

Accelerated Distributed Optimization with Compression and Error Feedback

Yuan Gao^{*†}
yuan.gao@cispa.de

Anton Rodomanov^{*}
anton.rodomanov@cispa.de

Jeremy Rack^{*†}
michael.rack@cispa.de

Sebastian U. Stich^{*}
stich@cispa.de

March 12, 2025

Abstract

Modern machine learning tasks often involve massive datasets and models, necessitating distributed optimization algorithms with reduced communication overhead. Communication compression, where clients transmit compressed updates to a central server, has emerged as a key technique to mitigate communication bottlenecks. However, the theoretical understanding of stochastic distributed optimization with contractive compression remains limited, particularly in conjunction with Nesterov acceleration—a cornerstone for achieving faster convergence in optimization. In this paper, we propose a novel algorithm, ADEF (**A**ccelerated **D**istributed **E**rror **F**eedback), which integrates Nesterov acceleration, contractive compression, error feedback, and gradient difference compression. We prove that ADEF achieves the first accelerated convergence rate for stochastic distributed optimization with contractive compression in the general convex regime. Numerical experiments validate our theoretical findings and demonstrate the practical efficacy of ADEF in reducing communication costs while maintaining fast convergence.

1 Introduction

Gradient methods are the workhorses of the modern machine learning paradigm. They are the backbone for training modern machine learning models. With the rapidly growing sizes of the datasets and models, distributed training has become a necessity as accumulating the entire dataset on a single central machine is simply infeasible. Much of the recent breakthrough models are trained in such a distributed fashion, e.g. large language models [Shoeybi et al., 2019], generative models [Ramesh et al., 2021, 2022], and others [Wang et al., 2020], where data are distributed across different clients/workers and model updates are coordinated by a parameter server. Another instances of distributed optimization is the federated learning setting [Konečný et al., 2016, Kairouz et al., 2019], where clients (e.g. edge devices or hospitals) jointly train a model without sharing their local data.

One of the key challenges in distributed optimization is the *communication bottleneck*—the cost of transmitting large model updates between clients and the server [Seide et al., 2014, Strom, 2015]. To address this, **communication compression** has emerged as a practical solution, where updates are transmitted in a compressed format to reduce communication overhead. Contractive compression (see Theorem 2.1), despite being potentially biased, has been shown to outperform unbiased compression

^{*}CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany.

[†]Universität des Saarlandes, Germany.

schemes in practice [Lin et al., 2018, Sun et al., 2019, Vogels et al., 2019] and offers favorable theoretical properties [Stich et al., 2018, Albasyoni et al., 2020, Beznosikov et al., 2023]. However, naive aggregation of compressed updates can lead to divergence [Beznosikov et al., 2023]. To mitigate this, **Error Feedback (EF)** [Seide et al., 2014] has been proposed as an effective remedy, compensating for compression errors [Stich et al., 2018, Karimireddy et al., 2019]. EF and its variants (e.g., **PowerSGD** by Vogels et al. [2019]) have been widely adopted in practice, integrated into popular deep learning frameworks such as PyTorch [Paszke et al., 2019], and deployed to train state-of-the-art transformer models [Ramesh et al., 2021].

Despite the empirical success of EF and contractive compression, their theoretical understanding remains incomplete. Early theoretical studies of EF [Stich et al., 2018, Karimireddy et al., 2019] primarily focus on single-client or homogeneous settings. Recent works have extended EF to heterogeneous datasets using bias correction mechanisms [Fatkhullin et al., 2023, Gao et al., 2024], while the initial explorations often require additional unbiased compression or suffering from divergence in stochastic settings [Mishchenko et al., 2019, Richtárik et al., 2021].

On the other hand, most of these advances are made with unaccelerated methods. Nesterov acceleration [Nesterov, 1983] is one of the most important algorithmic tools for achieving faster convergence rates for deterministic and stochastic first order methods in the convex regime. However, its integration with EF and contractive compression in the general convex regime remains largely unexplored. Existing works on accelerated methods with compression primarily focus on deterministic or strongly convex settings [Li et al., 2020, Qian et al., 2021a, Bylinkin and Beznosikov, 2024], rely on unbiased compression [Li and Richtárik, 2021], or effectively function as uncompressed methods [He et al., 2023].¹ Consequently, the question of whether Nesterov acceleration can be achieved alongside contractive compression in the general convex regime remains open.

1.1 Contribution

In this paper, we partially address the aforementioned gap by proposing **ADEF (Accelerated Distributed Error Feedback)**, which integrates Nesterov acceleration, contractive compression, and bias-corrected error feedback in the stochastic and general convex regime. Our contributions are as follows:

- **Algorithm:** We introduce ADEF, a novel algorithm for accelerated distributed optimization that combines Nesterov acceleration with contractive compression, error feedback, and gradient difference compression.
- **General theoretical framework (acceleration with inexact updates):** We develop a general and versatile analysis framework for accelerated methods with inexact updates, which is of independent interest to the optimization and machine learning communities. This framework rigorously handles errors arising from compression, stochasticity, and other inexactness in distributed optimization. We demonstrate the flexibility of our framework by applying it to analyze other algorithms and compression techniques. This highlights the robustness of our approach and its potential to inspire future advances in distributed optimization.
- **Breakthrough theoretical results:** Using our framework, we prove that ADEF is the first distributed optimization algorithm to achieve accelerated convergence rates under contractive compression in the general convex regime. This result bridges a critical gap in the theoretical understanding of communication-efficient optimization and acceleration, overcoming longstanding challenges in the field.

Numerical evaluation: We conduct extensive numerical experiments to validate our theoretical findings. The results demonstrate that ADEF significantly reduces communication costs while achieving state-of-the-art convergence performance.

¹We explain this in more details in Section 2.2 and Appendix F.

Table 1: Comparison of key existing works on stochastic distributed optimization with contractive compression in the general convex regime. We compare the rates in terms of the number of communication rounds from the client to the server, when the local oracle complexities are minimized. For simplicity, we assume that $L = \ell = L_{\max}$.

Algorithm	Acc ^(a)	No BGS ^(b)	# Comm. Rounds	# Local Oracle Calls
Lower Bound [He et al., 2023]	-	-	$\Omega\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)$	$\Omega\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)$
EF [Karimireddy et al., 2019]	No	No	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}(\frac{\sigma}{\delta} + \sigma)}{\sqrt{\delta\varepsilon^{3/2}}} + \frac{LR_0^2}{\delta\varepsilon}\right)$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}(\frac{\sigma}{\delta} + \sigma)}{\sqrt{\delta\varepsilon^{3/2}}} + \frac{LR_0^2}{\delta\varepsilon}\right)$
EControl [Gao et al., 2024]	No	Yes	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}\sigma}{\delta^2\varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{LR_0^2}{\delta\varepsilon}\right)$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}\sigma}{\delta^2\varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{LR_0^2}{\delta\varepsilon}\right)$
NEOLITHIC ^(c) [He et al., 2023]	Yes	No	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{\delta n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)^{(d)}$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)$
ADEF new	Yes	Yes	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}\sigma}{\delta^2\varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\delta^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}\sigma}{\delta^2\varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\delta^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)$

(a) Acc stands for accelerated methods.

(b) BGS stands for Bounded Gradient Similarity assumption: $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \zeta^2, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. See also Theorem D.1.

(c) He et al. [2023] presented their rates when batch size is $\max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$ where κ is the total number of updates at the server. We present the rate, as is the same with other methods, when the local oracle complexity is minimized, i.e. when the batch size is one. We also note that, in the worst case, NEOLITHIC transmit more bits than simply sending the uncompressed vector between each update at the server and is therefore an uncompressed method.

(d) $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ hides logarithmic factors in $1/\varepsilon$.

By bridging the gap between communication-efficient distributed optimization and accelerated convergence, ADEF opens new avenues for scalable and efficient training of large-scale machine learning models.

2 Communication Compression and Accelerated Methods

In this paper, we study distributed optimization algorithms equipped with communication compression. In particular, we consider the class of contractive compression operators:

Definition 2.1. We say that a (possibly randomized) mapping $\mathcal{C}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a contractive compression operator if for some constant $0 < \delta \leq 1$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \leq (1 - \delta) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1)$$

The classic example satisfying Theorem 2.1 is Top- K [Stich et al., 2018]. Top- K keeps the K largest entries in terms of absolute value and zeros out the rest and it is a biased compression. The class of contractive compressors also includes sparsification [Alistarh et al., 2018, Stich et al., 2018] and quantization operators [Wen et al., 2017, Alistarh et al., 2017, Bernstein et al., 2018, Horváth et al., 2019], and many others [Zheng et al., 2019, Beznosikov et al., 2020, Vogels et al., 2019, Safaryan et al., 2022, Islamov et al., 2023]. We follow the assumption made in most existing works on the theory of communication compressed optimization that the server-to-client communication is much more efficient (as compared to client to server communication) and the broadcast cost is negligible [Mishchenko et al., 2019, Kairouz et al., 2019, Fatkhullin et al., 2023, Gao et al., 2024]. Therefore, we only consider client-to-server communication compression in this paper.

In Table 1 we compare our method to some key existing works most relevant to our setting, stochastic distributed optimization with contractive compression in the general convex regime. We measure the

complexity in terms of the number of communication rounds from the client to the server when the local oracle complexity is minimized, in other word, when the batch size is 1.

