

# Large Batch Analysis for Adagrad Under Anisotropic Smoothness

Yuxing Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Rui Pan<sup>2\*</sup>, Tong Zhang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fudan University

<sup>2</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

<sup>3</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

yuxingliu20@fudan.edu.cn, rpan@connect.ust.hk, tozhang@illinois.edu

## Abstract

Adaptive gradient algorithms have been widely adopted in training large-scale deep neural networks, especially large foundation models. Despite their huge success in practice, their theoretical advantages over stochastic gradient descent (SGD) have not been fully understood, especially in the large batch-size setting commonly used in practice. This is because the only theoretical result that can demonstrate the benefit of Adagrad over SGD was obtained in the original paper of Adagrad for nonsmooth objective functions. However, for nonsmooth objective functions, there can be a linear slowdown of convergence when batch size increases, and thus a convergence analysis based on nonsmooth assumption cannot be used for large batch algorithms. In this work, we resolve this gap between theory and practice by providing a new analysis of Adagrad on both convex and nonconvex smooth objectives suitable for the large batch setting. It is shown that under the anisotropic smoothness and noise conditions, increased batch size does not slow down convergence for Adagrad, and thus it can still achieve a faster convergence guarantee over SGD even in the large batch setting. We present detailed comparisons between SGD and Adagrad to provide a better understanding of the benefits of adaptive gradient methods. Experiments in logistic regression and instruction following fine-tuning tasks provide strong evidence to support our theoretical analysis.

## 1 Introduction

To solve the stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{w}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\xi} [f(\mathbf{w}; \xi)], \quad (1)$$

adaptive gradient algorithms [Duchi et al., 2011, Zeiler, 2012, Tieleman et al., 2012, Kingma and Ba, 2014, Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017] are among the most popular methods, which have gained incredible importance from their superior efficiency, especially in training large foundation models, where large batch sizes are commonly employed. The first adaptive gradient method is Adagrad Duchi et al. [2011], Streeter and McMahan [2010], which employs an update rule of

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t$$

if we omit the projection step. Here  $\mathbf{g}_t$  notes the stochastic gradient estimation obtained at  $\mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a diagonal positive definite matrix, which is the square root of the coordinate-wise summation of former gradient estimations.

---

\*Equal contribution.

Despite the huge success in practice, as also noted in Li et al. [2021], Kunstner et al. [2023], the theoretical understanding of when and why adaptive gradient methods enjoy acceleration over SGD is still limited, especially in the smooth stochastic optimization settings, where a large batch size can be helpful. On the theory side, the original Adagrad paper Duchi et al. [2011], Streeter and McMahan [2010] shows the superiority of Adagrad over SGD in the non-smooth convex scheme, suggesting that if the gradients are sparse and the predictor is limited in an appropriate convex set, Adagrad can perform well. However, their results can be insufficient for the smooth and large-batch training scheme, which is a realistic setting gaining extensive focus. This is because the scale of stochastic gradients doesn't decrease linearly as the batch size  $M$  increases. Therefore, if we fix the sample number  $N = MT$ , where  $M$  is the batch size and  $T$  is the iteration number, such that increasing  $M$  leads to a linear decrease in  $T$ , the original convergence rate  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$  may be unsatisfying. Many of the theoretical papers in this setting provide analysis of popular adaptive gradient methods (e.g. Adagrad, Adam) under classical smoothness and noise assumptions with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_2$ . However, to the best of our knowledge, their proven results have no better or even worse dimensional dependence than the standard convergence results of SGD in the same settings. The existence of this gap between practice and theory makes us wonder: *Can we give better theoretical guarantees for adaptive gradient algorithms to explain their practical success, especially in large batch settings?*

To answer this question, let us begin with the well-known intuition of adaptive gradient algorithms. Intuitively, Adagrad shines when the problem is highly imbalanced, i.e., coordinates of the gradient have very different magnitudes. It schedules a larger learning rate (compared to SGD) for dimensions with small gradients and thus converges faster. The intuition indicates that the performance of adaptive algorithms relies largely on the imbalanced structure of the problem. However, standard assumptions fail to describe this property. Take the standard smoothness Nesterov et al. [2018] as an example, which assumes a constant  $L > 0$  such that  $-L\mathbf{I}_d \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) \preceq L\mathbf{I}_d$  for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ . It is evident that this assumption is coordinate-wise equivalent and cannot reflect the imbalance between coordinates, thus the benefits of adaptive gradient methods are hidden, as shown in the results of Vaswani et al. [2020], Défossez et al. [2020], Wang et al. [2023].

Therefore, to explore the provable benefits of adaptive gradient algorithms, it is necessary to employ appropriate assumptions that can better describe the structure of models. In this paper, we consider the anisotropic smoothness and noise assumptions. Based on these assumptions, we give novel convergence analysis of Adagrad in both convex and nonconvex cases and show that Adagrad can well adapt to the anisotropic nature of the problem. By a comparison between the convergence results of Adagrad and SGD, we justify that the adaptive power shines when the model is highly skewed or imbalanced.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We present convergence upper bounds of Adagrad under the anisotropic smoothness and noise assumption for both convex and nonconvex cases.
2. We theoretically explain the power of adaptive gradient methods under smooth and large batch size settings in the sense of faster convergence guarantees. We provide improved upper bounds tailored for both convex and nonconvex cases, showing how and when Adagrad can potentially outperform SGD.
3. Experiments provide concrete evidence to support our claims.

## 2 Related Work

**Adaptive gradient methods.** Adaptive gradient methods are popular optimizers for training neural networks [Choi et al., 2019, Vani and Rao, 2019]. Among them, Adagrad [Duchi et al., 2011, Streeter and McMahan, 2010] is considered to be the first adaptive gradient method in this branch, which was originally proposed to solve non-smooth online convex optimization problems. Ever since its first appearance, numerous adaptive gradient methods have emerged, such as RMSProp [Tieleman et al., 2012], AdaDelta [Zeiler, 2012], Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014], SC-Adagrad [Mukkamala and Hein, 2017], AdamW [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017], WNGrad [Wu et al., 2018], AMSGrad [Reddi et al., 2019], SAdam [Wang et al., 2019] to name a

few. They have revolutionized the field of deep neural network training, and are still widely adopted in the literature of large language models [Radford et al., 2019, Touvron et al., 2023, Touvron et al.].

**Results of SGD.** Stochastic gradient descent (SGD), a popular optimizer for many real-world tasks, has been extensively studied in the literature [Robbins and Monro, 1951, Nemirovski and Yudin, 1978, Nemirovskij and Yudin, 1983, Nemirovski et al., 2009, Hazan et al., 2007, Rakhlin et al., 2011, Shamir and Zhang, 2013]. In the smooth stochastic optimization scheme, Moulines and Bach [2011] and Ghadimi and Lan [2013] gave analysis of SGD under standard assumptions in the convex and nonconvex settings separately. More recently, a line of work [Richtárik and Takác, 2020, Gower et al., 2019, 2021, Khaled and Richtárik, 2020] attempts to relax the standard assumptions employed in Moulines and Bach [2011], Ghadimi and Lan [2013] and obtain tighter results.

**Results of Adagrad.** As the pioneering work of Adagrad, Duchi et al. [2011] provided an analysis for Adagrad’s convergence guarantees in online convex optimization settings, showing acceleration over SGD when the gradients are sparse. However, the presented analysis is only for general nonsmooth objectives, which cannot explain Adagrad’s effectiveness under large batch settings. Levy [2017], Levy et al. [2018] proved Adagrad-Norm, a non-coordinate-wise variant of Adagrad (first proposed in Streeter and McMahan [2010]), achieves a convergence rate of  $\mathcal{O}(LD_2^2/T + D_2\sigma_2/\sqrt{T})$  where  $L$  notes the standard smoothness,  $D_2$  notes the global bound of  $\|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2$ , and  $\sigma_2$  notes the global bound of 2-norm of gradient noise. Vaswani et al. [2020] followed this result and studied Adagrad in the interpolation scheme. However, their results show no better or even worse dimensional dependence than Adagrad-Norm or SGD. In another line of work, the convergence of non-convex Adagrad or its close variants in the smooth nonconvex setting is extensively studied [Li and Orabona, 2019, Défossez et al., 2020, Ward et al., 2020, Faw et al., 2022, Wang et al., 2023, Kavis et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2023b, Attia and Koren, 2023]. Among them, Ward et al. [2020] obtained the  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$  rate of Adagrad-Norm under global bounded gradient assumption. More recently, Faw et al. [2022], Wang et al. [2023] further improved the result to hold in relaxed assumptions. [Liu et al., 2023b, Attia and Koren, 2023] modified the convergence results to hold in high probability assuming that the gradient noise is sub-Gaussian. There are also extensive studies focused on the convergence of Adam and its close variants, we list some of them here for reference: [Reddi et al., 2019, De et al., 2018, Défossez et al., 2020, Guo et al., 2021, Zhang et al., 2022, Wang et al., 2022, Li et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024, Hong and Lin, 2024].

**Theoretical understanding of adaptive gradient methods:** Surprisingly, though the community tends to have a common sense that adaptive gradient methods converge fast in specific tasks, theoretical explanations on when and why this happens are relatively rare compared to extensive empirical studies. It is worth pointing out that among all the above-mentioned works on theoretical analysis of adaptive gradient methods, only the initial Adagrad analysis [Duchi et al., 2011] clearly shows the acceleration of Adagrad upon SGD in the online convex programming setting. How Adagrad can help accelerate convergence in smooth stochastic optimization still remains unclear. We also notice that past literatures [Cesa-Bianchi et al., 2007, Orabona and Pál, 2015, 2018, Zhuang et al., 2022] mentioned the intuition of scale-free algorithms and Zhuang et al. [2022] demonstrates the connection between scale-freeness of adaptive gradient algorithms and better condition number dependence. More recently, Zhang et al. [2024], Das et al. [2024] also investigated why Adam is effective in certain tasks compared to SGD and gives theoretical results in quadratics settings. However, their results are more intuitive and analysis is restricted to deterministic settings, which is insufficient to explain real-world scenarios where stochastic gradients are widely adopted. In another line of work, Bernstein et al. [2018a], Wu et al. [2020], Kunstner et al. [2023], Liu et al. [2023a] suggests a relation between the benefits of adaptive gradient methods and their sign-based nature. These intuitions may shed light on the theoretical understanding of adaptive gradient methods.

