

# Differentially Private Gradient-Tracking-Based Distributed Stochastic Optimization over Directed Graphs

Jialong Chen, Jimin Wang, *Member, IEEE*, and Ji-Feng Zhang, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper proposes a new differentially private gradient-tracking-based distributed stochastic optimization algorithm over directed graphs. Specifically, privacy noises are added to each agent's state and tracking variable to prevent information leakage, and then perturbed states and tracking variables are transmitted to neighbors. We design two novel schemes of the iteration step-sizes and the sampling number for the algorithm. By using the sampling parameter-controlled subsampling method, both schemes enhance the differential privacy level, and achieve the finite cumulative privacy budget even over infinite iterations. The convergence rate of the algorithm is shown for both nonconvex with the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition and strongly convex objectives: *Scheme (S1)* achieves the polynomial convergence rate, and *Scheme (S2)* achieves the exponential convergence rate. The trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate is presented. The algorithm's effectiveness and superior performance over the existing works are demonstrated through numerical examples of distributed training on benchmark datasets "MNIST" and "CIFAR-10".

**Index Terms**—Differential privacy, directed graphs, distributed stochastic optimization, exponential convergence rate, gradient-tracking.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**D**ISTRIBUTED optimization enables multiple cooperative agents to compute and update their state variables through inter-agent communication to obtain an optimal solution of a common optimization problem [1]. As a branch of distributed optimization, distributed stochastic optimization focuses on the case where objectives are inherently stochastic [2], and has been widely applied in various fields, such as

distributed machine learning [3], cloud-based control systems [4], and Internet of Things [5]. In the existing distributed stochastic optimization algorithms, while stochastic gradient descent (SGD) has been commonly used due to its flexibility in communication efficient techniques [6] and simplicity in algorithm structure [7], noises in stochastic gradients can slow down the convergence rate [8], [9]. To address this issue, the gradient-tracking method has been proposed over undirected graphs [10], [11], which uses tracking variables to accelerate the convergence rate. What is more, the convergence analysis of this method has also been extended to directed graphs [12]–[15]. Specifically, [13], [14] have achieved an exponential convergence rate, and [15] has proposed a new gradient-tracking-based approach under noisy information sharing.

When cooperative agents exchange information to solve a distributed stochastic optimization problem, adversaries can infer stochastic gradients from the exchanged information, and obtain agents' sensitive information by the model inversion attack [16], [17]. To address this issue, numerous privacy-preserving techniques have been developed [18]. For example, homomorphic encryption [19] uses mathematical transformations to encrypt sensitive information. Structure technique [20]–[23] alters systems' structures "softly" to make the system unobservable. Time-correlated noise technique [24] protects the sensitive information by adding time-correlated noises to each agent's state variable before transmitting. However, homomorphic encryption often incurs the computation burden due to complex encryption operations, structure technique is only suitable for systems with special structures, and time-correlated noise technique only provides limited protection.

Due to its simplicity in realization and immunity to post-processing, differential privacy [25], [26] has attracted considerable interest and has been widely used in distributed optimization, especially in the case based on the gradient-tracking method [27]–[31]. [27]–[30] achieve the finite cumulative differential privacy budget over infinite iterations, and [27], [28], [31] achieve the exponential convergence rate. However, due to the difficulty caused by stochastic objectives, the methods in [27]–[31] cannot be used for differentially private distributed stochastic optimization. Then, the differentially private distributed stochastic optimization based on SGD method [32]–[41] have been given. To achieve the differential privacy, the discrete Gaussian mechanism [32], the Gaussian mechanism [33], [35], the random subsampling method [34], [38], the probabilistic quantization method [36],

The work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 62433020, 62203045 and T2293770. The material in this paper was not presented at any conference.

Jialong Chen is with the Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Institute of Systems Science, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, and also with the School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China. (e-mail: chenjialong23@mails.ucas.ac.cn)

Jimin Wang is with the School of Automation and Electrical Engineering, University of Science and Technology Beijing, Beijing 100083, and also with the Key Laboratory of Knowledge Automation for Industrial Processes, Ministry of Education, Beijing 100083, China (e-mail: jimwang@ustb.edu.cn)

Ji-Feng Zhang is with the School of Automation and Electrical Engineering, Zhongyuan University of Technology, Zheng Zhou 450007; and also with the Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Institute of Systems Science, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China. (e-mail: jif@iss.ac.cn)

and the binomial mechanism-aided quantization method [37] are used, respectively. However, these works only give the per-iteration differential privacy budget, leading to the infinite cumulative differential privacy budget over infinite iterations. By exploiting unique characteristics of the distributed online learning, [39] first achieves the finite cumulative differential privacy budget over infinite iterations. Recently, the time-varying sampling number method [40] and the sampling parameter-controlled subsampling method [41] are used to achieve the finite cumulative differential privacy budget over infinite iterations, respectively. It is worth noting that [32]–[41] can only achieve the polynomial convergence rate no faster than  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})$ . In addition, the convergence rate analysis therein cannot be directly extended to directed graph cases. As a result, the differentially private distributed stochastic optimization based on the gradient-tracking method is a challenging issue, especially on how to achieve the finite cumulative differential privacy budget even over infinite iterations and the exponential convergence rate.

Summarizing the discussion above, we are interested in designing a differentially private distributed stochastic optimization algorithm based on the gradient-tracking method. By using the sampling parameter-controlled subsampling method, we design schemes of the iteration step-sizes and the sampling number to enhance the differential privacy level and to achieve the exponential convergence rate. In particular, the main contribution of this paper is as follows:

- We propose a new differentially private gradient-tracking-based distributed stochastic optimization algorithm over directed graphs. By using the sampling parameter-controlled subsampling method to enhance the differential privacy level. Compared to [6]–[15] that only analyze the convergence rate, the privacy protection is considered for both schemes. Moreover, compared to [32]–[38] that only achieve the infinite cumulative differential privacy budget over infinite iterations, the finite cumulative differential privacy budget is achieved for both schemes even over infinite iterations.
- We design two novel schemes of the iteration step-sizes and the sampling number for the algorithm. *Scheme (S1)* uses the polynomially decreasing iteration step-sizes and the increasing sampling number with the maximum iteration number. *Scheme (S2)* uses the constant iteration step-sizes and the exponentially increasing sampling number with the maximum iteration number. For *Scheme (S1)*, we prove that the polynomial convergence rate and the cumulative differential privacy budget are achieved simultaneously even over infinite iterations. This result shows advantages over [8], [33], [37], [38] that cannot achieve the convergence and the differential privacy simultaneously. For *Scheme (S2)*, we further prove that the exponential convergence rate and the cumulative differential privacy budget are achieved simultaneously even over infinite iterations. This is different from [6]–[8], [11], [12], [15], [32]–[41] that cannot achieve the exponential convergence rate.
- We give the convergence rate of the algorithm for both non-convex with the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition and strongly convex objectives. Furthermore, the convergence rate is

analyzed over directed graphs with spanning trees, which are more general than undirected connected graphs in [6], [8]–[11], [15], [32]–[37], [39]–[41], directed graphs with stochastic weight matrices in [12], and strongly connected directed graphs in [21]. Moreover, the convergence rate analysis does not rely on the assumption of bounded gradients required in [6], [7], [32]–[36], [38], [39].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II presents preliminaries and the problem formulation. Section III provides the algorithm with its convergence rate and privacy analysis. Section IV verifies the effectiveness of the algorithm through numerical examples of the distributed training on benchmark datasets “MNIST” and “CIFAR-10”. Finally, Section V concludes the paper.

*Notation.*  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n$  denote the set of real numbers and  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space, respectively.  $\mathbf{1}_n$  denotes a  $n$ -dimensional vector whose elements are all 1, and  $\|x\|$  denotes the standard Euclidean norm of a vector  $x$ .  $X \sim \text{Lap}(b)$  refers to a random variable that has a Laplacian distribution with the variance parameter  $b > 0$ , and the probability density function of the random variable  $X$  is given by  $p(x; b) = \frac{1}{2b} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|}{b}\right)$ . For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $A^\top$ ,  $\rho_A$  stand for its transpose and spectral radius, respectively.  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the inner product.  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  denotes a probability space,  $\mathbb{P}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{E}X$  stand for the probability of an event  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  and the expectation of the random variable  $X$ , respectively.  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product of matrices.  $\lfloor z \rfloor$  denotes the largest integer which is not larger than  $z$ . For a differentiable function  $f(x)$ ,  $\nabla f(x)$  denotes its gradient at the point  $x$ . For a vector  $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the notation  $\text{diag}(x)$  denotes the diagonal matrix with diagonal elements being  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ .

## II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

### A. Graph theory

In this paper, we consider a network of  $n$  agents which exchange the information over two different directed graphs  $\mathcal{G}_R = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_R)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_C = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_C)$ .  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is the set of all agents, and  $\mathcal{E}_R, \mathcal{E}_C$  are sets of directed edges in  $\mathcal{G}_R, \mathcal{G}_C$ , respectively. In our gradient-tracking algorithm, agents exchange state variables over  $\mathcal{G}_R$  and tracking variables over  $\mathcal{G}_C$ . Directed graphs  $\mathcal{G}_R$  and  $\mathcal{G}_C$  are induced by the weight matrix  $R = (R_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  and  $C = (C_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ , respectively. Any element  $R_{ij}$  of  $R$  is either strictly positive if Agent  $i$  can receive Agent  $j$ 's state variable, or 0, otherwise. The same property holds for any element  $C_{ij}$  of  $C$ . For any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , its in-neighbor and out-neighbor set of over  $\mathcal{G}_R$  are defined as  $\mathcal{N}_{R,i}^- = \{j \in \mathcal{V} : R_{ij} > 0, j \neq i\}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{R,i}^+ = \{j \in \mathcal{V} : R_{ji} > 0, j \neq i\}$ , respectively. Similarly, Agent  $i$ 's in-neighbor and out-neighbor set over  $\mathcal{G}_C$  are defined as  $\mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{C,i}^+$ , respectively. The assumption about directed graphs  $\mathcal{G}_R, \mathcal{G}_C$  is given as follows:

*Assumption 1:* Let  $\mathcal{G}_R$  and  $\mathcal{G}_C^\top$  be directed graphs induced by nonnegative matrices  $R$  and  $C^\top$ , respectively. Then, both  $\mathcal{G}_R$  and  $\mathcal{G}_C^\top$  contain at least one spanning tree. Moreover, there exists at least one agent being a root of spanning trees in both  $\mathcal{G}_R$  and  $\mathcal{G}_C^\top$ .

*Remark 1:* Directed graphs in Assumption 1 are more general than undirected connected graphs in [6], [8]–[11], [15],

[27], [31]–[37], [39]–[41], directed graphs with stochastic weight matrices in [12], and strongly connected directed graphs in [21]. In addition, by Theorem 3.8 in [42], Assumption 1 is a necessary condition for the consensus of Agents' state and tracking variables.

Based on Assumption 1, we have the following useful lemma for weight matrices  $R$  and  $C$ .

*Lemma 1:* [1, Lemmas 1 and 3] Let the in-Laplacian matrix of  $R$  and the out-Laplacian matrix of  $C$  be  $\mathcal{L}_1 = \text{diag}(R \cdot \mathbf{1}_n) - R$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2 = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top C) - C$ , respectively. If Assumption 1 holds, then for any  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that  $I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1$  and  $I_n - \beta \mathcal{L}_2$  are nonnegative matrices, there exist unique nonnegative vectors  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $v_1^\top (I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) = v_1^\top$ ,  $(I_n - \beta \mathcal{L}_2) v_2 = v_2$ ,  $v_1^\top \mathbf{1}_n = n$ ,  $v_2^\top \mathbf{1}_n = n$ ,  $v_1^\top v_2 > 0$ . Furthermore, there exist  $r_{\mathcal{L}_1}, r_{\mathcal{L}_2} > 0$  such that the spectral radii of the matrices  $I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n v_1^\top$  and  $I_n - \beta \mathcal{L}_2 - \frac{1}{n} v_2 \mathbf{1}_n^\top$  are  $1 - \alpha r_{\mathcal{L}_1}$  and  $1 - \beta r_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ , respectively.

