
Self-Interested Agents in Collaborative Learning: An Incentivized Adaptive Data-Centric Framework

Nithia Vijayan¹ Bryan Kian Hsiang Low¹

Abstract

We propose a framework for adaptive data-centric collaborative learning among self-interested agents, coordinated by an arbiter. Designed to handle the incremental nature of real-world data, the framework operates in an online manner: at each step, the arbiter collects a batch of data from agents, trains a machine learning model, and provides each agent with a distinct model reflecting its data contributions. This setup establishes a feedback loop where shared data influence model updates, and the resulting models guide future data-sharing strategies. Agents evaluate and partition their data, selecting a partition to share using a stochastic parameterized policy optimized via policy gradient methods to optimize the utility of the received model as defined by agent-specific evaluation functions. On the arbiter side, the expected loss function over the true data distribution is optimized, incorporating agent-specific weights to account for distributional differences arising from diverse sources and selective sharing. A bilevel optimization algorithm jointly learns the model parameters and agent-specific weights. Mean-zero noise, computed using a distortion function that adjusts these agent-specific weights, is introduced to generate distinct agent-specific models, promoting valuable data sharing without requiring separate training. Our framework is underpinned by non-asymptotic analyses, ensuring convergence of the agent-side policy optimization to an approximate stationary point of the evaluation functions and convergence of the arbiter-side optimization to an approximate stationary point of the expected loss function.

1. Introduction

Collaborative machine learning (CML) leverages aggregated data from multiple agents to develop more accurate model(s) than any single agent can achieve independently. This approach is particularly valuable in scenarios where data is distributed across various sources such as different institutions or geographic locations. CML comprises two main approaches: data-centric and model-centric. The data-centric approach enhances training by centrally pooling data, providing access to a comprehensive and unified dataset that utilizes diverse data to gain a deeper understanding of the data distribution. In contrast, the model-centric approach retains data locally, sharing only model parameters or updates. Although this method emphasizes privacy, it may overlook the full complexity of the data distribution, leading to models that are more susceptible to biases.

Traditionally, data-centric CML methods consider all participants to be benevolent and freely share their data to support the development of a collaborative model. Additionally, it often relies on offline learning in which the entire dataset is available upfront, rather than accommodating online algorithms that handle data arriving incrementally. In real-world scenarios, data is typically gathered incrementally rather than all at once, necessitating an online approach. This allows models to continuously update as new data becomes available, ensuring they effectively learn from ongoing inputs. However, instead of processing data as a continuous stream, it is more practical to consider sequential data processing in batches. This mirrors how data is often shared in discrete intervals, such as in systems where data is periodically exchanged or collected, allowing for more efficient processing while managing computational constraints and synchronization needs.

The participating agents are often self-interested entities with distinct goals and constraints, such as businesses or organizations. While collaboration can help address the limitations of an agent's own dataset, they may choose to withhold portions of their data due to concerns regarding the quality or relevance of others' data, or to maintain a competitive edge, as sharing too much could risk losing a strategic advantage or compromising their position in research and innovation. Sharing its entire dataset may not be beneficial

¹Department of Computer Science, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore. Correspondence to: Nithia Vijayan <nithia@comp.nus.edu.sg>.

if the resulting combined model does not serve an agent’s specific objectives. Allowing each agent to strategically decide on its data contributions enables the creation of batch online learning frameworks that cater to individual goals while maximizing collaborative benefits. This approach highlights that simply optimizing for collaborative gains without considering individual objectives can lead to less effective outcomes. By giving agents the power to influence the process, we enhance their engagement and motivation, ultimately fostering a more productive collaborative environment. This approach accommodates the diverse priorities and perspectives driven by each agent’s self-interest and unique data-sharing strategies.

Potential applications of batch online data-centric CML with self-interested agents are evident in both healthcare and finance. For instance, hospitals can collaborate on cancer treatment research by leveraging unique patient data, such as demographics and treatment outcomes, to gain a comprehensive understanding of treatment efficacy. This pooling of data overcomes limitations like small sample sizes, resulting in more robust predictive models that enhance patient outcomes. A batch online approach is essential here because new patient data is continuously generated, and models must be updated in real-time with each new batch of data to remain current and reflect the latest treatment trends. Similarly, in finance, CML can enhance credit card fraud detection by addressing the challenge of imbalanced data, where fraudulent transactions are far less common than legitimate ones. As fraud patterns evolve rapidly, a batch online learning method ensures that models can be updated in real-time with each new batch of data, allowing them to quickly adapt to emerging fraud cases and improve detection capabilities. This approach enables institutions to continuously train models on a more diverse set of fraud cases, ensuring the system remains effective as fraud tactics evolve. However, due to self-interests, hospitals and financial institutions may strategically withhold certain proprietary data while selectively sharing others to protect their competitive advantages, ensuring they maintain an edge in their fields.

We consider a framework for batch online data-centric CML among self-interested agents, facilitated by an arbiter. One might interpret the arbiter as a service provider that the collaborating agents have jointly agreed to use. The collaboration unfolds in an online manner, acknowledging that the data in real-world applications are not available all at once. In each online step, the arbiter collects a batch of data from the agents, trains a machine learning model, and subsequently provides each agent with a distinct model that reflects their data contributions. This online approach allows agents to develop strategies or policies for selectively sharing data, optimizing the utility they derive from the models they receive. Our framework comprises two key compo-

nents, representing the agents and the arbiter, respectively, as outlined in the following paragraphs.

The agent component involves each agent utilizing a constant number of ranked partitions for its data, indicating that while the number of partitions remains unchanged, the size of each partition may vary over time. Different agents may have differing numbers of partitions. Our framework enables each agent to learn a parameterized stochastic policy to decide which partition of data to share with the arbiter at each time step. By incorporating stochasticity, the policy balances exploration and exploitation, allowing agents to occasionally select suboptimal partitions. This exploration is essential for discovering more effective data-sharing strategies, ultimately leading to improved long-term collaborative learning outcomes. At each time step, each agent categorize its data into partitions based on its perceived value, considering both the quality and quantity of the data. An agent may perceive the value of its data based on various factors such as its uniqueness, relevance to the task at hand, quality, and potential impact on the model’s performance. Each agent assesses the value of its data independently, and the framework does not impose any specific guidelines for this evaluation. For instance, in a credit card fraud detection scenario, one agent might find a data partition containing predominantly fraudulent transactions to be the most valuable, while another agent might prioritize a data partition containing transactions primarily from high-risk merchant categories, such as online electronics retailers.

Each agent can develop distinct policies that align with their specific objectives. The model provided by the arbiter reflects the relative value of the agent’s data concerning the collaborative model, in comparison to the data from other agents. To assess the benefits of sharing a particular partition, agents must evaluate the model they receive, with each agent possibly using a unique evaluation metric suited to their needs. Our framework enables each agent to fine-tune the received model using unshared data, and subsequently evaluate the fine-tuned model to quantify the advantages of sharing that specific data partition. Fine-tuning a model with unshared data gives agents a competitive advantage by allowing them to refine their models using additional data that others may not have access to. This improvement enhances model performance and enables agents to leverage more data, helping them maintain an edge while still participating in collaborative efforts.

In the context of the arbiter, it is essential to note that the data collected from various agents often displays distributional differences that are exacerbated by selective data sharing. In machine learning context, the true data distribution is often unknown and must be inferred from the available data. While we accommodate diverse data-sharing strategies among the agents, we must also consider the potential

for malicious agents. To address the aforementioned issues, we propose a data weighting scheme that assigns relative weights to agents based on the value of their data contributions. While learning the collaborative model, each agent’s data is weighted instead of simply averaged, ensuring that data from agents with more valuable contributions have a proportionately greater impact.

The weighting scheme also helps correct distributional differences among the data contributed by various agents. We derive these weights by utilizing a separate validation set for each agent, allocating a portion of their data to evaluate their contributions within the context of the collaborative model. This approach is crucial as it acknowledges the unique characteristics of each agent’s data while assessing its influence on overall model performance. By validating against these individualized sets, we can accurately capture the distinct impact of each agent’s data on the collaborative effort. Furthermore, if agents provide malicious data, the evaluation based on their own data could lead to lower assigned weights, discouraging such behaviour and reinforcing the integrity of the collaborative process. In the context of online learning, it is essential to account for the historical interactions of agents to accurately assess their value. An incremental weighting scheme can effectively incorporate the contributions from previous cycles, ensuring that the evaluation is not solely based on the current time step. This approach acknowledges the ongoing commitment and consistent quality of contributions from agents, leading to more reliable collaborative learning outcomes. We develop a bilevel optimization algorithm that concurrently learns both model parameters and agent-specific weights.

In collaborative data-sharing frameworks, incentivizing agents with tailored models encourages high-quality data contributions. Traditional approaches in data-centric CML often involve training separate models for each agent. In contrast, our method generates distinct models by introducing mean-zero noise to the collaborative model using agent-specific weights, thereby eliminating the need for separate training. These weights, which reflect each agent’s relative impact, collectively form a distribution over the agents within the collaborative framework. To further motivate contributions, we apply distortion functions that adjust portions of this distribution, determining whom to nudge further—whether those with the highest, middle, or lowest contributions—and how much nudging is necessary. This targeted adjustment helps customize incentives, encouraging agents to contribute data that enhances the model’s effectiveness and generalization capabilities.

Related work

Federated Learning (FL) (Yang et al., 2019), a widely used model-centric approach, addresses the iterative nature of collaborative learning by enabling agents to refine a global

model through repeated parameter updates while preserving privacy by avoiding raw data sharing. However, FL often overlooks individual agent-specific goals and the diversity in data distributions across agents (Wu et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2023). In contrast, data-centric collaborative learning typically employs offline algorithms that incentivize data sharing through equitable rewards (Sim et al., 2020; 2024), assuming agents act benevolently. These approaches fail to accommodate the self-interested nature of agents, who might strategically maximize their benefits, or to dynamically adapt to agents’ behavior.