**Large batch training:** Large batch training enjoys extensive focus for its practical impact. It has been observed that large batch sizes are beneficial for accelerating large model training in practice [You et al., 2017a,b, 2018, 2019, Pan et al., 2022]. Furthermore, large batch training is a valuable acceleration technique

in distributed machine learning [Verbraeken et al., 2020] and pretraining [Zhou et al., 2023], where adaptive gradient algorithms are popular. In particular, it is a common practice in pretraining of large language models to combine large batch sizes with adaptive gradient algorithms [Radford et al., 2019, Touvron et al., 2023, Touvron et al.], where thousands of GPUs can be utilized and a fixed number of batch sizes will be assigned to each GPU, rendering the total batch size extremely large.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Notations

We use  $\odot$  to denote the coordinate-wise product of vectors and without leading to confusion,  $\sqrt{\cdot}$  is sometimes used to denote the coordinate-wise square root of a vector or diagonal matrix. We use notation  $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$  to hide absolute constants and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$  to hide logarithmic terms of iteration number  $T$  additionally. Let  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a symmetric positive definite matrix, we denote the vector norm induced by  $\mathbf{H}$  that  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2 \triangleq \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{H} \mathbf{w}$ . Note that when  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I}_d$  is the identity matrix,  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{H}}$  denotes the standard Euclidean norm. With a slightly abuse of notation, for a vector  $\mathbf{h}$  with positive coordinates, we denote  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{h}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{w}_j^2$ . For a symmetric positive definite matrix  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and convex set  $\mathcal{W}$  we also introduce the  $\mathbf{H}$ -based projection operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{H}}(\cdot)$  such that  $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{w}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2$ . As discussed in Hazan et al. [2007], the projection is a convex program and can be solved efficiently.

Let us denote  $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}; \xi)$  the stochastic gradient oracle at  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{g}_t$  as the gradient estimation employed at  $\mathbf{w}_t$ .  $\mathcal{F}_t \triangleq \sigma(\mathbf{g}_0, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{t-1})$  stands for the sigma field of the gradient estimators from the first iteration to the  $t-1$  iteration. We use  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  to denote total expectation over  $\mathcal{F}_T$  where  $T$  is the maximum iteration number and  $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot]$  as an abbreviation of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t]$ .

### 3.2 Problem Settings and Assumptions

We study the stochastic optimization problem (1), where we can only access the stochastic gradient oracle  $\nabla f(\mathbf{w}; \xi)$  at  $\mathbf{w}$ . We assume that  $f$  is twice-differentiable in our paper for convenience. Throughout this paper, we consider the following assumptions.

**Assumption 3.1** (Convexity).  $f(\cdot)$  is convex. We search solution in a convex set  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and diameters  $D_\infty$  and  $D_2$  such that there exists at least one optimal solution  $\mathbf{w}_* \in \mathcal{W}$  and

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_\infty \leq D_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_2 \leq D_2. \quad (2)$$

**Assumption 3.2** (Lower bounded). There exists constant  $f^*$  such that for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f(\mathbf{w}) \geq f^*$ .

**Assumption 3.3** (Anisotropic smoothness). There exists a positive vector  $\mathbf{L} = [L_1, \dots, L_d] \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$  such that  $f(\cdot)$  is  $\mathbf{L}$ -smooth, namely, for  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$f(\mathbf{w}') \leq f(\mathbf{w}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2. \quad (3)$$

Assumption 3.1 and 3.2 are standard for convex and nonconvex problems, respectively. Assumption 3.3 implies an anisotropic smoothness condition of  $f(\cdot)$ . As norms are equivalent in a finite-dimensional space, Assumption 3.3 can be viewed as a natural generalization of the standard smoothness assumption, as it implies the standard smoothness assumption by  $L = \|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty$ <sup>1</sup>. As we do not explicitly require the vector  $\mathbf{L}$  in the algorithm,  $\mathbf{L}$  can be the tightest vector satisfying (3). When the Hessian of  $f(\cdot)$  is imbalanced, namely, coordinates have very different scales,  $\mathbf{L}$  can be adapted to this imbalanced distribution and can better approximate the Hessian of  $f(\cdot)$ , resulting in  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \ll Ld$ . The power of this adaptation shines when adaptive algorithms are employed. Note that Assumption 3.3 is also employed in a line of work on SignSGD

<sup>1</sup>This can be verified by noticing  $\|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2 \leq L \|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|_2^2$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Adagrad

---

- 1: **Input:** convex set  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $\{\eta_t\}_{t=0}^{T-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ , and batch size  $M \in \mathbb{N}$
  - 2: Initialize  $\mathbf{v}_{-1} = \mathbf{0}$
  - 3: **for**  $t = 0$  **to**  $T - 1$  **do**
  - 4:   Sample mini-batch  $\mathcal{B}_t$  uniformly
  - 5:    $\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi)$
  - 6:    $\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{v}_{t-1} + (\mathbf{g}_t \odot \mathbf{g}_t)$
  - 7:    $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_t}) + \epsilon \mathbf{I}_d$
  - 8:   **Option I:**  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{\Lambda}_t}(\mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t)$
  - 9:   **Option II:**  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t$
  - 10: **end for**
  - 11: **Output:**  $1/T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{w}_t$
- 

(e.g. [Bernstein et al., 2018a,b]). To some degree, we address how the analysis of SignSGD sheds light on adaptive gradient methods, as noted in Bernstein et al. [2018a], Balles and Hennig [2018], Balles et al. [2020].

We consider the standard stochastic approximation framework [Kushner and Clark, 2012] and denote the gradient noise at  $\mathbf{w}$  to be  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}; \xi) \triangleq \nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}; \xi)$ . We assume the following assumptions on gradient noise throughout this paper.

**Assumption 3.4** (Unbiased Independent gradient). Each  $\nabla f(\mathbf{w}; \xi)$  is independently drawn and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}; \xi)] = \mathbf{0}. \quad (4)$$

**Assumption 3.5** (Anisotropic noise). There exists a positive vector  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d] \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{n}_j(\mathbf{w}; \xi)^2] \leq \sigma_j^2 \quad \text{for all } j \in [d]. \quad (5)$$

Note that Assumption 3.5 implies the standard bounded noise assumption by  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}; \xi)\|_2^2] \leq \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2$ . Intuitively, it upper bounds all the coordinates of  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}; \xi)$  instead of only the norm and gives more detailed information on the scale of noise. Generally, Combining Assumption 3.3 and 3.5 allows more fine-grained analysis, which can take the sparsity of the model into account. Note that the anisotropic noise assumption has also been explored in other lines of studies on sign-based methods [Bernstein et al., 2018a,b, Crawshaw et al., 2022] and quadratics [Dieuleveut et al., 2017, Ge et al., 2019, Pan et al., 2021, 2023]. It is also closely related to Assumption 2 in Zhang et al. [2020], where the authors attempt to model the heavy-tailedness of neural networks.

Let  $\mathcal{B}_t$  be the mini-batch sampled at iteration  $t$ . We consider the case where all mini-batches share the same batch size  $|\mathcal{B}_t| \equiv M$ . It follows that the sample size is  $N = MT$ . Notice that with a mini-batch of size  $M$ , the variance of gradient noise is reduced by a factor of  $M$  due to the unbiasedness and independence of each stochastic gradient sample. In most cases in the paper, we consider the large batch training scheme with a fixed number of samples  $N$ , thus a larger batch size  $M$  generally means a smaller iteration  $T = N/M$ .

## 4 Standard Convergence of SGD

We begin with the standard convergence results of SGD.

**Theorem 4.1** (Convex convergence of SGD). *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, for the sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  generated by SGD (Algorithm 2 with option I), if we appropriately take step size  $\eta_t = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty}, \sqrt{\frac{D_2^2 M}{2\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2(t+1)}} \right\}$ , it holds that for  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T \triangleq 1/T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{w}_t$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{D_2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T} \right).$$

---

**Algorithm 2** SGD

---

- 1: **Input:** convex set  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $\{\eta_t\}_{t=0}^{T-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and batch size  $M \in \mathbb{N}$
  - 2: **for**  $t = 0$  **to**  $T - 1$  **do**
  - 3:   Sample mini-batch  $\mathcal{B}_t$  uniformly
  - 4:    $\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi)$
  - 5:   **Option I:**  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{W}}^d(\mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{g}_t)$
  - 6:   **Option II:**  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{g}_t$
  - 7: **end for**
  - 8: **Output:**  $1/T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{w}_t$
- 

**Theorem 4.2** (Nonconvex convergence of SGD). *Under Assumption 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, for the sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  generated by SGD (Algorithm 2 with option II), if we appropriately take step size  $\eta_t \equiv \eta = \left\{ \frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty}, \sqrt{\frac{2(f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*)M}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2 T}} \right\}$ , it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2 \right] = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty (f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*)} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty (f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*)}{T} \right).$$

Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 are standard results of the convergence of SGD under  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty$ -smooth settings. Similar results have been extensively studied (e.g. [Orabona, 2019, Garrigos and Gower, 2023, Ghadimi and Lan, 2013, Bernstein et al., 2018a]). We also include the proof in Appendix D for completeness. Note that when batch size  $M$  increases, the optimal step size of SGD, as shown in Theorem 4.1, can be in the order of  $\sqrt{M}$  and guarantees comparable convergence rate of the algorithm when batch size is increased. To be more specific, when the sample size  $N = MT$  is fixed, the adjusted step size ensures the leading order is  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$  when  $M \leq T$ .

Besides the dependence on  $M$  and  $T$ , it is well-known that the convergence of SGD does not explicitly depend on dimension  $d$ ; the dependence is implicitly implied in  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2$ ,  $D_2$  and  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty$ .

## 5 Convergence of Adagrad

To accelerate the convergence of SGD, one approach is to lower the implicit dependence of dimension  $d$ . As discussed in Nguyen et al. [2019], in smooth strongly convex settings, the lower bound of SGD can be  $d$  times larger than a wider class of algorithms including adaptive gradient methods. The original Adagrad paper Duchi et al. [2011] showed that Adagrad has better dimension dependence than SGD when the gradients are generally sparse in the non-smooth convex scheme. However, in the stochastic smooth optimization scheme, to the best of our knowledge, no theoretical guarantees of how adaptive gradient algorithms can outperform SGD exist. Furthermore, although it was widely recognized that adaptive gradient methods enjoy further acceleration in large batch settings Kunstner et al. [2023], existing theoretical results are insufficient to account for that. We attempt to fill the gap, equipped with the anisotropic Assumptions 3.3 and 3.5.

