

Linear Convergence Analysis of Single-loop Algorithm for Bilevel Optimization via Small-gain Theorem

Jianhui Li

JIANHUILI@ZJU.EDU.CN

College of Control Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University, P. R. China

School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, P. R. China

Shi Pu

PUSHI@CUHK.EDU.CN

School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, P. R. China

Jianqi Chen

JQCHEN@NJU.EDU.CN

Center for Advanced Control and Smart Operations (CACSO), Nanjing University, P. R. China

Junfeng Wu

JUNFENGWU@CUHK.EDU.CN

School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, P. R. China

Abstract

Bilevel optimization has gained considerable attention due to its broad applicability across various fields. While several studies have investigated the convergence rates in the strongly-convex-strongly-convex (SC-SC) setting, no prior work has proven that a single-loop algorithm can achieve linear convergence. This paper employs a small-gain theorem in robust control theory to demonstrate that a single-loop algorithm based on the implicit function theorem attains a linear convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$, where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is specified in Theorem 3. Specifically, We model the algorithm as a dynamical system by identifying its two interconnected components: the controller (the gradient or approximate gradient functions) and the plant (the update rule of variables). We prove that each component exhibits a bounded gain and that, with carefully designed step sizes, their cascade accommodates a product gain strictly less than one. Consequently, the overall algorithm can be proven to achieve a linear convergence rate, as guaranteed by the small-gain theorem. The gradient boundedness assumption adopted in the single-loop algorithm (Hong et al. (2023); Chen et al. (2022)) is replaced with a gradient Lipschitz assumption in Assumption 2.2. To the best of our knowledge, this work is first-known result on linear convergence for a single-loop algorithm.

Keywords: Bilevel optimization, convergence rate, computational complexity

1. Introduction

Bilevel optimization has witnessed an up-soaring in recent years due to its broad applicability to various domains, such as adversarial training (Huang et al. (2020); Robey et al. (2023)), hyperparameter tuning (Franceschi et al. (2018); Sinha et al. (2020); Okuno et al. (2021)), and model pruning (Zhang et al. (2022); Schwag et al. (2020)). This class of optimization problems is characterized by two nested levels, namely an upper and a lower level, where the decision variables are mutually constrained. Specifically, a bilevel optimization problem can be formalized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{\omega} && f(\omega, v) && \text{(upper-level problem)} \\ & \text{s.t.} && v \in \arg \min_v g(\omega, v) && \text{(lower-level problem),} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where f and g are continuously differentiable functions, and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the upper- and lower-level variables, respectively.

Table 1: Summary of convergence rates of bilevel optimization algorithms. “Design” refers to whether the algorithm adopts a single-loop or double-loop structure. We use the abbreviations SC-SC for strongly-convex-strongly-convex and NC-SC for nonconvex-strongly-convex conditions. For the specific values of ρ_1 and ρ , readers are referred to corresponding papers and Theorem 3 for details.

Algorithm	Condition	Design	Step sizes (upper, lower)	Rate
BA (Ghadimi and Wang (2018))	deterministic SC-SC	double	$\mathcal{O}(1), \mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(\rho_1^k)$ ^(a)
stocBIO (Ji et al. (2021))	stochastic NC-SC	double	$\mathcal{O}(1), \mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$ ^(b)
STABLE (Chen et al. (2022))	stochastic SC-SC	single	$\mathcal{O}(k^{-1/2}), \mathcal{O}(k^{-1/2})$	$\mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$
TTSA (Hong et al. (2023))	stochastic SC-SC	single	$\mathcal{O}(k^{-1}), \mathcal{O}(k^{-2/3})$	$\mathcal{O}(k^{-2/3})$
Proposed method (Theorem 3)	deterministic SC-SC	single	$\mathcal{O}(1), \mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$

^(a) The linear rate solely considers the update iterations of the upper-level, overlooking the gradually increasing number of lower-level gradient evaluations that might be involved in each evaluation of the upper-level gradient.

^(b) In the nonconvex setting, the analysis establishes convergence towards the stationary point.

To tackle the problem (1), a double-loop iterative algorithm is first adopted in Ghadimi and Wang (2018), where the inner loop searches the minimizer of $g(\omega, \cdot)$ given fixed ω , and the outer loop minimizes the upper-level objective function. Variants of double-loop algorithms can be found in Ji et al. (2021); Arbel and Mairal (2021) and their applications in Shou and Di (2020); Franceschi et al. (2017). However, this approach is considered as computationally inefficient since the lower-level solution becomes outdated with every update of ω , requiring repeated recalculations due to the shifting lower-level problem.