To address the aforementioned limitations, we propose a framework for data-centric collaborative learning that includes the following key contributions: (i) self-interested agent modeling: Our framework explicitly accounts for the self-interested nature of agents, allowing them to determine what data to share based on their individual criteria, while also addressing distributional differences due to agents’ distinct data acquisition practices and self-interest. (ii) policy learning for data sharing: Agents learn a stochastic policy that optimizes their data-sharing strategies, aligning collaboration with their individual goals rather than assuming benevolent behavior. (iii) incremental data handling: The framework operates online, addressing the incremental nature of data collection in real-world settings. (iv) non-asymptotic convergence guarantees: We provide rigorous non-asymptotic analyses, ensuring convergence of both the agents’ policy optimization and the arbiter’s expected loss minimization to approximate stationary points.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides preliminaries for the prediction problem. Section 3 introduces our proposed framework. Section 4 presents the non-asymptotic analysis of our proposed algorithms. Finally, Section 5 provides the concluding remarks.

2. Preliminaries

We consider a family of predictors $\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} | \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, each defined by its parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and maps each input value x in input space \mathcal{X} to a corresponding target value y in output space \mathcal{Y} . The loss function $l_\theta : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ measures the discrepancy between the predicted value $f_\theta(x)$ and the true target value y .

The goal of each agent is to learn optimal parameters θ^* such that its resulting predictor f_{θ^*} exhibits effective generalization on unseen data. Specifically, let

$$J(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [l_\theta(x, y)], \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{D} represents the data distribution over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. The goal is to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\theta^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} J(\theta), \tag{2}$$




Figure 1: An illustration of the design approach.

by employing a version of the gradient descent algorithm which involves finding the optimal parameters θ^* s.t. $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta^*) = 0$. To derive an expression for the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$, the following assumption is made about the loss function l_{θ} :

Assumption 2.1. For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $\|\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta}(x, y)\| \leq L_l$; $0 \leq L_l < \infty$.

Using Assumption 2.1 and the dominated convergence theorem, an expression for $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ can be derived as follows:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta}(x, y)]. \quad (3)$$

Since the true data distribution \mathcal{D} is unknown, each agent must estimate the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$ from their available data. With limited datasets, agents benefit from collaborating with others for broader data access, which improves model accuracy and enhances generalization. To facilitate this collaboration, we introduce a batch online CML framework, which is described in the following section.

3. Batch Online CML Framework

We consider collaborative learning among $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ self-interested agents, where the collaboration is facilitated by an arbiter. We process data in batches, where each batch represents a finite subset of the underlying space of input-output pairs, $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. At each time step, the arbiter collects a batch of data from each agent, trains a machine learning model using the aggregated data, and derives a unique model for each agent commensurate with their individual contributions, then returns the model to the respective agent. In the following sections, we elaborate on our design approach involving both the agents and the arbiter. Figure 1 provides an illustration of our framework.

3.1. Agents

A distribution \mathcal{D}^i represents how the agent obtains batches from the global space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, capturing its distinct data acquisition practices, influenced in part by considerations of self-interest. While \mathcal{D}^i governs the distribution over subsets of data (batches), the global data distribution \mathcal{D} governs the distribution over individual data points. Despite operating at different levels, \mathcal{D}^i over subsets and \mathcal{D} over individual points, the two distributions are intrinsically connected, as the subsets governed by \mathcal{D}^i are composed of data points drawn from the same global data space as the individual points governed by \mathcal{D} .

Due to self-interest and uncertainty about the relevance of others' data, agents engage in selective sharing, fearing exposure of sensitive information or loss of competitive advantages. We define a strategy set $S^i = \{1, \dots, n^i\}$, and agent i divides its data $D \sim \mathcal{D}^i$ into n^i partitions, $\{D_j\}_{j \in S^i}$, prioritizing data based on their own criteria, where D_1 contains the most significant data and D_{n^i} the least. The agent has the flexibility to determine its own partitioning criteria, with the framework not imposing any restrictions or directives on how the agent organizes its data.

We introduce a set of parameterized stochastic policies $\{\pi_{\nu}^i : S^i \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}\}$, which guide agent i in selecting an optimal strategy $s^i \in S^i$ for choosing and sharing the data D_{s^i} with the arbiter. One example of such a policy is the softmax policy, which is described below:

$$\pi_{\nu}^i(s) = \exp(\nu(s)) / \sum_{j \in S^i} \exp(\nu(j)), \quad \forall s \in S^i, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}. \quad (4)$$

Agents, with no knowledge of other agents' policies and relying solely on the model received from the arbiter, face uncertainty about the contributions of other agents. Parameterized stochastic policies enable probabilistic selection of data partitions, balancing exploration and exploitation. Adaptive parameter learning is essential, as it allows the policy to continuously adjust based on the model feedback from the arbiter, improving the agent's policy and ensuring that the policy remains effective as the behaviour and contributions of other agents evolve.

We optimize the policy parameter ν by maximizing the expected model performance, evaluated across various strategies from S^i . Model performance is evaluated using the function m_{θ}^i , which measures the effectiveness of model θ on a validation set. Examples include accuracy, precision, recall, mean-squared error, etc., with agent i selecting an evaluation function based on its preferences.

Specifically, we learn an optimal policy parameter ν^* by solving the optimization problem

$$\nu^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}} G^i(\nu), \quad \text{where} \quad (5)$$

$$G^i(\nu) = \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, s \sim \pi_{\nu}^i} [m_{\theta_s}^i(\bar{V}_s)], \quad (6)$$

where

$$D = \{D_j\}_{j \in S^i}; \forall s \in S^i, \bar{D}_s = D \setminus D_s, p \in (0.5, 1), \\ \bar{T}_s \subset \bar{D}_s \text{ s.t. } |\bar{T}_s| = \lfloor p|\bar{D}_s| \rfloor, \bar{V}_s = \bar{D}_s \setminus \bar{T}_s. \quad (7)$$

In (7), \bar{T}_s and \bar{V}_s represent the training and validation set, respectively. As we process data sequentially in batches, using a non-fixed validation set that adapts with each batch ensures that the model evaluation adapts with the evolving data, allowing for more accurate policy learning. In (6), the model $\tilde{\theta}_s$ is obtained by fine-tuning, using \bar{T}_s , the parameters θ^i that agent i received from the arbiter after sharing its dataset D_s .

We solve the optimization problem in (5) using a policy gradient algorithm. To derive an expression for the gradient $\nabla_\nu G(\nu^i)$, we make the following assumption about the norm of the function m_θ^i and on the policy π_ν^i :

Assumption 3.1. For a given i , $\forall D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, \forall s \in S^i$, $|m_{\tilde{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s)| \leq M_m^i$ a.s.; $0 \leq M_m^i < \infty$.

Assumption 3.2. For a given i , $\forall \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}, \forall s \in S^i$, $\|\nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)\| \leq M_d^i$; $0 \leq M_d^i < \infty$.

We obtain an expression for the gradient $\nabla_\nu G(\nu)$ in the lemma below, and the proof is available in Appendix A.1.

Lemma 3.3. Let Assumptions 3.1–3.2 hold. Then,

$$\nabla_\nu G^i(\nu) = \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, s \sim \pi_\nu^i} \left[m_{\tilde{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \right]. \quad (8)$$

At time step t , agent i has data $D_t = \{D_{t,j}\}_{j \in S^i}$, and selects a strategy $s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i$, and shares the data partition D_{t,s_t} with the arbiter, and in return receives a unique model parameter θ_{t+1}^i . We construct \bar{T}_{s_t} and \bar{V}_{s_t} as in (7), and fine-tune θ_t^i to $\tilde{\theta}_{s_t}^i$. Then, we estimate the gradient $\nabla_\nu G(\nu)$ in (8) as

$$\hat{\nabla}_\nu G^i(\nu_t) = m_{\tilde{\theta}_{s_t}^i}^i(\bar{V}_{s_t}) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_{\nu_t}^i(s_t), \quad (9)$$

and learn ν_{t+1} as given below:

$$\nu_{t+1} = \nu_t - b_t \hat{\nabla}_\nu G^i(\nu_t), \quad b_t \in (0, 1), \quad (10)$$

where ν_0 is set arbitrarily. Algorithm 1 provides the pseudocode for the agent-specific component of the CML framework.

3.2. Arbiter

Let $\mathcal{D}^\theta = \{\mathcal{D}^{\theta^i}\}_{i \in N}$, where \mathcal{D}^{θ^i} represents the distribution over the data batches shared by agent i . The distribution \mathcal{D}^{θ^i} deviate from the agent's local data batch distribution \mathcal{D}^i that we discussed in Section 3.1, because agent i does not share all data in $D \sim \mathcal{D}^i$, but instead selects and shares

Algorithm 1 CML-Agent

- 1: **Initialize:** ν_0 ;
- 2: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
- 3: Get $D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i$;
- 4: Partition D_t into $\{D_{t,j}\}_{j \in S^i}$;
- 5: $s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}(\cdot)$;
- 6: Share D_{t,s_t} with arbiter;
- 7: $\bar{D}_{t,s_t} = D_t \setminus D_{t,s_t}$;
- 8: $\bar{T}_{t,s_t} \subset \bar{D}_{t,s_t}$ s.t. $|\bar{T}_{t,s_t}| = \lfloor p|\bar{D}_{t,s_t}| \rfloor$;
- 9: $\bar{V}_{t,s_t} = \bar{D}_{t,s_t} \setminus \bar{T}_{t,s_t}$;
- 10: Divide \bar{T}_{t,s_t} into n_b^i batches $\{T_t^0, \dots, T_t^{n_b^i-1}\}$;
- 11: Get θ_{t+1}^i from the arbiter;
- 12: $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \theta_{t+1}^i$;
- 13: **for** $k = 0, \dots, n_b^i - 1$ **do**
- 14: $\tilde{\theta}^{k+1} = \tilde{\theta}^k - a_k \frac{1}{|T_t^k|} \sum_{(x,y) \in T_t^k} \nabla_{\tilde{\theta}} l_{\tilde{\theta}^k}(x,y)$;
- 15: **end for**
- 16: $\tilde{\theta}_{s_t} = \tilde{\theta}^{n_b^i}$;
- 17: $\nu_{t+1} = \nu_t - b_t \hat{\nabla}_\nu G^i(\nu_t)$;
- 18: **end for**

a subset of D , based on its sharing policy π^i . Consequently, the data received by the arbiter does not directly follow the global data distribution \mathcal{D} . Instead it reflects a combination of each agent's local distribution, \mathcal{D}^i , and its data-sharing policy π^i , which depends on the shared model parameters.