## B. Problem formulation

In this paper, the following distributed stochastic optimization problem is considered:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(x) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \quad f_i(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(x, \xi_i)], \quad (1)$$

where  $x$  is available to all agents,  $\ell_i(x, \xi_i)$  is a local objective which is private to Agent  $i$ , and  $\xi_i$  is a random variable drawn from an unknown probability distribution  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . In practice, since the probability distribution  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is difficult to obtain, it is usually replaced by the dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{\xi_{i,l}, 1 \leq l \leq D\}$ . Then, (1) can be rewritten as the following empirical risk minimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(x) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \quad f_i(x) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{l=1}^D \ell_i(x, \xi_{i,l}). \quad (2)$$

To solve the empirical risk minimization problem (2), we need the following standard assumption:

*Assumption 2:* (i) For any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , there exists  $L > 0$ , such that for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f_i$  is  $L$ -smooth, i.e.,  $\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ .

(ii) There exists  $\sigma_g > 0$  and a stochastic first-order oracle such that for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\lambda_i$  uniformly sampled from  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , the stochastic first-order oracle returns a sampled gradient  $g_i(x, \lambda_i)$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[g_i(x, \lambda_i)] = \nabla f_i(x)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\|g_i(x, \lambda_i) - \nabla f_i(x)\|^2] \leq \sigma_g^2$ .

*Remark 2:* Assumption 2(i) requires that each objective  $f_i$  has  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients, which is commonly used (see e.g. [1], [7]–[14], [21], [27], [29]–[41]). Assumption 2(ii) requires that each sampled gradient  $g_i(x, \lambda_i)$  is unbiased with a bounded variance  $\sigma_g^2$ , which is standard for distributed stochastic optimization (see e.g. [8]–[11], [13], [14], [32], [34], [36], [37], [39]–[41]).

Next, assumptions for the nonconvex and strongly convex global objective are respectively given as follows:

*Assumption 3:* There exists  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $F(x^*)$  is the global minimum of the nonconvex global objective  $F(x)$ . Moreover, the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition holds, i.e., there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $2\mu(F(x) - F(x^*)) \leq \|\nabla F(x)\|^2$ .

*Assumption 4:* There exists  $s > 0$  such that the global objective  $F(x)$  is  $s$ -strongly convex, i.e., for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $F(y) \geq F(x) + \langle \nabla F(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{s}{2}\|y - x\|^2$ .

*Remark 3:* Assumption 3 requires the gradient  $\nabla F(x)$  to grow faster than a quadratic function as we move away from the global minimum, which is commonly used (see e.g. [7], [13], [31], [33], [41]). Assumption 4 is a standard assumption for strongly convex objectives, which is also commonly used (see e.g. [1], [11], [12], [21], [27], [30], [32], [33], [38], [40]).

In practice, since finding the exact optimal solution is computationally expensive and time-consuming, suboptimal solutions within a given error  $\varphi > 0$  are often preferred. Inspired by [2], the  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution and the oracle complexity are defined as follows:

*Definition 1:* Let  $\varphi > 0$ ,  $K \geq 0$ ,  $x_K = [x_{1,K}^\top, \dots, x_{n,K}^\top]^\top$  be the output of the algorithm and  $x^*$  be the optimal solution of the problem (2). Then,  $x_K$  is a  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution if for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K}) - F(x^*)) < \varphi$ .

*Definition 2:* Let  $\varphi > 0$ ,  $N(\varphi) = \min\{K : x_K \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-suboptimal solution}\}$ , and  $m_k$  be the sampling number at the  $k$ -th iteration. Then, the oracle complexity of the algorithm is  $\sum_{k=0}^{N(\varphi)} m_k$ .

## C. Differential privacy

As shown in [35], [36], [39], there are two kinds of adversary models widely used in the privacy-preserving issue for distributed stochastic optimization:

- A *semi-honest* adversary. This kind of adversary is defined as an agent within the network which has access to certain internal information (such as the state variable  $x_{i,k}$  of Agent  $i$ ), follows the prescribed protocols and accurately computes iterative state correctly. However, it aims to infer the sensitive information of other agents.
- An *eavesdropper*. This kind of adversary refers to an external adversary who has capability to wiretap and monitor all communication channels, allowing them to capture distributed messages from any agent. This enables the eavesdropper to infer the sensitive information of agents.

When cooperative agents exchange information to solve the empirical risk minimization problem (2), these two kinds of adversaries can use the model inversion attack [16] to infer sampled gradients, and further obtain the sensitive information in agents' data samples from sampled gradients [17]. In order to provide the privacy protection for data samples, a symmetric binary relation called *adjacency relation* is defined as follows:

*Definition 3 ([41]):* Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{\xi_{i,l}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq l \leq D\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}' = \{\xi'_{i,l}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq l \leq D\}$  be two sets of data samples. If for a given  $C > 0$  and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^r$ , there exists exactly one pair of data samples  $\xi_{i_0, l_0}, \xi'_{i_0, l_0}$  in  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \|g_i(x, \xi_{i,l}) - g_i(x, \xi'_{i,l})\| \leq C, & \text{if } i = i_0 \text{ and } l = l_0; \\ \|g_i(x, \xi_{i,l}) - g_i(x, \xi'_{i,l})\| = 0, & \text{if } i \neq i_0 \text{ or } l \neq l_0, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

then  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  are said to be adjacent, denoted by  $\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')$ .

*Remark 4:* The boundary  $C$  characterizes the ‘‘closeness’’ of a pair of data samples  $\xi_{i_0, l_0}, \xi'_{i_0, l_0}$ . The larger the boundary  $C$  is, the larger the allowed magnitude of sampled gradients between adjacent datasets is, and thus, the higher the privacy protection level is. For more details, please refer to [41, Subsec. IV-B].

Next, the following definition of differential privacy is given to show the privacy-preserving level of the algorithm:



**Definition 4 ([26]):** Let  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  be the differential privacy budget. Then, the randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  achieves the  $\varepsilon$ -differential privacy for  $\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')$  if for any observation set  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathcal{O}) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') \in \mathcal{O}) + \delta$  holds.

**Remark 5:** As shown in [32]–[41], the differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  measure the similarity of the randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$ 's output distributions under two adjacent datasets  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ . The smaller the differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is, the higher the differential privacy level is.

**Problem of interest:** In this paper, we first aim to propose a new differentially private gradient-tracking-based algorithm for the problem (2) over directed graphs; then design schemes of the iteration step-sizes and the sampling number to enhance the differential privacy level, and further accelerate the convergence rate.

### III. MAIN RESULTS

#### A. The proposed algorithm

In this subsection, we propose a differentially private gradient-tracking-based distributed stochastic optimization algorithm over directed graphs. Detailed steps are given in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1** Differentially private gradient-tracking-based distributed stochastic optimization algorithm over directed graphs

**Initialization:**  $x_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $m$  different data samples  $\lambda_{i,0,1}, \dots, \lambda_{i,0,m}$  in  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $y_{i,0} = g_{i,0} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m g_i(x_{i,0}, \lambda_{i,0,l})$  for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , weight matrices  $R = (R_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ ,  $C = (C_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ , the maximum iteration number  $K$ , the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  and the sampling number  $m$ .

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

1: Agent  $i$  adds independent  $d$ -dimensional Laplacian noises  $\zeta_{i,k}, \eta_{i,k}$  to its state variable  $x_{i,k}$  and tracking variable  $y_{i,k}$ , respectively:  $\check{x}_{i,k} = x_{i,k} + \zeta_{i,k}$ ,  $\check{y}_{i,k} = y_{i,k} + \eta_{i,k}$ , where each coordinate of  $\zeta_{i,k}, \eta_{i,k}$  has the distribution  $\text{Lap}(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)})$  and  $\text{Lap}(\sigma_k^{(\eta)})$ , respectively.

2: Agent  $i$  broadcasts its perturbed state variable  $\check{x}_{i,k}$  to all its out-neighbors in  $\mathcal{N}_{R,i}^+$ , and broadcasts its perturbed tracking variable  $\check{y}_{i,k}$  to all its out-neighbors in  $\mathcal{N}_{C,i}^+$ .

3: Agent  $i$  receives  $\check{x}_{j,k}$  from all its in-neighbors in  $\mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-$  and  $\check{y}_{j,k}$  from all its in-neighbors in  $\mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-$ .

4: Agent  $i$  updates its state variable by

$$x_{i,k+1} = (1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij}) x_{i,k} + \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij} \check{x}_{j,k} - \gamma y_{i,k}. \quad (4)$$

5: Agent  $i$  takes  $m$  different samples  $\lambda_{i,k+1,1}, \dots, \lambda_{i,k+1,m}$  uniformly from  $\mathcal{D}_i$  to generate sampled gradients  $g_i(x_{i,k+1}, \lambda_{i,k+1,1}), \dots, g_i(x_{i,k+1}, \lambda_{i,k+1,m})$ . Then, Agent  $i$  puts these data samples back into  $\mathcal{D}_i$ .

6: Agent  $i$  computes the averaged sampled gradient by

$$g_{i,k+1} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m g_i(x_{i,k+1}, \lambda_{i,k+1,l}). \quad (5)$$

7: Agent  $i$  updates its tracking variable by

$$y_{i,k+1} = (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij}) y_{i,k} + \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij} \check{y}_{j,k} + g_{i,k+1} - g_{i,k}. \quad (6)$$

**end for**

**Return**  $x_{1,K+1}, \dots, x_{n,K+1}$

For the convenience of the analysis, let  $x_k = [x_{1,k}^\top, \dots, x_{n,k}^\top]^\top$ ,  $y_k = [y_{1,k}^\top, \dots, y_{n,k}^\top]^\top$ ,  $\zeta_k = [\zeta_{1,k}^\top, \dots, \zeta_{n,k}^\top]^\top$ ,  $\eta_k = [\eta_{1,k}^\top, \dots, \eta_{n,k}^\top]^\top$ ,  $g_k = [g_{1,k}^\top, \dots, g_{n,k}^\top]^\top$ . Then, Algorithm 1 can be written in the following compact form:

$$x_{k+1} = ((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d) x_k - \alpha (\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d) \zeta_k - \gamma y_k, \quad (7)$$

$$y_{k+1} = ((I_n - \beta \mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d) y_k - \beta (\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I_d) \eta_k + g_{k+1} - g_k. \quad (8)$$

#### B. Convergence rate analysis

In this subsection, we will analyze the convergence rate of Algorithm 1. First, we give the following key lemma:

