

A Stochastic Newton-type Method for Non-smooth Optimization

Titus Pinta

March 3, 2025

Abstract

We introduce a new framework for analyzing (Quasi-)Newton type methods applied to non-smooth optimization problems. The source of randomness comes from the evaluation of the (approximation) of the Hessian. We derive, using a variant of Chernoff bounds for stopping times, expectation and probability bounds for the random variable representing the number of iterations of the algorithm until approximate first order optimality conditions are validated. As an important distinction to previous results in the literature, we do not require that the estimator is unbiased or that it has finite variance. We then showcase our theoretical results in a stochastic Quasi-Newton method for X-ray free electron laser orbital tomography and in a sketched Newton method for image denoising.

Keywords: Newton's Method, Stochastic Optimization, Higher Order Methods, Nonsmooth Optimization, Subspace Methods

1 Introduction

Stochastic optimization is a critical approach to numerous problems of current interests. The randomness can come from sampling large data sets, as in machine learning, or from inherent properties of the physical systems modeled, as in quantum mechanical simulations. While for deterministic and unconstrained problems, (semismooth) Newton's method reigns supreme in terms of speed of convergence and quasi-Newton methods shine due to the performance per cost ratio, it seems that the stochastic optimization community has focused primarily on gradient descent based approaches. The aim of this work is to bridge this gap and to bring the tools of non-smooth

(Quasi-)Newton-type methods to the world of stochastic optimization. Numerical experiments in tomography and image denoising confirm the validity and applicability of the proposed approach.

Frameworks for the analysis of stochastic (Quasi-)Newton-type methods applied to non-smooth and non-convex problems have been studied and developed in [9, 28, 27, 21, 20, 7, 22].

In our work, we are interested in a general optimization problem,

$$\min_{x \in U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n} f(x),$$

with a (nonsmooth) objective, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The difficulty stems from the fact that higher order information such as Hessian, directional derivatives, or second order Clarke subdifferential, is only accessible via a possibly biased stochastic oracle. Such examples abound in the sciences, where the objective can be constructed statistically from large datasets or where the randomness is intrinsic in physical systems. Another source of randomness comes from stochastic approximations of the higher order information as encountered in sketching methods, based on the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Embedding Lemma.

For this purpose, we propose an algorithm based on a backtracking strategy for accepting a step. The final section of this work presents some concrete practical applications of our algorithm.

In order to fully analyze such frameworks, the machinery of stochastic processes has to be involved. In the rest of this section, we recall some of the key aspects of stochastic processes required in the rest of this work. The second section deals with the notion of regularity that is behind our analysis and derives some properties of the Newton-like update, under this regularity assumption. The third section assembles everything together into our main result.

1.1 Stochastics

We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard notions of probability theory, such as random variables, expected values, conditional expectations and so on. For a standard reference covering these topics, the reader should consult [12].

In this work, we consider the standard Euclidean spaces equipped with the standard Borel sigma algebra, σ and the standard cylindrical sigma algebra defined on the space of functions between Euclidean spaces (so a random function is a measurable function, with respect to the cylindrical

sigma algebra). For the definitions in this section, π is an arbitrary probability measure. To set the stage and to fix some notation, we provide the following definitions.

Definition 1.1. A function $X : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n, \sigma, \pi)$, usually denoted as a sequence $\{X^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, is called a *stochastic process*. A random variable, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, is called a *stopping time* for the process X if for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variable $I\{K > k\}$ is independent from any X^n with $n \geq k$.

The following properties of a special class of stopping times are well known.

Proposition 1.2 (Hitting Times are Stopping Times). Let $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in [0, \infty)$ be a sequence of independent random variables. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and assume that $\mathbb{E}(T^k) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(T^k) > \varepsilon$ for all k . Consider the stochastic process $\{S^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$S^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k.$$

Then K , defined by

$$K = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid S^n \geq \alpha\},$$

is a stopping time for S^k and for any $\alpha \geq 0$. Furthermore $\mathbb{E}(K) < \infty$. Such a stopping time is called a *hitting time*.

The first statement we recall is a classic result from martingale theory, namely Doob's optional stopping theorem (see [14] for the proof).

Theorem 1.3 (Doob's Optional Stopping Theorem). Let $\{X^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \geq 0$ be a stochastic process with $\mathbb{E}(X^k) < \infty$ for all k and let K be a stopping time for this process with $\mathbb{E}(K) < \infty$. Assume that for all k

$$\mathbb{E}(X^k \mid X^{k-1}, \dots, X^0) \leq X^{k-1}.$$

Then X^K is bounded almost surely and $\mathbb{E}(X^K) \leq \mathbb{E}(X^0)$.

We are also going to use the well known behavior of the expectation of a particular kind of stochastic process evaluated at a stopping time.

Proposition 1.4 (Expectation of Sums). Let $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \geq 0$ be a sequence of independent random variables, with $\mathbb{E}(T^k) \geq \alpha$ for all k . Let $S^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k$ be a stochastic process and K a stopping time for $\{S^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathbb{E}(K) < \infty$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}(S^K) \geq \mathbb{E}(K)\alpha.$$

The next result is due to Young [29]. We adapted the proof of a much more general statement to fit better into our context.

Proposition 1.5 (Chernoff Bound for Stopping Times). Let $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent Bernoulli random variables, with $\mathbb{P}(T^k = 1) \geq 1 - \delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for all k . Let $S^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k$ be a stochastic process and K a stopping time for $\{S^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $E < \infty$. Then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and for any $E \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \gamma)K \geq 2S^K + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)E) \leq e^{-\gamma^2 E}.$$

Proof. We define the stochastic process $\{\Phi^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $\Phi^0 = e^{-\gamma^2 E}$ and

$$\Phi^N = (1 + \gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (1 - T^k) (1 - \gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (T^k) e^{-\gamma^2 E}.$$

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the inequality

$$\forall x, y, \varepsilon \in [0, 1], \quad (1 \pm \varepsilon)^x \leq 1 \pm \varepsilon x,$$

we can bound, recognizing the fact that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, T^k \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Phi^N}{\Phi^{N-1}} &= (1 + \gamma)^{1 - T^{N-1}} (1 - \gamma)^{T^{N-1}} \leq (1 + (1 - T^{N-1})\gamma)(1 - \gamma T^{N-1}) \\ &\leq 1 + ((1 - T^{N-1}) - T^{N-1})\gamma - \gamma^2 T^{N-1} (1 - T^{N-1}) \\ &\leq 1 + ((1 - T^{N-1}) - T^{N-1})\gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

