

A Randomized Zeroth-Order Hierarchical Framework for Heterogeneous Federated Learning

Yuyang Qiu, Kibaek Kim, and Farzad Yousefian

Abstract

Heterogeneity in federated learning (FL) is a critical and challenging aspect that significantly impacts model performance and convergence. In this paper, we propose a novel framework by formulating heterogeneous FL as a hierarchical optimization problem. This new framework captures both local and global training process through a bilevel formulation and is capable of the following: (i) addressing client heterogeneity through a personalized learning framework; (ii) capturing pre-training process on server's side; (iii) updating global model through nonstandard aggregation; (iv) allowing for nonidentical local steps; and (v) capturing clients' local constraints. We design and analyze an implicit zeroth-order FL method (ZO-HFL), provided with nonasymptotic convergence guarantees for both the server-agent and the individual client-agents, and asymptotic guarantees for both the server-agent and client-agents in an almost sure sense. Notably, our method does not rely on standard assumptions in heterogeneous FL, such as the bounded gradient dissimilarity condition. We implement our method on image classification tasks and compare with other methods under different heterogeneous settings.

I. INTRODUCTION

Federated learning (FL) [19], as a decentralized, communication-efficient learning paradigm, enables participating clients to obtain a generalizable model while preserving data privacy. One of the primary challenges in FL is the presence of client heterogeneity. Effectively addressing heterogeneity is crucial for ensuring robust performance, fairness, and generalization of the

This work is supported in part by by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Advanced Scientific Computing Research, under Grant DE-SC0025570 and Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357, and in part by the Office of Naval Research under Grant N00014-22-1-2757.

Yuyang Qiu and Farzad Yousefian are with the Department of Industrial and systems Engineering, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA. {yuyang.qiu, farzad.yousefian}@rutgers.edu

Kibaek Kim is with the Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, IL 60439, USA. kimk@anl.gov

global model across all participating clients. Heterogeneity impacts FL in several critical ways as follows: (i) *Data heterogeneity*: When clients possess non-independent and identically distributed (non-iid) data, traditional aggregation methods may lead to biased global models that underperform on certain client data [13]. (ii) *System heterogeneity*: Devices involved in FL often have varying computational power and network conditions, making synchronous aggregation challenging and potentially leading to straggler effects [1]. (iii) *Model heterogeneity*: Different clients may require tailored models, especially in personalized FL scenarios [26].

Various strategies have been proposed to tackle heterogeneity in FL. Regularization schemes [13], [28] and variance control techniques [8], have been employed to handle non-iid data and system inconsistencies. Some FL methods are equipped with asynchronous updates [21], [6] or nonidentical local steps [32], allowing clients to update and communicate based on local computation and network constraints. Personalized approaches [29] such as meta-learning [5], clustering [25], and model-remapping [17] allow adaptation to client-specific data distributions. We note that some existing personalized FL frameworks address heterogeneity through bilevel optimization, such as fairness and robustness approach [12], [14], sparse personalized approach [16], and adaptive mixed model approach [3]. Additionally, some nonstandard aggregation steps at server-side were proposed, such as server-side momentum [20], extrapolation mechanism [7], and robust aggregation [22], [4]. However, there seems to be no FL framework that considers training with both clients and server's data. Therefore, an open problem arises: *Can we design a framework that captures training on clients and server while addressing clients' heterogeneity?* To this end, we propose a novel modeling framework to address heterogeneity in FL, while capturing server-side pre-training.

We consider a distributed hierarchical optimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \mathbb{E}[f_1(x, \xi)] + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_2(x, y_i(x)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_i(x) = \arg \min_{y_i \in Y_i(x)} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_i(x, y_i, \zeta_i)], \quad \forall i \in [m], \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the upper-level is associated with a server-agent, and the lower-level is associated with m client-agents. Let $[m]$ denote the set of all integers from 1 to m , $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\zeta_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$ for all $i \in [m]$ denote the data samples. $Y_i(x) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $i \in [m]$ denotes the local constraint sets in the lower level. Function $f_2(\bullet, y_i(\bullet))$ is utilized to penalize the dissimilarity between server and client models, e.g., $f_2(x, y_i(x)) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - y_i(x)\|^2$. We define $f_2(\bullet) \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_2(\bullet, y_i(\bullet))$ to denote the implicit function, mitigating the drift of local clients. Let $f_1(x) = \mathbb{E}[f_1(x, \xi)]$ denote

pre-training loss function at server’s side, and $h_i(x, y_i) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_i(x, y_i, \zeta_i)]$, for all $i \in [m]$ denote the client’s local loss function. For example, $\tilde{h}_i(x, y_i, \zeta_i) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(y_i, \zeta_i) + \frac{\mu_i}{2}\|x - y_i\|^2$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i$ denotes the local loss and $\mu_i > 0$ is a regularization parameter for penalizing the dissimilarity. We consider a flexible setting where each client-agent is locally constrained by $Y_i(x)$ enabling personalization, e.g., when $Y_i(x) = \{y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|y_i - x\| \leq \rho_i\}$ where ρ_i denotes the i th client’s local dissimilarity bound. Our proposed framework not only captures a global model x at server’s end, but also allows each client to maintain their personalized local model y_i characterized by their local datasets $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$, make it particularly suitable for heterogeneous FL scenarios. Throughout, we denote the server’s global objective by $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$. We note that problem (1) is distinct from standard bilevel FL formulations, such as those studied in [34], [23] where the hierarchical structure arises from the learning task (e.g., hyperparameter optimization), but not the heterogeneous setting.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows. (i) We design and analyze a randomized zeroth-order implicit heterogeneous FL method, **ZO-HFL**, for addressing problem (1). Notably, our method utilizes nonstandard aggregations and allows nonidentical local steps. (ii) We provide nonasymptotic guarantees for the setting when the implicit function is nondifferentiable and nonconvex. (iii) We also provide almost sure convergence with asymptotic guarantees for both upper-level and lower-level objectives. To the best of our knowledge, this seems to be the first time to achieve asymptotic guarantees in nonsmooth nonconvex FL. (iv) We numerically validate our theoretical findings under various settings, and achieve better test accuracy under highly heterogeneous settings.

Notation. Throughout, we let $\|\bullet\|$ denote the ℓ_2 norm, and $x^\top y$ denote the inner product $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We use $\Pi_C[x]$ to denote the Euclidean projection of point x onto set C ; we have the nonexpansive property of projection mapping: $\|\Pi_C[x] - \Pi_C[y]\| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We let \mathbb{B} and \mathbb{S} denote the n -dimensional unit ball and its surface, respectively, i.e., $\mathbb{B} = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|u\| \leq 1\}$ and $\mathbb{S} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|v\| = 1\}$. We use *a.s.* to abbreviate “almost surely”. Throughout, we use $\mathbb{E}[\bullet]$ to denote the expectation of a random variable. We denote the big O notation by $\mathcal{O}(\bullet)$. We say a function $f : C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on a convex set C is μ -strongly convex if and only if $(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y))^\top (x - y) \geq \mu\|x - y\|^2$ for all $x, y \in C$; and is L -smooth if and only if $f(y) \leq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{L}{2}\|y - x\|^2$, for all $x, y \in C$.