**Lemma 2:** For any given  $K \geq 1$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq K$ , let  $x^*$  be an optimal solution of the global objective  $F(x)$ ,  $W_1 = I_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top$ ,  $W_2 = I_n - \frac{1}{n} v_2 \mathbf{1}_n^\top$ , and  $V_k = [ \| (W_1 \otimes I_d) x_k \|^2, \| (W_2 \otimes I_d) y_k \|^2, F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*) ]^\top$ . If Assumptions 1-3 and  $3\gamma L < 1$  hold, then

$$\mathbb{E} V_{k+1} \leq A \mathbb{E} V_k + u_k, \quad (9)$$

where  $u_k = [u_k^{(1)}, u_k^{(2)}, u_k^{(3)}]^\top$ ,  $u_k^{(1)} = 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 (\sigma_k^{(\zeta)})^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}$ ,  $u_k^{(2)} = \frac{2n\sigma_g^2}{m} + \frac{3n(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2 \gamma^2 L^2 \sigma_g^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2} m \beta} + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 \beta^2 (\sigma_k^{(\eta)})^2 + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 (\sigma_k^{(\zeta)})^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2} \beta}$ ,  $u_k^{(3)} = \frac{(\gamma + \gamma^2 L) \sigma_g^2}{2m}$ , and the matrix  $A$  is given as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A^{(11)} & A^{(12)} & A^{(13)} \\ A^{(21)} & A^{(22)} & A^{(23)} \\ A^{(31)} & A^{(32)} & A^{(33)} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(11)} &= 1 - r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha + \frac{4(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2 \rho_{W_1}^2 \|v_2\|^2 L^2}{nr_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}, & A^{(12)} &= \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2 \rho_{W_1}^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}, \\ A^{(13)} &= \frac{8(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\rho_{W_1}^2 \|v_2\|^2 L}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}, & A^{(31)} &= \frac{3\gamma^2 L^3}{2n} + \frac{\gamma L^2}{n}, \\ A^{(32)} &= \frac{\|v_1\|^2 \gamma}{n^2} + \frac{3\|v_1\|^2 \gamma^2 L}{2n^2}, & A^{(33)} &= 1 - \mu\gamma + 3\mu\gamma^2 L, \\ A^{(21)} &= \frac{(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2 L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2} \beta} \left( 3\alpha^2 \rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 + \frac{6\|v_2\|^2 \gamma^2 L^2}{n} \right), \\ A^{(22)} &= 1 - r_{\mathcal{L}_2} \beta + \frac{3(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2 \gamma^2 L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2} \beta}, & A^{(23)} &= \frac{12(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2 \|v_2\|^2 \gamma^2 L^3}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2} \beta}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** See Appendix B.  $\blacksquare$

Next, we will give two different schemes of the iteration step-sizes and the sampling number for Algorithm 1 as follows:

**Scheme (S1):** For any given  $K \geq 1$ ,

- (I) the iteration step-sizes:  $\alpha = \frac{a_1}{K^{p_\alpha}}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{a_2}{K^{p_\beta}}$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{a_3}{K^{p_\gamma}}$ ,
  - (II) the sampling number:  $m = \lfloor a_4 K^{p_m} \rfloor + 1$ ,
- where  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 > 0$ ,  $p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma > 0$ ,  $p_m \geq 0$ .

**Scheme (S2):** For any given  $K \geq 1$ ,

- (I) the iteration step-sizes:  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are constants,
  - (II) the sampling number:  $m = \lfloor p_m^K \rfloor + 1$ ,
- where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ ,  $p_m \geq 0$ .

To get the convergence rate of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)*, we need the following assumption:

**Assumption 5:** Under *Scheme (S1)*, the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , the sampling number  $m$ , and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = (k+1)^{p_\zeta}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = (k+1)^{p_\eta}$  satisfy  $3a_3 L < K^{p_\gamma}$ ,  $2p_\alpha - 2p_\zeta - p_\beta > 0$ ,  $p_\beta - p_\eta > 0$ ,  $2p_\gamma - p_\alpha > 0$ ,  $2p_\gamma - p_\beta > 0$ .

Then, the polynomial convergence rate and the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* are given as follows:

**Theorem 1:** Under Assumptions 1-3 and 5, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* achieves the following polynomial convergence rate for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\theta = \min\{p_m, 2p_\alpha - 2p_\zeta - p_\beta, 2p_\beta - 2p_\eta, 2p_\gamma - p_\beta\}$ . Furthermore, for any  $0 < \varphi < \frac{1}{3}$ , if  $p_\alpha = 1$ ,  $p_\beta = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $p_\gamma = 1$ ,  $p_m = \frac{4}{3}$ ,  $p_\zeta = p_\eta = \frac{\varphi}{2}$ , then the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* is  $O(\varphi^{-\frac{3+3\varphi}{1-3\varphi}})$ .

**Proof.** See Appendix C. ■

*Remark 6:* In Theorem 1, the polynomial convergence rate is given for privacy noises with decreasing, constant (see e.g. [32], [33], [35], [38]), and increasing variances (see e.g. [39]–[41]). This is non-trivial even without considering the privacy protection. For example, let the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha = \gamma = \frac{1}{K}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{1}{K^{\frac{2}{3}}}$ . Then, Theorem 1 holds as long as privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  have the increasing rate no more than  $O(k^{\frac{2}{3}})$ .

*Remark 7:* The key to achieving the polynomial convergence rate without the assumption of bounded gradients is to use the polynomially decreasing iteration step-sizes and the increasing sampling number, which reduces the effect of stochastic gradient noises and privacy noises. As a result, the convergence error decreasing with the maximum iteration number is achieved. This is different from [6], [7], [32]–[39], where [6], [7], [32]–[36], [38], [39] require the assumption of bounded gradients, and [33], [37] cannot achieve the decreasing convergence error.

*Remark 8:* Theorem 1 shows how the error  $\varphi$  affects the convergence rate and the oracle complexity. By (10), the smaller the error  $\varphi$  is, the faster Algorithm 1 converges, but the higher the oracle complexity is. This leads to a trade-off between the convergence rate and the oracle complexity. For example, if the error  $\varphi = 0.02$ , then the convergence rate is  $O(\frac{1}{K^{0.31}})$ , and the oracle complexity is  $O(10^6)$ . This requirement for total number of data samples is acceptable since the computational cost for centralized SGD is  $O(10^6)$  to achieve the same accuracy as Algorithm 1.

Based on Theorem 1, the polynomial convergence rate and the oracle complexity for the strongly convex case are given as follows:

*Corollary 1:* Under Assumptions 1, 2, 4 and 5, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* achieves the same polynomial convergence rate and oracle complexity as in Theorem 1.

**Proof.** Note that by Assumption 4,  $F(x)$  is  $s$ -strongly convex. Then, by [43, Lemma 6.9] we have  $2s(F(x) - F(x^*)) \leq \|\nabla F(x)\|^2$ . Thus, Assumption 3 is satisfied with  $\mu = s$ . Therefore, by Theorem 1, this corollary is proved. ■

*Remark 9:* As shown in the proof of Corollary 1, non-convex objectives with the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition (Assumption 3) are weaker than strongly convex objectives (Assumption 4). Thus, we have provided a general frame for Algorithm 1's convergence rate analysis under both non-convex objectives with Polyak-Łojasiewicz conditions and strongly convex objectives.

Next, we give the convergence rate of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)*. To do this, we need the following assumption:

*Assumption 6:* Under *Scheme (S2)*, the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , the sampling number  $m$ , and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = p_\zeta^K$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = p_\eta^K$  satisfy  $0 < p_\zeta, p_\eta < 1$ ,  $p_m > 1$ ,  $3\gamma L < 1$ ,  $\rho_A < 1$ , where the matrix  $A$  is given in Lemma 2.

Under *Scheme (S2)*, verifying  $\rho_A < 1$  in Assumption 6

is challenging due to the difficulty of computing the spectral radius  $\rho_A$  of the matrix  $A$ . To address this issue, we give the following lemma to show that  $\rho_A < 1$  can be satisfied when the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are sufficiently small.

*Lemma 3:* There exists  $K_1 \geq 1$  such that if the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha = \frac{1}{K_1^{0.8}}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{1}{K_1^{0.7}}$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{K_1}$ , then  $\rho_A < 1$  holds.

**Proof.** See Appendix D. ■

Then, the exponential convergence rate and the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* are given as follows:

*Theorem 2:* Under Assumptions 1-3 and 6, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* achieves the following exponential convergence rate for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) = O\left(\max\left\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}, p_\zeta^2, p_\eta^2\right\}^K\right).$$

Furthermore, for any  $0 < \varphi < 1$ , if the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \varphi$ , the sampling number  $m = \lfloor (\frac{1}{\varphi})^K \rfloor + 1$ , and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = \sigma_k^{(\eta)} = \varphi^K$ , then the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* is  $O(-\varphi^{\ln \varphi} \ln \varphi)$ .

**Proof.** See Appendix E. ■

*Remark 10:* By Theorem 2, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* achieves the exponential convergence rate, while Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* and [6]–[8], [11], [12], [15], [32]–[41] only achieve the polynomial convergence rate. Thus, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* is suitable for the scenarios where the convergence rate is prioritized. However, the exponential convergence rate requires more data samples than the polynomial convergence rate to achieve the same accuracy. For example, if the error  $\varphi = 0.02$ , then the oracle complexity is  $O(10^7)$  to achieve the exponential rate, while  $O(10^6)$  is needed to achieve the polynomial rate. This shows the trade-off of Algorithm 1 between the convergence rate and the oracle complexity.

Based on Theorem 2, the exponential convergence rate and the oracle complexity for the strongly convex case are given as follows:

*Corollary 2:* Under Assumptions 1, 2, 4 and 6, Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* achieves the same exponential convergence rate and oracle complexity as in Theorem 2.

**Proof.** As shown in the proof of Corollary 1, if  $F(x)$  satisfies Assumption 4, then by [43, Lemma 6.9], we have  $2s(F(x) - F(x^*)) \leq \|\nabla F(x)\|^2$ . Therefore, by Theorem 2 this corollary is proved. ■

### C. Privacy analysis

In the following, the definition of the sensitivity is provided to compute the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1.

*Definition 5 ([41]):* For any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ , let  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  be two groups of adjacent sample sets,  $q$  be a mapping, and  $\mathcal{D}_k = \{\lambda_{i,k,l}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq l \leq m\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}'_k = \{\lambda'_{i,k,l}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq l \leq m\}$  be the data samples taken from  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  at the  $k$ -th iteration, respectively. Define the sensitivity of  $q$  at the  $k$ -th iteration of Algorithm 1 as follows:

$$\Delta_k^q \triangleq \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|q(\mathcal{D}_k) - q(\mathcal{D}'_k)\|_1. \quad (11)$$

*Remark 11:* Definition 5 captures the magnitude by which a single agent's data sample can change the mapping  $q$  in

the worst case. It is the key quantity showing how many noises should be added such that Algorithm 1 achieves the  $\varepsilon_k$ -differential privacy at the  $k$ -th iteration. In Algorithm 1, the mapping  $q(\mathcal{D}_k) = [x_k^\top, y_k^\top]^\top$ , and the randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_k) = [(x_k + \zeta_k)^\top, (y_k + \eta_k)^\top]^\top$ .

The following lemma gives the sensitivity  $\Delta_k$  of Algorithm 1 for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ .

**Lemma 4:** Under Assumption 1, the sensitivity of Algorithm 1 at the  $k$ -th iteration satisfies  $\Delta_k^q = \|\Delta x_k\|_1 + \|\Delta y_k\|_1$ , where  $\|\Delta x_k\|_1$  and  $\|\Delta y_k\|_1$  are given as follows:

$$\|\Delta x_k\|_1 \leq \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \frac{\gamma C}{m}, & \text{if } k = 1; \\ \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j}|^{k-t} \gamma \|\Delta y_{t-1}\|_1 \\ \quad + \gamma \|\Delta y_{k-1}\|_1, & \text{if } 2 \leq k \leq K, \end{cases}$$

$$\|\Delta y_k\|_1 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{m}, & \text{if } k = 0; \\ |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}| \frac{C}{m} + \frac{2C}{m}, & \text{if } k = 1; \\ \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}|^{k-t} \frac{2C}{m} \\ \quad + |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}|^k \frac{C}{m} + \frac{2C}{m}, & \text{if } 2 \leq k \leq K. \end{cases}$$

**Proof:** See Appendix F. ■

**Lemma 5:** Under Assumption 1, for any given  $K \geq 1$ , Algorithm 1 achieves the  $\varepsilon$ -differential privacy over  $K$  iterations, where  $\varepsilon = \sum_{k=0}^K (\frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} + \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}})$ .

