
DISTRIBUTED NORMAL MAP-BASED STOCHASTIC PROXIMAL GRADIENT METHODS OVER NETWORKS

A PREPRINT

Kun Huang

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
School of Data Science (SDS)
Shenzhen, Guangdong, China
kunhuang@link.cuhk.edu.cn

Shi Pu

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
School of Data Science (SDS)
Shenzhen, Guangdong, China
pushi@cuhk.edu.cn

Angelia Nedić

Arizona State University
School of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering
Tempe, AZ, United States
angelia.nedich@asu.edu

December 18, 2024

ABSTRACT

Consider n agents connected over a network collaborate to minimize the average of their local cost functions combined with a common nonsmooth function. This paper introduces a unified algorithmic framework for solving such a problem through distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods, leveraging the normal map update scheme. Within this framework, we propose two new algorithms, termed Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) and Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED), to solve the distributed composite optimization problem over a connected network. We demonstrate that both methods can asymptotically achieve comparable convergence rates to the centralized stochastic proximal gradient descent method under a general variance condition on the stochastic gradients. Additionally, the number of iterations required for norM-ED to achieve such a rate (i.e., the transient time) behaves as $\mathcal{O}(n^3/(1-\lambda)^2)$ for minimizing composite objective functions, matching the performance of the non-proximal ED algorithm. Here $1-\lambda$ denotes the spectral gap of the mixing matrix related to the underlying network topology. To our knowledge, such a convergence result is state-of-the-art for the considered composite problem. Under the same condition, norM-DSGT enjoys a transient time of $\mathcal{O}(\max\{n^3/(1-\lambda)^2, n/(1-\lambda)^4\})$ and behaves more stable than norM-ED under decaying stepsizes for solving the tested problems.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate how a group of networked agents $\mathcal{N} := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ collaborate to solve the following distributed composite optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \psi(x) := f(x) + \varphi(x), \quad f(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \quad (1)$$

where each agent i only has access to its local objective function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the possibly nonsmooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$. The function φ can capture regularization terms, constraints, and penalties. For instance, when φ is an indicator function of a feasible set, Problem (1) becomes the distributed constrained optimization problem [6]. The rich choices of φ enable broad applications of Problem (1), including machine learning [8, 24], sparse regression [22], and compressed sensing [41].

In this work, we assume φ is a weakly convex, lower semicontinuous, proper function, and that each f_i is continuously differentiable on an open set containing $\text{dom}(\varphi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : \varphi(x) < \infty\}$, thereby encompassing most of the aforementioned applications. We also assume that the proximal operator

$$\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|y - x\|^2 \right\} \in \text{dom}(\varphi), \quad \gamma > 0,$$

is easy to compute. Typical examples of φ include ℓ_1 -norm, discrete information divergence [14], elastic net [55], among others; see, e.g., [10].

To solve Problem (1), we assume each agent is able to query noisy or stochastic gradients $g_i(x; \xi_i)$ of $\nabla f_i(x)$. This is particularly relevant in data-intensive settings, such as deep learning, where querying full gradients can be computationally prohibitive. The stochastic gradients are assumed to satisfy the so-called ABC condition [26, 23, 17]:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \left[\|g_i(x; \xi_i) - \nabla f_i(x)\|^2 \mid x \right] \leq C_0 [f_i(x) - f_i^*] + \sigma^2, \quad (2)$$

for some positive constants C_0 and σ , where ξ_i denotes some random variable and $f_i^* := \inf_{x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)} f_i(x)$. Condition (2) generalizes the typical bounded variance condition ($C_0 = 0$), which is often difficult to verify and can be violated in practice. By contrast, the ABC condition applies to more practical scenarios such as sampling a mini-batch of data points to obtain the stochastic gradients [26, 23, 17]. Concrete examples can be found in [23, 17].

Despite the importance of solving Problem (1) with stochastic gradients, the development of relevant algorithms is less advanced, particularly compared to the rich literature that considers $\varphi(x) \equiv 0$. Furthermore, most existing research suggests that distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods that solve Problem (1) suffer from slower convergence compared to centralized stochastic proximal gradient method (Prox-SGD) [11, 27], especially when the number of agents increases. For instance, the study in [21] demonstrates a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/[(1-\lambda)^2 K^{2/3}])$ for solving Problem (1) under the Mean Squared Smoothness (MSS) condition [4] with additional variance reduction procedures, where K stands for the number of iterations, and $1-\lambda$ denotes the spectral gap of the mixing matrix related to the underlying network topology. Another work [29] reports a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/[(1-\lambda)^2 K])$ for solving Problem (1) when f is smooth and strongly convex. For sparse networks such as ring graphs, $\mathcal{O}(1/(1-\lambda))$ behaves as $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ [34]. Therefore, the above two results indicate a significant slowdown in convergence rates for distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods.

Only the recent work [47] demonstrates that distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods can benefit from an increasing number of agents and enjoy the so-called ‘‘asymptotic network independence (ANI)’’ property [40], that is, the convergence rate of distributed methods matches that of centralized implementation (e.g., $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{nK})$ for smooth and possibly nonconvex f) after a sufficient number of iterations called the *transient time*. However, the transient time reported in [47] behaves as $\mathcal{O}(n^3/(1-\lambda)^4)$ when f is smooth and possibly nonconvex, which is much larger than the $\mathcal{O}(n^3/(1-\lambda)^2)$ transient time established in previous works that consider $\varphi(x) \equiv 0$ [18, 3]. Such a discrepancy is particularly pronounced in sparse networks, limiting its applicability in large-scale networks.

We notice that the unsatisfactory transient time reported in [47] can be partly attributed to the update scheme of the typical Prox-SGD method: $x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\alpha\varphi}(x_k - \alpha g(x_k; \xi_k))$ [11]. More specifically, Prox-SGD may introduce bias even when the stochastic gradients are unbiased, since we generally have $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\text{prox}_{\alpha\varphi}(x_k - \alpha g(x_k; \xi_k)) \mid x_k] \neq \text{prox}_{\alpha\varphi}(x_k - \alpha \nabla f(x_k))$ given that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[g(x_k; \xi_k) \mid x_k] = \nabla f(x_k)$ at the k -th iteration. Such a bias can adversely affect the consensus update in distributed optimization methods, resulting in unsatisfactory performance. To address this issue, we apply the *normal map* update scheme [42, 32, 39] to distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods. The normal map update with stochastic gradient $g(x_k; \xi_k)$ performs the following core step:

$$z_{k+1} = z_k - \alpha [g(x_k; \xi_k) + \gamma^{-1} (z_k - x_k)], \quad x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{k+1}). \quad (3)$$

It is easy to see that (3) preserves the unbiasedness as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} \left\{ z_k - \alpha [g(x_k; \xi_k) + \gamma^{-1} (z_k - x_k)] \mid x_k, z_k \right\} = z_k - \alpha [\nabla f(x_k) + \gamma^{-1} (z_k - x_k)],$$

given that $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[g(x_k; \xi_k) \mid x_k] = \nabla f(x_k)$.

Inspired by the observation above, we introduce a unified algorithmic framework for distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods using the normal map update, termed Normal Map-based Stochastic ABC-2 (norM-SABC-2), and propose two algorithms: Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) and Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED), within this framework. The proposed methods inherit the advantages of the normal map update scheme and avoids the bias compared to distributed Prox-SGD method. Both methods enhance the transient times for solving Problem (1) compared to the earlier work [47]. In particular, the norM-ED method attains the same transient time as its non-proximal counterpart in [18, 3] while norM-DSGT exhibits robust performance when

using decaying stepsize for solving the testing problems. In particular, the norM-ED method achieves the shortest transient time for solving Problem (1) to our knowledge. It is worth noting that the proposed methods do not introduce additional computation or communication overhead compared to those distributed variants of Prox-SGD, including [47, 29].

1.1 Related Works

We focus on the recent advances in distributed composite optimization that considers Problem (1). The study of Problem (1) with full gradients available dates back to the seminal work [37], where φ represents the indicator function of a common constrained set. Subsequent works including [54, 9] expands to the case where φ is a convex function. However, the proposed algorithms are based on the Distributed Gradient Descent (DGD) method [36] which does not converge to the exact solution under a constant stepsize. To improve the algorithmic convergence, there are mainly two lines of works, including [12, 45, 52] that apply the gradient tracking technique [50, 12, 35], and primal-dual type methods including [44, 30, 1, 16] which are inspired by earlier works assuming $\varphi = 0$ [43, 53]. Specifically, the method in [52] utilizes multiple inner loops of communication at every iteration to obtain the optimal complexity when the smooth component f is strongly convex. The paper [45] considers the composite optimization problem on the Riemannian manifolds and proves the sublinear convergence for the proposed Decentralized Riemannian Proximal Gradient Tracking (DR-ProxGT) algorithm when the smooth component f is possibly nonconvex. The work [12] applies the proximal step to a surrogate function and proves the asymptotic convergence for the considered method. Regarding the primal-dual type algorithms, those in [44, 30, 16] allow for different nonsmooth components across the agents and enjoy the sublinear convergence when f is convex. The paper [1] establishes the linear convergence for the proposed method under a shared φ and strongly convex smooth component f . In [49, 2], both gradient tracking-based and primal-dual type methods are unified under a shared φ , and linear convergence rates are demonstrated for strongly convex f .

When only noisy gradients of f_i are available, the study on distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods is less advanced. The early work in [7] establishes the asymptotic convergence of the distributed projected stochastic gradient method. When large mini-batches are available, the authors in [46] prove convergence with momentum updates. The work in [48] demonstrates a topology-independent sample complexity, provided that large mini-batches of data samples and multiple inner loops of communication are utilized. However, the requirement for large mini-batches or multiple inner loops communication can be impractical in real-world applications. The works in [51, 29] employ communication compression, achieving $\mathcal{O}(1/[(1-\lambda)^3\sqrt{K}])$ convergence rate for possibly nonconvex and smooth f , and $\mathcal{O}(1/[(1-\lambda)^2K])$ for strongly convex and smooth f respectively without compression. To our knowledge, only the recent works in [47, 38] demonstrate the ANI property. Notably, the methods proposed in [47] involve momentum-like update and require communicating additional variables. The work [38] establishes the ANI property for distributed stochastic subgradient methods under specific stepsizes while the transient time remains unknown.

1.2 Main Contribution

The main contribution of this paper is three-fold.

Firstly, this work is the first to explore normal map-based distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods and introduce a unified algorithmic framework, termed Normal Map-based Stochastic ABC-2 (norM-SABC-2), to solve Problem (1). Within this framework, two novel algorithms are proposed, termed Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) and Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED). Both methods exhibit the asymptotic network independence (ANI) property with improved transient times. In particular, under smooth and possibly nonconvex component function f and weakly convex function φ , norM-DSGT reduces the state-of-the-art transient time from $\mathcal{O}(n^3/(1-\lambda)^4)$ to $\mathcal{O}(\max\{n^3/(1-\lambda)^2, n/(1-\lambda)^4\})$, and norM-ED reduces the transient time to $\mathcal{O}(n^3/(1-\lambda)^2)$. Notably, norM-ED is the first distributed stochastic proximal gradient method that matches the transient time of its non-proximal counterpart, which is the shortest so far to our knowledge.

Secondly, we make less restrictive assumptions compared to the previous works to obtain the enhanced results. Specifically, this paper assumes only weak convexity on φ and the ABC condition on the stochastic gradients, and does not impose any additional data heterogeneity conditions among the individual functions f_i . Given the smoothness of f , these relaxed assumptions represent the most general conditions for solving Problem (1), even considering the centralized setting. Therefore, this work broadens the practical applicability of distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods.

Thirdly, we explore a flexible analytical framework for distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods. Such a framework accommodates multi-step analysis with an arbitrary number of steps $m \geq 1$. Compared to previous works that are tailored to specific algorithms, our analysis encloses a wide range of distributed stochastic proximal gradient

algorithms, provided that their averaged iterates update as a centralized method with some additional error terms. Moreover, by choosing m appropriately, the considered framework extends naturally to other problem settings, including utilizing the random reshuffling strategy for sampling stochastic gradients and optimization over time-varying networks.

1.3 Notation and Assumptions

Throughout this paper, column vectors are considered by default unless specified otherwise. Let $x_{i,k}, y_{i,k}, z_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ represent the iterates of agent $i \in \mathcal{N} := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ at the k -th iteration. To simplify notation, we introduce stacked variables such as the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_k &:= (x_{1,k}, x_{2,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \\ \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_k) &:= (\nabla f_1(x_{1,k}), \nabla f_2(x_{2,k}), \dots, \nabla f_n(x_{n,k}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \\ \mathbf{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\mathbf{z}_k) &:= (\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{1,k}), \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{2,k}), \dots, \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{n,k}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}. \end{aligned}$$

The average of x_i across all the agents is denoted as $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. For example, the variable $\bar{x}_k := 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,k}$ represents the average of all the agents' iterates at the k -th iteration. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the Frobenius norm for a matrix and the ℓ_2 -norm for a vector by default. The inner product of two vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is written as $\langle a, b \rangle$. For two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle$ is defined as $\langle A, B \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n \langle A_i, B_i \rangle$, where A_i (and B_i) represents the i -row of A (and B).

