

# Accelerated Fully First-Order Methods for Bilevel and Minimax Optimization

Chris Junchi Li<sup>◊</sup>

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences<sup>◊</sup>  
University of California, Berkeley

May 3, 2024

## Abstract

This paper presents a new algorithm member for accelerating first-order methods for bilevel optimization, namely the *(Perturbed) Restarted Accelerated Fully First-order methods for Bilevel Approximation*, abbreviated as (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA. The algorithm leverages *fully* first-order oracles and seeks approximate stationary points in nonconvex-strongly-convex bilevel optimization, enhancing oracle complexity for efficient optimization. Theoretical guarantees for finding approximate first-order stationary points and second-order stationary points at the state-of-the-art query complexities are established, showcasing their effectiveness in solving complex optimization tasks. Empirical studies for real-world problems are provided to further validate the outperformance of our proposed algorithms. The significance of (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA in optimizing nonconvex-strongly-convex bilevel optimization problems is underscored by its state-of-the-art convergence rates and computational efficiency.

## 1 Introduction

Bilevel optimization has garnered significant attention recently, owing to its remarkable success in addressing crucial machine learning tasks such as meta-learning [FFS<sup>+</sup>18, BHTV19, JLLP20], reinforcement learning [KT99, HWY23, SZB20], hyperparameter optimization [SCHB19, FH19, GFPS20], and many more. We concentrate in this work on a version of the *nonconvex-strongly-convex bilevel optimization problem*:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \quad & \Phi(x) \triangleq f(x, y^*(x)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y^*(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} g(x, y) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the upper-level function  $f(x, y)$  is smooth and possibly nonconvex, and the lower-level function  $g(x, y)$  is smooth and convex with respect to  $y$  for any given  $x$ . Our goal is to establish the theoretical convergence guarantee to this problem, with access to *fully first-order oracles* of  $f(x, y)$  and  $g(x, y)$  in the sense that there is no cheap access to second-order information such as Jacobian- or Hessian-vector-product oracle, where we will be assuming  $g(\cdot, y)$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex for some  $\mu > 0$  which is shared across all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Additional smoothness conditions posed on  $f$  and  $g$  capture the smoothness of the overall *hyperobjective function*  $\Phi(x)$  [§2]. An important special case of the bilevel optimization problem (1)—the problem of minimax optimization, where  $g = -f$  in the lower-level problem (1)—has been extensively studied in the literature [LLC22, LJJ20].

Recent work [KKWN23] considers the first-order approximation for bilevel optimization problem (1) where they introduce the auxiliary function as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda(x, y) \triangleq f(x, y) + \lambda \left( g(x, y) - \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} g(x, z) \right) \tag{2}$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is the regularization parameter.

Under proper smoothness condition, taking  $\lambda \geq 2\kappa = \frac{2\ell}{\mu}$  leads to  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda(x, y)$  being strongly convex in  $y$  for any given  $x$ , which implies that the function

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) \triangleq \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda(x, y) \quad (3)$$

is smooth [Dan12]. By setting  $\lambda$  appropriately, the approximate first-order and second-order stationary points of the objective  $\Phi(x) \triangleq f(x, y^*(x))$  in the bilevel problem (1) are sufficiently close to the corresponding stationary points. This implies that we can address the bilevel problem by considering the minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) \triangleq \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda(x, y) \right\} \quad (4)$$

The expression of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda(x, y)$  in (2) suggests we can solve problem (4) by only accessing the first-order oracles of  $f(x, y)$  and  $g(x, y)$ . Based on this idea, [KKWN23] proposed, among many other methods, a nonstochastic fully first-order method for finding  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary points of  $\Phi(x)$  with a first-order oracle complexity of  $\epsilon^{-3}$ .

**Relationship with [YLL<sup>+</sup>23].** Closely related to this work is [YLL<sup>+</sup>23] by same (extended) group of authors [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], which successfully accelerates an alternative family of algorithm—the inexact hypergradient method—for solving nonconvex-strongly-convex bilevel optimization problem. We will carefully point out the connections between the two families, especially on their equivalence in the minimax optimization setting.

**Key Ingredients due to [CMZ23] and our contribution.** Very recently and concurrent to our work [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], Chen et al. [CMZ23] revisits the fully firstorder methods of [KKWN23] and improves the first-order oracle complexity upper bound to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$ .<sup>1</sup> The key observation is that the Lipschitz continuous constant of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$ , defined as in (4), can be set to be not dependent on  $\epsilon$ . By further assuming that  $g(x, y)$  admits Lipschitz continuous third-order derivatives, [CMZ23] also provided a perturbed first-order method to find  $(\epsilon, \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{2.5} \sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary points of  $\Phi(x)$  within  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$  first-order oracle complexity.

We illustrate that our acceleration framework can be effectively incorporated into the idea of fully first-order methods, improving the dependency on  $\epsilon$  from  $\epsilon^{-2}$  to  $\epsilon^{-1.75}$ .

**Organization.** The rest of this work is organized as follows. In §2 we conduct the technical overview and establish the basic notions, assumptions and algorithmic subroutines for the problem setting. §3 presents the (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA algorithm with theoretical complexity bounds for accelerated fully first-order methods, highlighting the improvements in convergence rates and algorithmic frameworks compared to existing approaches. §4 connects (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA with perturbed restarted accelerated gradient descent ascent, discussing the algorithm’s versatility and efficiency in solving the special case of nonconvex-concave minimax optimization problems. We present a complete theoretical analysis presented in §3 in §5. §6 conducts a series of real-world experiments to demonstrate the algorithm’s effectiveness in practical scenarios, such as hyperparameter optimization, and many more. §7 concludes the entire paper. In the appendix, we present the related works in §A, and also proofs of basic lemmas in §B.

---

<sup>1</sup>We became aware of the work [CMZ23] around two to three months after the initial arXiv posting of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23].

**Notation.** Let  $\lambda_{\max}(A)$  (resp.  $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ ) denote its largest (resp. smallest) eigenvalue, and also  $\kappa(A) = \lambda_{\max}(A)/\lambda_{\min}(A)$  denote the condition number, where  $A$  is a real symmetric matrix. Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be the spectral norm of matrices and the Euclidean norm of vectors. Denote  $\mathbb{B}(r)$  to present the closed Euclidean ball with radius  $r$  centered at the origin. Denote  $Gc(f, \epsilon)$ ,  $JV(f, \epsilon)$  and  $HV(f, \epsilon)$  as the oracle complexities of gradients, Jacobian-vector products and Hessian-vector products, respectively. For two positive sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  we denote  $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$  (resp.  $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$ ) if  $a_n \geq Cb_n$  (resp.  $a_n \lesssim Cb_n$ ) for all  $n$ , and also  $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$  if both  $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$  and  $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$  hold for some absolute constant  $C > 0$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$  or  $\tilde{\Omega}(\cdot)$  is adopted in turn when  $C$  incorporates a polylogarithmic factor in problem parameters.

## 2 Technical Preliminaries

In this section, we proceed to present the notation and assumptions necessary for our problem setting. Immediately afterward, we establish convergence of the algorithmic subroutine of *accelerated gradient descent* (AGD).

We first revisit the formal definition of an  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary point as well as an  $(\epsilon, \tau)$ -second-order stationary point of a twice differentiable function  $\Phi(x)$  for any prescribed  $\epsilon, \tau > 0$ , as follows:

**Definition 1** (Approximate first-order stationary point). *Call  $x$  an  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$  if  $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ .*

**Definition 2** (Approximate second-order stationary point). *Call  $x$  an  $(\epsilon, \tau)$ -second-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$  if  $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2\Phi(x)) \geq -\tau$ .*

We turn to introduce some basic lemmas as follows. First and foremost, we introduce the following list of assumptions, which is core for our theoretical guarantees to hold:

**Assumption 1.** *The upper-level function  $f(x, y)$  and lower-level function  $g(x, y)$  satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i) *Function  $g(x, y)$  is three times differentiable and  $\mu$ -strongly convex with respect to  $y$  for any fixed  $x$ ;*
- (ii) *Function  $f(x, y)$  is twice differentiable and  $M$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $y$ ;*
- (iii) *Gradient  $\nabla f(x, y)$  and  $\nabla g(x, y)$  are  $\ell$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$  and  $y$ ;*
- (iv) *The Jacobians  $\nabla_{xy}^2 f(x, y)$ ,  $\nabla_{xy}^2 g(x, y)$  and Hessians  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f(x, y)$ ,  $\nabla_{yy}^2 f(x, y)$ ,  $\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y)$  are  $\rho$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$  and  $y$ ;*
- (v) *The third-order derivatives  $\nabla_{xyx}^3 g(x, y)$ ,  $\nabla_{yxy}^3 g(x, y)$  and  $\nabla_{yyy}^3 g(x, y)$  are  $\nu$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$  and  $y$ .*

We then show that  $\Phi(x)$  admits Lipschitz continuous gradients and Lipschitz continuous Hessians, as established in the next lemma:

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, then*

(i)  $\Phi(x)$  is  $\tilde{L}$ -gradient Lipschitz continuous; that is,  $\|\nabla\Phi(x) - \nabla\Phi(x')\| \leq \tilde{L} \|x - x'\|$  for any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , where

$$\tilde{L} = \ell + \frac{2\ell^2 + \rho M}{\mu} + \frac{\ell^3 + 2\rho\ell M}{\mu^2} + \frac{\rho\ell^2 M}{\mu^3}$$

In short,  $\tilde{L} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3)$ .