Our goal is to solve the optimization problem in (2), by deriving an estimate of the gradient in (3) by utilizing the batch data that follows the distribution \mathcal{D}^θ . Since the underlying distributions are unknown and must be estimated from the available data. To account for distributional differences and effectively model the data, we employ a data weighting scheme that assigns suitable weights to each agents' data. Since the policy π^i is learned based on the models received from the arbiter, a feedback loop naturally arises between the data shared by the agents and the models provided by the arbiter. This dynamic interplay motivates the need for a learning algorithm to determine agent-specific weights, ensuring that the model adapts to the evolving data-sharing policies of the agents.

Specifically, we consider parameterized weight functions $\{h_\omega : N \rightarrow [0, 1] | \omega \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ that assigns relative weight to each agent i , as defined below:

$$h_\omega(i) = \exp(\omega(i)) / \sum_{j=1}^n \exp(\omega(j)), \quad \forall i \in N, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (11)$$

In order to jointly learn the model parameters θ and agent-specific weights ω , we define $L(\theta, \omega, D)$ and $M(\theta, \omega, D)$, as given below:

$$\forall D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta, D = \{D^i\}_{i \in N},$$

$$L(\theta, \omega, D) = \left\langle \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [l_\theta(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n, h_\omega \right\rangle, \quad (12)$$

$$M(\theta, \omega, D) = \left\langle \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [(1-p)|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_\theta(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n, \omega \right\rangle + (\lambda_\omega/2) \|\omega\|^2, \quad \lambda_\omega \in (0, 0.5], p \in (0.5, 1) \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{U}(A, a)$ denotes the uniform distribution over subsets of A of size a . The notation $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ represents a vector of size n , where each element of the vector is denoted by a_i .

In (12), the function $l_\theta(\cdot)$ is as defined in Section 2, and $m_\theta : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function that evaluate the learned model θ . The evaluation function used by the arbiter differ from the evaluation functions $m_\theta^i(\cdot)$ used by agents to learn the policy π^i in Section 3.1, where each agent may choose its own evaluation function independently, without requiring consensus on a common evaluation function. The arbiter has no knowledge of the evaluation functions used by agents to learn their policies. Instead, the arbiter utilizes its own evaluation function, such as a sigmoid function or mean-squared error, to determine the agent-specific weights ω . In (17), T^i and V^i represent the training and the validation sets, respectively. By evaluating the model on agent-specific validation sets, we can assess how well the model generalizes to each agent's data using the evaluation function $m_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$. This enables the adjustment of agent-specific weights to better align with the model's performance on each agent's data. As we process data sequentially in batches, a fixed validation set may not provide an accurate evaluation of model performance due to the changing characteristics of the data. Using a non-fixed validation set that adapts with each batch ensures that model evaluation remains representative of the most recent data.

To obtain an for the gradient $\nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega, D)$, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 3.4. $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, |m_\theta(x, y)| \leq M_m; 0 \leq M_m < \infty$.

We obtain an expression for the gradients $\nabla_\theta L(\theta, \omega, D)$ and $\nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega, D)$ in the lemma below, and the proof is available in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 3.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.4 hold. Then,*

$$\nabla_\theta L(\theta, \omega, D) = \left[\mathbb{E}_{\substack{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [\nabla_\theta l_\theta(x^i, y^i)] \right]_{i=1}^n h_\omega, \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega, D) \\ = \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [(1-p)|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_\theta(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n + \lambda_\omega \omega. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In the above, the notation $[a_i]_{i=1}^n$ denotes a matrix with n columns, where each column is represented by a_i . We make

the following assumption to solve the optimization problem in (2).

Assumption 3.6. There exists a function $\omega^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{W} = \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\omega\| \leq M_{\omega^*}, 0 \leq M_{\omega^*} < \infty\}$ s.t. for a given θ , $\omega^*(\theta)$ is the unique solution to $\mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega^*(\theta), D)] = 0$, and $\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\theta L(\theta, \omega^*(\theta), D)]$.

Solving the optimization problem in (2) by finding a point θ^* , where $\nabla_\theta J(\theta^*) = 0$ is equivalent to finding a point $(\theta^*, \omega^*(\theta^*))$ that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\theta L(\theta^*, \omega^*(\theta^*), D)] &= 0 \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\omega M(\theta^*, \omega^*(\theta^*), D)] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

At time t , the arbiter receives the data $D_t = \{D_t^i\}_{i \in N}$. Then $\forall i \in N$, we construct a training set T_t^i , and a validation set V_t^i as given below:

$$T_t^i \subset D_t^i \text{ s.t. } |T_t^i| = \lfloor p|D_t^i| \rfloor, V_t^i = D_t^i \setminus T_t^i, p \in (0.5, 1). \quad (17)$$

We further divide the training set T_t^i into n_b batches $\{T_{t,0}^i, \dots, T_{t,n_b-1}^i\}$, and learn θ and ω as are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{t,0} &= \theta_t, k = 0, \\ \left. \begin{aligned} \theta_{t,k+1} &= \theta_{t,k} - \alpha_t \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t), \\ k &= k + 1, \end{aligned} \right\} n_b \text{ times} \\ \theta_{t+1} &= \theta_{t,n_b}, \theta_0 \text{ is set arbitrarily, } \alpha_t \in (0, 1); \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\omega_{t+1} = \omega_t - \beta_t \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t), \omega_0 = \mathbf{0}, \beta_t \in (0, 1) \quad (19)$$

We start with a weight $\omega_0 = \mathbf{0}$, so that every agent get equal priority when we start our learning. Here $\widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $\widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ are estimators of $\nabla_\theta L(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $\nabla_\omega M(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$, respectively. The details of these estimators are provided below.

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \\ = \left[\frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_\theta l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right]_{i=1}^n h_{\omega_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) \\ = \left(\frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i) \right)_{i=1}^n + \lambda_\omega \omega_t. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We obtain distinct model parameters for each agent i by introducing zero-mean noise $\epsilon(i)$ to the learned model parameter θ , as defined below.

$$\eta^i \sim \mathbb{B}^d(1 - g(h_\omega(i))), \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbb{B}^d(r) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|v\| \leq r\}$ is a ball centered at origin with radius r . In the above, $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a distortion function which is non-decreasing with $g(0) = 0$

Quadratic function	$g(u) = (1 + \lambda)u - \lambda u^2, 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$
Exponential function	$g(u) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda u) / (1 - \exp(-\lambda)), \lambda > 0$
Square-root function	$g(u) = \sqrt{1 + \lambda u} - 1 / \sqrt{1 + \lambda} - 1, \lambda > 0$
Logarithmic function	$g(u) = \log(1 + \lambda u) / \log(1 + \lambda), \lambda > 0$

Table 1: Examples of distortion functions




Figure 2: Examples of distortion functions

and $g(1) = 1$. We use $g(\cdot)$ to nudge the weights $h_\omega(\cdot)$ to incentivize the agents to share more valuable data. A few examples of distortion functions are given in the Table 1 and their plots in Figure 2. By adjusting the parameter λ , one can determine the degree of incentivization. If we employ the identity function as $g(\cdot)$, we rely solely on the relative weights without incorporating any extra incentives. From Figure 2, we can see that distortion functions nudge each agent differently based on their relative weight. The chosen distortion function determines the extent of nudging applied to the relative weights. For instance, agents with weights in the middle to highest range may be nudged more significantly compared to those with nearly low weights.

We are sampling a vector uniformly at random from a ball of radius $1 - g(h_\omega(i))$ as noise η^i which ensure $\|\eta^i\| \leq 1 - g(h_\omega(i))$. We opt for a ball rather than a sphere for sampling noise to introduce variability in the length of the noise vector, with a maximum length of $1 - g(h_\omega(i))$. At time t , the arbiter learn the model parameter θ_{t+1} , and calculate a unique θ_{t+1}^i for each agent i as given below:

$$\theta_{t+1}^i = \theta_{t+1} + \eta_{t+1}^i, \forall i \in N, \quad (23)$$

where $\eta_{t+1}^i \sim \mathbb{B}^d(1 - g(h_\omega(i)))$.

Algorithm 2 provides pseudocode for the arbiter-specific component of the CML framework.