II. ASSUMPTION AND ALGORITHM OUTLINE

In this section, we present the main assumptions and outline of the proposed FL algorithm.

Assumption 1. Let the following assumptions hold.

- (i) For all $i \in [m]$, $f_2(\bullet, y_i(\bullet))$ is L_0^{imp} -Lipschitz, $f_2(\bullet, y)$ is $L_{0,x}^{f_2}$ -Lipschitz any y , and $f_2(x, \bullet)$ is $L_{0,y}^{f_2}$ -Lipschitz any x .
- (ii) For all $i \in [m]$, for any x , $h_i(x, \bullet) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i}[\tilde{h}_i(x, \bullet, \zeta_i)]$ is $L_{1,y}^{h_i}$ -smooth and μ_{h_i} -strongly convex. For any y , the map $\nabla_y h_i(\bullet, y)$ is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $L_{0,x}^{\nabla h_i}$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}[\nabla_y \tilde{h}_i(x, y_i, \zeta_i) \mid y_i] = \nabla_y h_i(x, y_i)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_i) - \nabla_y \tilde{h}_i(x, y_i, \zeta_i)\|^2 \mid y_i] \leq \sigma_i^2$.
- (iii) For any x , $f_1(x)$ is $L_1^{f_1}$ -smooth, $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \tilde{f}_1(x, \xi) \mid x] = \nabla f_1(x)$, and $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \tilde{f}_1(x, \xi) - \nabla f_1(x)\|^2 \mid x] \leq \sigma^2$.
- (iv) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the sets $Y_i(x)$ are closed and convex.

Remark 1. Note that Assumption 1 does not require standard assumptions made in heterogeneous FL, such as the bounded gradient dissimilarity condition [8], which is critical in establishing convergence, and is criticized in capturing data heterogeneity [31].

The outline of our methods is described as follows. We employ implicit programming approach for solving problem (1). During local steps, client-agents update their local models by solving the lower-level problem in (1) with local solver (e.g., projected SGD). Then, after receiving information sent from clients, the server-agent updates the global model based on the global hierarchical objective $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$.

A major challenge in hierarchical optimization is that the *implicit function is often nondifferentiable and nonconvex*, especially when the lower-level problems are constrained [23]. This is shown using an example in the appendix (Fig. 3). Therefore, we employ a randomized smoothing scheme (e.g., [15], [23], [2]) on the implicit function $f_2(\bullet)$. The definition and properties of the smoothed function are given in Lemma 7 in the appendix. We define the smoothed version of $f_2(x)$ as

$$f_2^\eta(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{u \in \mathbb{B}}[f_2(x + \eta u, y_i(x + \eta u))].$$

We also define $f^\eta(x) = f_1(x) + f_2^\eta(x)$, and $\nabla f^\eta(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}}[(f_2(x + \eta v, y_i(x + \eta v)) - f_2(x - \eta v, y_i(x - \eta v)))v]$. However, the exact evaluation of $y_i(\bullet)$ is typically intractable [23],

[2], so we use an inexact evaluation $y_{\varepsilon_i}(\bullet)$ defined as $\mathbb{E}[\|y_i(\bullet) - y_{\varepsilon_i}(\bullet)\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_i$ in the gradient instead. Therefore, we may utilize a stochastic inexact zeroth-order gradient of $f^n(x)$, given as

$$\hat{g}_\varepsilon = \nabla \tilde{f}_1(x, \xi) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n}{2\eta} (f_2(x + \eta v_i, y_{\varepsilon_i}(x + \eta v_i)) - f_2(x - \eta v_i, y_{\varepsilon_i}(x - \eta v_i))) v_i.$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the smoothing parameter, and $v_i \in \eta\mathbb{S}$. Then, we consider a gradient-based global step at round r given as $\hat{x}_{r+1} = \hat{x}_r - \gamma_r \hat{g}_{\varepsilon,r}$, where $\hat{g}_{\varepsilon,r}$ denotes the realization of \hat{g}_ε at round r . The details of the proposed FL scheme are presented in Algorithms 1 and 2.

Algorithm 1 ZO-HFL

- 1: **Initialization:** server obtains initial global model \hat{x}_0
 - 2: **for** $r = 0, 1, \dots, R - 1$ **do**
 - 3: server generates $v_{i,r} \in \mathbb{S}$, and broadcast \hat{x}_r and $v_{i,r}$ to clients
 - 4: **for** $i = 1, \dots, m$ **do**
 - 5: client i calls Algorithm 2 twice, and obtains $y_{\varepsilon_i,r}^+ \triangleq y_{\varepsilon_i,r}(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r})$ and $y_{\varepsilon_i,r}^- \triangleq y_{\varepsilon_i,r}(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r})$, and sends them to server
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: server generates a random sample $\xi_r \in \mathcal{D}$ and computes $\hat{g}_{\varepsilon,r} = \nabla \tilde{f}_1(\hat{x}_r, \xi_r) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_{i,r}^{\eta,\varepsilon}$, where $g_{i,r}^{\eta,\varepsilon} = \frac{n}{2\eta} (f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r}, y_{\varepsilon_i,r}^+) - f_2(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r}, y_{\varepsilon_i,r}^-)) v_{i,r}$
 - 8: server updates $\hat{x}_{r+1} = \hat{x}_r - \gamma_r \hat{g}_{\varepsilon,r}$
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: return \hat{x}_R
-

Algorithm 2 Client i 's local steps ($i, r, x, H_{i,r}, \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}$)

- 1: **Initialization:** client i choose initial point $y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet}$
 - 2: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, H_{i,r} - 1$ **do**
 - 3: client i generates a random sample $\zeta_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$
 - 4: $y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} = \Pi_{Y_i(x)}[y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \nabla_y \tilde{h}_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}, \zeta_{i,t}^{r,\bullet})]$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: return $y_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,\bullet}$ as $y_{\varepsilon_i,r}^\bullet$
-

Remark 2. In Alg. 1, $y_{\varepsilon_i,r}(\bullet) \triangleq y_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,\bullet}$ denotes an $\varepsilon_{i,r}$ -accurate solution defined as $\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{i,r}$, where $y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}$ denotes the optimal solution of the lower-level problem

$\min_{y_i \in Y_i(x)} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_i(\bullet, y_i, \zeta_i)]$. We let $y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}$ denote client i 's local iterates at round r , given $\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r}$ or $\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r}$ as the input variable x in Alg. 2 (e.g., if the iterate is $y_{i,t}^{r,+}$, it means Alg. 2 receives $x_r + \eta v_{i,r}$ as the input variable x).