From the assumption, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(T^k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq \mathbb{E}(1 - T^k),$$

and equivalently

$$\mathbb{E}(1 - T^k - T^k) \leq 0.$$

Because T^{N-1} is independent on all T^k with $k < N - 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}(1 - T^{N-1} - T^{N-1} | T^{N-2}, \dots, T^0) = \mathbb{E}(1 - T^{N-1} - T^{N-1}) \leq 0.$$

We can take conditional expectations in (1)

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi^N}{\Phi^{N-1}} | T^{N-2}, \dots, T^0 \right) \leq 1 + \gamma \mathbb{E}((1 - T^{N-1}) - T^{N-1} | T^{N-2}, \dots, T^0) \leq 1.$$

Because Φ is defined in terms of T and Φ^0 is a constant, we can rewrite the previous equation as

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi^N}{\Phi^{N-1}} | \Phi^{N-1}, \dots, \Phi^1 \right) \leq 1.$$

Pulling out the known factor and using the properties of conditional expectations, shows

$$\frac{1}{\Phi^{N-1}} \mathbb{E} \left(\Phi^N | \Phi^{N-1}, \dots, \Phi^1 \right) \leq 1.$$

Because K is a stopping time with finite expectation for $\{S^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and because we can define $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in terms of $\{S^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and then we can define $\{\Phi^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in terms of $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so K is a stopping time for $\{\Phi^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with finite expectation. Because $\{\Phi^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is positive, we can use Doob's optional stopping theorem to conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}(\Phi^K) \leq \mathbb{E}(\Phi^0).$$

The last part of the proof requires us to use Markov's inequality for Φ^K , yielding

$$\mathbb{P}(\Phi^K \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}(\Phi^K) \leq \mathbb{E}(\Phi^0) = e^{-\gamma^2 E}. \quad (2)$$

It is a classic result that if γ is sufficiently small, for any $x \in [-\gamma, \gamma]$, $\frac{x}{1+x} \leq \log(1+x)$, so we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1+\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) + \frac{-\gamma}{1-\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\log(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) + \frac{\log(1-\gamma)}{\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k. \end{aligned}$$

This bound transforms into a relation between probabilities, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{1+\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k \geq \gamma E \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\log(1+\gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) + \log(1-\gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k \geq \gamma^2 E \right). \end{aligned}$$

The exponential is monotone, so

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{1+\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k) \geq \gamma E \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left((1+\gamma)^{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k} (1-\gamma)^{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-T^k)} \geq e^{\gamma^2 E} \right), \quad (3)$$

and using the definition of Φ^T ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left((1+\gamma)\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1-T^k)(1-\gamma)\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}T^k \geq e^{\gamma^2 E}\right) = \mathbb{P}(\Phi^T \geq 1).$$

Combining (3) with (2) gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{1+\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1-T^k) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}T^k \geq \gamma E\right) \leq e^{-\gamma^2 E}. \quad (4)$$

In order to complete the proof, we investigate the expression from the left hand side of (4). By our definition $S^K = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}T^k$, so $K - S^K = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1 - T^k)$. This allows us to rewrite (4), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{1+\gamma}(K - S^K) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}S^K \geq \gamma E\right) &= \mathbb{P}((1-\gamma)(K - S^K) - (1+\gamma)S^K \geq \gamma(1-\gamma^2)E) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((1-\gamma)K \geq 2S^K + \gamma(1-\gamma^2)E) \leq e^{-\gamma^2 E}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

Corollary 1.6. In the setting of Proposition 1.5, set $E = \mathbb{E}(K)$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}((1-\gamma)K \geq 2S^K + \gamma(1-\gamma^2)\mathbb{E}(K)) \leq e^{-\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}(K)}.$$

This result is a generalization of the standard Chernoff bounds.

Proposition 1.7 (Chernoff Bound). Let $\{T^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent Bernoulli random variables, with $\mathbb{P}(T^k = 1) \geq (1-\delta)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}T^k \leq (1-\gamma)\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}T^k\right)\right) \leq e^{-n(1-\delta)\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}.$$

2 Regularity

The notion of smoothness that emerged as the key ingredient in the analysis of non-smooth Newton-type methods is that of Newton differentiability. This notion has its roots in the work on semismooth optimization and it was introduced by Qi in [25], where it was called C-differentiability. Further works, such as [6], where it was used in the context of infinite dimensional optimization, renamed this notion to Newton differentiability.

Definition 2.1 (Weak Uniform Newton differentiability). A function $F : U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called *weakly uniformly Newton differentiable on U* if there exists a set valued mapping $\mathcal{H}F : U \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $x \in U$ and all $y \in U$,

$$\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}F(x)} \frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - H(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \leq c.$$

The smallest such number c is called the *constant of Newton differentiability*.

In order to replace the (Clarke) subdifferential with a single valued object that can equally characterize first order stationarity, we require the following adaptation.

Definition 2.2 (Single-Valued Adaptation). Let $F : U \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the auxiliary function $F_1^m : U \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$, defined by

$$F_1^m(x) = \text{proj}_{\overline{F(x)}} 0.$$

Any selection $F_1 : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ of F_1^m is called a *single-valued adaptation of F* . Clearly $0 \in F(x)$ if and only if $0 = F_1(x)$, so the problem of finding a zero of F is the same as the problem of finding a zero of F_1 .

For the remaining of this work, we impose the following assumption on the regularity of the objective.

Assumption 2.3 (Regularity Assumption). Let $f : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous and assume U is small enough and with an isolated local minimum and unique critical point at \bar{x} and denote by ∂f_1 the single-valued adaptation of the Clarke subdifferential of f . Assume that ∂f_1 is uniformly weakly Newton differentiable on U . Denote the Newton differential of ∂f_1 by $\mathcal{H}f$ and assume that $\forall x \in U$ all $H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$ are positive definite and further assume that the set $\bigcup_{x \in U} \{\|H^{-1}\| \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)\}$ is bounded by $\Omega < \infty$ and the set $\bigcup_{x \in U} \{\|H\| \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)\}$ is bounded by $\omega < \infty$. Let c be as in Definition 2.1 and assume that $c\Omega < 1$.

This regularity assumption can be used to construct a Newton-like sequence with strong convergence guarantees. In our work, we focus on the notions of sufficient decrease and subdifferential lower bound. These notions have been looked at by Bolte et al. in [3].

