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + anp^2\varpi_5 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_{t+1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{3}{a\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2. \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

From (41)–(43), and choosing $a = 10$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{0}_{m_i}) \\
& \leq 2npF_2\varpi_2 + (2\varpi_4 + 1)npF_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 10np^2\varpi_5 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_{t+1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{3}{10\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2 + 2nF_2\varpi_2 \\
& + 2nF_2\varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 20nF_2\varpi_3 \sum_{t=2}^T \alpha_t + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{10\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2 \\
& \leq 2(p+1)nF_2\varpi_2 + nF_2\hat{\varpi}_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + 10n\hat{\varpi}_3 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t. \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (32), (34) and (44) yields (27).

(ii) We first provide a loose bound for network cumulative constraint violation.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ & = \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ + \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ - \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ \\
& \geq \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - \|\mu_i\| \left| [g_{i,t}(x_{i,t})]_+ - [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - \|\mu_i\| \|g_{i,t}(x_{i,t}) - g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})\| \\
&\geq \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|x_{i,t} - x_{j,t}\| \\
&\geq \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - x_{i,t}\| - F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| \\
&\quad - F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{j,t} - x_{j,t}\| - F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{j,t} - \bar{x}_t\|, \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since projection operator is non-expansive, and the third inequality holds due to (25b).

Combining (30) and (45), setting $y_t = y$, and summing over $j \in [n]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_i^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - \frac{1}{2} \beta_{t+1} \|\mu_i\|^2) + \sum_{i=1}^n f_t(x_{i,t}) - n f_t(y) \\
&\leq 2n \hat{\omega}_1^2 \gamma_{t+1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) + \frac{1}{n} \check{\Delta}_t + 2n F_2 \tau_t + \frac{2n R(\mathbb{X}) \tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \frac{2n R(\mathbb{X})^2 (\xi_t - \xi_{t+1})}{\alpha_{t+1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha_{t+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\|\hat{y}_t - z_{i,t+1}\|^2 - \|\hat{y}_{t+1} - z_{i,t+2}\|^2) + \sum_{i=1}^n F_2 (R(\mathbb{X}) \xi_t + \delta_t) (\|q_{i,t}\| + 1), \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) &= \check{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) + F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + F_2 \tau_t \|\mu_i\|, \\
\check{\Delta}_t &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{j,t} - \bar{x}_t\| + \sum_{i=1}^n n F_2 \tau_t \|\mu_i\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the way to (38), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n F_2 \|\mu_i\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| \\
&\leq F_2 \varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a \alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n a F_2 \varpi_3 \alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + F_2 \varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\|. \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (38), (41)–(43), (47), and choosing $a = 20$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\Delta}_{i,t+1}(\mu_i) \\
&\leq 2(p+1)n F_2 \varpi_2 + 20n \hat{\omega}_3 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t + n F_2 \hat{\omega}_2 \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t + (2p+1) F_2 \varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| \\
&\quad + 20(p^2 \varpi_5 + F_2 \varpi_3) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + F_2 (2p \varpi_4 + p + \varpi_4 + 1) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$- \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{20\alpha_{t+1}} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\|^2. \quad (48)$$

From (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mu_j\| \|\hat{x}_{i,t} - \bar{x}_t\| \\ & \leq n\varpi_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mu_j\| + 2 \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\| \|\mu_j\| + \frac{n\tau}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\| \|\mu_j\| \\ & \quad + n\varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_j\| \\ & \leq n\varpi_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mu_j\| + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2aF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + 2aF_2\alpha_t \|\mu_j\|^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2aF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + \frac{an^2F_2\tau^2\alpha_t}{2(1-\lambda)^2} \|\mu_j\|^2 \right) + n\varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_j\| \\ & = n\varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n an\varpi_3\alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{n}{aF_2\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 \\ & \quad + n\varpi_4 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Choosing $a = 20$ in (49) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \check{\Delta}_t \\ & \leq F_2\varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n 20F_2\varpi_3\alpha_t \|\mu_i\|^2 + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{20\alpha_t} \|\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x\|^2 + F_2\varpi_8 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Let $h_{ij} : \mathbb{R}_+^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined as

$$h_{ij}(\mu_i) = \mu_i^T \sum_{t=1}^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ - \frac{1}{2} \|\mu_i\|^2 \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{t=1}^T (\beta_t + 40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_t) \right). \quad (51)$$