**Proof:** See Appendix G. ■

**Theorem 3:** For the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , the sampling number  $m$  satisfying *Scheme (S1)*, and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = (k+1)^{p_\zeta}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = (k+1)^{p_\eta}$ , if Assumption 1 and the conditions  $0 < a_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $0 < a_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $p_m - p_\beta - \max\{0, 1 - p_\eta\} > 0$ ,  $p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\} - \max\{0, 1 - p_\zeta\} > 0$  hold, then the cumulative privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is finite even over infinite iterations.

**Proof.** First, we compute  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}$ . Since  $0 < a_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ , it can be seen that  $0 < \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ . When  $k = 0$  and 1,  $\|\Delta y_k\|_1 = O(\frac{1}{K^{p_m}})$  by Lemma 4. When  $2 \leq k \leq K$ , we have

$$\|\Delta y_k\|_1 = O\left(\frac{|1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}| (1 - |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}|^k)}{m(1 - |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j}|)}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{K^{p_m - p_\beta}}\right). \quad (12)$$

Then, for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $\|\Delta y_k\|_1 = O(\frac{1}{K^{p_m - p_\beta}})$ , and  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}$  can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}} = \frac{1}{K^{p_m - p_\beta}} O\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k^{p_\eta}}\right) = O\left(\frac{\ln K}{K^{p_m - p_\beta - \max\{0, 1 - p_\eta\}}}\right).$$

Hence, if  $p_m - p_\beta - \max\{0, 1 - p_\eta\} > 0$  holds, then  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}$  is finite.

Next, we compute  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}$ . Since  $0 < a_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ , it can be seen that  $0 < \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ . When  $k = 0$

and 1, by Lemma 4  $\|\Delta x_k\|_1 = O(\frac{1}{K^{p_m}})$ . When  $2 \leq k \leq K$ , by (12) we have

$$\|\Delta x_k\|_1 \leq \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j}|^{k-t} \gamma \|\Delta y_{t-1}\|_1 + \gamma \|\Delta y_{k-1}\|_1$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{K^{p_m + p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta}}\right).$$

Then, for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $\|\Delta x_k\|_1 = O(\frac{1}{K^{p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\}}})$ , and  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}$  can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} = \frac{1}{K^{p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\}}} O\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k^{p_\zeta}}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{\ln K}{K^{p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\} - \max\{0, 1 - p_\zeta\}}}\right).$$

Hence, if  $p_m - p_\beta - \max\{0, 1 - p_\eta\} > 0$  and  $p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\} - \max\{0, 1 - p_\zeta\} > 0$ , then  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}$  is finite.

Therefore, this theorem is proved. ■

**Theorem 4:** For the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , the sampling number  $m$  satisfying *Scheme (S2)*, and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = p_\zeta^k$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = p_\eta^k$ ,  $0 < p_\zeta, p_\eta < 1$ , if Assumption 1 and the conditions  $0 < \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $0 < \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $\frac{1}{p_m} < \min\{p_\zeta, p_\eta\}$  hold, then the cumulative privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is finite even over infinite iterations.

**Proof.** By Lemma 4, it can be seen that

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} + \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}} = O\left(K \left(\frac{1}{p_m p_\zeta}\right)^K + K \left(\frac{1}{p_m p_\eta}\right)^K\right).$$

Hence, if  $\frac{1}{p_m} < \min\{p_\zeta, p_\eta\}$ , then  $\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} + \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}$  is finite. Therefore, this theorem is proved. ■

**Remark 12:** Theorems 3 and 4 establish the sufficient condition for Algorithm 1 with *Schemes (S1)*, *(S2)* to achieve the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  even over infinite iterations, respectively. This is different from [6]–[15] that do not consider the privacy protection, and [32]–[38] that only achieve the infinite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  over infinite iterations. Thus, compared to [32]–[38], Algorithm 1 with both *Schemes (S1)* and *(S2)* provides a higher differential privacy level.

#### D. Trade-off between privacy and convergence rate

Based on Theorems 1-4 and Corollaries 1, 2, the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate is given in the following corollary:

**Corollary 3:** (i) If Assumptions 1, 2, 5,  $0 < a_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $0 < a_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $p_m - p_\beta - \max\{0, 1 - p_\eta\} > 0$ , and  $p_m + \min\{0, p_\gamma - p_\alpha - p_\beta\} - \max\{0, 1 - p_\zeta\} > 0$  hold in Assumption 3 or 4, then Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* achieves the polynomial convergence rate and the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  even over infinite iterations simultaneously.

(ii) If Assumptions 1, 2, 6,  $0 < \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R, i_0}^-} R_{i_0 j} < 1$ ,  $0 < \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C, i_0}^-} C_{i_0 j} < 1$ , and  $\frac{1}{p_m} < \min\{p_\zeta, p_\eta\}$  hold in Assumption 3 or 4, then Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* achieves the exponential convergence rate and the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  even over infinite iterations simultaneously.



**Proof.** By Theorems 1, 3 and Corollary 1, Corollary 3(i) is proved. Then, by Theorems 2, 4 and Corollary 2, Corollary 3(ii) is proved. ■

*Remark 13:* Corollary 3 shows the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate of Algorithm 1. By Corollary 3, the smaller privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the faster Algorithm 1 converges, while the smaller the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is.

*Remark 14:* By Corollary 3(i), *Scheme (S1)* achieves the polynomial convergence rate and the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  even over infinite iterations for privacy noises with decreasing, constant, and increasing variances; while by Corollary 3(ii), *Scheme (S2)* achieves the exponential convergence rate and the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  even over infinite iterations only for decreasing privacy noises. Hence, the differential privacy level of *Scheme (S1)* is higher than the one of *Scheme (S2)*, while the convergence rate of *Scheme (S2)* is faster than the one of *Scheme (S1)*. This shows the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate for *Schemes (S1)* and *(S2)*.

Based on Corollary 3, we have the following corollary as the sampling number goes to infinity:

*Corollary 4:* Under the conditions of Corollary 3, Algorithm 1 with both *Schemes (S1)*, *(S2)* achieves the convergence and the finite cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  over infinite iterations simultaneously as the sampling number goes to infinity.

*Remark 15:* The result of Corollary 4 does not contradict the trade-off between privacy and utility. In fact, to achieve differential privacy, Algorithm 1 incurs a compromise on the utility. However, different from [33], [37], [38] that compromise convergence accuracy to enable differential privacy, Algorithm 1 compromises the convergence rate and the sampling number (which are also utility metrics) instead. From Corollary 4, it follows that the larger privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the slower the convergence rate is. Besides, the sampling number  $m$  is required to go to infinity when the convergence of Algorithm 1 and the finite cumulative privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  over infinite iterations are considered simultaneously. The ability to retain convergence accuracy makes our approach suitable for accuracy-critical scenarios.

#### IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

To show the effectiveness of Algorithm 1, we train the machine learning model ResNet18 ([44]) in a distributed manner with the benchmark datasets “MNIST” ([45]) and “CIFAR-10” ([46], [47]), respectively. Specifically, five agents cooperatively train ResNet18 over the directed graphs shown in Fig. 1, which satisfy Assumption 1. Then, each benchmark dataset is divided into two subsets for training and testing, respectively. The training dataset of each benchmark dataset is uniformly divided into 5 subsets, each of which can only be accessed by one agent to update its model parameters. The following three numerical experiments are given:

(a) the effect of privacy noises on Algorithm 1’s convergence rate and differential privacy level;

- (b) the comparison of Algorithm 1 with *Schemes (S1)*, *(S2)* between the convergence rate and the differential privacy level;
- (c) the comparison between Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* and methods in [33], [36], [37], [39], [41] for the convergence rate and the differential privacy level.




Fig. 1: Topology structures of directed graphs  $\mathcal{G}_R$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_C$  induced by weight matrices  $R$ ,  $C$

#### A. Effect of privacy noises

First, let the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha = \frac{80}{2000} = 0.04$ ,  $\beta = \frac{0.75}{2000^{0.66}} = 0.005$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{100}{2000} = 0.05$ , the sampling number  $m = \lfloor 0.00003 \cdot 2000^{1.9} \rfloor + 1 = 57$ , and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = (k+1)^{p_\zeta}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = (k+1)^{p_\eta}$  with  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = -0.1, 0.1, 0.2$  respectively in *Scheme (S1)*. Then, the training and testing accuracy on benchmark datasets “MNIST” and “CIFAR-10” are given in Fig. 2(a)-2(d), from which one can see that the smaller privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the faster Algorithm 1 converges. This is consistent with the convergence rate analysis in Theorem 1. Meanwhile, the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 is given in Fig. 2(e), from which one can see that that the smaller privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the smaller the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is. This is consistent with the privacy analysis in Theorem 3, and thus consistent with the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate in Corollary 3.

Next, let the iteration step-sizes  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $\beta = 0.01$ ,  $\gamma = 0.1$ , the sampling number  $m = \lfloor 1.002^{2000} \rfloor + 1 = 55$ , and privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)} = p_\zeta^{2000}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)} = p_\eta^{2000}$  with  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = 0.9994, 0.9996, 0.9998$  respectively in *Scheme (S2)*. Then, the training and testing accuracy on benchmark datasets “MNIST” and “CIFAR-10” are given in Fig. 3(a)-3(d), from which one can see that the smaller privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the faster Algorithm 1 converges. This is consistent with the convergence rate analysis in Theorem 2. Meanwhile, the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 is given in Fig. 3(e), from which one can see that that the smaller privacy noise parameters  $\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}$ ,  $\sigma_k^{(\eta)}$  are, the smaller the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  is. This is consistent with the privacy analysis in Theorem 4, and thus, consistent with the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate in Corollary 3.

#### B. Comparison of Algorithm 1 with Schemes (S1) and (S2)

In this subsection, the comparison of Algorithm 1 with *Schemes (S1)*, *(S2)* between the convergence rate and the

differential privacy level is given. Let  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = 0.1$  in *Scheme (S1)*, and  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = 0.9996$  in *Scheme (S2)*. Then, from Fig. 4(a)-4(d) one can see that Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* converges faster than Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)*, while from Fig. 4(e) one can see that the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* is smaller than the cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)*.




Fig. 2: Accuracy and cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S1)* and  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = -0.1, 0.1, 0.2$




Fig. 3: Accuracy and cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* and  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = 0.9994, 0.9996, 0.9998$

### C. Comparison with methods in [33], [36], [37], [39], [41]

Let  $p_\zeta, p_\eta = 0.9996$  in *Scheme (S2)*. Then, the comparison of the convergence rate and the differential privacy level between Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* and the methods in [33], [36], [37], [39], [41] is given in Figs. 5, 6, respectively. From Fig. 5 one can see that Algorithm 1 with both *Schemes (S1)* and *(S2)* converges faster than [33], [36], [37], [39], [41]. Moreover, from Fig. 6 one can see that cumulative differential privacy parameters  $\varepsilon, \delta$  of Algorithm 1 with both *Schemes (S1)* and *(S2)* are smaller than [33], [36], [37], [39], [41].

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed a new differentially private gradient-tracking-based distributed stochastic optimization algorithm over directed graphs. Two novel schemes of the




Fig. 4: Comparison of Algorithm 1 with *Schemes (S1), (S2)* on accuracy and cumulative differential privacy budget  $\varepsilon$




Fig. 5: Comparison of accuracy on benchmark datasets “MNIST” and “CIFAR-10”




Fig. 6: Comparison of cumulative differential privacy parameters  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$



iteration step-sizes and the sampling number are given: *Scheme (S1)* uses the polynomially decreasing iteration step-sizes and the increasing sampling number with the maximum iteration number. *Scheme (S2)* uses the constant iteration step-sizes and the exponentially increasing sampling number with the maximum iteration number. By using the sampling number parameter-controlled subsampling method, both schemes achieve the finite cumulative privacy budget even over infinite iterations, and thus, enhance the differential privacy level compared to the existing ones. By using the gradient-tracking method, the polynomial convergence rate (*Scheme (S1)*) and the exponential convergence rate (*Scheme (S2)*) are given for both nonconvex with the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition and strongly convex objectives. Furthermore, the oracle complexity of the algorithm, the trade-off between the privacy and the convergence rate are shown, respectively. Finally, numerical examples of the distributed training on benchmark datasets ‘‘MNIST’’ and ‘‘CIFAR-10’’ are given to show the effectiveness of the algorithm.