(ii)  $\Phi(x)$  is  $\tilde{\rho}$ -Hessian Lipschitz continuous; that is,  $\|\nabla^2\Phi(x) - \nabla^2\Phi(x')\| \leq \tilde{\rho} \|x - x'\|$  for any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho} = & \left( \rho + \frac{2\ell\rho + M\nu}{\mu} + \frac{2M\ell\nu + \rho\ell^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{M\ell^2\nu}{\mu^3} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu} \right) \\ & + \left( \frac{2\ell\rho}{\mu} + \frac{4M\rho^2 + 2\ell^2\rho}{\mu^2} + \frac{2M\ell\rho^2}{\mu^3} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{M\rho^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{\rho\ell}{\mu} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu} \right)^3 \end{aligned}$$

In short,  $\tilde{\rho} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^5)$ .

We also introduce the following property for  $y^*(x)$ , solution to lower-level problem of (1):

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, then  $y^*(x)$  is  $\kappa := (\tilde{L}/\mu)$ -Lipschitz continuous; that is,  $\|y^*(x) - y^*(x')\|_2 \leq \kappa \|x - x'\|_2$  for any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$*

Similar to Condition 10 in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Section 3] for the analysis of RAHGD (in Algorithm 3), we introduce a condition that bounds the estimation error of  $y^*(w_{t,k})$  and  $z^*(w_{t,k})$  after running AGD for sufficient number of iterates. Let  $\lambda > 0$  be a regularization parameter that can grow with inverse desired accuracy, to be assigned later.

**Condition 1.** *Let  $w_{t,-1} = x_{t,-1}$  and denote  $y^*(w_{t,k}) = \arg \min f(w_{t,k}, \cdot) + \lambda g(w_{t,k}, \cdot)$ ,  $z^*(w_{t,k}) = \arg \min g(w_{t,k}, \cdot)$ . Then for some  $\sigma > 0$  and  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we assume that the estimators  $y_{t,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  and  $z_{t,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  satisfy the conditions*

$$\|y_{t,k} - y^*(w_{t,k})\|_2 \leq \frac{\sigma}{2(1+\lambda)\ell} \quad \text{for each } k = -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (5)$$

and

$$\|z_{t,k} - z^*(w_{t,k})\|_2 \leq \frac{\sigma}{2\ell} \quad \text{for each } k = -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (6)$$

We then introduce the following gradient approximation that calibrates the inexactness of our gradient estimate:

$$\hat{\nabla}\Phi(x_k) = \nabla_x f(x_k, y_k) - \nabla_{xy}^2 g(x_k, y_k) v_k$$

where

$$v_k \equiv (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x_k, y_k))^{-1} \nabla_y f(x_k, y_k)$$

and conclude

**Lemma 3** (Inexact gradients). *Suppose Assumption 1 and Condition 1 hold, then we have*

$$\left\| \nabla\Phi(w_k) - \hat{\nabla}\Phi(w_k) \right\|_2 \leq \sigma$$

---

**Algorithm 1** AGD( $h, z_0, T, \alpha, \beta$ ), Nesterov’s Acceleration

---

- 1: **Input:** objective  $h(\cdot)$ ; initialization  $z_0$ ; iteration number;  $T \geq 1$ ; step-size  $\alpha > 0$ ; momentum param.  $\beta \in (0, 1)$
  - 2:  $\tilde{z}_0 \leftarrow z_0$
  - 3: **for**  $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$  **do**
  - 4:      $z_{t+1} \leftarrow \tilde{z}_t - \alpha \nabla h(\tilde{z}_t)$
  - 5:      $\tilde{z}_{t+1} \leftarrow z_{t+1} + \beta (z_{t+1} - z_t)$
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: **Output:**  $z_T$
- 

Finally, as important components of our algorithmic design, we introduce here Algorithm 1, namely *Nesterov’s accelerated gradient descent* (AGD) for a given smooth and strongly convex objective, which achieve optimality among first-order methods in its setting. The method achieve the following *optimal rate* [Nes13]:<sup>2</sup>

**Lemma 4.** *Running Algorithm 1 on an  $\ell_h$ -smooth and  $\mu_h$ -strongly convex objective function  $h(\cdot)$  with  $\alpha = 1/\ell_h$  and  $\beta = (\sqrt{\kappa_h} - 1) / (\sqrt{\kappa_h} + 1)$  produces an output  $z_T$  satisfying*

$$\|z_T - z^*\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \kappa_h) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_h}}\right)^T \|z_0 - z^*\|_2^2$$

where  $z^* = \arg \min_z h(z)$  and  $\kappa_h = \ell_h/\mu_h$  denotes the condition number of the objective  $h$ .

Alternatively, the conjugate gradient method was often used to further improve the rate for minimizing quadratic objective of form  $\frac{1}{2}q^\top Aq - q^\top b$  where matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is positive definite and vector  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is arbitrary. The conjugate gradient method is used not in this work but heavily in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23] in designing RAHGD and PRAHGD, and we forgo its details. Under slightly different oracles the algorithm achieves an accelerated convergence rate with an improved coefficient. See [NW06] for more on the details.

### 3 Theoretical Guarantees for Accelerated Fully First-Order Methods

In this section, we propose the fully first-order methods for bilevel optimization [KKWN23, CMZ23] and draw connections between our algorithmic framework and theirs. For further analysis we recall our Assumption 1 which our theory highly relies upon. Here we present some properties of function  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  and its connection to function  $\Phi(x)$  in the following lemma [CMZ23].

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose Assumption 1(i)-(iv) hold and set  $\lambda \geq 2\kappa$ , then*

- (i)  $|\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2/\lambda)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$
- (ii)  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla \Phi(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3/\lambda)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$
- (iii)  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  is  $L_\lambda$ -gradient Lipschitz, where  $L_\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3)$

If we further suppose Assumption 1(v) holds, then

---

<sup>2</sup>One can replace this by any subroutine that achieves essentially the same optimal rate; see, e.g., [Rd17].

---

**Algorithm 2** (Perturbed) Restarted Accelerated F<sup>2</sup>BA, (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA
 

---

1: **Input:** initial vector  $x_{0,0}$ ; step-size  $\eta > 0$ ; momentum parameter  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ; parameters  $\alpha, \alpha' > 0$ ,  $\beta, \beta' \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\{T_{t,k}\}, \{T'_{t,k}\}$  of AGD; iteration threshold  $K \geq 1$ ; parameter  $B$  for triggering restarting; perturbation radius  $r > 0$ ; option `Perturbation`  $\in \{0, 1\}$

2:  $k \leftarrow 0, t \leftarrow 0, x_{0,-1} \leftarrow x_{0,0}$

3:  $y_{0,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(f(x_{0,-1}, \cdot) + \lambda g(x_{0,-1}, \cdot), 0, T'_{0,-1}, \alpha', \beta')$

4:  $z_{0,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(g(x_{0,-1}, \cdot), 0, T_{0,-1}, \alpha, \beta)$

5: **while**  $k < K$  **do**

6:    $w_{t,k} \leftarrow x_{t,k} + (1 - \theta)(x_{t,k} - x_{t,k-1})$

7:    $z_{t,k} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(g(w_{t,k}, \cdot), z_{t,k-1}, T_{t,k}, \alpha, \beta)$

