

Linearly Convergent Mixup Learning

Gakuto Obi[†], Ayato Saito[‡], Yuto Sasaki[‡] and Tsuyoshi Kato[‡]

[†]Graduate School of Informatics [‡]Faculty of Informatics

Gunma University, Japan

Email: katotsu.cs@gunma-u.ac.jp

Abstract— Learning in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) such as the support vector machine has been recognized as a promising technique. It continues to be highly effective and competitive in numerous prediction tasks, particularly in settings where there is a shortage of training data or computational limitations exist. These methods are especially valued for their ability to work with small datasets and their interpretability. To address the issue of limited training data, mixup data augmentation, widely used in deep learning, has remained challenging to apply to learning in RKHS due to the generation of intermediate class labels. Although gradient descent methods handle these labels effectively, dual optimization approaches are typically not directly applicable. In this study, we present two novel algorithms that extend to a broader range of binary classification models. Unlike gradient-based approaches, our algorithms do not require hyperparameters like learning rates, simplifying their implementation and optimization. Both the number of iterations to converge and the computational cost per iteration scale linearly with respect to the dataset size. The numerical experiments demonstrate that our algorithms achieve faster convergence to the optimal solution compared to gradient descent approaches, and that mixup data augmentation consistently improves the predictive performance across various loss functions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Techniques based on learning in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS), including support vector machines (SVM) and kernel methods, have gained recognition as powerful approaches. These methods remain highly effective and continue to outperform in various prediction tasks, especially in situations where training data is limited or computational resources are restricted (e.g. [1]).

As a method to overcome the issue of insufficient training data, *mixup* data augmentation is often used in the context of deep learning [2]. However, the mixup cannot be applied in an uncomplicated manner to some learning algorithms for kernel methods. Using mixup augmentation generates intermediate class labels. When gradient descent-based optimization algorithms are applied to the primal problem, intermediate class labels do not pose an algorithmic difficulty. However, it is not straightforward to apply the conventional optimization algorithms to the dual problem. Mochida et al. [3] found that in the case of SVM, optimization to the dual problem is possible with the classical theories as an exception, even though these theories are not applicable in a direct manner.

In this paper, we introduce two new algorithms applicable to a broader range of learning models. The two new algorithms are based on the stochastic dual coordinate ascent algorithm (SDCA) [4] that is a framework to solve the dual problem. Both algorithms inherit the favorable properties of SDCA:

they do not require any hyperparameters, such as learning rates, and the number of iterations required to converge to the optimal solution and the computational cost per iteration are both guaranteed to scale linearly with respect to the dataset size. Additionally, numerical experiments confirmed that using these two algorithms developed in this study led to faster convergence to the optimal solution than classical gradient descent-based methods, and that mixup data augmentation improved predictive performance across various loss function.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we first review the existing research on mixup and highlight the significance of this study. Section III formalizes the learning problem in RKHS with the mixup data augmentation, which is the focus of this study. Section IV demonstrates that the maximization problem does not become trivial when taking the dual problem in a naive way. In response, the two solution methods developed in this study are presented in Sections V and VI, respectively. Section VII reports the results of experiments using real-world data, investigating the impact of the mixup data augmentation on the predictive performance. Additionally, we demonstrate the efficiency of the two algorithms developed in this study. The final section concludes this study.

II. RELATED WORK

The success of mixup [2], a well-known simple data augmentation technique, has led to various extensions and applications across different domains including computer vision [5]–[7], facial expression recognition [8], natural language processing [9], and time series forecasting [10]. Several studies provided theoretical insights into the effectiveness of the mixup technique [11]–[14].

