

A Note on Complexity for Two Classes of Structured Non-Smooth Non-Convex Compositional Optimization

Yao Yao Qihang Lin Tianbao Yang

Abstract

This note studies numerical methods for solving compositional optimization problems, where the inner function is smooth, and the outer function is Lipschitz continuous, non-smooth, and non-convex but exhibits one of two special structures that enable the design of efficient first-order methods. In the first structure, the outer function allows for an easily solvable proximal mapping. We demonstrate that, in this case, a smoothing compositional gradient method can find a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point—specifically defined for compositional optimization—in $\mathcal{O}(1/(\delta\epsilon^2))$ iterations. In the second structure, the outer function is expressed as a difference-of-convex function, where each convex component is simple enough to allow an efficiently solvable proximal linear subproblem. In this case, we show that a prox-linear method can find a nearly ϵ -critical point in $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations.

1 Introduction

In this work, we consider the following *compositional optimization problem*

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) := h(g(x)), \quad (1)$$

where $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous, non-smooth and non-convex function and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth map. Overall, (1) is a non-smooth non-convex compositional optimization problem.

This note focuses on first-order methods for (1) under some structural assumptions and analyzes their convergence. For general non-smooth non-convex optimization problems, both asymptotic convergence analysis, e.g., [5, 20, 28, 11], and non-asymptotic convergence analysis, e.g., [21, 44], have been established in literature for different first-order methods under various settings. Typically, non-asymptotic convergence analysis implies the iteration complexity of a first-order method for finding an ϵ -stationary point. However, for general non-smooth and non-convex optimization, it has been shown that a traditional ϵ -stationary point cannot be obtained in finite complexity [21, 44, 37, 19]. Therefore, recent studies have focused finding a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point [44, 19] (also called a (δ, ϵ) -Goldstein stationary point).

The first result of this note is a *smoothing compositional gradient* method that finds a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point for (1) with iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta\epsilon^2)$. The definition of such a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point (Definition 4.5) is tailored for the compositional structure in (1), and is similar to but different form that in [44, 19].

In addition, we consider a special case of (1), which is a difference-of-convex (DC) optimization with the following compositional structure.

$$\min_x f(x) := h_2(g_2(x)) - h_1(g_1(x)), \quad (2)$$

where $h_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous convex function and $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth map for $i = 1, 2$. To solve this problem, we propose a *prox-linear* method where the solution is updated by solving two proximal linear subproblems. We show that, when the subproblems can be solved exactly, the method finds a nearly ϵ -critical point of (2), originally defined by [35], within $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations.

2 Related Works

Non-smooth non-convex problems. General non-smooth non-convex problems and their associated algorithms have been systematically discussed in several monographs, including algorithms'

asymptotic convergence [5, 28, 11, 6, 41] and non-asymptotic convergence [44, 21, 3, 19]. Instead of considering a general problem, this note studies the algorithms for non-smooth non-convex optimization that exploit some special structure of problems.

Non-smooth compositional optimization. One important structure is the compositional structure like the one in (1). [45, 38] consider the case when $h \circ g$ is convex while [15, 10, 13] assume convex h and smooth g , which ensures weak convexity of $h \circ g$. [39] consider a problem where a non-Lipschitz ℓ_p ($0 < p < 1$) regularizer is added to the compositional function $h \circ g$ but still assume convexity of h and smoothness of g . In a recent work [18], the authors consider the case when h and g are both weakly convex and h is non-decreasing in each component, which also ensures weak convexity of $h \circ g$. On the contrary, we assume h is a non-convex function which is not necessarily weakly convex, so (1) is not necessarily weakly convex. [27] consider a similar setting to ours. Assuming g is linear, they show the asymptotic convergence of a smoothing gradient method. This note considers nonlinear g and provides a non-asymptotic convergence analysis of a similar algorithm. [7] considers the same problem as (1) and they convert the compositional problem to a constrained optimization problem. To solve the equivalent constrained problem, they use Lagrangian-based method and establish algorithm's asymptotic convergence.

Structured difference-of-convex problems. The applications of DC optimization have arisen from statistical learning [31, 2, 8, 26, 9], resource allocation [4], and stochastic program [25]. The algorithms in [32, 33] can be applied to find a stationary point stronger than the one considered in this note, but the convergence analysis in those works is asymptotic so the overall complexity for finding a (nearly) ϵ -stationary is not provided in those works. Non-asymptotic convergence analysis for DC programs has been developed in many papers, including but not limited to [42, 35, 29, 40, 36, 1, 17]. The difference-of-convex algorithm (DCA), e.g., the ones in [36, 1, 23], finds a nearly ϵ -stationary point in $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations, and can achieve a linear convergence when the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property holds with certain exponents. However, the DCA requires exactly solving a non-trivial convex subproblem, which may not be easy in general. The smoothing methods based on Moreau envelopes [42, 35, 29] only need to solve a subproblem inexactly using an inner loop, and finds a nearly ϵ -stationary point with $O(1/\epsilon^4)$ iteration complexity. DC optimization with a compositional structure like (2) have also been studied recently [22, 17]. The authors of [22] proposed a method that linearizes $g_1(x)$ and $g_2(x)$ and then applies the DCA. The asymptotic convergence analysis is shown and they also consider DC compositional optimization problems with non-convex constraints. [17] studied a DC optimization problem formulated as

$$\min_x \left[\max_{y \in Y} \varphi(x, y) - \max_{z \in Z} \psi(x, z) \right]$$

where $\Phi(x) = \max_{y \in Y} \varphi(x, y)$ and $\Psi(x) = \max_{z \in Z} \psi(x, z)$ are weakly convex and $\varphi(x, y)$ and $\psi(x, z)$ are strongly concave in y and z , respectively. They develop a single-loop algorithm for such a problem and show an $O(1/\epsilon^4)$ complexity for finding a nearly ϵ -stationary point. If h_1 and h_2 in (2) are smooth so that their Fréchet conjugates are strongly concave, (2) becomes a special case of the problem above. In this note, we show that, when g_1 and g_2 are smooth and h_1 and h_2 are simple enough so the two proximal linear subproblems can be solved exactly, an analysis similar to [17] leads to $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iteration complexity.

Prox-linear method. The prox-linear method [14, 13, 12, 24] is a well-studied method for a problem like (1). Given a current iteration x_k , the prox-linear method generates the next iterate x_{k+1} as an optimal or nearly optimal solution of

$$\min_x h(g(x_k) + \nabla g(x_k)(x - x_k)) + \frac{1}{2t} \|x - x_k\|^2.$$

When h is a finite-valued Lipschitz convex function and g is a smooth mapping, this method finds an ϵ -stationary point in $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iteration, provided that the subproblem above is solved exactly. [12] extends this algorithm by replacing the objective function in the subproblem above with a Taylor-like model.