8:    $y_{t,k} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(f(w_{t,k}, \cdot) + \lambda g(w_{t,k}, \cdot), y_{t,k-1}, T'_{t,k}, \alpha', \beta')$

9:    $u_{t,k} \leftarrow \nabla_x f(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) - \nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, z_{t,k}))$

10:    $x_{t,k+1} \leftarrow w_{t,k} - \eta u_{t,k}$

11:    $k \leftarrow k + 1$

12:   **if**  $k \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \|x_{t,i+1} - x_{t,i}\|^2 > B^2$  **then**

13:     **if** `Perturbation` = 0 **then**

14:        $x_{t+1,0} \leftarrow x_{t,k}$

15:     **else**

16:        $x_{t+1,0} \leftarrow x_{t,k} + \xi_{t,k}$  with  $\xi_{t,k} \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{B}(r))$

17:     **end if**

18:      $x_{t+1,-1} \leftarrow x_{t+1,0}$

19:      $y_{t+1,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(f(x_{t+1,-1}, \cdot) + \lambda g(x_{t+1,-1}, \cdot), 0, T'_{t+1,-1}, \alpha', \beta')$

20:      $z_{t+1,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(g(x_{t+1,-1}, \cdot), 0, T_{t+1,-1}, \alpha, \beta)$

21:      $k \leftarrow 0, t \leftarrow t + 1$

22:   **end if**

23: **end while**

24:  $K_0 \leftarrow \arg \min_{\lfloor \frac{K}{2} \rfloor \leq k \leq K-1} \|x_{t,k+1} - x_{t,k}\|_2$

25: **Output:**  $\hat{w} \leftarrow \frac{1}{K_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K_0} w_{t,k}$

---

(i)  $\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla^2 \Phi(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\kappa^6/\lambda)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$

(ii)  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  is  $\rho_\lambda$ -Hessian Lipschitz, where  $\rho_\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^5)$

The detailed expression for error controls  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla \Phi(x)\|_2$ ,  $L_\lambda$ ,  $|\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \Phi(x)|$ ,  $\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla^2 \Phi(x)\|_2$  and  $\rho_\lambda$  can be found in Section 5.1.

**The Proposed Algorithm.** We present our detailed *(Perturbed) Restarted Accelerated Fully First-order methods for Bilevel Approximation* Algorithm 2, or (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA for short. The theoretical guarantees of this algorithm are presented as follows:

**Theorem 2** (RAF<sup>2</sup>BA finding  $\epsilon$ -FOSP). *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let  $\Delta = \Phi(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \Phi(x)$ ,  $\kappa' = (\lambda + 1)\ell/(\lambda\mu - \ell)$ , and*

$$\eta = \frac{1}{4L_\lambda} \quad B = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\rho_\lambda}} \quad \theta = (\rho_\lambda \epsilon \eta^2)^{1/4} \quad K = \frac{1}{\theta} \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{\ell} \quad \beta = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa} + 1}$$

$$\lambda = \Theta(\max\{\kappa^2/\Delta, \kappa^3/\epsilon\}) \quad \alpha' = \frac{1}{(\lambda + 1)\ell} \quad \beta' = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa'} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa'} + 1} \quad \sigma = \epsilon^2$$

**Table 1.** Comparison table for nonconvex-strongly-concave bilevel optimization algorithms, finding approximate FOSP (first five rows) and SOSP (last three rows)

Algorithm	Complexities	$Gc(f, \epsilon)$	$Gc(g, \epsilon)$	$JV(g, \epsilon)$	$HV(g, \epsilon)$
AID-BiO [JYL21]		$\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{3.5} \epsilon^{-2})$
ITD-BiO [JYL21]		$\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$
RAHGD [YLL <sup>+</sup> 23]		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$
RAF <sup>2</sup> BA (this work)		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$
Perturbed AID [HJML22]		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^3 \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.5} \epsilon^{-2})$
PRAHGD [YLL <sup>+</sup> 23]		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$
PRAF <sup>2</sup> BA (this work)		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{2.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$

•  $Gc(f, \epsilon)$  and  $Gc(g, \epsilon)$  : gradient query complexity of  $f$  and  $g$  •  $JV(g, \epsilon)$  : Jacobian-vector-product query complexity of  $g$  •  $HV(g, \epsilon)$  : Hessian-vector product query complexity of  $g$  •  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$  omits a polylogarithmic factor in problem-dependent parameters •  $\kappa$  denotes the condition number of lower-level objective

and assume that  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \leq L_\lambda^2 / \rho_\lambda$ . Then our RAF<sup>2</sup>BA (Algorithm 2) can find an  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -first-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$ . Additionally, the oracle complexities satisfy  $Gc(f, \epsilon) = Gc(g, \epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$ .

Analogous to accelerating inexact hypergradient method as in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], we have the following perturbed version to hold:

**Theorem 3** ((P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA finding  $(\epsilon, \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{2.5} \sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -SOSP). Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let  $\Delta = \Phi(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \Phi(x)$ ,  $\kappa' = (\lambda + 1)\ell / (\lambda\mu - \ell)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{d_x}{\zeta \epsilon}\right) & \eta &= \frac{1}{4L_\lambda} & K &= \frac{2\chi}{\theta} & B &= \frac{1}{288\chi^2} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\rho_\lambda}} & \theta &= \frac{1}{2} (\rho_\lambda \epsilon \eta^2)^{1/4} \\ \alpha &= \frac{1}{\ell} & \beta &= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa} + 1} & \alpha' &= \frac{1}{(\lambda + 1)\ell} & \beta' &= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa'} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa'} + 1} \\ r &= \min \left\{ \frac{L_\lambda B^2}{4C}, \frac{B + B^2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\theta B}{20K}, \sqrt{\frac{\theta B^2}{2K}} \right\} & \lambda &= \Theta \left( \max \left\{ \frac{\kappa^2}{\Delta}, \frac{\kappa^3}{\epsilon}, \frac{\kappa^6}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right\} \right) & \sigma &= \min \left\{ \frac{\rho_\lambda B \zeta r \theta}{2\sqrt{d_x}}, \epsilon^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C$  and assume that  $\epsilon \leq L_\lambda^2 / \rho_\lambda$ . Then our PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA (Algorithm 2 with *Perturbation* = 1) can find an  $(\mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{2.5} \sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$  with probability at least  $1 - \zeta$ . Additionally, the oracle complexities satisfy  $Gc(f, \epsilon) = Gc(g, \epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$ .

The presented query complexities match the state-of-the-art of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23] and furthermore does not invoke any Hessian-vector-product or Jacobian-vector-product queries, and is hence fully first-order. A detailed comparison is listed in Table 1.

## 4 (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA for Accelerating Minimax Optimization

This section applies the ideas of PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA to find an *approximate second-order stationary point* in the *nonconvex-concave* minimax optimization problem of the form

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \left\{ \bar{\Phi}(x) \triangleq \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \bar{f}(x, y) \right\} \quad (7)$$

---

**Algorithm 3** Perturbed Restarted Accelerated Gradient Descent Ascent, PRAGDA

---

1: **Input:** initial vector  $x_{0,0}$ ; step-size  $\eta > 0$ ; momentum param.  $\theta \in (0,1)$ ; params.  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta \in (0,1)$ ,  $\{T_{t,k}\}$  of AGD; iteration threshold  $K \geq 1$ ; param.  $B$  for triggering restarting; perturbation radius  $r > 0$   
2:  $k \leftarrow 0$ ,  $t \leftarrow 0$ ,  $x_{0,-1} \leftarrow x_{0,0}$   
3:  $y_{0,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(-\bar{f}(x_{0,-1}, \cdot), 0, T_{0,-1}, \alpha, \beta)$   
4: **while**  $k < K$  **do**  
5:      $w_{t,k} \leftarrow x_{t,k} + (1 - \theta)(x_{t,k} - x_{t,k-1})$   
6:      $y_{t,k} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(-\bar{f}(w_{t,k}, \cdot), y_{t,k-1}, T_{t,k}, \alpha, \beta)$   
7:      $x_{t,k+1} \leftarrow w_{t,k} - \eta \nabla_x \bar{f}(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k})$   
8:      $k \leftarrow k + 1$   
9:     **if**  $k \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|x_{t,i+1} - x_{t,i}\|^2 > B^2$  **then**  
10:          $x_{t+1,0} \leftarrow x_{t,k} + \xi_{t,k}$  with  $\xi_{t,k} \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{B}(r))$   
11:          $x_{t+1,-1} \leftarrow x_{t+1,0}$   
12:          $k \leftarrow 0, t \leftarrow t + 1$   
13:          $y_{t,-1} \leftarrow \text{AGD}(-\bar{f}(x_{t,-1}, \cdot), 0, T_{t,-1}, \alpha, \beta)$   
14:     **end if**  
15: **end while**  
16:  $K_0 \leftarrow \arg \min_{\lfloor \frac{K}{2} \rfloor \leq k \leq K-1} \|x_{t,k+1} - x_{t,k}\|_2$   
17: **Output:**  $\hat{w} \leftarrow \frac{1}{K_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^{K_0} w_{t,k}$ 

