

Stochastic interior-point methods for smooth conic optimization with applications

Chuan He* Zhanwang Deng[†]

December 18, 2024

Abstract

Conic optimization plays a crucial role in many machine learning (ML) problems. However, practical algorithms for conic constrained ML problems with large datasets are often limited to specific use cases, as stochastic algorithms for general conic optimization remain underdeveloped. To fill this gap, we introduce a stochastic interior-point method (SIPM) framework for general conic optimization, along with four novel SIPM variants leveraging distinct stochastic gradient estimators. Under mild assumptions, we establish the global convergence rates of our proposed SIPMs, which, up to a logarithmic factor, match the best-known rates in stochastic unconstrained optimization. Finally, our numerical experiments on robust linear regression, multi-task relationship learning, and clustering data streams demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of our approach.

Keywords: Conic optimization, stochastic interior-point method, global convergence rate, robust linear regression, multi-task relationship learning, clustering data streams

Mathematics Subject Classification: 90C25, 90C30

1 Introduction

Conic optimization covers a broad class of optimization problems with constraints represented by convex cones, including common forms such as linear constraints, second-order cone constraints, and semidefinite constraints. Over the years, this class of optimization problems has found applications across various fields, including control [21], energy systems [55], combinatorial optimization [49], and machine learning (ML) [40]. In practice, the efficient handling of traditional conic optimization problems has been extensively studied for decades, with interior-point methods (IPMs) standing out due to their ability to effectively and elegantly solve a wide range of conic constrained problems within a unified framework (see the monograph by [35]).

1.1 Stochastic optimization with conic constraints for machine learning

Existing studies on IPMs primarily focus on the deterministic regime, despite the recent widespread applications of stochastic conic optimization in ML. These applications include multi-task relationship learning [4, 54], robust learning with chance constraints [39, 51], kernel learning [5], and clustering data streams [10, 36, 42]. Next, we briefly highlight two examples.

*Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, Sweden (email: chuan.he@liu.se).

[†]Academy for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, Peking University, China (email: dzw_opt2022@stu.pku.edu.cn).

Multi-task relationship learning Multi-task learning is an ML paradigm where related tasks are learned together to improve generalization by sharing information (see [53]). In many applications, task correlations are not explicitly available. To learn these correlations from data, a regularization framework is proposed, where the relationships between models for different tasks are controlled by a regularizer defined using the covariance matrix Ω [4, 54]:

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(w_i, a_{ij}) + \lambda \text{tr}(W^T P(\Sigma) W) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^p, \quad \text{tr}(\Sigma) = 1, \quad (1)$$

where $W = [w_1, \dots, w_p]^T$, \mathbb{S}_+^p denotes the positive semidefinite cone, $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the loss function, w_i and $\{a_{ij}\}_{j=1}^m$ are respectively the model weight and the training set for the i th task, $1 \leq i \leq p$, $\lambda > 0$ is a tuning parameter, $P: \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a given map that controls the interaction between W and Ω , and $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix.

Robust learning with chance constraints Consider supervised learning with feature-label pairs $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where the a_i 's are assumed to be generated from a distribution \mathcal{D} with expected value \bar{a} and covariance matrix Σ . To mitigate the uncertainty in the a_i 's, a chance constraint $\mathbb{P}_{a \sim \mathcal{D}}(|w^T(a - \bar{a})| \geq \theta) \leq \eta$ is proposed to be incorporated when performing robust linear regression [39, 51], where θ and η are the confidence level and desired probability, respectively. By approximating this chance constraint with a second-order cone constraint, [39] propose the following robust regression problem with conic constraints:

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, v \geq 0} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \phi(w^T a_i - b_i) + \lambda_1 \theta + \lambda_2 v \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (w, v) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}, \quad (\Sigma^{1/2} w, \sqrt{\eta} \theta) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}, \quad (2)$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ is the loss, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ are tuning parameters, and $\mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \doteq \{(u, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ : \|u\| \leq t\}$ denotes the second-order cone.

Both examples in (1) and (2) involve nonlinear conic constraints and are typically coupled with large datasets in real applications. However, stochastic algorithms for addressing general conic optimization problems in ML remains largely underdeveloped. Existing algorithmic developments for conic constrained ML problems are limited to specific use cases: for instance, alternating minimization is widely employed in the literature [4, 54] to solve (1), while [39] formulates (2) as second-order cone programming, assuming that ϕ is convex. Nevertheless, these developments do not unify the treatment of conic constraints and often lack convergence guarantees for problems with nonconvex objective functions.

In this paper we aim for proposing a stochastic interior-point method (SIPM) framework for smooth conic optimization problems, including (1) and (2) as special cases. This class of problems takes the following form:

$$\min_x f(x) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \Omega \doteq \{x : Ax = b, x \in \mathcal{K}\}, \quad (3)$$

where f is continuously differentiable and possibly nonconvex on Ω , but its derivatives are not accessible. Instead, we rely on stochastic estimators $G(\cdot; \xi)$ of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ (see Assumptions 1(c) and 3(b) for assumptions on $G(\cdot; \xi)$). Here, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is of full row rank, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed and pointed convex cone with a nonempty interior. Assume that (3) has at least one optimal solution.

1.2 Our contributions

In this paper we propose an SIPM framework (Algorithm 1) for solving problem (3), which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first stochastic algorithmic framework for this problem. Building on Algorithm 1, we introduce four novel SIPM variants by incorporating different stochastic gradient estimators: mini-batch

estimators, Polyak momentum, extrapolated Polyak momentum, and recursive momentum. Under mild assumptions, we establish the global convergence rates for these variants. For our SIPMs, we summarize the samples per iteration, global convergence rates, and smoothness assumptions in Table 1. In addition, numerical results demonstrate the practical advantages of our SIPMs over existing methods.

Table 1: Samples per iteration, global convergence rates based on the stationary measure in Definition 1, and smoothness assumptions.

	samples per iteration	global convergence rate	smoothness assumption
SIPM-ME (Sec. 3.1)	$k + 1$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/2})$ (Rmk. 2)	1st-order locally smooth (Asm. 1(b))
SIPM-PM (Sec. 3.2)	1	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/4})$ (Rmk. 3)	1st-order locally smooth (Asm. 1(b))
SIPM-EM (Sec. 3.3)	1	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-2/7})$ (Rmk. 4)	1st- & 2nd-order locally smooth (Asm. 1(b) and 2(b))
SIPM-RM (Sec. 3.4)	1	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/3})$ (Rmk. 6)	average smooth (Asm. 3(b))

Our main contributions are highlighted below.

- We propose an SIPM framework (Algorithm 1) for solving problem (3). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first stochastic algorithmic framework for ML problems with general conic constraints. Building upon this framework, we introduce four novel SIPM variants that incorporate different stochastic gradient estimators.
- We establish the global convergence rates of our SIPMs using mini-batch estimations, Polyak momentum, and extrapolated Polyak momentum under *locally Lipschitz* assumptions (Assumptions 1(b) and 2(b)), which relax the *globally Lipschitz* assumptions commonly used in the literature (e.g., [23, 16]). In addition, we introduce a novel *local-norm-truncated recursive momentum* scheme into an SIPM and establish its global convergence rate. All of the convergence rates established in this paper are entirely new and match, up to a logarithmic factor, the best-known rates in stochastic unconstrained optimization.
- We conduct numerical experiments (Section 4) to compare our SIPMs with existing methods on robust linear regression, multi-task relationship learning, and clustering data streams. The results demonstrate that our SIPMs achieve solution quality comparable to or better than existing methods, and importantly, they consistently solve ML problems with general conic constraints, unlike existing task-specific approaches.

1.3 Related work

Interior-point methods In the deterministic regime, IPMs are recognized as a fundamental and widely used algorithmic approach for solving constrained optimization problems, having been extensively studied for decades [2, 11, 26, 35, 37, 46, 47, 50, 22]. In particular, primal-dual IPMs are a popular class of methods that iterate towards to an optimal solution by applying Newton’s method to solve a system of equations derived from the perturbed first-order necessary conditions of the optimization problem [47, 50]. Another early and classical family of IPMs is the affine scaling method, which iteratively improves a feasible point within the relative interior of the feasible region by scaling the search direction to prevent the solution from exiting the boundary [45, 18]. The SIPMs developed in this paper are more closely aligned with the algorithmic ideas of affine scaling methods. Moreover, IPM-based solvers are widely adopted for large-scale constrained optimization, including Ipopt [47], Knitro [11], and LOQO [46] for functional constrained problems, and SDPT3 [43] and SeDuMi [41] for conic constrained problems.

Studies on SIPMs have only emerged recently. In particular, [6] and [33] propose randomized IPMs for minimizing a linear function over a convex set. In addition, [14] introduces an SIPM for bound-constrained

optimization by augmenting the objective function with a log-barrier function, and [13] generalizes this approach to solve inequality constrained optimization problems. The optimization problems and algorithmic ideas studied in these previous works differ significantly from those in this paper.

Stochastic first-order methods Recent significant developments in ML, fueled by large-scale data, have made stochastic first-order optimization methods widely popular for driving ML applications. In particular, many stochastic first-order methods have been developed for solving unconstrained and simple constrained problems of the form $\min_{x \in X} f(x)$, where $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a set for which the projection can be computed exactly [16, 17, 19, 23, 27, 44, 48, 52]. Assuming that f has a Lipschitz continuous gradient, a global convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(k^{-1/4})$ has been established for the methods in [23, 16], in terms of minimizing the stationary measure $\text{dist}(0, \nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{N}_X(x^k))$, where $\mathcal{N}_X(x^k)$ denotes the normal cone of X at x^k . The global convergence rate improves to $\mathcal{O}(k^{-2/7})$ by using an implicit gradient transport technique, assuming that f has a Lipschitz continuous Hessian [16], and to $\mathcal{O}(k^{-1/3})$ by using various variance reduction techniques, assuming that ∇f has a stochastic estimator satisfying the average smoothness condition [17, 19, 44, 48, 52]. In addition, a number of recent efforts have been devoted to equality constrained optimization in the stochastic regime, including sequential quadratic programming methods [7, 8, 9, 15, 20, 31, 32] and penalty methods [1, 28, 30, 38].

2 Notation and preliminaries

Throughout this paper, let \mathbb{R}^n denote the n -dimensional Euclidean space and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the standard inner product. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the Euclidean norm of a vector or the spectral norm of a matrix. For the closed convex cone \mathcal{K} , its interior and dual cone are denoted by $\text{int}\mathcal{K}$ and \mathcal{K}^* , respectively. We define the barrier function of problem (3) as:

$$\phi_\mu(x) \doteq f(x) + \mu B(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega^\circ \doteq \{x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K} : Ax = b\}. \quad (4)$$

For a finite set \mathcal{B} , let $|\mathcal{B}|$ denote its cardinality. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $[t]_+$ and $[t]_-$ denote its nonnegative and nonpositive parts, respectively (i.e., set to zero if t is positive or negative, respectively). We use the standard big-O notation $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ to present convergence rate, and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ to represent the order with a logarithmic factor omitted.

For the rest of this section, we review some background on logarithmically homogeneous self-concordant barriers and introduce the approximate optimality conditions for our SIPMs.

2.1 Logarithmically homogeneous self-concordant barrier

Logarithmically homogeneous self-concordant (LHSC) barrier functions play a crucial role in the development of IPMs for conic optimization (see [35]). In this paper the design and analysis of SIPMs also heavily rely on the LHSC barrier function. Throughout this paper, assume that \mathcal{K} is equipped with a ϑ -LHSC barrier function B for some $\vartheta \geq 1$. Specifically, $B : \text{int}\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions: (i) B is convex and three times continuously differentiable in $\text{int}\mathcal{K}$, and moreover, $|\varphi'''(0)| \leq 2(\varphi''(0))^{3/2}$ holds for all $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\varphi(t) = B(x + tu)$; (ii) B is a *barrier function* for \mathcal{K} , meaning that $B(x)$ goes to infinity as x approaches the boundary of \mathcal{K} ; (iii) B satisfies the *logarithmically homogeneous property*: $B(tx) = B(x) - \vartheta \ln t$ for all $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}, t > 0$.

