

A Stochastic Block-coordinate Proximal Newton Method for Nonconvex Composite Minimization

Hong Zhu^{*1} and Xun Qian^{†2}

¹School of Mathematical Sciences, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, 212013, Jiangsu, China.

Abstract

We propose a stochastic block-coordinate proximal Newton method for minimizing the sum of a blockwise Lipschitz-continuously differentiable function and a separable nonsmooth convex function. In each iteration, this method randomly selects a block and approximately solves a strongly convex regularized quadratic subproblem, utilizing second-order information from the smooth component of the objective function. A backtracking line search is employed to ensure the monotonicity of the objective value. We demonstrate that under certain sampling assumption, the fundamental convergence results of our proposed stochastic method are in accordance with the corresponding results for the inexact proximal Newton method. We study the convergence of the sequence of expected objective values and the convergence of the sequence of expected residual mapping norms under various sampling assumptions. Furthermore, we introduce a method that employs the unit step size in conjunction with the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of the smooth component to formulate the strongly convex regularized quadratic subproblem. In addition to establishing the global convergence rate, we also provide a local convergence analysis for this method under certain sampling assumption and the higher-order metric subregularity of the residual mapping. To the best knowledge of the authors, this is the first stochastic second-order algorithm with a superlinear local convergence rate for addressing nonconvex composite optimization problems. Finally, we conduct numerical experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness and convergence of the proposed algorithm.

Keywords: stochastic block-coordinate method proximal Newton method nonconvex composite optimization higher-order metric subregularity .

^{*}zhuhongmath@126.com

[†]ORCID: 0000-0002-6072-2684, xunqian2099@163.com

1 Introduction

In this paper, we propose a stochastic second-order method for addressing large-scale nonconvex and nonsmooth composite optimization problems, which frequently occur in the fields of science, engineering, and machine learning [45]. As the dimensionality of the problem increases, the computational cost associated with evaluating gradients and Hessian matrices can become prohibitively high. Consequently, block coordinate descent (BCD) methods [3, 38, 39] and their variants have garnered significant attention in the literature [41, 42, 32, 37].

Roughly speaking, BCD methods select one block of coordinates to significantly decrease the objective value while maintaining the other blocks fixed during each iteration. A widely adopted technique for selecting such a block is by means of a cyclic strategy. Randomized strategies for block selection at each iteration of the BCD method have been introduced, as these randomized BCD methods demonstrate particular efficacy in addressing large-scale optimization problems encountered in the field of machine learning [7, 36, 35]. The iteration complexity of randomized BCD methods for minimizing smooth convex functions has been studied in [26, 7, 19, 36], while the complexity associated with convex composite functions has been discussed in [31, 23]. Randomized BCD methods for the minimization of nonconvex composite functions have been studied in [29, 44, 24]. All of the aforementioned methods are first-order methods, which indicates that only the gradient information of the smooth component of the objective function is used during each iteration.

Recently, second-order subspace methods have been proposed to utilize the local curvature information of the smooth component of the objective function for solving large-scale problems. These methods employ random subspace techniques to address high dimension Hessian. For smooth convex optimization, Gower et al. [11] proposed a randomized subspace Newton method. For smooth nonconvex optimization, Fuji et al. [10] proposed a randomized subspace variant of the regularized Newton method discussed by Ueda and Yamashita [40] and Zhao et al. [47] proposed a cubic regularized subspace Newton method. The existing literature on randomized second-order methods for composite optimization is comparatively less extensive. Hanzely et al. [12] proposed a cubic regularization method to address convex composite optimization problems. The cubic regularization Newton method demonstrates superior iteration complexity in comparison to both gradient and Newton methods [27, 6]. However, both [12, 47] require the exact solution of the cubic regularization subproblem at each iteration, which typically lacks a closed-form solution. This requirement results in a discrepancy between theoretical expectations and practical implementation.

The (inexact) proximal Newton methods [17, 18, 34, 15, 46, 13, 14, 25,

21, 48] have been studied to address the composite problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) := f(x) + g(x), \quad (1)$$

where f is a twice continuously differentiable function and g is a convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper mapping. Numerical experiments in [46, 25] have demonstrated that proximal Newton methods are highly effective for solving regularized logistic regression problems when n is large. The stochastic block-coordinate variants of the inexact proximal Newton method have been studied for convex composite optimization problems [22, 9, 16]. In [22], f was assumed to be self-concordant, that is, f is convex and three times continuously differentiable. The termination condition of the subproblem solver proposed by [9] may be costly to verify, except for specific choices of the regularizer. Lee and Wright [16] provided a more practical termination criterion for the subproblem solver and provide a global convergence analysis in terms of the expected minimal squared norm of the KKT residual mapping for nonconvex composite optimization problems. The convergence of expected objective values and the local convergence rate of the algorithm were not discussed in their analysis. In this paper, we introduce a stochastic block-coordinate proximal Newton method (SBCPNM) for Problem (1) and present a comprehensive convergence analysis. Throughout this paper, we assume that φ is lower-bounded and denote x_* as any minimizer of φ , with $\varphi_* := \varphi(x_*)$ representing the corresponding optimal value. Additionally, we establish the following assumption.

Assumption 1. (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is twice continuously differentiable and ∇f is coordinatewise Lipschitz continuous with constants L_S for any index set $S \subseteq [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, that is

$$\|\nabla f(x+h)_S - \nabla f(x)_S\| \leq L_S \|h\|, \quad \forall h \in R_S^n, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $R_S^n := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_i = 0, \forall i \notin S\}$.

(ii) $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is coordinate separable, that is, g takes the form of

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(x_i),$$

where $\psi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is a proper closed convex function, $\min_z \{\psi_i(z) + \frac{1}{2}(z-u)^2\}$ is efficiently solvable, and $0 \in \text{dom}\psi_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(iii) For any $x^0 \in \text{dom}g$, the level set $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(x^0) = \{x \mid \varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x^0)\}$ is bounded.

Throughout, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm or its induced norm on matrices. From Assumption 1 (i), we have

$$f(x+h) \leq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top h + \frac{L_S}{2} \|h\|^2, \quad \forall h \in R_S^n, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2)$$

Define $L_g := \max_{S \subseteq [n]} \{L_S\}$, ∇f is L_g -Lipschitz continuous. Hence, $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\| \leq L_g$ over $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(x^0)$. Moreover, there exist $\bar{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_1 > 0$, such that for every $x \in \mathcal{L}_\varphi(x^0)$, we have

$$\varphi(x) \geq \varphi_*, \quad \|x\| \leq \bar{\epsilon}_0, \quad \|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \bar{\epsilon}_1.$$

For any local minimum \bar{x} of (1), we have $0 \in \nabla f(\bar{x}) + \partial g(\bar{x})$. Any vector \bar{x} satisfying this relation is called a stationary point for Problem (1). Define $\mathcal{G}(x) = x - \text{prox}_g(x - \nabla f(x))$, where $\text{prox}_g(u) := \arg \min_x \{g(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - u\|^2\}$. Let \mathcal{S}^* be the set of stationary points of Problem (1). It immediately follows from Assumption 1 that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ if and only if $\mathcal{G}(\bar{x}) = 0$. $\mathcal{G}(x)$ also known as the KKT residual mapping of Problem (1).

Contribution. SBCPNM can be regarded as a stochastic block-coordinate variant of the inexact proximal Newton method (IPNM) as described by Zhu [48]. Under particular selections of the function g and associated parameters, SBCPNM exhibits similarities to several existing methods. It is noteworthy that the knowledge of blockwise Lipschitz constants is not required. i) We demonstrate that the sequence of expected objective values generated by SBCPNM converges to the expected limit of the objective values. ii) We investigate the convergence rate of the (expected) minimal squared norms of residual mappings under various sampling assumptions. We demonstrate that under specific sampling condition, any accumulation point of the sequence generated by SBCPNM is a stationary point of Problem (1). The core convergence results of SBCPNM under thus sampling assumption are in accordance with the corresponding results for IPNM. iii) We show that SBCPNM with a unit step size is well-defined when the Lipschitz constant L_g is employed to formulate the regularized subproblem for each iteration. We also present the superlinear local convergence rate under particular sampling assumption as well as the high-order metric subregularity of $\mathcal{G}(x)$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first stochastic second-order algorithm that exhibits a superlinear convergence rate for addressing nonconvex composite optimization problems. In comparison to the most relevant reference [16], our study on the convergence of the expected objective values sequence, SBCPNM with a unit step size, and the local convergence analysis are novel.

Notation and facts. Let $S \subseteq [n]$ be sampled from an arbitrary but fixed distribution \mathcal{D} , we use $|S|$ to denote the cardinality of S and denote $\bar{S} := [n] \setminus S$ as the complementary set of S . For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, denote $x_{[S]} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A_{[S]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by $(x_{[S]})_i = x_i$ if $i \in S$ and $(x_{[S]})_i = 0$, otherwise; and $(A_{[S]})_{ij} = A_{ij}$ if $i, j \in S$ and $(A_{[S]})_{ij} = 0$, otherwise. We also denote $x_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$ and $A_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times |S|}$ as the subvector of x and the submatrix of A that contain entries corresponding to S , respectively. For vector x , $|x|$ denotes the absolute value of x . For any symmetric matrix Q , $Q \succeq 0$ indicates that Q is a semidefinite positive matrix. We use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ to denote the expectation and probability, respectively.