2.1 Brief History on the Theory of EF

The EF mechanism, proposed by Seide et al. [2014], was first analyzed theoretically in Stich et al. [2018], Alistarh et al. [2018], Karimireddy et al. [2019], but only for the single client setting. Extensions to the distributed setting were first made under data similarity assumptions, either implicitly in the form of bounded gradient assumption [Cordonnier, 2018, Alistarh et al., 2018], or explicitly in the form of gradient similarity assumptions [Stich and Karimireddy, 2020], both are very limiting factors. Further extensions to fully decentralized settings were also considered in [Koloskova et al., 2019, 2020] under the bounded gradient assumption. The theory of distributed EF were further refined in [Beznosikov et al., 2020, Stich, 2020]. A key point in the analysis of distributed EF is to obtain an convergence rate in the number of communication rounds, where the leading term (term that involves the variance of the stochastic oracle, see Theorem 3.7) are unaffected by the compression quality δ and enjoys the linear speedup in the number of clients.

Mishchenko et al. [2019] proposed the DIANA algorithm, which incorporates an additional *unbiased* compressor into EF for bias correction, alleviating the need for the data similarity assumptions. It inspired a number of follow up works [Gorbunov et al., 2020, Stich, 2020, Qian et al., 2021b], and eventually led to the EF21 algorithm, which is the first one that fully supports contractive compression in the full gradient regime [Richtárik et al., 2021]. However, the bias correction mechanism of EF21 does not work with stochastic gradients and leads to unconvergence up to the variance of the stochastic oracle. The challenge of bias correction with stochastic gradients was finally addressed in Fatkhullin et al. [2023] with the application of momentum (which however, is not known to work in the general convex regime), and in Gao et al. [2024] using an error-controlled EF combined with bias correction which covers the strongly convex, general convex and non-convex cases.

2.2 Accelerated Methods with Compression

Compared to the rich literature on the unaccelerated EF and its variants, theory for accelerated methods [Nesterov, 1983] with communication compression is still lacking, with only a handful available [Murata and Suzuki, 2019, Li et al., 2020, Qian et al., 2021a, Li and Richtárik, 2021, He et al., 2023, Bylinkin and Beznosikov, 2024]. This is particularly the case with contractive compression, where some work [He et al., 2023] see the potential biasedness in the updates a forbidding factor, due to the negative results [Devolder et al., 2014] on acceleration with inexact oracles.

Unbiased Compression: ADIANA [Li et al., 2020] and CANITA [Li and Richtárik, 2021] are both restricted to unbiased compressions. The S-NAG-EF proposed in [Murata and Suzuki, 2019] even requires a more specific class of randomized unbiased compressors. We also note that a very recent work by Gupta et al. [2024] essentially rediscovered the theory for compressed GD with unbiased compressors and its accelerated variant [Li et al., 2020], under the notion of noisy gradient with relative noise. The unbiasedness assumption is a very strong assumption, and it is known in practice that contractive compressors are superior [Vogels et al., 2019, Albasyoni et al., 2020, Beznosikov et al., 2023], rendering these theories unsatisfactory.

Lack of Theory for General Convex Case: ADIANA, ECLK [Qian et al., 2021a] and EF-OLGA [Bylinkin and Beznosikov, 2024] only work for the strongly-convex regime. It is not known if these methods can be extended to the general convex case.

Only Supports Full Gradient: As we have seen before, mixing stochastic gradients with compression can already be problematic in the unaccelerated case. ADIANA, ECLK, CANITA and EF-OLGA all only work with full gradients. In particular, ECLK and EF-OLGA combines EF with Katyusha-style acceleration [Allen-Zhu, 2018], which utilizes the special finite-sum structure of f and

requires epoch-wise *uncompressed* communications of *full* gradients, making it unlikely to be extendable to the stochastic setting. ADIANA and CANITA does not utilize the classic EF mechanism, and evidences suggest that their gradient difference compression mechanism might lead to unconvergence up to the variance of the stochastic oracle when combined with contractive compression [Fatkhullin et al., 2023].

Uncompressed Method in Disguise: NEOLITHIC [Huang et al., 2022, He et al., 2023] takes a rather different approach than the above. It does not utilize any additional algorithmic tools on top of a naively compressed Nesterov accelerated method. It uses $\Omega(\frac{1}{\delta})$ rounds² of communications between each update to account for compression errors. However, this means that in the worst case the algorithm will transmit *more* bits than simply sending the uncompressed vector between each server updates, making it an *uncompressed* method in disguise. See Appendix F for a more in-depth discussion on these issues.

3 Problem Formulation and Assumptions

In this paper we consider the following distributed stochastic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{x}^* := \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right], \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{x} are the parameters of a model that we train. The objective function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an average of n functions $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in [n]$. Each function f_i is a local loss associated with a local dataset \mathcal{D}_i which can only be accessed by client i .

We analyze the setting where there is a central server coordinating the training process. The server receives and aggregates the messages from the clients via a compressed communication channel, where the messages are compressed by some δ -contractive compression (see Theorem 2.1), performs an update on the model parameters, and broadcasts the updated model back to the clients. We measure the performance of the algorithm in terms of the number of communication rounds from the clients to the server, when the local oracle complexity of the clients are minimized.

We first introduce the following notation which we use throughout the paper.

Notation 3.1. We denote the Bregman divergence of f between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} as $\beta_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, i.e.,

$$\beta_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Next we list the assumptions that we make in this paper. Notably, we do not assume that the local functions f_i 's have gradient dissimilarity, which is a common limiting assumption in many of the existing works, in both the unaccelerated and accelerated cases, e.g. [Lian et al., 2017, Huang et al., 2022, Li and Li, 2023, He et al., 2023]. A crucial algorithmic component of our method that enables the acceleration also achieves this bias correction phenomenon naturally.

Assumption 3.2. We assume that the objective function f is convex, closed and proper.

Assumption 3.3. We assume that the objective function f has L -Lipschitz gradients, i.e. for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y})\| \leq L \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|. \quad (4)$$

Many existing works further assumes that each local function f_i is L_{\max} -smooth and convex [Li and Richtárik, 2021, He et al., 2023]. We instead make the following weaker assumption:

²More precisely: $R = \max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$. Here ζ^2 denotes the gradient similarity and κ denotes the total number of updates

Assumption 3.4. We assume that there exists some $\ell > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2\ell\beta_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (5)$$

It is easy to show that Theorem 3.4 follows from L_{\max} -smoothness of each local function f_i , in particular:

Fact 3.5. Given the assumption that each f_i is L_{\max} -smooth and convex, then Theorem 3.4 holds with $\ell \leq L_{\max}$.

Another class of common assumptions used in the literature are variants of the Hessian similarity assumption [Khaled and Jin, 2022, Jiang et al., 2024, Rodomanov et al., 2024, Bylinkin and Beznosikov, 2024], which also implies Theorem 3.4:

Fact 3.6. Given Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, if the local functions f_i 's satisfy the λ -Hessian similarity assumption in the following sense:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \nabla \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{y}) \right\|^2 \leq 2\lambda\beta_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{f}_i := f - f_i$, then $\ell \leq L + \lambda$.

Next we make the following standard assumption on the stochastic gradient oracles.

Assumption 3.7. We assume that each client i has access to an unbiased stochastic gradient oracle $\mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}, \xi^i) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for the local function f_i , such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi^i} [\mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}, \xi^i)] &= \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbb{E}_{\xi^i} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}, \xi^i) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \right] &\leq \sigma^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Mini-batches are also allowed, which simply divides the variance by the batch size. Our algorithm does not impose restrictions on the minimal batch size needed during training. We compare the total number of communication rounds from the client to the server for the algorithms, when the local oracle complexity (i.e. the number of oracle calls of the client) is minimized, i.e. when the batch size is 1. This is also the standard metric in most existing works on stochastic distributed optimization with compression [Karimireddy et al., 2019, Stich, 2020, Fatkhullin et al., 2023, Gao et al., 2024].

4 Accelerated Method with Inexact Update

In this section, we present a general framework for studying accelerated methods with inexact updates. Here we do not make any assumptions on the inexactness and obtain a general framework for the analysis. Our framework is flexible and can be applied to different setups and algorithms, unlike some existing works such as Devolder et al. [2014] which assumes specific structures on the inexactness. We consider Algorithm 1. The algorithm is a simple extension to the standard accelerated method, where in Line 5 we use some inexact $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ that is ‘‘approximately’’ the stochastic gradient \mathbf{g}_t of f at \mathbf{y}_t . We assume the following for the stochastic gradient \mathbf{g}_t :

Algorithm 1 Accelerated Method with Inexact Update

```
1: Input:  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, A_0, (a_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ 
2: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
3:    $A_{t+1} = A_t + a_{t+1}$ 
4:    $\mathbf{y}_t = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_t$ 
5:   Compute  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t \approx \mathbf{g}_t$ 
6:    $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ 
7:    $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ 
```

Assumption 4.1. For all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{g}_t := \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y}_t, \xi_t)$ is a stochastic gradient of f at \mathbf{y}_t , where ξ_t are independent copies of the oracle's randomness ξ . We assume that for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$ is an unbiased stochastic gradient with bound variance:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \xi)] &= \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \right] &\leq \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Furthermore, we assume that $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ is a deterministic function of $\xi_{[t]} := \{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_t\}$.

The value of $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2$ can be adapted to different setups, and in particular, for distributed optimization problems, we think of \mathbf{g}_t as the average of the local stochastic gradients (see Theorem 3.7) and therefore we have $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$. For now, we do not assume any specific structure on the inexact gradient $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$. Such an inexact gradient could be the result of absolute compression (see Appendix E); or it could be built algorithmically via some compressed communication channel, which is the focus of this paper.

The main result in this section is a descent theorem for the final iterate of Algorithm 1, up to some accumulative error that depends on the inexactness of the gradient $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$. In particular, we define the following accumulative error at iteration t :

$$\mathbf{e}_t := \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j). \tag{9}$$

We also introduce some additional notations:

$$\begin{aligned} F_t &:= \mathbb{E} f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*), \\ R_t^2 &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right], \\ E_t &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Now, the main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.2. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 4.1, for all $T \geq 1$, for $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{v}_t)_{t=0}^\infty$ generated by*

Algorithm 1, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + 2\sigma_g^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} a_{t+1}^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) a_{t+1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \right] \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t)]
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we write $w_t := \min\{2, a_t L\} + \frac{4La_t^2}{A_t} + \frac{4La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}}$.

