# arXiv:2504.01497v1 [math.OC] 2 Apr 2025

# Acceleration via Perturbations on Low-resolution Ordinary Differential Equations\*

Xudong Li<sup>†</sup> Lei Shi<sup>‡</sup> Mingqi Song<sup>§</sup>

### Abstract

Recently, the high-resolution ordinary differential equation (ODE) framework, which retains higherorder terms, has been proposed to analyze gradient-based optimization algorithms. Through this framework, the term  $\nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , known as the gradient-correction term, was found to be essential for reducing oscillations and accelerating the convergence rate of function values. Despite the importance of this term, simply adding it to the low-resolution ODE may sometimes lead to a slower convergence rate. To fully understand this phenomenon, we propose a generalized perturbed ODE and analyze the role of the gradient and gradient-correction perturbation terms under both continuous-time and discrete-time settings. We demonstrate that while the gradient-correction perturbation is essential for obtaining accelerations, it can hinder the convergence rate of function values in certain cases. However, this adverse effect can be mitigated by involving an additional gradient perturbation term. Moreover, by conducting a comprehensive analysis, we derive proper choices of perturbation parameters. Numerical experiments are also provided to validate our theoretical findings.

Keywords: Accelerated algorithms; Ordinary differential equation; Lyapunov function; Perturbations

# **1** Introduction

The swift progression of machine learning contributes to notable advancements in first-order optimization methods. Accelerated first-order methods garner significant attention due to their ability to achieve faster iteration complexity without introducing additional computational overhead compared to their nonaccelerated counterparts. A seminal contribution in this domain is Nesterov's accelerated method [15, 16]. However, the derivations presented therein are often considered counterintuitive and rely heavily on casespecific algebraic manipulations [11], thus highlighting the need for a deeper understanding of the acceleration phenomenon.

While there exists a long history linking optimization algorithms with trajectories of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) [9, 17, 7], it was only recently that Su et al. [20, 3] effectively connected Nesterov's accelerated scheme for solving smooth convex problems with a specially crafted second-order ODE. Since

<sup>\*</sup>Authors are listed in alphabetical order.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>School of Data Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China (lixudong@fudan.edu.cn). The research of Xudong Li is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China 12271107.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China (leishi@fudan.edu.cn). The research of Lei Shi is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China 12171039.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>§</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China (23110180034@m.fudan.edu.cn).

this groundbreaking work, many subsequent studies [12, 21, 22, 23, 3] have endeavored to offer deeper insights and enhanced understanding of the acceleration schemes from the perspective of ODEs. Among these studies, the work [23] drew analogies between the differential equations of some popular algorithms and damped oscillator systems, offering valuable physical insights. Quite recently, it was observed in [18] that the continuous ODEs corresponding to the trajectory X(t), derived following the approach in [20, 21] for two fundamentally different algorithms—Nesterov's accelerated gradient method for  $\mu$ -strongly convex functions (NAG-SC) and Polyak's heavy-ball method—are identically taking the following form:

$$\ddot{X}_t + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_t + \nabla f(X_t) = 0, \qquad (1.1)$$

where f(x) is a smooth  $\mu$ -strongly convex function to be minimized and the following notation are used:

$$X_t = X(t), \quad \dot{X}_t = \frac{\mathrm{d}X_t}{\mathrm{d}t}, \quad \ddot{X}_t = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 X_t}{\mathrm{d}t^2}.$$

This indicates that the continuous approach promoted in [20] may not fully describe the behaviors of discrete accelerated algorithms. By preserving higher-order terms, in [18], the authors derive the following *high-resolution* ODEs

$$\ddot{X}_{t} + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_{t} + (1 + \sqrt{\mu}s)\nabla f(X_{t}) + \sqrt{s}\nabla^{2}f(X_{t})\dot{X}_{t} = 0,$$
(1.2)

and

$$\ddot{X}_t + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_t + (1 + \sqrt{\mu}s)\nabla f(X_t) = 0,$$
(1.3)

where *s* is the step size in the discrete algorithms, as more accurate surrogates for NAG-SC and the heavyball method, respectively. Compared to the low-resolution ODE (1.1), the two ODEs (1.2) and (1.3) contain extra high order terms  $\sqrt{\mu s} \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $\sqrt{s} \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , and thus possess more potential in characterizing the performance of NAG-SC and the heavy-ball method. As one can observe, the key difference between the high-resolution ODEs of NAG-SC (1.2) and the heavy-ball method (1.3) lies in an extra term  $\sqrt{s} \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , referred to as the gradient correction term, in (1.2). In [18], it is emphasized that this term is essential for acceleration. Interestingly, an alternative line of research [1, 2, 4, 3] also highlights the term  $\nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , where it is coined as the Hessian-driven damping term. Unlike the approach in [18], this line of work derives the term by leveraging second-order information obtained via the Newton method. The pivotal role of the gradient correction term  $\nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  in accelerating optimization algorithms is further underscored in the existing literature. For instance, this term can effectively neutralize oscillations, as demonstrated in [3], and is crucial for achieving a rapid convergence rate of  $o(1/k^3)$  in the gradient norm of Nesterov's accelerated gradient method for minimizing convex functions (NAG-C) [6], as well as in the proximal subgradient norm of FISTA [13].

Although the existing literature underscores the crucial impact of the gradient correction term  $\nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , an intriguing anomaly arises wherein the mere inclusion of this term into the low-resolution ODE may paradoxically decrease the convergence rate of the function value, for example the system  $(DIN)_{2\sqrt{\mu},\beta}$  in [3]. Specifically, for any given  $\beta \in [0, 1/2\sqrt{\mu}]$ ,  $(DIN)_{2\sqrt{\mu},\beta}$  is referred to as an inertial system for minimizing a  $\mu$ -strongly convex function f:

$$\ddot{X}_{t} + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_{t} + \beta\nabla^{2}f(X_{t})\dot{X}_{t} + \nabla f(X_{t}) = 0.$$
(1.4)

The convergence rate of the function value  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$  for (1.4) derived in [3, Theorem 7(i)] is  $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}t})$ , while the convergence rate of the same quantity for the corresponding low-resolution ODE (1.1) is a faster

decay rate  $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t})$  [22, Proposition 5]. In contrast, the high-resolution ODE (1.2) also contains the gradient correction term but exhibits the same convergence rate  $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t})$  as that of (1.1). We also note that the main distinction between (1.4) and (1.2) resides in the presence of the perturbation from  $\nabla f(X_t)$  within (1.2). Consequently, the following question naturally arises:

**Problem 1.** Does the presence of the gradient correction term  $\nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  adversely affect the convergence rate of the function value? If so, what strategies can be employed to mitigate or eliminate this negative influence?

In this paper, we address the above problem from the perturbation perspective and propose to study the following perturbed version of (1.1):

$$\ddot{X}_{t} + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_{t} + (1+\Delta_{1})\nabla f(X_{t}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla^{2}f(X_{t})\dot{X}_{t} = 0,$$
(1.5)

where  $\Delta_1$ ,  $\Delta_2$  are two nonnegative constants. This perturbed ODE extends the system (1.4) and covers both the high-resolution ODEs for NAG-SC (1.2) and the heavy-ball method (1.3).

We begin by offering intuitive interpretations of the gradient perturbation  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and the gradientcorrection perturbation  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  in (1.5). Specifically, we connect the general perturbed ODE (1.5) with a damped oscillator system, a perturbed version of the physical system studied in [23]. In our model, the term  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  reinforces the system's resilience, accelerating the particle's return to the equilibrium position, but may increase the oscillations. Meanwhile, the term  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  can be viewed as a force resulting from the change in the impulse  $\Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t)$ . It is negative if the resilience is decreasing. This may slow down the particle's approaching the equilibrium position but is beneficial for reducing oscillations. Intuitively, properly combining these two terms may accelerate the convergence. Indeed, we can demonstrate that incorporating only  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  does not slow down the convergence rate of  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$ , specifically,  $f(X_t) - f(x^*) = \Theta(e^{-\sqrt{\mu t}})$ . In contrast, incorporating only  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  may decrease the convergence rate. Moreover, we show that when  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  are both positive and a proper ratio between them is maintained, the convergence rate of  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$  can even exceed  $\Theta(e^{-\sqrt{\mu t}})$ . See Section 2 for more discussions.