**Theorem 5.1** (Convex convergence of Adagrad). *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, for the sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  generated by Adagrad (Algorithm 1 with option I) with constant step size  $\eta_t \equiv \eta = D_\infty$ , it holds that for  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T = (1/T) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} f(\mathbf{w}_t)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} [f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{D_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 D_\infty^2}{T} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{D_\infty T} \right).$$

Note that  $\epsilon$  is employed mainly for numerical stability and is commonly very small (default is  $10^{-10}$  in Pytorch). Consider the large batch training scheme, where we fix  $N = MT$  as the sample size. If we directly apply the nonsmooth results  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$  in the original Adagrad paper Duchi et al. [2011], Streeter



and McMahan [2010], we may find that the convergence of Adagrad becomes worse when batch size increases as the iteration number  $T = N/M$  is decreasing. In contrast, Theorem 5.1 fills this gap by showing that in the batch training scheme, the leading order is  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{MT})$ , which guarantees comparable performance with increased batch size  $M$ . This guarantees the same dependence on  $M$  and  $T$  as SGD and is applicable in both convex and nonconvex cases. Note that Theorem 5.1 can also be extended to the settings that we relax Assumption 3.5 to only bounded noise at  $\mathbf{w}_*$ . Please refer to Appendix E.1.1 for details.

**Theorem 5.2** (Nonconvex convergence of Adagrad). *Under Assumption 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, for the sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t=1}^{T-1}$  generated by Adagrad (Algorithm 1 with option II) with constant step size  $\eta_t \equiv \eta = \sqrt{\frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{\Delta}}$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{t-1} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_1^2} \right] \right)^2 &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\Delta} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1^2}{M\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\Delta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T} \right) \\ &+ \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d\epsilon \left( \frac{\sqrt{\Delta} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta = f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*$ .

We defer the proof of the theorems to Appendix E. It is worth pointing out that Theorem 5.2 obtains convergence of  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|_1]$  instead of the common  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|_2]$  by SGD, which can be at most  $\sqrt{d}$  times larger when the gradient is dense. On the other side, the convergence rate depends on  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_1$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1$  that bridge the gap. This is consistent with the results of SignSGD [Bernstein et al., 2018a], with lighter dependence on large batch size  $M$ . This consistency between the convergence of Adagrad and SignSGD also provides theoretical insights into the close relation between adaptive gradient methods and sign-based methods. In the next section, we will further discuss how to understand the results presented in Theorem 5.1 and 5.2 and their implication of the superiority of Adagrad.

*Remark 5.3.* Let's omit the involvement of the anisotropic nature of the model and talk about Theorem 5.2 from the technical side. Our proof generally considers a similar main line to Ward et al. [2020]. However, we modify the proof technique and remove the restrictive assumption on global bounded  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|$ . Compared to Faw et al. [2022], Wang et al. [2023], Theorem 5.2 presents a much cleaner result in the  $\mathcal{O}(1/T)$  term and avoids the complicated proof in Faw et al. [2022] and the heavy dependence on  $1/\epsilon$  in Wang et al. [2023]. On the other hand, Faw et al. [2022], Wang et al. [2023] allows relaxed noise and smoothness assumptions, which may be of interest and we leave for possible future work.

## 6 Comparison of the Results

Theorem 5.1 and 5.2 show novel fine-grained convergence results of Adagrad, where we employ anisotropic smoothness settings and allow a large batch size. In this section, we further interpret that these results can indicate possible benefits of Adagrad compared to SGD by examining their convergence rates. We would like to note that the comparison is not fully rigorous, as the upper bounds of convergence rates here only suggest the worst-case performance of algorithms. However, our intention is to exploit the insight behind this comparison and inspire a better understanding of how and when one algorithm outperforms another. This can also be beneficial for giving explanations on their empirical performance gap from a theoretical guarantee viewpoint. It is worth mentioning that this type of approach was adopted in past literature to investigate the theoretical properties of different algorithms [Bernstein et al., 2018a] as well.

Following Bernstein et al. [2018a], we define the density notion  $\phi(\cdot)$  of a nonzero vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) \triangleq \frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2}{d\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} \in [1/d, 1]$ . It should be clear that small  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  indicates sparse  $\mathbf{v}$ . For simplicity, we also define  $\phi(\mathbf{g}) \triangleq \inf_{t \in [T]} \phi(\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t))$  to be the infimum of deterministic gradients density and  $\phi(D) \triangleq D_2^2/(dD_\infty^2) \in [1/d, 1]$  for the convex case with a slight abuse of notations. When a large batch size  $M$  is employed, both

$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{MT})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(1/T)$  terms can be the leading order term. Therefore, we consider both terms in the comparison to better understand the performance difference between the two algorithms.

## 6.1 Convex Case

Based on Theorem 5.1 and 4.1, we can write the convex results as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adagrad: } \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}}{\sqrt{\phi(D)}} \cdot \frac{D_2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\phi(\mathbf{L})}{\phi(D)} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T}\right). \\ \text{SGD: } \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{D_2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

One can find that the convergence rate comparison largely relies on the ratios  $R_1 \triangleq \sqrt{\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/\phi(D)}$  and  $R_2 \triangleq \phi(\mathbf{L})/\phi(D)$ , which is determined by the sparsity of the curvature, noise, and the geometry of  $\mathcal{W}$ . When  $M$  is small such that the variance term is dominant, the comparison is consistent with that presented in Duchi et al. [2011] for nonsmooth cases. Generally, when (1)  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is sparse, i.e. has very different scales in different coordinates, which implies that  $\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \ll 1$ ; (2)  $\mathcal{W}$  satisfies that  $D_2 \ll \sqrt{d}D_\infty$ , which can be satisfied by setting  $\mathcal{W}$  to be a hypercube, the variance term of Adagrad might be much smaller than that of SGD. When a large batch size is employed, the bias term  $\mathcal{O}(1/T)$  can also be important and thus the superior performance of Adagrad additionally requires that (3)  $\mathbf{L}$  is sparse such that  $\phi(\mathbf{L})$  can be smaller than  $\phi(D)$ . Following Duchi et al. [2011], we also provide a concrete example for better understanding the quantities in Appendix B.

*Remark 6.1.* It is also worth pointing out that  $R_2$  can be in order  $\Theta(1/d)$  in extreme cases, while  $R_1$  can only be  $\Theta(1/\sqrt{d})$ , which suggests an even sharper possible gap when  $M$  is large and might provide some intuition on the observation that adaptive gradient methods benefit more from large batch size than SGD [Kunstner et al., 2023].

## 6.2 Nonconvex Case

Based on the definition of  $\phi(\mathbf{g})$ , we have  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_1^2 \geq d\phi(\mathbf{g})\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2$  for all  $t \in [T]$ . Thus when  $M$  is large enough such that  $M \geq \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1^2/(\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \Delta)$ , we can write the upper bounds for Adagrad and SGD in nonconvex cases as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adagrad: } \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\phi(\mathbf{L})\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}}{\phi(\mathbf{g})} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \Delta} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\phi(\mathbf{L})}{\phi(\mathbf{g})} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \Delta}{T}\right). \\ \text{SGD: } \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \Delta} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \Delta}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\Delta \triangleq f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*$ . Note that the logarithmic terms are generally mild constants and we omit them here. We can observe that this comparison between Adagrad and SGD is generally consistent with that between SignSGD and SGD presented in Bernstein et al. [2018a], with better variance convergence rate. Generally speaking, when  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  are sparse and  $\nabla f(\mathbf{w})$  is relatively dense, Adagrad shines compared to SGD in the nonconvex case. Among the quantities, as  $\mathbf{L}$  can be viewed as a diagonal estimation of the Hessian, small  $\phi(\mathbf{L}) \ll 1$  is closely related to the highly imbalanced spectrum distribution of the Hessian, which has been widely observed [Sagun et al., 2016, Arjevani and Field, 2020, Pan et al., 2021]. On the other side, Bernstein et al. [2018a] showed that  $\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$  and  $\phi(\mathbf{g})$  can be mild constants in real tasks. Therefore, by combining the comparison and quantities, we can suggest a possibly faster convergence performance of Adagrad compared to SGD. In the next section, we further provide empirical evidence for this superior performance.



## 7 Experimental Results

### 7.1 Convex Case

To verify the aforementioned theoretical results, we conduct experiments on logistic regressions, whose loss functions are generally convex smooth. Specifically, we utilize real-world datasets **a4a**, **a6a**, **a9a**, **real-sim** and **rcv1.binary** from libsvm [Chang and Lin, 2011], which comprises of  $N = 4781, 11220, 32561, 20242$  and  $72309$  samples respectively. Within the former three datasets, each sample has a feature of  $d = 123$  dimensions, which are generally sparse given only 14 non-zero-valued dimensions in average for each sample. For the latter two large datasets, each sample possesses  $d = 47, 236$  and  $d = 20, 958$  feature dimensions individually in each dataset, where only 51.29 and 74.05 dimensions in average are non-zero. More details of the experimental setup are available in Appendix A.

As shown by the results presented in Table 2, for cases when the variance term dominates, e.g. **a9a**, Adagrad demonstrates similar convergence behaviors for varied batch sizes. This behavior cannot be explained by previous nonsmooth theories, since  $T = N/M$  should provide worse convergence guarantees  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$  when batch size  $M$  increases. Furthermore, Adagrad constantly provides faster convergence than SGD, which verifies the superiority suggested in our theorems. In addition, when the batch size increases and the bias term becomes dominant, Adagrad is affected less than SGD, showing its robustness against different batch sizes.

Table 1: Statistics on logistic regression.  $D_2 = \max_t \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2$  and  $D_\infty = \max_t \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_\infty$  are estimated by the maximum value under all searched settings without loss explosion. Smaller values in  $C_{\text{var}} \triangleq D_\infty/D_2$  represent better theoretical bounds for Adagrad when compared with SGD. It is evident that in large sparse datasets,  $D_\infty$  is much smaller than  $D_2$ , verifying the empirical gains of Adagrad implied by our theory.

Dataset	$D_\infty$	$D_2$	$\ \mathbf{L}\ _1$	$\ \mathbf{L}\ _\infty$	$C_{\text{var}}$
<b>a4a</b>	9.73	32.24	14.87	7.26	<b>0.30</b>
<b>a6a</b>	8.88	28.57	14.87	7.26	<b>0.31</b>
<b>a9a</b>	9.79	29.43	14.87	7.27	<b>0.32</b>
<b>real-sim</b>	34.70	729.50	2.00	1.01	<b>0.05</b>
<b>rcv1.bin</b>	15.32	635.47	2.00	1.02	<b>0.02</b>

Table 2: Training losses of SGD and Adagrad on logistic regression with dataset **a4a**, **a6a** and **a9a**. We report statistics over 3 seeds with different batch sizes  $M$ . Note that Adagrad’s convergence behavior is generally unaffected by the batch size when  $M \leq \sqrt{N}$ .