The missing proof is in Appendix B. We point out that while Theorem 4.2's proof employs virtual iteration techniques used in the analysis of EF and its variants (e.g. [Karimireddy et al., 2019, Stich, 2020, Gao et al., 2024]), the proof is more involved as it also carefully integrates the acceleration scheme. More importantly, Theorem 4.2 takes a different approach from the one-step descent analysis template which most existing works applied [Karimireddy et al., 2019, Stich, 2020, Richtárik et al., 2021, Fatkhullin et al., 2023, Gao et al., 2024], in that it is an overall descent lemma for the final iterate. Instead of constructing a single Lyapunov function that attempts to captures all the individual one-step descent (e.g. R_t^2 and E_t etc) that in many cases involves quite some speculations for the appropriate choices of parameters, we only need to upper bound the sum of the accumulative errors now.

As a technicality in the analysis, we weight each error term E_{t+1} with $\min\{2M, a_{t+1}L\}$, instead of simply using either one throughout. This comes from the fact that the stepsize a_{t+1} , albeit typically growing linearly, might attain lower value than a fixed constant throughout the algorithm due to the stepsize tuning for the stochastic terms.

As discussed before, Theorem 4.2 covers a wide range of algorithms that takes the form of Algorithm 1 and can be applied to study the convergence of these algorithms as long as the sum of the accumulative errors can be controlled. To demonstrate its flexibility, we apply Theorem 4.2 to analyze various algorithms besides our main algorithm in this paper:

- in Appendix D, we analyze Algorithm 3 where $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ is built via the vanilla error feedback, and demonstrate that it does not achieve the accelerated rate;
- in Appendix F, we analyze Algorithm 6, which is essentially the NEOLITHIC algorithm in He et al. [2023], where $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ is built via repeated communication rounds.
- in Appendix E, we briefly study a different class of compressors, absolute compressor \mathcal{C}_Δ such that $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{C}_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \leq \Delta^2$, and analyze the convergence of Algorithm 4 with such compressors.

Most importantly, in the next section, we present our main algorithm for distributed optimization with communication compression, ADEF, and analyze its convergence using Theorem 4.2.

5 Acceleration with Error Feedback

In this section we present our main algorithm, ADEF, summarized in Algorithm 2. All missing proofs can be found in Appendix C. At its core, the algorithm is still the accelerated method with inexact updates in the form of Algorithm 1. However, we introduce an enhanced error feedback mechanism to

Algorithm 2 ADEF Accelerated Distributed Error Feedback

```

1: Input:  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, A_0, (a_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ .
2:  $\mathbf{e}_0^i = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-1}^i = \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{y}_0, \xi_0^i)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-1}^i$ 
3: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
4:   server:
5:    $A_{t+1} = A_t + a_{t+1}$ 
6:   send to each client  $\mathbf{y}_t = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_t$ 
7:   each client  $i$ :
8:    $\mathbf{g}_t^i = \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{y}_t, \xi_t^i)$ 
9:    $\tilde{\delta}_t^i = \mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t-1}^i$ ,  $\tilde{\Delta}_t^i = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\delta}_t^i)$ 
10:   $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t-1}^i + \tilde{\Delta}_t^i$ 
11:   $\delta_t^i = \mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i - \frac{1}{a_{t+1}} \mathbf{e}_t^i$ ,  $\Delta_t^i = \mathcal{C}(\delta_t^i)$ 
12:   $\mathbf{e}_{t+1}^i = a_{t+1}(\Delta_t^i - \delta_t^i)$ 
13:  send to server  $\tilde{\Delta}_t^i, \Delta_t^i$ 
14:  server:
15:   $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t-1} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\Delta}_t^i$ 
16:   $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_t^i$ 
17:   $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$ 
18:   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ 

```

build the inexact gradient $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$, and we highlight the procedures in which we build the inexact gradient with red and green color boxes in Algorithm 2. The algorithm employs a delicate combination of error feedback and gradient difference compression. The green lines, Line 11, 12, 16, is the backbone error feedback procedure:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_t^i &= \mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i - \frac{1}{a_{t+1}} \mathbf{e}_t^i, & \Delta_t^i &= \mathcal{C}(\delta_t^i), \\
 \mathbf{e}_{t+1}^i &= a_{t+1}(\Delta_t^i - \delta_t^i), & \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t &= \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_t^i.
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

For any sequences $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$, the error feedback mechanism summarized above records the errors that occurred due to the compression. The following lemma, which is the key property of EF and most of its variants [Karimireddy et al., 2019, Stich, 2020, Gao et al., 2024], states that the accumulative error defined in (9) is precisely the average of the local errors tracked by (12), irrespective of the choice of $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$'s. Consequently, we can bound the sum of the accumulative errors $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1}$ with the following quantity that quantifies the distance between the local stochastic gradients and the control variates:

$$H_t := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i\|^2 \right]. \tag{13}$$

Now we have:

Lemma 5.1. *For an algorithm that follows (12), the local error terms $(\mathbf{e}_t^i)_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies the following:*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_t^i = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) =: \mathbf{e}_t, \tag{14}$$

where \mathbf{g}_t 's are the average local stochastic gradients $\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_t^i$.

Further, if for all $t \leq T-1$, $(1 - \frac{\delta}{2})w_{t+1} \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{4})w_t$, then it holds that:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} \leq \frac{8}{\gamma} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} H_t, \quad (15)$$

where $w'_t := w_t a_t^2$

Now, for the vanilla error feedback method, the control variate $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$'s are simply $\mathbf{0}$. This is however undesirable, as upper bounding $w'_{t+1} H_t$ will involve upper bounding $\frac{w'_{t+1}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2]$. This in turns will require the data similarity assumption, and more importantly, an upper bound in the form of $2w'_{t+1} \ell \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)$. This cannot be canceled out unless we force the stepsizes to be very small which effectively eliminate all the acceleration. See Appendix D for more details. To address these issues with the vanilla EF mechanism, we build the control variate $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$'s to approximate \mathbf{g}_t^i 's as well and therefore reduce the overall errors from the compression. The construction of $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$'s are highlighted in red in Algorithm 2 and we summarize it below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_t^i &= \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{y}_t, \xi_t^i), & \tilde{\delta}_t^i &= \mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t-1}^i, \\ \tilde{\Delta}_t^i &= \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\delta}_t^i), & \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i &= \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t-1}^i + \tilde{\Delta}_t^i. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The procedure described in (16) is sometimes known as a gradient difference compression mechanism, which are mostly applied to address the data heterogeneity issue for unaccelerated methods [Mishchenko et al., 2019, Fatkhullin et al., 2021, Gao et al., 2024]. Here, it reduces the error of compression and addresses the daaa heterogeneity issue all at once. We have the following lemma regarding the weighted sum of H_t :

Lemma 5.2. *Given Theorems 3.4 and 3.7, for an algorithm that follows (16), if for all $t \leq T-1$, we have $w'_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w'_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$, then it holds that:*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} H_t \leq \frac{16}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t-1})\|^2] + \frac{16\sigma^2}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1}. \quad (17)$$

Finally, we can combine Theorem 4.2 with Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 to give the main convergence result for Algorithm 2. As we pointed out before, for the distributed optimization setting that we consider in this section, \mathbf{g}_t is simply the average of the local gradient and therefore $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Given Theorems 3.2–3.4 and 3.7, and let $a_t := (t + \frac{32}{\delta})/M$ and $A_0 := 32^2/2\delta^2 M$, it suffices to have:*

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{R_0^2 \sigma^2}{n \varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{L} R_0^2 \sigma}{\delta^2 \varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{\ell} R_0^2}{\delta^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right), \quad (18)$$

number of iterations (communication rounds) of Algorithm 2 to get $F_T \leq \varepsilon$, where we can set $M = \max \left\{ \frac{2^{13} \ell}{\delta^4}, \left(\frac{4T(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2 \sigma^2}{R_0^2 n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 8 \left(\frac{LT(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^3 \sigma^2}{\delta^4 R_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\}$.

Remark 5.4. We note that for the proof of Theorem 5.3, we mainly focus on the asymptotic behavior and does not optimize the choices of constants. Most likely one can pick much smaller constants for M in practice, see also Section 6.




Figure 1: **Competitive performance.** Comparison of the performance of ADEF, EControl, EF and NEOLITHIC on the MNIST classification problem. We use Top- K compression with $\delta = 0.1$. We see that ADEF performs competitively in both the loss and the accuracy, while NEOLITHIC performs the worst.

Remark 5.5. Theorem 5.3 gives the first accelerated convergence rate for distributed stochastic optimization with error feedback and contractive compression. We first point out that the stochastic terms $\mathcal{O}(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}\sigma}{\delta^2\varepsilon^{3/2}})$ matches that of EControl [Gao et al., 2024], which is the best known for the distributed setting under arbitrary data heterogeneity. In particular, the leading term $\mathcal{O}(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2})$ is optimal, δ -free, and enjoys the linear speedup in the number of clients n .

Importantly, in the deterministic regime, i.e. when $\sigma^2 = 0$, we see that ADEF achieves the accelerated $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}})$ convergence rate. There is however a $\frac{1}{\delta^2}$ factor, instead of a $\frac{1}{\delta}$ factor. Nonetheless, this is faster than the unaccelerated $\mathcal{O}(\frac{LR_0^2}{\delta\varepsilon})$ when $\delta \geq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{LR_0^2}}$ (for simplicity of the illustration, we assume that $L = \ell = L_{\max}$ in this comparison). We also point out that this higher dependence on the δ factor in the deterministic term seems to be a common issue in the analysis of bias-corrected EF when using two compressions. In particular, such a phenomenon was also observed in the analysis of an unaccelerated method D-EC-SGD with Bias Correction and Double Contractive Compression [Gao et al., 2024]. It is unknown if this is merely a deficiency in the analysis, or some inherent limitation of the method. The EControl method resolved this issue in the unaccelerated case using a delicate error-control mechanism, but it seems to be difficult to adapt to cases where stepsizes are changing drastically which is precisely the case with acceleration. We leave it for future work to investigate if more refined analysis that improves the δ dependence in the deterministic term for ADEF is possible or if the EControl mechanism can be adapted to the accelerated setting.