4. Convergence Analysis

We provide non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for our algorithms toward an ϵ -stationary point, defined as follows:

Definition 4.1. (ϵ -stationary point) Consider an optimization problem $\theta^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\theta)$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, and let θ_R be the random output of an iterative algorithm designed to solve this problem. Then, θ_R is called an ϵ -stationary point of the optimization problem, if $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\theta_R)\|^2] \leq \epsilon$, where

Algorithm 2 CML-Arbiter

```

1: Initialize:  $\theta_0, \omega_0 = \mathbf{0}$ ;
2: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$  do
3:   Get data  $\{D_t^i\}_{i \in N}$  from agents;
4:   for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  do
5:      $T_t^i \subset D_t^i$  s.t.  $|T_t^i| = \lfloor p|D_t^i| \rfloor$ ;
6:      $V_t^i = D_t^i \setminus T_t^i$ ;
7:     Divide  $T_t^i$  into  $n_b$  batches  $\{T_{t,0}^i, \dots, T_{t,n_b-1}^i\}$ ;
8:   end for
9:    $\theta_{t,0} = \theta_t$ ;
10:  for  $k = 0, \dots, n_b - 1$  do
11:     $\theta_{t,k+1} = \theta_{t,k} - \alpha_t \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t)$ ;
12:  end for
13:   $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_{t,n_b}$ ;
14:   $\omega_{t+1} = \omega_t - \beta_t \widehat{\nabla}_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t)$ ;
15:  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
16:     $\eta_{t+1}^i \sim \mathbb{B}^d(1 - g(h_{\omega_{t+1}}(i)))$ ;
17:     $\theta_{t+1}^i = \theta_{t+1} + \eta_{t+1}^i$ ;
18:    Send  $\theta_{t+1}^i$  to agent  $i$ ;
19:  end for
20: end for
    
```

the expectation is over R .

For the sake of analysis, we make additional assumptions as follows:

Assumption 4.2. For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 l_{\theta}(x, y)\| \leq L_V; 0 \leq L_V < \infty$.

Assumption 4.3. For a given $i, \forall \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}, \forall s \in S^i$, $\|\nabla_{\nu}^2 \log \pi_{\nu}^i(s)\| \leq M_h^i; 0 \leq M_h^i < \infty$.

Assumption 4.4. $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $\|\nabla_{\theta} m_{\theta}(x, y)\| \leq L_m; 0 \leq L_m < \infty$.

Theorem 4.5 (Agent i). Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 4.3 hold. Let $\{\nu_t\}_{t=0}^{T^i-1}$ be the policy parameters generated by the Algorithm 1 for T^i iterations. Let $\mathbb{P}(R = t) = 1/T^i$, and the step size $b_t = 1/\sqrt{T^i}, \forall t$. Then after T^i iterations of the Algorithm 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_R)\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{G^i(\nu_0) - G^{i*}}{\sqrt{T^i}} + \frac{(M_h^i + M_d^i) M_m^{i^3} M_d^{i^2}}{2\sqrt{T^i}}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

In the above, $G^{i*} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}} G(\nu)$, and the constants M_d^i, M_h^i and M_m^i are as defined in Assumptions 3.2, 4.3 and 3.1, respectively.

Proof. See Appendix A.1. \square

Remark 4.6. The result above shows that after T^i iterations, Algorithm 1 returns an iterate that satisfies

$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_R) \right\|^2 \right] = O(1/\sqrt{T^i})$. In other words, to find an ϵ -stationary point, $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations of Algorithm 1 are sufficient.

Theorem 4.7 (Arbiter). *Let Assumptions 2.1, 4.2, 3.4, 4.4 and 3.6 hold. Let $\{\{\theta_{t,k}\}_{t=0}^{T-1}\}_{k=0}^{n_b-1}$ be the model parameters generated by the Algorithm 2 for T iterations. Let $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = t) = 1/T$ and $\mathbb{P}(R_2 = k) = 1/n_b$, and the step sizes $\alpha_t = 1/T^{3/5}$; $\beta_t = 1/T^{2/5}$, $\forall t$. Then after T iterations of the Algorithm 2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla J(\theta_{R_1, R_2}) \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \frac{2(J(\theta_0) - J^*)}{n_b T^{2/5}} \\ &+ \left(\frac{A_1}{T^{4/5}} + \frac{A_2}{T^{2/5}} + A_3 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\lfloor (1-p) |D_{R_1}^i| \rfloor} \right] \\ &+ \frac{A_4}{T^{2/5}} + \frac{A_5}{T^{3/5}} + \frac{A_6}{T^{4/5}} + \frac{A_7}{T^{6/5}} + \frac{A_8}{T^{7/5}} + \frac{A_9}{T^{8/5}} + \frac{A_{10}}{T^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \frac{196nL_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega}, \quad A_2 = \frac{84nL_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \\ A_3 &= \frac{32L_l^2}{\lambda_\omega^3} (7nM_m^2 + \lambda_\omega^3 e^2 n_b), \\ A_4 &= \frac{7L_l^2 n (7L_l^2 L_m^2 n^2 n_b^2 + 6\lambda_\omega^3 (M_m^2 n + \lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2))}{\lambda_\omega^5}, \\ A_5 &= \frac{7nL_l^2 M_{\omega^*}^2}{\lambda_\omega^2}, \\ A_6 &= \frac{7n^2 n_b L_l^4 (\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b)}{2\lambda_\omega^4} \\ &+ \frac{98L_l^2 n (M_m^2 n + 28\lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2)}{\lambda_\omega}, \\ A_7 &= \frac{119n^3 n_b^2 L_l^4 L_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^3}, \quad A_8 = \frac{49n^4 n_b^2 L_l^6 L_m^2 (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^4}, \\ A_9 &= \frac{21n^3 n_b^2 L_l^4 L_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2}, \quad A_{10} = \frac{49n^3 n_b^2 L_l^4 L_m^2}{\lambda_\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, $J^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} J(\theta)$, and the constants L_l , L_l , M_m , L_m and M_{ω^*} are as defined in Assumptions 2.1, 4.2, 3.4, 4.4 and 3.6, respectively. The parameters $p \in (0.5, 1)$ from (17), $\lambda_\omega \in (0, 0.5]$ from (13), and n is the number of collaborating agents.

Proof. See Appendix A.2. \square

Remark 4.8. The result above shows that after T iterations, Algorithm 2 returns an iterate that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\left\| \nabla J(\theta_{R_1, R_2}) \right\|^2] = O(1/T^{2/5}) + O(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[1/\lfloor (1-p) |D_{R_1}^i| \rfloor])$. Therefore, the convergence rate is influenced by the expected data size from the agents.

5. Conclusion and Future work

We have presented a novel framework for adaptive data-centric collaborative learning, explicitly designed to accommodate the self-interested nature of agents and the incremental nature of data collection. By incorporating a feedback loop between data-sharing policies and model updates, the framework aligns collaborative strategies with agent-specific goals through the optimization of stochastic policies. The arbiter's bilevel optimization approach addresses distributional differences and ensures efficient utilization of shared data. Additionally, the use of a distortion-based mechanism to generate distinct models fosters meaningful collaboration without added training complexity. Rigorous non-asymptotic analyses guarantee convergence to approximate stationary points for both agent-side and arbiter-side optimization objectives, ensuring the robustness and practicality of the proposed approach in dynamic, real-world environments. This work advances the understanding of collaborative learning frameworks, highlighting the importance of incentivizing agents while respecting their strategic interests and decision-making flexibility.

As future work, incorporating differential privacy mechanisms into the framework could further enhance its practicality, particularly in settings where sensitive data is involved. By introducing rigorous privacy guarantees, the framework could ensure that agents' shared data cannot be exploited to infer sensitive information, thereby encouraging greater participation. Differential privacy could be integrated alongside the current structure to balance the trade-off between data utility and privacy preservation, enabling secure and equitable collaborative learning.

References

- Gao, B. and Pavel, L. On the properties of the softmax function with application in game theory and reinforcement learning, 2018.
- Hayes, T. A large-deviation inequality for vector-valued martingales. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 2005.
- Lin, X., Xu, X., Ng, S. K., Foo, C. S., and Low, B. K. H. Fair yet asymptotically equal collaborative learning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-23)*, 2023.
- Nesterov, Y. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1 edition, 2014.
- Sim, R. H. L., Zhang, Y., Chan, M. C., and Low, B. K. H. Collaborative machine learning with incentive-aware model rewards. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 8927–8936. PMLR, 2020.

Sim, R. H. L., Zhang, Y., Hoang, T. N., Xu, X., Low, B. K. H., and Jaillet, P. Incentives in private collaborative machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS '23. Curran Associates Inc., 2024.

Wu, Z., Amiri, M. M., Raskar, R., and Low, B. K. H. Incentive-aware federated learning with training-time model rewards. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Yang, Q., Liu, Y., Chen, T., and Tong, Y. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 10(2), 2019.

A. Proofs

A.1. Agents

Proof. [Lemma 3.3]

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nabla_\nu G^i(\nu) &= \nabla_\nu \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, s \sim \pi_\nu^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \\
 &= \nabla_\nu \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \pi_\nu^i(s) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \nabla_\nu \pi_\nu^i(s) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu(s) \pi_\nu^i(s) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, s \sim \pi_\nu^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above step (a) follows by the application of dominated convergence theorem to interchange the expectation and differentiation operators. The aforementioned application is allowed since S^i is a finite set and $\left| m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\cdot) \right|$ and $\|\nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(\cdot)\|$ are bounded from Assumption 3.1 and Assumptions 3.2, respectively. The step (b) follows from the fact that $\nabla_\nu \pi_\nu^i(s)/\pi_\nu^i(s) = \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)$. \square

Lemma A.1.

For a given i , $\forall \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}$, $\|\nabla_\nu G^i(\nu_1) - \nabla_\nu G^i(\nu_2)\| \leq M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|$.

Proof.

$$\nabla_\nu^2 G^i(\nu) = \nabla_\nu^2 \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i, s \sim \pi_\nu^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \quad (25)$$

$$= \nabla_\nu^2 \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \pi_\nu^i(s) \quad (26)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \nabla_\nu^2 \pi_\nu^i(s)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{s \in S^i} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right] \left(\nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(s) + \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)^\top \right) \pi_\nu^i(s)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi_\nu^i, D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \left(\nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(s) + \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)^\top \right) \right]. \quad (27)$$

In the above step (a) follows by the application of dominated convergence theorem to interchange the expectation and differentiation operators. The aforementioned application is allowed since S^i is a finite set and $\left| m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\cdot) \right|$, $\|\nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(\cdot)\|$ and $\|\nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(\cdot)\|$ are bounded from Assumption 3.1 and Assumptions 3.2–4.3. The step (b) follows since $\nabla_\nu^2 \pi_\nu^i(s)/\pi_\nu^i(s) = \nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(s) + \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)^\top$.