DATASET (SMALL)	METHOD	$(f(w) - f(w_*)) \times 10^{-3}$					
		$M = 1$	$M = 4$	$M = 16$	$M = 64$	$M = 256$	$M = 1024$
<b>A4A</b>	SGD	2.66±0.08	2.32±0.34	3.47±0.07	2.24±0.14	4.61±0.03	8.47±0.05
	ADAGRAD	0.22±0.03	0.22±0.03	0.25±0.03	0.24±0.03	0.29±0.03	0.51±0.08
<b>A6A</b>	SGD	0.87±0.09	1.40±0.01	0.82±0.09	1.56±0.03	1.03±0.01	2.53±0.03
	ADAGRAD	0.16±0.00	0.16±0.00	0.16±0.01	0.21±0.05	0.17±0.01	0.20±0.02
<b>A9A</b>	SGD	0.77±0.08	0.47±0.01	0.48±0.05	0.58±0.01	0.52±0.06	0.76±0.01
	ADAGRAD	0.14±0.01	0.14±0.00	0.15±0.00	0.16±0.01	0.20±0.01	0.12±0.02
DATASET (LARGE)	METHOD	$(f(w) - f(w_*)) \times 10^{-1}$					
		$M = 1$	$M = 4$	$M = 16$	$M = 64$	$M = 256$	$M = 1024$
<b>REAL-SIM</b>	SGD	0.42±0.08	0.27±0.08	0.52±0.06	0.92±0.03	1.57±0.02	2.68±0.01
	ADAGRAD	0.14±0.00	0.14±0.00	0.14±0.00	0.14±0.00	0.15±0.00	0.19±0.00
<b>RCV1.BINARY</b>	SGD	0.48±0.02	0.28±0.07	0.68±0.04	1.33±0.04	2.55±0.21	5.02±0.16
	ADAGRAD	0.10±0.00	0.10±0.00	0.10±0.00	0.11±0.00	0.14±0.01	0.20±0.01

## 7.2 Nonconvex Case

For nonconvex cases, we check the instruction following fine-tuning task on Alpaca [Taori et al., 2023] dataset with GPT-2 [Radford et al., 2019] model. GPT-2 utilizes GELU [Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2016] as its activation function, whose loss objective is generally smooth. As shown in Table 3 and Figure 1, it can be observed that Adagrad still outperforms SGD with different batch sizes. The loss gap is especially salient under large batch sizes. This also confirms that Adagrad’s convergence speed is not significantly affected by the large batch size, which matches the results in our theory. Full experimental details are available in Appendix A.

Table 3: Training losses of SGD and Adagrad on Alpaca with GPT2.

METHOD	TRAINING LOSS $f(w)$		
	$M = 32$	64	128
SGD	2.20	2.24	2.29
ADAGRAD	2.14	2.12	2.11
<hr/>			
	$M = 256$	512	1024
SGD	2.36	2.45	2.57
ADAGRAD	2.12	2.14	2.20




Figure 1: Training loss curves of SGD and Adagrad for instruction following tasks on Alpaca with GPT2. **Left:** batch size 256, **Right:** batch size 512.

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we present the theoretical results of Adagrad in both convex and nonconvex smooth objectives under anisotropic smoothness and noise assumptions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first theory that proves Adagrad’s non-degradation convergence behavior  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{MT})$  under large batch settings for anisotropic smoothness and noise assumptions in both convex and nonconvex cases. Based on the theorems, we also conduct comparisons between the convergence rates of AdaGrad and SGD in the large batch settings, which provides a deeper understanding of when and why AdaGrad can potentially outperform SGD from a theoretical perspective. Empirical studies also provide strong evidence to support our theory. To conclude, Adagrad is overall less affected by the changes in batch sizes and is generally more favorable for large-batch settings than SGD.

## References

- Yossi Arjevani and Michael Field. Analytic characterization of the hessian in shallow relu models: A tale of symmetry. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:5441–5452, 2020.
- Amit Attia and Tomer Koren. Sgd with adagrad stepsizes: Full adaptivity with high probability to unknown parameters, unbounded gradients and affine variance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08783*, 2023.
- Lukas Balles and Philipp Hennig. Dissecting adam: The sign, magnitude and variance of stochastic gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 404–413. PMLR, 2018.
- Lukas Balles, Fabian Pedregosa, and Nicolas Le Roux. The geometry of sign gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08056*, 2020.
- Jeremy Bernstein, Yu-Xiang Wang, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Animashree Anandkumar. signsgd: Compressed optimisation for non-convex problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 560–569. PMLR, 2018a.
- Jeremy Bernstein, Jiawei Zhao, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Anima Anandkumar. signsgd with majority vote is communication efficient and fault tolerant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05291*, 2018b.
- Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Yishay Mansour, and Gilles Stoltz. Improved second-order bounds for prediction with expert advice. *Machine Learning*, 66:321–352, 2007.
- Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin. Libsvm: A library for support vector machines. *ACM transactions on intelligent systems and technology (TIST)*, 2(3):1–27, 2011.
- Dami Choi, Christopher J Shallue, Zachary Nado, Jaehoon Lee, Chris J Maddison, and George E Dahl. On empirical comparisons of optimizers for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05446*, 2019.
- Michael Crawshaw, Mingrui Liu, Francesco Orabona, Wei Zhang, and Zhenxun Zhuang. Robustness to unbounded smoothness of generalized signsgd. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:9955–9968, 2022.
- Rudrajit Das, Naman Agarwal, Sujay Sanghavi, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Towards quantifying the preconditioning effect of adam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07114*, 2024.
- Soham De, Anirbit Mukherjee, and Enayat Ullah. Convergence guarantees for rmsprop and adam in non-convex optimization and an empirical comparison to nesterov acceleration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06766*, 2018.
- Alexandre Défossez, Léon Bottou, Francis Bach, and Nicolas Usunier. A simple convergence proof of adam and adagrad. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02395*, 2020.
- Aymeric Dieuleveut, Nicolas Flammarion, and Francis Bach. Harder, better, faster, stronger convergence rates for least-squares regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):3520–3570, 2017.
- John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.
- Matthew Faw, Isidoros Tziotis, Constantine Caramanis, Aryan Mokhtari, Sanjay Shakkottai, and Rachel Ward. The power of adaptivity in sgd: Self-tuning step sizes with unbounded gradients and affine variance. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 313–355. PMLR, 2022.
- Guillaume Garrigos and Robert M Gower. Handbook of convergence theorems for (stochastic) gradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11235*, 2023.

- Rong Ge, Sham M Kakade, Rahul Kidambi, and Praneeth Netrapalli. The step decay schedule: A near optimal, geometrically decaying learning rate procedure for least squares. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 14977–14988, 2019.
- Saeed Ghadimi and Guanghui Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.
- Robert Gower, Othmane Sebbouh, and Nicolas Loizou. Sgd for structured nonconvex functions: Learning rates, minibatching and interpolation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1315–1323. PMLR, 2021.
- Robert Mansel Gower, Nicolas Loizou, Xun Qian, Alibek Sailanbayev, Egor Shulgin, and Peter Richtárik. Sgd: General analysis and improved rates. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5200–5209. PMLR, 2019.
- Zhishuai Guo, Yi Xu, Wotao Yin, Rong Jin, and Tianbao Yang. A novel convergence analysis for algorithms of the adam family. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03459*, 2021.
- Elad Hazan, Amit Agarwal, and Satyen Kale. Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69:169–192, 2007.
- Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016.
- Yusu Hong and Junhong Lin. On convergence of adam for stochastic optimization under relaxed assumptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03982*, 2024.
- Ali Kavis, Kfir Yehuda Levy, and Volkan Cevher. High probability bounds for a class of nonconvex algorithms with adagrad stepsize. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02833*, 2022.
- Ahmed Khaled and Peter Richtárik. Better theory for sgd in the nonconvex world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03329*, 2020.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Frederik Kunstner, Jacques Chen, Jonathan Wilder Lavington, and Mark Schmidt. Noise is not the main factor behind the gap between sgd and adam on transformers, but sign descent might be. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13960*, 2023.
- Harold Joseph Kushner and Dean S Clark. *Stochastic approximation methods for constrained and unconstrained systems*, volume 26. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Kfir Levy. Online to offline conversions, universality and adaptive minibatch sizes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Kfir Y Levy, Alp Yurtsever, and Volkan Cevher. Online adaptive methods, universality and acceleration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Haochuan Li, Alexander Rakhlin, and Ali Jadbabaie. Convergence of adam under relaxed assumptions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Xiaoyu Li and Francesco Orabona. On the convergence of stochastic gradient descent with adaptive stepsizes. In *The 22nd international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 983–992. PMLR, 2019.
- Yan Li, Dhruv Choudhary, Xiaohan Wei, Baichuan Yuan, Bhargav Bhushanam, Tuo Zhao, and Guanghui Lan. Frequency-aware sgd for efficient embedding learning with provable benefits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04844*, 2021.