3 Notations and Preliminaries

In this section, we present some notations and preliminaries. Throughout this work, a Euclidean space is considered and denoted by \mathbb{R}^d , with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the induced norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let B denote

the unit Euclidean ball and $\text{conv}(\cdot)$ denote the convex hull. Given a linear map $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$, the operator norm of A is defined as $\|A\|_{\text{op}} := \max_{\|u\| \leq 1} \|Au\|$. Given a set S in \mathbb{R}^d , the distance of a point x onto S is given by

$$\text{dist}(x; S) := \inf_{y \in S} \|y - x\|.$$

For a non-convex function $f(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\hat{\partial}f(x)$ denote the Fréchet subgradient and $\partial f(x)$ denote the limiting subgradient, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\partial}f(\bar{x}) &= \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \liminf_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} \frac{f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - v^\top(x - \bar{x})}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \partial f(\bar{x}) &= \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists x_k \xrightarrow{f} \bar{x}, v_k \in \hat{\partial}f(\bar{x}), v_k \rightarrow v \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $x \xrightarrow{f} \bar{x}$ means that $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $f(x) \rightarrow f(\bar{x})$. It is known that $\hat{\partial}f(\bar{x}) \subset \partial f(\bar{x})$.

For any proper function f and any real number $\mu > 0$, the *Moreau envelope* and the *proximal mapping* of f are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f_\mu(x) &:= \min_y \left\{ f(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - x\|^2 \right\}, \\ \text{prox}_{\mu f}(x) &:= \arg \min_y \left\{ f(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - x\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. It is not hard to see that

$$\min_y f(y) \leq f_\mu(x) \leq f(x) \text{ for all } x.$$

4 Outer Function with Easy Mapping

In this section, we study (1) under the following assumptions.

Assumption 4.1. *The following statements hold for (1).*

1. $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a L_h -Lipschitz continuous function:

$$|h(x) - h(y)| \leq L_h \|x - y\| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m;$$

There exists a constant \underline{h} such that $h(\cdot) \geq \underline{h}$ and $\text{prox}_{\mu h}(\cdot)$ can be solved easily.

2. $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a L_g -Lipschitz continuous and C^1 -smooth mapping with a β -Lipschitz continuous Jacobian map:

$$\|\nabla g(x) - \nabla g(y)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \beta \|x - y\| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

There exists a constant C_g such that $\|g(x)\| \leq C_g$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

To solve problem (1), we first introduce the Moreau envelope of h at $g(x)$:

$$h_\mu(g(x)) := \min_y \left\{ h(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - g(x)\|^2 \right\},$$

and the proximal mapping of h at $g(x)$:

$$\text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x)) := \arg \min_y \left\{ \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - g(x)\|^2 + h(y) \right\},$$

where $\mu > 0$. A nice property of the Moreau envelope function is that it can be written as a difference-of-convex (DC) function [27, 40]:

$$h_\mu(g(x)) = \frac{1}{2\mu} \|g(x)\|^2 - \underbrace{\max_y \left(\frac{1}{\mu} y^\top g(x) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y\|^2 - h(y) \right)}_{G(x)}, \quad (3)$$

where $G(x)$ is a weakly convex function because it is the max of weakly convex functions of x . Also, if the assumptions above are satisfied, it is easy to verify that $\frac{1}{2\mu} \|g(x)\|^2$ is $\frac{L_g^2 + C_g \beta}{\mu}$ -smooth and hence $\frac{L_g^2 + C_g \beta}{\mu}$ -weakly convex. We also present following nice properties that are useful.

Lemma 4.2. *Under Assumption 4.1, it holds that*

$$\text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x)) \subset (I + \mu \partial h)^{-1}(g(x)) \text{ for all } x, \quad (4)$$

$$\forall v \in \text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x)), \quad \frac{1}{\mu}(g(x) - v) \in \partial h(v). \quad (5)$$

The proof of (4) can be found in [34, Example 10.2] and the proof of (5) can be found in [34, Theorem 10.1].

Lemma 4.3. *If Assumption 4.1 holds, for any $v \in \text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x))$,*

$$\|v\| \leq C_v,$$

where $C_v := C_g + \sqrt{2\mu(\max_x h(g(x)) - \underline{h})}$.

Proof. Since $h_\mu(g(x)) \leq h(g(x))$ and h is lower bounded by \underline{h} , we can get for any $v \in \text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x))$

$$\underline{h} + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|v - g(x)\|^2 \leq h(v) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|v - g(x)\|^2 \leq h(g(x)).$$

By rearranging the above inequalities, we have

$$\|v - g(x)\|^2 \leq 2\mu(h(g(x)) - \underline{h}) \leq 2\mu\left(\max_x h(g(x)) - \underline{h}\right).$$

By the L_h -Lipschitz continuity of h and the upper boundness of $\|g(x)\|$, we know that the $\max_x h(g(x))$ exists. Then by triangle inequality, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\| &\leq \|g(x)\| + \sqrt{2\mu\left(\max_x h(g(x)) - \underline{h}\right)} \\ &\leq C_g + \sqrt{2\mu\left(\max_x h(g(x)) - \underline{h}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \square

4.1 Targeted solution

Consider the problem (1), the Fréchet subgradient of f can be get following a chain-rule [34, Theorem 10.6].

Lemma 4.4 (Chain rule). *For f defined in (1), at any x , one has*

$$\nabla g(x)^\top \hat{\partial} h(g(x)) \subset \hat{\partial} f(x) \subset \partial f(x) \subset \nabla g(x)^\top \partial h(g(x)).$$

Ideally, we want to find a point x such that $\min\{\|\xi\| \mid \xi \in \partial f(x)\} \leq \epsilon$. However, the existing results show that this cannot be done with finite complexity [21, 44, 37, 19]. Instead, one can find a (δ, ϵ) -Goldstein stationary point using first-order methods [44, 19] with iteration complexity $O(1/(\delta\epsilon^3))$. Here, a (δ, ϵ) -Goldstein stationary point is a point x satisfying

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial f(x + \delta B)) \leq \epsilon \quad (6)$$

where $\partial f(x + \delta B) := \text{conv}\left(\bigcup_{y \in x + \delta B} \partial f(y)\right)$ is the Goldstein δ -subdifferential [16].