Based on the above theoretical advances, we take a step further to study the optimization algorithms, as well as the corresponding perturbation terms, resulting from discretizations of (1.5). For this purpose, we briefly review popular discretizations used in the literature. Notably, the Runge-Kutta scheme, the symplectic integration of Hamiltonian systems, the explicit Euler, symplectic Euler, and implicit Euler discretizations have been investigated in [24, 5, 19, 25], respectively. Among these, symplectic and implicit schemes exhibit characteristics of simplicity in form, convenience in analysis, and excellent numerical performance. Therefore, we focus on the discrete optimization algorithms obtained by discretizing (1.5) using the implicit and symplectic Euler schemes. Proper conditions on the perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ are proposed to ensure the acceleration of the resulting discrete algorithms, and a new class of accelerated algorithms for minimizing strongly convex functions is derived. We also examine the roles of  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_k)$  and  $\Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))/\sqrt{s}$ , which correspond to the discretizations of  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ . For implicit Euler discretization, the two aforementioned terms play roles analogous to their continuous counterparts. However, the situation becomes more intricate for symplectic Euler discretization. We show that in this case, the gradient perturbation  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_k)$  alone is insufficient to ensure a fast convergence rate, and the gradient-correction perturbation  $\Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))/\sqrt{s}$  is crucial for achieving acceleration. Nevertheless, adding only the gradient-correction perturbation may, in some cases—such as when minimizing a strongly convex quadratic function—slow down the convergence rate. The gradient perturbation  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_k)$ plays a vital role in counteracting this potential drawback.

The main contributions of our paper are summarized below:

- 1. We propose a general perturbed ODE (1.5) and analyze the role of the two perturbations  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$ and  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ . We highlight that in certain cases, the gradient correction perturbation  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ may negatively impact the convergence rate of function values. A slight involvement of the gradient perturbation  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  can mitigate this effect.
- 2. We study implicit and symplectic Euler discretizations of the perturbed ODE (1.5). A comprehensive analysis of these discretized schemes is conducted, and appropriate choices for the perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  are provided.

### **Organization and notations**

We organize the reminder of the paper as follows. In Section 2, we study the roles of two perturbation terms,  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , in (1.5) from a physical perspective and provide the corresponding proofs. In Section 3, we analyze the implicit Euler and the discrete symplectic Euler discretization schemes of the perturbed ODE (1.5) and discuss the roles of gradient and gradient-correction perturbations. In Section 4, some preliminary numerical experiments are provided to validate our theoretical results. Lastly, in Section 5, we conclude the paper.

Throughout the paper, we use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , and  $\|\cdot\|$  to denote the inner product and induced norm in a real finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , respectively. We also use  $C^1$  and  $C^2$  to denote the sets of first-order and second-order continuously differentiable functions, respectively. A function  $f \in C^1$  is said to be *L*-smooth if  $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ , and is said to be  $\mu$ -strongly convex if  $f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \mu \|y - x\|^2/2, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ . In this paper, we focus on the following minimization problem

$$\min\left\{f(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{H}\right\},\tag{1.6}$$

where  $f \in C^1$  is assumed to be  $\mu$ -strongly convex for some  $\mu > 0$ . Then, the above minimization problem has only one optimal solution, denoted by  $x^*$ .

### **2** Perturbed ODE for strongly convex functions

In this section, we focus on the general ODE model (1.5). When the perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$ , (1.5) reduces to (1.1). As is noted in [23], model (1.1) with the following equivalent form

$$\ddot{X}_t = -2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_t - \nabla f(X_t) \tag{2.1}$$

describes a damped oscillator system, where the particle's mass is unitary, the damping coefficient is  $2\sqrt{\mu}$ ,  $X_t$  denotes the position of the particle at time *t*, and the function *f* represents the potential energy. Similarly, (1.5), in the following equivalent form

$$\ddot{X}_t = -2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_t - \nabla f(X_t) - \Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t) - \Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t)\dot{X}_t, \qquad (2.2)$$

describes a perturbed damped oscillator system. Compared to (2.1), the above ODE (2.2) includes two additional terms,  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ . Next, we provide an intuitive understanding of these two terms from the physical perspective.

We start by discussing a simple special horizontal damped spring oscillator described by (2.2) with  $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}X^2$ . Here,  $\mathcal{R}$  is the Hooke's constant of the spring, and X represents the elongation of the spring. Let  $x^*$  denote the position of the spring at its equilibrium length. In this context,  $x^* = 0$  and the two



Figure 1: An illustration of four stages of a horizontal damped spring oscillator described by (2.2) with  $f(X) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{K}X^2$ .

perturbation terms are  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t) = \Delta_1 \mathcal{R} X_t$ ,  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t = \Delta_2 \mathcal{R} \dot{X}_t$ . As shown in Figure 1, the motion of the object in the system can be divided into four distinct stages. In the following, we examine the impact of the two perturbation terms on the motion of the object in each of these four stages.

At stage I, the spring is stretched, and the particle's velocity is directed to the right. The directions of  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  point to the left. Therefore, at this stage, both perturbation terms accelerate the particle back towards  $x^*$ . At stage II, the spring remains stretched, but the velocity of the particle is now directed to the left. The directions of  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  are to the left and right respectively. As a result,  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  still accelerates the particle back towards  $x^*$ , while  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  acts as a "brake". helping the particle decelerate and stop right at  $x^*$ . At stage III, the spring is compressed, and the particle's velocity is directed to the left. The directions of  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X_t}$  are both directed to the right. Hence, at this stage, the effect of both perturbation terms mirrors that of stage I, pushing the particle back towards  $x^*$ . Finally, at stage IV, the spring is compressed, and the particle's velocity is directed to the right. The directions of  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  are to the right and the left, respectively. So, the effects of the two perturbation terms are similar to those in stage II. In summary, the term  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ accelerates the particle as it moves away from  $x^*$  and decelerates it as it approaches  $x^*$ , effectively reducing oscillations. On the other hand, regardless of whether the particle is moving away from  $x^*$  or towards  $x^*$ , as long as the object deviates from  $x^*$ ,  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  will accelerate its return to  $x^*$ . Based on these observations, if only  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  is present, the deceleration as the particle approaches  $x^*$  could slow its convergence rate. Conversely, if only  $-\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  is present, the particle may struggle to stop near  $x^*$ , resulting in increased oscillations. Thus, appropriately combining both terms enables the particle to change its moving direction more quickly when traveling away from  $x^*$ , while also ensuring it reaches  $x^*$  at a satisfied speed with minimal oscillations.

For a more general strongly convex potential energy f, we can expect similar roles of the two aforementioned perturbation terms. Indeed, as observed in [23], the properties of a strongly convex energy naturally mimic that of a quadratic potential energy. Based on this analysis, intuitively, adding appropriate perturbation terms  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$  and  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  will not slow down the system's convergence rate, and may even accelerate it. This intuition is proved in the following two results based on a Lyapunov analysis with the Lyapunov function & defined as:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) := e^{\sqrt{\mu}t} \left( (1 + \Delta_1)(f(X_t) - f(x^*)) + \frac{1}{2} \| \dot{X}_t + \sqrt{\mu}(X_t - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t) \|^2 \right).$$
(2.3)

The following theorem shows that a properly perturbed ODE exhibits the same convergence rate of  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$  as the unperturbed one (i.e.  $f(X_t) - f(x^*) = O(e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t})$  [22, Proposition 5]).

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that  $f \in C^2$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex. Then, the following inequality holds

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{E}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t}e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \leqslant -\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\|\dot{X}_t\|^2 - \frac{\mu\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\Delta_1\|X_t - x^*\|^2 + \Delta_2(\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)\|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2.$$

If the non-negative perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$  satisfy

$$0 \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 \leqslant \Delta_1, \tag{2.4}$$

then it holds that

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \mathcal{E}(0).$$
 (2.5)

Besides, if  $\Delta_1 = 0$ ,  $\Delta_2 > 0$  and f is L-smooth, then the following estimation holds

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leqslant \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t(1 - \Delta_2^2 L)} \mathcal{E}(0).$$
(2.6)

*Proof.* By differentiating  $\mathcal{E}(t)$  defined in (2.3) and multiplying both sides by  $e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t}$ , and recalling (1.5), we have

$$\begin{split} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{E}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} &= \sqrt{\mu}(1+\Delta_1) \left( f(X_t) - f(x^*) \right) + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \| \dot{X}_t + \sqrt{\mu}(X_t - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t) \|^2 \\ &+ (1+\Delta_1) \langle \nabla f(X_t), \dot{X}_t \rangle + \langle \dot{X}_t + \sqrt{\mu}(X_t - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t), -\sqrt{\mu} \dot{X}_t - (1+\Delta_1) \nabla f(X_t) \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{\mu}(1+\Delta_1) \left( f(X_t) - f(x^*) \right) - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \| \dot{X}_t \|^2 + \frac{\mu \sqrt{\mu}}{2} \| X_t - x^* \|^2 \\ &+ \sqrt{\mu} \left( \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - (1+\Delta_1) \right) \langle \nabla f(X_t), X_t - x^* \rangle + \Delta_2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 - (1+\Delta_1) \right) \| \nabla f(X_t) \|^2. \end{split}$$