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the convergence of the proposed scheme. We begin by defining the method's history.

Definition 1. We first define the history of Algorithm 2 at round r , for all $i \in [m]$, $r \geq 0$, and $1 \leq t \leq H_{i,r}$. $\mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} \triangleq \mathcal{F}_{i,t-1}^{r,\bullet} \cup \{\zeta_{i,t-1}^{r,\bullet}\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{i,0}^{r,\bullet} \triangleq \{y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet}\} \cup (\cup_{i=1}^m \cup_{j=0}^r \{v_{i,j}\}) \cup \mathcal{F}_r$, for all $r \geq 1$; and $\mathcal{F}_{i,0}^{0,\bullet} \triangleq \{y_{i,0}^{0,\bullet}\} \cup \{v_{i,0}\}$ when $r = 0$. Next, we define the history of Algorithm 1, for all $r \geq 1$. $\mathcal{F}_r \triangleq (\cup_{i=1}^m \{\mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,r-1}}^{r-1,+}, \mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,r-1}}^{r-1,-}\}) \cup \{\xi_{r-1}\}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,+}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,-}$ are defined above, let $\mathcal{F}_0 \triangleq \{\hat{x}_0\} \cup (\cup_{i=1}^m \{\mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,0}}^{0,+}, \mathcal{F}_{i,H_{i,0}}^{0,-}\})$.

Next, we introduce an important result in establishing almost sure convergence of stochastic methods.

Lemma 1 (Robbins-Siegmund Theorem [24]). For $t = 0, 1, \dots$, let X_t, Y_t, Z_t , and α_t be nonnegative $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable random variables, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t+1}$. Suppose the following relations hold: (a) $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t] \leq (1 + \alpha_t)Y_t - X_t + Z_t$; (b) $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} Z_t < \infty$, $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t < \infty$. Then we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t = Y \geq 0$, and $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} X_t < \infty$ a.s.

Next, we derive a nonasymptotic error bound for Algorithm 2 that characterizes the inexactness.

Proposition 1. Consider Algorithm 2. Let Assumption 1 (ii) hold. Let $y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}$ denote the optimal solution to the lower-level problem $\min_{y_i \in Y_i(\bullet)} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_i(\bullet, y_i, \zeta_i)]$, and $g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} \triangleq \nabla_y \tilde{h}_i(\bullet, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}, \zeta_{i,t}^{r,\bullet})$. Then, the following results hold.

(i) Let $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \triangleq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i}{t+\Gamma} \leq \frac{\mu_{h_i}}{2(L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2}$, where $\Gamma, \tilde{\gamma}_i > 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,H_{i,r}}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2] \leq \frac{\max\{\frac{2\sigma_i^2 \tilde{\gamma}_i^2}{\mu_{h_i} \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1}, \Gamma \|y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2\}}{H_{i,r} + \Gamma}.$$

(ii) Let $\{\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}\}$ be a nonsummable and square summable sequence. We have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\| \rightarrow 0$, a.s.

Proof. (i) By the nonexpansive property of the projection mapping, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 &= \|\Pi_{Y_i(x)}[y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] - \Pi_{Y_i(x)}[y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet} - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet})]\|^2 \\
&\leq \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - (y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet} - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}))\|^2 \\
&= \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}) - g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}(y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet})^\top (\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}) - g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking conditional expectation on both sides, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] &\leq \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}) - g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] \\
&\quad - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}(y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet})^\top \mathbb{E}[g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - \nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, add and subtract $\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet})$ in the second term of the previous relation, and utilize $\mathbb{E}[g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] = \nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] &\leq \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}) - \nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet})\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}) - g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] \\
&\quad - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}(y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet})^\top (\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}) - \nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet})).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, utilize Assumption 1 (ii) that $h_i(x, \bullet)$ is μ_{h_i} -strongly convex and $L_{1,y}^{h_i}$ -smooth, and $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_y h_i(x, y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}) - g_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] \leq \sigma_i^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] &\leq \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 (L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2 \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \sigma_i^2 \\
&\quad - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i} \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \\
&= (1 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 (L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i}) \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \sigma_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \leq \frac{\mu_{h_i}}{2(L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2}$. We have $1 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 (L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i} \leq 1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i} < 1$. We obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,t+1}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] \leq (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i}) \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \sigma_i^2. \quad (2)$$

Next, let $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \triangleq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i}{t+\Gamma} \leq \frac{\mu_{h_i}}{2(L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2}$, where $\Gamma, \tilde{\gamma}_i > 0$. Invoking [2, Lemma 8], we obtain for all $k \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{i,t}^{r,\bullet}] \leq \frac{\max\left\{\frac{2\sigma_i^2 \tilde{\gamma}_i^2}{\mu_{h_i} \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1}, \Gamma \|y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2\right\}}{t+\Gamma}.$$

Taking total expectation on both sides and let $t = H_{i,r}$, we obtain the desired result. We note that $\|y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2$ remains bounded if $\forall i \in [m]$ and $r \geq 0$: (i) $y_{i,0}^{r,\bullet} \in \mathcal{B}_{y,0} \cap Y_i(x)$, where $\mathcal{B}_{y,0}$ is a compact set; (ii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\cup_{i=1}^m y_i(x)$ is bounded.

(ii) By invoking equation (2) and letting $X_t = \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \mu_{h_i} \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2$, $Y_t = \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2$, and $Z_t = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t}^2 \sigma_i^2$, we can apply Lemma 1 and obtain $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \|y_{i,t}^{r,\bullet} - y_{i,*}^{r,\bullet}\|^2 < \infty$ almost surely. The rest of the proof can be done in a similar fashion as in [35, Prop. 1]. \square

Lemma 2 (Lévy concentration on sphere \mathbb{S} [30]). Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a given L_0 -Lipschitz continuous function, and v uniformly distributed on sphere \mathbb{S} . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|h(v) - \mathbb{E}[h(v)]| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2\sqrt{2\pi}e^{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{8L_0^2}}, \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Lemma 3. Let Assumption 1 (i) hold. Define $h_i(v) = f_2(x + \eta v, y_i(x + \eta v))$, where $\eta > 0$, $v \in \mathbb{S}$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, for all $i \in [m]$, $h_i(v)$ is ηL_0^{imp} -Lipschitz continuous in v .