Lemma 2.4 (Sufficient Decrease). If Assumption 2.3 is satisfied, then there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for all $x \in U$ and for all $x^+ \in \{x - H^{-1}\partial f_1(x) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x), \det H \neq 0\} \cap U$,

$$f(x) - f(x^+) \geq \rho \|x^+ - x\|^2.$$

Proof. Let $x^+ \in \{x - H^{-1}\partial_1 f_1(x) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x), \det H \neq 0\} \cap U$ and set $H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$ such that $H(x^+ - x) = \partial_1 f_1(x)$. In order to prove this lemma, we require two model decrease bounds. Pursuant to this, we introduce the model

$$Q(x) = f(x) + \langle \partial_1 f(x), x - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x, H(x - x) \rangle$$

The first bound we need is

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(x^+) - f(x^+) &= f(x) - f(x^+) + \langle \partial_1 f(x), x^+ - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x^+ - x, H(x^+ - x) \rangle \\
&= \int_0^1 \langle -\partial_1 f(x + t(x^+ - x)), x^+ - x \rangle dt + \langle \partial_1 f(x), x^+ - x \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle x^+ - x, H(x^+ - x) \rangle \\
&= \int_0^1 \langle \partial_1 f(x) - \partial_1 f(x + t(x^+ - x)), x^+ - x \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle x^+ - x, H(x^+ - x) \rangle \\
&= \int_0^1 \langle \partial_1 f(x) - \partial_1 f(x + t(x^+ - x)), x^+ - x \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 t dt \langle x^+ - x, H(x^+ - x) \rangle \\
&= \int_0^1 \langle \partial_1 f(x) - \partial_1 f(x + t(x^+ - x)), x^+ - x \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle t(x^+ - x), H(x^+ - x) \rangle dt \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \|\partial_1 f(x) - \partial_1 f(x + t(x^+ - x)) + Ht(x^+ - x)\| \|x^+ - x\| dt \\
&\leq \int_0^1 tc \|x^+ - x\| \|x^+ - x\| dt \\
&= \frac{c}{2} \|x^+ - x\|^2. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

The second bound is derived from the observation that $x^+ - x = -H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_k(x^+) - f(x) &= \langle \partial_1 f(x), x^+ - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x^+ - x, H(x^+ - x) \rangle \\
&= -\langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x), HH^{-1}\partial_1 f(x) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x) \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that H is symmetric. Equivalently, and using the positive definiteness of H

$$f(x) - Q_k(x^+) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

After a simple algebraic manipulation, we see

$$1 - \frac{f(x) - f(x^+)}{f(x) - Q(x)} = \frac{f(x^+) - Q(x)}{f(x) - Q(x)}.$$

Substituting (5) and (6) in the previous bound yields

$$1 - \frac{f(x) - f(x^+)}{f(x) - Q(x)} \leq c \frac{\|x^+ - x\|^2}{\langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle}. \quad (7)$$

The final hurdle consists in computing

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^+ - x\|^2 &= \langle H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle \\ &\leq \|H^{-1}\| |\langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle| \\ &= \|H^{-1}\| \langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle \\ &\leq \Omega \langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and equivalently

$$\frac{\|x^+ - x\|^2}{\langle \partial_1 f(x), H^{-1} \partial_1 f(x) \rangle} \leq \Omega. \quad (9)$$

Combining (7) with (9) and using the assumption $c\Omega < 1$, we see that

$$1 - \frac{f(x) - f(x^+)}{f(x) - Q(x)} \leq 1 - (1 - c\Omega),$$

yielding

$$f(x) - f(x^+) \geq (1 - c)\Omega(f(x) - Q(x)).$$

Finally, using (6) and (8) produces the desired result

$$f(x) - f(x^+) \geq \frac{1 - c}{2} \|x^+ - x\|^2.$$

□

Lemma 2.5 (Subdifferential Lower Bound). If Assumption 2.3 is satisfied, then there exists $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in U$ and for all $x^+ \in \{x - H^{-1} \partial f_1(x) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x), \det H \neq 0\} \cap U$,

$$\|\partial_1 f(x)\| \leq \tau \|x^+ - x\|.$$

Proof. Let $x^+ \in \{x - H^{-1}\partial f_1(x) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x), \det H \neq 0\} \cap U$ and set $H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$ such that $H(x^+ - x) = \partial f_1(x)$, so

$$\|x^+ - x\| = \|H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)\|$$

and because of the bound on $\|H\|$

$$\|\partial_1 f(x)\| = \|HH^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)\| \leq \|H^k\| \|H^{k-1}\partial_1 f(x)\| \leq \omega \|H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)\|,$$

we can derive the conclusion

$$\|x^+ - x\| \geq \frac{1}{\omega} \|\partial_1 f(x)\|.$$

□

3 Stochastic Framework

In this section we present an algorithmic framework for solving the problem

$$\min_{x \in U} f(x),$$

where f satisfies Assumption 2.3, but the Newton differential, $\mathcal{H}f$ is only available through a stochastic oracle. In this context this, the minimization problem is equivalent to the problem of finding the zero of ∂f_1 , i.e. \bar{x} .

Our proposed algorithm works by sampling the oracle, represented by a random variable concentrated on the Newton differential, $\mathcal{H}f$. The stochastic framework employs a backtracking approach in order to check if an instance of the random variable is part of the Newton differential. This insight is made concrete by Algorithm 1.

Remark 3.1. In Algorithm 1, if an iteration executes the **then** branch of the conditional, we call this iteration a *successful iteration*. Otherwise we call it an *unsuccessful iteration*. Similarly, if $B^{k-1} \in \mathcal{H}f(x^k)$ we call the iteration *true*, and otherwise *false*.

Based on the discussion from the previous section, the number of true, but unsuccessful iterations is going to be bounded. This guarantees that all successful iterations make some progress towards the critical point of f and all true iterations are going to be successful.

Algorithm 1: Stochastic Newton-type Method

Data: $f, \partial_1 f, x^0, c_0 \in [0, \infty), \alpha \in (0, 1), \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$;
1 $k \leftarrow 0$;
2 **while** $\|\partial_1 f(x^k)\| \geq \varepsilon$ **do**
 Sample: B^k ;
3 $y \leftarrow x^k - B^k \partial_1 f(x^k)$;
4 **if** $f(x^k) - f(y) \geq c\|y - x^k\|$ **and** $\|\partial_1 f(x^k)\| \leq c^k\|y - x^k\|$ **then**
 5 $x^{k+1} \leftarrow y$;
 6 $c_{k+1} \leftarrow c_k$;
7 **else**
 8 $x^{k+1} \leftarrow x^k$;
 9 $c_{k+1} \leftarrow \alpha c_k$;
10 **end**
11 $k \leftarrow k + 1$;
12 **end**
13 **return** x^k ;

Theorem 3.2. Assume Assumption 2.3 is satisfied and let $\mathbb{H} : U \rightarrow \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \det A \neq 0\}$ be a random function such that for any $x \in U$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{H}(x) \in \mathcal{H}f(x)) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (10)$$

Consider for any $x^0 \in U$ the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $X^0 \sim \delta_{x^0}$ and $B^{k-1} \sim \mathbb{H}(X^k)$ random variables. Further assume that for all k , $X^k \in U$ (a.s.). Let K be the (possibly infinite) random variable representing the number of iterations before the algorithm terminates.

