

DECENTRALIZED CONJUGATE GRADIENT AND MEMORYLESS BFGS METHODS *

LIPING WANG[†], HAO WU[‡], AND HONGCHAO ZHANG[§]

Abstract. This paper considers the decentralized optimization problem of minimizing a finite sum of continuously differentiable functions over a fixed-connected undirected network. Summarizing the lack of previously developed decentralized conjugate gradient methods, we propose new decentralized conjugate gradient (NDCG) and memoryless BFGS (DMBFGS) methods for nonconvex and strongly convex problems, respectively. Firstly, to the best of our knowledge, NDCG is the first decentralized conjugate gradient method to be shown to have global convergence with constant stepsize for general nonconvex optimization problems, which profits from our designed conjugate parameter and relies only on the same mild conditions as the centralized conjugate gradient method. Secondly, considering the conjugate gradient method as a special quasi-Newton method, we apply a scaled memoryless BFGS technique and develop the DMBFGS method that requires only vector-vector products to capture the curvature information of Hessian matrices. DMBFGS ensures quasi-Newton matrices have bounded eigenvalues without introducing any regularization term or damping method. Under proper choice of stepsizes, DMBFGS has global linear convergence for solving strongly convex decentralized optimization problems. Our numerical results show both NDCG and DMBFGS are very efficient respectively compared with other state-of-the-art methods for solving nonconvex and strongly convex decentralized optimization.

Key words. Decentralized optimization, conjugate gradient method, constant stepsize, memoryless BFGS, global convergence

AMS subject classifications.

1. INTRODUCTION. In this paper, we consider the following decentralized optimization problem over an undirected and connected network containing n nodes.

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in R^p} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{z}), \quad (1.1)$$

where the local objective function $f_i : R^p \rightarrow R$ is continuously differentiable. Consider the underlying network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of nodes, and \mathcal{E} is the collection of unordered edges. We denote two nodes as neighbors if they are connected by an edge. In decentralized setting, there does not exist one central server to gather local information from other nodes, compute shared global information, and broadcast it to all other nodes. Each local function f_i is only known to node i and all the nodes collaborate with their neighbors through information exchange (i.e., communication) to obtain the consensus minimizer. Decentralized optimization has wide applications including decentralized resources control[1], wireless networks[2], decentralized machine learning[3], power systems[4], federated learning[5].

As the above practical applications spring up, decentralized optimization methods have been extensively studied, where first-order methods, especially gradient-based methods, first gain attention due to their simple iterative schemes and low computational expense. Let us focus on the nonconvex problems first. Among numerous

*

[†]wlpmath@nuaa.edu.cn, School of Mathematics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

[‡]wuhoo104@nuaa.edu.cn, School of Mathematics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

[§]hozhang@math.lsu.edu, Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University

first-order methods, decentralized gradient descent (DGD) [6, 7, 8] is the most well-known. However, DGD converges to an exact stationary point of the original problem with only a diminishing stepsize. When taking a constant stepsize, the iterates generated by DGD converge to a stationary point of a Lyapunov function [7]. There are many works devoted to a constant stepsize without losing the exact convergence. Gradient Tracking (GT) based methods [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15] utilize a dynamical average consensus [16] technique to designate local average gradient approximations at any nodes to track the global average gradient, therefore realizing an exact convergence. Actually, the convergence of the original GT method is first studied for convex and strongly convex optimization problems [9, 10, 11], where they design different proof frameworks. [17] considers a more general case that the Lipschitz continuity of gradients just holds on some given compact set, not the universal set. They propose a multi-stage GT method with global convergence. Note that nonconvex optimization methods are more extensively studied in stochastic optimization, which can easily turn to deterministic optimization. [18] proposes a GT-based nonconvex stochastic decentralized method, which replaces the gradient in the original GT with the stochastic gradient. [19] introduces the momentum to stochastic GT for acceleration and presents a momentum tracking (MT) method, generating local approximations to track the global average momentum. [20] proposes a theoretically faster method that utilizes the momentum tracking technique as well as the Loopless Chebyshev Acceleration [15] method. Considering GT-based and MT-based methods require two rounds of communication per iteration, [21] proposes to apply the tracking mechanism with respect to the variable updates instead of the gradients or momentums, saving communication cost but causing a slow convergence due to sensitivity to the dissimilarity between local and global gradients.

In centralized nonconvex optimization, the conjugate gradient (CG) methods have been demonstrated to have better performance beyond the gradient descent method without losing theoretical guarantee and easy implementation. However, few decentralized CG methods have been developed. [22] considers a distributed online optimization problem whose objective function is iteration-varying, and presents a distributed online CG algorithm. Their method uses diminishing stepsizes composed of two components where the first is given by an exact line search and the second is $O(1/\sqrt{t})$. Additionally, uniformly bounded conjugate parameters and an extra projection step are needed. A decentralized Riemannian CG descent method [23] is proposed to address the decentralized optimizations on Riemannian manifolds. It needs the stepsize to be decreasing and to satisfy the local strong Wolfe condition on each node. [24] gives a decentralized CG method with constant stepsizes through a conjugate direction tracking technique which generates an estimate of the average conjugate direction by the dynamic average consensus technique [25]. However, the convergence proofs of the above three works are not quite right or complete, which will be detailedly indicated in Section II.A.

If the problem under consideration is strongly convex, we have more flexibility in designing algorithms. [12] presents a distributed heavy ball method, called ABm, that combines GT with an alternative momentum. Note that the momentum in [12] is the variable difference that covers the consensus gap of variables while that in MT [19] is actually the integration of the history gradient. [13] introduces the Barzilai-Borwein (BB) [26] technique to the original GT method, obtaining automatically computed stepsizes for each node. Optimal GT (OGT) [15] is the first decentralized gradient-based method, not relying on inner loops to reach the optimal complexities for mini-

mizing strongly convex and smooth optimization problems. Actually, it is preferable for strongly convex optimization problems to using the quasi-Newton methods since the curvature information of the Hessian of the objective function can be captured with a low computation cost. [27] focuses on penalized approaches for solving a constrained problem, where a consensus constraint is introduced to reformulate the problem (1.1). They propose a decentralized BFGS (DBFGS) method to the penalized problem. However, DBFGS is an inexact penalty method in the sense that the penalty parameter needs to go to infinity for ensuring global convergence. PD-QN[28] improves DBFGS in the primal-dual framework. A decentralized ADMM [29] incorporates the BFGS quasi-Newton technique to improve computation efficiency. Note quasi-Newton methods overcome the difficulty in computing Hessian matrices but can not avoid high memory storage of the Hessian approximation matrices. [30] proposes the damped limited-memory BFGS (D-LM-BFGS) and damped regularized limited-memory DFP (DR-LM-DFP) methods which require modest storage. In addition, D-LM-BFGS reduces computation cost by realizing the two-loop recursion. Existing decentralized quasi-Newton methods usually add a regularization term or take a damping technique in order to ensure quasi-Newton matrices are positive definite and have bounded eigenvalues. We think these ways are too conservative and might cause underutilization for second-order information.

In this paper, new decentralized CG and memoryless quasi-Newton methods are proposed, respectively aimed at nonconvex and strongly convex optimization problems. Our main contributions are as follows.

1. We propose a decentralized CG method using constant stepsizes, called NDCG. To the best of our knowledge, NDCG is the first decentralized CG method with global convergence for minimizing nonconvex problems, where the convergence condition, Lipschitz continuity of gradients, is not stricter than that of the centralized CG method. Numerical results are presented to indicate our method is superior to other advanced nonconvex decentralized optimization methods.
2. Consider the close connection between the CG method and the memoryless quasi-Newton method. Our aim is to seek a decentralized updating direction from the scaled memoryless BFGS method proposed by [31], thus giving a decentralized memoryless BFGS method, named DMBFGS. Two advantages of this method are capturing the second-order information with only vector-vector products and generating secure quasi-Newton matrices whose eigenvalues are bounded without any regularizing or damping technique. DMBFGS effectively utilizes second-order information and its computation and communication overheads are the same as well-developed first-order methods. This method is shown to have a linear convergence rate under the strongly convex assumption. Numerical results are provided to show our method performs better than these advanced first-order methods for minimizing strongly convex optimization problems.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review the previously developed decentralized CG methods and then propose two new methods, as well as show their global convergence. Numerical experiments are performed in Section 3 to compare our methods with other well-established first-order methods for solving decentralized optimization. Finally, we draw some conclusions in Section 4.

1.1. Notation. We let uppercase boldface denote matrices, and lowercase boldface denote vectors. We let \mathbf{x}_i denote the local copy of the global variable \mathbf{z} at node

i and define \mathcal{N}_i as the set consisting of the neighbors of node i (In this paper, we treat node i itself as one of its neighbors for convenience). For vectors \mathbf{v}_i (\mathbf{v}_i could for instance be \mathbf{x}_i , \mathbf{g}_i and so on) defined for $i = 1, \dots, n$ we denote by

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_n \end{bmatrix} \in R^{np},$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i$. We define $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and further extend the definition to the gradient of $f(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x}_2) \\ \vdots \\ \nabla f_n(\mathbf{x}_n) \end{bmatrix} \in R^{np}.$$

We let \mathbf{g}^t , \mathbf{g}_i^t denote $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^t)$, $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^t)$, respectively. We say that \mathbf{x} is consensual or gets consensus if $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_n$. We use \mathbf{I}_p to denote the $p \times p$ identity matrix and let \mathbf{I} denote \mathbf{I}_{np} for simplicity. $\text{Null}(\mathbf{N})$ denotes the null space of the matrix \mathbf{N} . We let $\text{span}(\mathbf{v})$ denote the linear subspace spanned by the vector \mathbf{v} . Kronecker Product is denoted as \otimes . Given a symmetric matrix \mathbf{N} , $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{N})$, $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{N})$, and $\rho(\mathbf{N})$ denote its smallest eigenvalue, largest eigenvalue, and spectral radius, respectively. For any vector \mathbf{v} and matrix \mathbf{N} , $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{N}}^2$ denotes $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{v}$. \mathbf{N}^T denotes transpose of the matrix \mathbf{N} . For matrices \mathbf{N}_1 and \mathbf{N}_2 , $\mathbf{N}_1 \succeq \mathbf{N}_2$ means $\mathbf{N}_1 - \mathbf{N}_2$ is positive definite. We let $\log(\cdot)$ denote $\log_{10}(\cdot)$ and define $\mathbf{M} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes \mathbf{I}_p$ where $\mathbf{1}_n$ denotes the all-one vector in R^n .