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_i(v_1) - h_i(v_2)| &= |f_2(x + \eta v_1, y_i(x + \eta v_1)) - f_2(x + \eta v_2, y_i(x + \eta v_2))| \\ &\leq |f_2(x + \eta v_1, y_i(x + \eta v_1)) - f_2(x + \eta v_1, y_i(x + \eta v_2))| \\ &\quad + |f_2(x + \eta v_1, y_i(x + \eta v_2)) - f_2(x + \eta v_2, y_i(x + \eta v_2))| \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assumption 1 (i)}}{\leq} L_{0,y}^{f_2} \|y_i(x + \eta v_1) - y_i(x + \eta v_2)\| + L_{0,x}^{f_2} \|\eta v_1 - \eta v_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

We can show that $y_i(\bullet)$ is $\frac{L_{0,x}^{\nabla h_i}}{\mu_{h_i}}$ -Lipschitz continuous and $L_0^{\text{imp}} = \frac{L_{0,y}^{f_2} L_{0,x}^{\nabla h_i}}{\mu_{h_i}} + L_{0,x}^{f_2}$ in a similar fashion as in [23, Lemma 2]. Then, we obtain $|h_i(v_1) - h_i(v_2)| \leq \eta \left(\frac{L_{0,y}^{f_2} L_{0,x}^{\nabla h_i}}{\mu_{h_i}} + L_{0,x}^{f_2} \right) \|v_1 - v_2\| = \eta L_0^{\text{imp}} \|v_1 - v_2\|$. Therefore, $h_i(v)$ is ηL_0^{imp} -Lipschitz continuous. \square

Next, we present some definitions for the analysis.

Definition 2. Let us define the following terms.

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2,i,r}^+ &= f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r})), \\ f_{2,i,r}^- &= f_2(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r}, y_i(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r})), \\ f_{2,i,r}^{\epsilon,+} &= f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r}, y_{\epsilon_{i,r}}(\hat{x}_r + \eta v_{i,r})), \\ f_{2,i,r}^{\epsilon,-} &= f_2(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r}, y_{\epsilon_{i,r}}(\hat{x}_r - \eta v_{i,r})), \\ g_{i,r}^\eta &= \frac{n}{2\eta} (f_{2,i,r}^+ - f_{2,i,r}^-) v_{i,r}, \quad g_{i,r}^{\eta,\epsilon} = \frac{n}{2\eta} (f_{2,i,r}^{\epsilon,+} - f_{2,i,r}^{\epsilon,-}) v_{i,r}, \\ \bar{g}_r^\eta &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_{i,r}^\eta, \quad \bar{g}_r^{\eta,\epsilon} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_{i,r}^{\eta,\epsilon}, \\ w_{i,r}^\eta &= g_{i,r}^{\eta,\epsilon} - g_{i,r}^\eta, \quad \bar{w}_r^\eta = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m w_{i,r}^\eta, \quad \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r = \nabla \tilde{f}_1(\hat{x}_r, \xi_r). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we present some preliminary results for the analysis.

Lemma 4 (Preliminaries for Theorems 1 and 2). Consider Algorithm 1 and Proposition 1, where $\mathbb{E}[\|y_{\varepsilon_{i,r}}(\bullet) - y(\bullet)\|^2] = \mathcal{O}(1/T_{i,r}) \leq \varepsilon_{i,r}$. Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, the following hold for all $i \in [m]$ and $r \geq 0$.

- (i) $\mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \nabla f_2^\eta(\hat{x}_r)$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta\|^2] \leq 16\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n$.
- (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\|w_{i,r}^\eta\|^2] \leq \frac{n^2}{\eta^2}(L_{0,y}^f)^2 \varepsilon_{i,r}$.
- (iv) $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2] \leq \frac{n^2}{\eta^2}(L_{0,y}^f)^2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}$.
- (v) $\mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)$.
- (vi) $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r\|^2] \leq 32\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + 2\sigma^2 + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2]$.
- (vii) $\mathbb{E}[\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top (\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r)] = \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2]$.

Proof. (i) Invoking Def. 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta \mid \mathcal{F}_r] &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[g_{i,r}^\eta \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{v_{i,r}} \left[\frac{n}{2\eta} (f_{2,i,r}^+ - f_{2,i,r}^-) v_{i,r} \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 7 (i)}}{=} \nabla f_2^\eta(\hat{x}_r). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|g_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] &= \mathbb{E}[\|\frac{n}{2\eta}(f_{2,i,r}^+ - f_{2,i,r}^-)v_{i,r}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \frac{n^2}{4\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^+ - f_{2,i,r}^-)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\leq \frac{n^2}{2\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^+ - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\quad + \frac{n^2}{2\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^- - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{S}$. Then by the symmetric distribution of $v_{i,r}$ and \hat{v} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^+ - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^- - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r]. \end{aligned}$$

From the previous two relations, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|g_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \leq \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^+ - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta\hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r].$$

Next, define $h_i(v) = f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta v, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta v))$, where $v \in \mathbb{S}$. Invoking Lemma 3, we have $h_i(v)$ is ηL_0^{imp} -Lipschitz continuous in v . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(f_{2,i,r}^+ - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[f_2(\hat{x}_r + \eta \hat{v}, y_i(\hat{x}_r + \eta \hat{v}))])^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(|h_i(v_{i,r}) - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[h_i(\hat{v})]|^2 \geq \alpha) d\alpha \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(|h_i(v_{i,r}) - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{v}}[h_i(\hat{v})]| \geq \sqrt{\alpha}) d\alpha \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 2}}{\leq} \int_0^\infty 2\sqrt{2\pi} e^{-\frac{n\alpha}{8(\eta L_0^{\text{imp}})^2}} d\alpha = \frac{16\sqrt{2\pi}(\eta L_0^{\text{imp}})^2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the preceding results, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\|g_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \leq 16\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n$. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\|g_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = 16\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n.$$

Taking total expectation on both sides, we obtain the result.

(iii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|w_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}[\|g_{i,r}^{\eta,\varepsilon} - g_{i,r}^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \frac{n^2}{4\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[\|f_{2,i,r}^{\varepsilon,+} - f_{2,i,r}^{\varepsilon,-} - f_{2,i,r}^+ + f_{2,i,r}^-\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\leq \frac{n^2}{2\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[\|f_{2,i,r}^{\varepsilon,+} - f_{2,i,r}^+\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &+ \frac{n^2}{2\eta^2} \mathbb{E}[\|f_{2,i,r}^{\varepsilon,-} - f_{2,i,r}^-\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \stackrel{\text{Assump. 1 (i)}}{\leq} \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2 \varepsilon_{i,r}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking total expectation on both sides, we obtain the desired bound in (iii).

(iv) We have $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\|w_{i,r}^\eta\|^2] \stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{\leq} \frac{n^2}{\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}$.

(v) We have $\mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta \mid \mathcal{F}_r] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \stackrel{\text{Lemma 4 (i)}}{=} \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)$. Taking total expectation on both sides, we obtain the result.

