

On Smoothing, Regularization and Averaging in Stochastic Approximation Methods for Stochastic Variational Inequalities

Farzad Yousefian*, Angelia Nedić† and Uday V. Shanbhag‡

January 6, 2016

Abstract

Traditionally, stochastic approximation schemes for SVIs have relied on strong monotonicity and Lipschitzian properties of the underlying map. In contrast, we consider monotone stochastic variational inequality (SVI) problems where the strong monotonicity and Lipschitzian assumptions on the mappings are weakened. In the first part of the paper, to address such shortcomings, a regularized smoothed SA (RSSA) scheme is developed wherein the stepsize, smoothing, and regularization parameters are diminishing sequences updated after every iteration. Under suitable assumptions on the sequences, we show that the algorithm generates iterates that converge to a solution in an almost sure sense, extending the results in [16] to the non-Lipschitzian regime. Additionally, we provide rate estimates that relate iterates to their counterparts derived from a smoothed Tikhonov trajectory associated with a deterministic problem. Motivated by the need to develop non-asymptotic rate statements, in the second part of the paper, we develop a variant of the RSSA scheme, denoted by aRSSA_r , in which we employ a weighted iterate-averaging, *parametrized* by a scalar r where $r = 1$ provides us with the standard averaging scheme. We make several contributions in this context: First, we show that the gap function associated with the sequences by the aRSSA_r scheme tends to zero in both an almost sure and an expected-value sense, when the parameter sequences are chosen appropriately. Second, we show that the gap function associated with the averaged sequence diminishes to zero at the optimal rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{K})$ after K steps when smoothing and regularization are suppressed and $r < 1$, thus *improving* the rate statement for the standard averaging which admits a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(K)/\sqrt{K})$. Third, we develop a window-based variant of this scheme that also displays the optimal rate for $r < 1$. Notably, we prove the superiority of the scheme with $r < 1$ with its counterpart with $r = 1$ in terms of the constant factor of the error bound when the size of the averaging window is sufficiently large. Our numerical study on a stochastic Nash-Cournot game provides two empirically driven insights: (i) Iterates generated by the RSSA scheme under almost sure convergence guarantees rather than convergence in the mean display far smaller variances in terms of gap function; and (ii) In the window-based variants of the RSSA scheme, choosing $r < 1$ leads to lower average gap function values compared to $r = 1$, particularly when the window sizes are large.

*Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, State College, PA 16802, USA, szy5@psu.edu

†Industrial & Enterprise Systems Engineering Department, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA, angelia@illinois.edu

‡Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, State College, PA 16802, USA, udaybag@psu.edu; Nedić and Shanbhag gratefully acknowledge the support of the NSF through awards CMMI 0948905 ARRA (Nedić and Shanbhag), CMMI-0742538 (Nedić) and CMMI-1246887 (Shanbhag). A part of this paper has appeared in [40].

1 Introduction

Given a set X and a mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, a variational inequality (VI) problem, denoted by $\text{VI}(X, F)$, requires a vector $x^* \in X$ such that $F(x^*)^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$. Over the last several decades, variational inequality problems have been applied in capturing a wide range of optimization and equilibrium problems in engineering, economics, game theory, and finance (cf. [7, 31]). In this paper, we consider a stochastic generalization of this problem where the components of the mapping F are expectation-valued. More precisely, we are interested in solving $\text{VI}(X, F)$ where mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the expected value of a stochastic mapping $\Phi : X \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., $F(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x, \xi(\omega))]$ where $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d -dimensional random variable and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ represents the probability space. Then $x^* \in X$ solves $\text{VI}(X, F)$ if

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(x^*, \xi(\omega))]^T (x - x^*) \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (1)$$

For brevity, throughout this paper, ξ is used to denote $\xi(\omega)$.

The stochastic variational inequality (SVI) problem (1) assumes relevance in a range of settings. Such models have immediate utility as they represent the (sufficient) optimality conditions of stochastic convex optimization problems [2, 33] as well as the equilibrium conditions of stochastic convex Nash games [29, 11, 14]. These models find further applicability when the evaluation of the map is corrupted by errors. While SVIs represent a natural extension of their deterministic counterparts, generally deterministic schemes cannot be applied directly, particularly when the expectation cannot be evaluated efficiently or the underlying distribution \mathbb{P} is unavailable. Our interest lies in developing schemes that produce asymptotically exact solutions. A popular avenue for solving SVI problems is through Monte-Carlo sampling methods. Of these, sample average approximation methods (SAA) and stochastic approximation methods (SA) are amongst the well-known approaches. In the context of SAA methods for solving stochastic optimization problems, asymptotic convergence of estimators and exponential rate analysis have been studied comprehensively by Shapiro [32]. Extensions to SVI problems have been provided by Xu in [37], where the exponential convergence rate of the estimators was established under more general assumptions on sampling while confidence statements for such problems are examined in [20, 21].

Ref.	Algorithm	Monotonicity	Lipschitz	Metric	Convergence	Rate
[10]	Standard	S	Y	Soln	a.s.	—
[25]	Mirror-descent (averaging, opt. problems)	Y	N	Gap	mean	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$
[12]	Mirror-Prox (averaging)	Y	N	Gap*	mean	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$
[16]	Regularized SA	Y	Y	Soln	a.s.	—
[38]	Self-tuned smoothing SA	S	N	Soln*	a.s.	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$
[35]	Incremental constraint projection	S	Y	Soln	a.s.	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$
this paper	Regularized smoothing SA (RSSA)	Y	N	Soln	a.s.	—
	Averaging (aSA _r)	Y	N	Gap	mean	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$
	Window-based Averaging (aRSSA _{ℓ,r})	Y	N	Gap	mean	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$

Table 1: A comparison of stochastic approximation methods for solving SVIs (S: Strongly Monotone, *: Approximate solution, a.s.: almost sure, Y: Yes, N: No)

A different tack is adopted by stochastic approximation (SA) schemes which were first introduced by Robbins and Monro [30] for stochastic root-finding problems; this class of problems require an $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbb{E}[g(x, \xi)] = 0$, where $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random variable and $g(\cdot, \xi) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous map for any realization of ξ . The standard SA scheme is based on the iteration $x_{k+1} := x_k - \gamma_k g(x_k, \xi_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$, where $\gamma_k > 0$ denotes the stepsize while ξ_k represents a realization of a random variable ξ at the k -th iteration. SA schemes have been applied extensively in solving convex stochastic optimization problems [6, 17, 39, 4, 8]. There has been a surge of

interest in the solution of SVIs via stochastic approximation schemes. Amongst the earliest work was by Jiang and Xu [10], who considered SVIs with strongly monotone and Lipschitz continuous maps over a closed and convex set and proved that the sequence of solution iterates converge to the unique solution in an almost sure sense. In an extension of that work, motivated by Tikhonov regularization scheme, a regularized SA method was developed for solving SVIs with a merely monotone but continuous mapping [16]. A comprehensive summary of the various schemes for solving SVIs via SA schemes is provided in Table 1. We emphasize that our focus is on developing asymptotic and rate statements for stochastic variational inequality problems in which the map is not necessarily Lipschitz continuous, a problem that has been considered only in [12]. Next, we provide a brief summary of the paper.

1.1 Motivation and summary

The first part of this paper is motivated by the need to weaken Lipschitzian and strong monotonicity requirements. Employing a smoothing technique introduced by Steklov [34] and utilized for the solution of stochastic optimization problems [1, 26, 18, 5], our first goal is to weaken the typical conditions for almost sure convergence of SA methods by allowing for a non-Lipschitzian mapping. Recall that given a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a random variable ω with probability distribution $P(\omega)$, the function \hat{f} given by $\hat{f}(x) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x + \omega) P(\omega) d\omega = \mathbf{E}[f(x + \omega)]$ is *differentiable*. Incorporating this technique within SA schemes allows for addressing nonsmoothness in stochastic convex optimization problems [39] and the absence of Lipschitzian properties on the maps in monotone SVIs [38]. The main limitation of the proposed smoothing SA scheme in [39, 38] is that the smoothing parameter is assumed to be fixed through implementing the SA method. As a consequence, the generated sequence by the smoothing SA scheme is shown to converge almost surely to the optimal solution of the approximate problem, i.e., $\min_{x \in X} \hat{f}(x)$, where \hat{f} is the smoothed objective function. A logical extension to achieve convergence to an optimal solution lies in “adaptive smoothing” schemes where the smoothing parameter is reduced adaptively to zero. For instance in [22], a deterministic nondifferentiable function is minimized by solving a sequence of smoothed problems. Unfortunately, such an approach in the current setting requires getting solutions to a sequence of *smoothed* stochastic variational inequality problems, each of which requires resolution via simulation-based schemes. An implementable “single-loop” scheme requires updating the smoothing parameter after every step. In fact, Xu [36] utilizes an analogous approach in the context of Newton schemes for the solution of nonsmooth equations where a smoothing scheme is utilized for computing an element of the Clarke generalized Jacobian and the smoothing parameter is updated after *every* Newton step. Our goal lies in introducing a single-loop SA scheme where the steplength and smoothing parameters are updated at each iteration.

Our second goal lies in weakening the strong monotonicity requirement on the mapping. We achieve this by utilizing a regularization term, inspired by Tikhonov regularization [7] and their iterative counterparts [9, 13, 16]. In the resulting scheme, referred to as a *regularized smoothed stochastic approximation* (RSSA) scheme, *both* the smoothing parameter and the regularization parameter are updated after every iteration and are driven to zero in the limit, in sharp contrast with our prior work [39, 38], where the smoothing parameter is assumed to be fixed. This allows for proving asymptotic convergence to the solution set of the original problem, rather than an approximate problem. Unfortunately, we cannot derive non-asymptotic rate statements without reverting to averaging, which is the focus of the second part of the paper.

In the second part of this paper, motivated by the need to derive rate statements, we consider averaged counterparts of the RSSA scheme. Averaging approaches have proved useful in developing

rate statements (cf. [28, 12]) for an averaged sequence \bar{x}_k defined as $\bar{x}_k = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{\gamma}_t x_t$, where

$$\bar{\gamma}_t \triangleq \frac{\gamma_t}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_i}$$

and x_k is generated via a standard SA scheme. However, when the stepsize parameter γ_k is decreasing, the averaging weights $\bar{\gamma}_k$ are decreasing as well, implying that recent iterates x_k are assigned less weight than the older iterates. This suggests that it may be sensible to consider an increasing set of weights. In fact, Nedić and Lee [24] showed that by using weights of the form

$$\tilde{\gamma}_t \triangleq \frac{\gamma_t^{-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_i^{-1}},$$

the subgradient mirror-descent algorithm attains the optimal rate of convergence *without* requiring window-based averaging. In this paper, we show optimality of the rates for an averaged sequence $\bar{x}_k(r) \triangleq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{\gamma}_{t,r} x_t$ when $r < 1$ and

$$\bar{\gamma}_{t,r} \triangleq \frac{\gamma_t^r}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_i^r}. \quad (2)$$

1.2 Outline of contributions

We now outline our main contributions.

(a) *Almost sure convergence under monotone non-Lipschitzian regimes:* We consider SVIs where the mapping is monotone and not necessarily Lipschitz continuous. A regularized smoothing SA scheme, referred to as the RSSA scheme, is developed wherein the regularization parameter, smoothing parameter, and the steplength are updated after each iteration. Under suitable assumptions on the smoothing, regularization, and steplength sequences, the sequence of iterates is shown to converge to the solution set of the SVI in an almost sure sense, which is in contrast with almost all available almost sure convergence results (that typically require Lipschitz continuity). We also derive a bound on the mean-squared distance of any iterate produced by the RSSA scheme from the regularized smoothed trajectory (which is known to converge to a solution of the original SVI).

(b) *Optimal averaging schemes:* Motivated by the need to develop rate statements, we first consider an averaging-based extension of the RSSA scheme, referred to as aRSSA_r, in which \bar{x}_k is defined as a weighted average: $\bar{x}_k(r) \triangleq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{\gamma}_{t,r} x_t$ where $\bar{\gamma}_{t,r}$ is defined by (2). We derive the underlying conditions under which the mean gap function of the averaged sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$ converges to zero. Additionally, under suitable conditions, we show that the aRSSA_r scheme with $r < 1$ produces a sequence of iterates that converges to the solution set in an almost sure sense and the mean gap function diminishes to zero at a rate given by $\mathcal{O}(1/K^{(1/6)-\delta})$ where $\delta \in (0, 1/6)$. When both regularization and smoothing are suppressed and $\gamma_k = 1/\sqrt{k}$, we further show that the mean gap function diminishes to zero at the optimal rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{K})$ when $r < 1$. This represents an improvement over the rate $\mathcal{O}(\ln(K)/\sqrt{K})$ obtained for standard averaging schemes based on $r = 1$. When a window-based averaging sequence is employed, we show that the scheme recovers the optimal rate and provide some insights on how the constant factor in the error bound is improved when $r < 1$ compared to the setting when $r = 1$, when the window size is large.

(c) *Numerics:* Preliminary numerics on a set of stochastic Nash-Cournot games support the theoretical findings and several observations can be made. First, the performance of the RSSA scheme is relatively robust to choices of the parameter sequences. Second, iterates generated by the RSSA scheme under the almost sure convergence guarantee, rather than convergence in the mean, are shown to have lower variance in the gap function. Third, in the window-based regimes,

choices of $r < 1$ tend to outperform standard averaging schemes with $r = 1$, particularly when the window sizes are large.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the RSSA scheme, its averaged variants, and our main assumptions. In Section 3, we prove the almost sure convergence of the RSSA scheme while in Section 4, we analyze the convergence and derive the rate for the averaged variants of the RSSA scheme. In Section 5, the performance of the proposed methods is tested on a stochastic Nash-Cournot game. The paper ends with some concluding remarks in Section 6.

Notation: A vector x is assumed to be a column vector, x^T denotes the transpose of a vector x , and $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean vector norm, i.e., $\|x\| = \sqrt{x^T x}$. We use $\Pi_X(x)$ to denote the Euclidean projection of a vector x on a set X , i.e., $\|x - \Pi_X(x)\| = \min_{y \in X} \|x - y\|$. We abbreviate “almost surely” as *a.s.*, while $\mathbb{E}[z]$ is used to denote the expectation of a random variable z . We let $\text{dist}(s, S)$ denote the Euclidean distance of a vector $s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We use $B_n(y, \rho)$ to denote the ball centered at a point y with a radius ρ , i.e., $B_n(y, \rho) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x - y\| \leq \rho\}$. We use X^* to denote the solution set of the variational inequality problem in (1).

2 Algorithm and assumptions

We present our schemes of interest and our assumptions in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively.

2.1 Algorithm

In this section, we present the regularized smoothing stochastic approximation (RSSA) scheme for solving (1). We motivate our scheme by first defining the traditional stochastic approximation scheme for SVIs. Given an $x_0 \in X$, the standard SA scheme generates a sequence $\{x_k\}$:

$$x_{k+1} := \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k \Phi(x_k, \xi_k)), \quad k \geq 0, \quad (\text{SA})$$

where $\{\gamma_k\}$ defines a steplength sequence, while $x_0 \in X$ is an initial random vector independent of the random variables ξ_k and such that $\mathbb{E}[\|x_0\|^2] < \infty$. This SA scheme for SVIs appears to have been first studied by Jiang and Xu [10] where a.s. convergence statements were provided under Lipschitz continuity and strong monotonicity of the map. In deterministic variational inequality problems, Tikhonov regularization techniques have proved useful for solving merely monotone problems through the generation of increasingly accurate solutions of a sequence of a *regularized* VIs (cf. [7]). Unfortunately, in stochastic regimes, such an approach is not practical since it requires running a sequence of simulations of increasingly longer lengths. Inspired by prior work in deterministic VIs [9, 13], the stochastic iterative Tikhonov regularization scheme was developed subsequently [16]. The *regularized* stochastic approximation scheme (RSA) is defined as follows:

$$x_{k+1} := \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k(\Phi(x_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k)), \quad k \geq 0, \quad (\text{RSA})$$

where $\{\eta_k\}$ denotes a regularization sequence that is driven to zero at specified rates to ensure a.s. convergence of the sequence of iterates to the least norm solution of the monotone stochastic variational inequality problem. However, the RSA scheme requires Lipschitz continuity of the map. In prior work, in the context of nonsmooth stochastic optimization [39], we have employed *local smoothing* to construct an approximate problem with a prescribed Lipschitz constant. Such a problem can then be solved via standard SA schemes. However, this avenue provides only approximate solutions. In this paper, we resolve this shortcoming by presenting a smoothed variant

of the RSA scheme, referred to as the *regularized smoothed SA* (or RSSA) scheme under which we can recover solutions to the original problem without requiring Lipschitz continuity of the map:

$$x_{k+1} := \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k(\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k)), \quad k \geq 0, \quad (\text{RSSA})$$

where $z_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a uniform random variable over an n -dimensional ball centered at the origin with radius ϵ_k for any $k \geq 0$. To have a well defined Φ in the RSSA scheme, we define X^ϵ as ϵ -enlargement of the set X , i.e.,

$$X^\epsilon \triangleq X + B_n(0, \epsilon), \quad (3)$$

where ϵ is an upper bound of the sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}$ (which will be finite under our assumptions). Note that by introducing stochastic errors w_k , the RSSA scheme is equivalent to the following method:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k)), & k \geq 0, \\ w_k &\triangleq \Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) - F(x_k + z_k), & k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{RSSA}_w)$$

In this representation of the RSSA scheme, w_k is the deviation between the sample $\Phi(x, \xi_k)$ observed at the k -th iteration and the expected-value mapping $F(x)$, at $x = x_k + z_k$. An implicit assumption in our work is that we have access to a stochastic oracle which is able to generate random samples $\Phi(\cdot, \xi_k)$ at a given point. Such an oracle is assumed to be an unbiased estimator, meaning that $F(x) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x, \xi)]$ for any $x \in X^\epsilon$. The results in this paper can be extended to the case where Φ is a biased estimator of the mapping F , i.e., $F(x) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x, \xi)] + b$ for some $b > 0$ and all $x \in X^\epsilon$.

