

Non-Euclidean High-Order Smooth Convex Optimization

Juan Pablo Contreras*

*Institute for Mathematical and Computational Engineering
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile*

JCONTRERE@UC.CL

Cristóbal Guzmán*

*Institute for Mathematical and Computational Engineering
Faculty of Mathematics and School of Engineering
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile*

CRGUZMANP@MAT.UC.CL

David Martínez-Rubio*

*Signal Theory and Communications Department,
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain*

DMRUBIO@ING.UC3M.ES

Abstract

We develop algorithms for the optimization of convex objectives that have Hölder continuous q -th derivatives with respect to a p -norm by using a q -th order oracle, for $p, q \geq 1$. We can also optimize other structured functions. We do this by developing a non-Euclidean inexact accelerated proximal point method that makes use of an inexact uniformly convex regularizer. We also provide nearly matching lower bounds for any deterministic algorithm that interacts with the function via a local oracle.

1. Introduction

In this work, we study the optimization of a general convex q -times differentiable function f whose q -th derivative is (L, ν) -Hölder continuous with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, for $p \in [1, \infty]$, that is,

$$\|\nabla^q f(x) - \nabla^q f(y)\|_{p_*} \leq L\|x - y\|_p \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1)$$

where $p_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 1/p)^{-1}$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1]$. In this case, we say f is q -th order (L, ν) -Hölder smooth. We make use of an oracle that returns all derivatives of f at a point up to order q . We also study the optimization of convex functions with a reduction to inexact p -norm ball optimization oracles. That is, using an oracle to approximately minimize the function in balls of fixed radius with respect to a p -norm, we minimize the function globally. The oracle can be implemented fast for some functions with structure.

We note that [Bae09] was the first work to develop (unaccelerated) general high-order methods under convexity and high-order smoothness, defined with respect to the Euclidean norm. [Nes21] showed that choosing the right weight for the regularizer, the proximal subproblems appearing in [Bae09] are convex. Previously, Monteiro and Svaiter [MS13] developed a general accelerated inexact proximal point algorithm, for which they achieved near optimal second-order oracle complexity for convex functions with a Lipschitz Hessian with respect to the Euclidean norm. Building on this framework, three works [GDG+19; BJL+19; JWZ19] independently achieved near optimal

. *Equal contribution.

q -th order oracle complexity for high-order Euclidean smooth convex optimization. Later [KG22; CHJ+22] concurrently achieved optimal q -th order oracle complexity, up to constants, by improving over previous solutions by logarithmic factors, via two very different techniques. [SJM19] studied the problem above in its full generality for functions with p -norm regularity, but they only solved the case where $p < q + 1$, where q is the degree of the high-order oracle. Besides, their algorithm requires solving two different regularized Taylor expansions of the function with different regularization functions, and also a binary search per iteration.

In this work, we propose an inexact accelerated proximal point algorithm that, by making use of an inexact uniformly convex regularizer and a q -th order oracle, it solves the problem for every $p, q \geq 1$, and does not need a binary search per iteration. We also provide lower bounds for any deterministic algorithm that interacts with a local oracle of the function. The upper and lower bounds match up to constant and logarithmic factors.

Regarding lower bounds, Arjevani, Shamir, and Shiff [ASS19] showed a lower bound for deterministic algorithms for convex functions with Lipschitz q -th derivatives with respect to the Euclidean norm, by providing a hard function in the form of a $(q + 1)$ -degree polynomial, which afterward the algorithms mentioned proved to be optimal. Later and independently, [AH18] developed some suboptimal lower bounds by an interesting technique consisting of compounding randomized smoothing by repeated convolution of a hard convex Lipschitz instance resulting in a function with Lipschitz high-order derivatives. In this spirit and inspired by them, [GKN+21] developed a nearly optimal lower bound via applying randomized smoothing to a construction similar to the classical Lipschitz instance consisting of a maximum of linear functions, but using the maximum of a variant of these functions via applying several softmax. They achieve, up to logarithmic factors, the lower bound in [ASS19], but they also provide lower bounds for highly parallel randomized algorithms, and for quantum algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, before this work no lower bound was developed for the non-Euclidean convex q -th order Hölder smooth case, except for $q = 1$.

In this work, in the spirit of [GKN+21], we construct lower bounds by composing a non-Euclidean randomized smoothing with a hard Lipschitz instance built as the maximum of softmax of an increasing sequence of linear functions. We firstly prove by the divergence theorem that if a function f is G -Lipschitz with respect to a p -norm, then the function that at each point x evaluates to the average of f in a p -norm ball of fixed radius is differentiable with Lipschitz gradient with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$. Interestingly, our technique to construct a smoothing of a hard instance for the convex Lipschitz case to obtain a hard instance for the convex high-order smooth case works seamlessly for all values of $p \in [1, \infty]$, whereas all previous non-Euclidean smoothing techniques, e.g. [GN15; Guz15; DG20], would only work for $p \geq 2$. All existing lower bounds for smooth convex optimization with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, and $p \in [1, 2)$ had come from intricate reductions based on high-dimensional embeddings from the $p = \infty$ case, even for deterministic algorithms in the first-order smooth case. In fact, it is known that the requirements for a local infimal convolution smoothing kernel are unattainable for $p \in [1, 2)$ without paying polynomial in the dimension factors (this is implicit in e.g. [dGJ18, Example 5.1]). However, our combination of composing a local randomized smoothing with the construction based on the softmax function circumvents this difficulty. We believe this technique will simplify current non-Euclidean lower-bound analyses and will become suitable for generalizations.

Concurrent independent work. We note that the concurrent work [ABJ+24], independently showed primal convergence of an analogous accelerated non-Euclidean proximal algorithm. As opposed to them, we also introduced the notion of inexact uniformly convex regularizers and proved

primal-dual convergence when we use such regularizers, as well as when we allow for the inexact implementation of the proximal oracles. [ABJ+24] also apply their framework to the optimization of non-Euclidean high-order smooth convex functions by exactly solving a regularized Taylor expansion of the function. However, we studied the more general q -order ν -Hölder smooth case with respect to a p -norm and established the optimal or near-optimal convergence, by inexactly solving a regularized Taylor expansion, for all cases $p \geq 1$, $q \geq 1$, $\nu \in (0, 1]$, where the smooth case corresponds to $\nu = 1$. The analysis of [ABJ+24] is limited to $p \geq 2$ and $q + 1 \leq p$.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout, we consider a finite-dimensional normed space $(\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|)$, endowed with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Importantly, we do not assume the norm is induced by the inner product. We will primarily focus on the case $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_p$, where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

Definition 1 (Young’s conjugate number) *Given $p \in [1, \infty]$, we define its Young’s conjugate as $p_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 1/p)^{-1}$ so that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p_*} = 1$. For $p = 1$ it is $p_* = \infty$ and vice versa. It is well known that the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_p$ is $\|\cdot\|_{p_*}$.*

Definition 2 (Enlarged subdifferential) *Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we define the δ -enlarged subdifferential of f as*

$$\partial^\delta f(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{g \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(z) \geq f(y) + \langle g, z - y \rangle - \delta\} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We say any $g \in \partial^\delta f(y)$ is a δ -enlarged subgradient of f at y .

Definition 3 (Non-Euclidean Moreau envelope) *Given a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and a parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, define the Moreau envelope of a convex, proper, and closed function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as*

$$M_\lambda(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(y) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|x - y\|^2 \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where for $\lambda = 0$ we define $M_0(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(x)$. Similarly, we define $\text{Prox}_\lambda(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{f(y) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|x - y\|^2\}$ and $\text{prox}_\lambda(x) \in \text{Prox}_\lambda(x)$ to be an arbitrary element. We omit subindices if λ is clear from context.

We now present some properties of this envelope. The proof can be found in [Appendix B](#).

Proposition 4 (Envelope properties) \Downarrow *Using [Definition 3](#) and letting x^* be a minimizer of f , the following holds:*

1. *If $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_p$, for $p \in (1, \infty)$, $\text{Prox}(x)$ contains a single element. This may not be the case for $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$.*
2. *$M_\lambda(x)$ is convex.*
3. *$f(\text{prox}(x)) \leq M_\lambda(x) \leq f(x)$. In particular, $f(x^*) = M(x^*)$.*

4. Let $h_x(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \partial_x \frac{\|x-y\|^2}{2\lambda}$ be the subdifferential of $\frac{\|\cdot-y\|^2}{2\lambda}$ at x . Then $\partial M(x) = \text{conv}\{h_x(z) : z \in \text{Prox}(x)\}$
and there is $g \in h_x(\text{prox}(x))$ such that $g \in \partial f(\text{prox}(x))$.
5. For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g \in h_x(y)$, it is $\lambda \langle g, y - x \rangle = \|x - y\|^2 = \lambda^2 \|g\|_*^2$. In particular, for any $g \in h_x(\text{prox}(x)) \subseteq \partial M(x)$ we have $\|g\|_* = \frac{1}{\lambda} \|x - \text{prox}(x)\|$.
6. For any $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0$, we have the following descent condition:

$$M_{\lambda_1}(x) - M_{\lambda_2}(\text{prox}_{\lambda_1}(x)) \geq \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \|x - \text{prox}_{\lambda_1}(x)\|^2.$$

Given a function class \mathcal{F} and a set \mathcal{X} , a local oracle is a functional, mapping $(f, x) \mapsto \mathcal{O}_f(x)$ to a vector space, such that when queried with the same point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for two different functions $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ that are equal in a neighborhood of x , it returns the same answer [NY83; Nem95]. An example of such an oracle that we use for our upper bounds is a q -th order oracle, for $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Given the family \mathcal{F} of functions that are q -times differentiable, the q -th order oracle is defined as $\mathcal{O}_f(x) = (f(x), \nabla f(x), \dots, \nabla^q f(x))$. The main problem we study is the optimization of high-order Hölder-smooth functions convex functions by making use of a q -order oracle. Similarly to the definition of Hölder smoothness, we say a function is L -Lipschitz with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$ if $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L\|x - y\|_p$. For a convex function that has $(L, 1)$ -Hölder continuous first derivative with respect to some norm, we simply say that the function is L -smooth with respect to that norm.

Definition 5 (Bregman divergence) *Given a differentiable function ψ , we define the Bregman divergence of ψ at x, y as*

$$D_\psi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi(x) - \psi(y) - \langle \nabla \psi, x - y \rangle.$$

We also introduce the following definition. Our algorithms make use of regularizers with the property of inexact uniform convexity, which we introduce in the following and which is key in order to fully solve all cases of high-order smooth convex optimization.

Definition 6 (Uniform and inexact uniform convexity) *Given $\mu > 0, \sigma \geq 2$, a differentiable function ψ is said to be (μ, σ) -uniformly convex with respect to a norm $\|\cdot\|$, in a convex set \mathcal{X} , if for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ we have*

$$D_\psi(x, y) \geq \frac{\mu}{\sigma} \|x - y\|^\sigma.$$

Similarly, ψ is δ -inexact uniformly convex in \mathcal{X} if for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$D_\psi(x, y) \geq \frac{\mu}{\sigma} \|x - y\|^\sigma - \delta.$$

for $\delta > 0$, where now we allow for any $\sigma > 0$.

Uniformly convex functions with respect to some exponent are inexact uniformly convex functions with respect to smaller exponents.

Lemma 7 *Let ψ be a function that is $(1, \sigma)$ -uniformly convex, $\sigma \geq 2$. If $0 < s < \sigma$, then ψ is also $(a^{\frac{\sigma^2}{s(\sigma-s)}}, \frac{s(\sigma-s)}{\sigma})$ -inexact $(s^2 a^{\frac{\sigma}{s}}, s)$ -uniformly convex for any $a > 0$.*

Note that although (μ, σ) -uniform convexity is a property that requires $\sigma \geq 2$, our definition of δ -inexact (μ, s) -uniform convexity, and the example provided in the previous lemma, allows for any $s > 0$. Our algorithms work with inexact uniformly convex regularizers for $s > 1$.

Proof By using Young's inequality with conjugate exponents $\sigma/s > 1$ and $\sigma/(\sigma - s) > 1$:

$$\|x - y\|^s \leq \frac{1}{a^{\frac{\sigma}{s}} \sigma/s} \|x - y\|^\sigma + a^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-s}} \frac{\sigma - s}{\sigma},$$

or equivalently we have ① below

$$(s^2 a^{\frac{\sigma}{s}})^{\frac{1}{s}} \|x - y\|^s - a^{(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-s} + \frac{\sigma}{s})} \frac{s(\sigma - s)}{\sigma} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sigma} \|x - y\|^\sigma \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} D_\psi(x, y),$$

where ② holds by $(1, \sigma)$ -uniform convexity of ψ . Simplifying the left hand side yields the statement. \blacksquare

We will make use of the following regularizers.

Fact 8 (Regularizers' properties) *If $p \geq 2$, the regularizer $\psi(x) = \frac{1}{p} \|x - x_0\|_p^p$, is $(2^{-\frac{p(p-2)}{p-1}}, m)$ -uniformly convex regularizer with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, and if $p \leq 2$, $\psi = \frac{1}{2(p-1)} \|x - x_0\|_p^2$ is $(1, m)$ -uniformly convex with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, where $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{2, p\}$.*

See [Zal83, Proposition 3.2] and [BCL94] for these facts, respectively.