## APPENDIX A USEFUL LEMMAS

*Lemma A.1:* [41, Lemma A.1] If Assumption 2(i) holds for a function  $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a global minimum  $h(x^*)$ , then following statements holds:

- (i) For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $h(y) \leq h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), y-x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y-x\|^2$ .
- (ii) For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|\nabla h(x)\|^2 \leq 2L(h(x) - h(x^*))$ .

*Lemma A.2:* [48, Cor. 8.1.29 and Th. 8.4.4] For any  $n \geq 1$ , let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a positive vector. Then, following statements hold:

- (i) If there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that  $Ax \leq \rho x$ , then  $\rho_A \leq \rho$ .
- (ii) If  $A$  is irreducible, then  $\rho_A > 0$  and there exists a positive vector  $y = [y_1, \dots, y_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $y^\top A = \rho_A y^\top$ .

## APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Note that by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{L}_1 W_1 = W_1 \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_1$ . Then, multiplying  $W_1 \otimes I_d$  on both sides of (7) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & (W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1} \\ &= ((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(W_1 \otimes I_d)y_k, \\ &= ((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k - \frac{\gamma}{n}(W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)y_k. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Let  $\bar{y}_k = \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)y_k$ . Then, taking the mathematical expectation on the squared Euclidean norm of (13) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k - \gamma(W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Since for any  $k \geq 0$ , the Laplacian noise  $\zeta_k$  is independent of  $x_k, y_k$  and satisfies  $\mathbb{E}\zeta_k = 0, \mathbb{E}\|\zeta_k\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\zeta_k\|^2 = 2d\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2$ , (14) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \gamma(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \\ & \quad - (W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|\alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \gamma(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 \left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Note that for any  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0$ , the following Cauchy-Schwarz inequality holds:

$$\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq (1+r)\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right)\|\mathbf{b}\|^2. \quad (16)$$

Then, setting  $r = r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha$  in (16) and substituting (16) into (15) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\right)\mathbb{E}\|\gamma(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k + \gamma(W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 \left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

By Lemma 1, since  $v_1^\top \mathbf{1}_n = n$ , we have  $W_1^\top = W_1$ . Thus, it can be seen that  $((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k = ((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n v_1^\top) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k$ . Moreover, since the spectral radius of  $I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n v_1^\top$  is  $1 - \alpha r_{\mathcal{L}_1}$ , by Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\|((I_n - \alpha \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)(1-r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)^2\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Substituting (18) into (17) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 \left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\gamma^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\mathbb{E}\|((W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k + (W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Since for any  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the following inequality holds:

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{a}_i\right\|^2 \leq m \sum_{i=1}^m \|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2. \quad (20)$$

Setting  $m = 2$  in (20) and substituting (20) into (19) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 \left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\gamma^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\gamma^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 \alpha^2 \left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\gamma^2 \rho_{W_1}^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha)\gamma^2 \rho_{W_1}^2 \|v_2\|^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1} \alpha}\mathbb{E}\|\bar{y}_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathcal{L}_2 = 0$ . Then, by (8) and  $y_0 = g_0$ , it can be seen that for any  $k \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{y}_k &= \bar{y}_{k-1} + \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)(g_k - g_{k-1}) \\ &= \bar{g}_0 + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)(g_{m+1} - g_m) \\ &= \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)g_k. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Thus, by Assumption 2(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\bar{y}_k\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\|\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)g_k\right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m} + \mathbb{E}\left\|\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)\nabla f(x_k)\right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Since  $\nabla f(x_k) = (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f((\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}_k)) + \nabla f((\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{x}_k)$ , setting  $m = 2, n$ , respectively in (20), and substituting (20) into  $\|\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)\nabla f(x_k)\|^2$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)\nabla f(x_k) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)) \right\|^2 + 2 \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 + 2 \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By Assumption 2(i), it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,k} - \bar{x}_k\|^2 = L^2 \|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Substituting (24) and (25) into (23) results in

$$\mathbb{E}\|\bar{y}_k\|^2 \leq \frac{2L^2}{n} \|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (26)$$

Note that by Lemma A.1(ii),  $\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \leq 2L(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*))$ . Then, (26) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}\|\bar{y}_k\|^2 \leq \frac{2L^2}{n} \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 4L\mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)) + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (27)$$

Substituting (27) into (21) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \left( 1 - r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha + \frac{4(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2\rho_{W_1}^2\|v_2\|^2L^2}{nr_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha} \right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2\rho_{W_1}^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha} \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{8(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2\rho_{W_1}^2\|v_2\|^2L}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha} \mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)) \\ & \quad + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2\alpha^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Note that by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{L}_2W_2 = W_2\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2$ . Then, multiplying  $W_2 \otimes I_d$  on both sides of (8) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (W_2 \otimes I_d)y_{k+1} &= ((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \\ & \quad - \beta(\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I_d)\eta_k + (W_2 \otimes I_d)(g_{k+1} - g_k). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Thus, taking the mathematical expectation on the squared Euclidean norm of (29) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = \mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k - \beta(\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I_d)\eta_k \\ & \quad + (W_2 \otimes I_d)(g_{k+1} - g_k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

By  $\eta_k \sim \text{Lap}\left(\sigma_k^{(\eta)}\right)$  and Assumption 2(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\eta_k = 0, \mathbb{E}\|\eta_k\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\eta_k\|^2 = 2d\left(\sigma_k^{(\eta)}\right)^2, \\ & \mathbb{E}(g_k - \nabla f(x_k)) = \mathbb{E}(g_{k+1} - \nabla f(x_{k+1})) = 0, \\ & \mathbb{E}\|g_{k+1} - \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \leq \frac{n\sigma_g^2}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Moreover, note that  $\eta_k, g_k - \nabla f(x_k)$  and  $g_{k+1} - \nabla f(x_{k+1})$  are mutually independent and independent of  $y_k$ . Then, (30) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_{k+1}\|^2 & \leq \mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \\ & \quad + (W_2 \otimes I_d)(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2\beta^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\eta)}\right)^2 + \frac{2n\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (32)$$

Then, setting  $r = r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta$  in (16) and substituting (16) into (32) results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq (1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))\|^2 \\ & \quad + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2\beta^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\eta)}\right)^2 + \frac{2n\sigma_g^2}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

By Assumption 2(i), it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k+1}) - \nabla f_i(x_{i,k})\|^2 \\ & \leq L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k}\|^2 = L^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq L^2 \mathbb{E}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (34)$$

By (7),  $x_{k+1} - x_k$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & x_{k+1} - x_k \\ & = -\alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(y_k - (\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k) - \gamma(\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k \\ & = -\alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k - \alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)\zeta_k \\ & \quad - \gamma(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k - \gamma(v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Taking the mathematical expectation on the squared Euclidean norm of (35), setting  $m = 3$  in (20) and substituting (20) into  $\mathbb{E}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2$  imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ & \leq 3\mathbb{E}\|\alpha(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I_d)(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E}\|\gamma(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + 3\mathbb{E}\|\gamma(v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2\alpha^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2 \\ & \leq 3\alpha^2\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2\mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + 3\gamma^2\mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + 3\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2\mathbb{E}\|\bar{y}_k\|^2 + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2\alpha^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Substituting (27) and (36) into (34) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left( 3\alpha^2\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 + \frac{6\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2L^2}{n} \right) L^2 \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + 3\gamma^2L^2\mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 + 12\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2L^3\mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)) \\ & \quad + \frac{3\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2\sigma_g^2L^2}{m} + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2L^2\alpha^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

By Lemma 1, since  $v_2^\top \mathbf{1}_n = n$ , we have  $W_2^\top = W_2$ . Thus, it can be seen that  $((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k = ((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2 - \frac{1}{n}v_2\mathbf{1}_n^\top) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k$ . Moreover, since the spectral radius of  $I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2 - \frac{1}{n}v_2\mathbf{1}_n^\top$  is  $1 - \beta r_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ , by Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\|((I_n - \beta\mathcal{L}_2) \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \leq (1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)(1 - \beta r_{\mathcal{L}_2})^2\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\ & \leq (1 - r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Substituting (37) and (38) into (33) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_{k+1}\|^2 \\
& \leq \left(1 - r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta + \frac{3(1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2\gamma^2L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{12(1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2L^3}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta} \mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)) \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)(3\alpha^2\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2 + \frac{6\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2L^2}{n})\rho_{W_2}^2L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta} \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{2n\sigma_g^2}{m} + \frac{3n(1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2\gamma^2L^2\sigma_g^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}m\beta} \\
& \quad + \frac{2(1 + r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2\alpha^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}\right)^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta} + 2d\rho_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2\beta^2\left(\sigma_k^{(\eta)}\right)^2. \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, let  $\bar{x}_k = \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)x_k$ . Then, multiplying  $\frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)$  on both sides of (7) results in

$$\bar{x}_{k+1} = \bar{x}_k - \frac{m}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k. \quad (40)$$

Thus, setting  $y = \bar{x}_{k+1}$ ,  $x = \bar{x}_k$  and substituting (40) into Lemma A.1(i) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\bar{x}_{k+1}) & \leq F(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla F(\bar{x}_k), \bar{x}_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|\bar{x}_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \\
& = F(\bar{x}_k) - \gamma \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{x}_k), \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{\gamma^2L}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2. \quad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|^2}{2}$  for any  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\gamma \langle \nabla F(\bar{x}_k), \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \rangle \\
& = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\
& \leq -\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\| \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2. \quad (42)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (42) into (41) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\bar{x}_{k+1}) & \leq F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^2L}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\| \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2. \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the mathematical expectation of (43) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}F(\bar{x}_{k+1}) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^2L}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2. \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \\
& = \left( \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) \right) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - g_{i,k}). \quad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, setting  $m = 2$  in (20) and substituting (20), (31) into (45) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k) - \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2\|v_1\|^2}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 + \frac{2L^2}{n} \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (22),  $\frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \\
& = \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(y_k - (v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k) + (v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k \\
& = \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(y_k - (v_2 \otimes I_d)\bar{y}_k) + (v_2 \otimes I_d)\left(\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes I_d)g_k\right) \\
& = \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_{i,k} - \nabla f_i(x_{i,k})) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)) + \nabla F(\bar{x}_k). \quad (47)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (47) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k + \nabla F(\bar{x}_k) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)) \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

Setting  $m = 3$  in (20) and substituting (20) into (48) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 \\
& \leq 3\mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{n}(v_1^\top \otimes I_d)(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k \right\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \\
& \quad + 3\mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_k)) \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m} \\
& \leq \frac{3\|v_1\|^2}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 + 3\mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{3L^2}{n} \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_g^2}{m}. \quad (49)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, substituting (46) and (49) into (44) results in

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}F(\bar{x}_{k+1}) & \leq \mathbb{E}F(\bar{x}_k) + \left(-\frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{3\gamma^2L}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\|v_1\|^2\gamma}{n^2} + \frac{3\|v_1\|^2\gamma^2L}{2n^2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{3\gamma^2L^3}{2n} + \frac{\gamma L^2}{n}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{(\gamma + \gamma^2L)\sigma_g^2}{2m}. \quad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

If  $3\gamma L < 1$ , then  $-\frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{3\gamma^2L}{2} < 0$ . Thus, by Assumption 2(iv), we have  $(-\frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{3\gamma^2L}{2})\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_k)\|^2 \leq (-\mu\gamma + 3\mu\gamma^2L)(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*))$ . Hence, subtracting  $F(x^*)$  from both sides of (50) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_{k+1}) - F(x^*)) \\
& \leq (1 - \mu\gamma + 3\mu\gamma^2L) \mathbb{E}(F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\|v_1\|^2\gamma}{n^2} + \frac{3\|v_1\|^2\gamma^2L}{2n^2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{3\gamma^2L^3}{2n} + \frac{\gamma L^2}{n}\right) \mathbb{E}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2 + \frac{(\gamma + \gamma^2L)\sigma_g^2}{2m}. \quad (51)
\end{aligned}$$



Let  $V_k = [\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_k\|^2, \|(W_2 \otimes I_d)y_k\|^2, F(\bar{x}_k) - F(x^*)]^\top$ . Then, by (28), (39) and (51), this lemma is proved.  $\blacksquare$

### APPENDIX C PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let  $0 < \Gamma < 1$ ,  $\omega = \Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}$ , and  $\tilde{u} = [\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3]^\top$  be a positive vector such that  $\frac{L}{n}\tilde{u}_1 + \frac{\|v_1\|^2}{n^2}\tilde{u}_2 < \frac{(1-\Gamma)\mu}{2}\tilde{u}_3$ . Then, the following four steps are given to prove Theorem 1.