For any $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$, the function B induces the following local norms for vectors:

$$\|v\|_x \doteq (v^T \nabla^2 B(x) v)^{1/2}, \quad \|v\|_x^* \doteq (v^T \nabla^2 B(x)^{-1} v)^{1/2} \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5)$$

The induced local norm for matrices is given by:

$$\|M\|_x^* \doteq \max_{\|v\|_x \leq 1} \|Mv\|_x^* \quad \forall M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}. \quad (6)$$

2.2 Approximate optimality conditions

Since f is nonconvex, finding a global solution to (3) is generally impossible. Instead, we aim to find a point that satisfies approximate optimality conditions, as is common in nonconvex optimization. For deterministic IPMs developed to solve (3), the following approximate optimality conditions are proposed in [25, 24]:

$$x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}, \quad Ax = b, \quad \nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda \in \mathcal{K}^*, \quad \|\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* \leq \epsilon \quad (7)$$

with a given tolerance $\epsilon > 0$. In addition, stochastic algorithms typically produce solutions that satisfy approximate optimality conditions only in expectation. To facilitate our developments of SIPMs, we next derive an alternative approximate optimality condition for (3) using B , which is a sufficient condition for (7). Its proof is deferred to Section 5.1.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mu > 0$. Suppose that $(x, \lambda) \in \Omega^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies $\|\nabla \phi_\mu(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* \leq \mu$, where ϕ_μ and Ω° are given in (4). Then, (x, λ) also satisfies (7) with $\epsilon = (1 + \sqrt{\vartheta})\mu$.*

The above lemma offers an alternative approximate optimality condition for (3). We extend this condition to an expectation form and define a μ -stochastic stationary point for problem (3), which our SIPMs aim to achieve.

Definition 1. Let $\mu > 0$. We say that $x \in \Omega^\circ$ is a μ -stochastic stationary point of problem (3) if it, together with some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$, satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_\mu(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^*] \leq \mu$, where the expectation is taken over the random variables involved in the algorithm.

3 Stochastic interior-point methods

In this section we propose an SIPM framework for solving (3) and then analyze the global convergence rates of four SIPM variants. We now make the following additional assumptions that will be used throughout this section.

Assumption 1. (a) *The feasible region Ω is compact, and the Slater's condition holds; that is, $\Omega^\circ \neq \emptyset$, where Ω and Ω° are given in (3) and (4), respectively.*

(b) *There exists $L_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x)\|_x^* \leq L_1 \|y - x\|_x \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega^\circ \text{ with } \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta, \quad (8)$$

where $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-defined input of Algorithm 1 to control the step sizes.

(c) *The stochastic gradient estimator $G : \Omega^\circ \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[G(x; \xi)] = \nabla f(x), \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\|G(x; \xi) - \nabla f(x)\|_x^*)^2] \leq \sigma^2 \quad \forall x \in \Omega^\circ \quad (9)$$

for some $\sigma > 0$.

Remark 1. (i) Since f is continuous on Ω and B is convex, we see from Assumption 1(a) that f and B are bounded below on Ω and Ω° , respectively. For convenience, define

$$\Delta(x) \doteq f(x) + [B(x)]_+ - f_{\text{low}} - [B_{\text{low}}]_- \quad \forall x \in \Omega^\circ, \quad (10)$$

where $f_{\text{low}} \doteq \inf_{x \in \Omega} f(x)$ and $B_{\text{low}} \doteq \inf_{x \in \Omega^\circ} B(x)$.

- (ii) Assumption 1(b) implies that ∇f is locally Lipschitz continuous on Ω° with respect to local norms. Since Ω° is bounded under Assumption 1(a), it follows from Theorem 1 in [25] that $\nabla^2 B(x)^{-1}$ is bounded above for all $x \in \Omega^\circ$. Consequently, using (5), we see that Assumption 1(b) holds if ∇f is globally Lipschitz continuous on Ω° . For convenience, we define

$$L_\phi \doteq L_1 + 1/(1 - s_\eta), \quad (11)$$

which denotes the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla \phi_\mu$ for any $\mu \in (0, 1]$ (see Lemma 11 below).

- (iii) Assumption 1(c) implies that $G(\cdot; \xi)$ is an unbiased estimator of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ and that its variance, with respect to the local norm, is bounded above. As noted in Remark 1(ii), $\nabla^2 B(x)^{-1}$ is bounded for all $x \in \Omega^\circ$. By this and (5), we have that the second relation in (9) holds if the variance of $G(\cdot; \xi)$ with respect to the Euclidean norm is bounded.

In what follows, we propose an SIPM framework in Algorithm 1 for solving problem (3). Subsequently, we will employ four distinct stochastic estimators to construct $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$, with specific schemes provided in (13), (18), (24), and (34), respectively.

We remark that computations involving $\nabla^2 B(x^k)^{-1}$ can be performed efficiently for common nonlinear cones \mathcal{K} . For example, when \mathcal{K} is the second-order cone, $\nabla B(x^k)^{-1}$ can be computed analytically (e.g., see [3]), and $(A \nabla^2 B(x^k)^{-1} A^T)^{-1} v$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ can be efficiently evaluated using Cholesky factorization. When \mathcal{K} is the semidefinite cone, we have that $\nabla^2 B(X^k)^{-1}[V] = X^k V X^k$ holds for any $n \times n$ symmetric matrix V , and that $A \nabla^2 B(X^k)^{-1} A^T$ can be efficiently computed by exploiting the sparsity of A (see [43] for details).

Algorithm 1 An SIPM framework

Input: starting point $x^0 \in \Omega^\circ$, maximum step length $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$, nonincreasing barrier parameters $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$.

Let $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence of predefined or adaptive step sizes satisfying $\eta_k \in (0, s_\eta]$ for all $k \geq 0$.

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Construct a stochastic estimator \bar{m}^k for $\nabla f(x^k)$, and set $m^k = \bar{m}^k + \mu_k \nabla B(x^k)$.

Update dual and primal variables as follows:

$$\lambda^k = -(A H_k A^T)^{-1} A H_k m^k, \quad x^{k+1} = x^k - \eta_k H_k (m^k + A^T \lambda^k) / \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*, \quad (12)$$

where $H_k = \nabla^2 B(x^k)^{-1}$.

end for

Our next lemma shows that all iterates $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Algorithm 1 are strictly feasible, i.e., $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$ holds for all $k \geq 0$. Its proof is deferred to Section 5.1.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ and $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$ for all $k \geq 0$, where Ω° is defined in (4).*

In the remainder of this section, we propose four variants of SIPMs in Sections 3.1 to 3.4 and study their global convergence rates. The developments and guarantees of these four SIPM variants are independent of each other.

3.1 An SIPM with mini-batch estimators

We now describe a variant of Algorithm 1, where the step size sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is predefined and nonincreasing, and $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is constructed using mini-batch estimators:

$$\bar{m}^k = \sum_{i \in B_k} G(x^k; \xi_i^k) / |B_k| \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (13)$$

where $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1(c), and the sequence $\{B_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the sets of sample indices. We refer this variant as SIPM with mini-batch estimators (SIPM-ME).

The following lemma establishes an upper bound for the estimation error of the mini-batch estimators defined in (13), and its proof is deferred to Section 5.3.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (13), and let $\{(\eta_k, B_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_i^k\}_{i \in B_k}} [(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2] \leq \sigma^2 / |B_k| \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

where σ is given in Assumption 1(c).

We next provide an upper bound for the average expected error of the stationary condition across all iterates generated by SIPM-ME. Its proof is relegated to Section 5.3.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (13), and let $\{(\eta_k, B_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing. Then, for any $K \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \leq \frac{\Delta(x^0) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k \left(\frac{2\sigma}{|B_k|^{1/2}} + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k \right)}{\eta_{K-1}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$, L_ϕ , and σ are given in (10), (11), and Assumption 1(c), respectively.

3.1.1 Hyperparameters and convergence rate

To establish the convergence rate of SIPM-ME, we specify its inputs $\{(\eta_k, B_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ as

$$\eta_k = s_\eta / (k+1)^{1/2}, \quad |B_k| = k+1, \quad \mu_k = \ln^2(k+7) / (4(k+1)^{1/2}) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

where $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-defined maximum length for step sizes in Algorithm 1. It follows that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, s_\eta]$ and $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$, with both sequences decreasing.

The following theorem presents the global convergence rate of SIPM-ME with inputs specified in (16). Its proof is deferred to Section 5.3.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (13) and $\{(\eta_k, B_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ specified as in (16). Let $\kappa(k)$ be uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, and define*

$$K_{\text{me}} \doteq \max\{5, \exp(32\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 64\sigma + 16s_\eta L_\phi)\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ is defined in (10), L_ϕ and σ are given in (11) and Assumption 1(c), respectively, and s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$ holds for all $k \geq K_{\text{me}}$.

Remark 2. From Theorem 2, we see that when $k \geq K_{\text{me}}$, SIPM-ME can return a $\mu_{\kappa(k)}$ -stochastic stationary point of problem (3) within $2k$ iterations. In addition, using the fact that $\kappa(k) \in \{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$ and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (16), we deduce that $\mu_{\kappa(k)} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/2})$. Therefore, SIPM-ME achieves a global convergence rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/2})$.

3.2 An SIPM with Polyak momentum

We now propose a variant of Algorithm 1, in which the step size sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is predefined and nonincreasing, and $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is constructed using Polyak momentum [16] as follows:

$$\gamma_{-1} = 1, \quad \bar{m}^{-1} = 0, \quad \bar{m}^k = (1 - \gamma_{k-1})\bar{m}^{k-1} + \gamma_{k-1}G(x^k, \xi^k) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (18)$$

where $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1(c), and $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the sequence of momentum parameters. We refer this variant as SIPM with Polyak momentum (SIPM-PM).

The next lemma provides the recurrence relation for the estimation error of the gradient estimators based on Polyak momentum defined in (18). Its proof is deferred to Section 5.4.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (18), and $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. For all $k \geq 0$, assume that $\gamma_k > \eta_k$ holds, and define $\alpha_k = 1 - (1 - \gamma_k)/(1 - \eta_k)$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \leq (1 - \alpha_k)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{L_1^2 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \sigma^2 \gamma_k^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (19)$$

where L_1 and σ are given in Assumption 1.

We now derive an upper bound for the average expected error of the stationary condition across all iterates generated by SIPM-PM. Its proof is deferred to Section 5.4.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (18), and let $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing and also that $\gamma_k > \eta_k$ holds for all $k \geq 0$. Define $\alpha_k = 1 - (1 - \gamma_k)/(1 - \eta_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \leq \frac{\Delta(x^0) + \frac{\sigma^2}{L_1} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{L_\phi \eta_k^2}{2} + \frac{2L_1 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{L_1} \right)}{\eta_{K-1}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ is defined in (10), L_ϕ is given in (11), and L_1 and σ are given in Assumption 1.

