A Simple yet Highly Accurate Prediction-Correction Algorithm for Time-Varying Optimization

Tomoya Kamijima¹, Naoki Marumo¹, and Akiko Takeda^{1,2}

¹Department of Mathematical Informatics, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan. ²RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Tokyo, Japan.

Abstract

This paper proposes a simple yet highly accurate prediction-correction algorithm, SHARP, for unconstrained time-varying optimization problems. Its prediction is based on an extrapolation derived from the Lagrange interpolation of past solutions. Since this extrapolation can be computed without Hessian matrices or even gradients, the computational cost is low. To ensure the stability of the prediction, the algorithm includes an acceptance condition that rejects the prediction when the update is excessively large. The proposed method achieves a tracking error of $O(h^p)$, where his the sampling period, assuming that the *p*th derivative of the target trajectory is bounded and the convergence of the correction step is locally linear. We also prove that the method can track a trajectory of stationary points even if the objective function is non-convex. Numerical experiments demonstrate the high accuracy of the proposed algorithm.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the unconstrained time-varying optimization problem

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x}; t), \tag{1.1}$$

where $f(\cdot;t): \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a differentiable function that depends on a continuous-time variable $t \ge 0$. In the real world, there are many situations in which decisions must be made while the objective function is gradually changing due to environmental changes and other factors, making it necessary to solve optimization problems that change with time. Time-varying optimization problems arise in various applications such as robotics [Koppel et al., 2017], control [Hours and Jones, 2014], signal processing [Jakubiec and Ribeiro, 2012], electronics [Dall'Anese and Simonetto, 2016], and machine learning [Dixit et al., 2019].

Time-varying optimization methods aim to track a *target trajectory* $\mathbf{x}^* \colon \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with high accuracy. The trajectory $\mathbf{x}^*(t)$ is assumed to be a smooth function of t and is a stationary point of $f(\cdot;t)$ for each t. The problem (1.1) can be solved by recasting it as a sequence of time-invariant problems

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x}; t_k) \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$
(1.2)

where $t_k \coloneqq kh$ is sampling time and h > 0 is a sampling period. Popkov [2005] proposed to apply Gradient Descent (GD) to the problem (1.2) for each round k. We call this method Time-Varying Gradient Descent (TVGD) to distinguish it from GD for time-invariant cases. The sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}_k$ generated by TVGD satisfies an asymptotic error bound, $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|\hat{x}_k - x^*(t_k)\| = O(h)$, assuming that $f(\cdot; t)$ is strongly convex.

To improve this bound, Simonetto et al. [2016] proposed the Gradient Trajectory Tracking (GTT) algorithm, which consists of prediction and correction steps. The prediction step computes a prediction \hat{x}_k of the next target point $x^*(t_k)$ using the inverse Hessian of $f(\cdot; t_{k-1})$, and the correction step

corrects the prediction to \mathbf{x}_k by applying GD to (1.2). GTT achieves an improved error bound, $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*(t_k)\| = O(h^2)$, under the assumption of strong convexity. Note that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ is the last estimate before the actual function $f(\cdot; t_k)$ reveals at $t = t_k$; we focus on the error with respect to the predicted solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$, not the corrected solution \mathbf{x}_k as focused on previous studies (e.g., [Simonetto et al., 2016]).

Since GTT requires the inverse Hessian of f in its prediction step, we can think of several challenges when applying it to real-world problems. The inverse Hessian is computationally expensive, particularly for high-dimensional problems. Even for moderate dimensions, longer computation times necessitate a larger sampling period h, leading to greater errors. Furthermore, achieving higher accuracy than $O(h^2)$ requires higher-order derivatives because the prediction step is based on the Taylor expansion of f. In addition, GTT cannot be directly applied to non-strongly convex problems. In such cases, the inverse Hessian may not exist. Even if it does exist at every round, the error bound of $O(h^2)$ is not necessarily guaranteed.

1.1 Our Contributions

This paper proposes a Simple yet Highly AccuRate Prediction-correction algorithm, named SHARP, for the problem (1.1). The key advantages of the proposed algorithm are as follows:

- Its prediction step is Hessian-free. It relies on extrapolating past solutions and can be computed without Hessian matrices or even gradients.
- The algorithm can track x^* with high accuracy. It guarantees an asymptotic tracking error of

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| = O(h^p)$$

under the assumption that the target trajectry has a bounded *p*th derivative and the correction step converges locally linearly.

• The algorithm is applicable to non-convex functions. It guarantees small tracking errors for Polyak–Lojasiewicz (PL) functions, defined in Definition 4.5, and even for general non-convex functions.

Table 1 provides a comparison with other algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, SHARP is the first algorithm that guarantees a tracking error smaller than $O(h^2)$. In contrast, the best existing algorithms—whether limited to strongly convex functions or designed for general non-convex functions—are not guaranteed to achieve such a small error.

To achieve these advantages, we leverage the Lagrange interpolation of past solutions. The Lagrange interpolation can be computed from a linear combination of past solutions, and the coefficients are given by binomial coefficients in this setting. In the tracking error analysis, we derive a recursion of the tracking error by leveraging the properties of the Lagrange interpolation and binomial coefficients. This recursion-based analysis provides a clear understanding of the tracking error. Although the analysis does not directly extend to general non-convex functions, the proposed method still guarantees an upper bound on the error in such cases. This is due to an acceptance condition in the algorithm that rejects the prediction when the update is excessively large.

1.2 Related Work

Prediction-correction algorithms for strongly convex functions Since the introduction of the prediction-correction framework by Simonetto et al. [2016], various algorithms have been developed for a wide range of strongly convex time-varying optimization. Simonetto and Dall'Anese [2017] proposed an algorithm for convex constrained problems by using the projection operator $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}}$ onto the feasible region \mathcal{X} . For linearly constrained problems, Simonetto [2018] proposed a dual-ascent-type algorithm that solves a convex optimization problem at each round. Bastianello et al. [2019] proposed a splitting-type algorithm for non-smooth problems. While the asymptotic tracking error

Table 1: Comparison of time-varying optimization algorithms. A constant κ corresponds to the condition number defined in Section 4. LCP stands for Linear Complementarity Problem. The errors are the asymptotic bounds on $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\|$ other than the following exceptions: *1 $f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k) - \min_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}; t_k)$, *2 $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\|$.

Assumption	Algorithm	Constraint	Oracles	Error
Strongly convex	TVGD [Popkov, 2005]		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	O(h)
	SPC [Lin et al., 2019]		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(h^2)$
	GTT [Simonetto et al., 2016]		$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f)^{-1}$	$O(h^2)$
	[Qi and Zhang, 2019]		$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f)^{-1}$	-
	[Simonetto and Dall'Anese, 2017]	\mathcal{X}	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{xx}} f, \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{X}}$	O(h)
	[Bastianello et al., 2019]	\mathcal{X}	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f, \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{X}}$	O(h)
	[Simonetto, 2018]	Ax = b	Convex opt.	O(h)
	[Bastianello et al., 2023]	Ax = b	Convex opt.	O(h)
	SHARP (Thm. 4.2)		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(h^p)$
Strongly convex	[Zavala and Anitescu, 2010]	$oldsymbol{g}(oldsymbol{x}) \leq oldsymbol{0}$	LCP	$O(h^2)$
(local)	[Dontchev et al., 2013]	\mathcal{X}	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f)^{-1}, \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{X}}$	$O(h^2)$
	SHARP (Thm. 4.6)		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(h^p)$
PL	TVGD [Iwakiri et al., 2024]		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(h)^{*1}$
	SHARP (Thm. 5.4)		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(h^2)^{*1}$
Non-convex	[Massicot and Marecek, 2019]	$oldsymbol{g}(oldsymbol{x}) \leq oldsymbol{0}$	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{g}$	-
	[Ding et al., 2021]	$oldsymbol{g}(oldsymbol{x}) = oldsymbol{0}$	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{g}$	-
	[Tang et al., 2022]	$\mathcal{X}, \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \boldsymbol{0}$	$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{g}, \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{X}}$	-
	TVGD [Iwakiri et al., 2024]		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(\sqrt{h})^{*2}$
	SHARP (Thm. 5.5)		$ abla_{oldsymbol{x}} f$	$O(\sqrt{h})^{*2}$

of $O(h^2)$ for unconstrained problems has been proved by Simonetto et al. [2016], the tracking error of the aforementioned three algorithms in [Bastianello et al., 2019, Simonetto, 2018, Simonetto and Dall'Anese, 2017] is O(h). This paper aims at obtaining tracking error bounds better than $O(h^2)$ for unconstrained problems.

Non-convex time-varying optimization Non-convex problems have also been investigated, but most studies assume local strong convexity and focus on the behavior in the neighborhood of the target trajectory. Zavala and Anitescu [2010] proposed an algorithm for constrained problems that solves a linear complementarity problem (LCP) at each round. Dontchev et al. [2013] proposed the Euler–Newton method for parametric variational inequalities. Non-convex problems have also been analyzed from the perspective of their continuous-time limit [Ding et al., 2021, Massicot and Marecek, 2019, Tang et al., 2022]. For non-convex problems without local strong convexity, Iwakiri et al. [2024] derived a tracking error bound of TVGD and proposed a prediction-correction algorithm. Unlike previous studies, which focus on either local or global guarantees, our analysis provides both: the proposed method achieves a significantly smaller error in local regions while ensuring that the global error remains controlled even for non-convex functions.

