

# Beyond Minimax Optimality: A Subgame Perfect Gradient Method

Benjamin Grimmer\*

Kevin Shu†

Alex L. Wang‡

January 29, 2025

## Abstract

The study of unconstrained convex optimization has historically been concerned with worst-case *a priori* convergence rates. The development of the Optimized Gradient Method (OGM), due to Drori and Teboulle [12], Kim and Fessler [19], marked a major milestone in this study, as OGM achieves the optimal worst-case convergence rate among all gradient-span first-order methods. However, this notion of worst-case optimality is relatively coarse and allows OGM to have worst-case performance even on instances where stronger convergence guarantees are possible. For example, OGM is known to converge at its worst-case rate even on the toy example  $Lx^2/2$ , where exact convergence in just two steps is possible.

We introduce a notion of optimality which is stronger than minimax optimality that requires a method to give optimal *dynamic* guarantees that exploit any “non-adversarialness” in the first-order oracle’s reported information. We then give an algorithm which achieves this stronger optimality notion: the Subgame Perfect Gradient Method (SPGM). SPGM is a refinement of OGM whose update rules and convergence guarantees are dynamically computed in response to first-order information seen during the algorithm’s execution. From a game-theoretic viewpoint, OGM can be seen as one side of a Nash Equilibrium for the “minimization game” whereas SPGM can be seen as one side of a *Subgame Perfect Equilibrium* for the same game. We also show that SPGM can be implemented with minimal computational and storage overhead in each iteration and provide a Julia implementation.

## 1 Introduction

This paper considers black-box first-order methods for smooth convex minimization. Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $L$ -smooth convex function with a minimizer  $x_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We wish to construct algorithms that effectively minimize the normalized suboptimality:

$$\frac{f(x_N) - f(x_*)}{L\|x_0 - x_*\|^2/2},$$

where  $x_N$  is the final iterate of the method and  $x_0$  is the starting iterate of the method.

Classically, the design of first-order methods has focused on algorithms with good (or in some cases, optimal) *a priori* worst-case guarantees [28]. In [12, 19], a momentum based first-order method known as the Optimized Gradient Method (OGM) was exhibited, and this method was shown in [9] to achieve the best possible worst-case performance on the class of  $L$ -smooth convex functions. This is often referred to as *minimax optimality*. To be precise, it was shown in [19] that for any  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f$ , OGM guarantees

$$\frac{f(x_N) - f(x_*)}{L\|x_0 - x_*\|^2/2} \leq \frac{1}{\tau_N^O},$$

where we define  $\tau_N^O$  in (OGM recurrence).<sup>1</sup> It was later shown in [9] that as long as  $d \geq N + 2$ , there exists a

\*Johns Hopkins University, Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, grimmer@jhu.edu

†California Institute of Technology, Computational and Mathematical Sciences, kshu@caltech.edu

‡Purdue University, Daniels School of Business, wang5984@purdue.edu

<sup>1</sup>We state the (OGM recurrence) in terms of a sequence  $\tau_0^O, \dots, \tau_N^O$ . This differs from the original presentation in [19, Equation 6.13] that involves a sequence  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_N$ . Equivalence between the two recurrences follows from the change of variables:  $\tau_i^O = 2\theta_i^2$  for  $i = 0, \dots, N - 1$  and  $\tau_N^O = \theta_N^2$ .




Figure 1: Left: The first five iterates of OGM on  $f(x) = Lx^2/2$  with  $x_0 = 1$ . OGM produces  $x_4 \approx 0.304$ . Right: The first three iterates of SPGM on  $f(x) = Lx^2/2$  with  $x_0 = 1$ . After seeing the history  $\mathcal{H} = \{(x_0, f_0, g_0), (x_1, f_1, g_1)\}$ , SPGM determines that  $x_\star = 0$  for all  $L$ -smooth convex functions agreeing with  $\mathcal{H}$ .

function  $f_{\text{hard}}$  so that for any gradient span first-order method,

$$\frac{f_{\text{hard}}(x_N) - f_{\text{hard}}(x_\star)}{L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2/2} \geq \frac{1}{\tau_N^{\text{O}}}.$$

Recall, a first-order method is a gradient span method if at each iteration,  $x_i \in x_0 + \text{span}\{\nabla f(x_0), \dots, \nabla f(x_{i-1})\}$ .

While OGM achieves the optimal *a priori* worst-case guarantee, its guarantees may be overly conservative, and its execution may be suboptimal when faced with non-adversarial functions. As a simple example, consider the quadratic function  $f(x) = \frac{L}{2}x^2$  with initial iterate  $x_0 = 1$  (see Figure 1). It is known [20, Theorem 5.1] that OGM’s behavior on this function satisfies  $f(x_N) - f(x_\star) = \frac{L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2}{2\tau_N^{\text{O}}}$ . However, OGM’s choice of  $x_2, \dots, x_N$  is suboptimal, as after seeing just the function and gradient values at  $x_0$  and  $x_1$ , one can deduce that  $x_\star = 0$  for *any*  $L$ -smooth convex function agreeing with this history. We see that OGM provides optimal guarantees on “hard instances”, but fails to improve its guarantees on “easy instances”.

In practical settings, the first-order oracle simply reports first-order information from a fixed function and may, at times, reveal useful information that would otherwise not be present in an adversarial function. Thus, our goal is to construct a method that exploits useful information in a dynamic way to achieve optimal convergence on both “hard instances” and “easy instances” in a formal sense.

In order to make this notion of optimality precise, we consider a game-theoretic framework for evaluating first-order methods. This will allow us to state a criterion for a first-order method that demands that it capitalizes on useful information. We then construct a method, the Subgame Perfect Gradient Method (SPGM), that achieves this stronger notion of optimality. Here, the terminology “subgame perfect” references the game-theoretic notion of a “Subgame Perfect Equilibrium”, which will be defined shortly. We present the game-theoretic framework next and then state precisely SPGM’s performance guarantees in Theorem 1.

## 1.1 A game-theoretic framework for analysis of first order methods

We consider a zero-sum game, which we refer to as the *minimization game*. This game is played between two players, Alice and Bob, where Alice represents the first-order method and Bob represents the first-order oracle. We will say that a set of triples  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  indexed by some index set  $\mathcal{I}$  is *interpolable* if there exists an  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f$  so that  $f$  is  $L$ -smooth and convex, and  $f(x_i) = f_i$  and  $\nabla f(x_i) = g_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ .

The game proceeds in  $N + 1$  rounds, indexed by  $n = 0, \dots, N$ . In round  $n$ , Alice chooses a point  $x_n \in x_0 + \text{span}\{g_0, \dots, g_{n-1}\}$  representing a query point, and Bob responds with a pair  $(f_n, g_n)$  with  $f_n \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $g_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in such a way that there exists a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  so that  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=0}^n$  is interpolable. At the end of round  $N$ , Bob additionally specifies a triple  $(x_\star, f_\star, g_\star) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $g_\star = 0$  so that  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in [0, N] \cup \{\star\}}$  is interpolable. Alice’s payoff is the reciprocal of the normalized suboptimality:

$$\frac{L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2/2}{f(x_N) - f(x_\star)}.$$

The subgames where Alice has a decision to make can be fully specified by the first-order history  $\mathcal{H} = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ , which is guaranteed to be interpolable. We will denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of subgames where it is Alice's turn to make a decision. A deterministic strategy for Alice in the minimization game is a mapping from each subgame to a query point  $x_n \in x_0 + \text{span}(\{g_0, \dots, g_{n-1}\})$ .

Similarly, the subgames where Bob has a decision to make can be fully specified by the first-order history  $\mathcal{H} = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$  together with some  $x_n \in x_0 + \text{span}(\{g_0, \dots, g_{n-1}\})$ . We will denote by  $\mathcal{B}$  the set of subgames where Bob must make a decision. A deterministic strategy for Bob is a mapping from each subgame  $(\mathcal{H}, x_n) \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $|\mathcal{H}| \leq N - 1$  to some  $(f_n, g_n)$  so that  $\mathcal{H} \cup \{(x_n, f_n, g_n)\}$  is interpolable, and a mapping for each subgame  $(\mathcal{H}, x_N) \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $|\mathcal{H}| = N$  to  $(f_N, g_N, x_*, f_*)$  so that  $\mathcal{H} \cup \{(x_N, f_N, g_N), (x_*, f_*, g_*)\}$  is interpolable, where  $g_* := 0$ .

For a given pair of strategies  $(A, B)$ , the payoff of the strategies (from Alice's perspective) is the final value of

$$\frac{L \|x_0 - x_*\|^2 / 2}{f(x_N) - f(x_*)},$$

where the query points are chosen according to  $A$  and the oracle responses are chosen according to  $B$ .

## 1.2 Equilibrium notions in the minimization game

We say that a pair of strategies  $(A, B)$  is in *Nash Equilibrium* if neither player can increase their payoff by changing strategies. In this game, one strategy for Alice would be to choose query points consistent with OGM (see Algorithm 1). The OGM guarantee states

$$f(x_N) - f(x_*) \leq \frac{L}{2\tau_N^O} \|x_0 - x_*\|^2.$$

That is, Alice is guaranteed a payoff of at least  $\tau_N^O$  regardless of Bob's play. Here,  $\tau_N^O$  is the result of the following recurrence:

$$\tau_n^O := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \tau_{n-1}^O + 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\tau_{n-1}^O} & \text{if } n \in [1, N - 1], \\ \tau_{N-1}^O + \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\tau_{N-1}^O}}{2} & \text{if } n = N, \end{cases} \quad (\text{OGM recurrence})$$

and grows asymptotically like  $\tau_N^O \approx \frac{N^2}{2}$ .

One strategy for Bob would be to report the function and gradient values from the  $L$ -smooth function  $f_{\text{hard}}$ . This strategy is available as long as  $d \geq N + 2$ . By [9, Theorem 3], Bob can guarantee that

$$f_N - f_* \geq \frac{L}{2\tau_N^O} \|x_0 - x_*\|^2$$

regardless of Alice's play, i.e., Alice is guaranteed a payoff of at most  $\tau_N^O$  regardless of Alice's play. Thus, these two strategies form a Nash Equilibrium; neither player can increase their payoff by deviating their strategies.

While Nash Equilibrium is perhaps the most popular notion of equilibrium in a game, stronger notions exist. A pair of strategies  $(A, B)$  is said to be in *Subgame Perfect Equilibrium* if for every subgame, the strategies defined by restricting  $A$  and  $B$  to that subgame are in Nash Equilibrium. This notion is stronger than that of Nash Equilibrium (see [32] for details on game theory), and the situation described in Figure 1 shows that OGM does not have this stronger property.