The  $\mu$ -strong convexity of f and the optimality of  $x^*$  imply that

$$\begin{cases} f(X_t) + \langle \nabla f(X_t), x^* - X_t \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| X_t - x^* \|^2 \leqslant f(x^*), \\ \mu \langle \nabla f(X_t), X_t - x^* \rangle \leqslant \| \nabla f(X_t) \|^2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{E}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t}e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \leqslant -\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\|\dot{X}_t\|^2 - \frac{\mu\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\Delta_1\|X_t - x^*\|^2 + \Delta_2(\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)\|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2.$$
(2.7)

By integrating (2.7), we see that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) + \int_0^t e^{\sqrt{\mu}u} \left( \Delta_2(\Delta_1 - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2) \|\nabla f(X_u)\|^2 + \frac{\mu\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_1 \|X_u - x^*\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \|\dot{X}_u\|^2 \right) du \leqslant \mathcal{E}(0).$$

Now, if  $0 \leq \sqrt{\mu}\Delta_2/2 \leq \Delta_1$ , we know that

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \mathcal{E}(t) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \mathcal{E}(0).$$

Now, if *f* is *L*-smooth, it holds from the optimality of  $x^*$  that

$$\|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2 \leq 2L(f(X_t) - f(x^*))$$

Therefore, (2.7) with  $\Delta_1 = 0$  further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{E}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} &\leqslant -\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \|\dot{X}_t\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2^2 \|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2 \\ &\leqslant \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2^2 L \big( f(X_t) - f(x^*) \big) \\ &\leqslant \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2^2 L e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \mathscr{E}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds from the definition of  $\mathcal{E}(t)$  in (2.3). Thus, we have  $\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \mathcal{E}(0)e^{\sqrt{\mu}\Delta_2^2 L}$ , which further implies that

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leqslant e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \mathcal{E}(t) \leqslant e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t(1-\Delta_2^2 L)} \mathcal{E}(0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

**Remark 1.** In [3], the authors discussed a special case of the general mode (1.5) with  $\Delta_1 = 0$ , i.e.,

$$\ddot{X}_{t} + 2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_{t} + \nabla f(X_{t}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla^{2}f(X_{t})\dot{X}_{t} = 0.$$
(2.8)

As is shown in [3, Theorem 7(i)], if  $0 \le \Delta_2 \le 1/(2\sqrt{\mu})$ , then it holds that  $f(X_t) - f(x^*) = \Theta(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu}t})$ , which is slower than  $\Theta(e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t})$ , the convergence rate resulted from the unperturbed ODE (1.1). This observation aligns with (2.6) indicating that adding only the perturbation term  $\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$  may slow the convergence rate of  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$ .

On the contrary, Theorem 1 shows that involving only the perturbation term  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(X_t)$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_2 = 0$  and  $\Delta_1 \ge 0$ , in (1.5), will not slow the convergence rate of  $f(X_t) - f(x^*)$ . However, as we will show later (see Section 3.2), this is not the case for the symplectic Euler discretization case.

Next, we show that with a slightly strict assumption on  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ , i.e., (2), it is possible to obtain a even faster convergence rate.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that  $f \in C^2$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex. If

$$0 < \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 < \Delta_1,$$

then it holds that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{E}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \leqslant -c_1 \mathscr{E}(t) \quad \text{with} \quad c_1 = \min\left\{\frac{2\mu\Delta_2}{1+\Delta_1+3\mu\Delta_2^2}(\Delta_1-\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}\Delta_2), \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{3}\Delta_1\right\} > 0.$$

Thus,

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-(\sqrt{\mu} + c_1)t} \mathcal{E}(0).$$

*Proof.* From (2.3), we see that

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{E}(t)e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} &= (1+\Delta_1)\big(f(X_t) - f(x^*)\big) + \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{X}_t + \sqrt{\mu}(X_t - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t)\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\Delta_1)\big(f(X_t) - f(x^*)\big) + \frac{3}{2} \|\dot{X}_t\|^2 + \frac{3\mu}{2} \|X_t - x^*\|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \Delta_2^2 \|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1+\Delta_1 + 3\mu \Delta_2^2}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \|\dot{X}_t\|^2 + \frac{3\mu}{2} \|X_t - x^*\|^2, \end{split}$$

where the first inequality is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\|\dot{X}_{t} + \sqrt{\mu}(X_{t} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla f(X_{t})\|^{2} \leq 3(\|\dot{X}_{t}\|^{2} + \mu\|X_{t} - x^{*}\|^{2} + \Delta_{2}^{2}\|\nabla f(X_{t})\|^{2}),$$

and the second inequality follows from the  $\mu$ -strong convexity of f and the optimality of  $x^*$ 

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leqslant \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2$$

Then, from the definition of  $c_1$ , we further have

$$c_1 \mathcal{E}(t) e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t} \leq \Delta_2 (\Delta_1 - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2) \|\nabla f(X_t)\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \|\dot{X}_t\|^2 + \frac{\mu\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_1 \|X_t - x^*\|^2.$$

This, together with (2.7), implies that

$$\frac{d\mathscr{E}(t)}{dt}e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t}\leqslant -c_1\mathscr{E}(t)e^{-\sqrt{\mu}t}.$$

Solving the above ODE inequality and recalling (2.3), we have

$$e^{c_1 t} \mathcal{E}(t) = e^{(c_1 + \sqrt{\mu})t} \left( (1 + \Delta_1)(f(X_t) - f(x^*)) + \frac{1}{2} \| \dot{X}_t + \sqrt{\mu}(X_t - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(X_t) \|^2 \right) \leq \mathcal{E}(0).$$

Thus,

$$f(X_t) - f(x^*) \leqslant \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} e^{-(\sqrt{\mu} + c_1)t} \mathscr{E}(0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

# **3** Optimization algorithms obtained by discretizing (1.5)

The previous section shows that under proper choices of  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ , the resulting trajectory of (1.5) enjoys a favorable convergence rate of function values. In this section, we demonstrate that a proper time discretization of the perturbed dynamic (1.5), combined with carefully chosen values of  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ , yields first-order optimization algorithms with fast convergence properties. For this purpose, we focus on the following phase-space form of the perturbed ODE (1.5)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX}{dt} = \dot{X}, \\ \frac{d\dot{X}}{dt} = -2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X} - (1+\Delta_1)\nabla f(X) - \Delta_2\nabla^2 f(X)\dot{X}. \end{cases}$$
(3.1)

The above reformulation is closely related to the phase-space representation technique proposed in [18], which has yielded interesting results [6, 13, 14, 19] in accelerated algorithms. In this section, we study optimization algorithms by taking the popular implicit Euler and symplectic Euler discretizations on (3.1). The implicit and symplectic Euler schemes are well-known discretizations for solving ODEs, and have recently been highlighted in the study of accelerated optimization algorithms. See, for example, [5, 10, 19, 8]. In particular, the discrete algorithms obtained by the implicit and symplectic discretizations of the phase-space form of the unperturbed ODE (1.1), i.e.  $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$  in (3.1), have been investigated in [19].

Here, for (3.1), we utilize Lyapunov functions translated from the continuous case via the phase-space representation to show that appropriate perturbations do not slow down and can even accelerate the convergence of function values. Furthermore, our analysis leads to new accelerated methods that extend the acceleration techniques proposed in [19].