(vi) We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r - \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) + \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(v)}}{=} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r - \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r - \nabla f_1(\hat{x}_r) - \nabla f_2^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta - \nabla f_2^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] + 2\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r - \nabla f_1(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(i), Assump. 1 (iii)}}{\leq} 2\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}_r^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r] + 2\sigma^2 \\ &= 32\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + 2\sigma^2 + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking total expectation on both sides, we obtain the result.

(vii) We have $\mathbb{E}[\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top (\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r) \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_r^\eta + \nabla \tilde{f}_1^r \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \stackrel{(v)}{=} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2$. Taking total expectation on both sides, we obtain the desired bound. \square

The next result will be employed in establishing convergence guarantees of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 5. Consider Algorithm 1, and Definitions 1 and 2. Let Assumption 1 hold. Let $\gamma_r \leq \frac{\eta}{4(\eta L_1^{f_1} + L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n})}$. Then, the following holds.

$$\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - \frac{\gamma_r}{4} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \gamma_r^2 c_1 + \gamma_r c_2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r},$$

where $c_1 = (32\sqrt{2\pi}L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n L^f + 2\sigma^2 L^f$ and $c_2 = \frac{3n^2}{4\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2$ are constants.

Proof. From Lemma 7 (iv), we have $f_2^\eta(x, y_i(x))$ is $\frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta}$ -smooth in x . Therefore $f^\eta(x) = f_1(x) + f_2^\eta(x)$ is $(L_1^{f_1} + \frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta})$ -smooth. Let $L^f \triangleq L_1^{f_1} + \frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta}$. We have

$$f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) \leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) + \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top (\hat{x}_{r+1} - \hat{x}_r) + \frac{L^f}{2} \|\hat{x}_{r+1} - \hat{x}_r\|^2.$$

From Algorithm 1 and Definition 2, we have $\hat{x}_{r+1} = \hat{x}_r - \gamma_r (\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_{i,r}^{\eta,\varepsilon}) = \hat{x}_r - \gamma_r (\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta + \bar{w}_r^\eta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) &\leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - \gamma_r \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top (\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta + \bar{w}_r^\eta) + \frac{\gamma_r^2 L^f}{2} \|\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta + \bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2 \\ &\leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - \gamma_r \nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)^\top (\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta) + \frac{\gamma_r}{2} (\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2) \\ &\quad + \gamma_r^2 L^f (\|\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta\|^2 + \|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we utilized the fact that $-a^\top b \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2)$ and $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$. Next, by taking conditional expectation with respect to \mathcal{F}_r on both sides and invoking Lemma 4 (vii), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_r] &\leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - \gamma_r \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_r}{2} (\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r]) \\ &\quad + \gamma_r^2 L^f \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \tilde{f}_1^r + \bar{g}_r^\eta\|^2 + \|\bar{w}_r^\eta\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_r]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\gamma_r \leq \frac{1}{4L^f}$. By invoking Lemma 4 (iv) and (vi), and combining terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_r] &\leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - \frac{\gamma_r}{4} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \gamma_r^2 (32\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n L^f + 2\sigma^2 L^f) \\ &\quad + \frac{3\gamma_r n^2}{4\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

We now present nonasymptotic guarantees for Alg. 1.

Theorem 1 (Rate and complexity statement for problem (1)). Consider Algorithms 1 and 2 for solving problem (1). Let Assumption 1 hold. Let $\gamma_r \leq \frac{\eta}{4(\eta L_1^{f_1} + L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n})}$, and r^* be uniformly sampled from $0, \dots, R-1$.

(i) Consider Algorithm 2, let $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} \triangleq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i}{t+\Gamma} \leq \frac{\mu_{h_i}}{2(L_{1,y}^{h_i})^2}$, where $\Gamma, \tilde{\gamma}_i > 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{\varepsilon_{i,r}}(\bullet) - y(\bullet)\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{i,r} = \mathcal{O}(1/H_{i,r}).$$

(ii) **[Error bound]** Let $\gamma_r = \frac{c}{\sqrt{r+1}}$, where $c = \frac{1}{4L^f}$, $L^f \triangleq L_1^{f_1} + \frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta}$. Let $H_{i,r} = \tau_i \sqrt{r+1}$, where $\tau_i \geq 1$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r^*})\|^2] \leq \frac{\Theta_1 + \Theta_2 + \Theta_3}{\sqrt{R}},$$

where $\Theta_1 = 4L^f(|\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_0)]| + |f_*^\eta|)$, $\Theta_2 = 64\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + 4\sigma^2$, and $\Theta_3 = \frac{6n^2}{\eta^2}(L_{0,y}^f)^2$.

(iii) **[Communication complexity]** Let $\epsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary scalar and R denote the number of communications such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r^*})\|^2] \leq \epsilon$. Then the communication complexity is

$$R = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta} + (L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + \frac{n^2}{\eta^2}\right)^2 \epsilon^{-2}\right).$$

(iv) **[Iteration complexity of client i]** Let $K_i \triangleq \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} H_{i,r}$. Then, we have

$$K_i = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta} + (L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + \frac{n^2}{\eta^2}\right)^3 \epsilon^{-3}\right).$$

Proof. (i) See Proposition 1.

(ii) Let $\gamma_r \leq \frac{1}{4L^f}$, where $L^f \triangleq L_1^{f_1} + \frac{L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n}}{\eta}$. By invoking Lemma 5, and taking expectations on both sides, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)] - \frac{\gamma_r}{4} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2] + \gamma_r^2 (32\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n L^f + 2\sigma^2 L^f) \\ &\quad + \frac{3\gamma_r n^2}{4\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\gamma_r = \frac{(4L^f)^{-1}}{\sqrt{r+1}}$. Divide both side by $\frac{\gamma_r R}{4}$ and summing the relation on r from 0 to $R-1$. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2] \leq \frac{4L^f(|\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_0)]| + |f_*^\eta|)}{\sqrt{R}} + \frac{64\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + 4\sigma^2}{\sqrt{R}} + \frac{3n^2}{\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \varepsilon_{i,r},$$

where we utilized $\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_R)] \geq f_*^\eta$, $a - b \leq |a| + |b|$, and $\sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+1}} \leq 2\sqrt{R}$ in the preceding relation, where f_*^η denotes the infimum of $f^\eta(x)$.