From (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\nabla_\nu^2 G^i(\nu)\| &= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi_\nu^i, D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \left(\nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(s) + \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s) \nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)^\top \right) \right\| \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi_\nu^i, D \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| m_{\bar{\theta}_s}^i(\bar{V}_s) \right\| \left(\|\nabla_\nu^2 \log \pi_\nu^i(s)\| + \|\nabla_\nu \log \pi_\nu^i(s)\|^2 \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}).
 \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Finally, the result follows from (28) and (Nesterov, 2014, Lemma 1.2.2). \square

Lemma A.2.

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right] = \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t).$$

Proof. From (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[m_{\bar{\theta}_{s_t}}^i(\bar{V}_{s_t}) \nabla_{\nu} \log \pi_{\nu_t}^i(s_t) \right] \\ &= \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.3.

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq M_m^{i^2} M_d^{i^2}.$$

Proof. From (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| m_{\bar{\theta}_{s_t}}^i(\bar{V}_{s_t}) \nabla_{\nu} \log \pi_{\nu_t}^i(s_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \pi_{\nu_t}^i, D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^i} \left[\left\| m_{\bar{\theta}_{s_t}}^i(\bar{V}_{s_t}) \right\|^2 \left\| \nabla_{\nu} \log \pi_{\nu_t}^i(s_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} M_m^{i^2} M_d^{i^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows the fact that $\|ab\| \leq \|a\| \|b\|$. The step (b) follows from Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2. □

PROOF [THEOREM 4.5]

Using the fundamental theorem of calculus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &G^i(\nu_{t+1}) - G^i(\nu_t) \\ &= \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nu_{t+1} - \nu_t \rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t + \tau(\nu_{t+1} - \nu_t)) - \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nu_{t+1} - \nu_t \rangle d\tau \\ &\leq \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nu_{t+1} - \nu_t \rangle + \int_0^1 \left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t + \tau(\nu_{t+1} - \nu_t)) - \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\| \|\nu_{t+1} - \nu_t\| d\tau \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nu_{t+1} - \nu_t \rangle + M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) \|\nu_{t+1} - \nu_t\|^2 \int_0^1 \tau d\tau \\ &= \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nu_{t+1} - \nu_t \rangle + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2})}{2} \|\nu_{t+1} - \nu_t\|^2 \\ &= b_t \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), -\widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \rangle + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) b_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \\ &= b_t \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \rangle - b_t \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \rangle + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) b_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \\ &= b_t \langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \rangle - b_t \left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) b_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Taking expectations on both sides of (29), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [G^i(\nu_{t+1})] - \mathbb{E} [G^i(\nu_t)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq b_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t), \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\rangle \right] - b_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) b_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -b_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] + \frac{M_m^i (M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) b_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -b_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] + b_t^2 \frac{(M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) M_m^{i^3} M_d^{i^2}}{2}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from Lemma A.2, and the step (b) follows from Lemma A.3.

Summing (30) from $t = 0, \dots, T^i - 1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T^i-1} b_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} [G^i(\nu_0)] - \mathbb{E} [G^i(\nu_{T^i})] + \sum_{t=0}^{T^i-1} b_t^2 \frac{(M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) M_m^{i^3} M_d^{i^2}}{2}. \tag{31}$$

We have $\forall t, b_t = 1/\sqrt{T^i}$. Let $G^{i*} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}} G(\nu)$. Then,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T^i-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T^i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq G^i(\nu_0) - G^{i*} + \frac{(M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) M_m^{i^3} M_d^{i^2}}{2}. \tag{32}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(R = t) = 1/T^i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_R) \right\|^2 \right] &= \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{T^i-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right]}{T^i} = \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{T^i-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T^i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\nu} G^i(\nu_t) \right\|^2 \right]}{\sqrt{T^i}} \\
 &\leq \frac{G^i(\nu_0) - G^{i*}}{\sqrt{T^i}} + \frac{(M_h^i + M_d^{i^2}) M_m^{i^3} M_d^{i^2}}{2\sqrt{T^i}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

□

A.2. Arbiter

Proof. [Lemma 3.5]

We derive expressions for $\nabla_{\theta} L(\theta, \omega, D)$ and $\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega, D)$ as given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta, \omega, D) &= \nabla_{\theta} \left\langle \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [l_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n, h_{\omega} \right\rangle \\
 &= \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [l_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)] \right]_{i=1}^n h_{\omega} \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)] \right]_{i=1}^n h_{\omega}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from Assumption 2.1 by using the dominated convergence theorem.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega, D) &= \nabla_{\omega} \left\langle \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [(1-p)|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n, \omega \right\rangle + \nabla_{\omega} (\lambda_{\omega}/2) \|\omega\|^2 \\
 &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [(1-p)|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n + \lambda_{\omega} \omega.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.4. $\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_1}(x, y) - \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_2}(x, y)\| \leq L_{\nu} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|, \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

Proof. The result follows from Assumption 2.1 and (Nesterov, 2014, Lemma 1.2.2).

□

Lemma A.5. $\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta_1) - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta_2)\| \leq L_V \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta_1) - \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta_2)\| &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \|\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_1}(x, y) - \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_2}(x, y)]\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\|\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_1}(x, y) - \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_2}(x, y)\|] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} L_V \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|] \\ &= L_V \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

The step (a) follows from (3) and step (b) follows since $\|\mathbb{E}[X]\| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|X\|]$. The step (c) follows from Lemma A.4. \square

Lemma A.6. $\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|m_{\theta_1}(x, y) - m_{\theta_2}(x, y)| \leq L_m \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$, $\forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

Proof. Using fundamental theorem of calculus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{\theta_1}(x, y) - m_{\theta_2}(x, y)| &= \left| \int_0^1 \langle \nabla m_{\theta_2 + \tau(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}(x, y), \theta_1 - \theta_2 \rangle d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 |\langle \nabla m_{\theta_2 + \tau(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}(x, y), \theta_1 - \theta_2 \rangle| d\tau \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \|\nabla m_{\theta_2 + \tau(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}(x, y)\| \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| d\tau \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \int_0^1 L_m \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| d\tau \\ &= L_m \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

The step (a) follows from the fact that $|\langle a, b \rangle| \leq \|a\| \|b\|$. The step (b) follows from Assumption 4.4. \square

Lemma A.7.

$$\forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|h_{\omega_1} - h_{\omega_2}\| \leq \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|.$$

Proof. The result follows from (Gao & Pavel, 2018, Proposition 4). \square

Lemma A.8. $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $M(\theta, \omega, D)$ is a smooth strongly convex function in ω with strong convexity and smoothness parameter λ_{ω} a.s., i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle &\geq \lambda_{\omega} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2; \\ \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_2, D)\| &\leq \lambda_{\omega} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\omega}^2 M(\theta, \omega, D) &= \nabla_{\omega}^2 \langle (\mathbb{E}_{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor)} [m_{\theta}(x^i, y^i)])_{i=1}^n, \omega \rangle + (\lambda_{\omega}/2) \nabla_{\omega}^2 \|\omega\|^2 \\ &= \lambda_{\omega} \mathbf{I}_n \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

From (13), we have $\lambda_{\omega} > 0$. From (Nesterov, 2014, Theorem 2.1.11 and Lemma 1.2.2), we obtain $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $M(\theta, \omega, D)$ is a smooth strongly convex function in ω with strong convexity and smoothness parameter λ_{ω} . \square

Lemma A.9.

$$\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D)\|^2 \leq 2nL_m^2 \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 + 2\lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D)\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)D^i \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n + \lambda_{\omega} (\omega_1 - \omega_2) \right\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)D^1 \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}, \dots, V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)D^n \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\left\| (m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i))_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] + 2\lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \\
 &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)D^1 \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}, \dots, V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)D^n \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)|^2 \right] + 2\lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2nL_m^2 \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 + 2\lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2. \tag{35}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from the fact that $\|x + y\|^2 \leq 2\|x\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2$, and $\|\mathbb{E}[x]\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\|x\|^2]$. The step (b) follows from Lemma A.6. \square

Lemma A.10.

$$\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_2, D)\|^2 = \lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta, \omega_2, D)\|^2 = \|\lambda_{\omega} (\omega_1 - \omega_2)\|^2 = \lambda_{\omega}^2 \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2. \tag{36}$$

\square

Lemma A.11.

$$\forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_1, \omega, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_2, \omega, D)\|^2 = nL_m^2 \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_1, \omega, D) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_2, \omega, D)\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)D^i \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}}} [m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)D^1 \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}, \dots, V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)D^n \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\left\| (m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i))_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)D^1 \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}, \dots, V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)D^n \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} nL_m^2 \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2. \tag{37}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from the fact that $\|\mathbb{E}[x]\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\|x\|^2]$. The step (b) follows from Lemma A.6. \square

Lemma A.12.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D_t)\|^2 \right] \leq 2nM_m^2 + 2\lambda_{\omega}^2 M_{\omega^*}^2.$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\omega} M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D_t) \right\|^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right)_{i=1}^n + \lambda_\omega \omega^*(\theta_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right)_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\lambda_\omega \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] \\
 &= 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right|^2 \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\lambda_\omega \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} |m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i)|^2 \right] + 2\lambda_\omega^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2nM_m^2 + 2\lambda_\omega^2 M_\omega^2. \tag{38}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows since $\mathbb{E} \left[\|a + b\|^2 \right] \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|a\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|b\|^2 \right]$. The step (b) follows since $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\|^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|a_i\|^2$. The step (c) follows from Assumption 3.4 and Assumption 3.6. \square

Lemma A.13.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq 4M_m^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\lfloor (1-p)|D_t^i \rfloor} \right]$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n - \left(\frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right)_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right)_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right|^2 \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E}_{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right] \right|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor)} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_t}(x^i, y^i) \right|^2 \right] \right]. \tag{39}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from the fact that $|\mathbb{E}[x]|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[|x|^2]$. From Assumption 3.4, we have $|m_\theta(x, y)| \leq M_m$. Let $V_{t_j}^i$ represents first j elements of V_t^i , then

$\left\{ j \left(\mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_{t_j}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_{t_j}^i} m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i) \right) \right\}_{j=1}^{|V_t^i|}$ is a set of partial sums of bounded mean zero r.v.s and hence they are martingales. Using Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i) \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp \frac{-|V_t^i| \epsilon^2}{2M_m^2}, \tag{40}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}_{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i \rfloor)} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i) \right|^2 \right] \\
 &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)} [m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|V_t^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in V_t^i} m_{\theta_{t+1}}(x^i, y^i) \right| > \sqrt{\epsilon} \right) d\epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \int_0^\infty 2 \exp \frac{-|V_t^i| \epsilon}{2M_m^2} d\epsilon \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{4M_m^2}{|V_t^i|}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from (40), and the step (b) follows from the fact that $\int_0^\infty \exp(-a\epsilon) d\epsilon = \frac{1}{a}$, $\forall a > 0$.