Define

$$\mathcal{G}_S(y) = y - \text{prox}_{\tilde{g}}(y - \nabla f(x)_S),$$

where $S \subseteq [n]$ is a sampled index set, $y = x_S$, and $\tilde{g}(y) = \sum_{i \in S} \psi_i(x_i)$. The following properties hold.

Proposition 1. *Under Assumption 1 (ii), we have*

- (i) $(\text{prox}_g(x))_i = \text{prox}_{\psi_i}(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{G}_S(y) = \mathcal{G}(x)_S$.

The statement (i) follows from [2, Theorem 6.6]. The statement (ii) follows from the statement (i) and the definitions of $\mathcal{G}(x)$ and $\mathcal{G}_S(y)$.

Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present SBCPNM and provide detailed global convergence analysis. In Section 3, we discuss a special case where L_g is known and used to design SBCPNM and provide its global and local convergence rates. In Section 4 we conduct numerical experiments on the ℓ_1 -regularized Student's t -regression, nonconvex binary classification, and biweight loss with group regularization. We make some conclusions in Section 5.

2 The Stochastic Block-coordinate Proximal Newton Method

In this section, we present SBCPNM for Problem (1). Knowledge of coordinatewise Lipschitz constants is not assumed.

2.1 The stochastic block-coordinate proximal Newton method

Given the current iterate x^k , the fundamental approach of IPNM is to approximately solve the subproblem

$$\min_x \{q_k(x) := f(x^k) + \langle \nabla f(x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle Q_k(x - x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2 + g(x)\}, \quad (3)$$

where the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix Q_k is an approximation to $\nabla^2 f(x_k)$ and $\eta_k > 0$ is the regularization parameter. (3) is a strongly convex composite problem, which has been widely studied in the literature. Let \hat{x}^k be an approximate solution to Problem (3). x^k will be updated along the direction $\hat{x}^k - x^k$. The convergence rate of the proximal Newton method [15, 13, 48] in terms of the minimal norm of $\mathcal{G}(x_k)$ is $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$.

We consider the following stochastic variant of IPNM. Given the current iterate x^k , pick $S_k \subseteq [n]$ from an arbitrary but fixed distribution \mathcal{D} . We approximately solve the following problem:

$$\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k|}} \{q_{S_k}^k(y) := l_{S_k}^k(y) + \frac{1}{2} \langle (Q_k)_{S_k}(y - y^k), y - y^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|y - y^k\|^2\},$$

where $l_{S_k}^k(y) := f(x^k) + \langle \nabla f(x_k)_{S_k}, y - y^k \rangle + g_k(y)$, $y^k = x_{S_k}^k$, and $g_k(y) = \sum_{i \in S_k} \psi_i(y_i)$. Let \hat{y}^k be an approximate solution of the above problem. We then update x^k by setting $x_{S_k}^{k+1} = x_{S_k}^k + \alpha_k(\hat{y}^k - y^k)$ and $x_{\bar{S}_k}^{k+1} = x_{\bar{S}_k}^k$, where $\alpha_k > 0$ is the step size.

We use the following criterion for the approximate solution \hat{y}^k : there exists $\varsigma_k \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) := \nabla f(x_k)_{S_k} + (Q_k)_{S_k}(\hat{y}^k - y^k) + \eta_k(\hat{y}^k - y^k) + \partial g_k(\hat{y}^k)$, such that

$$\|\varsigma_k\| \leq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\| \quad (4)$$

for some $\mu > 0$. In addition, \hat{y}^k can be stated as an exact solution of the problem

$$\hat{y}^k = \arg \min_y \{q_{S_k}^k(y) + \langle \hat{\varepsilon}_k, y - y^k \rangle\} \quad (5)$$

for some $\|\hat{\varepsilon}_k\| \leq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|$ since the first-order optimality condition of Problem (5) yields $0 \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \hat{\varepsilon}_k$, which implies $-\hat{\varepsilon}_k \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)$. Notice that the setting $\mu = 0$ corresponds to the special case in which the subproblems are solved exactly. Accuracy criterion (4) can be satisfied by the proximal gradient method [2] and the FIAST method [2] when $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)_{S_k}\| \neq 0$. Further discussions on solvers satisfy (4) can be found in [48]. We summarize SBCPNM in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Stochastic Block-coordinate proximal Newton (SBCPN) method with backtracking line search.

Require: $x^0 \in \text{dom}g$, $\bar{\eta} > 0$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, \mu)$, and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, distribution \mathcal{D} of random index set.

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 2: sample S_k from \mathcal{D} ;
- 3: set $\eta_k \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ and Q_k satisfy $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$;
- 4: set $y^k = x_{S_k}^k$, compute

$$\hat{y}^k \approx \arg \min_y \{q_{S_k}^k(y)\},$$

where satisfying (4).

- 5: compute \hat{x}^k , where $\hat{x}_{S_k}^k = \hat{y}^k$ and $\hat{x}_{\bar{S}_k}^k = x_{\bar{S}_k}^k$.
- 6: set $d_k = \hat{x}^k - x^k$, $x^{k+1} = x^k + \alpha_k d_k$, where $\alpha_k = \theta^{j_k}$ and j_k is the smallest nonnegative integer such that

$$\varphi(x^k + \theta^{j_k} d_k) \leq \varphi(x^k) - \frac{\tau}{2} \theta^{j_k} \|d_k\|^2. \quad (6)$$

- 7: **end for**
 - 8: **return** $\{x^k\}$
-

Remark 1. Algorithm 1 becomes IPNM proposed in [48] when $S_k \equiv [n]$, $\forall k$. The main differences between Algorithm 1 and the inexact variable metric block-coordinate descent method proposed in [16] are the termination condition of the subproblem and the line search condition. In the latter method, the approximate solution \hat{y}^k for each k satisfies

$$q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - q_{S_k}^{k,*} \leq -\eta_{vm}[q_{S_k}^{k,*} - f(x^k) - g_k(y^k)],$$

where $q_{S_k}^{k,*} = \inf_y q_{S_k}^k(y)$ and $\eta_{vm} \in (0, 1)$. Adaptive choices of η_{vm} are allowed and $q_{S_k}^{k,*}$ is not required in calculating. x^{k+1} is updated by $x^k + \alpha_k d_k$, where α_k satisfies

$$\varphi(x^k + \alpha d_k) \leq \varphi(x^k) + \alpha_k \gamma_{vm} (\nabla f(x^k)^\top d_k + g_k(\hat{y}^k) - g_k(y^k))$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

Remark 2. The resulting methods with specific choices of g and parameters in Algorithm 1 are similar to several existing methods.

1. If $(Q_k)_{S_k} \equiv 0$, $\varepsilon_k \equiv 0$ ($\mu = 0$), and $\eta_k = L_{S_k}$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, where L_{S_k} denotes the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f(x)_{S_k}$, then in Algorithm 1,

$$\hat{y}^k = \text{prox}_{\frac{1}{L_{S_k}} g_k}(y^k - \frac{1}{L_{S_k}} \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}); \quad (d_k)_{S_k} = \hat{y}^k - y^k; \quad (d_k)_{\overline{S_k}} = 0.$$

Next, we show $\alpha_k = 1$ satisfies (6) in this case. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x^k + d_k) &= f(x^k + d_k) + g(x^k + d_k) = f(x^k + d_k) + g_k(\hat{y}^k) + \sum_{i \in \overline{S_k}} \psi_i(x_i^k) \\ &\leq f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k)^\top d_k + \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \|d_k\|^2 + g_k(\hat{y}^k) + \sum_{i \in \overline{S_k}} \psi_i(x_i^k) \\ &\leq f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k)^\top d_k + \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \|d_k\|^2 + g_k(y^k) - \langle \hat{y}^k - y^k, \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} \rangle \\ &\quad - L_{S_k} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|^2 + \sum_{i \in \overline{S_k}} \psi_i(x_i^k) = \varphi(x^k) - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \|d_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (2) and the second inequality follows from the optimality condition of problem with respect to \hat{y}^k and the convexity of $g_k(y)$ (see (3.12) in [5]). Hence, by setting $L_{S_k} \geq \tau$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\varphi(x^k + d_k) \leq \varphi(x^k) - \frac{\tau}{2} \|d_k\|^2.$$

The above iterate can be viewed as the randomized block-coordinate descent method [31] if we further assume f to be convex. In addition,

- (a) if $g \equiv 0$ and we further assume f to be convex, then the above iterate can be viewed as the coordinate descent method [26].
- (b) if $g = \delta_{C_1 \times \dots \times C_m}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_{(i)} \in C_i, \forall i, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, where C_1, \dots, C_m are convex sets, $x_{(i)}$ denotes the i -th block of x , and we further assume f to be convex, then the above iterate can be viewed as the constrained coordinate descent method [26].