Extrapolation-based prediction-correction algorithms A similar idea of our extrapolation has been employed in strongly convex time-varying optimization problems. Lin et al. [2019] proposed a prediction-correction method, the Simplified Prediction-Correction algorithm (SPC), which corresponds to our algorithm under specific parameter settings (i.e., $(P, v) = (2, \infty)$). The same extrapolation as ours has been investigated in [Zhang et al., 2019] from the viewpoint of the Taylor expansion and Vandermonde's matrix. Based on their extrapolation, Qi and Zhang [2019] proposed a prediction-correction method, but their method requires the inverse Hessian and they do not provide

Algorithm 1 Simple yet Highly AccuRate Prediction-correction algorithm (SHARP)

Input: $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, P \ge 1, 0 \le v \le \infty$ 1: $x_{-P+1} = \cdots = x_{-1} = x_0$ 2: for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$: for $p = P, P - 1, \dots, 1$: ▷ Prediction 3: $egin{aligned} \hat{x}_k^p &= \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} x_{k-i} \ ext{if } \| \hat{x}_k^p - x_{k-1} \| &\leq vh: \ \hat{x}_k &= \hat{x}_k^p \end{aligned}$ 4: \triangleright Acceptance condition 5: 6: 7: break Set \boldsymbol{x}_k to be an approximate solution to $\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}; t_k)$ by e.g., (2.3) 8: 9: \triangleright Correction

a tracking error analysis. Bastianello et al. [2023] proposed a method that extrapolates the objective function assuming the Hessian is time-invariant. Although our method uses a similar extrapolation to the above methods, Hessian matrices are not required. Moreover, the method guarantees a tracking error smaller than $O(h^2)$ for the first time.

1.3 Notation

Let \mathbb{R} and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denote the set of real and nonnegative numbers, respectively. We denote the first, second, and *n*th derivative of a function $\varphi(t)$ by $\dot{\varphi}(t)$, $\ddot{\varphi}(t)$, and $\varphi^{(n)}(t)$, respectively. For the partial derivatives of $f(\boldsymbol{x};t)$ with regard to \boldsymbol{x} and t, we use $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and ∇_t , respectively, and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{xx}}$, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{xt}}$, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{tt}}$ and so on for higher-order derivatives. We denote the binomial coefficient by $\binom{n}{k} \coloneqq n!/(k!(n-k)!)$ for $k \in \{0,\ldots,n\}$, and $\binom{n}{k} \coloneqq 0$ for $k \notin \{0,\ldots,n\}$. The norm $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm for vectors and the induced operator norm for matrices and tensors. The distance between a vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $dist(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{X}) \coloneqq \inf_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}\|$.

2 Proposed Method

This section introduces a Simple yet Highly AccuRate Prediction-correction algorithm (SHARP) to solve the time-varying optimization problem (1.1). The algorithm is given in Algorithm 1, which consists of a prediction step (Lines 3–7) and a correction step (Line 8). For each round k, we compute \hat{x}_k as a prediction of the next target point $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)$ before $f(\cdot; t_k)$ is revealed and correct the prediction to \boldsymbol{x}_k using the revealed information of $f(\cdot; t_k)$.

The prediction step computes

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}_{k-i}, \qquad (2.1)$$

for p = P, P - 1, ..., 1, where $P \ge 1$ is a predetermined maximum order of prediction. The proposed prediction scheme (2.1) is reduced to the non-prediction scheme when p = 1, and to the prediction used in the SPC algorithm [Lin et al., 2019] when p = 2.

The prediction (2.1) is based on the following idea. Given the past target points $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-p}), \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-1})$, the next target point $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)$ can be extrapolated by the Lagrange interpolation:

$$\boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left(\prod_{\substack{j=1\\j\neq i}}^{p} \frac{t_{k} - t_{k-j}}{t_{k-i} - t_{k-j}} \right) \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}).$$

Although $\mathbf{x}^*(t_{k-i})$ is unknown in reality, it is reasonable to assume that \mathbf{x}_{k-i} is close to the target point $\mathbf{x}^*(t_{k-i})$ since \mathbf{x}_{k-i} is computed by the correction step. Under this assumption, the prediction (2.1) is expected to approximate $\mathbf{x}^*(t_k)$ well, as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The prediction \hat{x}_k^4 is computed from the Lagrange interpolation of x_{k-4}, \ldots, x_{k-1} , which approximates $x^*(t_k)$ well.

An error bound for the Lagrange interpolation of scalar-valued functions can be found in standard textbooks on numerical analysis (e.g., [Süli and Mayers, 2003, Theorem 6.2]). The following lemma extends the error bound to the vector-valued function \boldsymbol{x}^* , which is useful in our analysis.

Lemma 2.1. Let $0 \leq \underline{k} < \overline{k} \leq \infty$ be constants. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{x}^* : [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is p-times differentiable with $1 \leq p \leq \overline{k} - \underline{k}$. Then, the following holds for all $\underline{k} + p \leq k \leq \overline{k}$:

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) - \sum_{i=1}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) \right\| \leq h^{p} \sup_{t \in [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}]} \left\| (\boldsymbol{x}^{*})^{(p)}(t) \right\|.$$

This lemma can be proved by modifying the proof for scaler-valued functions by replacing Rolle's theorem with the fundamental theorem of calculus. To make this paper self-contained, we provide the proof in Appendix A.

Since the prediction (2.1) is justified under the assumption $\mathbf{x}_{k-i} \approx \mathbf{x}^*(t_{k-i})$, we have to detect the case where this assumption is violated. Indeed, the prediction (2.1) can cause the sequence $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\}_k$ to diverge if \mathbf{x}_{k-i} is far from $\mathbf{x}^*(t_{k-i})$. In addition, the prediction (2.1) may not work well when there is another stationary point near $\mathbf{x}^*(t_{k-i})$, as shown in Figure 2.

To detect these invalid cases, we propose checking the following acceptance condition:

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| \le vh, \tag{2.2}$$

where $v \ge 0$ is a predetermined threshold parameter, which will be discussed later in Remark 3.4. Since the tracking error can be smaller for large p, we take the largest p satisfying the condition (2.2), as stated on Lines 3–7 of Algorithm 1. This condition comes from the approximation

$$\boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k) - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-1}) \approx \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t_k)h = O(h),$$

which is valid as long as \boldsymbol{x}^* has a bounded derivative. The condition (2.2) prevents the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_k\}_k$ from diverging, particularly when the objective function is non-strongly convex. If the objective function is strongly convex or satisfies the Polyak–Lojasiewicz condition, the condition becomes unnecessary (i.e., we can set $v = \infty$, as stated in Theorem 4.2).

The correction step approximately minimizes $f(\boldsymbol{x}; t_k)$ to correct the prediction $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k$ to \boldsymbol{x}_k . For example, we can use the Gradient Descent (GD) update

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c} - \alpha \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c}; t_{k}) \quad (c = 0, \dots, C-1)$$

$$(2.3)$$

from the initial point $\boldsymbol{x}_k^0 = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k$, where $\alpha > 0$ is a step-size parameter and $C \ge 1$ is a predetermined iteration number of the correction step.

3 General Tracking Error Analysis

This section shows that Algorithm 1 tracks a target trajectory with high accuracy under some general assumptions. We will confirm that the assumptions are satisfied in some specific settings in Section 4 and will discuss cases where the assumptions do not hold in Section 5.





(a) The prediction \hat{x}_k^2 is close to the next target point (b) The prediction \hat{x}_k^2 is far from both $x^*(t_k)$ and $x^*(t_k)$. $\tilde{x}^*(t_k)$.

Figure 2: The prediction $\hat{x}_k^2 = 2x_{k-1} - x_{k-2}$ does not work well when there is another stationary point $\tilde{x}^*(t)$ near $x^*(t)$.

3.1 Assumptions

Assumptions in this section are summarized as follows. Note that P and v below are input parameters of Algorithm 1.

Assumption 3.1. Let $0 \leq \underline{k} < \overline{k} \leq \infty$ and $0 < r \leq \infty$ be constants. There exists $\boldsymbol{x}^* : [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the following holds:

- (a) $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t_{\underline{k}} \leq t \leq t_{\overline{k}}$.
- (b) \boldsymbol{x}^* is differentiable on $[t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}]$, and the following holds:

$$\sigma_1 \coloneqq \sup_{t \in [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}]} \| \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t) \| < \begin{cases} \frac{r}{h} - v & \text{if } r < \infty, \\ \infty & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(3.1)

- (c) The constant r is ∞ , or there exists $k_0 \in \{\underline{k}, \ldots, \overline{k} P\}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k_0} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k_0})\| \leq r (v + \sigma_1)h$, where \boldsymbol{x}_{k_0} is the corrected solution computed on Line 8 of Algorithm 1.
- (d) If $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \leq r$ holds at round k of Algorithm 1, then \boldsymbol{x}_k computed on Line 8 satisfies $\|\boldsymbol{x}_k \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \leq \gamma \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\|$, where γ is a constant independent of k satisfying

$$\gamma < \frac{1}{2^P - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma \le \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{v + \sigma_1}{r} h & \text{if } r < \infty, \\ 1 & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(3.2)

Assumptions 3.1(a) and 3.1(b) guarantee the existence of a stationary point $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t)$ that evolves smoothly over time. These assumptions are essential for ensuring a small tracking error, as the trajectory \boldsymbol{x}^* may otherwise become discontinuous. The condition (3.1) is not restrictive when h is sufficiently small.