- Hong Liu, Zhiyuan Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. Sophia: A scalable stochastic second-order optimizer for language model pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14342*, 2023a.
- Zijian Liu, Ta Duy Nguyen, Thien Hang Nguyen, Alina Ene, and Huy Nguyen. High probability convergence of stochastic gradient methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 21884–21914. PMLR, 2023b.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*, 2016.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- Eric Moulines and Francis Bach. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- Lev Muchnik, Sen Pei, Lucas C Parra, Saulo DS Reis, José S Andrade Jr, Shlomo Havlin, and Hernán A Makse. Origins of power-law degree distribution in the heterogeneity of human activity in social networks. *Scientific reports*, 3(1):1783, 2013.
- Mahesh Chandra Mukkamala and Matthias Hein. Variants of rmsprop and adagrad with logarithmic regret bounds. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2545–2553. PMLR, 2017.
- Arkadi Nemirovski and D Yudin. On cezari’s convergence of the steepest descent method for approximating saddle point of convex-concave functions. In *Soviet Mathematics. Doklady*, volume 19, pages 258–269, 1978.
- Arkadi Nemirovski, Anatoli Juditsky, Guanghui Lan, and Alexander Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009.
- Arkadij Semenovič Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983.
- Yurii Nesterov et al. *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer, 2018.
- Phuong\_Ha Nguyen, Lam Nguyen, and Marten van Dijk. Tight dimension independent lower bound on the expected convergence rate for diminishing step sizes in sgd. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Francesco Orabona. A modern introduction to online learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13213*, 2019.
- Francesco Orabona and Dávid Pál. Scale-free algorithms for online linear optimization. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 287–301. Springer, 2015.
- Francesco Orabona and Dávid Pál. Scale-free online learning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 716:50–69, 2018.
- Rui Pan, Haishan Ye, and Tong Zhang. Eigencurve: Optimal learning rate schedule for sgd on quadratic objectives with skewed hessian spectrums. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14109*, 2021.
- Rui Pan, Shizhe Diao, Jianlin Chen, and Tong Zhang. Extremebert: A toolkit for accelerating pretraining of customized bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.17201*, 2022.
- Rui Pan, Yuxing Liu, Xiaoyu Wang, and Tong Zhang. Accelerated convergence of stochastic heavy ball method under anisotropic gradient noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14567*, 2023.
- Zhaonan Qu, Wenzhi Gao, Oliver Hinder, Yinyu Ye, and Zhengyuan Zhou. Optimal diagonal preconditioning: Theory and practice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00809*, 2022.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019.

- Alexander Rakhlin, Ohad Shamir, and Karthik Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.5647*, 2011.
- Sashank J Reddi, Satyen Kale, and Sanjiv Kumar. On the convergence of adam and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09237*, 2019.
- Peter Richtárik and Martin Takáč. Stochastic reformulations of linear systems: algorithms and convergence theory. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 41(2):487–524, 2020.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- Levent Sagun, Leon Bottou, and Yann LeCun. Eigenvalues of the hessian in deep learning: Singularity and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07476*, 2016.
- Ohad Shamir and Tong Zhang. Stochastic gradient descent for non-smooth optimization: Convergence results and optimal averaging schemes. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 71–79. PMLR, 2013.
- Matthew Streeter and H Brendan McMahan. Less regret via online conditioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1002.4862*, 2010.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca), 2023.
- Tijmen Tieleman, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *COURSERA: Neural networks for machine learning*, 4(2):26–31, 2012.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, and Kevin Stone. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2302.13971. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>. Publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- S Vani and TV Madhusudhana Rao. An experimental approach towards the performance assessment of various optimizers on convolutional neural network. In *2019 3rd international conference on trends in electronics and informatics (ICOEI)*, pages 331–336. IEEE, 2019.
- Sharan Vaswani, Issam H Laradji, Frederik Kunstner, Si Yi Meng, Mark Schmidt, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Adaptive gradient methods converge faster with over-parameterization (and you can do a line-search). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06835*, 2020.
- Joost Verbraeken, Matthijs Wolting, Jonathan Katzy, Jeroen Kloppenburg, Tim Verbelen, and Jan S Rellermeyer. A survey on distributed machine learning. *Acm computing surveys (csur)*, 53(2):1–33, 2020.
- Bohan Wang, Yushun Zhang, Huishuai Zhang, Qi Meng, Zhi-Ming Ma, Tie-Yan Liu, and Wei Chen. Provable adaptivity in adam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.09900*, 2022.
- Bohan Wang, Huishuai Zhang, Zhiming Ma, and Wei Chen. Convergence of adagrad for non-convex objectives: Simple proofs and relaxed assumptions. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 161–190. PMLR, 2023.
- Bohan Wang, Jingwen Fu, Huishuai Zhang, Nanning Zheng, and Wei Chen. Closing the gap between the upper bound and lower bound of adam’s iteration complexity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.



- Guanghui Wang, Shiyin Lu, Weiwei Tu, and Lijun Zhang. Sadam: A variant of adam for strongly convex functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.02957*, 2019.
- Rachel Ward, Xiaoxia Wu, and Leon Bottou. Adagrad stepsizes: Sharp convergence over nonconvex landscapes. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):9047–9076, 2020.
- Xiaoxia Wu, Rachel Ward, and Léon Bottou. Wngrad: Learn the learning rate in gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02865*, 2018.
- Yikai Wu, Xingyu Zhu, Chenwei Wu, Annie Wang, and Rong Ge. Dissecting hessian: Understanding common structure of hessian in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04261*, 2020.
- Hongzhi Yin, Bin Cui, Jing Li, Junjie Yao, and Chen Chen. Challenging the long tail recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.6700*, 2012.
- Yang You, Igor Gitman, and Boris Ginsburg. Large batch training of convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03888*, 2017a.
- Yang You, Zhao Zhang, C Hsieh, James Demmel, and Kurt Keutzer. 100-epoch imagenet training with alexnet in 24 minutes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.05011*, 8, 2017b.
- Yang You, Zhao Zhang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, James Demmel, and Kurt Keutzer. Imagenet training in minutes. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 1–10, 2018.
- Yang You, Jing Li, Sashank Reddi, Jonathan Hseu, Sanjiv Kumar, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Xiaodan Song, James Demmel, Kurt Keutzer, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Large batch optimization for deep learning: Training bert in 76 minutes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00962*, 2019.
- Matthew D Zeiler. Adadelta: an adaptive learning rate method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5701*, 2012.
- Jingzhao Zhang, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Andreas Veit, Seungyeon Kim, Sashank Reddi, Sanjiv Kumar, and Suvrit Sra. Why are adaptive methods good for attention models? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15383–15393, 2020.
- Tong Zhang. *Mathematical Analysis of Machine Learning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. doi: 10.1017/9781009093057.
- Yushun Zhang, Congliang Chen, Naichen Shi, Ruoyu Sun, and Zhi-Quan Luo. Adam can converge without any modification on update rules. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:28386–28399, 2022.
- Yushun Zhang, Congliang Chen, Tian Ding, Ziniu Li, Ruoyu Sun, and Zhi-Quan Luo. Why transformers need adam: A hessian perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16788*, 2024.
- Ce Zhou, Qian Li, Chen Li, Jun Yu, Yixin Liu, Guangjing Wang, Kai Zhang, Cheng Ji, Qiben Yan, Lifang He, et al. A comprehensive survey on pretrained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09419*, 2023.
- Zhenxun Zhuang, Mingrui Liu, Ashok Cutkosky, and Francesco Orabona. Understanding adamw through proximal methods and scale-freeness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00089*, 2022.
- George Kingsley Zipf. *Human behavior and the principle of least effort: An introduction to human ecology*. Ravenio Books, 2016.

## A More Experimental Details

### A.1 Convex Case

For `a4a`, `a6a` and `a9a`, we run 100 epochs of optimization with SGD and Adagrad individually, starting from a uniform distribution initialization  $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \mathcal{U}(-0.05, 0.05)^d$ . To find the best hyperparameter, grid searches are conducted for both algorithms, with the search space being initial learning rate  $\eta \in \{10.0, 1.0, 0.1, 0.01\}$  and learning rate schedules being either constant  $\eta_t \equiv \eta$  or inverse square root decay  $\eta_t = \eta/\sqrt{t+1}$ , the same choices as in our theorems. For large datasets `real-sim` and `rcv1.binary`, all settings stay the same, except for the number of epochs 3 and the initialization  $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \mathcal{U}(-1/d, 1/d)^d \times 10^{-2}$ .

Since it is generally hard to obtain analytical closed-form solutions for logistic regressions, we run gradient descent for  $10^6$  epochs to obtain an approximated optimum  $w_*$  for small datasets `a4a`, `a6a` and `a9a`. For larger ones `real-sim` and `rcv1.binary`, we run  $10^2$  epochs of Adagrad instead, since GD converges much slower in comparison. In addition, for computing  $\|\mathbf{H}\|_2$  in large datasets, we run 10 iterations of power iteration to approximate the largest eigenvalue, which quickly converge to desired precisions  $\leq 10^{-5}$ .

### A.2 Nonconvex Case

For all experiments, we run 3 epochs of optimization with SGD and Adagrad, which is one of the recommended settings of the Alpaca dataset [Taori et al., 2023] ([https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca?tab=readme-ov-file#fine-tuning](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca?tab=readme-ov-file#fine-tuning)). We search the learning rate  $\eta \in \{1.0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}\}$  and report the best result in training loss for both SGD and Adagrad. The maximum sequence length is set to 512, along with the learning rate schedule being set to cosine decay [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2016]. Other settings remain the same as default ones in huggingface `transformers` (<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>). In all our implementations, we use the version `transformers==4.38.2`. All experiments are conducted on a single A40 GPU, where gradient accumulation is adopted for batch sizes larger than 128 to reduce memory cost.

Regarding licenses, the Alpaca dataset is released under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Public License ([https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca/blob/main/DATA\\_LICENSE](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca/blob/main/DATA_LICENSE)), while GPT-2 is released under MIT License (<https://huggingface.co/openai-community/gpt2>). The code repository of huggingface ‘transformers’ is released under Apache License 2.0 (<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers/blob/main/LICENSE>).

## B An Example in the Convex Case

Following the SVM example in Duchi et al. [2011], we provide Example B.1 to create a concrete case to help our illustration.

**Example B.1.** Consider a finite-sum optimization problem in a hypercube  $\mathcal{W}$ :

$$f(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{w}),$$

where  $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are convex and twice-differentiable functions and  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ . We assume that the first and second order derivatives are bounded such that  $|\phi_i'(\mathbf{w})| \leq G_1$  and  $\phi_i''(\mathbf{w}) \leq G_2$  for all  $i$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ . We also assume that the data points  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  yield that

$$\left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^2 \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq M_p,$$

for  $p \geq 1$  and denote  $\mathbf{H} = 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top$ . In this case, stochastic gradient yields that

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}; \xi) = \mathbf{x}_\xi \cdot \phi'_\xi(\mathbf{x}_\xi^\top \mathbf{w}),$$

where  $\xi$  is uniformly sampled from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

Note that Example B.1 includes a wide range of problems such as linear and logistic regression. We can check that the problem in Example B.1 yields Assumptions of Theorem 4.1 and 5.1. As the stochastic gradients are sampled uniformly with replacement, the variance of gradient noise is reduced by factor  $M$ , where  $M$  is the batch size, as proven in Lemma C.2. We also assume an exponential tail to quantify the imbalance of Hessian in our following example.

**Assumption B.2.** We say the problem has an exponential tail when there exists some constants  $\tau > 1/d$  such that

$$\mathbf{H}_{j,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^2 \propto \exp(-\tau j)$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , where without loss of generality, we assume that  $\mathbf{H}_{j,j} \geq \mathbf{H}_{k,k}$  for all  $j \leq k$ .