Let $H_{i,r} = \tau_i \sqrt{r+1}$, where $\tau_i \geq 1$. In view of $\varepsilon_{i,r} = \mathcal{O}(1/H_{i,r})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \varepsilon_{i,r} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\tau_i} \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+1}} \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\tau_i} \frac{2}{\sqrt{R}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{R}}.$$

Therefore, from preceding relations, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2] \leq \frac{4L^f(\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_0)] + |f_*^\eta|)}{\sqrt{R}} + \frac{64\sqrt{2\pi}(L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n + 4\sigma^2}{\sqrt{R}} + \frac{6n^2(L_{0,y}^f)^2}{\sqrt{R}}.$$

(iii) Let $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r^*})\|^2] \leq \epsilon$. Then, by the relation in (ii), we obtain the desired result.

(iv) Let K_i be number of total iterations by client i . We have $K_i = \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \tau_i \sqrt{r+1} \leq \tau_i \int_1^R \sqrt{r} \leq \frac{2\tau_i}{3} R^{3/2}$. Then, by the relation in (iii), we obtain the result. \square

The next result will be employed in establishing asymptotic convergence guarantees for Algorithm 1.

Lemma 6. Let $\{\gamma_r\}$ be a nonnegative, nonsummable and square-summable sequence. Further, let sequence $\{\gamma_r \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}\}$ to be nonnegative and summable. Then we have $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_r^2 c_1 + \gamma_r c_2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}) < \infty$, where c_1 and c_2 are positive constants.

Remark 3. We note that the requirements on sequences $\{\gamma_r\}$ and $\{\gamma_r \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}\}$ in Lemma 6 are indeed realistic. A simple example would be to let $\gamma_r = \frac{c}{(r+1)^p}$, where $p \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $c > 0$; then set $\varepsilon_{i,r} = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(r+1)^q})$, where $q \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Next, we formally present asymptotic convergence guarantee for our methods in solving problem (1).

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic guarantee for Algorithm 1). Consider Algorithms 1 and 2 for solving problem (1) and let Assumption 1 hold. Let $\gamma_r \leq \frac{\eta}{4(\eta L_1^f + L_0^{\text{imp}} \sqrt{n})}$. Let $\{\gamma_r\}$ be a nonnegative, nonsummable and square-summable sequence. Further, let the sequence $\{\gamma_r \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}\}$ to be nonnegative and summable. Then we have

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Proof. From Lemma 5 and 6, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f^\eta(\hat{x}_{r+1}) - f_*^\eta \mid \mathcal{F}_r] \leq f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - f_*^\eta - \frac{\gamma_r}{4} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 + \gamma_r^2 c_1 + \gamma_r c_2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r},$$

and $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_r^2 c_1 + \gamma_r c_2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}) < \infty$, where $c_1 = (32\sqrt{2\pi}L_0^{\text{imp}})^2 n L^f + 2\sigma^2 L^f$, $c_2 = \frac{3n^2}{4\eta^2} (L_{0,y}^f)^2$ and $f_*^\eta \triangleq \inf_x f^\eta(x)$. Let $X_r = \frac{\gamma_r}{4} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2$, $Y_r = f^\eta(\hat{x}_r) - f_*^\eta$, and

$Z_r = \gamma_r^2 c_1 + \gamma_r c_2 \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{i,r}$. We can employ the Robbins-Siegmund Theorem in Lemma 1 and obtain $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \gamma_r \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\|^2 < \infty$ almost surely. Since $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \gamma_r = \infty$, we have $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f^\eta(\hat{x}_r)\| \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark 4. *Theorem 1 is equipped with guarantees of convergence rate, communication and iteration complexity. In (ii), we set $H_{i,r} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{r+1})$ in the analysis, but in practice, we can choose $H_{i,r}$ such that the sum of all the inexact errors, i.e., $\sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \varepsilon_{i,r} \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{R})$, leading to the convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{R})$. We note that the rate is given in terms of communication rounds instead of iteration number. This is indeed because we took an implicit programming approach, and the zeroth-order gradient steps on the implicit function only happen at global steps. Theorem 2 provides an asymptotic guarantee, which appears to be the first in FL when the aggregation function is nonconvex and nonsmooth, extending the results in centralized settings in [18].*

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We consider image classification tasks with MNIST [10], CIFAR-10 [9], and Fashion-MNIST [33] dataset. Throughout the experiments, we simulate the non-iid setting with Dirichlet distribution $Dir(\alpha)$, which is commonly used in FL experiments (e.g. [11]). α is the concentration parameter that is used to determine the non-iid level. We consider $\alpha = 0.1$ for non-iid settings and $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ for iid settings. We note that when α is small (e.g., $\alpha \leq 1$), all clients only possess a small subset of all classes, making the data distribution among clients nonidentical. Fig. 1 visually demonstrates the non-iid data distribution in the experiments.

We consider cross-entropy loss, where $f_1(x) = -\frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} \sum_{c=1}^C I_{jc} \log(p_{jc}^x)$, $f_2(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i \|x - y_i(x)\|^2$, $y_i(x) = \arg \min_{y_i} -\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \sum_{c=1}^C I_{jc} \log(p_{jc}^{y_i}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y_i\|^2$. Let N_s, N_i denote the number of data samples assigned to the server-agent and client-agent i , respectively, C is the number of classes, $I_{jc} = 1$ if sample u_j belongs to class c , else $I_{jc} = 0$. $p_{jc}^x = e^{u_j^T x_c} / \sum_{h=1}^C e^{u_j^T x_h}$, $p_{jc}^{y_i} = e^{u_j^T y_c^i} / \sum_{h=1}^C e^{u_j^T y_h^i}$, and $\rho_i = N_i / N_{tr}$. λ and μ are positive scalars, $x = [x_c]_{c=1}^C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ and $y_i = [y_c^i]_{c=1}^C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$.

Throughout the experiments, we set $\gamma_r = \frac{0.01}{\sqrt{r+1}}$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,t} = \frac{0.1}{t+1}$, and $\eta = 0.1$. The data is distributed as follows: first we split the data into 90% training and 10% testing data, then we assign 30% of the training data to the server-agent and the rest to client-agent with Dirichlet distribution. We simulate the straggler effect by sampling a subset $S_r \subset [m]$ during communication round r ; we note that in our scheme, set $H_{i,r} = 0$ for some r have a similar effect. We consider $m = 10$ client-agents in the experiments.




Fig. 1: Non-iid data simulation across clients with MNIST.

(i) Convergence behavior. We show the convergence behavior of Algorithm 1 in terms of global loss in Fig. 2. We denote by β the proportion of participating clients in each communication round. We set the number of local steps $H_{i,r} = \tau\sqrt{r+1}$ to match with our theory, and choose $\tau \in \{5, 20, 50\}$. We consider three settings with an increasing level of heterogeneity (in terms of both data and system), each setting is assigned with a pair of (α, β) : (1000, 90%) represents a homogeneous setting; (1, 50%) represents a moderately heterogeneous setting; and (0.1, 10%) represents an extreme heterogeneous setting. We observe that the global loss converge faster with a larger number of local steps under homogeneous and moderately heterogeneous environments. However, under extreme heterogeneity, local steps is not contributing to faster convergence. This is due to that only one client communicates per round, more local steps may lead to a biased solution towards that client. This can be handled by carefully increasing the value of μ , so that the local models remain closer to the global model.