However, there has been little research contributing to optimization algorithms for performing mixup learning in RKHS. To the best of our knowledge, the only exception is the work by Mochida et al. [3]. They applied mixup data augmentation to the training of SVM. Learning problems in RKHS such as SVM are usually expressed as a convex formulation, and for numerical stability, approaches based on solving the dual problem are generally preferred [15]–[22]. However, a technical challenge lies in the dual function that contains the convex conjugate of the mixup loss function. This convex conjugate is expressed by an infimal convolution, and generally, computing the value of an infimal convolution requires numerical searching. In contrast, Mochida et al. [3] showed that, in the case of hinge loss used with SVMs, the

infimal convolution has a closed form. This was an exception in the broader context of learning models. When training other kernel methods under the mixup setting, the issue of the convex conjugate has not been addressed so far. In this paper, we propose new solutions to address this issue.

III. PRIMAL PROBLEM

In this section, we formulate the learning problem that arises when the number of examples is increased using the mixup method [2]. The mixup method randomly selects two examples from the training dataset, (\mathbf{x}_i^o, y_i^o) and $(\mathbf{x}_j^o, y_j^o) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{\pm 1\}$, and uses a value $\eta \in [0, 1]$ sampled from a Beta distribution. Then, the two examples are combined to create a new example by linearly interpolating both the features and labels:

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}} = (1 - \eta)\mathbf{x}_i^o + \eta\mathbf{x}_j^o, y_{\text{new}} = (1 - \eta)y_i^o + \eta y_j^o. \quad (1)$$

This results in a new label that is not strictly binary but lies between the two binary class labels ± 1 , which is a key characteristic in the mixup data setting. The augmentation process can be repeated to generate additional examples and enhance the training dataset.

We wish to determine a binary classifier $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from the dataset with continuous class labels $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ generated with some data augmentation method.

In order to learn a predictor f from mixup data, the mixup loss function defined as

$$\phi_{\text{mup}}(s; y) := \frac{1+y}{2}\phi_0(s) + \frac{1-y}{2}\phi_0(-s) \quad (2)$$

is used, where the function $\phi_0 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a standard loss function used without intermediate labels (e.g., a binary class label). Examples of the loss functions ϕ_0 include the binary cross entropy (BCE) function, the smoothed hinge function, and the quadratic hinge function. Their definitions are given in Appendix A. Suppose that the loss function ϕ_0 is monotonically decreasing, $\phi_0(0) > 0$, and $1/\gamma_{\text{sm-smooth}}$ with $\gamma_{\text{sm}} > 0$ [23], and the value of the convex conjugate can be computed in constant time.

The core idea of kernel methods is to find a function f in the RKHS \mathcal{H}_{κ} , where the function f minimizes the regularized empirical risk. The function $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a positive definite kernel such as the RBF kernel and polynomial kernel. We employ the standard regularized empirical risk defined as:

$$R[f] := \frac{\lambda}{2}\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa}}^2 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{\text{mup}}(f(\mathbf{x}_i); y_i), \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization constant. The first term $\frac{\lambda}{2}\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa}}^2$ is called the regularization term that helps control the complexity of the model to avoid overfitting, where $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa}}$ is the norm of f in the RKHS. The second term in (3) measures how well the model f fits the training examples using the mixup loss function.

For more complex models like deep learning models, gradient descent is typically the only feasible optimization method, although it requires careful tuning of step sizes. In contrast,

kernel methods benefit from optimization algorithms like SDCA [4], which solve the dual formulation of the problem. This is a more efficient method in the case of kernel-based learning as it does not require hyperparameter tuning (like step size adjustment in gradient descent).

When applying the mixup augmentation in RKHS, technical challenges lie in a naïve dual problem. The straightforward approach may not work efficiently in such a problem in the presence of the mixup data augmentation, which adds complexity to the optimization process. The next section investigates the details of this issue and explains why optimization becomes more complicated in the mixup data augmentation setting.