1. Then there exists $\rho > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(K) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)$$

Furthermore, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(K \geq \frac{2 + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)}{1 - \gamma} \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right) \right) \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma^2}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}.$$

2. Then there exist $\rho > 0$ and $\tau > 0$, such that for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{n \leq K} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho\tau^2 \left((1-\gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}} \right) \leq e^{-K(1-\delta)\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}.$$

Proof.

1. From Lemma 2.4 there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for any $x \in U$ and for all $H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$

$$f(x) - f(x - H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)) \geq \rho \|H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)\|, \quad (11)$$

and from Lemma 2.5 we know that there exists $\tau > 0$ such that for any $x \in U$ and for all $H \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$

$$\|H^{-1}\partial_1 f(x)\| \geq \tau \|\partial_1 f(x)\|. \quad (12)$$

We consider the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ produced by the successful iterates of the algorithm. We call an iteration k true if $B^k \in \{H^{-1} \mid H \in \mathcal{H}f(x^k)\}$ and define the Bernoulli random variable T^k to be 1 if the k th iteration is true and 0 otherwise.

From (10) we know that for any iteration k

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T^k = 1 | X^k) &= \mathbb{P}(B^{k-1} \in \mathcal{H}f(X^k) | X^k) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{H}(X^k) \in \mathcal{H}f(X^k) | X^k) \\ &\geq 1 - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Because T^k are Bernoulli,

$$\mathbb{E}(T^k | X^k) = \mathbb{P}(T^k = 1 | X^k) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Using the law of total expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}(T^k) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(T^k | X^k)) \geq \mathbb{E}(1 - \delta) = 1 - \delta.$$

We can conclude from (11) and (12) that for any true and successful iteration $k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq \rho \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2$$

and

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \geq \tau \|\partial_1 f(x^k)\|.$$

For any successful but false iteration, clearly

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq 0 \tag{13}$$

and

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \geq 0. \tag{14}$$

We can unify these two bounds in

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq T^k \rho \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \tag{15}$$

and

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \geq T^k \tau \|\partial_1 f(x^k)\|. \tag{16}$$

for any successful iteration.

Remark 3.3. The bounds in (13) and (14) can easily be improved to involve $\alpha^{\text{number of unsuccessful iterations}}_{c_0}$ instead of 0, yielding a slightly tighter result.

Denote by T_S the random number of true successful iterations and denote by S the total number of successful iterations. We can assume that the algorithm did not terminate before the S th iteration, so

$$\min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\| > \varepsilon. \tag{17}$$

Clearly, for any iteration k one has

$$T^k \tau \|\partial_1 f(x^k)\| \geq T^k \tau \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|,$$

and using 16

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \geq T^k \tau \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|.$$

Squaring everything and multiplying by $T^k \rho$, and using the fact that T^k is Bernoulli, and as such $T^{k^2} = T^k$, we obtain

$$T^k \rho \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \geq T^k \rho \tau^2 \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|^2.$$

Using 15 shows

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq T^k \rho \tau^2 \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|^2,$$

followed by summing and telescoping, to arrive at

$$f(x^0) - f(x^{S+1}) \geq \sum_{k=0}^S T^k \rho \tau^2 \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|^2. \quad (18)$$

To complete this part of the proof, we use the fact that \bar{x} is the minimum of f , so $f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x^{S+1})$ and the fact that T^k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are Bernoulli variables indicating if a successful iteration is true, so their sum counts the number of true and successful iterations, together with 17, yielding

$$T_S = \sum_{k=0}^S T^k \leq \frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2}. \quad (19)$$

Next we focus on the number of unsuccessful iterations. For this purpose, now consider the entire, sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ produced by the algorithm, including all the repeated points yielded by unsuccessful iterations. As before, we denote with T^k the random variable representing whether an iteration is true or not, and by I and T_I the total number of unsuccessful, and true and unsuccessful iterations respectively. We remark that $T_I \leq I$.

Clearly, when $c_k \leq \min \rho, \tau$ we can use Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 to see that a true iteration is successful. Any unsuccessful iteration decreases c_k by a factor of α . This provides the bound

$$\alpha^I c_0 \geq \rho$$

and rearranging

$$T_I \leq I \leq \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha}. \quad (20)$$

We can easily see that $T_S + T_I = T$. By the definition of T^k , we know

$$T = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k. \quad (21)$$

From the two bounds (19) and (20) we can derive

$$T \leq \frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha}. \quad (22)$$

This allows us to express K as

$$K = \min \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k \leq \frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right\}$$

and to conclude, that K is a hitting time for the stochastic process and thus K is a stopping time with finite expectation for the stochastic process. Next we use (21) to compute the expectation of T

$$\mathbb{E}(T) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T^k \right),$$

which can be bounded by employing Proposition 1.4

$$\mathbb{E}(T) \leq \mathbb{E}(K)(1 - \delta).$$

Rearranging in (22) and using Proposition 1.4 yields

$$\mathbb{E}(K) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(T)}{1 - \delta} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(T_S + T_I)}{1 - \delta} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right), \quad (23)$$

finishing the first part of the proof.

For the second part, we use Corollary 1.6 to conclude that, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \gamma)K \geq 2T + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)\mathbb{E}(K)) \leq e^{-\gamma^2\mathbb{E}(K)}.$$

Using (22) together with (23)

$$\frac{2}{1 - \gamma}T + \gamma(1 + \gamma)\mathbb{E}(K) \leq \frac{2 + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)}{(1 - \gamma)(1 - \delta)} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right),$$

and this allows us to relate the probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(K \geq \frac{2 + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)}{(1 - \gamma)(1 - \delta)} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}((1 - \gamma)K \geq 2T + \gamma(1 - \gamma^2)\mathbb{E}(K)) \\ & \leq e^{-\gamma^2\mathbb{E}(K)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (23), we compute

$$e^{-\gamma^2\mathbb{E}(K)} \leq e^{-\gamma^2 \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho(\tau\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)},$$

finalizing the argument.