---

where the minimax objective  $\bar{f}(x, y)$  is (strongly) concave in  $y$  but possibly nonconvex in  $x$ . As is discussed in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Section B], minimax problems of form (7) can be regarded as a special case of our bilevel optimization problem (1) with  $f(x, y) = \bar{f}(x, y)$  and  $g(x, y) = -\bar{f}(x, y)$ . We first show in the upcoming Fact 4 that the derivatives of our minimax objective enjoy tighter Lipschitz constants than the general bilevel optimization problem, as is established in §2:

**Fact 4** ([LLC22, YLL<sup>+</sup>23]). *Let  $f(x, y)$  be  $\ell$ -smooth,  $\rho$ -Hessian Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$  and  $y$  and  $\mu$ -strongly concave in  $y$  but possibly nonconvex in  $x$ . Then the hyperobjective  $\bar{\Phi}(x)$  is  $(\kappa + 1)\ell$ -smooth and has  $(4\sqrt{2}\kappa^3\rho)$ -Lipschitz continuous Hessians.*

In comparison with the SOSP-finding task in bilevel optimization, one observes from Fact 4 that the  $\kappa$ -dependency is improved from  $\kappa^{2.5}$  to  $\kappa^{1.5}$ , and our goal is to find a (more stringent)  $(\epsilon, O(\kappa^{1.5}\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\bar{\Phi}(x)$ .

**Connection between (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and the perturbed restarted accelerated gradient descent ascent.** We recap the perturbed restarted accelerated gradient descent ascent (PRAGDA) introduced by [YLL<sup>+</sup>23] (Algorithm 3 therein) as a special case of their proposed algorithm, PRAHGD. The details are in Algorithm 3. As we will point out immediately, this is exactly our Algorithm 2 applied to minimax problem (7).

When applying to the minimax problem (7), the procedures of Algorithm 2 (with `Perturbation = 1`) and Algorithm 3 are identical with the appropriate parameters setup. We observe that since  $\lambda > 1$ , the regularized objective  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  is exactly equal to the objective function  $\bar{\Phi}(x)$  in minimax



**Table 2.** Comparisons of gradient query complexity for finding approximate SOSP in nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization algorithms

Algorithm	Complexities	$Gc(\bar{f}, \epsilon)$	$HV(\bar{f}, \epsilon)$	$JV(\bar{f}, \epsilon)$
IMCN [LLC22]		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^2 \epsilon^{-1.5})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{1.5} \epsilon^{-2})$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa \epsilon^{-2})$
PRAGDA ([YLL <sup>+</sup> 23], this work)		$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{1.75} \epsilon^{-1.75})$	0	0

problem (7). Indeed, function  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) &= \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \left( f(x, y) + \lambda \left( g(x, y) - \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} g(x, z) \right) \right) \\ &= \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \left( \bar{f}(x, y) + \lambda \left( -\bar{f}(x, y) - \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} -\bar{f}(x, z) \right) \right) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \left( (1 - \lambda) \bar{f}(x, y) + \lambda \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \bar{f}(x, z) \right) \\ &= (1 - \lambda) \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \bar{f}(x, y) + \lambda \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \bar{f}(x, z) = \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \bar{f}(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

which reduces to the objective function  $\bar{\Phi}(x)$  in the minimax problem (7).

Now, careful examination of the algorithm procedures indicates that applying Algorithm 2 to minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  with  $\alpha = \alpha'$  and  $\beta = \beta'$  implies that the  $y_{t,k} = z_{t,k}$  always holds, since the sequences  $\{y_{t,k}\}$  and  $\{z_{t,k}\}$  correspond to the iterations for problems  $\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} -f(w_{t,k}, y)$  and  $\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} -(\lambda - 1)f(w_{t,k}, y)$ , respectively. Hence, Lines 7–8 of Algorithm 2 is identical to Line 7 of Algorithm 3 when  $\eta = \eta_x$ , proving the equivalence.

Therefore under this setup, utilizing Fact 4 we can take  $\tilde{L} = (\kappa + 1)\ell$  and  $\tilde{\rho} = 4\sqrt{2}\kappa^3\rho$  to conclude an improved oracle complexity upper bounds for finding second-order stationary points for this particular problem, indicated by the following statement:

**Theorem 5** (Oracle complexity of (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA for accelerating minimax optimization). *For solving (7) under the settings of Fact 4. Algorithm 2 reduces to Algorithm 3 which outputs an  $(\epsilon, \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{1.5}\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\bar{\Phi}(x)$  in (7) within  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{1.75}\epsilon^{-1.75})$  gradient query complexity of  $\bar{f}(x, y)$ .*

The proof of Theorem 5 is straightforward using the above equivalence, PRAHGD complexity result as in Theorem 16, Proposition 17 of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], and also Fact 4. As is discussed in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], this oracle query complexity achieves the state-of-the-art in this setting; see details in Table 2.

## 5 Proofs of Theoretical Results in §3

Here, we provide more details for Lemma 5, Theorem 2 and Theorem 3

### 5.1 Full Version of Lemma 5

Here we present the detailed expression of the upper bounds in Lemma 5. We refer readers to their work for proof details.

**Lemma 6.** [CMZ23, Sections B and C] *Suppose Assumption 1(i)-(iv) hold and set  $\lambda \geq 2\kappa$ , then*

(i)  $|\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq D_0/\lambda$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , where

$$D_0 = \left( M + \frac{M\ell}{2\mu} \right) \frac{M}{\mu} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2)$$

(ii)  $\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla\Phi(x)\| \leq D_1/\lambda$ , where

$$D_1 = \left( \ell + \frac{2\rho\ell + M\rho}{2\mu} + \frac{M\rho\ell}{2\mu^2} \right) \frac{M}{\mu} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3) \quad (8)$$

(iii)  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  is  $L_\lambda$ -Lipschitz, where

$$L_\lambda = \ell + \frac{5\ell^2 + M\rho}{\mu} + \frac{2M\ell\rho + 2\ell^3}{\mu^2} + \frac{2M\ell^2\rho}{\mu^3} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3)$$

If we further suppose Assumption 1(v) holds, then

(i)  $\|\nabla^2\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) - \nabla^2\Phi(x)\| \leq D_2/\lambda$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , where

$$D_2 = 2\ell \left(1 + \frac{2\ell}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\ell}{\mu} + \frac{M\rho}{\mu^2}\right)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(\frac{M\rho}{\mu} + \frac{M\ell\rho}{\mu^2} + \frac{M^2\nu}{2\mu^2} + \frac{M^2\rho^2}{2\mu^3}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^6)$$

(ii)  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  is  $\rho_\lambda$ -Hessian Lipschitz, where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\lambda &= \left(1 + \frac{4\ell}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(3\rho + \frac{2\ell\rho}{\mu}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(\frac{M\nu}{\mu} + \frac{M\rho^2}{\mu^2}\right) + \left(2 + \frac{5\ell}{\mu}\right) \left(1 + \frac{2\ell}{\mu}\right) \left(\frac{\ell\rho}{\mu} + \frac{M\rho^2}{\mu^2}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2\ell\rho}{\mu^2} \left(1 + \frac{\ell}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(\ell + \frac{M\rho}{\mu}\right) + \frac{14\ell\rho}{\mu^2} \left(1 + \frac{2\ell}{\mu}\right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\mu} + \frac{M\rho}{\mu^2}\right) + \frac{50\ell^2}{\mu^3} \left(\frac{M\nu}{\mu} + \rho\right) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^5) \end{aligned}$$

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 2

From Lemma 5, setting  $\lambda = \Theta(\max\{\kappa^2/\Delta, \kappa^3/\epsilon\})$  leads to

- $\|\nabla\Phi(x) - \nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$
- $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) \leq \mathcal{O}(\Delta)$

Thus, we only need to prove that RAF<sup>2</sup>BA (in Algorithm 2) can find an  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary point of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  within the desired complexity.