This notion is practically important when the function we are trying to optimize is not adversarially chosen. We may model the non-adversarial nature of typical functions as Bob playing this game "suboptimally", i.e. playing a strategy that is not part of a Nash Equilibrium for the game. Thus, a strategy for Alice which is part of a Subgame Perfect Equilibrium can be regarded as an algorithm which capitalizes on suboptimal

play to the largest extent possible, while still accounting for the possibility that Bob may begin to play adversarially in the future.

The following theorem essentially states SPGM is part of a Subgame Perfect Equilibrium.

**Theorem 1.** *For any  $0 < n \leq N$  and any set of first-order history  $\mathcal{H} = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in [0, n-1]}$  generated by SPGM, the output  $x_N$  of running SPGM for  $N - n$  additional iterations satisfies*

$$f(x_N) - f(x_\star) \leq \frac{L}{2\hat{\tau}_N} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2,$$

where  $\hat{\tau}_N$  is the result of (SPGM recurrence). Additionally, if  $d \geq N + 2$ , then there exists an  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  agreeing with the history  $\mathcal{H}$  such that the output  $x_N$  from any method satisfying

$$x_i \in x_0 + \text{span}(\{g_0, \dots, g_{i-1}\}), \quad \forall i \in [n, N]$$

satisfies

$$f_N - f_\star \geq \frac{L}{2\hat{\tau}_N} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2.$$

**Remark 1.** Technically, SPGM is not a “strategy” for Alice as SPGM does not assign an action to certain game states, namely those that cannot occur as a result of running SPGM on some first-order oracle. However, because we are primarily concerned with the design of algorithms, such subgames are not relevant to us, as they would not result from choices made by the algorithm. It can be shown via backward induction that there is a Subgame Perfect Equilibrium  $(A, B)$  so that  $A$  extends SPGM in the sense that  $A$  plays the same action as SPGM in all cases where SPGM is defined, but this is beyond the scope of this paper.  $\square$

An identical result holds for the setting where the history from only the  $k$  most recent iterations is stored. In this setting, it is natural to augment the first-order history  $\mathcal{H}$  with a minimal amount of additional information  $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $z_{i+1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  related to intermediate deductions about the unknown function  $f$  made in the  $i$ th iteration. See Sections 2.2 and 3 for the motivation and definition for  $\tau_i$  and  $z_{i+1}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Given any set of first-order history  $\mathcal{H} = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i, \tau_i, z_{i+1})\}_{i \in [n-k, n-1]}$  generated by SPGM, the output  $x_N$  of running SPGM for  $N - n$  additional iterations satisfies*

$$f_N - f_\star \leq \frac{L}{2\tau_N} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2,$$

where  $\tau_N$  is the result of (SPGM recurrence). Additionally, if  $d \geq N + 2$ , then there exists an  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  agreeing with the history  $\mathcal{H}$  such that the output  $x_N$  from any method satisfying

$$x_i \in \text{aff}(\{x_0\} \cup \{x_i, z_{i+1}\}_{i \in [n-k, n-1]}) + \text{span}(\{g_{n-k}, \dots, g_{i-1}\}), \quad \forall i \in [n, N] \quad (1)$$

satisfies

$$f_N - f_\star \geq \frac{L}{2\tau_N} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2.$$

The computational overhead of limited-memory variant of SPGM can be shown to be  $O(k^3 + dk)$  time per iteration (see Remark 3).

SPGM can be derived constructively through the Performance Estimation Program (PEP) framework [12, 37]. Specifically, SPGM is an optimized version of OGM where the quantities  $(f_i, x_i, g_i)_{i \in [0, n-1]}$ , which are treated as *variables* in the PEP framework before the start of the optimization procedure, become constants at round  $n$ . Surprisingly, the computation required to implement the SPGM amounts to solving a single *low-dimensional convex* optimization problem in each iteration. Thus, the SPGM can be implemented in a numerically stable manner with minimum additional overhead.

### 1.3 Related work

Smooth convex optimization is a classic problem with, by now, a lengthy history. We summarize some relevant literature both classic and modern.

Gradient descent, which dates back at least to Cauchy et al. [6], is perhaps the simplest algorithm for smooth convex optimization. In this setting, gradient descent with stepsize  $1/L$ , i.e., the algorithm  $x_n = x_{n-1} - \frac{1}{L}g_{n-1}$  can be shown to achieve suboptimality  $f_N - f_\star \leq \frac{L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2}{2N}$  [13]. In a seminal result of Nesterov [30], a method was constructed with the guarantee  $f_N - f_\star \leq \frac{2L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2}{N^2}$ . An almost matching lower bound was given by Nemirovsky and Yudin [28] showing that  $f_N - f_\star \leq \frac{2L\|x_0 - x_\star\|^2}{N^2}$  is optimal up to constants. This *acceleration*, from  $N$  in the denominator to  $N^2$  in the denominator, also generalizes to problems with simple constraints, minimizing the maximum of smooth convex functions, and the composite optimization framework (see [31]).

Since the early 2010s, there has been an explosion of work seeking optimal methods in large part due to the Performance Estimation Program (PEP) framework initiated by Drori and Teboulle [12], Taylor et al. [37]. There, it was shown that the problem of proving a convergence rate for a Fixed-Step First-Order Method (FSFOM) can be rephrased as solving a semidefinite program. Formally, a FSFOM is a first-order method where stepsizes and/or momentum terms are *constants* that are chosen offline independent of the first-order oracle’s output. This opened the door to the computer-assisted design of first-order methods [12, 16]. By now, a significant list of *minimax optimal* or conjectured minimax optimal first-order methods have been discovered. In the game-theoretic framework of Section 1.1, minimax optimal corresponds to the best possible payoff for Alice that she can guarantee when playing against an optimal adversary.

The Optimized Gradient Method for smooth convex optimization was first observed numerically in [12] and proved analytically in [19]. It was proved to be minimax optimal in [9]. Adaptive versions of this method have been designed using linesearching [10, 35] as well as restarting [22] techniques. An optimized first-order method for strongly convex minimization was derived in [8, 33, 39], culminating in the development of the minimax optimal Information-Theoretic Exact Method of [36]. Optimized methods able to be applied to various constrained settings or settings with proximal terms have been developed as well [4, 17, 18, 21, 38]. The minimax optimal constant stepsize gradient descent scheme for smooth convex or strongly convex optimization was first observed numerically in [12] and proved in [24, 34]. Conjectured minimax optimal long stepsize gradient descent schemes with partial acceleration were first observed numerically in [16] with upper bounds proved analytically in [1, 2, 14, 15, 40, 41].

In conjunction with all of the above algorithmic developments, a significant body of literature has now evolved for producing *lower bounds* [9, 11, 28, 29]. Our analysis in Section 4 relies heavily on the *zero-chain* constructions of [11].

We emphasize that all results above are *a priori* minimax optimal or conjectured minimax optimal. In contrast, the guarantees of SPGM are *dynamic* minimax optimal. Additionally, the SPGM is *not* a FSFOM as its stepsizes and momentum terms are chosen dynamically at runtime.

### 1.4 Outline

We provide some background information on PEP and OGM in Section 2. Section 3 introduces the SPGM formally and proves its convergence guarantee (Theorem 3). The proof of Theorem 3 is constructive in the sense that it shows how the update rules defining SPGM can be derived naturally from the PEP framework. Section 4 constructs matching worst-case functions agreeing with given history (see Propositions 1 and 2). Together, Theorem 3 and Propositions 1 and 2 constitute a proof for Theorems 1 and 2. We conclude with preliminary numerical experiments in Section 5 comparing SPGM with gradient descent, OGM, and Limited-Memory BFGS [25].

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Smooth convex minimization and performance estimation

This section summarizes background material on the Performance Estimation Programming (PEP) methodology, initiated by Drori and Teboulle [12], Taylor et al. [37], in the setting of unconstrained smooth convex optimization.

Our goal is to find an optimal solution to the unconstrained minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x),$$

where  $f$  is known to be convex and  $L$ -smooth, and is assumed to have a minimizer.

Recall, a convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $L$  smooth if it is differentiable and for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|.$$

Instead of thinking about the function  $f$  itself, it will be useful to think about the collection of first-order data that a first-order method encounters:  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ . Here,  $\mathcal{I}$  is some index set and we use the shorthand  $f_i = f(x_i)$  and  $g_i = \nabla f(x_i)$ . The following lemma gives a characterization of when a set of first-order data is consistent (or *interpolable*) by an  $L$ -smooth convex function.

**Lemma 1.** *Given a set of first-order data  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ , there exists a  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f$  satisfying*

$$f(x_i) = f_i \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla f(x_i) = g_i, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$$

*if and only if the quantity*

$$Q_{i,j} := f_i - f_j - \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2$$

*is nonnegative for all  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$ .*

### 2.2 Optimized Gradient Method (OGM)

The OGM algorithm can be described as follows:

---

#### Algorithm 1 OGM

---

Given  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f$ , initial iterate  $x_0$ , iteration budget  $N$

- Define  $\tau_0^O = 2$  and  $z_1 = x_0 - 2g_0$
- For  $n = 1, \dots, N$ 
  - Reveal  $g_{n-1} = \nabla f(x_{n-1})$
  - Set  $\phi_n := \tau_{n-1}^O$
  - Define

$$\psi_n := \begin{cases} 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\phi_n} & \text{if } n \leq N - 1 \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\phi_n}}{2} & \text{else} \end{cases}, \quad \tau_n^O := \phi_n + \psi_n,$$

$$x_n := \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_n^O} \left( x_{n-1} - \frac{1}{L} g_{n-1} \right) + \frac{\psi_n}{\tau_n^O} z_n, \quad \text{and} \quad z_{n+1} := z_n - \frac{\psi_n}{L} g_n.$$


---

Note that at the time that  $z_{n+1} = z_n - \frac{\psi_n}{L} g_n$  is defined, the quantity  $g_n$  is still unknown. What we mean by this definition is that  $z_{n+1}$  is a *formal expression* in  $g_n$  that becomes a concrete vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  upon learning  $g_n$  at the beginning of iteration  $n + 1$ .