3.2.1 Hyperparameters and convergence rate

To analyze the convergence rate of SIPM-PM, we specify its inputs $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ as:

$$\eta_k = s_\eta / (k + 2)^{3/4}, \quad \gamma_k = 1 / (k + 2)^{1/2}, \quad \mu_k = \ln^2(k + 150) / (22(k + 2)^{1/4}) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (21)$$

where $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-defined input of Algorithm 1. It can be verified that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, s_\eta]$ and $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$, with both sequences decreasing. From (21) and $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$, we observe that the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in Lemma 4 and Theorem 3 satisfies:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{(k + 2)^{1/4} - s_\eta}{(k + 2)^{3/4} - s_\eta} > \frac{(k + 2)^{1/4} - 1}{(k + 2)^{3/4}} \geq \frac{1 - 1/2^{1/4}}{(k + 2)^{1/2}} > \frac{1}{7(k + 2)^{1/2}} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (22)$$

The following theorem presents the global convergence rate of SIPM-PM with its inputs specified in (21). Its proof is relegated to Section 5.4.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (18) and $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ specified as in (21). Let $\kappa(k)$ be uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k - 1\}$, and define*

$$K_{\text{pm}} \doteq \max\{3, \exp(176(\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 2\sigma^2/(s_\eta L_1) + s_\eta L_\phi + 14s_\eta L_1))\}, \quad (23)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ is defined in (10), L_ϕ is given in (11), L_1 and σ are given in Assumption 1, and s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$ holds for all $k \geq K_{\text{pm}}$.

Remark 3. From Theorem 4, we see that when $k \geq K_{\text{pm}}$, SIPM-PM can return a $\mu_{\kappa(k)}$ -stochastic stationary point of problem (3) within $2k$ iterations. Moreover, using the fact that $\kappa(k) \in \{k, \dots, 2k - 1\}$ and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (21), we find that $\mu_{\kappa(k)} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/4})$. Therefore, SIPM-PM achieves a global convergence rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/4})$. This rate matches the rate for the unconstrained case [16], up to a logarithmic factor.

3.3 An SIPM with extrapolated Polyak momentum

We now propose a variant of Algorithm 1, where the step size sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is predefined and nonincreasing, and $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is constructed based on extrapolated Polyak momentum [16] as follows:

$$\gamma_{-1} = 1, \quad x^{-1} = x^0, \quad \bar{m}^{-1} = 0, \quad (24a)$$

$$z^k = x^k + \frac{1 - \gamma_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}}(x^k - x^{k-1}), \quad \bar{m}^k = (1 - \gamma_{k-1})\bar{m}^{k-1} + \gamma_{k-1}G(z^k, \xi^k) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (24b)$$

where $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1(c), and $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, +\infty)$ denotes momentum parameters. We refer to this variant as SIPM with extrapolated Polyak momentum (SIPM-EM).

To analyze SIPM-EM, we make the following additional assumption regarding the local Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla^2 f$.

Assumption 2. (a) *The function f is twice continuously differentiable on Ω° .*

(b) *There exists $L_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\|\nabla^2 f(y) - \nabla^2 f(x)\|_x^* \leq L_2 \|y - x\|_x \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega^\circ \text{ with } \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta, \quad (25)$$

where $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-defined input of Algorithm 1.

The following lemma shows that the iterates $\{z^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by SIPM-EM lie in Ω° . Its proof is deferred to Section 5.5.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\{z^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (24), and let $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume $\eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta$ for all $k \geq 0$, where s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Then, $z^k \in \Omega^\circ$ for all $k \geq 0$, where Ω° is defined in (4).*

The next lemma provides the recurrence relation for the estimation error of the gradient estimators based on extrapolated Polyak momentum defined in (24). Its proof is deferred to Section 5.5.

Lemma 6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (24), and let $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, and that $\eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta$ holds for all $k \geq 0$, where s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Define $\alpha_k = 1 - (1 - \gamma_k)/(1 - \eta_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] &\leq (1 - \alpha_k)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\ &+ \frac{L_2^2 \eta_k^4}{(1 - \eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\} \alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{(1 - \eta_0)^2 (1 - \eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} \quad \forall k \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where σ and L_2 are given in Assumptions 1(c) and 2(b), respectively.

We next derive an upper bound for the average expected error of the stationary condition across all iterates generated by SIPM-EM. Its proof is relegated to Section 5.5.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (24), and let $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, and that $\eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta$ holds for all $k \geq 0$, where s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Define $\alpha_k = 1 - (1 - \gamma_k)/(1 - \eta_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Let $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a nondecreasing sequence satisfying $(1 - \alpha_k)p_{k+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_k/2)p_k$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \\ & \leq \frac{\Delta(x^0) + p_0\sigma^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{L_\phi}{2}\eta_k^2 + \frac{2\eta_k^2}{p_k\alpha_k} + \frac{L_2^2\eta_k^4 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\}\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2\gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2(1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} \right)}{\eta_{K-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ and L_ϕ are defined in (10) and (11), respectively, and σ and L_2 are given in Assumptions 1(c) and 2(b), respectively.

3.3.1 Hyperparameters and convergence rate

To establish the convergence rate of SIPM-EM, we specify its inputs $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ as

$$\eta_k = s_\eta/(k+4)^{5/7}, \quad \gamma_k = 1/(k+4)^{4/7}, \quad \mu_k = \ln^2(k+70)/(13(k+4)^{2/7}) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (28)$$

where $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-defined input of Algorithm 1. It then follows that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, s_\eta]$ and $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$, with both sequences decreasing. In addition, it can be verified that $\eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta$ for all $k \geq 0$. We also define

$$p_k = (k+4)^{1/7} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

The next lemma provides some useful properties of the sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in Theorem 5 and (29), respectively. These properties will be used to establish the global convergence rate of SIPM-EM, and the proof is deferred to Section 5.5.

Lemma 7. *Let $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be defined in (28), and $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be defined in Theorem 5 and (29), respectively. Then, $\alpha_k \geq 1/(6(k+4)^{4/7})$ and $(1 - \alpha_k)p_{k+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_k/2)p_k$ hold for all $k \geq 0$.*

The next theorem establishes the global convergence rate of SIPM-EM with its inputs specified in (28). Its proof is relegated to Section 5.5.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ constructed as in (24) and $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ specified in (28). Let $\kappa(k)$ be uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, and define*

$$K_{\text{em}} \doteq \max\{5, \exp(104((\Delta(x^0) + 162\sigma^2)/s_\eta + s_\eta L_\phi + 12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3))\}, \quad (30)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ and L_ϕ are defined in (10) and (11), respectively, σ and L_2 are given in Assumptions 1(c) and 2(b), respectively, and s_η is an input of Algorithm 1. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T\lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$ holds for all $k \geq K_{\text{em}}$.

Remark 4. From Theorem 6, we see that when $k \geq K_{\text{em}}$, SIPM-EM can return a $\mu_{\kappa(k)}$ -stochastic stationary point of (3) within $2k$ iterations. In addition, using $\kappa(k) \in \{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$ and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (28), we can see that $\mu_{\kappa(k)} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-2/7})$. Thus, SIPM-EM achieves a global convergence rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-2/7})$. This rate matches the rate in stochastic unconstrained optimization [16], up to a logarithmic factor.

3.4 An SIPM with recursive momentum

This subsection incorporates recursive momentum into Algorithm 1. We make the following additional assumptions throughout this subsection.

Assumption 3. (a) *The function f is continuously differentiable on Ω .*

(b) *The stochastic gradient estimator $G : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[\|G(y, \xi) - G(x, \xi)\|^2] \leq L_a^2 \|y - x\|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega, \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[G(x, \xi)] = \nabla f(x), \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi[\|G(x, \xi) - \nabla f(x)\|^2] \leq \sigma_a^2 \quad \forall x \in \Omega \quad (32)$$

for some $\sigma_a, L_a > 0$.

Remark 5. (i) Using Assumptions 1(a) and 3(a), we obtain that $\nabla f(x)$ is bounded on Ω . It then follows from the boundedness of Ω° and Lemma 2 in [25] that $\nabla^2 B(x)^{-1}$ is bounded on Ω° . For convenience, we denote

$$U_B \doteq \sup_{x \in \Omega^\circ} \|\nabla^2 B(x)^{-1}\|, \quad U_f \doteq \sup_{x \in \Omega^\circ} \|\nabla f(x)\|_x^*. \quad (33)$$

(ii) Assumption 3(b) implies $\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x)\| \leq L_a \|y - x\|$ for all $x, y \in \Omega$. This is known as the average smoothness condition, which is commonly used in the literature of stochastic optimization (e.g, [17, 19]).

We next describe a variant of Algorithm 1 with recursive momentum, in which $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are updated as follows:

- The gradient estimators $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are constructed using a *local norm-truncated recursive momentum*:

$$\gamma_{-1} = 1, \quad x^{-1} = x^0, \quad (34a)$$

$$\underline{m}^k = G(x^k, \xi^k) + (1 - \gamma_{k-1})(\bar{m}^{k-1} - G(x^{k-1}, \xi^k)), \quad \bar{m}^k = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{U_f}{\|\underline{m}^k\|_{x^k}^*} \right\} \underline{m}^k \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (34b)$$

where $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 3(b), and $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is the sequence of momentum parameters. Here, the first relation in (34b) follows the update for recursive momentum, while the second projects the recursive momentum update onto a local norm ball.

- The step sizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are updated as:

$$\eta_k = \tilde{\eta}_k \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (35)$$

where $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a predefined sequence satisfying

$$\tilde{\eta}_k \in (0, s_{\tilde{\eta}}] \quad \text{with} \quad s_{\tilde{\eta}} \doteq \min\{s_\eta/(U_f + \sqrt{\vartheta}), 1/(2L_\phi), 1/(8L_a U_B)\} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (36)$$

Here, $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ is an input of Algorithm 1, and U_f and L_ϕ are given in (33) and (11), respectively.

Notice from (12) and (34b) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* &= \|(I - H_k^{1/2} A^T (A H_k A^T)^{-1} A H_k^{1/2}) H_k^{1/2} m^k\| \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \|I - H_k^{1/2} A^T (A H_k A^T)^{-1} A H_k^{1/2}\| \|m^k\|_{x^k}^* \leq \|\bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^* + \|\nabla B(x^k)\|_{x^k}^* \leq U_f + \sqrt{\vartheta}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the second inequality is due to $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$ and the fact that the norm of a projection matrix is less than 1, and the last inequality follows from (34b) and $\|\nabla B(x^k)\|_{x^k}^* = \sqrt{\vartheta}$ (see Lemma 10(i) below). From this, together with (35) and (36), we obtain that $\eta_k \in (0, s_\eta]$ for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, the sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated according to (35) satisfies the assumption in Algorithm 1. For ease of reference, we refer to this variant of Algorithm 1 as SIPM with recursive momentum (SIPM-RM).

The next lemma provides the recurrence for the estimation error of the gradient estimators based on the recursive momentum described in (34). Its proof is deferred to Section 5.6.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that Assumptions 1(a), 1(b), and 3 hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ updated according to (34) and (35), respectively, and let $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] \\ & \leq (1 - \gamma_k)^2 \|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 + 6L_a^2 U_B \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + 3\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where L_a and σ_a are given in Assumption 3(b), and U_B is given in (33).

We next provide an upper bound for the average expected error of the stationary condition among all iterates generated by SIPM-RM. Its proof is relegated to Section 5.6.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that Assumptions 1(a), 1(b), and 3 hold. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ updated according to (34) and (35), respectively, and let $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs. Assume that $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, and that $\tilde{\eta}_k \leq 2\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}$ and $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \leq 1$ hold for all $k \geq 0$. Then,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2] \leq \frac{40\Delta(x^0) + \frac{2\sigma_a^2}{3L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_0} + \frac{4\sigma_a^2}{L_a^2 U_B} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\tilde{\eta}_k}}{\tilde{\eta}_{K-1}}, \quad (39)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ and U_B are defined in (10) and (33), respectively, and L_a and σ_a are given in Assumption 3(b).

3.4.1 Hyperparameters and convergence rate

To establish the convergence rate of SIPM-RM, we specify its inputs $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ as

$$\tilde{\eta}_k = s_{\tilde{\eta}} / (k+1)^{1/3}, \quad \gamma_k = 1 / (k+1)^{2/3}, \quad \mu_k = \ln(k+4) / (2(k+1)^{1/3}) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (40)$$

where $s_{\tilde{\eta}}$ is defined in (36). It follows that $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, s_{\tilde{\eta}}]$ and $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$, with both sequences decreasing. Moreover, the following lemma shows that $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in (40) satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 7. Its proof is deferred to Section 5.6.