We now introduce the standing assumptions considered in this paper. Generally speaking, Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 pertain to the objective functions, Assumption 1.3 states the ABC condition regarding the stochastic gradients, and Assumption 1.4 relates to the communication graph.

Assumption 1.1 states that the objective functions are smooth and bounded below on an open set containing $\text{dom}(\varphi)$. Such a condition is common in the literature [19, 17] when $\varphi(x) \equiv 0$.

Assumption 1.1. Each $f_i : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth on an open set \mathcal{U} containing $\text{dom}(\varphi)$, meaning that

$$\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(x')\| \leq L \|x - x'\|, \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathcal{U}.$$

In addition, each f_i is bounded below, i.e., $f_i(x) \geq f_i^* := \inf_{x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)} f_i(x) > -\infty, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We also denote $f^* := \inf_{x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)} f(x)$.

Regarding the nonsmooth term, Assumption 1.2 considers a more general condition compared to previous works (see e.g., [47, 44]), where φ is ρ -weakly convex, i.e., $\varphi(x) + \rho\|x\|^2/2$ is convex for some $\rho > 0$.

Assumption 1.2. The function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is ρ -weakly convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper. We denote $\varphi^* := \inf_{x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)} \varphi(x)$.

We consider the ABC condition on the stochastic gradients in Assumption 1.3, which is the most general variance condition under the distributed optimization setting [19, 17, 23].

Assumption 1.3. Assume each agent has access to a conditionally unbiased stochastic gradient $g_i(x; \xi_i)$ of $\nabla f_i(x)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i}[g_i(x; \xi_i)|x] = \nabla f_i(x)$, and there exist constants $C_0 \geq 0$ and $\sigma \geq 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \left[\|g_i(x; \xi_i) - \nabla f_i(x)\|^2 \middle| x \right] \leq C_0 [f_i(x) - f_i^*] + \sigma^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (4)$$

for an open set \mathcal{U} containing $\text{dom}(\varphi)$. In addition, the stochastic gradients are independent across different agents at each $k \geq 0$.

Consider the set of agents connected via a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ with $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ representing the set of edges connecting the agents. In particular, $(i, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. The set of neighbors for agent i is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{N} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. The element w_{ij} in the weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represents the weight of the edge between agents i and j . Regarding the network topology, we consider Assumption 1.4 that is standard in the distributed optimization literature. The condition guarantees that the spectral norm λ of the matrix $(W - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/n)$ is strictly less than one.

Assumption 1.4. The graph \mathcal{G} is undirected and strongly connected, i.e., there exists a path between any two nodes in \mathcal{G} . There is a direct link between i and j ($i \neq j$) in \mathcal{G} if and only if $w_{ij} > 0$ and $w_{ji} > 0$; otherwise, $w_{ij} = w_{ji} = 0$. The mixing matrix W is nonnegative, stochastic, and symmetric, i.e., $\mathbf{1}^\top W = \mathbf{1}^\top$ and $W^\top = W$.

2 Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Proximal Gradient Methods

In this section, we first introduce the definition of *normal map* $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, as established in [42], along with a critical property (6) in subsection 2.1. Such a property further inspires the unified framework stated in (8). Subsection 2.2 then presents the proposed algorithms within the unified framework.

2.1 Motivation and Unified Framework

The normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is defined as:

$$F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z) := \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) + \frac{1}{\gamma}(z - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) \in \partial\psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad (5)$$

where $\partial\psi$ denotes the limiting differential of ψ with $\partial\psi(x) = \nabla f(x) + \partial\varphi(x)$ [5]. The normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$ essentially serves as a subgradient of the objective function ψ . Notably, given an unbiased stochastic gradient $g(x; \xi)$ of $\nabla f(x)$, the normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$ preserves the unbiasedness:

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[g(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z); \xi) + \frac{1}{\gamma}(z - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) \mid z \right] = F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (6)$$

Such a property enables the use of existing analytical tools developed for the full gradient case. By contrast, the unbiasedness of $g(x; \xi)$ is not preserved for traditional stochastic proximal gradient methods, since $\mathbb{E}_\xi[\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(x - \gamma g(x; \xi)) \mid x] \neq \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(x - \gamma \nabla f(x))$ in general. As a result, the use of previous analytical tools for proximal gradient methods may introduce additional errors into the variance term $\mathbb{E}_\xi[\|g(x; \xi) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \mid x]$ and further results in unsatisfactory convergence results for existing distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods. By considering (6) in developing and analyzing new algorithms, the additional term $1/(1 - \lambda)$ in the variance term can be avoided (see the proof of Lemma 3.9), thereby improving the transient times.

From the above discussion, it is natural to define the normal map for each local function $\psi_i := f_i + \varphi$ as follows:

$$F_{i, \text{nor}}^\gamma(z) := \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) + \frac{1}{\gamma}(z - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) \in \partial\psi_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (7)$$

Then, the update of each agent applies such a subgradient by replacing $\nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z))$ with the stochastic gradient $g_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z); \xi)$. This motivates the basis for the unified framework.

We are thus able to consider the following unified framework:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} &= A \{ C\mathbf{z}_k - \alpha [\mathbf{g}_k + \gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{x}_k)] \} - B\mathbf{d}_k = A \{ C\mathbf{z}_k - \alpha [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) + \mathbf{g}_k - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_k)] \} - B\mathbf{d}_k, \\ \mathbf{d}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{d}_k + B\mathbf{z}_{k+1}, \\ \mathbf{x}_{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here, $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) = \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_k) + \gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{x}_k)$. When $\varphi = 0$ and thus $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) = \nabla F(\mathbf{z}_k)$, (8) reduces to the ones considered in [3]. The unified framework (8) is named as Normal Map-based Stochastic ABC-2 (norM-SABC-2), where ABC-2 refers to the existing unified algorithms employing matrices A , B and C [49, 2, 3] and the ABC condition concerning the stochastic gradients (4). The matrices A , B , and C are assumed to satisfy Assumption 2.1 below.

Assumption 2.1. *The matrices $A, B^2, C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are chosen as a polynomial function of W : $A = \sum_{d=0}^s a_d W^d$, $B^2 = \sum_{d=0}^s b_d W^d$, $C = \sum_{d=0}^s c_d W^d$, where $s \geq 0$ is an integer. Moreover, the constants $\{a_d, b_d, c_d\}_{d=0}^s$ are chosen such that A and C are doubly stochastic and the matrix B satisfies $B\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$.*

Choosing different matrices A , B , and C that satisfy the assumption leads to specific normal map-based distributed stochastic proximal gradient methods. The mild condition in Assumption 2.1 is satisfied by most distributed gradient based methods.

2.2 Proposed Algorithms

We introduce two novel algorithms within the proposed framework (8): Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) and Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED). Specifically, letting $A = W$, $B = I - W$, $C = W$, and $\mathbf{d}_0 = -W\mathbf{z}_0$ in (8) leads to norM-DSGT method, outlined in Algorithm 1. At each iteration, agent i first performs an approximate subgradient step in Line 9 and communicates with its neighbors to obtain the variable $z_{i,k+1}$ in Line 11. A proximal step is then applied to $z_{i,k+1}$ to compute the next iterate, $x_{i,k+1}$ (Line 12). Notably, the stochastic gradient is evaluated at $x_{i,k+1}$ in Line 13 to maintain the relation in (6). Line 14 is applied to track the overall stochastic subgradients (normal maps). Relation (9) holds given the initialization in Line 7, where the averaged variable $\bar{y}_k := \sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,k}/n$ tracks the averaged stochastic subgradients (normal maps).

$$\bar{y}_k = \bar{g}_k + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_k - \bar{x}_k), \quad \bar{g}_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_{i,k}, \quad \bar{z}_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{i,k}, \quad \bar{x}_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,k}. \quad (9)$$

Algorithm 1 A Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) Method

```

1: Initialize  $z_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  for all agent  $i \in \mathcal{N}$ , determine  $W = [w_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , stepsize  $\alpha_k$  and parameter  $\gamma$ .
2: Calculate  $x_{i,0} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,0})$ .
3: for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$  do
4:   for Agent  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  in parallel do
5:     if  $k = 0$  then
6:       Acquires a stochastic gradient  $g_{i,0} = g_i(x_{i,0}; \xi_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .
7:       Initialize  $y_{i,0} = g_{i,0} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,0} - x_{i,0})$ .
8:     end if
9:     Update  $z_{i,k+\frac{1}{2}} = z_{i,k} - \alpha y_{i,k}$ .
10:    Communicate  $(z_{i,k+\frac{1}{2}}, y_{i,k})$  to the neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ .
11:    Update  $z_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} z_{j,k+\frac{1}{2}}$ .
12:    Update  $x_{i,k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k+1})$ .
13:    Acquires a stochastic gradient  $g_{i,k+1} = g_i(x_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .
14:    Update  $y_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} y_{j,k} + [g_{i,k+1} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k+1})] - [g_{i,k} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,k} - x_{i,k})]$ .
15:   end for
16: end for
    
```

Setting $A = W$, $B = (I - W)^{1/2}$, $C = I$, and $\mathbf{d}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ yields the norM-ED method, outlined in Algorithm 2. In norM-ED, agent i performs a local update in Line 9, which can be regarded as a combination of a local subgradient step $a_{i,k+1} = z_{i,k} - \alpha[g_{i,k} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,k} - x_{i,k})]$ and a correction step $z_{i,k+\frac{1}{2}} = z_{i,k} + a_{i,k+1} - a_{i,k}$ according to [53]. Notably, norM-ED reduces the communication overhead compared to norM-DSGT but can be sensitive to the change of stepsizes due to the update in Line 9.

Algorithm 2 A Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED) Method

```

1: Initialize  $z_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  for all agent  $i \in \mathcal{N}$ , determine  $W = [w_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , stepsize  $\alpha_k$  and parameter  $\gamma$ .
2: Calculate  $x_{i,0} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,0})$ .
3: for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$  do
4:   for Agent  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  in parallel do
5:     Acquires a stochastic gradient  $g_{i,k} = g_i(x_{i,k}; \xi_{i,k}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .
6:     if  $k = 0$  then
7:       Update  $z_{i,\frac{1}{2}} = z_{i,0} - \alpha [g_{i,0} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,0} - x_{i,0})]$ .
8:     else
9:       Update  $z_{i,k+\frac{1}{2}} = 2z_{i,k} - z_{i,k-1} - \alpha[g_{i,k} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,k} - x_{i,k})] + \alpha[g_{i,k-1} + \gamma^{-1}(z_{i,k-1} - x_{i,k-1})]$ .
10:    end if
11:    Communicate  $z_{i,k+\frac{1}{2}}$  to the neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ .
12:    Update  $z_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} z_{j,k+\frac{1}{2}}$ .
13:    Update  $x_{i,k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k+1})$ .
14:   end for
15: end for
    
```

The rationale behind the effectiveness of norM-DSGT and norM-ED can be seen from the update (10) for the averaged iterates \bar{x}_k and \bar{z}_k (see Lemma 3.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{z}_{k+1} &= \bar{z}_k - \alpha [\bar{g}_k + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_k - \bar{x}_k)] \\
 &= \bar{z}_k - \alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - g_i(x_{i,k}; \xi_{i,k})] + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k) - F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_{i,k})], \\
 \bar{x}_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k+1}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

From (10), both proposed methods can be viewed as approximate implementations of the centralized norM-SGD method described in [32]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 z_{k+1} &= z_k - \alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_k) + \alpha [\nabla f(x_k) - g(x_k; \xi_k)], \\
 x_{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{k+1}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The update for \bar{z}_k in (10) resembles that of the norM-SGD method. However, the update for \bar{x}_k differs due to the nonlinearity of the proximal operator, in other words,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k}) \neq \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{i,k}\right), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

The introduced analytical challenges will be addressed by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 in the next section. Intuitively, the discrepancy described in (12) can be bounded by the consensus error term, $\sum_{i=1}^n \|z_{i,k} - \bar{z}_k\|/n$ thanks to Assumptions 1.2 and 1.4.

3 Convergence Analysis

We present the convergence analysis for the proposed unified algorithmic framework in this section. Specifically, we state the preliminary results along with the stationarity measure (18) in Subsection 3.1 followed by the main analysis in Subsection 3.2.

3.1 Preliminaries

In this part, we introduce several preliminary results that facilitate the convergence analysis in the subsequent subsection. Generally speaking, these preliminaries help establish the relationship between the two sequence of variables $\{z_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{x_{i,k} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k})\}_{i=1}^n$ for $k \geq 0$, so that we can focus on analyzing the terms involving $\{z_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$ only. Such a relationship can be seen from Lemma 3.5 that connects the ‘‘proximal gradient mapping’’ with the normal map.

In what follows, Lemma 3.1 first states the update for the averaged iterate \bar{z}_k and a transformed update related to the consensus error, $\sum_{i=1}^n \|z_{i,k} - \bar{z}_k\|^2$. Lemma 3.2 then helps handle the terms, $[\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)]$ and $[\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{k+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)]$, appeared in Lemma 3.1. It is worth noting that the updates in Lemma 3.1 involve the variables $\{x_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$, which prevents us from solely focusing on the terms involving $\{z_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$. To address such an issue, we further introduce Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 that establish connections between the variables $\{x_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{z_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^n$.