The performance of OGM can be understood in terms of an inductive statement that is maintained throughout the algorithm. The elegant analysis below was first given by [35] and presented clearly in [13, Theorem 4.4]

and [33]. We begin the induction by setting  $\tau_0^O = 2$  and partially defining  $z_1 = x_0 - \frac{2}{L}g_0$ . Then, the following expression is guaranteed to be nonnegative:

$$H_0 := \tau_0^O \left( f_\star - f_0 + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_0\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_1 - x_\star\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Indeed, one can check that  $H_0 = 2Q_{\star,0}$ . Next, at iteration  $n \in [1, N-1]$ , we may assume inductively that

$$H_{n-1} := \tau_{n-1}^O \left( f_\star - f_{n-1} + \frac{1}{2} \|g_{n-1}\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_n - x_\star\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Then, the definitions of  $\psi_n, \phi_n, \tau_n^O, x_n, z_{n+1}$  in OGM and direct algebraic manipulations yields that

$$\begin{aligned} H_n &:= \tau_n^O \left( f_\star - f_n + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_n\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{n+1} - x_\star\|^2 \\ &= H_{n-1} + \psi_n Q_{\star,n} + \phi_n Q_{n-1,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $H_n$  is nonnegative and we may continue the induction.

Finally, at iteration  $N$ , we make a slight change in the choice of  $\psi_N$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_N^O (f_\star - f_N) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{N+1} - x_\star\|^2 \\ = H_{N-1} + \psi_N Q_{\star,N} + \phi_N Q_{N-1,N} \end{aligned}$$

is nonnegative. Thus, the output  $x_N$  of OGM is guaranteed to satisfy

$$f_N - f_\star \leq \frac{1}{\tau_N^O} \left( \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{N+1} - x_\star\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{L}{2\tau_N^O} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2.$$

### 3 Subgame perfect strategies for the Minimization Game

This section introduces the *Subgame Perfect Gradient Method* (SPGM), which is a generalization of OGM to the setting where some amount of first-order information is known (or learned throughout the course of SPGM's execution). Throughout this and the next section, we will assume that we have completed  $n-1$  iterations of our algorithm, and have produced the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \{(x_i, f_i, g_i, \tau_i, z_{i+1})\}_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \text{ where} \\ f_i &= f(x_i), \\ g_i &= \nabla f(x_i), \\ \tau_i &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

We also assume that we have produced guarantees that the following expression is known to be nonnegative for all  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ :

$$H_i := \tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1} - x_\star\|^2.$$

We may assume that  $z_{i+1} \neq x_0$  for any  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ , as Corollary 1 shows that if this is not the case, then  $f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \leq f_\star$  and that  $x_i - \frac{1}{L}g_i \in \arg \min_x f(x)$ .

Here, taking  $k = n$  corresponds to the situation where all first-order history is stored.

Given this information, we deduce that the convex function  $f$  that we are attempting to minimize must belong to the following subclass of  $L$ -smooth convex functions:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}} := \left\{ f : \begin{array}{l} f \text{ is convex and } L\text{-smooth} \\ f(x_i) = f_i, \forall i \in [n-k, n-1] \\ \nabla f(x_i) = g_i, \forall i \in [n-k, n-1] \\ \tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1} - x_\star\|^2 \geq 0, \\ \forall i \in [n-k, n-1] \end{array} \right\}.$$

SPGM will behave similarly to OGM in that it will inductively maintain a nonnegative expression  $H_n$  in each iteration. However, where OGM requires  $H_n$  to be nonnegative for any  $L$ -smooth convex  $f$  satisfying  $H_{n-1} \geq 0$ , SPGM only needs this expression to be nonnegative for  $f$  in the subclass  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Thus, SPGM can pick the quantity  $\phi_n$  more aggressively. In particular, we will choose  $\phi_n$  using the subproblem defined in (2).

In order to define (2), we will need to define a number of auxiliary quantities for notational convenience. Let  $Z$  be indexed by  $[n-k, n-1]$  with  $i$ th column  $z_{i+1} - x_0$  and let  $G$  be indexed by  $[n-k, n-1]$  with  $i$ th column  $\frac{1}{L}g_i$ . Define the vectors  $\tau, v, h, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$  indexed by  $[n-k, n-1]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i &:= \tau_i \\ v_i &:= f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \\ h_i &:= \tau_i v_i - \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 + \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1}\|^2 \\ q_i &:= f_i - \langle g_i, x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, in terms of these quantities, we define  $\phi_n$  to be the optimal value of the following nonnegative second-order cone problem in variables  $\mu, \lambda_\star \in \mathbb{R}^k$  indexed by  $[n-k, n-1]$ :

$$\phi_n := \sup_{\mu, \lambda_\star \in \mathbb{R}^k} \left\{ \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle : \begin{array}{l} \frac{L}{2} \|Z\mu - G\lambda_\star\|^2 \leq \langle \mu, h - v_m \tau - LZ^\top x_0 \rangle + \langle \lambda_\star, q - v_m 1 + LG^\top x_0 \rangle \\ \mu, \lambda_\star \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 2.** *The problem (2) is feasible and its optimal value is at least  $\tau_{n-1}$ . If  $z_{i+1} \neq x_0$  for any  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ , then strong duality holds for (2).*

*Proof.* Consider the solution  $\mu = \alpha e_{n-1}$  and  $\lambda_\star = 0$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . We have that,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mu, h - v_m \tau - Z^\top x_0 \rangle + \langle \lambda_\star, q - v_m 1 + G^\top x_0 \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|Z\mu - G\lambda_\star\|^2 \\ = \alpha h_{n-1} - \alpha v_m \tau_{n-1} - L\alpha \langle z_n - x_0, x_0 \rangle - \frac{L\alpha^2}{2} \|z_n - x_0\|^2 \\ = \alpha \tau_{n-1} (v_{n-1} - v_m) + \frac{L(\alpha - \alpha^2)}{2} \|z_n - x_0\|^2 \\ \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, this solution is feasible for any  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . The feasible solution at  $\alpha = 1$  has objective value  $\tau_{n-1}$ .

If  $z_n \neq x_0$ , then for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the expression in the display above is strictly positive. Thus, (2) is essentially strictly feasible, in the sense of [5, Definition 1.4.2]. This guarantees strong duality holds for (2).  $\blacksquare$

Finally, we come to the definition of SPGM in terms of the optimization problem (2).



---

**Algorithm 2** SPGM
 

---

Given  $L$ -smooth convex function  $f$ , initial iterate  $x_0$ , iteration budget  $N$

- Define  $\tau_0 = 2$  and  $z_1 = x_0 - \frac{2}{L}g_0$
- For  $n = 1, \dots, N$ 
  - Reveal  $g_{n-1} = \nabla f(x_{n-1})$  and update first-order information set  $\mathcal{H} := \{(x_i, f_i, g_i, \tau_i, z_{i+1})\}_{i=n-k}^{n-1}$
  - Let  $m \in \arg \min_{i \in [n-k, n-1]} \left( f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right)$
  - If  $z_{i+1} = x_0$  for some  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$  or if (2) is unbounded, break and output  $x_m - \frac{1}{L}g_m$ . Else, let  $(\mu, \lambda_*)$  be an optimal solution to (2) and set  $\phi_n = \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle$  and  $z' = x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_*$ .
  - Define

$$\psi_n := \begin{cases} 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\phi_n} & \text{if } n \leq N - 1 \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\phi_n}}{2} & \text{else} \end{cases}, \quad \tau_n := \phi_n + \psi_n,$$

$$x_n := \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_n} \left( x_m - \frac{1}{L}g_m \right) + \frac{\psi_n}{\tau_n} z', \quad \text{and} \quad z_{n+1} := z' - \frac{\psi_n}{L}g_n.$$


---

**Remark 2.** An equivalent and more practical definition of SPGM would place the definition of  $z_n$  immediately after revealing  $g_{n-1}$ . We adopt the form above to parallel our eventual proof strategies for SPGM's convergence guarantees. We caution that any implementation of SPGM should carefully ensure that  $z_n$  is defined using the  $\psi_{n-1}$  and not  $\psi_n$ .  $\square$

The following theorem states that SPGM correctly maintains an appropriate inductive hypothesis in each iteration as long as  $(\mu, \lambda_*)$  is *feasible*.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose  $\mu, \lambda_* \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$  are feasible in (2) and set  $\phi_n = \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle$  and  $z' = x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_*$ . Let  $\tau_n, z_{n+1}, x_n$  be defined according to SPGM. If  $n \leq N - 1$ , then

$$\tau_n \left( f_* - f_n + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_n\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_*\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{n+1} - x_*\|^2 \geq 0$$

for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . If  $n = N$ , then

$$\tau_N (f_* - f_N) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_*\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{N+1} - x_*\|^2 \geq 0$$

for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

We defer the proof of Theorem 3 to the next subsection.

**Remark 3** (Computational and storage overhead of SPGM). Running SPGM requires storing the vectors  $\tau, v, h, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , the matrices  $Z, G \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ , and the points  $x_0, x_{n-k}, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . It is also useful to dynamically maintain the inner product matrices  $Z^\top Z, G^\top G, G^\top Z \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ . This amounts to a total storage overhead of  $O(dk)$  assuming that  $k \ll d$ . The computational overhead in each iteration involves updating the inner product matrices in  $O(dk)$  time and solving the convex quadratic optimization problem (2) in  $2k$  variables. Assuming that  $k \ll d$ , the computational cost of solving the low-dimensional optimization problem is dominated by  $O(dk)$ .  $\square$

The following corollary to Theorem 3 shows that if SPGM terminates early, then SPGM correctly identifies a *minimizer* of  $f$ .

**Corollary 1.** If  $z_{i+1} = x_0$  for some  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$  or if the program (2) is unbounded, then

$$x_m - \frac{1}{L}g_m \in \arg \min_x f.$$

*Proof.* First, suppose  $z_{i+1} = x_0$  for some  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ . Then,  $H_i \geq 0$  is equivalent to

$$\tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) \geq 0.$$

Thus,

$$f \left( x_m - \frac{g_m}{L} \right) \leq f_m - \frac{\|g_m\|^2}{2L} = v_m \leq v_i \leq f_\star.$$

Suppose that (2) does not admit an optimal solution. Then, its domain must be unbounded and there exists a nonzero  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  such that  $(\alpha\mu, \alpha\lambda_\star)$  is feasible for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ .

Any such  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  must satisfy  $Z\mu - G\lambda_\star = 0$  as otherwise the quadratic constraint in  $\alpha$  would be violated for all  $\alpha$  large enough.