### 3.1 Optimization algorithms obtained by the implicit discretization

We start by discretizing (3.1) using the following implicit Euler scheme:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{\sqrt{s}} = v_{k+1}, \\ \frac{v_{k+1} - v_k}{\sqrt{s}} = -2\sqrt{\mu}v_{k+1} - (1+\Delta_1)\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \Delta_2 \frac{\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)}{\sqrt{s}}. \end{cases}$$
(3.2)

Associated with (3.2), similar to the continuous case in (2.3), we define the following Lyapunov function:

$$E(k) = (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^k \left( (1 + \Delta_1)(f(x_k) - f(x^*)) + \frac{1}{2} \| v_k + \sqrt{\mu}(x_k - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_k) \|^2 \right).$$
(3.3)

With this potential function, we derive the convergence rate of  $f(x_k) - f^*$  in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that  $f \in C^1$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex. If the non-negative perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$  satisfy

$$0 \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 \leqslant \Delta_1, \tag{3.4}$$

then for any step size s > 0 and any initial point  $x_0$  and  $v_0$ , it holds that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0), \quad \forall k \ge 0.$$
 (3.5)

*Proof.* Recalling the definition of E(k) in (3.3), we see that

$$(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} (E(k+1) - E(k))$$
  
=  $(1 + \Delta_1) (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)) + \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_1) (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*)) + M_1^k + M_2^k,$  (3.6)

where

$$M_1^k := \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|v_k + \sqrt{\mu}(x_k - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_k)\|^2$$

and

$$M_2^k := \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \|v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2.$$

Based on the iterative scheme (3.2), we have that

$$v_{k+1} - v_k + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)) = -\sqrt{\mu s}v_{k+1} - (1 + \Delta_1)\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1}),$$

which further implies that

$$M_{1}^{k} = \langle v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla f(x_{k+1}), -\sqrt{\mu}sv_{k+1} - (1 + \Delta_{1})\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\mu}sv_{k+1} + (1 + \Delta_{1})\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2}.$$

Then, we have by simple calculations that

$$M_{1}^{k} + M_{2}^{k} = -\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \|v_{k+1}\|^{2} + \frac{\mu}{2} \sqrt{\mu s} \|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2} + \Delta_{2} \sqrt{s} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_{2} - (1 + \Delta_{1})\right) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} - (1 + \Delta_{1}) \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_{k+1} - x_{k} \rangle + \sqrt{\mu s} \left(\sqrt{\mu} \Delta_{2} - (1 + \Delta_{1})\right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle$$
(3.7)  
$$- \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} + (1 + \Delta_{1}) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2}.$$

Now, from (3.6) and (3.7), we have that

$$\begin{split} &(1+\sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} \big( E(k+1)-E(k) \big) \\ =&(1+\Delta_1) \big( f(x_{k+1})-f(x_k) \big) + \sqrt{\mu s} (1+\Delta_1) \big( f(x_{k+1})-f(x^*) \big) - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \| v_{k+1} \|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{2} \sqrt{\mu s} \| x_{k+1} - x^* \|^2 + \Delta_2 \sqrt{s} \big( \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 - (1+\Delta_1) \big) \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2 - (1+\Delta_1) \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &+ \sqrt{\mu s} \big( \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - (1+\Delta_1) \big) \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \| \sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} + (1+\Delta_1) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2 \\ =&(1+\Delta_1) \big( f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \big) + \mu \sqrt{s} \Delta_2 \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &+ \sqrt{\mu s} (1+\Delta_1) \big( f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x^* - x_{k+1} \rangle \big) + \frac{\mu}{2} \sqrt{\mu s} \| x_{k+1} - x^* \|^2 \\ &+ \Delta_2 \sqrt{s} \big( \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 - (1+\Delta_1) \big) \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \| v_{k+1} \|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \| \sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} + (1+\Delta_1) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2. \end{split}$$

Since *f* is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $x^*$  is the optimal solution, it holds that

$$\begin{cases} f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle x^* - x_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x_{k+1} - x^* \|^2 \leq 0, \\ f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) + \langle x_k - x_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x_{k+1} - x_k \|^2 \leq 0, \\ \mu \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \leq \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have

$$(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} (E(k+1) - E(k))$$

$$\leq -\frac{\mu}{2} (1 + \Delta_1) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \frac{\mu \sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \Delta_1 \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \Delta_2 \sqrt{s} (\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2} \Delta_2 - \Delta_1) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2$$

$$-\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \|v_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} + (1 + \Delta_1) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2$$

$$\leq 0,$$

where the last inequality holds under the condition (3.4). Hence,

$$E(k+1) \leqslant E(k), \quad \forall k \ge 0$$

Thus, using (3.3) and the above inequality, we obtain

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(k) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

The condition (3.4) is identical to (2.4) in Theorem 1. Set  $k\sqrt{s} \equiv t$ , and let  $s \to 0+$ , then the discrete Lyapunov function E(k) converges  $\mathcal{E}(t)$  defined in (2.3), and the rate  $(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k}$  converges to  $e^{-\sqrt{\mu t}}$ . Therefore, Theorem 3 can be considered a discrete counterpart of Theorem 1. This implies that the implicit Euler discretization (3.2) effectively preserves the convergence properties of the trajectory of the continuous system (1.5).

In [19, Theorem 3.2(c)], the algorithm obtained by the implicit discretization of the phase-space ODE (3.1) for the low-resolution ODE (1.1), i.e.  $\Delta_1 = 0$ ,  $\Delta_2 = 0$ , has been shown to possess a convergence rate

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\mu s}\right)^{-k}\right)$$

for a  $\mu$ -strongly convex, *L*-smooth function *f* if the step size *s* satisfies  $0 < s \le 1/L$ . Here, under a weaker assumption, i.e., only assuming *f* to be  $\mu$ -strongly convex, Theorem 3 obtains a stronger and broader result, i.e., when  $0 \le \Delta_2 \sqrt{\mu}/2 \le \Delta_1$ ,

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = \mathcal{O}\left((1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k}\right)$$

for any step size s > 0. Thus, similar to the continuous case, Theorem 3 shows that proper perturbation will not slow down the convergence rate of  $f(x_k) - f(x^*)$  compared to the unperturbed case. In particular, involving only the perturbation term  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_{k+1})$  in (3.2), i.e.,  $\Delta_2 = 0$  and  $\Delta_1 \ge 0$ , will not slow down the convergence rate.

We shall also mention that by simple calculations, the iterative scheme (3.2) can be rewritten into the following form

$$\begin{cases} y_k = x_k + \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_k) - \frac{1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} (x_k - x_{k-1}), \\ x_{k+1} = \operatorname{prox}_{\beta f}(y_k) \text{ with } \beta = \frac{\sqrt{s}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} [(1 + \Delta_1)\sqrt{s} + \Delta_2]. \end{cases}$$
(3.8)

Note that, in (3.8), the proximal mapping associated with f is included and thus poses computational difficulties in practical applications.

### **3.2** Optimization algorithms obtained by symplectic discretizations

In this subsection, we first discretize the phase space ODE (3.1) using the symplectic Euler scheme and arrive at the following updating formula:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{\sqrt{s}} = v_k, \\ \frac{v_{k+1} - v_k}{\sqrt{s}} = -2\sqrt{\mu}v_{k+1} - (1 + \Delta_1)\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \Delta_2 \frac{\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)}{\sqrt{s}}, \end{cases}$$
(3.9)

which can be further equivalently rewritten as:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} (x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} s \nabla f(x_k) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k-1})).$$
(3.10)

The following Lyapunov function is used to analyze the convergence rate of (3.10):

$$E(k) = \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{k} \left((1 + \Delta_{1})\left(f(x_{k}) - f(x^{*}) - \frac{\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2}\|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\|v_{k} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2}\right).$$
(3.11)

Unlike the one used in (3.3), the Lyapunov function *E* in (3.11) contains an extra term  $-\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} ||\nabla f(x_k)||^2/2$  in the first part associated with the difference of function value  $f(x_k) - f^*$ .

**Theorem 4.** Suppose that f is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and L-smooth. If the non-negative perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$ , and step size s > 0 satisfy:

$$(1) \Delta_{2}\sqrt{s} \leq \frac{1}{L};$$

$$(2) \Delta_{2} \leq \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_{1});$$

$$(3) \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}} \Delta_{2}^{2} - \Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_{1}) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}}+2\right) + (1+\Delta_{1})^{2}s - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}} \frac{\Delta_{1}}{L}$$

$$+ \frac{2\mu\sqrt{s}}{(1+\sqrt{\mu s})L} \left(\Delta_{2} - \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_{1})\right) \leq 0,$$

$$(3.12)$$

then for any initial point  $x_0$  and  $v_0$ , the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by (3.10) satisfies that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} E(0).$$

Thus, if in addition  $\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} < 1/L$ , then

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - L\Delta_2\sqrt{s})(1 + \Delta_1)} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} E(0).$$
(3.13)

*Proof.* The proof for the current theorem is quite similar to the one for Theorem 3. Particularly, we will argue that E(k), defined in (3.11), is nonincreasing across the iteration k. For this purpose, we compute

$$\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} \left(E(k+1) - E(k)\right)$$

$$= (1 + \Delta_1) \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)\right) + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (1 + \Delta_1) \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*)\right) + M_1^k + M_2^k$$

$$- \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2} (1 + \Delta_1) (\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} (1 + \Delta_1) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2,$$

$$(3.14)$$

where

$$M_1^k := \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+2} - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|v_k + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+1} - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_k)\|^2,$$

and

$$M_2^k := \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1+\sqrt{\mu s})} \|v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+2} - x^*) + \Delta_2 \nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2.$$