Applying (41) in (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{4M_m^2}{|V_t^i|} \right] \\
 &= 4M_m^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|(1-p)|D_t^i|} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

□

Lemma A.14. $\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle + \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. From Lemma A.8 and (Nesterov, 2014, Definition 2.1.2), we obtain

$$M(\theta_1, \omega_2, D) \geq M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) + \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D), \omega_2 - \omega_1 \rangle + \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_2 - \omega_1\|^2; \tag{43}$$

$$M(\theta_2, \omega_1, D) \geq M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D) + \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle + \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2. \tag{44}$$

Adding (43) and (44), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D), \omega_2 - \omega_1 \rangle + \lambda_\omega \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \\
 &\leq M(\theta_1, \omega_2, D) - M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D) - (M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - M(\theta_2, \omega_1, D)) \\
 &= \langle \omega_2 - \omega_1, \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, \lfloor (1-p)|D^i| \rfloor) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^i, 1)}} [m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)] \right)_{i=1}^n \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda_\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)|D^1| \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}}, \dots, \substack{V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)|D^n| \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\left\| (m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i))_{i=1}^n \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda_\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)|D^1| \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}}, \dots, \substack{V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)|D^n| \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |m_{\theta_1}(x^i, y^i) - m_{\theta_2}(x^i, y^i)|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 + \frac{L_m^2}{2\lambda_\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{V^1 \sim \mathcal{U}(D^1, \lfloor (1-p)|D^1| \rfloor) \\ (x^1, y^1) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^1, 1)}}, \dots, \substack{V^n \sim \mathcal{U}(D^n, \lfloor (1-p)|D^n| \rfloor) \\ (x^n, y^n) \sim \mathcal{U}(V^n, 1)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 \right] \\
 &= \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 + \frac{nL_m^2}{2\lambda_\omega} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows since $\langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{\|a\|^2}{2\delta} + \frac{\delta\|b\|^2}{2}$, $\delta > 0$, and from the fact that $\|\mathbb{E}[x]\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\|x\|^2]$. The step (b) follows from Lemma A.6.

Re-arranging (45), we obtain

$$\|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_1, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_2, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle + \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2. \tag{46}$$

□

Lemma A.15.

$$\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_\omega} \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. From Lemma A.8 and (Nesterov, 2014, Definition 2.1.2), we obtain

$$M(\theta, \omega_2, D) \geq M(\theta, \omega_1, D) + \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_1, D), \omega_2 - \omega_1 \rangle + \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_2 - \omega_1\|^2; \quad (47)$$

$$M(\theta, \omega_1, D) \geq M(\theta, \omega_2, D) + \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle + \frac{\lambda_\omega}{2} \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2. \quad (48)$$

Adding (47) and (48), we obtain

$$\langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_2, D), \omega_2 - \omega_1 \rangle + \lambda_\omega \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \leq 0. \quad (49)$$

Re-arranging (49), we obtain

$$\|\omega_1 - \omega_2\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_\omega} \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_1, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega_2, D), \omega_1 - \omega_2 \rangle. \quad (50)$$

□

Lemma A.16. For any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{nL_m^2 \alpha_t^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right].$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega_t\|^2 \\ &= \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) + \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \\ &= \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 + \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 + 2 \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (1 + \delta) \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} (1 + \delta) \|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t,k+1}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D), \omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

In the above, the step (a) follows since $\langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{\|a\|^2}{2\delta} + \frac{\delta\|b\|^2}{2}$, $\delta > 0$, and the step (b) follows from Lemma A.14.

Taking expectation on both sides of (51), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t,k+1}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D), \omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) \rangle \right] \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{nL_m^2 \alpha_t^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right]. \quad (52)$$

In the above, the step (a) follows since $\mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega^*(\theta), D)] = 0$ from Assumption 3.6, and the step (b) follows from (18). \square

Lemma A.17.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_{t+1} - \omega^*(\theta_{t+1})\|^2 \right] &\leq (1 - \beta_t \lambda_\omega + \beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 17\beta_t \lambda_\omega \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\omega_{t+1} - \omega^*(\theta_{t+1})\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \omega_t - \beta_t \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\| (\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)) - (\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)) - \beta_t (\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \beta_t (\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) + (\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D)) \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 + 3\beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\beta_t^2 \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2 \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t) \rangle - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \left\langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t \left\langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t^2 \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t^2 \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta_t^2 \left\langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D), \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 + 3\beta_t^2 \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\beta_t^2 \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7} \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -2\beta_t \lambda_\omega \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \\
 & + \frac{\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7} \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{7\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \frac{\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7} \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{7\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 & - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\
 & + 7\beta_t \lambda_\omega \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t}{7\lambda_\omega} \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \beta_t \lambda_\omega \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \beta_t \lambda_\omega \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 & + \frac{3\beta_t}{7\lambda_\omega} \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 = & \left(1 - 2\beta_t \lambda_\omega + \frac{3\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7}\right) \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 9\lambda_\omega \beta_t\right) \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \\
 & + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \left(\beta_t^2 + \frac{4\beta_t}{7\lambda_\omega}\right) \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 & - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\
 \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} & \left(1 - 2\beta_t \lambda_\omega + \frac{3\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7}\right) \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 9\lambda_\omega \beta_t\right) \|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \\
 & + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \left(\beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2 + \frac{4\beta_t \lambda_\omega}{7}\right) \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) nL_m^2 \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2 \\
 & + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 & - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\
 \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} & (1 - \beta_t \lambda_\omega + \beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \\
 & + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \\
 & - 2\beta_t \langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle - 2\beta_t \langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle \\
 & + \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{14}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^2} + 18\beta_t\right) \langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D), \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t) \rangle \\
 & + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 17\beta_t \lambda_\omega\right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2. \tag{53}
 \end{aligned}$$

The step (a) follows the facts that $\|a - b - c - d\|^2 = \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2 + \|c\|^2 + \|d\|^2 - 2\langle a, b \rangle - 2\langle a, c \rangle - 2\langle a, d \rangle - 2\langle b, c \rangle -$

$2\langle b, d \rangle - 2\langle c, d \rangle, \langle a, b + c + d \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle + \langle a, c \rangle + \langle a, d \rangle$, and $\|a + b + c\|^2 \leq 3\|a\|^2 + 3\|b\|^2 + 3\|c\|^2$. The step (b) follows from Lemma A.15, and $\forall a, b, \langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{\|a\|^2}{2\delta} + \frac{\delta\|b\|^2}{2}$, $\delta > 0$. The step (c) follows from Lemma A.10 and A.11, and the step (d) follows from Lemma A.14.

Taking expectation on both sides of (53), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_{t+1} - \omega^*(\theta_{t+1})\|^2 \right] \\
 & \leq (1 - \beta_t \lambda_\omega + \beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & \quad - 2\beta_t \mathbb{E} [\langle \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle] - 2\beta_t \mathbb{E} [\langle \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t), \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \rangle] \\
 & \quad + \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{14}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^2} + 18\beta_t \right) \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}), D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D), \omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega^*(\theta_t) \rangle] \\
 & \quad + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 17\beta_t \lambda_\omega \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2 \right] \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{=} (1 - \beta_t \lambda_\omega + \beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] + (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_\omega^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega} + 17\beta_t \lambda_\omega \right) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2 \right]. \tag{54}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows since $\mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\omega M(\theta, \omega^*(\theta), D)] = 0$ from Assumption 3.6. \square

Lemma A.18. Let $\{\hat{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d, vector-valued r.v.s., such that $\chi = \mathbb{E} [\hat{X}_i]$, $\forall \hat{X}_i$. Let $S_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{X}_i$. Assume $\forall i$, $\|\hat{X}_i\| \leq M$ a.s. Then,

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \mathbb{P} (\|S_n - \chi\| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2e^2 \exp \left(\frac{-n\epsilon^2}{8M^2} \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$Y_{n'} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^{n'} (\hat{X}_i - \chi), & \text{for } n' = \{1, \dots, n\} \\ 0, & \text{for } n' = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\{Y_{n'}\}_{n'=1}^n$ is a set of partial sums of bounded mean zero r.v.s. Hence it is a martingale, and $\forall n' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|Y_{n'} - Y_{n'-1}\| &= \frac{1}{2M} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n'} (\hat{X}_i - \chi) - \sum_{i=1}^{n'-1} (\hat{X}_i - \chi) \right\| \\
 &= \frac{1}{2M} \|\hat{X}_{n'} - \chi\| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2M} 2M = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P} (\|S_n - \chi\| \geq \epsilon) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\|Y_n\| \geq \frac{n\epsilon}{2M} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2e^2 \exp \left(\frac{-n\epsilon^2}{8M^2} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from (Hayes, 2005, Theorem 1.8), and the fact that every martingale is a very weak martingale (cf. (Hayes, 2005, Definition 1.3)). \square