**Step 1:** First, we prove that there exists  $K_0 \geq 1$  such that for any  $K \geq K_0$ ,

$$\rho_A \leq 1 - \omega. \quad (52)$$

Since  $\omega = \Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}$ , it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mathcal{L}_1} - \frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\alpha} &\geq r_{\mathcal{L}_1} - \frac{\Gamma r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha}{\alpha} = (1 - \Gamma)r_{\mathcal{L}_1}, \\ r_{\mathcal{L}_2} - \frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\beta} &\geq r_{\mathcal{L}_2} - \frac{\Gamma r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}{\beta} = (1 - \Gamma)r_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \\ \mu - \frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\gamma} &\geq \mu - \frac{\Gamma \mu\gamma}{\gamma} = (1 - \Gamma)\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $2p_\alpha - 2p_\zeta - p_\beta > 0$ ,  $2p_\gamma - p_\alpha > 0$ , and  $2p_\gamma - p_\beta > 0$  hold by Assumption 5. Then, when  $K$  is sufficiently large, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{4(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2\rho_{W_1}^2\|v_2\|^2L^2}{nr_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha}(\tilde{u}_1+2\tilde{u}_3)+\frac{2(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha)\gamma^2\rho_{W_1}^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha}\tilde{u}_2 \\ &\leq \left(r_{\mathcal{L}_1} - \frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\alpha}\right)\tilde{u}_1, \\ &\frac{(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}\left(3\alpha^2\rho_{\mathcal{L}_1}^2+\frac{6\|v_2\|^2\gamma^2L^2}{n}\right)\tilde{u}_1 \\ &+ \frac{3(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2\gamma^2L^2}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}\tilde{u}_2+\frac{12n(1+r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta)\rho_{W_2}^2\gamma^2L^3}{r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta}\tilde{u}_3 \\ &\leq \left(r_{\mathcal{L}_2} - \frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\beta}\right)\tilde{u}_2, \\ &\left(\frac{3\gamma L^3}{2n}+\frac{L^2}{n}\right)\tilde{u}_1+\left(\frac{\|v_1\|^2}{n^2}+\frac{3\|v_1\|^2\gamma L}{2n^2}\right)\tilde{u}_2 \\ &\leq \left(\mu-3\mu\gamma L-\frac{\Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}}{\gamma}\right)\tilde{u}_3. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Thus, there exists  $K_0 \geq 1$  such that (53) holds for any  $K \geq K_0$ . By Lemma 2, (53) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(11)}\tilde{u}_1 + A^{(12)}\tilde{u}_2 + A^{(13)}\tilde{u}_3 &\leq (1 - \omega)\tilde{u}_1, \\ A^{(21)}\tilde{u}_1 + A^{(22)}\tilde{u}_2 + A^{(23)}\tilde{u}_3 &\leq (1 - \omega)\tilde{u}_2, \\ A^{(31)}\tilde{u}_1 + A^{(32)}\tilde{u}_2 + A^{(33)}\tilde{u}_3 &\leq (1 - \omega)\tilde{u}_3. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Then by (54) and Lemma A.2(i), (52) holds for any  $K \geq K_0$ .

**Step 2:** At this step, we prove that there exists a positive vector  $\tilde{v} = [\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3]^\top$  such that for any  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right)$ , where  $\theta = \min\{p_m, 2p_\alpha - 2p_\zeta - p_\beta, 2p_\beta - 2p_\eta, 2p_\gamma - p_\beta\}$ . Since (52) holds for any  $K \geq K_0$ , by Lemma A.2(ii), there exists a positive vector  $\tilde{v} = [\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3]^\top$  such that  $\tilde{v}^\top A = \rho_A \tilde{v}^\top \leq (1 - \omega)\tilde{v}^\top$ . Then, multiplying  $\tilde{v}^\top$  on both sides of (9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{k+1}) &\leq \tilde{v}^\top A \mathbb{E}V_k + \tilde{v}^\top u_k \\ &\leq (1 - \omega)\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_k) + \tilde{v}^\top u_k. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Let  $\theta = \min\{p_m, 2p_\alpha - 2p_\zeta - p_\beta, 2p_\beta - 2p_\eta, 2p_\gamma - p_\beta\}$ . Then, by Scheme (S1) and Lemma 2,  $\tilde{v}^\top u_k = O\left(\frac{1}{K^\theta}\right)$  holds for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . Thus, iteratively computing (55) results in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) &\leq (1 - \omega)^{K+1}\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_0) + O\left(\sum_{k=0}^K (1 - \omega)^k \frac{1}{K^\theta}\right) \\ &= (1 - \omega)^{K+1}\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_0) + O\left(\frac{1}{\omega K^\theta}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Since  $\omega = \Gamma \min\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}\alpha, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}\beta, \mu\gamma\}$ , it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} O\left(\frac{1}{\omega K^\theta}\right) &= O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right), \\ (1 - \omega)^{K+1} &= \exp((K + 1)\ln(1 - \omega)) \\ &\leq \exp(-(K + 1)\omega) = \exp\left(-O\left(K^{1 - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}\right)\right) \\ &= o\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

By (57), we have  $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right)$  for any given  $K \geq K_0$ . Thus, there exists  $S_0 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) \leq \frac{S_0}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}$ . Let  $S = \max\{\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_1), 2^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_2), \dots, (K_0 - 1)^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K_0-1}), S_{K_0}\}$ . Then, for any given  $K \geq 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) \leq \frac{S}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}$ , which leads to

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right). \quad (58)$$

**Step 3:** At this step, we prove that for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right)$ . By Lemma A.1(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) \\ &\leq \langle \nabla F(\bar{x}_{K+1}), x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1} \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Note that  $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2}{2}$  for any  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, (59) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_{K+1})\|^2 + \|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2}{2} + \frac{L}{2}\|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{L+1}{2}\|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2 + \frac{\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_{K+1})\|^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

By Lemma A.1(ii),  $\|\nabla F(\bar{x}_{K+1})\|^2 \leq 2L(F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*))$ . Substituting it into (60) gives  $F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) \leq \frac{L+1}{2}\|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2 + L(F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*))$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{L+1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{i,K+1} - \bar{x}_{K+1}\|^2 + L(F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*)) \\ &= \frac{L+1}{2}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{K+1}\|^2 + L(F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*)). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Then, by (61) it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*) \\ &= (F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(\bar{x}_{K+1})) + (F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*)) \\ &\leq \frac{L+1}{2}\|(W_1 \otimes I_d)x_{K+1}\|^2 + (L+1)(F(\bar{x}_{K+1}) - F(x^*)) \\ &\leq (L+1)(\mathbf{1}_3^\top \mathbb{E}V_{K+1}) = O(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1})). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Thus, combining (58) and (62) gives  $\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) = O\left(\frac{1}{K^{\theta - \max\{p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma\}}}\right)$ . Hence, the polynomial convergence rate is achieved.

**Step 4:** At this step, we prove that the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with Scheme (S1) is  $O(\varphi^{-\frac{3+3\varphi}{1-3\varphi}})$  for any  $0 < \varphi < \frac{1}{3}$ . Let the maximum iteration number in Algorithm 1 be  $N(\varphi)$ . Then, we have  $m = \lfloor a_4 N(\varphi)^\varphi \rfloor + 1 \leq a_4 N(\varphi)^\varphi + 1$ .

Note that by Theorem 1, there exists  $\Phi_1 > 0$  such that for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) \leq \frac{\Phi_1}{K^{\frac{1}{3}-\varphi}}. \quad (63)$$

Then, when  $K > (\frac{\Phi_1}{\varphi})^{\frac{3}{1-3\varphi}}$ , (63) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) \leq \frac{\Phi_1}{K^{\frac{1}{3}-\varphi}} < \frac{\Phi_1}{(\frac{\Phi_1}{\varphi})^{(\frac{1}{3}-\varphi)\frac{3}{1-3\varphi}}} = \varphi. \quad (64)$$

Thus, by (64) and Definition 1,  $x_{K+1}$  is a  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution. Since  $N(\varphi)$  is the smallest integer such that  $x_{N(\varphi)}$  is a  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(\varphi) &\leq 1 + \min\{K : K \geq \lfloor (\frac{\Phi_1}{\varphi})^{\frac{3}{1-3\varphi}} \rfloor + 1\} \\ &= \lfloor (\frac{\Phi_1}{\varphi})^{\frac{3}{1-3\varphi}} \rfloor + 2. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Hence, by Definition 2 and (65), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N(\varphi)} m &= (N(\varphi) + 1)m \\ &\leq (N(\varphi) + 1)(a_4 N(\varphi)^\varphi + 1) \\ &= O(N(\varphi)^{1+\varphi}) = O\left(\varphi^{-\frac{3+3\varphi}{1-3\varphi}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, this theorem is proved.  $\blacksquare$

### APPENDIX D PROOF OF LEMMA 3

By Step 1 of Appendix C, we can prove that there exists  $K_1 \geq 1$  such that  $\rho_A \leq 1 - \frac{\max\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \mu\}}{K}$  holds for any  $K \geq K_1$ . Thus, let  $\alpha = \frac{1}{K_1^{0.8}}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{1}{K_1^{0.7}}$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{K_1}$ . Then, we have  $\rho_A \leq 1 - \frac{\max\{r_{\mathcal{L}_1}, r_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \mu\}}{K_1} < 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

### APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The following two steps are given to prove Theorem 2.

**Step 1:** First, we prove that Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* achieves the exponential convergence rate. Note that by Assumption 6, we have  $\rho_A < 1$ . Moreover, by Lemma A.2(ii), there exists a positive vector  $\tilde{v} = [\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3]^\top$  such that  $\tilde{v}^\top A = \rho_A \tilde{v}^\top$ . Then, by Lemma 2, multiplying  $\tilde{v}^\top$  on both sides of (9) implies that for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{k+1}) &\leq \tilde{v}^\top A \mathbb{E}V_k + \tilde{v}^\top u_k \\ &= \rho_A \mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_k) + \tilde{v}^\top u_k. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Iteratively computing (66) gives

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1} \leq \rho_A^{K+1} \mathbb{E}\tilde{v}^\top V_K + \sum_{k=0}^K \rho_A^{K-k} \tilde{v}^\top u_k. \quad (67)$$

By *Scheme (S2)* and Lemma 2,  $\tilde{v}^\top u_k = O(p_m^{-K} + p_\zeta^{2K} + p_\eta^{2K})$  for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . Then, (67) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1} &= \rho_A^{K+1} \mathbb{E}\tilde{v}^\top V_0 + O\left(\max\left\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}\right\}^K\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\max\{\rho_A, p_\zeta^2\}^K\right) + O\left(\max\{\rho_A, p_\eta^2\}^K\right) \\ &= O\left(\max\left\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}, p_\zeta^2, p_\eta^2\right\}^K\right). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

As shown in Step 3 of Appendix C,  $F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*) = O(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{v}^\top V_{K+1}))$ . Hence, by (68) the exponential mean convergence rate of Algorithm 1 is achieved.