According to the last inclusion in Lemma 4.4, if we weaken a (δ, ϵ) -Goldstein stationary point in (6) to a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point defined with respect to set $\nabla g(x)^\top \partial h(g(x))$, it is possible to find such a weakened stationary point more easily, i.e., with lower iteration complexity. To verify this, the point we want to find through this study is defined below.

Definition 4.5. *A point x is called a (chain-rule) (δ, ϵ) -stationary point for (1) if*

$$\text{dist}(0, \nabla g(x)^\top \partial h(g(x) + \delta B)) \leq \epsilon, \quad (7)$$

where $\partial h(g(x) + \delta B) := \text{conv}\left(\bigcup_{y \in g(x) + \delta B} \partial h(y)\right)$ is the Goldstein δ -subdifferential, introduced in [16]. A random variable x is called a stochastic (chain-rule) (δ, ϵ) -stationary point for (1) if

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(0, \nabla g(x)^\top \partial h(g(x) + \delta B))] \leq \epsilon. \quad (8)$$

Remark 4.6. To interpret Definition 4.5, we write (1) equivalently into a constrained problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, v \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(v) \text{ s.t. } g(x) = v. \quad (9)$$

According to the optimality conditions of this problem, we can say (x, v) is a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) point of (9) if there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\lambda \in \partial h(v)$, $\nabla g(x)^\top \lambda = 0$, and $v = g(x)$. Suppose x is a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point in Definition 4.5 for (1) with $\delta = O(\epsilon)$. There exist $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\lambda \in \partial h(v)$ such that $\|g(x) - v\| \leq \delta = O(\epsilon)$ and $\|\nabla g(x)^\top \lambda\| \leq \epsilon$, indicating that (x, v) is an ϵ -KKT point of (9).

4.2 Algorithm and convergence analysis

To find a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point of (1), we propose a smoothing compositional gradient method (SCGM) in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is essentially a gradient method applied to minimize $h_\mu(g(x))$ in (3), which is a smooth approximation of (1). Since we have assumed the proximal mapping $\text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x))$ can be easily solved, we can get $v(g(x_k)) \in \text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x_k))$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Note that $v(g(x_k))$ may not be unique since $h(\cdot)$ is not necessarily weakly convex. If there are multiple possible $v(g(x_k))$, our algorithm can use any one of them. Recall (3). At the k th iteration, after getting one proximal point $v(g(x_k))$, we can get

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k) - \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k)) \in \partial h_\mu(g(x_k)),$$

and then we apply subgradient update on x to generate x_{k+1} .

Algorithm 1 Smoothing Compositional Gradient Method (SCGM)

- 1: **Initialization:** $x_1, K \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \mu > 0, \gamma > 0$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 - 3: Get $v(g(x_k)) \in \text{prox}_{\mu h}(g(x_k))$
 - 4: Let $F_k(x) = \left(\frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k) - \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k)) \right)^\top (x - x_k) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2$
 - 5: $x_{k+1} = \arg \min_x F_k(x)$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **return** x_τ with τ uniformly sampled from $\{1, \dots, K\}$
-

The convergence property of Algorithm 1 is presented as follows.

Theorem 4.7. Suppose Assumption 4.1 holds and $\mu = \frac{\delta}{2L_h}$, $\gamma = \frac{2C}{\mu}$, and $K = \frac{16L_h C \Delta}{\delta \epsilon^2}$ with $C := L_g^2 + \beta C_g + C_v L_g$ and $\Delta := h(g(x_1)) - \underline{h}$, then the output of the Algorithm 1 x_τ is a stochastic (δ, ϵ) -stationary point for (1).

Proof. Since $\frac{1}{2\mu} \|g(x)\|^2$ is $\frac{L_g^2 + \beta C_g}{\mu}$ -smooth, we have for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\frac{1}{2\mu} \|g(u)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\mu} \|g(x_k)\|^2 + \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k), u - x_k \right\rangle + \frac{L_g^2 + \beta C_g}{2\mu} \|u - x_k\|^2. \quad (10)$$

By the Lemma 4.3, we observe that $G(x)$ in (3) is $\frac{C_v L_g}{\mu}$ -weakly convex with C_v defined in Lemma 4.3. Then we have for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$-G(u) \leq -G(x_k) - \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k)), u - x_k \right\rangle + \frac{C_v L_g}{2\mu} \|u - x_k\|^2. \quad (11)$$

Combine (10) and (11) to get

$$h_\mu(g(u)) \leq h_\mu(g(x_k)) + \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top (g(x_k) - v(g(x_k))), u - x_k \right\rangle + \frac{L_g^2 + \beta C_g + C_v L_g}{2\mu} \|u - x_k\|^2.$$

Let $C := L_g^2 + \beta C_g + C_v L_g$ and replace u with x_{k+1} in above inequality, we have

$$h_\mu(g(x_{k+1})) \leq h_\mu(g(x_k)) + \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top (g(x_k) - v(g(x_k))), x_{k+1} - x_k \right\rangle + \frac{C}{2\mu} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (12)$$

Since $x_{k+1} = \arg \min_x F_k(x)$, we have $F_k(x_{k+1}) \leq F_k(x_k)$, i.e.,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top (g(x_k) - v(g(x_k))), x_{k+1} - x_k \right\rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq 0 \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k) - \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k)) + \gamma(x_{k+1} - x_k) = 0. \quad (14)$$

By adding (13) to (12), we have

$$h_\mu(g(x_{k+1})) \leq h_\mu(g(x_k)) + \left(\frac{C}{2\mu} - \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (15)$$

By letting $\gamma = \frac{2C}{\mu}$, (15) can be easily converted to

$$\frac{C}{2\mu} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq h_\mu(g(x_k)) - h_\mu(g(x_{k+1})).$$

Rearrange (14) and combine with the above formula, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mu^2} \|\nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k) - \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k))\|^2 &= \gamma^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq 4\gamma (h_\mu(g(x_k)) - h_\mu(g(x_{k+1}))) \end{aligned}$$