2. If $g \equiv 0$ and $\varepsilon_k \equiv 0$ ($\mu = 0$), then in Algorithm 1,

$$\begin{cases} \hat{y}^k = y^k - ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I)^{-1} \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}; \\ (d_k)_{S_k} = \hat{y}^k - y^k; \quad (d_k)_{\overline{S_k}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Next, we show $\alpha_k = 1$ satisfies (6) if $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \frac{\tau + L_{S_k}}{2})I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x^k + d_k) &= f(x^k + d_k) \leq f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k)^\top d_k + \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \|d_k\|^2 \\ &= f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}^\top ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})^{-1} \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} \\ &\quad + \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}^\top ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})^{-2} \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}. \end{aligned}$$

To satisfy (6), it is sufficient to ensure

$$-\frac{\tau + L_{S_k}}{2} ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})^{-2} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})^{-1} \succeq 0.$$

- (a) If we further assume f to be $\hat{\mu}$ -strongly convex, using a similar way, we can prove that $\alpha_k \equiv \frac{\hat{\mu}}{L_g}$ satisfies (6) if $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \frac{\tau + L_{S_k} \hat{\mu}^2}{2L_g \hat{\mu}})I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$. When $\eta_k \equiv 0$ and $Q_k \equiv \nabla^2 f(x^k)$, the above iterate can be viewed as a special case of the randomized subspace Newton method [11].
- (b) If $(Q_k)_{S_k} = (\nabla^2 f(x^k))_{S_k} + c_1 \max\{0, -\lambda_{\min}((\nabla^2 f(x^k))_{S_k})\}I + c_2 \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^\delta I$ for some $c_1 > 1$, $c_2 > 0$, and $\delta \geq 0$, then Algorithm 1 is similar to the randomized subspace regularized Newton method [10] except that the line search conditions are different.

2.2 Properties of Algorithm 1

Before studying convergence, we introduce some properties of Algorithm 1 to show that the line search condition (6) is well defined. In this subsection, we focus on a particular iteration k .

Lemma 1. Suppose for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$. Let x^k and \hat{x}^k be points generated by Algorithm 1. We have

$$q_k(\hat{x}^k) \leq \varphi(x^k).$$

Proof. Notice that $q_{S_k}^k$ is a μ -strongly convex function since $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$. For any y and $u^k \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)$, it holds that

$$q_{S_k}^k(y) \geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \langle u^k, y - \hat{y}^k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - \hat{y}^k\|^2.$$

According to the optimality condition of problem (5), we have $0 \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \hat{\varepsilon}_k$. Hence, by setting $y := \hat{y}^k$ and $u^k := -\hat{\varepsilon}_k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) &\geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - \hat{\varepsilon}_k^\top (\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^k\|^2 \\ &\geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - \|\hat{\varepsilon}_k\| \|\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^k\| + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^k\|^2 \geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that by the definition of \hat{x}^k and $q_{S_k}^k$, we have $q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) = f(\hat{x}^k) + g_k(\hat{y}^k) = \varphi(\hat{x}^k) - \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k) \geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)$, which yields

$$\varphi(\hat{x}^k) \geq q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) &= l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \frac{1}{2} \langle (Q_k)_{S_k} (\hat{y}^k - y^k), \hat{y}^k - y^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|^2 \\ &= f(\hat{x}^k) + \langle \nabla f(\hat{x}^k), \hat{x}^k - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle Q_k (\hat{x}^k - x^k), \hat{x}^k - x^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\hat{x}^k - x^k\|^2 + g(\hat{x}^k) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k) \\ &= q_k(\hat{x}^k) - \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Therefore, we have $\varphi(\hat{x}^k) \geq q_k(\hat{x}^k)$. The statement holds. \square

We next show that the line search condition in Algorithm 1 is well-defined.

Lemma 2. *Suppose for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$ and Assumption 1 hold. Let α_k be chosen by the backtracking line search (6) in Algorithm 1 at iteration k . Then we have the step size estimate*

$$\alpha_k \geq \min\left\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_{S_k}}\right\}$$

with the cost function decrease satisfying

$$\varphi(x^{k+1}) - \varphi(x^k) \leq -\frac{\tau}{2} \min\left\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_{S_k}}\right\} \|d_k\|^2. \tag{8}$$

Proof. From (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(\hat{x}^k) &= q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k) \\ &= l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \frac{1}{2} \langle (Q_k)_{S_k}(\hat{y}^k - y^k), \hat{y}^k - y^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|^2 + \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\varphi(x^k) = f(x^k) + g_k(y^k) + \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k) = l_{S_k}^k(y^k) + \sum_{i \notin S_k} \psi_i(x_i^k)$. By Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq q_k(\hat{x}^k) - \varphi(x^k) \\ &= l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) + \frac{1}{2} \langle (Q_k)_{S_k}(\hat{y}^k - y^k), \hat{y}^k - y^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|^2 - l_{S_k}^k(y^k) \\ &\geq l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - l_{S_k}^k(y^k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|d_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$. Therefore, we have

$$l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|d_k\|^2. \quad (9)$$

Notice that for any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(x^k) - \varphi(x^k + td_k) \\ &= l_{S_k}^k(y^k) + \sum_{i \in \overline{S_k}} \psi_i(x_i^k) - f(x^k + td_k) - g(x^k + td_k) \\ &= l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(y^k + t(\hat{y}^k - y^k)) - (f(x^k + td_k) - f(x^k) - t \langle \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k}, \hat{y}^k - y^k \rangle) \\ &= l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(y^k + t(\hat{y}^k - y^k)) - (f(x^k + td_k) - f(x^k) - t \langle \nabla f(x^k), d_k \rangle) \\ &\geq l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(y^k + t(\hat{y}^k - y^k)) - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} t^2 \|d_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds since $(d_k)_{S_k} = \hat{y}^k - y^k$ and $(d_k)_{\overline{S_k}} = 0$, the last inequality holds since $\nabla f(\cdot)_{S_k}$ is L_{S_k} -Lipschitz continuous. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x^k) - \varphi(x^k + td_k) - \frac{\tau}{2} t \|d_k\|^2 &\geq l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(y^k + t(\hat{y}^k - y^k)) - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} t^2 \|d_k\|^2 - \frac{\tau}{2} t \|d_k\|^2 \\ &\geq t(l_{S_k}^k(y^k) - l_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)) - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} t^2 \|d_k\|^2 - \frac{\tau}{2} t \|d_k\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\mu}{2} t \|d_k\|^2 - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} t^2 \|d_k\|^2 - \frac{\tau}{2} t \|d_k\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} ((\mu - \tau) - L_{S_k} t) t \|d_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since $l_{S_k}^k$ is convex and the last inequality holds because of (9). Hence, (6) holds for any t that satisfies

$$0 < t \leq \frac{\mu - \tau}{L_{S_k}}.$$

Combing with the backtracking technique used in Algorithm 1, we have $\alpha_k \geq \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu-\tau)}{L_{S_k}}\}$. Therefore,

$$\varphi(x^k) - \varphi(x^k + \alpha_k d_k) \geq \frac{\tau}{2} \alpha_k \|d_k\|^2 \geq \frac{\tau}{2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu-\tau)}{L_{S_k}}\} \|d_k\|^2.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

At the end of this subsection, we establish the bound of $\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|$, which will be used in the subsequent analysis on the convergence rate of Algorithm 1. Throughout this paper we assume that

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - Q_k\| \leq \zeta, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (10)$$

for some $\zeta > 0$. Notice that $\|\nabla^2 f(x^k)_{S_k} - (Q_k)_{S_k}\| \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - Q_k\|$. Combine with Assumption 1 (i), inequality (10) implies that $\max\{\|(Q_k)_{S_k}\|\} \leq \max\{\|Q_k\|\} \leq \zeta + \|\nabla^2 f(x)\| \leq \zeta + L_g$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$0 \leq \eta_k \leq \bar{\eta} := \mu + 2L_g + \zeta, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Lemma 3. *Suppose for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$, the boundedness (10), and Assumption 1 hold. Let x^k be the point generated by Algorithm 1 and $y^k = x_{S_k}$. Define $\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y) = y - \text{prox}_{g_k}(y - \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k})$, we have*

$$\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\| \leq c_1 \|d_k\|,$$

where $c_1 = 1 + L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2}$.