2. ALGORITHM DEVELOPMENT AND MAIN RESULTS. This section derives two algorithms for non convex and strongly convex optimization problems, respectively. We start by discussing a simple decentralized CG (SDCG) method. We notice that the methods from [22, 23, 24] were developed on the basis of SDCG. The following are several necessary assumptions for the objective function.

ASSUMPTION 1. *The local objective function f_i is bounded below, namely, $f_i(z) > -\infty$ for all $z \in R^p$.*

ASSUMPTION 2. *The local gradients $\{\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})\}_{i=1}^n$ are Lipschitz continuous with constant $L > 0$, i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}) - \nabla f_i(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})\| \leq L \|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|, \quad (2.1)$$

$\forall \mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in R^p, i = 1, \dots, n$.

In decentralized optimization it is convenient to parameterize communication by a mixing matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = [\tilde{W}_{ij}] \in R^{n \times n}$

DEFINITION 1. (*Mixing matrix*)

1. $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is nonnegative and \tilde{W}_{ij} characterizes the active link (i, j) , i.e., $\tilde{W}_{i,j} > 0$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, $\tilde{W}_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise.
2. $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is symmetric and doubly stochastic, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$.

There are a few common choices for the mixing matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, such as Laplacian-based constant edge weight matrix [16] and Metropolis constant edge weight matrix [32]. Let $\lambda_i(\tilde{\mathbf{W}})$ denote the i -th largest eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$. Then by Definition 1,

$$1 = \lambda_1(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}) > \lambda_2(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}) > -1.$$

Let σ be the second largest magnitude eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$. Then,

$$0 < \sigma = \max \left\{ |\lambda_2(\tilde{\mathbf{W}})|, |\lambda_n(\tilde{\mathbf{W}})| \right\} < 1,$$

Define $\mathbf{W} := \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_p$. Then we know $\rho(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M}) = \sigma$. The following lemma establishes the contraction with matrix \mathbf{W} .

LEMMA 2.1.

$$\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}\| = \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x})\| \leq \sigma \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}\|$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in R^{np}$.

This contraction property will be frequently used in the rest of the paper.

2.1. Previous Algorithms Review. The SDCG method can be given as

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^t + \alpha \mathbf{d}_i^t, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_i^{t+1} = -\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} + \beta_i^{t+1} \mathbf{d}_i^t, \quad (2.3)$$

with initialization $\mathbf{d}_i^0 = -\mathbf{g}_i^0$. $\alpha > 0$ is the stepsize. Since the line search is hard to apply to decentralized optimization, here we just consider the method using constant stepsizes. β_i^t in (2.3) is called conjugate parameter. The following is a list of several well-known formulas of β_i^t for different CG methods such as Fletcher-Reeves(FR) [33], Polak-Ribiere-Polak(PRP) [34], Hestenes-Stiefel(HS) [35], Dai-Yuan(DY) [36] and so on [37, 38]:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i^{t,FR} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_i^t\|^2}{\|\mathbf{g}_i^{t-1}\|^2}, & \beta_i^{t,PRP} &= \frac{(\mathbf{g}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^{t-1}}{\|\mathbf{g}_i^{t-1}\|^2}, \\ \beta_i^{t,HS} &= \frac{(\mathbf{g}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^{t-1}}{(\mathbf{d}_i^{t-1})^\top \mathbf{y}_i^{t-1}}, & \beta_i^{t,DY} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{d}_i^{t-1})^\top \mathbf{y}_i^{t-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_i^t = \mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t$.

REMARK 2.1. Note that SDCG from (2.2) and (2.3) is equivalent to DGD when $\beta_i^t = 0$ for all i and t . SDCG is the direct extension of the centralized CG method in decentralized optimization, where it turns to the centralized CG method when $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ becomes the identity matrix.

Following our notations, we rewrite (2.2) and (2.3) for all the nodes together as

$$\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t + \alpha \mathbf{d}^t, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathbf{d}^{t+1} = -\mathbf{g}^{t+1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{t+1} \mathbf{d}^t, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1^{t+1} \mathbf{I}_p & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \beta_n^{t+1} \mathbf{I}_p \end{bmatrix} \in R^{np \times np}.$$




Fig. 2.1: Relative error and consensus error of SDCG versus iterations for stepsizes 0.1, 0.01, 0.001, and 0.0001. Relative error is given by (3.2) and consensus error is defined as $\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|$.

Through numerical experiments of using SDCG to minimize the linear regression problem like (3.3), we find from figure 2.1 that when taking the PRP conjugate parameter, SDCG has a similar performance to DGD where the convergence accuracy is dependent on the stepsize. However, SDCG may not converge when using FR, DY, and HS conjugate parameters (centralized FR, DY, and HS methods can not even converge with constant stepsizes). We notice that one advantage of the PRP method over FR, DY, and HS methods in practical computations is that if a small step is generated to guarantee convergence, the direction in the PRP method will tend to the negative gradient direction. Recall the PRP conjugate parameter with regard to node i is that

$$\frac{(\mathbf{g}_i^t)^\top (\mathbf{g}_i^t - \mathbf{g}_i^{t-1})}{\|\mathbf{g}_i^{t-1}\|^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

When the step-lengths $\|\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t\|$ tend to zero, by the Lipschitz continuity of gradients, we have gradient variations $\|\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t\|$ go zero too. However, considering the optimality condition of the problem (1.1), we have the average gradient on any stationary point $\mathbf{z}^* \in \mathcal{Z}^*$ is zero, which implies that the local gradient may not be zero. Thus, the PRP conjugate parameter will become very small and the direction will tend to be the negative gradient direction, which is demonstrated from figure 2.2.

Since the local minimizers are usually not equivalent to the global minimizer for the decentralized optimization problem (1.1), it is easy to explain why the DY method can not work. The numerator of the DY conjugate parameter is $\|\mathbf{g}_i^t\|^2$ which may not go zero while the denominator, i.e., $(\mathbf{d}_i^{t-1})^\top (\mathbf{g}_i^t - \mathbf{g}_i^{t-1})$ will approach zero, causing the DY conjugate parameter goes infinity.

Summarizing the above analysis, we think the SDCG algorithm (2.4) and (2.5) would not converge unless it applies the PRP conjugate parameter. Based on SDCG, the previous works [22, 23] add additional algorithm steps and stricter conditions to try to give a complete algorithm. However, we find they all fail to prove the convergence. In [22], they did not correctly show the norm of the direction is bounded by that of the gradient. [23] required the local strong Wolfe condition holds on each




Fig. 2.2: $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i |\beta_i^t|$ versus iterations for β_i^t being taken as (2.6).

node, which further yields that the local gradient goes zero. We think it is impossible that a limit point can make all local gradients simultaneously equal to zero.

In addition, as figure 2.1 shows, SDCG just yields an inaccurate solution even though it can converge. We further analyse the cause of inexact convergence of SDCG with a fixed stepsize. Let \mathbf{x}^∞ be the limit of \mathbf{x}^t (assuming the stepsize is small enough to ensure convergence), and \mathbf{d}^∞ and β^∞ be generated by \mathbf{x}^∞ . Assuming the consensus of \mathbf{x}^∞ means that $\mathbf{x}_1^\infty = \dots = \mathbf{x}_n^\infty =: \mathbf{z}^\infty$, i.e. $\mathbf{x}^\infty = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^\infty$. Taking the limit over t on both sides of iterations of SDCG gives us a limiting form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^\infty &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^\infty + \alpha \mathbf{d}^\infty, \\ \mathbf{d}^\infty &= -\mathbf{g}^\infty + \beta^\infty \mathbf{d}^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

When α is fixed and nonzero, $\mathbf{d}^\infty = \mathbf{0}$ implying that $\mathbf{g}^\infty = \mathbf{0}$ which is equivalent to $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}^\infty) = \mathbf{0}$ for any i . This is impossible for the same point \mathbf{z}^∞ to simultaneously minimize f_i to achieve $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}^\infty) = \mathbf{0}$ for any i .

There is only one previously developed work devoted to the exact decentralized CG method with a fixed constant stepsize. In [24], they proposed to use an average conjugate direction tracking method to allow non-diminishing stepsizes. However, their convergence proof is not right since it does not hold that the local conjugate direction converges to its mean over all nodes. Note that in the centralized optimization, Dai [39] showed the PRP method with constant stepsizes has a global convergence. Hence, the aforementioned issues suggest the following question:

Question(): Is there such a decentralized CG algorithm using a fixed constant stepsize with exact convergence guarantee under the same mild conditions as the traditional centralized CG algorithm [39], such as the Lipschitz continuity of gradients?*

2.2. New Decentralized CG Method. In this subsection, we will answer *Question(*)*. As GT improves DGD and achieves an exact convergence through the average gradient tracking technique, we are inspired to utilize average gradient approximations rather than local gradients on each node. The motivation is stated as follows. If we replace $\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1}(\mathbf{g}^{t+1})$ with $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^{t+1}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^{t+1})$ in (2.5), a fixed constant stepsize can be adopted without losing exact convergence. Therefore, we introduce a variable \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} to track the average of the gradients $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^{t+1}$ by a dynamical average consensus [16]

technique. \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} is updated as follows

$$\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} (\mathbf{v}_j^t + \mathbf{g}_j^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_j^t), \quad (2.7)$$

with initialization $\mathbf{v}_i^0 = \mathbf{g}_i^0$. Next, the lemma below states that the average of \mathbf{v}_i^t over i is the sum of local gradients.