By taking average over $1, \dots, K$ for above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\mu^2} \|\nabla g(x_k)^\top g(x_k) - \nabla g(x_k)^\top v(g(x_k))\|^2 &\leq 4\gamma \frac{h_\mu(g(x_1)) - h_\mu(g(x_K))}{K} \\ &\leq 4\gamma \frac{h_\mu(g(x_1)) - \inf_x h_\mu(g(x))}{K} \\ &\leq \frac{4\Delta\gamma}{K}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta := h(g(x_1)) - \underline{h}$. Here, we have used the fact that $h_\mu(g(x_1)) - \inf_x h_\mu(g(x)) \leq \Delta$. Indeed, by the definition of $h_\mu(g(x))$, we have $\inf_x h_\mu(g(x)) \geq \min_x h(x) \geq \underline{h}$ and $h_\mu(g(x_1)) \leq h(g(x_1))$. Hence, we have

$$h_\mu(g(x_1)) - \inf_x h_\mu(g(x)) \leq h_\mu(g(x_1)) - \underline{h} \leq h(g(x_1)) - \underline{h} = \Delta.$$

Then by the definition of x_τ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\mu^2} \|\nabla g(x_\tau)^\top (g(x_\tau) - v(g(x_\tau)))\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{4\Delta\gamma}{K}.$$

Next, we want to bound the distance between $v(g(x_\tau))$ and $g(x_\tau)$. By the definition of $v(g(x_\tau))$, we have

$$h(v(g(x_\tau))) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|v(g(x_\tau)) - g(x_\tau)\|^2 \leq h(g(x_\tau)),$$

from which we can get

$$\frac{1}{2\mu} \|v(g(x_\tau)) - g(x_\tau)\|^2 \leq h(g(x_\tau)) - h(v(g(x_\tau))) \leq L_h \|g(x_\tau) - v(g(x_\tau))\|,$$

where the last inequality comes from the L_h -Lipschitz continuity of h . From the above inequality, we can get

$$\|g(x_\tau) - v(g(x_\tau))\| \leq 2\mu L_h.$$

By setting $\mu = \frac{\delta}{2L_h}$ and $K = \frac{16L_h C \Delta}{\delta \epsilon^2}$, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\mu} \|\nabla g(x_\tau)^\top (g(x_\tau) - v(g(x_\tau)))\| \right] &\leq \epsilon, \\ \|g(x_\tau) - v(g(x_\tau))\| &\leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By combining the above results with the Lemma (4.2), we can get

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{dist}(0, \nabla g(x_\tau)^\top \partial h(v(g(x_\tau))))] \leq \epsilon$$

with $v(g(x_\tau)) \in g(x_\tau) + \delta B$, which shows that x_τ is a stochastic (δ, ϵ) -stationary point for the problem (1). \square

This result shows that the iteration complexity of finding a (chain-rule) (δ, ϵ) -stationary point is lower than that of (δ, ϵ) -Goldstein stationary point by a factor of $O(1/\epsilon)$.

5 Difference-of-Convex Outer Function

In this section, we consider (2), which is a special case of (1) called compositional DC optimization. We define $f_1(x) := h_1(g_1(x))$ and $f_2(x) := h_2(g_2(x))$ so (2) can be rewritten as

$$\min_x f(x) := f_2(x) - f_1(x) = h_2(g_2(x)) - h_1(g_1(x)).$$

Throughout this section, we make the following assumptions on (2).

Assumption 5.1. *The following statements hold for (2).*

1. $h_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex and L -Lipschitz continuous function and $\text{prox}_{\mu h_i(Ax+b)}(\cdot)$ can be solved easily for $i = 1, 2$ and for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ and any $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.
2. $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a C^1 -smooth mapping with a β -Lipschitz continuous Jacobian map for $i = 1, 2$. There exists a constant C_g such that $\max\{\|g_1(x)\|, \|g_2(x)\|\} \leq C_g$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 5.2 (Lemma 4.2 in [13]). *Under Assumption 5.1, f_1 and f_2 are ρ -weakly convex with*

$$\rho := L\beta.$$

By the Lemma 5.2, problem (2) is DC optimization where the two convex components can be $f_2(x) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x\|^2$ and $f_1(x) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x\|^2$ for any $\mu \in (0, \rho^{-1})$.

5.1 Targeted solution

We say $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *critical point* of (2) if $0 \in \partial f_2(x) - \partial f_1(x)$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, we say $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an ϵ -*critical point* of (2) if there exist $\xi_1 \in \partial f_1(x)$ and $\xi_2 \in \partial f_2(x)$ such that $\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\| \leq \epsilon$. Since computing an ϵ -critical point is difficult, following recent literature [35, 42, 17], we instead consider finding a *nearly ϵ -critical point* defined below.

Definition 5.3. *Given $\epsilon > 0$, we say $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a nearly ϵ -critical point of (2) if there exist $\xi_1, \xi_2, x',$ and $x'' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\xi_1 \in \partial f_1(x'), \xi_2 \in \partial f_2(x'')$ and $\max\{\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|, \|x - x'\|, \|x - x''\|\} \leq \epsilon$. A random variable x is called a stochastic nearly ϵ -critical point for (2) if there exist random variables $\xi_1, \xi_2, x',$ and $x'' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\xi_1 \in \partial f_1(x'), \xi_2 \in \partial f_2(x'')$ and $\max\{\mathbb{E}\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|, \mathbb{E}\|x - x'\|, \mathbb{E}\|x - x''\|\} \leq \epsilon$.*

Remark 5.4. *To interpret Definition 5.3, we write (2) equivalently into a constrained problem*

$$\min_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d} f_2(x_2) - f_1(x_1) \text{ s.t. } x_1 = x_2. \quad (16)$$

This is still DC optimization as it can be represented as $[f_2(x_2) + \mathbf{1}_{x_1=x_2}(x_1, x_2)] - f_1(x_1)$, where $\mathbf{1}_{x_1=x_2}(x_1, x_2)$ is an indicator function that equals zero if $x_1 = x_2$ and equals positive infinity if $x_1 \neq x_2$. We then can say (x_1, x_2) is a critical point of (16) if $x_1 = x_2$ and there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\partial[f_2(x_2) + \mathbf{1}_{x_1=x_2}(x_1, x_2)] \cap \partial f_1(x_1) = \{\lambda\} \times (\partial f_2(x_2) - \lambda) \cap f_1(x_1) \times \{0\} \neq \emptyset.$$

These conditions can be stated as $\lambda \in \partial f_2(x_2)$, $\lambda \in \partial f_1(x_1)$ and $x_2 = x_1$, which can be viewed as KKT conditions for (16) with λ being a Lagrangian multiplier. Then, suppose x is a nearly ϵ -critical point with $\xi_1, \xi_2, x',$ and $x'' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defined in Definition 5.3. We then have $\xi_2 \in \partial f_2(x'')$, $\text{dist}(\xi_2, \partial f_1(x')) \leq \|\xi_2 - \xi_1\| \leq \epsilon$, and $\|x' - x''\| \leq \|x' - x\| + \|x - x''\| \leq 2\epsilon$, suggesting that (x', x'') is a 2ϵ -KKT point of (16) and thus (x, x) can be called a nearly 2ϵ -KKT point of (16) in the sense that $\|(x, x) - (x', x'')\| \leq 2\epsilon$.