Lemma 9. *Let $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be defined in (40). Then, $\tilde{\eta}_k \leq 2\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}$ and $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \leq 1$ hold for all $k \geq 0$.*

The following theorem presents the global convergence rate of SIPM-RM with its inputs specified in (40). Its proof is relegated to Section 5.6.

Theorem 8. *Suppose that Assumptions 1(a), 1(b), and 3 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ updated using (34) and (35), respectively, and inputs $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k, \mu_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ specified in (40). Let $\kappa(k)$ be uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, and define*

$$K_{\text{rm}} \doteq \max\{5, \exp(64(20\Delta(x^0)/s_{\tilde{\eta}} + 7\sigma_a^2/(3L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2)))\}, \quad (41)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ and $s_{\tilde{\eta}}$ are defined in (10) and (36), respectively, and L_a and σ_a are given in Assumption 3(b). Then, $\mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*)^2] \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}^2$ holds for all $k \geq K_{\text{rm}}$.

Remark 6. From Theorem 8, we see that when $k \geq K_{\text{rm}}$, SIPM-RM can return a $\mu_{\kappa(k)}$ -stochastic stationary point of (3) within $2k$ iterations. In addition, using $\kappa(k) \in \{k, \dots, 2k - 1\}$ and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (40), we can see that $\mu_{\kappa(k)} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/3})$. Therefore, SIPM-RM achieves a convergence rate of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{-1/3})$. This rate matches the best-known rate in the unconstrained case [17], up to a logarithmic factor.

4 Numerical experiments

We now conduct numerical experiments to evaluate the performance of our proposed SIPMs. For SIPM-ME, we consider two versions: SIPM-ME⁺ with increasing batch sizes and SIPM-ME¹ with a fixed batch size of one. We compare our SIPMs against a deterministic variant of Algorithm 1 with full-batch gradients (IPM-FG) and other popular methods on robust linear regression (Section 4.1), multi-task relationship learning (Section 4.2), and clustering data streams (Section 4.3).

We evaluate the approximate solutions found by our SIPMs using two measures: relative objective value: $f(x^k)/f(x^0)$; and relative estimated stationary error: $\|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* / \|m^0 + A^T \lambda^0\|_{x^0}^*$. All experiments are carried out using Matlab 2024b on a standard PC with 3.20 GHz AMD R7 5800H microprocessor with 16GB of memory. The code to reproduce our numerical results is available at <https://github.com/dengzhanwang/SIPM>.

Table 2: The relative objective value and relative estimated stationary error for all methods applied to solve problem (2).

	wine-quality				energy-efficiency			
	$(d, p) = (2000, 10)$		$(d, p) = (4000, 20)$		$(d, p) = (5000, 10)$		$(d, p) = (10000, 20)$	
	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary
SIPM-ME ¹	0.2860	1.550e-2	0.3170	2.500e-2	0.8243	3.303e-3	0.8406	6.500e-3
SIPM-ME ⁺	0.2376	3.611e-3	0.2220	3.813e-3	0.8128	5.982e-5	0.8126	5.493e-5
SIPM-PM	0.2307	2.002e-3	0.2372	3.703e-3	0.8131	8.123e-5	0.8133	8.051e-5
SIPM-EM	0.2307	2.002e-3	0.2322	3.702e-3	0.8128	6.954e-6	0.8127	7.527e-6
SIPM-RM	0.2306	1.903e-3	0.2302	4.303e-3	0.8128	2.167e-6	0.8127	2.444e-6
IPM-FG	0.2359	4.652e-3	0.2350	4.503e-3	0.8128	2.974e-6	0.8127	1.453e-5
SALM-RM	0.2583	–	0.2570	–	0.8532	–	0.8241	–




Figure 1: Convergence behavior of the relative objective value and average relative stationary error for each epoch. The first two and last two plots correspond to the ‘wine-quality’ and ‘energy-efficiency’ datasets, respectively.

4.1 Robust linear regression with chance constraints

In this subsection we consider the second-order cone constrained regression problem in (2), which is derived from robust regression with chance constraints. We let $\phi(t) = t^2/(1 + t^2)$ as a robust modification

of the quadratic loss [12]. We consider two datasets, namely, ‘wine-quality’ and ‘energy-efficiency’, from UCI repository.¹ Following [39], we simulate missing values by randomly deleting 25% of the features in 50% of the training samples, and filling the missing values using linear regression on the remaining features.

We apply our SIPMs, IPM-FG, and a stochastic augmented Lagrangian method with recursive momentum in [1, 30] (SALM-RM) to solve (2). For SIPM-ME¹, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, SIPM-RM, and SALM-RM, we set the maximum number of epochs as 10,000. For a fair comparison, we set the maximum number of iterations for SIPM-ME⁺ and IPM-FG such that the total number of data points used during training equals that in 10,000 epochs. For all methods, we set the initial point (w^0, v^0, θ^0) to $(0, 1, 1)$. We tune the other hyperparameters of all methods to optimize their individual practical performance.

Comparing the relative objective values and the relative estimated stationary errors in Table 2, we see that our SIPM-ME⁺, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, and SIPM-RM yield solutions of similar quality to IPM-FG. In addition, SIPM-ME¹ converges slowly and returns suboptimal solutions, which corroborates the theoretical results that incorporating momentum facilitates gradient estimation and improves solution quality. We also observe that the solution quality of SALM-RM is generally worse than that of our SIPMs, except SIPM-ME¹. From Fig. 1, we observe that SIPM-ME¹ converge much slower than the other three variants, and SIPM-RM is slightly faster than SIPM-PM and SIPM-EM, which corroborates our established convergence rates for these methods.

4.2 Multi-task relationship learning

In this subsection we consider the problem of multi-task relationship learning in (1), where $a_{ij} = (p_{ij}, q_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, $\ell(w_i, a_{ij}) = \phi(w_i^T p_{ij} - q_{ij})$, and $\phi(t) = t^2 / (1 + t^2)$. We consider five datasets from the UCI repository: ‘wine-quality-red’, ‘wine-quality-white’, ‘energy-efficiency’, ‘air-quality’, and ‘abalone’. In our multi-task learning, we consider problems with five tasks and ten tasks, where, in the former case, we treat a subset of each of the five datasets as a separate task, and in the latter case, we take two subsets from each dataset, treating each subset as a separate task.

We apply our SIPMs, IPM-FG, and the alternating minimization method in [4] (AM) to solve (1). For SIPM-ME¹, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, and SIPM-RM, we set the maximum number of epochs as 2,000. For a fair comparison, we set the maximum number of iterations for SIPM-ME⁺, IPM-FG and AM such that the total number of data points used during training equals that in 2,000 epochs. For all methods, we set the initial point W^0 as the all-zero matrix and Σ^0 as a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements equal to $1/p$.




Figure 2: Loss per task for the training (left five) and validation (right five) datasets.

¹see archive.ics.uci.edu/datasets

Table 3: The relative objective value and relative estimated stationary error for all methods applied to solve problem (1).

	five tasks				ten tasks			
	$m = 200$		$m = 500$		$m = 200$		$m = 500$	
	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary
SIPM-ME ¹	0.3260	2.985e-2	0.3137	3.002e-2	0.3985	8.985e-3	0.4245	3.587e-3
SIPM-ME ⁺	0.3254	8.763e-3	0.2854	8.733e-3	0.2879	4.803e-3	0.2987	9.564e-3
SIPM-PM	0.3215	8.654e-3	0.2868	1.383e-2	0.2875	5.123e-3	0.2884	1.251e-2
SIPM-EM	0.3203	8.685e-3	0.2850	8.254e-3	0.2865	4.954e-3	0.2764	8.527e-3
SIPM-RM	0.3198	8.534e-3	0.2843	8.234e-3	0.2765	4.547e-3	0.2774	8.436e-3
IPM-FG	0.3243	8.778e-3	0.2975	8.447e-3	0.2909	4.987e-3	0.2894	8.554e-3
AM	0.3535	–	0.3743	–	0.4043	–	0.4253	–




Figure 3: Convergence behavior of the relative objective value and average relative stationary error for each epoch. The first two figures correspond to the problem with five tasks, and the last two correspond to the problem with ten tasks.

From Fig. 2, our SIPMs and IPM-FG outperform AM in loss for each task on both training and validation datasets, improving multi-task learning performance. By comparing the relative objective values and the relative estimated stationary errors in Table 3, we observe that our SIPM-ME⁺, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, and SIPM-RM yield solution of similar quality compared to IPM-FG. In addition, SIPM-ME¹ converges slowly and returns suboptimal solutions, which corroborates the theoretical results that incorporating momentum aids gradient estimation and improves solution quality. We also observe that the solution quality, in terms of relative objective value, of AM is generally worse than that of our SIPM variants. From Fig. 3, we observe that SIPM-ME¹ converges more slowly than the other three variants, and SIPM-RM is faster than SIPM-PM and SIPM-EM, which corroborates our established convergence rates for these methods.

4.3 Clustering data streams

In this subsection we consider the problem of clustering data streams [10], which aims at assigning d points to k clusters, with each point having p data observations that arrive continuously. Applying the semidefinite relaxation from [36] to this clustering problem results in:

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \langle A_i, W \rangle + \tau \sum_{i=1}^d \ln(\gamma + \lambda_i(W)) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad W \in \mathbb{S}_+^d, \quad W e_d = e_d, \quad \langle I_d, W \rangle = k, \quad (42)$$

where $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are computed from data streams, $\tau \sum_{i=1}^d \ln(\gamma + \lambda_i(W))$ is a nonconvex regularizer that imposes low rankness, with τ and γ as tuning parameters [29], and e_d and I_d denote the d -dimensional all-one vector and the $d \times d$ identity matrix, respectively. We consider two datasets, namely, ‘spam-base’

and ‘cover-type’, from UCI repository. To simulate stream scenarios, we apply $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -drifts adapted from [10] to each dataset, where ε is randomly drawn from a standard Gaussian distribution.




Figure 4: Visualization of the clustering results obtained by solving (42) using our SIPMs at the 1st, 333rd, 666th, and 1000th data observations in the stream (from left to right). The first and second rows display the clustering results for the ‘spam-base’ and ‘cover-type’ datasets, respectively.

Table 4: The relative objective value and relative estimated stationary error for all methods applied to solve problem (42).

	spam-base				cover-type			
	$(d, p) = (100, 10)$		$(d, p) = (500, 20)$		$(d, p) = (100, 10)$		$(d, p) = (500, 20)$	
	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary	objective	stationary
SIPM-ME ¹	-19.14	3.108e-1	-17.21	1.544e-1	0.2909	6.822e-2	0.2302	3.996e-2
SIPM-ME ⁺	-19.15	2.950e-2	-17.24	3.789e-2	0.2908	6.165e-3	0.2299	9.096e-3
SIPM-PM	-19.15	2.952e-2	-17.23	3.790e-2	0.2908	6.165e-3	0.2297	1.108e-2
SIPM-EM	-19.15	2.948e-2	-17.23	3.611e-2	0.2908	6.163e-3	0.2297	9.179e-3
SIPM-RM	-19.15	2.947e-2	-17.24	3.609e-2	0.2908	6.163e-3	0.2296	9.096e-3
IPM-FG	-19.15	2.950e-2	-17.24	3.623e-2	0.2909	6.235e-3	0.2297	9.026e-3




Figure 5: Convergence behavior of the relative objective value and average relative stationary error for each epoch. The first two and last two plots correspond to the ‘spam-base’ and ‘cover-type’ datasets, respectively.