Now, let  $\alpha \geq 0$  and consider the guarantee of Theorem 3 for  $(\alpha\mu, \alpha\lambda_\star)$  using the second definition of  $\psi$ . We have that  $z' = x_0 + \alpha(Z\mu - G\lambda_\star) = x_0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n &:= \alpha(\langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle) \\ \psi_n &:= \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\phi_n}}{2} \\ \tau_n &:= \phi_n + \psi_n \\ x_n &:= \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_n} \left( x_m - \frac{1}{L} g_m \right) + \frac{\psi_n}{\tau_n} x_0 \\ z_{n+1} &:= x_0 - \frac{\psi_n}{L} g_n. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Then, by Theorem 3, for any  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$f(x_n) - f_\star \leq \frac{1}{\tau_n} \left( \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - \psi_n g_n - x_\star\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{L}{2\tau_n} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2.$$

Note that  $\phi_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . This follows as  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  is nonzero and  $\tau$  and 1 are entrywise positive. Thus,  $x_n$  goes to  $x_m - g_m/L$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  and the LHS converges to  $f(x_m - g_m/L) - f_\star$ . On the other hand,  $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . We conclude that  $x_m - \frac{1}{L} g_m \in \arg \min f$ . ■

While Theorem 3 provides a guarantee

$$f(x_n) - f(x_\star) \leq \frac{L}{2\tau_n} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|g_n\|^2$$

on the quality of  $x_n$  that can be made at iteration  $n$ , we will be more interested in a guarantee on the quality of  $x_N$  that can be made at iteration  $n$ . To this end, we define the following sequence, which we can think of as being generated by the OGM update rule for  $N - n$  iterations, where the starting bound is given by  $\tau_n$  rather than  $\tau_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_n &= \tau_n && \text{(SPGM recurrence)} \\ \hat{\tau}_i &:= \begin{cases} \hat{\tau}_{i-1} + 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\hat{\tau}_{i-1}} & \text{if } n < i < N \\ \hat{\tau}_{N-1} + \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\hat{\tau}_{N-1}}}{2} & \text{if } n < i = N. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The next corollary shows that  $\hat{\tau}_N$  will be a lower bound on  $\tau_N$  that is valid at iteration  $n$  of SPGM.

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose that (2) has an optimal solution  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$ . Let  $x_N$  denote the output of running SPGM for  $N - n$  additional iterations. It holds that*

$$f(x_N) - f(x_\star) \leq \frac{1}{2\hat{\tau}_N} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2.$$

*Proof.* We may assume SPGM does not terminate early as otherwise SPGM would have found a minimizer of  $f$ . We will show inductively that  $\tau_i \geq \hat{\tau}_i$  for all  $i \in [n, N]$ . By definition,  $\tau_i = \hat{\tau}_i$  at iteration  $i = n$ . In all subsequent iterations  $i \in [n + 1, N]$ , by Lemma 2, SPGM will take  $\phi_i \geq \tau_{i-1} \geq \hat{\tau}_{i-1}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &= \begin{cases} \phi_i + 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\phi_i} & \text{if } i < N \\ \phi_i + \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\phi_i}}{2} & \text{if } i = N \end{cases} \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \hat{\tau}_{i-1} + 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\hat{\tau}_{i-1}} & \text{if } i < N \\ \hat{\tau}_{i-1} + \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\hat{\tau}_{i-1}}}{2} & \text{if } i = N \end{cases} \\ &= \hat{\tau}_i. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows as the expression in either case is an increasing function of  $\phi_i$ . ■

### 3.1 Proof of Theorem 3

This subsection contains a proof Theorem 3.

Let  $H_n$  denote the expression that we would like to certify is nonnegative:

$$H_n := \tau_n \left( f_\star - f_n + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_n\|^2 1_{n < N} \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{n+1} - x_\star\|^2.$$

Here,  $1_{n < N}$  is the indicator function that takes the value 1 if  $n < N$  and is 0 otherwise.

The most direct proof simply expands the following claimed identity

$$H_n = \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \mu_i H_i + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{\star, i} Q_{\star, i} + \psi_n Q_{\star, n} + \phi_n Q_{m, n} + \epsilon,$$

where  $\epsilon \geq 0$  denotes the difference between the RHS and LHS in the first constraint in (2), and notes that the expressions on either side agree.

We now give a longer, but constructive proof that we hope clarifies the “magic” parameter choices in SPGM and makes future extensions of this analysis straightforward. By assumption, we have that for each  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$ ,

$$H_i = \tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1} - x_\star\|^2 \geq 0.$$

We now wish to select  $\tau_n$ ,  $x_n$  and  $z_{n+1}$  such that for *any* choice of  $g_n$ ,  $f_n$ ,  $x_\star$  and  $f_\star$ , the inequality  $H_n \geq 0$  holds. Here, we assume that  $z_{n+1}$  takes the form  $z_{n+1} = z' - \frac{\alpha}{L} g_n$  for some  $\alpha$  and  $z'$  are independent of  $g_n$ ,  $f_n$ ,  $x_\star$ ,  $f_\star$ . Our strategy will be to write  $H_n$  as a conic combination of the expressions  $H_i$  for  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$  and  $Q_{i, j}$  for  $i, j \in [n - k, n] \cup \{\star\}$ , which are nonnegative by assumption, and the constant 1. As the quantities  $(x_i, f_i, g_i, \tau_i, z_{i+1})$  for  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$  and  $x_0$  are known, we can view the expressions  $H_i$  and  $Q_{i, j}$  as *polynomials* in the variables  $g_n$ ,  $f_n$ ,  $x_\star$  and  $f_\star$  only. Specifically, each expression takes the form

$$C + af_\star + bf_n + \langle v, g_n \rangle + \langle w, x_\star \rangle + \frac{c}{2L} \|g_n\|^2 + d \langle g_n, x_\star \rangle + \frac{e}{2} \|x_\star\|^2$$

for some choice of  $C, a, b, c, d, e \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $w, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Our goal now becomes to find the  $\tau_n$ ,  $x_n$ ,  $z'$  and  $\alpha$  so that the following equation holds *as polynomials in these variables*:

$$H_n = \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \mu_i H_i + \sum_{i=n-k}^n \lambda_{\star, i} Q_{\star, i} + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i, n} Q_{i, n} + \epsilon, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu_i, \lambda_{\star, i}, \lambda_{i, n}, \lambda_{\star, n}, \epsilon \geq 0$  for each  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$ .

	1	$f_\star$	$f_n$	$g_n$	$x_\star$	$\frac{1}{2L}\ g_n\ ^2$	$\langle g_n, x_\star \rangle$
$H_n$	$\frac{L}{2}\ x_0\ ^2 - \frac{L}{2}\ z'\ ^2$	$\tau_n$	$-\tau_n$	$\alpha z'$	$L(z' - x_0)$	$\tau_n 1_{n < N} - \alpha^2$	$\alpha$
$H_i$	$-h_i$	$\tau_i$			$L(z_{i+1} - x_0)$		
$Q_{\star,i}$	$-q_i$	1			$-g_i$		
$Q_{i,n}$	$v_i$		-1	$x_n - (x_i - \frac{1}{L}g_i)$		-1	
$Q_{\star,n}$		1	-1	$x_n$		-1	1
1	1						

Table 1: Coefficients on each monomial in the expressions  $H_n, H_i, Q_{\star,i}, Q_{i,n}, Q_{\star,n}$  for  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ . Each row corresponds to an expression which makes up our certificate (where the index  $i$  ranges from  $n-k$  to  $n-1$ ), and each column corresponds to a monomial. We have omitted the column  $\|x_\star\|^2$  as its coefficient is zero in each of the expressions we consider.

**Remark 4.** Note that if  $i, j \in [n-k, n-1]$ , the quantity  $Q_{i,j}$  is simply a nonnegative constant as it does not depend on any of the variables  $g_n, f_n, x_\star, f_\star$ . For this reason, they can be safely omitted from our ansatz.

In principle, we could also include the inequalities  $Q_{i,\star} \geq 0$  and  $Q_{n,i} \geq 0$  in (4), which do involve  $g_n, f_n, x_\star$  or  $f_\star$ . However, these inequalities “go the wrong way”, in the sense that they are either lower bounds on  $f_n$  or upper bounds on  $f_\star$ . Moreover, our analysis later shows that in the worst case, these inequalities are slack.  $\square$

We list the coefficient of each monomial in each of the expressions in (4) in Table 1. We now equate the coefficients on each monomial on the LHS and RHS of (4) by taking a weighted sum across each column of Table 1. To ease notation, let  $\lambda_\star \in \mathbb{R}^k$  denote the vector with entries  $\lambda_{\star,n-k}, \dots, \lambda_{\star,n-1}$ . This produces the seven following equations:

$$\frac{L}{2}\|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|z'\|^2 = -\langle h, \mu \rangle - \langle q, \lambda_\star \rangle + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} v_i + \epsilon \quad (5)$$

$$\tau_n = \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle + \lambda_{\star,n} \quad (6)$$

$$-\tau_n = -\sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} - \lambda_{\star,n} \quad (7)$$

$$\alpha z' = \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} \left( x_n - \left( x_i - \frac{1}{L}g_i \right) \right) + \lambda_{\star,n} x_n \quad (8)$$

$$L(z' - x_0) = LZ\mu - LG\lambda_\star \quad (9)$$

$$\tau_n 1_{n < N} - \alpha^2 = -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} - \lambda_{\star,n} \quad (10)$$

$$\alpha = \lambda_{\star,n}. \quad (11)$$

Many of these inequalities simplify immediately. From equations (11), (9), (8), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \lambda_{\star,n} \\ z' &= x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_\star, \quad \text{and} \\ x_n &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\star,n} + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n}} \left( \lambda_{\star,n} z' + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} \left( x_i - \frac{1}{L}g_i \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we wish to maximize the value of

$$\tau_n = \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} + \lambda_{\star,n} = \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle + \lambda_{\star,n}$$

subject to the remaining constraints:

$$\max_{\lambda_{i,n}, \lambda_*, \lambda_{*,n}, \mu, \epsilon} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} + \lambda_{*,n} : \\ \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} = \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle \\ 1_{n < N} \left( \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} + \lambda_{*,n} \right) - \lambda_{*,n}^2 = - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} - \lambda_{*,n} \\ \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_*\|^2 = - \langle h, \mu \rangle - \langle q, \lambda_* \rangle + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n} v_i + \epsilon \\ \lambda_{*,n}, \mu_i, \lambda_{*,i}, \lambda_{i,n}, \epsilon \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in [n-k, n-1] \end{array} \right\}.$$

We make a few final simplifications. First, we may use the second constraint to solve for  $\lambda_{*,n}$ :

$$\lambda_{*,n} = \begin{cases} 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2 \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n}} & \text{if } n < N, \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n}}}{2} & \text{if } n = N. \end{cases}$$

Second, noting that  $\lambda_{*,n}$  is an increasing function of  $\sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} \lambda_{i,n}$ , it suffices to drop the term  $\lambda_{*,n}$  from the objective function. Third, we claim that it suffices to consider only feasible solutions where  $\lambda_{i,n} = 0$  for all  $i \neq m$  (recall  $m$  is chosen in  $\arg \min_i v_i$ ). To see this, consider any feasible solution. We may modify this feasible solution by setting  $\lambda_{m,n} \leftarrow \sum_i \lambda_{i,n}$  and  $\lambda_{i,n} \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \neq m$ . The effect is that  $\sum_i \lambda_{i,n}$  remains constant and  $\sum_i \lambda_{i,n} v_i$  is nonincreasing. We increase  $\epsilon$  as necessary to maintain the third constraint. Fourth, we drop the variable  $\epsilon \geq 0$  to get an inequality constraint.