6 Experiments

In this section we present numerical evaluations of our algorithm, and verify its theoretical properties discussed in the previous sections. We consider parameters of the following form: $a_t = \gamma(t + \frac{1}{\delta})$ and $A_0 = \frac{1}{\delta^2}$, where γ acts as the inverse of M in Theorem 5.3. For all experiments, we perform a grid search for γ , unless otherwise stated. We always report the performance in terms of the number of communications performed.

6.1 Synthetic Logistic Regression

We first evaluate the performance of our algorithm on a synthetic logistic regression. We generate non-separable data with sklearn’s built-in function [Pedregosa et al., 2011] and split the dataset into n clients. We consider the following logistic loss for each data point (\mathbf{a}_i, b_i) :

$$\ell((\mathbf{a}_i, b_i), \mathbf{x}) := -b_i\mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{x} + \log(1 + \exp(\mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{x})). \quad (19)$$




Figure 2: **Achieving acceleration.** Performance of ADEF and EF with $\sigma^2 = 0$. We set a target error of 0.01. We see that ADEF achieves the accelerated $\mathcal{O}(1/t^2)$ rate.




Figure 3: **Achieving linear speedup.** The performance of ADEF with increasing number of clients n for the synthetic logistic regression problem. We fix γ to be 0.0001. The error that the algorithm stabilizes around decreases as n increases.

For the stochastic oracle, we generate the noise from a Normal distribution with variance σ^2 . We use the Top- K compressor, with $\delta = 0.1$. Now we verify some of the key properties of our algorithm.

Accelerated rate in the deterministic case We first demonstrate that Algorithm 2 indeed achieves the accelerated $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{T^2})$ rate when $\sigma^2 = 0$. We contrast this against the convergence rate of the unaccelerated EF. The results are summarized in Figure 2. We see that ADEF indeed achieves the accelerated rate $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{T^2})$, while EF converges at the rate of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{T})$.

Linear speedup with the number of clients Next we verify the linear speedup property of our algorithm with the number of clients n with the leading terms in the convergence rate. We fix $\sigma^2 = 25$ and small enough γ to be 0.0001, and increase the number of clients n . The results are summarized in Figure 3. We see that the algorithm gets more stable as the number of clients increases, and the error that the algorithm stabilizes around decreases as n increases, which verifies the linear speedup property of our algorithm.

6.2 MNIST Classification

Next we evaluate our algorithm on the MNIST classification problem [Deng, 2012] when using Top- K compression with $\delta = 0.1$, and compare it against the state of the art distributed optimization algorithms with communication compression, in particular, the classical EF algorithm, and the recent EControl algorithm. We also compare against the NEOLITHIC method, where we set the number of repeated communication rounds to be 2. The results are summarized in Figure 1. We see that ADEF (with $\gamma = 0.05$ as selected by grid search) performs competitively in both the loss and the accuracy, while NEOLITHIC performs the worst.

7 Conclusion and Outlook

In this work, we propose a novel method ADEF that provably achieves the accelerated convergence rate in the general convex regime for distributed optimization with contractive compression, making a first step towards the resolution of the open theoretical problem therein. We provide a general analysis framework for accelerated methods with inexact updates and apply it to analyze ADEF, along with several others. Future works can look into the compression error dependence of algorithms employing double compressions such as ours; or study the possibility of extending our method, or indeed, (unaccelerated) error feedback methods, to constraint and composite optimization problems, which has been a long-standing theoretical issue in the field.

References

- Alyazeed Albasyoni, Mher Safaryan, Laurent Condat, and Peter Richtárik. Optimal gradient compression for distributed and federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03246*, 2020. (Cited on pages 2 and 4)
- Dan Alistarh, Demjan Grubic, Jerry Li, Ryota Tomioka, and Milan Vojnovic. QSGD: Communication-efficient SGD via gradient quantization and encoding. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1709–1720, 2017. (Cited on page 3)
- Dan Alistarh, Torsten Hoefer, Mikael Johansson, Nikola Konstantinov, Sarit Khirirat, and Cédric Renggli. The convergence of sparsified gradient methods. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018. (Cited on pages 3 and 4)
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(221):1–51, 2018. (Cited on page 4)
- Jeremy Bernstein, Yu-Xiang Wang, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Animashree Anandkumar. signsgd: Compressed optimisation for non-convex problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 560–569. PMLR, 2018. (Cited on page 3)
- Aleksandr Beznosikov, Samuel Horváth, Peter Richtárik, and Mher Safaryan. On biased compression for distributed learning. *Journal on Machine Learning Research*, 2020. (Cited on pages 3 and 4)
- Aleksandr Beznosikov, Samuel Horváth, Peter Richtárik, and Mher Safaryan. On biased compression for distributed learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(276):1–50, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 30)
- Dmitry Bylinkin and Aleksandr Beznosikov. Accelerated methods with compressed communications for distributed optimization problems under data similarity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16414*, 2024. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 6)
- Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier. Convex optimization using sparsified stochastic gradient descent with memory. Technical report, 2018. (Cited on page 4)
- Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 2012. (Cited on page 12)
- Olivier Devolder, François Glineur, and Yurii Nesterov. First-order methods of smooth convex optimization with inexact oracle. *Mathematical Programming*, 146:37–75, 2014. (Cited on pages 4 and 6)

- Ilyas Fatkhullin, Igor Sokolov, Eduard Gorbunov, Zhize Li, and Peter Richtárik. Ef21 with bells & whistles: Practical algorithmic extensions of modern error feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2110.03294*, 2021. (Cited on page 10)
- Ilyas Fatkhullin, Alexander Tyurin, and Peter Richtárik. Momentum provably improves error feedback! *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2305.15155*, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 29, and 30)
- Yuan Gao, Rustem Islamov, and Sebastian U Stich. EControl: Fast distributed optimization with compression and error control. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11)
- Eduard Gorbunov, Dmitry Kovalev, Dmitry Makarenko, and Peter Richtárik. Linearly converging error compensated sgd. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. (Cited on page 4)
- Kanan Gupta, Jonathan W. Siegel, and Stephan Wojtowytsch. Nesterov acceleration despite very noisy gradients. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on page 4)
- Suyog Gupta, Ankur Agrawal, Kailash Gopalakrishnan, and Pritish Narayanan. Deep learning with limited numerical precision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1737–1746. PMLR, 2015. (Cited on page 28)
- Yutong He, Ximmeng Huang, Yiming Chen, Wotao Yin, and Kun Yuan. Lower bounds and accelerated algorithms in distributed stochastic optimization with communication compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2305.07612*, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 30, and 31)
- Samuel Horváth, Chen-Yu Ho, Ľudovít Horváth, Atal Narayan Sahu, Marco Canini, and Peter Richtárik. Natural compression for distributed deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1905.10988*, 2019. (Cited on page 3)
- Ximmeng Huang, Yiming Chen, Wotao Yin, and Kun Yuan. Lower bounds and nearly optimal algorithms in distributed learning with communication compression. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. (Cited on pages 5 and 30)
- Rustem Islamov, Xun Qian, Slavomír Hanzely, Mher Safaryan, and Peter Richtárik. Distributed newton-type methods with communication compression and bernoulli aggregation. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. (Cited on page 3)
- Xiaowen Jiang, Anton Rodomanov, and Sebastian U Stich. Federated optimization with doubly regularized drift correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08447*, 2024. (Cited on page 6)
- Peter Kairouz, H. Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista A. Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, Rafael G. L. D’Oliveira, Salim El Rouayheb, David Evans, Josh Gardner, Zachary Garrett, Adrià Gascón, Badih Ghazi, Phillip B. Gibbons, Marco Gruteser, Zaïd Harchaoui, Chaoyang He, Lie He, Zhouyuan Huo, Ben Hutchinson, Justin Hsu, Martin Jaggi, Tara Javidi, Gauri Joshi, Mikhail Khodak, Jakub Konečný, Aleksandra Korolova, Farinaz Koushanfar, Sanmi Koyejo, Tancrede Lepoint, Yang Liu, Prateek Mittal, Mehryar Mohri, Richard Nock, Ayfer Özgür, Rasmus Pagh, Mariana Raykova, Hang Qi, Daniel Ramage, Ramesh Raskar, Dawn Song, Weikang Song, Sebastian U. Stich, Ziteng Sun, Ananda Theertha Suresh, Florian Tramèr, Praneeth Vepakomma, Jianyu Wang, Li Xiong, Zheng Xu, Qiang Yang, Felix X. Yu, Han Yu, and Sen Zhao. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1912.04977*, 2019. (Cited on pages 1 and 3)

- Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Quentin Rebjock, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Error feedback fixes signsgd and other gradient compression schemes. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2019)*, 2019. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9)
- Ahmed Khaled and Chi Jin. Faster federated optimization under second-order similarity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02257*, 2022. (Cited on page 6)
- Anastasia Koloskova, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Decentralized stochastic optimization and gossip algorithms with compressed communication. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019. (Cited on page 4)
- Anastasia Koloskova, Tao Lin, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Decentralized deep learning with arbitrary communication compression. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. (Cited on page 4)
- Jakub Konečný, H. Brendan McMahan, Felix Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. Federated learning: strategies for improving communication efficiency. In *Proceedings of NIPS Private Multi-Party Machine Learning Workshop*, 2016. (Cited on page 1)
- Xiaoyun Li and Ping Li. Analysis of error feedback in federated non-convex optimization with biased compression: Fast convergence and partial participation. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. (Cited on page 5)
- Zhize Li and Peter Richtárik. Canita: Faster rates for distributed convex optimization with communication compression, 2021. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 5)
- Zhize Li, Dmitry Kovalev, Xun Qian, and Peter Richtárik. Acceleration for compressed gradient descent in distributed and federated optimization, 2020. (Cited on pages 2 and 4)
- Xiangru Lian, Ce Zhang, Huan Zhang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Wei Zhang, and Ji Liu. Can decentralized algorithms outperform centralized algorithms? a case study for decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2017. (Cited on page 5)
- Yujun Lin, Song Han, Huizi Mao, Yu Wang, and Bill Dally. Deep gradient compression: Reducing the communication bandwidth for distributed training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. (Cited on page 2)
- Konstantin Mishchenko, Eduard Gorbunov, Martin Takáč, and Peter Richtárik. Distributed learning with compressed gradient differences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09269*, 2019. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, and 10)
- Tomoya Murata and Taiji Suzuki. Accelerated sparsified sgd with error feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12224*, 2019. (Cited on page 4)
- Yurii Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $o(1/k^2)$. In *Dokl akad nauk Sssr*, volume 269, page 543, 1983. (Cited on pages 2 and 4)
- Yurii Nesterov et al. *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer, 2018. (Cited on page 18)
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, 2019. (Cited on page 2)

- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12: 2825–2830, 2011. (Cited on page 11)
- Xun Qian, Peter Richtárik, and Tong Zhang. Error compensated distributed sgd can be accelerated. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:30401–30413, 2021a. (Cited on pages 2 and 4)
- Xun Qian, Peter Richtárik, and Tong Zhang. Error compensated distributed sgd can be accelerated. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021b. (Cited on page 4)
- Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8821–8831. PMLR, 2021. (Cited on pages 1 and 2)
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. 2022. (Cited on page 1)
- Peter Richtárik, Igor Sokolov, and Ilyas Fatkhullin. Ef21: A new, simpler, theoretically better, and practically faster error feedback. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 8)
- Anton Rodomanov, Xiaowen Jiang, and Sebastian U Stich. Universality of adagrad stepsizes for stochastic optimization: Inexact oracle, acceleration and variance reduction. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on page 6)
- Mher Safaryan, Rustem Islamov, Xun Qian, and Peter Richtarik. FedNL: Making Newton-type methods applicable to federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. (Cited on page 3)
- Atal Sahu, Aritra Dutta, Ahmed M Abdelmoniem, Trambak Banerjee, Marco Canini, and Panos Kalnis. Rethinking gradient sparsification as total error minimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8133–8146, 2021. (Cited on page 28)
- Amedeo Sapio, Marco Canini, Chen-Yu Ho, Jacob Nelson, Panos Kalnis, Changhoon Kim, Arvind Krishnamurthy, Masoud Moshref, Dan Ports, and Peter Richtárik. Scaling distributed machine learning with {In-Network} aggregation. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 21)*, pages 785–808, 2021. (Cited on page 28)
- Frank Seide, Hao Fu, Jasha Droppo, Gang Li, and Dong Yu. 1-bit stochastic gradient descent and its application to data-parallel distributed training of speech dnns. In *Proceedings of 15th annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2014. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 4)
- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick Le Gresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019. (Cited on page 1)
- Sebastian U. Stich. On communication compression for distributed optimization on heterogeneous data. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2009.02388*, 2020. (Cited on pages 4, 6, 8, and 9)
- Sebastian U Stich and Sai Praneeth Karimireddy. The error-feedback framework: Better rates for sgd with delayed gradients and compressed updates. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2020. (Cited on page 4)

- Sebastian U Stich, Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, and Martin Jaggi. Sparsified sgd with memory. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 4)
- Nikko Strom. Scalable distributed DNN training using commodity GPU cloud computing. In *Proceedings of Interspeech 2015*, 2015. (Cited on page 1)
- Haobo Sun, Yingxia Shao, Jiawei Jiang, Bin Cui, Kai Lei, Yu Xu, and Jiang Wang. Sparse gradient compression for distributed sgd. In *International Conference on Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, pages 139–155. Springer, 2019. (Cited on page 2)
- Thijs Vogels, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, and Martin Jaggi. PowerSGD: Practical low-rank gradient compression for distributed optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, 2019. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 4)
- Meng Wang, Weijie Fu, Xiangnan He, Shijie Hao, and Xindong Wu. A survey on large-scale machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2020. (Cited on page 1)
- Wei Wen, Cong Xu, Feng Yan, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li. Terngrad: Ternary gradients to reduce communication in distributed deep learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. (Cited on page 3)
- Shuai Zheng, Ziyue Huang, and James Kwok. Communication-efficient distributed blockwise momentum sgd with error-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. (Cited on page 3)
- Heng Zhu, Avishek Ghosh, and Arya Mazumdar. Optimal compression of unit norm vectors in the high distortion regime. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 719–724. IEEE, 2023. (Cited on page 31)

A Auxiliary Facts and Results

In this section we collect some auxiliary facts and results that are useful for the analysis of our algorithms. The first one is a simple fact regarding the square of the norm of a sum of vectors.

Fact A.1. For any $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_T$, we have:

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t \right\|^2 \leq T \sum_{t=1}^T \|\gamma_t\|^2. \quad (20)$$

The next one is on upper bounding the sum of a sequence under a descent condition on the sequence:

Lemma A.2. Given a sequence of non-negative values $\{\alpha_t\}_{t \in [T-1]}$, and some other sequences $\{\lambda_t\}_{t \in [T-1]}$. If there exists $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that the following holds:

$$\alpha_{t+1} \leq (1 - \gamma)\alpha_t + \lambda_t, \quad \alpha_0 = 0, \quad (21)$$

then we have:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha_{t+1} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \lambda_t \quad (22)$$

Proof. We sum (21) on both sides from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha_{t+1} &\leq (1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha_t + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \lambda_t \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} (1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \alpha_t + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \lambda_t, \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we used the fact that $\alpha_0 = 0$. Now we can subtract $(1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \alpha_t$ from both sides and get:

$$\gamma \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha_{t+1} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \lambda_t,$$

divide both sides by γ and we get the desired result. \square

The next fact is on the convexity and smoothness of a function:

Fact A.3. Given Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have:

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2L\beta_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (23)$$

We also have the following fact.

Fact A.4. If Theorem 3.4 holds with some $\ell \geq 0$, then Theorem 3.3 holds with $L \leq \ell$.

See, e.g. Theorem 2.1.5 in Nesterov et al. [2018] for a proof for both Theorem A.3 and Theorem A.4.

B Analysis of Accelerated Method with Inexact Updates

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.2. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 4.1, for all $T \geq 1$, for $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{v}_t)_{t=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1, it holds that:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + 2\sigma_g^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} a_{t+1}^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} \\
 &\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) a_{t+1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \right] \right) \\
 &\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t)]
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we write $w_t := \min\{2, a_t L\} + \frac{4La_t^2}{A_t} + \frac{4La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}}$.

Proof. Recall that

$$\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t.$$

We consider $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \mathbf{v}_0$ defined the in the following way:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} := \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - a_{t+1} \mathbf{g}_t$$

We also consider $\tilde{R}_t := \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right]$.

We start by giving a one step descent. Given any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[A_t f(\mathbf{x}_t) + a_{t+1} f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} [A_t (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t))] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \mathbb{E} [A_t (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t))] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\
& \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \mathbb{E} [A_t (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t))] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} [A_t (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t))] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 + a_{t+1} \langle \mathbf{g}_t - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t \rangle \right] \\
& \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[A_{t+1} (f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + a_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 + a_{t+1} \langle \mathbf{g}_t - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t \rangle - a_{t+1} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where for (i) we applied the convexity of f . For (ii) we applied the independence and unbiasedness of \mathbf{g}_t . For (iii) we used the fact that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \Psi_t(\mathbf{v}) := a_{t+1} \langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2$$

where Ψ_t is 1-strongly convex. For (iv) we used the definition of \mathbf{x}_{t+1} . Next, we apply the smoothness and convexity of f :

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathbf{y}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle &= f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \\
&\geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) - L \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_t\|^2 \\
&= f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{L a_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}^2} \|\mathbf{v}_{t+1} - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2 \\
&\geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{2L a_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}^2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 - \frac{2L a_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}^2} \|\mathbf{e}_{t+1} - \mathbf{e}_t\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

We plug it back in:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[A_t f(\mathbf{x}_t) + a_{t+1} f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + a_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 + a_{t+1} \langle \mathbf{g}_t - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t \rangle \right] \\
&- \left(\mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle + \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \|\mathbf{e}_{t+1} - \mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right] \right) \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + a_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \\
&- \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{3a_{t+1}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{6} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 + a_{t+1} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle + \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \|\mathbf{e}_{t+1} - \mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we applied Young's inequality and the bounded variance assumption. Now we pick $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}^*$, and subtract $A_{t+1} f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ from both sides, and rearrange the terms. We get:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{t+1} F_{t+1} &\leq A_t F_t + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{R}_t^2 - \tilde{R}_{t+1}^2) + \frac{3a_{t+1}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] - a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&- \mathbb{E} [A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)] - \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t)] + \mathbb{E} \left[a_{t+1} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle + \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \|\mathbf{e}_{t+1} - \mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Now we need to upper bound $a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle]$. There are two options:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle] &= a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle] + a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t) - \mathbf{g}_t, \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{6} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] + \frac{a_{t+1}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2}{2} + 2E_{t+1}
\end{aligned}$$

The other option is:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle] &\leq \frac{a_{t+1}}{4L} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + a_{t+1} L E_{t+1} \\
&\leq \frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + a_{t+1} L E_{t+1}
\end{aligned}$$

We combine these two upper bounds and get:

$$a_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t), \mathbf{e}_{t+1} \rangle] \leq \frac{1}{6} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] + \frac{a_{t+1}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2}{2} + \frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + \min\{2, a_{t+1} L\} E_{t+1}$$

Plug it back in, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{t+1} F_{t+1} &\leq A_t F_t + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{R}_t^2 - \tilde{R}_{t+1}^2) + 2a_{t+1}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^2 - \left(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{t+1}\|^2 \right] - \frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&- \mathbb{E} [A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)] - \mathbb{E} [A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t)] + \left(\min\{2, a_{t+1} L\} + \frac{4La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) E_{t+1} + \frac{4La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} E_t
\end{aligned}$$

Now we sum over both sides from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$, and noticing that $E_t = 0$ and $R_0^2 = \tilde{R}_0^2$, we get the desired result. \square

C Missing Proofs for Section 5

In this section we present the missing proofs for the analysis of Algorithm 2.