Assumptions 3.1(c) and 3.1(d) guarantee that the correction step sufficiently reduces the error. Assumption 3.1(c) means that the sequence $\{x_k\}_k$ of corrected solutions approaches sufficiently close to the trajectory $x^*(t)$. In existing local analyses [Dontchev et al., 2013, Zavala and Anitescu, 2010], it is commonly assumed that the initial point is a local optimum at the initial time, in which case Assumption 3.1(c) is naturally satisfied. Assumption 3.1(d) states that the correction step reduces the distance to the target point by a factor γ . The condition (3.2) states that γ is sufficiently small, and the second inequality in (3.2) is weaker than the first one when h is small enough. The constant γ depends on the objective function and the algorithm used in the correction step. As confirmed in Section 4, this assumption holds if the objective function is strongly convex or satisfies the Polyak– Lojasiewicz condition around $x^*(t)$, and the correction step employs GD. We will also discuss how γ can be estimated in specific settings.

For example, when $f(\cdot; t)$ is assumed to be strongly convex on \mathbb{R}^n , Assumption 3.1 holds with $(\underline{k}, \overline{k}, r) = (0, \infty, \infty)$, as stated in Theorem 4.2.

In the rest of this section, we restrict our discussion to a trajectory x^* satisfying Assumption 3.1. For this x^* , let

$$\sigma_{i} \coloneqq \begin{cases} \sup_{t \in [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}]} \|(\boldsymbol{x}^{*})^{(i)}(t)\| & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}^{*} \text{ is } i\text{-times differentiable on } [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}], \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$
$$e_{k} \coloneqq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})\|, \qquad (3.3)$$

where \hat{x}_k is the prediction defined on Line 6 of Algorithm 1.

3.2 Acceptance of Higher-Order Predictions

As explained in Section 2, the acceptance condition (2.2) rejects predictions with excessively large step sizes. To ensure that most predictions are not rejected, this subsection provides sufficient conditions for predictions to be accepted. In particular, we show that the prediction is always accepted after a certain round, which will be formally stated in Proposition 3.3.

First, we derive an upper bound on e_k of (3.3).

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Then, $e_k \leq r$ for all $k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$, and

$$e_k \le \frac{v + \sigma_1}{1 - \gamma} h + e_{k_0} \gamma^{k - k_0}$$

for all $k_0 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Proof. We first prove

$$e_k \le \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-1})\| + (v + \sigma_1)h \tag{3.4}$$

for all $\underline{k} + 1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$. The triangle inequality gives

$$e_{k} = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})\| \\ \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| + \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1})\| + \|\boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1}) - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})\|.$$
(3.5)

By using the acceptance condition (2.2), the first term of (3.5) is upper bounded by vh. Lemma 2.1 with p = 1 implies that the last term of (3.5) is upper bounded by $\sigma_1 h$. Thus, (3.4) holds for all $\underline{k} + 1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Next, we prove $e_k \leq r$ for all $k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$ by induction. The case $k = k_0 + 1$ follows from Assumption 3.1(c) and (3.4). Assume (3.4) for some $k \in \{k_0 + 1, \dots, \overline{k} - 1\}$. Then, we have

$$e_{k+1} \le \|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| + (v + \sigma_1)h \le \gamma e_k + (v + \sigma_1)h \le \gamma r + (v + \sigma_1)h \le r,$$

where the first inequality follows from (3.4); the second one, from Assumption 3.1(d) and the induction hypothesis; the third one, from the induction hypothesis; the last one, from the second inequality of (3.2). Thus, $e_k \leq r$ for all $k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

From (3.4) and Assumption 3.1(d), we have

$$e_k \le \gamma e_{k-1} + (v + \sigma_1)h$$

for all $k_0 + 1 \le k \le \overline{k}$. Solving this recursion gives

$$e_k \le \frac{v + \sigma_1}{1 - \gamma} h + \left(e_{k_0} - \frac{v + \sigma_1}{1 - \gamma}h\right)\gamma^{k - k_0} \le \frac{v + \sigma_1}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_0}\gamma^{k - k_0}$$

for all $k_0 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Lemma 3.2 gives the following sufficient condition for predictions to be accepted.

Proposition 3.3. Let $P \ge 1$ be the maximum order of prediction in Algorithm 1. Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. If

$$v = \infty, \quad p = 1, \quad or \quad (2^p - 2)\gamma \left(\frac{v + \sigma_1}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_0}\gamma^{k - k_0 - p}\right) + \sigma_1 h + \sigma_p h^p \le vh$$
 (3.6)

holds for some $p \in \{1, \ldots, P\}$ and $k \in \{k_0 + p, \ldots, \overline{k}\}$, then the prediction $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k^p$ satisfies the acceptance condition (2.2).

Proof. For the case $v = \infty$ or p = 1, the condition (2.2) always holds. We consider the case $v < \infty$ and $p \ge 2$ in the rest of the proof.

We give an upper bound on $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\|$ to prove (2.2). Rewriting the prediction (2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} (\boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})) + (p-1) (\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1})) \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) + \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the norm and using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{p} {p \choose i} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})\| + (p-1)\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1})\| + \left\|\sum_{i=0}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})\right\| + \|\boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1})\|.$$

$$(3.7)$$

We will bound each term on the right-hand side. To bound the first and second terms, we use Assumption 3.1(d) and Lemma 3.2:

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})\| \leq \gamma e_{k-i} \leq \gamma \left(\frac{v + \sigma_{1}}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_{0}}\gamma^{k-i-k_{0}}\right)$$
$$\leq \gamma \left(\frac{v + \sigma_{1}}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_{0}}\gamma^{k-k_{0}-p}\right)$$
(3.8)

for all $k_0 + p \le k \le \overline{k}$ and $1 \le i \le p$. The third term can be bounded by Lemma 2.1:

$$\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{p} (-1)^{i} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})\right\| \leq \sigma_{p} h^{p}.$$
(3.9)

Similarly, the last term can be bounded by Lemma 2.1 with p = 1:

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-1})\| \leq \sigma_{1}h.$$
(3.10)

By combining (3.7)–(3.10), we get

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}^{p} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| \leq \left(\sum_{i=2}^{p} {p \choose i} + (p-1)\right) \gamma \left(\frac{v + \sigma_{1}}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_{0}}\gamma^{k-k_{0}-p}\right) + \sigma_{1}h + \sigma_{p}h^{p}$$
$$= (2^{p} - 2)\gamma \left(\frac{v + \sigma_{1}}{1 - \gamma}h + e_{k_{0}}\gamma^{k-k_{0}-p}\right) + \sigma_{1}h + \sigma_{p}h^{p}$$
(3.11)

for all $k_0 + p \le k \le \overline{k}$. Combining (3.6) and (3.11) completes the proof.

This proposition states that the prediction \hat{x}_k^p is always accepted after a specific round satisfying the last inequality of (3.6), since the left-hand side is monotonically decreasing in k. Although $v = \infty$ is included in (3.6), this choice leads to a poor tracking performance when Assumption 3.1 is violated (see Theorems 5.4 and 5.5).

Remark 3.4. The last inequality in (3.6) gives a lower bound on v. This is because the inequality is equivalent to

$$v \ge \frac{1 + (2^p - 3)\gamma}{1 - (2^p - 1)\gamma} \sigma_1 + \frac{(1 - \gamma)\left((2^p - 2)e_{k_0}\gamma^{k - k_0 - p + 1} + \sigma_p h^p\right)}{h(1 - (2^p - 1)\gamma)}$$
(3.12)

under the condition (3.2) and $p \ge 2$. Consider the case where $(p, \sigma_p) = (6, 10^6)$, $\gamma = 0.01$, h = 0.01, and $(k_0, k, e_{k_0}) = (0, 100, 1)$ as an example. The right-hand side of (3.12) is

$$\frac{1.61}{0.37}\sigma_1 + \frac{0.99 \cdot (62 \cdot 0.01^{95} + 10^{-6})}{0.01 \cdot 0.63} \approx 4.4\sigma_1.$$

This suggests that the lower bound on v is nearly proportional to σ_1 , which represents the maximum velocity of the target trajectory.

3.3 General Tracking Error

In this subsection, we bound the tracking error of Algorithm 1 in a general form. The result in this subsection will be used to analyze the tracking error for specific function classes in the next section.

The following lemma states that the tracking error can be bounded recursively. The first and second terms on the right-hand side of (3.13) represent the correction and prediction errors, respectively.