The RSA and RSSA schemes in their presented forms do not easily allow for determination of non-asymptotic rates of convergence. This may be provided by constructing averaging-based counterparts which have been developed both in the context of stochastic optimization problems [28] as well as their variational inequality counterparts [12]. Strictly speaking, averaging schemes are not distinct algorithmically but merely average the generated sequence of iterates. In contrast with the traditional averaging approach, we consider *weighted averaging* akin to recent work in stochastic optimization [24] by defining the sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$ for $k \geq 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. The *averaged* variant of the RSSA scheme using the parameter r (referred to as aRSSA $_r$) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &:= \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k(\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k)), \\ \bar{x}_{k+1}(r) &\triangleq \frac{\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r x_t}{\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{aRSSA}_r)$$

Throughout the paper, when we neither regularize nor smooth, the aRSSA $_r$ algorithm is referred to as aSA $_r$. Finally, variants of aSA $_r$ in which averaging is carried out over a *window* are denoted by aSA $_{\ell, r}$. If $0 < \ell \leq k$ and $k \geq 1$, aSA $_{\ell, r}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &:= \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k \Phi(x_k, \xi_k)), \\ \bar{x}_{k+1}^\ell(r) &\triangleq \frac{\sum_{t=\ell}^k \gamma_t^r x_t}{\sum_{t=\ell}^k \gamma_t^r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{aSA}_{\ell, r})$$

2.2 Assumptions

We now outline the key assumptions employed in the remainder of this paper. Let \mathcal{F}_k denote the history of the method up to time k , i.e., $\mathcal{F}_k = \{x_0, \xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k-1}, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}\}$ for $k \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{x_0\}$. Our first set of assumptions is on the properties of the set X , the mapping F , and the non-emptiness of the solution set X^* for the problem in (1).

Assumption 1 (Problem properties). *Let the following hold:*

- (a) *The set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is closed, bounded, and convex;*
- (b) *The mapping $F(x) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x, \xi)]$ is monotone and continuous over the set X^ϵ given in (3);*
- (c) *There exists a scalar $C > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x, \xi)\|^2] \leq C^2$ for any $x \in X^\epsilon$;*
- (d) *$X^* \neq \emptyset$, i.e., there exists an $x^* \in X$ such that $(x - x^*)^T \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x^*, \xi)] \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$.*

Remark 1. *Note that by using Jensen's inequality and Assumption 1(c) we can write*

$$\|F(x)\| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x, \xi)\|] = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x, \xi)\|^2]} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x, \xi)\|^2]} \leq \sqrt{C^2} = C.$$

In our analysis, we make use of the preceding inequality, i.e.

$$\|F(x)\| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x, \xi)\|] \leq C, \quad \text{for all } x \in X^\epsilon. \quad (4)$$

We also utilize the boundedness of X by which there exists a positive scalar M such that

$$\|x\| \leq M \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

In the implementation of the RSSA scheme, two distinct random variables require discussion. First, the random vector ξ is idiosyncratic to problem (1), while the random vector z is artificially introduced. Next, we provide some assumptions on these two random variables.

Assumption 2 (Random variables ξ and z). *Let the following hold:*

- (a) *The random variables $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are independent and identically distributed for any $j \geq 0$.*
- (b) *The random variables $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are independent and uniformly distributed in an n -dimensional ball with radius ϵ_i centered at the origin for any $i \geq 0$.*
- (c) *The random variables z_i and ξ_j are independent for any $i, j \geq 0$.*

Based on this assumption, we may derive the following regarding the conditional first and second moments of w_k .

Lemma 1 (Conditional first and second moments of w_k). *Consider the (RSSA_w) scheme and suppose Assumptions 1(c) and 2 hold. Then, the stochastic error w_k satisfies the following relations for any $k \geq 0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}[w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] \leq C^2.$$

Furthermore, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq C^2.$$

Proof. Let k be a fixed nonnegative integer. The definition of w_k in (RSSA_w) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] - F(x_k + z_k) = F(x_k + z_k) - F(x_k + z_k) = 0,$$

where we used the independence of z_k and ξ_k . By taking expectations with respect to z_k , we obtain $\mathbb{E}[w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$. For the term $\mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}]$ using Assumption 1(c), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] &= \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) - F(x_k + z_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}]}_{\text{Term 1}} + \|F(x_k + z_k)\|^2 - \underbrace{2\mathbb{E}[\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}]^T F(x_k + z_k)}_{\text{Term 2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Using Assumption 1(c), we observe that Term 1 $\leq C^2$. Furthermore, we have

$$\text{Term 2} = F(x_k + z_k)^T F(x_k + z_k) = \|F(x_k + z_k)\|^2. \quad (6)$$

Therefore, from relations (5) and (6) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] \leq C^2 - \|F(x_k + z_k)\|^2 \leq C^2.$$

Taking expectation with respect to z_k implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq C^2$. \square

3 Convergence analysis of RSSA scheme

In this section, we provide some properties of the smoothed map (Section 3.1). Then, we prove a.s. (Section 3.2) and mean-squared convergence (Section 3.3) of the RSSA scheme.

3.1 Smoothed map and its properties

Our RSSA scheme uses a family of approximate smoothed mappings defined as follows.

Definition 1 (Smoothed mapping). Consider mapping $F : X^\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $z_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a uniform random vector in $B_n(0, \epsilon_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$. The smoothed (approximate) mapping $F_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$F_k(x) = \mathbb{E}[F(x + z_k)], \quad \text{for any } x \in X.$$

Note that F_k is characterized by the random variable z_k which is assumed to be uniformly distributed over the ϵ_k -ball centered at the origin. Thus, when ϵ_k is small, the mapping F_k can be viewed as an approximation of the original mapping F . More precisely, the random variable z_k has the following probability distribution function:

$$p_u(z_k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} & \text{for } z_k \in B_n(0, \epsilon_k), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where c_n is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $c_n = \int_{B_n(0,1)} dy = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + 1)}$, and Γ is the gamma function defined by

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + 1\right) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)!, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \sqrt{\pi} \frac{n!!}{2^{(n+1)/2}}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The advantage of smoothing is that, when the mapping F is bounded over the set X^ϵ , then each approximate mapping F_k is Lipschitz continuous, with Lipschitz constant depending on ϵ_k . When F is not Lipschitz continuous, one may consider approximating F with F_k , and thus take advantage of efficiently solving the variational inequality $\text{VI}(X, F_k)$ in order to find an approximate solution to $\text{VI}(X, F)$, and obtain a solution to $\text{VI}(X, F_k)$ as ϵ_k decreases to 0. This can be done using either *two-loop* or *single-loop* schemes.

A two-loop scheme consists of an outer loop for iteratively changing ϵ_k , and an inner loop for solving $\text{VI}(X, F_k)$ for a fixed value of ϵ_k . In instances where F has a closed-form expression and the evaluation of the integral F_k (possibly multi-dimensional) can be done efficiently, then $\text{VI}(X, F)$

can be solved by employing an adaptive smoothing scheme [22]. In our prior work [39, 38], we have used the adaptive smoothing to address nonsmoothness in stochastic convex optimization problems [39] and the absence of Lipschitzian properties on the maps in monotone SVIs [38]. Specifically, regarding the variational inequality problems, we developed an adaptive smoothing SA scheme for the case where in the inner loop, the problem $\text{VI}(X, F_k)$ is solved using a smoothing variant of SA method and the asymptotic convergence of the scheme is shown in an almost sure sense. A challenge associated with the adaptive smoothing approach is that in many settings, F_k cannot be evaluated efficiently; this could be a consequence of the stochasticity of F_k . As a result, the inner loop of such a scheme requires conducting a simulation. In fact, even if the subproblem was characterized by a tractable F_k , the Lipschitz constant of F_k is proportional to the inverse of ϵ_k , as we will show soon. Therefore, when $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, the Lipschitz constant tends to $+\infty$, thus making the problems $\text{VI}(X, F_k)$ increasingly challenging to solve.

As a possible remedy for this situation, in this paper, we develop a single-loop approach where we change ϵ_k at each iteration, thus changing the smoothed map F_k at each step of the algorithm. Furthermore, we also update the regularization parameter at every step. The parameters are driven to zero at prescribed rates to ensure a.s. convergence of the produced iterate sequence (Theorem 1).

Next, we prove the monotonicity and Lipschitz continuity of the smoothed mapping.

Lemma 2 (Properties of smoothed mapping). *Consider the smoothed mapping F_k as given in Definition 1. Then, the following hold:*

- (a) *Let $\{x_t\} \subset X$ be a convergent sequence in X i.e., such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t = \hat{x}$ with $\hat{x} \in X$. Also, let F be continuous on the set X^ϵ . If Assumption 1(c) holds and $\epsilon_t \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_t(x_t) = F(\hat{x}).$$

- (b) *Let Assumptions 1(a) and 1(c) hold. For any $k \geq 0$, the mapping F_k is Lipschitz continuous over the set X with the parameter $\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}$, where $\kappa = 1$ if n is odd and $\kappa = \frac{2}{\pi}$ otherwise.*

- (c) *If the mapping $F : X^\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is monotone over the set X^ϵ , then the mapping F_k is monotone over the set X .*

Proof. Using the definition of F_t and letting c_n be the volume of the n -dimensional unit ball, i.e., $c_n = \int_{\|y\| \leq 1} dy$, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[F(x_t + z_t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\|z\| \leq \epsilon_t} F(x_t + z) \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_t^n} dz.$$

By change of variables, $y = \frac{z}{\epsilon_t}$, it follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[F(x_t + z_t)] = \frac{1}{c_n} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\|y\| \leq 1} F(x_t + \epsilon_t y) dy.$$

By Assumption 1(c) we have that $\|F(x + z)\| \leq C$ (see Remark 1), implying that $F(x + z)$ is integrably bounded with respect to the distribution defining the random variable z . Thus, by appealing to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we interchange the limit and the integral leading to the following relations:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[F(x_t + z_t)] = \frac{1}{c_n} \int_{\|y\| \leq 1} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(x_t + \epsilon_t y) dy = \frac{1}{c_n} \int_{\|y\| \leq 1} F(\hat{x}) dy,$$

where the last equality follows by the continuity of the mapping F , and $x_t \rightarrow \hat{x}$, $\epsilon_t \rightarrow 0$. Finally, we may conclude that the above integral reduces to $F(\hat{s})$ by invoking the definition of c_n as the volume of $B_n(0, 1)$.

(b) Let p_u denote the probability density function of the random vector z and suppose $k \geq 0$ is fixed. From the definition of F_k , for any $x, y \in X$,

$$\|F_k(x) - F_k(y)\| = \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x + z_k) p_u(z_k) dz_k - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(y + z_k) p_u(z_k) dz_k \right\|.$$

By changing the integral variable in the preceding relation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_k(x) - F_k(y)\| &= \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (p_u(v - x) - p_u(v - y)) F(v) dv \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |p_u(v - x) - p_u(v - y)| \|F(v)\| dv \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |p_u(v - x) - p_u(v - y)| dv, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the first inequality follows from Jensen's inequality and the second inequality is a consequence of boundedness of the mapping F over X^ϵ . The remainder of the proof is similar to that of¹ Lemma 8 of [39].

(c) Since F is monotone over X^ϵ we have that

$$(a - b)^T (F(a) - F(b)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } a, b \in X^\epsilon.$$

Therefore, for choice of $a = x + z_k$ and $b = y + z_k$ in X^ϵ , we have that

$$((x + z_k) - (y + z_k))^T (F(x + z_k) - F(y + z_k)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

It follows that

$$(x - y)^T (F(x + z_k) - F(y + z_k)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

Taking expectations on both sides of the preceding relation, the monotonicity of F_k follows from

$$(x - y)^T (F_k(x) - F_k(y)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

□

Remark 2. Note that $\frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!}$ in Lemma 2(b) is of the order \sqrt{n} . Lemma 2(c) implies that the mapping $F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I}$ is strongly monotone for any $\eta_k > 0$. In view of Lemma 2(c), when X is closed and convex, Theorem 2.3.3(b) of [7], page 156, ensures that $\text{VI}(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$ has a unique solution.

3.2 Almost sure convergence

Our main result in this section shows that the sequence produced by the RSSA scheme converges to X^* in an almost sure sense for suitably chosen stepsize values and other parameters. The proof idea is to consider the (Tikhonov) sequence $\{s_k\}$ where s_k is the solution to the regularized smoothed approximation $\text{VI}(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$ of the original SVI. Then, knowing the behavior of the sequence $\{s_k\}$ and a relation for the consecutive differences $\|s_{k+1} - s_k\|$, we can show that $\|x_{k+1} - s_k\| \rightarrow 0$ under suitable conditions on the stepsizes, the regularization and the smoothening parameters.

¹In [39], we have considered a convex nondifferentiable optimization problem, where the smoothening was effectively applied to the subdifferential set of the objective function. A part of that proof applies here.

Definition 2 (Solution of the smoothed regularized problem). For a given iteration index k , let s_k be the unique solution of $VI(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$, where $F_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by Definition 1 and $\eta_k > 0$ is the regularization parameter.

We now present a bound on $\|s_k - s_{k-1}\|$ and proceed to prove that the sequence $\{s_k\}$ of approximate solutions has accumulation points in the set X^* .

Proposition 1 (Convergence of $\{s_k\}$). Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Consider the sequence $\{s_k\}$ of solutions s_k given in Definition 2. Then,

(a) For any $k \geq 1$,

$$\|s_k - s_{k-1}\| \leq \frac{2nC}{\eta_{k-1}} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right) + M \left| 1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right|,$$

where M and C are the bounds on X and F (see Remark 1 and Assumption 1(c), respectively).

(b) Suppose that the sequences $\{\eta_k\}$ and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ tend to zero, i.e., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_k = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \eta_k = 0$. Then, we have the following:

- (1) $\{s_k\}$ has an accumulation point and every accumulation point of $\{s_k\}$ is a solution to $VI(X, F)$;
- (2) Let t^* be the smallest norm solution to $VI(X, F)$. If $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$ and F is differentiable at t^* with a bounded Jacobian in a neighborhood of t^* , then $\{s_k\}$ converges to t^* .

Proof. (a) Suppose $k \geq 1$ is fixed. Since s_k and s_{k-1} are the solutions to $VI(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$ and $VI(X, F_{k-1} + \eta_{k-1} \mathbf{I})$, respectively, it follows that

$$(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) + \eta_k s_k) \geq 0 \text{ and } (s_k - s_{k-1})^T (F_{k-1}(s_{k-1}) + \eta_{k-1} s_{k-1}) \geq 0.$$

Adding the preceding relations, yields $(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_{k-1}) + \eta_k s_k - \eta_{k-1} s_{k-1}) \geq 0$. By adding and subtracting $(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_{k-1}(s_k) + \eta_{k-1} s_k)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & (s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)) + (s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_{k-1}(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_{k-1})) \\ & + (\eta_k - \eta_{k-1})(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T s_k - \eta_{k-1} \|s_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of F_{k-1} , it follows that $(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_{k-1}(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_{k-1})) \leq 0$, thus implying

$$(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)) + (\eta_k - \eta_{k-1})(s_{k-1} - s_k)^T s_k \geq \eta_{k-1} \|s_k - s_{k-1}\|^2.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and by recalling that $\|s_k\| \leq M$ (see Remark 1), we obtain

$$\eta_{k-1} \|s_k - s_{k-1}\| \leq \|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\| + M |\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k|. \quad (10)$$

Let p_u denote the density function of the random vector z_k uniformly distributed over the ball $B_n(0, \epsilon_k)$ given by equation (7). To estimate the term $\|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\|$, we consider two cases based on whether ϵ_k is less than ϵ_{k-1} or not.

(i) ($\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_{k-1}$): We begin by showing that $\|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\|$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\| &= \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(s_k + z_k) p_u(z_k) dz_k - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(s_k + z_{k-1}) p_u(z_{k-1}) dz_{k-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} dz - \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} dz - \left(\int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz + \int_{\epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz \right) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality, we note that $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}\} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|z\| < \epsilon_k\} \cup \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}\}$ when $\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_{k-1}$. The right hand side may be further bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} dz - \left(\int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz + \int_{\epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz \right) \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} F(s_k + z) \left(\frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} - \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} \right) dz \right\| + \left\| \int_{\epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{F(s_k + z)}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz \right\| \\ & \leq \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \|F(s_k + z)\| \left| \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} - \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} \right| dz + \int_{\epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{\|F(s_k + z)\|}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last two inequalities, we use the triangle inequality and Jensen's inequality respectively. Invoking relation (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\| & \leq C \int_{\|z\| < \epsilon_k} \left| \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} - \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} \right| dz + C \int_{\epsilon_k \leq \|z\| < \epsilon_{k-1}} \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} dz \\ & = C(c_n \epsilon_k^n) \left(\frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_k^n} - \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} \right) + C(c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n - c_n \epsilon_k^n) \frac{1}{c_n \epsilon_{k-1}^n} \\ & = 2C \left(1 - \left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right)^n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using relation (10), we obtain

$$\|s_k - s_{k-1}\| \leq \frac{2C}{\eta_{k-1}} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right)^n \right) + M \left| 1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right|. \quad (11)$$

Since we assumed that $\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_{k-1}$, we may write

$$1 - \left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right)^n = \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right) + \dots + \left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right)^{n-1} \right) \leq n \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} \right). \quad (12)$$

Therefore when $\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_{k-1}$, from (12) and (11), the desired inequality holds for all $k \geq 1$.

(ii) ($\epsilon_k \geq \epsilon_{k-1}$): Now, suppose $\epsilon_k \geq \epsilon_{k-1}$. Following the similar steps above, one may note that that if $\epsilon_k \geq \epsilon_{k-1}$, then $\|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\| \leq 2C(1 - (\epsilon_{k-1}/\epsilon_k)^n)$.

Therefore, the desired equality follows by combining cases (i) and (ii) to obtain the following bound:

$$\|F_k(s_k) - F_{k-1}(s_k)\| \leq 2nC \left(1 - \frac{\min(\epsilon_{k-1}, \epsilon_k)}{\max(\epsilon_{k-1}, \epsilon_k)} \right).$$

(b) We begin by considering part (1). By Definition 2, the vector s_k is the solution of $\text{VI}(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$ indicating that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$(x - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) + \eta_k s_k) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in X, \quad (13)$$

with $s_k \in X$. Furthermore, by Assumption 1(a), the set X is bounded and, therefore, $\{s_k\}$ is bounded and has at least one accumulation point. Let \hat{s} denote an arbitrary accumulation point of the sequence $\{s_k\}$, i.e. $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s_{k_i} = \hat{s}$. Observe that by Lemma 2(a), it follows that the limit $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} F_{k_i}(s_{k_i})$ exists, namely

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} F_{k_i}(s_{k_i}) = F(\hat{s}).$$

Thus, by taking the limit along the subsequence $\{k_i\}$ in relation (13) and using $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, for any $x \in X$ we obtain

$$(x - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s_{k_i})^T \left(\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} F_{k_i}(s_{k_i}) + \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{k_i} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s_{k_i} \right) \geq 0 \quad \implies (x - \hat{s})^T F(\hat{s}) \geq 0,$$

showing that \hat{s} is a solution to VI(X, F). Thus, all accumulation points of $\{s_k\}$ are solutions to VI(X, F), which proves the statement in part (1).