From (31), (33), (48), (50), and (51), summing (46) over $t \in [T]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_t} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{t+1}} + \beta_{t+1} \right) \|q_{i,t} - \mu_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}(\mu_i) + n\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]}) \\ & \leq 2(p+1)nF_2\varpi_2 + 2n\hat{\varpi}_1^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t + 20n\hat{\varpi}_3 \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t + nF_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2) \sum_{t=1}^T \tau_t \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mu_i\| + F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_t \|\mu_i\| + 2nR(\mathbb{X}) \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \frac{2nR(\mathbb{X})^2}{\alpha_{T+1}} \\
& + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{2nR(\mathbb{X})^2(\xi_t - \xi_{t+1})}{\alpha_{t+1}} + \sum_{t=1}^T nF_2(R(\mathbb{X})\xi_t + \delta_t) \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1}{\beta_t} + 1 \right). \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\mu_i = \mu_{ij}^0$ into (51) yields

$$h_{ij}(\mu_{ij}^0) = \frac{\|\sum_{t=1}^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+\|^2}{2\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{t=1}^T (\beta_t + 40\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_t)\right)}. \tag{53}$$

From $g_t(x) = \text{col}(g_{1,t}(x), \dots, g_{n,t}(x))$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_{i,t}(x_{j,t})]_+ \right\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{j,t})]_+ \right\|^2. \tag{54}$$

From (6a), we have

$$-\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]}) \leq F_1 T. \tag{55}$$

From (6b), we have

$$\|\mu_{ij}^0\| \leq \frac{F_1 T}{\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{t=1}^T (\beta_t + 40\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_t)}. \tag{56}$$

Substituting $\mu_i = \mu_{ij}^0$ into (52), combining (53)–(56) yields (28).

B. Proof of Theorem 1

Based on Lemma 5, we are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

(i) For any constant $a \in [0, 1)$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t^a} \leq 1 + \int_1^T \frac{1}{t^a} dt = \frac{T^{1-a} - a}{1-a} \leq \frac{T^{1-a}}{1-a}. \tag{57}$$

Form (57), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\frac{\Psi_t}{t}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \leq 2\sqrt{T\Psi_T}. \tag{58}$$

From Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{\sqrt{\frac{\Psi_{t+1}}{t+1}}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\tau_{t+1}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\tau_t} \leq \sqrt{T\Psi_T}. \tag{59}$$

From (10), we have

$$\frac{t}{t^\kappa} - \frac{t+1}{(t+1)^\kappa} + \frac{1}{(t+1)^\kappa} = \frac{t}{t^\kappa} - \frac{t}{(t+1)^\kappa} > 0. \tag{60}$$

For any $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a constant $H > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{t+1} - \frac{1}{t+2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t+1}{\Psi_{t+1}}} \leq H \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Psi_2}}. \quad (61)$$

Combining (10), (27), (57)–(61) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\ & \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\omega}_1^2}{\kappa}T^\kappa + 20\hat{\omega}_3\sqrt{T\Psi_T} + F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\Psi_T + 2R(\mathbb{X})\sqrt{T\Psi_T} + 2\sqrt{2}R(\mathbb{X})^2\sqrt{\frac{T}{\Psi_T}} \\ & \quad + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1}{\kappa}T^\kappa + \log(T)\right) + 2HR(\mathbb{X})^2\sqrt{\frac{1}{\Psi_2}} + 2R(\mathbb{X})\sqrt{\frac{T}{\Psi_T}}P_T, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

which gives (11).

(ii) Combining (10), (28), (57)–(61) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2\right] \\ & \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 2nF_1F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)T\Psi_T + 2\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\kappa}}{1-\kappa} + 80\hat{\omega}_3\sqrt{T\Psi_T}\right)\left(nF_1T \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2(p+1)nF_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2n\hat{\omega}_1^2}{\kappa}T^\kappa + 40n\hat{\omega}_3\sqrt{T\Psi_T} + nF_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\Psi_T + 2nR(\mathbb{X})\sqrt{T\Psi_T} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2\sqrt{2}nR(\mathbb{X})^2\sqrt{\frac{T}{\Psi_T}} + 2nHR(\mathbb{X})^2\sqrt{\frac{1}{\Psi_2}} + nF_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1}{\kappa}T^\kappa + \log(T)\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

From Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2. \quad (64)$$

We have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\| \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|_1 \leq \sqrt{m} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\| \quad (65)$$

Combining (63)–(65) yields (12). ■

C. Proof of Theorem 2

Based on Lemma 5, we are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

For any $T \geq 3$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \leq 1 + \int_1^T \frac{1}{t} dt \leq 1 + \log(T) \leq 2 \log(T). \quad (66)$$

For any constant $b > 1$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t^b} \leq M. \quad (67)$$