Under Condition 1 and Assumption 1 we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and Condition 1 hold, then for each  $k = -1, 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we have*

$$\|u_{t,k} - \nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(w_{t,k})\|_2 \leq \sigma$$

where  $u_{t,k}$  is defined in Line 9 in Algorithm 2.

*Proof of Lemma 7.* Note that

$$u_{t,k} = \nabla_x f(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) - \nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, z_{t,k}))$$

and

$$\nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(w_{t,k}) = \nabla_x f(w_{t,k}, y^*(w_{t,k})) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, y^*(w_{t,k})) - \nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, z^*(w_{t,k})))$$

Then from Condition 1 and the Lipschitz continuity of gradient of  $f$  and  $g$ , we have

$$\|u_{t,k} - \nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(w_{t,k})\| \leq (1 + \lambda)\ell \cdot \frac{\sigma}{2(1 + \lambda)\ell} + \ell \cdot \frac{\sigma}{2\ell} = \sigma$$

proving the lemma.  $\square$

Note that the only difference of Algorithm 2 and the PRAHGD algorithm proposed in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Algorithm 3] lies on the constructions of the inexact gradient of the objective functions, i.e.,  $\nabla \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(w_{t,k}) \approx u_{t,k} = \nabla_x f(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) - \nabla_x g(w_{t,k}, z_{t,k}))$  for Algorithm 2 and  $\nabla \Phi(w_{t,k}) \approx u_{t,k} = \nabla_x f(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k}) - \nabla_{xy}^2 g(w_{t,k}, y_{t,k})v_{t,k}$  for PRAHGD. Thus, we can directly follow the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Theorem 14] by replacing  $\Phi(x)$  by  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  and achieve the following result:

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 and Condition 1 hold. Denote  $\Delta_\lambda = \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  and  $\kappa' = (\lambda + 1)\ell/(\lambda\mu - \ell)$  (recall our choice of  $\lambda \geq 2\kappa$ ). Let*

$$\eta = \frac{1}{4L_\lambda} \quad B = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\rho_\lambda}} \quad \theta = 4(\rho_\lambda \epsilon \eta^2)^{1/4} \quad K = \frac{1}{\theta} \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{\ell} \quad \beta = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa} + 1}$$

$$\alpha' = \frac{1}{(\lambda + 1)\ell} \quad \beta' = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa'} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa'} + 1} \quad \sigma = \epsilon^2$$

and assume that  $\epsilon \leq L_\lambda^2/\rho_\lambda$ . Then our **RAF<sup>2</sup>BA** in Algorithm 2 terminates within  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_\lambda L_\lambda^{0.5} \rho_\lambda^{0.25} \epsilon^{-1.75})$  iterates, outputting  $\hat{w}$  satisfying  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\hat{w})\| \leq 83\epsilon$ .

Now we consider the overall inner loop iteration number from the step of AGD to achieve  $z_{t,k}$  in the algorithm. Following the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 31] (Section D.2 therein), we achieve the upper bound of  $\|z^*(w_{t,-1})\|_2 \leq \hat{C}_z$  as follows.

**Lemma 8.** *Consider the setting of Theorem 6, and we run Algorithm 2, then we have*

$$\|z^*(w_{t,-1})\| \leq \hat{C}_z$$

for any  $t > 0$  and some constant  $C > 0$ , where  $\hat{C}_z = \|z^*(x_{0,0})\|_2 + (2B + \eta\sigma + \eta C)\kappa\Delta_\lambda\sqrt{\rho_\lambda}\epsilon^{-3/2}$ .

Taking

$$T_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa} \log \left( \frac{2\ell\sqrt{\kappa+1}}{\sigma} \hat{C}_z \right) \right\rceil & k = -1 \\ \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa} \log \left( \frac{2\ell\sqrt{\kappa+1}}{\sigma} \left( \frac{\sigma}{2\ell} + 2\kappa B \right) \right) \right\rceil & k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

for Algorithm 2, we can use induction to show Lemma 8 and (6) in Condition 1 hold, which is similar to the analysis in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Section D.2].

Finally, we consider the overall inner loop iteration number from the step of AGD to achieve  $y_{t,k}$  in the algorithm. Following the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 31] (Section D.2 therein), we achieve the upper bound of  $\|y^*(w_{t,-1})\|_2 \leq \hat{C}_y$  as follows.

**Lemma 9.** *Consider the setting of Theorem 6, and we run Algorithm 2, then we have*

$$\|y^*(w_{t,-1})\| \leq \hat{C}_y$$

for any  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and some constant  $C > 0$ , where  $\hat{C}_y = \|y^*(x_{0,0})\| + (2B + \eta\sigma + \eta C)\kappa'\Delta_\lambda\sqrt{\rho_\lambda}\epsilon^{-3/2}$ .

Notice that the condition number of  $f(x, \cdot) + \lambda g(x, \cdot)$  is  $\kappa' = (\lambda + 1)\ell/(\lambda\mu - \ell) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . Analogizing the setting of  $T_{t,k}$ , we take

$$T'_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa'} \log \left( \frac{2(1+\lambda)\ell\sqrt{\kappa'+1}}{\sigma} \hat{C}_y \right) \right\rceil & k = -1 \\ \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa'} \log \left( \frac{2(\lambda+1)\ell\sqrt{\kappa'+1}}{\sigma} \left( \frac{\sigma}{2(\lambda+1)\ell} + 2\kappa' B \right) \right) \right\rceil & k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

for Algorithm 2. We can also use induction to show Lemma 9 and (5) in Condition 1 hold, which is similar to the analysis in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Section D.2].

Combining Theorem 6 with the above settings of  $T_{t,k}$  and  $T'_{t,k}$ , we conclude that our RAF<sup>2</sup>BA can find an  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary point of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  (also an  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -first-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$ ) within oracle complexities  $Gc(f, \epsilon) = Gc(g, \epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25}\epsilon^{-1.75})$ , which is similar to the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Corollary 15] (Section D.3 therein).

### 5.3 Proof of Theorem 3

From Lemma 5, setting  $\lambda = \Theta(\max\{\kappa^2/\Delta, \kappa^3/\epsilon, \kappa^6/\sqrt{\epsilon}\})$  leads to

- $\|\nabla\Phi(x) - \nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$
- $\|\nabla^2\Phi(x) - \nabla^2\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$
- $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x) \leq \mathcal{O}(\Delta)$

Now all we need is to show that our (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA can find an  $(\epsilon, \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{2.5}\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  within the desired complexity.

Following the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Theorem 16], we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 and Condition 1 hold. We denote  $\Delta_\lambda = \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x_{\text{int}}) - \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  and  $\kappa' = (\lambda + 1)\ell/(\lambda\mu - \ell)$  and let*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{d_x}{\zeta\epsilon}\right) & \eta &= \frac{1}{4L_\lambda} & K &= \frac{2\chi}{\theta} & B &= \frac{1}{288\chi^2} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\rho_\lambda}} & \theta &= \frac{1}{2} (\rho_\lambda \epsilon \eta^2)^{1/4} & \sigma &= \min\left\{\frac{\rho_\lambda B \zeta r \theta}{2\sqrt{d_x}}, \epsilon^2\right\} \\ \alpha &= \frac{1}{\ell} & \beta &= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa} + 1} & \alpha' &= \frac{1}{(\lambda + 1)\ell} & \beta' &= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa'} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa'} + 1} & r &= \min\left\{\frac{L_\lambda B^2}{4C}, \frac{B + B^2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\theta B}{20K}, \sqrt{\frac{\theta B^2}{2K}}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C$ , where we assume that  $\epsilon \leq L_\lambda^2/\rho_\lambda$ . Then (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA in Algorithm 2 terminates in at most  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_\lambda L_\lambda^{0.5} \rho_\lambda^{0.25} \chi^6 \cdot \epsilon^{-1.75})$  iterations and the output satisfies  $\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\hat{w})\| \leq \epsilon$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(\hat{w})) \geq -1.011\sqrt{\rho_\lambda\epsilon}$  with probability at least  $1 - \zeta$ .