Lemma A.19.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq 16L_l^2 e^2 n_b \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|p|D_t^i|} \right]$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left[\mathbb{E}_{\substack{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right]_{i=1}^n h_{\omega^*(\theta_{t,k})} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \|h_{\omega^*(\theta_{t,k})}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|]) \\ (x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)}}} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|])} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|])} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \right] \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|])} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \right] \right] \quad (55) \end{aligned}$$

The step (a) follows from the fact that for a vector a and a matrix A , $\|Aa\|^2 \leq \|a\|^2 (\sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i\|^2)$, where A_i is the i^{th} column of A . The step (b) follows since $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|h_{\omega^*(\theta)}\| \leq 1$. The step (c) follows from the fact that $|\mathbb{E}[x]|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[x^2]$

From Assumption 2.1, we have $\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta}(x, y) \leq L_l$. Using Lemma A.18, we obtain $\forall i$ and $\forall \theta_{t,k}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\| \geq \epsilon \right) \leq 2e^2 \exp \left(\frac{-b_{t,k}^i \epsilon^2}{8L_l^2} \right), \quad (56)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{T^i \sim \mathcal{U}(D^i, [p|D^i|])} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E}_{(x^i, y^i) \sim \mathcal{U}(T^i, 1)} [\nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i)] - \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \right) d\epsilon \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \int_0^{\infty} 2e^2 \exp \left(\frac{-T_{t,k}^i \epsilon}{8L_l^2} \right) d\epsilon \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{16L_l^2 e^2}{b_{t,k}^i}, \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

where the step (a) follows from (56), and the step (b) follows from the fact that $\int_0^{\infty} \exp(-a\epsilon) d\epsilon = \frac{1}{a}$, $\forall a > 0$.

Applying (57) in (55), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] &\leq 16L_l^2 e^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \right] = 16L_l^2 e^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{n_b}{|T_t^i|} \right] \\ &= 16L_l^2 e^2 n_b \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|p|D_t^i|} \right]. \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.20.

$$\forall t, k, \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq nL_l^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right].$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left[\frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right]_{i=1}^n (h_{\omega^*(\theta_{t,k})} - h_{\omega_t}) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \|h_{\omega^*(\theta_{t,k})} - h_{\omega_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} nL_l^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|h_{\omega^*(\theta_{t,k})} - h_{\omega_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} nL_l^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

The step (a) follows from the fact that for a vector a and a matrix A , $\|Aa\|^2 \leq \|a\|^2 (\sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i\|^2)$, where A_i is the i^{th} column of A . The step (b) follows from Assumption 2.1 and from the fact that $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\|^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|a_i\|^2$. The step (c) follows from Lemma A.7. □

Lemma A.21.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq nL_l^2.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left[\frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right]_{i=1}^n h_{\omega_t} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{|T_{t,k}^i|} \sum_{(x^i, y^i) \in T_{t,k}^i} \nabla_{\theta} l_{\theta_{t,k}}(x^i, y^i) \right\|^2 \|h_{\omega_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} nL_l^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|h_{\omega_t}\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} nL_l^2. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

The step (a) follows from the fact that for a vector a and a matrix A , $\|Aa\|^2 \leq \|a\|^2 (\sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i\|^2)$, where A_i is the i^{th} column of A . The step (b) follows from Assumption 2.1 and from the fact that $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\|^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|a_i\|^2$. The step (c) follows from the fact that $\|h_{\omega_t}\|^2 \leq 1$. □

PROOF [THEOREM 4.7]

Using the fundamental theorem of calculus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\theta_{t,k+1}) - J(\theta_{t,k}) \\ &= \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k} \rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k} + \tau(\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k})) - \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k} \rangle d\tau \\ &\leq \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k} \rangle + \int_0^1 \|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k} + \tau(\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k})) - \nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\| \|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\| d\tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k} \rangle + L_V \|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\|^2 \int_0^1 \tau d\tau \\
 &= \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k} \rangle + \frac{L_V}{2} \|\theta_{t,k+1} - \theta_{t,k}\|^2 \\
 &= \alpha_t \left\langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), -\widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \\
 &= \alpha_t \left\langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\rangle - \alpha_t \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) \rangle \\
 &\quad + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 - \alpha_t \langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) \rangle \\
 &\quad + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \tag{61}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from Lemma A.5, and the step (b) follows from the fact that $2\langle x, y \rangle \leq \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2$. Taking expectations on both sides of (61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k+1})] - \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k})] \\
 &\leq \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] + \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad - \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}), \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) \rangle \right] + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] + \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= -\frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] + \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &= -\frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right], \tag{62}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the step (a) follows from Assumption 3.6 since $\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{D \sim \mathcal{D}^\theta} [\nabla_\theta L(\theta, \omega^*(\theta), D)]$.

Let

$$R_{t,k} = \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k})] + r_{t,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right]. \tag{63}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &R_{t,k+1} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k+1})] + r_{t,k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k})] + r_{t,k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k+1}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] - \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] + \frac{L_V \alpha_t^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k})] + r_{t,k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] - \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + r_{t,k+1} (1 + n_b) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_{t,k})] + \left(r_{t,k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right) + \alpha_t n L_l^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,k}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] - \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + r_{t,k+1} (1 + n_b) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right], \tag{64}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the step (a) follows from (62). The step (b) follows from Lemma A.16 with $\delta = 1/n_b$, and step (c) follows from Lemma A.20.

Let

$$r_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \alpha_t n L_l^2 + r_{t,k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right) & \text{for } k \in \{0, \dots, n_b - 1\} \\ 0 & \text{for } k \geq n_b. \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

Solving the recursion in (65), we obtain

$$r_{t,k} = \alpha_t n L_l^2 n_b \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right)^{n_b - k} - 1 \right). \tag{66}$$

We can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &r_{t,k} \leq r_{t,0}, \quad \forall k, \text{ and} \\
 &r_{t,0} = \alpha_t n L_l^2 n_b \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right)^{n_b} - 1 \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \alpha_t n L_l^2 n_b (e - 1) \leq \frac{7}{4} \alpha_t n L_l^2 n_b, \tag{67}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the step (a) follows since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 + 1/n)^n = e$.

From (67), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in \{0, \dots, n_b - 1\}} \alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + r_{t,k+1} (1 + n_b) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) &= \alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + r_{t,0} (1 + n_b) \frac{nL_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \\
 &\leq \alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right). \tag{68}
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying (63), (65) and (68) in (64), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{t,k+1} &\leq R_{t,k} - \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] + \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right], \tag{69}
 \end{aligned}$$

Summing (69) from $k = 0, \dots, n_b - 1$, we obtain

$$R_{t,n_b} \leq R_{t,0} - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right]. \tag{70}
 \end{aligned}$$

From (63), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{t,n_b} & = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t,n_b})] + r_{t,n_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,n_b}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t,n_b})] \stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t+1})], \tag{71}
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{t,0} & = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t,0})] + r_{t,0} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t,0}) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\
 & \stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + r_{t,0} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_t) - \omega_t\|^2 \right]. \tag{72}
 \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) follows since $r_{t,n_b} = 0$ from (65), and step (b) and (c) follows since $\theta_{t,n_b} = \theta_{t+1}$ and $\theta_{t,0} = \theta_t$ from (18).

Applying (71) and (72) in (70), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t+1})] & \leq \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + r_{t,0} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_t) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right]. \tag{73}
 \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$S_t = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + s_t \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_t) - \omega_t\|^2 \right]. \tag{74}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & S_{t+1} \\
 & = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_{t+1})] + s_{t+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + s_{t+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_{t+1}) - \omega_{t+1}\|^2 \right] + r_{t,0} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_t) - \omega_t\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_{l'}}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + (r_{t,0} + s_{t+1} (1 - (\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2))) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t)\|^2 \right] \\
 & + s_{t+1} \left((3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega}) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 & + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_{\omega}} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & \left. + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega}^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_{\omega}} + 17\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} \right) \frac{n L_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|^2 \right] \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_l}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} & \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + (r_{t,0} + s_{t+1} (1 - (\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2))) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + s_{t+1} \left((3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega}) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \right\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_{\omega}} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(1 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega}^3 + 3\beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2 + \frac{7}{\beta_t \lambda_{\omega}} + 17\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} \right) \frac{n L_m^2}{\lambda_{\omega}^2} \alpha_t^2 n_b \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \right) \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \left(\alpha_t^2 \left(\frac{L_l}{2} + \alpha_t \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 = & \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_t)] + (r_{t,0} + s_{t+1} (1 - (\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2))) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \omega_t - \omega^*(\theta_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 & + s_{t+1} \left((3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega}) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D) \right\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_{\omega}} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_{\omega} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_{\omega} M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_{\omega} L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_{\omega}} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_{\omega}^2} + \frac{\lambda_{\omega}^2 L_l}{2\lambda_{\omega}^2} + \frac{2L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_{\omega}^3} \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \times \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \right) \\
 & + \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla J(\theta_{t,k}) \right\|^2 \right]. \tag{75}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from (18) and the fact that $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right\|^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|a_i\|^2$. Let

$$s_t = \begin{cases} r_{t,0} + s_{t+1} (1 - (\beta_t \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_t^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2)) & \text{for } t \in \{0, T-1\} \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq T, \end{cases} \tag{76}$$

Solving the recursion in (77), we obtain

$$s_t = \sum_{i=t}^{T-1} r_{i,0} \prod_{j=t}^{i-1} (1 - (\beta_j \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_j^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2)), \text{ where } \sum_{i=t}^{t-1} r_{i,0} = 0 \text{ and } \prod_{j=t}^{t-1} (1 - (\beta_j \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_j^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2)) = 1. \tag{77}$$

We can see that

$$\forall t, s_t \leq s_0, \tag{78}$$

and

$$s_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} r_{i,0} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (1 - (\beta_j \lambda_{\omega} - \beta_j^2 \lambda_{\omega}^2))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \alpha_i n L_i^2 n_b \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{n_b}\right)^{n_b} - 1 \right) \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (1 - (\beta_j \lambda_\omega - \beta_j^2 \lambda_\omega^2)) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \frac{7}{4} \alpha_i n n_b L_i^2 \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (1 - (\beta_j \lambda_\omega - \beta_j^2 \lambda_\omega^2)) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \frac{7}{4} \alpha_i n n_b L_i^2 \exp \left(- \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (\beta_j \lambda_\omega - \beta_j^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \right). \tag{79}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from the fact that $\prod_{i=0}^n (1 - a_i) \leq \exp(-\sum_{i=0}^n a_i)$, $a_i \geq 0$ along with $(\beta_j \lambda_\omega - \beta_j^2 \lambda_\omega^2) \geq 0$ as $\forall t, \beta_t \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda_\omega \in (0, 0.5]$.