Proof. Define $r_{S_k}^k(y) = y - \text{prox}_{g_k}(y - (\nabla f(x_k)_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(y - y^k)))$. We have

$$\hat{y}^k - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) = \text{prox}_{g_k}(\hat{y}^k - \nabla f(x_k)_{S_k} - ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\hat{y}^k - y^k)). \quad (11)$$

Recall (5), we have

$$\hat{y}^k = \text{prox}_{g_k}(\hat{y}^k - \nabla f(x_k)_{S_k} - ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\hat{y}^k - y^k) - \hat{\varepsilon}_k). \quad (12)$$

Using the nonexpansivity of prox_{g_k} [2, Th. 6.42], (11) and (12) yield

$$\|r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\| \leq \|\hat{\varepsilon}_k\|. \quad (13)$$

Notice that (11) also implies

$$r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} - ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\hat{y}^k - y^k) \in \partial g_k(\hat{y}^k - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)). \quad (14)$$

Form the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y)$, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} \in \partial g_k(y^k - \mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)). \quad (15)$$

Using the monotonicity of ∂g_k , (14) and (15) yield

$$\langle \mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\hat{y}^k - y^k) - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k), y^k - \mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - \hat{y}^k + r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) \rangle \geq 0.$$

Combine the above inequality with $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\|^2 \leq \langle \mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k), y^k - \hat{y}^k + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(y^k - \hat{y}^k) \rangle.$$

By Cauchy inequality and (10), we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\| \leq \|((Q_k)_{S_k} + (1 + \eta_k)I_{|S_k|})(y^k - \hat{y}^k)\| \leq \hat{\eta} \|d_k\|,$$

where $\hat{\eta} = 1 + L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta}$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\| \leq \|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k) - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\| + \|r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\| \leq (\hat{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2}) \|d_k\| = c_1 \|d_k\|.$$

The statement holds. \square

2.3 Convergence of expected objective value

In this subsection, we show that the expected objective values sequence generated by Algorithm 1 converges to the expectation of the limit of the objective values.

After k iterations, Algorithm 1 generates a random output $\{(x^k, \varphi(x^k))\}$, which depends on the observed realization of the history of random index selection. Denote

$$\xi_k = \{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_k\}$$

and $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{-1}}[\varphi(x^0)] = \varphi(x^0)$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$ and Assumption 1 hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{d_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following statements hold:*

(i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|d_k\| = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x^k) = \varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*$ for some $\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^* \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\xi_\infty = \{S_0, S_1, \dots\}$.

(ii) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|d_k\|] = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*]$.

Proof. From (8), we have

$$\varphi(x^{k+1}) \leq \varphi(x^k) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\varphi(x^{k+1})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Hence, $\{\varphi(x^k)\}$ and $\{\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)]\}$ are nonincreasing. Since φ is bounded below, so are $\{\varphi(x^k)\}$ and $\{\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)]\}$. It follows that there exist some $\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*, \tilde{\varphi}^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x^k) = \varphi_{\xi_\infty}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \tilde{\varphi}^*.$$

In addition, it follows from (8) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|d_k\| = 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\varphi(x^{k+1})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\varphi(x^k)] - \frac{\tau}{2} \min\left\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\right\} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|d_k\|^2], \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ on both side of the above inequality and noting that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\varphi(x^k)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \tilde{\varphi}^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\varphi(x^{k+1})],$$

we conclude that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\|d_k\|^2] = 0$, which yields $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\|d_k\|] = 0$. Notice that $\varphi_* \leq \varphi(x^k) \leq \varphi(x^0)$, which implies that $|\varphi(x^k)| \leq \max\{|\varphi(x^0)|, |\varphi_*|\}$ for all k and $\{\varphi(x^k)\}$ is uniformly bounded. Then by [4, Theorem 5.4], we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi(x^k)].$$

Together with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi(x^k)]$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*].$$

□

2.4 Global convergence

In this subsection, we present the global convergence of Algorithm 1 in terms of the minimum (expected) norm of $\mathcal{G}(x^k)$ under different sampling assumptions.

Assumption 2. Suppose $\{S_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies one of the following assumptions. Let $p_i^k = \mathbb{P}(i \in S_k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

S1. The sampling S_k satisfies $p_i^k > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

S2. The sampling S_k satisfies $p_i^k \equiv p_i$ with $p_i \geq p_{\min} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

S3. The sampling S_k satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x)_{S_k}\|^2 \geq c \|\mathcal{G}(x)\|^2, \quad \forall x \quad (16)$$

for some $c > 0$.

Assumption 2 **S1** holds with $p_i^k = \frac{|S_k|}{n}$ if S_k follows the uniform sampling. If the size of S_k is fixed, that is, $S_k \equiv s$ for some $1 \leq s \leq n$, then Assumption 2 **S2** holds with $p_i = \frac{s}{n}$. Top- k sampling [8] satisfies Assumption 2 **S3** with $c = \frac{k}{n}$ if we choose S_k as the index set that containing the top k largest components of $|\mathcal{G}(x^k)|$.

Proposition 2. Suppose Assumption 1 (ii) holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{y^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following statements hold.

(i) Under Assumption 2 **S1**,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2] \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{p_i^k\} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2], \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (17)$$

(ii) Under Assumption 2 **S2**,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2] \geq p_{\min} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2], \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Recall Proposition 1, $\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)$ is a subvector of $\mathcal{G}(x^k)$ corresponding to S_k , which leads to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [(\mathcal{G}(x^k)_i \delta_{S_k}^i)^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [(\mathcal{G}(x^k)_i)^2 p_i^k], \quad (19)$$

where $\delta_{S_k}^i = 1$ if $i \in S_k$ and $\delta_{S_k}^i = 0$ if $i \notin S_k$.

(i) Under Assumption 2 **S1**, we have $p_i^k \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{p_i^k\}$. Hence, (17) holds from (19).

(ii) (18) holds by noting that $p_i^k \geq p_{\min}$ under Assumption 2 **S2**. \square

Theorem 2. Suppose for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$, the boundedness (10), and Assumption 1 hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 and $\omega(x^0)$ be the cluster points set of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then the following statements hold.

(i) Under Assumption 2 **S2**, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|] = 0. \quad (20)$$

(ii) Under Assumption 2 **S3**, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| = 0, \quad (21)$$

that is, $\omega(x^0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$. Moreover, $\omega(x^0)$ is nonempty and compact.

Proof. (i) Under Assumption 2 **S2**, from (18) and Lemma 3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{p_{\min}} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{c_1^2}{p_{\min}} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|d_k\|^2].$$

Hence, (20) holds.

(ii) Under Assumption 2 **S3**, from (16) and Lemma 3, we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{c} \|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{c_1^2}{c} \|d_k\|^2. \quad (22)$$

(21) holds by taking k to ∞ on the both side of the above inequality and combining with Theorem 1 (i). Hence, we have $\omega(x^0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$. $\omega(x^0)$ is nonempty and bounded since $\{x^k\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\varphi(x^0)$ is bounded. The continuity of \mathcal{G} ensures the closedness of $\omega(x^0)$ and $\|\mathcal{G}(\bar{x})\| = 0$ for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$. \square

Theorem 3. Suppose for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \mu)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0$, the boundedness (10), and Assumption 1 hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then, the following statements hold.

(i) Under Assumption 2 **S2**, we have

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{p_{\min}} \cdot \frac{2c_1^2(\varphi(x^0) - \varphi_*)}{\tau \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\}K}. \quad (23)$$

(ii) Under Assumption 2 **S3**, we have

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \frac{2c_1^2(\varphi(x^0) - \varphi_*)}{\tau \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\}K}. \quad (24)$$

Proof. From Lemmas 3 and 2, we have

$$\varphi(x^{k+1}) \leq \varphi(x^k) - \frac{\tau}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\|^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which yields

$$\varphi_* \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{K-1}}[\varphi(x^K)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{K-1}}[\varphi(x^{K-1})] - \frac{\tau}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{K-1}}[\|\mathcal{G}_{S_{K-1}}(y^{K-1})\|^2]. \quad (25)$$

(i) Under Assumption 2 **S2**, from (18) and (25), we have

$$\varphi_* \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{-1}}[\varphi(x^0)] - \frac{\tau p_{\min}}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2].$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{\tau p_{\min}}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2] \leq \varphi(x^0) - \varphi_*,$$

which yields (23).

(ii) Under Assumption 2 **S3**, from (16), (25) becomes to

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_* &\leq \varphi(x^K) - \frac{\tau c}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \|\mathcal{G}_{S_K}(x^{K-1})\|^2 \\ &\leq \varphi(x^0) - \frac{\tau c}{2c_1^2} \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu - \tau)}{L_g}\} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(x^k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (24) holds. \square

Theorems 2 (ii) and 3 match [48, Theorem 1] for IPNM.

3 The SBCPN Method When L_{S_k} is Known

In this section, we assume that the Lipschitz constants $\{L_{S_k}\}$ are known. We show that when Q_k and η_k satisfies

$$(Q_k)_{S_k} + (\eta_k - \vartheta)I_{|S_k|} \succeq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k + (\eta_k - L_{S_k} - \mu)I_n \succeq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (26)$$

for some $\vartheta \geq 1.1\mu \times \max\{\frac{1}{2}(1+2\zeta+3L_g+\mu), \frac{1}{2-\mu}(1+2\zeta+2L_g)\}$. Algorithm 1 is well-defined with unit step size. Without lose of generality, we can assume that

$$0 \leq \eta_k \leq \bar{\eta} := \max\{\mu + 2L_g + \zeta, \vartheta + L_g + \zeta\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We present the SBCPN method for this case in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 SBCPN method without line search.

Require: $x^0 \in \text{dom}g$, $\bar{\eta}$, and $\mu \in (0, 1]$, distribution \mathcal{D} of random index set.