In Lemma 3.1 below, we present the transformed form of (8). The key idea is to leverage the eigenvalue decomposition of the symmetric and stochastic matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Define $\hat{\Lambda}$ as $\hat{\Lambda} := \text{diag}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$, where $1 = \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of W . Then,

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{1} & \hat{U} \\ 0 & \hat{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{1}^\top \\ \hat{U}^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{U}\hat{U}^\top = I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/n$ and $\hat{U}^\top\hat{U} = I_{n-1}$. Here, $I \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $I_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ are both identity matrices, and $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector with all one elements.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. We have*

$$\bar{z}_{k+1} = \bar{z}_k - \alpha \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k) - \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbf{F}_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_{i,k}) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)] - \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,k} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,k})], \quad (14a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \Gamma \mathbf{u}_k - \alpha V^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)] \\ \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a U^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{k+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)] \end{pmatrix} - \alpha V^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_k - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_k)] \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14b)$$

for every iteration $k \geq 0$. The matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n-1) \times 2(n-1)}$ is given by

$$\Gamma := V^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{\Lambda}_c - \hat{\Lambda}_b^2 & -\hat{\Lambda}_b \\ \hat{\Lambda}_b & I_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} V$$

where $V \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n-1) \times 2(n-1)}$ is some invertible matrix, and $\hat{\Lambda}_a$, $\hat{\Lambda}_b^2$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_c$ are diagonal matrices composed of eigenvalues of A , B^2 , and C , respectively: $\hat{\Lambda}_a = \text{diag}(\lambda_{a,2}, \dots, \lambda_{a,n})$, $\hat{\Lambda}_b^2 = \text{diag}(\lambda_{b,1}^2, \dots, \lambda_{b,n-1}^2)$, and $\hat{\Lambda}_c = \text{diag}(\lambda_{c,2}, \dots, \lambda_{c,n})$.

In addition, $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n-1) \times p}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{u}_k := V^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}^\top \mathbf{z}_k \\ \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{U}^\top \mathbf{d}'_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark 3.1. The quantity $\|\mathbf{u}_k\|^2$ is closely related to the consensus error term $\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top\|^2$ due to $\|\mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top\|^2 \leq \|V\mathbf{u}_k\|^2$. In addition, we define $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\beta := \|\Gamma\| \quad (15)$$

and assume in the subsequent analysis that $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, such an assumption is satisfied for many distributed algorithms [3], including the considered algorithms *norM-DSGT* and *norM-ED*.

Proof. See Appendix B.1. □

Lemma 3.2 states that both $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$ and $F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous given that $\gamma < 1/\rho$ under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2.

Lemma 3.2. Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold. Set $\gamma < 1/\rho$. The normal maps $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ are L_F -Lipschitz continuous, where $L_F := (L - \rho + 2/\gamma)/(1 - \gamma\rho)$.

Proof. See Appendix B.2. □

Lemma 3.3 identifies the relationship between $[f(\bar{x}_k) - f^*]$ and $[f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - f^*]$, characterizing the impact due to the nonlinearity of the proximal operator. The function value $f(\bar{x}_k)$ arises because of the ABC condition (4). Consequently, the subsequent analysis can focus on the changes in $\psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) = f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) + \varphi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k))$, as detailed in Lemma 3.7 later.

Lemma 3.3. Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold. We have

$$f(\bar{x}_k) - f^* \leq 2 [f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - f^*] + L \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2, \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Proof. See Appendix B.3. □

Lemma 3.4 introduces a way to encapsulate the consensus error $\|\Pi\mathbf{x}_k\|^2$ ($\Pi := I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/n$) and the error term $\|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2$ within the consensus error $\|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2$. As a result, we can handle all such errors based on the update of \mathbf{u}_k in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.4. Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 hold. We have for all $k \geq 0$ that

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\Pi\mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2. \quad (16)$$

In particular, if $\gamma < (2 - \sqrt{2})/(2\rho)$, then we have

$$\|\Pi\mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \leq 2 \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2, \quad \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2. \quad (17)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.4. □

Stationarity measure. Regarding the stationarity measure for Problem (1), we consider the multi-agent version of the “proximal gradient mapping” [6], defined in (18) below:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_i)\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{\gamma} (x_i - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(x_i - \gamma\nabla f(x_i))) \right\|^2, \quad (18)$$

where the natural residual mapping $F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is defined as

$$F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x) := x - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(x - \gamma\nabla f(x)). \quad (19)$$

Such a measure has been used in previous works including [47, 31].¹ Lemma 3.5 below establishes a link between the stationarity measure² and the normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$.

¹When $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ -strongly convex, L -smooth, and φ is convex, the measure (18) also bounds the distance between each agent’s iterate to the optimal solution. Noting that $\psi(x) = f(x) + \varphi(x)$ is strongly convex and satisfies the quadratic growth condition, we can conclude from [13, Corollary 3.6] that $\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - x^*\|^2/n \leq [(2\mu^{-1} + \gamma)/(1 + L\gamma)]^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_i)\|^2/n$, where x^* is the unique solution to the problem $\min_x \psi(x)$.

²Notably, it is equivalent to use the proximal gradient mapping and the normal map to measure the stationarity [32, Lemma 2.7].

Lemma 3.5. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 hold. We have for any $k \geq 0$ that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 + \frac{2L_F^2}{n(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2. \quad (20)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.5. □

In this work, we consider (18) for the ease of comparison with previous works.

3.2 A Multi-step Analysis

Lemma 3.5 underscores the goal of our analysis: bounding $\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2$ and $L_F^2 \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_k\|^2/n$ simultaneously. However, analyzing the recursions of these terms between the $(k+1)$ -th and the k -th iteration can be problematic that results in large accumulated errors.³ To address this issue, we consider the recursions between iterates $\{(x_{i,k_1}, z_{i,k_1})\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{(x_{i,k_2}, z_{i,k_2})\}_{i=1}^n$ for integers k_1 and k_2 satisfying $0 \leq k_1 < k_2 := k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$). The intuition is, by choosing a sufficiently large m , the errors can be better controlled. Notably, the choice of $m \geq 1$ is solely for the analysis purpose. The algorithms do not require any inner loop.

Before delving into details, we first define a filtration for the subsequent analysis. Let the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be generated by $\{\xi_{i,\ell} | i \in \mathcal{N}, \ell = 0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, the set of random variables (such as random data samples) utilized by the agents before the k -th iteration.

The key strategy is to locate a Lyapunov function and construct its dynamic between the k_1 -th and k_2 -th iteration. Specifically, we consider \mathcal{L}_k in (21) below:

$$\mathcal{L}_k := \mathcal{H}_k + \frac{\alpha\mathcal{C}_1}{n(1-\beta^2)} \|\mathbf{u}_k\|^2, \quad (21)$$

where β is defined in (15) and is assumed to satisfy $\beta \in (0, 1)$ according to Remark 3.1. The function \mathcal{H}_k is defined below.

$$\mathcal{H}_k := \psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - \bar{\psi} + \frac{\gamma\mathcal{C}_0}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2. \quad (22)$$

Here $\mathcal{C}_0 := \frac{3-4\gamma\rho}{2(3-4\gamma\rho+4\gamma^2L^2)} \in [4/9, 1/2)$, $\mathcal{C}_1 = 50\mathcal{T}_2^2$, and $\bar{\psi} := f^* + \varphi^*$. The Lyapunov function \mathcal{H}_{k_1} is inspired by the works in [32, 39]. The introduced $\bar{\psi}$ is the same as in [32].

We follow the roadmap below in presenting the remaining analysis of this section.

1. Lemma 3.6 rewrites the updates of the unified algorithmic framework in Lemma 3.1 to accommodate the multi-step analysis.
2. Lemma 3.7 characterizes the approximate descent property between \mathcal{H}_{k_2} and \mathcal{H}_{k_1} , motivating us to upper bound an ‘‘additional error’’ term in the next step.
3. Lemma 3.8 upper bounds the ‘‘additional error’’ term resulting from the stochastic gradients and consensus updates.
4. Derive the recursion for the transformed consensus error $\|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2$ in Lemma 3.9.
5. Obtain the recursion for the Lyapunov function \mathcal{L}_{k_1} by combining the results derived above (Lemma 3.10).

We begin by examining the updates between the k_2 -th iteration and the k_1 -th iteration for integers k_1 and k_2 satisfying $0 \leq k_1 < k_2 := k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$). In particular, the averaged iterate \bar{z}_{k_2} can be regarded as performing m -step normal map updates on \bar{z}_{k_1} with some additional error $e_{k_1:k_2}$ (defined in (25)).

Lemma 3.6. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 2.1 hold. We have for any $k_2 = k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$) that*

$$\bar{z}_{k_2} = \bar{z}_{k_1} - m\alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + e_{k_1:k_2}, \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{k_2} = & \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1} - \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} V^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_p) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \\ \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{p+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \end{array} \right) \\ & - \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} V^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_p - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p)] \\ \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

³This is part of the reasons that previous works require large mini-batches [15] or variance reduction [21] to achieve convergence.

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 e_{k_1:k_2} &:= \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \alpha [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p)] - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n\gamma} [\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,p})] \\
 &\quad - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - g_{i,p}].
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Proof. See Appendix B.6. □

We next consider the approximate descent property of the Lyapunov function \mathcal{H}_k , inspired by the works [32, 39].

Lemma 3.7. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set $\alpha < \min\{\gamma/(2m), 1/(10mL)\}$ and $\gamma \leq 1/[4(\rho+L)]$. Then, for any $k_2 = k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$),*

$$\mathcal{H}_{k_2} \leq \mathcal{H}_{k_1} - \frac{\alpha m C_0}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha m} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2. \tag{26}$$

Proof. See Appendix B.7. □

We next bound the term $\mathbb{E}[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$, which arises due to the stochastic gradients and the consensus error among the networked agents.

Lemma 3.8. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set α and γ to satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{3D_2 L_F}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}mL_F}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|} \right\}, \\
 \gamma &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0(D_1^2+1)} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $k_2 = k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &\leq \frac{24\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 8\alpha^2 m [C_0\gamma + 6\alpha^2 m^3 \mathcal{T}_2^2] \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 &\quad + 16\alpha^2 m C_0 \left[\frac{1}{n} + 2\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] [\psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_{k_1})) - \bar{\psi}] \\
 &\quad + 4\alpha^2 m \left[\frac{1}{n} + 2\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &+ \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{6\beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 12\alpha^2 m^3 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 &\quad + 8\alpha^2 m C_0 \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) [\psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_{k_1})) - \bar{\psi}] \\
 &\quad + 2\alpha^2 m \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_f^* &:= f^* - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^*, \\
 D_1^2 &:= \|V^{-1}\|^2 \|\hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top\|^2, \quad D_2^2 := \|V^{-1}\|^2 \|\hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top\|^2 \\
 \mathcal{T}_1^2 &:= (D_1^2 + 1)L_F^2 + 16(\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2)/3 + 4C_0L/(3n), \\
 \mathcal{T}_2^2 &:= L_F^2 + 2(2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})\|V\|^2 + 4C_0L\|V\|^2 + 4C_0\gamma^{-1}, \quad \beta_{0:m}^2 := \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \beta^{2t}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix B.8. □

Remark 3.2. The constant \mathcal{T}_i represents a constant related to L , C_0 , and γ while the constant D_i does not involve those parameters.

Lemma 3.9 states the recursion of the transformed consensus error term.

Lemma 3.9. Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Let

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}mL_F}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|}, \frac{1}{3D_2L_F} \right\},$$

$$\gamma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0(D_1^2+1)} \right\}.$$

Then, for any $k_2 = k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 1$),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &\leq \frac{1+\beta^{2m}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 mn \mathcal{T}_3^2}{1-\beta^{2m}} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \right\} \\ &+ 4\alpha^2 n \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1-\beta^{2m}} \right) \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 8\alpha^2 n C_0 \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1-\beta^{2m}} \right) [\psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_{k_1})) - \bar{\psi}] \\ &+ 2\alpha^2 n \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1-\beta^{2m}} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_3^2 := \|V\|^2[L_F^2 D_1^2 + 2L(L+C_0) + \gamma^{-2} + 4D_1^2 C_0 L] + L_F^2 + 2\gamma^{-2}$.

Proof. See Appendix B.9. □

In Lemma 3.10, we obtain a critical relation related to the Lyapunov function function \mathcal{L}_k . It serves as a cornerstone for deriving the convergence guarantee of the considered algorithmic framework.

Lemma 3.10. Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set α and γ to satisfy

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|}, \frac{1-\beta^2}{\mathcal{T}_3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2}{600m}}, \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{294(D_2+1)\mathcal{T}_2}, \frac{1}{144m\mathcal{T}_2} \right\},$$

$$\gamma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0(D_1^2+1)} \right\}.$$

Then, we have for any $k_1 \geq 0$ and $k_2 = k_1 + m$ ($m \geq 432$) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}_{k_2} | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &\leq \left(1 + \frac{19\alpha C_0}{n} + \frac{150\alpha^3 m D_1^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{193\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \mathcal{L}_{k_1} \\ &- \frac{\alpha m}{5} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \left(\frac{14\alpha}{3n} + \frac{80\alpha^3 m D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{50\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.10. □

Remark 3.3. Suppose we consider a special case where $C_0 = 0$ (bounded variance). Then, the recursion (30) can lead to a dominant error term $\mathcal{O}(\sigma^2/(mn))$ due to the stochastic gradients when upper bounding the term $\sum_{k_1} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2$. Thus, choosing $m = \mathcal{O}(\lceil \sqrt{K/n} \rceil)$ leads to a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{nK})$ for a given iteration number $K > 0$. The subsequent section formalizes such an argument for $C_0 \geq 0$.