(i) Combining (17) with $\theta_3 \in (\theta_1, 1)$, (57), (60) and (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\ & \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{10\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{1+\theta_1-\theta_3}}{(1+\theta_1-\theta_3)\alpha_0} + \frac{F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2+2)\tau_0 T^{1-\theta_3}}{1-\theta_3} \\ & \quad + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})T^{\theta_1} P_T}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X})+r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 = 1$, (57), (60), (66) and (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\ & \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{10\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{\theta_1}}{\theta_1\alpha_0} + 2F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2+2)\tau_0 \log(T) \\ & \quad + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})T^{\theta_1} P_T}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X})+r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Combining (17) with $1 < \theta_3 < 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (67) and (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\ & \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{10\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{1+\theta_1-\theta_3}}{(1+\theta_1-\theta_3)\alpha_0} + F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2+2)\tau_0 M \\ & \quad + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})T^{\theta_1} P_T}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X})+r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 = 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (66), (67) and (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\ & \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{10\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 \log(T)}{\alpha_0} + F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2+2)\tau_0 M \\ & \quad + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})T^{\theta_1} P_T}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X})+r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 > 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (67) and (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}[\text{Net-Reg}(\{x_{i,t}\}, y_{[T]})] \\
& \leq 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{10\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{2R(X)\tau_0 M}{\alpha_0} + F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 M \\
& \quad + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})T^{\theta_1} P_T}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

From (68)–(72), we have (18).

(ii) Combining (17) with $\theta_3 \in (\theta_1, 1)$, (57), (60) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2\right] \\
& \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + \frac{2nF_1F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 T^{2-\theta_3}}{1-\theta_3} + 2n\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\theta_2}}{1-\theta_2} + \frac{40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1}\right) \left(F_1T\right. \\
& \quad + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{20\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{1+\theta_1-\theta_3}}{\alpha_0(1+\theta_1-\theta_3)} + \frac{F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 T^{1-\theta_3}}{1-\theta_3} + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 = 1$, (57), (60), (66) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2\right] \\
& \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 4nF_1F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 T \log(T) + 2n\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\theta_2}}{1-\theta_2} + \frac{40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1}\right) \left(F_1T\right. \\
& \quad + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{20\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0\theta_1} + 2F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 \log(T) + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X}))\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T)\right)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Combining (17) with $1 < \theta_3 < 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (67) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2\right] \\
& \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 4nF_1F_2(\hat{\varpi}_2 + 2)\tau_0 MT + 2n\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\theta_2}}{1-\theta_2} + \frac{40\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1}\right) \left(F_1T\right. \\
& \quad + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\varpi}_1^2 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{20\hat{\varpi}_3\alpha_0 T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2 T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 T^{1+\theta_1-\theta_3}}{\alpha_0(1+\theta_1-\theta_3)} + F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\tau_0 M + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X})) \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T) \right). \quad (75)$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 = 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (66), (67) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 4nF_1F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\tau_0MT + 2n \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\theta_2}}{1-\theta_2} + \frac{40\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_0T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} \right) \left(F_1T \right. \\ & \quad + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\omega}_1^2T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{20\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_0T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0 \log(T)}{\alpha_0} + F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\tau_0M + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X})) \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T) \right) \right). \quad (76) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (17) with $\theta_3 > 1 + \theta_1$, (57), (60), (67) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [g_t(x_{i,t})]_+ \right\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4(p+1)nF_1F_2\varpi_2T + 4nF_1F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\tau_0MT + 2n \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{T^{1-\theta_2}}{1-\theta_2} + \frac{40\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_0T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} \right) \left(F_1T \right. \\ & \quad + 2(p+1)F_2\varpi_2 + \frac{2\hat{\omega}_1^2T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \frac{20\hat{\omega}_3\alpha_0T^{1-\theta_1}}{1-\theta_1} + \frac{4R(\mathbb{X})^2T^{\theta_1}}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})^2(2-\theta_1)}{\alpha_0(1-\theta_1)} \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2R(\mathbb{X})\tau_0M}{\alpha_0} + F_2(\hat{\omega}_2 + 2)\tau_0M + F_2(R(\mathbb{X}) + r(\mathbb{X})) \left(\frac{\hat{\omega}_1 T^{\theta_2}}{\theta_2} + \log(T) \right) \right). \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (64), (65) and (73)–(77) yields (19).

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Hazan, “Introduction to online convex optimization,” *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, vol. 2, no. 3-4, pp. 157–325, 2016.
- [2] M. Zinkevich, “Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2003, pp. 928–936.
- [3] E. Hazan, A. Agarwal, and S. Kale, “Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 69, no. 2-3, pp. 169–192, 2007.
- [4] A. Mokhtari, S. Shahrampour, A. Jadbabaie, and A. Ribeiro, “Online optimization in dynamic environments: Improved regret rates for strongly convex problems,” in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2016, pp. 7195–7201.
- [5] J. Yuan and A. Lamperski, “Online convex optimization for cumulative constraints,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, pp. 6140–6149.
- [6] L. Zhang, S. Lu, and Z. Zhou, “Adaptive online learning in dynamic environments,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, pp. 1323–1333.
- [7] H. Guo, X. Liu, H. Wei, and L. Ying, “Online convex optimization with hard constraints: Towards the best of two worlds and beyond,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022, pp. 6426–6439.