In contrast, single-loop algorithms (Li et al. (2022); Chen et al. (2022)) update ω and v concurrently. Since the gradient of the upper-level objective function ideally depends on the exact solution of the lower-level problem, these algorithms need to replace the exact gradient with an estimate that incorporates the current iterate v_k of the lower-level variable v to break the dependency. Compared to double-loop counterparts, single-loop algorithms are more computationally efficient and simpler to implement. Nonetheless, establishing their convergence and convergence rate is more challenging due to the use of an approximated upper-level gradient. Numerous studies have explored the convergence of single-loop algorithms. For instance, Ji et al. (2021) proves a sublinear convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$ for the implicit differentiation (AID) and iterative differentiation (ITD) methods, which computes the approximated gradient using either a single update or iterative updates per iteration. The papers Chen et al. (2021); Khanduri et al. (2021) further incorporate stochastic approximation techniques. Due to the computational burden of calculating the inverse of the Hessian matrix in gradient approximation, Li et al. (2022) proposes a Hessian inverse-free algorithm. The paper Liu et al. (2022) further applies the algorithm to incentive design problem and proves a sublinear con-

vergence rate. The paper [Hong et al. \(2023\)](#) analyzes the convergence rate under the SC-SC setting. They propose a two-timescale stochastic approximation (TTSA) algorithm, where the upper- and lower-level step sizes decay at different rates, and demonstrate its convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(k^{-2/3})$. However, they assume a bounded upper-level gradient which may conflict with the strong convexity condition on the upper-level function. Additionally, [Ji and Liang \(2023\)](#) derives an optimistic complexity bound for linear convergence under SC-SC, meaning that if the algorithm can achieve linear convergence, the rate cannot exceed its established limit. Their work also establishes linear convergence for a double-loop algorithm, wherein the update frequency of the inner loop is adaptively determined based on the targeted error of the loss function. To summarize, various single-loop algorithms have been developed and analyzed under different settings (such as convex-strongly-convex or stochastic settings).

In this paper, robust control techniques are employed to establish linear convergence of the order $\mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$, for some $\rho \in (0, 1)$ specified in [Theorem 3](#). We model the update process of the single-loop method as a dynamical system, with the gradients as inputs and the upper- and lower-level variables as system states. Inspired by the approach in [Hu and Lessard \(2017a\)](#), we apply a small-gain theorem to examine the input-output stability of a modified rendition of the modeled dynamical system. Several studies, including [Hu and Lessard \(2017a,b\)](#); [Lessard et al. \(2016\)](#), also utilize robust control techniques (such as integral quadratic constraints and the small-gain theorem) to derive convergence for optimization algorithms. However, these works primarily focus on single-level optimization, where the convergence result is comparatively more well-known to the community.

Main contributions: First, we establish a linear convergence rate for a single-loop algorithm under the SC-SC condition, as formalized in [Theorem 3](#). To the best of our knowledge, this presents the first result that demonstrates linear convergence for the single-loop algorithm. Prior studies ([Hong et al. \(2023\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2022\)](#)) predominantly achieve sublinear rates in stochastic gradient setting. These studies typically rely on the assumption of a bounded upper-level gradient (i.e., $\|\nabla f_*(\omega)\|$ is bounded; see [Remark 1](#) for a detailed discussion.). This restrictive assumption prevents the derivation of linear convergence rates, even in deterministic setting. Second, in contrast to the bounded upper-level gradient assumption, we adopt a gradient Lipschitz condition ([Assumption 2.2](#)). It aligns the theoretical derivations more closely with practical scenarios, as the bounded upper-level gradient assumption may conflict with the SC-SC condition.

Notation: Unless otherwise specified, lowercase letters (e.g., ω, v) denote vectors, while uppercase letters (M) denote matrices. The gradient of the twice continuously differentiable function $g(\omega, \cdot)$ with respect to v is denoted by $\nabla_v g(\omega, v)$, and the Hessian matrix with respect to v is denoted by $\nabla_{vv}^2 g(\omega, v)$. We denote $\nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} g(\omega, v)$. Let $\|v\|_2$ denote the standard Euclidean norm of a vector v . Let ℓ_{2e}^p denote the set of all one-sided sequences $\{x_0, x_1, \dots\}$ with each $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and let $\ell_2^p \subseteq \ell_{2e}^p$ denote the set of square-summable sequences, i.e., those with bounded ℓ_2 norm $\|x\| := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x_k\|_2^2$. The superscript p will be skipped if it is clear from the context. The gain of a causal bounded operator $K : \ell_{2e} \rightarrow \ell_{2e}$ is induced by ℓ_2 signals, defined as $\|K\| = \sup_{x \in \ell_2, x \neq 0} \frac{\|Kx\|}{\|x\|}$. In particular, when K is a linear time-invariant system, the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of the transfer function $\hat{K}(z)$ of K is defined as $\|\hat{K}\|_\infty := \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]} \sigma_{\max}(\hat{K}(e^{j\omega}))$, which evaluates the highest singular value of $\hat{K}(e^{j\omega})$ over the frequency range $[-\pi, \pi]$, and has $\|\hat{K}(z)\|_\infty = \|K\|$.