Lemma C.1. *For an algorithm that follows (12), the local error terms $(\mathbf{e}_T^i)_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies the following:*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_t^i = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) =: \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (14)$$

where \mathbf{g}_t 's are the average local stochastic gradients $\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_t^i$.

Further, if for all $t \leq T-1$, $(1 - \frac{\delta}{2})w_{t+1} \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{4})w_t$, then it holds that:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} \leq \frac{8}{\gamma} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} H_t, \quad (15)$$

where $w'_t := w_t a_t^2$

Proof. We first prove (9) by induction. For the base case $t = 0$, we have $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_0^i = \mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Now assume that the lemma holds for some $t \geq 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) &= \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) + a_{t+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t - \mathbf{g}_t) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_t^i + a_{t+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t - \mathbf{g}_t) \\ &= a_{t+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_t^i - \mathbf{g}_t^i + \frac{1}{a_{t+1}} \mathbf{e}_t^i + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_{t+1}^i, \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we used the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof for (9). This identity allows us to loosen the upper bound on E_t , and we consider the following quantity:

$$\bar{E}_t := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{e}_t^i\|^2 \right] \quad (24)$$

We note that \bar{E}_t is an upper bound on E_t , we have:

$$E_t = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_t^i \right\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{e}_t^i\|^2 \right] = \bar{E}_t$$

Therefore, instead of upper bounding E_t directly, we will consider upper bounding \bar{E}_t . To utilize Theorem A.2 to upper bound the weighted some of \bar{E}_t , we first give an individual descent on \bar{E}_t :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{E}_{t+1} &= a_{t+1}^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Delta_t^i - \delta_t^i\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} (1 - \delta) a_{t+1}^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i - \frac{1}{a_{t+1}} \mathbf{e}_t^i \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \bar{E}_t + \frac{2a_{t+1}^2}{\delta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i\|^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where in (ii) we used the definition of \mathcal{C} . In (iii) we used the Young's inequality. Apply the definition of H_t and we get:

$$\bar{E}_{t+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \bar{E}_t + \frac{2a_{t+1}^2}{\delta} H_t \quad (25)$$

For $t \in [T - 1]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{t+1} \bar{E}_t &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) w_{t+1} \bar{E}_t + \frac{2w'_{t+1}}{\delta} H_t \\
&\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{4}\right) w_t \bar{E}_t + \frac{2w'_{t+1}}{\delta} H_t
\end{aligned}$$

where in (iv) we used the assumption that $w'_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w'_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$. Now we note that $\bar{E}_0 = E_0 = 0$, write $\alpha_t = w_t \bar{E}_t$, $\lambda_t = w'_{t+1} H_t$, $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{4}$ and apply Theorem A.2 and get the desired result. \square

Lemma C.2. *Given Theorems 3.4 and 3.7, for an algorithm that follows (16), if for all $t \leq T - 1$, we have $w'_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w'_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$, then it holds that:*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} H_t \leq \frac{16}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t-1})\|^2 \right] + \frac{16\sigma^2}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. We first give a one step descent on H_t :

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{t+1} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_{t+1}^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{t+1}^i\|^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_{t+1}^i - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i - \tilde{\Delta}_t^i\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{(1 + \alpha)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\delta}_t^i - \tilde{\Delta}_t^i\|^2 \right] + \frac{(1 + \alpha^{-1})}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_{t+1}^i - \mathbf{g}_t^i\|^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we used Young's inequality. Pick $\alpha = \frac{\delta}{2(1-\delta)}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{t+1} &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) H_t + \frac{2}{\delta n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_{t+1}^i - \mathbf{g}_t^i\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) H_t + \frac{4}{\delta n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \frac{4\sigma^2}{\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

where in (ii) we used the definition of \mathcal{C} . In (iii) we used the Young's Inequality and Theorem 3.7.

For all $t \in [T - 2]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} w'_{t+2}H_{t+1} &\leq w'_{t+2}\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)H_t + \frac{4w'_{t+2}}{\delta n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \frac{4w'_{t+2}\sigma^2}{\delta} \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} w'_{t+1}\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{4}\right)H_t + \frac{4w'_{t+2}}{\delta n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \frac{4w'_{t+2}\sigma^2}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where (iv) uses the assumption. Note that by the algorithm we have $H_0 = 0$. Now we take $w'_{t+1}H_t$ to be α_t , $\frac{\delta}{4}$ to be γ , and $\frac{4w'_{t+2}}{\delta n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \frac{4w'_{t+2}\sigma^2}{\delta}$ to be λ_t in Theorem A.2, we can then apply Theorem A.2 to get the desired result. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Given Theorems 3.2-3.4 and 3.7, and let $a_t := (t + \frac{32}{\delta})/M$ and $A_0 := 32^2/2\delta^2 M$, it suffices to have:*

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{R_0^2 \sigma^2}{n \varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{L} R_0^2 \sigma}{\delta^2 \varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{\ell} R_0^2}{\delta^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right), \quad (18)$$

number of iterations (communication rounds) of Algorithm 2 to get $F_T \leq \varepsilon$, where we can set $M = \max \left\{ \frac{2^{13} \ell}{\delta^4}, \left(\frac{4T(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2 \sigma^2}{R_0^2 n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 8 \left(\frac{LT(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^3 \sigma^2}{\delta^4 R_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\}$.

Proof. We first further upper bound the weighted sum of \bar{E}_t by noticing the following;

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_t) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{4\ell}{n} (\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_t) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t)), \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we used the Young's inequality and in (ii) we used Theorem 3.4. We now apply this to (15) from Theorem 5.1 and get:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} \bar{E}_{t+1} \leq \frac{512\ell}{\delta^4} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} (\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1})) + \frac{128\sigma^2}{\delta^4} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1}$$

Now consider $a_t := \frac{t + \frac{32}{\delta}}{M}$ and $A_0 = \frac{32^2}{2\delta M}$. It's easy to verify that $w'_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w'_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$ and $w_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$.

We combine the above with (11) from Theorem 4.2 and get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} + \frac{512\ell}{\delta^4} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} (\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1})) + \frac{128\sigma^2}{\delta^4} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \right) a_{t+1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t\|^2 \right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

We need:

$$\frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \leq \frac{1}{6}, \quad \wedge \quad \frac{512\ell w'_{t+1}}{\delta^4} \leq A_t, \quad \wedge \quad \frac{512\ell w'_{t+2}}{\delta^4} \leq A_{t+1}$$

Algorithm 3 Accelerated Distributed Vanilla Error Feedback

```

1: Input:  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{e}_0^i = \mathbf{0}, A_0, (a_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ 
2: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
3:   server side:
4:    $A_{t+1} = A_t + a_{t+1}$ 
5:    $\mathbf{y}_t = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_t$ 
6:   server send  $\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t$  to the clients
7:   each client  $i$ :
8:    $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \mathcal{C}(\frac{1}{a_{t+1}} \mathbf{e}_t^i + \mathbf{g}_t^i)$ 
9:    $\mathbf{e}_{t+1}^i = \mathbf{e}_t^i + a_{t+1}(\mathbf{g}_t^i - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i)$ 
10:  send to server  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
11:  server side:
12:   $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
13:   $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
14:   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ 

```

When $M \geq 24L$, we have $\frac{2La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \leq \frac{1}{6}$. For such M , we have $w_t \leq \frac{8}{3}$. It now suffices to have $M \geq \frac{2^{13}\ell}{\delta^4}$ for all the above inequalities to be satisfied. Therefore:

$$A_T F_T \leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} + \frac{128\sigma^2}{\delta^4} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} w'_{t+1}$$

Therefore:

$$F_T \leq \frac{2^{10}F_0}{\delta^2 (T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2} + \frac{MR_0^2}{(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2} + \frac{4T\sigma^2}{Mn} + \frac{2^9 LT (T + \frac{32}{\delta}) \sigma^2}{\delta^4 M^2}$$

Now we pick $M = \max \left\{ 24L, \frac{2^{13}\ell}{\delta^4}, \left(\frac{4T(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2 \sigma^2}{R_0^2 n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 8 \left(\frac{LT(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^3 \sigma^2}{\delta^4 R_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\}$, we get:

$$F_T \leq \frac{24LR_0^2}{(T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2} + \frac{2^{10}F_0}{\delta^2 (T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2} + \frac{2^{13}\ell R_0^2}{\delta^4 (T + \frac{32}{\delta})^2} + \frac{8L^{\frac{1}{3}} \sigma^{\frac{2}{3}} R_0^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\delta^{\frac{4}{3}} T^{\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{2R_0\sigma}{\sqrt{T}n}$$

It implies that, to reach ε -suboptimality, i.e. $F_T \leq \varepsilon$, we need:

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{R_0^2 \sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{L}R_0^2 \sigma}{\delta^2 \varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{\ell}R_0^2}{\delta^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon}} + \frac{\sqrt{L}R_0^2}{\delta \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right),$$