LEMMA 2.2. $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t$ ($\bar{\mathbf{v}}^t = \bar{\mathbf{g}}^t$).

Additionally, we propose a new PRP conjugate parameter presented with regard to node i as

$$\beta_i^{t+1} = \frac{(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1})^\top (\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t)}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t = \mathbf{v}_i^t + \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{x}_i^t - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^t)$. Note $-\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t$ serves as the updating direction of GT since its iterative scheme $\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^t - \alpha \mathbf{v}_i^t$ gives $\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_i^t - \alpha \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t$. Combining β_i^{t+1} with $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}$, we obtain a conjugate direction as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} = -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1} + \beta_i^{t+1} \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t. \quad (2.9)$$

This conjugate parameter has a restart property that if the direction $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1}$ will tend to that of GT, namely $-\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}$ if a small step is generated far away from the solution point.

Using (2.7), (2.8), and (2.9), we develop a new decentralized CG (NDCG) method, and the detailed algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 NDCG with respect to node i

Input: \mathbf{x}_i^0 , MaxIter, $\alpha > 0$, \mathbf{W} .

- 1: Set $t = 0$, $T = \text{MaxIter}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^0 = -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^0 = -\mathbf{g}_i^0 - \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{x}_i^0 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^0)$, $\mathbf{v}_i^0 = \mathbf{g}_i^0$.
- 2: If $t \geq T$, stop.
- 3: $\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_i^t + \alpha \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t$.
- 4: $\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} (\mathbf{v}_j^t + \mathbf{g}_j^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_j^t)$.
- 5: $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^{t+1})$.
- 6: $\beta_i^{t+1} = \frac{(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1})^\top (\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t)}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2}$.
- 7: $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} = -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1} + \beta_i^{t+1} \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t$.
- 8: Set $t = t + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Output: \mathbf{x}^T .

REMARK 2.2.

a. *Connection with several existing decentralized methods:*

If $\beta_i^t = 0$ for all i and t , we can reformulate the update of \mathbf{x}^t as

$$\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \alpha \mathbf{v}^t$$

which is equivalent to the GT method [10]. We can also rewrite NDCG as

$$\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \alpha \mathbf{v}^t + \beta^t (\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^{t-1}),$$

which can be viewed as a decentralized heavy ball method with an adaptive momentum parameter and is equivalent to the ABm method [12] when $\beta^t \equiv \beta$ (β is some positive constant diagonal matrix).

b. *Connection with traditional single-machine CG method [39]:*

Consider $n = 1$ in this case the $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = [1]$. The updates of NDCG can be further simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_1^{t+1} &= \mathbf{x}_1^t + \alpha \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1^t, \\ \beta_1^{t+1} &= \frac{(\mathbf{g}_1^{t+1})^\top (\mathbf{g}_1^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_1^t)}{\|\mathbf{g}_1^t\|^2}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1^{t+1} &= -\mathbf{g}_1^{t+1} + \beta_1^{t+1} \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1^t,\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the PRP method given by Dai [39].

2.2.1. Convergence of NDCG. In this part, we will establish the global convergence of NDCG for minimizing general nonconvex problems. We start by defining some notations:

$$F(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{z}), \quad \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^t).$$

Then, we obtain $\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t$. Note that the iterate \mathbf{x}^t achieves the exact first-order stationarity if the following holds:

$$\|\bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

To obtain (2.10), it suffices to show $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\| = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\| = 0$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t = \mathbf{v}^t + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W})\mathbf{x}^t$ and $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t$ by **Lemma 2.2**, which implies $\mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t$ due to $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\| = \|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t\| = \|\mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|.$$

Then, we can define the following ϵ -stationary solution by (2.10) and taking into consideration the iterations,

$$\text{avg-gap}(T) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2) \leq \epsilon.$$

A way of showing the convergence of the nonconvex optimization algorithm is to find a potential function that is bounded below and then show it is monotonically decreasing. We define the following potential function $P(\cdot)$:

$$P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}}^2 + \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2.$$

The terms $F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)$ and $\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2$ respectively capture the objective function value on the average of \mathbf{x}_i^t about i and the distance between \mathbf{x}_i^t with all node's average, namely consensus error. The term $\frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}}^2$ describes the distance between \mathbf{x}_i^t with its neighbor's average. The term $\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2$ indicates the distance between the average gradient approximation \mathbf{v}^t with the average gradient, called gradient tracking error.

Obviously, P is bounded below since each f_i is bounded below. Our goal is to show the sufficient descent of $P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t)$. At first, we deduce the bounds for $\langle -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t \rangle$ and $\|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t\|$, where $\langle -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t \rangle$ indicates the angle between our updating direction with that of GT.

LEMMA 2.3. [39] Assume that α is some constant in $(0, \frac{1}{4L}]$. Define the sequence $\{\xi^t\}$ as follows:

$$\xi^0 = 1; \quad \xi^{t+1} = 1 + L\alpha(\xi^t)^2, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then we have that

$$1 \leq \xi^t < c, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

where c is the constant

$$c = 2 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4L\alpha}\right)^{-1},$$

that satisfies

$$1 < c \leq 2.$$

LEMMA 2.4. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Consider the NDCG algorithm with $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4L}]$. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$ and any i ,

$$(2 - \xi^t) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2 \leq -(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t \leq \xi^t \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2, \quad (2.11)$$

$$(2 - \xi^t) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t\| \leq \xi^t \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|, \quad (2.12)$$

where ξ^t is the sequence defined in **Lemma 2.3**.

Proof. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^0 = -\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^0$ and $\xi^0 = 1$, (2.11) and (2.12) clearly hold for $t = 0$. Assume that (2.11) and (2.12) hold for some t . Then by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| &= \|\beta_i^{t+1} \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t\| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t\| \\ &\leq \frac{L\alpha \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t\|^2}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t\|^2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| \leq L\alpha(\xi^t)^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

By the triangular inequality and the above relation, we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1}\| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| \leq (1 + L\alpha(\xi^t)^2) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|$$

and

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1}\| \geq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| - \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| \geq (1 - L\alpha(\xi^t)^2) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|.$$

By the recursion of ξ^t and the choice of α , we have (2.12) holds for $t + 1$. By (2.13) and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have that

$$|(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1})^\top \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|^2| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{t+1} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\| \leq L\alpha(\xi^t)^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^{t+1}\|^2.$$

Similarly, by the recursion of ξ^t and the choice of α , we obtain (2.11) holds for $t + 1$. \square

Then, we give the descent estimate of $F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2$.

LEMMA 2.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. If $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4L}]$, then we have for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 &\leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha n} - \frac{L}{2n}\right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha}{n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Proof. By Lipschitz continuity of gradients of $F(\cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2$ with moduli L and $\rho(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}) < 2$, we have

$$F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t\|^2, \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W})\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \quad (2.16)$$

Adding the above two inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 &\leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 + \left(\frac{L}{2n} + \frac{1}{2\alpha n}\right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \rangle + \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W})\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

For the last two terms of the right side hand of (2.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \rangle + \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W})\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \rangle + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{x}_i^t - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j^t), \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \right\rangle \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \rangle}_{\text{term (A)}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t), \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \rangle}_{\text{term (B)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbf{v}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \rangle}_{\text{term (C)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

For term (A), we use **Lemma 2.4** with $\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_i^t + \alpha \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^t$ and then obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \quad (2.19)$$

For term (B), using Young's inequality with c being some positive constant, the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients, and the relation $\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t), \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \right\rangle &\leq \frac{c}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2nc} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{L^2 c}{2n^2} \|\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2nc} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &= \frac{L^2 c}{2n^2} \|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2nc} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

For term (C), using Young's inequality with d being some positive constant and the relation $\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t$ by **Lemma 2.2** yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbf{v}_i^t, \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t \right\rangle &\leq \frac{d}{2n} \|\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2nd} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{d}{2n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2nd} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Substituting (2.19), (2.20), and (2.21) into (2.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t \right\rangle + \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t \right\rangle \\ &\leq - \left(\frac{1}{\alpha n} - \frac{1}{2n} \left(\frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d} \right) \right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{L^2 c}{2n^2} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{d}{2n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above inequality into (2.17) and setting $c = 4\alpha$, $d = 4\alpha$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 &\leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \|\mathbf{x}^t\|_{\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{W}}^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha n} - \frac{L}{2n} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha}{n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

THEOREM 2.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. If*

$$\alpha < \min \left\{ \frac{(1 - \sigma^2)n^2}{4L^2}, \frac{1 - \sigma^2}{8n\sigma^2L^2 + 16n + 2L} \right\}, \quad (2.22)$$

then we have the following convergence rate for NDCG

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^T b_1 \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2 + b_2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + b_3 \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \leq \frac{P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^0; \mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{v}^0) - P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T; \mathbf{x}^T; \mathbf{v}^T)}{T},$$

where b_1, b_2, b_3 are some positive constant dependent on n, L , and σ .

Proof. At first, we estimate the descent of $\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^{t+1}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{v}^t + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{g}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^{t+1} + \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \eta) \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + (1 + 1/\eta) \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}^t)\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \eta)\sigma^2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + (1 + 1/\eta)\sigma^2 L^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

where we use Young's inequality with η being some positive constant in the first inequality; use **Lemma 2.1** and the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients in the second inequality.