(ii) Testing accuracy. We compare the testing accuracy on the test data of our method in Algorithm 1 with FedAvg [19], SCAFFOLD [8], and FedProx [13]. We set $\tau = 20$, and for fair comparison, we set the total number of local steps to be the same across the four methods. We set $R = 500$ in this experiment. Similar to the previous experiment, we consider 3 combinations of (α, β) . The test accuracy is given in Table I. We observe that **ZO-HFL** demonstrates robust performance under various settings, and has the best test accuracy in 5 out of 6 heterogeneous environments, and stays competitive in the homogeneous setting.




Fig. 2: Comparison of different τ under increasing heterogeneity with Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR-10.

TABLE I: Test accuracy on the *global model* with increasing heterogeneity level

	$\alpha = 1000, \beta = 90\%$			$\alpha = 1, \beta = 50\%$			$\alpha = 0.1, \beta = 10\%$		
	MNIST	Fa.-MNIST	CIFAR-10	MNIST	Fa.-MNIST	CIFAR-10	MNIST	Fa.-MNIST	CIFAR-10
FedAvg [19]	87.17%	77.52%	68.36%	77.33%	59.64%	37.20%	39.19%	45.50%	27.43%
FedProx [13]	86.90%	77.34%	67.52%	75.61%	60.28%	38.55%	45.15%	49.44%	29.03%
SCAFFOLD [8]	91.54%	82.25%	72.36%	91.25%	83.48%	50.41%	87.36%	74.91%	44.65%
ZO-HFL	90.82%	78.51%	68.12%	88.44%	85.51%	58.06%	87.70%	76.86%	52.51%

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We introduce a novel hierarchical optimization framework explicitly designed to address heterogeneity in federated learning. We design and analyze a zeroth-order implicit federated algorithm, **ZO-HFL**, equipped with both asymptotic and nonasymptotic convergence, iteration and communication complexity guarantees. Our approach enhances traditional FL methodologies by enabling both global and personalized training. This structure not only maintains a global model at the server level, but also facilitates personalized adaptations at the client level. It also allows for nonidentical number of local steps among clients at each communication round, providing significant flexibility compared with standard FL methods for resolving system heterogeneity.

VI. APPENDIX

Lemma 7 (Randomized spherical smoothing). Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a given continuous function and define $h^\eta(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{u \in \mathbb{B}} [h(x + \eta u)]$. Then, the following hold.

(i) h^η is continuously differentiable and $\nabla h^\eta(x) = \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}} [h(x + \eta v)v]$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\nabla h^\eta(x) = \frac{n}{2\eta} \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}} [(h(x + \eta v) - h(x - \eta v))v]$.

Suppose h is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $L_0 > 0$. Then, the following statements hold.

(ii) $|h^\eta(x) - h^\eta(y)| \leq L_0 \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$;

(iii) $|h^\eta(x) - h(x)| \leq L_0 \eta$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$;

(iv) $\|\nabla h^\eta(x) - \nabla h^\eta(y)\| \leq \frac{L_0 \sqrt{n}}{\eta} \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c > 0$ is a constant.

Proof. (i) From Lemma 1 in [2], we have $\nabla h^\eta(x) = \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}} [h(x + \eta v)v]$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By the symmetric property of the distribution of v , we have $\mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}} [h(x + \eta v)v] = \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathbb{S}} [h(x - \eta v)(-v)]$. Therefore, we have $\frac{n}{2\eta} \mathbb{E}_v [(h(x + \eta v) - h(x - \eta v))v] = \frac{n}{2\eta} \mathbb{E}_v [h(x + \eta v)v] + \frac{n}{2\eta} \mathbb{E}_v [h(x - \eta v)(-v)] = \frac{n}{\eta} \mathbb{E}_v [h(x + v)v] = \nabla h^\eta(x)$.

(ii, iii) See Lemma 1 in [2].

(iv) From [35, Lemma 8], we have $\|\nabla h^\eta(x) - \nabla h^\eta(y)\| \leq \frac{C_n L_0}{\eta} \|x - y\|$, where $C_n = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{n!}{(n-1)!}$ if n is even, and $C_n = \frac{n!}{(n-1)!}$ if n is odd. It remains to show that $C_n \leq \sqrt{n}$.

Let $w_n = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n(x) dx$ denotes the Wallis's integral, we have two properties: (i) $w_n = \frac{n-1}{n} w_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$, where we define $w_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $w_1 = 1$; (ii) $w_{n+1} < w_n$ [27]. Then, by simple induction, we have $w_n = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{(n-1)!}{n!}$ for all even n , and $w_n = \frac{(n-1)!}{n!}$ for all odd n . Therefore, we have $C_n = \frac{1}{w_n}$.

Next, by noting that $(n+1)w_n w_{n+1} = (n+1) \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{(n-1)!}{n!} \frac{n!}{(n+1)!} = \frac{\pi}{2}$, and by property (ii), we have $w_n > \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2(n+1)}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi n}{2(n+1)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{3}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, for $n \geq 2$.

Therefore, we obtain $C_n = \frac{1}{w_n} < \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \sqrt{n} < \sqrt{n}$. □

An example of nonsmooth nonconvex implicit function. Consider a bilevel optimization problem given as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|x + \mathbf{1}_n - y(x)\|^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \|y - x\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Let $f(\bullet) = \frac{1}{2} \|\bullet + \mathbf{1}_n - y(\bullet)\|^2$ denotes the implicit function, where $\mathbf{1}_n$ denotes an n -dimensional vector with all elements equal to 1. The lower-level problem can be expressed as $y(x) = \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}[x]$.

Note that $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x_i)$, where $g_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}(x_i + 1 - \max\{0, x_i\})^2$, and $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the i -th element of x . We observe $g_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}$ for $x_i \geq 0$, else $g_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}(x_i + 1)^2$. We can easily verify that $g_i(x_i)$ is nondifferentiable and nonconvex in terms of x_i . Furthermore, we can also verify that $f(x)$ is nondifferentiable and nonconvex in terms of x . Recall that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex if and only if for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and any $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)z) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1-\lambda)f(z)$. Let $\lambda = 0.5$, $x = \mathbf{1}_n$, and $z = -\mathbf{1}_n$. Then, we obtain $f(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)z) = \frac{n}{2} > \frac{n}{4} = \lambda f(x) + (1-\lambda)f(z)$. Therefore, $f(x)$ is a *nonconvex* function. Furthermore, by noting that functions $g_i(x_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ are independent of each other in terms of the variable x_i , and $g_i(x_i)$ are nondifferentiable at $x_i = 0$, we can conclude that $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x_i)$ is *nondifferentiable* at x when at least one element x_i is equal to zero. Fig. 3 shows function $f(x)$.