Thus, we may define away  $\lambda_{m,n} := \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle$  and consider the problem

$$\max_{\lambda_*, \mu} \left\{ \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle : \begin{array}{l} \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_*\|^2 \geq - \langle h, \mu \rangle - \langle q, \lambda_* \rangle + v_m (\langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_* \rangle) \\ \lambda_*, \mu \geq 0 \end{array} \right\},$$

which is equivalent to (2).

We recognize  $\lambda_{m,n}$  and  $\lambda_{*,n}$  as the quantities  $\phi_n$  and  $\psi_n$  in SPGM. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

## 4 Dynamic Lower Bounds

In this section, we construct a worst-case function in  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$  showing that no gradient-span first-order method can outperform the guarantee of Corollary 2. Section 4.1 provides key definitions and constructs triples  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  where  $\mathcal{I} := [n-k, N] \cup \{\star\}$ . We can then define the following hard function in  $f_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ :

$$f_{\mathcal{H}}(y) = \max_{\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}} \left\{ \frac{L}{2} \left\| y - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_i \left( x_i - \frac{1}{L} g_i \right) \right\|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_i \left( f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$  is the simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ . Section 4.2 then proves that (i)  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$  lies in  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$  and interpolates each triple  $(x_i, f_i, g_i)$  (i.e.,  $f_{\mathcal{H}}(x_i) = f_i$  and  $\nabla f_{\mathcal{H}}(x_i) = g_i$ ) and (ii) that no sequence of  $N-n$  additional steps satisfying (1) can produce an objective gap less than  $\frac{L\|x_0 - x_*\|^2}{2\tau_N}$ . Both of these properties correspond to checking certain inequalities in terms of  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  established by [11, 37].

**Remark 5.** The presentation in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 is mostly algebraic, but stems from the following guiding intuition. Our goal is to construct a function  $f_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$  that is hard for all gradient span first-order methods. Here, “hard” means that no gradient span first-order method can outperform the bound in Corollary 2. Note that the guarantee of Corollary 2 matches the guarantee for the *hybrid* algorithm that takes a single SPGM step followed by  $N-n-1$  OGM steps (see Section 2.2). Thus, as a first step, we construct a function so that the guarantee of Corollary 2 is *tight* for this hybrid algorithm. This requires us to specify the oracle’s strategy against this fixed strategy, i.e., the responses  $(x_i, f_i, g_i)$  for  $i \in [n, N] \cup \{\star\}$ . It should be expected that this construction will be stated in terms of the hybrid algorithm’s internal parameters  $(\phi_i, \psi_i, \tau_i, z_{i+1})$ . The responses  $(x_i, f_i, g_i)$  are chosen to ensure that  $Q_{i,j} \geq 0$  for all  $i, j \in [n-k, N] \cup \{\star\}$  and  $H_i \geq 0$  for all  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ . Additionally, since the effective proof of Corollary 2 (see Theorem 3 and Section 2.2) uses the inequalities  $Q_{m,n}, Q_{n,n+1}, \dots, Q_{N-1,N}, Q_{\star,n}, \dots, Q_{\star,N}, H_n, \dots, H_N \geq 0$ , in order to match this guarantee, a

hard instance must set each of these expressions to zero. The natural construction with these properties is presented in Section 4.1. We prove in Proposition 1 that these definitions satisfy the interpolating conditions and conclude that the convergence guarantee of Corollary 2 is tight for the hybrid algorithm on the function (12). Finally, Proposition 2 checks that this function is not only hard for the hybrid algorithm, but also for *any* gradient span first-order method (including SPGM).  $\square$

## 4.1 Construction

It suffices to prove a lower bound in the case where (2) is bounded. To construct this worst-case function, we inspect the dual to (2). The following lemma states the dual of (2) and interprets complementary slackness between (2) and its dual. Its proof is standard and is deferred to Appendix B.

**Lemma 3.** *The dual program to (2) is*

$$\inf_{\xi, y} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{2\|y\|^2}{\xi L} + \frac{\xi L}{2}\|x_0\|^2 + 2\langle x_0, y \rangle : \\ \xi(-h + v_m\tau) - 2Z^\top y \geq \tau \\ \xi(-q + v_m1) + 2G^\top y \geq 1 \\ \xi > 0. \end{array} \right\} \quad (13)$$

Here, the inf can be replaced by a min as long as (2) is bounded. Strong duality holds between (2) and (13). If  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  and  $(\xi, y)$  are optimal solutions to (2) and (13) respectively, then

$$\frac{-2y}{\xi L} = x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_\star = z'.$$

Define  $f_\star$  so that  $\frac{1}{\xi} = v_m - f_\star$ . We rewrite dual feasibility in terms of  $f_\star$  and  $z'$  as

$$\tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1}\|^2 + L \langle z_{i+1} - x_0, z' \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in [n-k, n-1] \quad (14)$$

$$f_\star - f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 - \langle g_i, z' - x_i \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in [n-k, n-1]. \quad (15)$$

For notational convenience, define  $\Delta = \|z'_n - x_0\|^2$ . By strong duality, i.e., equating the primal and dual optimal values, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \frac{2\|y\|^2}{\xi L} + \frac{\xi L}{2}\|x_0\|^2 + 2\langle x_0, y \rangle \\ &= \frac{\xi L}{2} \left\| \frac{2y}{\xi L} + x_0 \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\xi L \Delta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this identity shows that  $f_\star = v_m - \frac{L\Delta}{2\phi}$ .

For  $i \in [n, N]$ , let  $\hat{\phi}_i, \hat{\psi}_i, \hat{\tau}_i$  denote the quantities that would be defined by one iteration of SPGM followed by  $N - n - 1$  iterations of OGM. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}_n &= \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle \\ \hat{\phi}_i &:= \tau_{i-1}, \quad \forall i \in [n+1, N] \\ \hat{\psi}_i &:= \begin{cases} 1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\hat{\phi}_i} & \text{if } n \leq i \leq N-1 \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\hat{\phi}_i}}{2} & \text{else} \end{cases} \\ \hat{\tau}_i &:= \hat{\phi}_i + \hat{\psi}_i, \quad \forall i \in [n, N]. \end{aligned}$$

For the hard function  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$ , it will turn out that these quantities will agree with the values of  $\phi_i, \psi_i, \tau_i$  that arise from running SPGM on  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$  for the remaining  $N - n - 1$  iterations, and so we will abuse notation somewhat and let  $\phi_i = \hat{\phi}_i, \psi_i = \hat{\psi}_i, \tau_i = \hat{\tau}_i$  for  $i \in [n, N]$ .

Inductively define  $\eta_n, \dots, \eta_N$  so that

$$\eta_i = \frac{1}{2\phi_i\psi_i} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=n}^{i-1} \psi_j^2 \eta_j \right) \quad \forall i \in [n, N].$$

Note that, by definition,  $\eta_n = \frac{1}{2\phi_n\psi_n}$ . These choices of  $\eta_i$  satisfy the following properties (proof in Appendix A).

**Lemma 4.** *It holds that  $\eta_i > 0$  for all  $i \in [n, N]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)} &\leq \eta_i \leq \frac{1}{2\phi_n\psi_i} \quad \forall i \in [n, N], \\ \tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i &\leq \tau_j(\psi_j - 1)\eta_j \quad \forall i < j \in [n, N], \quad \text{and} \\ (\psi_i - 1)\eta_i &\geq \psi_j\eta_j \quad \forall i < j \in [n, N]. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $g_n, \dots, g_N$  denote mutually orthogonal vectors in  $(\text{range}(Z) + \text{range}(G))^\perp$ , where  $g_i$  has norm

$$\|g_i\|^2 = L^2\eta_i\Delta.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} z_{i+1} &= \begin{cases} z'_n - \frac{\psi_n}{L}g_n & \text{if } i = n \\ z_i - \frac{\psi_i}{L}g_i & \text{if } i \in [n+1, N] \end{cases} \\ x_n &= \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_n} \left( x_m - \frac{1}{L}g_m \right) + \frac{\psi_n}{\tau_n}z' \\ x_i &= \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_n} \left( x_m - \frac{1}{L}g_m \right) + \frac{\psi_n}{\tau_n}z' & \text{if } i = n \\ \frac{\phi_i}{\tau_i} \left( x_{i-1} - \frac{1}{L}g_{i-1} \right) + \frac{\psi_i}{\tau_i}z_i & \text{if } i \in [n+1, N] \end{cases} \\ f_i &= v_m - \frac{L\Delta}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\phi_n} - (2\psi_i - 1)\eta_i \right) \quad \forall i \in [n, N] \\ &= f_\star + \frac{L\Delta}{2} (2\psi_i - 1)\eta_i \\ x_\star &= z_{N+1}. \end{aligned}$$

## 4.2 Lower bound guarantees

Define  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$  according to (12) using the set  $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in [n-k, N] \cup \{\star\}}$  constructed in Section 4.1. The following propositions establish desirable properties of  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  is an optimal solution to (2) and  $\left(\frac{1}{v_m - f_\star}, z'\right)$  is an optimal solution to (13). Then  $f_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$  is  $L$ -smooth, convex, and for all  $i \in [n-k, N] \cup \{\star\}$ , has*

$$f(x_i) = f_i, \quad \nabla f(x_i) = g_i,$$

and for all  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ , has

$$\tau_i \left( f_\star - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_\star\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1} - x_\star\|^2 \geq 0.$$

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  is an optimal solution to (2) and  $\left(\frac{1}{v_m - f_\star}, z'\right)$  is an optimal solution to (13). Then  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$  possess the zero-chain property of [11], that is, for any  $j \in [n, N-1]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} y &\in \text{aff} \left( \{x_0\} \cup \{x_i, z_{i+1}\}_{i \in [n-k, n-1]} \right) + \text{span} \left( \{g_{n-k}, \dots, g_{j-1}\} \right) \\ \implies \nabla f_{\mathcal{H}}(y) &\in \text{span} \left( \{x_i - x_0, z_{i+1} - x_0\}_{i \in [n-k, n-1]} \cup \{g_{n-k}, \dots, g_j\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

These two propositions establish that any gradient-span first-order method playing the remaining iterations  $n$  through  $N$  against the hard instance  $f_{\mathcal{H}}$  will have its  $N$ th iterate lie in the affine subspace  $\text{aff}(\{x_{n-k}, \dots, x_{n-1}, z_{n-k+1}, \dots, z_n\}) + \text{span}(\{g_{n-k}, \dots, g_{N-1}\})$ . Since  $g_N$  is orthogonal to this subspace, any such first-order method's final iterate's objective gap must be at least  $f_N - f_{\star} = \frac{L}{2\tau_N} \|x_0 - x_{\star}\|^2$ . Since  $f_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , this establishes our matching lower bound.