Lemma 3.5. Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Fix $p \in \{1, ..., P\}$ arbitrarily and let k_1 be the smallest $k \geq \underline{k}$ satisfying (3.6). Then, the following holds for all $k_1 + P \leq k \leq \overline{k}$:

$$e_k \le \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} \binom{P}{i} e_{k-i} + 2^{P-p} \sigma_p h^p.$$
(3.13)

Proof. Since (3.13) is trivial when $\sigma_p = \infty$, we focus on the case $\sigma_p < \infty$. Let p_k be the accepted order of prediction at round k, i.e., p_k is the largest $q \in \{1, \ldots, P\}$ such that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k^q - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| \leq vh$. Proposition 3.3 implies $p_k \geq p$ for all $k_1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Rewriting the prediction (2.1) yields

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_{k}} (-1)^{i-1} {p_{k} \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{p_{k}} (-1)^{i-1} {p_{k} \choose i} (\boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})) + \sum_{i=0}^{p_{k}} (-1)^{i-1} {p_{k} \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}).$$

By taking the norm and using the triangle inequality, we have

$$e_{k} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p_{k}} {p_{k} \choose i} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i})\| + \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{p_{k}} (-1)^{i} {p_{k} \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) \right\|.$$
(3.14)

The first term on the right-hand side can be bounded by Lemma 3.2 and Assumption 3.1(d):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p_k} {p_k \choose i} \| \boldsymbol{x}_{k-i} - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-i}) \| \le \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} {p_k \choose i} e_{k-i} \le \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} {P \choose i} e_{k-i}$$
(3.15)

for all $k_1 + P \leq k \leq \overline{k}$. To complete the proof, we will prove

$$\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{p_k} (-1)^i \binom{p_k}{i} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-i})\right\| \le 2^{P-p} \sigma_p h^p \tag{3.16}$$

for all $k_1 + P \le k \le \overline{k}$.

Vandermonde's convolution formula $\binom{a+b}{i} = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{a}{i-j} \binom{b}{j}$ gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p_k} (-1)^i \binom{p_k}{i} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-i}) = \sum_{i=0}^{p_k} \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^i \binom{p_k - p}{i - j} \binom{p}{j} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-i})$$
$$= \sum_{\substack{d,j \ge 0 \\ d+j \le p_k}} (-1)^{d+j} \binom{p_k - p}{d} \binom{p}{j} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-d-j})$$
$$= \sum_{d=0}^{p_k - p} \sum_{j=0}^p (-1)^{d+j} \binom{p_k - p}{d} \binom{p}{j} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-d-j})$$
$$= \sum_{d=0}^{p_k - p} (-1)^d \binom{p_k - p}{d} \sum_{j=0}^p (-1)^j \binom{p}{j} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-d-j})$$

where we set $d \coloneqq i - j$ for the second equality and omit the terms with zero binomial coefficients for the third equality. We evaluate the norm of the above summation using Lemma 2.1, where k is replaced by k - d, as follows:

$$\left\|\sum_{j=0}^{p} (-1)^{j} {p \choose j} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{(k-d)-j})\right\| \leq \sigma_{p} h^{p}.$$
(3.17)

To apply the lemma, we verify that $\underline{k} + p \leq k - d \leq \overline{k}$. The upper bound follows directly as $k - d \leq k \leq \overline{k}$, and the lower bound is confirmed by

$$k - d \ge (k_1 + P) - (p_k - p) = k_1 + p + (P - p_k) \ge k_1 + p \ge \underline{k} + p.$$

We have thus obtained (3.17), and hence

$$\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{p_k} (-1)^i \binom{p_k}{i} \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_{k-i})\right\| \le \sum_{d=0}^{p_k-p} \binom{p_k-p}{d} \sigma_p h^p = 2^{p_k-p} \sigma_p h^p \le 2^{P-p} \sigma_p h^p,$$

which proves (3.16).

Combining (3.14)–(3.16) completes the proof.

The proof of Lemma 3.5 depends on the inequality $p_k \ge p$, which is guaranteed by Proposition 3.3. Note that $p_k = p$ is not necessary.

By Lemma 3.5, Algorithm 1 guarantees an $O(h^p)$ asymptotic tracking error.

Theorem 3.6 (Tracking Error of SHARP). Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Fix $p \in \{1, \ldots, P\}$ arbitrarily and let k_1 be the smallest $k \ge \underline{k}$ satisfying (3.6). Then, there exists a constant $M \ge 0$ which is independent of \overline{k} such that the following holds for all $k_1 + P \le k \le \overline{k}$:

$$e_k \le \frac{2^{P-p}\sigma_p}{1-(2^P-1)\gamma}h^p + M\left((1+\gamma^{-1})^{1/P}-1\right)^{-k}.$$
(3.18)

Furthermore, if $\overline{k} = \infty$, the following holds:

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} e_k \le \frac{2^{P-p} \sigma_p}{1 - (2^P - 1)\gamma} h^p.$$
(3.19)

Proof. Lemma 3.5 guarantees that the recursion (3.13) holds. Solving the recursion gives the theorem. See Appendix B for the details. \Box

Table 2: Correspondence of constants in Algorithm 1 and Theorem 3.6. Constants θ_1 , θ_2 , and ρ are defined in Theorems 4.2 and 4.6. The column C shows a lower bound when $\alpha = 1/L_{2,0}$, where $\kappa \coloneqq L_{2,0}/\mu$. The column v shows whether we can take $v = \infty$ or not, and v should be set to satisfy (3.12) when $v < \infty$.

Assumption	$\mid \gamma$	C	v
μ -strongly convex (Theorem 4.2)	θ_1^C	$O(\kappa)$	∞
$\mu ext{-PL}$	$\rho \theta_2^{C/2}$	$O(\kappa \log \kappa)$	∞
Locally μ -strongly convex	θ_1^C	$O(\kappa)$	$<\infty$
Locally μ -PL (Theorem 4.6)	$\left \begin{array}{c} ho heta_2^{C/2} \end{array} \right $	$O(\kappa \log \kappa)$	$<\infty$

4 Specific Tracking Error Analysis

This section analyzes the tracking error of the proposed method for strongly convex functions and Polyak–Lojasiewicz (PL) functions using Theorem 3.6. Recall that Theorem 3.6 provides error bounds under Assumption 3.1. Section 4.1 does not assume Assumption 3.1 but instead derives it from strong convexity, and Section 4.2 assume Assumptions 3.1(a)-3.1(c) and derives Assumption 3.1(d) from the PL condition.

Throughout this section, the following conditions are assumed.

Assumption 4.1. Let $L_{2,0} > 0$ be a constant.

- (a) $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{y};t)\| \le L_{2,0} \|\boldsymbol{x} \boldsymbol{y}\|$ for all $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \ge 0$.
- (b) Line 8 of Algorithm 1 computes x_k by C iterations of GD (2.3) with step size $\alpha \in (0, 2/L_{2,0})$.

Assumption 4.1(a) is called $L_{2,0}$ -smoothness, which implies

$$|f(\boldsymbol{y};t) - f(\boldsymbol{x};t) - \langle \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t), \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x} \rangle| \leq \frac{L_{2,0}}{2} \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\|^2$$
(4.1)

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \ge 0$ [Nesterov et al., 2018, Lemma 1.2.3]. By using (2.3) and (4.1), we can see that Assumption 4.1 guarantees

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c+1};t_{k}) \leq f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c};t_{k}) + \left\langle \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c};t_{k}), \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c} \right\rangle + \frac{L_{2,0}}{2} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c}\|^{2}$$
$$= f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c};t_{k}) - \left(\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}\right) \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c};t_{k})\|^{2}$$
(4.2)

for all $0 \le c \le C - 1$.

Although this section only exemplifies two cases, globally strongly convex functions and locally PL functions, we can also apply Theorem 3.6 to other settings (e.g., locally strongly convex functions and globally PL functions). Since the results are similar, we omit the details. The correspondence of constants in Algorithm 1 and Theorem 3.6 is shown in Table 2.

4.1 Case 1: Strongly Convex Functions

Under strong convexity and smoothness, it is known in time-invariant settings that GD converges linearly to the optimum (e.g., [Ryu and Boyd, 2016, p. 15]). Using this fact, we can derive the following tracking error result from Theorem 3.6.

Theorem 4.2 (Tracking Error of SHARP, Strongly Convex). Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds, f is twice continuously differentiable, $f(\cdot;t)$ is μ -strongly convex (i.e., $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{xx}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) \succeq \mu \boldsymbol{I}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$) for all $t \ge 0$, and there exists $L_{1,1} \ge 0$ such that $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}t} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \le L_{1,1}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \ge 0$. Set the parameter v of Algorithm 1 as $v = \infty$ and the iteration number C of GD (2.3) as

$$C > \frac{\log(2^{P} - 1)}{\log(\theta_{1}^{-1})}, \quad where \quad \theta_{1} \coloneqq \max\{|1 - \alpha \mu|, |1 - \alpha L_{2,0}|\} < 1.$$
(4.3)

Then, Assumption 3.1 holds with $(\underline{k}, \overline{k}, r, \gamma) = (0, \infty, \infty, \theta_1^C)$, and therefore the tracking error bound (3.19) holds for all $1 \le p \le P$ satisfying $\sigma_p < \infty$.