Now we set parameters  $T_{t,k}$  and  $T'_{t,k}$  in a similar way to the counterparts in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Section E.2] and Section 5.2, that is,

$$T_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa} \log\left(\frac{2\ell\sqrt{\kappa+1}}{\sigma} \tilde{C}_z\right) \right\rceil & k = -1 \\ \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa} \log\left(\frac{2\ell\sqrt{\kappa+1}}{\sigma} \left(\frac{\sigma}{2\ell} + 2\kappa B\right)\right) \right\rceil & k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and

$$T'_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa'} \log\left(\frac{2(1+\lambda)\ell\sqrt{\kappa'+1}}{\sigma} \tilde{C}_y\right) \right\rceil & k = -1 \\ \left\lceil 2\sqrt{\kappa'} \log\left(\frac{2(\lambda+1)\ell\sqrt{\kappa'+1}}{\sigma} \left(\frac{\sigma}{2(\lambda+1)\ell} + 2\kappa' B\right)\right) \right\rceil & k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\tilde{C}_z = \|z^*(x_{0,0})\| + (2B + B^2 + \eta\sigma + \eta C) \kappa \Delta_\lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} \epsilon^{-3/2}$$

and

$$\tilde{C}_y = \|y^*(x_{0,0})\| + (2B + B^2 + \eta\sigma + \eta C) \kappa' \Delta_\lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} \epsilon^{-3/2}$$

We can also use induction to prove that Condition 1 will hold when we choose  $T_{t,k}$  and  $T'_{t,k}$  as set in (11) and (12).

Combining Theorem 7 with the above settings of  $T_{t,k}$  and  $T'_{t,k}$ , we can conclude that our (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA can find an  $(\epsilon, \kappa^{2.5}\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^*(x)$  (also an  $(\mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \kappa^{2.5}\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -second-order stationary point of  $\Phi(x)$ ) within oracle complexities  $Gc(f, \epsilon) = Gc(g, \epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{3.25}\epsilon^{-1.75})$ , which is similar to the proof of [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Corollary 18] (Section D therein).

## 6 Empirical Studies

In this section we conduct selective empirical studies to validate the theoretical advances of this work. We validate the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposed algorithms, RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA, by applying them to three classical machine learning tasks: hyperparameter optimization of logistic regression (for the 20 News Group dataset) data, data hyper-cleaning (for the MNIST dataset), as well as a synthetic example for minimax optimization. Our experiments demonstrate that our algorithms outperform several established baseline algorithms, such as BA, AID-BiO, ITD-BiO, PAID-BiO as well as RAHGD, PRAHGD proposed in the recent work [YLL<sup>+</sup>23], and (in synthetic minimax problem) our PRAGDA algorithm therein when compared to IMCN, exhibiting improved convergence rates.

### 6.1 Hyperparameter Optimization


The goal of *hyperparameter optimization* is to find the optimal hyperparameter in minimizing the loss on the validation dataset. Such a problem can be cast to the bilevel optimization of form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p} \quad & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}} L(w^*(\lambda); x_i, y_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & w^*(\lambda) = \arg \min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times p}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}} L(w; x_i, y_i) + \frac{1}{2cp} \sum_{j=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^p \exp(\lambda_k) w_{jk}^2 \end{aligned}$$


where  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$  is the training dataset,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$  is the validation dataset,  $L$  is the cross-entropy loss function,  $c = 20$  is the number of topics and  $p = 130,170$  is the dimension of features. As suggested in the theory part we use the conjugate gradient descent method to approximate the Hessian-inverse-vector product.

We compare the performance of our algorithms with the baseline algorithms listed in Table 1 over a logistic regression problem on 20 Newsgroup dataset [GFPS20]. This dataset consists of 18,846 news items divided into 20 topics, and features include 130,170 tf-idf sparse vectors. We divided the data into three parts:  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}| = 5,657$  samples for training,  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}| = 5,657$  samples for validation, and 7,532 samples for testing.


For all algorithms listed in Figure 1, we choose the inner-loop learning rate and outer-loop learning rate from  $\{0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1\}$  where the iteration number of GD or AGD step is chosen from  $\{5, 10, 30, 50\}$  and the iteration number of CG step from  $\{5, 10, 30, 50\}$ . For BA-CG, we choose the iteration number of GD steps from  $\{[c(k+1)^{1/4}] : c \in \{0.5, 1, 2, 4\}\}$ , as is adopted by [GW18]. For RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA, we choose  $\lambda$  (in (2)) from  $\{100, 300, 500, 700\}$ . The results are shown in Figure 1. We observe that our RAHGD, PRAHGD, RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA converge faster than rival algorithms.




(a) testing accuracy vs. running time



(b) testing loss vs. running time



(c) testing accuracy vs. number of oracle calls



(d) testing loss vs. number of oracle calls


**Figure 1.** Comparison of various bilevel algorithms on logistic regression on 20 Newsgroup dataset. Figures (a) and (b) show the results of testing accuracy and testing loss vs. running time respectively. Figures (c) and (d) show the results of testing accuracy and testing loss vs. number of oracles calls respectively

## 6.2 Data Hypercleaning

In *data hypercleaning* [FDFP17, SCHB19] we have a dataset with label noise and wish to train a model while cleaning up a subset of the noisy data at limited time and/or cost. It is an application example of bilevel optimization where one treats the cleaned data as the validation set and the remaining data as the training set:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}|}} f(W^*(\lambda), \lambda) &\triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}} -\log(y_i^\top W^*(\lambda)x_i) \\
 \text{s.t. } W^*(\lambda) &= \arg \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_x}} g(W, \lambda) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}} -\sigma(\lambda_i) \log(y_i^\top W x_i) + C_r \|W\|^2
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$  is the training dataset,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$  is the validation dataset,  $W$  is the weight of the classifier,  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid function and  $C_r$  is a regularization parameter. Following [SCHB19] and [JYL21], we choose  $C_r = 0.001$ .



**Figure 2.** Comparison of various bilevel algorithms for data hypercleaning at different corruption rates

We conducted an experiment on MNIST [LBBH98], which has  $d_x = 785$  and  $d_y = 10$  for problem (13). The training set contains  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}| = 20,000$  images, some of which have their labels randomly disrupted. We refer to the ratio of images with disrupted labels as the corruption rate  $p$ . The validation set contains  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}| = 5,000$  images with correct labels, and the testing set consists of 10,000 images.

The experimental results are shown in Figure 2. Analogous to Section 5.1 we continue to use the CG method to approximate the Hessian-inverse-vector product. For the BA algorithm proposed by [GW18], we also use the conjugate gradient descent method to compute the Hessian vector since they did not specify it and we called it BA-CG in Figure 2. For all algorithms, We choose the inner-loop learning rate and outer-loop learning rate from  $\{0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10\}$  and the iteration number of CG step from  $\{3, 6, 12, 24\}$ . For all algorithms except BA, we choose the iteration number of GD or AGD steps from  $\{50, 100, 200, 500, 1000\}$  and for BA algorithm, as adopted by [GW18], we choose the iteration number of GD steps from  $\{\lceil c(k+1)^{1/4} \rceil : c \in \{0.5, 1, 2, 4\}\}$ . For RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA, we choose  $\lambda$  (in (2)) from  $\{100, 300, 500, 700\}$ . We observe that our RAHGD, PRAHGD, RAF<sup>2</sup>BA and PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA converge faster than rival algorithms.


### 6.3 $W$ -Shaped Synthetic Minimax Example

We construct the following nonconvex-strong-concave minimax problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x, y) = w(x_3) - 10y_1^2 + x_1y_1 - 5y_2^2 + x_2y_2$$

where  $x = [x_1, x_2, x_3]^\top$  and  $y = [y_1, y_2]^\top$  and

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\epsilon}(x + (L+1)\sqrt{\epsilon})^2 - \frac{1}{3}(x + (L+1)\sqrt{\epsilon})^3 - \frac{1}{3}(3L+1)\epsilon^{3/2} & x \leq -L\sqrt{\epsilon} \\ \epsilon x + \frac{\epsilon^{3/2}}{3} & -L\sqrt{\epsilon} < x \leq -\sqrt{\epsilon} \\ -\sqrt{\epsilon}x^2 - \frac{x^3}{3} & -\sqrt{\epsilon} < x \leq 0 \\ -\sqrt{\epsilon}x^2 + \frac{x^3}{3} & 0 < x \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \\ -\epsilon x + \frac{\epsilon^{3/2}}{3} & \sqrt{\epsilon} < x \leq L\sqrt{\epsilon} \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}(x - (L+1)\sqrt{\epsilon})^2 + \frac{1}{3}(x - (L+1)\sqrt{\epsilon})^3 - \frac{1}{3}(3L+1)\epsilon^{3/2} & L\sqrt{\epsilon} < x \end{cases} \quad (14)$$



**Figure 3:** W-shape function [TSJ<sup>+</sup>18]

is the *W-shape-function* [TSJ<sup>+</sup>18] and we set  $\epsilon = 0.01, L = 5$  in our experiment.  $w(\cdot)$  is depicted in Figure 3.