We apply our SIPMs and IPM-FG to solve (42). For SIPM-ME¹, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, and SIPM-RM, we set the maximum number of epochs as 100. For a fair comparison, we set the maximum number of iterations for SIPM-ME⁺ and IPM-FG such that the total number of data points used during training equals that in 100 epochs. For all methods, we set the initial point W^0 with all diagonal elements equal

to k/d and all other elements equal to $(d - k)/(d(d - 1))$. We tune other hyperparameters of all methods to optimize their individual practical performance.

From Fig. 4, we observe that the solutions obtained using our SIPMs on (42) effectively cluster the data streams. By comparing the relative objective values and the relative estimated stationary errors in Table 4, we observe that our proposed SIPM-ME⁺, SIPM-PM, SIPM-EM, and SIPM-RM yield solutions of similar quality to the deterministic variant IPM-FG. In addition, SIPM-ME¹ converges slowly and returns suboptimal solutions, which corroborates the theoretical results that incorporating momentum greatly facilitates gradient estimation, thereby improving solution quality. From Fig. 5, we see that SIPM-ME¹ converges much more slowly than the other three variants, while SIPM-RM is slightly faster than SIPM-PM and SIPM-EM. This observation corroborates the convergence rates we established for these methods.

5 Proof of the main results

In this section we provide proofs of our main results presented in Sections 2 and 3, which are particularly, Lemmas 3 to 9, Theorems 1, 3, 5 and 7, and Theorems 2, 4, 6 and 8.

We start with the next lemma regarding the properties of the ϑ -LHSC barrier function.

Lemma 10. *Let $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$ and $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$ be given. Then the following statements hold for the ϑ -LHSC barrier function B .*

- (i) $(\|\nabla B(x)\|_x^*)^2 = -x^T \nabla B(x) = \|x\|_x^2 = \vartheta$.
- (ii) $\{y : \|y - x\|_x < 1\} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{K}$ and $\{s : \|s + \nabla B(x)\|_x^* \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}^*$.
- (iii) *For any y satisfying $\|y - x\|_x < 1$, the relation $(1 - \|y - x\|_x)\|v\|_x^* \leq \|v\|_y^* \leq (1 - \|y - x\|_x)^{-1}\|v\|_x^*$ holds for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*
- (iv) $\|\nabla B(y) - \nabla B(x)\|_x^* \leq \|y - x\|_x / (1 - s_\eta)$ holds for all y with $\|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta$.

Proof. The proof of statements (i)-(iii) can be found in Lemma 1 in [25].

We next prove statement (iv). Let y satisfy $\|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta$. Using this and Eq.(2.3) in [34], we obtain $|z^T(\nabla B(y) - \nabla B(x))| \leq \|y - x\|_x / (1 - s_\eta)$ for all z satisfying $\|z\|_x \leq 1$. In addition, notice that $\max_{\|z\|_x \leq 1} \|z^T(\nabla B(y) - \nabla B(x))\| = \|\nabla B(y) - \nabla B(x)\|_x^*$. By combining these inequalities, we conclude that statement (iv) holds as desired. \square

5.1 Proof of Lemmas 1 and 2

In this subsection we prove Lemmas 1 and 2.

Proof of Lemma 1. It suffices to prove that the last two relations in (7) hold. Using $\mu > 0$ and $\|\nabla \phi_\mu(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* \leq \mu$, we have $\|(\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda) / \mu + \nabla B(x)\|_x^* \leq 1$, which together with Lemma 10(ii) implies that $(\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda) / \mu \in \mathcal{K}^*$. Thus, we see that the third relation in (7) holds. Next, we show that the fourth relation in (7) holds with $\epsilon = (1 + \sqrt{\vartheta})\mu$. Using $\|\nabla \phi_\mu(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* \leq \mu$ and $\|\nabla B(x)\|_x^* = \sqrt{\vartheta}$ from Lemma 10(i), we have $\mu \geq \|\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* - \mu \|\nabla B(x)\|_x^* = \|\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* - \mu \sqrt{\vartheta}$. Therefore, it follows that $\|\nabla f(x) + A^T \lambda\|_x^* \leq (1 + \sqrt{\vartheta})\mu$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Notice from the update of x^{k+1} in (12) that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} \stackrel{(12)}{=} \eta_k \frac{\|H_k(m^k + A^T \lambda^k)\|_{x^k}}{\|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*} \stackrel{(5)}{=} \eta_k \leq s_\eta < 1.$$

Hence, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ for all $k \geq 0$. We now prove $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$ for all $k \geq 0$ by induction. Note from Algorithm 1 that $x^0 \in \Omega^\circ$. Suppose $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$ for some $k \geq 0$. We next prove $x^{k+1} \in \Omega^\circ$. Since $x^k \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$ and $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} < 1$, it then follows from Lemma 10(ii) that $x^{k+1} \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$. In addition, by $Ax^k = b$ and (12), one has that

$$Ax^{k+1} \stackrel{(12)}{=} Ax^k - \eta_k \frac{AH_k(m^k - A^T(AH_k A^T)^{-1}AH_k m^k)}{\|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*} = Ax^k = b.$$

This together with $x^{k+1} \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$ implies that $x^{k+1} \in \Omega^\circ$, which completes the induction. \square

5.2 Proof of some auxiliary lemmas

In this subsection we prove several auxiliary lemmas. The following lemma shows that ϕ_μ is locally Lipschitz continuous under Assumption 1(b) and that a useful inequality holds.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that Assumption 1(b) holds. Let $\mu \in (0, 1]$. Then,*

$$\|\nabla\phi_\mu(y) - \nabla\phi_\mu(x)\|_x^* \leq L_\phi \|y - x\|_x \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega^\circ \text{ with } \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta, \quad (43)$$

$$\phi_\mu(y) \leq \phi_\mu(x) + \nabla\phi_\mu(x)^T(y - x) + L_\phi \|y - x\|_x^2 / 2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega^\circ \text{ with } \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta, \quad (44)$$

where ϕ_μ and Ω° are defined in (4), and L_ϕ is defined in (11).

Proof. Fix any $x, y \in \Omega^\circ$ satisfying $y \in \{y : \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta\}$. Using the definition of ϕ_μ in (4), $\mu \in (0, 1]$, Assumption 1(b), and Lemma 10(iv), we obtain that (43) holds.

We next prove (44). Indeed, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\mu(y) - \phi_\mu(x) - \nabla\phi_\mu(x)^T(y - x) &= \int_0^1 (\nabla\phi_\mu(x + t(y - x)) - \nabla\phi_\mu(x))^T(y - x) dt \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \|\nabla\phi_\mu(x + t(y - x)) - \nabla\phi_\mu(x)\|_x^* dt \|y - x\|_x \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} \frac{L_\phi}{2} \|y - x\|_x^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (44) holds as desired. \square

The following lemma establishes a key inequality under Assumption 2, whose proof is identical to that of Lemma 3 in [25] and is therefore omitted here.

Lemma 12. *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then,*

$$\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x) - \nabla^2 f(x)(y - x)\|_x^* \leq \frac{L_2}{2} \|y - x\|_x^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega^\circ \text{ with } \|y - x\|_x \leq s_\eta,$$

where Ω° is defined in (4), L_2 is given in Assumption 2(b), and s_η is an input of Algorithm 1.

The following lemma concerns the descent of ϕ_μ for iterates generated by Algorithm 1.

Lemma 13. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then, for all $k \geq 0$, it holds that*

$$\phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) \leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + 2\eta_k \|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2, \quad (45)$$

where ϕ_{μ_k} and L_ϕ are defined in (4) and (11), respectively.

Proof. We fix an arbitrary $k \geq 0$. Recall from Lemma 2 that $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ and $x^k, x^{k+1} \in \Omega^\circ$. It then follows that $A(x^{k+1} - x^k) = 0$, and from (12) that

$$\langle m^k + A^T \lambda^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \stackrel{(12)}{=} -\eta_k \frac{(m^k + A^T \lambda^k)^T H_k (m^k + A^T \lambda^k)}{\|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*} \stackrel{(5)}{=} -\eta_k \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*. \quad (46)$$

In view of these and (44) with $(x, y, \mu, \eta) = (x^k, x^{k+1}, \mu_k, \eta_k)$, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \langle \nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 \\ &= \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \langle m^k + A^T \lambda^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 \\ &\stackrel{(46)}{=} \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + \langle \nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 \\ &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|m^k + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 \\ &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + 2\eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ and $A(x^{k+1} - x^k) = 0$, the second inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$, and the last inequality is due to the triangular inequality. Hence, this lemma holds. \square

We next present a lemma regarding the estimation of the partial sums of series.

Lemma 14. *Let $\zeta(\cdot)$ be a convex univariate function. Then, for any integers a, b satisfying $[a - 1/2, b + 1/2] \subset \text{dom} \zeta$, it holds that $\sum_{p=a}^b \zeta(p) \leq \int_{a-1/2}^{b+1/2} \zeta(\tau) d\tau$.*

Proof. Since ζ is convex, one has $\sum_{p=a}^b \zeta(p) \leq \sum_{p=a}^b \int_{p-1/2}^{p+1/2} \zeta(\tau) d\tau = \int_{a-1/2}^{b+1/2} \zeta(\tau) d\tau$. \square

As a consequence of Lemma 14, we consider $\zeta(\tau) = 1/\tau^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$, where $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any positive integers a, b , one has

$$\sum_{p=a}^b 1/p^\alpha \leq \begin{cases} \ln(b+1/2) - \ln(a-1/2) & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\ \frac{1}{1-\alpha} ((b+1/2)^{1-\alpha} - (a-1/2)^{1-\alpha}) & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, +\infty). \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

5.3 Proof of the main results in Section 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3. Fix any $k \geq 0$. It follows from (9) and (13) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_i^k\}_{i \in B_k}} [(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2] = \sum_{i \in B_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i^k} [(\|G(x^k; \xi_i^k) - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2] / |B_k| \leq \sigma^2 / |B_k|,$$

where the first equality follows from (13) and the first relation in (9), and the last inequality follows from the second relation in (9). Hence, (14) holds as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. By summing (45) over $k = 0, \dots, K-1$ and taking expectation on $\{\xi_i^k\}_{i \in B_k, 1 \leq k \leq K-1}$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \leq \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) - \mathbb{E}[\phi_{\mu_K}(x^K)] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) \mathbb{E}[B(x^{k+1})] \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^*] + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k^2 \\
& \leq \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) - \mathbb{E}[\phi_{\mu_K}(x^K)] + (\mu_K - \mu_0) B_{\text{low}} + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^*] + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k^2 \\
& \leq \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) - \mathbb{E}[\phi_{\mu_K}(x^K)] + (\mu_K - \mu_0) B_{\text{low}} + 2\sigma \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\eta_k}{|B_k|^{1/2}} + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k^2, \\
& \leq f(x^0) + \mu_0[B(x^0)]_+ - f_{\text{low}} - \mu_0[B_{\text{low}}]_- + 2\sigma \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\eta_k}{|B_k|^{1/2}} + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (45), the second inequality is due to the definition of B_{low} and $\mu_k - \mu_{k+1} \geq 0$, the third inequality follows from $\mathbb{E}[X]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[X^2]$ for any random variable X and (14), and the last inequality is due to the definitions of ϕ_μ , f_{low} , and B_{low} . Using the above inequality, (10), the definition of ϕ_μ in (4), $\mu_0 \leq 1$, and the fact that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \leq \frac{\Delta(x^0)}{\eta_{K-1}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{K-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k (2\sigma/|B_k|^{1/2} + L_\phi \eta_k/2).$$