Note that $L \leq \ell$ by Theorem A.4 and we get the desired result. \square

D Convergence of Acceleration with Vanilla EF

In this section, we consider an algorithm that combines acceleration with vanilla error feedback, summarized in Algorithm 3. We apply Theorem 4.2 and give a tailored upper bound on the weighted sum of E_t (in fact, as before, we upper bound the sum of \bar{E}_t). We need the following gradient similarity assumption:

Assumption D.1. We assume that there exists ζ^2 such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \zeta^2 \quad (26)$$

Since $(\mathbf{e}_t^i)_{t=0}^\infty$ also follows Theorem 5.1, it suffices that we give the following simple upper bound on H_t where $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \mathbf{0}$:

Lemma D.2. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.7 and D.1, for all $t \geq 0$, it holds that:*

$$H_t \leq 2\zeta^2 + 4L\mathbb{E}[\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sigma^2 \quad (27)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} H_t &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_t^i\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \sigma^2 \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_t) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] + \sigma^2 \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} 2\zeta^2 + 4L\mathbb{E}[\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we applied Theorem 3.7, in (ii) we used the Young's inequality, and in (iii) we used Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and D.1. \square

Now to give an upper bound on $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1}$:

Lemma D.3. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.7 and D.1, for all $T \geq 1$, if $w_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$, it holds that:*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} \leq \frac{32L}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \mathbb{E}[\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \frac{4(4\zeta^2 + \delta\sigma^2)}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \quad (28)$$

Proof. We simply combine (15) from Theorem 5.1 and (27) from Theorem D.2 and get the desired result. \square

Now we can combine (28) from Theorem D.3 with (11) from Theorem 4.2 to get the following convergence rate:

Theorem D.4. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.7 and D.1, and let $a_t := \frac{t+\frac{4}{\delta}}{M}$ and $A_0 := \frac{8}{\delta^2 M}$, it suffices to have:*

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 R_0^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{L} R_0^2 (\zeta/\sqrt{\delta} + \sigma)}{\sqrt{\delta} \varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{L R_0^2}{\delta \varepsilon} \right) \quad (29)$$

number of iterations of Algorithm 3 to get $F_T \leq \varepsilon$, where we can set

$$M = \max \left\{ \frac{40L(T + \frac{4}{\delta})}{\delta}, \sqrt{\frac{4T(T + \frac{4}{\delta})^2 \sigma^2}{R_0^2 n}}, \left(\frac{544L(4\zeta^2 + \delta\sigma^2)T(T + \frac{4}{\delta})^3}{\delta^2 R_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\}.$$

Proof. It's easy to check that for this choice of a_t and A_0 , we have that $w_{t+1}(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \leq w_t(1 - \frac{\delta}{4})$.

In addition, we have that $\frac{La_{t+1}^2}{A_{t+1}} \leq \frac{2L}{M}$.

We combine (11) from Theorem 4.2 and (28) from Theorem D.3, pick $M \geq 24L$ and get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} \\
&\quad + \frac{32L}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \frac{8(2\zeta^2 + \sigma^2)}{\delta^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w'_{t+1} \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right) \\
&\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} \\
&\quad + \frac{32L^2}{\delta^2 M^3} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(t + 17 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right) \left(t + 1 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&\quad + \frac{4L(4\zeta^2 + \delta\sigma^2)}{\delta^2 M^3} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(t + 17 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right) \left(t + 1 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We need M such that:

$$\frac{32L^2 \left(t + 17 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right) \left(t + 1 + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)^2}{\delta^2 M^2} \leq \frac{t + 1 + \frac{4}{\delta}}{2}, \forall 0 \leq t \leq T-1$$

It suffices that $M \geq \frac{40L(T + \frac{4}{\delta})}{\delta}$, and we have the following:

$$F_T \leq \frac{16F_0}{\delta^2 \left(T + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)^2} + \frac{MR_0^2}{\left(T + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)^2} + \frac{4T\sigma^2}{Mn} + \frac{544L(4\zeta^2 + \delta\sigma^2)T \left(T + \frac{4}{\delta} \right)}{\delta^2 M^2}$$

Now pick $M = \max \left\{ \frac{40L(T + \frac{4}{\delta})}{\delta}, \sqrt{\frac{4T(T + \frac{4}{\delta})^2 \sigma^2}{R_0^2 n}}, \left(\frac{544L(4\zeta^2 + \delta\sigma^2)T(T + \frac{4}{\delta})^3}{\delta^2 R_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\}$, we would have that after

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 R_0^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{L} R_0^2 (\zeta / \sqrt{\delta} + \sigma)}{\sqrt{\delta} \varepsilon^{3/2}} + \frac{L R_0^2}{\delta \varepsilon} \right)$$

iterations of Algorithm 3, we have $F_T \leq \varepsilon$. □

Remark D.5. We notice that Algorithm 3 fail to achieve accelerated rate in the deterministic term and obtain the same rate as the unaccelerated error feedback. This is due to the lower bound where we need $M \geq \frac{40L(T + \frac{4}{\delta})}{\delta}$, which canceled out the acceleration effect. Such a requirement on the minimal M comes the fact that in (11), we only have $\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)]$ to cancel out the error terms involving $\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*)$. In contrast, in Algorithm 2, we applied the gradient difference compression, which enables us to the cancel out the errors with $A_t \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)]$ and $A_{t+1} \mathbb{E} [\beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t)]$ and therefore achieve the accelerated $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}})$ rate.

Algorithm 4 Accelerated Distributed Optimization with Absolute Compression

```

1: Input:  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{e}_0^i = \mathbf{0}, A_0, (a_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ 
2: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
3:   server side:
4:    $A_{t+1} = A_t + a_{t+1}$ 
5:    $\mathbf{y}_t = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_t$ 
6:   server send  $\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t$  to the clients
7:   each client  $i$ :
8:    $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \mathcal{C}_\Delta(\mathbf{g}_t^i)$ 
9:   send to server  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
10:  server side:
11:   $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
12:   $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$ 
13:   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ 

```

E Convergence of Accelerated Distributed Optimization with Absolute Compression

In this section we consider a different kind of compressor, absolute compression:

Definition E.1. We say that a (possibly randomized) mapping $\mathcal{C}_\Delta: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is an Δ -absolute compression operator if for some constant $\Delta \geq 0$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \leq \Delta^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (30)$$

This class of compressor also include some popular examples of compressions, including hard-thresholding [Sahu et al., 2021], rounding with bounded errors [Gupta et al., 2015], and scaled integer rounding [Sapio et al., 2021].

We summarize the accelerated distributed optimization with absolute compression method in Algorithm 4. Here the algorithm simply aggregates the compressed gradients and perform the update. We demonstrate our framework with Theorem 4.2 is very flexible and can also be applied to analyze Algorithm 4.

We pick the standard choice of a_t and A_0 : $a_t := \frac{t}{M}$ and $A_0 = 0$. We can apply Theorem 4.2 to get the following convergence rate:

Theorem E.2. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 3.7, and let $a_t := \frac{t}{M}$ and $A_0 = 0$, then we have*

$$F_T \leq \frac{24LR_0^2}{T^2} + \sqrt{\frac{4R_0^2\sigma^2}{nT}} + (32LR_0^4\Delta^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (31)$$

where we set $M = \max\{24L, \sqrt{\frac{4T^3\sigma^2}{nR_0^2}}, \left(\frac{2L\Delta^2(T+16)T^5}{R_0^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\}$.

Proof. With the choice of a_t , we can give an upper bound on E_t :

$$\begin{aligned}
E_t &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} (\mathcal{C}_\Delta(\mathbf{g}_j) - \mathbf{g}_j) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq a_{t+1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (\mathcal{C}_\Delta(\mathbf{g}_j) - \mathbf{g}_j) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq a_{t+1}^2 t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{C}_\Delta(\mathbf{g}_j) - \mathbf{g}_j\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq a_{t+1}^2 t^2 \Delta^2
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} &\leq \frac{L\Delta^2}{M^3} \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (t+17)(t+1)^2 t^2 \\
&\leq \frac{L\Delta^2(T+16)T^5}{M^3}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we plug it into (11) from Theorem 4.2, assume that $M \geq 24L$, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} + \frac{L\Delta^2(T+16)T^5}{M^3} \\
&= \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2T^3 \sigma^2}{M^2 n} + \frac{L\Delta^2(T+16)T^5}{M^3}
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by A_T , we get:

$$F_T \leq \frac{MR_0^2}{T^2} + \frac{4T\sigma^2}{Mn} + \frac{2L\Delta^2(T+16)T^3}{M^2}$$

Now pick $M = \max\{24L, \sqrt{\frac{4T^3\sigma^2}{nR_0^2}}, \left(\frac{2L\Delta^2(T+16)T^5}{R_0^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\}$, we would have that:

$$F_T \leq \frac{24LR_0^2}{T^2} + \sqrt{\frac{4R_0^2\sigma^2}{nT}} + (32LR_0^4\Delta^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

□

Remark E.3. We see that Algorithm 4 converges up to some $\mathcal{O}(LR_0^4\Delta^2)$ neighborhood of the optimal solution. There exists some works that scales the compressed message by the inverse of the stepsize, see, e.g. Fatkhullin et al. [2023]. We do not pursue this direction as here we are interested in the applicability of our framework Theorem 4.2, instead of the best possible rate.