2. Preliminary

2.1. The Single-loop Algorithm

We are concerned about the single-loop algorithm as studied in [Hong et al. \(2023\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2022\)](#), which updates ω, v simultaneously. The underlying intuition is as follows. When $g(\omega, \cdot)$ is strongly-convex, this function has a unique minimizer for any ω , denoted as $v_*(\omega)$. The upper-level objective function can then be written as $f_*(\omega) := f(\omega, v_*(\omega))$. Therefore, its gradient can be computed as

$$\nabla_{\omega} f_*(\omega) = \nabla_{\omega} f(\omega, v_*(\omega)) + \nabla_{\omega} v_*(\omega) \nabla_v f(\omega, v_*(\omega)).$$

Note that the gradient typically requires access to $v_*(\omega)$, which is in general not available unless the lower-level problem admits a closed-form solution. To evaluate $\nabla_{\omega} v_*(\omega)$, by differentiating both sides of the first-order optimality condition $\nabla_v g(\omega, v_*(\omega)) = 0$ with respect to ω , we have

$$\nabla_{\omega} v_*(\omega) \nabla_{vv}^2 g(\omega, v_*(\omega)) + \nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v_*(\omega)) = 0.$$

With the strong convexity assumption, $g(\omega, \cdot)$ admits an invertible Hessian matrix. In virtue of the implicit function theorem ([Ghadimi and Wang \(2018\)](#)), we have

$$\nabla_{\omega} f_*(\omega) = \nabla_{\omega} f(\omega, v_*(\omega)) - \nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v_*(\omega)) [\nabla_{vv}^2 g(\omega, v_*(\omega))]^{-1} \nabla_v f(\omega, v_*(\omega)).$$

In order to devise an iterative update, we replace $v_*(\omega)$ in the above formula with an arbitrary v and define the so-called approximated gradient as follows:

$$\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega, v) := \nabla_{\omega} f(\omega, v) - \nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v) [\nabla_{vv}^2 g(\omega, v)]^{-1} \nabla_v f(\omega, v).$$

Finally, the update rule of ω and v can be formalized as

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{k+1} &= \omega_k - \alpha \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k), \\ v_{k+1} &= v_k - \beta \nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where α, β are step sizes.

2.2. Assumptions

In this subsection, we characterize the assumptions necessary for the convergence rate analysis of the algorithm (2).

Assumption 1 *The lower-level objective function satisfies*

1. Function $g(\omega, \cdot)$ is μ_g -strongly convex, i.e., $\langle \nabla_v g(\omega, v), v' - v \rangle \leq -\frac{\mu_g}{2} \|v - v'\|_2^2$ holds for any ω, v, v' ;
2. Function $g(\omega, \cdot)$ is L_g -smooth, i.e., $\|\nabla_v g(\omega, v) - \nabla_v g(\omega, v')\|_2 \leq L_g \|v - v'\|_2$ holds for all ω, v, v' .

Assumption 2 *The upper-level objective function satisfies*

1. Function $f_*(\cdot)$ is μ_f -strongly convex, i.e., $\langle \nabla_{\omega} f_*(\omega), \omega' - \omega \rangle \leq -\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2^2$ holds for all ω, ω' ;

2. The approximated gradient $\tilde{\nabla}f(\omega, v)$ is H_ω -Lipschitz with respect to ω , and H_v -Lipschitz with respect to v , i.e., for all ω, ω', v, v' ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\nabla}f(\omega, v) - \tilde{\nabla}f(\omega', v)\| &\leq H_\omega \|\omega - \omega'\|_2, \\ \|\tilde{\nabla}f(\omega, v) - \tilde{\nabla}f(\omega, v')\| &\leq H_v \|v - v'\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Assumptions 1 and 2.1 are customary for analysis of bilevel optimization with SC-SC setting, used in Liu et al. (2022); Hong et al. (2023); Ghadimi and Wang (2018). The H_ω -Lipschitz property in Assumption 2.2 is used in Liu et al. (2022) and can be derived from Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 in Hong et al. (2023) or from the identical assumptions (Assumption 1 and 2) in Ghadimi and Wang (2018).

Remark 1 Prior studies (Chen et al. (2022); Hong et al. (2023)) commonly assume a uniformly bounded upper-level gradient $\nabla_\omega f_*(\omega)$. However, such an assumption is overly restrictive and may potentially conflict with the strong convexity of $\nabla_\omega f_*(\omega)$ (Assumption 2.1). In contrast, we substitute this assumption with H_v -Lipschitz property in Assumption 2.2 in the derivation of our main result, which is less restrictive in the sense that it better aligns with real-world scenarios.

We further assume that the Hessian $\nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v)$ is bounded.

Assumption 3 There exists $H > 0$ such that, for all ω, v , $\|\nabla_{\omega v}^2 g(\omega, v)\|_2 < H$.

Given Assumption 1.1 that $g(\omega, \cdot)$ is μ_g -strongly convex, we have $\|[\nabla_{vv}^2 g(\omega, v)]^{-1}\|_2 \leq 1/\mu_g$. Consequently, the lower-level solution $v_*(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous, proved by following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Lemma B.3 in Liu et al. (2022)) For problem (1), under Assumptions 1.1 and 3, we have $\|v_*(\omega) - v_*(\omega')\|_2 \leq \frac{H}{\mu_g} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2$.