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 2: sample S_k from \mathcal{D} ;
- 3: set $\eta_k \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ and Q_k satisfy (26);
- 4: let $y^k = x_{S_k}^k$, compute

$$\hat{y}^k \approx \arg \min_y \{q_{S_k}^k(y)\},$$

where there exist $\varsigma_k \in \partial q_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)$ such that (4) holds.

- 5: compute x^{k+1} , where $x_{S_k}^{k+1} = \hat{y}^k$ and $x_{\bar{S}_k}^{k+1} = x_{\bar{S}_k}^k$;
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **return** $\{x^k\}$
-

3.1 Global convergence

Similar results to Lemma 3 and Theorem 3 hold for Algorithm 2.

Theorem 4. *Suppose Assumption 1, (10), and (26) hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{y^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) $\|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(y^k)\| \leq c_1 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|$, where $c_1 = 1 + L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2}$.
- (b) $\varphi(x^k) - \varphi(x^{k+1}) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2$.
- (c) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x^k) = \varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*$ for some $\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^* \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\xi_\infty = \{S_0, S_1, \dots\}$.
- (d) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|] = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{k-1}}[\varphi(x^k)] = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_\infty}[\varphi_{\xi_\infty}^*]$.

(e) Suppose Assumption 2 **S2** holds. We have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|] = 0$ and

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{p_{\min}} \cdot \frac{2c_1^2(\varphi(x^0) - \varphi_*)}{\tau \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu-\tau)}{L_g}\}K}.$$

(f) Suppose Assumption 2 **S3** holds. We have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| = 0$. Let $\omega(x^0)$ be the cluster points set of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $\omega(x^0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$ is nonempty and compact. Moreover,

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \frac{2c_1^2(\varphi(x^0) - \varphi_*)}{\tau \min\{1, \frac{\theta(\mu-\tau)}{L_g}\}K}.$$

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix A. □

3.2 Local convergence

Next, we establish the superlinear local convergence rate of Algorithm 2 under the higher-order metric subregularity of the residual mapping $\mathcal{G}(x)$ and the sampling Assumption 2 **S3**.

The metric subregularity property of the residual mapping has been used to analyze the local convergence rate of proximal Newton methods [25, 21, 48]. Denote $\mathbb{B}(x, r)$ as the open Euclidean norm ball centered at x with radius $r > 0$. In the following, we assume that the residual mapping \mathcal{G} satisfies the metric q -subregularity property.

Assumption 3. For any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$, the metric q -subregularity at \bar{x} with $q > 1$ on \mathcal{S}^* holds, that is, there exist $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \kappa \|\mathcal{G}(x)\|^q, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon).$$

We also assume that f and g satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 4. (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is twice continuously differentiable on an open set Ω_2 containing the effective domain $\text{dom}g$ of g , ∇f is L_g -Lipschitz continuous over Ω_2 ; $\nabla^2 f$ is L_C -Lipschitz continuous over an open neighborhood of $\omega(x^0)$ with radius ϵ_0 for some $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$.

(ii) $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ takes the form of

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(x_i),$$

where $\psi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is proper closed convex, nonsmooth and continuous, $\min_z \{\psi(z) + \frac{1}{2}(z - u)^2\}$ is efficiently solvable, and $0 \in \text{dom}\psi_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(iii) For any $x^0 \in \text{dom}g$, the level set $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(x^0) = \{x | \varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x^0)\}$ is bounded.

Under Assumption 4 (i) and (ii), $\nabla f(\cdot) + \partial g(\cdot)$ is outer semicontinuous over $\text{dom}g$ [33, Prop. 8.7]. Hence, the stationary set \mathcal{S}^* is closed. The following result holds from the continuity of φ .

Lemma 4. $\varphi \equiv \varphi_* := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x^k)$ on $\omega(x^0)$.

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\bar{y}^k = \arg \min_y \{q_{S_k}^k(y)\}$. We first establish the error bound between \bar{y}^k and \hat{y}^k .

Lemma 5. Assume (26) holds. Let $\{\hat{y}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then we have

$$\|\hat{y}^k - \bar{y}^k\| \leq \frac{(1 + \bar{\eta} + \zeta + L_g)\mu}{2\vartheta} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. By the definition of \bar{y}^k and using the first-order optimality condition, we have

$$-\nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} - (Q_k)_{S_k}(\bar{y}^k - y^k) - \eta_k(\bar{y}^k - y^k) \in \partial g_k(\bar{y}). \quad (27)$$

Combining with (14), using the monotonicity of ∂g_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle \hat{y}^k - r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) - \bar{y}^k, r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) \rangle + \langle (Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|}(\bar{y}^k - \hat{y}^k) \rangle \\ &\leq -\langle (Q_k)_{S_k} + (1 + \eta_k) I_{|S_k|}(\bar{y}^k - \hat{y}^k), r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k) \rangle + \langle \hat{y}^k - \bar{y}^k, ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\bar{y}^k - y^k) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From (26) and Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\vartheta \|\hat{y}^k - \bar{y}^k\| \leq (1 + \bar{\eta} + L_g + \zeta) \|r_{S_k}^k(\hat{y}^k)\| \leq \frac{(1 + \bar{\eta} + \zeta + L_g)\mu}{2} \|d_k\|,$$

where the last inequality follows from (13). The statement holds. \square

Next, we estimate the error bound between y^k and \bar{y}^k in terms of $\text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*)$.

Lemma 6. Consider any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$. Suppose that Assumption 4 and (26) hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\hat{y}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then, for all $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0/2)$ with ϵ_0 defined in Assumption 4 (i), we have

$$\|y^k - \bar{y}^k\| \leq \frac{LC}{\vartheta} \text{dist}^2(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) + (1 + \frac{\zeta + \bar{\eta}}{\vartheta}) \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*).$$

Proof. For any $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0/2)$, let $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x^k)$ be the projection set of x^k onto \mathcal{S}^* . Then $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x^k) \neq \emptyset$ since \mathcal{S}^* is closed. Pick $x^{k,*} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x^k)$. Notice that $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$, we have

$$\|x^{k,*} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^{k,*} - x^k\| + \|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq 2\|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq \epsilon_0,$$

which implies that $x^{k,*} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0)$. Hence, $(1-t)x^k + tx^{k,*} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0) \cap \text{dom}g$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Notice that $x^{k,*} \in \mathcal{S}^*$, we have $-\nabla f(x^{k,*}) \in \partial g(x^{k,*})$. Moreover, $-\nabla f(x^{k,*})_{S_k} \in \partial g_k(x_{S_k}^{k,*})$ under Assumption 4 (ii). Combine with (27), using the monotonicity of ∂g_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle x_{S_k}^{k,*} - \bar{y}^k, -\nabla f(x^{k,*})_{S_k} + \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\bar{y}^k - y^k) \rangle \\ &= \langle x_{S_k}^{k,*} - \bar{y}^k, -\nabla f(x^{k,*})_{S_k} + \nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(x_{S_k}^{k,*} - y^k) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle x_{S_k}^{k,*} - \bar{y}^k, ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(\bar{y}^k - x_{S_k}^{k,*}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By (26) and Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{S_k}^{k,*} - \bar{y}^k\| &\leq \frac{1}{\vartheta} \|\nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} - \nabla f(x^{k,*})_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(x_{S_k}^{k,*} - y^k)\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\vartheta} \|E_k^\top (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^{k,*})) + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I_{|S_k|})(x_{S_k}^{k,*} - y^k)\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\vartheta} \|E_k^\top \int_0^1 [Q_k + \eta_k I_n - \nabla^2 f(x^k + t(x^{k,*} - x^k))](x^{k,*} - x^k)_{[S_k]} dt\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\vartheta} \left\| \int_0^1 [Q_k + \eta_k I_n - \nabla^2 f(x^k + t(x^{k,*} - x^k))](x^{k,*} - x^k)_{[S_k]} dt \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\vartheta} \left\| \int_0^1 [\nabla^2 f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^k + t(x^{k,*} - x^k))](x^{k,*} - x^k)_{[S_k]} dt \right\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\vartheta} \left\| \int_0^1 [Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x^k) + \eta_k I_n](x^{k,*} - x^k)_{[S_k]} dt \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{LC}{2\vartheta} \|x^{k,*} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{\zeta + \bar{\eta}}{\vartheta} \|x^{k,*} - x^k\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $E_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times |S_k|}$ is the column submatrix of I_n that corresponds to S_k and the last inequality follows from Assumption 4 (i), $\|(x^{k,*} - x^k)_{[S_k]}\| \leq \|x^{k,*} - x^k\|$, and (10). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^k - \bar{y}^k\| &\leq \|y^k - x_{S_k}^{k,*}\| + \|x_{S_k}^{k,*} - \bar{y}^k\| \\ &\leq \|x^k - x^{k,*}\| + \frac{LC}{\vartheta} \|x^{k,*} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{\zeta + \bar{\eta}}{\vartheta} \|x^{k,*} - x^k\| \\ &\leq \frac{LC}{\vartheta} \|x^k - x^{k,*}\|^2 + (1 + \frac{\zeta + \bar{\eta}}{\vartheta}) \|x^k - x^{k,*}\|. \end{aligned}$$