Applying (76) and (77) in (75), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &S_{t+1} \leq S_t \\
 &+ s_{t+1} \left((3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 &\quad + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_i^2 n_b (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^3} \right) \\
 &\quad \times \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \Bigg) \\
 &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right]. \tag{80}
 \end{aligned}$$

Summing (80) from $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &S_T \leq S_0 \\
 &+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_{t+1} \left((3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2 \right] \right. \\
 &\quad + \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D) \right\|^2 \right] \\
 &\quad + \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_i^2 n_b (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^3} \right) \\
 &\quad \times \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t) \right\|^2 \right] \Bigg) \\
 &+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t) \right\|^2 \right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right]. \tag{81}
 \end{aligned}$$

From (74), we obtain

$$S_T = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_T)] + s_T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_T) - \omega_T\|^2 \right] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_T)], \tag{82}$$

and

$$S_0 = \mathbb{E} [J(\theta_0)] + s_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\omega^*(\theta_0) - \omega_0\|^2 \right]. \tag{83}$$

where step (a) follows since $s_T = 0$ from (76).

Applying (82) and (83) in (81), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_T)] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_0)] + s_0 \mathbb{E}[\|\omega^*(\theta_0) - \omega_0\|^2] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_{t+1} (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_\omega M(\theta_t, \omega^*(\theta_t), D)\|^2] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_{t+1} \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\widehat{\nabla}_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D_t) - \nabla_\omega M(\theta_{t+1}, \omega_t, D)\right\|^2\right] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_{t+1} \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2}\right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^3}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega_t, D_t)\right\|^2\right] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\nabla_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D) - \widehat{\nabla}_\theta L(\theta_{t,k}, \omega^*(\theta_{t,k}), D_t)\right\|^2\right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2\right] \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_0)] + s_0 \mathbb{E}[\|\omega^*(\theta_0) - \omega_0\|^2] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_0 (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) (2nM_m^2 + 2\lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2) \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_0 \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) 4M_m^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{|(1-p)|D_t^i|}\right] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_0 \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2}\right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^3}\right) n n_b L_l^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha_t 16L_l^2 e^2 n_b^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{|p|D_t^i|}\right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2\right] \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[J(\theta_0)] + s_0 \mathbb{E}[\|\omega^*(\theta_0) - \omega_0\|^2] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_0 (3\beta_t^2 + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega) (2nM_m^2 + 2\lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2) \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(s_0 \left(3\beta_t^2 + \frac{8\beta_t}{\lambda_\omega} + 7\beta_t^3 \lambda_\omega\right) 4M_m^2 + \alpha_t 16L_l^2 e^2 n_b^2\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{|(1-p)|D_t^i|}\right] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_0 \alpha_t^2 \left(\beta_t^3 7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b + \beta_t^2 3L_m^2 n n_b + \frac{\beta_t 17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega} + \frac{\alpha_t 7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1+n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2}\right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\beta_t \lambda_\omega^3}\right) n n_b L_l^2 \\
 & \quad - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2\right]. \tag{84}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from (78), and Lemmas A.12, A.13, A.21 and A.19. The step (b) follows since $p \in (0.5, 1)$ from (17).

As $\forall t$, $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{T^{3/5}}$; $\beta_t = \frac{1}{T^{2/5}}$, from (79), we obtain

$$s_0 \leq \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \frac{7}{4} \alpha_i n n_b L_l^2 \exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (\beta_j \lambda_\omega - \beta_j^2 \lambda_\omega^2)\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \frac{7}{4} \frac{1}{T^{3/5}} n n_b L_l^2 \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \exp\left(-i \left(\frac{1}{T^{2/5}} \lambda_\omega - \frac{1}{T^{4/5}} \lambda_\omega^2\right)\right) \\
 &\leq \frac{7}{4} \frac{1}{T^{3/5}} n n_b L_l^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \exp\left(-i \left(\frac{1}{T^{2/5}} \lambda_\omega - \frac{1}{T^{4/5}} \lambda_\omega^2\right)\right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{7}{4} \frac{1}{T^{3/5}} n n_b L_l^2 \frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{1}{T^{2/5}} \lambda_\omega - \frac{1}{T^{4/5}} \lambda_\omega^2\right)\right)} \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{7}{4} \frac{1}{T^{3/5}} n n_b L_l^2 \frac{2}{\frac{1}{T^{2/5}} \lambda_\omega - \frac{1}{T^{4/5}} \lambda_\omega^2} \\
 &= \frac{7}{2} n n_b L_l^2 \frac{1}{T^{1/5} \lambda_\omega - \frac{1}{T^{1/5}} \lambda_\omega^2} \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{7}{2} n n_b L_l^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_\omega^2 T^{1/5}}. \tag{85}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the step (a) follows from the fact that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r^i = 1/1-r$, $|r| < 1$. The step (b) follows from the fact that $\exp(-x) \leq 1 - x/2$, $x \in [0, 1.59]$. The step (c) follows from the fact that $1/(ax^{1/5} - a^2/x^{1/5}) \leq 1/a^2 x^{1/5}$, $x \geq 1$, $a \in (0, 0.5]$ along with $T \geq 1$ and $\lambda_\omega \in (0, 0.5]$ from (13).

Let $J^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} J(\theta)$. From (19) we have $\omega_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and from Assumption 3.6, we have $\omega^*(\theta_0) \leq M_{\omega^*}^2$. We also have $\forall t$, $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{T^{3/5}}$; $\beta_t = \frac{1}{T^{2/5}}$. Then, applying (85) and in (84), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{1}{2T^{3/5}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \leq J(\theta_0) - J^* \\
 &+ \frac{21n n_b L_l^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} (n M_m^2 + \lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2) + \frac{7n n_b L_l^2 M_{\omega^*}^2}{2\lambda_\omega^2 T^{1/5}} + \frac{49n n_b L_l^2}{\lambda_\omega T^{2/5}} (n M_m^2 + \lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2) \\
 &+ \left(\frac{98n n_b L_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega T^{7/5}} + \frac{42n n_b L_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega T} + \frac{16L_l^2 n_b (7n M_m^2 / \lambda_\omega^3 + e^2 n_b)}{T^{3/5}} \right) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|(1-p)D_t^i|} \right] \\
 &+ \frac{7n^2 n_b^2 L_l^4}{2\lambda_\omega^2} \left(\frac{7\lambda_\omega L_m^2 n n_b}{T^{8/5}} + \frac{3L_m^2 n n_b}{T^{6/5}} + \frac{7n^2 L_m^2 L_l^2 n_b (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2 T} + \frac{17L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega T^{4/5}} + \frac{\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b}{2\lambda_\omega^2 T^{2/5}} + \frac{7L_m^2 n n_b}{\lambda_\omega^3} \right). \tag{86}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = t) = 1/T$ and $\mathbb{P}(R_2 = k) = 1/n_b$, from (86) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{R_1, R_2})\|^2 \right] &= \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right]}{T n_b} = \frac{2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_b-1} \frac{1}{2T^{3/5}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla J(\theta_{t,k})\|^2 \right]}{T^{2/5} n_b} \\
 &\leq \frac{2(J(\theta_0) - J^*)}{n_b T^{2/5}} + \frac{7L_l^2 n (7L_l^2 L_m^2 n^2 n_b^2 + 6\lambda_\omega^3 (M_m^2 n + \lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2))}{\lambda_\omega^5 T^{2/5}} \\
 &+ \left(\frac{196n L_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega T^{4/5}} + \frac{84n L_l^2 M_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2 T^{2/5}} + \frac{32L_l^2}{\lambda_\omega^3} (7n M_m^2 + \lambda_\omega^3 e^2 n_b) \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|(1-p)D_{R_1}^i|} \right] \\
 &+ \frac{7n L_l^2 M_{\omega^*}^2}{\lambda_\omega^2 T^{3/5}} + \frac{7L_l^2 n (n n_b L_l^2 (\lambda_\omega^2 L_l + 2L_m^2 n n_b) + 28\lambda_\omega^3 (M_m^2 n + 28\lambda_\omega^2 M_{\omega^*}^2))}{2\lambda_\omega^4 T^{4/5}} \\
 &+ \frac{7n^3 n_b^2 L_l^4 L_m^2}{\lambda_\omega^2} \left(\frac{7\lambda_\omega}{T^2} + \frac{3}{T^{8/5}} + \frac{7L_l^2 n (1 + n_b)}{4\lambda_\omega^2 T^{7/5}} + \frac{17}{\lambda_\omega T^{6/5}} \right). \tag{87}
 \end{aligned}$$

□