Next, we estimate the descent of $\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2$. By rewriting $\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \alpha\mathbf{v}^t + \alpha\boldsymbol{\beta}^t\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^{t-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t - \alpha\mathbf{v}^t + \alpha\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t + \alpha\boldsymbol{\beta}^t\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^{t-1} - \alpha\mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\beta}^t\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^{t-1}\|^2 \quad (2.24) \\ &\leq (1+\tau)\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 2(1+1/\tau)\alpha^2\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1+1/\tau)\alpha^2\|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M})\boldsymbol{\beta}^t\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^{t-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\tau)\sigma^2\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 2(1+1/\tau)\alpha^2\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1+1/\tau)\|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we first use Young's inequality with τ being some positive constant and then Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the first inequality; use **Lemma 2.1** and (2.13) in the second inequality. Adding up (2.14), (2.23), and (2.24) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{v}^{t+1}; t+1) \\ &\leq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha n} - \frac{L}{2n} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\sigma^2 L^2 - 2\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(1 - (1+\eta)\sigma^2 - 2\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)\alpha^2 - \frac{2\alpha}{n} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(1 - (1+\tau)\sigma^2 - \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\eta = \tau = \frac{1-\sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{v}^{t+1}; t+1) \quad (2.25) \\ &\leq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) - \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha n} - \frac{L}{2n} - \frac{(1+\sigma^2)\sigma^2 L^2}{1-\sigma^2} - \frac{2(1+\sigma^2)}{1-\sigma^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2(1+\sigma^2)\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2} - \frac{2\alpha}{n} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) - \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{4\alpha n} - \frac{4n(\sigma^2 L^2 + 2) + L}{2n(1-\sigma^2)} \right)}_{\text{term}(D)} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2(1+\sigma^2)\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2} - \frac{2\alpha}{n} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where simplifying the factor of $\|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2$ by $\sigma^2 < 1$ yields term (D). By **Lemma 2.4**, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2. \quad (2.26)$$

Since $\alpha < \frac{1-\sigma^2}{8n\sigma^2L^2+16n+2L}$ makes $\text{term}(D) > 0$, we have by (2.25) and (2.26) that

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{v}^{t+1}; t+1) \\ & \leq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) - \left(\frac{\alpha}{4n} - \frac{4n(\sigma^2L^2+2)+L}{2n(1-\sigma^2)}\alpha^2 \right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2(1+\sigma^2)\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2} - \frac{2\alpha}{n} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{1-\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{2L^2\alpha}{n^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the choice of α again, we have there exist some positive constants b_1 , b_2 and b_3 dependent on n , L , σ , and σ such that

$$P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{v}^{t+1}; t+1) \leq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t; t) - b_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2 - b_2\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 - b_3\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2.$$

Summing the above relation over $t = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^T (b_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^t\|^2 + b_2\|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + b_3\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2) \leq \frac{P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^0, \mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{v}^0; 0) - P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T, \mathbf{x}^T, \mathbf{v}^T; T)}{T}.$$

□

REMARK 2.3.

a. A direct corollary from **Theorem 2.6** is that $\text{avg-gap}(T) \leq \epsilon$ when

$$T \geq P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^0, \mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{v}^0; 0)(\epsilon \min\{b_1, b_2, b_3\})^{-1}.$$

b. By our designed conjugate parameter β^t , the convergence of our method is guaranteed with only Lipschitz continuity of gradients. Such a result is the same as that of the centralized PRP method with constant stepsizes [39]. However, the convergence of the ABm method is unknown even though it has a similar updating scheme.

c. If $\frac{16n+2L}{8nL^2} < 1$, for the network with $\sigma \geq \sqrt{\frac{16n+2L}{8nL^2}}$, we have by (2.22) that the range of the stepsize α of NDCG is

$$\left(0, O \left(\min \left\{ \frac{(1-\sigma^2)n^2}{L^2}, \frac{1-\sigma^2}{n\sigma^2L^2} \right\} \right) \right)$$

while that of GT [17] is

$$\left(0, O \left(\min \left\{ \frac{(1-\sigma^2)n}{L^2}, \frac{1-\sigma^2}{nL^2} \right\} \right) \right); \quad (2.27)$$

for networks with $\sigma < \sqrt{\frac{16n+2L}{8nL^2}}$, the range of the stepsize α of NDCG becomes

$$\left(0, O \left(\min \left\{ \frac{(1-\sigma^2)n^2}{L^2}, \frac{1-\sigma^2}{n+L} \right\} \right) \right) \quad (2.28)$$

which is less sensitive to L , while that of GT is still given as (2.27). If $\frac{16n+2L}{8nL^2} \geq 1$, the range of the stepsize α of NDCG is always given as (2.28).

2.3. Decentralized Memoryless BFGS Method. For decentralized quasi-Newton methods, how to construct positive definite Hessian or Hessian inverse approximations with bounded eigenvalues is a critical issue. A conservative way could hinder the utilization of second-order information, causing a slow convergence rate in practice. We think the essence of the regularizing or damping techniques used by [27, 28, 29, 30] is to add a significant perturbation to render quasi-Newton matrices positive definite. [29] even requires the perturbation parameter to be bounded below for convergence. Thus, an aggressive method should be considered. The aim of this subsection is to derive a new quasi-newton direction from the self-scaling memoryless BFGS method by Shanno [31] which is also regarded as some CG method. We need another standard assumption about the objective function.

ASSUMPTION 3. *The local objective functions $\{f_i(\mathbf{z})\}_{i=1}^n$ are strongly convex with modulus $\mu > 0$, i.e.,*

$$f_i(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \geq f_i(\mathbf{z}) + \nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}\|^2, \quad (2.29)$$

$\forall \mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in R^p, i = 1, \dots, n$. Combining **Assumption 2** with **Assumption 3**, we have

$$\mu \mathbf{I}_p \preceq \nabla^2 f_i(\mathbf{z}) \preceq L \mathbf{I}_p, \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in R^p, i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.30)$$

Since the Hessian $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$ is the block diagonal matrix whose i -th diagonal block is $\nabla^2 f_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$, the above bounds also hold for $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$, i.e.,

$$\mu \mathbf{I} \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) \preceq L \mathbf{I}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in R^{np}. \quad (2.31)$$

Moreover, the original problem (1.1) has the global optimal solution denoted by \mathbf{z}^* .

We define the function $H_i^t : R^p \rightarrow R^{p \times p}$

$$H_i^t(\mathbf{y}) = \tau_i^t \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t(\mathbf{y})^\top + \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}} \right) + \left(1 + \frac{\tau_i^t \|\mathbf{y}\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}} \right) \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}}, \quad (2.32)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i^t = \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t$. Then, a decentralized memoryless BFGS (DMBFGS) method is proposed and the detailed algorithm is given in **Algorithm 2**.

\mathbf{d}_i^{t+1} in **Algorithm 2** can be also written as the following quasi-Newton direction:

$$\mathbf{d}_i^{t+1} = -\mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1}, \quad (2.33)$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} = \tau_i^t \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t(\mathbf{y}_i^t)^\top + \mathbf{y}_i^t(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} \right) + \left(1 + \frac{\tau_i^t \|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} \right) \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}. \quad (2.34)$$

The aim of Step 5 in **Algorithm 2** is to ensure the quasi-Newton matrix (2.34) has bounded eigenvalues. Since \mathbf{v}_i^t captures some information of the average gradient, we prefer using \mathbf{v}_i^t to generate the quasi-Newton matrix by $H_i^t(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t = \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{v}_i^t$. However, $H_i^t(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ is not necessarily positive definite. So, we check the smallest eigenvalue of this matrix in Step 5 of **Algorithm 2**. If the smallest eigenvalue of $H_i^t(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ is smaller than the given threshold l , we use the alternative \mathbf{g}_i^t to update the quasi-Newton matrix by $H_i^t(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ with $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t = \mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t$ which is obviously positive definite by Assumptions 2, 3. On the other hand, we prevent the largest eigenvalue of $H_i^t(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ from being too large. If the largest eigenvalue of $H_i^t(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ is larger than

Algorithm 2 DMBFGS with respect node i

Input: \mathbf{x}_i^0 , MaxIter, $\alpha > 0$, $\{\tau_i^t\}_{t=0}$, \mathbf{W} , $0 < l \ll u$.

- 1: Set $t = 0$, $T = \text{MaxIter}$, $\mathbf{d}_i^0 = -\mathbf{v}_i^0 = -\mathbf{g}_i^0$.
- 2: If $t \geq T$, stop.
- 3: $\mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_j^t + \alpha \mathbf{d}_j^t)$.
- 4: $\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{W}_{ij}(\mathbf{v}_j^t + \mathbf{g}_j^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_j^t)$.
- 5:

$$\mathbf{y}_i^t = \begin{cases} \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t, & \text{if } [\lambda_{\min}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)), \lambda_{\max}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t))] \subset [l, u] \text{ and } (\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t \neq 0, \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i^t = \mathbf{x}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^t$, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t = \mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t$, $\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t = \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{v}_i^t$.

- 6: $\beta_i^{t+1} = \frac{\tau_i^t (\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1})^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} - \left(1 + \frac{\tau_i^t \|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}\right) \frac{(\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1})^\top \mathbf{s}_i^t}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}$.
- 7: $\theta_i^{t+1} = \frac{\tau_i^t (\mathbf{v}_i^{t+1})^\top \mathbf{s}_i^t}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}$.
- 8: $\mathbf{d}_i^{t+1} = -\tau_i^t \mathbf{v}_i^{t+1} + \beta_i^{t+1} \mathbf{s}_i^t + \theta_i^{t+1} \mathbf{y}_i^{t+1}$.
- 9: Set $t = t + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Output: \mathbf{x}^T .

the given threshold u , we also switch to using $H_i^t(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ which has an upper bound by Assumptions 2, 3.