Simplifying  $M_1^k$  using (3.9), we obtain

$$M_{1}^{k} = \langle v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu}(x_{k+2} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2}\nabla f(x_{k+1}), -\sqrt{\mu}sv_{k+1} - (1 + \Delta_{1})\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\mu}sv_{k+1} + (1 + \Delta_{1})\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2}.$$

Since  $x_{k+2} = x_{k+1} + \sqrt{s}v_{k+1}$ , we have

$$\begin{split} M_{1}^{k} + M_{2}^{k} &= \langle (1 + \sqrt{\mu s}) v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu} (x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2} \nabla f(x_{k+1}), -\sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} - (1 + \Delta_{1}) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \| \sqrt{\mu s} v_{k+1} + (1 + \Delta_{1}) \sqrt{s} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^{2} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \| (1 + \sqrt{\mu s}) v_{k+1} + \sqrt{\mu} (x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \Delta_{2} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^{2} \\ &= - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \| v_{k+1} \|^{2} + \frac{\mu \sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \| x_{k+1} - x^{*} \|^{2} \\ &+ \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \Delta_{2}^{2} - \Delta_{2} \sqrt{s} (1 + \Delta_{1}) - \frac{1}{2} (1 + \Delta_{1})^{2} s \right) \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^{2} \\ &- (1 + \Delta_{1}) \sqrt{s} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \langle v_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &+ \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_{2} - \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_{1}) \right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle. \end{split}$$

Using (3.9), we have

$$(1+2\sqrt{\mu s})v_{k+1} = v_k - (1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} &(1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}(1+2\sqrt{\mu s})\langle v_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ =&(1+\Delta_1)\langle x_{k+1}-x_k, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle - (1+\Delta_1)^2 s \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &-(1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}\Delta_2\langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k), \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ =&(1+\Delta_1)\langle x_{k+1}-x_k, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle - (1+\Delta_1)^2 s \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &-\frac{1}{2}(1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}\Delta_2(\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to  $\sqrt{s}v_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$ , the second equality follows from

$$\langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k), \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2).$$

Then, it holds that

$$M_{1}^{k} + M_{2}^{k} = -\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \|v_{k+1}\|^{2} + \frac{\mu\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2} + \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \Delta_{2}^{2} - \Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}(1 + \Delta_{1}) + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \Delta_{1})^{2}s\right) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} - (1 + \Delta_{1})\langle x_{k+1} - x_{k}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle + \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\sqrt{\mu}\Delta_{2} - \sqrt{\mu s}(1 + \Delta_{1})\right)\langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}(\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} - \|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2}).$$

$$(3.15)$$

Now, we combine (3.14) and (3.15) and obtain

$$\begin{split} & \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} \left[E(k+1) - E(k)\right] \\ = & (1 + \Delta_1) \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)\right) + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (1 + \Delta_1) \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*)\right) \\ & - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2} (1 + \Delta_1) (\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} (1 + \Delta_1) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \|\nu_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\mu \sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ & + \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})} \Delta_2^2 - \Delta_2 \sqrt{s} (1 + \Delta_1) + \frac{1}{2} (1 + \Delta_1)^2 s\right) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ & - (1 + \Delta_1) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle + \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_1)\right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (1 + \Delta_1) \Delta_2 \sqrt{s} (\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2) \\ = & (1 + \Delta_1) \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2\right) \\ & + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \left(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle x^* - x_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2\right) \\ & + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \|\nu_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \left(\sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_1)\right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \|\nu_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \left(\sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_1)\right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \left(-\frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (1 + \Delta_1) + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \Delta_2^2 - 2\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} (1 + \Delta_1)^2 + (1 + \Delta_1)^2 s\right). \end{split}$$

By the  $\mu$ -strong convexity and *L*-smoothness of *f*, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} f(x_{k+1}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) \|^2 \leqslant f(x_k), \\ f(x_{k+1}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x^* - x_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2 \leqslant f(x^*), \\ f(x_{k+1}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x^* - x_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x_{k+1} - x^* \|^2 \leqslant f(x^*). \\ \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \geqslant \frac{1}{L} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2. \end{cases}$$

The above inequalities further imply that

$$\begin{split} &\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} \left[E(k+1) - E(k)\right] \\ \leqslant &\frac{1 + \Delta_1}{2} (\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} - \frac{1}{L}) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} (1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}) \|v_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \left[ -\frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (1 + \Delta_1) + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \Delta_2^2 - 2\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} (1 + \Delta_1) \right. \\ &+ (1 + \Delta_1)^2 s - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \frac{\Delta_1}{L} + \frac{2\sqrt{\mu s}}{(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})L} \left(\sqrt{\mu} \Delta_2 - \sqrt{\mu s} (1 + \Delta_1)\right) \right] \\ \leqslant 0, \end{split}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.12). Then, it holds by recalling the definition of E(k) in (3.11) that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} E(k) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \Delta_1} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} E(0).$$

Next, we prove (3.13). Since f is L-smooth and  $x^*$  is the optimal solution, we have

$$\|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq 2L(f(x_k) - f(x^*)),$$

which, together with the above inequality and the condition that  $\Delta_2 \sqrt{s} < 1/L$ , implies that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 - L\Delta_2\sqrt{s}} \left( f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2\sqrt{s}}{2} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \right)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{(1 - L\Delta_2\sqrt{s})(1 + \Delta_1)} \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} \right)^{-k} E(0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

In the above theorem, condition (3.12) seems to be complicated. By simple calculations, we can reformulate (3) in (3.12) to be:

$$\begin{split} \left(\Delta_2 - \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}(1+\Delta_1)\right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}} \left(\Delta_2 - \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}(1+\Delta_1)\right) - 2\sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1)\right) - \frac{s}{4}(1+\Delta_1)^2 \\ + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}} \frac{2\sqrt{\mu}}{L} \left(\Delta_2 - \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1)\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1+\sqrt{\mu s}} \Delta_1 \leqslant 0. \end{split}$$

Thus, we can replace (2), (3) in (3.12) by the following simple sufficient condition

$$\frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}(1+\Delta_1) \leqslant \Delta_2 \leqslant \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1).$$

As a result, the following corollary can be readily obtained.

**Corollary 1.** Suppose that f is  $\mu$ -strongly and L-smooth. If the non-negative perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$ , and step size s > 0 satisfy the conditions:

$$(1)\Delta_2\sqrt{s} < \frac{1}{L};$$

$$(2)\frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}(1+\Delta_1) \leqslant \Delta_2 \leqslant \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1),$$

$$(3.16)$$

then for any initial points  $x_0$ ,  $v_0$ , it holds that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - L\Delta_2\sqrt{s})(1 + \Delta_1)} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-k} E(0).$$
(3.17)

Here, we shall compare the rate result in (3.17) with that in [19]. Under the same setting as in [19, Theorem 3.1(a)], i.e.,  $\Delta_1 = \sqrt{\mu s}$ ,  $\Delta_2 = \sqrt{s}$ , and s = 4/(9L), the result in (3.17) yields

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{\mu/L}}{3 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L}}\right)^{-k}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{2}{5}\sqrt{\mu/L}\right)^{-k}\right),$$

which improve the result  $f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O((1 + 1/9\sqrt{\mu/L})^{-k})$  in [19, Theorem 3.1(a)]. This comparison demonstrates that proper perturbations could further accelerate the convergence rate. In fact, we can obtain a class of accelerated algorithms with an even larger step-size, i.e., s = 1/L and a better convergence rate. We summarize the corresponding algorithm in Algorithm 1. It can be regarded as generalizations of the one obtained in [19] by applying the symplectic scheme on the high-resolution system for NAG-SC (1.2). Under the following condition on the perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ 

$$(1+\Delta_1)/2 \le \sqrt{L\Delta_2} < 1,$$

one can show by (3.17) that the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\mu/L}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu/L}}\right)^{-k}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu/L}\right)^{-k}\right).$$

Algorithm 1 Optimization algorithm derived from the symplectic Euler discretization

1: Choose  $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \ge 0$  satisfying  $(1 + \Delta_1)/2 \le \sqrt{L}\Delta_2 < 1$ , and set  $x_1 = x_0$ . 2: for k = 1, 2, ... do 3:  $x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L}} (x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{(1 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L})L} \nabla f(x_k) - \frac{\Delta_2}{(1 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L})\sqrt{L}} (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k-1})).$ 4: end for Next, we examine the special choices of perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ , and discuss relations with known results. We start with the unperturbed case where  $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$ . Then, (3.12) requires that

$$s \leq \frac{2\mu s}{(1+\sqrt{\mu s})L}$$
 or equivalently  $\sqrt{\mu s} \leq \frac{2\mu}{L} - 1.$  (3.18)