4 Convergence Results

In this section, we establish the iteration complexity for norM-DSGT and norM-ED with respect to the iteration number $K > 0$. Let $K = Tm + Q$, where $T \geq 0$ and $Q \in [0, m - 1]$ are integers. We consider a subsequence $\{\mathbf{k}_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ of $\{0, 1, \dots, K - 1\}$. The subsequence is specified as follows and illustrated in Figure 1.

$$\mathbf{k}_0 = 0, \mathbf{k}_1 = m, \mathbf{k}_2 = 2m, \dots, \mathbf{k}_T = Tm. \quad (31)$$




Figure 1: An illustration of the subsequence $\{\mathbf{k}_j\}_{j \geq 0}$.

The goal is to upper bound $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2]$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_k\|^2]$ according to Lemma 3.5. To achieve the goal, we utilize the multi-step analysis from Section 3. Regarding $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2]$, we divide the summation into two parts: one summing over the points $\mathbf{k}_0, \mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_T$, and the other summing over the interval $\mathbf{k}_j, \mathbf{k}_j + 1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_j + m - 1$ for each \mathbf{k}_j based on Figure 1. Specifically, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2] = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q})\|^2] + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_T+q})\|^2] \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q})\|^2]. \quad (32)$$

A similar argument applies to the aggregated consensus error $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_k\|^2]$.

Lemma 4.1 presents a way to upper bound the desired stationarity measure based on (32).

Lemma 4.1. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2] &\leq \frac{4m}{(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t})\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{4L_{\text{F}}^2 (\|V\|^2 + 1)}{(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t} - \bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.11. □

Lemma 4.2 states that the terms in $\{\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_j}]\}_{j=0}^T$ are bounded for any given $T \geq 0$ if the stepsize α is chosen properly. Such a result helps decouple the right-hand-side of (33), which involves the summation of $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_j}]$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, T$ due to (28).

Lemma 4.2. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set α, γ , and m to satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|}, \frac{1-\beta^2}{\mathcal{T}_3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{0,m}^2}{600m}}, \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{294(D_2+1)\mathcal{T}_2}, \frac{1}{144m\mathcal{T}_2}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{114C_0} \sqrt{\frac{n}{K}}, \left(\frac{1-\beta^2}{5460D_1^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2K} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}}, \left(\frac{n}{5460m^2D_2^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2L_{\text{F}}^2K} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} \right\}, \\ \gamma &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0(D_1^2+1)} \right\}, \quad m = \max \left\{ \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right\rceil, 432 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_j}] \leq \exp(1) \left[\mathcal{L}_0 + \frac{2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2}{7C_0} \right] =: \hat{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \forall 0 < j \leq T+1. \quad (34)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.12. □

Now we are ready to state the complexity result for the unified framework (43) in Theorem 4.1 below.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set α and γ to satisfy*

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|}, \frac{1-\beta^2}{\mathcal{T}_3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2}{600m}}, \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{294(D_2+1)\mathcal{T}_2}, \frac{1}{144m\mathcal{T}_2}, \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{24D_1L_F\sqrt{\|V\|^2+1}}, \frac{1}{114C_0}\sqrt{\frac{n}{K}}, \left(\frac{1-\beta^2}{5460D_1^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2K}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \left(\frac{n}{5460m^2D_2^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2L_F^2K}\right)^{\frac{1}{5}} \right\}, \\ \gamma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0(D_1^2+1)} \right\}, \quad m = \max \left\{ \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right\rceil, 432, \frac{5}{1-\beta} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1}F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{60\mathcal{L}_0}{\alpha K} \\ + 1452 \left(\frac{1}{mn} + \frac{12\alpha^2D_1^2\mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{11\alpha^4m^2D_2^2\mathcal{T}_2^2L_F^2}{n} \right) [5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)] \\ + 42\alpha^2L_F^2(\|V\|^2+1) \left(\frac{8m}{n} + \frac{48D_1^2+1}{1-\beta^2} \right) [5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)], \quad (35)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \leq \psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_0)) - \bar{\psi} + \frac{1}{L+\rho} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_0)\|^2 + \frac{6\|V^{-1}\|^2\mathcal{T}_2\|\Pi\mathbf{z}_0\|^2}{n}. \quad (36)$$

In addition, if we set

$$m = \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right\rceil + 432, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{4[\rho+L+(D_1^2+1)C_0]}, \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{114(C_0+L)\sqrt{\frac{K}{n}}+\eta} \\ \eta = \sqrt{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8+3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2+1)} + 2\sqrt{2}m\|V\|\mathcal{T}_1 + \frac{\mathcal{T}_3}{1-\beta^2} \sqrt{\frac{600m}{\beta_{0:m}^2}} + 144m\mathcal{T}_2 \\ + \frac{294(D_2+1)\mathcal{T}_2}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}} + 24D_1L_F\sqrt{\|V\|^2+1} + \left(\frac{5460D_1^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2K}{1-\beta^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} + \left(\frac{5460m^2D_2^2C_0\mathcal{T}_2^2L_F^2K}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{5}}, \quad (37)$$

then

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1}F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1+\|V\|D_1}{\sqrt{nK}} + \frac{D_1\|V\|}{\sqrt{1-\beta}(nK^3)^{1/4}} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{(D_2+D_1)\|V\|}{\sqrt{1-\beta}K} + \left(\frac{D_1^2\|V\|^2}{(1-\beta)K^2}\right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{\|V\|^2D_1^2D_2^2}{n^2K^3}\right)^{1/5} + \frac{n}{(1-\beta)K} + \frac{D_2^2\|V\|^2}{K} \right). \quad (38)$$

Proof. See Appendix B.13. □

For comparison purpose, we also present the complexity result for the centralized Normal Map-based Stochastic Gradient Descent method (norM-CSGD, Algorithm 3) in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1 hold. Set α , γ , and m to satisfy*

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{16mL_F}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{64mC_0\gamma^{-1}}}, \frac{1}{114C_0} \sqrt{\frac{n}{K}}, \left(\frac{1}{5460C_0L_F^2K} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \left(\frac{n}{5460m^2C_0L_F^4K} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} \right\},$$

$$\gamma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4(\rho+L)}, \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\rho}, \frac{1}{4C_0} \right\}, \quad m = \max \left\{ 432, \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right\rceil \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_k)\|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK}} + \frac{1}{K^{2/3}} + \frac{1}{(n^2K^3)^{1/5}} + \frac{1}{K} \right).$$

Remark 4.1. *Intuitively, having n agents computing the stochastic gradients in parallel reduces the variance, thereby accelerating the convergence. The proof is similar to the derivation of Theorem 4.1 without the consensus error terms and is omitted here. It is worth noting that the convergence rate of centralized Prox-SGD is also $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{nK})$ based on the result in [27].*

In what follows, we state the convergence guarantees for norM-DSGT and norM-ED. In particular, we not only demonstrate that the proposed algorithms enjoy $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{nK})$ rate of convergence when K is large enough, but also establish the transient times (defined in (39)) required for norM-DSGT and norM-ED to achieve convergence rates comparable to norM-CSGD, respectively. The proof is straightforward once we specify the choices of A , B , and C in Theorem 4.1.

$$K_{\text{Transient}}^{(\text{NCVX})} := \inf_K \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,t})\|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nk}} \right), \forall k \geq K \right\} \quad (39)$$

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 4.1 hold. Let $A = W$, $B = I - W$, and $C = W$. Then,*

$$\|V\|^2 \leq 3, \quad \|V^{-1}\|^2 \leq 9, \quad D_1^2 \leq 9, \quad D_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{(1-\lambda)^2}, \quad \beta = \lambda.$$

The iterates generated by norM-DSGT satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \right] &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\lambda}(nK^3)^{1/4}} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{1}{(1-\lambda)^2 K} + \left(\frac{1}{(1-\lambda)K^2} \right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{1}{n^2(1-\lambda)^2K^3} \right)^{1/5} + \frac{n}{(1-\lambda)K} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The transient time of norM-DSGT is given by

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{n^3}{(1-\lambda)^2}, \frac{n}{(1-\lambda)^4} \right\} \right).$$

Remark 4.2. *When the problem of interest is smooth, i.e., the term $\varphi(x) \equiv 0$, the transient time of DSGT behaves as $\mathcal{O}(\max\{n^3/(1-\lambda)^2, n/(1-\lambda)^{8/3}\})$ [3]. For ring networks, such a result becomes $\mathcal{O}(n^7)$ for DSGT and $\mathcal{O}(n^9)$ for norM-DSGT. The transient time of norM-DSGT is slightly worse compared to its non-proximal counterpart, but it beats the previous result in [47].*

Next, we show the same transient time for norM-ED compared to its non-proximal counterpart [18, 3], stated in Corollary 4.4.

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 4.1 hold and assume further that W is positive semi-definite⁴. Let $A = W$, $B = (I - W)^{1/2}$, and $C = I$. Then,*

$$\|V\|^2 \leq 4, \quad \|V^{-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\lambda}, \quad D_1^2 \leq 1, \quad D_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda}, \quad \beta = \sqrt{\lambda},$$

⁴We can choose $(I + W)/2$ as the mixing matrix that is positive semi-definite for any symmetric doubly stochastic matrix W .




Figure 2: Illustration of ring graph topology with $n = 16$.

where $\underline{\lambda}$ is the minimum non-zero eigenvalue of W .

The iterates generated by *norM-ED* satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \right] &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \lambda(nK^3)^{1/4}}} \right. \\ &\left. + \left(\frac{1}{(1 - \beta)K^2} \right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{1}{n^2(1 - \lambda)K^3} \right)^{1/5} + \frac{n}{(1 - \lambda)K} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The transient time of *norM-ED* is thus given by

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n^3}{(1 - \lambda)^2} \right).$$

5 Simulation Results

This section presents two numerical examples that illustrate the superior performance of *norM-ED* and *norM-DSGT* in comparison to existing methods over a ring graph (Figure 2). Both normal map-based and Prox-SGD type methods utilize the same stochastic oracle to output stochastic gradients and apply the proximal operator once per iteration. Regarding the data distribution, we consider the heterogeneous setting, i.e., the samples are first sorted by their labels and then partitioned among the agents.

5.1 Sparse Binary Classification

We first evaluate the algorithms on a sparse nonconvex binary classification problem (42) following that in [33, 32] to validate the theoretical findings. The experiment uses the MNIST dataset [25], extracting handwritten digits 2 and 6 as the training samples. The optimization problem is formulated as follows:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \psi(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{S}_i|} [1 - \tanh(b_{ij} \cdot a_{ij}^\top x)] + \nu \|x\|_1, \quad (42)$$

where \mathcal{S}_i is the local dataset of agent i , $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the j -th training sample, and $b_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the associated label of agent i . The hyperbolic tangent function, $\tanh(x)$, is defined as $\tanh(x) := [e^x - e^{-x}] / [e^x + e^{-x}]$. We set $\nu = 0.01$ in the simulations.

We compare *norM-ED* and *norM-DSGT* with Prox-DASA, Prox-DASA-GT in [47], and the benchmark methods *norM-CSGD* and Prox-CSGD in Figure 3 to highlight the enhanced performance of the proposed methods. The term “stationarity” stands for $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2$ for the distributed methods and $\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_k)\|^2$ for *norM-CSGD* and Prox-CSGD. It can be seen that both *norM-ED* and *norM-DSGT* outperform Prox-DASA and Prox-DASA-GT, indicating their enhanced transient times. Notably, *norM-ED* shows better performance than *norM-DSGT* as the number of agents increases (corresponding to a smaller $1 - \lambda$ and thereby a sparser network). Such a phenomenon corroborates the theoretical findings in Section 4, where *norM-ED* enjoys shorter transient time compared to *norM-DSGT*. The fluctuations for *norM-ED* shown in Figure 3 are attributed to the decaying stepsizes, which stabilize as the algorithm progresses.




Figure 3: Comparison among norM-ED, norM-DSGT, norM-CSGD, Prox-CSGD, Prox-DASA, and Prox-DASA-GT for solving Problem (42) on the MNIST dataset. For all the methods, the stepsizes are sequentially set as $1/40$, $1/200$, and $1/1000$, and the proximal parameter γ is set as 0.1 . The results are averaged over 10 repeated experiments.

5.2 Neural Network

In this part, we compare the performance of the aforementioned algorithms on a multi-class image classification task using the MNIST dataset over ring networks. The stationarity measures stay the same as in Subsection 5.1. The objective is to train a one-hidden-layer neural network with the sigmoid activation function and the elastic network [55] regularizer $\varphi(x) = \nu_1 \|x\|_1 + \nu_2 \|x\|_2^2$. Here, the parameters $\nu_1 = 0.001$ and $\nu_2 = 0.005$. Such a problem aligns with the structure of Problem (1).

Figure 4 highlights the enhanced performance of norM-ED and norM-DSGT compared to previous works. In particular, the proposed methods outperform the Prox-SGD type distributed optimization methods and demonstrate comparable convergence to centralized algorithms. Among the proposed methods, norM-ED outperforms norM-DSGT, especially when the number of agents increases. This behavior aligns with the theoretical findings, i.e., norM-ED enjoys shorter transient time compared to norM-DSGT.