IV. NAÏVE DUAL PROBLEM AND ITS CHALLENGE

If the regularized empirical risk function is convex, solving the dual problem instead of the primal problem is advantageous. One of the advantages is that the dual variables offer a way to avoid storing the infinite-dimensional vector f . The following function is a standard choice for the dual function of the regularized empirical risk:

$$D_0(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) := -\frac{\lambda}{2}\|f_{0,\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa}}^2 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{\text{mup}}^*(-\alpha_i; y_i) \quad (4)$$

where

$$f_{0,\boldsymbol{\alpha}} := \frac{1}{\lambda n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \cdot); \quad (5)$$

Therein, $\phi_{\text{mup}}^*(\cdot; y_i) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ represents the convex conjugate of the mixup loss function $\phi_{\text{mup}}(\cdot; y_i)$. If the dual variable vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_*$ that maximizes the dual function is found successfully, the primal variable optimal to the primal problem is obtained by $f_* = f_{0,\boldsymbol{\alpha}_*}$.

The challenge in solving the dual problem comes from the fact that the convex conjugate of the mixup loss for $i \in [n]$ such that $|y_i| < 1$ can be expressed as an infimal convolution [24]:

$$\phi_{\text{mup}}^*(-\alpha_i; y_i) = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1+y_i}{2}\phi_0^*\left(\frac{2u}{1+y_i}\right) + \frac{1-y_i}{2}\phi_0^*\left(\frac{2(\alpha_i+u)}{1-y_i}\right) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

The infimal convolution requires a computationally expensive numerical operation in most cases even if each of ϕ_0^* can be computed with a low computational cost. As a result, using this in the dual problem (such as in SDCA) introduces additional complexity. In what follows, we shall describe how this convex conjugate complicates optimization when SDCA is applied straightforwardly.

Consider an iterative algorithm that determines the value of the dual variable vector at the t th iteration, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)} := [\alpha_1^{(t)}, \dots, \alpha_n^{(t)}]^\top$, and let $f^{(t)} := f_{0,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}}$. Denote the primal and dual objective errors, respectively, by:

$$h_p^{(t)} := R[f^{(t)}] - R[f_*], \quad h_D^{(t)} := D_0(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_*) - D_0(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}). \quad (7)$$

Lemma 1: Consider a randomized algorithm that computes $\alpha^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from $\alpha^{(t-1)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that there exists a constant β such that $0 < \beta < 1$ and

$$\beta \cdot \max \left\{ h_p^{(t-1)}, h_D^{(t-1)} \right\} \leq \mathbb{E}[h_D^{(t)}] - h_D^{(t-1)}. \quad (8)$$

Then, for any constant $\epsilon_P > 0$, it holds that $\mathbb{E} \left[h_p^{(t)} \right] \leq \epsilon_P$ for

$$t \geq \frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(\frac{h_D^{(0)}}{\beta \epsilon_P} \right). \quad (9)$$

Indeed, SDCA guarantees the inequality (8) with $\beta^{-1} = O(n)$, suggesting that the required number of iterations is linear with respect to the dataset size if the logarithmic term is regarded as a constant.

At each iteration t of SDCA, a single example $i \in [n]$ is selected at random, and the corresponding dual variable α_i is updated with the other dual variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n$ fixed. The updated value at the t th iteration can be expressed as $\alpha^{(t)} = \alpha^{(t-1)} + \Delta \alpha_i^{(t-1)} e_i$ where $\Delta \alpha_i^{(t-1)} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the difference from the i th dual variable in the previous iteration, and e_i is the unit vector with i th entry one. It is ideal to determine the value of $\Delta \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$ by maximizing

$$J_t^0(\Delta \alpha_i^{(t-1)}) := D_0(\alpha^{(t-1)} + \Delta \alpha_i^{(t-1)} e_i) - D_0(\alpha^{(t-1)}). \quad (10)$$