Therefore, in this case, the desirable step size *s* may not exist when  $\mu/L \leq 1/2$ . This indicates that the symplectic discretization of the low-resolution ODE (1.1) may be difficult to obtain an accelerated convergence rate. Indeed, it has been shown in [19] that the algorithm obtained by the symplectic discretization of the phase-space form of the low-resolution ODE (1.1) enjoys the convergence rate

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O\left((1 + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\mu s})^{-k}\right)$$

for the step size *s* satisfying  $0 < s \le \mu/(16L^2)$ , thus not achieving acceleration. Next, we consider the case where  $\Delta_1 = 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$ . In this case, as is discussed before, by setting s = 1/L and  $1/2\sqrt{L} \le \Delta_2 < 1/\sqrt{L}$ , one can obtain a class of algorithms with the following accelerated convergence rate

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O\left((1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu/L})^{-k}\right).$$

Lastly, we consider the case where  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 = 0$ . In this case, (3.12) becomes:

$$s \leqslant \frac{2\mu s}{(1+\sqrt{\mu s})L} \frac{1}{1+\Delta_1} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{(1+\sqrt{\mu s})L} \frac{\Delta_1}{(1+\Delta_1)^2}.$$
(3.19)

Simple calculations assert that all the possible step sizes *s* satisfying (3.19) are of the order  $O(\mu/L^2)$ , which is the same order obtained in [19, Theorem 3.2(a)]. Then, (3.13) in Theorem 4 implies the non-accelerated rate  $f(x^k) - f^* = O((1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu/L)^{-k})$ , coinciding with the conclusion in [19, Theorem 3.2(a)].

The above discussions highlight that unlike the continuous case and the case of implicit discretization, with only the perturbation term  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_k)$  in (3.9) using the symplecitc discretization (i.e.,  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 = 0$ ), the sequence generated by (3.10) fails to achieve acceleration. Meanwhile, our findings also align with previous work indicating that  $\Delta_2 > 0$  is crucial for enabling large step sizes and desired accelerated convergence rates of  $f(x_k) - f(x^*)$ . Similar to our physical interpretation on the gradient perturbation term  $-\Delta_2 \nabla^2 f(X_t) \dot{X}_t$ , we observe here that for the symplectic discretization scheme (3.9), involving only the gradient perturbation term  $\Delta_2 (\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)) / \sqrt{s}$  (i.e.,  $\Delta_1 = 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$  in (3.9)) may not be a good choice. In fact, as is shown in the following example on minimizing a toy convex quadratic function, the convergence rate corresponding to the case  $\Delta_1 = 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$  can be slower than the unperturbed case  $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$ , while a proper choice of  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$  could result better convergence rate. For this purpose, we define  $A = \text{Diag}([\mu; L])$  with given  $0 < \mu < L$  and consider

$$\min_{x \in \Re^2} f(x) := \frac{1}{2} \langle x, Ax \rangle.$$

For this special problem, the symplectic discretization scheme (3.10) generate the sequence  $\{x_k = [z_k^1; z_k^2]\}$  in the following way:

$$z_{k+1}^{i} = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{i}s(1 + \Delta_{1})}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} + \frac{1 - \lambda_{i}\sqrt{s}\Delta_{2}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}}\right)z_{k}^{i} + \frac{\lambda_{i}\sqrt{s}\Delta_{2} - 1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}}z_{k-1}^{i}$$

where i = 1, 2, and  $\lambda_1 = \mu$  and  $\lambda_2 = L$ . In the following analysis, the step-size *s* is set to be s = 1/L. For the case  $\Delta_1 = 0$  and  $\Delta_2 = 1/\sqrt{L}$ , a tight analysis reveals that

$$f(x^k) = O\left(\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{\mu/L}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L}}\right)^{2k}\right),$$

which is slower than that for the unperturbed case (i.e.,  $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$ ) with

$$f(x^k) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu/L}}\right)^k\right).$$

Now, if we set  $\Delta_1 = \sqrt{\mu/L}$  and  $\Delta_2 = 1/\sqrt{L}$ , the convergence rate can be further improved to at least

$$f(x^{k}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1+2\sqrt{\mu/L}-3\mu^{2}/(4L^{2})}{(1+2\sqrt{\mu/L})^{2}}\right)^{k}\right).$$

These findings will be further illustrated through numerical experiments in the next section.

We further note that in the updating scheme (3.10), the momentum coefficient is  $1/(1+2\sqrt{\mu s})$  rather than  $(1-\sqrt{\mu s})/(1+\sqrt{\mu s})$  as in the classic NAG-SC. To obtain the same momentum coefficient as NAG-SC, we propose the following modified symplectic discretization

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{\sqrt{s}} = v_k, \\ \frac{v_{k+1} - v_k}{\sqrt{s}} = -\sqrt{\mu}(v_{k+1} + v_k) - (1 + \Delta_1)\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \Delta_2 \frac{\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)}{\sqrt{s}}, \end{cases}$$
(3.20)

where the key difference between (3.20) and (3.9) is the use of  $-\sqrt{\mu}(v_{k+1}+v_k)$  rather than  $-2\sqrt{\mu}v_{k+1}$  as the discretization of  $-2\sqrt{\mu}\dot{X}_t$ . Note that (3.20) can be rewritten as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} (x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 + \sqrt{\mu s}} s \nabla f(x_k) - \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \sqrt{s} (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k-1})).$$
(3.21)

As promised, in (3.21), we have  $(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})/(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})$  as the momentum coefficient. The analysis for the scheme (3.21) is documented in Appendix A.

## **4** Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to verify our theoretical findings. Our primary focus is on the numerical experiments on the direct symplectic discretization scheme (3.10). We test updating scheme (3.10) with different perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  on minimizing a  $\mu$ -strongly convex and *L*-smooth function *f*. Specifically, these two perturbation parameters are chosen from the following four cases:

$$(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \in \{(0,0), (\widehat{\Delta}_1, 0), (\widehat{\Delta}_2, 0), (\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2)\}$$

with some given  $\widehat{\Delta}_1$  and  $\widehat{\Delta}_2$ . In our tests, we set s = 1/L, and choose  $\widehat{\Delta}_1 \in \{\sqrt{\mu s}, 1\}$  and  $\widehat{\Delta}_2 \in \{\sqrt{s}, 2\sqrt{s}/3\}$ . For comparison, we also run the classic NAG-SC as the baseline algorithm. In the tests, the accuracy of an approximate solution  $\widetilde{x} \in \mathcal{H}$  is measured by  $\eta = \|\nabla f(\widetilde{x})\|$ , and the tested algorithms will be terminated if  $\eta < \varepsilon$  with  $\varepsilon > 0$  being a given stopping tolerance. Here, we set  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ . The experiments are conducted by running Matlab (version 9.12) on a nootbook (4-core, Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-8250U@1.60GHz, 8 Gigabytes of RAM).



Figure 2: Numerical comparisons of scheme (3.10) with different  $(\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2)$  on solving problem (4.1).

### 4.1 Numerical experiments on quadratic function minimization problem

We first test the algorithms on the following problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T A x, \tag{4.1}$$

where  $A = \text{Diag}([\mu; L])$  with  $\mu = 1, L = 100$ . For our scheme (3.10), we initialize

$$x_0 = [1;1], \quad x_1 = x_0 - \frac{s(1+\Delta_1)}{1+2\sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_0).$$

Figure 2 presents a detailed comparison between tested schemes, where the logarithm of the function value difference,  $\log_{10}(f(x_k) - f(x^*))$ , is plotted against the iteration count *k*.

From Figure 2, it is clear that  $\Delta_2$  is crucial in reducing oscillations. However, the scheme involving only the gradient-correction perturbation, i.e.,  $\Delta_1 = 0, \Delta_2 > 0$ , may be slower than the scheme with properly chosen values of  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$ . Notably, the gradient perturbation  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_{k+1})$  introduces oscillations, but

it can also mitigate the negative effects of the gradient-correction perturbation  $\Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))/\sqrt{s}$ . Thus, an appropriate choice of both  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$  yields a better convergence rate. These observations are consistent with our discussions in Section 3.2.

The above observations are further verified by comparing Figure 2(a) with Figures 2(b) and 2(c). Specifically, increasing  $\Delta_1$  from  $\sqrt{\mu s}$  to 1 intensifies oscillations but accelerates convergence. Meanwhile, decreasing  $\Delta_2$  from  $\sqrt{s}$  to  $2\sqrt{s}/3$  improves the convergence rate, suggesting that the gradient-correction perturbation  $\Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k))/\sqrt{s}$  can be harmful to the algorithm.