Figure 4: Comparison among norM-ED, norM-DSGT, norM-CSGD, Prox-CSGD, Prox-DASA, and Prox-DASA-GT for training a neural network on the MNIST dataset. For all the methods, the stepsizes are sequentially set as $1/70$, $1/140$, and $1/400$, and the proximal parameter γ is set as 0.02 . The results are averaged over 5 repeated experiments.

6 Conclusions

This paper addresses the distributed stochastic composite optimization problem over networked agents. To solve the considered problem, we introduce a unified algorithmic framework, norM-SABC-2, that leverages the normal map update scheme. Within this framework, we propose two novel algorithms, Normal Map-based Distributed Stochastic Gradient Tracking (norM-DSGT) and Normal Map-based Exact Diffusion (norM-ED). Both algorithms asymptotically achieve network independent convergence rate comparable to a centralized method and demonstrate superior transient times under a general variance condition. In particular, norM-ED matches the transient time of the non-proximal ED algorithm. Such a result is state-of-the-art for solving the considered problem to our knowledge. The norM-DSGT method shortens the transient time compared to previous distributed proximal gradient tracking based methods. Experimental results corroborate the theoretical findings and suggest that norM-DSGT can behave more stable than norM-ED under decaying stepsizes. Additionally, the employed multi-step analysis is of independent interest which may inspire further advancements in distributed optimization algorithms, particularly when utilizing the random reshuffling strategy for sampling stochastic gradients and dealing with time-varying networks.

7 Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Andre Milzarek and Junwen Qiu from The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen (CUHK-Shenzhen) for providing insightful discussions about normal map.

A norM-CSGD

Algorithm 3 A Normal Map-based Centralized Stochastic Gradient Descent (norM-CSGD)

- 1: Initialize $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ for the server, determine $W = [w_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, stepsize α_k and parameter γ .
 - 2: Calculate $x_0 = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_0)$.
 - 3: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 4: Server sends x_k to all the agent.
 - 5: **for** Agent $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ in parallel **do**
 - 6: Acquires a stochastic gradient $g_{i,k} = g_i(x_k; \xi_{i,k}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and sends to the server.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Server receives $g_{i,k}$ from all the agents and aggregate $\bar{g}_k = \sum_{i=1}^n g_{i,k}/n$.
 - 9: Server updates $z_{k+1} = z_k - \alpha[\bar{g}_k + \gamma^{-1}(z_k - x_k)]$ and $x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{k+1})$.
 - 10: **end for**
-

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

According to Assumptions 1.4 and 2.1, the update (8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{z}_{k+1} &= (AC - B^2) \mathbf{z}_k - \alpha A [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_k) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top) + \mathbf{g}_k - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_k)] - \mathbf{d}'_k, \\
 \mathbf{x}_{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\mathbf{z}_{k+1}), \\
 \mathbf{d}'_{k+1} &= \mathbf{d}'_k + B^2 \mathbf{z}_k + \alpha A [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{k+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)],
 \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $\mathbf{d}'_k := B(\mathbf{d}_k - B\mathbf{z}_k) + \alpha A \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_k^\top)$. Invoking the eigenvalue decomposition of W in (13) and the forms of matrices A , B , and C lead to the desired results (14a) and (14b). The details can refer to [20, Appendix II.B] and are omitted here.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3.2

We first introduce Lemma B.1 ([28, (8)]), which states the nonexpansive property of $\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\cdot)$ under Assumption 1.2.

Lemma B.1. *Let Assumption 1.2 hold. Set $\gamma \in (0, \rho^{-1})$. We have for all $w, v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ that*

1. $\langle w - v, \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(w) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(v) \rangle \geq (1 - \gamma\rho) \|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(w) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(v)\|^2$, and

$$2. \|w - v\| \geq (1 - \gamma\rho) \|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(w) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(v)\|.$$

Based on Lemma B.1, we have for any $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and L -smooth f that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z')\| &= \left\| \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) + \frac{1}{\gamma}(z - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) - \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z')) - \frac{1}{\gamma}(z' - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z')) \right\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z)) - \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z'))\| + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|z - z'\| + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z')\| \\ &\leq \left(L + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z')\| + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|z - z'\| \\ &\leq \left[\frac{(L + 1/\gamma)}{1 - \gamma\rho} + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right] \|z - z'\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked Lemma B.1 in the last inequality. Since f_i is L -smooth under Assumption 1.1, the above argument also applies to $F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(\cdot)$.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3.3

From the descent lemma, we have for all $k \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\bar{x}_k) - f^* &\leq f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - f^* + \langle \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)), \bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - f^* + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k))\|^2 + L \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq 2[f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) - f^*] + L \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where the last inequality holds due to $\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \leq 2L(f(x) - f^*)$ under Assumption 1.1.

B.4 Proof of Lemma 3.4

Recall that $x_{i,k} = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k})$ for any $k \geq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \|\Pi \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k}) \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k}) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 - \left\| \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,k}) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_k\|^2 - \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where we invoked Lemma B.1 in the last inequality. Letting $\gamma < (2 - \sqrt{2})/(2\rho)$ yields the desired result (17).

B.5 Proof of Lemma 3.5

We denote $L_{\text{nat}} := 1 + (1 + \gamma L)/(1 - \gamma\rho) = \gamma L_F$. Then, $F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(\cdot)$ is L_{nat} -Lipschitz continuous under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x) - F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x')\| &\leq \|x - x'\| + \frac{1}{1 - \gamma\rho} \|x - x' - \gamma(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x'))\| \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1 + \gamma L}{1 - \gamma\rho}\right) \|x - x'\| = L_{\text{nat}} \|x - x'\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, relation (18) becomes

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \leq \frac{2L_{\text{nat}}^2}{n\gamma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,k} - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 + \frac{2}{(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2, \quad \forall \bar{z}_k \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad (46)$$

where the inequality holds by noting that

$$F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)) = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k - \gamma F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)).$$

We also have from Lemma 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,k} - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \|\Pi \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \|\bar{x}_k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Substituting (47) into (46) leads to the desired result.

B.6 Proof of Lemma 3.6

We have from (14a) that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{z}_{k_2} &= \bar{z}_{k_1} - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p) - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_{i,p}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p)] + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - g_{i,p}] \\ &= \bar{z}_{k_1} - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \alpha [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p)] - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n\gamma} [\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,p})] \\ &\quad - \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - g_{i,p}], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the following relation is applied:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_{i,p}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p)] &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,p})) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\bar{z}_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,p}) \right) \\ &\quad - \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p)) - \frac{1}{\gamma} [\bar{z}_p - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p)]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The proof for (24) is straightforward by unrolling the update in (14b).

B.7 Proof of Lemma 3.7

The proof proceeds in three steps and is inspired by those in [32, 28, 39]. For simplicity, we denote $\underline{x}_k := \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)$ for $k \geq 0$.

In the first two steps, we derive the recursion for $\psi(\underline{x}_k)$ and $\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2$, respectively. The last step constructs the Lyapunov function \mathcal{H}_k based on these results.

Step I: Obtaining the recursion for $\psi(\underline{x}_{k_2})$. Due to Assumption 1.2 that φ is ρ -weakly convex, we have for any $x, x' \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$ and any $v \in \partial\varphi(x')$ that

$$\varphi(x) \geq \varphi(x') + \langle v, x - x' \rangle - \frac{\rho}{2} \|x - x'\|^2. \quad (50)$$

Note that $\gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_2}) \in \partial\varphi(\underline{x}_{k_2})$. For any $k_2 > k_1 \geq 0$, setting $x' = \underline{x}_{k_2}$, $x = \underline{x}_{k_1}$, and $v = \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_2})$ in (50) leads to

$$\varphi(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \varphi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) \leq -\gamma^{-1} \langle \bar{z}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_2}, \underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2} \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2. \quad (51)$$

Based on $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) = \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_1})$ and Assumption 1.1 that f is L -smooth, we have

$$f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) \leq f(\underline{x}_{k_1}) + \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle - \gamma^{-1} \langle \bar{z}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_1}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2. \quad (52)$$

Combining (51) and (52) yields

$$\psi(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) \leq \left(\frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2 + \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle + \gamma^{-1} \langle \bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle. \quad (53)$$

Step II: Deriving the recursion for $\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_2})\|^2$. According to the definition of $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(z)$ in (5) and the update (23), we have

$$F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_2}) = \left(1 - \frac{m\alpha}{\gamma} \right) F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \gamma^{-1}(\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}e_{k_1:k_2}. \quad (54)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_2})\|^2 &= \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right)^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \|\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \|\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right) \left\langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \frac{\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}}{\gamma} + \frac{e_{k_1:k_2}}{\gamma} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\gamma^2} \langle \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})] - (\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}), e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{\gamma} \langle \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1}), \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right)^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \left(L + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right)^2 \|\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right) \left\langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \frac{\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}}{\gamma} + \frac{e_{k_1:k_2}}{\gamma} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\gamma^2} \langle \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})] - (\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}), e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where we applied the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and invoked the L -smoothness of f in the last inequality.

Step III: Obtaining the recursion for \mathcal{H}_{k_2} . Substituting (55) and (53) into (22) and rearranging it yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{k_2} &\leq \psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi} + \left[\left(\frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 \gamma}{2} \left(L + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right] \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2 + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{2\gamma} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma \mathcal{C}_0}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right)^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} \langle \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})], e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) - \mathcal{C}_0 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right) F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} e_{k_1:k_2}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \mathcal{C}_0 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})] + e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

According to (23), we have $e_{k_1:k_2} - \alpha m F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) = \bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}$ and $F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) = (\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_{k_2} + e_{k_1:k_2})/(\alpha m)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) - \mathcal{C}_0 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma} \right) F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} e_{k_1:k_2} \\ &= (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) - \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} [e_{k_1:k_2} - \alpha m F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})] \\ &= (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1})] \\ &= (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) \left[\frac{\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_{k_2}}{\alpha m} + \frac{e_{k_1:k_2}}{\alpha m} + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) \right] \\ &= (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha m} \right) (\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) + \frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{\alpha m} e_{k_1:k_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Recall that $\underline{x}_k = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)$. We have from Lemma B.1 that

$$-\langle \bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \rangle \leq -(1 - \gamma\rho) \|\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2. \quad (58)$$

Combining (57) and (58), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) + \gamma^{-1}(\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}) - \mathcal{C}_0 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{\gamma}\right) F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} e_{k_1:k_2}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \right\rangle \\
 &= - \left\langle (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha m} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) (\bar{z}_{k_2} - \bar{z}_{k_1}), \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{\alpha m} e_{k_1:k_2}, \underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1} \right\rangle \\
 &\leq \left[\frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{4\alpha m} - (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha m} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) (1 - \gamma\rho) \right] \|\underline{x}_{k_2} - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{\alpha m} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where we invoked Young's inequality in the last step.

For the remaining inner products in (56), we have from Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{\gamma} \langle \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})], e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle &\leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{2L} \|\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 L}{2} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \\
 &\leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 L}{2} (\|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2 + \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}), \gamma [\nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_2}) - \nabla f(\underline{x}_{k_1})] + e_{k_1:k_2} \rangle \\
 &\leq \frac{\alpha m}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^2 L^2}{\alpha m} \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha m} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi_0 &:= \frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{4\alpha m} - (1 - \mathcal{C}_0) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha m} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) (1 - \gamma\rho) + \left(\frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 \gamma}{2} \left(L + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)^2 \\
 &\quad + \frac{\gamma^2 L^2 \mathcal{C}_0 (1 - \alpha m / \gamma)}{\alpha m} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 L}{2} \\
 &= - \frac{(1 - \mathcal{C}_0)(3 - 4\gamma\rho) - 4\gamma^2 L^2 \mathcal{C}_0}{4\alpha m} + \mathcal{C}_0 \left(\frac{\gamma\rho - 1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2\gamma} - \gamma L^2 + \frac{3L}{2} + \frac{\gamma L^2}{2}\right) + \frac{1 - \gamma\rho}{\gamma} + \frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \\
 &= - \frac{3 - 4\gamma\rho}{4\alpha m} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 (3 - 4\gamma\rho + 4\gamma^2 L^2)}{4\alpha m} + \mathcal{C}_0 \left(\rho - \frac{1}{2\gamma} + \frac{3L}{2} - \frac{\gamma L^2}{2}\right) + \frac{L - \rho}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{C}_0 = \frac{3 - 4\gamma\rho}{2(3 - 4\gamma\rho + 4\gamma^2 L^2)}$ and $\gamma \leq 1/[4(\rho + L)]$. We have $\mathcal{C}_0 < 1/2$. Substituting (59)-(61) and the expression of χ_0 into (56) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{H}_{k_2} &< \mathcal{H}_{k_1} + \left[-\frac{1}{4\alpha m} + \frac{5L}{4}\right] \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2 + \left[\frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{2\gamma} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0(1 - \alpha m / \gamma)}{\alpha m} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 L}{2} + \frac{1 - \mathcal{C}_0}{\alpha m}\right] \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \alpha m \mathcal{C}_0 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha m}{2\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha m}{2\gamma}\right) \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 &\leq \mathcal{H}_{k_1} - \frac{\alpha m \mathcal{C}_0}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha m} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 - \frac{1}{8\alpha m} \|\underline{x}_{k_1} - \underline{x}_{k_2}\|^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\alpha m \leq 1/(10L)$.