Note that the exponential tail is a typical example of highly imbalanced distributions of data, which is common in natural language modeling Zipf [2016], social networks Muchnik et al. [2013], and recommender systems Yin et al. [2012]. Then recall the comparison between AdaGrad and SGD in the convex case:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AdaGrad: } \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}}{\sqrt{\phi(D)}} \cdot \frac{D_2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\phi(\mathbf{L})}{\phi(D)} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T}\right) \\ \text{SGD: } \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{D_2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and we take the ratios  $R_1 \triangleq \sqrt{\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/\phi(D)}$  and  $R_2 \triangleq \phi(\mathbf{L})/\phi(D)$ . As we take  $\mathcal{W}$  to be a hypercube, it holds that  $\phi(D) = D_2^2/(dD_\infty^2) = 1$ . Concerning  $R_1$ , we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \leq \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\phi'_i(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{w})]^2 \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^2} \leq G_1 M_1$$

and similarly,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2 \leq \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^d [\phi'_i(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{w})]^2 \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^2} \leq G_1 M_2.$$

Therefore, based on the heavy-tailed assumption (Assumption B.2), we can obtain that

$$R_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\phi(D)}} = \frac{M_1 D_\infty}{M_2 D_2} = \frac{M_1}{\sqrt{d} M_2} \propto \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\tau j)}{\sqrt{d \sum_{j=1}^d \exp(-\tau j)}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{1 - \exp(-\tau)}}{1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\tau)} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

If we consider  $\tau$  to be a mild constant, it should be clear that  $R_1$  can be close to  $1/\sqrt{d}$  and  $R_1 \ll 1$ . On the other side, we have for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi''_i(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top \preceq G_2 \mathbf{H}.$$

Moreover, that the diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{L}_m = \text{diagonal}(\mathbf{L})$  satisfies  $\mathbf{L}_m \succeq G_2 \mathbf{H}$  is a sufficient condition for the smoothness assumption (Assumption 3.3). This is equivalent to that  $\left\| \mathbf{L}_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{L}_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \leq 1/G_2$ . Thus actually  $\mathbf{L}_m$  can be taken as the optimal solution to an optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \left\| \mathbf{L}_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{L}_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{G_2},$$

which shares a similar form with the optimal diagonal preconditioner problem in solving linear systems, where an optimal preconditioner for a fixed matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  can result in much faster convergence as pointed out in [Qu et al. \[2022\]](#). As an example, when  $\mathbf{H}$  is diagonally dominant, we can choose  $\mathbf{L}_m = \text{diagonal}(2G_2 \mathbf{H})$  which takes the diagonal entries. Then we have  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty = 2G_2 \mathbf{H}_{1,1}$  and  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 = 2G_2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{H})$ . In this case, based on the heavy-tailed assumption (Assumption B.2), we have

$$R_2 = \frac{\phi(\mathbf{L})}{\phi(D)} = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}) D_\infty^2}{\mathbf{H}_{1,1} D_\infty^2} = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H})}{d \mathbf{H}_{1,1}} \propto \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \exp(-\tau j)}{d \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\tau)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-\tau)} \cdot \frac{1}{d}.$$

When  $\tau$  is a mild constant, it should be clear that  $R_2$  can be close to  $1/d$  and  $R_2 \ll 1$ .

To conclude, in this concrete example, we address that  $R_1$  can be close to  $1/\sqrt{d}$ ,  $R_2$  can be close to  $1/d$  and both  $R_1, R_2 \ll 1$ .

## C Proof Preliminaries

**Notation.** In the appendix, we define

$$\mathbf{n}_t \triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi) \quad (6)$$

to note the gradient noise at iteration  $t$ . We further use  $\nabla f_{t,j}$ ,  $\mathbf{g}_{t,j}$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{t,j}$  to denote the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)$ ,  $\mathbf{g}_t$  and  $\mathbf{n}_t$ , separately.

**Lemma C.1** (Projection). *Suppose  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is a closed convex set and  $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is symmetric and positive definite. Then for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{\Lambda}}[\mathbf{w}]$  if and only if for all  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 \quad (7)$$

or equivalently, for all  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle \leq 0. \quad (8)$$

*Proof.* Equation (7) simply follows the definition. To prove (8), take any  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we know that  $\alpha \mathbf{z} + (1 - \alpha) \bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{W}$  as  $\mathcal{W}$  is a convex set. Hence by (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - [\alpha \mathbf{z} + (1 - \alpha) \bar{\mathbf{w}}]\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 \\ \iff \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) - \alpha(\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 \\ &\iff 0 \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 - \alpha \langle \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle \\ \iff \langle \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle &\leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\alpha$  can be arbitrarily close to 0, we have that (8) holds.  $\square$

With the definition of (6), we can obtain the following lemma describing the variance reduced by batch size  $M$ .

**Lemma C.2** (Variance reduced by batch size). *Under Assumption 3.4, 3.5, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2] \leq \frac{\sigma_j^2}{M}. \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* It holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_t [\mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2] = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \mathbf{n}_j(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi) \right)^2 \right] \stackrel{(4)}{=} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}_t} \mathbb{E}_t [(\mathbf{n}_j(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi))^2] \stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \frac{\sigma_j^2}{M},$$

where the second equality is based on the independence of  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{w}_t; \xi)$ .  $\square$

## D Proof of Section 4

### D.1 Convex

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* For  $\mathbf{w}_* \in \mathcal{W}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2] &\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{w}_t - \eta_t \mathbf{g}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2] \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle] + \eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_2^2] \\ &= \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle + \eta_t^2 \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2 + \eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{n}_t\|_2^2], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_t = \mathbf{g}_t - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)$ . With convexity and standard smoothness of  $f(\cdot)$ , we have

$$\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle \geq f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2.$$

Then after rearranging, it holds that

$$(2 - \eta_t \|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty)(f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)) \leq \frac{1}{\eta_t} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{\eta_t} \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2] + \eta_t \mathbb{E}_t [\|\mathbf{n}_t\|_2^2].$$

If we take summation and full expectation with  $\eta_t \leq 1/L$  and  $\eta_t \leq \eta_{t+1}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\eta_t} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{\eta_t} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 \right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \eta_t \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{n}_t\|_2^2] \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\eta_t} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{\eta_t} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 \right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\eta_t \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_0} \|\mathbf{w}_0 - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{\eta_{T-1}} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{w}_T - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2] + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2] \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\eta_t \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \frac{D_2^2}{\eta_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left( \frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} \right) D_2^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\eta_t \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \\ &= \frac{D_2^2}{\eta_{T-1}} + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\eta_t \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2 = \sigma_V^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{V})$ . Therefore, by having both sides of the inequality divided by  $T$  and making use of the convexity, we conclude the proof that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] \stackrel{\text{Asm. 3.1}}{\leq} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] \leq \frac{D_2^2}{\eta_{T-1}T} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{MT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \eta_t,$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T = 1/T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{w}_t$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2 = \sigma_V^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{V})$ . Then by taking

$$\eta_t = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty}, \sqrt{p \frac{D_2^2 M}{\sigma_2^2(t+1)}} \right\},$$

where  $p$  is a constant, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_T) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &\leq \frac{D_2^2}{\eta_{T-1}T} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{MT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \eta_t \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty D_2^2}{T} + \sqrt{\frac{D_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{MT}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{D_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{MT}} \cdot 2\sqrt{p}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds as

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}} \leq 2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1} + \sqrt{t}} = 2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\sqrt{t+1} - \sqrt{t}}{t+1-t} = 2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{t+1} - \sqrt{t} = 2\sqrt{T}.$$

Thus by taking  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ , we finish the proof.  $\square$

## D.2 Nonconvex

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Based on the smoothness condition, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|_2^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2}{2} \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_2^2 \\ &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2 \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2 \|\mathbf{n}_t\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - \eta_t \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{g}_t \rangle] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_2^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - \eta_t \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{n}_t\|_2^2] \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - \eta_t \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{2M} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - \frac{\eta_t}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta_t^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{2M}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_t = \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \mathbf{g}_t$  and the last inequality holds as we take  $\eta_t \leq 1/\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty$ . As  $\eta_t \equiv \eta$ , we have after rearranging that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_2^2] &\leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)]}{\eta T} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M} \\ &\leq \frac{2(f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*)}{\eta T} + \frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \eta \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2}{M}. \end{aligned}$$



Then by taking  $\eta = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty}, \sqrt{\frac{(f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*)M}{\|\mathbf{L}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2^2 T}} \right\}$ , we finish the proof.  $\square$

## E Proof of Section 5

### E.1 Convex

To prove Theorem 5.1, we first look at the standard AdaGrad convergence under the non-smooth convex stochastic optimization setting.

**Theorem E.1** (Convergence for convex nonsmooth AdaGrad). *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.4, for the sequence  $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  generated by Algorithm 1 with constant step size  $\eta_t \equiv \eta$ , it holds that*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - f(\mathbf{w}_*) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \eta + \frac{D_\infty^2}{\eta} \right) \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{2\eta} \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* This proof is a stochastic optimization version of the proof of AdaGrad in the online convex learning scheme Duchi et al. [2011], Streeter and McMahan [2010], Zhang [2023]. We also include the proof here for completeness.

First, we give an important result that the gradient norm can be expressed as  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}$ .

$$\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j} + \lambda_{t-1,j}} = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda_{t,j}^2 - \lambda_{t-1,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j} + \lambda_{t-1,j}} = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}), \quad (11)$$

where we note  $\lambda_{t,j}$  is the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t$ . Then we start the proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 \right] &\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* - \eta_t \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 - 2\eta_t \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle + \eta_t^2 \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 \right] - 2\eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta_t^2 \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 \right] - 2\eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_* \rangle + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta_t^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}) \right] \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}}^2 - 2\eta_t (f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)) + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta_t^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}}^2 - 2\eta_t (f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)) + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta_t^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ D_\infty^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality holds as  $f(\cdot)$  is convex. After taking  $\eta_t = \eta$ , summing up, taking full expectation and rearrangement, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1}}^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t}^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{D_\infty^2}{2\eta} \right) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{t-1})] \\ &= \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{w}_0 - \mathbf{w}_*\|_2^2}{2\eta} - \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_T - \mathbf{w}_*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T-1}}^2}{2\eta} + \left( \frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{D_\infty^2}{2\eta} \right) \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T-1} - \epsilon \mathbf{I}_d] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{2\eta} + \left(\frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{D_\infty^2}{2\eta}\right) \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{2\eta} + \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{D_\infty^2}{2\eta}\right) \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we take  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{-1} = \epsilon \mathbf{I}_d$  and the last inequality holds as  $\sqrt{x+y} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}$  for all  $x, y \geq 0$ .  $\square$

Then we consider giving a bound on the noise summation term.