The following lemmas will be useful in proving Proposition 1 and Proposition 2.

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose  $j < i$  with  $i \in [n, N]$ . Then,*

$$\langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1) \eta_j L \Delta - \psi_j \eta_j L \Delta & \text{if } j \geq n \\ \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_i} \langle g_j, x_m - g_m - z'_n \rangle + \langle g_j, z'_n - x_j \rangle & \text{if } j < n \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We first expand

$$\langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle = \langle g_j, x_i - z_i \rangle + \langle g_j, z_i - x_j \rangle.$$

Note that by definition,  $z_i = z'_n - \sum_{\ell=n}^{i-1} \frac{\psi_{\ell}}{L} g_{\ell}$ , thus the second term is

$$\langle g_j, z_i - x_j \rangle = \begin{cases} -\psi_j \eta_j L \Delta & \text{if } j \geq n \\ \langle g_j, z'_n - x_j \rangle & \text{if } j < n \end{cases}.$$

For the first term, we use the inductive definition of  $x_i$ ,  $z_i$ , and  $\phi_i$  to write

$$\langle g_j, x_i - z_i \rangle = \frac{\tau_{i-1}}{\tau_i} \left\langle g_j, x_{i-1} - \frac{1}{L} g_{i-1} - z_{i-1} + \frac{\psi_{i-1}}{L} g_{i-1} \right\rangle.$$

Note that if  $i-1 \geq n$  and  $i-1 > j$ , then  $g_j$  and  $g_{i-1}$  are orthogonal and we get that  $\langle g_j, x_i - z_i \rangle = \frac{\tau_{i-1}}{\tau_i} \langle g_j, x_{i-1} - z_{i-1} \rangle$ . Thus, we can unroll this recursion to get

$$\langle g_j, x_i - z_i \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1) \eta_j L \Delta & \text{if } j \geq n \\ \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_i} \langle g_j, x_m - \frac{1}{L} g_m - z'_n \rangle & \text{if } j < n \end{cases}. \quad \blacksquare$$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* It suffices to check that  $H_i \geq 0$  for all  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$  and  $Q_{i,j} \geq 0$  for all  $i, j \in [n-k, N] \cup \{\star\}$ . This breaks into the cases below:

Suppose  $i \in [n-k, n-1]$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} H_i &= \tau_i \left( f_{\star} - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_{\star}\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1} - x_{\star}\|^2 \\ &= \tau_i \left( f_{\star} - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1}\|^2 + L \langle z_{i+1} - x_0, x_{\star} \rangle \\ &= \tau_i \left( f_{\star} - f_i + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \right) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z_{i+1}\|^2 + L \langle z_{i+1} - x_0, z'_n \rangle \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the third line follows as  $x_{\star} = z'_n - \sum_{\ell=n}^N \frac{\psi_{\ell}}{L} g_{\ell}$  where  $g_{\ell}$  is orthogonal to  $z_{i+1} - x_0$  for all  $\ell \in [n, N]$ . The last line follows by (14).

If  $i, j \in [n-k, n-1]$ , then  $Q_{i,j}$  contains only quantities given by  $\mathcal{H}$ . We have by assumption that  $Q_{i,j} \geq 0$ .



Suppose  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$  and  $j \in [n, N]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,j} &= f_i - f_j - \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \\
&= f_i - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 - f_j - \frac{\eta_j L \Delta}{2} \\
&\geq v_m - f_j - \frac{\eta_j L \Delta}{2} \\
&= \frac{L \Delta}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\phi_n} - (2\psi_j - 1) \eta_j \right) - \frac{\eta_j L \Delta}{2} \\
&= \frac{L \Delta}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\phi_n} - 2\psi_j \eta_j \right) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first line follows as  $g_j$  is orthogonal to  $g_i$  and  $x_i - x_j$ . The second line follows as  $m \in \arg \min_{i \in [n-k, n-1]} v_i$ . The last inequality follows by Lemma 4.

Suppose  $i \in [n - k, n - 1]$  and  $j = \star$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,\star} &= f_i - f_\star - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \\
&\geq v_m - f_\star \\
&> 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the last line follows by dual feasibility.

Suppose  $i \in [n, N]$  and  $j \in [n - k, n - 1]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,j} &= f_i - f_j - \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \\
&= v_m - (v_m - f_i) - f_j - \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_i} \left\langle g_j, x_m - \frac{1}{L} g_m - z'_n \right\rangle - \langle g_j, z'_n - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= \frac{\tau_i - \phi_n}{\tau_i} \left( v_m - f_j - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 + \langle g_j, x_j - z'_n \rangle \right) - (v_m - f_i) - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_i} \left( v_m - f_j - \left\langle g_j, x_m - x_j - \frac{1}{L} g_m \right\rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\tau_i - \phi_n}{\tau_i} \left( f_\star - f_j - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 + \langle g_j, x_j - z'_n \rangle \right) + \frac{\phi_n}{\tau_i} Q_{m,j} \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_i - \phi_n}{\tau_i} (v_m - f_\star) - (v_m - f_i) - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{\tau_i - \phi_n}{\tau_i} \frac{L \Delta}{2 \phi_n} - \frac{L \Delta}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\phi_n} - (2\psi_i - 1) \eta_i \right) - \frac{\eta_i L \Delta}{2} \\
&= \frac{L \Delta}{2} \left( 2(\psi_i - 1) \eta_i - \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second line uses the fact that  $g_i$  is orthogonal to  $g_j$  and the definition of  $f_i$  and Lemma 5. The first inequality recognizes that  $f_\star - f_j - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 + \langle g_j, x_j - z'_n \rangle \geq 0$  by (15) and  $Q_{m,j} \geq 0$  by assumption. The last line follows from Lemma 4.

Suppose  $i \in [n, N]$  and  $j = \star$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,\star} &= f_i - f_\star - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{2} ((2\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \eta_i) \\
&= L\Delta(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $i = \star$  and  $j \in [n - k, n - 1]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\star,j} &= f_\star - f_j - \langle g_j, x_\star - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= f_\star - f_j - \langle g_j, z'_n - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second line follows as  $x_\star = z'_n - \sum_{\ell=n}^N \frac{\psi_\ell}{L} g_\ell$  where  $g_\ell$  is orthogonal to  $g_j$  for all  $\ell \in [n, N]$ . The inequality follows from (15).

Suppose  $i = \star$  and  $j \in [n, N]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\star,j} &= f_\star - f_j - \langle g_j, x_\star - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= f_\star - f_j + \frac{\psi_j}{L} \|g_j\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= -(2\psi_j - 1) \frac{\eta_j L\Delta}{2} + (2\psi_j - 1) \frac{\eta_j L\Delta}{2} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $i, j \in [n, N]$  with  $i < j$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,j} &= f_i - f_j - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{2} ((2\psi_i - 2)\eta_i - (2\psi_j)\eta_j) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the last line follows from Lemma 4.

Suppose  $i, j \in [n, N]$  with  $i > j$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{i,j} &= f_i - f_j - \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j\|^2 \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{2} ((2\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - (2\psi_j - 1)\eta_j) - \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1)\eta_j L\Delta + \psi_j \eta_j L\Delta - \frac{\eta_i L\Delta}{2} - \frac{\eta_j L\Delta}{2} \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{\tau_i} (\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \tau_j(\psi_j - 1)\eta_j) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second line follows from Lemma 5 and the last line follows from Lemma 4. ■

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Conditions ensuring that (12) satisfies (16) for  $j \in [n, N - 1]$  are given by Drori and

Taylor [11, Theorem 3]. In particular, it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle g_i, g_j \rangle &= \langle g_i, g_\ell \rangle, \quad \forall j \in [n, N-1], i \in [0, j-1], \ell \in [j+1, N] \\
f_j - \frac{1}{L} \langle g_i, g_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j - L(x_j - x_0)\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|x_j - x_0\|^2 \\
&\geq f_\ell - \frac{1}{L} \langle g_i, g_\ell \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_\ell - L(x_\ell - x_0)\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|x_\ell - x_0\|^2, \quad \forall i \in [0, N], \forall n \leq j < \ell \leq N \\
g_j &\text{ is linearly separable from } \{g_{j+1}, \dots, g_N\}, \quad \forall j \in [n, N-1]
\end{aligned}$$

The first and third conditions above hold immediately as the considered gradients are all nonzero and orthogonal to each other. Hence we only need to verify the second condition, which can be algebraically simplified to

$$Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle \geq 0.$$

We verify this below in several cases:

First suppose  $i \in [0, n-1]$  and consider any  $n \leq j < \ell \leq N$ . Since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = 0$ , we have

$$Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = f_j - f_\ell + \frac{(\eta_j - \eta_\ell)L\Delta}{2} = L\Delta(\psi_j\eta_j - \psi_\ell\eta_\ell) \geq 0$$

which is nonnegative as  $\psi_j\eta_j \geq \psi_\ell\eta_\ell$ .