Following [35, 42, 17], to solve (2), we approximate $f(x)$ by a smooth function using the Moreau envelopes of f_1 and f_2 , which are defined as

$$f_{1,\mu}(z) := \min_x \left\{ h_1(g_1(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - z\|^2 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{2,\mu}(z) := \min_x \left\{ h_2(g_2(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - z\|^2 \right\} \quad (17)$$

where $\mu \in (0, \rho^{-1})$. The proximal mappings of f_1 and f_2 are defined as

$$x_1^*(z) := \arg \min_x \left\{ h_1(g_1(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - z\|^2 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2^*(z) := \arg \min_x \left\{ h_2(g_2(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - z\|^2 \right\}. \quad (18)$$

Note that $x_1^*(z)$ and $x_2^*(z)$ are unique because the minimization problems above are strongly convex. It is well known that $f_{i,\mu}(x)$ is smooth with $\nabla f_{i,\mu}(z) = \mu^{-1}(z - x_i^*(z))$ [34, Proposition 13.37]. Moreover, $x_i^*(z)$ is $(1 - \mu\rho)^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5 (Lemma 3.5 in [43]). *For any $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\|x_i^*(z) - x_i^*(z')\| \leq (1 - \mu\rho)^{-1} \|z - z'\|, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Hence, using the Moreau envelopes, we can construct a smooth approximation of (2) as follows

$$\min_z \{f_\mu(z) := f_{2,\mu}(z) - f_{1,\mu}(z)\}. \quad (19)$$

By the aforementioned properties of $f_{1,\mu}$ and $f_{2,\mu}$, function f_μ is smooth with $\nabla f_\mu(z) = \mu^{-1}(x_1^*(z) - x_2^*(z))$ and ∇f_μ is L_μ -Lipschitz continuous with $L_\mu = \frac{2}{\mu - \mu^2 \rho}$.

5.2 Algorithm and convergence analysis

After approximating (2) by (19), we can directly apply a first-order method for smooth non-convex optimization to (19). Suppose the solution for (19) at iteration k is z^k . To compute $\nabla f_\mu(z^k)$, we need to compute $x_1^*(z^k)$ and $x_2^*(z^k)$ exactly, which is not easy. Suppose, during the last iteration, we have obtained some approximations to $x_i^*(z^{k-1})$, denoted by x_i^k , for $i = 1$ and 2 . Then we adopt the key idea of the single-loop prox-linear approximate gradient method (PAGM) where $g_i(x)$ and term $\frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - z^k\|^2$ in (17) are linearized at $x = x_i^k$ for $i = 1$ and 2 , and the following prox-linear subproblems are solved.

$$x_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_x \left\{ h_i(g_i(x_i^k) + \nabla g_i(x_i^k)^\top (x - x_i^k)) + \frac{1}{\mu} \langle x_i^k - z^k, x - x_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2t} \|x - x_i^k\|^2 \right\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (20)$$

where $t > 0$ is a step size. Note that x_i^{k+1} can be obtained easily thanks to Assumption 5.1. Then x_1^{k+1} and x_2^{k+1} are used as approximations to $x_1^*(z^k)$ and $x_2^*(z^k)$, respectively, so we obtain an approximation of $\nabla f_\mu(z^k) = \mu^{-1}(x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k))$ as $\mu^{-1}(x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1})$. Then z^k can be updated to z^{k+1} through a gradient descend step along the direction of this approximate gradient, that is, $z^{k+1} = z^k - \gamma \mu^{-1}(x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1})$ where $\gamma > 0$ is a step size. This procedure is formally stated in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Prox-Linear Approximate Gradient Method (PAGM)

- 1: **Initialization:** $x_1^1, x_2^1, z^1, K \in \mathbb{Z}_+, t > 0, \mu > 0, \gamma > 0$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 - 3: $x_1^{k+1} = \arg \min_x \left\{ h_1(g_1(x_1^k) + \nabla g_1(x_1^k)^\top (x - x_1^k)) + \frac{1}{\mu} \langle x_1^k - z^k, x - x_1^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2t} \|x - x_1^k\|^2 \right\}$
 - 4: $x_2^{k+1} = \arg \min_x \left\{ h_2(g_2(x_2^k) + \nabla g_2(x_2^k)^\top (x - x_2^k)) + \frac{1}{\mu} \langle x_2^k - z^k, x - x_2^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2t} \|x - x_2^k\|^2 \right\}$
 - 5: $z^{k+1} = z^k - \gamma \mu^{-1}(x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1})$
 - end for**
 - 6: **return** $x_1^{\tau+1}$ with τ uniformly sampled from $\{1, \dots, K\}$
-

Before analyzing the convergence of Algorithm 2, we need the following lemma and proposition.

Lemma 5.6 (Lemma 3.2 in [13]). *Let $f_i(z, y) := h_i(g_i(y) + \nabla g_i(y)(z - y))$ for $i = 1$ and 2 . For any $z, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$-\frac{\rho}{2} \|z - y\|^2 \leq f_i(z) - f_i(z, y) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \|z - y\|^2.$$

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\mu^{-1} > \rho$ and $t^{-1} \geq \mu^{-1} + \rho$, we have*

$$\|x_i^{k+1} - x_i^*(z^k)\|^2 \leq (1 - tc)\|x_i^k - x_i^*(z^k)\|^2, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $c := \mu^{-1} - \rho$.