**Lemma E.2** (variance bound). *Under Assumption 3.4 and 3.5, it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \right] \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}}.$$

*Proof.* If we note  $\mathbf{V}_j$  as the  $j$ -th diagonal coordinate of  $\mathbf{V}$ , it holds that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2]} \right] \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{V}}^2}{M} \mathbf{V}_j} = \frac{\sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}},$$

where the first inequality holds as Jensen's inequality.  $\square$

Then we are ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* From Theorem E.1, we can obtain that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t)] - f(\mathbf{w}_*) \stackrel{(10)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\eta + \frac{D_\infty^2}{\eta}\right) \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{2\eta},$$

and in Lemma E.2 we bound the noise term. Then we consider the bias term. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} \right] \stackrel{(23)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{L_j}} \right] \\
&\leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{L_j} \right]} = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_{\mathbf{L}^{-1}}^2]},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses Lemma F.1 and the second inequality holds as the Jensen's inequality. Moreover, if we make use of Assumption 3.3, we can obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_{\mathbf{L}^{-1}}^2] \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)].$$

Thus if we denote  $A = 1/T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)]$ , then combining (10), there is a simplified expression that

$$A - CC_1 \sqrt{A} - CC_0 \leq 0,$$

where from Theorem E.1 and Lemma E.2,

$$C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \eta + \frac{D_\infty^2}{\eta} \right), \quad C_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2 \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T}}, \quad C_0 = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{2\eta TC}.$$

Then we can solve this inequality by conducting simple derivation that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{A} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[ CC_1 + \sqrt{C^2 C_1^2 + 4CC_0} \right] \\ \implies A &\leq \frac{1}{2} [C^2 C_1^2 + (C^2 C_1^2 + 4CC_0)] \\ &= C^2 C_1^2 + 2CC_0. \end{aligned}$$

If we replace  $C, C_0$  and  $C_1$  by their corresponding value, we can obtain that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \eta + \frac{D_\infty^2}{\eta} \right)^2 \frac{2 \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \eta + \frac{D_\infty^2}{\eta} \right) \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{\eta T}$$

If we further take the optimal step size  $\eta = D_\infty$  based on this bound, we can obtain that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)] \leq \frac{4 \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 D_\infty^2}{T} + \frac{\sqrt{2} D_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\epsilon D_2^2}{D_\infty T},$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### E.1.1 Relaxation of the Noise Assumption

Note that Assumption 3.5 assumes a universal bound on the noise. However, similar to a line of recent works on SGD Richtárik and Takác [2020], Gower et al. [2019, 2021], Khaled and Richtárik [2020], Theorem 5.1 can also be extended to the settings that we only assume noise on  $\mathbf{w}_*$  as Assumption E.3, with Assumption 3.3 replaced by an assumption that aligns with the expected smoothness (Assumption E.4). Based on this setting, our analysis can be well adapted to the interpolation or overparameterized scheme.

**Assumption E.3** (Anisotropic noise on  $\mathbf{w}^*$ ). There exists a positive vector  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_* = [\sigma_{*,1}, \dots, \sigma_{*,d}] \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that for all  $\mathbf{w}_* \in \mathcal{W}$  that are minimum, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{n}_j(\mathbf{w}_*; \xi)^2] \leq \sigma_j^2 \quad \text{for all } j \in [d]. \quad (12)$$

**Assumption E.4** (Expected anisotropic smoothness). There exists a positive vector  $\mathbf{L}_* = [L_{*,1}, \dots, L_{*,d}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$  such that  $f(\cdot)$  is  $\mathbf{L}_*$ -expected smooth, namely, for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$  is the stochastic gradient oracle and  $\mathbf{w}_* \in \mathcal{W}$  that is the minimum, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_*)\|_{\mathbf{L}_*^{-1}}^2 \right] \leq f(\mathbf{w}) - f(\mathbf{w}_*). \quad (13)$$

With these two assumptions replaced, we may rewrite the last step in Theorem E.1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2} \right] &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2]} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[2|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_t) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_*)|_j^2]} + \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[2|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_*)|_j^2]} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(23),(12)}{\leq} \sqrt{2 \|\mathbf{L}_*\|_1 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_t) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_*)\|_{\mathbf{L}_*^{-1}}^2 \right]} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_*\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{2T}{M}} \\
&\stackrel{(13)}{\leq} \sqrt{4 \|\mathbf{L}_*\|_1 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)]} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_*\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{2T}{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can process the proof of Theorem 5.1 in the same manner, which guarantees our convergence result in this case.

## E.2 Nonconvex

Let us first give a brief overview of the proof of AdaGrad in nonconvex cases. Based on Assumption 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2 \\
&= f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Unlike in SGD, here a critical problem is it is nontrivial to straightforwardly transfer  $\mathbb{E}_t[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle]$  to  $\mathbb{E}_t[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|]$  as both  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t$  and  $\mathbf{g}_t$  is relevant with  $\mathbf{g}_t$ . To deal with this issue, we consider diagonal matrix  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t$  with each diagonal entry being

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}^2 = \lambda_{t-1,j}^2 + \nabla f_{t,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2. \quad (14)$$

for all  $j \in [d]$ . Note that here we only consider the case batch size  $M = 1$  for clearness. For general  $M$ , based on Lemma C.2, the results are straightforward by replacing  $\sigma_j$  by  $\sigma_j/\sqrt{M}$ . Note that this auxiliary sequence is a coordinate-wise version of that employed in Ward et al. [2020]. Then we consider

$$-\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle = -\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}) \mathbf{g}_t \rangle$$

and attempt to bound the second term, which is described in Lemma E.5. With the second term bounded, the final convergence property would be determined by

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle \right],$$

which largely relies on  $\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t)]$  that we bound in Lemma E.6. Then we could be ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.2.

**Lemma E.5** (Bound of  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}) \mathbf{g}_t \rangle$ ). *Under the same setting as Theorem 5.2 and assume batch size  $M = 1$ , if we take diagonal matrix  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t$  as defined in (14), it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}) \mathbf{g}_t \rangle \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^d 2\sigma_j \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t) \rangle. \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \left( \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} - \Lambda_t^{-1} \right) \mathbf{g}_t \right\rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla f_{t,j} \mathbf{g}_{t,j} \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{t,j}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\nabla f_{t,j} \mathbf{g}_{t,j} (\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2 - \nabla f_{t,j}^2 - \sigma_j^2)}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j} (\lambda_{t,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j})} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2 - \nabla f_{t,j}^2 - \sigma_j^2|}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j} (\lambda_{t,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j})} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2 - \nabla f_{t,j}^2|}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j} (\lambda_{t,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j})} + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \sigma_j^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j} (\lambda_{t,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j})} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \left( \|\mathbf{g}_{t,j}\| - |\nabla f_{t,j}| \right)}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j}} + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \sigma_j}{\lambda_{t,j} \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}},
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where in the first and second inequality we take the properties of absolute values. In the last inequality, we use the fact that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}^2 = \lambda_{t-1,j}^2 + \nabla f_{t,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2 \geq \sigma_j^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{t,j}^2 = \lambda_{t-1,j}^2 + \mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2 \geq \mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2.$$

Then we consider an arbitrary coordinate  $j \in [d]$ . We first consider the first term of the right-hand side of (16). By applying inequality (24) with

$$c = \frac{2\sigma_j^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}}, \quad x = \frac{|\mathbf{g}_{t,j}|}{\lambda_{t,j}}, \quad y = \frac{|\mathbf{g}_{t,j} - \nabla f_{t,j}| |\nabla f_{t,j}|}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}},$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j} \mathbf{g}_{t,j}| |\nabla f_{t,j} - \mathbf{g}_{t,j}|}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j}} \right] &\stackrel{(24)}{\leq} \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}}{4\sigma_j^2} \cdot \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}^2} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ |\mathbf{g}_{t,j} - \nabla f_{t,j}|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \sigma_j \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{4\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we turn to the second term of (16). By applying inequality (24) with

$$c = \frac{2\sigma_j^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}}, \quad x = \frac{|\mathbf{g}_{t,j}|}{\lambda_{t,j}}, \quad y = \frac{\sigma_j |\nabla f_{t,j}|}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}},$$

it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \sigma_j}{\lambda_{t,j} \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}} \right] \stackrel{(24)}{\leq} \sigma_j \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{4\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}}.$$

Thus by substituting into (16), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \left( \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} - \Lambda_t^{-1} \right) \mathbf{g}_t \right\rangle \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \left( \|\mathbf{g}_{t,j}\| - |\nabla f_{t,j}| \right)}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j}} + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|\nabla f_{t,j}| |\mathbf{g}_{t,j}| \sigma_j}{\lambda_{t,j} \tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d 2\sigma_j \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{2\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d 2\sigma_j \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma E.6** (Bound of  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})$ ). *Under the same settings of Theorem 5.2 and  $M = 1$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})] \leq 2d\epsilon + \frac{2}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + 5 \left( \eta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \right) \ln \left( \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\epsilon} + e \right). \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* From  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ -based smoothness, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^2 + \eta \langle \mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then after summation and rearrangement, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \eta \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1})] + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} + \eta \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{n}_{t,j} \mathbf{g}_{t,j}}{\lambda_{t,j}} \\ &\stackrel{(25)}{\leq} f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \ln \left( \frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon} \right) + \eta \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{n}_{t,j} \mathbf{g}_{t,j}}{\lambda_{t,j}} \\ &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \ln \left( \frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon} \right) + \eta \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. Moreover, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}} \geq \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j} + \lambda_{t-1,j}} = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\lambda_{t,j} - \lambda_{t-1,j}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{-1}),$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{-1} = \epsilon \mathbf{I}_d$ . Then by combining the two inequalities and taking expectation, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})] &\leq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{-1}) + \frac{1}{\eta} [f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}} \right] \\ &\leq d\epsilon + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \ln \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}} \right] \\ &\leq d\epsilon + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \ln \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{n}_{t,j}^2 \right]} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2} \right]} \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(5),(25)}{\leq} d\epsilon + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \frac{\eta}{2}\sum_{j=1}^d L_j \ln\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon}\right]\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{T}\sigma_j \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\ln\left(\frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon}\right)\right]} \\
&\leq d\epsilon + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \left(\frac{\eta}{2}\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T}\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1\right) \ln\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T-1})^2]}{\epsilon}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is based on the Jensen's inequality and the third inequality is based on the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Then by taking

$$C_1 = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\eta}{2}\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T}\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1\right), \quad C_0 = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(d\epsilon + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)]\right)$$

in Lemma F.4, we can obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T-1})] \leq 2d\epsilon + \frac{2}{\eta}\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + 5\left(\eta\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{T}\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1\right) \ln\left(\frac{\eta\|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T}\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\epsilon} + e\right),$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Then we are ready to proof Theorem 5.2.