It is straightforward to verify that  $[x_0; y_0] = [[0, 0, 0]^\top; [0, 0]^\top]$  is a saddle point of  $f(x, y)$ . We construct our experiment with two different initial points:  $[x_1; y_1] = [[10^{-3}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-16}]^\top; [0, 0]^\top]$  and  $[x_2; y_2] = [[0, 0, 1]^\top; [0, 0]^\top]$ . Note that  $[x_1; y_1]$  is relatively close to initialization  $[x_0; y_0]$ , while  $[x_2; y_2]$  is relatively distant from  $[x_0; y_0]$ . We numerically compare our PRAGDA with the IMCN [LLC22] algorithm and classical GDA [LJJ20] algorithm. The results are shown in Figure 4 where a grid search is adopted to choose the learning rate of AGD steps, GDA, and outer-loop learning rate of PRAGDA. The grids are for learning rates  $\{c \times 10^i : c \in \{1, 5\}, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}$  and momentum parameters  $\{c \times 0.1 : c \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}\}$ .

We compare the number of oracle calls against  $\Phi(x) - \Phi(x^*)$ ,  $\|\nabla\Phi(x)\|$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2\Phi(x))$  and plot the results in Figure 4. From the curves corresponding to initial point  $(x_2, y_2)$ , we observe that all the three algorithms converge to the minimum when the initial point is far from the strict saddle point, but our PRAGDA converges much faster than IMCN and GDA. When the initial point is close to the strict saddle point, Figure 4(b) shows that the GDA algorithm gets stuck at the strict saddle point since its Hessian minimum eigenvalue is always negative. However, our PRAGDA and IMCN can reach the points which have positive Hessian minimum eigenvalues. Also, our PRAGDA converges faster than IMCN.

## 7 Conclusion

In summary, the *(Perturbed) Restarted Accelerated Fully First-order methods for Bilevel Approximation* ((P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA) introduced in this paper aims at solving (nonconvex-strongly-convex) bilevel optimization problems with effectiveness and efficiency. By leveraging fully first-order oracles and incorporating acceleration techniques, (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA algorithm finds approximate first-order stationary points and second-order stationary points of the hyperobjective function within desirable oracle query complexities. Additionally, PRAF<sup>2</sup>BA rediscovers PRAGDA that achieves the state-of-the-art complexity for finding approximate second-order stationary points in (nonconvex-strongly-concave) minimax optimization, where the parameter flexibility of the algorithm enhances its adaptability to diverse problem settings. Overall, the (P)RAF<sup>2</sup>BA algorithm represents a significant advancement in





**Figure 4.** A selection of empirical results with convergence measured by both the function value gap, gradient norm and minimal eigenvalue of Hessian (in absolute value), applied on the task of the synthetic minimax problem

accelerated fully first-order methods for bilevel optimization, offering a comprehensive theoretical framework and analysis of accelerated fully first-order methods for bilevel optimization problems, paving the way for further advancements in solving associated family of optimization problem.

## References

- [ACB17] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- [BHTV19] Luca Bertinetto, Joao F Henriques, Philip Torr, and Andrea Vedaldi. Meta-learning with differentiable closed-form solvers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [CLZ21] Ziyi Chen, Qunwei Li, and Yi Zhou. Escaping saddle points in nonconvex minimax optimization via cubic-regularized gradient descent-ascent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07098*, 2021.
- [CMZ23] Lesi Chen, Yaohua Ma, and Jingzhao Zhang. Near-optimal fully first-order algorithms for finding stationary points in bilevel optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14853*, 2023.
- [CSY21] Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. Closing the gap: Tighter analysis of alternating stochastic gradient methods for bilevel problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25294–25307, 2021.

- [Dan12] John M. Danskin. *The theory of max-min and its application to weapons allocation problems*, volume 5. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [FDFP17] Luca Franceschi, Michele Donini, Paolo Frasconi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Forward and reverse gradient-based hyperparameter optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1165–1173. PMLR, 2017.
- [FFS<sup>+</sup>18] Luca Franceschi, Paolo Frasconi, Saverio Salzo, Riccardo Grazi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1568–1577. PMLR, 2018.
- [FH19] Matthias Feurer and Frank Hutter. Hyperparameter optimization. In *Automated Machine Learning: Methods, Systems, Challenges*, pages 3–33. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [GFPS20] Riccardo Grazi, Luca Franceschi, Massimiliano Pontil, and Saverio Salzo. On the iteration complexity of hypergradient computation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3748–3758. PMLR, 2020.
- [GPAM<sup>+</sup>20] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020.
- [GSS14] Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- [GW18] Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02246*, 2018.
- [HJML22] Minhui Huang, Kaiyi Ji, Shiqian Ma, and Lifeng Lai. Efficiently escaping saddle points in bilevel optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03684*, 2022.
- [HML21] Minhui Huang, Shiqian Ma, and Lifeng Lai. A Riemannian block coordinate descent method for computing the projection robust Wasserstein distance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4446–4455. PMLR, 2021.
- [HWY23] Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A two-timescale stochastic algorithm framework for bilevel optimization: Complexity analysis and application to actor-critic. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(1):147–180, 2023.
- [JL23] Kaiyi Ji and Yingbin Liang. Lower bounds and accelerated algorithms for bilevel optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(22):1–56, 2023.
- [JLLP20] Kaiyi Ji, Jason D Lee, Yingbin Liang, and H Vincent Poor. Convergence of meta-learning with task-specific adaptation over partial parameters. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11490–11500, 2020.
- [JLLY22] Kaiyi Ji, Mingrui Liu, Yingbin Liang, and Lei Ying. Will bilevel optimizers benefit from loops. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3011–3023, 2022.

- [JNJ20] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Michael Jordan. What is local optimality in nonconvex-nonconcave minimax optimization? In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4880–4889. PMLR, 2020.
- [JYL21] Kaiyi Ji, Junjie Yang, and Yingbin Liang. Bilevel optimization: Convergence analysis and enhanced design. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4882–4892. PMLR, 2021.
- [KKWN23] Jeongyeol Kwon, Dohyun Kwon, Stephen Wright, and Robert D Nowak. A fully first-order method for stochastic bilevel optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18083–18113. PMLR, 2023.
- [KT99] Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- [LBBH98] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [LFH<sup>+</sup>20] Tianyi Lin, Chenyou Fan, Nhat Ho, Marco Cuturi, and Michael Jordan. Projection robust Wasserstein distance and Riemannian optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9383–9397, 2020.
- [LHH22] Junyi Li, Feihu Huang, and Heng Huang. Local stochastic bilevel optimization with momentum-based variance reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01608*, 2022.
- [LJJ20] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020.
- [LLC22] Luo Luo, Yujun Li, and Cheng Chen. Finding second-order stationary points in nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:36667–36679, 2022.
- [LTHC20] Songtao Lu, Ioannis Tsaknakis, Mingyi Hong, and Yongxin Chen. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:3676–3691, 2020.
- [LYHZ20] Luo Luo, Haishan Ye, Zhichao Huang, and Tong Zhang. Stochastic recursive gradient descent ascent for stochastic nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20566–20577, 2020.
- [Nes13] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [NSH<sup>+</sup>19] Maher Nouiehed, Maziar Sanjabi, Tianjian Huang, Jason D Lee, and Meisam Razaviyayn. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [NW06] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition, 2006.