Hence, (15) holds as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Substituting (16) into (15), we obtain that for all $k \geq 5$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_p}(x^p) + A^T \lambda^p\|_{x^p}^*] \stackrel{(15)(16)}{\leq} \frac{(2k)^{1/2} \Delta(x^0)}{s_\eta} + (2k)^{1/2} \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \frac{4\sigma + s_\eta L_\phi}{2(p+1)} \\
& \leq \frac{2\Delta(x^0)k^{1/2}}{s_\eta} + (4\sigma + s_\eta L_\phi)k^{1/2} \ln(4k+1) \leq (4\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 8\sigma + 2s_\eta L_\phi)k^{1/2} \ln k, \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to (47) with $(a, b, \alpha) = (1, 2k, 1)$, and the last inequality follows from $1 \leq \ln(4k+1) \leq 2 \ln k$ given that $k \geq 5$. Since $\kappa(k)$ is uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \stackrel{(48)}{\leq} \frac{4\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 8\sigma + 2s_\eta L_\phi}{k^{1/2}} \ln k. \tag{49}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (17) and $k \geq K_{\text{me}}$ that

$$\ln(k+7) > \ln k \geq 32\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 64\sigma + 16s_\eta L_\phi.$$

By this, (49), the fact that $\ln k/k^{1/2} \leq 2 \ln(k+7)/(k+1)^{1/2}$ for all $k \geq 5$, and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (16), one has $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$, where the last inequality is because $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is decreasing and $\kappa(k) \geq k$. Hence, this theorem holds. \square

5.4 Proof of the main results in Section 3.2

Proof of Lemma 4. Fix any $k \geq 0$. Recall from Lemma 2 that $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$. Using this and (18), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \\ & \stackrel{(18)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|(1 - \gamma_k)(\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^{k+1})) + \gamma_k(G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^{k+1}))\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \\ & \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} (1 - \gamma_k)^2(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2 + \sigma^2 \gamma_k^2 \leq (1 - \alpha_k)^2(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \sigma^2 \gamma_k^2, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 10(iii) and the definition of α_k . By Young's inequality, we have for any $a > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \alpha_k)^2(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\ & \leq (1 - \alpha_k)^2(1 + a)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + (1 - \alpha_k)^2(1 + 1/a)(\|\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\ & \leq (1 - \alpha_k)^2(1 + a)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + (1 - \alpha_k)^2(1 + 1/a)L_1^2 \eta_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (8) and $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$. Letting $a = \alpha_k/(1 - \alpha_k)$ and combining this inequality with (50), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \leq (1 - \alpha_k)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{(1 - \alpha_k)^2 L_1^2 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \sigma^2 \gamma_k^2,$$

which together with $\alpha_k \in (0, 1)$ implies that (19) holds as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. For convenience, we define the following potentials:

$$P_k \doteq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + (\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 / L_1 \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (51)$$

Then, by (19), (45), and the definition of B_{low} in Remark 1(i), one has that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] \stackrel{(51)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\phi_{\mu_{k+1}}(x^{k+1}) + (\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2 / L_1] \\ & = (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[B(x^{k+1})] + \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) + (\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2 / L_1] \\ & \stackrel{(19)(45)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + 2\eta_k \|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^* \\ & \quad + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 + (1 - \alpha_k)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 / L_1 + \frac{L_1 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{L_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

In addition, notice that $2\eta_k \|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^* \leq L_1 \eta_k^2 / \alpha_k + \alpha_k (\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 / L_1$, which together with (51) and (52) implies that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] \leq (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) B_{\text{low}} + P_k - \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 + \frac{2L_1 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{L_1}. \quad (53)$$

On the other hand, by (51), $\bar{m}^0 = G(x^0, \xi^0)$, and $\mu_0 \leq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[P_0] & = \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) + \mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^0 - \nabla f(x^0)\|_{x^0}^*)^2] / L_1 \leq f(x^0) + [B(x^0)]_+ + \sigma^2 / L_1, \\ \mathbb{E}[P_K] & = \phi_{\mu_K}(x^K) + \mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^K - \nabla f(x^K)\|_{x^K}^*)^2] / L_1 \geq f_{\text{low}} + \mu_K [B_{\text{low}}]_-. \end{aligned}$$

By summing (53) over $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$, and using the above two inequalities, (10), and the fact that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, we obtain that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] \leq \frac{\Delta(x^0) + \sigma^2 / L_1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 + \frac{2L_1 \eta_k^2}{\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{L_1} \right)}{\eta_{K-1}}.$$

Hence, the conclusion of this theorem holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Observe from (21) that $\gamma_k > \eta_k$ for all $k \geq 0$. Thus, $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined as in (21) satisfies the assumption on $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ in Theorem 3. Substituting (21) and (22) into (20), we obtain for all $k \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_p}(x^p) + A^T\lambda^p\|_{x^p}^*] \\
& \stackrel{(20)(21)(22)}{\leq} (2k+1)^{3/4} \left(\frac{\Delta(x^0) + \sigma^2/L_1}{s_\eta} + \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \left(\frac{s_\eta L_\phi}{2(p+2)^{3/2}} + \frac{14s_\eta L_1 + \sigma^2/(s_\eta L_1)}{p+2} \right) \right) \\
& \leq 2k^{3/4} \left(\frac{\Delta(x^0) + \sigma^2/L_1}{s_\eta} + s_\eta L_\phi + \left(14s_\eta L_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{s_\eta L_1} \right) \ln(4k/3 + 1) \right) \\
& \leq 4(\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 2\sigma^2/(s_\eta L_1) + s_\eta L_\phi + 14s_\eta L_1) k^{3/4} \ln k, \tag{54}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (47) with $(a, b) = (2, 2k+1)$ and $\alpha = 1, 3/2$, and the last inequality is due to $1 \leq \ln(4k/3 + 1) \leq 2 \ln k$ given that $k \geq 3$. Since $\kappa(k)$ is uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T\lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \stackrel{(54)}{\leq} \frac{4 \left(\frac{\Delta(x^0)}{s_\eta} + \frac{2\sigma^2}{s_\eta L_1} + s_\eta L_\phi + 14s_\eta L_1 \right)}{k^{1/4}} \ln k. \tag{55}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (23) and $k \geq K_{\text{pm}}$ that

$$\ln(k+150) > \ln k \geq 176(\Delta(x^0)/s_\eta + 2\sigma^2/(s_\eta L_1) + s_\eta L_\phi + 14s_\eta L_1).$$

By this, (55), the fact that $\ln k/k^{1/4} \leq 2 \ln(k+150)/(k+2)^{1/4}$ for all $k \geq 3$, and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (21), one has $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T\lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$, where the last inequality is because $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is decreasing and $\kappa(k) \geq k$. Hence, this theorem holds. \square

5.5 Proof of the main results in Section 3.3

Proof of Lemma 5. Recall from Algorithm 1 and (24a) that $x^0 = x^{-1} \in \Omega^\circ$. Let $\eta_{-1} = 0$. By these and Lemma 2, we have that $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ and $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$ hold for all $k \geq -1$. Fix an arbitrary $k \geq -1$, we next prove $z^{k+1} \in \Omega^\circ$. In view of $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$ and (24b), we observe that $\|z^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta < 1$, which together with Lemma 10(ii) implies that $z^{k+1} \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$. In addition, by (24b) and $x^{k+1}, x^k \in \Omega^\circ$, one has that $Az^{k+1} = Ax^{k+1} + [(1-\gamma_k)/\gamma_k]A(x^{k+1} - x^k) = b$. Hence, $z^{k+1} \in \Omega^\circ$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. Fix any $k \geq 0$. Observe from (24b) that $z^{k+1} - x^k = (x^{k+1} - x^k)/\gamma_k$. Recall from Lemma 2 that $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$. It then follows that $\|z^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k/\gamma_k$. In addition, using the update of \bar{m}^{k+1} in (24b), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1}) &= (1-\gamma_k)(\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)) + \gamma_k(G(z^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(z^{k+1})) \\
&\quad - (\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(x^{k+1} - x^k)) \\
&\quad + \gamma_k(\nabla f(z^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(z^{k+1} - x^k)). \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \leq \frac{1}{(1-\eta_k)^2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^k}^*)^2] \\
& \stackrel{(56)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|G(z^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(z^{k+1})\|_{x^k}^*)^2]}{(1-\eta_k)^2} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{(1-\eta_k)^2} (\|(1-\gamma_k)(\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)) - (\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(x^{k+1} - x^k)) \\
& \quad \quad + \gamma_k(\nabla f(z^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(z^{k+1} - x^k))\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|G(z^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(z^{k+1})\|_{z^{k+1}}^*)^2]}{(1-\eta_k)^2(1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} + (1-\alpha_k)^2(1+a)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{2(1+1/a)}{(1-\eta_k)^2} (\|\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{2(1+1/a)\gamma_k^2}{(1-\eta_k)^2} (\|\nabla f(z^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(z^{k+1} - x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2, \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 10(iii) and $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$, the second inequality follows from (56) and the first relation in (9), and the third inequality is due to Young's inequality, Lemma 10(iii), and $\|z^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k/\gamma_k$. In addition, using Lemma 12, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k$, and $\|z^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \eta_k/\gamma_k \leq s_\eta$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|_{x^k}^* \leq L_2 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/2 \leq L_2 \eta_k^2/2, \\
& \|\nabla f(z^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)(z^{k+1} - x^k)\|_{x^k}^* \leq L_2 \|z^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/2 \leq L_2 \eta_k^2/(2\gamma_k^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (57), the above two inequalities, and the second relation in (9), and letting $a = \alpha_k/(1-\alpha_k)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2}{(1-\eta_k)^2(1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} + (1-\alpha_k)(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{L_2^2 \eta_k^4}{2(1-\eta_k)^2 \alpha_k} + \frac{L_2^2 \eta_k^4}{2(1-\eta_k)^2 \gamma_k^2 \alpha_k},
\end{aligned}$$

which along with the fact that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing implies that this lemma holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. For convenience, we define the following potentials:

$$P_k \doteq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + p_k(\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0. \tag{58}$$

Then, by (26), (45), and the definition of B_{low} in Remark 1(i), one has that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] \stackrel{(58)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\phi_{\mu_{k+1}}(x^{k+1}) + p_{k+1}(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \\
& = (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[B(x^{k+1})] + \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) + p_{k+1}(\|\bar{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|_{x^{k+1}}^*)^2] \\
& \stackrel{(26)(45)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + 2\eta_k \|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 \\
& \quad + (1-\alpha_k) p_{k+1} (\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{L_2^2 \eta_k^4 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\} \alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 (1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} \\
& \leq (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \eta_k \|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* + 2\eta_k \|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^* + \frac{L_\phi}{2} \eta_k^2 \\
& \quad + (1-\alpha_k/2) p_k (\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{L_2^2 \eta_k^4 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\} \alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2 \gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 (1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $(1 - \alpha_k)p_{k+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_k/2)p_k$. In addition, note that $2\eta_k\|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|_{x^k}^* \leq \alpha_k p_k (\|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|_{x^k}^*)^2/2 + 2\eta_k^2/(p_k \alpha_k)$, which together with (58) and the above inequality implies that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] &\stackrel{(58)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k)B_{\text{low}} + P_k - \eta_k\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* \\ &\quad + \frac{L_\phi}{2}\eta_k^2 + \frac{2\eta_k^2}{p_k\alpha_k} + \frac{L_2^2\eta_k^4 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\}\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2\gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2(1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

On the other hand, by (58), $\bar{m}^0 = G(x^0, \xi^0)$, and the fact that $\mu_0 \leq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[P_0] &= \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) + p_0\mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^0 - \nabla f(x^0)\|_{x^0}^*)^2] \leq f(x^0) + [B(x^0)]_+ + p_0\sigma^2, \\ \mathbb{E}[P_K] &= \phi_{\mu_K}(x^K) + p_K\mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^K - \nabla f(x^K)\|_{x^K}^*)^2] \geq f_{\text{low}} + \mu_K[B_{\text{low}}]_-. \end{aligned}$$