Proof. The proof is modified from the proof of [30, Theorem 2.3.4]. For simplicity, we omit the subscript i in h_i, g_i, x_i^{k+1} and $x_i^*(z^k)$, and define the following notations without reflecting their dependency on i, z^k and μ :

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &:= h(g(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x - z^k\|^2, \\ F(\bar{x}; x) &:= h(g(\bar{x}) + \nabla g(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x})) + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle \bar{x} - z^k, x - \bar{x} \rangle, \\ F_t(\bar{x}; x) &:= F(\bar{x}; x) + \frac{1}{2t}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2, \\ F^*(\bar{x}; t) &:= \min_x F_t(\bar{x}; x), \\ x_F &:= \arg \min_x F_t(\bar{x}; x), \\ g_F &:= \frac{1}{t}(\bar{x} - x_F). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{x}; x) &= F_t(\bar{x}; x) - \frac{1}{2t}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\geq F_t(\bar{x}; x_F) + \frac{1}{2t}\|x - x_F\|^2 - \frac{1}{2t}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &= F^*(\bar{x}; t) + \frac{1}{2t}\langle \bar{x} - x_F, 2x - x_F - \bar{x} \rangle \\ &= F^*(\bar{x}; t) + \langle g_F, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{t}{2}\|g_F\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the first inequality is because $F_t(\bar{x}; x)$ is $\frac{1}{t}$ -strongly convex. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(\bar{x}; t) &= F(\bar{x}; x_F) + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &= h(g(\bar{x}) + \nabla g(\bar{x})(x_F - \bar{x})) + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle \bar{x} - z^k, x_F - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\geq h(g(x_F)) - \frac{\rho}{2}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2t}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_F - z^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\geq F(x_F) - \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the last inequality comes from the Lemma 5.6 and the fact that $\frac{1}{\mu}\langle \bar{x} - z^k, x_F - \bar{x} \rangle = \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_F - z^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_F - \bar{x}\|^2$, and the second inequality is because $t^{-1} \geq \mu^{-1} + \rho$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= h(g(x)) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x - z^k\|^2 \\ &\geq h(g(\bar{x}) + \nabla g(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x})) - \frac{\rho}{2}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle \bar{x} - z^k, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &= F(\bar{x}; x) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2 + \frac{\mu^{-1} - \rho}{2}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the first inequality comes from the Lemma 5.6 and the fact that $\frac{1}{2\mu}\|x - z^k\|^2 = \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\bar{x} - z^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle \bar{x} - z^k, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2$. Combine inequalities (21), (22) and (23), we can get

$$F(x) \geq F(x_F) + \langle g_F, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{t}{2}\|g_F\|^2 + \frac{\mu^{-1} - \rho}{2}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2. \quad (24)$$

Recall that

$$x^*(z^k) = \arg \min_x F(x).$$

Let $x = x^*(z^k)$ and $\bar{x} = x^k$ in (24) so $x_F = x^{k+1}$ and $g_F = (x^k - x^{k+1})/t$. Since $F(x_F) - F(x^*(z^k)) \geq 0$, it is implied by (24) that

$$\langle g_F, x^k - x^*(z^k) \rangle \geq \frac{t}{2}\|g_F\|^2 + \frac{\mu^{-1} - \rho}{2}\|x^*(z^k) - x^k\|^2. \quad (25)$$

The optimality condition of the subproblem $\min_x F_t(\bar{x}; x)$ reads

$$g_F \in \nabla g(x^k)^* \partial h(g(x^k) + \nabla g(x^k)(x^{k+1} - x^k)) + \frac{1}{\mu}(x^k - z^k).$$

Then, in view of (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*(z^k)\|^2 &= \|x^k - x^*(z^k) - tg_F\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*(z^k)\|^2 - 2t\langle g_F, x^k - x^*(z^k) \rangle + t^2\|g_F\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - t(\mu^{-1} - \rho))\|x^k - x^*(z^k)\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - tc)\|x^k - x^*(z^k)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

□

The convergence property of Algorithm 2 is presented as follows.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose the assumptions hold and set $\mu^{-1} > \max\{1, \rho\}$, $t^{-1} \geq \mu^{-1} + \rho$, $\gamma = \min\left\{\frac{1}{4L_\mu}, \sqrt{\frac{t^3 c^4 \mu^3}{48(1-t^2 c^2)}}\right\}$ and $K = O(1/\epsilon^2)$ with $c := \mu^{-1} - \rho$, then the output of Algorithm 2 is a stochastic nearly 2ϵ -critical point of (2).*

Proof. Recall that

$$\nabla f_\mu(z) = \mu^{-1}(x_1^*(z) - x_2^*(z))$$

and $\nabla f_\mu(z)$ is L_μ -Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_\mu(z^k) - f_\mu(z^{k+1}) \\ & \geq \langle -\nabla f_\mu(z^k), z^{k+1} - z^k \rangle - \frac{L_\mu}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 \\ & = \langle \mu^{-1}(x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)), \gamma\mu^{-1}(x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1}) \rangle - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{2\mu^2}\|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = \frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} \langle x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k), x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k) + x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k) \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{2\mu^2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k) + x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \\ & \geq \frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} \langle x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k), x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k) \rangle \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \right) \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality to the first term on the right-hand side of the last inequality above gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_\mu(z^k) - f_\mu(z^{k+1}) \\
& \geq -\frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \right) \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \\
& = \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\mu^2} - \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \right) \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 - \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\mu^2} + \frac{\gamma^2 L_\mu}{\mu^2} \right) \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \\
& \geq \frac{\gamma}{4\mu^2} \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 - \frac{3\gamma}{4\mu^2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4L_\mu}$. Rearrange terms, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\gamma}{4\mu^2} \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 & \leq \frac{3\gamma}{4\mu^2} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_2^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k) + x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 + f_\mu(z^k) - f_\mu(z^{k+1}) \\
& \leq \frac{3\gamma}{2\mu^2} (\|x_1^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 + \|x_2^{k+1} - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2) + f_\mu(z^k) - f_\mu(z^{k+1})
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Let $\theta := tc$ and α be a positive constant whose value will be determined later. By Proposition 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|x_1^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 \leq (1-tc) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad = (1-tc) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1}) + x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 \\
\text{(By Young's inequality)} & \leq (1+\theta)(1-tc) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) (1-tc) \|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 \\
& \quad (\theta = tc) \leq (1-\theta^2) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) (1-\theta)\sigma \|z^{k-1} - z^k\|^2 \\
\text{(By Lemma 5.5 } \sigma = 1/\mu c) & = (1-\theta^2) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) (1-\theta)\sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} \|x_1^k - x_2^k\|^2 \\
& = (1-\theta^2) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) (1-\theta)\sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^k + x_2^*(z^{k-1}) + x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
\text{(By Young's inequality)} & \leq (1-\theta^2) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} (1+\alpha) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^k + x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} (1+1/\alpha) \|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
\text{(By Young's inequality)} & \leq (1-\theta^2) \|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} 2(1+\alpha) (\|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \|x_2^k + x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2) \\
& \quad + \frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} (1+1/\alpha) \|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose we can choose γ such that

$$\gamma^2 \leq \frac{\theta^3 \mu^2}{6(1-\theta^2)\sigma(1+\alpha)} = \frac{\theta^3 \mu^3 c}{6(1-\theta^2)(1+\alpha)}.$$