Next, we explain that the cost of calculating the smallest and largest eigenvalues of $H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)$ can be negligible. We note that \mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} is regarded as being obtained from a scalar matrix $\tau_i^t \mathbf{I}_p$ from BFGS updating formula and has $p - 2$ eigenvalues of τ_i^t and two positive eigenvalues $\lambda_i^{t+1} < \Lambda_i^{t+1}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_i^{t+1} \Lambda_i^{t+1} &= \tau_i^t \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}, \\ \lambda_i^{t+1} + \Lambda_i^{t+1} &= \frac{\tau_i^t \|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2 \|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}{((\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t)^2} + \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}. \end{cases}$$

Specially, substituting $\tau_i^t = \frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}{\|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}$ into (2.34) yields

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} = \frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}{\|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2} \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t (\mathbf{y}_i^t)^\top + \mathbf{y}_i^t (\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} \right) + 2 \frac{\mathbf{s}_i^t (\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}, \quad (2.35)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_i^{t+1} \Lambda_i^{t+1} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{\|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}, \\ \lambda_i^{t+1} + \Lambda_i^{t+1} &= \frac{2\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t}. \end{cases} \quad (2.36)$$

The system (2.36) defines a quadratic function of λ_i^{t+1} , Λ_i^{t+1} , which after some manipulation can be solved yielding

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_i^{t+1} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\phi_i^t)), \\ \Lambda_i^{t+1} &= \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\phi_i^t)), \\ \cos^2(\phi_i^t) &= \frac{((\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \mathbf{y}_i^t)^2}{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2 \|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.37)$$

So, we can easily obtain $\lambda_{\min}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t))$ and $\lambda_{\max}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t))$ used in Step 5 of **Algorithm 2** by

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{\min}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)) = \min \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)), \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)) \right\}, \\ \lambda_{\max}(H_i^t(\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)) = \max \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)), \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)) \right\}, \end{cases} \quad (2.38)$$

where $(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t \neq 0$, $\cos^2(\check{\phi}_i^t) = \frac{((\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)^2}{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2 \|\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2}$.

Denote $\check{\tau}_i^t = \frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t}{\|\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2}$, $\check{\lambda}_i^{t+1} = \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t))$, $\check{\Lambda}_i^{t+1} = \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t))$. If $\check{\tau}_i^t \geq 0$, we have $\check{\lambda}_i^{t+1} \leq \check{\tau}_i^t \leq \check{\Lambda}_i^{t+1}$. The right hand inequality follows from $\cos^2(\check{\phi}_i^t) \leq 1$, which yields

$$\check{\tau}_i^t = \frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t}{\|\check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)).$$

The left hand inequality can be derived by

$$1 - \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t) \leq 1 - \sin^2(\check{\phi}_i^t) = \cos^2(\check{\phi}_i^t).$$

Then, $\frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \check{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\check{\phi}_i^t)) \leq \check{\tau}_i^t$. If $\check{\tau}_i^t < 0$, it can be similarly obtained that $\check{\lambda}_i^{t+1} \geq \check{\tau}_i^t \geq \check{\Lambda}_i^{t+1}$. Hence, (2.38) is established.

REMARK 2.4. *Our DMBFGS method realizes efficient computation and modest memory storage. DMBFG involves only vector-vector products whose both computation cost and memory requirement per iteration are at the order of $O(p)$. D-LM-BFGS also has low computation cost and memory requirement at the order of $O(Mp)$ due to the two-loop recursion while computation cost and memory requirement of DR-LM-DFP are $O(Mp^2)$ and $O(Mp)$, where M is the memory size. The other existing decentralized quasi-Newton methods require matrix-vector products and store matrices where overheads of computation and storage are at least $O(p^2)$.*

2.3.1. Convergence of DMBFGS. In this part, we will establish the convergence of a class of decentralized methods which also run Steps 3,4 of **Algorithm 2** with $\mathbf{d}_i^t = -\mathbf{H}_i^t \mathbf{v}_i^t$. We write the iterative scheme of such methods across all nodes as

$$\mathbf{x}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{x}^t - \alpha \mathbf{H}^t \mathbf{v}^t), \quad (2.39)$$

$$\mathbf{v}^{t+1} = \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{v}^t + \mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}^t), \quad (2.40)$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}^t = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1^t & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{H}_n^t \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we give a necessary assumption about the matrix \mathbf{H}^t .

ASSUMPTION 4. *The approximate matrices $\{\mathbf{H}^t\}$ satisfy*

$$\psi \mathbf{I} \preceq \mathbf{H}^t \preceq \Psi \mathbf{I},$$

for any t , where $\Psi > \psi > 0$.

\mathbf{H}^t in (2.33) is easily shown to be bounded. From Step 5 of **Algorithm 2**, we have $\mathbf{I}_p \preceq \mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} \preceq u\mathbf{I}_p$ when \mathbf{y}_i^t takes $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t$. When \mathbf{y}_i^t takes $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t$, we have by $\frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t}{\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2} > 0$ that

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 - \sin(\hat{\phi}_i^t)) \mathbf{I}_p \preceq \mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} \preceq \frac{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} (1 + \sin(\hat{\phi}_i^t)) \mathbf{I}_p,$$

where $\cos^2(\hat{\phi}_i^t) = \frac{((\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t)^2}{\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2}$. By the inequality $\frac{\cos^2(\hat{\phi}_i^t)}{2} \leq 1 - \sin(\hat{\phi}_i^t)$, we obtain

$$\frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t}{2\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2} \mathbf{I}_p \preceq \mathbf{H}_i^{t+1} \preceq \frac{2\|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2}{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t} \mathbf{I}_p.$$

By $(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t \geq \frac{1}{L} \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t\|^2$ yielded by the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients, the left hand side of the above inequality can be bounded below by $\frac{1}{2L}$. By $(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t \geq \mu \|\mathbf{s}_i^t\|^2$ following from the μ -strong convexity of the objective function, the right hand side of the above inequality can be bounded above by $\frac{2}{\mu}$. Hence, we obtain

$$\min \left\{ l, \frac{1}{2L} \right\} \mathbf{I} \preceq \mathbf{H}^{t+1} \preceq \max \left\{ u, \frac{2}{\mu} \right\} \mathbf{I}.$$

Some notations are given below. The condition number of the objective function is defined as

$$\kappa_f = \frac{L}{\mu}.$$

The condition number of the network can be defined as

$$\kappa_g = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma^2},$$

which measures the network topology and is an important factor affecting the performance of decentralized methods. In general, a smaller condition number means greater connectivity of the network. We also define

$$\kappa_H = \frac{\Psi}{\psi}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}_i^t, \quad F(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{z}), \quad \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^t).$$

To establish the convergence of DMBFGS, we show some necessary lemmas.

LEMMA 2.7. *Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2L^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{12\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2Ln}{1 - \sigma^2} (F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. According to the update of \mathbf{x}^{t+1} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2 && (2.41) \\ &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t + \alpha(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2\sigma^2} \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2 + \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)\alpha^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2\sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|\mathbf{d}^t\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Young's inequality ($\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq (1 + \eta)\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + (1 + 1/\eta)\|\mathbf{b}\|^2$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in R^p$) with parameter $\eta = \frac{1-\sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}$ in the first inequality; use **Lemma 2.1** in the last inequality. Next, we bound the term $\|\mathbf{d}^t\|$. By Assumption 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{d}^t\| &= \|\mathbf{H}^t \mathbf{v}^t\| \leq \Psi \|\mathbf{v}^t\| \\ &= \Psi \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t + \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\| \\ &\leq \Psi \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\| + \Psi \sqrt{n} \|\bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) - \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\| + \Psi \sqrt{n} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\| \\ &\leq \Psi \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\| + \Psi L \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\| + \Psi \sqrt{n} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is from the relation that $\mathbf{1}_n \otimes \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t$ by **Lemma 2.2**; the second and last inequalities is respectively due to the triangle inequality and the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients. By taking square on both sides of the above inequality and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\|\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \leq 3\Psi^2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + 3\Psi^2 L^2 \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 3\Psi^2 n \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2. \quad (2.42)$$

By the inequality $\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \leq 2L(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*))$ yielded by the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients, we have

$$\|\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \leq 3\Psi^2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + 3\Psi^2 L^2 \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 6\Psi^2 Ln(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)). \quad (2.43)$$

Substituting (2.43) into (2.41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2L^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{12\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2Ln}{1 - \sigma^2} (F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 2.8. *Under Assumption 2, 3, and 4, we have*

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \leq \frac{2\Psi^2}{n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\Psi^2 L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2.$$

Proof. It is written by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Assumption 4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 &= \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t) + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t (\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t))\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2 + 2\Psi^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

For the first term of the right hand side of the above inequality, since $\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}_i^t (\mathbf{v}_i^t - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)) - \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)$, we compute by Assumption 4 that

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)\|^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}_i^t (\mathbf{v}_i^t - \bar{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}^t)) \right\|^2 \leq \frac{\Psi^2}{n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2.$$

Applying the above inequality and the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients to (2.44), we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \leq \frac{2\Psi^2}{n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\Psi^2 L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2.$$

□

LEMMA 2.9. Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, if $\alpha < \frac{1}{3L\Psi\kappa_H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) &\leq \left[1 - \left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2 L\Psi^2}{2}\right)\mu\right] n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Taking the average of the update of \mathbf{x}^{t+1} over all the nodes, we have

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t + \alpha\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t.$$

By the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients, we have

$$F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) \leq F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) + \alpha\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{d}}^t \rangle + \frac{L\alpha^2}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t\|^2. \quad (2.45)$$

By the relation that $\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) \rangle \geq \psi \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2$ following from Assumption 4 and Young's inequality ($2\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b} \leq \eta \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$) with $\eta = \psi$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{d}}^t \rangle &\leq -\psi \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 + \langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t), \bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) \rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\psi}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\psi} \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t + \bar{\mathbf{H}}^t \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{\psi}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 + \frac{\Psi^2}{\psi n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{\Psi^2 L^2}{\psi n} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

where the last inequality is from **Lemma 2.8**. Further, by (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L\alpha^2}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}^t\|^2 &\leq \frac{L\alpha^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \leq \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2} L\Psi^2\alpha^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.47)$$