By summing (59) over $k = 0, \dots, K-1$, and using the above two inequalities, (10), and the fact that $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*] &\leq \frac{\Delta(x^0) + p_0\sigma^2}{\eta_{K-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\eta_{K-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{L_\phi}{2}\eta_k^2 + \frac{2\eta_k^2}{p_k\alpha_k} + \frac{L_2^2\eta_k^4 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2 \min\{\gamma_k^2, 1\}\alpha_k} + \frac{\sigma^2\gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}}{(1-\eta_0)^2(1-\eta_k/\gamma_k)^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the conclusion of this theorem holds as desired. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. It follows from the definition of $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \alpha_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ that

$$\alpha_k = \frac{(k+4)^{1/7} - s_\eta}{(k+4)^{5/7} - s_\eta} > \frac{(k+4)^{1/7} - 1}{(k+4)^{5/7}} \geq \frac{1 - 1/4^{1/7}}{(k+4)^{4/7}} > \frac{1}{6(k+4)^{4/7}} \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

where the first inequality is due to $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$. We next prove $(1 - \alpha_k)p_{k+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_k/2)p_k$ for all $k \geq 0$. By the definition of $\{(\eta_k, \gamma_k, \alpha_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$, one has for all $k \geq 0$ that

$$\frac{1 - \alpha_k/2}{1 - \alpha_k} = 1 + \frac{(1 - s_\eta/(k+4)^{1/7})/2}{(k+4)^{4/7} - 1} > 1 + \frac{(1 - 1/(k+4)^{1/7})/2}{(k+4)^{4/7}} > 1 + \frac{1}{12(k+4)^{4/7}},$$

where the first inequality is due to $s_\eta \in (0, 1)$. In addition, notice from (29) that $p_{k+1}/p_k = (1 + 1/(k+4))^{1/7} \leq 1 + 1/(7(k+4))$ for all $k \geq 0$. Combining the above two inequalities with the fact that $7(k+4) > 12(k+4)^{4/7}$ for all $k \geq 0$, we obtain that $(1 - \alpha_k)p_{k+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_k/2)p_k$ holds for all $k \geq 0$.

Hence, this lemma holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Notice from Lemma 7 that $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in (29) and $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in Theorem 5 satisfy the assumption on $\{(\alpha_k, p_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ in Theorem 5. Substituting (28), (29), and $\alpha_k \geq 1/(6(k+4)^{4/7})$ into (27), we obtain for all $k \geq 5$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_p}(x^p) + A^T\lambda^p\|_{x^p}^*] \\ &\stackrel{(27)(28)(29)}{\leq} (2k+3)^{5/7} \left(\frac{\Delta(x^0) + 2\sigma^2}{s_\eta} + \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \left(\frac{s_\eta L_\phi}{2(p+4)^{10/7}} + \frac{12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3 + \frac{160\sigma^2}{s_\eta}}{p+4} \right) \right) \\ &\leq 2k^{5/7} ((\Delta(x^0) + 2\sigma^2)/s_\eta + s_\eta L_\phi + (12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3 + 160\sigma^2/s_\eta) \ln(4k/7 + 1)) \\ &\leq 4((\Delta(x^0) + 2\sigma^2)/s_\eta + s_\eta L_\phi + 12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3 + 160\sigma^2/s_\eta) k^{5/7} \ln k, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where the second inequality follows from (47) with $(a, b) = (4, 2k + 3)$ and $\alpha = 1, 10/7$, and the last inequality is due to $1 \leq \ln(4k/7 + 1) \leq 2 \ln k$ given that $k \geq 5$. Since $\kappa(k)$ is uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k - 1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T\lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \frac{4\left(\frac{\Delta(x^0)+162\sigma^2}{s_\eta} + s_\eta L_\phi + 12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3\right)}{k^{2/7}} \ln k. \quad (61)$$

On the other hand, it follows from (30) and $k \geq K_{\text{em}}$ that

$$\ln(k + 70) > \ln k \geq 104((\Delta(x^0) + 162\sigma^2)/s_\eta + s_\eta L_\phi + 12s_\eta + 32L_2^2 s_\eta^3).$$

By this, (61), the fact that $\ln k/k^{2/7} \leq 2 \ln(k + 70)/(k + 4)^{2/7}$ for all $k \geq 5$, and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (28), one has $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T\lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*] \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}$, where the last inequality is because $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is decreasing and $\kappa(k) \geq k$. Hence, this theorem holds. \square

5.6 Proof of the main results in Section 3.4

We first provide an auxiliary lemma regarding some key inequalities for later analysis.

Lemma 15. *Suppose that Assumptions 1(a), 1(b), and 3 hold. Let $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\bar{m}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ updated according to (34) and (35), respectively, and let $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be predefined algorithm inputs satisfying (36). Then,*

$$\phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) \leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/(4\tilde{\eta}_k) + \tilde{\eta}_k U_B \|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|^2/2 \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (62)$$

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 \geq (\tilde{\eta}_k \|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2/2 - U_B (\tilde{\eta}_k \|\nabla f(x^k) - \bar{m}^k\|)^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (63)$$

where U_B is defined in (33).

Proof. Fix any $k \geq 0$. Recall from the discussions after Remark 5 that $\eta_k \in (0, s_\eta]$ and can be used as step sizes for Algorithm 1. It then follows from Lemma 2 that $x^k \in \Omega^\circ$. In addition, by (5), (12), and (35), one has

$$\tilde{\eta}_k (\|m^k + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2 = -\langle m^k + A^T\lambda^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle = \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/\tilde{\eta}_k. \quad (64)$$

Using (36), (37), and the the above inequality, we have $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k} = \tilde{\eta}_k \|m^k + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^* \leq s_\eta$. It then follows from (44) with $(x, y, \mu) = (x^k, x^{k+1}, \mu_k)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mu_k}(x^{k+1}) &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \langle \nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + L_\phi \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/2 \\ &= \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \langle m^k + A^T\lambda^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \langle \nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + L_\phi \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/2 \\ &\stackrel{(64)}{=} \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - (1/\tilde{\eta}_k - L_\phi/2) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + \langle \nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \\ &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - (1/(2\tilde{\eta}_k) - L_\phi/2) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + \tilde{\eta}_k (\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2/2 \\ &\leq \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2/(4\tilde{\eta}_k) + \tilde{\eta}_k (\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2/2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to $A(x^{k+1} - x^k) = 0$, the second inequality is due to Young's inequality, and the last inequality follows from $\tilde{\eta}_k \leq s_{\tilde{\eta}} \leq 1/(2L_\phi)$ (see (36)). The above inequality along with (33) implies that (62) holds as desired. In addition, notice that

$$\tilde{\eta}_k^2 (\|m^k + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2 \geq \tilde{\eta}_k^2 (\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T\lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2/2 - \tilde{\eta}_k^2 (\|\nabla\phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) - m^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2,$$

which together with (64) and (33) implies that (63) holds. \square

Proof of Lemma 8. Fix any $k \geq 0$. It follows from (34b) that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1}) &= G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^{k+1}) \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma_k)(\underline{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)) + (1 - \gamma_k)(\nabla f(x^k) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1})). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

For notational convenience, we define a projection operator as $P_{r,x}(v) \doteq \min\{1, r/\|v\|_x^*\}v$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{K}$, and $r > 0$. Then from (34b), we observe that $\underline{m}^{k+1} = P_{U_f, x^{k+1}}(\underline{m}^{k+1})$. In addition, by the definition of U_f in (33), we have $P_{U_f, x^{k+1}}(\nabla f(x^{k+1})) = \nabla f(x^{k+1})$. Using this and nonexpansiveness of the projection operator, we obtain that

$$\|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2 = \|P_{U_f, x^{k+1}}(\underline{m}^{k+1}) - P_{U_f, x^{k+1}}(\nabla f(x^{k+1}))\|^2 \leq \|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2.$$

Combining this with (65) and taking expectation on ξ^{k+1} , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] = (1 - \gamma_k)^2 \|\underline{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^{k+1}) + (1 - \gamma_k)(\nabla f(x^k) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1}))\|^2], \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where the equality is due to the first relation in (32). Also, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^{k+1}) + (1 - \gamma_k)(\nabla f(x^k) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1}))\|^2] \\ &\leq 3\|\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1})\|^2] \\ &\quad + 3\gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\nabla f(x^k) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1})\|^2] \\ &\leq 6\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|G(x^{k+1}, \xi^{k+1}) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1})\|^2] + 3\gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\nabla f(x^k) - G(x^k, \xi^{k+1})\|^2] \\ &\leq 6L_a^2 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 3\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2 \leq 6L_a^2 U_B \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + 3\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Jensen's inequality, the third inequality is due to (31) and the second relation in (32), and the last inequality is due to (5) and (33). The above inequality together with (66) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] \leq (1 - \gamma_k)^2 \|\underline{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 + 6L_a^2 U_B \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + 3\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2.$$

Hence, the conclusion of this lemma holds as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 7. For convenience, we construct potentials as

$$P_k = \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + p_k \|\underline{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \quad \text{with} \quad p_k = 1/(60L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (67)$$

Combining this, (38), (62), and the definition of B_{low} in Remark 1(i), we obtain that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] &\stackrel{(67)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[\phi_{\mu_{k+1}}(x^{k+1}) + p_{k+1} \|\underline{m}^{k+1} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] \\ &\stackrel{(38)(62)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \left((1 - \gamma_k)^2 \frac{p_{k+1}}{p_k} + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k U_B}{2p_k} \right) p_k \|\underline{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{4\tilde{\eta}_k} - 6L_a^2 U_B p_{k+1} \right) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + 3\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2 p_{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Substituting the definition of $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (67) into this inequality, we obtain that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\xi^{k+1}}[P_{k+1}] &\leq (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k)B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) \\
&+ \left((1 - \gamma_k)^2 \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k}{\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}} + 30L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \right) p_k \|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 - \frac{1}{20\tilde{\eta}_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{x^k}^2 + \frac{\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2}{10L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_k} \\
&\stackrel{(63)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k)B_{\text{low}} + \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + \left((1 - \gamma_k)^2 \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k}{\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \right) p_k \|\bar{m}^k - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k}{40} (\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2}{10L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_k} \\
&\stackrel{(67)}{\leq} (\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k)B_{\text{low}} + P_k - \frac{\tilde{\eta}_k}{40} (\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2 + \frac{\sigma_a^2 \gamma_k^2}{10L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_k}, \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to (68) and $\tilde{\eta}_k \leq 2\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}$, and the third inequality is due to $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \leq 1$. Then, by (67), $\bar{m}^0 = G(x^0, \xi^0)$, and $\mu_0 \leq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[P_0] &= \phi_{\mu_0}(x^0) + p_0 \mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^0 - \nabla f(x^0)\|_{x^0}^*)^2] \leq f(x^0) + [B(x^0)]_+ + \sigma_a^2 / (60L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_0), \\
\mathbb{E}[P_K] &= \phi_{\mu_K}(x^K) + p_K \mathbb{E}[(\|\bar{m}^K - \nabla f(x^K)\|_{x^K}^*)^2] \geq f_{\text{low}} + \mu_K [B_{\text{low}}]_-.
\end{aligned}$$

By summing (69) over $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$, and using the above two inequalities, (10), and the fact that $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is nonincreasing, we obtain that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_k}(x^k) + A^T \lambda^k\|_{x^k}^*)^2] \leq \frac{40\Delta(x^0) + 2\sigma_a^2 / (3L_a^2 U_B \tilde{\eta}_0)}{\tilde{\eta}_{K-1}} + \frac{4\sigma_a^2 / (L_a^2 U_B)}{\tilde{\eta}_{K-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\tilde{\eta}_k}.$$

Hence, the conclusion of this theorem holds. \square

Proof of Lemma 9. From (40), we observe that $\tilde{\eta}_k \leq 2\tilde{\eta}_{k+1}$ holds clearly for all $k \geq 0$. We next prove $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \leq 1$ for all $k \geq 0$. We obtain from (40) that $\tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} = (1 + 1/(k+1))^{1/3} \leq 1 + 1/(3(k+1))$. By this, (40), and $\gamma_k \in (0, 1]$, one has

$$(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} \leq (1 - 1/(k+1))^{2/3} (1 + 1/(3(k+1))) < 1 - 2/(3(k+1))^{2/3} \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