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* Let us first consider the case  $M = 1$  for clearness. By taking  $\eta_t \equiv \eta$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1})^{(3)} &\leq f(\mathbf{w}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2 \\
&= f(\mathbf{w}_t) - \eta \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle + \frac{\eta^2}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by taking summation over 0 to  $T - 1$  and expectation, we have

$$-\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] \leq -\eta \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle] + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{j=1}^d L_j \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}\right]. \quad (18)$$

We first consider the third term in (18). Based on Lemma F.3, it holds that for all  $j \in [d]$ ,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}\right] \stackrel{(25)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\ln\left(\frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon}\right)\right] \leq \ln\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon}\right]\right), \quad (19)$$

where the last inequality is based on Jensen's inequality. Then by taking summation and full expectation and substituting Lemma E.5, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle] &= -\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle\right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{-1}) \mathbf{g}_t \rangle\right] \\
&\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle\right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{j=1}^d 2\sigma_j \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{g}_{t,j}^2}{\lambda_{t,j}^2}\right] \\
&\stackrel{(19)}{\leq} -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle\right] + \sum_{j=1}^d 2\sigma_j \ln\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2}{\epsilon}\right]\right) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \rangle\right] + 2\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \ln\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T-1})^2)}{\epsilon}\right]\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_t$  is defined as (14) such that  $\tilde{\lambda}_{t,j}^2 = \lambda_{t-1,j}^2 + \nabla f_{t,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2$  for all coordinate  $j \in [d]$ . Therefore, after substituting the inequality into (18), it holds

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \right\rangle \right] \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbb{E} [f(\mathbf{w}_t) - f(\mathbf{w}_{t+1})] + \left( 2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \right) \ln \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})^2)}{\epsilon} \right] \right). \quad (20)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \mathbf{g}_t \right\rangle \right] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_t^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{t-1,j}^2 + \nabla f_{t,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2}} \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\nabla f_{t,j}^2}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2}} \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} \right] \right)^2}{\mathbb{E} \left[ 2\sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right]} \\ &\geq \frac{\left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} \right] \right)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ 2\sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right]}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where in the second last and last inequality we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[|XY|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \mathbb{E}[|Y|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^d |X_j Y_j| \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^d X_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d Y_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We can further deal with the denominator such that for all  $j \in [d]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{s,j}^2} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{s,j}^2} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} (\mathbf{g}_{s,j} - \mathbf{n}_{s,j})^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right] \\ &\leq 3\mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{s,j}^2} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} 2\mathbf{n}_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} 3\mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{g}_{s,j}^2} \right] + 2\sqrt{T}\sigma_j = 3\mathbb{E}[\lambda_{t,j}] + 2\sqrt{T}\sigma_j, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the inequalities are based on algebra. Therefore, with Lemma E.6 bounding  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_t)$ , combining (20) with (21) and (22) we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} \right] \right)^2 \\
& \stackrel{(20),(21)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda_{T-1,j}^2 + \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{s,j}^2 + \sigma_j^2} \right] \\
& \quad \cdot \left( \frac{2}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \left( 2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \right) \ln \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})^2)}{\epsilon} \right] \right) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(22)}{\leq} \left( 6 \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})] + 2\sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left( \frac{2}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + \left( 2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \right) \ln \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{T-1})^2)}{\epsilon} \right] \right) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(17)}{\leq} 6 \left( 5B(\eta) + 2d\epsilon + 12\sqrt{TV} \right) \cdot (2B(\eta) + 2V),
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote

$$B(\eta) = \frac{1}{\eta} (f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*) + \eta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \left( C_{\log} + \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right), \quad V = \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \left( C_{\log} + \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{\log} &= 2 \ln \left( 2d\epsilon + \frac{2}{\eta} [f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f(\mathbf{w}_T)] + 5 \left( \frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 \right) \ln \left( \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 + \sqrt{T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\epsilon} + e \right) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(\log T)
\end{aligned}$$

based on Lemma E.6. By taking  $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{\Delta}}$ , we can obtain that

$$B(\eta) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{\|\mathbf{L}\|_1} (f(\mathbf{w}_0) - f^*) \right).$$

Then combining the fact proven in Lemma F.5 that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \nabla f_{t,j}^2} \geq \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_1^2},$$

and replacing  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1$  by  $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 / \sqrt{M}$  based on Lemma C.2 for general  $M \geq 1$ , we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_t)\|_1^2} \right] \right)^2 &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\Delta} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1^2}{M\sqrt{T}} \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{\Delta \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1^2}{MT} \right) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \frac{d\epsilon \sqrt{\Delta} \|\mathbf{L}\|_1}{T} + \frac{d\epsilon \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1}{\sqrt{MT}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## F Useful Lemmas

**Lemma F.1** (A useful inequality). *Assume a non-negative sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$  and a positive sequence  $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^n$  with  $S = \sum_{i=1}^n s_j$ , it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{S} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{x_j^2}{s_j}}. \quad (23)$$

The inequality holds as an equality if and only if for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\frac{x_i}{s_i} = \frac{x_j}{s_j}.$$

*Proof.* We first multiply  $S$  by both sides and take the square, then the right-hand side minus the left-hand side will be

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{S}{s_j} x_j^2 - \left( \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \right)^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s_i}{s_j} x_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_j \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{s_i}{s_j} x_j^2 - \sum_{j \neq i} x_i x_j \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \sqrt{\frac{s_i}{s_j}} x_j - \sqrt{\frac{s_j}{s_i}} x_i \right)^2 \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. Note that this result is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma F.2** (A basic inequality). *For  $c \geq 0$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , it holds that*

$$|xy| \leq \frac{c}{2} x^2 + \frac{1}{2c} y^2. \quad (24)$$

**Lemma F.3** (Sum of ratios with the denominator being the sum of past numerators). *Assume a non-negative sequence  $(a_n)$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . We define  $b_n = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ . Then it holds that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^N \frac{a_t}{b_t + \epsilon} \leq \ln \left( \frac{b_N + \epsilon}{\epsilon} \right). \quad (25)$$

*Proof.* It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_t}{b_t + \epsilon} &\leq -\ln \left( 1 - \frac{a_t}{\epsilon + b_t} \right) \\ &= \ln(b_t + \epsilon) - \ln(b_t - a_t + \epsilon) \\ &= \ln(b_t + \epsilon) - \ln(b_{t-1} + \epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is based on the fact that  $x \leq \ln(1+x)$  for all  $x > -1$  and we set  $b_0 = 0$ . Then by summing up for 1 to  $N$  we finish the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma F.4** (Solving inequality  $x \leq C_0 + C_1 \ln x$ ). *Assume  $C_1 \geq C_0 \geq 0$  and  $x > 0$ . If  $x \leq C_0 + C_1 \ln x$  (where  $\ln$  denotes the natural logarithm), it holds that for  $\zeta \geq 5$ ,*

$$x \leq 2C_0 + \zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e). \quad (26)$$

*Proof.* Denote  $g(x) = x - C_1 \ln x - C_0$ . Then we have  $g$  is a convex function and attains uniform lower bound at  $C_1$ . For  $x \geq C_1$ ,  $g$  is a monotonically increasing function. Therefore, to verify (26), it is equivalent to verify that if  $x = 2C_0 + \zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e)$ , where  $\zeta = 5$ , then  $x \geq C_0 + C_1 \ln x$ . We begin the verification then.

Denote  $z = 2C_0 + \zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} z - (C_0 + C_1 \ln z) &= z - (C_0 + C_1 \ln(2C_0 + \zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e))) \\ &\geq z - \left( C_0 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2C_0 + C_1 \ln(\zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e)) \right) \\ &= C_1 (\zeta \ln(C_1 + e) - \ln(\zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e))), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is based on the fact that

$$C_1 \ln(2C_0 + \zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e)) \leq \frac{1}{2} C_0 + C_1 \ln(\zeta C_1 \ln(C_1 + e))$$

for  $C_0 \geq 0$  and  $\zeta \geq 2$ . Then let us consider function  $h(y) = \zeta \ln(y + e) - \ln(\zeta y \ln(y + e))$  for  $y \geq 0$  and we have  $h(1) \geq 0$ . We also have

$$h'(y) = \frac{\zeta}{y + e} - \frac{1}{\zeta y \ln(y + e)} \left( \zeta \ln(y + e) + \frac{\zeta y}{y + e} \right) = \frac{\zeta}{y + e} - \frac{1}{y} - \frac{1}{(y + e) \ln(y + e)},$$

which implies that if  $y \geq 1$ , we have  $h'(y) \geq 0$  and thus  $h(y) \geq 0$  for  $y \geq 1$ . For  $y \in [0, 1)$ , it is also straightforward to obtain that  $h(y) \geq \zeta - \ln(\zeta \ln(1 + e)) \geq 0$ . Therefore, we conclude that  $h(y) \geq 0$ . By substituting  $y = C_1$ , we have

$$z - (C_0 + C_1 \ln z) \geq 0$$

and thus  $x \leq C_0 + C_1 \ln x$  implies  $x \leq z$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma F.5** (comparison of measures). *For a sequence  $\{a_{t,j}\}$  with  $t = 1, \dots, T$  and  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , it holds that*

$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j}^2} \right)^2 \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d |a_{t,j}| \right)^2. \quad (27)$$

*Proof.* It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j}^2} \right)^2 \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d |a_{t,j}| \right)^2 \\ \iff &\sum_{j_1 \neq j_2}^d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j_1}^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j_2}^2} \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2}^d |a_{t,j_1} a_{t,j_2}| \\ \iff &\sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j_1}^2 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,j_2}^2 \geq \left( \sum_{t=1}^T |a_{t,j_1} a_{t,j_2}| \right)^2, \quad \forall j_1 \neq j_2. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. Thus we finish the proof.  $\square$