3. Main Results

In this section, we derive the linear convergence rate of the single-loop algorithm (2) for solving the bilevel optimization under the SC-SC condition. The update rule (2) is modeled as a dynamical system in Section 3.1, with the nonlinear components (i.e., the gradients) as control inputs, and the linear components as a linear state space model. We then compute the gain of the nonlinear component in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3, by optimizing the gain of the linear part, we establish a set of feasible step sizes that enable the single-loop algorithm to converge linearly, along with a characterization of the convergence rate.

3.1. The Dynamical System

We begin by modeling the iterative update (2) of variables as a dynamical system. Since the equilibrium of (2) is in general not at the origin, for the convenience of analysis, we introduce a coordinate shift to reshape the variable update dynamics. Specifically, we define a new state $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ as

$$x_k := \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,k} \\ x_{2,k} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \omega_k - \omega^* \\ v_k - v_*(\omega_k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: (a) The feedback interconnection of P and K with external inputs s and r . (b) The diagram of the system after implementing the linear transformation M , as specified by (16), onto the system depicted in (a). The inputs s and r are absent. (c) The feedback interconnection modified by introducing operators $\rho_- := \rho^{-k}$, $\rho_+ := \rho^k$ for some given $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

where ω^* is the minimizer of $f_*(\cdot)$. Sequently, by introducing a nonlinear function $\phi(x_k)$, which is component-wise defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(x_k) &:= \tilde{\nabla} f(x_{1,k} + \omega^*, x_{2,k} + v_*(\omega_k)), \\ \phi_2(x_k) &:= \nabla_v g(x_{1,k} + \omega^*, x_{2,k} + v_*(\omega_k)) + \frac{1}{\beta} (v_*(x_{1,k} + \omega^* - \alpha \phi_1(x_k)) - v_*(x_{1,k} + \omega^*)),\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

we obtain the following dynamics in a compact form for (2):

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \text{diag}(\alpha I_m, \beta I_n) \phi(x_k). \quad (5)$$

Following the conventional representation of feedback systems in control theory, it can be further cast as the interconnection $[P, K]$ of a linear system (in state-space form) with P :

$$\begin{aligned}x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + Bu_k, \\ y_k &= Cx_k + Du_k,\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where $A = I_{m+n}$, $B = \text{diag}(\alpha I_m, \beta I_n)$, $C = I_{m+n}$ and $D = 0$ (x_k, y_k will be used interchangeably since they are identical.), and a memoryless nonlinear component K : $u_k = \phi(y_k)$. See Figure 1(a) for the system diagram with external inputs at rest, i.e., $s, r = 0$.

We introduce different stability definitions of a dynamical system (Dullerud and Paganini (2013)) with setup specified in (6).

Definition 1 (Internal Stability) *The system in Figure 1(a) is said to be internally stable if it is well-posed¹, and for every initial conditions x_0 of P , $x_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $s, r = 0$. It is said to be exponentially stable with rate ρ if there exist constants $c > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|x_k\|_2 \leq c\rho^k \|x_0\|_2$ with any initial state x_0 and $s, r = 0$.*

Definition 2 (Bounded-input-bounded-output (BIBO) Stability) *The system in Figure 1(a) is said to be bounded-input-bounded-output stable if the closed-loop map $\begin{bmatrix} r \\ s \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ is a bounded, casual operator.*

1. The system in Figure 1(a) is well posed if unique solutions exist for x_k, u_k and y_k , for all initial conditions x_0 and all regular inputs s_0 and r_0 .

Our primary approach to certify the linear convergence of (2) is to establish a connection with the BIBO stability of a modified system. To achieve this, we introduce the operators ρ_+ and ρ_- as two time-varying multipliers ρ^k and ρ^{-k} , where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. By breaking the interconnection of $[P, K]$ and incorporating ρ_+ and ρ_- at the break point, we derive a modified system resembling the configuration in Figure 1(c). Since for a signal u with z -transform $\hat{u}(z)$, the z -transforms of $\rho_+ u$ and $\rho_- u$ are $\hat{u}(z/\rho)$ and $\hat{u}(\rho z)$, respectively, the operator $\rho_- \circ P \circ \rho_+$ has z -transform $\hat{P}(\rho z)$. The following lemma formally articulates the connection.

Lemma 2 (Proposition 5 in Boczar et al. (2015)) *Suppose the system P has a minimal realization. If the interconnection in Figure 1(c) is BIBO stable, then the system in Figure 1(a) is exponentially stable with rate ρ .*

The small-gain theorem is used to certify the BIBO stability.

Lemma 3 (Small-gain theorem in Desoer and Vidyasagar (2009)) *Suppose $[P, K]$ shown in Figure 1(a) is well-posed, and P and K are bounded causal operators. If $\|K\|\|P\| < 1$, then $[P, K]$ is BIBO stable.*

The roadmap for overall proof unfolds as follows. First we relocate the nonlinearity K into a sector-bounded region by a linear transformation applied to x_k, u_k of the system $[P, K]$, thus determining the gain of the nonlinear mapping. Subsequently, we build the modified system as depicted in Figure 1(c) by incorporating the ρ_+ and ρ_- operators. Finally, we separately compute the gain to analyze the BIBO stability of the system using the small-gain theorem.