Algorithm 5 Repeated Compressor \mathcal{C}_R

1: **Input:** \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{C} , and R
2: **Client side:**
3: $\mathbf{c}_0 = \mathbf{0}$
4: **for** $q = 1, 2, \dots, R$ **do**
5: $\Delta_q = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_{q-1})$
6: $\mathbf{c}_q = \mathbf{c}_{q-1} + \Delta_q$
7: Client sends $\{\Delta_q\}_{q \in [R]}$ to server
8: **Server side:**
9: $\Delta = \sum_{q=1}^R \Delta_q$

Algorithm 6 NEOLITHIC

1: **Input:** $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, A_0, (a_t)_{t=1}^\infty, \mathcal{C}_R$ and M
2: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
3: **server side:**
4: $A_{t+1} = A_t + a_{t+1}$
5: $\mathbf{y}_t = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_t$
6: **each client** i :
7: $\mathbf{g}_t^i = \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{y}_t, \xi_{\mathbf{y}_t}^i)$
8: $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i = \mathcal{C}_R(\mathbf{g}_t^i)$
9: send to server Δ_t^i
10: **server side:**
11: $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t^i$
12: $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_t - a_{t+1} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_t$
13: $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{A_t}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{a_{t+1}}{A_{t+1}} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$

F Method of Repeated Communication

In this section we further discuss NEOLITHIC and the method of repeated communication, proposed by Huang et al. [2022] initially for unaccelerated methods, and later extended to accelerated methods by He et al. [2023]. The method at its core is the same as compressed SGD and compressed accelerated SGD, where the server naively aggregates the compressed gradients and make an update. The only difference is that the compressor used here is a repeated compressor \mathcal{C}_R that compresses the gradient by applying the basic contractive compressor \mathcal{C} for R rounds (and therefore communicating with the server for R rounds). For completeness, we provide the precise definition of \mathcal{C}_R in Algorithm 5, which is taken (with some simple reformulation for clarity) from He et al. [2023].

The key point of the repeated compressor \mathcal{C}_R is that it reduces the error of the compression, we state the following lemma from He et al. [2023]:

Lemma F.1. *Given a δ -contractive compressor \mathcal{C} and R , the repeated compressor \mathcal{C}_R satisfies the following:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{C}_R(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right] \leq (1 - \delta)^R \|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (32)$$

However, we point out that when R is some constant value independent of δ and δ is small enough (so that $R \leq \frac{1}{2\delta}$)

$$1 - R\delta \leq (1 - \delta)^R \leq (1 - R\delta + R^2\delta^2) \leq \left(1 - \frac{R\delta}{2}\right),$$

implying that in such a case \mathcal{C}_R is essentially an $R\delta$ -contractive compressor. Therefore, in such a case when R is some fixed constant, the NEOLITHIC algorithm simply reduces to the compressed SGD with $R\delta$ -contractive compressor. It is well known that compressed SGD diverges [Beznosikov et al., 2023] and therefore so will NEOLITHIC. This also explains why in the practical situation where R is some fixed constant, NEOLITHIC's performance is very poor, as observed in [Fatkhullin et al., 2023]. See also Section 6.2

He et al. [2023] suggested choosing $R = \max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$ (where κ denotes the total number of updates at the server), i.e. in between each updates, the algorithm sends $\max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$ messages compressed by \mathcal{C} to approximate the original

gradient. Consider the classical example of Top- K compressor, which is $\frac{K}{d}$ -contractive compression, which sends K entries out of d entries of the uncompressed vector. In this case, $\max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$ Top- K compressed messages will contain $\max\{4d \ln(\frac{4d}{K}), d \ln(\kappa)\}$ entries in total, much more than the original uncompressed message. Note also that running Algorithm 5 with Top- K for exactly $\frac{d}{K}$ rounds would send the uncompressed vector *exactly*. More generally, if a δ -contractive compression \mathcal{C} sends a τ fraction of bits of the uncompressed vector, then as shown in Zhu et al. [2023], in the worst case,

$$\tau = \Omega(\delta)$$

In other words, in the worst case, for any δ -contractive compression, NEOLITHIC sends a $\Omega(\max\{\ln(\frac{1}{\delta}), \ln(\kappa)\})$ factor of the size of the uncompressed local gradient. For reasonable δ and κ , this factor is larger than one, implying, again, there is no compression at all.

Finally, with such high accuracy compression (with the relative error $(1 - \delta)^R \leq \frac{1}{\kappa}$), He et al. [2023] showed that the compressed accelerated (and the unaccelerated) SGD's convergence is essentially unaffected by the compression error. Therefore, NEOLITHIC performs, up to some constant, the same number of server side updates as the uncompressed method, that is, $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}})$. Therefore, the total number of communication rounds becomes

$$RO \left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{\delta n\varepsilon^2} + \frac{\sqrt{LR_0^2}}{\delta\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right),$$

where, importantly, the leading term has a $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{1}{\delta})$ factor. Therefore, NEOLITHIC has no benefit over the uncompressed method (which is unsurprising as NEOLITHIC itself is an uncompressed method in disguise). This is in stark contrast to most other works with Error Feedback, including ours, where the leading term is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2})$. We point out that in the write up by He et al. [2023], they claimed that NEOLITHIC achieves a $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2})$ leading term. This is misleading, because, to achieve this rate, they have to take a $B = R = \max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4}{\delta}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(24\kappa + \frac{25n^2\kappa^3\zeta^4}{\sigma^4} + 5n\kappa^{3/2})\}$ batch for each update. Recall that taking a batch of size B effectively divides the variance by B , and therefore, for a fair comparison, we point out that, our method (along with most other error feedback variants), would achieve a $o(\frac{\delta R_0^2\sigma^2}{n\varepsilon^2})$ leading term when using the same batch size, still better by an $\Omega(\frac{1}{\delta})$ factor.

F.1 Convergence Analysis of NEOLITHIC

In this section we provide an alternative analysis of NEOLITHIC based on Theorem 4.2, further demonstrating the flexibility of our proposed framework. NEOLITHIC is summarized in Algorithm 6. We point out that the presentation of the algorithm here is slightly different from the original presentation in He et al. [2023], where we made some modifications to their underlying acceleration method to align with ours. Note that we also give slightly different recommendation on R , the number of rounds of communications between each server update.

Now we upper bound the weighted sum of E_t :

Lemma F.2. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.7 and D.1, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} E_{t+1} &\leq (1 - \delta)^R \zeta^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 + 2L(1 - \delta)^R \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{x}^*) \\ &\quad + (1 - \delta)^R \sigma^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{t+1} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1} \mathbf{g}_j - a_{j+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{g}}_j^i \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{g}_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{g}}_j^i \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{t}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_j - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_j^i\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{(1-\delta)^{Rt}}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{g}_j\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{(1-\delta)^{Rt}}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_j)\|^2 \right] + (1-\delta)^{Rt} \sigma^2 \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2
\end{aligned}$$

We note the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_j)\|^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}_j) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_j)\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_j)\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \zeta^2 + 2L\beta_f(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{x}^*)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging it back in, we get:

$$E_{t+1} \leq (1-\delta)^R \zeta^2 t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 + 2L(1-\delta)^{Rt} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{x}^*) + (1-\delta)^{Rt} \sigma^2 \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2$$

Summing this up, we get the desired result. \square

Now we can combine the Theorem 4.2 and Theorem F.2 to get the convergence rate of NEOLITHIC:

Theorem F.3. *Given Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.7 and D.1, and let $a_t := \frac{t}{M}$, $A_0 = 0$, and $R := \max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(T), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4nT^2}{3}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4n\zeta^2 T^2}{3\sigma^2})\}$, it suffices to take*

$$RT = \mathcal{O} \left(\left(\frac{R_0^2 \sigma^2}{\delta n \varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{LR_0^2}{\varepsilon}} \right) \left(\ln(nT) + \ln\left(\frac{n\zeta^2 T^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \right) \right) \quad (34)$$

total number of communication rounds to get $F_T \leq \varepsilon$, where we can set $M = \max\{24L, \sqrt{\frac{12T^3 \sigma^2}{nR_0^2}}\}$.

Proof. As before, we assume that $M \geq 24L$. Now we have $w_t \leq \frac{8}{3}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_T F_T &\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} \\
&\quad + (1-\delta)^R \zeta^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 + 2L(1-\delta)^R \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{x}^*) \\
&\quad + (1-\delta)^R \sigma^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_{t+1} t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_{j+1}^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right) \\
&\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} \\
&\quad + \frac{8(1-\delta)^R \zeta^2}{3M^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} t^4 + \frac{16L(1-\delta)^R T^4}{3M^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{8(1-\delta)^R \sigma^2}{3M^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} t^4 \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right) \\
&\leq A_0 F_0 + \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{2a_T^2 T \sigma^2}{n} \\
&\quad + \frac{8(1-\delta)^R \zeta^2 T^5}{3M^2} + \frac{16L(1-\delta)^R T^4}{3M^2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{8(1-\delta)^R \sigma^2 T^5}{3M^2} \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_{t+1}}{2} \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}^*) + A_t \beta_f(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) + A_{t+1} \beta_f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t) \right] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we need the following:

$$\frac{16L(1-\delta)^R T^4}{3M} \leq \frac{t+1}{2} \quad \wedge \quad \frac{8(1-\delta)^R T^5}{3} \leq \frac{2T^3}{n} \quad \wedge \quad \frac{8(1-\delta)^R \zeta^2 T^5}{3} \leq \frac{2T^3 \sigma^2}{n}$$

it suffices if $R := \max\{\frac{4}{\delta} \ln(T), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4nT^2}{3}), \frac{1}{\delta} \ln(\frac{4n\zeta^2 T^2}{3\sigma^2})\}$. With this R , we have:

$$A_T F_T \leq \frac{R_0^2}{2} + \frac{6T^3 \sigma^2}{M^2 n}$$

Therefore, with $M = \max\{24L, \sqrt{\frac{12T^3 \sigma^2}{nR_0^2}}\}$, we have that it suffices to take

$$T = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{R_0^2 \sigma^2}{n \varepsilon^2} + \sqrt{\frac{LR_0^2}{\varepsilon}}\right)$$

number of server updates to achieve ε -accuracy, as desired. \square