Proof. First, we prove that Assumptions 3.1(a)–3.1(c) hold with $(\underline{k}, \overline{k}, r) = (0, \infty, \infty)$. From the strong convexity of $f(\cdot; t)$, there exists a unique optimum: $\{\boldsymbol{x}^*(t)\} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x}; t)$. The first-order optimality condition gives

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t) = \boldsymbol{0} \tag{4.4}$$

for all $t \ge 0$, which implies that Assumption 3.1(a) holds with $(\underline{k}, \overline{k}) = (0, \infty)$. Since $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f$ is continuously differentiable and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t)$ is invertible for all $t \ge 0$, the implicit function theorem guarantees that \boldsymbol{x}^* is differentiable for all $t \ge 0$. Differentiating (4.4) by t yields

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t) \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}t} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t) = \mathbf{0}.$$
(4.5)

From $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) \succeq \mu \boldsymbol{I}$ and $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}t} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \leq L_{1,1}$, we have

$$\sigma_1 = \sup_{t \ge 0} \|\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t)\| = \sup_{t \ge 0} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t)^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}t} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t); t)\| \le \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu} < \infty,$$

which implies that Assumption 3.1(b) holds with $r = \infty$. Since $r = \infty$, Assumption 3.1(c) is satisfied.

Next, we prove that Assumption 3.1(d) holds. The linear convergence of GD in the time-invariant setting [Ryu and Boyd, 2016, p. 15] implies

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \le \theta_1^C e_k$$

for all $k \ge 1$. The assumption (4.3) guarantees that the first inequality in (3.2) is satisfied with $\gamma = \theta_1^C$. The second inequality in (3.2) is trivial since $r = \infty$. Thus, Assumption 3.1(d) is satisfied with $(r, \gamma) = (\infty, \theta_1^C)$.

Since $v = \infty$, the condition (3.6) is satisfied. Applying Theorem 3.6 completes the proof.

When the step size is $\alpha = 1/L_{2,0}$, the condition (4.3) is satisfied if $C \ge \kappa \log(2^P - 1)$ holds, where $\kappa := L_{2,0}/\mu \ge 1$ is the condition number. This lower bound is derived from $\log(\theta_1^{-1}) = -\log \theta_1 \ge 1 - \theta_1 = \kappa^{-1}$. Thus, we can take $C = \lceil \kappa \log(2^P - 1) \rceil$, and the computational cost per iteration becomes $O(\kappa)$, as shown in Table 2.

The inequality (3.19) guarantees an $O(h^p)$ error only when $\sigma_p < \infty$. The following proposition gives a sufficient condition for $\sigma_2 < \infty$. The proof is similar to that of $\sigma_1 < \infty$ in Theorem 4.2. Sufficient conditions for $\sigma_p < \infty$ for p > 2 can be derived in the same way.

Proposition 4.3. Let f be three-times continuously differentiable. Suppose that $f(\cdot;t)$ is μ -strongly convex for all $t \ge 0$ and there exist constants $L_{1,1}, L_{3,0}, L_{2,1}, L_{1,2} \ge 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}t}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| &\leq L_{1,1}, \quad \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \leq L_{3,0}, \\ \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{t}}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| &\leq L_{2,1}, \quad \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{t}\boldsymbol{t}}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \leq L_{1,2} \end{aligned}$$
(4.6)

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \geq 0$. Then, $\sigma_2 < \infty$ holds with $(\underline{k}, \overline{k}) = (0, \infty)$.

Proof. The equation (4.5) holds in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4.2. Since $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f$ is twice continuously differentiable and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{xx}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t);t)$ is invertible for all $t \ge 0$, the implicit function theorem guarantees that \boldsymbol{x}^* is twice differentiable for all $t \ge 0$. Differentiating (4.5) by t again gives

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t);t)[\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*]^2 + 2\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}t} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t);t)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t);t)\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}tt} f(\boldsymbol{x}^*(t);t) = \mathbf{0}.$$

From the assumption (4.6) and $\nabla_{xx} f(x;t) \succeq \mu I$, we have

$$\sigma_2 = \sup_{t \ge 0} \|\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}^*(t)\| \le \frac{L_{3,0}L_{1,1}^2}{\mu^3} + \frac{2L_{2,1}L_{1,1}}{\mu^2} + \frac{L_{1,2}}{\mu} < \infty,$$

which completes the proof.

Proposition 4.3 combined with Theorem 4.2 implies that the tracking error of the proposed method is $O(h^2)$ for strongly convex functions under the assumption (4.6). These assumptions are standard to guarantee an $O(h^2)$ tracking error for strongly convex functions [Lin et al., 2019, Simonetto et al., 2016].

Remark 4.4. The prediction scheme $\hat{x}_k^2 = 2x_{k-1} - x_{k-2}$ has already been proposed by Lin et al. [2019], though a revision to their theoretical analyses might be necessary. We need to add an assumption on the iteration number of the correction step to justify the identification between the computed point x_k and the solution of a dynamical system [Lin et al., 2019, eq. (7)] derived from the continuous-time limit of the update. As a result of this revision, our theorem does not need the assumption $\|\nabla_x f\| \leq L_{1,0}$, which is assumed in the previous work, and we successfully obtained the sufficient condition (4.3) for C.

4.2 Case 2: PŁ Functions

This subsection replaces the strong convexity in Theorem 4.2 with the PL condition around $x^*(t)$. Strongly convex functions satisfy the PL condition (see, e.g., [Karimi et al., 2016, Theorem 2]).

Definition 4.5 (Polyak–Lojasiewicz). Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty set. For $\mu > 0$, a differentiable function $f(\cdot; t) \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a μ -PL function on \mathcal{X} if

$$\frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\|^2 \ge f(\boldsymbol{x};t) - \inf_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\boldsymbol{y};t)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

If the PL condition holds on \mathbb{R}^n , GD converges linearly [Polyak, 1963, Theorem 4]. Under the PL condition, the following tracking error result is derived by using Theorem 3.6.

Theorem 4.6 (Tracking Error of SHARP, Locally PL). Suppose that Assumptions 3.1(a)-3.1(c) hold. Let r be the constant in Assumption 3.1. Assume that there exists $\mu > 0$ such that $f(\cdot;t)$ is a μ -PL function on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid ||x - x^*(t)|| \le (1 + \rho)r\}$ for all $t \ge 0$, where

$$\rho \coloneqq \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{\theta_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha L_{2,0}}{2 - \alpha L_{2,0}}} > 0 \quad and \quad \theta_2 \coloneqq 1 - \alpha \mu (2 - \alpha L_{2,0}) < 1.$$

Set C sufficiently large to satisfy (3.2) with $\gamma \coloneqq \rho \theta_2^{C/2}$. Fix $p \in \{1, \ldots, P\}$ arbitrarily and let k_1 be the smallest $k \geq \underline{k}$ satisfying (3.6). Then, there exists a constant $M \geq 0$ which is independent of \overline{k} such that (3.18) holds with γ defined above for all $k_1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Proof. First, we prove that if $e_k \leq r$, the inequality $\|\boldsymbol{x}_k^c - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \leq (1+\rho)r$ holds for all $0 \leq c \leq C$ by induction. The case c = 0 follows from the assumption $e_k \leq r$. Assume $\|\boldsymbol{x}_k^i - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \leq (1+\rho)r$ for all $i \leq c$. From the standard argument for GD under the PL condition [Polyak, 1963, p. 868], we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i}\|^{2} \leq \frac{2\alpha}{2 - \alpha L_{2,0}} \theta_{2}^{i} \left(f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{0}; t_{k}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{*}; t_{k}) \right) \leq \frac{\alpha L_{2,0}}{2 - \alpha L_{2,0}} \theta_{2}^{i} e_{k}^{2}$$

$$(4.7)$$

for all $i \leq c$, where the second inequality follows from (4.1) with $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, t) = (\boldsymbol{x}_k^*, \boldsymbol{x}_k^0, t_k)$. The triangle inequality gives

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c+1} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})\| \le e_{k} + \sum_{i=0}^{c} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i}\| \le e_{k} + \sum_{i=0}^{c} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha L_{2,0}}{2 - \alpha L_{2,0}}} \theta_{2}^{i} e_{k} \le (1 + \rho)r,$$

where the second inequality follows from (4.7) and the last inequality from $e_k \leq r$. Thus, if $e_k \leq r$, the inequality $\|\boldsymbol{x}_k^c - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\| \leq (1+\rho)r$ holds for all $0 \leq c \leq C$.

The results established above allow us to follow an argument similar to that of [Polyak, 1963, Theorem 4], thereby showing that \boldsymbol{x}_k^C converges to $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)$ as $C \to \infty$. In addition, (4.7) holds for all $0 \leq i \leq C$. Using these facts and the triangle inequality yields

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k})\| = \lim_{C' \to \infty} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{C} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{C'}\| \leq \sum_{i=C}^{\infty} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{i}\|$$
$$\leq \sum_{i=C}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha L_{2,0}}{2 - \alpha L_{2,0}}} \theta_{2}^{i} e_{k} = \rho \theta_{2}^{C/2} e_{k} = \gamma e_{k},$$

which implies that Assumption 3.1(d) holds.

Applying Theorem 3.6 completes the proof.

When the step size is $\alpha = 1/L_{2,0}$ and (3.2) is reduced to $\gamma < (2^P - 1)^{-1}$, the condition for C becomes

$$C > \frac{2\log\frac{2^{P}-1}{1-\sqrt{1-\kappa^{-1}}}}{-\log(1-\kappa^{-1})},$$

where $\kappa \coloneqq L_{2,0}/\mu \ge 1$ is the condition number. Since $-\log(1-\kappa^{-1}) \ge \kappa^{-1}$ and $1-\sqrt{1-\kappa^{-1}} \ge (2\kappa)^{-1}$ hold, we get a sufficient condition: $C \ge 2\kappa \log(2\kappa(2^P-1))$. Thus, we can take $C = \lceil 2\kappa \log(2\kappa(2^P-1)) \rceil$, and the computational cost per iteration becomes $O(\kappa \log \kappa)$, as shown in Table 2.