B.8 Proof of Lemma 3.8

The proof is divided into five steps. The first step outlines the roadmap, identifying three key components necessary to establish the desired result (see (65)). The subsequent three steps address these components individually. Specifically, **Step II** presents bounds for two variance terms (see (72) and (73)); **Step III** and **Step IV** derive bounds for the summation terms (see (76) and (83), respectively). Finally, **Step V** combines these components to obtain the desired result.

Step I: Exploring components that bound $\mathbb{E}[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$. We first explore the ingredients that help bound the term $\mathbb{E}[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$.

Noting that $k_2 - k_1 = m$, we have from (25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 &\leq \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} 4\alpha^2 m \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_p)\|^2 + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{4\alpha^2 m}{n\gamma^2} \|\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p) - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(z_{i,p})\|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} 4\alpha^2 m \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] \right\|^2 + 4 \left\| \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - g_{i,p}] \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The term $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] \right\|^2$ can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] \right\|^2 &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,p}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_p) + \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_p) - \nabla f_i(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p))] \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2L^2}{n} \|\Pi \mathbf{x}_p\|^2 + 2L^2 \|\bar{x}_p - \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_p)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2L^2}{n(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where the last inequality holds due to (16).

Substituting (64) into (63) and invoking Lemma B.1 lead to

$$\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \leq \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} 4\alpha^2 m L_F^2 \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{4\alpha^2 m (\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2)}{n(1-\gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 + 4s_{k_1:k_2}^2, \quad \forall k_1 < k_2, \quad (65)$$

where $s_{k_1:k_2}^2 := \left\| \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}] \right\|^2$.

Step II: Bounding two variance terms. In this step, we bound the two variance terms $s_{k_1:p}^2 := \left\| \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha}{n} [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}] \right\|^2$ and $s_{k_1:p}^2 := \left\| \alpha \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \Gamma^{p-1-q} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_q - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_q)] \right\|^2$ for any integer $k_1 < p \leq k_2$. Here, we define $[V^{-1}]_l$ as the first $(n-1)$ columns of V^{-1} . Notably, $\mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$ appears in (65). To deal with the consensus error $\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2$ that appears in the second term in (65), we bound $\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2$ due to $\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 \leq \|V\|^2 \|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2, \forall k_1 < p \leq k_2$. Such a step requires bounding $\mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$ according to (24).

We first bound the term $\mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &= \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 2 \sum_{k_1 \leq q < j \leq p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}], \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,j}) - g_{i,j}] \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}_{k_1} \subset \mathcal{F}_q \subset \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathbb{E}[\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - g_{i,k} | \mathcal{F}_k] = \mathbf{0}$ for any $k \geq 0$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$ based on Assumption 1.3. We have from the tower property that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}], \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,j}) - g_{i,j}] \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}], \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x_{i,j}) - g_{i,j}] \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_j \right] \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Substituting (67) into (66) and noting that the stochastic gradients are independent across different agents (Assumption 1.3) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &= \frac{\alpha^2}{n^2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_q \right] | \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha^2}{n^2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [C_0 [f_i(x_{i,q}) - f_i^*] + \sigma^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}].\end{aligned}\tag{68}$$

According to Assumption 1.1 that each f_i is L -smooth, we have from the descent lemma that

$$\begin{aligned}f_i(x_{i,q}) - f_i^* &\leq f_i(\bar{x}_q) - f_i^* + \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_q), x_{i,q} - \bar{x}_q \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_{i,q} - \bar{x}_q\|^2 \\ &\leq f_i(\bar{x}_q) - f_i^* + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f_i(\bar{x}_q)\|^2 + L \|x_{i,q} - \bar{x}_q\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 [f_i(\bar{x}_q) - f_i^*] + L \|x_{i,q} - \bar{x}_q\|^2, \quad \forall q > 0,\end{aligned}\tag{69}$$

where the last inequality comes from $\|\nabla f_i(x)\|^2 \leq 2L(f_i(x) - f_i^*)$. Taking the average on both sides of (69) among $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, invoking Lemma 3.3 and (16) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [f_i(x_{i,q}) - f_i^*] &\leq 2 [f(\bar{x}_q) - f^*] + 2\sigma_f^* + \frac{L}{n} \|\Pi \mathbf{x}_q\|^2 \\ &\leq 4 [\psi(\underline{x}_q) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{4L}{n} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 + 2\sigma_f^*,\end{aligned}\tag{70}$$

where $\sigma_f^* = f^* - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^*/n$.

Recall that $\underline{x}_k = \text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_k)$ for any $k \geq 0$. Similar to the derivations in (53), we have for $k_2 \geq q > k_1$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\underline{x}_q) - \psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) &\leq \left(\frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \|\underline{x}_q - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\underline{x}_q - \underline{x}_{k_1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma^{-1} \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\| \|\underline{x}_q - \underline{x}_{k_1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma\rho} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{1 - \gamma\rho} \left(\frac{\rho + L}{2} - \frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \right] \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2,\end{aligned}\tag{71}$$

where we invoked the nonexpansiveness of the proximal operator in Lemma B.1 for the second last inequality, and applied $\gamma \leq \min\{1/[4(\rho + L)], (2 - \sqrt{2})/(2\rho)\}$ in the last inequality.

Substituting (70) and (71) into (68), we have for any integer $k_1 < p \leq k_2$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &\leq \frac{4\alpha^2 C_0 (p - k_1)}{n} [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{4\alpha^2 C_0}{n\gamma} \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\alpha^2 C_0 L}{n^2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] + \frac{2\alpha^2 C_0 \gamma (p - k_1)}{n} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 (p - k_1) (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)}{n}.\end{aligned}\tag{72}$$

We next bound the term $\mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$. Similar to the derivations in (67), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &= \alpha^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Gamma^{p-1-q} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_q - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_q)] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\leq \alpha^2 \|V^{-1}\|^2 \left\| \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top \right\|^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(x_{i,q}) - g_{i,q}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\leq 4\alpha^2 n C_0 D_1^2 \beta_{0:p-k_1}^2 [\psi(\underline{\mathbf{x}}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + 4\alpha^2 n C_0 \gamma^{-1} D_1^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\quad + 2\alpha^2 n C_0 D_1^2 \gamma \beta_{0:p-k_1}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1})\|^2 + 4\alpha^2 C_0 L D_1^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha^2 n D_1^2 \beta_{0:p-k_1}^2 (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where $D_1^2 = \|V^{-1}\|^2 \|\hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top\|^2$ and $\beta_{0:p-k_1}^2 := \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} = \sum_{t=0}^{p-k_1-1} \beta^{2t}$.

Step III: Bounding $\sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$.

Note that (65) also holds for any integer $k_1 < p \leq k_2$. Then, according to $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_p = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \alpha(p - k_1)F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1}) + e_{k_1:p}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq 2 \left\{ \alpha^2 (p - k_1)^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1})\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\|e_{k_1:p}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \right\} \tag{74}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq 2(p - k_1)^2 \alpha^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1})\|^2 + 8\alpha^2 (p - k_1) \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} L_{\text{F}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \frac{8\alpha^2 (p - k_1) (\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2)}{n(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + 8\mathbb{E} [s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}].
 \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

Summing on both sides of (75) from $p = k_1$ to $k_2 - 1$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &\leq \alpha^2 m^3 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1})\|^2 + 4\alpha^2 m^2 L_{\text{F}}^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 &\quad + \frac{8\alpha^2 m^2 (\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2)}{n} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + 8 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [s_{k_1:p}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}].
 \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Step IV: Bounding $\sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$.

Note that

$$\sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \left\| \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{q+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}_q^\top) \right\|^2 \leq n L_{\text{F}}^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{q+1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_q\|^2 \right], \tag{77}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{q+1} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_q &= -\alpha F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1}) + \alpha [F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k_1}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_q)] - \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{i,\text{nor}}^\gamma(z_{i,q}) - F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_q)] \\
 &\quad - \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})].
 \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Invoking (49) and (64) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \|\bar{z}_{q+1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 &\leq \alpha^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \alpha^2 L_F^2 \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{2\alpha^2(2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})}{n(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 + \alpha^2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})] \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Then, we have from (24) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &\leq 3\beta^{2(p-k_1)} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{s}_{k_1:p}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 3\alpha^2 (p - k_1) \|V^{-1}\|^2 \left\| \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top \right\|^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_q) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_q^\top)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 3\alpha^2 (p - k_1) \|V^{-1}\|^2 \left\| \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top \right\|^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{q+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_q^\top)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &\leq 3\beta^{2(p-k_1)} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 3\alpha^2 (p - k_1) L_F^2 \left[D_1^2 + \frac{8\alpha^2 D_2^2 (2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})}{(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \right] \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 12\alpha^4 n (p - k_1) D_2^2 L_F^2 \beta_{0:p-k_1}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{s}_{k_1:p}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 12\alpha^4 n (p - k_1) D_2^2 L_F^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 12\alpha^4 n L_F^4 (p - k_1) D_2^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_q - \bar{z}_{k_1}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right], \quad \forall k_1 < p \leq k_2, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where $D_2^2 = \|V^{-1}\|^2 \|\hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top\|^2$.

Note that $\beta < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} (p - k_1) \sum_{q=k_1}^{p-1} \beta^{2(p-1-q)} a_q &\leq \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} (p - k_1) \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} a_q \leq \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} a_q, \quad \forall a_q \geq 0, \\ \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \beta_{0:(p-k_1)}^2 &= \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{(1 - \beta^{2(p-k_1)})}{1 - \beta^2} \leq \frac{m}{1 - \beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Summing on both sides of (81) from $p = k_1 + 1$ to $k_2 - 1$ and invoking (82) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] &= \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \sum_{p=k_1+1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq 3\beta_{0:m}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 3 \sum_{p=k_1+1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{s}_{k_1:p}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 6\alpha^4 m^2 n D_2^2 L_F^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 6\alpha^4 m^2 n D_2^2 L_F^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\ &+ 6\alpha^4 m^2 n L_F^4 D_2^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_q - \bar{z}_{k_1}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 m^2 L_F^2 \left[D_1^2 + \frac{8\alpha^2 D_2^2 (2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})}{(1 - \gamma\rho)^2} \right] \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

where $\beta_{0:m}^2 = \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \beta^{2t}$.

Step V: Bounding $\mathbb{E}[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$. In this step, we combine the ingredients derived in **Step II-Step IV** to obtain the desired result.

Note that $\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 \leq \|V\|^2 \|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2$ for any $p > 0$. Combining (83) and (76) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{3\beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{3}{n} \sum_{p=k_1+1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[s_{k_1:p}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 & + \alpha^2 m^3 \left(1 + \frac{6\alpha^2 L_F^2 D_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{m} \right) \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 8 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[s_{k_1:p}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 & + 2\alpha^2 m^2 \|V\|^2 \left[D_1^2 L_F^2 + 4(\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2) (1 + 3\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2) \right] \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 & + 2\alpha^2 m^2 L_F^2 (3\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 + 2) \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 & + 6\alpha^4 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Similar to the derivations in (66)-(68), the last term in (84) can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,q} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,q})] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{4mC_0}{n} [\psi(\mathbf{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{2mC_0\gamma}{n} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 & + \frac{4C_0}{n\gamma} \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \frac{4C_0L}{n^2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \frac{(2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)m}{n}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Substituting (72), (73), and (85) into (84) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \chi_1 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \chi_2 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{3\beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 \\
 & + 4\alpha^2 m C_0 \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) [\psi(\mathbf{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] \\
 & + \alpha^2 m^3 \left(1 + \frac{6\alpha^2 L_F^2 D_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{m} + 8C_0\gamma + 6\gamma C_0 D_1^2 + \frac{12\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 C_0\gamma}{n} \right) \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 & + \alpha^2 m \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi_1 & := 1 - 2\alpha^2 m^2 L_F^2 \left[3\alpha^2 D_2^2 \left(L_F^2 + \frac{4C_0}{n\gamma} \right) + 2 \right] - 4\alpha^2 m C_0 \gamma^{-1} \left(\frac{8}{n} + 3D_1^2 \right) \\
 \chi_2 & := 1 - 2\alpha^2 m^2 \|V\|^2 \left[D_1^2 L_F^2 + \frac{12\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 C_0 L}{n} + 4(\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2) (1 + 3\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2) \right] \\
 & - 4\alpha^2 m C_0 L \|V\|^2 \left(\frac{8}{n} + 3D_1^2 \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

We determine the parameters α and γ such that $\chi_1 \geq 1/2$ and $\chi_2 \geq 1/2$. It suffices to have

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{3D_2 L_F}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}mL_F}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{16mC_0\gamma^{-1}(8 + 3D_1^2)(\|V\|^2 + 1)}}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}m\mathcal{T}_1\|V\|} \right\}, \quad \gamma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2C_0}, \frac{1}{2L} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1^2 = (D_1^2 + 1)L_F^2 + 16(\gamma^{-2} + 2L^2)/3 + 4C_0L/(3n)$.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{6\beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 \\
 & + 8\alpha^2 m C_0 \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] \\
 & + 12\alpha^2 m^3 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 2\alpha^2 m \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

where we applied $\gamma \leq 1/[4C_0(D_1^2 + 1)]$ and invoked the choice of α in the last inequality.