Next suppose  $i \in [n, N]$ . Considering any  $i < j < \ell \leq N$ , since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = 0$ , we have

$$Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = L\Delta(\psi_j\eta_j - \psi_\ell\eta_\ell) \geq 0$$

where the inequality uses that  $\psi_j\eta_j \geq \psi_\ell\eta_\ell$  by Lemma 4. Considering  $i = j < \ell \leq N$ , since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = 0$ ,

$$Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = Q_{i,\ell} - 0 + 0 \geq 0.$$

Considering any  $n \leq j < i < \ell \leq N$ , since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = -\langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle$ , Lemma 5 ensures

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{2} ((2\psi_i - 2)\eta_i - 2\psi_\ell\eta_\ell) - \frac{L\Delta}{\tau_i} (\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \tau_j(\psi_j - 1)\eta_j) - \left( \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1)\eta_j L\Delta - \psi_j\eta_j L\Delta \right) \\
&= \Delta(\psi_j\eta_j - \psi_\ell\eta_\ell) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Considering any  $n \leq j < i = \ell \leq N$ , since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = -\langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle$ , Lemma 5 ensures

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle \\
&= 0 - \frac{L\Delta}{\tau_i} (\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \tau_j(\psi_j - 1)\eta_j) - \left( \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1)\eta_j L\Delta - \psi_j\eta_j L\Delta \right) \\
&= \Delta((\psi_i - 1)\eta_i + \psi_j\eta_j) \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows as both component terms are nonnegative. Finally, consider any  $n \leq j < \ell < i \leq N$ . Since  $\langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle = \langle g_\ell, x_i - x_\ell \rangle - \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle$ , applying Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_{i,\ell} - Q_{i,j} + \langle g_\ell - g_j, x_i - x_0 \rangle \\
&= \frac{L\Delta}{\tau_i} (\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \tau_\ell(\psi_\ell - 1)\eta_\ell) - \frac{L\Delta}{\tau_i} (\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i - \tau_j(\psi_j - 1)\eta_j) \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{\tau_\ell}{\tau_i} (\psi_\ell - 1)\eta_\ell L\Delta - \psi_\ell\eta_\ell L\Delta \right) - \left( \frac{\tau_j}{\tau_i} (\psi_j - 1)\eta_j L\Delta - \psi_j\eta_j L\Delta \right) \\
&= L\Delta(\psi_j\eta_j - \psi_\ell\eta_\ell) \geq 0. \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

## 5 Numerical results

This section evaluates the computational performance of SPGM on unconstrained smooth minimization problems involving random and real data. We implement SPGM in Julia and use MOSEK [3] via JuMP [26] to solve (2) in each iteration of SPGM. All experiments are run on an Intel i7 processor with 64GB of memory. A GitHub repository containing our implementations and preliminary numerical experiments is available at

<https://github.com/ootks/SubgamePerfectGradientMethod>

We compare the performance of SPGM and its limited memory variant with the following benchmarks: gradient descent (GD) with constant stepsize, i.e.,  $x_n = x_{n-1} - \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(x_{n-1})$ , the Optimized Gradient Method (OGM) [19], and BFGS and its limited-memory variant (L-BFGS) [25]. We implement GD and OGM directly in Julia and use the implementations of BFGS and L-BFGS (restricted to a memory of ten past iterations) provided in `Optim.jl` [27].

Overall, we find SPGM with either a full memory or a memory limited to size  $k = 10$  (denoted SPGM-10) consistently outperforms GD and OGM and their well-established worst-case smooth convex optimization guarantees by exploiting the non-adversarialness of the given problem instances. Moreover, SPGM and its associated guarantee  $1/\tau_n$  stay fairly competitive with the convergence of BFGS and L-BFGS. Figure 2 shows the scaled objective gap  $(f(x_n) - f(x_*))/\frac{L}{2}\|x_0 - x_*\|^2$  and  $1/\tau_n$  for each method on two representative problem instances from the larger experiments below with random and real problem data respectively.




Figure 2: Two representative plots of convergence of  $(f(x_n) - f(x_*))/\frac{L}{2}\|x_0 - x_*\|^2$  for the considered methods. Left: A randomly generated instance of minimizing the `logSumExp` function (21) with dimensions  $d = 256, m = 1024$ . Right: An instance of the logistic regression (23) using the LIBSVM dataset “`ionosphere`” with  $d = 34, m = 351$ . On these instances, the limited memory versions of SPGM and BFGS had nearly identical convergence to their full memory counterparts and are omitted.

The optimal subgame payoff,  $\hat{\tau}_N$ , of the remaining game after  $n$  iterations is a function of  $n$  that increases with each suboptimal or non-adversarial response from the first-order oracle. Figure 3 plots  $1/\hat{\tau}_N$  for SPGM and SPGM-10, as a function of  $n$ . We also plot the constant non-adaptive guarantee of OGM,  $1/\tau_N^O$ , for reference.

### 5.1 A sample of randomly generated problem instances

We consider six different families of smooth convex minimization problems all parameterized by  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For each problem family, we draw seven problem instances  $A, b, x_0$  with sampled with i.i.d. normal entries, each with fixed, different problem dimensions  $d = 8, 16, 32, \dots, 512$  and  $m = 4d$ . Together these provide a collection of 42 synthetic problem instances to compare performance across. The problem instances considered fall within two general categories.




Figure 3: Two representative plots of  $1/\hat{\tau}_N$  as a function of  $n$  as SPGM-10 and SPGM are run on Least Squares Regression problems of dimension  $d = 512$ ,  $m = 2048$ . OGM displays its constant guarantee,  $1/\tau_N^O$ , providing the baseline, non-adaptive guarantee. Left instance is of the form (17) with  $N = 300$  and right instance is of the form (20) with  $N = 30$ .

First, we consider (regularized) least squares regression problems defined in the following four ways:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \|Ax - b\|_2^2, \quad (17)$$

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_2^2, \quad (18)$$

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + h_{100}(\|x\|_2), \quad (19)$$

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n h_{100}(|x_i|) \quad (20)$$

where  $h_L(r)$  takes the value  $\frac{L}{2}r^2$  if  $r \leq 1$  and the value  $Lr - \frac{L}{2}$  otherwise, denotes the Huber function. Note  $h_{100}(\|x\|_2)$  provides a smooth approximation of  $100\|x\|_2$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_{100}(|x_i|)$  provides a smooth approximation of regularization by  $100\|x\|_1$ . While the first two definitions have constant Hessian, the latter may not have Hessians exist everywhere. Second, we consider smoothed approximations of minimizing a finite maximum  $\max_i \{a_i^T x - b_i\}$ , defined in the following two ways:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \exp(a_i^T x - b_i) \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \rho_{\max}(Ax - b) \quad (22)$$

where  $\rho_{\max}(z) = \min_{z'} \{ \max_i z'_i + \frac{1}{2} \|z' - z\|_2^2 \}$  denotes the Moreau envelope of the max function. Note while the first formulation is analytic, the second is not even twice differentiable everywhere.

Sampling seven instances from these six classes provides our first test set. Figure 4 shows the performance of each considered method, displaying at each iteration  $n$ , the fraction of these 42 problem instances for which the method has reached accuracy

$$\frac{f(x_n) - f(x_*)}{\frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - x_*\|^2} \leq \{10^{-3}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-9}\}$$

corresponding to the method reaching a low, medium, or high level of (appropriately rescaled) accuracy.

## 5.2 Regression problem instances derived from real data

To provide a more realistic numerical survey, we next consider performance on two types of regression problems with data from the LIBSVM dataset [7]. We consider six regularized least squares regressions of the




Figure 4: Performance comparison over 42 randomly generated instances for the problems (17)–(22). From left to right, the target accuracy ranges as  $10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-6}$ ,  $10^{-9}$ .




Figure 5: Performance comparison over twelve instances derived from LIBSVM data for the regression problems (20) and (23). From left to right, the target accuracy ranges as  $10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-6}$ ,  $10^{-9}$ . Often, the performance of SPGM-10 matched that of SPGM with full memory, and hence, the lines overlap.

form (20) with data from the “housing”, “mpg”, “pyrim”, “space\_ga”, “triazines”, “bodyfat” datasets. Further, we consider six regularized logistic regression problems defined as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \exp(b_i \cdot a_i^T x)) + \frac{1}{2m} \|x\|_2^2, \quad (23)$$

using normalized data  $A, b$  from the classification datasets “australian”, “diabetes”, “heart”, “ionosphere”, “splice”, and “sonar”. The performance on these twelve instances is presented in Figure 5.

## 6 Conclusion and discussion

This paper offers a framework for analyzing first-order methods beyond the classical notion of minimax optimality. In contrast to minimax optimality, which can be thought of as a strategy in a Nash Equilibrium for the minimization “game”, the notion of a Subgame Perfect Equilibrium requires that a first-order method optimally capitalize on any non-adversarial first-order information. We believe this is a fundamental avenue towards deriving formal beyond-worst-case results in the design of optimization algorithms.

As a first algorithm in this space, we design the Subgame Perfect Gradient Method (SPGM) for unconstrained smooth convex minimization. SPGM matches the performance guarantee of the Optimized Gradient Method when faced with an adversarial function, but *improves* upon these guarantees dynamically as first-order information is revealed. We show that SPGM’s dynamic convergence guarantees are optimal among algorithms that can adapt to past information. We conjecture that subgame perfect versions of known minimax optimal first-order methods such as ITEM for smooth strongly convex optimization [11] and OGM-G for minimizing the gradient norm [23] also exist and leave these extensions as future work.

## References

- [1] Jason M. Altschuler and Pablo A. Parrilo. Acceleration by stepsize hedging I: Multi-step descent and the silver stepsize schedule, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07879>.
- [2] Jason M. Altschuler and Pablo A. Parrilo. Acceleration by stepsize hedging II: Silver stepsize schedule for smooth convex optimization, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16530>.
- [3] MOSEK ApS. *Optimizer API for Julia 10.2.10*, 2019. URL <https://docs.mosek.com/latest/juliaapi/index.html>.
- [4] Mathieu Barré, Adrien B. Taylor, and Francis Bach. Principled analyses and design of first-order methods with inexact proximal operators. *Math. Program.*, 201(1–2):185–230, December 2022. ISSN 0025-5610. doi: 10.1007/s10107-022-01903-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-022-01903-7>.
- [5] Aharon Ben-Tal and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Lectures on modern convex optimization: analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications*. SIAM, 2001.
- [6] Augustin Cauchy et al. Méthode générale pour la résolution des systemes d’équations simultanées. *Comp. Rend. Sci. Paris*, 25(1847):536–538, 1847.
- [7] Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin. LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 2(3), May 2011.
- [8] Saman Cyrus, Bin Hu, Bryan Van Scoy, and Laurent Lessard. A robust accelerated optimization algorithm for strongly convex functions. In *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1376–1381, 2018. doi: 10.23919/ACC.2018.8430824.
- [9] Yoel Drori. The exact information-based complexity of smooth convex minimization. *J. Complex.*, 39: 1–16, 2017.
- [10] Yoel Drori and Adrien B. Taylor. Efficient first-order methods for convex minimization: a constructive approach. *Mathematical Programming*, 184:183 – 220, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:96494612>.
- [11] Yoel Drori and Adrien B. Taylor. On the oracle complexity of smooth strongly convex minimization. *J. Complex.*, 68:101590, 2021.
- [12] Yoel Drori and Marc Teboulle. Performance of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization: a novel approach. *Math. Program.*, 145:451–482, 2012.
- [13] Alexandre d’Aspremont, Damien Scieur, Adrien Taylor, et al. Acceleration methods. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 5(1-2):1–245, 2021.
- [14] Benjamin Grimmer, Kevin Shu, and Alex L. Wang. Accelerated objective gap and gradient norm convergence for gradient descent via long steps, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14045>.
- [15] Benjamin Grimmer, Kevin Shu, and Alex L. Wang. Composing optimized stepsize schedules for gradient descent. 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.16249>.
- [16] Shuvomoy Das Gupta, Bart P.G. Van Parys, and Ernest Ryu. Branch-and-bound performance estimation programming: A unified methodology for constructing optimal optimization methods. *Math. Program.*, 2023.
- [17] Uijeong Jang, Shuvomoy Das Gupta, and Ernest K. Ryu. Computer-assisted design of accelerated composite optimization methods: Optista, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15704>.
- [18] Donghwan Kim. Accelerated proximal point method for maximally monotone operators. *Math. Program.*, 190(1–2):57–87, November 2021. ISSN 0025-5610. doi: 10.1007/s10107-021-01643-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-021-01643-0>.