3.2. Gain of Nonlinear Component

In this subsection, we compute the gain of the nonlinear operator K . We first derive the following lemmas that characterize the inequalities governing the state (3) and control input (4).

Lemma 4 *Under Assumption 2, for any k , we have*

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k), \omega_k - \omega^* \rangle \geq \frac{3\mu_f}{8} \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 - \frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2, \quad (7)$$

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2 \leq 2(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2}) \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 + 4H_v^2 \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2. \quad (8)$$

Proof Routine calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k), \omega_k - \omega^* \rangle &= \langle \nabla f_*(\omega_k), \omega^* - \omega_k \rangle + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k) - \nabla f_*(\omega_k), \omega^* - \omega_k \rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{\mu_f} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k) - \nabla f_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu_f}{8} \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{3\mu_f}{8} \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 + \frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to Assumption 2.1 and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and the second inequality is due to Assumption 2.2. As for (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2 &\leq 2\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k) - \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega^*, v_k)\|_2^2 + 4\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega^*, v_k) - \tilde{\nabla} f(\omega^*, v_*(\omega_k))\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + 4\|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega^*, v_*(\omega_k)) - \nabla f_*(\omega^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 2(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2}) \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2^2 + 4H_v^2 \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is based on Assumption 2.2 and Lemma 1. \blacksquare

Lemma 5 *Under Assumption 1, for any k , we have*

$$\langle \nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k) + \frac{1}{\beta}(v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - v_*(\omega_k)), v_k - v_*(\omega_k) \rangle \geq \frac{3\mu_g}{8} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^3} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2, \quad (9)$$

$$\|\nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k) + \frac{1}{\beta}(v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - v_*(\omega_k))\|_2^2 \leq 2L_g^2 \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^2} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

Proof Routine calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle \nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k) + \frac{1}{\beta}v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - \frac{1}{\beta}v_*(\omega_k), v_k - v_*(\omega_k) \rangle \\ & \leq - \frac{\mu_g}{2} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{\beta^2 \mu_g} \|v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu_g}{8} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq - \frac{3\mu_g}{8} \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^3} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the first inequality is due to Assumption 1.1, and the third one is due to Lemma 1 as well as (2). As for (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k) + \frac{1}{\beta}v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - \frac{1}{\beta}v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq 2\|\nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_k) - \nabla_v g(\omega_k, v_*(\omega_k))\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{\beta^2} \|v_*(\omega_{k+1}) - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq 2L_g^2 \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^2} \|\tilde{\nabla} f(\omega_k, v_k)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to Assumption 1.2. \blacksquare

Next we adopt a linear transformation to x_k and u_k and further derive the gain of a transformed nonlinear mapping on top of Lemmas 4 and 5.

Lemma 6 *If there exist positive scalars $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \alpha$, and β satisfying following conditions*

$$\frac{3\lambda_1^2}{4\lambda_3} > \frac{3\mu_f}{8} \lambda_1 - 2(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2}) \lambda_3, \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\lambda_2^2}{4\lambda_4} > -\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} \lambda_1 + \frac{3\mu_g}{8} \lambda_2 - 4H_v^2 \lambda_3 - 2L_g^2 \lambda_4, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{2}{3} \lambda_3 \geq \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^3} \lambda_2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^2} \lambda_4, \quad (14)$$

then there exists a linear transformation $M \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)}$, defining $\begin{bmatrix} \xi_k \\ \sigma_k \end{bmatrix} = M \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}$, such that the transformed state ξ_k and input σ_k satisfy $(\sigma_k - \xi_k)^\top (\sigma_k + \xi_k) \leq 0$.

Proof From (3) and (4), inequalities (7),(9),(8),(10) are equivalent to the following: $-\langle \phi_1(x_k), x_{1,k} \rangle \leq -\frac{3\mu_f}{8}\|x_{1,k}\|_2^2 + \frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f}\|x_{2,k}\|_2^2$, $-\langle \phi_2(x_k), x_{2,k} \rangle \leq -\frac{3\mu_g}{8}\|x_{2,k}\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^3}\|\phi_1(x_k)\|_2^2$, $\|\phi_1(x_k)\|_2^2 \leq 2(H_\omega^2 + \frac{2H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})\|x_{1,k}\|_2^2 + 4H_v^2\|x_{2,k}\|_2^2$ and $\|\phi_2(x_k)\|_2^2 \leq 2L_g^2\|x_{2,k}\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^2}\|\phi_1(x_k)\|_2^2$. Suppose there exists positive scalars $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \alpha, \beta$ satisfying (12), (13), and (14), we obtain following inequality in compact form by summing the above four inequalities using weight parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} aI_m & & -\frac{\lambda_1}{2}I_m & \\ & bI_n & & -\frac{\lambda_2}{2}I_n \\ -\frac{\lambda_1}{2}I_m & & \frac{\lambda_3}{3}I_m & \\ & -\frac{\lambda_2}{2}I_n & & \lambda_4 I_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}^\top N_0 \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} \leq 0, \quad (15)$$

where $a := \frac{3\mu_f}{8}\lambda_1 - 2(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})\lambda_3$, $b := -\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f}\lambda_1 + \frac{3\mu_g}{8}\lambda_2 - 4H_v^2\lambda_3 - 2L_g^2\lambda_4$. Let