### 4.2 Numerical experiments on $\ell_2$ -regularized logistic regression problem

In this subsection, we focus on solving the following  $\ell_2$ -regularized logistic regression problem:

$$\min_{x \in \Re^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + e^{-b_i a_i^T x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x\|_2^2,$$
(4.2)

with  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  being *m* given feature and label pairs and  $\mu > 0$  being the regularization parameter. By simple calculations, we use the following upper bound as an estimate of the Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla f$ :

$$L = \frac{1}{4m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} ||a_i||^2 + \mu$$

It is not difficult to see that f here is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and L-smooth. Here, we set the regularization parameter  $\mu = 10^{-2}$ , the initial point

$$x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x_1 = x_0 - \frac{s(1 + \Delta_1)}{1 + 2\sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_0).$$

In our experiments, we solve problem (4.2) using the pairs  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}$  from the LIBSVM datasets **a9a**, **CINA**, and **ijcnn1**. Since the exact solution to problem (4.2) is unavailable, we use the point returned by NAG-SC under a stricter stopping criterion,  $\|\nabla f(x_k)\| < 10^{-8}$ , as an approximate optimal solution and denote it by  $x^*$ . The detailed comparisons on the datasets **CINA**, **a9a** and **ijcnn1** are presented in Figures 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

From Figure 3(a), Figure 4(a) and Figure 5(a), we observe that involving only the perturbation term  $\Delta_1 \nabla f(x_{k+1})$ , i.e., setting  $\Delta_2 = 0$  in (3.10), results in persistent oscillations and slow convergence. In contrast, introducing a non-zero gradient correction perturbation term, i.e., setting  $\Delta_2 > 0$ , significantly reduces oscillations and accelerates convergence. These observations are consistent with the theoretical results in Theorem 4 and Corollary 1. The desired results can be further verified through the comparison between Figure 3(a) and Figure 3(b), Figure 3(c) on dataset **CINA**, Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(b), Figure 4(c) on dataset **a9a**, Figure 5(a) and Figure 5(b), Figure 5(c) on dataset **ijcnn1**. Notably, increasing  $\Delta_1$  from  $\sqrt{\mu s}$  to 1 exacerbates oscillations in function values, whereas decreasing  $\Delta_2$  from  $\sqrt{s}$  to  $2\sqrt{s}/3$  further intensifies these oscillations.

# 5 Conclusion

In this paper, to better understand the role of the gradient-correction term in accelerated algorithms, we investigate a perturbed version of the low-resolution ODE (1.1). We derive appropriate choices for the



Figure 3: Numerical comparisons of scheme (3.10) with different  $(\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2)$  on solving  $\ell_2$ -regularized logistic regression (4.2) with dataset **CINA**.

perturbation parameters to ensure acceleration in both the continuous-time trajectory and its implicit and symplectic Euler discretizations. Additionally, we analyze the effects of the gradient perturbation and gradient-correction perturbation terms in detail. In particular, we show that while the gradient-correction perturbation is crucial for reducing oscillations and enabling acceleration, it may also hinder the convergence rate in certain cases. Interestingly, despite introducing oscillations, the gradient perturbation can counteract the adverse effects of the gradient-correction perturbation. As a promising direction for future work, extending our analysis to general convex composite optimization problems is highly desirable.

# **Data Availability**

The code and data set are available at https://github.com/smq1918/codes-for-Acceleration-via-Perturbations-on-Low-resolution-Ordinary-Differential-Equations-.



Figure 4: Numerical comparisons of scheme (3.10) with different  $(\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2)$  on solving  $\ell_2$ -regularized logistic regression (4.2) with dataset **a9a** 



Figure 5: Numerical comparisons of scheme (3.10) with different  $(\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2)$  on solving  $\ell_2$ -regularized logistic regression (4.2) with dataset **ijcnn1**.

# **Declarations**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

# References

- [1] F. ALVAREZ, On the minimizing property of a second order dissipative system in Hilbert spaces, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 38 (2000), pp. 1102–1119.
- [2] F. ALVAREZ, H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, AND P. REDONT, A second-order gradient-like dissipative dynamical system with Hessian-driven damping: Application to optimization and mechanics, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 81 (2002), pp. 747–779.
- [3] H. ATTOUCH, Z. CHBANI, J. FADILI, AND H. RIAHI, *First-order optimization algorithms via inertial* systems with Hessian driven damping, Mathematical Programming, 193 (2022), pp. 113–155.
- [4] H. ATTOUCH, J. PEYPOUQUET, AND P. REDONT, A dynamical approach to an inertial forwardbackward algorithm for convex minimization, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 24 (2014), pp. 232–256.
- [5] M. BETANCOURT, M. I. JORDAN, AND A. C. WILSON, *On symplectic optimization*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03653, 2018.
- [6] S. CHEN, B. SHI, AND Y. XIANG YUAN, Gradient norm minimization of Nesterov acceleration:  $o(1/k^3)$ . arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.08862, 2022.
- [7] S. FIORI, *Quasi-geodesic neural learning algorithms over the orthogonal group: A tutorial*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 6 (2005), pp. 743–781.
- [8] G. FRANÇA, M. I. JORDAN, AND R. VIDAL, On dissipative symplectic integration with applications to gradient-based optimization, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2021 (2021), p. 043402.
- [9] U. HELMKE AND J. MOORE, *Optimization and dynamical systems*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 84 (1996), p. 907.
- [10] M. I. JORDAN, Dynamical, symplectic and stochastic perspectives on gradient-based optimization, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018), (2019), pp. 523–549.
- [11] A. JUDITSKY, Convex Optimization II: Algorithms. Lecture notes, 2013.
- [12] W. KRICHENE, A. BAYEN, AND P. L. BARTLETT, Accelerated mirror descent in continuous and discrete time, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 28, 2015.
- [13] B. LI, B. SHI, AND Y. XIANG YUAN, *Proximal subgradient norm minimization of ISTA and FISTA*. arXiv preprint arXiv: 2211.01610, 2022.
- [14] B. LI, B. SHI, AND Y.-X. YUAN, Linear convergence of forward-backward accelerated algorithms without knowledge of the modulus of strong convexity, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 34 (2024), pp. 2150–2168.

- [15] Y. NESTEROV, A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate  $O(1/k^2)$ , Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 269 (1983), pp. 543–547.
- [16] Y. NESTEROV, Lectures on Convex Optimization, Springer, 2018.
- [17] J. SCHROPP AND I. SINGER, A dynamical systems approach to constrained minimization, Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, 21 (2000), pp. 537–551.
- [18] B. SHI, S. S. DU, M. I. JORDAN, AND W. J. SU, Understanding the acceleration phenomenon via high-resolution differential equations, Mathematical Programming, 195 (2022), pp. 79–148.
- [19] B. SHI, S. S. DU, W. SU, AND M. I. JORDAN, Acceleration via symplectic discretization of highresolution differential equations, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 32, 2019.
- [20] W. SU, S. BOYD, AND E. J. CANDÈS, A differential equation for modeling Nesterov's accelerated gradient method: Theory and insights, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 17 (2016), pp. 1–43.
- [21] A. WIBISONO, A. C. WILSON, AND M. I. JORDAN, A variational perspective on accelerated methods in optimization, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113 (2016), pp. E7351–E7358.
- [22] A. C. WILSON, B. RECHT, AND M. I. JORDAN, A Lyapunov analysis of accelerated methods in optimization, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 22 (2021), pp. 1–34.
- [23] L. YANG, R. ARORA, V. BRAVERMAN, AND T. ZHAO, *The physical systems behind optimization algorithms*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 31, 2018.
- [24] J. ZHANG, A. MOKHTARI, S. SRA, AND A. JADBABAIE, Direct Runge-Kutta discretization achieves acceleration, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 31, 2018.
- [25] P. ZHANG, A. ORVIETO, H. DANESHMAND, T. HOFMANN, AND R. S. SMITH, *Revisiting the role of Euler numerical integration on acceleration and stability in convex optimization*, in Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, vol. 130, PMLR, 2021, pp. 3979–3987.