We now consider (2) of (b) where we show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_k = t^*$ where $t^* \in X^*$. Therefore,

$$(x - t^*)^T F(t^*) \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$(x - s_k)^T (F_k(s_k) + \eta_k s_k) \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (15)$$

Replacing x by s_k in (14) and replacing x by t^* in (15) and then summing the resulting inequalities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (s_k - t^*)^T (F(t^*) - F_k(s_k) - \eta_k s_k) \geq 0 \\ \implies & \eta_k \|s_k\|^2 \leq \eta_k s_k^T t^* + (s_k - t^*)^T (F(t^*) - F_k(s_k)) \\ \implies & \eta_k \|s_k\|^2 \leq \eta_k s_k^T t^* + (s_k - t^*)^T (F(t^*) - F_k(t^*)) + (s_k - t^*)^T (F_k(t^*) - F_k(s_k)). \end{aligned}$$

By observing the nonpositivity of the third term on the right from the monotonicity of F_k and by using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_k \|s_k\|^2 \leq \eta_k \|s_k\| \|t^*\| + \|s_k - t^*\| \|F(t^*) - F_k(t^*)\| \\ \implies & \|s_k\| \leq \|t^*\| + \eta_k^{-1} \left(\frac{\|s_k\| + \|t^*\|}{\|s_k\|} \right) \|F(t^*) - F_k(t^*)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \notin X$ (In the case that $0 \in X$, since X is bounded, we can reformulate the problem VI(X, F) by changing the variable x and defining $v = x + 2(\max_{x \in X} \|x\|) \mathbf{1}_n$ where $\mathbf{1}_n$ is the unit vector. Note that $\|v\| \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$). Therefore, since we assume $0 \notin X$, there exists $d > 0$ such that $\|s_k\| \geq d$. Since X is bounded, then $\|t^*\| \leq M$ where M is the bound on set X . This implies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_k\| & \leq \|t^*\| + \eta_k^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{M}{d} \right) \left\| \int (F(t^* + z_k) - F(t^*)) p_u(z_k) dz_k \right\| \\ & \leq \|t^*\| + \eta_k^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{M}{d} \right) \int_{\|z_k\| \leq \epsilon_k} \|F(t^* + z_k) - F(t^*)\| p_u(z_k) dz_k \\ & \leq \|t^*\| + \eta_k^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{M}{d} \right) \sup_{\|z_k\| \leq \epsilon_k} \|F(t^* + z_k) - F(t^*)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Let J_F denote the Jacobian of F . By assumption, there exists a $\rho > 0$ where $\|J_F(x)\| \leq J_{ub}$ for any $x \in B(t^*, \rho)$. Using the mean value theorem,

$$F(x + \delta) - F(x) = \left(\int_0^1 J_F(x + \tau\delta) d\tau \right) \delta, \quad \text{for any } \|\delta\| \leq \rho. \quad (17)$$

Assume that K is a large number such that for any $k > K$, $\epsilon_k < \rho$. Using the boundedness of J_F and the triangle inequality, from (17) we obtain

$$\|F(t^* + z_k) - F(t^*)\| \leq J_{ub}\|z_k\| \leq J_{ub}\epsilon_k.$$

Note that it is assumed that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_k/\eta_k = 0$. By the preceding inequality, relation (16) and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_k/\eta_k = 0$, we conclude that every subsequence of s_k , denoted by $\{s_{k_i}\}$, has a limit point \bar{s} such that $\|\bar{s}\| \leq \|t^*\|$. But from Prop. 1 (b), every accumulation point of $\{s_k\}$ lies in X^* . But, since every limit point is bounded in norm by $\|t^*\|$ and t^* is the least-norm point in X^* , it follows that every limit point of $\{s_k\}$ is t^* , the unique least-norm solution. It follows that $\{s_k\}$ is a convergent sequence that tends to the least-norm solution t^* . \square

Remark 3. We note that part (2) of (b) in the above proposition requires a local differentiability and boundedness property. This can be seen to be weaker than a global Lipschitzian requirement. We also note that without such an assumption, we may still claim that $\{s_k\}$ converges to a point in X^* but cannot provide a characterization of its limit point.

For the convergence of RSSA to X^* in an almost sure sense we have to suitably choose stepsize and the parameters values. Specifically, there are three user-defined sequences in the RSSA scheme: the stepsize sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$, the regularization sequence $\{\eta_k\}$, and the smoothing sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}$. At each iteration, all three parameters are updated. We next present the underlying conditions on these sequences.

Assumption 3. Let the following hold:

- (a) $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are positive sequences for $k \geq 0$ converging to zero;
- (b) There exists $K_1 \geq 0$ such that $\frac{\gamma_k \epsilon_k^2}{\eta_k} \leq 0.5 \left(\frac{(n-1)!!}{n!! \kappa C} \right)^2$ for any $k \geq K_1$, where n is the dimension of the space and $\kappa = 1$ if n is odd and $\kappa = \frac{2}{\pi}$ otherwise;
- (c) For any $k \geq 0$, $\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon$, where ϵ is the parameter of the set X^ϵ ;
- (d) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k \eta_k = \infty$; (e) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k^2 < \infty$; (f) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right)^2 < \infty$;
- (g) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right)^2 < \infty$;
- (h) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k} = 0$; (i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\eta_k^2 \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right) = 0$; (j) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k} \left| 1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right| = 0$.

The notation “!!” in the condition in (b) denotes the double factorial. Later on, in Lemma 5, we provide some choices for the sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ that satisfy Assumption 3.

Remark 4. If we neither regularize nor smooth, then our scheme reduces to the SA scheme and the necessary conditions for the almost-sure convergence would be $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k^2 < \infty$, as well as the Lipschitzian property and the strong monotonicity of the mapping F (cf. [10]).

Next, we establish a recursive relation that relates a bound on the difference between x_{k+1} and s_k with that from the prior step. Such a relation essentially captures the distance of the sequence generated by the RSSA scheme from the regularized smoothed trajectory $\{s_k\}$, which is important in our proof of the a.s. convergence.

Lemma 3 (A recursive relation for $\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|$). Consider the RSSA scheme and let Assumptions 1, 2, 3(b), and 3(c) hold. Also, assume that there exists $K_2 \geq 0$ such that $\eta_k \gamma_k < 1$ for

all $k \geq K_2$. Then, with K_1 given by Assumption 3(b), the following relation holds a.s. for any $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\eta_k\gamma_k\right) \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 + 2C^2\gamma_k^2 + 4M^2\eta_k^2\gamma_k^2 \\ &\quad + 16n^2C^2 \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}^2\eta_k\gamma_k} + 4M^2 \left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\eta_k\gamma_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Proof. Using the fixed point property of the projection operator at the solution s_k of the VI($X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I}$), we may write $s_k = \Pi_X(s_k - \gamma_k(F_k(s_k) + \eta_k s_k))$. Employing the non-expansivity property of the projection operator, the preceding relation, and the RSSA_w algorithm, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 &\leq \|x_k - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k) - s_k + \gamma_k(F_k(s_k) + \eta_k s_k)\|^2 \\ &= \|(1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)(x_k - s_k) - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)) - \gamma_k w_k\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \|w_k\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma_k(1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)(x_k - s_k)^T (F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)) \\ &\quad - 2\gamma_k \left((1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)(x_k - s_k) - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)) \right)^T w_k. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Using the iterated expectation rule and Lemma 1, we find that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left((1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)(x_k - s_k) - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)) \right)^T w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right] = 0.$$

Thus, by taking the conditional expectations conditioned on \mathcal{F}_k in (19) and using $\mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq C^2$ (cf. Lemma 1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq (1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] + \gamma_k^2 C^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma_k(1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)(x_k - s_k)^T (\mathbb{E}[F(x_k + z_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] - F_k(s_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\mathbb{E}[F(x_k + z_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] = F_k(x_k)$ and using the monotonicity of F_k (see Lemma 2(c)), we further obtain $(x_k - s_k)^T (\mathbb{E}[F(x_k + z_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k] - F_k(s_k)) \geq 0$. Since $\eta_k\gamma_k < 1$ for any $k \geq K_2$, the term $(1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)$ is positive implying that, for all $k \geq K_2$ we have almost surely,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq (1 - \eta_k\gamma_k)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] + \gamma_k^2 C^2. \quad (20)$$

To estimate $\mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k]$ we add and subtract $F_k(x_k)$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 &= \|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(x_k)\|^2 + \|F_k(x_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(x_k))^T (F_k(x_k) - F_k(s_k)) \\ &\leq \|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(x_k)\|^2 + \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k} \right)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(x_k))^T (F_k(x_k) - F_k(s_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by the Lipschitz continuity of F_k with constant $\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}$ (see Lemma 2(b)). Taking expectations conditioned on \mathcal{F}_k and using $F_k(x_k) = \mathbb{E}[F(x_k + z_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k]$, we

find that almost surely for all $k \geq K_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(s_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k) - F_k(x_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] + \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|F(x_k + z_k)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] - \|F_k(x_k)\|^2 + \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 \\ &\leq C^2 + \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by using $\|F(x_k + z_k)\| \leq C$ (see Remark 1) and by ignoring the negative term. Substituting the preceding estimate in the relation (20), we obtain a.s. for $k \geq K_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq \left((1 - \eta_k \gamma_k)^2 + \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2\right) \|x_k - s_k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 C^2 \\ &= \left(1 - 2\eta_k \gamma_k + \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 + \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2\right) \|x_k - s_k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 C^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Using the definition of M in Remark 1 and the triangle inequality, we may write $\|x_k - s_k\| \leq \|x_k\| + \|s_k\| \leq 2M$, which leads to the following bound on $\eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2$,

$$\eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 \|x_k - s_k\|^2 \leq 4\eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 M^2.$$

This inequality and relation (21) yield a.s. for all $k \geq K_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq \left(1 - 2\eta_k \gamma_k + \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2\right) \|x_k - s_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma_k^2 C^2 + 4\eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 M^2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

To obtain a recursion, we need to estimate the term $\|x_k - s_k\|$ in terms of $\|x_k - s_{k-1}\|$. Using the triangle inequality, we may write $\|x_k - s_k\| \leq \|x_k - s_{k-1}\| + \|s_k - s_{k-1}\|$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\|x_k - s_k\|^2 \leq \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 + \|s_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\|s_k - s_{k-1}\|\|x_k - s_{k-1}\|. \quad (23)$$

Using the relation $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|s_k - s_{k-1}\|\|x_k - s_{k-1}\| &= 2(\sqrt{\eta_k \gamma_k} \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|) \left(\frac{\|s_k - s_{k-1}\|}{\sqrt{\eta_k \gamma_k}}\right) \\ &\leq \eta_k \gamma_k \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\|s_k - s_{k-1}\|^2}{\eta_k \gamma_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this result, Proposition 1(a), and (23), we obtain for all $k \geq K_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_k - s_k\|^2 &\leq (1 + \eta_k \gamma_k) \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{2nC}{\eta_{k-1}} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}\right) + M \left|1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}}\right| \right)^2 \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where in the last inequality we used $1 + 1/(\eta_k \gamma_k) < 2/\eta_k \gamma_k$ as a consequence of $\gamma_k \eta_k < 1$ for $k \geq K_2$. If q_k is defined as

$$q_k \triangleq 1 - 2\eta_k \gamma_k + \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k}\right)^2,$$

then inequalities (22) and (24) imply that for $k \geq K_2$, the following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq q_k(1 + \eta_k \gamma_k) \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2 + 2C^2 \gamma_k^2 + 4M^2 \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 \\ &\quad + 2q_k \left(\underbrace{\frac{2nC}{\eta_{k-1}} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right)}_a + \underbrace{M \left| 1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right|}_b \right)^2 \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By Assumption 3(b), we can write for $k \geq K_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} \leq 0.5 \left(\frac{(n-1)!!}{n!! \kappa C} \right)^2 &\implies \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k} \right)^2 \leq \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k}{2} \\ &\implies -2\eta_k \gamma_k + \gamma_k^2 \left(\kappa \frac{n!!}{(n-1)!!} \frac{C}{\epsilon_k} \right)^2 \leq -\frac{3}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $q_k \leq 1 - \frac{3}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k$. Consequently, we may provide an upper bound on $q_k(1 + \eta_k \gamma_k)$ using the preceding relation:

$$q_k(1 + \eta_k \gamma_k) \leq (1 - \frac{3}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k)(1 + \eta_k \gamma_k) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k - \frac{3}{2} \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k.$$

Using relation (25) and $q_k \leq 1$ (which follows by $q_k \leq 1 - \frac{3}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k$), and $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, we conclude that the desired relation holds. \square

The following supermartingale convergence theorem is a key in our analysis in establishing the almost sure convergence of the RSSA scheme and may be found in [27] (cf. Lemma 10, page 49).

Lemma 4 (Robbins and Siegmund Lemma). *Let $\{v_k\}$ be a sequence of nonnegative random variables, where $\mathbb{E}[v_0] < \infty$, and let $\{\alpha_k\}$ and $\{\mu_k\}$ be deterministic scalar sequences such that $0 \leq \alpha_k \leq 1$, and $\mu_k \geq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_k < \infty$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_k}{\alpha_k} = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[v_{k+1} | v_0, \dots, v_k] \leq (1 - \alpha_k)v_k + \mu_k$ a.s. for all $k \geq 0$. Then, $v_k \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

We are now ready to present the main convergence result showing that the sequence generated by the RSSA scheme has its accumulation points in the solution set X^* of the original VI(F, X) almost surely. Under the assumption that $\epsilon_k/\eta_k \rightarrow 0$ and suitable local requirements, we may further claim that the sequence converges to the smallest norm solution in X^* almost surely.

Theorem 1 (Almost sure convergence of RSSA scheme). *Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold, and let $\{x_k\}$ be given by the RSSA scheme. Then, the following statements hold almost surely:*

- (a) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{k+1} - s_k\| = 0$ and every accumulation point of $\{x_k\}$ is a solution of VI(X, F).
- (b) Let t^* be the smallest norm solution of VI(X, F). If $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$ and F is differentiable at t^* with a bounded Jacobian in a neighborhood of t^* , then $\{x_k\}$ converges to t^* .

Proof. (a) From Assumption 3(a), γ_k and η_k go to zero. Thus, there exists a constant $K_2 \geq 0$ such that $\gamma_k \eta_k < 1$ for any $k \geq K_2$. Let us define sequences $\{v_k\}$, $\{\alpha_k\}$, and $\{\mu_k\}$ for $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$ given by $v_k \triangleq \|x_k - s_{k-1}\|$, $\alpha_k \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \eta_k$ and

$$\mu_k \triangleq 2C^2 \gamma_k^2 + 4M^2 \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 + 16n^2 C^2 \left(\overbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right)^2}^{\text{Term 1}} \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k} + 4M^2 \left(\overbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right)^2}^{\text{Term 2}} \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k} \right). \right.$$

Therefore, Lemma 3 implies that $\mathbb{E}[v_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \leq (1 - \alpha_k)v_k + \mu_k$, for $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$. To claim convergence of the sequence $\{x_k\}$, we show that conditions of Lemma 4 hold. The nonnegativity of v_k , α_k , and μ_k for $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$ is trivial. Assumption 3(d) indicates that the condition $\sum_k \alpha_k = \infty$ is satisfied. On the other hand, positivity of γ_k and η_k indicates that $\alpha_k \leq 1$ holds for $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$. Since η_k goes to zero, there exists a bound $\bar{\eta}$ such that $\eta_k \leq \bar{\eta}$ for $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$. Therefore, $\mu_k \leq (2C^2 + 4M^2\bar{\eta}^2)\gamma_k^2 + 16n^2C^2(\text{Term 1}) + 4M^2(\text{Term 2})$. Assumptions 3(e), (f), and (g) show that γ_k^2 , Terms 1 and 2 are summable. Therefore, we conclude that μ_k is summable too. It remains to show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_k}{\alpha_k} = 0$. It suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\alpha_k} = 0, \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Term 1}}{\alpha_k} = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Term 2}}{\alpha_k} = 0.$$

These three conditions hold due to Assumption 3 (h), (i), and (j) respectively. In conclusion, all of the conditions of Lemma 4 hold and thus $\|x_k - s_k\|$ goes to zero almost surely.

Since F is continuous and η_k and ϵ_k go to zero, Proposition 1(b1) implies that any limit point of the sequence $\{s_k\}$ converges to a solution of $\text{VI}(X, F)$. Hence, from the result of part (a), we conclude that any accumulation point of the sequence $\{x_k\}$ generated by the RSSA algorithm converges to a solution of $\text{VI}(X, F)$ almost surely.

(b) The statement in part (b) follows by part (a) and Proposition 1(b2). \square

A reader might question whether Assumption 3 is vacuous in that there are no set of sequences satisfying the required assumptions. We show that this is not the case by showing that there is a set of stepsize, regularization, and smoothing sequences that satisfy the given conditions.

Lemma 5. *Suppose sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are given by $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0(k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0(k+1)^{-c}$ where a , b , and c satisfy the following conditions:*

$$a, b, c > 0, \quad a + 3b < 1, \quad a > b + 2c, \quad a > 0.5,$$

and $\gamma_0, \eta_0, \epsilon_0$ are strictly positive scalars and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon$. Then, sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ satisfy Assumption 3.

Proof. We show that each part of Assumption 3 holds as follows:

- (a) Assumption 3(a) holds since $a, b, c, \gamma_0, \eta_0$, and ϵ_0 are strictly positive.
- (b) To show that condition 3(b) holds, we note that

$$\frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} = \frac{\gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}}{\eta_0(k+1)^{-b} \epsilon_0^2(k+1)^{-2c}} = (k+1)^{-(a-b-2c)} \frac{\gamma_0}{\eta_0 \epsilon_0^2}.$$

Since $a > b + 2c$, then $(k+1)^{-(a-b-2c)} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, $\frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} \rightarrow 0$ implying that there exists $K_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$\frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} \leq 0.5 \left(\frac{(n-1)!!}{n!! \kappa C} \right)^2$$

for any $k \geq K_1$. This indicates that Assumption 3(b) holds.

(c) Condition 3(c) is satisfied since $\epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_0$ for any $k \geq 0$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon$.

(d) We have $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta_k \gamma_k = \eta_0 \gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1/(k+1)^{a+b}$. Since $a, b > 0$ and $a + 3b < 1$, then $a + b < 1$. Thus, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1/(k+1)^{a+b} = \infty$. Therefore, Assumption 3(d) is met.

(e) To verify that condition 3(e) holds, it suffices to show that γ_k^2 is summable. We have $\gamma_k^2 =$

$\gamma_0^2(k+1)^{-2a}$ and $2a > 1$ since $a > 0.5$. Therefore, γ_k^2 is summable.