2. We consider again the sequence produced by the successful iterations and we use the same notation as before. From Proposition 1.7, we bound

$$\mathbb{P}(T \leq (1 - \gamma)K) \leq e^{-K(1-\delta)\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}. \quad (24)$$

Like in the proof of the previous part, we can bound the number of true but unsuccessfully iterations by

$$T_I \leq \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha},$$

so

$$T_S \geq T - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha}.$$

Using the probability from (24)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(T_S \leq (1 - \gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{\rho_0}}{\log \alpha}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(T \leq (1 - \gamma)K) \leq e^{-K(1-\delta)\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}. \quad (25)$$

Recalling from 18, together with the definition of T_S , one obtains that

$$f(x^0) - f(\bar{x}) \geq T_S \rho \tau^2 \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|^2.$$

Rearranging, gives

$$\min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{T_S \rho \tau^2}}. \quad (26)$$

Using 26, we can conclude that the event

$$\sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho \tau^2 \left((1 - \gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}} \leq \min_{n \leq S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\|$$

implies the event

$$\sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho \tau^2 \left((1 - \gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{T_S \rho \tau^2}}.$$

Then

$$T_S \leq (1 - \gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha}.$$

This induces the probability relation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\min_{n \leq T_S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho\tau^2 \left((1-\gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P} \left(T_S \leq (1-\gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho}{c_0}}{\log \alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substitution in (25) yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{n \leq T_S} \|\partial_1 f(x^n)\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{\rho_{\min} d^2 \left((1-\gamma)K - \frac{\log \frac{\rho_{\min}}{\rho^0}}{\log \alpha} \right)}} \right) \leq e^{-K(1-\delta)\frac{\gamma^2}{2}},$$

finishing the proof. □

The first part of Theorem 3.2 provides a probability distribution on the number of iterates required in order to achieve approximate first order optimality. The second part provides a dual result on the probability distribution of the first order residual after a fixed amount of iterations.

Remark 3.4. Different to a significant part of the literature, see for example [27, 26, 8, 13, 5, 2], we **do not require** that the estimator is unbiased, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{H}(x)) \in \mathcal{H}f(x)$, or that it has finite variance, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(\text{tr } \mathbb{H}(x)^2) < \infty$. Also, the sub-exponential tail condition encountered in [22] is not present in our work.

4 Applications

In this section we showcase the wide applicability of our framework. We first present a theoretical result covering random additive noise. Then we cover the numerical analysis of a quasi-Newton method involved in a physical experiment from X-FEL imaging. The relationship between Newton differentiability and quasi-Newton methods has further been explored in [23]. The final example provides a theoretical analysis of a sketching approach to Newton-type methods, together with numerical results. The advantage of our approach when compared to previous methods, such as the ones developed in [27, 21, 20], lies in the applicability of our strong theoretical results to a large class of algorithms and problems.

4.1 Random Noise

Regarding the algebraic setup for this subsection, we consider the Frobenius norm of a matrix and we denote the closed ball in this norm with radius ρ and center $M \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\mathbb{B}_\rho[M]$. We recall that the Frobenius norm is given by an inner product, i.e. $\|M\|^2 = \text{tr } M^T M$ and that this inner product coincides with the usual inner product if we identify $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with \mathbb{R}^{n^2} . We denote this identification with $\nu : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ and remark that $\nu(M)\nu(M)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$ and $\text{tr } \nu(M)\nu(M)^T = \|M\|^2$.

The purpose of this subsection is to work thorough an example of a Newton-type method where the Newton differential is evaluated with noise, showing that if the noise is normally distributed, with sufficient mass concentrated in a small enough neighborhood of 0, we can characterize the expected number of iterations in order to attain approximate first order optimality.

Proposition 4.1 (Noisy Newton-type Methods). Using the same assumptions and notations as in the setting of Theorem 3.2, let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$ be a covariance (positive semidefinite) matrix acting on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Consider the noisy version of the Newton Differential, $\mathcal{G}f(x) = \mathcal{H}f(x) + N$, where $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a random variable. Let K the random number of iterations until Algorithm 1 with B^{k-1} sampled from $\mathcal{G}f(x^k)$ terminates. If N follows the multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ and $c + n^{3/2}\sqrt{\text{tr } \Sigma} < \Omega^{-1}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(K) \leq \frac{1}{1 - n^{-1}} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{0.5(1 - c)(\omega^{-1}\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{0.5(1-c)}{\rho^0}}{\log \alpha} \right).$$

Remark 4.2. Because the space of non-invertible matrices has Lebesgue measure 0, the probability that B sampled from $\mathcal{G}f(x)$ is not invertible is 0. This allows us to remove the non-invertible matrices from the output of this random variable, without changing its distribution.

For the proof, we first need an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4.3. If $\mathcal{H}F(x)$ is a Newton differential for F , then so is $\mathcal{H}f(x) + \mathbb{B}_\beta[0]$ with constant at most $c + \beta$.

Proof. This follows simply by using the triangle inequality and the defini-

tions, showing that for any x, y and $G \in \mathcal{H}f(x) + \mathbb{B}_\beta[0]$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}F(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - G(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} &\leq \frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - (G - H + H)(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \\
&\leq \frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - H(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \\
&\quad + \frac{\|(H - G)(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \\
&\leq \frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - H(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} + \|H - G\| \\
&\leq \frac{\|F(x) - F(y) - H(x - y)\|}{\|x - y\|} + \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Because x, y, H and G are arbitrary, taking the supremum and using the definition of Newton differentiability proves the desired result. \square

We can now prove the main result from this subsection.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. From the previous lemma, we know that $\mathcal{H}f(x) + \mathbb{B}_{n^{3/2}\sqrt{\text{tr}\Sigma}}[0]$ is a Newton differential for $\partial_1 f(x)$ with constant at most $c + n^2\sqrt{\text{tr}\Sigma}$.