The statement holds. \square

By invoking Lemmas 5 and 6, for all $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0/2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| &= \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\| \leq \|\hat{y}^k - \bar{y}^k\| + \|\bar{y}^k - y^k\| \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + \bar{\eta} + \zeta + Lg)\mu}{2\vartheta} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \frac{LC}{\vartheta} \text{dist}^2(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) \\ &\quad + (1 + \frac{\zeta + \bar{\eta}}{\vartheta}) \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*). \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality yields that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \frac{2L_C}{\tilde{\eta}} \text{dist}^2(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) + \frac{2(\vartheta + \zeta + \bar{\eta})}{\tilde{\eta}} \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*), \quad (28)$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = 2\vartheta - \mu(1 + \bar{\eta} + \zeta + L_g) \geq 2\vartheta - (1 + 2\zeta + 2L_g + \vartheta) > 0$. Therefore, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*))$.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that Assumptions 3, 2 **S3**, and 4, the boundedness (10), and (26) hold. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q -superlinear convergence rate of order q .*

Proof. Recall that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| = 0$ under Assumptions 2 **S3**. Combine with Assumption 3, and (28), we know there exists $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $k \geq \hat{k}$, $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \leq 1$, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq c_6 \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*)$ for some $c_6 > 0$ if $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_1)$ with $\epsilon_1 = \min\{\epsilon, \epsilon_0/2\}$.

We first show that for all $k \geq \hat{k}$, if $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_1)$, then

$$\text{dist}(x^{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) = \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}^q(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*)). \quad (29)$$

Under Assumptions 3 and 2 **S3**, we have

$$\text{dist}(x^{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \kappa \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})\|^q \leq \kappa c^{-q/2} \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]}\|^q.$$

Let $r^k(x) = x - \text{prox}_g(x - \nabla f(x_k) - (Q_k + \eta_k I)(x - x^k))$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows from Assumption 4(ii) that $r^k_{S_k}(y) = r^k(x)_{S_k}$ for any $y = x_{S_k}$ and $y^k = x^k_{S_k}$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]}\| &= \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]} - r^k(x^{k+1})_{[S_k]}\| + \|r^k_{S_k}(y^k)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]} - r^k(x^{k+1})_{[S_k]}\| + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)\| + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k) - \mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_k]}\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_k]} - r^k(x^{k+1})_{[S_k]}\| + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

For all $k \geq \hat{k}$, if $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_1)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \\ &= \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_{k+1}]} + \mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{G}_{S_{k+1}}(x^{k+1}_{S_{k+1}}) - \mathcal{G}_{S_{k+1}}(x^k_{S_{k+1}})\| + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \\ &\leq \|x^{k+1}_{S_{k+1}} - x^k_{S_{k+1}}\| + \|x^{k+1}_{S_{k+1}} - \nabla f(x^{k+1})_{S_{k+1}} - x^k_{S_{k+1}} + \nabla f(x^k)_{S_{k+1}}\| + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \\ &\leq 2\|x^{k+1}_{S_{k+1}} - x^k_{S_{k+1}}\| + \|\nabla f(x^{k+1})_{S_{k+1}} - \nabla f(x^k)_{S_{k+1}}\| + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \\ &\leq (2 + L_g)\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{S_{k+1}}(\cdot)$, the non-expansivity of $\text{prox}_{g_{k+1}}$, and the fact $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_{k+1}]} - \mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \leq \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}(x^k)_{[S_k]} - r^k(x^{k+1})_{[S_k]}\| &= \|\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(x_{S_k}^k) - r_{S_k}^k(x_{S_k}^{k+1})\| \\ &\leq (2+L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta})\|x_{S_k}^k - x_{S_k}^{k+1}\| \leq (2+L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta})\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{S_k}(\cdot)$ and $r_{S_k}^k(\cdot)$ and the nonexpansivity of prox_{g_k} . Hence, we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]}\| \leq (4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + 2\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|,$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]}\|^2 &\leq 2((4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})^2\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 4\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|^2) \\ &\leq 2(4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})^2\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 8\frac{c_1^2}{c}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (22). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x^{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) &\leq \kappa c^{-q/2} \|\mathcal{G}(x^{k+1})_{[S_{k+1}]}\|^q \\ &\leq \kappa c^{-q/2} 2^{q/2} ((4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})^2 + 4\frac{c_1^2}{c})^{q/2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^q \\ &\leq \kappa c^{-q/2} 2^{q/2} ((4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})^2 + 4\frac{c_1^2}{c})^{q/2} c_6^q \text{dist}^q(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*), \end{aligned}$$

which yields (29).

Recall that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) = 0$ under Assumption 3 and Theorem 4 (f). By (29), for any $c_7 \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1)$ and $\tilde{k} \geq \hat{k}$, such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}$, if $x^k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$, then we have

$$\text{dist}(x^{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq c_7 \text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*).$$

Define $\bar{\epsilon} = \min\{\frac{\epsilon_2}{2}, \frac{(1-c_7)\epsilon_2}{2c_6}\}$. Next, we show that if $x^{k_0} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon})$ for some $k_0 \geq \tilde{k}$, then $x^{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$ for all $k \geq k_0$ by induction.

Notice that $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$, there exists $k_0 \geq \tilde{k}$, such that $x^{k_0} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k_0+1} - \bar{x}\| &\leq \|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + \|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\| \leq \|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + c_6 \text{dist}(x^{k_0}, \mathcal{S}^*) \\ &\leq (1 + c_6)\bar{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $x^{k_0+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$. For any $k > k_0$, suppose that for all $k_0 \leq l \leq k-1$, we have $x^{l+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^{k_0}\| &\leq \sum_{l=k_0}^k \|x^{l+1} - x^l\| \leq c_6 \sum_{l=k_0}^k \text{dist}(x^l, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq c_6 \sum_{l=k_0}^k c_7^{l-k_0} \text{dist}(x^{k_0}, \mathcal{S}^*) \\ &\leq \frac{c_6}{1-c_7} \|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^{k+1} - x^{k_0}\| + \|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \frac{c_6}{1-c_7})\|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \frac{c_6}{1-c_7})\bar{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_2$. Hence, $x^{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$.

Notice that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\bar{k} \geq k_0$, such that

$$\text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) < \tilde{\epsilon}, \quad \forall k > \bar{k},$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} = \frac{1-c_7}{c_6}\epsilon$. For any $k_1, k_2 > \bar{k}$, without loss of generality we assume $k_1 > k_2$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k_1} - x^{k_2}\| &\leq \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} \|x^{j+1} - x^j\| \leq c_6 \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} \text{dist}(x^j, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq c_6 \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} c_7^{j-k_2} \text{dist}(x^{k_2}, \mathcal{S}^*) \\ &\leq \frac{c_6}{1-c_7} \text{dist}(x^{k_2}, \mathcal{S}^*) < \frac{c_6}{1-c_7} \tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Recall that the cluster point set $\omega(x^0)$ of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is closed. We have $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $\bar{x} \in \omega(x^0)$. By setting $k_2 = k + 1$ and passing the limit $k_1 \rightarrow \infty$, we have for any $k > \bar{k}$,

$$\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \frac{c_6}{1-c_7} \text{dist}(x^{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \frac{c_6 c_8}{1-c_7} \text{dist}^q(x^k, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \frac{c_6 c_8}{1-c_7} \|x^k - \bar{x}\|^q,$$

where $c_8 = \kappa c^{-q/2} 2^{q/2} ((4 + 2L_g + \zeta + \bar{\eta} + \frac{\mu}{2})^2 + 4\frac{c_1^2}{c})^{q/2} c_6^q$. Therefore, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q-supperlinear rate of order q . \square

4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposed method on the ℓ_1 -regularized Student's t -regression, nonconvex binary classification with Geman-McClure loss function, and biweight loss with group regularization. All numerical experiments are implemented in MATLAB R2023b running on a computer with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-10885U CPU @ 2.40GHz \times 2.4 and 32GB of RAM.

4.1 ℓ_1 -regularized Student's t -regression

We first consider the following ℓ_1 -regularized Student's t -regression [1] problem:

$$\min_x \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + (Ax - b)_i^2 / \nu) + \lambda \|x\|_1, \quad (30)$$

where $\nu > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ is the regularized parameter. Problem (30) is a special case of Problem (1) with $f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + (Ax - b)_i^2 / \nu)$ and $g(x) := \lambda \|x\|_1$. In the following test, we generate the reference signal $x^{\text{true}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of length n with $k = \lceil n/40 \rceil$ nonzero entries, where the k different indices

$i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ of nonzero entries are randomly chosen and the magnitude of each nonzero entry is determined via $x_i^{\text{true}} = \eta_1(i)10^{\eta_2(i)}$, $\eta_1(i) \in \{-1, +1\}$ is a symmetric random sign and $\eta_2(i)$ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$. The matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ takes m random cosine measurements, i.e., $Ax^{\text{true}} = (\text{dct}(x^{\text{true}}))_J$, where $J \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $|J| = n$ is randomly chosen and dct denotes the discrete cosine transform. The measurement b is obtained by adding Student's t-noise with degree of freedom 5 and rescaled by 0.1 to Ax^{true} . We set $\lambda = 0.1\|\nabla f(0)\|_\infty$ and $\nu = 0.25$ in Problem (30). For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain the approximate solution \hat{y}^k by using the semismooth Newton (SSN) method [30, 20]. Details are similar to that used in [48] so we omit it.