- [Rd17] Vincent Roulet and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Sharpness, restart and acceleration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [SCHB19] Amirreza Shaban, Ching-An Cheng, Nathan Hatch, and Byron Boots. Truncated back-propagation for bilevel optimization. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1723–1732. PMLR, 2019.
- [SND18] Aman Sinha, Hongseok Namkoong, and John Duchi. Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [SZB20] Bradly Stadie, Lunjun Zhang, and Jimmy Ba. Learning intrinsic rewards as a bi-level optimization problem. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 111–120. PMLR, 2020.
- [TSJ<sup>+</sup>18] Nilesh Tripuraneni, Mitchell Stern, Chi Jin, Jeffrey Regier, and Michael I Jordan. Stochastic cubic regularization for fast nonconvex optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [YLL<sup>+</sup>23] Haikuo Yang, Luo Luo, Chris Junchi Li, Michael Jordan, and Maryam Fazel. Accelerating inexact hypergradient descent for bilevel optimization. In *OPT 2023: Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2023.

## A More Related Work

**Related Work on Bilevel Optimization.** Ghadimi and Wang [GW18] introduced a convergence rate for the AID approach under convex  $f(x, y)$ , analyzing a gradient descent-based accelerated algorithm. Ji et al. [JYL21, JLLY22] improved upon this with their iterative differentiation (ITD) method, refining complexity analysis and providing insights into a randomized version. Hong et al. [HWWY23] proposed the TTSA algorithm, offering a single-loop solution for alternating variable updates, notably applicable to randomized reinforcement learning scenarios. For stochastic bilevel problems, various methods like BSA [GW18], TTSA [HWWY23], stocBiO [JYL21], and ALSET [CSY21] have been proposed, pushing the frontier with variance reduction and momentum techniques [JL23, LHH22, KKWN23]. While much focus has been on first-order stationary points in bilevel optimization, the pursuit of second-order stationary points remains largely underexplored. Until recently, Huang et al. [HJML22] introduced a perturbed algorithm to find approximate second-order stationary points, combining gradient descent with conjugate gradient methods.

**Related Work on Minimax Optimization.** Minimax optimization, pivotal in machine learning applications like GAN training [GPAM<sup>+</sup>20, ACB17], adversarial learning [GSS14, SND18], and optimal transport [LFH<sup>+</sup>20, HML21], has garnered attention. Nouiehed et al. [NSH<sup>+</sup>19, JNJ20] explored the complexity of Multistep Gradient Descent Ascent (GDmax), while Lin et al. [LJJ20, LTHC20] provided the first convergence analysis for the gradient descent ascent (GDA) algorithm. Luo et al. [LYHZ20] extended stochastic variance reduction techniques, achieving optimal complexity bounds in specific cases. Recent work by Luo et al. [LLC22] and Chen et al. [CLZ21] introduced cubic-regularized Newton methods for local minimax point convergence. Despite these strides, non-asymptotic convergence rates for local minimax points remain relatively unexplored, presenting a compelling area for future work.

## B Proofs of Basic Lemmas in §2

The proofs in this section are adapted from those in [YLL<sup>+</sup>23, Appendix C].

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Recall that

$$\nabla\Phi(x) = \nabla_x f(x, y^*(x)) - \nabla_{xy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} \nabla_y f(x, y^*(x))$$

We denote  $\mathcal{H}_1(x) = \nabla_x f(x, y^*(x))$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2(x) = \nabla_{xy}^2 g(x, y^*(x))$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_3(x) = (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_4(x) = \nabla_y f(x, y^*(x))$ , then

$$\nabla\Phi(x) = \mathcal{H}_1(x) - \mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x)\mathcal{H}_4(x)$$

We first consider  $\mathcal{H}_1(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2(x)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_4(x)$ . For any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , we have

$$\|\mathcal{H}_1(x) - \mathcal{H}_1(x')\| \leq \ell (\|x - x'\| + \|y^*(x) - y^*(x')\|) \leq \ell(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\|$$

where we use triangle inequality in the first inequality and Lemma 2.2 in the second one.

We also have

$$\|\mathcal{H}_2(x) - \mathcal{H}_2(x')\| \leq \rho (\|x - x'\| + \|y^*(x) - y^*(x')\|) \leq \rho(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\|$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{H}_4(x) - \mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \leq \ell (\|x - x'\| + \|y^*(x) - y^*(x')\|) \leq \ell(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\|$$

We next consider  $\mathcal{H}_3(x)$ . For any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{H}_3(x) - \mathcal{H}_3(x')\| &= \left\| (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} - (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x', y^*(x')))^{-1} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} \right\| \left\| \nabla_{yy}^2 g(x', y^*(x')) - \nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) \right\| \left\| (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x', y^*(x')))^{-1} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu^2} \rho (\|x - x'\| + \|y^*(x) - y^*(x')\|) \leq \frac{\rho(1 + \kappa)}{\mu^2} \|x - x'\| \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\| \leq \ell \quad \|\mathcal{H}_3(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{H}_4(x)\| \leq M$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . Then for any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\Phi(x) - \nabla\Phi(x')\| &\leq \|\mathcal{H}_1(x) - \mathcal{H}_1(x')\| + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x)\mathcal{H}_4(x) - \mathcal{H}_2(x')\mathcal{H}_3(x')\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \\ &\leq \ell(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x)\mathcal{H}_4(x) - \mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x)\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x)\mathcal{H}_4(x') - \mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x')\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\mathcal{H}_3(x')\mathcal{H}_4(x') - \mathcal{H}_2(x')\mathcal{H}_3(x')\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \\ &\leq \ell(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\| \|\mathcal{H}_3(x)\| \|\mathcal{H}_4(x) - \mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{H}_2(x)\| \|\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \|\mathcal{H}_3(x) - \mathcal{H}_3(x')\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{H}_3(x')\| \|\mathcal{H}_4(x')\| \|\mathcal{H}_2(x) - \mathcal{H}_2(x')\| \\ &\leq \ell(1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| + \frac{\ell^2}{\mu} (1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| + \frac{\ell\rho M}{\mu^2} (1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| + \frac{M\rho}{\mu} (1 + \kappa) \|x - x'\| \\ &= \left( \ell + \frac{2\ell^2 + \rho M}{\mu} + \frac{\ell^3 + 2\rho\ell M}{\mu^2} + \frac{\rho\ell^2 M}{\mu^3} \right) \|x - x'\| \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the first part. For the second part see the detailed proof associated with [HJML22, Lemma 2.4].  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Recall that  $y^*(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} g(x, y)$ . The optimality condition leads to

$$\nabla_y g(x, y^*(x)) = 0$$

for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . Taking a further derivative with respect to  $x$  on both sides and some algebra gives

$$\nabla_{yx}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) + \nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) \frac{\partial y^*(x)}{\partial x} = 0$$

The smoothness and strong convexity of  $g$  in  $y$  immediately indicate

$$\frac{\partial y^*(x)}{\partial x} = - (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} \nabla_{yx}^2 g(x, y^*(x))$$

Thus we have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial y^*(x)}{\partial x} \right\| = \left\| (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} \nabla_{yx}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) \right\| \leq \frac{\ell}{\mu} = \kappa$$

where the inequality is based on the fact that  $g(x, y)$  is  $\ell$ -smooth with respect to  $x$  and  $y$  and  $\mu$ -strongly convex with respect to  $y$  for any  $x$ . Therefore, we proved that  $y^*(x)$  is  $\kappa$ -Lipschitz continuous.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* Recall that

$$\nabla \Phi(x) = \nabla_x f(x, y^*(x)) - \nabla_{xy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)) (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x, y^*(x)))^{-1} \nabla_y f(x, y^*(x))$$

We define

$$\bar{\nabla} \Phi(x_k) = \nabla_x f(x_k, y_k) - \nabla_{xy}^2 g(x_k, y_k) (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(x_k, y_k))^{-1} \nabla_y f(x_k, y_k)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla \Phi(w_k) - \hat{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) \right\|_2 &= \left\| \nabla \Phi(w_k) - \bar{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) + \bar{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) - \hat{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla \Phi(w_k) - \bar{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) \right\|_2 + \left\| \bar{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) - \hat{\nabla} \Phi(w_k) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{L} \|y_k - y^*(w_k)\|_2 + \ell \left\| v_k - (\nabla_{yy}^2 g(w_k, y_k))^{-1} \nabla_y f(w_k, y_k) \right\|_2 \leq \sigma \end{aligned}$$

where we use the triangle inequality in the first inequality, Lemma 1 and Assumption 1(iii) in the second inequality and Condition 1 in the last inequality.  $\square$