In addition, we notice from $s_{\tilde{\eta}} \leq 1/(8L_a U_B)$ (see (36)) and the definition of $\tilde{\eta}_k$ and that $\tilde{\eta}_k^2 = s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2 / (k+1)^{2/3} < 2/(99L_a^2 U_B^2 (k+1)^{2/3})$, which together with the above inequality implies that $(1 - \gamma_k)^2 \tilde{\eta}_k / \tilde{\eta}_{k+1} + 33L_a^2 U_B^2 \tilde{\eta}_k^2 \leq 1$ holds for all $k \geq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8. Notice from Lemma 9 that $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k, \gamma_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ defined in (40) satisfies the assumption in Theorem 7. Substituting (40) into (39), we obtain that for all $k \geq 5$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_p}(x^p) + A^T \lambda^p\|_{x^p}^*)^2] &\stackrel{(39)(40)}{\leq} (2k)^{1/3} \left(\frac{40\Delta(x^0) + \frac{2\sigma_a^2}{3L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}}}{s_{\tilde{\eta}}} + \frac{4\sigma_a^2}{L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2} \sum_{p=0}^{2k-1} \frac{1}{p+1} \right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{40\Delta(x^0)}{s_{\tilde{\eta}}} + \frac{2\sigma_a^2}{3L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2} + \frac{4\sigma_a^2 \ln(4k+1)}{L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2} \right) (2k)^{1/3} \leq 8 \left(\frac{20\Delta(x^0)}{s_{\tilde{\eta}}} + \frac{7\sigma_a^2}{3L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2} \right) k^{1/3} \ln k, \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to (47) with $(a, b, \alpha) = (1, 2k, 1)$, and the last inequality follows from $1 \leq \ln(4k+1) \leq 2 \ln k$ given that $k \geq 5$. Since $\kappa(k)$ is uniformly drawn from $\{k, \dots, 2k-1\}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*)^2] \leq \frac{8(20\Delta(x^0)/s_{\tilde{\eta}} + 7\sigma_a^2/(3L_a^2 U_B s_{\tilde{\eta}}^2))}{k^{2/3}} \ln k. \tag{71}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (41) and $k \geq K_{\text{rm}}$ that

$$\ln(k+4) > \ln k \geq 64(20\Delta(x^0)/s_{\bar{\eta}} + 7\sigma_a^2/(3L_a^2U_B s_{\bar{\eta}}^2)).$$

By this, (71), the fact that $\ln k/k^{2/3} \leq 2\ln(k+4)/(k+1)^{2/3}$ for all $k \geq 5$, and the definition of $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in (21), one has $\mathbb{E}[(\|\nabla \phi_{\mu_{\kappa(k)}}(x^{\kappa(k)}) + A^T \lambda^{\kappa(k)}\|_{x^{\kappa(k)}}^*)^2] \leq \mu_k^2 \leq \mu_{\kappa(k)}^2$, where the last inequality is because $\{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is decreasing and $\kappa(k) \geq k$. Hence, the conclusion of this theorem holds as desired. \square

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. The two authors contributed equally to this paper.

References

- [1] A. Alacaoglu and S. J. Wright. Complexity of single loop algorithms for nonlinear programming with stochastic objective and constraints. In *AISTATS*, pages 4627–4635, 2024.
- [2] F. Alizadeh. Interior point methods in semidefinite programming with applications to combinatorial optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 5(1):13–51, 1995.
- [3] F. Alizadeh and D. Goldfarb. Second-order cone programming. *Math. Program.*, 95(1):3–51, 2003.
- [4] A. Argyriou, T. Evgeniou, and M. Pontil. Convex multi-task feature learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 73:243–272, 2008.
- [5] F. R. Bach, G. R. Lanckriet, and M. I. Jordan. Multiple kernel learning, conic duality, and the SMO algorithm. In *ICML*, page 6, 2004.
- [6] R. Badenbroek and E. de Klerk. Complexity analysis of a sampling-based interior point method for convex optimization. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47(1):779–811, 2022.
- [7] A. S. Berahas, F. E. Curtis, M. J. O’Neill, and D. P. Robinson. A stochastic sequential quadratic optimization algorithm for nonlinear-equality-constrained optimization with rank-deficient Jacobians. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 2023.
- [8] A. S. Berahas, F. E. Curtis, D. Robinson, and B. Zhou. Sequential quadratic optimization for nonlinear equality constrained stochastic optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 31(2):1352–1379, 2021.
- [9] A. S. Berahas, J. Shi, Z. Yi, and B. Zhou. Accelerating stochastic sequential quadratic programming for equality constrained optimization using predictive variance reduction. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 86(1):79–116, 2023.
- [10] A. Bidaurrezaga, A. Pérez, and M. Capó. K -means for evolving data streams. In *IEEE ICDM*, pages 1006–1011, 2021.
- [11] R. H. Byrd, M. E. Hribar, and J. Nocedal. An interior point algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 9(4):877–900, 1999.
- [12] Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, O. Hinder, and A. Sidford. “Convex until proven guilty”: Dimension-free acceleration of gradient descent on non-convex functions. In *ICML*, pages 654–663, 2017.

- [13] F. E. Curtis, X. Jiang, and Q. Wang. Single-loop deterministic and stochastic interior-point algorithms for nonlinearly constrained optimization. *arXiv:2408.16186*, 2024.
- [14] F. E. Curtis, V. Kungurtsev, D. P. Robinson, and Q. Wang. A stochastic-gradient-based interior-point algorithm for solving smooth bound-constrained optimization problems. *arXiv:2304.14907*, 2023.
- [15] F. E. Curtis, D. P. Robinson, and B. Zhou. Inexact sequential quadratic optimization for minimizing a stochastic objective function subject to deterministic nonlinear equality constraints. *arXiv:2107.03512*, 2021.
- [16] A. Cutkosky and H. Mehta. Momentum improves normalized SGD. In *ICML*, pages 2260–2268, 2020.
- [17] A. Cutkosky and F. Orabona. Momentum-based variance reduction in non-convex SGD. In *NIPS*, volume 32, 2019.
- [18] P. Dvurechensky and M. Staudigl. Hessian barrier algorithms for non-convex conic optimization. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–59, 2024.
- [19] C. Fang, C. J. Li, Z. Lin, and T. Zhang. Spider: Near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator. In *NIPS*, volume 31, 2018.
- [20] Y. Fang, S. Na, M. W. Mahoney, and M. Kolar. Fully stochastic trust-region sequential quadratic programming for equality-constrained optimization problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 34(2):2007–2037, 2024.
- [21] B. Fares, P. Apkarian, and D. Noll. An augmented Lagrangian method for a class of LMI-constrained problems in robust control theory. *Int. J. Control*, 74(4):348–360, 2001.
- [22] A. Forsgren, P. E. Gill, and M. H. Wright. Interior methods for nonlinear optimization. *SIAM review*, 44(4):525–597, 2002.
- [23] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first- and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.
- [24] C. He, H. Huang, and Z. Lu. A Newton-CG based barrier-augmented Lagrangian method for general nonconvex conic optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, pages 1–52, 2024.
- [25] C. He and Z. Lu. A Newton-CG based barrier method for finding a second-order stationary point of nonconvex conic optimization with complexity guarantees. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 33(2):1191–1222, 2023.
- [26] S.-J. Kim, K. Koh, M. Lustig, S. Boyd, and D. Gorinevsky. An interior-point method for large-scale ℓ_1 -regularized least squares. *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.*, 1(4):606–617, 2007.
- [27] G. Lan. *First-Order and Stochastic Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*. Springer, 2020.
- [28] Z. Li, P.-Y. Chen, S. Liu, S. Lu, and Y. Xu. Stochastic inexact augmented lagrangian method for nonconvex expectation constrained optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 87(1):117–147, 2024.
- [29] C. Lu, J. Tang, S. Yan, and Z. Lin. Generalized nonconvex nonsmooth low-rank minimization. In *IEEE CVPR*, pages 4130–4137, 2014.
- [30] Z. Lu, S. Mei, and Y. Xiao. Variance-reduced first-order methods for deterministically constrained stochastic nonconvex optimization with strong convergence guarantees. *arXiv:2409.09906*, 2024.

- [31] S. Na, M. Anitescu, and M. Kolar. An adaptive stochastic sequential quadratic programming with differentiable exact augmented Lagrangians. *Math. Program.*, 199(1):721–791, 2023.
- [32] S. Na and M. W. Mahoney. Asymptotic convergence rate and statistical inference for stochastic sequential quadratic programming. *arXiv: 2205.13687 v1*, 2022.
- [33] H. Narayanan. Randomized interior point methods for sampling and optimization. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 26(1):597–641, 2016.
- [34] A. Nemirovski. Interior point polynomial time methods in convex programming. *Lecture Notes*, 2004.
- [35] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovski. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.
- [36] J. Peng and Y. Wei. Approximating k -means-type clustering via semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 18(1):186–205, 2007.
- [37] F. A. Potra and S. J. Wright. Interior-point methods. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 124(1-2):281–302, 2000.
- [38] Q. Shi, X. Wang, and H. Wang. A momentum-based linearized augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex constrained stochastic optimization. *Optimization Online*, 2022.
- [39] P. K. Shivaswamy, C. Bhattacharyya, and A. J. Smola. Second order cone programming approaches for handling missing and uncertain data. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, pages 1283–1314, 2006.
- [40] S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. J. Wright. *Optimization for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2011.
- [41] J. F. Sturm. Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 11(1-4):625–653, 1999.
- [42] D. Sun, K.-C. Toh, and Y. Yuan. Convex clustering: Model, theoretical guarantee and efficient algorithm. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(9):1–32, 2021.
- [43] K.-C. Toh, M. J. Todd, and R. H. Tütüncü. SDPT3—a MATLAB software package for semidefinite programming, version 1.3. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 11(1-4):545–581, 1999.
- [44] Q. Tran-Dinh, N. H. Pham, D. T. Phan, and L. M. Nguyen. A hybrid stochastic optimization framework for composite nonconvex optimization. *Math. Program.*, 191(2):1005–1071, 2022.
- [45] P. Tseng and Z.-Q. Luo. On the convergence of the affine-scaling algorithm. *Math. Program.*, 56(1):301–319, 1992.
- [46] R. J. Vanderbei and D. F. Shanno. An interior-point algorithm for nonconvex nonlinear programming. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 13:231–252, 1999.
- [47] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler. On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *Math. Program.*, 106:25–57, 2006.
- [48] Z. Wang, K. Ji, Y. Zhou, Y. Liang, and V. Tarokh. Spiderboost and momentum: Faster variance reduction algorithms. In *NIPS*, volume 32, 2019.
- [49] H. Wolkowicz, R. Saigal, and L. Vandenberghe. *Handbook of Semidefinite Programming: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [50] S. J. Wright. *Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*. SIAM, 1997.
- [51] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Optimization under probabilistic envelope constraints. *Oper. Res.*, 60(3):682–699, 2012.
- [52] Y. Xu and Y. Xu. Momentum-based variance-reduced proximal stochastic gradient method for composite nonconvex stochastic optimization. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 196(1):266–297, 2023.
- [53] Y. Zhang and Q. Yang. A survey on multi-task learning. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 34(12):5586–5609, 2021.
- [54] Y. Zhang and D.-Y. Yeung. A convex formulation for learning task relationships in multi-task learning. In *UAI*, 2010.
- [55] F. Zohrizadeh, C. Jozs, M. Jin, R. Madani, J. Lavaei, and S. Sojoudi. Conic relaxations of power system optimization: Theory and algorithms. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 287(2):391–409, 2020.