Notation. In this work, we mostly use functions that are regular with respect to p -norms, and use regularizers that are, possibly δ -inexact, (μ, r) -uniformly convex, and reserve the letters p, q, r, δ, μ for this. We always use $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{2, p\}$. We denote $\mathbb{1}_A$ the event indicator that is 1 if A holds true and 0 otherwise. We use $O_p(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ as the big- O notation omitting, respectively, factors depending on p and logarithmic factors.

3. Accelerated Inexact Proximal Point with an Inexact Uniformly Convex Regularizer

In this section, we study an accelerated optimization method that interacts with a function f via an inexact proximal oracle, in the spirit of the one by Monteiro and Svaiter [MS13], as in the following.

Inexact Proximal Oracle *Given a function f , the oracle $y_k, v_k \leftarrow \mathcal{O}_r(x_k)$ returns an inexact proximal point y_k of the proximal problem $\min_y \{f(y) + \frac{1}{r\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^r\}$, and an enlarged subgradient $v_k \in \partial^{\varepsilon_k} f(y_k)$. Given $\sigma, \sigma' \in [0, 1/2)$, a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and exponent r , the requirement on the oracle is*

$$\|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_* \leq \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - y_k\|^{r-1} \text{ for some } \hat{v}_k \in \partial_y \left(-\frac{1}{r\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^r\right)(y_k), \text{ and } \varepsilon_k \leq \frac{\sigma'}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - y_k\|^r. \quad (3)$$

It is straightforward to check that an exact solution of the proximal problem satisfies the properties in (3) for $\sigma = \sigma' = 0$. We also have the following, by Proposition 4, Property 5 and $\hat{v}_k \in \partial \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_k r} \|y - x_k\|^r\right)(y_k) = \|y_k - x_k\|^{r-2} \partial \left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^2\right)(y_k)$:

$$\|\hat{v}_k\|_* = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - y_k\|^{r-1} \text{ and } \langle \hat{v}_k, y_k - x_k \rangle = -\frac{1}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - y_k\|^r. \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1 Non-Euclidean Accelerated Inexact Proximal Point with Inexact Uniformly Convex Regularizer

Input: Convex function f with a minimizer at x^* . Regularizer ψ that is a δ -inexact (μ, r) -uniformly convex function w.r.t. a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $r > 1$. Inexactness constants σ, σ' .

```

1:  $z_0 \leftarrow y_0 \leftarrow x_0$ ;  $A_0 \leftarrow 0$ ;  $C \leftarrow \frac{\mu}{2} \left( \frac{r_*(1-\sigma-\sigma')}{1+\sigma r_*} \right)^{r-1}$ 
2: for  $k = 1$  to  $T$  do
3:    $A_k = a_k + A_{k-1}$ 
4:    $a_k = (C^{r-1} A_k^{r-1} \lambda_k)^{1/r}$  ◇  $r$ -degree equation on  $a_k > 0$ .
5:    $x_k \leftarrow \frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} y_{k-1} + \frac{a_k}{A_k} z_{k-1}$ 
6:    $y_k, v_k \leftarrow \mathcal{O}_r(x_k)$  ◇ Oracle satisfying (3)
7:    $z_k \leftarrow \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{ \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \langle v_i, z \rangle + D_\psi(z, x_0) \}$ 
8: end for
9: return  $y_T$ .
```

Making use of this oracle, we show the following convergence rate. In [Section 4](#) we discuss how to implement such an oracle in different settings.

Theorem 9 *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and let ψ be a δ -inexact (μ, r) -uniformly convex regularizer w.r.t. a norm $\|\cdot\|$, for $r > 1$. Given some constants σ, σ' and proximal parameters $\lambda_i > 0$, the iterates y_t of [Algorithm 1](#) satisfy for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$f(y_t) - f(u) = O_r \left(\frac{D_\psi(u, x_0) + \delta t}{\mu \left(\sum_{k=1}^t \lambda_k^{1/r} \right)^r} \right).$$

In particular, it holds for a minimizer $u = x^$ of f , if it exists.*

Proof Our algorithm makes use of a δ -inexact (μ, r) -uniformly convex regularizer with respect to a norm $\|\cdot\|$, i.e. $D_\psi(x, y) \geq \frac{\mu}{r} \|x - y\|^r - \delta$. Note that for convex h we have that $\ell(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi(x) + h(x)$ is also δ -inexact (μ, r) -uniformly convex and if z is a global minimizer of ℓ , then by the first-order optimality condition, we have $\ell(x) - \ell(z) \geq D_\ell(x, z) \geq \frac{\mu}{r} \|x - z\|^r - \delta$.

We use a primal-dual technique in the spirit of Nesterov's estimate sequences [[Nes04](#)] and the approximate duality gap technique of Diakonikolas and Orecchia [[DO19](#)] in order to naturally define a Lyapunov function that allows to prove convergence. Given $a_i > 0$, for $i \geq 1$ and $A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$ to be chosen later, we define the following lower bound L_k on $f(u)$, for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_k f(u) &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i f(y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \langle v_i, u - y_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i f(y_i) + \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i \langle v_i, z - y_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z, x_0) \right\} - D_\psi(u, x_0) \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i f(y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i \langle v_i, z_k - y_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z_k, x_0) - D_\psi(u, x_0) \\
&\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_k L_k,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where ① holds because $v_i \in \partial^{\varepsilon_i} f(y_i)$. In ②, we added and subtracted the regularizer $D(u, x_0)$ and took a minimum to remove the dependence of u in the lower bound (except for the term $-D_\psi(u, x_0)$ that is irrelevant for defining the algorithm, as it will become evident in a moment). Equality ③ simply uses that z_k was defined as the arg min of that minimization problem. Since $A_0 = 0$, we define $A_0 L_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$. We define the δ -inexact (μ, r) -uniformly convex function

$$\ell_k(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i \langle v_i, z - x_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z, x_0),$$

which is part of the bound above, and recall that its minimizer is z_k . Now, if we define an upper bound $U_k \geq f(y_k)$ and we show that for some numbers E_k , the duality gap $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_k - L_k$ satisfies

$$A_k G_k - A_{k-1} G_{k-1} \leq E_k \text{ for all } k > 1, \text{ and } A_1 G_1 - A_0 G_0 = A_1 G_1 \leq D_\psi(u, x_0) + E_1, \quad (6)$$

then telescoping the inequalities above, we obtain the following convergence rate after T steps:

$$f(y_T) - f(u) \leq U_T - L_T = G_T \leq \frac{A_1 G_1 + \sum_{i=2}^T E_i}{A_T} \leq \frac{D_\psi(u, x_0) + \sum_{i=1}^T E_i}{A_T}, \quad (7)$$

We choose the upper bound $U_k = f(y_k)$. Thus, we have, for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} A_k G_k - A_{k-1} G_{k-1} - \mathbb{1}_{\{k=1\}} D_\psi(u, x_0) &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} A_{k-1} (f(y_k) - f(y_{k-1})) + \cancel{a_k f(y_k)} \\ &\quad - \cancel{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i f(y_i)} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (a_i \langle v_i, z_k - y_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z_k, x_0) \right) - a_k \langle v_k, z_k - y_k \rangle + a_k \varepsilon_k \\ &\quad + \cancel{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i f(y_i)} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (a_i \langle v_i, z_{k-1} - y_i \rangle - a_i \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z_{k-1}, x_0) \right) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \langle v_k, A_{k-1} (y_k - y_{k-1}) - a_k (\pm z_{k-1} + z_k - y_k) \rangle - \frac{\mu}{r} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^r + \delta + A_k \varepsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\equiv} \langle v_k, A_k (y_k - x_k) + a_k (z_{k-1} - z_k) \rangle - \frac{\mu}{r} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^r + \delta + A_k \varepsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\leq} A_k \langle v_k, y_k - x_k \rangle + \frac{a_k^{r_*}}{\mu^{1/(r-1)} r_*} \|v_k\|_*^{r_*} + \delta + A_k \varepsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\leq} A_k \langle \hat{v}_k, y_k - x_k \rangle + A_k \|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_* \cdot \|y_k - x_k\| + \left(\frac{2}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \frac{1}{r_*} a_k^{r_*} (\|\hat{v}_k\|_*^{r_*} + \|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_*^{r_*}) + \delta + A_k \varepsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{6}}{\leq} \left(-\frac{A_k}{\lambda_k} + \frac{\sigma A_k}{\lambda_k} + \frac{a_k^{r/(r-1)}}{\lambda_k^{r/(r-1)}} \left(\frac{2}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \frac{1 + \sigma^{r_*}}{r_*} + \frac{\sigma' A_k}{\lambda_k} \right) \|y_k - x_k\|^r + \delta \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{7}}{\leq} \delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_k. \end{aligned}$$

Above, we wrote the definition of the gaps in ①, we canceled some terms and we used the indicator on the left hand side to handle the cases $k = 1$ and $k > 1$ at the same time. In ②, we applied the enlarged subgradient property on the first term, which gives an error of $A_{k-1} \varepsilon_k$ that we group

with the other $a_k \varepsilon_k$ error, and we grouped the resulting expression with another term, and we used that the terms in parentheses are $\ell_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) - \ell_{k-1}(z_k)$. The inexact uniform convexity of $\ell_{k-1}(\cdot)$ and the fact that z_{k-1} is its minimizer implies the bound. In ③, we used that by definition of x_k it is $A_k x_k = A_{k-1} y_{k-1} + a_k z_{k-1}$. We had added and subtracted z_{k-1} to apply Hölder's and Young's inequalities in ④, namely $\langle v, u \rangle \leq \|v\|_* \|u\| \leq \frac{c}{r_*} \|v\|_*^{r_*} + \frac{1}{c p} \|u\|^r$, with $c = a_k$, and where $r_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - 1/r)^{-1}$. In ⑤, we added and subtracted some \hat{v}_k terms and use bounds to make $\|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_*$ appear, and other terms that we can bound with something proportional to $\|y_k - x_k\|^r$. For the second summand, after applying the triangular inequality we used the means inequality $\frac{a+b}{2} \leq (\frac{a^{r_*} + b^{r_*}}{2})^{1/r_*}$, for $r_* > 1$. In ⑥ we applied the inequalities of our oracle \mathcal{O}_r criterion for the second and fourth terms and used ④ that yields equality for the first terms and $\|\hat{v}_k\|_*^{r_*}$.

Let $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mu}{2} \left(\frac{r_* (1 - \sigma - \sigma')}{1 + \sigma r_*} \right)^{r-1}$. It is enough to satisfy $a_k^r \leq C A_k^{r-1} \lambda_k$ to make ⑦ hold, and then we define E_k as δ . We choose $a_k > 0$ as large as possible, that is, $a_k^r = C A_k^{r-1} \lambda_k$. For notational simplicity, let $D_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C \lambda_k$. Then, since $A_k = a_k + A_{k-1}$, we can express the equation as $\hat{a}_k^{r/(r-1)} = \hat{a}_k + \hat{A}_{k-1}$, where $\hat{a}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_k D_k^{-1}$ and $\hat{A}_{k-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_{k-1} D_k^{-1}$. Now, using this expression and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} = \hat{a}_k^{1/r} (\hat{a}_k^{1/(r-1)} - 1)^{1/r} \leq \frac{\hat{a}_k^{1/(r-1)}}{r_*} + \frac{\hat{a}_k^{1/(r-1)} - 1}{r} = \hat{a}_k^{1/(r-1)} - \frac{1}{r},$$

which implies ① below

$$\hat{a}_k + \hat{A}_{k-1} \stackrel{\text{①}}{\geq} \left(\hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} + \frac{1}{r} \right)^{r-1} + \hat{A}_{k-1} \stackrel{\text{②}}{\geq} \left(\hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} + \frac{1}{r} \right)^r.$$

Above, ② holds by Bernoulli's inequality $(1 - 1/x)^r \geq 1 - r/x$ for $x, r > 1$, since dividing by the right hand side and simplifying gives $\frac{x}{\hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} r + 1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} r + 1}\right)^r \geq 1$, where here $x = \hat{A}_{k-1}^{1/r} r + 1 > 1$. Multiplying by D_k and taking an r -th root, we obtain

$$A_k^{1/r} = (a_k + A_{k-1})^{1/r} \geq A_{k-1}^{1/r} + \frac{1}{r} D_k^{1/r} = A_{k-1}^{1/r} + \frac{1}{r} C^{\frac{1}{r}} \lambda_k^{1/r}, \quad (8)$$

and thus, $A_k^{1/r} \geq \frac{1}{r} C^{\frac{1}{r}} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^{1/r}$. Hence, we conclude by ⑦ that for any $T \geq 1$, we have:

$$f(y_T) - f(u) \leq \frac{D_\psi(u, x_0) + \delta T}{A_T} \leq \frac{r^r (D_\psi(u, x_0) + \delta T)}{C \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \lambda_i^{1/r} \right)^r} = O_r \left(\frac{D_\psi(u, x_0) + \delta T}{\mu \left(\sum_{i=1}^T \lambda_i^{1/r} \right)^r} \right).$$

■

3.1. Adaptive version

In this section, we present a generalized algorithm, where make use of a more general inexact proximal oracle, that uses a guess for the proximal parameter. The purpose of this generalization, inspired by the adaptive Euclidean analysis in [CHJ+22], is avoiding double dependencies in the definition of the proximal parameter, that occur in some cases for Algorithm 1 when implementing the oracle for high-order Hölder smooth functions via a q -th order oracle. We note that adaptivity solely refers to adapting for the value of the proximal parameter λ_k , not for the Hölder constant L .