(f) Note that sequences $\{\eta_k\}$ and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are both decreasing. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}}\right)^2 < \frac{1}{\eta_k^3 \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}}\right)^2 \triangleq \text{Term 1}.$$

It suffices to show that Term 1 is summable. First, we estimate $1 - \epsilon_k/\epsilon_{k-1}$. We have

$$1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} = 1 - \frac{\epsilon_0(k+1)^{-c}}{\epsilon_0 k^{-c}} = 1 - \left(\frac{k}{k+1}\right)^c = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k+1}\right)^c.$$

Recall that the Taylor expansion of $(1-x)^p$ for $|x| < 1$ and any scalar p is given by

$$(1-x)^p = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j \binom{p}{j} x^j = 1 - px + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} x^2 - \frac{p(p-1)(p-2)}{6} x^3 + \dots.$$

Using this expansion for $x = \frac{1}{k+1}$ and $p = c$, we have

$$1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{\epsilon_{k-1}} = 1 - \left(1 - c \frac{1}{k+1} + \frac{c(c-1)}{2} \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} - \frac{c(c-1)(c-2)}{6} \frac{1}{(k+1)^3} + \dots\right) = \mathcal{O}(k^{-1}).$$

Therefore, from the preceding relation, we obtain

$$\text{Term 1} = \frac{\mathcal{O}(k^{-2})}{\eta_0^3 \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-3b-a}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(2-a-3b)}).$$

To ensure summability of Term 1, it suffices that $2 - a - 3b > 1$ or equivalently $a + 3b < 1$. This holds by assumption and condition 3(f) is met.

(g) In a similar fashion that we used in part (f), we can show that $1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$. Consider Term 3 defined as follows:

$$\text{Term 3} \triangleq \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}}\right)^2 \frac{\mathcal{O}(k^{-2})}{\eta_0 \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-(a+b)}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(2-a-b)}).$$

To show that condition (g) is satisfied, it suffices to show that Term 3 is summable. From the preceding relation, we need to show that $2 - a - b > 1$ or equivalently $a + b < 1$. We assumed that $a + 3b < 1$ and $b > 0$. Thus, we have $a + b = a + 3b - 2b < 1 - 2b < 1$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}(k^{-(2-a-b)})$ is summable and we conclude that condition 3(g) is satisfied.

(h) We have $\gamma_k/\eta_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}/(\eta_0(k+1)^{-b}) = (\gamma_0/\eta_0)(k+1)^{-(a-b)}$. To show that γ_k/η_k goes to zero when k goes to infinity, we only need to show that $a > b$. We assumed that $a + 3b < 1$. Therefore, $b < (1-a)/3$. Since $a > 0.5$, the preceding relation yields $b < 1/6$. Thus, $b < 0.5 < a$, implying that condition 3(h) holds.

(i) From part (f), we have $1 - \epsilon_k/\epsilon_{k-1} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$. To show the condition 3(i), we write

$$\text{Term 4} \triangleq \frac{1}{\eta_k^2 \gamma_k} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}\right) = \frac{1}{\eta_0^2 \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a-2b}} \mathcal{O}(k^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-a-2b)}).$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $a + 2b < 1$. This is true since $a + 3b < 1$ and $b > 0$. Hence, Term 4 goes to zero implying that the condition 3(i) holds.

(j) Term 5 is defined as

$$\text{Term 5} \triangleq \frac{1}{\eta_k \gamma_k} \left|1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}}\right| = \frac{1}{\eta_0 \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a-b}} \mathcal{O}(k^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-a-b)}).$$

Since $a + 3b < 1$ and $b > 0$, we have $a + b < 1$, showing that Term 5 converges to zero. \square

In order to satisfy the additional condition $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$ used in Proposition 1(b2) and Theorem 1(b), one would need an additional requirement $b - c < 0$ in Lemma 5. As a concrete example satisfying the conditions in Lemma 5, consider the choice $a = \frac{9}{16}$, $b = \frac{2}{16}$, and $c = \frac{3}{16}$. In this case we also have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$ since $b - c < 0$.

3.3 Rate of convergence to regularized smoothed trajectory

Thus far, we have discussed the convergence of the sequence $\{x_k\}$ generated by the RSSA scheme in an almost sure sense. Naturally, one may be curious about the rate at which these iterates converge to the solution set. In the existing literature, the development of non-asymptotic rates of convergence has been provided either in terms of mean-squared error for solution iterates or in terms of the mean gap function (see Table 1). However, we are unaware of any statements provided in non-Lipschitzian and merely monotone regimes in terms of solution iterates. In this subsection, we provide a partial answer to this question.

Our metric of convergence is the distance from the solution set X^* , denoted by $\text{dist}(x_k, X^*)$, and the question is at what rate the error $\text{dist}(x_k, X^*)$ will diminish to zero. We may provide a partial answer by establishing the rate at which the sequence $\{x_k\}$ approaches the regularized smoothed trajectory $\{s_k\}$. The idea is as follows: At step k , instead of comparing the iterate x_k with a true solution x^* , we want to estimate the distance between x_k and the approximate solution s_k . Note that, as the algorithm proceeds, we expect s_k to be approaching the solution set X^* (according to Proposition 1). We begin the discussion by providing an assumption on the sequences.

Assumption 4. *Let the following hold:*

(a) *There exist $\delta \in (0, 0.5)$ and $K_3 \geq 0$ such that for any $k \geq K_3$,*

$$\frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} \leq \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{\eta_{k+1} \epsilon_{k+1}^2} (1 + \delta \eta_{k+1} \gamma_{k+1});$$

(b) *There exists a constant $B_1 > 0$ such that for any $k \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{\epsilon_k^2}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k^3} \left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}} \right)^2 \leq B_1;$$

(c) *There exists a constant $B_2 > 0$ such that for any $k \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{\epsilon_k^2}{\eta_k \gamma_k^3} \left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}} \right)^2 \leq B_2.$$

The following result provides a bound on the error that relates the iterates $\{x_k\}$ and the approximate sequence $\{s_k\}$. This result provides us an estimate of the performance of our algorithm with respect to the iterates of the solutions to the approximated problems $\text{VI}(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$.

Proposition 2 (An upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2]$). *Consider the RSSA scheme where $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are strictly positive sequences. Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3(b), 3(c), and 4 hold. Suppose $\{\eta_k\}$ is bounded by some $\bar{\eta} > 0$ and there exists some scalar $K_2 \geq 0$ such that for any $k \geq K_2$ we have $\eta_k \gamma_k < 1$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2] \leq \theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2}, \quad \text{for any } k \geq \bar{K}, \quad (26)$$

where $\bar{K} \triangleq \max\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$, s_k is the unique solution of $VI(X, F_k + \eta_k \mathbf{I})$, K_1 and K_3 are given by Assumptions 3(b) and 4(a), respectively. The parameter θ in (26) is such that

$$\theta \geq \max \left(4M^2 \frac{\eta_{\bar{K}} \epsilon_{\bar{K}}^2}{\gamma_{\bar{K}}}, \frac{2C^2 \epsilon^2 + 4M^2 \bar{\eta}^2 \epsilon^2 + 16n^2 C^2 B_1 + 4M^2 B_2}{0.5 - \delta} \right). \quad (27)$$

Proof. We begin by employing Lemma 3 and by letting $e_k \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\|x_k - s_{k-1}\|^2]$ for all k . Taking expectations on both sides of (18) in Lemma 3, we obtain a recursion in terms of the mean squared error e_k . For any $k \geq \bar{K} + 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+1} \leq & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k\right) e_k + 2C^2 \gamma_k^2 + 4M^2 \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 \\ & + 16n^2 C^2 \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\min\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}{\max\{\epsilon_k, \epsilon_{k-1}\}}\right)^2}{\eta_{k-1}^2 \eta_k \gamma_k} + 4M^2 \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_{k-1}}\right)^2}{\eta_k \gamma_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

To prove the result, we employ the mathematical induction on k . The first step is to show that the result holds for $k = \bar{K}$. Using the definition of M in Remark 1 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\bar{K}+1} &= \mathbb{E}[\|x_{\bar{K}+1}\|^2 - 2x_{\bar{K}+1}^T s_{\bar{K}} + \|s_{\bar{K}}\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|x_{\bar{K}+1}\|^2 + 2\|x_{\bar{K}+1}\| \|s_{\bar{K}}\| + \|s_{\bar{K}}\|^2] \\ &\leq M^2 + 2M^2 + M^2 = \left(4M^2 \frac{\eta_{\bar{K}} \epsilon_{\bar{K}}^2}{\gamma_{\bar{K}}}\right) \frac{\gamma_{\bar{K}}}{\eta_{\bar{K}} \epsilon_{\bar{K}}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\theta_{\bar{K}} \triangleq 4M^2 \eta_{\bar{K}} \epsilon_{\bar{K}}^2 / \gamma_{\bar{K}}$. Thus, the preceding relation implies that relation (26) holds for $k = \bar{K}$ with $\theta = \theta_{\bar{K}}$. Now, suppose $e_{t+1} \leq \theta \gamma_t / (\eta_t \epsilon_t^2)$ for $\bar{K} < t \leq k-1$ for some finite constant $\theta \geq \theta_{\bar{K}}$. We will proceed to show that $e_{k+1} \leq \theta \gamma_k / (\eta_k \epsilon_k^2)$. Using the induction hypothesis, relation (28), and Assumptions 4(b) and 4(c), we obtain

$$e_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k\right) \theta \frac{\gamma_{k-1}}{\eta_{k-1} \epsilon_{k-1}^2} + 2C^2 \gamma_k^2 + 4M^2 \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 + 16n^2 C^2 \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\epsilon_k^2} B_1 + 4M^2 \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\epsilon_k^2} B_2.$$

Using Assumption 4(a), we obtain

$$e_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k\right) (1 + \delta \eta_k \gamma_k) \theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} + 2C^2 \gamma_k^2 + 4M^2 \eta_k^2 \gamma_k^2 + 16n^2 C^2 \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\epsilon_k^2} B_1 + 4M^2 \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\epsilon_k^2} B_2. \quad (29)$$

Note that, we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \gamma_k\right) (1 + \delta \eta_k \gamma_k) \theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} = \theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} - \theta \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right) \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k^3}{\epsilon_k^2} + \theta \eta_k \gamma_k \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \delta\right) \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2}. \quad (30)$$

Using nonpositivity of $-\theta \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right) \frac{\eta_k \gamma_k^3}{\epsilon_k^2}$ and equation (30), relation (29) can be expressed as follows:

$$e_{k+1} \leq \theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2} + \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\epsilon_k^2} \overbrace{\left[-\theta \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta\right) + 2C^2 \epsilon^2 + 4M^2 \bar{\eta}^2 \epsilon^2 + 16n^2 C^2 B_1 + 4M^2 B_2\right]}^{\text{Term 1}}, \quad (31)$$

where we invoke the boundedness of η_k and ϵ_k from above by $\bar{\eta}$ and ϵ , respectively (the latter follows from Assumption 3(c)). To complete the proof, it suffices to show that Term 1 is nonpositive for some $\theta \geq \theta_{\hat{K}}$. By Assumption 4(a), we have $(\frac{1}{2} - \delta) > 0$. Therefore, if

$$\theta \geq \frac{2C^2\epsilon^2 + 4M^2\bar{\eta}^2\epsilon^2 + 16n^2C^2B_1 + 4M^2B_2}{0.5 - \delta},$$

then Term 1 is nonpositive. Hence, $e_{k+1} \leq \theta\gamma_k/(\eta_k\epsilon_k^2)$ and, thus, the induction argument is complete. In conclusion, when θ satisfies relation (27), relation (26) holds for any $k \geq \bar{K}$. \square

The following proposition states that the RSSA algorithm generates a sequence converging to the solution set of $\text{VI}(X, F)$ in a mean-square sense.

Proposition 3 (Convergence in mean-squared distance from solution set). *Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3(a,b,c), and 4 hold. Also, assume that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k/(\eta_k\epsilon_k^2) = 0$, and let $\{x_k\}$ be generated by the RSSA scheme. Then, we have the following:*

(a) *The sequence $\{x_k\}$ converges to the solution set X^* of $\text{VI}(X, F)$ in mean-squared sense, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}^2(x_k, X^*)] = 0.$$

(b) *If in addition $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$ and F is differentiable at the smallest norm solution $t^* \in X^*$ with a bounded Jacobian in a neighborhood of t^* , then $\{x_k\}$ converges to t^* in mean-squared sense.*

Proof. To show part (a), using the triangle inequality and by recalling that $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we estimate $\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, X^*)$ from above, as follows:

$$\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, X^*) \leq (\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, s_k) + \text{dist}(s_k, X^*))^2 \leq 2\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, s_k) + 2\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*).$$

Taking expectations in the preceding relation, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, X^*)] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2] + 2\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*). \quad (32)$$

Note that in the inequality above, the term $\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*)$ is a deterministic quantity since s_k is a (unique) solution to a deterministic problem. By Proposition 2, there exists a finite constant $\theta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - s_k\|^2] \leq \theta\gamma_k/(\eta_k\epsilon_k^2)$. Therefore, from (32) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, X^*)] \leq 2\theta \frac{\gamma_k}{\eta_k\epsilon_k^2} + 2\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*). \quad (33)$$

Proposition 1(b1) indicates that the term $\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*)$ goes to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k/(\eta_k\epsilon_k^2) = 0$, from relation (33), we conclude that the term $\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}^2(x_{k+1}, X^*)]$ goes to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

The result in part (b) follows similarly to the preceding analysis, wherein we replace $\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, X^*)$ and $\text{dist}^2(s_k, X^*)$, respectively, by $\|x_{k+1} - t^*\|^2$ and $\|s_k - t^*\|^2$ with t^* being the smallest norm solution, and by invoking Proposition 1(b2). \square

As a counterpart of Lemma 5, the following result presents a class of the stepsize, regularization, and smoothing sequences that ensure mean-square convergence.

Lemma 6. *Suppose sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are given by $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0(k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0(k+1)^{-c}$ where a , b , and c satisfy the following conditions:*

$$a, b, c > 0, \quad a + b < 1 \quad a + b \leq \frac{2}{3}(1 + c), \quad a > b + 2c,$$

$\gamma_0, \eta_0, \epsilon_0$ are positive scalars and $\epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon$. Then, sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ satisfy Assumption 4 and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k/(\eta_k\epsilon_k^2) = 0$. If in addition $b < c$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{\eta_k} = 0$.

Proof. The proof of this Lemma can be carried out in a similar vein to Lemma 5. We only show that the condition 4(a) is satisfied. Equivalently, we need to show that there exist $0 < \delta < 0.5$ and $K_3 \geq 0$ such that

$$\text{Term 1} \triangleq \left(\frac{\gamma_{k-1}}{\eta_{k-1} \epsilon_{k-1}^2} \right) \left(\frac{\eta_k \epsilon_k^2}{\gamma_k} \right) - 1 \leq \delta \eta_k \gamma_k, \quad \text{for any } k > K_3. \quad (34)$$

Substituting the sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ by their rules we obtain

$$\text{Term 1} = \left(\frac{\gamma_0 k^{-a}}{\eta_0 k^{-b} \epsilon_0 k^{-2c}} \right) \left(\frac{\eta_0 (k+1)^{-b} \epsilon_0^2 (k+1)^{-2c}}{\gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a}} \right) - 1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right)^{a-b-2c} - 1.$$

Using the Taylor expansion for $(1+x)^p$ where $x = \frac{1}{k}$ and $p = a - b - 2c$, it can be shown that $\text{Term 1} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$. Suppose δ is an arbitrary scalar in $(0, 0.5)$. Multiplying and dividing by $\delta \gamma_k \eta_k$, we obtain

$$\text{Term 1} = \delta \gamma_k \eta_k \frac{\mathcal{O}(k^{-1})}{\delta \gamma_k \eta_k} = \delta \gamma_k \eta_k \frac{\mathcal{O}(k^{-1})}{\delta \eta_0 \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a-b}} = \delta \gamma_k \eta_k \mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-a-b)}). \quad (35)$$

Note that $a + b < 1$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-a-b)}) \rightarrow 0$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that there exists some nonnegative number K_3 such that for any $k > K_3$, $\mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-a-b)}) \leq 1$. From (35) we obtain $\text{Term 1} \leq \delta \gamma_k \eta_k$ for any $k > K_3$. Hence, we conclude that relation (34) holds implying that the condition 4(a) is satisfied. \square

Remark 5. Figure 1 shows the feasible ranges for parameters a, b , and c when $\gamma_k = \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0 (k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0 (k+1)^{-c}$. Figure 1(a) represents the feasible set of these parameters for which the almost sure convergence is guaranteed, and Figure 1(b) shows the set for the mean-square convergence. We observe that each set is relatively large. Note that the two sets are distinct with a nonempty intersection. This corresponds well with theory in that almost-sure convergence and convergence in mean-square are not equivalent.

We conclude this section by noting that our rate statement is not altogether satisfactory in that we do not relate x_k to X^* . To allow for precisely such a statement, we consider an averaging framework in the next section.




Figure 1: Feasible ranges for a, b , and c when $\gamma_k = \gamma_0 (k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0 (k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0 (k+1)^{-c}$.

4 Rate of convergence analysis under weighted averaging

In this part, our interest is in analyzing the convergence and deriving rate statements for the averaged sequences associated with the RSSA scheme. It should be emphasized that while the underlying algorithm does not change in any way, the extracted sequence differs in that it is a weighted average of the sequence generated by the original scheme. The aRSSA_r scheme generalizes the classical stochastic approximation method with averaging in two directions:

Weighted averaging: In the aRSSA_r algorithm, the iterates $\bar{x}_k(r)$ are defined as the weighted average of x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k with the corresponding weights $\gamma_0^r / (\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r), \gamma_1^r / (\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r), \dots, \gamma_k^r / (\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r)$. Note that when the stepsizes are decreasing, for $r > 0$ these weights are also decreasing, while for $r < 0$, the weights are increasing. When $r = 0$, $\bar{x}_k(r)$ represents the average of x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k with equal weights $\frac{1}{k}$. By allowing r to be an arbitrary number, we analyze the convergence rate of a class of averaging schemes. In fact, we will see that the choice of r will affect the rate of convergence of a suitably defined gap function.

Regularization and smoothing: Similar to the first part of the paper, in the aRSSA_r scheme, we employ regularization and randomized smoothing. Using this generalization, we present almost sure convergence results for the aRSSA_r scheme (Proposition 5) for the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ to a solution of problem (1). Moreover, we derive the convergence rate of the method in terms of the gap function values (Proposition 6). Note that, here we allow for the case that $\{\eta_k\}$ and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are zero sequences (referred as aSA_r). In that case, the aSA_r algorithm represents the classic stochastic approximation method utilizing the averaging technique.