Substituting (2.46) and (2.47) into (2.45), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nF(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) &\leq nF(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2 L\Psi^2}{2}\right) n \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the relation $\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t)\|^2 \geq 2\mu(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*))$ following from the μ -strong convexity of the objective function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} nF(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) &\leq nF(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2 L\Psi^2}{2}\right) \mu n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $nF(\mathbf{z}^*)$ on both sides of the above inequality completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 2.10. *Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 &\leq (8 + 6\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 6\alpha^2 \Psi^2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + 12\alpha^2 L \Psi^2 n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the relation that $\|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}^t\| = \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I})(\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t)\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 &= \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}^t + \alpha \mathbf{W}\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \leq 8\|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 2\alpha^2 \|\mathbf{d}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq (8 + 6\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + 6\alpha^2 \Psi^2 \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + 12\alpha^2 L \Psi^2 n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (2.43). \square

LEMMA 2.11. *Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^{t+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{12\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} + \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2L^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} (8 + 6\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{24\alpha^2 L^3 \Psi^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)), \end{aligned}$$

Proof. According to the update of \mathbf{v}^{t+1} , we have by using Young's inequality ($\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq (1 + \eta)\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + (1 + 1/\eta)\|\mathbf{b}\|^2$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in R^p$) with parameter $\eta = \frac{1 - \sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^{t+1}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{v}^t + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{g}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^{t+1} + \mathbf{M}\mathbf{g}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{M})(\mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}^t)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{2\sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|\mathbf{g}^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 + \frac{2L^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^t\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2L^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} (8 + 6\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2) \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \left(\frac{12\alpha^2 L^2 \Psi^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} + \frac{1 + \sigma^2}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{24\alpha^2 L^3 \Psi^2 \sigma^2}{1 - \sigma^2} n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)), \end{aligned}$$

where we respectively use **Lemma 2.1**, the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients, and **Lemma 2.10** in the second, third, and last inequalities. \square

So far, we have established the bounds on the consensus error $\|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2$, the network optimality gap $F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)$, and the gradient tracking error $\|\mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^{t+1}\|^2$. We stack the four errors and develop a new vector \mathbf{u}^{t+1} :

$$\mathbf{u}^{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{x}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^{t+1}\|^2 \\ n(F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) \\ \|\mathbf{v}^{t+1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}^{t+1}\|^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, \mathbf{u}^t is a distance measure between \mathbf{x}_i^t and \mathbf{z}^* since $\mathbf{u}^t = \mathbf{0}$ implies that $\mathbf{x}_i^t = \bar{\mathbf{x}}^t = \mathbf{z}^*$ for any i . Now we give the convergence theorem.

THEOREM 2.12. *Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, we have*

$$\mathbf{u}^{t+1} \preceq \mathbf{J}\mathbf{u}^t, \quad (2.48)$$

where \mathbf{J} is defined as (2.49).

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1+\sigma^2}{2} + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2L^2}{1-\sigma^2} & \frac{12\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2L}{1-\sigma^2} & \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2} \\ \frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2} & 1 - \left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2L\Psi^2}{2}\right)\mu & \frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2} \\ \frac{2L^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2} (8 + 6\alpha^2L^2\Psi^2) & \frac{24\alpha^2L^3\Psi^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2} & \frac{12\alpha^2L^2\Psi^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2} + \frac{1+\sigma^2}{2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.49)$$

If

$$\alpha \leq \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{2L\Psi\kappa_H} \sqrt{\frac{1}{688}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\kappa_f}}.$$

then the spectral radius of \mathbf{J} , namely $\rho(\mathbf{J}) = 1 - \frac{1}{2752} \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{(\kappa_f)^2(\kappa_H)^2}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_i^t - \mathbf{z}^*\|$ converges to zero linearly at the rate of $O(\rho(\mathbf{J})^t)$ for any i .

Especially, consider the network is fully connected, i.e., $\sigma = 0$. If

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{32L\Psi\kappa_H},$$

the spectral radius of \mathbf{J} is improved as $\rho(J) = 1 - \frac{1}{1024(\kappa_H)^2\kappa_f}$.

Proof. Our goal is to find the range of α such that $\rho(\mathbf{J}) < 1$. Consider an important **Lemma**(*):

Lemma(*). [40] Let $\mathbf{M} \in R^{p \times p}$ be nonnegative and $\mathbf{m} \in R^p$ be positive. If $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{m} \leq \omega\mathbf{m}$, then $\rho(\mathbf{M}) \leq \omega$.

Thus, it suffices to solve for the range of α such that $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{v} \leq (1 - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2)\mathbf{v}$ holds for some positive vector $\mathbf{v} = [v_1; v_2; v_3]$, where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant. We now expand this inequality as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{12\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2L}{1-\sigma^2}v_2 + \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2}v_3 \leq \left(1 - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2 - \frac{1+\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{6\sigma^2\Psi^2\alpha^2}{1-\sigma^2}\right)v_1, \\ \left(\frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right)v_1 + \left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2}\right)v_3 \leq \left(\left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2L\Psi^2}{2}\right)\mu - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2\right)v_2, \\ \frac{2L^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2}(8 + 6\alpha^2L^2\Psi^2)v_1 + \frac{24\alpha^2L^3\Psi^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2}v_2 \leq \left(1 - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2 - \frac{12\alpha^2L^2\Psi^2\sigma^2}{1-\sigma^2} - \frac{1+\sigma^2}{2}\right)v_3. \end{cases} \quad (2.50)$$

To ensure α is solvable on its domain $(0, +\infty)$, we require v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_4 satisfy the following conditions

$$\begin{cases} \mu v_2 - 2L^2(\kappa_H)^2v_1 - 2(\kappa_H)^2v_3 > 0, \\ (1-\sigma^2)^2v_3 - 16L^2\sigma^2v_1 > 0. \end{cases}$$

Taking $v_2 = \frac{(\kappa_H)^2}{\mu} \left(\frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{16\sigma^2} + 3\right)v_3$, $v_1 = \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{32L^2\sigma^2}v_3$, we can obtain the range of α :

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{64}{361L\Psi\kappa_H + \frac{196\Psi\kappa_H\kappa}{\mu}}, \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{2L\Psi\kappa_H\sigma^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{687 + \kappa \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^3\mu}{L^3(\kappa_H)^2\sigma^4}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}} \right\}.$$

In particular, we set $\kappa = \frac{\mu L}{(1-\sigma^2)^2}$ to obtain

$$\alpha \leq \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2}{2L\Psi\kappa_H} \sqrt{\frac{1}{688}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\kappa_f}}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\rho(\mathbf{J}) = 1 - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2752} \frac{(1-\sigma^2)^2\mu^2}{L^2(\kappa_H)^2}. \quad (2.51)$$

The linear convergence of \mathbf{x}^t follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}_i^t - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + n\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{n}{\mu^2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - \nabla F(\mathbf{z}^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|^2 + \frac{L}{\mu^2} n (F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) - F(\mathbf{z}^*)) \\ &= O(\rho(\mathbf{J})^t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^* = \underbrace{[\mathbf{z}^*; \dots; \mathbf{z}^*]}_n$; the second inequality is due to the μ -strong convexity of the objective function and the third inequality is from the L -Lipschitz continuity of gradients.

If the network is fully connected, i.e., $\sigma = 0$, we simplify (2.50) as

$$\begin{cases} \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \left(\frac{\alpha L^2\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L^3\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2} \right) v_1 + \left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^2}{\psi} + \frac{3L\Psi^2\alpha^2}{2} \right) v_3 \\ \leq \left(\left(\frac{\psi\alpha}{2} - \frac{3\alpha^2 L\Psi^2}{2} \right) \mu - \kappa\Psi^2\alpha^2 \right) v_2, \end{cases} \quad (2.52)$$

and then need the following inequality holds

$$\mu v_2 - 2L^2(\kappa_H)^2 v_1 - 2(\kappa_H)^2 v_3 > 0.$$

Setting $v_1 = \frac{1}{L^2}$, $v_2 = \frac{5(\kappa_H)^2}{\mu}$, and $\kappa = \mu L$, we can obtain the range of α :

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{32L\Psi\kappa_H},$$

and the spectral radius of \mathbf{J} :

$$\rho(J) = 1 - \frac{1}{1024(\kappa_H)^2\kappa_f}. \quad (2.53)$$

□

REMARK 2.5. *To reach ϵ -accuracy, the number of iterations (iterative complexity) needed by DMBFGS is at the order of $O\left(\frac{\kappa_f^2\kappa_H^2}{(1-\sigma^2)^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$ and is improved as $O\left(\kappa_f\kappa_H^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$ when the network is fully connected. We see that the iterative complexity of D-LM-BFGS [30] is always $O\left(\frac{\kappa_f^2\kappa_H^2}{(1-\sigma^2)^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$.*

Considering the case that $\mathbf{H}^t = \mathbf{I}$, i.e., $\kappa_H = 1$, we find DMBFGS turns to GT. The iterative complexity by GT [41] is $O\left(\frac{\kappa_f^{1.5} n^{0.5}}{(1-\sigma)^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$. Our given complexity $O\left(\frac{\kappa_f^2}{(1-\sigma^2)^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$ is independent of the number of nodes while is more sensitive to the condition number. For the fully connected network, both [41] and this paper give a better complexity $O\left(\kappa_f \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$ which matches that of the centralized steepest descent method for minimizing strongly convex and smooth optimization problems.

3. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS. In this section, we would like to test and compare our developed algorithms, NDCG and DMBFGS with some well-developed first-order algorithms on solving nonconvex and strongly convex optimization problems respectively over a connected undirected network with edge density $d \in (0, 1]$. For the generated network, we choose the Metropolis constant edge weight matrix [32] as the mixing matrix, that is

$$\tilde{W}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\max\{\deg(i), \deg(j)\} + 1}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}, \\ 0, & \text{if } (i, j) \notin \mathcal{E} \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ 1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i / \{i\}} \tilde{W}_{ik}, & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases}$$

where $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ indicates there is an edge between node i and node j , and $\deg(i)$ means the degree of node i . In our experiments, we introduce the communication volume which can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Communication volume} \\ &= \text{number of iterations} \\ & \quad \times \text{number of communication rounds per iteration} \\ & \quad \times \text{number of edges, i.e., } dn(n-1)/2 \\ & \quad \times \text{dimension of transmitted vectors on each edge.} \end{aligned}$$

In all experiments, we set the number of nodes $n = 10$ and the edge density $d = 0.56$ for the network, where $\kappa_g = 8.2$. For all comparison algorithms, we initialize $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$. All experiments are coded in MATLAB R2017b and run on a laptop with Intel Core i5-9300H CPU, 16GB RAM, and Windows 10 operating system.

3.1. Experiments for NDCG. We consider the nonconvex decentralized binary classification problem. Using a logistic regression formulation with a nonconvex regularization, the optimization is given by

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in R^p} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(1 + \exp(-b_{ij} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{z})) + \hat{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\mathbf{z}_{[k]}^2}{1 + \mathbf{z}_{[k]}^2}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_{ij} \in R^p$ are the feature vectors, $b_{ij} \in \{-1, +1\}$ are the labels, $\mathbf{z}_{[k]}$ denotes the k -th component of the vector \mathbf{z} , and $\hat{\lambda} > 0$ is the regularization parameter. The experiments are conducted on four datasets from the LIBSVM library: **mushroom**, **ijcnn1**, **w8a** and **a9a**. The regularization parameter $\hat{\lambda} = 1$. Comparison algorithms are listed: GT [18], Global Update Tracking (GUT) [21], MT [19], DSMT [20], and NDCG (**Algorithm 1**). Note that GT is commonly used as a benchmark in experiments on decentralized algorithms; GUT, MT, and DSMT are stochastic methods and therefore we use the full gradient over all samples for these methods. From the

first-order stationarity given in (2.10), the success of each algorithm is measured by the optimality error stated as

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^t) \right\| + \|\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}^t\|.$$

Table 3.1: Datasets

| Dataset | # of samples ($\sum_{i=1}^n n_i$) | # of features (p) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| mushroom | 8120 | 112 |
| ijcnn1 | 49990 | 22 |
| w8a | 49740 | 300 |
| a9a | 32560 | 123 |

For datasets **mushroom**(**ijcnn1**;**w8a**;**a9a**), algorithm parameters are set as follows their better performance and parameter notations follow the source papers. We set $\eta = 0.06(0.09; 0.09; 0.08)$ in GT. We set $\eta_t = 0.03\sqrt{\frac{n}{t}}$ and $\mu = 0.3(0.3; 0.3; 0.2)$ in GUT. We set $\eta = 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.31(0.41; 0.33; 0.35)$ in MT. We set $\eta_w = 1/(1 + \sqrt{1 - \sigma^2})$, $\beta = 1 - (1 - \sqrt{\eta_w})/n^{1/3}$, and $\alpha = 0.04(0.08; 0.04; 0.08)$ in DSMT, where σ is given by **Lemma 2.1**. We set $\alpha = 0.08(0.11; 0.1; 0.1)$ in NDCG.

Note that all algorithms except GUT need two rounds of communication per iteration; GUT needs only one communication per iteration but uses a decreasing stepsize, which yields very slow convergence as shown in figure 3.1. So, it not necessary to show the optimality error with respect to iteration number. From figure 3.1, we know that our proposed NDCG is significantly better than GT and even outperforms the momentum-based methods including MT and DSMT. Although DSMT has a theoretically fast convergence by Loopless Chebyshev Acceleration (LCA), it does not have a fairly good numerical performance. We think LCA actually accelerates the algorithm in the worst case, which might not improve the numerical performance in practice.

3.2. Experiments for DMBFGS. In this subsection, we choose the linear regression problem and the logistic regression problem using a strongly convex regularization. Comparison algorithms are given below:

- Gradient based methods including GT [10], ABm [12], and OGT [15];
- Quasi-Newton methods including DR-LM-DFP [30], D-LM-BFGS [30], and DMBFGS (**Algorithm 2**) with $\tau_i^t = \frac{(\mathbf{s}_i^t)^T \mathbf{y}_i^t}{\|\mathbf{y}_i^t\|^2}$.

Since random variables are involved in OGT, we will repeat OGT 5 times and record the best performance as OGT(BEST) and the average performance as OGT(AVG). The success of each algorithm is measured by

$$\text{Relative error} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i^t - \mathbf{z}^*\|}{\|\mathbf{z}^*\| + 1}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the true solution \mathbf{z}^* is explicitly obtained for the linear regression problem and is pre-computed by a centralized algorithm for the logistic regression problem.




Fig. 3.1: Optimality error of comparison algorithms for minimizing the nonconvex logistic regression problem (3.1) on different datasets w.r.t. communication volume.

3.2.1. Linear regression problem. Here, we investigate the impacts of the condition number of the objective function, denoted as κ_f . We focus on comparison between our algorithm and gradient-based algorithms (GT [10], ABm [12], and OGT [15]). We consider the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in R^p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}_i^\top \mathbf{z}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i \in R^{p \times p}$ and $\mathbf{b}_i \in R^p$ are private data available to node i . To control the condition number of problem (3.3), we construct $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{Q}^\top \text{diag}\{a_1, \dots, a_p\} \mathbf{Q}$, where \mathbf{Q} is a random orthogonal matrix. We set $a_1 = 1$ and a_p as an arbitrarily large number, and generate $a_j \sim U(1, 2)$ for $j = 2, \dots, p-1$, where $U(1, 2)$ represents the uniform distribution from 1 to 2. So $\kappa_f = a_p/a_1 = a_p$. We set $p = 1000$ and $a_p = 10^2, 10^3, 10^4, 10^5$.

For $\kappa_f = 10^2(10^3; 10^4; 10^5)$, algorithm parameters are set as follows their better performance, and parameter notations follow the source papers. We set $\eta = 5 \times 10^{-3}(5.3 \times 10^{-4}; 5.3 \times 10^{-5}; 5.2 \times 10^{-6})$ in GT. We set $\alpha = 1.2 \times 10^{-2}(1.1 \times 10^{-3}; 1.2 \times 10^{-4}; 1.4 \times 10^{-5})$ and $\beta = 0.71(0.83; 0.83; 0.83)$ in ABm. We set $\alpha = 0.02, \tau = 0.7,$




Fig. 3.2: Comparisons with gradient-based algorithms for minimizing the strongly convex linear regression problem (3.3) with different condition numbers w.r.t. iteration number.

$\gamma = \frac{4\alpha}{4-4\tau-3\alpha}$, $\eta = 0.21(2 \times 10^{-2}; 2.1 \times 10^{-3}; 2.1 \times 10^{-4})$, $\beta = 8.4 \times 10^{-2}(2 \times 10^{-2}; 2.1 \times 10^{-3}; 1.1 \times 10^{-4})$, and $p = q = 0.3$ in OGT. We set $\alpha = 0.52(9.5 \times 10^{-2}; 2.2 \times 10^{-2}; 2.2 \times 10^{-3})$ in DMBFGS.

From figures 3.2 and 3.3, we see that DMBFGS is more robust to the condition number compared to other algorithms. In figures 3.2a and 3.3a, ABm performs best for the problem with a small condition number, i.e., $\kappa_f = 10^2$. However, the performance of ABm degrades as the condition number increases. We find that OGT with the optimal complexity does not present a dominant performance. We think the lower complexity bounds are proved by considering the worst function belonging to the class including strong convex and smooth functions. Thus, since we do not often meet such the worst function in practice, OGT might not perform better than other algorithms as shown in figures 3.2 and 3.3. Additionally, note three rounds of communication per iteration are needed in OGT while other algorithms just require two rounds. Hence, for the problem with $\kappa_f = 10^4$, OGT(BEST) is better than NDCG in terms of iteration number but not as good as NDCG in terms of communication volume.




Fig. 3.3: Comparisons with gradient-based algorithms for minimizing the strongly convex linear regression problem (3.3) with different condition numbers w.r.t. communication volume.

3.2.2. Logistic regression problem. We consider the logistic regression with l_2 -regularization.

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in R^p} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(1 + \exp(-b_{ij} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^T \mathbf{z})) + \frac{\hat{\lambda}}{2} \|\mathbf{z}\|^2. \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_{ij} \in R^p$ are the feature vectors, $b_{ij} \in \{-1, +1\}$ are the labels, and $\hat{\lambda} > 0$ is the regularization parameter. The experiments are conducted on four datasets from the LIBSVM library: **mushroom**, **ijcnn1**, **w8a** and **a9a**. The regularization parameter $\hat{\lambda} = 1$.

We first focus on comparison results with gradient-based algorithms (GT [10], ABm [12], and OGT [15]). For datasets **mushroom**(**ijcnn1**;**w8a**;**a9a**), algorithm parameters are set as follows their better performance and parameter notations follow the source papers. We set $\eta = 0.09(0.12; 0.06; 0.12)$ in GT. We set $\alpha = 0.07(0.18; 0.07; 0.11)$ and $\beta = 0.59(0.6; 0.58; 0.58)$ in ABm. We set $\alpha = 0.2$, $\tau = 0.7$, $\gamma = \frac{4\alpha}{4-4\tau-3\alpha}$, $\eta = 0.4(0.6; 0.4; 0.6)$, $\beta = 0.2(0.3; 0.2; 0.3)$, and $p = q = 0.3$ in OGT. We set $\alpha = 0.18(0.34; 0.3; 0.32)$ in DMBFGS.