Generalized Inexact Proximal Oracle Given a function f , the oracle $\tilde{y}_k, v_k, \lambda_k \leftarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_r(x_k, \widehat{\lambda}_k)$ returns a proximal parameter λ_k , an inexact proximal point y_k of the proximal problem $\min_y \{f(y) + \frac{1}{r\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^r\}$, and an enlarged subgradient $v_k \in \partial^{\varepsilon_k} f(y_k)$, possibly using $\widehat{\lambda}_k$ for these estimations. Given $\sigma, \sigma' \in [0, 1/2)$, a norm $\|\cdot\|$ and exponent r , the output satisfies

$$\|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_* \leq \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - \tilde{y}_k\|^{r-1} \text{ for some } \hat{v}_k \in \partial_y \left(-\frac{1}{r\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^r\right)(\tilde{y}_k), \text{ and } \varepsilon_k \leq \frac{\sigma'}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - \tilde{y}_k\|^r. \quad (9)$$

Note that for a convex function f , the points in $\arg \min \{f(y) + \frac{1}{r\lambda_k} \|y - x_k\|^r\}$ satisfy the properties above. Recall that for any $r \in [1, \infty]$, we define $r_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{r}{r-1}$ so that $r_*^{-1} + r^{-1} = 1$. Then, we obtain the following theorem for our generalized algorithm, whose proof can be found in [Appendix A](#).

Algorithm 2 Non-Euclidean Adaptive Accelerated Proximal Point with Uniformly Convex Regularizer

Input: Convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Regularizer ψ that is $(1, r)$ -uniformly convex function wrt a norm $\|\cdot\|$. Initial $\widehat{\lambda}_0$. Adjustment constant factor $\alpha > 1$. Inexactness constants σ, σ' .

```

1:  $z_0 \leftarrow y_0 \leftarrow x_0$ ;  $A_0 \leftarrow 0$ ;  $C \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{r_*(1-\sigma-\sigma')}{1+\sigma r_*} \right)^{r-1}$ 
2:  $\tilde{y}_1, v_1, \lambda_1 \leftarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_r(x_0, \widehat{\lambda}_0)$ ;  $\widehat{\lambda}_1 \leftarrow \lambda_1$ 
3: for  $k = 1$  to  $T$  do
4:  $\widehat{A}_k = \widehat{a}_k + A_{k-1}$ ;  $\widehat{a}_k = (C \widehat{A}_k^{r-1} \widehat{\lambda}_k)^{1/r}$  ◇  $r$ -degree equation on  $\widehat{a}_k > 0$ .
5:  $x_k \leftarrow \frac{A_{k-1}}{\widehat{A}_k} y_{k-1} + \frac{\widehat{a}_k}{\widehat{A}_k} z_{k-1}$ 
6: if  $k > 1$  then  $\tilde{y}_k, v_k, \lambda_k \leftarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_r(x_k, \widehat{\lambda}_k)$  ◇ Oracle satisfying (9)
7:  $\gamma_k \leftarrow \min\{\lambda_k / \widehat{\lambda}_k, 1\}$ ;  $a_k \leftarrow \gamma_k \widehat{a}_k$ ;  $A_k \leftarrow a_k + A_{k-1}$ 
8:  $y_k \leftarrow \arg \min \{f(\tilde{y}_k), f(y_{k-1})\}$  ◇ Or  $y_k \leftarrow \frac{(1-\gamma_k)A_{k-1}}{A_k} y_{k-1} + \frac{\gamma_k \widehat{A}_k}{A_k} \tilde{y}_k$ 
9:  $z_k \leftarrow \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \langle v_i, z \rangle + D_\psi(z, x_0)\}$ 
10: if  $\widehat{\lambda}_t \leq \lambda_t$  then  $\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} \leftarrow \alpha \widehat{\lambda}_t$  else  $\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} \leftarrow \alpha^{-1} \widehat{\lambda}_t$ 
11: end for
12: return  $y_T$ .

```

Theorem 10 [[↓](#)] Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and let ψ be a (μ, r) -uniformly convex regularizer w.r.t. a norm $\|\cdot\|$. Given some constants σ, σ' and initial proximal parameter $\widehat{\lambda}_0 > 0$, every iterate y_t of [Algorithm 2](#) satisfies, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$f(y_t) - f(u) = O_r \left(\frac{D_\psi(u, x_0)}{A_t} \right).$$

In particular, it holds for a minimizer $u = x^*$ of f , if it exists, in which case we also have:

$$D_\psi(x^*, x_0) \geq \sum_{k=1}^t \widehat{A}_k \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r \frac{1 - \sigma - \sigma'}{2 \max\{\widehat{\lambda}_k, \lambda_k\}}. \text{ and } A_t^{1/r} \geq \frac{C^{1/r}}{2r} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} (\alpha^{r_i - 2} \widehat{\lambda}_i)^{1/r},$$

for some set of indices Λ and some numbers $r_i \geq 0$ satisfying $\sum_{i \in \Lambda} r_i = \frac{t-1}{2}$.

The second statement allows for lower bounding A_k in different contexts, in order to characterize the convergence of the method. We also note that above we could have used inexact uniformly convex regularizers instead of exact ones but we used the latter for simplicity. Moreover, we note that a similar statement as the second of the three results in the previous theorem can be made for [Algorithm 1](#) by slightly reducing the step size.

4. High-Order Smooth Convex or Structured Optimization

In this section, we use [Algorithms 1](#) and [2](#) in order to optimize high-order Hölder smooth convex functions with respect to p -norms by using a q -th order oracle. The main result of this section is the following theorem. In [Section 4.1](#), we also show convergence for structured functions for which we can implement an inexact p -norm ball optimization oracle.

Theorem 11 [[↓](#)] *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a q -times differentiable convex function with a minimizer at x^* whose q -th derivative is (L, ν) -Hölder continuous w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_p$, $p \in (1, \infty)$. By making use of [Algorithm 1](#) or its generalized version [Algorithm 2](#), initialized at x_0 and defining $R_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|x^* - x_0\|_p$, $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{2, p\}$, we obtain a point y_T after T iterations, satisfying*

$$f(y_T) - f(x^*) = O_{q+\nu, p} \left(LR_p^{q+\nu} T^{-\frac{(m+1)(q+\nu)-m}{m}} \right),$$

Each iteration of the algorithm makes 1 query to a q -th order oracle of f .

In [Section 5](#), we show that for convex functions with high-order smoothness, i.e., when $\nu = 1$, our bounds are nearly optimal for any algorithm that accesses f via a local oracle. We note that if we use the alternative definition of y_k in [Line 8](#) of [Algorithm 2](#), our algorithms do not require the knowledge of the function's 0-th order information.

Remark 12 *The bound above also holds in the case $p = 1$ up to some $\log(d)$ factors, by noticing that for $\hat{p} = 1 + \log^{-1}(d)$, we have $\|x\|_p = \Theta(\|x\|_{\hat{p}})$, so we can work in the corresponding new \hat{p} -norm and the constants depending on \hat{p} in the bound above amount to $O(\log(d))$ factors. Moreover, for the case $p = \infty$, we can nearly match the lower bound by making use of an unaccelerated method with convergence rate $O_{q+\nu}(LR_p^{q+\nu}T^{-(q+\nu-1)})$, as specified in [Appendix C](#).*

Before proving the theorem, we show in the following lemma how we can implement an inexact proximal oracle using one call of the q -th order oracle by building the q -th order Taylor expansion of f at one point.

Lemma 13 *Under the conditions of [Theorem 11](#), let $f_q(y; x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^q \frac{1}{i!} \nabla^i f(x)[y - x]^{\otimes i}$ be the q -th-order Taylor expansion of f around x , and consider $F(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_q(y; x_k) + \frac{1}{\lambda(q+\nu)} \|y - x_k\|^{q+\nu}$, for $\hat{\lambda} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sigma(q-1)!}{2L}$. The tuple $(y_k, v_k, \lambda_k) \leftarrow (y_k, \nabla f(y_k), \hat{\lambda} \|y_k - x_k\|^{r-q-\nu})$ implements the oracle $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_r(x_k, \cdot)$ for $\varepsilon_k = 0$, if y_k is an approximate critical point of F satisfying*

$$\|\nabla f_q(y_k; x_k) - \hat{v}_k\| \leq \frac{L}{(q-1)!} \|y_k - x_k\|^{q+\nu-1},$$

for some $\hat{v}_k \in \partial(-\frac{1}{\lambda(q+\nu)} \|y - x_k\|^{q+\nu})(y_k) = \partial(-\frac{1}{\lambda_k r} \|y - x_k\|^r)(y_k)$.

Proof Firstly, we have $\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f_q(y; x)\|_* \leq \frac{L}{(q-1)!} \|y - x\|^{q+\nu-1}$, see [SJM19, Lemma 2.5]. Then, for $v_k = \nabla f(y_k)$ and $\lambda_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\lambda} \|y_k - x_k\|^{r-q-\nu} = \frac{\sigma(q-1)!}{2L} \|y_k - x_k\|^{r-q-\nu}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k \|v_k - \hat{v}_k\|_* &\leq \lambda_k (\|\nabla f(y_k) - \nabla f_q(y_k; x_k)\|_* + \|\nabla f_q(y_k; x_k) - \hat{v}_k\|_*) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \lambda_k \frac{L}{(q-1)!} (\|y_k - x_k\|^{q+\nu-1} + \|y_k - x_k\|^{q+\nu-1}) = \sigma \|y_k - x_k\|^{r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ uses the bound above in [SJM19, Lemma 2.5] and the guarantee on y_k . ■

Remark 14 *The function F has a global minimizer, and thus at least one critical point. This is due to F being a polynomial of degree q plus the $(q + \nu)$ -homogeneous term $\frac{1}{\lambda(q+1)} \|y - x_k\|^{q+\nu}$ and so it is continuous and tends to $+\infty$ in every direction. Finding an approximate critical point does not require any further interaction with any oracle from f . Since f is convex, in the cases $q = 1$ and $q = 2$, its Taylor expansion, and thus F , is also convex.*

We are now ready to prove the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 11.

Solving the case $q + \nu \leq \max\{2, p\}$. Recall that we defined $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{p, 2\}$. We use the regularizers in Fact 8. Depending on whether $p > 2$, one or the other of these two regularizers is $(O_p(1), m)$ -uniformly convex with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$ and therefore that regularizer is, by Lemma 7, δ -inexact $(\mu, q + \nu)$ -uniformly convex regularizer with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, for some δ, μ that are a function of a constant a , that we will determine later. We use such regularizer. Note that if $p \leq 2$, the restriction $q + \nu \leq m = \max\{2, p\} = 2$ along with $q \geq 1, \nu \in (0, 1]$ implies $q = 1$. But for $p > 2$ we may still be working in greater order $q > 1$.

As established in Lemma 13, we can solve the inexact proximal problems in Algorithm 1 with a single call of the q -th order oracle if we set $r = q + \nu$ for the proximal parameter $\lambda_k = \frac{\sigma(q-1)!}{2L}$. This parameter λ_k , unlike for other cases, does not depend on y_k . This fact avoids having to perform a binary search or an adaptive guess on the value of the proximal parameter. Set $\sigma = \sigma' = 1/4$ for simplicity. Applying the results from the previous section, we obtain a convergence rate of

$$f(y_T) - f(x^*) \leq O_{p,r} \left(\frac{L(R_p^m + \delta T)}{\mu T^r} \right) = O_{p,r} \left(\frac{L \|x - x_0\|_p^m}{a^{\frac{m}{r}} T^r} + L a^{\frac{m}{m-r}} T^{1-r} \right),$$

where $R_p = \Theta_p(D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{1/r})$ is the initial distance $\|x^* - x_0\|_p$ measured with the p -norm. But we could also set it to an upper bound. The bound above is convex on $a > 0$. By taking derivatives and finding a zero, the bound is found to be optimized at a value $a = O_{p,r} \left(R_p^{\frac{m-r}{m}} T^{-\frac{r(m-r)}{m^2}} \right)$.

Thus, if we make this choice of a , the convergence rate becomes:

$$f(y_T) - f(x^*) = O_{p,r} \left(\frac{L R_p^r}{T^{\frac{mr+r-m}{m}}} \right) = O_{p,r} \left(\frac{L R_p^{q+\nu}}{T^{\frac{(m+1)(q+\nu)-m}{m}}} \right).$$

Our lower bounds were designed for $\nu = 1$. In such a case this convergence rate matches our lower bounds up to constants and log factors. Note that the step sizes a_k depend on the constant a via μ via the constant C .