In Section 4.1, we provide a brief background to gap functions and derive relevant bounds. We prove the almost sure convergence of the sequence derived from the aRSSA_r scheme in Section 4.2. Finally, in Section 4.3, we show that the expected gap function diminishes to zero at the optimal rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$ and extend the result to window-based averaging.

4.1 An introduction to gap functions

Unlike in optimization settings where the function value provides a natural metric to measure progress of an algorithm, no such object naturally arises in the context of variational inequality problems. Gap functions have emerged as the analog of the objective function for quantifying the sub-optimality of a candidate solution x for the problem $\text{VI}(X, F)$. It may be recalled that a function $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ is a gap function if satisfies two properties: (i) it is restricted in sign over X ; and (ii) $g(x) = 0$ if and only if x solves $\text{VI}(X, F)$. If g is a nonnegative function, then one may obtain a solution to $\text{VI}(X, F)$ by minimizing the gap function over X . A more expansive discussion on gap functions is provided by Larsson and Patriksson [19]. We consider a gap function that has found significant utility in the solution of monotone variational inequality problems.

Definition 3 (G function). Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed set, and let the mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined on the set X . Define the following function $G : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \cup \{+\infty\}$

$$G(x) \triangleq \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (x - y) \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \quad (36)$$

Next, we present some properties of the described function. We make use of these relations in the convergence analysis of the scheme (aRSSA_r).

Definition 4 (Weak solution). Consider $\text{VI}(X, F)$ where the set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is nonempty, closed, and convex, and the mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined on the set X . A vector $x_w^* \in X$ is said to be

a weak solution to $VI(X, F)$ if we have

$$F(y)^T(y - x_w^*) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } y \in X. \quad (37)$$

We let X_w^* denote the set of weak solutions to $VI(X, F)$.

Remark 6. A weak solution is considered to be a counterpart of the standard solution of $VI(X, F)$. A solution of $VI(X, F)$ is also referred to as a strong solution. Note that when the mapping F is monotone, any strong solution of $VI(X, F)$ is also a weak solution, i.e., $X^* \subseteq X_w^*$. Moreover, when F is continuous, it is known that $X_w^* \subseteq X^*$ (cf. [11]).

Throughout the paper, since we assume both monotonicity and continuity of the mapping F , there is no distinction between a weak and a strong solution.

Now, we provide some properties of the function $G(x)$ in the following lemma, the proof of which is in the Appendix.

Lemma 7 (Properties of $G(x)$). For the function $G(x)$ given by Definition 3, we have:

- (a) The function $G(x)$ is a gap function, i.e., it satisfies the following: (i) $G(x)$ is nonnegative for any $x \in X$; and (ii) $x \in X^*$ if and only if $G(x) = 0$.
- (b) Assume that the mapping F is bounded over X , i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|F(x)\| \leq C$ for any $x \in X$. Then, the following hold: (i) $G(x)$ is continuous at any $x \in X$; and (ii) If X is bounded, i.e., there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $\|x\| \leq M$ for any $x \in X$, then $G(x)$ is also bounded over X : $G(x) \leq 2CM$ for all $x \in X$.

4.2 Convergence analysis for the averaging schemes

Next, we derive an upper bound for the expected gap function value for the averaged sequence generated by the aRSSA_r scheme. We begin with a basic relation for the forthcoming development.

Lemma 8. Consider problem (1) and let the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be generated by the aRSSA_r algorithm, where $\gamma_k > 0$, $\epsilon_k \geq 0$ and $\eta_k \geq 0$ for any $k \geq 0$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then, for any $k \geq 0$ and $y \in X$ the following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k^{r-1} (\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k^{r-1} (\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2) \\ &\quad + \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Proof. For any $y \in X$, the non-expansivity property of the projection operator implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 &= \|\Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k)) - \Pi_X(y)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_k - \gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k) - y\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

From the preceding relation, by noting that $F(x_k + z_k) + w_k = \Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 &\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k(F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k)^T(x_k - y) + \gamma_k^2 \|F(x_k + z_k) + \eta_k x_k + w_k\|^2 \\ &= \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(x_k + z_k)^T(x_k - y) - 2\gamma_k \eta_k x_k^T(x_k - y) - 2\gamma_k w_k^T(x_k - y) \\ &\quad + \gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(x_k + z_k)^T((x_k + z_k) - y) + 2\gamma_k F(x_k + z_k)^T z_k + 2\gamma_k \eta_k x_k^T y \\ &\quad - 2\gamma_k w_k^T(x_k - y) + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 \|x_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where in the last inequality, we added and subtracted the term $2\gamma_k F(x_k + z_k)^T z_k$, dropped the term $2\gamma_k \eta_k x_k^T x_k$, and used $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$ to estimate the term $\|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k\|^2$. By using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, invoking Remark 1, and by recalling $\|z_k\| \leq \epsilon_k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 &\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(x_k + z_k)^T ((x_k + z_k) - y) + 2\gamma_k \|F(x_k + z_k)\| \|z_k\| \\
&\quad + 2\gamma_k \eta_k \|x_k\| \|y\| - 2\gamma_k w_k^T (x_k - y) + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 M^2 \\
&\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k (F(x_k + z_k) - F(y))^T ((x_k + z_k) - y) - 2\gamma_k F(y)^T ((x_k + z_k) - y) \\
&\quad + 2\gamma_k \epsilon_k C + 2\gamma_k \eta_k M^2 + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (y - x_k) + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 M^2 \\
&\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(y)^T (x_k - y) + 2\gamma_k \epsilon_k C + 2\gamma_k \epsilon_k C + 2\gamma_k \eta_k M^2 \\
&\quad + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (y - x_k) + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 M^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where in the second inequality, we add and subtract the term $2\gamma_k F(y)^T ((x_k + z_k) - y)$, while in the last inequality we invoke the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to obtain $-2\gamma_k F(y)^T z_k \leq 2\gamma_k \epsilon_k C$. In the last inequality, we also invoke the monotonicity property of mapping F on X^ϵ , which implies that the term $-2\gamma_k (F(x_k + z_k) - F(y))^T ((x_k + z_k) - y)$ in the second inequality is nonpositive.

We next define an auxiliary sequence u_{k+1} as

$$u_{k+1} = \Pi_X[u_k + \gamma_k w_k], \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0, \tag{41}$$

where $u_0 = x_0$. By writing $w_k^T (y - x_k) = w_k^T (u_k - x_k) + w_k^T (y - u_k)$, the inequality (40) yields for all $y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 &\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(y)^T (x_k - y) + 4\gamma_k \epsilon_k C + 2\gamma_k \eta_k M^2 \\
&\quad + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (u_k - x_k) + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (y - u_k) + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 M^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Next, we estimate the term $2\gamma_k w_k^T (y - u_k)$ by using (41) to obtain for all $y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_{k+1} - y\|^2 &= \|\Pi_X[u_k + \gamma_k w_k] - \Pi_X(y)\|^2 \leq \|u_k + \gamma_k w_k - y\|^2 \\
&= \|u_k - y\|^2 + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (u_k - y) + \gamma_k^2 \|w_k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $2\gamma_k w_k^T (y - u_k) \leq \|u_k - y\|^2 - \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \|w_k\|^2$. The preceding relation and (42) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 &\leq \|x_k - y\|^2 - 2\gamma_k F(y)^T (x_k - y) + 4\gamma_k \epsilon_k C + 2\gamma_k \eta_k M^2 + 2\gamma_k w_k^T (u_k - x_k) \\
&\quad + \|u_k - y\|^2 - \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \gamma_k^2 \|w_k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k^2 \eta_k^2 M^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms and multiplying both sides of the preceding inequality by $\gamma_k^{r-1}/2$ for some constant $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the required result follows for any $k \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_k^r F(y)^T (x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k^{r-1} (\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k^{r-1} (\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2) \\
&\quad + \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T (u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Using Lemma 8, we next provide a generic bound for the average sequence with any $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 9 (Error bounds for gap function). *Consider problem (1) and let the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be produced by the aRSSA_r algorithm, where $\gamma_k > 0$, $\epsilon_k \geq 0$ and $\eta_k \geq 0$ for any $k \geq 0$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and assume that the stepsize sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$ is non-increasing. Then, for any $N \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{4M^2(\gamma_0^{r-1} + \mathbb{1}_r \gamma_{N-1}^{r-1})}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} + \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + \frac{3}{2} \gamma_k C^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2) \right), \quad (43)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_r = 0$ when $r \geq 1$ and $\mathbb{1}_r = 1$ when $r < 1$.

Proof. We consider the two cases depending on the value of r , namely, $r \geq 1$ and $r < 1$.

Case of $r \geq 1$: Let us assume that r is an arbitrary fixed number such that $r \geq 1$, implying that $r - 1 \geq 0$. Since $\{\gamma_k\}$ is assumed to be a non-increasing sequence, it follows that $\gamma_{k+1}^{r-1} \leq \gamma_k^{r-1}$. Consequently, by Lemma 8 (cf. relation (38)) we have for all $k \geq 0$ and $y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k^{r-1} (\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{k+1}^{r-1} (\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2) \\ &\quad + \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing the preceding inequality from $k = 0$ to $N - 1$, where $N \geq 1$ is a fixed number, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^{r-1} (\|x_0 - y\|^2 + \|u_0 - y\|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_N^{r-1} (\|x_N - y\|^2 + \|u_N - y\|^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4M^2 \gamma_0^{r-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is a consequence of noting that $\|x_0 - y\|^2 \leq 4M^2$ and $\|u_0 - y\|^2 \leq 4M^2$, and the non-negativity of the sum $\|x_N - y\|^2 + \|u_N - y\|^2$. Since by the definition of $\bar{x}_N(r)$ we have

$$\bar{x}_N(r) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{\gamma_k^r}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} x_k,$$

we obtain for all $y \in X$ and $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \right) F(y)^T(\bar{x}_N(r) - y) &\leq 4M^2 \gamma_0^{r-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over the set X with respect to y and invoking the definition of the gap function (Definition 3), we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \right) G(\bar{x}_N(r)) &\leq 4M^2 \gamma_0^{r-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|w_k\|^2 + \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By taking expectations on both sides of the preceding inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \right) \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] &\leq 4M^2\gamma_0^{r-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2) + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \mathbb{E}[w_k^T(u_k - x_k)]}_{\text{Term 1}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2]}_{\text{Term 2}} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2]. \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate Terms 1 and 2. The aRSSA_r algorithm and the definition of u_k in (41) imply that x_k and u_k are both \mathcal{F}_k -measurable. Thus, the term $u_k - x_k$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable. Moreover, the definition of w_k imply that w_k is \mathcal{F}_{k+1} -measurable. Therefore, for any $k \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[w_k^T(u_k - x_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] = (u_k - x_k)^T \mathbb{E}[w_k \mid \mathcal{F}_k \cup \{z_k\}] = 0,$$

where in the last equality we have used Lemma 1. Taking expectations in the preceding equation, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[w_k^T(u_k - x_k)] = 0, \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0. \tag{45}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 1, we also have $\mathbb{E}[\|w_k\|^2] \leq C^2$ for all $k \geq 0$. By Assumption 1(c) it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2] \leq C^2$. Substituting the preceding two upper estimates and (45) in the inequality (44), we obtain the desired inequality.

Case of $r \leq 1$: Let us assume that r is an arbitrary fixed number such that $r < 1$. Adding and subtracting the term $0.5\gamma_{k-1}^{r-1}(\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2)$ from the right-hand side of relation (38), we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{k-1}^{r-1}(\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_k^{r-1}(\|x_{k+1} - y\|^2 + \|u_{k+1} - y\|^2) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_k^{r-1} - \gamma_{k-1}^{r-1})(\|x_k - y\|^2 + \|u_k - y\|^2)}_{\text{Term 3}} \\
&\quad + \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $1 - r > 0$ and $\{\gamma_k\}$ is non-increasing, the term $\gamma_k^{r-1} - \gamma_{k-1}^{r-1}$ is nonnegative. Recall that we have $\|x_k - y\|^2 \leq 2\|x_k\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2 \leq 4M^2$ and $\|u_k - y\|^2 \leq 4M^2$, allowing us to claim that $\text{Term 3} \leq 4M^2(\gamma_k^{r-1} - \gamma_{k-1}^{r-1})$. By using these estimates and, then, taking the summations over the resulting inequality from $k = 1$ to $N - 1$ for a fixed value $N \geq 1$, and dropping the non-positive terms $-0.5\gamma_{N-1}^{r-1}(\|x_N - y\|^2 + \|u_N - y\|^2)$ and $-4M^2\gamma_0^{r-1}$, we obtain the following relation for all $y \in X$ and $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0^{r-1}(\|x_1 - y\|^2 + \|u_1 - y\|^2) + 4M^2\gamma_{N-1}^{r-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right). \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now inequality (38) when $k = 0$. By adding the resulting inequality to relation (46), we obtain for all $y \in X$ and $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r F(y)^T(x_k - y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^{r-1} (\|x_0 - y\|^2 + \|u_0 - y\|^2) + 4M^2 \gamma_{N-1}^{r-1} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r \left(2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + w_k^T(u_k - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k \|w_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k)\|^2 + \gamma_k \eta_k^2 M^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the proof can be carried out in a similar fashion to that of the preceding case ($r \geq 1$). Combining the results of both cases, we obtain the stated result. \square

We make use of the following inequalities in our analysis, with proofs provided in the Appendix.

Lemma 10. *For any scalar α and integers ℓ and N where $0 \leq \ell \leq N - 1$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad \ln \left(\frac{N+1}{\ell+1} \right) &\leq \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{\ell+1} + \ln \left(\frac{N}{\ell+1} \right). \\ (b) \quad \frac{N^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1} &\leq \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^\alpha \leq (\ell+1)^\alpha + \frac{(N+1)^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1} \text{ for any } \alpha \neq -1. \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed to show that the expected gap function diminishes to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$ under suitable assumptions on the various parameter sequences. We also show that for a specific class of stepsize sequences and in the absence of smoothing and regularization, the expected gap function converges to zero at the optimal rate.

Lemma 11 (Convergence of the expected gap function values). *Consider problem (1) and let sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be generated by the aRSSA_r algorithm. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Also, assume that the sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are given by $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0(k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0(k+1)^{-c}$ with $\gamma_0 > 0$, $\eta_0 \geq 0$, $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$. Then, for any $b, c > 0$ and any a and r such that*

$$(a, r) \in \mathcal{S} \triangleq \{(u, v) \mid 0 < uv \leq 1 \text{ and } v \geq 1\} \cup \{(u, v) \mid 0 < u < 1 \text{ and } v < 1\},$$

the values $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_k(r))]$ converge to zero as k goes to infinity.

Proof. We consider the two cases corresponding to the two sets defining the range of (a, r) .

(1) Assume that $(a, r) \in \{(u, v) \mid 0 < uv \leq 1 \text{ and } v \geq 1\}$. In this case we have $r \geq 1$. Since $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}$ is a non-increasing sequence, the conditions of Lemma 9 hold. We show that when $0 < ar \leq 1$, the values $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_k(r))]$ converge to zero. Note that $\eta_k \leq \eta_0$ implies that $\eta_k^2 \leq \eta_0^2$. Let us define $M^* \triangleq 2 \max\{\eta_0^2 M^2, 1.5C^2\}$. From relation (43) for $r \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(4\gamma_0^{r-1} M^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + M^* \gamma_k) \right). \quad (47)$$

Let us define the following terms:

$$\begin{aligned} h_N &\triangleq \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-ar} \right)^{-1}, & \ell_N &\triangleq \epsilon_0 \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-(ar+c)}}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-ar}}, \\ m_N &\triangleq \eta_0 \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-(ar+b)}}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-ar}}, & p_N &\triangleq \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-(ar+a)}}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-ar}}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Therefore, relation (47) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq 4\gamma_0^{-1}M^2h_N + 2C\ell_N + M^2m_N + \gamma_0M^*p_N. \quad (49)$$

To show that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}(\bar{x}_N(r))]$ goes to zero, it is enough to prove that the terms h_N, ℓ_N, m_N , and p_N approach zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Since we assumed that $0 < ar \leq 1$, h_N goes to zero as N tends to $+\infty$.

In the following, we show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = 0$. If $\epsilon_0 = 0$, then $\ell_N = 0$ for all N . Otherwise, consider the following cases:

(i) *Case $ar \neq 1$ and $ar + c \neq 1$* : From Lemma 10 we obtain the following:

$$0 \leq \ell_N \leq \epsilon_0 \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-(ar+c)} - 1}{1-(ar+c)}}{\frac{N^{1-(ar)} - 1}{1-(ar)}} \triangleq \text{Term 1}.$$

Note that $c > 0$ and also $ar < 1$ since $(a, r) \in \mathcal{S}$ and we assumed $ar \neq 1$. If $ar < ar + c < 1$, then we have $\text{Term 1} = \mathcal{O}(N^{-c})$. If $ar < 1 < ar + c$, then $\text{Term 1} = \mathcal{O}(N^{ar-1})$. In both cases, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = 0$.

(ii) *Case $ar \neq 1$ and $ar + c = 1$* : Since $c > 0$, we have $ar < 1$. Lemma 10 yields the following:

$$0 \leq \ell_N \leq \epsilon_0 \frac{1 + \ln(N)}{\frac{N^{1-(ar)} - 1}{1-(ar)}} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(N)}{N^{1-ar}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(N)}{N^c} = 0.$$

(iii) *Case $ar = 1$ and $ar + c \neq 1$* : Since $c > 0$, we have $ar + c > 1$, and Lemma 10 implies

$$0 \leq \ell_N \leq \epsilon_0 \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-(ar+c)} - 1}{1-(ar+c)}}{\ln(N+1)} = \epsilon_0 \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{-c} - 1}{-c}}{\ln(N+1)} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 + c - (N+1)^{-c}}{\ln(N+1)} = 0.$$

In conclusion, when $r \geq 1$, when $0 < ar \leq 1$, we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = 0$. A similar limit can be derived for m_N and p_N . Therefore, using relation (49) we conclude that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}(\bar{x}_N(r))] = 0$.