# A Analysis for the modified symplectic Euler discretization (3.21)

Similar to (3.11), associated with (3.21), we define the following Lyapunov function E(k) and obtain rate of convergence result in Theorem 5:

$$E(k) = (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{k} \left( \frac{1 + \Delta_{1}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \left( f(x_{k}) - f(x^{*}) - \frac{\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})} \|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \frac{\Delta_{2}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} \right).$$
(A.1)

**Theorem 5.** Suppose that f is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and L-smooth. If the non-negative perturbation parameters  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$  and step size s > 0 satisfy the conditions:

$$(1)\frac{\Delta_2\sqrt{s}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}} \leqslant \frac{1}{L};$$

$$(2)\frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}(1+\Delta_1) \leqslant \Delta_2 \leqslant \sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1);$$

$$(3)1+\Delta_1 \geqslant \frac{1}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}},$$
(A.2)

then for any initial points  $x_0$ ,  $v_0$ , the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by (3.21) satisfies that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0).$$

Thus, if in addition  $\Delta_2\sqrt{s} < (1-\sqrt{\mu s})/L$ , then

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{sL}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-1} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0).$$
(A.3)

*Proof.* The proof here is similar to the one for Theorem 4. We start by showing that E(k) is nonincreasing.

$$(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} (E(k+1) - E(k))$$

$$= \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)) + \sqrt{\mu s} \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*))$$

$$- (1 + \sqrt{\mu s}) \frac{(1 + \Delta_1) \Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})^2} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{(1 + \Delta_1) \Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})^2} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2$$

$$+ M_1^k + M_2^k,$$
(A.4)

where

$$M_{1}^{k} = \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (x_{k+2} - x^{*}) + \frac{\Delta_{2}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (x_{k+1} - x^{*}) + \frac{\Delta_{2}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_{k}) \|^{2}$$

and

$$M_2^k = \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \|v_{k+1} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (x_{k+2} - x^*) + \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2.$$

Similar to the proof for Theorem 4, by utilizing (3.20) and  $x_{k+2} = x_{k+1} + \sqrt{sv_{k+1}}$ , we can get

$$\begin{split} M_{1}^{k} + M_{2}^{k} &= -\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \|v_{k+1}\|^{2} - \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})\langle v_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ &- \left\{\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}(1+\Delta_{1}) + \frac{\mu\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\left[(1+\Delta_{1})\sqrt{s} - \Delta_{2}\right]\right\}\langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ &+ \left[-\frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} - \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}s + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_{2}^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\right]\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2}\frac{\mu}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2}. \end{split}$$

Since

$$\begin{cases} (1+\sqrt{\mu s})v_{k+1} = (1-\sqrt{\mu s})v_k - (1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \Delta_2(\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)), \\ \sqrt{s}v_k = x_{k+1} - x_k, \end{cases}$$

and using

$$\langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \| \nabla f(x_k) \|^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})\langle v_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ =&\frac{1+\Delta_1}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}\langle x_{k+1}-x_k, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle - \frac{(1+\Delta_1)^2 s}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ &-\frac{(1+\Delta_1)\Delta_2\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \big(\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})-\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{split} M_{1}^{k} + M_{2}^{k} &= -\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \|v_{k+1}\|^{2} - \frac{1+\Delta_{1}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}} \langle x_{k+1} - x_{k}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &+ \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \big( \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} - \|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} \big) \\ &- \Big\{ \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}} (1+\Delta_{1}) + \frac{\mu\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \big[ (1+\Delta_{1})\sqrt{s} - \Delta_{2} \big] \Big\} \langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &+ \big[ -\frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} + \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} s + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_{2}^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \big] \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2} \frac{\mu}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} \|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2}. \end{split}$$
(A.5)

By substituting (A.5) into (A.4), we see that

$$(1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} (E(k+1) - E(k))$$
  
=  $\frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)) + \sqrt{\mu s} \frac{1 + \Delta_1}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}} (f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*))$ 

$$\begin{split} &-(1+\sqrt{\mu s})\frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} + \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} \\ &-\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|v_{k+1}\|^{2} - \frac{1+\Delta_{1}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}\langle x_{k+1} - x_{k}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ &+ \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}(\|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2} + \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} - \|\nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2}) \\ &- \left\{\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}(1+\Delta_{1}) + \frac{\mu\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\left[(1+\Delta_{1})\sqrt{s} - \Delta_{2}\right]\right\}\langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ &+ \left[-\frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}} + \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}s + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_{2}^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\right]\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2} \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{2}\frac{\mu}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2} \\ &= \frac{1+\Delta_{1}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_{k}) + \langle x_{k} - x_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle + \frac{\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_{k})\|^{2}) \\ &+ \sqrt{\mu s}\frac{1+\Delta_{1}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}}(f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^{*}) + \langle x^{*} - x_{k+1}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|x_{k+1} - x^{*}\|^{2} \\ &- \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\|v_{k+1}\|^{2} - \frac{\mu\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}[(1+\Delta_{1})\sqrt{s} - \Delta_{2}]\langle x_{k+1} - x^{*}, \nabla f(x_{k+1})\rangle \\ &+ \left(-\frac{(1+\Delta_{1})\Delta_{2}\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}(2+\sqrt{\mu s}) + \frac{(1+\Delta_{1})^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}s + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_{2}^{2}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^{2}}\right)\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^{2}. \end{split}$$

From the  $\mu$ -strong convexity and *L*-smoothness of *f*, we know

$$\begin{cases} f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \leqslant -\frac{1}{2L} \| \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) \|^2, \\ f(x_{k+1}) - f(x^*) + \langle \nabla f(x_{k+1}), x^* - x_{k+1} \rangle \leqslant -\frac{\mu}{2} \| x_{k+1} - x^* \|^2, \end{cases}$$

which further yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &(1+\sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} \left( E(k+1)-E(k) \right) \\ \leqslant &\frac{1+\Delta_1}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})} \left( -\frac{1}{L} + \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}} \right) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\mu \sqrt{\mu s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})} \left( -(1+\Delta_1) + \frac{1}{1-\sqrt{\mu s}} \right) \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &- \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}(1+\sqrt{\mu s})}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \|v_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\mu \sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \left( (1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s} - \Delta_2 \right) \langle x_{k+1} - x^*, \nabla f(x_{k+1}) \rangle \\ &+ \left( - \frac{(1+\Delta_1)\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} (2+\sqrt{\mu s}) + \frac{(1+\Delta_1)^2}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} s + \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_2^2}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \right) \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the coefficient before the last term  $\|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\|^2$  can be rewritten as follows:

$$-\frac{(1+\Delta_1)\Delta_2\sqrt{s}}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2}(2+\sqrt{\mu s})+\frac{(1+\Delta_1)^2}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2}s+\frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_2^2}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2}$$

$$= -\frac{(1+\Delta_1)\sqrt{s}}{(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \left(\Delta_2 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1)\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\mu s}\Delta_2}{2(1-\sqrt{\mu s})^2} \left(\sqrt{s}(1+\Delta_1) - \Delta_2\right)$$

Then, from A.2, we have

$$E(k+1)\leqslant E(k),\quad \forall k\geq 0,$$

which, together with (A.1), implies that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(k) \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0).$$

Then, the *L*-smoothness of *f* and the optimality of  $x^*$  further yield that the following inequality holds if  $\Delta_2 \sqrt{sL}/(1-\sqrt{\mu s}) < 1$ :

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{sL}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-1} \left(f(x_k) - f(x^*) - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{s}}{2(1 - \sqrt{\mu s})} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2\right)$$
$$\leq \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_2 \sqrt{sL}}{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}\right)^{-1} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\mu s}}{1 + \Delta_1} (1 + \sqrt{\mu s})^{-k} E(0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

Again, the roles of  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  in achieving the acceleration can be discussed. We omit the detailed discussions here but note that the roles of  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  in this context are similar to those in the previously discussed scheme resulted from the symplectic discretization. Similar to Algorithm 1, we can set s = 1/(4L),  $\Delta_1 = \sqrt{\mu}/(2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{\mu})$ , choose  $\Delta_2$  satisfying:

$$\frac{1}{2(2\sqrt{L}-\sqrt{\mu})} \leqslant \Delta_2 \leqslant \frac{1}{2\sqrt{L}-\sqrt{\mu}},$$

and obtaining a class of accelerated algorithms with the following convergence rate:

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = \Theta((1 + 1/2\sqrt{\mu/L})^{-k}).$$

The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Optimization algorithm derived from the modified symplectic Euler discretization
1: Choose the initial point $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ , $\Delta_1 = \sqrt{\mu}/(2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{\mu})$ , and $\Delta_2$ satisfying $1/(4\sqrt{L} - 2\sqrt{\mu}) \leq \Delta_2 \leq 1$
$1/(2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{\mu})$ , and set $x_1 = x_0$ .
2: for $k = 1, 2,$ do
$2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{H}$

3:  $x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{\mu}}{2\sqrt{L} + \sqrt{\mu}} (x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{1}{4L - \mu} \nabla f(x_k) - \frac{\Delta_2}{2\sqrt{L} - \sqrt{\mu}} (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k-1})).$ 4: end for