Solving the case $q + \nu > \max\{2, p\}$. We run [Algorithm 2](#) with $r = m = \max\{2, p\}$ with $\sigma = \sigma' = \frac{1}{4}$ for simplicity. From [\(12\)](#) we have that there is a set of iterates Q_T and some numbers $r_k \geq 0$ such that

$$A_T^{1/r} \geq \widehat{C} \sum_{k \in Q_T} \widehat{\lambda}_k^{1/r} (\alpha^{1/r})^{r_k - 2}. \quad (10)$$

for the constant $\widehat{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C^{1/r}/(2r)$ where C is defined in [Algorithm 2](#), and such that $\sum_{k \in Q_T} r_k = (T - 1)/2$. For notational convenience, we use $\widehat{q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} q + \nu$. By [Lemma 13](#), in the case of high-order methods, we can implement the oracle with one call to the q -th order oracle for $\lambda_k^{\frac{r}{r-\widehat{q}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\lambda}^{\frac{r}{r-\widehat{q}}} \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r$ for $\widehat{\lambda} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sigma(q-1)!}{2L}$. Thus, the analysis in [Theorem 10](#) yields

$$D_\psi(x^*, x_0) \geq \frac{1 - \sigma - \sigma'}{2} \sum_{k \in Q_T} A_k \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r \widehat{\lambda}_k^{-1} = \frac{1 - \sigma - \sigma'}{2} \widehat{\lambda}^{\frac{r}{r-\widehat{q}}} \sum_{k \in Q_T} A_k \widehat{\lambda}_k^{\frac{\widehat{q}}{r-\widehat{q}}}.$$

We will make use of the reverse Hölder inequality, with which is a common tool in analysis of Monteiro-Svaiter acceleration. For $s > 1$ and positive numbers α_i, β_i , we have

$$\sum_i \alpha_i \beta_i \geq \left(\sum_i \alpha_i^{1/s} \right)^s \left(\sum_i \beta_i^{1/(1-s)} \right)^{1-s}.$$

We apply this inequality in [\(2\)](#) below, for $s = \frac{\widehat{q} + r\widehat{q} - r}{r\widehat{q}} > 1$ where the inequality for s holds by the assumption of this section $\widehat{q} = q + \nu > \max\{2, p\} = r$. Also take into account that $\frac{1}{1-s} = \frac{r\widehat{q}}{r-\widehat{q}}$. Thus, we obtain the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{C}^{-1} A_t^{1/r} &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\geq} \sum_{k \in Q_t} \widehat{\lambda}_k^{1/r} (\alpha^{1/r})^{r_k - 2} = \sum_{k \in Q_t} \left(A_k^{s-1} (\alpha^{1/r})^{r_k - 2} \right) (A_k^{1-s} \widehat{\lambda}_k^{1/r}) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} \left(\sum_{k \in Q_t} A_k^{1-1/s} (\alpha^{1/(rs)})^{r_k - 2} \right)^s \left(\sum_{k \in Q_t} A_k \widehat{\lambda}_k^{\frac{\widehat{q}}{r-\widehat{q}}} \right)^{1-s} \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\geq} \left(\sum_{k \in Q_t} A_k^{\frac{\widehat{q}-r}{\widehat{q}+r\widehat{q}-r}} r_k c_{\alpha,s} \right)^s \left(\frac{2D_\psi(x^*, x_0)}{1 - \sigma - \sigma'} \widehat{\lambda}^{-\frac{r}{r-\widehat{q}}} \right)^{1-s} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where [\(1\)](#) uses [\(10\)](#). In [\(3\)](#) we used [Lemma 15](#) with $c_{\alpha,s} = \alpha^{-2/(rs)} \min\{1, \frac{1}{rs} \ln(\alpha)\}$. Now by using the notation $B_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_k^{\frac{\widehat{q}-r}{\widehat{q}+r\widehat{q}-r}}$ and

$$\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{C}^{1/s} c_{\alpha,s} \left(\frac{2D_\psi(x^*, x_0)}{1 - \sigma - \sigma'} \widehat{\lambda}^{-\frac{r}{r-\widehat{q}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}-1}$$

we have

$$B_t^{\frac{\widehat{q}}{r-\widehat{q}}} = A_t^{\frac{1}{rs}} \geq \Gamma \sum_{k \in Q_t \cap [t]} B_k r_k \text{ for all } t.$$

and note that the exponent above on the left hand side is $\frac{\hat{q}}{\hat{q}-r} > 1$. Thus, we can use [CHJ+22, Lemma 3] which yields

$$B_T \geq \left(\frac{\hat{q} - r + r^2}{\hat{q} + r\hat{q} - r} \Gamma \sum_{k \in Q_T} r_t \right)^{\frac{\hat{q}-r}{r}},$$

or equivalently

$$A_T \geq \left(\frac{\hat{q} - r + r^2}{\hat{q} + r\hat{q} - r} \Gamma \frac{T-1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\hat{q}+r\hat{q}-r}{r}} = \Omega_{\hat{q},r} \left(D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{\frac{r-\hat{q}}{r}} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} T^{\frac{\hat{q}+r\hat{q}-r}{r}} \right).$$

Note that above we took into account that α is a constant. The lower bound on A_T and (7) yield the convergence rate

$$f(y_T) - f(x^*) = O_{\hat{q},r} \left(\frac{LR_p^{\hat{q}}}{T^{\frac{(r+1)\hat{q}-r}{r}}} \right) = O_{\hat{q},r} \left(\frac{LR_p^{q+\nu}}{T^{\frac{(m+1)(q+\nu)-m}{m}}} \right),$$

where $R_p = \Theta_p(D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{1/r})$ is the initial distance to a minimizer measured with the p -norm, up to constants, due to our choice of regularizer. Our lower bounds apply to the case $\nu = 1$, they match up to constants and logarithmic factors. ■

Lemma 15 For $a > 1$ and $b \geq 0$, we have $a^{b-2} \geq a^{-2} \min\{1, \ln(a)\}b$.

Proof It holds at $b = 0$. Taking derivatives with respect to b , it is clear that the derivative of the left hand side is greater than the one of the right hand side for all $b \geq 0$. ■

4.1. Ball optimization oracle

For a function f for which we can implement the oracle in (9) while satisfying $\|x_k - \tilde{y}_k\|_p \geq \rho$, for some constant ρ , we can obtain faster rates. This is the case for instance for a function f that is quasi-self concordant with respect to a p -norm, cf. [CJJ+20]. In such a case, we have that the Hessian of f is stable in a p -norm ball of some radius ρ and any center x , that is, there exists a constant c such that $c^{-1}\nabla^2 f(y) \preceq \nabla^2 f(x) \preceq c\nabla^2 f(y)$, for all y satisfying $\|x - y\|_p \leq \rho$. Under this assumption f can be approximated fast in such p -norm ball by solving some linear systems with the Hessian at the center of the ball, since by Hessian stability, if we transform the space by $x \rightarrow (\nabla^2 f(x))^{-1}x$, we obtain a smooth and strongly convex function with $O(1)$ condition number. As an example, for the ℓ_∞ -regression problem, [CJJ+20, Section 4.2] proved that a smoothed version of the objective –whose optimization is enough for approximating the solution– satisfies quasi-self-concordance with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm. Thus, for certain radius ρ , one can implement a ball optimization oracle of radius ρ for any $p \in [2, \infty]$, by using a few linear system solves, while only $p = 2$ was exploited in [CJJ+20]. That is to say, we can implement an oracle like (9), for $\|x_k - \tilde{y}_k\| = \Omega(\rho)$. This results in a trade-off where a p -norm for greater p may give a smaller initial distance versus a slower convergence rate dependence on the problem parameters.

Indeed, analogously to the case $q + \nu > \max\{2, p\}$ in the proof of Theorem 11, we have that by Theorem 10:

$$D_\psi(x^*, x_0) = \Omega \left(\frac{1 - \sigma - \sigma'}{2} \sum_{k \in Q_t} A_k \rho^r \hat{\lambda}_k^{-1} \right),$$

and thus, using the same as (11) where the reverse Hölder's inequality is applied for $s = \frac{1+r}{r} > 1$, we obtain

$$\widehat{C}A_t^{1/r} = \Omega_r \left(\left(\sum_{k \in Q_t} A_k^{\frac{1}{r+1}} r_k \right)^{\frac{r+1}{r}} \rho D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{-1/r} \right).$$

Taking a power of $\frac{r}{r+1}$ and using $B_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_k^{\frac{1}{r+1}}$ we obtain

$$B_t = \Omega_r \left(\rho^{\frac{r}{r+1}} D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{-\frac{1}{r+1}} \sum_{k \in Q_t} B_k r_k \right) \text{ for all } t.$$

Thus, by [CHJ+22, Lemma 3], and the fact that for our regularizers it is $R_p = \Theta_p(D_\psi(x^*, x_0)^{1/r})$, we obtain $B_T \geq \exp \left(\Omega_r \left(T(\rho/R_p)^{\frac{r}{r+1}} + \log(A_1) \right) \right)$. Note that by (6) and the fact that $E_i \leq 0$, it is enough to obtain $A_T \geq \frac{D_\psi(x^*, x_0)}{\varepsilon}$ in order to reach an ε -minimizer. Hence, there is a $T = \widetilde{\Theta}_r \left(\frac{R_p}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{r}{r+1}}$ such that after at most that number of iterations, we find an ε -minimizer.

5. Lower bounds

In this section, we establish lower bounds for a general deterministic algorithm aimed at minimizing a convex function that is q -times differentiable and has (L, ν) -Hölder continuous q -derivatives with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_p$ norm, where $p \in [1, +\infty]$. In particular, we prove the following.

Theorem 16 [↓] *Let $p \geq 1$ and $m = \max\{2, p\}$. Then, for all accuracy $\varepsilon > 0$, initial distance $R_p > 0$ and Lipschitz constant $L > 0$, and for any deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} querying a local oracle, there exists a function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is q -times differentiable with L -Lipschitz q -th derivatives with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$ such that the algorithm must make $\widetilde{\Omega}_q \left(\left(\frac{LR_p^{q+1}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{m}{mq+q+1}} \right)$ queries to the local oracle to reach an ε -optimal solution. Moreover, when $p = \infty$, the algorithm must make at least $\widetilde{\Omega}_q \left(\left(\frac{LR_p^{q+1}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \right)$ queries to the local oracle.*

We observe that for $p = 2$ we recover the bound $\Omega(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{3q+1}})$ for the Euclidean setting in [ASS19; GKN+21], up to logarithmic factors. Moreover, for $q = 1$ and $p \geq 2$, we recover the bound $\widetilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{p}{p+1}})$ determined in [GN15; DG20]. When $p = \infty$ our lower bound is $\widetilde{\Omega}_q(\varepsilon^{-1/q})$ that in the case $q = 1$ was established in [GN15]. Interestingly, our proof is the first to establish lower complexity bounds on the smooth ℓ_p -setting for $1 \leq p \leq 2$, without resorting on high-dimensional embedding reductions [GN15], making these proofs arguably more constructive.

Our construction builds upon the approach in [GKN+21], combining randomized smoothing, similar to that proposed in [AH18], with a modified, truncated softmax version of the classical hard instance function from [NY83]. Randomized smoothing enables the approximation of a non-smooth function by one with Lipschitz continuous higher-order derivatives, which was not possible by previous approaches based on infimal-convolution smoothing [GN15]. Meanwhile, the truncated softmax function maintains the convexity and smoothness necessary for the lower-bound analysis while allowing one term of the hard instance to dominate in specific regions. This controlled

dominance is used to gradually reveal information from the instance, effectively establishing the lower bounds in a stepwise manner.

We generalize the results of [GKN+21] to accommodate general ℓ_p norms by noting that the properties of the truncated softmax operator hold in a broader context than previously stated in [GKN+21, Lemmas 2 & 3] (see Lemma 18). For the randomized smoothing technique, we derive new bounds on the Lipschitz and smoothness constants of the smoothing operation using a novel application of the divergence theorem, allowing for tighter control over the smoothing properties (see Lemma 17). Additionally, we estimate the Lipschitz constant of the smoothed function in Lemma 19 and we lower bound the optimality gap distinguishing the cases $p \geq 2$ and $1 \leq p < 2$ in Lemma 20, which is essentially inherited from the different hard instances for the Lipschitz case before the smoothing [NY83].

5.1. Randomized smoothing

In what follows, let $\nu(S)$ be the uniform distribution on a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define its randomized smoothing

$$S_\beta[f](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(B_\beta^p)}[f(x + v)],$$

where $B_\beta^p \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the ℓ_p ball of center 0 and radius β . For a given $\beta > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (S_{\beta/2^q} \circ S_{\beta/2^{q-1}} \circ \dots \circ S_{\beta/2})(f).$$

The following lemma briefs the main properties of our randomized smoothing.

Lemma 17 *Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is G -Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_p$. Then,*

1. $S_\beta[f]$ is G -Lipschitz and $\beta^{-1}dG$ -smooth w.r.t $\|\cdot\|_p$.
2. $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f]$ is q -times differentiable and $\nabla^i \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f]$ is L_i -Lipschitz in an ℓ_p ball of radius $\beta/2^q$ with $L_i \leq \frac{d^i 2^{i(i+1)/2}}{\beta^i} G$, for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q\}$.
3. $|\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x) - f(x)| \leq \beta G$.
4. If f is a convex function, then $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f]$ is also a convex function.
5. The value $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x)$ only depends on the values of f within the ℓ_p ball of radius $(1 - 2^{-q})\beta$ and center x .

Proof

1. Let $\mathcal{X} = B_\beta^p$. The Lipschitzness is a direct consequence of the smoothing as an averaging and f being G -Lipschitz. For the smoothness, we first note that we have $\nabla S_\beta[f](x) = \frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[f(x + \beta v)w_v]$, where w_v is defined as an outward $\|\cdot\|_2$ unit vector normal to $\partial\mathcal{X}$. In our case this vector will be unique except possibly for a set of measure zero, and so the selection in this set does not affect the value of the expectation.