**Step 2:** Next, we prove that the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 with *Scheme (S2)* is  $O(-\varphi^{\ln \varphi} \ln \varphi)$  for any  $0 < \varphi < 1$ . Let the maximum iteration number in Algorithm 1 be  $N(\varphi)$ . Then, we have  $m = \lfloor (\frac{1}{\varphi})^{N(\varphi)} \rfloor + 1$ .

Note that by Theorem 2, there exists  $\Phi_2 > 0$  such that for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) \leq \Phi_2 \max\left\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}, p_\zeta^2, p_\eta^2\right\}^K. \quad (69)$$

Then, when  $K > \frac{\ln \varphi - \ln \Phi_2}{\ln(\max\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}, p_\zeta^2, p_\eta^2\})}$ , (69) can be rewritten as  $\mathbb{E}(F(x_{i,K+1}) - F(x^*)) < \varphi$ . Thus, by Definition 1,  $x_{K+1}$  is a  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution. Since  $N(\varphi)$  is the smallest integer such that  $x_{N(\varphi)}$  is a  $\varphi$ -suboptimal solution, we have

$$N(\varphi) \leq \lfloor \frac{\ln \varphi - \ln \Phi_2}{\ln(\max\{\rho_A, \frac{1}{p_m}, p_\zeta^2, p_\eta^2\})} \rfloor + 2. \quad (70)$$

Hence, by Definition 2 and (70), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N(\varphi)} m &= (N(\varphi) + 1) \lfloor (\frac{1}{\varphi})^{N(\varphi)} \rfloor \\ &\leq (N(\varphi) + 1) \left( (\frac{1}{\varphi})^{N(\varphi)} + 1 \right) \\ &= O(-\varphi^{\ln \varphi} \ln \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, this theorem is proved.  $\blacksquare$

### APPENDIX F PROOF OF LEMMA 4

The following two steps are given to prove Lemma 4.

**Step 1:** We compute  $\|\Delta y_k\|_1$  for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . When  $k = 0$ , by Definition 5, we have

$$\|\Delta y_0\|_1 = \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_0 - y'_0\|_1 = \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_0 - g'_0\|_1. \quad (71)$$

Since  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  are adjacent, by Definition 3, there exists exactly one pair of data samples  $\xi_{i_0, l_0}, \xi'_{i_0, l_0}$  such that (3) holds. This implies that  $g_{j,k} = g'_{j,k}$  holds for any agent  $j \neq i_0$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . Thus, (71) can be rewritten as

$$\|\Delta y_0\|_1 = \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_{i_0, 0} - g'_{i_0, 0}\|_1. \quad (72)$$

Note that  $m$  different data samples are taken uniformly from  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ , respectively. Then, there exists at most one pair of data samples  $\lambda_{i_0, 0, l_1}, \lambda'_{i_0, 0, l_1}$  such that  $\lambda_{i_0, 0, l_1} = \xi_{i_0, l_0}, \lambda'_{i_0, 0, l_1} = \xi'_{i_0, l_0}$ . Thus, by (72) and (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta y_0\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \lambda_{i_0, 0, l}) - g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \lambda'_{i_0, 0, l})) \right\|_1 \\ &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| \frac{1}{m} (g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \lambda_{i_0, 0, l_1}) - g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \lambda'_{i_0, 0, l_1})) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \|g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \xi_{i_0, l_0}) - g_{i_0}(x_{i_0, 0}, \xi'_{i_0, l_0})\|_1 \leq \frac{C}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

When  $k = 1$ , by Definition 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_1\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_1 - y'_1\|_1 \\
&= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij}) (y_{i,0} - y'_{i,0}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij} (\check{y}_{j,0} - \check{y}'_{j,0}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (g_{i,1} - g'_{i,1}) + (g_{i,0} - g'_{i,0}) \right\|_1. \quad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the sensitivity is obtained by computing the maximum magnitude of the mapping  $q$  when changing one data sample. Then, observations  $(x_0, y_0, \dots, x_K, y_K)$ ,  $(x'_0, y'_0, \dots, x'_K, y'_K)$  of Algorithm 1 between adjacent datasets  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  should be equal such that only the effect of changing one data sample is considered. This shows how much noise should be added such that the probability of  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = s$  and the probability of  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') = s$  satisfy  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = s) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') = s)$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{O}$  and observation set  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2n(K+1)d}$ . Thus, we have  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathcal{O}) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') \in \mathcal{O})$ . Hence,  $\check{x}_{j,k} = \check{x}'_{j,k}$ ,  $\check{y}_{j,k} = \check{y}'_{j,k}$  holds for any agent  $j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^- \cup \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . Then, (74) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_1\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_1 - y'_1\|_1 \\
&= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij}) (y_{i,0} - y'_{i,0}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (g_{i,1} - g'_{i,1}) + (g_{i,0} - g'_{i,0}) \right\|_1. \quad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $y_{j,0} = y'_{j,0}$ ,  $g_{j,0} = g'_{j,0}$ ,  $g_{j,1} = g'_{j,1}$  hold for any agent  $j \neq i_0$ , by (73), (75) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_1\|_1 &\leq \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}) (y_{i_0,0} - y'_{i_0,0}) \right\|_1 \\
&\quad + \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_{i_0,1} - g'_{i_0,1}\|_1 + \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_{i_0,0} - g'_{i_0,0}\|_1. \quad (76)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  are adjacent. Then, there exists at most one pair of data samples  $\lambda_{i_0,1,l_2}, \lambda'_{i_0,1,l_2}$  such that  $\lambda_{i_0,1,l_2} = \xi_{i_0,l_0}$ ,  $\lambda'_{i_0,1,l_2} = \xi'_{i_0,l_0}$ . Hence, (76) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_1\|_1 &\leq \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}) (y_{i_0,0} - y'_{i_0,0}) \right\|_1 + \frac{2C}{m} \\
&= |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}| \|\Delta y_0\|_1 + \frac{2C}{m} \\
&\leq |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}| \frac{C}{m} + \frac{2C}{m}. \quad (77)
\end{aligned}$$

When  $2 \leq k \leq K$ , by Definition 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_k\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_k - y'_k\|_1 \\
&= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij}) (y_{i,k-1} - y'_{i,k-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i}^-} C_{ij} (\check{y}_{j,k-1} - \check{y}'_{j,k-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (g_{i,k} - g'_{i,k}) + (g_{i,k-1} - g'_{i,k-1}) \right\|_1. \quad (78)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $g_{j,m} = g'_{j,m}$ ,  $y_{j,m} = y'_{j,m}$ ,  $\check{y}_{j,m} = \check{y}'_{j,m}$  hold for any agent  $j \neq i_0$  and  $0 \leq m \leq k$ , (78) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_k\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| (1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}) (y_{i_0,k-1} - y'_{i_0,k-1}) \right\|_1 \\
&\quad + \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_{i_0,k} - g'_{i_0,k}\|_1 + \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|g_{i_0,k-1} - g'_{i_0,k-1}\|_1. \quad (79)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  are adjacent. Then, there exists at most one pair of data samples  $\lambda_{i,k,l_{k+1}}, \lambda'_{i,k,l_{k+1}}$  such that  $\lambda_{i,k,l_{k+1}} = \xi_{i,l_0}$ ,  $\lambda'_{i,k,l_{k+1}} = \xi'_{i,l_0}$ . Hence, (79) can be rewritten as

$$\|\Delta y_k\|_1 \leq |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}| \|\Delta y_{k-1}\|_1 + \frac{2C}{m}. \quad (80)$$

Iteratively computing (80) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta y_k\|_1 &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}|^{k-t} \frac{2C}{m} \\
&\quad + |1 - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{C,i_0}^-} C_{i_0j}|^k \frac{C}{m} + \frac{2C}{m}. \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

**Step 2:** Next, we compute  $\|\Delta x_k\|_1$  for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . When  $k = 0$ , since the initial value  $x_{i,0} = x'_{i,0}$  for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , we have  $\|\Delta x_0\|_1 = 0$ . When  $k = 1$ , by Definition 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta x_1\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|x_1 - x'_1\|_1 \\
&= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij}) (x_{i,0} - x'_{i,0}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij}^{(1)} (\check{x}_{j,0} - \check{x}'_{j,0}) - \gamma (y_{i,0} - y'_{i,0}) \right\|_1. \quad (82)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the initial value  $x_{i,0} = x'_{i,0}$  and  $\check{x}_{j,0} = \check{x}'_{j,0}$  for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-$ . Then, by (73), (82) can be rewritten as

$$\|\Delta x_1\|_1 = \gamma \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_0 - y'_0\|_1 \leq \frac{\gamma C}{m}. \quad (83)$$

When  $2 \leq k \leq K$ , by Definition 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta x_k\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|x_k - x'_k\|_1 \\
&= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij}) (x_{i,k-1} - x'_{i,k-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-} R_{ij} (\check{x}_{j,k-1} - \check{x}'_{j,k-1}) - \gamma (y_{i,k-1} - y'_{i,k-1}) \right\|_1. \quad (84)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $x_{i,0} = x'_{i,0}$ ,  $y_{j,m} = y'_{j,m}$  hold for any agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i}^-$ ,  $0 \leq m \leq k-1$ ,  $x_{j,m} = x'_{j,m}$  holds for any agent  $j \neq i_0$ . Thus, (84) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta x_k\|_1 &= \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \left\| (1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i_0}^-} R_{i_0j}) (x_{i_0,k-1} - x'_{i_0,k-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \gamma (y_{i_0,k-1} - y'_{i_0,k-1}) \right\|_1. \quad (85)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\|\Delta y_k\|_1 = \|\Delta y_{i_0,k}\|_1$  for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ . Then, by (81) (84) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta x_k\|_1 &\leq |1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i_0}^-} R_{i_0j}| \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|x_{i_0,k-1} - x'_{i_0,k-1}\|_1 \\
&\quad + \gamma \sup_{\text{Adj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')} \|y_{i_0,k-1} - y'_{i_0,k-1}\|_1 \\
&= |1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i_0}^-} R_{i_0j}| \|\Delta x_{k-1}\|_1 + \gamma \|\Delta y_{k-1}\|_1. \quad (86)
\end{aligned}$$

Iteratively computing (86) implies

$$\|\Delta x_k\|_1 \leq \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |1 - \alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{R,i_0}^-} R_{i_0j}|^{k-t} \gamma \|\Delta y_{t-1}\|_1 + \gamma \|\Delta y_{k-1}\|_1. \quad (87)$$

Therefore, by (73), (77), (81), (83) and (87), this lemma is proved.  $\blacksquare$