5 Specific Tracking Error Analysis without Assumption 3.1

This section derives tracking error results for the case where Assumption 4.1 holds but the assumptions in Theorem 3.6 does not necessarily hold. Note that theorems in this section also guarantee the asymptotic tracking error of TVGD because Algorithm 1 with v = 0 or P = 1 corresponds to TVGD under Assumption 4.1.

5.1 Case 3: PL Functions without Assumption 3.1

We consider the case where the PL condition holds on \mathbb{R}^n but Assumption 3.1 does not hold. In this setting, the definition of the tracking error needs to be modified to $\operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k, \mathcal{X}^*(t_k))$, where $\mathcal{X}^*(t) \coloneqq$ argmin $_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)$, and we can no longer obtain an $O(h^p)$ tracking error. We also give an asymptotic error bound on $f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k;t_k) - f^*(t_k)$ as a corollary, where $f^*(t) \coloneqq \min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)$.

Main assumptions in this subsection are summarized as follows:

Assumption 5.1. Let $\mu > 0$ and $L_{1,1} > 0$ be constants.

(a) The function $f(\cdot; t)$ is a μ -PL function on \mathbb{R}^n for all $t \ge 0$.

(b) $\mathcal{X}^*(t) \neq \emptyset$ for all $t \ge 0$.

(c) $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};s) - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \le L_{1,1}|s-t|$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s, t \ge 0$.

This assumption guarantees that the set of optima is Lipschitz continuous in the following sense.

Lemma 5.2. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 5.1 hold. Then the following holds for all $s, t \ge 0$:

$$d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}^{*}(s), \mathcal{X}^{*}(t)) \leq \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu} |s - t|,$$
(5.1)

where $d_{\rm H}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Hausdorff distance, defined by

$$d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \coloneqq \max \left\{ \sup_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{Y}), \sup_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}, \mathcal{X}) \right\}.$$

Proof. Note that μ -PL functions satisfy the error bound condition $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\| \ge \mu \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{X}^*(t))$ [Karimi et al., 2016, Theorem 2]. For any $s, t \ge 0$, we have

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^{*}(s)}\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathcal{X}^{*}(t)) \leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^{*}(s)}\frac{1}{\mu} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\|$$
$$\leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^{*}(s)}\frac{1}{\mu} (\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x};t) - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x};s)\| + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x};s)\|)$$
$$\leq \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}|s-t|,$$

where the first inequality follows from the error bound condition and the last from Assumption 5.1(c) and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x};s) = \boldsymbol{0}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^*(s)$. In the same way, $\sup_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{X}^*(t)} \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}, \mathcal{X}^*(s)) \leq (L_{1,1}/\mu)|s-t|$ follows. Therefore, we obtain (5.1).

Lemma 5.2 yields the following recursive relationship for the tracking error.

Lemma 5.3. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 5.1 hold. Then, the following holds for all $k \ge 2$:

$$\operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k})) \leq \sqrt{\kappa \theta_{2}^{C}} \operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k-1}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1})) + \left(v + \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}\right)h,$$
(5.2)

where $\kappa \coloneqq L_{2,0}/\mu$ and $\theta_2 \coloneqq 1 - \alpha \mu (2 - \alpha L_{2,0}) < 1$.

Proof. The triangle inequality for dist and $d_{\rm H}$ (see Appendix C) gives

$$dist(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k})) \leq dist(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1})) + d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1}), \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k})) \\ \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| + dist(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1})) + d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1}), \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k})).$$
(5.3)

We will bound each term of (5.3) in what follows. The first term can be bounded by vh from the acceptance condition (2.2). The second term can be bounded as follows:

$$dist(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1}))^{2} \leq \frac{2}{\mu} \left(f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}; t_{k-1}) - f^{*}(t_{k-1}) \right)$$
$$\leq \frac{2}{\mu} \theta_{2}^{C} \left(f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k-1}; t_{k-1}) - f^{*}(t_{k-1}) \right)$$
$$\leq \frac{L_{2,0}}{\mu} \theta_{2}^{C} \operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k-1}, \mathcal{X}^{*}(t_{k-1}))^{2}.$$
(5.4)

where the first inequality follows from the quadratic growth property of PL functions, i.e., $f(\boldsymbol{x};t) - f^*(t) \ge (\mu/2) \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{X}^*(t))^2$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \ge 0$ (see, e.g., [Karimi et al., 2016, Theorem 2] for details), the second follows from the linear convergence of GD, and the last follows from the inequality (4.1). Lemma 5.2 yields the following upper bound on the third term of (5.3):

$$d_{\rm H}(\mathcal{X}^*(t_{k-1}), \mathcal{X}^*(t_k)) \le \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}h.$$
 (5.5)

Combining the inequalities (5.3)-(5.5) completes the proof.

By using Lemma 5.3, we get a tracking error bound for general PL functions.

Theorem 5.4 (Tracking Error of SHARP, PL). Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 5.1 hold, and set

$$C > \frac{\log \kappa}{\log(\theta_2^{-1})}, \quad where \quad \kappa \coloneqq \frac{L_{2,0}}{\mu} \quad and \quad \theta_2 \coloneqq 1 - \alpha \mu (2 - \alpha L_{2,0}) < 1.$$

$$(5.6)$$

Then the following holds:

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k, \mathcal{X}^*(t_k)) \le \frac{v + \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C}} h = O(h)$$
(5.7)

and

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k) - f^*(t_k) \right) \le \frac{L_{2,0}}{2} \left(\frac{v + \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C}} \right)^2 h^2 = O(h^2).$$
(5.8)

Proof. Lemma 5.3 guarantees the inequality (5.2) for all $k \ge 2$. Solving (5.2) yields

$$\operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k, \mathcal{X}^*(t_k)) \leq \frac{v + \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C}} h + \left(\operatorname{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_1, \mathcal{X}^*(t_1)) - \frac{v + \frac{L_{1,1}}{\mu}}{1 - \sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C}} h\right) \left(\sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C}\right)^{k-1}$$

for all $k \ge 1$. Since (5.6) implies $\sqrt{\kappa \theta_2^C} < 1$, taking the limit $k \to \infty$ gives (5.7). The inequalities (4.1) and (5.7) yield (5.8).

The derived tracking error bound is $O(h^2)$, which is better than the O(h) bound for TVGD obtained by Iwakiri et al. [2024, Theorem 3.3].

5.2**Case 4: Non-convex Functions**

Finally, we consider general non-convex functions. We give a bound on $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\|$ as a tracking error because it is hopeless to bound dist($\hat{x}_k, \mathcal{X}^*(t_k)$).

The following tracking error bound shows that Algorithm 1 can track stationary points thanks to the acceptance condition, even if the objective function is not strongly convex or PL.

Theorem 5.5 (Tracking Error of SHARP, Non-convex). Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds, $\inf_{(\boldsymbol{x},t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) > -\infty$, and there exist constants $L_{1,0}, L_{0,1} \geq 0$ such that

$$|f(\boldsymbol{x};t) - f(\boldsymbol{y};t)| \le L_{1,0} ||\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}||$$
 and $|f(\boldsymbol{x};s) - f(\boldsymbol{x};t)| \le L_{0,1} |s - t|$ (5.9)

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s, t \ge 0$. Then, the following holds for all $K \ge 1$:

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\| \le \sqrt{\frac{L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1}}{\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^2}h} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\right).$$

and hence

$$\limsup_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\| \le \sqrt{\frac{L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1}}{\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^2}} h = O(\sqrt{h}).$$

Proof. Summing up the inequality (4.2) for $c = 0, \ldots, C - 1$ gives

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k};t_{k}) \leq f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k}) - \left(\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}\right) \sum_{c=0}^{C-1} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}^{c};t_{k})\|^{2} \\ \leq f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k}) - \left(\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}\right) \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k})\|^{2},$$
(5.10)

where we neglected $\sum_{c=1}^{C-1} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}_k^c; t_k)\|^2 \ge 0$ in the last inequality. The assumption (5.9) yields

$$f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1};t_{k-1}) + \left(f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k-1}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1};t_{k-1})\right) + \left(f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k}) - f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k-1})\right)$$

$$\leq f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1};t_{k-1}) + L_{1,0}\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k} - \boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}\| + L_{0,1}h$$

$$\leq f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1};t_{k-1}) + (L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1})h, \qquad (5.11)$$

where the last inequality follows from the acceptance condition (2.2).

By combining (5.10) and (5.11), we get

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_k; t_k) \le f(\boldsymbol{x}_{k-1}; t_{k-1}) + (L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1})h - \left(\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\|^2.$$

Summing up this inequality for k = 1, 2, ..., K gives

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_{K};t_{K}) \leq f(\boldsymbol{x}_{0};t_{0}) + (L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1})Kh - \left(\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k};t_{k})\|^{2}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k}; t_{k})\|^{2} &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}} \left((L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1})h + \frac{f(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}; t_{0}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_{K}; t_{K})}{K} \right) \\ &= \frac{L_{1,0}v + L_{0,1}}{\alpha - \frac{L_{2,0}}{2}\alpha^{2}}h + O\left(\frac{1}{K}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\inf_{(\boldsymbol{x},t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) > -\infty$ in the last equality. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality completes the proof.