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{3\lambda_1^2}{4\lambda_3} - a}} I_m & & & \\ & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2^2}{4\lambda_4} - b}} I_n & & \\ \frac{3\lambda_1}{2\lambda_3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{3\lambda_1^2}{4\lambda_3} - a}} I_m & & \sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda_3}} I_n & \\ & \frac{\lambda_2}{2\lambda_4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2^2}{4\lambda_4} - b}} I_n & & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_4}} I_n \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ M_2 & M_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

We can verify that $M^\top N_0 M = \text{diag}(-I_{m+n}, I_{m+n})$. Substituting $\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} = M \begin{bmatrix} \xi_k \\ \sigma_k \end{bmatrix}$ to (15) leads to $\sigma_k^\top \sigma_k \leq \xi_k^\top \xi_k$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

We remark that the conditions (12), (13) and (14) in Lemma 6 are not overly restrictive for ensuring the existence of M . At least, as long as $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}$ and $\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_4}$ are sufficiently large and $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is sufficiently small (Indeed, a specific threshold for $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is discussed in Theorem 3.), these conditions are satisfied. From the nonlinear component K and the linear transformation M that converts x_k, u_k from ξ_k, σ_k , an equivalent nonlinearity K' that directly maps ξ_k to σ_k can be outlined. The formulation is expressed as $K' : \xi_k \mapsto \sigma_k := M_3^{-1}(\phi(M_1 \xi_k) - M_2 \xi_k)$, where M_1, M_2, M_3 are specified in (16). Moreover, the gain of K' satisfies $\|K'\| = \sup_{\xi_k \neq 0} \frac{\|\sigma_k\|}{\|\xi_k\|} \leq 1$, indicated by Lemma 6. Finally, to pair with K' to close the loop, we need to construct a new linear system P' from P in tandem; see Figure 1(b) for the new interconnection between P' and K' .

3.3. Putting Things Together

To prove the final convergence of the overall single-loop algorithm, we need to construct a set of parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$ and step sizes α, β which satisfy the conditions outlined in Lemma 6 to ensure that $\|K'\|$ is less than 1 as well as the H_∞ norm of the transformed linear state space also less than 1. We construct such parameters with following theorem.

Theorem 3 *When the step sizes in the single-loop algorithm (2) satisfy*

$$\alpha < \min\left\{\frac{\mu_f}{8(H_\omega^2 + \frac{2H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})}, \frac{1}{24\mu_f}\right\}, \beta < \min\left\{\frac{\mu_g}{8L_g^2}, \frac{1}{4\mu_g}\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} < \frac{2\mu_f \mu_g^4}{81H_v^2 H^2},$$

the variables ω_k, v_k generated by (2) converges linearly to $\omega^*, v_*(\omega^*)$ with rate ρ^k , where

$$\rho \leq \max \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{3\mu_f\alpha}{4} \left(1 - \frac{8(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})\alpha}{\mu_f}\right)}, \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mu_g\beta}{2} (1 - 4L_g^2\beta)} \right\},$$

i.e., there exists constants $c_\omega, c_v > 0$ such that $\|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2 \leq c_\omega \rho^k (\|w_0 - \omega^*\|_2 + \|v_0 - v_*(\omega_0)\|_2)$, and $\|v_k - v_*(\omega^*)\|_2 \leq c_v \rho^k (\|w_0 - \omega^*\|_2 + \|v_0 - v_*(\omega_0)\|_2)$.

Proof Given parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \alpha$ and β satisfying conditions in Lemma 6, a real matrix M specified in (16) exists. We therefore construct the following P' to accomplish the new system interconnection $[P', K']$:

$$\xi_{k+1} = \text{diag} \left(\left(1 - \frac{3\lambda_1}{2\lambda_3}\alpha\right)I_m, \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2\lambda_4}\beta\right)I_n \right) \xi_k - \text{diag} \left(\alpha \sqrt{\frac{9\lambda_1^2}{4\lambda_3^2} - \frac{3a}{\lambda_3}} I_m, \beta \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2^2}{4\lambda_4^2} - \frac{b}{\lambda_4}} I_n \right) \sigma_k.$$