Then, recalling that $p_* = (1 - 1/p)^{-1}$, and assuming f is G -Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla S_\beta[f](x) - \nabla S_\beta[f](y)\|_{p_*} &= \frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \|\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[f(x+v)w_v - f(y+v)w_v]\|_{p_*} \\ &\leq \frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|f(x+v) - f(y+v)\| \|w_v\|_{p_*}] \\ &\leq G\|x - y\|_p \frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{X} = B_\beta^p$, therefore $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_p = \beta$. We also have $\frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}] = \beta^{-1}d$. Indeed, for $p \in (1, \infty)$, by taking the gradient of $\|v\|_p^p$ and normalizing we can compute

$$w_v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d |v_i|^{2p-2}}} (\text{sign}(v_1)|v_1|^{p-1}, \dots, \text{sign}(v_d)|v_d|^{p-1})$$

and thus

$$\|w_v\|_{p_*} = \frac{\|v\|_p^{p-1}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d |v_i|^{2p-2}}} = \frac{\|v\|_p^{p-1}}{\|v\|_{2p-2}^{p-1}}.$$

By the divergence theorem on the identity function $\phi(v) = v$ and on \mathcal{X} and by denoting μ_p the uniform probability measure on $\partial\mathcal{X}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d \text{vol}(\mathcal{X}) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial \phi(v)}{\partial v_i} dV(v) = \text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X}) \int_{\partial\mathcal{X}} \langle v, w_v \rangle d\mu_p(v) = \text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X}) \int_{\partial\mathcal{X}} \frac{\|v\|_p^p}{\|v\|_{2p-2}^{p-1}} d\mu_p(v) \\ &= \text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X}) \beta \int_{\partial\mathcal{X}} \frac{\|v\|_p^{p-1}}{\|v\|_{2p-2}^{p-1}} d\mu_p(v) = \text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X}) \beta \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}]. \end{aligned}$$

So we obtain the result. For $p = 1$ one can see that $\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}] = d^{-1/2}$ and $\frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} = \beta^{-1}d^{3/2}$. Similarly, for $p = \infty$ it is $\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}] = 1$ and $\frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} = \beta^{-1}d$. So in any case, we have $\frac{\text{vol}(\partial\mathcal{X})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \nu(\partial\mathcal{X})}[\|w_v\|_{p_*}] = \beta^{-1}d$.

2. It can be argued by induction similarly to [AH18, Corollary 2.4] but using the previous part.

We can prove the result by induction on q . We have the statement for $q = 0$ since the Lipschitzness of a function is preserved after smoothing. Let v_1, \dots, v_q be arbitrary unit vectors with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, and let $G_i = \frac{d^i 2^{i(i+1)/2}}{\beta^i} G$. If the result holds for $q - 1$, we have that $S_{\beta/2^q} \nabla^{q-1} \mathcal{S}^{(q-1)}[f](x)[v_1, \dots, v_{q-1}]$ is differentiable and its differential is $\nabla^q \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x)[v_1, \dots, v_{q-1}]$, by commutativity of the smoothing and differential operator, hence by the first part it is Lipschitz w.r.t $\|\cdot\|_p$ with constant $\frac{d^{2q}}{\beta} G_{q-1} = G_q$. Similarly, for $i < q$, by the commutativity of the operators again, we have that $\nabla^i \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x)[v_1, \dots, v_i] = S_{\beta/2^q} \nabla^i \mathcal{S}^{(q-1)}[f](x)[v_1, \dots, v_i]$, and we know that the right hand side is G_i Lipschitz by induction hypothesis and the fact that $S_{\beta/2^q}$ preserves the Lipschitzness.

3. By Lipschitzness of f , $|\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x) - f(x)| \leq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_p G = \beta G$.

4. This is a direct consequence of the convexity of f and the smoothing as an averaging.
5. By expanding the expectations in the definition of $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}$, we get that $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f](x) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \mu_x}[f](y)$ where μ_x is a distribution supported in $B_{(1-2^{-q})\beta}^p(x)$.

■

5.2. Hard instance construction

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $n \leq d$, define, respectively, the softmax and partial softmax as

$$\text{smax}_\mu(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \exp(x_i/\mu) \right), \quad \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq n}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(x_i/\mu) \right).$$

Lemma 18 *The following properties hold*

- (a) smax_μ is 1-Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.
- (b) $\nabla^q \text{smax}_\mu(x)$ is L_q -Lipschitz (w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$), and $L_q := \left(\frac{q+1}{\ln(q+2)} \right)^{q+1} \frac{q!}{\mu^q}$.
- (c) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n < d$. If $\frac{1}{\mu}[\text{smax}_\mu(x) - \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq n}(x)] = \delta < 1$ then

$$\|\nabla \text{smax}_\mu(x) - \nabla \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq n}(x)\|_1 \leq 4\delta.$$

See [Bec17, Example 5.15], [Bul20, Theorem 7], and [GKN+21, Lemma 3], respectively, where some properties were only stated in the original sources with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$ but the same proof works in general with our norms above. For [GKN+21, Lemma 3], inequality (43) in the reference holds now with equality.

Setting Our construction of the hard function family combines the maximum of several partial softmax smoothings with the high-order convolutional smoothing described above. We proceed with the details below.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and recall that we set $m := \max\{p, 2\}$. We define the parameters

$$d \geq 8k^{1+1/m}, \quad \gamma \leq \frac{1}{4k^{1+1/m}}, \quad \alpha = q + \frac{m}{m+1}$$

for $p \in [1, \infty)$. In the case $p = \infty$, we use $d \geq 8k$, $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4k}$, and $\alpha = q + 1$. Define in addition $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{\ln d}$ and $\mu = \frac{\gamma}{4\alpha \ln d}$.

Fix a sequence $\{v_j\}_{j \in [d]}$ of orthogonal vectors such that $\|v_j\|_{p^*} \leq 1$ for every $j \in [d]$. Define also a sequences of signs $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ define the functions $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq i}((\xi_j \langle v_j, x \rangle + (k-j)\gamma)_{j \in [d]} + \mu(k+1-i)d^{-\alpha}),$$

Finally, define

$$h(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{i \in [k]} f_i(x), \quad g(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[h](x).$$

The following lemma establishes the Lipschitzness of the hard function g .

Lemma 19 For any choice of orthogonal vectors $(v_j)_{j \in [d]}$ with $\|v_j\|_{p_*} \leq 1$ and signs $(\xi_j)_{j \in [d]}$, the function g is convex, q -times differentiable and $\nabla^q g(x)$ is L_q -Lipschitz with $L_q = \tilde{O}_q(k^{\frac{m+1}{m}q} (\ln k^{1+1/m})^q)$ if $p \in [1, \infty)$, and $L_q = \tilde{O}_q(k^q (\ln k)^q)$ if $p = \infty$.

Proof Each f_i is an instance of softmax up to a translation. Therefore, the high-order Lipschitzness and convexity properties of smax_μ in Lemma 18 also apply to f_i , and thus f_i is convex, q -times differentiable with $O_q(\mu^{-q})$ -Lipschitz q -th derivatives, regardless of the choices of ξ_i . The function h is also convex, since it is a maximum of convex functions. Since the smoothing operator $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}$ consists of an average of convex functions, the function $g = \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[h]$ is also convex.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $j \in [k]$ be the minimum number such that there is a point $\omega \in B_\beta^p(x)$ for which $h(\omega) = f_j(\omega)$. For every $z \in B_\beta^p(x)$, $h(z) = f_j(z) + \max_{i \geq j} \{f_i(z) - f_j(z)\}$. The term $f_j(z)$ is smooth in the ball whereas the term $\max_{i \geq j} \{f_i(z) - f_j(z)\}$ may not be smooth. If all points $z \in B_\beta^p(x)$ satisfy $h(z) = f_j(z)$, then the nonsmooth term is 0 and so h is as smooth as f_j , and the i -th derivative of $g = \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[h]$ enjoys the same Lipschitzness as the i -th derivative of f_j by Lemma 17.

We show that the nonsmooth term has a small Lipschitz constant in $B_\beta^p(x)$, which will be later used in conjunction with Lemma 17 to conclude. We can now assume that the non-smooth term is nonzero at some point in $B_\beta^p(x)$. Towards this let $x' \in B_\beta^p(x)$, and $I(x') = \{i \in [k] \mid h(x') = f_i(x')\}$. The set of subgradients of the nonsmooth term at x' is the convex hull of $\{\nabla(f_i - f_j)(x')\}_{i \in I(x')}$. So if we show that for an arbitrary $i \in I(x')$, $\|\nabla(f_i - f_j)(x')\|_{p_*} \leq L$, then we know that the nonsmooth part is L -Lipschitz at x' . If $i = j$, then the gradient is zero. Let us take an $i \neq j$ (since j is the smallest, in fact $i > j$). By convexity of the ball and the continuity of f_i and f_j , there must be a point y in $B_\beta^p(x)$ for which $h(y) = f_i(y) = f_j(y)$. Note that $x' \in B_{2\beta}^p(y)$. The statement $f_i(y) = f_j(y)$ translates to ① below

$$\begin{aligned}
(i-j)d^{-\alpha} &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} \frac{\text{smax}_\mu^{\leq i}((\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma)_{\ell \in [d]}) - \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq j}((\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma)_{\ell \in [d]})}{\mu} \\
&= \ln \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^i \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^j \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)} \right) = \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\ell=j+1}^i \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^j \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)} \right) \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} e^{-4\beta/\mu} \ln \left(1 + \frac{e^{2\beta/\mu} \sum_{\ell=j+1}^i \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)}{e^{-2\beta/\mu} \sum_{\ell=1}^j \exp\left(\frac{\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, y \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma}{\mu}\right)} \right) \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\geq} e^{-4\beta/\mu} \frac{\text{smax}_\mu^{\leq i}((\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, x' \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma)_{\ell \in [d]}) - \text{smax}_\mu^{\leq j}((\xi_\ell \langle v_\ell, x' \rangle + (k-\ell)\gamma)_{\ell \in [d]})}{\mu} \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{=} e^{-4\beta/\mu} (f_i(x') - f_j(x') + (i-j)d^{-\alpha}),
\end{aligned}$$

where ② holds since for all $c > 0$, it is $\ln(1+c) \geq e^{-4\beta/\mu} \ln(1+e^{4\beta/\mu}c)$ and ③ is due to $|x'_\ell - y_\ell| \leq 2\beta$ which for any ℓ is implied by the fact that $\|x' - y\|_p \leq 2\beta$. Finally ④ holds by the definition of f_i and f_j .

Therefore, by Lemma 18 (c) $\|\nabla(f_i - f_j)(x')\|_{p_*} \leq 4(i-j)d^{-\alpha}e^{4\beta/\mu} \leq 4kd^{-\alpha}(e^{4\beta/\mu} - 1)$. The q -th derivatives of $g = \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[h] = \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[f_j] + \mathcal{S}_\beta^{(q)}[\max_{i \geq j} \{f_i - f_j\}]$ are thus the sum of Lipschitz with constants $O_q(\mu^{-q})$ and $O_q(d^q \beta^{-q} k d^{-\alpha} (\exp(4\beta/\mu) - 1))$, where the last is a consequence of

Lemma 17. Using the values of the parameters for $p \in [1, \infty]$ to balance the two terms we have

$$\max \left\{ \mu^{-q}, d^q \beta^{-q} k d^{-\alpha} (\exp(4\beta/\mu) - 1) \right\} = \begin{cases} O_q \left(k^{\frac{m+1}{m} q} (\ln k^{1+1/m})^q \right) & \text{if } p \in [1, \infty) \\ O_q (k^q (\ln k)^q) & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

■

5.3. Optimality gap

Our hard function is $g(x)$, with the choices of ξ_j that we specify in the following. Given an algorithm \mathcal{A} , we denote x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} the first k query points, and the choice of ξ_i is made to depend only on $\{x_0, \dots, x_i\}$. In particular, our sign choices are based on inductively defined sets $I_t = \{i_j\}_{j=0}^t \subseteq [d]$, as follows. First, $I_{-1} = \emptyset$, and given I_{t-1} , let $I_t = I_{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}$, where $i_t \in \arg \max_{i \in [d] \setminus I_t} |\langle v_i, x_t \rangle|$, and we let $\xi_t = \text{sign}(\langle v_{i_t}, x_t \rangle)$.

The following lemma lower bounds the optimality gap $g(x^k) - \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} g(x)$ where \mathcal{X} is the unit ℓ_p ball.

Lemma 20 *Let $p \geq 1$ and $m = \max\{2, p\}$. For any deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} generating a sequence x_0, \dots, x_k , there exists an instance of the hard function g , and x^* with $\|x^*\|_p \leq 1$ such that we have $g(x_k) - g(x^*) \geq \varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{16} k^{-1/m}$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$, and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{16}$ for $p = \infty$.*

Proof

- For the case $p \geq 2$ we use canonical vectors $v_j = e_j$. Now, we note that $h(x_k) \geq f_k(x_k) \geq 0$, by dropping every argument in the softmax term $(\xi_{j+1} x_{k,j+1} + (k-j)\gamma)_j$ except for $j = k$, and noticing that it is not negative. Since h is 1-Lipschitz with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$, we have $g(x_k) \geq h(x_k) - 2\beta \geq -\gamma/2 \geq -\frac{1}{16} k^{-1/p}$. On the other hand, for the point $x^* = -k^{-1/p} \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i e_i$, we have $\|x^*\|_p \leq 1$ and for all $i \in [k]$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(x^*) &\leq \mu \log \left(k \exp \left(\frac{-k^{-1/p} + k\gamma}{\mu} \right) \right) + (k+1)d^{-\alpha} \\ &\leq \mu \log k - \frac{1}{k^{1/p}} + k\gamma + (k+1)d^{-\alpha} \\ &\leq k^{-1/p} \left(\frac{1}{4} - 1 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \right) \leq -\frac{1}{4} k^{-1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $g(x^*) \leq h(x^*) + 2\beta < -\frac{1}{8} k^{-1/p}$. Therefore, at least k steps are necessary in order to find an $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{16} k^{-1/p}$ minimizer.