6 Numerical Experiments

This section evaluates the numerical performance of the proposed algorithm in three problem settings. We used GD update (2.3) for Line 8 of Algorithm 1. All the experiments were conducted in Python 3.9.2 on a MacBook Air whose processor is 1.8 GHz dual-core Intel Core i5 and memory is 8GB.

6.1 Experiment 1: Toy Problem

To explore the relationship between parameters and accuracy, we consider the following onedimensional toy problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x;t) \coloneqq \sin(x-t) + \frac{1}{10}x^2.$$

This function is non-convex in x and has multiple isolated trajectories of local optima that disappear at some time. We fixed the initial point to $x_0 = 0$. Since $\nabla_{xx} f(x;t) = -\sin(x-t) + 1/5$, the function $f(\cdot;t)$ is 1.2-smooth and $f(\cdot;t)$ is locally 0.2-strongly convex around the local optimum satisfying $-\sin(x-t) \ge 0$. Hence, we set $\alpha = 1/1.2$ to satisfy Assumption 4.1(b). For the constants θ_1 , $L_{1,1}$, and σ_1 in Theorem 4.2, we can derive $\theta_1 = 5/6$, $L_{1,1} = 1$, and $\sigma_1 \le L_{1,1}/\mu = 5$ in this setting.

We investigate the behavior of the tracking error of the proposed algorithm when the four parameters h, P, C, and v are varied. We conducted two types of experiments: (i) fixing (C, v) = (30, 20)while varying $h \in \{1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and $P \in \{1, 2, 4, 7\}$, and (ii) fixing (h, P) = (0.1, 7) while varying $C \in \{1, 5, 30\}$ and $v \in \{0.1, 1, 20\}$. The values of C and v are derived from the following observations. To satisfy the first inequality in (3.2) with $(\gamma, P) = (\theta_1^C, 7)$, it suffices to take $C \ge 27$. The condition (3.12) with $(p, C, \gamma, \sigma_1) = (7, 30, \theta_1^C, 5)$ can roughly be rewritten into $v \ge 16.4$ when we neglect the terms γ^{k-k_0-p+1} and $\sigma_p h^p$ as sufficiently small.

The results of (i) are shown in Figures 3(a)–3(c). We measured the tracking error by $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k; t_k)\|$ instead of $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*(t_k)\|$ because the latter one is difficult to compute. Figure 3(a) (h = 1) shows no significant difference in the tracking error with different P. This is because $\sigma_p h^p$ in (3.19) does not decrease as p increases. Figure 3(b) (h = 0.1) shows that the error decreases as P increases, as presented in (3.19) with p = P. Another noteworthy aspect is the behavior around t = 8. At this time, the target trajectory disappears, and the error increases. Still, the proposed method did not diverge and succeeded in tracking a new target trajectory thanks to the acceptance condition (2.2). Figure 3(c) (h = 0.01) shows that the error gets much smaller than the case h = 0.1.



Figure 3: Results of Experiment 1



Figure 4: Results of Experiment 2

Figure 5: Results of Experiment 3

The results of (ii) are shown in Figures 3(d)-3(f). Figure 3(d) (v = 0.1) shows that the tracking error was not improved by increasing C. This is because the threshold v is too small. Figure 3(e) (v =1) shows that the error was lower for C = 5 and C = 30 than for C = 1. Notably, the observed values in the case of (C, v) = (5, 1) are smaller than the theoretically expected values (C, v) = (27, 16.4). This result suggests that the conditions (3.2) and (3.12) in the theoretical analysis are conservative in this setting. Figure 3(f) (v = 20) shows that the error was similar to the case v = 1 in $t \ge 8$. This result suggests that small C cannot improve the error even when v is large. Another noteworthy observation is that the error in the case (C, v) = (1, 20) is larger than those in the cases (C, v) = (1, 0.1) and (C, v) = (1, 1). This is consistent with the theoretical result in Theorem 5.5 that the upper bound of the error gets worse as v increases when the assumptions for the $O(h^p)$ error are not satisfied.

6.2 Experiment 2: Target Tracking

We consider the following two-dimensional strongly convex problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^2}f(\boldsymbol{x};t)\coloneqq\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}(t)\|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = (10 \sin 0.5t, 23 \cos 0.3t)$ is a target trajectory. This is the same setting as [Lin et al., 2019, Section 5]. We compared the proposed method with Gradient Trajectory Tracking (GTT) [Simonetto et al., 2016], a state-of-the-art algorithm for strongly convex problems. We fixed the sampling period to h = 0.1 and the initial point to $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = (0,0)$. The constants μ , $L_{2,0}$, and $L_{1,1}$ in Theorem 4.2 can be computed as $\mu = 2$, $L_{2,0} = 2$, and $L_{1,1} < 17.04$. We set $\alpha = 1/2$ and we can derive $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\sigma_1 \leq L_{1,1}/\mu = 8.52$, where θ_1 and σ_1 are the constants in Theorem 4.2. To satisfy the first inequality in (3.2) with $(\gamma, P) = (\theta_1^C, 7)$, it suffices to take $C \geq 1$. The condition (3.12) with $(p, C, \gamma) = (7, 1, \theta_1^C)$ is reduced to $v \geq \sigma_1$ when we neglect the terms γ^{k-k_0-p+1} and $\sigma_p h^p$ as sufficiently small. For these reasons, we set (C, v) = (1, 10).

Figure 4 shows the results. The proposed method outperformed GTT in terms of the tracking error. It is also worth noting that our algorithm achieved high accuracy in tracking the target trajectory after a certain number of rounds, as stated in Theorem 3.6.

6.3 Experiment 3: Non-convex Robust Regression

We consider the following non-convex problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x};t) \coloneqq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell\Big(\boldsymbol{a}_i(t)^\top \boldsymbol{x} - b_i(t)\Big),$$

where $\ell(\cdot)$ is the Geman-McClure loss function [Geman and McClure, 1985] defined by $\ell(z) := z^2/(1+z^2)$. For each $t = t_k$ (k = 0, 1, ...), we sampled $a_1(t), \ldots, a_m(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from the uniform

distribution on $[-1, 1]^n$ independently and computed $b_i(t)$ by $b_i(t) = \mathbf{a}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}^*(t)$, where $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = (\cos(t/n), \cos(2t/n), \dots, \cos t)$ is a smoothly changing true trajectory. Since the objective function is non-convex in \mathbf{x} and non-smooth in t, using $(\nabla_{\mathbf{xx}} f(\mathbf{x}; t))^{-1}$ or $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}t} f(\mathbf{x}; t)$ is unstable in this setting. We compare the proposed method with Time-Varying Gradient Descent (TVGD) because TVGD has a theoretical guarantee without the assumption that the initial point is sufficiently close to the initial optimum, even in non-convex optimization problems, as shown in [Iwakiri et al., 2024, Theorem 3.1] and Theorem 5.5 in this paper. We fixed the sampling period to h = 0.1 and the initial point to $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. We set the problem's parameters as (n, m) = (10, 100) and the algorithm's parameters as (P, C, v) = (7, 30, 10). Since $f(\cdot; t)$ is 2-smooth, we set $\alpha = 1/2$.

Figure 5 implies that the proposed method outperformed TVGD in terms of the tracking error. This result also suggests that our algorithm can perform well even when $f(\boldsymbol{x};t)$ is non-convex in \boldsymbol{x} and non-smooth in t as long as the target trajectory is sufficiently smooth. This is consistent with the theoretical result in Theorem 3.6, which only assumes the smoothness of the target trajectory (Assumption 3.1(b)) and local linear convergence of the correction step (Assumption 3.1(d)).

7 Conclusion

We proposed a prediciton-correction algorithm, SHARP, which tracks a target trajectory of timevarying optimization problems. Its prediction scheme is based on the Lagrange interpolation of past solutions and an acceptance condition, which can be computed without Hessian matrices or even gradients. We proved that the proposed method achieves an $O(h^p)$ tracking error, assuming that the target trajectory has a bounded *p*th derivative and the correction step converges locally linearly. We also proved that the proposed method can track a trajectory of stationary points even if the objective function is non-convex. Numerical experiments demonstrated that our algorithm tracks a target trajectory with high accuracy.

In the future, we will investigate how the proposed method can be generalized to more complex problems, such as constrained, non-smooth, or stochastic problems. Another possible direction is to weaken the assumptions of the tracking error analysis.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI (23H03351 and 24K23853) and JST CREST (JPMJCR24Q2).

References

- N. Bastianello, A. Simonetto, and R. Carli. Prediction-correction splittings for nonsmooth timevarying optimization. In 2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC), pages 1963–1968. IEEE, 2019.
- N. Bastianello, R. Carli, and A. Simonetto. Extrapolation-based prediction-correction methods for time-varying convex optimization. *Signal Processing*, 210:109089, 2023.
- E. Dall'Anese and A. Simonetto. Optimal power flow pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 9 (2):942–952, 2016.
- Y. Ding, J. Lavaei, and M. Arcak. Time-variation in online nonconvex optimization enables escaping from spurious local minima. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(1):156–171, 2021.
- R. Dixit, A. S. Bedi, R. Tripathi, and K. Rajawat. Online learning with inexact proximal online gradient descent algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(5):1338–1352, 2019.