Using the properties of the Wishart distribution

$$\mathbb{E}(\nu(N)\nu(N)^T) = n^2\Sigma,$$

and applying the trace, which is a linear operator, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|N\|^2) = n^2 \text{tr} \Sigma.$$

Markov's inequality shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|N\| \geq n^{3/2}\sqrt{\text{tr}\Sigma}) = \mathbb{P}(\|N\|^2 \geq n^3 \text{tr} \Sigma) \leq \frac{n^2 \text{tr} \Sigma}{n^3 \text{tr} \Sigma} = \frac{1}{n}$$

holds, so

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}f(x) \in \mathcal{H}f(x) + \mathbb{B}_{n^{3/2}\sqrt{\text{tr}\Sigma}}[0]) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}.$$

If the noise is small enough, such that $c + n^{3/2}\sqrt{\text{tr}\Sigma} < \Omega^{-1}$, we can use Theorem 3.2. Recall the formula for the constant of sufficient decrease from Lemma 2.4, and for the constant of a gradient lower bound from Lemma 2.5. This allows for the explicit formula for the expectation of K , the random

variable representing the total number of iterations of Algorithm 1, for a given ε . Namely

$$\mathbb{E}(K) \leq \frac{1}{1 - n^{-1}} \left(\frac{f(x^0) - f(\bar{x})}{0.5(1 - c)(\omega^{-1}\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{\log \frac{0.5(1-c)}{\rho^0}}{\log \alpha} \right).$$

□

4.2 X-ray, Free Electron Laser

This subsection is based on the mathematical formulation of the X-ray Free Electron Laser (XFEL) of Luke, Schultze, and Grubmüller, in [19] and on the author’s quasi-Newton the numerical algorithms implemented for this problem. The Julia code that produced the plots can be found in [24].

Single-shot femtosecond X-FEL imaging represents a useful test case for our stochastic Newton-type methods framework. This is an imaging technique that aims to recover the electron density of various biomolecules, by interpreting a diffraction pattern. Mathematically, a molecule can be represented by a probability distribution on \mathbb{R}^3 . Diffraction, through a random orientation of the molecule, represented by an element of $\text{SO}(3)$, induces a probability distribution on the detector plane, represented by \mathbb{R}^2 . The component-wise amplitude of a Fourier transform represents the likelihood of detecting a photon at a particular place on the detector plane. A point process generates around a hundred photon counts using these likelihoods. The problem we aim to solve is a maximum likelihood estimation, where the distribution is over photon counts in each discrete pixel of the detector plane, and the parameter is the representation of the biomolecule. Randomness enters the system, both through the stochastic nature of photon hits and through the random orientation of the molecule.

Remark 4.4. Due to Compton radiation, the pulse of photons that can hit a sample has to be very small. As such, we cannot create enough photon samples in order to build their probability distribution, via a histogram.

As far as this work is concerned, the only properties of the problem that are of importance are the smoothness of the objective and the fact that oracle information is only estimated randomly. Nonetheless, for completeness, we present a detailed mathematical formulation. Consider \mathcal{E} the finite dimensional parameter space and let $u \in \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$, where $\text{SO}(3)$ acts on \mathcal{E} , and $\rho = \text{Unif SO}(3)$. Let $|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Pi(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where $\Pi(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is the set of all probability measures on the plane. In practice this map is related to

the amplitudes of the Fourier transform. This induces a map $\delta : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Pi(\mathbb{R}^2)$ defined by

$$\delta_u(A) = \int_{\text{SO}(3)} |\mathcal{F}|(u \circ \rho)(A) \, d\rho.$$

This δ_u is a parametric probability distribution. We assume that δ_u is Lebesgue absolutely continuous for all u , and denote the Radon-Nykodim derivative by

$$f(u, \cdot) = \frac{\partial \delta_u}{\partial \lambda}.$$

Consider the maximum likelihood estimator for k photon samples $\mathcal{U}_k : \mathbb{R}^{2k} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{i=1}^k -\log f(u, x_i).$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{E}$ the true electron distribution and let $X_1, \dots, X_N \sim \delta_u$. The problem consists in understanding the distribution of $\mathcal{U}_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ as N goes to ∞ .

In our numerical approach, we consider the objective function $v : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$v(u) = \sum_{i=1}^N -\log f(u, X_i).$$

Consider a fixed batch size $B < N$ and a random sequence of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, $\{\sigma^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. With this, we define the gradient estimator

$$g_k(u) = \nabla \sum_{i=1}^B -\log f(u, X_{\sigma^k(i)}).$$

Let $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a method of producing a quasi-Newton matrix from an iterate, an estimation of the gradient, and a previous quasi-Newton matrix, such as Broyden, DFP, or BFGS. We run an inner loop of quasi-Newton steps with a given dataset $X_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, X_{\sigma(B)}$, followed by re-sampling the dataset and reinitializing the quasi-Newton method, but maintaining the current iterate. The points of interest to us are the points produced by the outer iteration. Let M be the number of inner iterations and let $\lfloor k/M \rfloor$ be the integer part of k/M , i.e. the iteration counter of the outer loop. The sequence of stochastic Newton differentials is then generated by

$$H^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \alpha \mathbf{I} & \text{if } M \text{ divides } k, \\ \mathcal{S}(u^k, g_{\lfloor k/M \rfloor}(u^k), H^k) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

for some algorithm parameter α .

In Figures 1 and 2, we see the behavior of this method, with $M = 10$ and $M = 300$ respectively, compared to a more traditional stochastic gradient descent, set up in the same inner and outer loop way. For constructing the quasi-Newton matrices, we use Samsara [16, 18], a reverse communication nonlinear optimization solver for smooth unconstrained objectives developed by Luke et al. Under standard statistical assumptions, it is known that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{U}_M(X_{kM+1}, \dots, X_{kM+M}) = \delta_u \quad (\text{a.s.}),$$

where u is the true representation that has produced the data X_1, X_2, \dots . This is the reason why we plot the means, $k^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^k u^i$. We can see in the figure, that the variance produced by the stochastic quasi-Newton method, for $M = 300$, is lower, and this suggests that the inner loop functions as a significantly better approximation of the maximum likelihood estimator, and thus the behavior of the outer loop is dominated by statistics and not by optimization. Paradoxically, the minimal variance is achieved by the stochastic gradient descent with $M = 10$. This happens because the steps taken by 10 iterations of gradient descent are smaller, producing thus a smaller variance. When looking at the objective value, the Newton-type method with $M = 300$ is significantly better than that obtained by the other methods.

4.3 Sketched Newton-type Methods

The Johnson-Lindenstrauss Embedding Lemma has been a tool of choice in solving large scale optimization systems, see for instance [10]. For completeness, we recall this important result here.

Lemma 4.5 (Johnson-Lindenstrauss). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta < 1/2$ and any $d \in \mathcal{O}(-\varepsilon^{-2} \log(\delta))$ there exists a distribution over $\mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ such that for any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|x\| = 1$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\|Ax\|^2 - 1| \leq \varepsilon) \leq \delta.$$

An example of such a distribution is given by matrices with components independent and identically distributed from the standard normal distribution.