We will have

$$\frac{\theta^2}{3} \geq \frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} 2(1+\alpha)$$

and

$$\frac{1-\theta^2}{\theta} \sigma \frac{\gamma^2}{\mu^2} (1+1/\alpha) \leq \frac{\theta^2(1+1/\alpha)}{6(1+\alpha)}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_1^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 &\leq (1 - \theta^2)\|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \frac{\theta^2}{3}\|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \frac{\theta^2}{3}\|x_2^k - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta^2(1 + 1/\alpha)}{6(1 + \alpha)}\|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Similarly, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_2^{k+1} - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 &\leq (1 - \theta^2)\|x_2^k - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \frac{\theta^2}{3}\|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \frac{\theta^2}{3}\|x_2^k - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta^2(1 + 1/\alpha)}{6(1 + \alpha)}\|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Add them to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x_1^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 + \|x_2^{k+1} - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta^2}{3}\right) (\|x_1^k - x_1^*(z^{k-1})\|^2 + \|x_2^k - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2) + \frac{\theta^2(1 + 1/\alpha)}{3(1 + \alpha)}\|x_1^*(z^{k-1}) - x_2^*(z^{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Let $\alpha = 7$, $\delta_k := \|x_1^{k+1} - x_1^*(z^k)\|^2 + \|x_2^{k+1} - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2$, $\Delta_k := \|x_1^*(z^k) - x_2^*(z^k)\|^2$ and sum (27) and $\frac{147\gamma}{32\mu^2\theta^2} \times (30)$, we can get

$$\frac{\gamma}{\mu^2} \left(\frac{1}{4}\Delta_k - \frac{7}{32}\Delta_{k-1} + \frac{49}{32}\delta_{k-1} - \frac{3}{2}\delta_k \right) \leq \frac{147\gamma}{32\mu^2\theta^2} (\delta_{k-1} - \delta_k) + f_\mu(z^k) - f_\mu(z^{k+1}).$$

Taking the sum over $k = 1, \dots, K$, dividing both sides by K and then multiplying both sides by $\frac{32\mu^2}{\gamma}$, we can get

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\Delta_k + \delta_k) \leq \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{147}{\theta^2}\delta_0 + 7\Delta_0 + 49\Delta_K + \frac{32\mu^2}{\gamma}(f_\mu(z^1) - f_\mu(z^{K+1})) \right). \quad (31)$$

Then we would like to bound Δ_K . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_K &= \|x_1^*(z^K) - x_2^*(z^K)\|^2 \\ &= \|x_1^*(z^K) - z^K + z^K - x_2^*(z^K)\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\|x_1^*(z^K) - z^K\|^2 + 2\|x_2^*(z^K) - z^K\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We assume that there exists a constant C_1 such that $h_i(g_i(z^K)) - \inf_x h_i(g_i(x)) \leq C_1$ for any x and $i = 1, 2$. Then by the definition of $x_i^*(z^K)$, we have for $i = 1, 2$,

$$h_i(g_i(x_i^*(z^K))) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_i^*(z^K) - z^K\|^2 \leq h_i(g_i(z^K)).$$

By rearrangement of the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i^*(z^K) - z^K\|^2 &\leq 2\mu (h_i(g_i(z^K)) - h_i(g_i(x_i^*(z^K)))) \\ &\leq 2\mu \left(h_i(g_i(z^K)) - \inf_x h_i(g_i(x)) \right) \leq 2\mu C_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $\Delta_K \leq 8\mu C_1$.

We also assume there is a constant C such that $f_\mu(z^1) - f_\mu(z^{K+1}) \leq C$, then by the definition of x_τ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau + \delta_\tau] \leq \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{147\delta_0}{\theta^2} + 7\Delta_0 + 392\mu C_1 + \frac{32\mu^2 C}{\gamma} \right). \quad (32)$$

By taking $K = \max \left\{ \frac{704\delta_0}{\theta^2}, 28\Delta_0, 1568\mu C_1, \frac{96\mu^2 C}{\gamma} \right\} \frac{1}{\mu^2 \epsilon^2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_1^{\tau+1} - x_1^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \mu\epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x_2^{\tau+1} - x_2^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \mu\epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x_1^*(z^\tau) - x_2^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \mu\epsilon.$$

By the definition of $x_1^*(z^\tau)$ and $x_2^*(z^\tau)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu}(z^\tau - x_1^*(z^\tau)) \in \partial f_1(x_1^*(z^\tau)), \quad \frac{1}{\mu}(z^\tau - x_2^*(z^\tau)) \in \partial f_2(x_2^*(z^\tau)).$$

Let $\xi_1 := \frac{1}{\mu}(z^\tau - x_1^*(z^\tau))$ and $\xi_2 := \frac{1}{\mu}(z^\tau - x_2^*(z^\tau))$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|] = \frac{1}{\mu} \mathbb{E}[\|x_2^*(z^\tau) - x_1^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x_1^{\tau+1} - x_1^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \mu\epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|x_2^{\tau+1} - x_2^*(z^\tau)\|] \leq \mu\epsilon.$$

By setting $\mu \leq \min\{1, 1/\rho\}$, we have shown that

$$\max\{\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|], \mathbb{E}[\|x_1^{\tau+1} - x_1^*(z^\tau)\|], \mathbb{E}[\|x_2^{\tau+1} - x_2^*(z^\tau)\|]\} \leq \epsilon,$$

which means that $x_1^{\tau+1}$ is a stochastic nearly 2ϵ -critical point of (2). □