- A. L. Dontchev, M. Krastanov, R. T. Rockafellar, and V. M. Veliov. An Euler–Newton continuation method for tracking solution trajectories of parametric variational inequalities. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51(3):1823–1840, 2013.
- S. Geman and D. E. McClure. Bayesian image analysis: An application to single photon emission tomography. *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, pages 12–18, 1985.
- J.-H. Hours and C. N. Jones. A parametric multi-convex splitting technique with application to real-time nmpc. In 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pages 5052–5057. IEEE, 2014.
- H. Iwakiri, T. Kamijima, S. Ito, and A. Takeda. Prediction-correction algorithm for time-varying smooth non-convex optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06181, 2024.
- F. Y. Jakubiec and A. Ribeiro. D-map: Distributed maximum a posteriori probability estimation of dynamic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 61(2):450–466, 2012.
- H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition. In Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2016, Riva del Garda, Italy, September 19-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 16, pages 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- A. Koppel, G. Warnell, E. Stump, and A. Ribeiro. D4l: Decentralized dynamic discriminative dictionary learning. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 3(4): 728–743, 2017.
- Z. Lin, F. Chen, L. Xiang, and G. Guo. A simplified prediction-correction algorithm for time-varying convex optimization. In 2019 Chinese Control Conference (CCC), pages 1989–1994. IEEE, 2019.
- O. Massicot and J. Marecek. On-line non-convex constrained optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07492, 2019.
- Y. Nesterov et al. Lectures on convex optimization, volume 137. Springer, 2018.
- B. Polyak. Gradient methods for the minimisation of functionals. USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 3(4):864–878, 1963. ISSN 0041-5553.
- A. Y. Popkov. Gradient methods for nonstationary unconstrained optimization problems. Automation and Remote Control, 66:883–891, 2005.
- Z. Qi and Y. Zhang. New models for future problems solving by using znd method, correction strategy and extrapolation formulas. *IEEE Access*, 7:84536–84544, 2019.
- E. K. Ryu and S. Boyd. Primer on monotone operator methods. *Appl. comput. math*, 15(1):3–43, 2016.
- A. Simonetto. Dual prediction-correction methods for linearly constrained time-varying convex programs. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 64(8):3355–3361, 2018.
- A. Simonetto and E. Dall'Anese. Prediction-correction algorithms for time-varying constrained optimization. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 65(20):5481–5494, 2017.
- A. Simonetto, A. Mokhtari, A. Koppel, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro. A class of prediction-correction methods for time-varying convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 64(17): 4576–4591, 2016.
- E. Süli and D. F. Mayers. An introduction to numerical analysis. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- Y. Tang, E. Dall'Anese, A. Bernstein, and S. Low. Running primal-dual gradient method for timevarying nonconvex problems. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 60(4):1970–1990, 2022.

- V. M. Zavala and M. Anitescu. Real-time nonlinear optimization as a generalized equation. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 48(8):5444–5467, 2010.
- Y. Zhang, Z. Yang, J. Chen, Z. Qi, and G. Yang. Presentation, derivation and numerical experiments of a group of extrapolation formulas. In 2019 9th International Conference on Information Science and Technology (ICIST), pages 240–246. IEEE, 2019.

A Proof of Lemma 2.1

Proof. First, we prove

$$\int_{[0,1]^p} \varphi^{(p)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p s_i\right) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{s} = \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^{p-i} \binom{p}{i} \varphi^{(i)}$$
(A.1)

for any *p*-times differentiable function $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by induction. For p = 1, the equation (A.1) is equivalent to $\int_0^1 \varphi'(s_1) ds_1 = \varphi(1) - \varphi(0)$, which holds from the fundamental theorem of calculus. Assume (A.1) holds for some *p*. Then, we have

$$\begin{split} \int_{[0,1]^{p+1}} \varphi^{(p+1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} s_i\right) \mathrm{d}s &= \int_{[0,1]^p} \varphi^{(p)} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^p s_i\right) \mathrm{d}s - \int_{[0,1]^p} \varphi^{(p)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p s_i\right) \mathrm{d}s \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^{p-i} \binom{p}{i} \varphi(1+i) - \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^{p-i} \binom{p}{i} \varphi(i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} (-1)^{p-i+1} \binom{p}{i-1} \varphi(i) + \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^{p-i+1} \binom{p}{i} \varphi(i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{p+1} (-1)^{p-i+1} \binom{p+1}{i} \varphi(i), \end{split}$$

where the first equality is the integration by s_{p+1} , and the second equality follows from the induction hypothesis. Thus, (A.1) holds for any $p \ge 1$.

(A.1) with $\varphi(s) = \boldsymbol{x}^*((k-s)h)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k}) - \sum_{i=1}^{p} (-1)^{i-1} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{p} (-1)^{m-i} {p \choose i} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}(t_{k-i}) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_{[0,1]^{p}} (\boldsymbol{x}^{*})^{(p)} \left(\left(k - \sum_{i=1}^{p} s_{i} \right) h \right) h^{p} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{s} \right\| \\ &\leq h^{p} \sup_{t \in [t_{\underline{k}}, t_{\overline{k}}]} \left\| (\boldsymbol{x}^{*})^{(p)}(t) \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

B Proof of Theorem 3.6

Proof. Lemma 3.5 guarantees (3.13) for all $k_1 + P \le k \le \overline{k}$. Let

$$a_{k} \coloneqq \begin{cases} e_{k} - \frac{2^{P-p}\sigma_{p}}{1 - (2^{P} - 1)\gamma}h^{p} & \text{if } k_{1} \leq k \leq k_{1} + P - 1, \\ \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} \binom{P}{i} a_{k-i} & \text{if } k_{1} + P \leq k \leq \overline{k}. \end{cases}$$
(B.1)

We prove

$$e_k \le a_k + \frac{2^{P-p}\sigma_p}{1 - (2^P - 1)\gamma}h^p$$
 (B.2)

for all $k_1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$ by induction. For $k_1 \leq k \leq k_1 + P - 1$, the inequality (B.2) holds with equality from (B.1). Assume that there exists $k_2 \in \{k_1 + P - 1, \dots, \overline{k} - 1\}$ such that (B.2) holds for all $k_1 \leq k \leq k_2$. Then, we have

$$e_{k_{2}+1} \leq \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} {P \choose i} e_{k_{2}+1-i} + 2^{P-p} \sigma_{p} h^{p}$$

$$\leq \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} {P \choose i} \left(a_{k_{2}+1-i} + \frac{2^{P-p} \sigma_{p}}{1 - (2^{P} - 1)\gamma} h^{p} \right) + 2^{P-p} \sigma_{p} h^{p}$$

$$= a_{k_{2}+1} + \frac{2^{P-p} \sigma_{p}}{1 - (2^{P} - 1)\gamma} h^{p},$$

where the first inequality follows from (3.13) and the second inequality from the induction hypothesis. Note that the last equality is obtained from (B.1). This implies that (B.2) holds for $k = k_2 + 1$. Therefore, (B.2) holds for all $k_1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Next, we find an upper bound on a_k . The roots of the polynomial

$$z^{P} - \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{P} {P \choose i} z^{P-i} = (1+\gamma)z^{P} - \gamma(z+1)^{P}$$

are

$$z = \left((1 + \gamma^{-1})^{1/P} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i\sqrt{-1}}{P}\right) - 1 \right)^{-1} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, P,$$

which are distinct from each other. The root with the largest absolute value is $((1 + \gamma^{-1})^{1/P} - 1)^{-1}$. Hence, there exists a constant $M \ge 0$ which is independent of \overline{k} such that the following holds for all $k_1 \le k \le \overline{k}$:

$$a_k \le M \left((1 + \gamma^{-1})^{1/P} - 1 \right)^{-k}$$

By combining with (B.2), we get (3.18) for all $k_1 \leq k \leq \overline{k}$.

Since the first inequality of (3.2) guarantees $((1 + \gamma^{-1})^{1/P} - 1)^{-1} < 1$, the asymptotic tracking error is directly obtained by taking the limit $k \to \infty$.

C Triangle Inequalities between Point and Set

The following triangle inequalities hold for the distance between points and sets, which are used in the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Lemma C.1. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Y}}) \le \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}\| + \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Y}}), \tag{C.1}$$

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Y}}) \leq \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}) + d_{\mathrm{H}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Y}}).$$
(C.2)

Proof. The inequality (C.1) can be proved by the triangle inequality:

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathcal{Y}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{y}'\in\mathcal{Y}} \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}'\| \le \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}\| + \inf_{\boldsymbol{y}'\in\mathcal{Y}} \|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{y}'\| = \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}\| + \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{y},\mathcal{Y}).$$

The inequality (C.1) holds even when restricting \boldsymbol{y} to \mathcal{X} . In this case, the second term on the right-hand side of (C.1) can be upper bounded by $d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ by the definition of the Hausdorff distance. Hence, we have

dist
$$(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{Y}) \leq \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}\| + d_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}),$$

for all $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{X}$. Taking the infimum with regard to $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{X}$ yields (C.2).