Note that $\gamma \leq 1/(2L)$. Denote $\mathcal{T}_2^2 := L_F^2 + 2(2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})\|V\|^2 + 4C_0L\|V\|^2 + 4C_0\gamma^{-1}$. Taking conditional expectation on both sides of (65) and substituting (72) into it lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\|e_{k_1:k_2}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] & \leq 4\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \right\} \\
 & + \frac{16\alpha^2 m C_0}{n} [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{8\alpha^2 m C_0 \gamma}{n} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)}{n}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Substituting (88) into (89) leads to the desired result (27).

B.9 Proof of Lemma 3.9

According to (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{u}_{k_2}\|^2 & \leq \|\Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + 2 \left\| \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} V^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_p) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. - \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{p+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right) \right\|^2 \\
 & + 2 \left\| \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_p - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p)] \right\|^2 \\
 & + 2 \left\langle \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}, \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} V^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_p) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. - \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{p+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right) \right\rangle \\
 & + 2 \left\langle \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}, \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_p - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p)] \right\rangle.
 \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p) - \mathbf{g}_p | \mathcal{F}_p] = \mathbf{0}$ based on Assumption 1.3. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}, \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{g}_p - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p)] \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \\
 & = \left\langle \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}, \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_p - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_p) | \mathcal{F}_p] | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \right\rangle = 0,
 \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where we invoked the tower property that $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}_{k_1}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}_p]|\mathcal{F}_{k_1}]$ for $p > k_1$. For the other inner products in (90), we have from Young's inequality and (77) that for any constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 2 \left\langle \Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}, \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} V^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_p) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \\ \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{p+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \end{array} \right) \right\rangle \\
 & \leq c \|\Gamma^{k_2-k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{c} \left\| \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_l \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{z}_p) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right\|^2 \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{c} \left\| \alpha \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \Gamma^{k_2-1-p} [V^{-1}]_r \hat{\Lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\Lambda}_a \hat{U}^\top [\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_{p+1}^\top) - \mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\mathbf{1}\bar{z}_p^\top)] \right\|^2 \\
 & \leq c\beta^{2m} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 m L_F^2 [D_1^2 + 8\alpha^2 D_2^2 (2L^2 + \gamma^{-2})]}{c} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 + \frac{4\alpha^4 m n D_2^2 L_F^4}{c} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 \\
 & \quad + \frac{4\alpha^4 m n D_2^2 L_F^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{c} \|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + \frac{4\alpha^4 m n D_2^2 L_F^2}{c} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \beta^{2(k_2-1-p)} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,p} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,p})] \right\|^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where $[V^{-1}]_r$ denotes the last $(n-1)$ columns of V^{-1} .

Similar to the derivations in (85), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \beta^{2(k_2-1-p)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_{i,p} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,p})] \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_1} \right] \leq \frac{4C_0 \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{2C_0 \gamma \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 & \quad + \frac{4C_0}{n\gamma} \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_q\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] + \frac{4C_0 L}{n^2} \sum_{q=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_q\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] + \frac{(2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \beta_{0:m}^2}{n}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Note that $\|\Pi \mathbf{z}_p\|^2 \leq \|V\|^2 \|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2$ for any $p > 0$. Combining (90)-(93), (73), and letting $c = (1 - \beta^{2m})/(2\beta^{2m})$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{u}_{k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] & \leq \frac{1 + \beta^{2m}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 m \|V\|^2 L_F^2 [D_1^2 + 8\alpha^2 D_2^2 (2L^2 + \gamma^{-2} + 2C_0 L)]}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \\
 & \quad + \frac{8\alpha^4 m n D_2^2 L_F^2 (L_F^2 + 2C_0 \gamma^{-1})}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] + \frac{8\alpha^4 m n D_2^2 L_F^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 (1 + 2C_0 \gamma)}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\
 & \quad + \frac{32\alpha^4 m D_2^2 L_F^2 C_0 \beta_{0:m}^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + \frac{8\alpha^4 m D_2^2 L_F^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)}{1 - \beta^{2m}} + 2\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{s}_{k_1:k_2}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \\
 & \leq \frac{1 + \beta^{2m}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 + \frac{8\alpha^2 m n [\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 (L_F^2 + 2C_0 \gamma^{-1}) + D_1^2 C_0 \gamma^{-1}]}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{z}_{k_1} - \bar{z}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \\
 & \quad + \frac{2\alpha^2 m \|V\|^2 [L_F^2 D_1^2 + 8\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2 (2L^2 + \gamma^{-2} + 2C_0 L) + 4D_1^2 C_0 L]}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \sum_{p=k_1}^{k_2-1} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{u}_p\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] \\
 & \quad + 4\alpha^2 n \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) \|\mathbf{F}_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 + 8\alpha^2 n C_0 \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] \\
 & \quad + 2\alpha^2 n \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2).
 \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

Letting $\alpha \leq 1/(3D_2 L_F)$ and $\gamma \leq 1/(2C_0 D_1^2)$ yields the desired result.

B.10 Proof of Lemma 3.10

Note that $[\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] \leq \mathcal{H}_{k_1}$ for any $k_1 \geq 0$ and $C_0 \geq 4/9$. Taking the conditional expectation on (26), substituting (27), and letting $\alpha \leq 1/(4\sqrt{6}m\mathcal{T}_2)$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}_{k_2} | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &\leq \left[1 + \frac{56\alpha C_0}{3n} + 96\alpha^3 m C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] \mathcal{H}_{k_1} + \frac{24\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{2\alpha m}{9} \left[1 - \frac{36}{m} (C_0 \gamma + 6\alpha^2 m^3 \mathcal{T}_2^2) \right] \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{4\alpha^2 m}{\alpha m} \left[\frac{13}{12n} + 6\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2). \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Denote

$$\chi_3 := \beta_{0:m}^2 \left(D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) + \frac{2\alpha^2 m^2 \mathcal{T}_3^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \left(\frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right).$$

Substituting (28) into (29) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_2}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k_1}] &\leq \left(\frac{1 + \beta^{2m}}{2} + \frac{12\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_3^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 4\alpha^2 n \beta_{0:m}^2 \left[D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^4 \mathcal{T}_3^2}{(1 - \beta^{2m}) \beta_{0:m}^2} \right] \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + 8\alpha^2 n C_0 \chi_3 [\psi(\underline{x}_{k_1}) - \bar{\psi}] + 2\alpha^2 n \chi_3 (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

We are now ready to derive the recursion for \mathcal{L}_k . Substituting (95) and (96) into (21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k_2}] &\leq \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{56\alpha C_0}{3n} + 96\alpha^3 m C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] + \frac{400\alpha^3 C_0 \chi_3 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} \right\} \mathcal{H}_{k_1} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{24\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} + \left(\frac{1 + \beta^{2m}}{2} + \frac{12\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_3^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) \frac{50\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2}{n(1 - \beta^2)} \right] \|\mathbf{u}_{k_1}\|^2 - \chi_4 \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left\{ 4\alpha \left[\frac{13}{12n} + 6\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_2^2 \left(D_1^2 \beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \right] + \frac{100\alpha^3 \chi_3 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} \right\} (2C_0 \sigma_f^* + \sigma^2), \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where

$$\chi_4 := -\frac{2\alpha m}{9} \left[1 - \frac{36}{m} (C_0 \gamma + 6\alpha^2 m^3 \mathcal{T}_2^2) \right] + \frac{200\alpha^3 \beta_{0:m}^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} \left[D_1^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2 m D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^4 \mathcal{T}_3^2}{(1 - \beta^{2m}) \beta_{0:m}^2} \right].$$

Note that $1 - \beta^{2m} = (1 - \beta^2) \beta_{0:m}^2$. Letting $\alpha \leq \frac{1 - \beta^2}{\mathcal{T}_3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2}{600m}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{24\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{n} + \left(\frac{1 + \beta^{2m}}{2} + \frac{12\alpha^2 m \mathcal{T}_3^2 \beta_{0:m}^2}{1 - \beta^{2m}} \right) \frac{50\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2}{n(1 - \beta^2)} \\ &\leq \frac{24\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2 (1 - \beta^{2m})}{n(1 - \beta^2)} + \left[1 - \frac{12(1 - \beta^{2m})}{25} \right] \frac{50\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2}{n(1 - \beta^2)} \leq \frac{50\alpha \mathcal{T}_2^2}{n(1 - \beta^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

We next simplify the coefficients in (97). Letting

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1 - \beta^2}{\mathcal{T}_3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2}{600m}}, \frac{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}{24D_2 L_F}, \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}m\mathcal{T}_2} \right\}$$

leads to

$$\frac{\alpha^3 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} \chi_3 \leq \frac{\alpha}{7200n} + \frac{14644\alpha^3 m D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{14400(1 - \beta^2)} + \frac{\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{50n}. \quad (99)$$

Substituting (99) into (97) leads to desired the coefficients in front of \mathcal{H}_{k_1} and $(2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2)$.

We next simplify the coefficient of $\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_1})\|^2$ in (97). Setting

$$m \geq 432, \gamma \leq \frac{1}{4C_0}, \alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{144m\mathcal{T}_2}, \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{120\sqrt{6}\mathcal{T}_2} \right\},$$

yields $\chi_4 \leq -\alpha m/5$.

Combining the above simplified coefficients leads to the desired result.

B.11 Proof of Lemma 4.1

According to Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q})\|^2 \leq 2L_{\text{F}}^2 \|\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t} - \bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}\|^2 + 2\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t})\|^2, \forall t \geq 0, 0 \leq q \leq m-1. \quad (100)$$

Substituting (100) into (32) leads to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_k)\|^2 \right] \leq 2L_{\text{F}}^2 \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t} - \bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}\|^2 \right] + 2m \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t})\|^2 \right]. \quad (101)$$

The consensus error can be bounded similarly as follows:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{n} \|\Pi_{\mathbf{z}_k}\|^2 \leq \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{n} \|\Pi_{\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}}\|^2 \leq \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \frac{\|V\|^2}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}_t+q}\|^2. \quad (102)$$

Thus, substituting (101) and (102) into (20) leads to the desired result.

B.12 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Denote

$$\mathcal{A}(\alpha, m) := \frac{19\alpha C_0}{n} + \frac{150\alpha^3 m D_1^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{193\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_{\text{F}}^2}{n}.$$

Based on the definition of $\{\mathbf{k}_j\}$ in (31), we have $\mathbf{k}_{j+1} - \mathbf{k}_j = m$ for any $j \geq 0$. Therefore, we can apply the recursion (30) to $\{\mathbf{k}_j\}$. Taking the full expectation on (30) yields that for any $(T+1) \geq j > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_j}] &\leq [1 + \mathcal{A}(\alpha, m)]^j \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_0} + \left(\frac{14\alpha}{3n} + \frac{80\alpha^3 m D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{50\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_{\text{F}}^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \sum_{t=0}^j (1 + \mathcal{A}(\alpha, m))^t \\ &\leq \exp[\mathcal{A}(\alpha, m)(T+1)] \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}_0} + \left(\frac{14\alpha}{3n} + \frac{80\alpha^3 m D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1-\beta^2} + \frac{50\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_{\text{F}}^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) (T+1) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where we invoked the relations $(1+x)^t \leq \exp(xt) \leq \exp[x(T+1)]$ for any $0 \leq t \leq (T+1)$ and $x \geq 0$.

Note that $T+1 = (K-Q)/m + 1 \leq K/m + 1 \leq 2K/m$. Letting

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{114C_0} \sqrt{\frac{n}{K}}, \left(\frac{1-\beta^2}{5460D_1^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 K} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \left(\frac{n}{5460m^2 D_2^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_{\text{F}}^2 K} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} \right\}, \\ m &= \max \left\{ \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right\rceil, 432 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

leads to the desired result.

B.13 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof is divided into three steps based on (33). In **Step I**, we apply the uniform bound on $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k_t}]$ to simplify the inner summation in the second term of (33), as shown in (104). Based on this step, the remaining task is to bound the sums $\sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2]$ and $\sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2]$. These two terms are addressed in **Step II** and **Step III**, as stated in (106) and (108), respectively.

Step I: Bounding the inner summation. For ease of presentation, we denote

$$\chi_5 := \frac{4m}{n} + 3D_1^2\beta_{0:m}^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{n}.$$

Invoking (28), (34), and taking the full expectation yields

$$\begin{aligned} 4L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right) \sum_{q=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{z}_{k_t} - \bar{z}_{k_t+q}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{k_t+q}\|^2 \right] &\leq \frac{24\beta_{0:m}^2 L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right)}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &+ \frac{m}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right] + 21\alpha^2 m L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right) \chi_5 \left[5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where we invoked the definition of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ in (34) and let $\alpha \leq 1/(24mL_F\sqrt{\|V\|^2 + 1})$.