From figures 3.4 and 3.5, we see that DMBFGS is more efficient than comparison algorithms in both the iteration number and communication volume. The logistic regression is more complex than the linear regression, where the Hessian of the object function of the logistic regression is not a fixed matrix. Thus, DMBFGS approximates the curvature information of Hessian matrices, yielding a better performance.

We now compare our algorithms with several well-developed decentralized limited memoryless quasi-Newton algorithms: DR-LM-DFP [30], D-LM-BFGS [30]. For datasets **mushroom**(**ijcnn1**;**w8a**;**a9a**), algorithm parameters are set as follows their better performance and parameter notations follow the source papers. We set $\alpha = 0.5(0.51; 0.52; 0.46)$, $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, $\beta = 10^{-3}$, $\mathcal{B} = 10^4$, $\tilde{L} = 20(20; 10; 10)$, $M = 5(8; 4; 3)$ in D-LM-BFGS. We set $\alpha = 0.04(0.05; 0.05; 0.05)$, $\rho = 0.6(0.8; 0.8; 0.6)$, $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, $\beta = 1$, $\mathcal{B} = 10^4$, $\tilde{L} = 10(1; 1; 1)$, $M = 6(5; 5; 5)$ in DR-LM-DFP.

Note all comparison algorithms require the same communication cost per iteration. We see from figures 3.6 that DMBFGS has a faster convergence. We think the reason is that our way of constructing quasi-Newton matrices seizes more curvature information of Hessian matrices than previous ways used by D-LM-BFGS and DR-LM-DFP. If the average gradient approximation \mathbf{v}_i^t is far away from the exact average gradient $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^t$, probably making traditional BFGS or DFP approximation matrices indefinite, the regularizing or damping techniques actually render D-LM-BFGS and DR-LM-DFP needing a big perturbation to keep quasi-Newton matrices positive definite. This would destroy the curvature information. In contrast, our DMBFGS realizes that the curvature information of local Hessian matrices can be caught although the alternative $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^t = \mathbf{g}_i^{t+1} - \mathbf{g}_i^t$ is used to generate quasi-Newton matrices.

4. CONCLUSIONS. This paper considers a decentralized consensus optimization problem and proposes two new methods, where the decentralized conjugate gradient (NDCG) method and a decentralized memoryless BFGS method, DMBFGS. For nonconvex problems, we propose a new decentralized conjugate gradient (NDCG) method. Using the average gradient tracking technique and a newly developed conjugate parameter based on the PRP format, NDCG succeeded in using constant stepsizes and converging to the stationary point of (1.1) under the assumption of the Lipschitz continuity of gradients. When considered problems are strongly convex, we propose a new decentralized memoryless BFGS (DMBFGS) method which incorporates the memoryless BFGS technique from Shanno. This method effectively explores second-order information, involving only vector-vector products. Under proper assumptions, DMBFGS has globally linear convergence for strongly convex optimization problems. The numerical results on nonconvex logistic regression problems show that NDCG is superior in terms of communication volume to comparison methods for nonconvex decentralized optimization, including GT, GUT, MT, and DSMT. Moreover, the numerical results on strongly convex linear regression and logistic regression problems indicate that DMBFGS performs significantly better in terms of iteration number and communication volume than the comparison decentralized methods, including GT, ABm, OGT, D-LM-BFGS, and DR-LM-DFP.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Fusco and M. Russo, "A decentralized approach for voltage control by multiple distributed energy resources," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3115–3127, 2021.
- [2] E. Jeong, M. Zecchin, and M. Kountouris, "Asynchronous decentralized learning over unreliable wireless networks," in *2022 International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2022, pp. 607–612.




Fig. 3.4: Comparisons with gradient-based algorithms for minimizing the strongly convex logistic regression problem (3.4) on different datasets w.r.t. iteration number.

- [3] X. Zhang, C. Hu, B. He, and Z. Han, “Distributed reptile algorithm for meta-learning over multi-agent systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 5443–5456, 2022.
- [4] Z. Chen, Z. Li, C. Guo, J. Wang, and Y. Ding, “Fully distributed robust reserve scheduling for coupled transmission and distribution systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 169–182, 2020.
- [5] K. Pillutla, S. M. Kakade, and Z. Harchaoui, “Robust aggregation for federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 1142–1154, 2022.
- [6] A. Nedić and A. Ozdaglar, “Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [7] K. Yuan, Q. Ling, and W. Yin, “On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1835–1854, 2016.
- [8] J. Zeng and W. Yin, “On nonconvex decentralized gradient descent,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 2834–2848, 2018.
- [9] J. Xu, S. Zhu, Y. C. Soh, and L. Xie, “Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes,” in *2015 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2015, pp. 2055–2060.
- [10] G. Qu and N. Li, “Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1245–1260, 2017.
- [11] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and W. Shi, “Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2597–2633, 2017.




Fig. 3.5: Comparisons with gradient-based algorithms for minimizing the strongly convex logistic regression problem (3.4) on different datasets w.r.t. communication volume.

- [12] R. Xin and U. A. Khan, “Distributed heavy-ball: A generalization and acceleration of first-order methods with gradient tracking,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 2627–2633, 2019.
- [13] J. Gao, X. Liu, Y.-H. Dai, Y. Huang, and P. Yang, “Geometric convergence for distributed optimization with barzilai-borwein step sizes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07852*, 2019.
- [14] J. Zhang, K. You, and K. Cai, “Distributed dual gradient tracking for resource allocation in unbalanced networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 2186–2198, 2020.
- [15] Z. Song, L. Shi, S. Pu, and M. Yan, “Optimal gradient tracking for decentralized optimization,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 207, no. 1, pp. 1–53, 2024.
- [16] A. H. Sayed, “Diffusion adaptation over networks,” in *Academic Press Library in Signal Processing*, 2014, vol. 3, pp. 323–453.
- [17] M. Hong, S. Zeng, J. Zhang, and H. Sun, “On the divergence of decentralized nonconvex optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 2879–2908, 2022.
- [18] S. Lu, X. Zhang, H. Sun, and M. Hong, “Gnsd: A gradient-tracking based nonconvex stochastic algorithm for decentralized optimization,” in *2019 IEEE Data Science Workshop (DSW)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 315–321.
- [19] Y. Takezawa, H. Bao, K. Niwa, R. Sato, and M. Yamada, “Momentum tracking: Momentum acceleration for decentralized deep learning on heterogeneous data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15505*, 2022.
- [20] K. Huang, S. Pu, and A. Nedić, “An accelerated distributed stochastic gradient method with




Fig. 3.6: Comparisons with limited memoryless quasi-Newton algorithms for minimizing the strongly convex logistic regression problem (3.4) on different datasets w.r.t. communication volume.

- momentum,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09714*, 2024.
- [21] S. A. Aketi, A. Hashemi, and K. Roy, “Global update tracking: A decentralized learning algorithm for heterogeneous data,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2023, pp. 48 939–48 961.
- [22] C. Xu, J. Zhu, Y. Shang, and Q. Wu, “A distributed conjugate gradient online learning method over networks,” *Complexity*, vol. 2020, pp. 1–13, 2020.
- [23] J. Chen, H. Ye, M. Wang, T. Huang, G. Dai, I. W. Tsang, and Y. Liu, “Decentralized riemannian conjugate gradient method on the stiefel manifold,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10547*, 2023.
- [24] O. Shorinwa and M. Schwager, “Distributed conjugate gradient method via conjugate direction tracking,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12235*, 2023.
- [25] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, “Discrete-time dynamic average consensus,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 322–329, 2010.
- [26] J. Barzilai and J. M. Borwein, “Two-point step size gradient methods,” *IMA journal of numerical analysis*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 141–148, 1988.
- [27] M. Eisen, A. Mokhtari, and A. Ribeiro, “Decentralized quasi-newton methods,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 10, pp. 2613–2628, 2017.
- [28] —, “A primal-dual quasi-newton method for exact consensus optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 23, pp. 5983–5997, 2019.
- [29] Y. Li, Y. Gong, N. M. Freris, P. Voulgaris, and D. Stipanović, “Bfgs-admm for large-scale distributed optimization,” in *2021 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*,

- 2021, pp. 1689–1694.
- [30] J. Zhang, H. Liu, A. M.-C. So, and Q. Ling, “Variance-reduced stochastic quasi-newton methods for decentralized learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 71, pp. 311–326, 2023.
 - [31] D. F. Shanno, “On the convergence of a new conjugate gradient algorithm,” *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1247–1257, 1978.
 - [32] L. Xiao, S. Boyd, and S.-J. Kim, “Distributed average consensus with least-mean-square deviation,” *Journal of parallel and distributed computing*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 33–46, 2007.
 - [33] R. Fletcher and C. M. Reeves, “Function minimization by conjugate gradients,” *The computer journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 149–154, 1964.
 - [34] B. T. Polyak, “The conjugate gradient method in extremal problems,” *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 94–112, 1969.
 - [35] M. R. Hestenes, E. Stiefel *et al.*, “Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems,” *Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 409–436, 1952.
 - [36] Y.-H. Dai and Y. Yuan, “A nonlinear conjugate gradient method with a strong global convergence property,” *SIAM Journal on optimization*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 177–182, 1999.
 - [37] Y. Hu and C. Storey, “Efficient generalized conjugate gradient algorithms, part 2: Implementation,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 69, pp. 139–152, 1991.
 - [38] A. Perry, “A modified conjugate gradient algorithm,” *Operations Research*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1073–1078, 1978.
 - [39] Y.-H. Dai, “Convergence of conjugate gradient methods with constant stepsizes,” *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 895–909, 2011.
 - [40] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
 - [41] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, W. Shi, and C. A. Uribe, “Geometrically convergent distributed optimization with uncoordinated step-sizes,” in *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 3950–3955.