(2) Assume now that $(a, r) \in \{(u, v) \mid 0 < u < 1 \text{ and } v < 1\}$. In this case $r < 1$. From relation (43) and the definition of M^* in the first part of this proof, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(\frac{4M^2}{\gamma_0^{1-r}} + \frac{4M^2}{\gamma_{N-1}^{1-r}} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r (2\epsilon_k C + \eta_k M^2 + \gamma_k M^*) \right). \quad (50)$$

Consider the definitions in (48) and the following

$$v_N \triangleq \frac{N^{a(1-r)}}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-ar}}. \quad (51)$$

Relation (50) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{4M^2}{\gamma_0} h_N + 2C\ell_N + M^2m_N + \gamma_0M^*p_N + \frac{4M^2}{\gamma_0} v_N. \quad (52)$$

Since in this case $ar \neq 1$, using Lemma 10 and the definition of v_N and that $a < 1$, we have

$$0 \leq v_N \leq \frac{N^{a(1-r)}}{\frac{N^{1-(ar)} - 1}{1-(ar)}} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} v_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{a-1} = 0. \quad (53)$$

Since $r < 1$ and $a > 0$, we have $1 \leq N^{a(1-r)}$ implying that $h_N \leq v_N$ for all N . Therefore, h_N tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To show that p_N tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we consider the following cases:

(i) *Case $a(1+r) < 1$:* Using Lemma 10, we obtain

$$0 \leq p_N \leq \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-a(1+r)} - 1}{1-a(1+r)}}{\frac{N^{1-(ar)} - 1}{1-ar}} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(N+1)^{1-a(1+r)}}{N^{1-ar}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-a} = 0.$$

(ii) *Case $a(1+r) > 1$:* Since $ar < 1$, by Lemma 10 we have

$$0 \leq p_N \leq \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-a(1+r)} - 1}{1-a(1+r)}}{\frac{N^{1-(ar)} - 1}{1-ar}} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a(1+r) - (N+1)^{1-a(1+r)}}{N^{1-ar} - 1} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{ar-1} = 0.$$

(iii) *Case $a(1+r) = 1$:* Since $ar < 1$, using Lemma 10 we see that

$$0 \leq p_N \leq \frac{1 + \ln(N)}{\frac{N^{1-ar} - 1}{1-(ar)}} \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(N)}{N^{1-ar}} = 0.$$

In a similar fashion to the preceding analysis, one can show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ell_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} m_N = 0$. Therefore, using relation (50) we conclude that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] = 0$. \square

In the following, we analyze the convergence of the averaged sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$ to the solution set of problem (1). First, we present conditions under which a subsequence of the averaged sequence converges to the solution set almost surely.

Proposition 4 (Almost sure convergence of subsequences of $\bar{x}_k(r)$). *Consider problem (1) and suppose the conditions of Lemma 11 are satisfied. Then, we have almost surely*

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(\bar{x}_k(r)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\bar{x}_k(r), X^*) = 0. \quad (54)$$

Proof. Since the conditions of Lemma 11 hold, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_k(r))] = 0$. Invoking Lemma 7(a) yields $G(\bar{x}_k(r)) \geq 0$ for any $k \geq 1$. Using Fatou's lemma, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(\bar{x}_k(r)) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

To prove the relation for $\text{dist}(\bar{x}_k(r), X^*)$, we note that every accumulation point of the sequences produced by this scheme lies in X by the definition of the algorithm and by the closedness of X . It follows that at every accumulation point, the gap function is nonnegative. We now proceed by contradiction and assume the result is false. Consequently, we have that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\bar{x}_k(r), X^*) > 0 \text{ with a positive probability.}$$

Consequently, along any sequence produced by the algorithm, with positive probability, there exists no subsequence that converges to the solution set. In other words, with positive probability, we have that the gap function tends to a positive number (since the limit point lies in X) along every such subsequence associated with this sequence, i.e.,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(\bar{x}_k(r)) > 0 \text{ with a positive probability.}$$

But this contradicts the fact that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(\bar{x}_k(r)) = 0$ a.s. and, hence, the result follows. \square

In Proposition 4, we proved the convergence of the averaged sequence in a subsequential sense. However, in the absence of regularization and smoothing, there is no guarantee that the entire sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$ is convergent. Motivated by this shortcoming, in sequel, we present a class of stepsize, regularization and smoothing sequences such that the entire averaging sequence is convergent in an almost-sure sense to the least norm solution of the problem. Subsequently, we also provide a rate analysis for the expected gap function when almost sure convergence is attained. In our analysis, we make use of the following basic result for averaged sequences.

Lemma 12 (Theorem 6, pg. 75 of [15]). *Let $\{u_t\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convergent sequence of vectors with the limit point $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that $\{\alpha_k\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers where $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty$. Consider the average sequence $\{v_k\}$ given by*

$$v_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \alpha_t u_t}{\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \alpha_t} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

Then, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v_k = \hat{u}$.

Remark 7. *When $\{x_k\}$ is a convergent sequence, by Lemma 12, the condition $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma_t^r = \infty$ needs to be met so that the averaging sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$ converges to the same limit point. When the stepsize γ_k is of the form $\frac{\gamma_0}{(k+1)^a}$, this condition is equivalent to $ar \leq 1$. For example, when $0.5 < a < 1$, the parameter r has to lie in $(-\infty, 2)$.*

Proposition 5 (Almost sure convergence of the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$). *Consider problem (1) and let sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be generated by the aRSSA_r algorithm. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Also, assume that sequences $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\eta_k\}$, and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ are given by $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k+1)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0(k+1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0(k+1)^{-c}$ with positive constants $\gamma_0, \eta_0, \epsilon_0$. Moreover, assume that mapping F is differentiable at t^* and its Jacobian is bounded in a neighborhood of t^* . Suppose that (a, b, c, r) are chosen such that the following hold:*

$$a, b, c > 0, \quad a > 0.5, \quad a + 3b < 1, \quad b + 2c < a, \quad b < c \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq \frac{1}{a}. \quad (55)$$

Then, almost surely, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{\bar{x}_k(r)\} = t^$ where t^* is the least norm solution of $VI(X, F)$.*

Proof. Since the conditions of Lemma 5 are satisfied, we may invoke Theorem 1b. This ensures that $\{x_k\}$ tends to t^* in an a.s. sense. Since we assumed $ar \leq 1$, Lemma 12 (see Remark 7) implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_k(r) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = t^*$ almost surely. \square

4.3 Rate analysis for the gap function

In this subsection, we analyze the convergence rate of the expected gap function.

Proposition 6 (Convergence rate of expected gap function values). *Suppose the conditions of Proposition 5 are satisfied. Then, for any given $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{6}$, there exist some a, b, c , and r satisfying (55) for which the term $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_k(r))]$ converges to zero with the order $\mathcal{O}(k^{-(\frac{1}{6}-\delta)})$. More precisely, let $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{6}$ be a given number and choose δ' such that $0 < \delta' < \delta$. Suppose $a = 0.5 + 3(\delta - \delta')$ and $b = \frac{1}{6} - \delta$, $c = \frac{1}{6}$, and $r < \frac{0.5-3(\delta-\delta')}{0.5+3(\delta-\delta')}$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_k(r))]$ converges to zero with the order $\mathcal{O}(k^{-(\frac{1}{6}-\delta)})$.*

Proof. Note that since $ar < 0.5 - 3(\delta - \delta')$ and $0 < \delta' < \delta < \frac{1}{6}$, we have $0 < ar < 0.5$ and $0 < r < 1$. Therefore, the inequality (43) holds for $r < 1$. Let us define $M^* \triangleq 2 \max\{\eta_0^2 M^2, 1.5C^2\}$ and consider the definitions given by (48) and (51). It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{4M^2}{\gamma_0} h_N + 2C\ell_N + M^2 m_N + \gamma_0 M^* p_N + \frac{4M^2}{\gamma_0} v_N. \quad (56)$$

Note that by choosing $a = 0.5 + 3(\delta - \delta')$ and $b = \frac{1}{6} - \delta$, $c = \frac{1}{6}$, and $r < \frac{0.5 - 3(\delta - \delta')}{0.5 + 3(\delta - \delta')}$, all of the values ar , $ar + c$, and $ar + b$, and $ar + a$ are smaller than one. Thus, from Lemma 10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_N &\leq \frac{1}{\frac{N^{1-ar}-1}{1-ar}} \implies h_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{ar-1}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(0.5+3(\delta-\delta'))}), \\ \ell_N &\leq \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-(ar+c)}-1}{1-(ar+c)}}{\frac{N^{1-ar}-1}{1-ar}} \implies \ell_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{-c}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{6}}), \\ m_N &\leq \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-(ar+b)}-1}{1-(ar+b)}}{\frac{N^{1-ar}-1}{1-ar}} \implies m_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{-b}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(\frac{1}{6}-\delta)}), \\ p_N &\leq \frac{1 + \frac{(N+1)^{1-(ar+a)}-1}{1-(ar+a)}}{\frac{N^{1-ar}-1}{1-ar}} \implies p_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{-a}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(0.5+3(\delta-\delta'))}), \\ v_N &\leq \frac{N^{a(1-r)}}{\frac{N^{1-ar}-1}{1-ar}} \implies v_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(1-a)}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(0.5-3(\delta-\delta'))}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\delta < \frac{1}{6}$ and $\delta' > 0$, it follows that $\frac{1}{6} - \delta < 0.5 - 3(\delta - \delta')$. Therefore, from (56), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] = \mathcal{O}(N^{-(\frac{1}{6}-\delta)})$. \square

In what follows, we set the regularization and smoothing parameters to zero i.e., $\eta_k = \epsilon_k = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. In this case, the aRSSA_r algorithm without regularization and smoothing reduces to the aSA_r algorithm given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= \Pi_X(x_k - \gamma_k \Phi(x_k, \xi_k)), \\ \bar{x}_{k+1}(r) &\triangleq \frac{\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r x_t}{\sum_{t=0}^k \gamma_t^r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{aSA}_r)$$

First, we show that the expected gap function values along the averaged sequence generated by the aSA_r algorithm, converges to zero at the optimal rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$ for $r < 1$.

Proposition 7 (Optimal rate of convergence for aSA_r). *Consider problem (1) and let sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be generated by the aSA_r algorithm and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2(a) and $\gamma_k = \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k+1}}$ with $\gamma_0 > 0$. Then, the following results hold:*

- (a) *If $r = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))]$ converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ at the rate $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln(N)}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.*
- (b) *For any arbitrary $r < 1$, $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))]$ converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ at the rate $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 9 and assuming $\epsilon_0 = \eta_0 = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(4M^2(\gamma_0^{r-1} + \mathbb{1}_r \gamma_{N-1}^{r-1}) + 1.5C^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \right). \quad (57)$$

(a) Replacing $r = 1$ and $\gamma_k = \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k+1}}$ in (57), and recalling Lemma 10, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] \leq \frac{4M^2 + 1.5C^2\gamma_0^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-1}}{\gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-0.5}} \leq \frac{4M^2\gamma_0^{-1} + 1.5C^2\gamma_0(1 + \ln(N))}{2(\sqrt{N} - 1)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln(N)}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

(b) Replacing $\gamma_k = \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k+1}}$ in (57), using $r < 1$, and invoking Lemma 10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N(r))] &\leq \frac{4M^2\gamma_0^{r-1} \left(1 + N^{\frac{1-r}{2}}\right) + 1.5C^2\gamma_0^{r+1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r+1}{2}}}{\gamma_0^r \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{8M^2\gamma_0^{-1} N^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + 1.5C^2\gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r+1}{2}}}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{8M^2\gamma_0^{-1} N^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + 1.5C^2\gamma_0 \left(1 + \frac{(N+1)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} - 1}{\frac{1-r}{2}}\right)}{(N^{1-\frac{r}{2}} - 1)/(1 - \frac{r}{2})} = \mathcal{O}\left(N^{\frac{1-r}{2} - (1-\frac{r}{2})}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Comparing this result with the more standard averaging scheme that uses $r = 1$ (cf. [25]) supports the idea of using $r < 1$ for the averaging sequence $\bar{x}_k(r)$. Specially, when $r < 0$ and the sequence γ_k is decreasing, the weights in the averaging sequence grow implying that more recently generated iterates are attributed more weight. A more general form of the aSA_r algorithm is when the average sequence is calculated using a window-based formula given by Algorithm $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$. The following result is derived using Lemma 9.

Corollary 1. *Consider problem (1) and let the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k(r)\}$ be generated by the $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ algorithm, where $\gamma_k > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and let the stepsize sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$ be non-increasing. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))\right] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(4M^2(\gamma_\ell^{r-1} + \gamma_{N-1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_r) + C^2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \right), \quad (58)$$

where $0 \leq \ell \leq N-1$, $N \geq 1$, $\mathbb{1}_r = 0$ when $r \geq 1$ and $\mathbb{1}_r = 1$ when $r < 1$.

Proof. The proof can be done in a similar fashion to the proofs of Lemmas 8 and 9. More precisely, in the proof of each of these Lemmas, we put $\epsilon_k = \eta_k = 0$ in all the steps. There is one place in the proof of Lemma 8 that we can make a sharper bound, which is in the relation (39). In the second inequality of (39), since $\eta_k = \epsilon_k = 0$, we have

$$\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k + z_k, \xi_k) + \eta_k x_k\|^2 = \gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k, \xi_k)\|^2,$$

implying that we do not have to use the relation $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$. As a consequence, instead of having $2\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k, \xi_k)\|^2$, we will have $\gamma_k^2 \|\Phi(x_k, \xi_k)\|^2$ in the last inequality of (39). As a result, in the final bound, the multiplier of C^2 changes from 1.5 to 1. □

Remark 8. The above result generalizes the bound in [25] in two directions. First, instead of assuming $r = 1$, we allow for r to be a real number, leading to the addition of the term $\gamma_{N-1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_r$. Second, we derive this bound for the gap function of monotone variational inequality problems, while the bound in [25] addresses convex stochastic optimization problems. Our generalization leads to a slightly different bound; specifically, in that C^2 in (58) is replaced by $0.5C^2$ in the optimization setting.

Next, we develop a window-based diminishing stepsize rule and provide an associated rate result.

Proposition 8 (Rate of convergence for window-based averaging schemes). *Consider problem (1) and let the sequence $\{\bar{x}_N^\ell(r)\}$ be generated by the aSA $_{\ell,r}$ algorithm, where $r \leq 1$ and $\ell = \lceil \lambda N \rceil$ for a fixed $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ with $N > \frac{2}{1-\lambda}$. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and the stepsize sequence $\{\gamma_N\}$ is given by*

$$\gamma_N = \frac{2M\sqrt{1+\mathbb{1}_r}}{C\sqrt{N+1}}, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 0. \quad (59)$$

Then, the following statements hold:

- (a) For $r = 1$, the optimal convergence rate is attained, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.
- (b) For any $r < 1$, the optimal convergence rate is attained, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.
- (c) Suppose the theoretical upper bound (TUB) of the expected gap function in (58) is defined as follows:

$$TUB(r, \lambda, N) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \gamma_k^r} \left(4M^2(\gamma_\ell^{r-1} + \gamma_{N-1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_r) + C^2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \gamma_k^{r+1} \right),$$

where γ_k is given by (59). Then, for any arbitrary $r < 1$, there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{N} \geq 1$ such that

$$TUB(r, \lambda, N) \leq TUB(1, \lambda, N), \quad \text{for any } \lambda < \bar{\lambda} \text{ and } N > \bar{N}.$$

Proof. Note that $\gamma_0 = \frac{2M\sqrt{1+\mathbb{1}_r}}{C}$ implying $\gamma_N = \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{N+1}}$.

(a) When $r = 1$, from (58) and Lemma 10 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(1))] &\leq \frac{4M^2 + \gamma_0^2 C^2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1}}{\gamma_0 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k+1}}} = 2MC \frac{1 + \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1}}{\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k+1}}} \\ &\leq 2MC \frac{1 + (\ell+1)^{-1} + \ln\left(\frac{N}{\ell+1}\right)}{2(\sqrt{N} - \sqrt{\ell+1})} \leq MC \frac{1 + 1 + \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)}{\sqrt{N} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\lambda N + 2}{N}}\right)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the relation $\lambda N \leq \ell < \lambda N + 1$ in the last inequality.

(b) When $r < 1$, from (58) and Lemma 10 and invoking $\gamma_0 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}M}{C}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))] &\leq TUB(r, \lambda, N) = \frac{4M^2 \gamma_0^{r-1} \left((\ell+1)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + N^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \right) + C^2 \gamma_0^{r+1} \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r+1}{2}}}{\gamma_0^r \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^{-\frac{r}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}MCN^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + 2\sqrt{2}MC \left((\ell+1)^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} + \frac{(N+1)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} - (\ell+1)^{\frac{1-r}{2}}}{\frac{1-r}{2}} \right)}{\frac{N^{1-\frac{r}{2}} - (\ell+1)^{1-\frac{r}{2}}}{1 - \frac{r}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we replaced γ_0 by its value and used $(\ell + 1)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \leq N^{\frac{1-r}{2}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))] &\leq TUB(r, \lambda, N) \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{2}MC \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right) \frac{N^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + N^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \left((\ell + 1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\ell+1}{N}\right)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} + \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} - \left(\frac{\ell+1}{N}\right)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \right) \frac{2}{1-r} \right)}{N^{1-\frac{r}{2}} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\ell+1}{N}\right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}}\right)} \\
&\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}MC \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1 + \left(1 \times 1 + \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)^{\frac{1-r}{2}} - \lambda^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \right) \frac{2}{1-r} \right)}{1 - \left(\frac{\lambda N + 2}{N}\right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}}} \\
&\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}MC \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1 + \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \frac{2}{1-r}\right)}{1 - \left(\lambda + \frac{2}{N}\right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}}} \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}MC \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1 + \frac{(\sqrt{2})^{1-r}}{1-r}}{1 - \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{2}{N}}}. \tag{60}
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mathbb{E}[G(\bar{x}_N^\ell(r))] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$ for any arbitrary $r < 1$.