Step II: Bounding the term $\sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2]$. Noting the choice of α and the definition of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ in (34), the recursion (96) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_{t+1}}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k_t} \right] &\leq \frac{2 + \beta^{2m}}{3} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2 \right] + 2\alpha^2 n \chi_3 \left[4C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right] \\ &+ 4\alpha^2 mn \left[\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2 D_1^2}{m} + \frac{4\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^3 \mathcal{T}_3^2}{(1 - \beta^2) \beta_{0:m}^2} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Summing on both sides of (105) from $t = 0$ to $t = T$ and noting that $(T + 1)/K \leq 2/m$ for any $T \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2 \right] &\leq \frac{12\alpha^2 mn}{(1 - \beta^{2m})K} \left[\frac{\beta_{0:m}^2 D_1^2}{m} + \frac{4\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{6\alpha^2 m^3 \mathcal{T}_3^2}{(1 - \beta^2) \beta_{0:m}^2} \right] \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right] \\ &+ \frac{12\alpha^2 n \chi_3}{m(1 - \beta^{2m})} \left[4C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

Step III: Bounding the outer summation in (32). According to (30) and (34), we have for any $T - 1 \geq t \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}_{k_{t+1}}] &\leq \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}_{k_t}] + \left(\frac{19\alpha C_0}{n} + \frac{150\alpha^3 m D_1^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{193\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 C_0 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \hat{\mathcal{L}} \\ &- \frac{\alpha m}{5} \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right] + \left(\frac{14\alpha}{3n} + \frac{80\alpha^3 m D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{50\alpha^5 m^3 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2). \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Summing on both sides of (107) from $t = 0$ to $t = T$ and noting that $(T + 1)/K \leq 2/m$ for any $T \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{m}{K} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{5\mathcal{L}_0}{\alpha K} + 121 \left(\frac{1}{mn} + \frac{12\alpha^2 D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{11\alpha^4 m^2 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \left[5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right]. \quad (108)$$

Substituting (104), (106), (108) into (33) and noting that $(T + 1)/K \leq 2/m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\gamma^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^\gamma(x_{i,k})\|^2 \right] &\leq \frac{9m}{K} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_{k_t})\|^2 \right] + \frac{48\beta_{0:m}^2 L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right)}{nK} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}_{k_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &+ 42\alpha^2 L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right) \chi_5 \left[5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{60\mathcal{L}_0}{\alpha K} + 1452 \left(\frac{1}{mn} + \frac{12\alpha^2 D_1^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{11\alpha^4 m^2 D_2^2 \mathcal{T}_2^2 L_F^2}{n} \right) \left[5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right] \\ &+ 42\alpha^2 L_F^2 \left(\|V\|^2 + 1 \right) \left[\frac{8m}{n} + \frac{48D_1^2}{1 - \beta^2} + \frac{1152\alpha^2 D_2^2 L_F^2}{7(1 - \beta^2)^2} \right] \left[5C_0\mathcal{L}_0 + (2C_0\sigma_f^* + \sigma^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

where we let $\alpha \leq 1/(24D_1L_F\sqrt{\|V\|^2+1})$. This completes the proof for (35).

Note that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_0\|^2 \leq \|V^{-1}\|^2 \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_0\|^2 + \alpha^2 D_2^2 n \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_0)\|^2. \quad (110)$$

We have

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \leq \psi(\text{prox}_{\gamma\varphi}(\bar{z}_0)) - \bar{\psi} + \frac{1}{L+\rho} \|F_{\text{nor}}^\gamma(\bar{z}_0)\|^2 + \frac{6\|V^{-1}\|^2 \mathcal{T}_2 \|\Pi\mathbf{z}_0\|^2}{n}.$$

Noting the choice of α , γ , and m in (37), we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha K} = \frac{114(C_0+L)}{\sqrt{nK}} + \frac{\eta}{K}, \quad \alpha^2 \leq \frac{n}{114^2(C_0+L)^2 K}, \quad \frac{1}{mn} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{nK}}, \quad \frac{1}{1-\beta^{2m}} \leq 2. \quad (111)$$

Additionally, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_1^2 = \mathcal{O}(D_1^2), \quad \mathcal{T}_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(\|V\|^2), \quad \mathcal{T}_3^2 = \mathcal{O}(\|V\|^2 D_1^2). \quad (112)$$

Substituting (111) and (112) into (35) leads to the desired result (38).

References

- [1] S. ALGHUNAIM, K. YUAN, AND A. H. SAYED, *A linearly convergent proximal gradient algorithm for decentralized optimization*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32 (2019).
- [2] S. A. ALGHUNAIM, E. K. RYU, K. YUAN, AND A. H. SAYED, *Decentralized proximal gradient algorithms with linear convergence rates*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 66 (2020), pp. 2787–2794.
- [3] S. A. ALGHUNAIM AND K. YUAN, *A unified and refined convergence analysis for non-convex decentralized learning*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 70 (2022), pp. 3264–3279.
- [4] Y. ARJEVANI, Y. CARMON, J. C. DUCHI, D. J. FOSTER, N. SREBRO, AND B. WOODWORTH, *Lower bounds for non-convex stochastic optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 199 (2023), pp. 165–214.
- [5] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, AND B. F. SVAITER, *Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward–backward splitting, and regularized gauss–seidel methods*, Mathematical Programming, 137 (2013), pp. 91–129.
- [6] A. BECK, *First-order methods in optimization*, SIAM, 2017.
- [7] P. BIANCHI AND J. JAKUBOWICZ, *Convergence of a multi-agent projected stochastic gradient algorithm for non-convex optimization*, IEEE transactions on automatic control, 58 (2012), pp. 391–405.
- [8] L. BOTTOU, F. E. CURTIS, AND J. NOCEDAL, *Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning*, Siam Review, 60 (2018), pp. 223–311.
- [9] A. I. CHEN AND A. OZDAGLAR, *A fast distributed proximal-gradient method*, in 2012 50th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), IEEE, 2012, pp. 601–608.
- [10] G. CHIERCHIA, E. CHOUZENOUX, P. L. COMBETTES, AND J.-C. PESQUET, *The proximity operator repository*, User, Åds guide <http://proximity-operator.net/download/guide.pdf>. Accessed, 6 (2020).
- [11] D. DAVIS AND D. DRUSVYATSKIY, *Stochastic model-based minimization of weakly convex functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 29 (2019), pp. 207–239.
- [12] P. DI LORENZO AND G. SCUTARI, *Next: In-network nonconvex optimization*, IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks, 2 (2016), pp. 120–136.
- [13] D. DRUSVYATSKIY AND A. S. LEWIS, *Error bounds, quadratic growth, and linear convergence of proximal methods*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 43 (2018), pp. 919–948.
- [14] M. EL GHECHE, G. CHIERCHIA, AND J.-C. PESQUET, *Proximity operators of discrete information divergences*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 64 (2017), pp. 1092–1104.
- [15] S. GHADIMI, G. LAN, AND H. ZHANG, *Mini-batch stochastic approximation methods for nonconvex stochastic composite optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 155 (2016), pp. 267–305.
- [16] L. GUO, X. SHI, J. CAO, AND Z. WANG, *Decentralized inexact proximal gradient method with network-independent stepsizes for convex composite optimization*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 71 (2023), pp. 786–801.

- [17] K. HUANG, X. LI, AND S. PU, *Distributed stochastic optimization under a general variance condition*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, (2024).
- [18] K. HUANG AND S. PU, *Cedas: A compressed decentralized stochastic gradient method with improved convergence*, 2023, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.05872>.
- [19] K. HUANG, S. PU, AND A. NEDIĆ, *An accelerated distributed stochastic gradient method with momentum*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09714, (2024).
- [20] K. HUANG, L. ZHOU, AND S. PU, *Distributed random reshuffling methods with improved convergence*, 2023, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.12037>.
- [21] B. M. IDREES, S. D. SHARMA, AND K. RAJAWAT, *Analysis of decentralized stochastic successive convex approximation for composite non-convex problems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07100, (2024).
- [22] Y. JI, G. SCUTARI, Y. SUN, AND H. HONNAPPA, *Distributed sparse regression via penalization*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 24 (2023), pp. 1–62.
- [23] A. KHALED AND P. RICHTÁRIK, *Better theory for SGD in the nonconvex world*, Transactions on Machine Learning Research, (2023), <https://openreview.net/forum?id=AU4qHN2Vks>. Survey Certification.
- [24] Y. LECUN, Y. BENGIO, AND G. HINTON, *Deep learning*, nature, 521 (2015), pp. 436–444.
- [25] Y. LECUN, L. BOTTOU, Y. BENGIO, AND P. HAFFNER, *Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 86 (1998), pp. 2278–2324, <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.726791>.
- [26] Y. LEI, T. HU, G. LI, AND K. TANG, *Stochastic gradient descent for nonconvex learning without bounded gradient assumptions*, IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems, 31 (2019), pp. 4394–4400.
- [27] X. LI AND A. MILZAREK, *A unified convergence theorem for stochastic optimization methods*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35 (2022), pp. 33107–33119.
- [28] X. LI, A. MILZAREK, AND J. QIU, *A new random reshuffling method for nonsmooth nonconvex finite-sum optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01047, (2023).
- [29] Y. LI, X. LIU, J. TANG, M. YAN, AND K. YUAN, *Decentralized composite optimization with compression*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04448, (2021).
- [30] Z. LI, W. SHI, AND M. YAN, *A decentralized proximal-gradient method with network independent step-sizes and separated convergence rates*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 67 (2019), pp. 4494–4506.
- [31] G. MANCINO-BALL, S. MIAO, Y. XU, AND J. CHEN, *Proximal stochastic recursive momentum methods for nonconvex composite decentralized optimization*, in Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, vol. 37, 2023, pp. 9055–9063.
- [32] A. MILZAREK AND J. QIU, *Convergence of a normal map-based prox-sgd method under the kl inequality*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05828, (2023).
- [33] A. MILZAREK, X. XIAO, S. CEN, Z. WEN, AND M. ULBRICH, *A stochastic semismooth newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 29 (2019), pp. 2916–2948, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1181249>.
- [34] A. NEDIĆ, A. OLSHEVSKY, AND M. G. RABBAT, *Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 106 (2018), pp. 953–976.
- [35] A. NEDIĆ, A. OLSHEVSKY, AND W. SHI, *Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27 (2017), pp. 2597–2633.
- [36] A. NEDIC AND A. OZDAGLAR, *Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 54 (2009), pp. 48–61.
- [37] A. NEDIĆ, A. OZDAGLAR, AND P. A. PARRILO, *Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 55 (2010), pp. 922–938.
- [38] A. OLSHEVSKY, *Asymptotic network independence and step-size for a distributed subgradient method*, Journal of machine learning research, 23 (2022), pp. 1–32.
- [39] W. OUYANG AND A. MILZAREK, *A trust region-type normal map-based semismooth newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex composite optimization*, Mathematical Programming, (2024), pp. 1–47.
- [40] S. PU, A. OLSHEVSKY, AND I. C. PASCHALIDIS, *Asymptotic network independence in distributed stochastic optimization for machine learning: Examining distributed and centralized stochastic gradient descent*, IEEE signal processing magazine, 37 (2020), pp. 114–122.

- [41] C. RAVAZZI, S. M. FOSSON, AND E. MAGLI, *Distributed iterative thresholding for ℓ_0/ℓ_1 -regularized linear inverse problems*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 61 (2015), pp. 2081–2100.
- [42] S. M. ROBINSON, *Normal maps induced by linear transformations*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 17 (1992), pp. 691–714.
- [43] W. SHI, Q. LING, G. WU, AND W. YIN, *Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 25 (2015), pp. 944–966.
- [44] W. SHI, Q. LING, G. WU, AND W. YIN, *A proximal gradient algorithm for decentralized composite optimization*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 63 (2015), pp. 6013–6023.
- [45] L. WANG, L. BAO, AND X. LIU, *A decentralized proximal gradient tracking algorithm for composite optimization on riemannian manifolds*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11573, (2024).
- [46] Z. WANG, J. ZHANG, T.-H. CHANG, J. LI, AND Z.-Q. LUO, *Distributed stochastic consensus optimization with momentum for nonconvex nonsmooth problems*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 69 (2021), pp. 4486–4501.
- [47] T. XIAO, X. CHEN, K. BALASUBRAMANIAN, AND S. GHADIMI, *A one-sample decentralized proximal algorithm for non-convex stochastic composite optimization*, in Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, PMLR, 2023, pp. 2324–2334.
- [48] R. XIN, S. DAS, U. A. KHAN, AND S. KAR, *A stochastic proximal gradient framework for decentralized non-convex composite optimization: Topology-independent sample complexity and communication efficiency*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01594, (2021).
- [49] J. XU, Y. TIAN, Y. SUN, AND G. SCUTARI, *Distributed algorithms for composite optimization: Unified framework and convergence analysis*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, (2021).
- [50] J. XU, S. ZHU, Y. C. SOH, AND L. XIE, *Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes*, in 2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), IEEE, 2015, pp. 2055–2060.
- [51] Y. YAN, J. CHEN, P.-Y. CHEN, X. CUI, S. LU, AND Y. XU, *Compressed decentralized proximal stochastic gradient method for nonconvex composite problems with heterogeneous data*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2023, pp. 39035–39061.
- [52] H. YE, Z. ZHOU, L. LUO, AND T. ZHANG, *Decentralized accelerated proximal gradient descent*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33 (2020), pp. 18308–18317.
- [53] K. YUAN, B. YING, X. ZHAO, AND A. H. SAYED, *Exact diffusion for distributed optimization and learning. Part I: Algorithm development*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 67 (2018), pp. 708–723.
- [54] J. ZENG AND W. YIN, *On nonconvex decentralized gradient descent*, IEEE Transactions on signal processing, 66 (2018), pp. 2834–2848.
- [55] H. ZOU AND T. HASTIE, *Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 67 (2005), pp. 301–320.