Remark 4.6. The dimension d depends on the desired error bound ε . In practice, in our algorithmic implementation, the dimension be given and the error analysis follow from this fixed dimension.




Figure 1: Mean and variance over k of the steps $x_{k+1} - x_k$, and the objective value compared between Stochastic Gradient Descent and Stochastic Quasi-Newton with $M = 10$ inner iterations

This approach involves modifying an iterative solver by using a randomly selected sketching matrix $\mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ to reduce the dimension of the objects involved. The computational advantages stem from the fact that $d \ll n$, so all the numerical linear algebra subroutines should be significantly faster.

In our Newton-type methods, we employ sketching both for the function, i.e. $F(x) \mapsto SF(x)$ and for the Newton differential, i.e. $H \mapsto S^T HS$. Using this approach yields a step in \mathbb{R}^d , and in order to map this step back to \mathbb{R}^n we use the S^T map. Next, we put this intuitive explanation into a formal definition.

Definition 4.7 (Sketched Newton-type Operator). Let $F : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be pointwise weakly Newton differentiable at \bar{x} with Newton differential $\mathcal{H}F$, and let $d \ll n$. The fixed point iteration of the set-valued operator $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}F} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$, defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}F}(x, S) = \{x - S^T(SHS^T)^{-1}SF(x) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}F(x), \det SHS^T \neq 0\},$$

is called a *sketched Newton-type method*.

Lemma 4.8. Let $F : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be pointwise weakly Newton differentiable at \bar{x} with $F(\bar{x}) = 0$ and Newton differential $\mathcal{H}F$, and let $d \ll n$. Let




Figure 2: Mean and variance over k of the steps $x_{k+1} - x_k$, and the objective value compared between Stochastic Gradient Descent and Stochastic Quasi-Newton with $M = 100$ inner iterations

\mathcal{S} be a distribution over $\mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ as in Lemma 4.5 and $c > 0$ be such that

$$\forall x \in U, \quad \sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}F(x)} \|F(x) - H(x - \bar{x})\| \leq c\|x - \bar{x}\|.$$

Let $y \in U$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}F(y)$ and let S be sampled from \mathcal{S} , and assume further that there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\begin{array}{l} \|S^T S H S^T S - H\| \leq \varepsilon \\ \|y - \bar{x} - S^T (S^T H S)^{-1} S F(y)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|S y - S \bar{x} - (S^T H S)^{-1} S F(y)\| \\ \|S F(y) - (S H S^T) S (y - \bar{x})\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|F(y) - S^T (S H S^T) S (y - \bar{x})\| \end{array} \right. \begin{array}{l} \text{and} \\ \text{and} \end{array} \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (27)$$

Let $y^+ \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}F}(y, S)$ be defined by

$$y^+ = y - S^T (S H S^T)^{-1} S F(y). \quad (28)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 (c + \varepsilon) \|(S H S^T)^{-1}\| \|y - \bar{x}\|) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (29)$$

Proof. Let E denote the event inside the probability in (27). If E implies the event inside the probability in (29), then we can deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(E) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2(c + \varepsilon)\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|y - \bar{x}\|). \quad (30)$$

Indeed, we now show that E implies the event inside the probability in (29). To show this implication, we assume that S is such that

$$\|S^T SHS^T S - H\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (31)$$

and

$$\|SF(y) - (SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x})\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|F(y) - S^T(SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x})\|, \quad (32)$$

and

$$\|y - \bar{x} - S^T(SHS^T)^{-1}SF(y)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|Sy - S\bar{x} - (SHS^T)^{-1}SF(y)\|. \quad (33)$$

Using (33), we can express

$$\|y - \bar{x} - S^T(SHS^T)^{-1}SF(y)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|(SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x}) - SF(y)\|,$$

and recalling the definition of y^+ from (28),

$$\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|(SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x}) - SF(y)\|. \quad (34)$$

Combining (34) with (32) gives

$$\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|F(y) - F(\bar{x}) - S^T(SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x})\|. \quad (35)$$

Using (31) shows that

$$S^T(SHS^T) \in B_\varepsilon[H],$$

and Lemma 4.3 gives

$$\|F(y) - F(\bar{x}) - S^T(SHS^T)S(y - \bar{x})\| \leq (c + \varepsilon)\|y - \bar{x}\|. \quad (36)$$

Finally, using (36) in (35) yields

$$\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2(c + \varepsilon)\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|y - \bar{x}\|.$$

Returning to the probability interpretation from (30), we complete the proof, computing

$$1 - \delta \leq \mathbb{P}(E) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|y^+ - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2(c + \varepsilon)\|(SHS^T)^{-1}\|\|y - \bar{x}\|).$$

□

Remark 4.9. In [11], it was shown that the d -principal component analysis (PCA) of a matrix H can be computed by

$$\underset{S \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|H - S^T S H\|.$$

This suggests that sketched Newton-type methods behave best, when the sketching mapping behaves like the PCA of the Newton differential.

We apply the sketched Newton-type method to the problem of denoising tubulin images coming from [1, 17]. This is a multicriteria optimization problem, with the state space consisting of $m_1 \times m_2$ real matrices. We identify this space with $\mathbb{R}^{m_1 m_2}$. Let $o \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}$ be the original image. The two objectives are given by the functions $n : \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $d : \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The first function measures the noise level of the image and is defined as

$$n(x) = \|\nabla x\|^2 := \sum_{i=2}^{m_1-1} \sum_{j=2}^{m_1-1} (x_{i,j+1} - x_{i,j-1})^2 + (x_{i+1,j} - x_{i-1,j})^2,$$


and the second one measures the distance to the original image, $d(x) = \|x - o\|_F^2$. To associate to it a scalar optimization problem that can be solved using the approach proposed in this paper, we employ a scalarization strategy, yielding

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}} n(x) + \alpha d(x)$$


for some parameter $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. How such a parameter α is chosen belongs to multicriteria optimization, and is beyond the scope of this work. For the interested reader, the author recommends [15, 4] for a reference on how to choose such a parameter. Both functions are smooth, so we can use the gradient and the Hessian in implementation of the algorithm. Our framework is then required in order to handle the randomness stemming from the sketching approximation.