Fig. 3: The implicit function $f(x)$ in (3) is nondifferentiable and nonconvex.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. BONAWITZ, H. EICHNER, W. GRIESKAMP, D. HUBA, A. INGERMAN, V. IVANOV, C. KIDDON, J. KONEČNÝ, S. MAZZOCCHI, B. MCMAHAN, ET AL., *Towards federated learning at scale: System design*, Proceedings of machine learning and systems, 1 (2019), pp. 374–388.
- [2] S. CUI, U. V. SHANBHAG, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Complexity guarantees for an implicit smoothing-enabled method for stochastic mpecs*, Mathematical Programming, 198 (2023), pp. 1153–1225.
- [3] Y. DENG, M. M. KAMANI, AND M. MAHDAVI, *Adaptive personalized federated learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13461, (2020).
- [4] M. EGGER, M. BAKSHI, AND R. BITAR, *Byzantine-resilient zero-order optimization for communication-efficient heterogeneous federated learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00193, (2025).

- [5] A. FALLAH, A. MOKHTARI, AND A. OZDAGLAR, *Personalized federated learning with theoretical guarantees: A model-agnostic meta-learning approach*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), vol. 33, 2020, pp. 3557–3568.
- [6] C. IAKOVIDOU AND K. KIM, *Asynchronous federated stochastic optimization for heterogeneous objectives under arbitrary delays*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10123, (2024).
- [7] D. JHUNJHUNWALA, S. WANG, AND G. JOSHI, *Fedexp: Speeding up federated averaging via extrapolation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09604, (2023).
- [8] S. P. KARIMIREDDY, S. KALE, M. MOHRI, S. REDDI, S. STICH, AND A. T. SURESH, *Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning*, in International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 5132–5143.
- [9] A. KRIZHEVSKY, G. HINTON, ET AL., *Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images*, (2009).
- [10] Y. LECUN, L. BOTTOU, Y. BENGIO, AND P. HAFFNER, *Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 86 (1998), pp. 2278–2324.
- [11] Q. LI, Y. DIAO, Q. CHEN, AND B. HE, *Federated learning on non-iid data silos: An experimental study*, in 2022 IEEE 38th international conference on data engineering (ICDE), IEEE, 2022, pp. 965–978.
- [12] T. LI, S. HU, A. BEIRAMI, AND V. SMITH, *Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization*, in International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2021, pp. 6357–6368.
- [13] T. LI, A. K. SAHU, M. ZAHEER, M. SANJABI, A. TALWALKAR, AND V. SMITH, *Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks*, Proceedings of Machine learning and systems, 2 (2020), pp. 429–450.
- [14] S. LIN, Y. HAN, X. LI, AND Z. ZHANG, *Personalized federated learning towards communication efficiency, robustness and fairness*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35 (2022), pp. 30471–30485.
- [15] T. LIN, Z. ZHENG, AND M. JORDAN, *Gradient-free methods for deterministic and stochastic nonsmooth nonconvex optimization*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35 (2022), pp. 26160–26175.
- [16] X. LIU, Q. WANG, Y. SHAO, AND Y. LI, *Sparse federated learning with hierarchical personalization models*, IEEE Internet of Things Journal, 11 (2023), pp. 8539–8551.
- [17] W. LU, H. YU, J. WANG, D. TENEY, H. WANG, Y. ZHU, Y. CHEN, Q. YANG, X. XIE, AND X. JI, *Zoopfl: Exploring black-box foundation models for personalized federated learning*, in International Workshop on Trustworthy Federated Learning, Springer, 2024, pp. 19–35.
- [18] L. MARRINAN, U. V. SHANBHAG, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Zeroth-order gradient and quasi-newton methods for nonsmooth nonconvex stochastic optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08665, (2023).
- [19] H. B. MCMAHAN, E. MOORE, D. RAMAGE, S. HAMPSON, AND B. AGUERA Y ARCAS, *Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data*, in Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS), 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [20] M. MOHRI, G. SIVEK, AND A. T. SURESH, *Agnostic federated learning*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2019, pp. 4615–4625.
- [21] J. NGUYEN, K. MALIK, H. ZHAN, A. YOUSEFPOUR, M. RABBAT, M. MALEK, AND D. HUBA, *Federated learning with buffered asynchronous aggregation*, in International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2022, pp. 3581–3607.
- [22] K. PILLUTLA, S. M. KAKADE, AND Z. HARCHAOUI, *Robust aggregation for federated learning*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 70 (2022), pp. 1142–1154.
- [23] Y. QIU, U. V. SHANBHAG, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Zeroth-order methods for nondifferentiable, nonconvex, and hierarchical federated optimization*, in Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023, pp. 3425–3438.

- [24] H. ROBBINS AND D. SIEGMUND, *A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications*, in *Optimizing methods in statistics*, Elsevier, 1971, pp. 233–257.
- [25] F. SATTLER, K.-R. MÜLLER, AND W. SAMEK, *Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multi-task optimization under privacy constraints*, in *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, 2020, pp. 3710–3722.
- [26] V. SMITH, C.-K. CHIANG, M. SANJABI, AND A. TALWALKAR, *Federated multi-task learning*, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017, pp. 4424–4434.
- [27] M. SPIVAK, *Calculus*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [28] C. T. DINH, N. TRAN, AND J. NGUYEN, *Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes*, *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33 (2020), pp. 21394–21405.
- [29] A. Z. TAN, H. YU, L. CUI, AND Q. YANG, *Towards personalized federated learning*, *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 34 (2022), pp. 9587–9603.
- [30] M. J. WAINWRIGHT, *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, vol. 48, Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [31] J. WANG, R. DAS, G. JOSHI, S. KALE, Z. XU, AND T. ZHANG, *On the unreasonable effectiveness of federated averaging with heterogeneous data*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04723*, (2022).
- [32] J. WANG, Q. LIU, H. LIANG, G. JOSHI, AND H. V. POOR, *Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization*, *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33 (2020), pp. 7611–7623.
- [33] H. XIAO, K. RASUL, AND R. VOLLGRAF, *Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, (2017).
- [34] Y. YANG, P. XIAO, AND K. JI, *Simfbo: Towards simple, flexible and communication-efficient federated bilevel learning*, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36 (2023), pp. 33027–33040.
- [35] F. YOUSEFIAN, A. NEDIĆ, AND U. V. SHANBHAG, *On stochastic gradient and subgradient methods with adaptive steplength sequences*, *Automatica*, 48 (2012), pp. 56–67.