Note that its transfer matrix is diagonal. We compute each term on the diagonal as follows: $\hat{P}'_1(z) = \frac{\alpha \frac{3\lambda_1}{2\lambda_3} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_3 a}{3\lambda_1^2}}}{z + \frac{3\lambda_1}{2\lambda_3}\alpha - 1}$ and $\hat{P}'_2(z) = \frac{\beta \frac{\lambda_2}{2\lambda_4} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_4 b}{\lambda_2^2}}}{z + \frac{\lambda_2}{2\lambda_4}\beta - 1}$, where a and b are defined in the proof of Lemma 6. Next we consider the interconnection modified by introducing operators $\rho_- := \rho^{-k}, \rho_+ := \rho^k$ for given $\rho \in (0, 1)$. The operator $\rho_- \circ P \circ \rho_+$ has z -transform $\hat{P}'_\rho(z) = \hat{P}'(\rho z)$, whose first diagonal term has \mathcal{H}_∞ norm given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{P}'_{\rho,1}(z)\|_\infty &= \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_3 a}{3\lambda_1^2}}}{\frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1\alpha}(\rho - 1) + 1} && \text{if } 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1}, \\ \|\hat{P}'_{\rho,1}(z)\|_\infty &= \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_3 a}{3\lambda_1^2}}}{\frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1\alpha}(1 + \rho) - 1} && \text{if } \alpha \geq \frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1}. \end{aligned}$$

The smallest value of ρ that makes this norm less than 1, if possible, is consistently achieved when $\alpha = \frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1}$. A similar observation occurs to $\hat{P}'_{\rho,2}(z)$ with $\beta = \frac{2\lambda_4}{\lambda_2}$.

Therefore, if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$ satisfy $a > 0, b > 0$ and (12), (13), and (14), then any $\rho > \max\{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_3 a}{3\lambda_1^2}}, \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_4 b}{\lambda_2^2}}\}$ will lead to $\|\hat{P}'_\rho(z)\| < 1$, which further implies the linear convergence of x_k in (2) with a rate no larger than $\max\{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_3 a}{3\lambda_1^2}}, \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda_4 b}{\lambda_2^2}}\}$ due to Lemma 2. To complete the proof, it suffices to establish sufficient condition under which λ_1 to λ_4 are feasible to the above set of five inequalities.

First, by dividing both sides of $a > 0$ and (12) with λ_1 and substituting $\alpha = \frac{2\lambda_3}{3\lambda_1}$ in the inequalities, we obtain $\frac{3\mu_f}{8} - 3(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})\alpha > 0$ and $\frac{3\mu_f}{8} - 3(H_\omega^2 + 2\frac{H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})\alpha < \frac{1}{2\alpha}$, which hold when $\alpha < \min\{\frac{\mu_f}{8(H_\omega^2 + \frac{2H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^2})}, \frac{1}{24\mu_f}\}$. Similarly, by assigning $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = \frac{\mu_g}{8} / \left(\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} + 6H_v^2\alpha\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{b}{\lambda_2} &= \left(-\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f}\lambda_1 + \frac{3\mu_g}{8}\lambda_2 - 4H_v^2\lambda_3 - 2L_g^2\lambda_4 \right) / \lambda_2 \\ &= -\left(\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} + 6H_v^2\alpha \right) \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} + \frac{3\mu_g}{8} - L_g^2\beta = \frac{\mu_g}{4} - L_g^2\beta. \end{aligned}$$

The inequalities $b > 0$ and (13) hold when $\beta < \min\{\frac{\mu_g}{8L_g^2}, \frac{1}{4\mu_g}\}$. Lastly, to find conditions such that (14) holds, we divide the right hand side of (14) with λ_3 and obtain

$$\frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^3} \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3} + \frac{2\alpha^2 H^2}{\beta^2 \mu_g^2} \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_3} = \left(\frac{2}{\beta \mu_g} + 1 \right) \frac{2\alpha H^2}{3\beta \mu_g^2} \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \leq \frac{9}{4\beta \mu_g} \frac{2\alpha H^2}{3\beta \mu_g^2} \frac{18H_v^2}{\mu_f \mu_g} = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \frac{27H_v^2 H^2}{\mu_g^4 \mu_f},$$

where the inequality is due to $\beta < \frac{1}{4\mu_g}$, $\alpha < \frac{1}{24\mu_f}$, and $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = \frac{\mu_g}{8} / \left(\frac{2H_v^2}{\mu_f} + 6H_v^2 \alpha \right)$. When $\frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} < \frac{2\mu_f \mu_g^4}{81H_v^2 H^2}$, (14) holds.