In Figure 3 we see the convergence of the algorithm when d , the dimension from the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Embedding Lemma 4.5, varies through different proportions of the full dimension $m_1 m_2$. We also see a Newton-type method without sketching for comparison. The sketching distribution, \mathcal{S} , from which S is drawn is $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ in Subfigure 3a and $\text{Unif } \Pi(n, d)$ in Subfigure 3b. Here the set $\Pi(n, d)$ represents the canonical projection matrices, i.e.

$$\Pi(n, d) = \left\{ (p_{ij}) \left| \forall i \leq d, j \leq n, \quad p_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \sum_{j=0}^n p_{ij} = 1 \right. \right\}.$$



(a) The probability distribution of the embedding matrices is $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$



(b) The probability distribution of the embedding matrices is $\text{Unif } \Pi(n, d)$

Figure 3: The step size of the sketched Newton algorithm with the dimension of the embedding space given as a percentage of the full space compared to a standard Newton method

Remark 4.10. Using a sketching matrix from $\Pi(n, d)$ corresponds to selecting d elements from the gradient and d^2 from the Hessian.

5 Conclusions

Contrary to the standard view in the machine learning community, (Quasi-)Newton methods can be successfully employed in big data environments. We have seen that the fast convergence of these methods can remove uncertain behavior due to inner optimization loops, thus the dynamics of the system can be interpreted from a purely statistical perspective. This paper shows that a backtracking approach can be used to maintain strong guarantees on the behavior of Newton-type methods. As a future research direction different backtracking strategies can be investigated. Finally, our approach only handles randomness in the Hessian approximation. While some structured noise in the objective can be seen as noise in the Hessian approximation, not all random estimators of the objective can easily be treated by our methods. As such, an investigation of a fully stochastic method, with a stochastic objective along the lines presented here would be of great interest.

6 Acknowledgments

This work is partially the PhD thesis of the author, completed at the University of Göttingen under the supervision of D. Russell Luke. The author would like to thank D. Russell Luke for his guidance and advice during the undertaking of the PhD. The author would also like to thank his postdoc mentor, Sorin-Mihai Grad. This work has been partially founded by ANR-22-EXES-0013.

References

- [1] K. Benkhadra, F. Alahdab, S. U. Tamhane, R. G. McCoy, L. J. Prokop, and M. H. Murad. “Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion versus multiple daily injections in individuals with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis”. en. In: *Endocrine* 55.1 (2017), pp. 77-84.
- [2] R. Bollapragada, R. H. Byrd, and J. Nocedal. “Exact and inexact subsampled Newton methods for optimization”. In: *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 39.2 (2018), pp. 545-578.

- [3] J. Bolte, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle. “Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 146.1 (2014), pp. 459-494.
- [4] R. I. Boç, S.-M. Grad, and G. Wanka. *Duality in vector optimization*. en. Vector optimization. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2009.
- [5] L. Bottou, F. Curtis, and J. Nocedal. “Optimization methods for large scale machine learning”. English (US). In: *SIAM Review* 60.2 (2018), pp. 223-311.
- [6] M. Brokate and M. Ulbrich. “Newton differentiability of convex functions in normed spaces and of a class of operators”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 32 (2022), pp. 1265-1287.
- [7] B. Bullins, K. Patel, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, and B. E. Woodworth. “A stochastic Newton algorithm for distributed convex optimization”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan. Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 26818-26830.
- [8] R. H. Byrd, S. L. Hansen, J. Nocedal, and Y. Singer. “A stochastic quasi-Newton method for large-scale optimization”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 26.2 (2016), pp. 1008-1031.
- [9] L. Cao, A. S. Berahas, and K. Scheinberg. “First- and second-order high probability complexity bounds for trust-region methods with noisy oracles”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 207.1 (2024), pp. 55- 106.
- [10] C. Cartis, J. M. Fowkes, and Z. Shao. *Randomised subspace methods for non-convex optimization, with applications to nonlinear least-squares*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09873>. 2022.
- [11] J. P. Cunningham and Z. Ghahramani. “Linear dimensionality reduction: survey, insights, and generalizations”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 16 (2014), pp. 2859-2900.
- [12] R. Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Florence, AL: Duxbury Press, 1990.
- [13] G. Garrigos and R. M. Gower. *Handbook of Convergence Theorems for (Stochastic) Gradient Methods*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11235>. 2024.

- [14] G. Grimmett and D. Stirzaker. *Probability and random processes*. en. 3rd ed. London, England: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [15] A. A. Khan, C. Tammer, and C. Zălinescu. *Set-valued Optimization: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015. isbn: 9783642542657.
- [16] D. R. Luke. *Samsara*. <https://publications.goettingen-research-online.de/handle/2/121> 2022.
- [17] D. R. Luke, C. Charitha, R. Shefi, and Y. Malitsky. “Efficient, quantitative numerical methods for statistical image deconvolution and denoising”. In: *Nanoscale Photonic Imaging*. 2020.
- [18] D. R. Luke and T. Pinta. *Samsara*. <https://pypi.org/project/samsara/>. 2022.
- [19] D. R. Luke, S. Schultze, and H. Grubmüller. *Stochastic Algorithms for Large-Scale Composite Optimization: the Case of Single-Shot X-FEL Imaging*. 2024.
- [20] A. Milzarek, X. Xiao, S. Cen, Z. Wen, and M. Ulbrich. “A stochastic semismooth Newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 29.4 (2019), pp. 2916- 2948.
- [21] A. Milzarek, X. Xiao, Z. Wen, and M. Ulbrich. “On the local convergence of a stochastic semismooth Newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization”. In: *Science China Mathematics* 65.10 (2022), pp. 2151-2170.
- [22] S. Na, M. Dereziński, and M. W. Mahoney. “Hessian averaging in stochastic Newton methods achieves superlinear convergence”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 201.1 (2023), pp. 473-520.
- [23] T. Pinta. “Newton-type Methods”. PhD thesis. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 2024.
- [24] T. Pinta. *Newton-type Methods*. <https://gitlab.com/titus.pinta/newton-type-methods>. 2024.
- [25] L. Qi. *C-differential operators, C-differentiability and generalized Newton methods*. Applied Mathematics Report, AMR 96/5. University of New South Wales, 1996.

- [26] G. Turinici. *The convergence of the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) : a self-contained proof*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.14350>. 2021.
- [27] M. Yang, A. Milzarek, Z. Wen, and T. Zhang. “A stochastic extra-step quasi-Newton method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 194.1 (2022), pp. 257-303.
- [28] H. Ye, L. Luo, and Z. Zhang. “Approximate Newton methods”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22.66 (2021), pp. 1-41.
- [29] N. Young. *Chernoff-type bounds for a stopped sum of independent random variables*. <https://mathoverflow.net/q/412038>, 2021. (Visited on 12/18/2024).