We consider the following three sampling strategies: i). cyclic sampling with continuous indices (named as **SBCPNM_cycr**). The sampling order is randomly determined for each cycle. ii). cyclic sampling with random indices (named as **SBCPNM_cycrd**). iii). Top- k sampling (named as **SBCPNM_topk**); We name the algorithm with $S_k = [n]$ as **IPNM**. In the following tests, we set $(m, n) = (2n, 2^{11})$. We stop Algorithm 1 when $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\| \leq 10^{-4}$ and set $\tau = 10^{-5}$ and $\theta = 0.6$, respectively. Figure 1 shows the norm of the residual mapping at iterates generated by each method along with running time and iteration, respectively. It can be seen that stochastic methods work well and outperform **IPNM** in terms of running time. The iterations required by **SBCPNM_cycr** and **SBCPNM_cycrd** are similar to each other. When k in Top- k sampling equal to s , **SBCPNM_topk** requires less number of iterations and performs faster than **SBCPNM_cycr** and **SBCPNM_cycrd**. The second column of Figure 1 also illustrates that SBCPNM can achieve better convergence rate in terms of $\|G(x^k)\|$ than sublinear when implemented. The last column of Figure 1 displays the distance between iterates generated by each method and \bar{x} , where \bar{x} is the value returned by IPNM. Superlinear convergence rate of **SBCPNM_topk** can be observed.

4.2 Nonconvex binary classification

We study the following nonconvex binary classification problem:

$$\min_x f(x) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell(y_j - z_j^\top x) + \lambda \|x\|^2, \quad (31)$$

where $\ell(t) = \frac{2t^2}{t^2+4}$ is the Geman-McClure loss function, $\lambda > 0$ is the regularized parameter and is fixed to 0.001 in the following tests, $y_j \in \{0, 1\}$ is commonly referred to as class labels, and z_j satisfies $\|z_j\| = 1$ is commonly referred to as features, $j \in [m]$. Problem (31) is a special case of Problem (1) with $g(x) \equiv 0$. Notice that in this case, $\arg \min_y \{q_{S_k}^k(y)\}$ is the




Figure 1: Average performance of SBCPNM under different samplings over 10 trials. Top line: **SBCPNM_cyrcr**; the second line: **SBCPNM_cycrd**; Bottom two lines: **SBCPNM_topk**.

unique solution of equation

$$\nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I)(y - y^k) = 0$$

since $(Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I \succeq 0$. We find the approximate solution \hat{y}^k satisfies $\|\nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} + ((Q_k)_{S_k} + \eta_k I)(y - y^k)\| \leq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{y}^k - y^k\|$ by using conjugate gradient (CG) method [28]. Notice that $\nabla^2 f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \ell''(y_j - z_j^\top x) z_j z_j^\top + 2\lambda I = ZD(x)Z^\top + 2\lambda I$, where $Z = [z_1, \dots, z_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $D(x) = \text{Diag}(d_1, \dots, d_m)$, and $d_j = \frac{1}{m} \ell''(y_j - z_j^\top x)$, $j \in [m]$. We choose $Q_k := \nabla^2 f(x^k)$ and set $\eta_k = 1.01 \times \max(-2\lambda + \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} (d_j), \mu)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mu = 10^{-5}$.

We consider random sampling (each iteration randomly samples s in-

dicators, named as **SBCPNM_r**) and Top-**k** sampling in this test. We stop **SBCPNM_r** and **SBCPNM_topk** when $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \leq 10^{-8}$ and set $\tau = 10^{-5}$ and $\theta = 0.6$, respectively. We test on real data sets, including rcv1, and real-sim. The datasets can be downloaded from <https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/>. We select a subsets from data rcv1 and real-sim and name them as rcv1_sel and real_sim_sel, respectively. The size of rcv1_sel and real_sim_sel is $[m, n] = [240, 47236]$ and $[m, n] = [180, 20958]$, respectively. Figures 2 and 3 display the norm of $\nabla f(x)$ at iterates generated by each method along with running time and iteration, respectively. It can be seen from Figure 2 that when $k = 28000$, **SBCPNM_topk** outperforms **SBCPNM_r** and IPNM in terms of running time and the number of iterations. Similar results can be observed from Figure 3 for $k = 16000$ in Top-**k** sampling. It can be seen that **SBCPNM_r** and **SBCPNM_topk** can achieve better convergence rate in terms of $\|\nabla f(x^k)\|$ than sublinear when implemented. The last column of Figure 1 displays the distance between iterates generated by each method and \bar{x} , where \bar{x} is the value returned by IPNM. Superlinear convergence rate of **SBCPNM_topk** can be observed. At the bottom line of Figures 2 and 3, we also display the results obtained by **SBCPNM_topk** for larger size of selected data. It can be seen that, for the appropriate value of **k**, **SBCPNM_topk** exhibits an advantage in terms of running time.

4.3 Biweight loss with group regularization

We study the following nonconvex problem:

$$\min_x \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \phi(a_j^\top x - b_j) + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/5 \rceil} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\min\{5, n-5(p-1)\}} x_{5(p-1)+j}^2}, \quad (32)$$

where $\phi(t) = \frac{t^2}{t^2+1}$, $\lambda > 0$ is the regularized parameter and is fixed to 0.001 in the following tests, $b_j \in \{-1, 1\}$ is commonly referred to as class labels, and a_j satisfies $\|z_j\| = 1$ is commonly referred to as features, $j \in [m]$. We can denote $f(x) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \phi(a_j^\top x - b_j)$ and $g(x) := \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/5 \rceil} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\min\{5, n-5(p-1)\}} x_{5(p-1)+j}^2}$ for Problem (32). Each set of five consecutive coordinates is grouped into a single block.

Notice that $\nabla^2 f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \phi''(a_j^\top x - b_j) a_j a_j^\top = AD(x)A^\top$, where $A = [a_1, \dots, a_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $D(x) = \text{Diag}(d_1(x), \dots, d_m(x))$, and $d_j(x) = \frac{1}{m} \phi''(a_j^\top x - b_j)$, $j \in [m]$. We choose $Q_k := A \tilde{D}_k A^\top$ where $\tilde{D}_k = \text{Diag}(\tilde{d}_1, \dots, \tilde{d}_m)$ with $\tilde{d}_j = \max\{\frac{1}{m} \phi''(a_j^\top x^k - b_j), 10^8\}$, $\eta_k = 0.01\mu$ if $\min_j \{\tilde{d}_j\} + 0.01\mu \geq \mu$, and $\eta_k = 1.01\mu$, otherwise, and $\mu = 10^{-3}$. Similar to Problem (30) in subsection 4.1, the approximate solution \hat{y}^k can be obtained by using the SSN method.




Figure 2: Average performance of SBCPNM under different samplings over 10 trials on datasets rcv1_sel. The top line: **SBCPNM_r**; the second line: **SBCPNM_{topk}**; the third line: **SBCPNM_{topk}** with $k = \{50\%n, 40\%n, 30\%n\}$ for selected data with $m = 240$; the bottom line: **SBCPNM_{topk}** for selected data with $m = 2000$.

We consider the cyclic sampling with $|S_k| \equiv 5$. We compare Algorithm 1 with the inexact variable metric stochastic block-coordinate descent method (named as **VM**) proposed in [16]. As in [16], we solve each subproblem of **VM** by using 10 SpaRAS [43] iterations. Notice that we do not need to update the blocks satisfy $x_{S_k}^k = 0$ and $-\frac{1}{\lambda}\nabla f(x^k)_{S_k} \in \partial\|x\|_{x_{S_k}^k}$. Figure 4 displays the performance of **SBCPNM** and **VM** in terms of $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|$ and $\|x^k - \bar{x}\|$, where \bar{x} is calculated by using IPNM. It can be seen that both **BBCPNM** and **VM** can achieve better convergence rate in terms of $\|\mathcal{G}(x^k)\|$




Figure 3: Average performance of SBCPNM under different samplings over 10 trials on datasets `real_sim_sel`. The top line: **SBCPNM_r**; the second line: **SBCPNM_topk**; the third line: **SBCPNM_topk** with $\mathbf{k} = \{50\%n, 40\%n, 30\%n\}$ for selected data with $m = 180$; the bottom line: **SBCPNM_topk** for selected data with $m = 1500$.

than sublinear when implemented. Algorithms **BCPNM** and **VM** follow the same change trend, but the running time and the number of iterations are different due to the different methods are used to solve subproblems (SSN vs SparAS). Both **BCPNM** and **VM** exhibit superlinear convergence.