Similarly, for $p = \infty$ we can take $x^* = -\sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i e_i$ that satisfy $\|x^*\|_\infty = 1$. Using that by definition $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4k}$ and $d^{-\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{(8k)^{q+1}}$ we obtain $g(x^k) \geq -\frac{1}{16}$ and $g(x^*) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$ and therefore $g(x^k) - g(x^*) \geq \frac{1}{16}$.

- Let $1 \leq p \leq 2$. Consider $d = 2^s$ with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{s-1} < 8k^{3/2} \leq 2^s$, and the Hadamard bases defined recursively as $H_0 = [1]$, and

$$H_{s+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} H_s & H_s \\ H_s & -H_s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Given k and corresponding dimension $d = 2^s \geq k^{3/2}$, let $\{\hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_d\}$ be the columns of matrix H_k . It is easy to see that

$$\|\hat{e}_j\|_2 = 1, \quad \|\hat{e}_j\|_\infty = 1/\sqrt{d}.$$

Using interpolation inequalities for p norms, we have that for all $j \in [d]$,

$$\|\hat{e}_j\|_{p^*} \leq \|\hat{e}_j\|_2^{\frac{2}{p^*}} \|\hat{e}_j\|_\infty^{1-\frac{2}{p^*}} = d^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{2}{p^*})} = d^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In particular, we have that $\{v_j\}_{j \in [d]}$, where $v_j = d^{1/2-1/p^*} \hat{e}_j$, is such that these vectors are orthogonal and have unit ℓ_{p^*} -norm.

We note now that for all $\xi \in \{-1, +1\}^k$

$$\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in [k]} \xi_j \langle v_j, x \rangle = \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \langle v_j, x \rangle = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} - \left\| \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \xi_j v_j \right\|_{p^*} = - \min_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \left\| \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \xi_j v_j \right\|_{p^*}.$$

In order to estimate this quantity. Consider first the $\|\cdot\|_2$:

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \xi_j v_j \right\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j^2 \|v_j\|_2^2} = k^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p^*}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} = k^{-1/p^*}.$$

Now, using Hölder's inequality:

$$k^{-\frac{1}{p^*}} = \left\| \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \xi_j v_j \right\|_2 \leq k^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p^*}} \left\| \sum_{j \in [k]} \lambda_j \xi_j v_j \right\|_{p^*},$$

hence

$$\Delta = \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in [k]} \xi_j \langle v_j, x \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}.$$

In particular, there exist $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$, $\|x^*\|_p \leq 1$ such that for every i

$$f_i(x^*) \leq k\gamma + \Delta - \gamma i \leq k\gamma + \Delta \leq -\frac{3}{4\sqrt{k}}.$$

Therefore, $h(x^*) \leq -\frac{3}{4\sqrt{k}}$ and

$$g(x^*) \leq h(x^*) + 2\beta \leq -\frac{1}{4\sqrt{k}}.$$

Moreover, as before, we have $g(x_k) \geq -\gamma/2 \geq -\frac{1}{16}k^{-1/2}$, hence, at least k steps are necessary in order to find an $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{16}k^{-1/2}$ minimizer. ■

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 16.

Let $y_t \in B_\beta(x_t)$, we show that $h(y_t)$ does not depend on ξ_i , for $i > t$. That is, $f_{t+1}(y_t) \geq f_{i+1}(y_t)$. Assume for simplicity from now on by relabeling the coordinates without loss of generality that

the index at the ℓ -th step is ℓ , that is $i_{\ell-1} = \ell$. Inequality $f_{t+1}(y_t) \geq f_{i+1}(y_t)$ holds if the following expression is $\leq (i-t)d^{-\alpha}$

$$\log \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \exp(\frac{\xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle + (k-j)\gamma}{\mu})}{\sum_{j=1}^{t+1} \exp(\frac{\xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle + (k-j)\gamma}{\mu})} \right) \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{\sum_{j=t+2}^{i+1} \exp(\frac{\xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle + (k-j)\gamma}{\mu})}{\sum_{j=1}^{t+1} \exp(\frac{\xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle + (k-j)\gamma}{\mu})} \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \frac{k \max_{t+2 \leq j \leq i+1} \exp(\frac{\xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle + (k-j)\gamma}{\mu})}{\exp(\frac{\xi_{t+1} \langle v_{t+1}, y_t \rangle + (k-t-1)\gamma}{\mu})}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ uses $\log(1+c) \leq c$, in $\textcircled{2}$ we drop all summands in the denominator but the last one and bounded the sum by a max and we bound j by $t+2$ in the exp in the numerator. It suffices to prove that the right hand side is upper bounded by $d^{-\alpha} \leq (i-t)d^{-\alpha}$. Equivalently, it suffices to show

$$\mu \log k + \max_{t+2 \leq j \leq i+1} \xi_j \langle v_j, y_t \rangle - \xi_{t+1} \langle v_{t+1}, y_t \rangle + \gamma \leq -\mu \alpha \log d.$$

By the definition of $i_t = t+1$, we have $\xi_{i+1} \langle v_{i+1}, x_t \rangle - \xi_{t+1} \langle v_t, x_t \rangle \leq 0$ for any $i > t$. Thus, we have $\xi_{i+1} \langle v_{i+1}, y_t \rangle - \xi_{t+1} \langle v_t, y_t \rangle \leq 2\beta$. So it suffices that

$$\mu(\log k + \alpha \log d) + 2\beta \leq \gamma,$$

which holds by construction.

Now, take $\tilde{g} = \frac{L}{L_q} g$ so \tilde{g} has L -Lipschitz q -th derivative. For $p \in [1, \infty)$ we have $\tilde{g}(x^k) - \tilde{g}(x^*) \geq \frac{L}{16L_q} k^{-1/m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon$. Setting $x_0 = 0$ so $R_p = \|x_0 - x^*\|_p = 1$, and recalling that $L_q = \tilde{O}(k^{\frac{m}{m+1}q} (\ln(k^{1+1/m}))^q)$ we obtain

$$\left(\frac{LR_p^{q+1}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{m}{mq+q+1}} \left(\log \frac{LR_p^{q+1}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-q} \leq O_q(k).$$

And since we have a lower bound of k on the number of calls to a q -order oracle in order to achieve an ε -minimizer, we obtain the statement.

Similarly, for $p = \infty$ we have $\tilde{g}(x^k) - \tilde{g}(x^*) \geq \frac{L}{16L_q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon$, $\|x^0 - x^*\|_\infty = 1$ and recalling that $L_q = \tilde{O}(k^q (\ln(k))^q)$ we obtain the complexity $\tilde{\Omega}_q \left(\left(\frac{LR_p^{q+1}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \right)$. ■

Acknowledgements

C. Guzmán's research was partially supported by INRIA Associate Teams project, ANID FONDECYT 1210362 grant, ANID Anillo ACT210005 grant, and National Center for Artificial Intelligence CENIA FB210017, Basal ANID. J.P. Contreras was supported by Postdoctoral Fondecyt Grant No. 3240505.

References

- [ABJ+24] Deeksha Adil, Brian Bullins, Arun Jambulapati, and Aaron Sidford. “Convex optimization with p -norm oracles”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.24158* (2024) (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [AH18] Naman Agarwal and Elad Hazan. “Lower Bounds for Higher-Order Convex Optimization”. In: *Conference On Learning Theory, COLT 2018, Stockholm, Sweden, 6-9 July 2018*. Ed. by Sébastien Bubeck, Vianney Perchet, and Philippe Rigollet. Vol. 75. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2018, pp. 774–792 (cit. on pp. 2, 14, 16).
- [ASS19] Yossi Arjevani, Ohad Shamir, and Ron Shiff. “Oracle complexity of second-order methods for smooth convex optimization”. In: *Math. Program.* 178.1-2 (2019), pp. 327–360 (cit. on pp. 2, 14).
- [Bae09] Michel Baes. “Estimate sequence methods: extensions and approximations”. In: *Institute for Operations Research, ETH, Zürich, Switzerland 2.1* (2009) (cit. on p. 1).
- [BCL94] Keith Ball, Eric A Carlen, and Elliott H Lieb. “Sharp uniform convexity and smoothness inequalities for trace norms”. In: *Inequalities: Selecta of Elliott H. Lieb* (1994), pp. 171–190 (cit. on p. 5).
- [Bec17] Amir Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. Vol. 25. SIAM, 2017 (cit. on p. 17).
- [BJL+19] Sébastien Bubeck, Qijia Jiang, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, and Aaron Sidford. “Near-optimal method for highly smooth convex optimization”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2019, pp. 492–507 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BNO03] Dimitri Bertsekas, Angelia Nedic, and Asuman Ozdaglar. “Convex analysis and optimization”. In: vol. 1. Athena Scientific, 2003, pp. 245–247 (cit. on p. 27).
- [Bul20] Brian Bullins. “Highly smooth minimization of non-smooth problems”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2020, 9-12 July 2020, Virtual Event [Graz, Austria]*. Ed. by Jacob D. Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal. Vol. 125. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2020, pp. 988–1030 (cit. on p. 17).
- [CHJ+22] Yair Carmon, Danielle Hausler, Arun Jambulapati, Yujia Jin, and Aaron Sidford. “Optimal and Adaptive Monteiro-Svaiter Acceleration”. In: *NeurIPS*. 2022 (cit. on pp. 2, 8, 13, 14, 24, 26).
- [CJJ+20] Yair Carmon, Arun Jambulapati, Qijia Jiang, Yujia Jin, Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Kevin Tian. “Acceleration with a Ball Optimization Oracle”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*. Ed. by Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. 2020 (cit. on p. 13).
- [DG20] Jelena Diakonikolas and Cristóbal Guzmán. “Lower Bounds for Parallel and Randomized Convex Optimization”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 5:1–5:31 (cit. on pp. 2, 14).

- [dGJ18] Alexandre d’Aspremont, Cristóbal Guzmán, and Martin Jaggi. “[Optimal Affine-Invariant Smooth Minimization Algorithms](#)”. In: *SIAM J. Optim.* 28.3 (2018), pp. 2384–2405 (cit. on p. 2).
- [DO19] Jelena Diakonikolas and Lorenzo Orecchia. “[The Approximate Duality Gap Technique: A Unified Theory of First-Order Methods](#)”. In: *SIAM J. Optim.* 29.1 (2019), pp. 660–689 (cit. on p. 6).
- [GDG+19] Alexander Gasnikov, Pavel Dvurechensky, Eduard Gorbunov, Evgeniya Vorontsova, Daniil Selikhanovych, and César A Uribe. “[Optimal tensor methods in smooth convex and uniformly convex optimization](#)”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2019, pp. 1374–1391 (cit. on p. 1).
- [GKN+21] Ankit Garg, Robin Kothari, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Suhail Sherif. “[Near-Optimal Lower Bounds For Convex Optimization For All Orders of Smoothness](#)”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*. Ed. by Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2021, pp. 29874–29884 (cit. on pp. 2, 14, 15, 17).
- [GN15] Cristóbal Guzmán and Arkadi Nemirovski. “[On lower complexity bounds for large-scale smooth convex optimization](#)”. In: *Journal of Complexity* 31.1 (2015), pp. 1–14 (cit. on pp. 2, 14).
- [Guz15] Cristóbal A Guzmán Paredes. “INFORMATION, COMPLEXITY AND STRUCTURE IN CONVEX OPTIMIZATION”. PhD thesis. Georgia Institute of Technology, 2015 (cit. on p. 2).
- [JWZ19] Bo Jiang, Haoyue Wang, and Shuzhong Zhang. “[An optimal high-order tensor method for convex optimization](#)”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2019, pp. 1799–1801 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KG22] Dmitry Kovalev and Alexander V. Gasnikov. “[The First Optimal Acceleration of High-Order Methods in Smooth Convex Optimization](#)”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*. Ed. by Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh. 2022 (cit. on p. 2).
- [MS13] Renato DC Monteiro and Benar Fux Svaiter. “[An accelerated hybrid proximal extragradient method for convex optimization and its implications to second-order methods](#)”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 23.2 (2013), pp. 1092–1125 (cit. on pp. 1, 5).
- [Nem95] Arkadi Nemirovski. “[Information-based complexity of convex programming](#)”. In: *Lecture notes* 834 (1995) (cit. on p. 4).
- [Nes04] Yurii E. Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization - A Basic Course*. Vol. 87. Applied Optimization. Springer, 2004. ISBN: 978-1-4613-4691-3 (cit. on p. 6).
- [Nes21] Yurii E. Nesterov. “[Implementable tensor methods in unconstrained convex optimization](#)”. In: *Math. Program.* 186.1 (2021), pp. 157–183 (cit. on p. 1).

- [NY83] A.S. Nemirovskii and D.B. Yudin. *Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization*. A Wiley-Interscience publication. Wiley, 1983. ISBN: 9780471103455 (cit. on pp. 4, 14, 15).
- [SJM19] Chaobing Song, Yong Jiang, and Yi Ma. “Unified Acceleration of High-Order Algorithms under Hölder Continuity and Uniform Convexity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00582* (2019) (cit. on pp. 2, 11).
- [Zal83] Constantin Zălinescu. “On Uniformly Convex Functions”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* (1983), pp. 344–374 (cit. on p. 5).