- [19] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A. Fessler. Optimized first-order methods for smooth convex minimization. *Math. Program.*, 159(1–2):81–107, 2016.
- [20] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A Fessler. On the convergence analysis of the optimized gradient method. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 172(1):187–205, 2017.
- [21] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A. Fessler. Another look at the fast iterative shrinkage/thresholding algorithm (fista). *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(1):223–250, 2018. doi: 10.1137/16M108940X. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M108940X>.
- [22] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A. Fessler. Adaptive restart of the optimized gradient method for convex optimization. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 178(1):240–263, July 2018. ISSN 0022-3239. doi: 10.1007/s10957-018-1287-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-018-1287-4>.
- [23] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A. Fessler. Optimizing the efficiency of first-order methods for decreasing the gradient of smooth convex functions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 188(1):192–219, 2021.
- [24] Jungbin Kim. A proof of exact convergence rate of gradient descent. Part II. Performance criterion  $(f(x_n) - f_*)/\|x_0 - x_*\|^2$ , 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.04427>.
- [25] Dong C Liu and Jorge Nocedal. On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization. *Math. Program.*, 45(1):503–528, 1989.
- [26] Miles Lubin, Oscar Dowson, Joaquim Dias Garcia, Joey Huchette, Benoît Legat, and Juan Pablo Vielma. JuMP 1.0: Recent improvements to a modeling language for mathematical optimization. *Math. Program. Comput.*, 2023.
- [27] Patrick Kofod Mogensen and Asbjørn Nilsen Riseth. Optim: A mathematical optimization package for Julia. *J. Open Source Softw.*, 3(24):615, 2018.
- [28] A. S. Nemirovsky and D. B. Yudin. *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. Wiley-Interscience, 1983.
- [29] Arkadi S Nemirovsky. Information-based complexity of linear operator equations. *J. Complex.*, 8(2):153–175, 1992.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate  $O(1/k^2)$ . *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 269:543–547, 1983.
- [31] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2014.
- [32] Martin J Osborne. An introduction to game theory. *Oxford University Press*, 2:672–713, 2004.
- [33] Chanwoo Park, Jisun Park, and Ernest K. Ryu. Factor- $\sqrt{2}$  acceleration of accelerated gradient methods. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 88:1–38, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:231925453>.
- [34] Teodor Rotaru, François Glineur, and Panagiotis Patrinos. Exact worst-case convergence rates of gradient descent: a complete analysis for all constant stepsizes over nonconvex and convex functions, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17506>.
- [35] Adrien Taylor and Francis Bach. Stochastic first-order methods: non-asymptotic and computer-aided analyses via potential functions. In Alina Beygelzimer and Daniel Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2934–2992. PMLR, 25–28 Jun 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v99/taylor19a.html>.
- [36] Adrien Taylor and Yoel Drori. An optimal gradient method for smooth strongly convex minimization. *Math. Program.*, 199(1–2):557–594, jun 2022. ISSN 0025-5610. doi: 10.1007/s10107-022-01839-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-022-01839-y>.



- [37] Adrien Taylor, Julien Hendrickx, and François Glineur. Smooth strongly convex interpolation and exact worst-case performance of first-order methods. *Math. Program.*, 161:307–345, 2017.
- [38] Adrien Taylor, Julien Hendrickx, and François Glineur. Exact worst-case performance of first-order methods for composite convex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(3):1283–1313, 2017. doi: 10.1137/16M108104X. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M108104X>.
- [39] Bryan Van Scoy, Randy A. Freeman, and Kevin M. Lynch. The fastest known globally convergent first-order method for minimizing strongly convex functions. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(1):49–54, 2018. doi: 10.1109/LCSYS.2017.2722406.
- [40] Zehao Zhang and Rujun Jiang. Accelerated gradient descent by concatenation of stepsize schedules, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.12395>.
- [41] Zihan Zhang, Jason D Lee, Simon S Du, and Yuxin Chen. Anytime acceleration of gradient descent. 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.17668>.

## A Proof of Lemma 4

*Proof of Lemma 4.* We will require the following identity

$$\tau_i(\psi_i - 1) = \begin{cases} \phi_i\psi_i + \tau_i & \text{if } i \in [n, N - 1], \\ \phi_N\psi_N & \text{if } i = N, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

which follows from  $\tau_i = \psi_i^2/2$  for  $i \in [n, N - 1]$  and  $\tau_N = \psi_N^2$ . Additionally, for all  $i \in [n, N - 1]$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\phi_{i+1}\psi_{i+1}\eta_{i+1} &= 1 + \sum_{\ell=n}^i \psi_\ell^2\eta_\ell \\ &= 1 + \sum_{\ell=n}^{i-1} \psi_\ell^2\eta_\ell + \psi_i^2\eta_i \\ &= 2\phi_i\psi_i\eta_i + \psi_i^2\eta_i \\ &= 2\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this identity and noting that  $\phi_{i+1} = \tau_i$ , we have that for all  $i \in [n, N - 1]$ , that  $\psi_{i+1}\eta_{i+1} = (\psi_i - 1)\eta_i$ .

We prove the first statement inductively. For  $i = n$ , we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\tau_n(\psi_n - 1)} = \frac{1}{2(\phi_n\psi_n + \tau_n)} \leq \eta_n = \frac{1}{2\phi_n\psi_n}.$$

Now, suppose  $i \in [n + 1, N]$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)} &\leq \frac{1}{2\phi_i\psi_i} \\ &\leq \eta_i = \frac{(\psi_{i-1} - 1)\eta_{i-1}}{\psi_i} \\ &\leq \frac{(\psi_{i-1} - 1)}{2\phi_n\psi_{i-1}\psi_i} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\phi_n\psi_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first line follows from (24).

For the second claim, suppose  $i \in [n, N - 2]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i(\psi_i - 1)\eta_i &= \tau_i\psi_{i+1}\eta_{i+1} \\ &= \phi_{i+1}\psi_{i+1}\eta_{i+1} \\ &\leq \tau_{i+1}(\psi_{i+1} - 1)\eta_{i+1},\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (24).

For the third claim, first suppose  $i \in [n, N - 1]$  and  $j = i + 1$ . Then,  $\psi_j\eta_j = (\psi_i - 1)\eta_i$  so that the claim holds. Now, suppose  $n \leq i < j \leq N$ . Then, we can chain together this inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_j\eta_j &\leq (\psi_{j-1} - 1)\eta_{j-1} \\ &\leq \psi_{j-1}\eta_{j-1} \\ &\leq (\psi_{j-2} - 1)\eta_{j-2} \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq (\psi_i - 1)\eta_i.\end{aligned}$$

■

## B Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof of Lemma 3.* The primal problem (2) can be written as

$$\sup_{\mu, \lambda_\star \in \mathbb{R}^k} \left\{ \langle \tau, \mu \rangle + \langle 1, \lambda_\star \rangle : \begin{pmatrix} \langle \mu, h - v_m\tau - LZ^\top x_0 \rangle + \langle \lambda_\star, q - v_m1 + LG^\top x_0 \rangle & Z\mu - G\lambda_\star \\ \mu, \lambda_\star \geq 0 & \frac{2}{L}I \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}.$$

Define dual variables

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi & (\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)^\top \\ \frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y & \Xi \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad a \geq 0, \quad b \geq 0.$$

A direct computation of the dual gives

$$\inf_{\xi, y, \Xi, a, b} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \xi(h - v_m\tau) + Z^\top y + a = -\tau \\ \xi(q - v_m1) - G^\top y + b = -1 \\ \frac{2}{L} \text{tr}(\Xi) : \begin{pmatrix} \xi & (\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)^\top \\ \frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y & \Xi \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0 \\ a, b \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

Note that  $\xi > 0$  at any feasible solution as otherwise  $\xi = 0$  implies  $y = 0$  contradicts both of the first two constraints. Partially minimizing over  $\Xi$  and dropping  $a, b$  gives

$$\inf_{\xi, y} \left\{ \frac{2}{L} \frac{\left\| \frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y \right\|^2}{\xi} : \begin{array}{l} \xi(h - v_m\tau) + Z^\top y \leq -\tau \\ \xi(q - v_m1) - G^\top y \leq -1 \\ \xi > 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

By Lemma 2, we know that (2) is essentially strictly feasible so that strong duality holds and that the inf can be replaced by a minimum as long as (2) is bounded.

Let  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$  and  $(\xi, y)$  denote optimal solutions to (2) and (13) respectively. Let  $\Xi = \frac{1}{\xi}(\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)(\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)^\top$ . Note that by optimality of  $(\mu, \lambda_\star)$ , it must hold that  $\langle \mu, h - v_m\tau - LZ^\top x_0 \rangle + \langle \lambda_\star, q - v_m1 + LG^\top x_0 \rangle =$

$\frac{L}{2} \|Z\mu - G\lambda_\star\|^2$ . Complementary slackness implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \langle \mu, h - v_m \tau - LZ^\top x_0 \rangle + \langle \lambda_\star, q - v_m \mathbf{1} + LG^\top x_0 \rangle & Z\mu - G\lambda_\star \\ Z\mu - G\lambda_\star & \frac{2}{L}I \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \xi & (\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)^\top \\ \frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y & \Xi \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \frac{L}{2} \|Z\mu - G\lambda_\star\|^2 & Z\mu - G\lambda_\star \\ Z\mu - G\lambda_\star & \frac{2}{L}I \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \xi & (\frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y)^\top \\ \frac{L\xi}{2}x_0 + y & \Xi \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{\xi L}{2} \|Z\mu - G\lambda_\star\|^2 + \xi L \left\langle Z\mu - G\lambda_\star, x_0 + \frac{2y}{\xi L} \right\rangle + \frac{\xi L}{2} \left\| x_0 + \frac{2y}{\xi L} \right\|^2 \\
&= \frac{\xi L}{2} \left\| Z\mu - G\lambda_\star + x_0 + \frac{2y}{\xi L} \right\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\frac{-2y}{\xi L} = x_0 + Z\mu - G\lambda_\star = z'_n. \quad \blacksquare$$