Figure 4: Performance of **SBCPNM** and **VM** on dataset `real_sim`.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a stochastic block-coordinate proximal Newton method for minimizing the sum of a smooth (possibly nonconvex) function and a separable convex (possibly nonsmooth) function. We establish the global convergence rate of the method under different assumptions on the sampling. We show the stochastic variant of the same convergence rate as the deterministic version proposed in [48] under certain sampling assumption. Our experiments demonstrated that stochastic strategies are effective when n is large, and the algorithm demonstrates a convergence rate that is superior to sublinear in terms of the norm of residual mapping and the superlinear convergence rate in terms of iterates.

A Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. (a) The proof of statement (a) is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.

(b) Notice that Lemma 1 still holds and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(x^k) &\geq q_k(x^{k+1}) \\
 &= \varphi(x^{k+1}) - (f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k)) + \frac{1}{2} \langle Q_k(x^{k+1} - x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \\
 &\quad + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\
 &\geq \varphi(x^{k+1}) - \frac{L_{S_k}}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle Q_k(x^{k+1} - x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\
 &\geq \varphi(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $Q_k + (\eta_k - L_{S_k} - \mu)I_n \succeq 0$.

(c) The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (i).

(d) The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (ii).

(e) The proof is similar to the proofs of Theorem 2 (i) and Theorem 3

(i).

(f) The proof is similar to the proofs of Theorem 2 (ii) and Theorem 3

(ii). \square

References

- [1] A. ARAVKIN, M. P. FRIEDLANDER, F. J. HERRMANN, AND T. V. LEEUWEN, *Robust inversion, dimensionality reduction, and randomized sampling*, *Mathematical Programming*, 134 (2012), pp. 101–125.
- [2] A. BECK, *First-Order Methods in Optimization*, Society for industrial and applied mathematics, Philadelphia, 2017.
- [3] D. P. BERTSEKAS, *Nonlinear Programming, 2nd edn*, Athena Scientific, 1999.
- [4] P. BILLINGSLEY, *Probability and Measure, 3rd ed.*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1995.
- [5] J. BOLTE, S. SABACH, AND M. TEBoulLE, *Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems*, *Mathematical Programming*, 146 (2014), pp. 459–494.
- [6] C. CARTIS, N. I. GOULD, AND P. L. TOINT, *Adaptive cubic regularisation methods for unconstrained optimization. part i: motivation, convergence and numerical results*, *Mathematical Programming*, 127 (2011), pp. 245–295.
- [7] K. W. CHANG AND C. J. L. C. J. HSIEH, *Coordinate descent method for large-scale ℓ_2 -loss linear support vector machines*, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9 (2008), pp. 1369–1398.
- [8] A. FAN, M. LEWIS, AND Y. DAUPHIN, *Hierarchical neural story generation*, 2018, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.04833>.
- [9] K. FOUNTOULAKIS AND R. TAPPENDEN, *A flexible coordinate descent method*, *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 70 (2018), pp. 351–394.
- [10] T. FUJI, P. L. POIRION, AND A. TAKEDA, *Randomized subspace regularized newton method for unconstrained non-convex optimization*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.04170>.
- [11] R. M. GOWER, D. KOVALEV, F. LIEDER, AND P. RICHTÁRIK, *Rsn: Randomized subspace newton*, in *In Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32 of *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [12] F. HANZELY, N. DOIKOV, P. RICHTÁRIK, AND Y. NESTEROV, *Stochastic subspace cubic newton method*, in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20, JMLR.org*, 2020, pp. 4027–4038.

- [13] C. KANZOW AND T. LECHNER, *Globalized inexact proximal newton-type methods for nonconvex composite functions*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 78 (2021), pp. 377–410.
- [14] C. P. LEE, *Accelerating inexact successive quadratic approximation for regularized optimization through manifold identification*, Mathematical Programming, 201 (2023), pp. 599–633.
- [15] C. P. LEE AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Inexact successive quadratic approximation for regularized optimization*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 72 (2019), pp. 641–674.
- [16] C. P. LEE AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Inexact variable metric stochastic block-coordinate descent for regularized optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 185 (2020), pp. 151–187.
- [17] J. D. LEE, Y. SUN, AND M. A. SAUNDERS, *Proximal newton-type methods for convex optimization*, in In Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 1 of NIPS’12, 2012, p. 827–835.
- [18] J. D. LEE, Y. SUN, AND M. A. SAUNDERS, *Proximal newton-type methods for minimizing composite functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 24 (2014), pp. 1420–1443.
- [19] D. LEVENTHAL AND A. S. LEWIS, *Randomized methods for linear constraints: convergence rates and conditioning*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 35 (2010), pp. 641–654.
- [20] X. D. LI, D. F. SUN, AND K. C. TOH, *A highly efficient semismooth newton augmented lagrangian method for solving lasso problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28 (2018), pp. 433–458.
- [21] R. Y. LIU, S. H. PAN, Y. WU, AND X. YANG, *An inexact regularized proximal newton method for nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 88 (2024), pp. 603–641.
- [22] Z. LU, *Randomized block proximal damped newton method for composite self-concordant minimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27 (2017), pp. 1910–1942.
- [23] Z. LU AND L. XIAO, *On the complexity analysis of randomized block-coordinate descent methods*, Mathematical Programming, 152 (2015), pp. 615–642.
- [24] Z. LU AND L. XIAO, *A randomized nonmotone block proximal gradient method for a class of structured nonlinear programming*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 55 (2017), pp. 2930–2955.

- [25] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, X. M. YUAN, S. Z. ZENG, AND J. ZHANG, *A globally convergent proximal newton-type method in nonsmooth convex optimization*, *Mathematical Programming*, 198 (2023), pp. 899–936.
- [26] Y. NESTEROV, *Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22 (2012), pp. 341–362.
- [27] Y. NESTEROV AND B. T. POLYAK, *Cubic regularization of newton method and its global performance*, *Mathematical Programming*, 108 (2006), pp. 177–205.
- [28] J. NOCEDAL AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer, New York, 2006.
- [29] A. PATRASCU AND I. NECOARA, *Efficient random coordinate descent algorithms for large-scale structured nonconvex optimization*, *Journal of Global Optimization*, 61 (2015), pp. 19–46.
- [30] L. Q. QI AND J. SUN, *A nonsmooth version of newton’s method*, *Mathematical Programming*, 58 (1993), pp. 353–367.
- [31] P. RICHTÁRIK AND M. TAKÁČ, *Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function*, *Mathematical Programming*, 144 (2014), pp. 1–38.
- [32] P. RICHTÁRIK AND M. TAKÁČ, *Parallel coordinate descent methods for big data optimization*, *Mathematical Programming*, 156 (2016), pp. 433–484.
- [33] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR AND R. J. B. WETS, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [34] K. SCHEINBERG AND X. TANG, *Practical inexact proximal quasi-newton method with global complexity analysis*, *Mathematical Programming*, 160 (2016), pp. 495–529.
- [35] S. S. SHAI AND T. ZHANG, *Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss minimization*, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14 (2013), pp. 567–599.
- [36] S. SHALEV-SHWARTZ AND A. TEWARI, *Stochastic methods for ℓ_1 regularized loss minimization*, in *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML, JMLR.org*, 2009, pp. 929–936.
- [37] R. TAPPENDEN, P. RICHTÁRIK, AND J. GONDZIO, *Inexact coordinate descent: Complexity and preconditioning*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 170 (2016), pp. 144–176.

- [38] P. TSENG, *Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for non-differentiable minimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 109 (2001), pp. 475–494.
- [39] P. TSENG AND S. YUN, *A coordinate gradient descent method for nonsmooth separable minimization*, Mathematical Programming, 117 (2009), pp. 387–423.
- [40] K. UEDA AND N. YAMASHITA, *Convergence properties of the regularized newton method for the unconstrained nonconvex optimization*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 62 (2010), pp. 27–46.
- [41] S. J. WRIGHT, *Accelerated block-coordinate relaxation for regularized optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 22 (2012), pp. 159–186.
- [42] S. J. WRIGHT, *Coordinate descent algorithms.*, Mathematical Programming, 151 (2015), pp. 3–34.
- [43] S. J. WRIGHT, R. D. NOWAK, AND M. A. T. FIGUEIREDO, *Sparse reconstruction by separable approximation*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 57 (2009), pp. 2479–2493.
- [44] Y. XU AND W. YIN, *Block stochastic gradient iteration for convex and nonconvex optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 25 (2015), pp. 1686–1716.
- [45] G.-X. YUAN, C.-H. HO, AND C.-J. LIN, *Recent advances of large-scale linear classification*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 100 (2012), pp. 2584–2603.
- [46] M. C. YUE, Z. ZHOU, AND M. C. SO, *A family of inexact sqa methods for non-smooth convex minimization with provable convergence guarantees based on the luo–tseng error bound property*, Mathematical Programming, 174 (2019), pp. 327–358.
- [47] J. ZHAO, A. LUCCHI, AND N. DOIKOV, *Cubic regularized subspace newton for non-convex optimization*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16666>.
- [48] H. ZHU, *An inexact proximal newton method for nonconvex composite minimization*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16535>.