- [8] K. Zhang, X. Yi, Y. Li, M. Cao, T. Chai, and T. Yang, “Distributed online constrained convex optimization with event-triggered communication,” *European Journal of Control*, p. 101042, 2024, in press.
- [9] S. Shalev-Shwartz, “Online learning and online convex optimization,” *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 107–194, 2012.
- [10] T. Yang, L. Zhang, R. Jin, and J. Yi, “Tracking slowly moving clairvoyant: Optimal dynamic regret of online learning with true and noisy gradient,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016, pp. 449–457.
- [11] X. Yi, X. Li, T. Yang, L. Xie, T. Chai, and K. H. Johansson, “Distributed bandit online convex optimization with time-varying coupled inequality constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 4620–4635, 2021.
- [12] A. D. Flaxman, A. T. Kalai, and H. B. McMahan, “Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: Gradient descent without a gradient,” in *the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2005, pp. 385–394.
- [13] A. Agarwal, O. Dekel, and L. Xiao, “Optimal algorithms for online convex optimization with multi-point bandit feedback,” in *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2010, pp. 28–40.
- [14] M. Mahdavi, R. Jin, and T. Yang, “Trading regret for efficiency: Online convex optimization with long term constraints,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 2503–2528, 2012.
- [15] T. Chen and G. B. Giannakis, “Bandit convex optimization for scalable and dynamic IoT management,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1276–1286, 2019.
- [16] X. Cao and K. R. Liu, “Online convex optimization with time-varying constraints and bandit feedback,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 2665–2680, 2019.
- [17] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, “A survey of distributed optimization,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, pp. 278–305, 2019.
- [18] X. Li, L. Xie, and N. Li, “A survey on distributed online optimization and online games,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, p. 100904, 2023.
- [19] D. Yuan, Y. Hong, D. W. C. Ho, and S. Xu, “Distributed mirror descent for online composite optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 714–729, 2021.
- [20] D. Yuan, B. Zhang, D. W. Ho, W. X. Zheng, and S. Xu, “Distributed online bandit optimization under random quantization,” *Automatica*, vol. 146, p. 110590, 2022.
- [21] D. Yuan, A. Proutiere, and G. Shi, “Distributed online optimization with long-term constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 1089–1104, 2022.
- [22] X. Cao and T. Başar, “Decentralized online convex optimization with feedback delays,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 2889–2904, 2021.
- [23] —, “Distributed constrained online convex optimization over multiple access fading channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 3468–3483, 2022.
- [24] X. Yi, X. Li, T. Yang, L. Xie, T. Chai, and K. H. Johansson, “Regret and cumulative constraint violation analysis for distributed online constrained convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2875–2890, 2023.
- [25] W. Yan and X. Cao, “Decentralized multi-task online convex optimization under random link failures,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 72, pp. 622–635, 2024.
- [26] X. Cao and T. Başar, “Decentralized online convex optimization with event-triggered communications,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 284–299, 2021.

- [27] M. Xiong, B. Zhang, D. Yuan, Y. Zhang, and J. Chen, “Event-triggered distributed online convex optimization with delayed bandit feedback,” *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 445, p. 127865, 2023.
- [28] A. K. Paul, A. D. Mahindrakar, and R. K. Kalaimani, “Distributed online mirror descent algorithm with event triggered communication,” *International Federation of Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 30, pp. 448–453, 2022.
- [29] K. Oakamoto, N. Hayashi, and S. Takai, “Distributed online adaptive gradient descent with event-triggered communication,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2023, DOI:10.1109/TCNS.2023.3294432.
- [30] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [31] G. S. Seyboth, D. V. Dimarogonas, and K. H. Johansson, “Event-based broadcasting for multi-agent average consensus,” *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 245–252, 2013.
- [32] D. Yang, W. Ren, X. Liu, and W. Chen, “Decentralized event-triggered consensus for linear multi-agent systems under general directed graphs,” *Automatica*, vol. 69, pp. 242–249, 2016.
- [33] L. Ding, Q. Han, X. Ge, and X. Zhang, “An overview of recent advances in event-triggered consensus of multiagent systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 1110–1123, 2017.
- [34] X. Ge, Q. Han, L. Ding, Y. Wang, and X. Zhang, “Dynamic event-triggered distributed coordination control and its applications: A survey of trends and techniques,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 3112–3125, 2020.
- [35] R. Yang, L. Liu, and G. Feng, “Cooperative output tracking of unknown heterogeneous linear systems by distributed event-triggered adaptive control,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 3–15, 2022.