(c) To prove this part, we derive a lower bound for $TUB(1, \lambda, N)$ and compare it with the upper bound we obtained for the case $r < 1$ given by (60). From (58) and Lemma 10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
TUB(1, \lambda, N) &= \frac{4M^2 + \gamma_0^2 C^2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1}}{\gamma_0 \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k+1}}} = 2MC \frac{1 + \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1}}{\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k+1}}} \\
&\geq 2MC \frac{\ln\left(\frac{N+1}{\ell+1}\right)}{(\ell + 1)^{-0.5} + 2(\sqrt{N+1} - \sqrt{\ell+1})} \\
&\geq 2MC \frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)}{1 + 2\sqrt{N+1}} \geq \frac{2MC \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)}{3\sqrt{2N}}. \tag{61}
\end{aligned}$$

From (60) and (61), for any $r < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{TUB(r, \lambda, N)}{TUB(1, \lambda, N)} &\leq \left(\frac{4\sqrt{2}MC \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1 + \frac{(\sqrt{2})^{1-r}}{1-r}}{1 - \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{2}{N}}} \right) / \left(\frac{2MC \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)}{3\sqrt{2N}} \right) \\
&= \frac{12 \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{(\sqrt{2})^{1-r}}{1-r}\right)}{\left(1 - \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{2}{N}}\right) \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)} \triangleq \frac{h(r)}{\left(1 - \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{2}{N}}\right) \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit from the preceding relation when λ goes to zero, it yields that the term $\frac{TUB(r, \lambda, N)}{TUB(1, \lambda, N)}$ converges to zero. This implies that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$, we have $TUB(r, \lambda, N) < TUB(1, \lambda, N)$. Note that to have $1 - \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{2}{N}} > 0$ for any $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$, it suffices to assume $N > \bar{N} \triangleq \frac{2}{1-\bar{\lambda}}$. Hence, the desired result holds. \square

Remark 9 (Comparison of the classic window-based averaging with the proposed averaging scheme). *The contribution of Proposition 8 is three-fold:*

- (i) *First, it addresses stochastic variational inequalities, a generalization of stochastic convex optimization problems addressed in [25, 24].*

- (ii) Second, it extends the theory of classical averaging SA schemes (cf. [25]) to the weighted averaging regime, and considers more general weighted averaging scheme than that of [24] for convex optimization (corresponding to $r = -1$). In particular, it shows that the optimal rate of convergence is attained not only for $r = 1$, but also for an arbitrary parameter $r < 1$.
- (iii) Third, in terms of the finite-time behavior of the algorithm, for any $r < 1$, we may always choose the window parameter λ such that the constant factor of the error bound is smaller than that of the classical window-based averaging scheme. This implies that we should expect a smaller gap value for $r < 1$, when the value of λ is selected small enough. In fact, this will be tested in our numerical experiments in the next section where we present our simulation results for a stochastic Nash-Cournot game.

Finally, we observe that an extreme case arises by choosing $\lambda = e^{-2h(r)}$. Through this choice, we obtain a crude bound on $TUB(r, \lambda, N)/TUB(1, \lambda, N)$ of the following nature:

$$\frac{TUB(r, \lambda, N)}{TUB(1, \lambda, N)} \leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \sqrt{e^{-h(r)} + 2/N})} \approx \frac{1}{2},$$

where $h(r) \gg 1$ and $N \gg 1$. In effect, when the window size is chosen in accordance with the choice of r , then the upper bound is improved by approximately 50% over the case when $r = 1$. We observe that in this case, the window size tends to N and we recover the full averaging SA schemes.

5 Numerical Results

In this section, we compare the performance of our schemes through a set of computational experiments conducted on a stochastic Nash-Cournot game. In Section 5.1, we introduce the stochastic Nash-Cournot game and derive the (sufficient) equilibrium conditions, which are compactly stated as a stochastic variational inequality. In Section 5.2, the simulation results for the RSSA scheme are presented and support the asymptotic a.s. and mean-square convergence results from Theorem 1 and Proposition 3, respectively. Next, in Section 5.3, we provide the simulation results the aRSSA_r scheme across different values of parameter r . Throughout this section, we use the gap function's evaluation as the metric for our comparisons. To calculate the gap value, we use the commercial solver KNITRO [3].

5.1 A networked stochastic Nash-Cournot game

A classical example of a Nash game is a networked Nash-Cournot game [23, 13]. In this problem, there are \mathcal{I} firms that compete over a network of \mathcal{J} nodes in selling a product. Each firm i wants to maximize profit by choosing nodal production at every node j , denoted by g_{ij} , and the level of sales at node j , denoted by s_{ij} . Let $\bar{s}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{I}} s_{ij}$ denote the aggregate sales at node j . By the Cournot structure, we assume that the price at node j , denoted by $P_j(\bar{s}_j, \xi)$, is a nonlinear stochastic function of the form $a_j - b_j \bar{s}_j^\sigma$, where a_j is a uniform random variable drawn from $[lb_{a_j}, ub_{a_j}]$, and b_j and $\sigma \geq 1$ are constants. Furthermore, we assume the firm i 's cost of production at node j is denoted by the $C_{ij}(g_{ij}) \triangleq c_j g_{ij} + d_j$, where c_j and d_j are constants. Other than the nonnegativity constraints for s_{ij} and g_{ij} , there are two types of constraints. Firm i 's production at node j is capacitated by cap_{ij} . Also, the aggregated level of sales of each firm is equal to the aggregated level of production. Therefore, firm i 's optimization problem is given by the following (Note that

we assume transportation costs are zero):

$$\min_{x_i \in X_i} \mathbb{E}[f_i(x, \xi)],$$

where $x = (x_1; \dots; x_{\mathcal{I}})$ with $x_i = (g_i; s_i)$, $g_i = (g_{i1}; \dots; g_{i\mathcal{J}})$, $s_i = (s_{i1}; \dots; s_{i\mathcal{J}})$,

$$f_i(x, \xi) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} (C_{ij}(g_{ij}) - P_j(\bar{s}_j, \xi) s_{ij}),$$

$$\text{and } X_i \triangleq \left\{ (g_i, s_i) \mid \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} g_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} s_{ij}, \quad g_{ij}, s_{ij} \geq 0, \quad g_{ij} \leq \text{cap}_{ij}, \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J} \right\}.$$

Applying the interchange between the expectation and the derivative operator, the resulting equilibrium conditions of the preceding stochastic Nash-Cournot game can be compactly captured by the stochastic variational inequality $\text{VI}(X, F)$ where $X \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{\mathcal{I}} X_i$ and $F(x) = (F_1(x); \dots; F_{\mathcal{I}}(x))$ with $F_i(x) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{x_i} f_i(x, \xi)]$. Note that it can be shown that when $1 < \sigma \leq 3$ and $\mathcal{I} \leq \frac{3\sigma-1}{\sigma-1}$, or $\sigma = 1$, the mapping F is strictly monotone. We consider a Cournot competition with 5 firms and 4 nodes, i.e., $\mathcal{I} = 5$ and $\mathcal{J} = 4$. We assume $\sigma = 1$, $[lb_{aj}, ub_{aj}] = [49.5, 50.5]$, $\text{cap}_{ij} = 300$, $b_j = 0.05$, $c_j = 1.5$ for all i and j . Throughout this section, we assume the mean and the standard deviation of the gap function is calculated using a sample of size 50. Also, we assume the starting point of algorithms is the origin, unless stated otherwise.

Throughout this section we use the following notation: N denotes the simulation length in the scheme, x_0 denotes the starting point of the algorithm. Furthermore, the gap function is given by Definition 3. We examine both the RSSA scheme, its averaged variant given by aRSSA_r for different values of r as well as the window-based variant denoted by $\text{aRSSA}_{\ell, r}$. In the $\text{aRSSA}_{\ell, r}$ scheme, ℓ is assumed to be equal to $\lceil \lambda N \rceil$ where $0 < \lambda < 1$ is a constant.


5.2 Convergence of the RSSA scheme

In this section, we present the simulation results for the RSSA scheme and report the performance of the algorithm using the sample mean and sample standard deviation of the gap function. Table 2 shows the results for 4000 iterations. For the stepsize γ_k , regularization parameter η_k , and the smoothing parameter ϵ_k , we use $\gamma_k = \gamma_0(k + 0.1N)^{-a}$, $\eta_k = \eta_0(k + 1)^{-b}$, and $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_0(k + 1)^{-c}$ where $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\eta_0 = 10^{-4}$ and $\epsilon_0 = 10^{-2}$. Note that the term $0.1N$ is added in the stepsize to stabilize the performance of the SA scheme. Furthermore, we chose η_0 and ϵ_0 to be smaller when b and c are small, respectively. In the first 9 settings, our goal is to study the sensitivity of the RSSA algorithm with respect to the parameters a, b, c , where we use $S(p)$ to denote a particular setting of these parameters. In these settings, the values of the parameters given in the table satisfy conditions of both Lemma 5 and Lemma 6. In the first three settings, we increase a and keep b and c unchanged. In the second group, b is increasing, while in the third group c is increasing. We observe that increasing a slows down the convergence of the gap function, but increasing b or c speeds up the convergence of the gap function slightly. This makes sense because the optimal rate of convergence is attained at $a = 0.5$. On the other hand, by making b or c , larger the regularization and smoothing sequences decay to zero faster implying that the perturbations introduced in the SA algorithm due to regularization and smoothing techniques are fading out. We also observe that the average value of the gap function is more sensitive to the change in the parameter a while being more robust to the changes in b or c . In setting $S(10)$, the parameters ensure convergence in the mean-squared sense provided by Lemma 6 but do not suffice in ensuring almost sure convergence

$S(p)$		Parameters			Gap function	
		a	b	c	mean	std
1	a	0.501	0.099	0.200	6.12e-3	2.68e-3
2		0.600	0.099	0.200	1.03e-1	9.48e-3
3		0.700	0.099	0.200	6.90e+1	1.74e-1
4	b	0.501	0.100	0.167	6.37e-3	3.56e-3
5		0.501	0.130	0.167	4.89e-3	2.68e-3
6		0.501	0.166	0.167	4.33e-3	2.11e-3
7	c	0.501	0.166	0.130	5.02e-3	2.65e-3
8		0.501	0.166	0.100	5.05e-3	2.42e-3
9		0.501	0.166	0.167	4.33e-3	2.11e-3
10	-	0.401	0.200	0.100	7.78e-3	5.04e-3
11	-	0.600	0.133	0.099	9.42e-2	7.56e-3

Table 2: RSSA algorithm with different settings of parameters a , b , and c .

provided in Lemma 5. In the setting $S(11)$, the converse holds. Figure 2 illustrates the sample mean of gap function over the set of simulations for settings $S(10)$ and $S(11)$. Both plots show the sample mean for the gap function. The round dots in these plots represent the observed gap values for each of the 50 sample paths at every 100 iterations.



(a) Setting $S(10)$ – $(a, b, c) = (0.401, 0.200, 0.100)$

(b) Setting $S(11)$ – $(a, b, c) = (0.600, 0.133, 0.099)$

Figure 2: Convergence of RSSA algorithm with different settings of parameters a , b , c .

We observe from Figure 2(a), that although the mean gap function is approaching zero, the variance across sample paths is relatively large. This observation is aligned with the knowledge that the choice of (a, b, c) do not guarantee almost sure convergence for $S(10)$. However, in Figure 2(b) the conditions of almost sure convergence are met, we observe that the variance in the gap function at the terminal iterate is far smaller and all of the 50 trajectories remain close to the sample mean. From a practical standpoint, this suggests that almost every sample path will show similar performance. Figure 3 illustrates the worst-case and the best-case sample paths among all of the 50 trajectories for each of the settings $S(10)$ and $S(11)$. We observe that the variance of the gap function’s value for the setting $S(10)$ is significantly larger than that of the setting $S(11)$.

5.3 Convergence of the aSA_r and $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ schemes

Next, we compare the performance of the averaging schemes across different values of r . Motivated by Proposition 8, the stepsize used in our analysis is assumed to be of the form $\gamma_k = \frac{2M}{C\sqrt{k+1}}$ where M is the bound on the Euclidean norm of $x \in X$ and C represents the bound on the norm on mapping F over the set X . Note that here we use identical stepsizes for $r = 1$ and $r = -1$, to allow




Figure 3: Convergence in mean vs. a.s. convergence: worst-case and best-case trajectories


for using the same set of iterates generated by the SA algorithm for both schemes. In Table 3, we report the sample mean of the gap function over 50 samples. The rows in Table 3 correspond to the value of the parameter λ which changes from 0 to 1 in steps of 0.1. Note that $\lambda = 0$ implies that $\ell = 0$, which corresponds to the aSA_r scheme. Moreover, $\lambda = 1$ corresponds to the SA scheme without averaging since $\ell = N$ in this case. Cases when λ is between 0 and 1 correspond to the $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ scheme. The columns in the table are sorted based on the iteration number N from 1000 to 4000. Each column includes the results for the case that $r = -1$ and the standard choice $r = +1$.

Scheme		N=1000		N=2000		N=3000		N=4000	
-	λ	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$
aSA_r	0	3.85e+1	1.19e+3	5.44e+0	5.93e+2	1.64e+0	3.93e+2	6.94e-1	2.94e+2
	0.1	1.97e+1	7.30e+1	1.49e+0	8.12e+0	2.47e-1	1.68e+0	5.96e-2	4.67e-1
$\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$	0.2	1.05e+1	2.31e+1	5.01e-1	1.40e+0	5.59e-2	1.80e-1	9.66e-3	3.38e-2
	0.3	6.03e+0	9.92e+0	2.01e-1	3.88e-1	1.68e-2	3.55e-2	2.51e-3	5.23e-3
	0.4	3.68e+0	5.04e+0	9.16e-2	1.39e-1	6.40e-3	1.01e-2	1.14e-3	1.57e-3
	0.5	2.35e+0	2.85e+0	4.62e-2	5.97e-2	3.14e-3	3.99e-3	8.46e-4	9.25e-4
	0.6	1.56e+0	1.75e+0	2.55e-2	2.94e-2	2.04e-3	2.25e-3	8.57e-4	8.71e-4
	0.7	1.08e+0	1.14e+0	1.55e-2	1.66e-2	1.70e-3	1.75e-3	1.00e-3	9.96e-4
	0.8	7.61e-1	7.79e-1	1.04e-2	1.06e-2	1.75e-3	1.77e-3	1.26e-3	1.26e-3
	0.9	5.52e-1	5.55e-1	7.64e-3	7.69e-3	1.84e-3	1.84e-3	1.60e-3	1.60e-3
SA	1	4.12e-1	4.12e-1	6.04e-3	6.04e-3	2.07e-3	2.07e-3	2.30e-3	2.30e-3


Table 3: Gap function's comparison between $r = -1$ and $r = +1$.

Naturally, when $\lambda = 1$, there is no averaging and in the last row of the table, the gap value is identical for both $r = -1$ and $r = +1$. Importantly, we see that for most values of N and λ , both the aSA_r scheme and the $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ scheme have lower gaps when $r = -1$ compared with $r = 1$. In fact, when λ is small and the averaging window is large, this difference becomes even more pronounced. For example, in the case that $\lambda = 0$ and $N = 1000$, the gap value for $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ scheme with $r = -1$ is about 39, while this gap is nearly two orders of magnitude larger at 1190 when $r = +1$. We show this difference in Figure 4 and Figure 5. It can be seen that when comparing both averaging schemes, both aSA_r and $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ have a lower gap for $r = -1$ vs $r = 1$ for any of the examined values of N . The smaller the value of λ , the larger the window over which averaging is carried out, implying the more robustness of the SA scheme. Therefore, there is a trade-off between increasing λ and the robustness of SA scheme. When λ is large, although the difference between the performance of $r = -1$ and $r = +1$ becomes small, the case $r = -1$ almost always has a smaller gap value than the case $r = 1$, as shown in Table 3.

One question that may arise is the optimal choice of λ in the design of the $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ scheme. We observe that the answer to this question depends on N . When N is small, in this case 1000, the SA scheme (essentially no averaging) displays the minimal error implying that $\lambda = 1$ performs the




(a) $\lambda = 0$




(b) $\lambda = 0.1$

Figure 4: Gap function: aSA_r scheme (l) and $\text{aSA}_{\ell,r}$ schemes with $\lambda = 0.1$ (r)



(a) $\lambda = 0.2$



(b) $\lambda = 0.3$

Figure 5: Gap function: $\text{aSA}_{r,\ell}$ scheme with $\lambda = 0.2$ (l) and $\lambda = 0.3$.

best. However, for larger values of N , the minimal error occurs at a smaller λ and the larger the value of N , the smaller the value of λ . For example, at $N = 4000$, $\lambda = 0.5$ has the smallest error.

5.4 Sensitivity analysis

In this section we investigate the performance of the averaging schemes when some parameters of the Cournot game change. First, we increase the number of firms from 5 to 15 and maintain other parameters fixed. Table 4 shows the simulation results for the new problem with 15 firms. We observe that the results are similar to the case where $\mathcal{I} = 5$. Importantly, for almost any N and any $\lambda < 1$, the averaging schemes perform better with $r = -1$ than with $r = +1$. Specifically, when λ is small this difference is significant. Next, we assume that x_0 for every sample path is a point where $s_{ij} = g_{ij} = 150$ for any i, j , rather than the origin. Table 5 provides the simulation results for this case. The performance of all the schemes is similar to the original setting. We observe that the averaging schemes have a smaller expected gap function when $r = -1$ than when $r = +1$. Lastly, we are interested in observing the performance of the averaging schemes for other choices

Scheme		N=1000		N=2000		N=3000		N=4000	
-	λ	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$
aSA _r	0	5.78e+1	1.47e+3	8.43e+0	7.33e+2	2.56e+0	4.86e+2	1.09e+0	3.63e+2
aSA _{ℓ, r}	0.1	3.19e+1	1.11e+2	2.67e+0	1.36e+1	4.75e-1	3.02e+0	1.22e-1	8.93e-1
	0.2	1.81e+1	3.80e+1	9.91e-1	2.66e+0	1.23e-1	3.79e-1	2.29e-2	7.73e-2
	0.3	1.09e+1	1.74e+1	4.29e-1	8.05e-1	4.04e-2	8.32e-2	6.18e-3	1.31e-2
	0.4	6.90e+0	9.29e+0	2.07e-1	3.09e-1	1.59e-2	2.50e-2	2.38e-3	3.60e-3
	0.5	4.56e+0	5.47e+0	1.09e-1	1.39e-1	7.51e-3	9.69e-3	1.36e-3	1.64e-3
	0.6	3.12e+0	3.46e+0	6.12e-2	7.06e-2	4.29e-3	4.87e-3	1.03e-3	1.09e-3
	0.7	2.20e+0	2.32e+0	3.67e-2	3.95e-2	3.01e-3	3.18e-3	1.02e-3	1.03e-3
	0.8	1.59e+0	1.63e+0	2.35e-2	2.42e-2	2.42e-3	2.47e-3	1.21e-3	1.20e-3
	0.9	1.18e+0	1.18e+0	1.58e-2	1.59e-2	2.32e-3	2.32e-3	1.55e-3	1.55e-3
SA	1	8.89e-1	8.89e-1	1.22e-2	1.22e-2	2.71e-3	2.71e-3	2.04e-3	2.04e-3

Table 4: Comparison of gap function for $\mathcal{I} = 15$.