References

- [1] Hadi Abbaszadehpeivasti, Etienne de Klerk, and Moslem Zamani. On the rate of convergence of the difference-of-convex algorithm (dca). *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 202(1):475–496, 2024.
- [2] Miju Ahn, Jong-Shi Pang, and Jack Xin. Difference-of-convex learning: directional stationarity, optimality, and sparsity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(3):1637–1665, 2017.
- [3] Jan Harold Alcantara, Ching pei Lee, and Akiko Takeda. A four-operator splitting algorithm for nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization, 2024.
- [4] Alberth Alvarado, Gesualdo Scutari, and Jong-Shi Pang. A new decomposition method for multiuser dc-programming and its applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 62(11):2984–2998, 2014.
- [5] Michel Benaïm, Josef Hofbauer, and Sylvain Sorin. Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44(1):328–348, 2005.
- [6] Jérôme Bolte and Edouard Pauwels. Conservative set valued fields, automatic differentiation, stochastic gradient method and deep learning, 2020.
- [7] Jérôme Bolte, Shoham Sabach, and Marc Teboulle. Nonconvex lagrangian-based optimization: Monitoring schemes and global convergence. *Mathematics of operations research*, 43(4):1210–1232, 2018.
- [8] Shanshan Cao, Xiaoming Huo, and Jong-Shi Pang. A unifying framework of high-dimensional sparse estimation with difference-of-convex (dc) regularizations. *Statistical Science*, 37(3):411–424, 2022.
- [9] Ying Cui, Jong-Shi Pang, and Bodhisattva Sen. Composite difference-max programs for modern statistical estimation problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(4):3344–3374, 2018.
- [10] Damek Davis and Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy. Stochastic model-based minimization of weakly convex functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):207–239, 2019.
- [11] Damek Davis, Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy, Sham Kakade, and Jason D. Lee. Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(1):119–154, Feb 2020.
- [12] D. Drusvyatskiy, A. D. Ioffe, and A. S. Lewis. Nonsmooth optimization using taylor-like models: error bounds, convergence, and termination criteria. *Mathematical Programming*, 185(1):357–383, Jan 2021.

- [13] D. Drusvyatskiy and C. Paquette. Efficiency of minimizing compositions of convex functions and smooth maps. *Mathematical Programming*, 178(1):503–558, Nov 2019.
- [14] Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy and Adrian S. Lewis. Error bounds, quadratic growth, and linear convergence of proximal methods. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 43(3):919–948, August 2018.
- [15] John C. Duchi and Feng Ruan. Stochastic methods for composite and weakly convex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(4):3229–3259, 2018.
- [16] A. A. Goldstein. Optimization of lipschitz continuous functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 13(1):14–22, Dec 1977.
- [17] Quanqi Hu, Qi Qi, Zhaosong Lu, and Tianbao Yang. Single-loop stochastic algorithms for difference of max-structured weakly convex functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024*, 2024.
- [18] Quanqi Hu, Dixian Zhu, and Tianbao Yang. Non-smooth weakly-convex finite-sum coupled compositional optimization. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 5348–5403. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- [19] Michael Jordan, Guy Kornowski, Tianyi Lin, Ohad Shamir, and Manolis Zampetakis. Deterministic nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4570–4597. PMLR, 2023.
- [20] Krzysztof C. Kiwiel. Convergence of the gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 18(2):379–388, 2007.
- [21] Guy Kornowski and Ohad Shamir. Oracle complexity in nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(314):1–44, 2022.
- [22] Hoai An Le Thi, Van Ngai Huynh, and Tao Pham Dinh. Minimizing compositions of differences-of-convex functions with smooth mappings. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 49(2):1140–1168, July 2023.
- [23] Hoai An Le Thi, Van Ngai Huynh, and Tao Pham Dinh. Convergence analysis of difference-of-convex algorithm with subanalytic data. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 179(1):103–126, 2018.
- [24] A. S. Lewis and S. J. Wright. A proximal method for composite minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 158(1):501–546, Jul 2016.
- [25] Junyi Liu, Ying Cui, Jong-Shi Pang, and Suvrajeet Sen. Two-stage stochastic programming with linearly bi-parameterized quadratic recourse. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(3):2530–2558, 2020.
- [26] Junyi Liu and Jong-Shi Pang. Risk-based robust statistical learning by stochastic difference-of-convex value-function optimization. *Operations Research*, 71(2):397–414, 2023.
- [27] Tianxiang Liu, Ting Kei Pong, and Akiko Takeda. A successive difference-of-convex approximation method for a class of nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problems. *Math. Program.*, 176(1–2):339–367, July 2019.
- [28] Szymon Majewski, Błażej Miasojedow, and Eric Moulines. Analysis of nonsmooth stochastic approximation: the differential inclusion approach, 2018.
- [29] Abdellatif Moudafi. A complete smooth regularization of dc optimization problems.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov. *Lectures on Convex Optimization*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2nd edition, 2018.
- [31] Maher Nouiehed, Jong-Shi Pang, and Meisam Razaviyayn. On the pervasiveness of difference-convexity in optimization and statistics. *Mathematical Programming*, 174(1):195–222, 2019.

- [32] Jong-Shi Pang, Meisam Razaviyayn, and Alberth Alvarado. Computing b-stationary points of nonsmooth dc programs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(1):95–118, 2017.
- [33] Jong-Shi Pang and Min Tao. Decomposition methods for computing directional stationary solutions of a class of nonsmooth nonconvex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1640–1669, 2018.
- [34] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J.-B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York, 1998.
- [35] Kaizhao Sun and Xu Andy Sun. Algorithms for difference-of-convex programs based on difference-of-moreau-envelopes smoothing. *INFORMS J. Optim.*, 5:321–339, 2022.
- [36] Pham Dinh Tao and LT Hoai An. Convex analysis approach to dc programming: theory, algorithms and applications. *Acta mathematica vietnamica*, 22(1):289–355, 1997.
- [37] Lai Tian and Anthony Man-Cho So. No dimension-free deterministic algorithm computes approximate stationarities of lipschitzians. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–24, 2024.
- [38] Bokun Wang and Tianbao Yang. Alexr: An optimal single-loop algorithm for convex finite-sum coupled compositional stochastic optimization, 2024.
- [39] Xiao Wang and Xiaojun Chen. Complexity of finite-sum optimization with nonsmooth composite functions and non-lipschitz regularization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(3):2472–2502, 2024.
- [40] Yi Xu, Qi Qi, Qihang Lin, Rong Jin, and Tianbao Yang. Stochastic optimization for dc functions and non-smooth non-convex regularizers with non-asymptotic convergence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [41] Lei Yang. Proximal gradient method with extrapolation and line search for a class of non-convex and non-smooth problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 200(1):68–103, Jan 2024.
- [42] Yao Yao, Qihang Lin, and Tianbao Yang. Large-scale optimization of partial AUC in a range of false positive rates. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022.
- [43] Jiawei Zhang and Zhi-Quan Luo. A proximal alternating direction method of multiplier for linearly constrained nonconvex minimization. *SIAM journal on optimization*, 30(3):2272–2302, 2020.
- [44] Jingzhao Zhang, Hongzhou Lin, Stefanie Jegelka, Suvrit Sra, and Ali Jadbabaie. Complexity of finding stationary points of nonsmooth nonconvex functions. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20*. JMLR.org, 2020.
- [45] Zhe Zhang and Guanghui Lan. Optimal algorithms for convex nested stochastic composite optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10076*, 2020.