Appendix A. Convergence of the adaptive algorithm

Algorithm 3 Non-Euclidean Adaptive Accelerated Proximal Point with Uniformly Convex Regularizer

Input: Convex function f with a minimizer at x^* . Regularizer ψ that is $(1, r)$ -uniformly convex function wrt a norm $\|\cdot\|$. Initial $\hat{\lambda}_0$. Adjustment factor $\alpha > 1$. Inexactness constants σ, σ' .

```

1:  $z_0 \leftarrow y_0 \leftarrow x_0$ ;  $A_0 \leftarrow 0$ ;  $C \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{r_*(1-\sigma-\sigma')}{1+\sigma^{r_*}} \right)^{r-1}$ 
2:  $\tilde{y}_1, v_1, \lambda_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{O}(x_0, \hat{\lambda}_0)$ ;  $\hat{\lambda}_1 \leftarrow \lambda_1$ 
3: for  $k = 1$  to  $T$  do
4:  $\hat{A}_k = \hat{a}_k + A_{k-1}$ ;  $\hat{a}_k = (C\hat{A}_k^{r-1}\hat{\lambda}_k)^{1/r}$   $\diamond r$ -degree equation on  $\hat{a}_k > 0$ .
5:  $x_k \leftarrow \frac{A_{k-1}}{\hat{A}_k}y_{k-1} + \frac{\hat{a}_k}{\hat{A}_k}z_{k-1}$ 
6: if  $k > 1$  then  $\tilde{y}_k, v_k, \lambda_k \leftarrow \mathcal{O}(x_k, \hat{\lambda}_k)$ 
7:  $\gamma_k \leftarrow \min\{\lambda_k/\hat{\lambda}_k, 1\}$ ;  $a_k \leftarrow \gamma_k\hat{a}_k$ ;  $A_k \leftarrow a_k + A_{k-1}$ 
8:  $y_k \leftarrow \arg \min\{f(\tilde{y}_k), f(y_{k-1})\}$   $\diamond$  Or  $y_k \leftarrow \frac{(1-\gamma_k)A_{k-1}}{A_k}y_{k-1} + \frac{\gamma_k\hat{A}_k}{A_k}\tilde{y}_k$ 
9:  $z_k \leftarrow \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \langle v_i, z \rangle + D_\psi(z, x_0)\}$ 
10: if  $\hat{\lambda}_t \leq \lambda_t$  then  $\hat{\lambda}_{t+1} \leftarrow \alpha\hat{\lambda}_t$  else  $\hat{\lambda}_{t+1} \leftarrow \alpha^{-1}\hat{\lambda}_t$ 
11: end for
12: return  $y_T$ .
```

This section proves convergence of the generalized version of our [Algorithm 1](#) that is, [Algorithm 2](#). We restate the algorithm for convenience.

Proof of Theorem 10. We use an adaptive scheme inspired by [\[CHJ+22\]](#) used to guess the proximal parameter λ_k . In some cases of high-order smooth convex optimization, we can implement the inexact proximal oracle of [Algorithm 1](#), but with a parameter of λ_k that depends on y_k . Because y_k also depends on λ_k , this double dependence leads to problems that can be solved by using a binary search at each iteration. However, the adaptive scheme removes the need for the binary search.

We use the same lower bound as in [\(5\)](#) but this time for simplicity we only use r -uniformly convex regularizers, $r \geq 2$, instead of inexact ones. As opposed to [Algorithm 1](#), this time we denote by \tilde{y}_k the points that the inexact proximal oracle returns. Therefore, $v_k \in \partial_{\varepsilon_k} f(\tilde{y}_k)$. We define a different convex combination for the point where we compute the gradient $x_k = \frac{A_{k-1}}{\hat{A}_k}y_{k-1} + \frac{\hat{a}_k}{\hat{A}_k}z_{k-1}$ for some \hat{a}_k to be determined later, that satisfies $a_k = \gamma_k\hat{a}_k$, where $\gamma_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\lambda_k/\hat{\lambda}_k, 1\}$, and where $\hat{\lambda}_k$ is a guess on the proximal parameter of our next oracle and λ_k is the proximal parameter that the oracle actually returns. We also have $\hat{A}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_{k-1} + \hat{a}_k$.

We define the upper bound $U_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(y_k)$ and the primal dual gap $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_k - L_k$ but this time we want $U_k \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_k)A_{k-1}}{A_k}f(y_{k-1}) + \frac{\gamma_k\hat{A}_k}{A_k}f(\tilde{y}_k)$. Therefore, we can define the combination $y_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(1-\gamma_k)A_{k-1}}{A_k}y_{k-1} + \frac{\gamma_k\hat{A}_k}{A_k}\tilde{y}_k$, which note it is a convex combination, or we can simply define it

as $y_k \in \arg \min\{f(y_{k-1}), f(\tilde{y}_k)\}$. With these definitions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_k G_k - A_{k-1} G_{k-1} - \mathbb{1}_{\{k=1\}} D_\psi(u, x_0) &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} (1 - \gamma_k) A_{k-1} f(y_{k-1}) + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k f(\tilde{y}_k) - \cancel{A_{k-1} f(y_{k-1})} \\
&\quad - a_k f(\tilde{y}_k) - \cancel{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i f(\tilde{y}_i)} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i (\langle v_i, z_k - \tilde{y}_i \rangle - \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z_k, x_0) \right) - a_k \langle v_k, z_k - \tilde{y}_k \rangle + a_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\quad + \cancel{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i f(\tilde{y}_i)} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i (\langle v_i, z_{k-1} - \tilde{y}_i \rangle - \varepsilon_i) + D_\psi(z_{k-1}, x_0) \right) \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \langle v_k, \gamma_k A_{k-1} (\tilde{y}_k - y_{k-1}) - a_k (\pm z_{k-1} + z_k - \tilde{y}_k) \rangle - \frac{1}{r} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^r + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{=} \langle v_k, \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k (\tilde{y}_k - x_k) + a_k (z_{k-1} - z_k) \rangle - \frac{1}{r} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^r + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\leq} \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \langle v_k, \tilde{y}_k - x_k \rangle + \frac{a_k^{r_*}}{2} \|v_k\|_*^{r_*} + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\leq} \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \langle \widehat{v}_k, \tilde{y}_k - x_k \rangle + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \|v_k - \widehat{v}_k\|_* \cdot \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\| + \frac{2^{1/(r-1)}}{r_*} a_k^{r_*} (\|\widehat{v}_k\|_*^{r_*} + \|v_k - \widehat{v}_k\|_*^{r_*}) + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{6}}{\leq} \left(\frac{\gamma_k \widehat{A}_k (-1 + \sigma)}{\lambda_k} + \frac{a_k^{r/(r-1)}}{\lambda_k^{r/(r-1)}} \frac{2^{1/(r-1)}}{r_*} (1 + \sigma^{r_*}) \right) \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{7}}{\leq} \left(-\widehat{A}_k (1 - \sigma - \sigma') + \frac{\widehat{a}_k^{r/(r-1)}}{\widehat{\lambda}_k^{1/(r-1)}} \frac{2^{1/(r-1)}}{r_*} (1 + \sigma^{r_*}) \right) \frac{\gamma_k}{\lambda_k} \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{8}}{\leq} -\frac{\widehat{A}_k (1 - \sigma - \sigma')}{2} \min \left\{ \widehat{\lambda}_k^{-1}, \lambda_k^{-1} \right\} \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Above, we wrote the definition of the gaps in $\textcircled{1}$, we canceled some terms and we used the indicator on the left hand side to handle the cases $k = 1$ and $k > 1$ at the same time. We also used the bound $A_k U_k \leq (1 - \gamma_k) A_{k-1} f(y_{k-1}) + \gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \tilde{y}_k$. In $\textcircled{2}$, we applied the enlarged subgradient property on the remaining terms with $f(\cdot)$, namely $\gamma_k A_{k-1} (f(y_k) - f(\tilde{y}_k))$ and used $a_k = \gamma_k \widehat{a}_k$, $\widehat{A}_k = A_{k-1} + \widehat{a}_k$, yielding error $\gamma_k A_{k-1} \varepsilon_k$ which gives $\gamma_k \widehat{A}_k \varepsilon_k$ after merging it with the other error. We grouped the resulting expression with another term, and we used that the terms in parentheses are $\ell_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) - \ell_{k-1}(z_k)$. The $(1, r)$ -uniform convexity of $\ell_{k-1}(\cdot)$ and the fact that z_{k-1} is its minimizer implies the bound. In $\textcircled{3}$, we used that by definition of x_k it is $\widehat{A}_k x_k = A_{k-1} y_{k-1} + \widehat{a}_k z_{k-1}$, along with $a_k = \gamma_k \widehat{a}_k$. We had added and subtracted z_{k-1} to apply Hölder's and Young's inequalities in $\textcircled{4}$, namely $\langle v, u \rangle \leq \|v\|_* \|u\| \leq \frac{1}{r_*} \|v\|_*^{r_*} + \frac{1}{r} \|u\|^r$. In $\textcircled{5}$, we added and subtracted some \widehat{v}_k terms and use simple bounds to make $\|v_k - \widehat{v}_k\|_*$ appear. We do this because the first and third resulting terms are proportional to $\|y_k - x_k\|^r$ and with our criterion we can make the rest to be as well. So indeed, in $\textcircled{6}$ we applied the properties of the oracle $\textcircled{3}$ for the second and fourth terms and used $\textcircled{4}$ which also holds in this algorithm, and this application yields equality for the first and third terms. We obtain $\textcircled{7}$ by substituting $a_k = \gamma_k \widehat{a}_k$, and using that by definition of $\gamma_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\lambda_k / \widehat{\lambda}_k, 1\}$, it is $\gamma_k / \lambda_k = \min\{\widehat{\lambda}_k^{-1}, \lambda_k^{-1}\} \leq \widehat{\lambda}_k^{-1}$. We also used the assumption $\varepsilon_k \leq \frac{\sigma'}{\lambda_k} \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\|^r$.

Finally, for ⑧, we find $\widehat{a}_k > 0$ so the second summand is half of the absolute value of the first summand. This only changes the value of \widehat{a}_k slightly with respect to making the bound 0, and at the same time, it provides a good negative term that can be used to guarantee fast growth of A_k when $\|y_k - x_k\|$ is large enough. Let $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_*(1-\sigma-\sigma')}{2(1+\sigma^{r_*})} \right)^{r-1}$. It is enough to solve the equation $\widehat{a}_k^r = C \widehat{A}_k^{r-1} \widehat{\lambda}_k$. And this does not require to know the value of λ_k , which is only revealed after we choose x_k and receive the answer from the oracle $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_r$. The first part of the second statement now holds by (7) and the definition of our E_k .

Borrowing from [CHJ+22] (note that our convention of for the proximal parameter λ being in the denominator of the Moreau's envelope definition reverses the order), we define $S_T^{\geq} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{k \in [T] \mid \lambda_k \geq \widehat{\lambda}_k\} = \{k \in [T] \mid \gamma_k = 1\}$ the set of up iterates, and recall that after any iterate k of them we have that $\widehat{\lambda}_k$ is increased to $\widehat{\lambda}_{k+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha \widehat{\lambda}_k$. Similarly, the set of down iterates is defined as $S_T^{\leq} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{k \in [T] \mid \lambda_k < \widehat{\lambda}_k\}$ and after any of these iterates k , we have $\widehat{\lambda}_{k+1} = \alpha^{-1} \widehat{\lambda}_k$. The first iterate is an up iterate by construction, see Line 2 of Algorithm 2.

The sequence of iterates up to T can be split into subsequences of maximal length with only up or only down iterates. We denote the last iterate of the i -th subsequence of down iterates as d_{i+1} . And for convenience, even if the first and last iterates are not down iterates we denote them by $d_1 = 1$ and $d_S = T$, where $S - 1$ is the number of up subsequences. We denote the last iterate of the i -th of these $S - 1$ up subsequences as u_i . As an example:

$$\underbrace{U}_{d_1} \ U \ \underbrace{U}_{u_1} \ D \ D \ \underbrace{D}_{d_2} \ U \ U \ \underbrace{U}_{u_2} \ D \ D \ D \ \underbrace{D}_{d_3} \ \underbrace{U}_{u_3} \ \underbrace{D}_{d_4} \ U \ U \ \underbrace{U}_{u_4} \ D \ \underbrace{D}_{d_5}$$

Because of how we update $\widehat{\lambda}_k$, and the indices definitions, we have for $i \in [S - 1]$ that $\widehat{\lambda}_{u_i} \geq \alpha^{d_{i+1}-u_i-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_{i+1}}$, where the inequality is an equality for $i = S$ in case that the last iterate is an up iterate in which case $u_{S-1} = d_S$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{u_{S-1}} = \widehat{\lambda}_{d_S} \geq \alpha^{d_S-u_{S-1}-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_S}$. We also have for all $i \in [S]$ that $\widehat{\lambda}_{u_i} \geq \alpha^{u_i-d_i-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i}$, where the inequality is also an equality except for $i = 1$ in case that the first subsequence of up iterates is of length one in which case $d_1 = u_1$ and so $\widehat{\lambda}_{u_1} \geq \alpha^{u_1-d_1-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_1}$.