## APPENDIX G

### PROOF OF LEMMA 5

For any observation set  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2n(K+1)d}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}} = \{(\zeta_0, \eta_0, \dots, \zeta_K, \eta_K) : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathcal{O}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}} = \{(\zeta'_0, \eta'_0, \dots, \zeta'_K, \eta'_K) : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') \in \mathcal{O}\}$  be sets of all possible state and tracking variables under the observation set  $\mathcal{O}$  for adjacent datasets  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$ , respectively. Then, by Appendix F, for any  $(\zeta_0, \eta_0, \dots, \zeta_K, \eta_K) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}$  there exists a unique  $(\zeta'_0, \eta'_0, \dots, \zeta'_K, \eta'_K) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}}$  such that  $(\check{x}_0, \check{y}_0, \dots, \check{x}_K, \check{y}_K) = (\check{x}'_0, \check{y}'_0, \dots, \check{x}'_K, \check{y}'_K)$  holds. Thus, we can define a bijection  $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}}$  such that  $\mathcal{B}((\zeta_0, \eta_0, \dots, \zeta_K, \eta_K)) = (\zeta'_0, \eta'_0, \dots, \zeta'_K, \eta'_K)$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & (x_0 + \zeta_0, y_0 + \eta_0, \dots, x_K + \zeta_K, y_K + \eta_K) \\ &= (\check{x}_0, \check{y}_0, \dots, \check{x}_K, \check{y}_K) \\ &= (\check{x}'_0, \check{y}'_0, \dots, \check{x}'_K, \check{y}'_K) \\ &= (x'_0 + \zeta'_0, y'_0 + \eta'_0, \dots, x'_K + \zeta'_K, y'_K + \eta'_K). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, let  $x_{i,k}^{(m)}$ ,  $y_{i,k}^{(m)}$ ,  $\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}$ ,  $\eta_{i,k}^{(m)}$ ,  $x_{i,k}^{(m)'}$ ,  $y_{i,k}^{(m)'}$ ,  $\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'}$ ,  $\eta_{i,k}^{(m)'}$  be the  $m$ -th coordinate of  $x_{i,k}$ ,  $y_{i,k}$ ,  $\zeta_{i,k}$ ,  $\eta_{i,k}$ ,  $x_{i,k}'$ ,  $y_{i,k}'$ ,  $\zeta_{i,k}'$ ,  $\eta_{i,k}'$ , respectively. Then, the following holds for any  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq d$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i,k}^{(m)} - x_{i,k}^{(m)'} &= \zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'} - \zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}, \\ y_{i,k}^{(m)} - y_{i,k}^{(m)'} &= \eta_{i,k}^{(m)'} - \eta_{i,k}^{(m)}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Next, note that probability density functions of  $(\zeta_0, \eta_0, \dots, \zeta_K, \eta_K)$  and  $(\zeta'_0, \eta'_0, \dots, \zeta'_K, \eta'_K)$  are given as follows, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\zeta, \eta) &= \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d p(\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}; \sigma_k^{(\zeta)}) p(\eta_{i,k}^{(m)}; \sigma_k^{(\eta)}), \\ p(\zeta', \eta') &= \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d p(\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'}; \sigma_k^{(\zeta)}) p(\eta_{i,k}^{(m)'}; \sigma_k^{(\eta)}). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Then, by (89)  $\frac{p(\zeta, \eta)}{p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta))}$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(\zeta, \eta)}{p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta))} &= \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d \frac{p(\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}; \sigma_k^{(\zeta)}) p(\eta_{i,k}^{(m)}; \sigma_k^{(\eta)})}{p(\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'}; \sigma_k^{(\zeta)}) p(\eta_{i,k}^{(m)'}; \sigma_k^{(\eta)})} \\ &= \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{|\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'}| - |\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}|}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{|\eta_{i,k}^{(m)'}| - |\eta_{i,k}^{(m)}|}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}\right) \\ &\leq \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{|\zeta_{i,k}^{(m)'} - \zeta_{i,k}^{(m)}|}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{|\eta_{i,k}^{(m)'} - \eta_{i,k}^{(m)}|}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

Substituting (88) into (90) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(\zeta, \eta)}{p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta))} &\leq \prod_{k=0}^K \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{m=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{|x_{i,k}^{(m)} - x_{i,k}^{(m)'}|}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{|y_{i,k}^{(m)} - y_{i,k}^{(m)'}|}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}\right) \\ &= \prod_{k=0}^K \exp\left(\frac{\|x_k - x'_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\|y_k - y'_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\sum_{k=0}^K \left(\frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} + \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Let  $\varepsilon = (\sum_{k=0}^K (\frac{\|\Delta x_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\zeta)}} + \frac{\|\Delta y_k\|_1}{\sigma_k^{(\eta)}}))$ . Then, by (91) we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathcal{O})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') \in \mathcal{O})} = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\zeta, \eta) d\zeta d\eta}{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}}} p(\zeta', \eta') d\zeta' d\eta'}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\zeta, \eta) d\zeta d\eta}{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}}} p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta)) d\zeta' d\eta'} = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{O}})} p(\zeta, \eta) d\zeta d\eta}{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta)) d\zeta d\eta} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\zeta, \eta) d\zeta d\eta}{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta)) d\zeta d\eta} \leq \frac{e^\varepsilon \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta)) d\zeta d\eta}{\int_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{O}}} p(\mathcal{B}(\zeta, \eta)) d\zeta d\eta} = e^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, this lemma is proved.  $\blacksquare$

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Pu, W. Shi, J. Xu, and A. Nedić, "Push-pull gradient methods for distributed optimization in networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [2] N. Bhavsar and L. A. Prashanth, "Nonasymptotic bounds for stochastic optimization with biased noisy gradient oracles," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1628–1641, 2023.
- [3] O. Shamir and N. Srebro, "Distributed stochastic optimization and learning," in *52nd Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun. Control Comput.*, Monticello, IL, USA, 2014, pp. 850–857.
- [4] T. Chen, A. G. Marques, and G. B. Giannakis, "DGLB: distributed stochastic geographical load balancing over cloud networks," *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1866–1880, 2016.
- [5] M. Wang, C. Xu, X. Chen, H. Hao, L. Zhong, and D. O. Wu, "Design of multipath transmission control for information-centric Internet of Things: a distributed stochastic optimization framework," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 9475–9488, 2019.
- [6] T. T. Doan, S. T. Maguluri, and J. Romberg, "Convergence rates of distributed gradient methods under random quantization: a stochastic approximation approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 4469–4484, 2021.
- [7] K. Lu, H. Wang, H. Zhang, and L. Wang, "Convergence in high probability of distributed stochastic gradient descent algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 2189–2204, 2024.
- [8] R. Xin, A. K. Sahu, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Distributed stochastic optimization with gradient tracking over strongly-connected networks," in *IEEE 58th Conf. Decis. Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 8353–8358.
- [9] R. Xin, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Variance-reduced decentralized stochastic optimization with accelerated convergence," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 68, pp. 6255–6271, Oct. 2020.
- [10] S. Pu and A. Nedić, "Distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods," *Math. Program.*, vol. 187, no. 1, pp. 409–457, 2021.
- [11] A. Koloskova, T. Lin, and S. U. Stich, "An improved analysis of gradient tracking for decentralized machine learning," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 34, 2021, pp. 11422–11435.
- [12] S. Zhao and Y. Liu, "Asymptotic properties of  $\mathcal{S}$ - $\mathcal{AB}$  method with diminishing step-size," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 3222–3229, 2024.
- [13] Y. Chen, A. Hashemi, and H. Vikalo, "Accelerated distributed stochastic non-convex optimization over time-varying directed networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2024.3479888, 2024.
- [14] J. Lei, P. Yi, J. Chen, and Y. Hong, "Distributed variable sample-size stochastic optimization with fixed step-sizes," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 5630–5637, 2022.
- [15] Y. Wang and T. Başar, "Gradient-tracking-based distributed optimization with guaranteed optimality under noisy information sharing," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 4796–4811, 2023.
- [16] M. Fredrikson, S. Jha, and T. Ristenpart, "Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures", in *Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Denver, CO, USA, 2015, pp. 1322–1333.
- [17] L. Zhu, Z. Liu, and S. Han, "Deep leakage from gradients," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, Vancouver, Canada, 2019, vol. 32, pp. 14774–14784.
- [18] J. F. Zhang, J. W. Tan, and J. Wang, "Privacy security in control systems," *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 64, no. 7, 2021, Art. no. 176201.
- [19] Y. Lu and M. Zhu, "Privacy preserving distributed optimization using homomorphic encryption," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 314–325, 2018.
- [20] Y. Wang, "Privacy-preserving average consensus via state decomposition," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4711–4716, 2019.
- [21] H. Gao, Y. Wang, and A. Nedić, "Dynamics based privacy preservation in decentralized optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 151, 2023, Art. no. 110878.

- [22] Y. Wang and A. Nedić, "Decentralized gradient methods with time-varying uncoordinated stepsizes: convergence analysis and privacy design," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 5352–5367, 2024.
- [23] G. Ramos, A. P. Aguiar, S. Karx, and S. Pequito, "Privacy preserving average consensus through network augmentation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 6907–6919, 2024.
- [24] Y. Mo and R. M. Murray, "Privacy preserving average consensus," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 753–765, 2017.
- [25] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 9, nos. 3–4, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [26] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private filtering," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 341–354, 2014.
- [27] T. Ding, S. Zhu, J. He, C. Chen, and X. Guan, "Differentially private distributed optimization via state and direction perturbation in multiagent systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 722–737, 2022.
- [28] Y. Xuan and Y. Wang, "Gradient-tracking based differentially private distributed optimization with enhanced optimization accuracy," *Automatica*, vol. 155, 2023, Art. no. 111150.
- [29] Y. Wang and A. Nedić, "Tailoring gradient methods for differentially private distributed optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 872–887, 2024.
- [30] L. Huang, J. Wu, D. Shi, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "Differential privacy in distributed optimization with gradient tracking," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 5727–5742, 2024.
- [31] A. Xie, X. Yi, X. Wang, M. Cao, and X. Ren, "Differentially private and communication-efficient distributed nonconvex optimization algorithms," 2024, *arXiv:2307.16656v2*.
- [32] J. Ding, G. Liang, J. Bi, and M. Pan, "Differentially private and communication efficient collaborative learning," in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, Palo Alto, CA, USA, 2021, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 7219–7227.
- [33] Y. Kang, Y. Liu, B. Niu, and W. Wang, "Weighted distributed differential privacy ERM: convex and non-convex," *Comput. Secur.*, vol. 106, 2021, Art. no. 102275.
- [34] J. Xu, W. Zhang, and F. Wang, "A (DP)<sup>2</sup> SGD: asynchronous decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent with differential privacy," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 8036–8047, 2022.
- [35] Y. Wang and T. Başar, "Decentralized nonconvex optimization with guaranteed privacy and accuracy," *Automatica*, vol. 150, 2023, Art. no. 110858.
- [36] Y. Wang and T. Başar, "Quantization enabled privacy protection in decentralized stochastic optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4038–4052, 2023.
- [37] G. Yan, T. Li, K. Wu, and L. Song, "Killing two birds with one stone: quantization achieves privacy in distributed learning," *Digit. Signal Process.*, vol. 146, 2024, Art. no. 104353.
- [38] C. Liu, K. H. Johansson, and Y. Shi, "Distributed empirical risk minimization with differential privacy," *Automatica*, vol. 162, 2024, Art. no. 111514.
- [39] Z. Chen and Y. Wang, "Locally differentially private distributed online learning with guaranteed optimality," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2024.3482977, 2024.
- [40] J. Wang and J. F. Zhang, "Differentially private distributed stochastic optimization with time-varying sample sizes," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 6341–6348, 2024.
- [41] J. Chen, J. Wang, and J. F. Zhang, "Differentially private distributed stochastic nonconvex optimization with quantized communication," 2024, *arXiv:2403.18254v2*.
- [42] W. Ren and R. W. Beard, "Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 655–661, 2005.
- [43] S. Bubeck, "Convex optimization: algorithms and complexity," *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 8, nos. 3-4, pp. 231–358, 2015.
- [44] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, Las Vegas, NV, USA, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [45] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. J. C. Burges, 1998, "The MNIST database of handwritten digits," National Institute of Standards and Technology. [Online]. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>
- [46] A. Krizhevsky, V. Nair, and G. Hinton, 2009, "Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, 10 classes," Department of Computer Science of University of Toronto. [Online]. Available: <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/kriz/cifar.html>
- [47] A. Krizhevsky, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," M.S. thesis, Dept. Comput. Sci., Univ. Toronto, Toronto, ON, CA, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://www.cs.utoronto.ca/kriz/learning-features-2009-TR.pdf>
- [48] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, "Positive and nonnegative matrices," in *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2012, ch. 8, sec. 4, pp. 529–545.