Scheme		N=1000		N=2000		N=3000		N=4000	
-	λ	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$	$r = -1$	$r = +1$
aSA _r	0	3.38e+1	1.24e+3	4.63e+0	5.72e+2	1.34e+0	3.56e+2	5.42e-1	2.52e+2
aSA _{ℓ, r}	0.1	1.76e+1	6.50e+1	1.32e+0	7.22e+0	2.20e-1	1.49e+0	5.35e-2	4.17e-1
	0.2	9.36e+0	2.05e+1	4.43e-1	1.25e+0	4.95e-2	1.60e-1	8.78e-3	3.00e-2
	0.3	5.38e+0	8.85e+0	1.76e-1	3.42e-1	1.49e-2	3.11e-2	2.39e-3	4.74e-3
	0.4	3.28e+0	4.50e+0	7.92e-2	1.21e-1	5.73e-3	8.85e-3	1.16e-3	1.54e-3
	0.5	2.10e+0	2.54e+0	3.94e-2	5.12e-2	2.91e-3	3.62e-3	9.02e-4	9.84e-4
	0.6	1.39e+0	1.56e+0	2.15e-2	2.49e-2	2.01e-3	2.19e-3	8.94e-4	9.09e-4
	0.7	9.56e-1	1.01e+0	1.29e-2	1.38e-2	1.76e-3	1.81e-3	1.03e-3	1.02e-3
	0.8	6.74e-1	6.90e-1	8.62e-3	8.84e-3	1.78e-3	1.80e-3	1.29e-3	1.28e-3
	0.9	4.89e-1	4.92e-1	6.47e-3	6.50e-3	1.80e-3	1.81e-3	1.62e-3	1.62e-3
SA	1	3.60e-1	3.60e-1	5.79e-3	5.79e-3	2.05e-3	2.05e-3	2.32e-3	2.32e-3

Table 5: Comparison of gap function for different starting points.

of r . In Proposition 7(b), we showed that the optimal rate of convergence is attained when $r < 1$. Our goal is to compare the case $r = +1$ with two other cases where $r = -0.5$ and $r = +0.5$. In this study, we used the original settings of parameters. Table 6 presents the results of this simulation. Interestingly, comparing these results with those in Table 3, we see that both cases $r = -0.5$ and $r = +0.5$ have a superior performance to $r = +1$. It is worth noting that when $\lambda \leq 0.6$, $r = -0.5$ tends to perform better than $r = 0.5$. A natural question that emerges is the best choice of r . While one may conjecture that that when $r < 1$, the performance of the averaging scheme improves as r tends to $-\infty$, this may not be true. Consider a setting when r goes to $-\infty$. Consequently, \bar{x}_N tends to x_{N-1} implying the SA scheme represents the case with $r = -\infty$. However, for example in Table 3, when $r = -1$ and $\lambda = 0.5$ the aSA _{ℓ, r} scheme performs better than the SA scheme. Therefore, decreasing r may not necessarily speed up the convergence of the gap function. Finding the best choice for r requires more analysis and remains the subject of future research.

Scheme		N=1000		N=2000		N=3000		N=4000	
-	λ	$r = -0.5$	$r = +0.5$	$r = -0.5$	$r = +0.5$	$r = -0.5$	$r = +0.5$	$r = -0.5$	$r = +0.5$
aSA _r	0	7.38e+1	4.13e+2	1.40e+1	1.48e+2	5.13e+0	8.07e+1	2.50e+0	5.24e+1
aSA _{ℓ, r}	0.1	2.72e+1	5.28e+1	2.30e+0	5.41e+0	4.07e-1	1.07e+0	1.02e-1	2.89e-1
	0.2	1.28e+1	1.90e+1	6.53e-1	1.10e+0	7.58e-2	1.37e-1	1.34e-2	2.51e-2
	0.3	6.84e+0	8.78e+0	2.38e-1	3.31e-1	2.04e-2	2.96e-2	3.01e-3	4.35e-3
	0.4	3.98e+0	4.66e+0	1.02e-1	1.26e-1	7.16e-3	8.99e-3	1.23e-3	1.44e-3
	0.5	2.47e+0	2.72e+0	4.93e-2	5.60e-2	3.33e-3	3.75e-3	8.61e-4	9.00e-4
	0.6	1.61e+0	1.70e+0	2.64e-2	2.83e-2	2.09e-3	2.19e-3	8.58e-4	8.65e-4
	0.7	1.09e+0	1.12e+0	1.57e-2	1.63e-2	1.72e-3	1.74e-3	1.00e-3	9.96e-4
	0.8	7.66e-1	7.74e-1	1.04e-2	1.06e-2	1.76e-3	1.77e-3	1.26e-3	1.26e-3
	0.9	5.53e-1	5.54e-1	7.65e-3	7.68e-3	1.84e-3	1.84e-3	1.60e-3	1.60e-3
SA	1	4.12e-1	4.12e-1	6.04e-3	6.04e-3	2.07e-3	2.07e-3	2.30e-3	2.30e-3

Table 6: Comparison of gap function: $r = -0.5$ and $r = +0.5$.

6 Concluding remarks

We consider a stochastic variational inequality problem with monotone and possibly non-Lipschitzian maps over a closed, convex, and compact set. Much of the past research aimed at deriving almost sure convergence of the iterates has required strong monotonicity and Lipschitz continuity of the map. In the first part of the paper, by conducting a simultaneous smoothing and regularization

of the map, we develop a regularized smoothing stochastic approximation (RSSA) scheme. By updating the smoothing parameter, regularization parameter, and the steplength sequence after every iteration at suitably defined rates, the generated sequence can be shown to converge almost surely to the solution of the original problem. Unfortunately, such a scheme does not immediately admit a non-asymptotic rate statement, motivating the development of an averaging-based scheme. In the second part of the paper, we generalize standard averaging-based SA schemes to a setting where the weights of the averaged sequence are parameterized in terms of a constant r which is known to be 1 in the classic averaging methods. We show that when $r < 1$, the mean of the gap function diminishes to zero at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/K^{(1/6)-\delta})$ while the optimal rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{K})$ is recovered when smoothing and regularization is suppressed. Note that the latter rate is superior to the sub-optimal rate of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(K)/\sqrt{K})$ seen in standard averaging schemes with $r = 1$. Furthermore, a window-based averaging method using $r < 1$ is also shown to recover the optimal convergence rate. Numerical experiments on a classical Nash-Cournot game provide several insights. First, we note that the RSSA schemes with a.s. convergence guarantees produce sequences that display far less variance in terms of the gap function in contrast with their counterparts that arise from guarantees of convergence in the mean. Second, significant benefits of using $r < 1$ are observed in comparison with $r = 1$ particularly when λ is smaller. Yet, much remains to be understood regarding the optimal (or good) choices of r , given how crucial a role it plays in the empirical performance.

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 7.

Proof. (a) We start by showing part (i). Let $x \in X$ be arbitrary. Then, we have

$$G(x) = \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(x - y) \geq F(z)^T(x - z), \quad \text{for any } z \in X.$$

For $z = x$, the preceding inequality implies that $G(x) \geq F(x)^T(x - x) = 0$. Therefore, the gap function (36) is nonnegative for any $x \in X$, thus showing part (i). To prove part (ii), assume that $x^* \in X_w^*$. Relation (37) implies that

$$F(y)^T(x_w^* - y) \leq 0, \quad \text{for any } y \in X.$$

Invoking the definition of G in (36), from preceding inequality we have

$$G(x_w^*) \leq 0, \quad \text{for any } y \in X.$$

However, since $x_w^* \in X$, Lemma 7(a) indicates that $G(x_w^*) \geq 0$. Therefore, we conclude that for any $x^* \in X_w^*$, we have $G(x^*) = 0$. Now assume that $G(x) = 0$ for some $x \in X$. Therefore, $\sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(x - y) = 0$ implying that $F(y)^T(x - y) \leq 0$ for any $y \in X$. Equivalently, we have $F(y)^T(y - x) \geq 0$ for any $y \in X$. This implies that $x \in X_w^*$.

(b)(i) Let $\{u_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary sequence in X such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k = u_0$. Since X is a closed set, we have $u_0 \in X$. We want to show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(u_k) = G(u_0)$. We show this relation in two steps. First, using relation (36), for any $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(u_k) &= \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(u_k - y) = \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(u_k - u_0 + u_0 - y) \\ &= \sup_{y \in X} (F(y)^T(u_0 - y) + F(y)^T(u_k - u_0)) \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(u_0 - y) + \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T(u_k - u_0), \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where in the second relation we add and subtract u_0 , and in the last relation we used the well-known inequality $\sup_A (f + g) \leq \sup_A f + \sup_A g$ for any two real valued functions f and g defined on the set A . Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and relation (62), we obtain for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(u_k) &\leq \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (u_0 - y) + \sup_{y \in X} (\|F(y)\| \|u_k - u_0\|) \\ &= \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (u_0 - y) + \|u_k - u_0\| \sup_{y \in X} \|F(y)\| \leq \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (u_0 - y) + C \|u_k - u_0\|, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the boundedness assumption of the mapping F over the set X . Taking the limit superiors on both sides of the preceding inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(u_k) &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (u_0 - y) + C \|u_k - u_0\| \right) \\ &= \sup_{y \in X} F(y)^T (u_0 - y) + C \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k - u_0\| = G(u_0), \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where the last relation is obtained by recalling that u_0 is the limit point of the sequence $\{u_k\}$. In the second step of the proof for continuity of $G(x)$, using relation (36), for any $y \in X$ and any $k \geq 0$, we have $G(u_k) \geq F(y)^T (u_k - y)$. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary fixed vector in X . Therefore, the preceding inequality holds for $y = v$, i.e.,

$$G(u_k) \geq F(v)^T (u_k - v).$$

Taking the limit inferiors in both sides of the preceding inequality when k goes to infinity, we have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(u_k) \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(v)^T (u_k - v) = F(v)^T \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (u_k) - v \right) = F(v)^T (u_0 - v).$$

Since the preceding relation holds for any arbitrary $v \in X$, taking supremum from the right-hand side and using the relation (36) we obtain

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(u_k) \geq \sup_{v \in X} F(v)^T (u_0 - v) = G(u_0). \quad (64)$$

From (63) and (64), we conclude that the gap function $G(x)$ is continuous at any $x \in X$.

(b)(ii) For any $x, y \in X$ we have

$$F(y)^T (x - y) \leq \|F(y)\| \|x - y\| \leq \|F(y)\| (\|x\| + \|y\|) \leq 2CM,$$

where the first, second, and third inequalities follow from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the triangle inequality, and the boundedness assumption on the mapping F and the set X . Taking the supremum over $y \in X$ in the preceding relation and by using (36), we obtain the desired result. \square

Proof of Lemma 10.

Proof. (a) Consider the function $h(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ for $x > 0$. Since $h(x)$ is a continuous decreasing function, we have

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1} = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^N \frac{1}{k} = \frac{1}{\ell+1} + \sum_{k=\ell+2}^N \frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{1}{\ell+1} + \int_{\ell+1}^N \frac{1}{x} dx = \frac{1}{\ell+1} + \ln \left(\frac{N}{\ell+1} \right).$$

Also, we may write

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k+1} = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^N \frac{1}{k} \geq \int_{\ell+1}^{N+1} \frac{1}{x} dx = \ln \left(\frac{N+1}{\ell+1} \right).$$

Therefore, the desired result in part (a) holds.

(b) Let us define $g(x) = x^\alpha$ for $x > 0$. Consider the case where $\alpha > 0$. This implies that $g(x)$ is an increasing function and we can write

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^\alpha = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^N k^\alpha \leq \int_{\ell+1}^{N+1} x^\alpha \leq (\ell+1)^\alpha + \frac{(N+1)^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1},$$

and

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^\alpha = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^N k^\alpha \geq \int_{\ell}^N x^\alpha dx \geq \int_{\ell+1}^N x^\alpha dx = \frac{N^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1}.$$

Therefore the result of part (b) holds for $\alpha > 0$. Now, we consider the case where $\alpha < 0$ and $\alpha \neq -1$. This implies that $g(x)$ defined in part (b) is a decreasing function and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^\alpha &= (\ell+1)^\alpha + \sum_{k=\ell+2}^N k^\alpha \leq (\ell+1)^\alpha + \int_{\ell+1}^N x^\alpha dx \leq (\ell+1)^\alpha + \int_{\ell+1}^{N+1} x^\alpha dx \\ &= (\ell+1)^\alpha + \frac{(N+1)^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{N-1} (k+1)^\alpha = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^N k^\alpha \geq \int_{\ell+1}^{N+1} x^\alpha dx \geq \int_{\ell+1}^N x^\alpha dx = \frac{N^{\alpha+1} - (\ell+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1}.$$

Therefore the result of part (b) holds for $\alpha < 0$ and $\alpha \neq -1$. □

References

- [1] D. P. Bertsekas, *Stochastic optimization problems with nondifferentiable cost functionals*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **12** (1973), no. 2, 218–231.
- [2] J. R. Birge and F. Louveaux, *Introduction to stochastic programming: Springer series in operations research*, Springer, 1997.
- [3] R. H. Byrd, M. E. Hribar, and J. Nocedal, *An interior point algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **9** (1999), 877–900.
- [4] D. Cicek, M. Broadie, and A. Zeevi, *General bounds and finite-time performance improvement for the Kiefer-Wolfowitz stochastic approximation algorithm*, Operations Research **59** (2011), 1211–1224.
- [5] J. C. Duchi, P. L. Bartlett, and Martin J. Wainwright, *Randomized smoothing for stochastic optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization (SIOPT) **22** (2012), no. 2, 674–701.
- [6] Y. M. Ermoliev, *Stochastic quasigradient methods and their application to system optimization*, Stochastics **9** (1983), 1–36.

- [7] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vols. I,II*, Springer Series in Operations Research, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [8] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan, *Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, part I: a generic algorithmic framework*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **22** (2012), no. 4, 1469–1492.
- [9] E. G. Golshtein and N. V. Tretyakov, *Modified Lagrangians and monotone maps in optimization*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1996, Translated from the 1989 Russian original by Tretyakov, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR MR1386892 (97a:90001)
- [10] H. Jiang and H. Xu, *Stochastic approximation approaches to the stochastic variational inequality problem*, IEEE Transactions in Automatic Control **53** (2008), no. 6, 1462–1475.
- [11] A. Juditsky, A. Nemirovski, and C. Tauvel, *Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm*, Stochastic Systems **1** (2011), no. 1, 17–58.
- [12] ———, *Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm*, Stochastic Systems (2011), DOI: 10.1214/10-SSY011, 17–58.
- [13] A. Kannan and U. V. Shanbhag, *Distributed computation of equilibria in monotone Nash games via iterative regularization techniques*, SIAM Journal of Optimization **22** (2012), no. 4, 1177–1205.
- [14] A. Kannan, U. V. Shanbhag, and H. M. Kim, *Addressing supply-side risk in uncertain power markets: stochastic Nash models, scalable algorithms and error analysis*, Optimization Methods and Software **28** (2013), no. 5, 1095–1138.
- [15] K. Knopp, *Theory and applications of infinite series*, Blackie & Son Ltd., Glasgow, Great Britain, 1951.
- [16] J. Koshal, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag, *Regularized iterative stochastic approximation methods for variational inequality problems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **58**(3) (2013), 594–609.
- [17] H. J. Kushner and G. G. Yin, *Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications*, Springer, New York, 2003.
- [18] H. Lakshmanan and D. Farias, *Decentralized recourse allocation in dynamic networks of agents*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **19** (2008), no. 2, 911–940.
- [19] T. Larsson and M. Patriksson, *A class of gap functions for variational inequalities*, Mathematical Programming **64** (1994), 53–79.
- [20] S. Lu, *Symmetric confidence regions and confidence intervals for normal map formulations of stochastic variational inequalities*, To appear.
- [21] S. Lu and A. Budhiraja, *Confidence regions for stochastic variational inequalities*, Math. Oper. Res. **38** (2013), no. 3, 545–568.
- [22] D. Q. Mayne and E. Polak, *Nondifferential optimization via adaptive smoothing*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **43** (1984), no. 4.

- [23] C. Metzler, B.F. Hobbs, and J.-S. Pang, *Nash-cournot equilibria in power markets on a linearized dc network with arbitrage: Formulations and properties*, Networks and Spatial Theory **3** (2003), no. 2, 123–150.
- [24] A. Nedić and S. Lee, *On stochastic subgradient mirror-descent algorithm with weighted averaging*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **24** (2014), no. 1, 84–107.
- [25] A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro, *Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **19** (2009), no. 4, 1574–1609.
- [26] V. I. Norkin, *The analysis and optimization of probability functions*, Tech. report, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis technical report, 1993, WP-93-6.
- [27] B.T. Polyak, *Introduction to optimization*, Optimization Software, Inc., New York, 1987.
- [28] B.T. Polyak and A.B. Juditsky, *Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **30** (1992), no. 4, 838–855.
- [29] U. Ravat and U. V. Shanbhag, *On the characterization of solution sets in smooth and nonsmooth stochastic convex Nash games*, SIAM Journal of Optimization **21** (2011), no. 3, 1046–1081.
- [30] H. Robbins and S. Monro, *A stochastic approximation method*, Ann. Math. Statistics **22** (1951), 400–407.
- [31] R.T. Rockafellar and R.J-B Wets, *Variational analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [32] A. Shapiro, *Monte carlo sampling methods*, Handbook in Operations Research and Management Science, vol. 10, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 2003, pp. 353–426.
- [33] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*, The society for industrial and applied mathematics and the mathematical programming society, Philadelphia, USA, 2009.
- [34] V. A. Steklov, *Sur les expressions asymptotiques de certaines fonctions définies par les équations différentielles du second ordre et leurs applications au problème du développement d’une fonction arbitraire en séries procédant suivant les diverses fonctions*, Comm. Charkov Math. Soc. **2** (1907), no. 10, 97–199.
- [35] M. Wang and D. P. Bertsekas, *Incremental constraint projection methods for variational inequalities*, Mathematical Programming (2014), DOI 10.1007/s10107-014-0769-x.
- [36] H. Xu, *Adaptive smoothing method, deterministically computable generalized jacobians, and the newton method*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **109** (2001), no. 1, 215–224.
- [37] H. Xu, *Sample average approximation methods for a class of stochastic variational inequality problems*, Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research **27** (2010), no. 1, 103–119.
- [38] F. Yousefian, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag, *Self-tuned stochastic approximation schemes for non-Lipschitzian stochastic multi-user optimization and Nash games*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, to appear, an extended version of the paper is available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.1711>, DOI 10.1109/TAC.2015.2478124.

- [39] ———, *On stochastic gradient and subgradient methods with adaptive steplength sequences*, Automatica **48** (2012), no. 1, 56–67, An extended version of the paper available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.4549>.
- [40] ———, *A regularized smoothing stochastic approximation (RSSA) algorithm for stochastic variational inequality problems*, Proceedings of the 2013 Winter Simulation Conference (2013), 933–944.