Now, given the relation $\widehat{a}_k^r = \frac{1}{2} C \widehat{A}_k^{r-1} \widehat{\lambda}_k$, and $a_k = \widehat{a}_k$ and $A_k = \widehat{A}_k$ for all k , and $A_k \geq A_{k-1}$, we have ① below by (8):

$$\begin{aligned} A_T^{1/r} &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\geq} A_{T-1}^{1/r} + \mathbb{1}_{\{T \in S_T^{\geq}\}} \frac{C^{1/r}}{r} \widehat{\lambda}_T^{1/r} \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} \sum_{i \in S_T^{\geq}} \frac{C^{1/r}}{r} \widehat{\lambda}_i^{1/r}. \\ &\geq \frac{C^{1/r}}{2r} \left(\sum_{i \in [S-1]} \widehat{\lambda}_{u_i}^{1/r} + \sum_{i \in [S-1]} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i}^{1/r} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\geq} \frac{C^{1/r}}{2r} \left(\sum_{i=2}^S (\alpha^{d_i-u_{i-1}-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i})^{1/r} + \sum_{i=1}^{S-1} (\alpha^{u_i-d_i-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i})^{1/r} \right) \tag{12} \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{\geq} \frac{C^{1/r}}{2r} \left((\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(u_1-d_1)-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_1})^{1/r} + \sum_{i=2}^{S-1} (\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(u_i-u_{i-1})-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i})^{1/r} + (\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(d_S-u_{S-1})-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_S})^{1/r} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{5}}{\geq} \frac{C^{1/r}}{2r} \sum_{i \in Q} (\alpha^{r_i-2} \widehat{\lambda}_{d_i})^{1/r}, \end{aligned}$$

where ② applied the same as ① recursively. In ③ we applied the bounds on $\widehat{\lambda}_{u_i}$ that we computed above. In ④, for the indices $i = 2, 3, \dots, S-1$, we used the r - and geometric mean inequality: $\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^{a/r} + \alpha^{b/r}) \geq \alpha^{(a+b)/(2r)} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^{(a+b)/(2r)}$ for any $r > 0$, where losing a factor of 2 is done just for convenience. In the first and third summands, we just reduce the value of the exponent in order to have a unified structure in ⑤, where we just used the numbers $r_i \geq 0$ defined as $r_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(n_1 - d_1) = \frac{1}{2}(n_1 - 1)$, $r_S = \frac{1}{2}(d_S - n_{S-1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(T - n_{S-1})$, and for $i = 2, 3, \dots, S-1$, it is $r_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}(n_i - n_{i-1})$. And note $\sum_{i=1}^S r_i = \frac{T-1}{2}$.

Finally, we note that T was arbitrary, and also that the numbers defined by the subsequence are compatible with a longer subsequence, except for the last one. The theorem statement holds, after some indices relabeling and using a set Λ . \blacksquare

Appendix B. Other proofs

Proof of Proposition 4.

Proof of Property 1. For the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $p = 1$, we can consider the function $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_1^2$, then for instance for $x = \mathbb{1}$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$, there is not a unique minimizer. Similarly, if $p = \infty$ and $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_\infty^2$ then for instance for $x = e_1$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ there is not a unique minimizer. For $p \in (1, \infty)$ the minimizer $\text{prox}(x)$ is unique since $\frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x - \cdot\|^2$ is strictly convex.

Proof of Property 2. The function to be optimized in the definition of $M(x)$ is jointly convex on x, y . Consequently, the epigraph of $(x, y) \mapsto f(y) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x - y\|^2$ is convex and so the epigraph of $M(x)$ is the projection of a convex set and therefore convex. The joint convexity is derived from the joint convexity of $(x, y) \mapsto \|x - y\|^2$ which holds since for points $x, x', y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\|(x + x')/2 - (y + y')/2\|^2 \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|x - y\| + \frac{1}{2}\|x' - y'\| \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x' - y'\|^2,$$

where we used the triangular inequality in ① and $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ in ②.

Proof of Property 3. By definition of M , we have

$$f(\text{prox}(x)) \leq f(\text{prox}(x)) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x - \text{prox}(x)\|^2 = M(x) \leq f(x) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x - x\|^2 = f(x).$$

In particular, since $f(x^*) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$, it must be $f(\text{prox}(x^*)) = M(x^*) = f(x^*)$.

Proof of Property 4. By the generalized Danskin's theorem [BNO03], we have $\partial M(x) = \text{conv}\{h_x(\text{prox}(x)) \mid \text{prox}(x) \in \text{Prox}(x)\}$. Moreover, by the first order optimality condition of any $\text{prox}(x) \in \text{Prox}(x)$ in the optimization problem defining $M(x)$, we have $0 \in \partial f(\text{prox}(x)) + \partial_y \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2\lambda} \Big|_{y=\text{prox}(x)}$ and so there is $g \in h_x(\text{prox}(x))$ such that $g \in \partial f(\text{prox}(x))$. Note that our proof relies on the symmetry of the function that we use to convolve with f , or more in particular, on $h_x(y) = -h_y(x)$ for all x, y . (compare to Bregman proximal point, in which one uses the Moreau envelope $M(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{f(y) + D_\psi(x, y)\}$ where D_ψ is not symmetric in general).

Proof of Property 5. Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2$ and let $g \in \partial f(x)$, for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 = f(x) \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} \langle g, x \rangle - f^*(g) \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} \|g\|_* \cdot \|x\| - f^*(g) \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}\|g\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 - f^*(g) \stackrel{\textcircled{4}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2.$$

where ① uses Fenchel duality, ② uses Cauchy-Schwarz, ③ is due to Young's inequality and ④ uses the duality between norms. Because we arrived to an equality, then ② and ③ must be equalities, which only holds if $\langle g, x \rangle = \|x\|^2 = \|g\|_*^2$. By shifting, scaling, and [Property 4](#), defining any $g \in h_x(\text{prox}(x))$ and $g_M \in \partial M(x)$, we have $\lambda \langle g, \text{prox}(x) - x \rangle = \|x - \text{prox}(x)\|^2 = \|\lambda g\|_*^2 \stackrel{?}{=} \lambda^2 \|g_M\|_*^2 \stackrel{?}{=} \lambda \langle g_M, \text{prox}(x) - x \rangle$, as desired.

Proof of [Property 6](#). We have

$$M_{\lambda_1}(x) - \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \|x - \text{prox}_{\lambda_1}(x)\|^2 \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} f(\text{prox}_{\lambda_1}(x)) \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} M_{\lambda_2}(\text{prox}_{\lambda_1}(x)),$$

where ① holds by definition of $M(x)$ and $\text{prox}(x)$, and ② uses [Property 3](#). ■

Appendix C. Unaccelerated Proximal Point Algorithm Analysis

In this section we present an analysis of an unaccelerated proximal point algorithm, that is optimal for convex functions with q -th high-order Lipschitz derivative for the case $p = \infty$. We focus on the exact proximal point case, whereas a generalization to the inexact implementation of the proximal point using oracle in [\(3\)](#) yields similar rates. For a possibly non-Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$, we define the algorithm

$$x_{k+1} \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ f(x) + \frac{1}{2\lambda_k} \|x_k - x\|^2 \right\},$$

for a closed convex set \mathcal{X} and a function f with minimizer x^* when constrained to \mathcal{X} . Let $g_k \in \partial f(x_{k+1})$ such that $\|g_k\|_* = \frac{1}{\lambda} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|$, see [Definition 3](#), [Property 5](#). Define $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{k \in [T]} \|x_i - x^*\|$. For instance, if \mathcal{X} is compact, we can use its diameter, or we can choose $\mathcal{X} = B_{\|\cdot\|_p}(x_0, O(\|x_0 - x^*\|_p))$. Also define $U_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_{k+1}(x_{k+1})$ and the lower bound L_k on $f(x^*)$ as $A_k L_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i M_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \langle g_i, x^* - x_i \rangle \leq A_k f(x^*)$. Recall $A_k = A_{k-1} + a_k = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$, for $a_k > 0$ to be determined later, and let $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_k - L_k$. We have, for all $k \geq 1$ (note $A_0 = 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} A_k G_k - A_{k-1} G_{k-1} &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} A_{k-1} (M_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - M_k(x_k)) + a_k M_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad - a_k M_k(x_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i M_i(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i \langle g_i, x^* - x_i \rangle - a_k \langle g_k, x^* - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i M_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i \langle g_i, x^* - x_i \rangle \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\leq} -\frac{A_k}{2\lambda} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{a_k}{\lambda} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| R. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Above, ① just uses the definitions and cancels some terms, and ② groups some terms, uses the descent [Definition 3](#), [Property 6](#), Hölder's inequality along with the definition of R , and $\|g_k\|_* = \frac{1}{\lambda} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|$. We can analyze now a few cases:

- Now suppose that, regardless of the value of λ , we can guarantee that either $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \geq c$ for a constant $c > 0$, or we find a minimizer (i.e., we implement a ball optimization oracle). Then, choosing $a_k = A_k \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| / (4R)$ we obtain that the right hand side of (13) is $\leq -\frac{A_k}{4\lambda_k} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \leq 0$. If we solve the equation $a_k = (A_{k-1} + a_k) \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| / (4R)$, we obtain $a_k = A_{k-1} \left(\frac{4R}{\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|} - 1 \right)^{-1}$ and so $A_k = A_{k-1} + a_k = A_{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| / (4R)} \right) \geq A_{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{1 - c / (4R)} \right) \geq A_1 \left(\frac{1}{1 - c / (4R)} \right)^{k-1} \geq A_1 \exp((k-1) \frac{c}{4R})$. Thus, we conclude:

$$f(x_{T+2}) - f(x^*) \leq M_{T+1}(x_{T+1}) - f(x^*) \leq G_T \leq \frac{A_1 G_1}{A_T} \leq G_1 \exp(-(k-1) \frac{c}{4R}).$$

So we obtain an ε -minimizer is $\tilde{O}(\frac{R}{c} \log(\frac{G_1}{\varepsilon}))$ iterations.

- Now instead let us upper bound $a_k \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| R / \lambda$ on the right hand side of (13) by $\frac{A_k}{4\lambda} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{a_k^2 R^2}{\lambda A_k}$ by using Young's inequality. Suppose $1/\lambda \leq c$, which is a movement bound that can be easily implemented inexactly for L -smooth functions by using $1/\lambda \leq L$ and the negative term we produced. Then, the right hand side can be bounded by $\frac{a_k^2 c R^2}{A_k}$, and we conclude

$$f(x_{T+2}) - f(x^*) \leq M_{T+1}(x_{T+1}) - f(x^*) \leq G_T \leq \frac{1}{A_T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{a_k^2 c R^2}{A_k} \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{4cR^2}{T+2}.$$

We obtain $\textcircled{1}$ above if we choose $a_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k+1$ and so $A_k = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$.

- More in general than in the previous point, suppose that $1/\lambda_k = c \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^{q+\nu-2}$. For example, this is what happens if we implement $x_{k+1} \in \arg \min \{f(x) + \frac{c}{q+\nu} \|x_k - x\|^{q+\nu}\}$ and can be implemented inexactly for high-order Hölder-smooth functions, as detailed in Section 4. Indeed, we have by the first-order optimality condition:

$$\partial f(x_{k+1}) + c \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^{q+\nu-2} \partial \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2 \right) (x_{k+1}) = \partial f(x_{k+1}) + \frac{c}{q+\nu} \partial (\|x - x_k\|^{q+\nu}) (x_{k+1}) = 0. \quad (14)$$

For notational convenience, let $\hat{q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} q + \nu$. Now arguing similarly as before, by using Young's inequality $ab \leq \frac{1}{r} (\omega a)^r + \frac{1}{s} (b/\omega)^s$ for $r = \hat{q}/(\hat{q}-1) > 1$, $s = \hat{q} > 1$ and $\omega = A_k^{(\hat{q}-1)/\hat{q}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{A_k}{2\lambda_k} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{a_k}{\lambda_k} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| R \\ &= -\frac{cA_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^{\hat{q}} + ca_k \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^{\hat{q}-1} R \\ &\leq -\frac{cA_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^{\hat{q}} + \frac{c(\hat{q}-1)}{\hat{q}} \left(A_k \frac{\hat{q} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^{\hat{q}}}{4(\hat{q}-1)} \right) + \frac{c}{\hat{q}} \left(\frac{(4(\hat{q}-1)/\hat{q})^{(\hat{q}-1)} R^{\hat{q}} a_k^{\hat{q}}}{A_k^{\hat{q}-1}} \right) \\ &= -\frac{cA_k}{4} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^{\hat{q}} + \frac{c(4(\hat{q}-1))^{(\hat{q}-1)} R^{\hat{q}} a_k^{\hat{q}}}{(\hat{q})^{\hat{q}} A_k^{\hat{q}-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

So if we choose $a_k = \Theta_q(k^{\hat{q}-1})$, we obtain $A_k = \Theta_q(k^{\hat{q}})$ and thus

$$f(x_{T+2}) - f(x^*) \leq M_{T+1}(x_{T+1}) - M_{T+1}(x^*) \leq G_T = O_{\hat{q}} \left(\frac{1}{A_T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{ca_k^{\hat{q}} R^{\hat{q}}}{A_k^{\hat{q}-1}} \right) = O_{q+\nu} \left(\frac{cR^{q+\nu}}{T^{q+\nu-1}} \right).$$