Therefore, we have $\omega_k - \omega^*$ and $v_k - v_*(\omega_k)$ converge to zero linearly with rate ρ^k . Furthermore, with Lipschitz continuity of $v_*(\cdot)$ proved in Lemma 1, we have $\|v_k - v_*(\omega^*)\|_2 \leq \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2 + \|v_*(\omega_k) - v_*(\omega^*)\|_2 \leq \|v_k - v_*(\omega_k)\|_2 + H_* \|\omega_k - \omega^*\|_2$ also converge linearly. ■

According to Theorem 3, linear convergence of (2) under the SC-SC condition necessitates sufficiently small step sizes α, β , along with a modest ratio of $\frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}$. An intuitive rationale for a small ratio of $\frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}$ may be that it guarantees a more effective convergence of the inner problem relative to the optimization at the outer layer. This setting may facilitate pinpointing a refined point at the lower level for conducting gradient approximations in the upper-level gradient descent.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we consider a single-loop algorithm for solving SC-SC bilevel optimization problem. Our main contribution is establishing a linear convergence rate which is primarily faster compared with existing sublinear rates. The proof technique is mainly motivated by control theory previously used to prove the convergence of single-level optimization problems. By constructing a set of parameters which ensure the product of gains of nonlinear control component and linear state-space system component is less than 1, we prove the linear convergence of the algorithm via the small-gain theorem and provide the convergence rate.

References

- Michael Arbel and Julien Mairal. Amortized implicit differentiation for stochastic bilevel optimization. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.14580](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.14580), 2021.
- Ross Boczar, Laurent Lessard, and Benjamin Recht. Exponential convergence bounds using integral quadratic constraints. In [2015 54th IEEE conference on decision and control \(CDC\)](#), pages 7516–7521. IEEE, 2015.
- Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. Closing the gap: Tighter analysis of alternating stochastic gradient methods for bilevel problems. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 34: 25294–25307, 2021.
- Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, Quan Xiao, and Wotao Yin. A single-timescale method for stochastic bilevel optimization. In [International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics](#), pages 2466–2488. PMLR, 2022.
- Charles A Desoer and Mathukumalli Vidyasagar. [Feedback systems: input-output properties](#). SIAM, 2009.

- Geir E Dullerud and Fernando Paganini. A course in robust control theory: a convex approach, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Luca Franceschi, Michele Donini, Paolo Frasconi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Forward and reverse gradient-based hyperparameter optimization. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 1165–1173. PMLR, 2017.
- Luca Franceschi, Paolo Frasconi, Saverio Salzo, Riccardo Grazi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning. In International conference on machine learning, pages 1568–1577. PMLR, 2018.
- Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02246, 2018.
- Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A two-timescale stochastic algorithm framework for bilevel optimization: Complexity analysis and application to actor-critic. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 33(1):147–180, 2023.
- Bin Hu and Laurent Lessard. Control interpretations for first-order optimization methods. In 2017 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 3114–3119. IEEE, 2017a.
- Bin Hu and Laurent Lessard. Dissipativity theory for nesterov’s accelerated method. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 1549–1557. PMLR, 2017b.
- W Ronny Huang, Jonas Geiping, Liam Fowl, Gavin Taylor, and Tom Goldstein. Metapoisson: Practical general-purpose clean-label data poisoning. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:12080–12091, 2020.
- Kaiyi Ji and Yingbin Liang. Lower bounds and accelerated algorithms for bilevel optimization. Journal of machine learning research, 24(22):1–56, 2023.
- Kaiyi Ji, Junjie Yang, and Yingbin Liang. Bilevel optimization: Convergence analysis and enhanced design. In International conference on machine learning, pages 4882–4892. PMLR, 2021.
- Prashant Khanduri, Siliang Zeng, Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A near-optimal algorithm for stochastic bilevel optimization via double-momentum. Advances in neural information processing systems, 34:30271–30283, 2021.
- Laurent Lessard, Benjamin Recht, and Andrew Packard. Analysis and design of optimization algorithms via integral quadratic constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 26(1):57–95, 2016.
- Junyi Li, Bin Gu, and Heng Huang. A fully single loop algorithm for bilevel optimization without hessian inverse. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 36, pages 7426–7434, 2022.
- Boyi Liu, Jiayang Li, Zhuoran Yang, Hoi-To Wai, Mingyi Hong, Yu Nie, and Zhaoran Wang. Inducing equilibria via incentives: Simultaneous design-and-play ensures global convergence. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:29001–29013, 2022.

- Takayuki Okuno, Akiko Takeda, Akihiro Kawana, and Motokazu Watanabe. On lp-hyperparameter learning via bilevel nonsmooth optimization. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 22(245): 1–47, 2021.
- Alexander Robey, Fabian Latorre, George J Pappas, Hamed Hassani, and Volkan Cevher. Adversarial training should be cast as a non-zero-sum game. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11035, 2023.
- Vikash Sehwal, Shiqi Wang, Prateek Mittal, and Suman Jana. Hydra: Pruning adversarially robust neural networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:19655–19666, 2020.
- Zhenyu Shou and Xuan Di. Reward design for driver repositioning using multi-agent reinforcement learning. Transportation research part C: emerging technologies, 119:102738, 2020.
- Ankur Sinha, Tanmay Khandait, and Raja Mohanty. A gradient-based bilevel optimization approach for tuning hyperparameters in machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.11022, 2020.
- Yihua Zhang, Yuguang Yao, Parikshit Ram, Pu Zhao, Tianlong Chen, Mingyi Hong, Yanzhi Wang, and Sijia Liu. Advancing model pruning via bi-level optimization. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:18309–18326, 2022.