However, this ideal maximization usually complicates computation. Instead, the lower bound, say $J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta)$, is maximized: for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$,

$$J_t^0(\eta q_{i,t}) \geq J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta) := \frac{\eta F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}}{n} + \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2 \eta}{2n} \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\bar{s}_t} \right) \quad (11)$$

where $z_i^{(t-1)} := f^{(t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, $u_i^{(t-1)} := -\nabla \phi_{\text{mup}}(z_i^{(t-1)}; y_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{i,t} &:= u_i^{(t-1)} - \alpha_i^{(t-1)}, \quad K_{i,i} := \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i), \\ F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)} &:= \phi_{\text{mup}}(z_i^{(t-1)}; y_i) + \phi_{\text{mup}}^*(-\alpha_i^{(t-1)}; y_i) \\ &+ \alpha_i^{(t-1)} z_i^{(t-1)}, \quad \bar{s}_t := \frac{\lambda n \gamma_{\text{sm}}}{K_{i,i} + \lambda n \gamma_{\text{sm}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Therein, $\nabla \phi_{\text{mup}}(z; y)$ denotes the derivative of $\phi_{\text{mup}}(z; y)$ with respect to z . The lower bound forms a simple parabola, making the line search quite simple:

$$\eta_{\text{van},t} := \min \left\{ 1, \bar{s}_t \cdot \frac{F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2}{\gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2} \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Thus, the vanilla SDCA includes the update rule that determines the step size optimal to the introduced parabola function. This eliminates the need for hyperparameter tuning, enabling numerically stable optimization.

The vanilla SDCA applied to maximizing $D_0(\alpha)$ is summarized in Algorithm 1. When this update rule is implemented in practice, the dual objective error decreases geometrically with $\beta^{-1} = O(n)$, ensuring the linear convergence to the minimum. However, there is a significant obstacle to executing this update

Algorithm 1: MIXUPSDCA_{naïve}.

```

1 begin
2   Choose  $\alpha^{(0)} \in \text{dom}(-D_0)$ ;
3    $f^{(0)} := \frac{1}{\lambda n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^{(0)} \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \cdot)$ ;
4   for  $t := 1$  to  $T$  do
5     Select  $i$  at random from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ;
6      $z_i^{(t-1)} := f^{(t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ;
7     Compute  $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$  and  $\bar{s}_t$  by (12);
8     Use (13) to compute  $\eta_{\text{van},t}$ ;
9      $\alpha^{(t)} := \alpha^{(t-1)} + q_{i,t} \eta_{\text{van},t} e_i$ ;
10     $f^{(t)} := f^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{\lambda n} \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \cdot) q_{i,t} \eta_{\text{van},t}$ ;
11  end
12 end
```

rule. The variable $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$ involves the convex conjugate of the mixup loss function, and its computation requires a numerical search method, as previously discussed. To overcome this obstacle, the authors have identified two approaches. Each approach shall be introduced in a separate section that follows.

V. APPROXIMATION APPROACH

As discussed in the previous section, handling the infimal convolutions poses a challenge for maximizing the dual function $D_0(\alpha)$. The infimal convolution requires numerical search to compute the variable $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$, which appears in the step-size update rule of the vanilla SDCA. This section presents a solution by approximating the computation of $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$. The algorithm introduced in this section is capable of performing this approximation while guaranteeing the existence of the coefficient β satisfying (8).

The approximation approach is described in Algorithm 3. As explained in the previous section, the step size in vanilla SDCA is determined by the vertex of the parabola $J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta)$, where $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$ is the coefficient of that parabola. Replacing the coefficient $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$ with a smaller value \tilde{F}_t does not exceed the parabola for any $\eta \in [0, 1]$. The approximation algorithm introduced here finds a lower value \tilde{F}_t that closely approximates $F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}$ while maintaining the property of linear convergence.

For the case of $y_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, it is straightforward to compute the value of $F_i^{(t-1)}$. Let $\tilde{F}_t := F_i^{(t-1)}$ in this case. Hereinafter, we shall focus on the case that $|y_i| < 1$. In this case, the value of \tilde{F}_t is determined by

$$\tilde{F}_t = \phi_{\text{mup}}(z_i^{(t-1)}; y_i) - \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\zeta}_t + \alpha_i^{(t-1)} z_i^{(t-1)} - \phi_{\text{mup}}(\tilde{\zeta}_t; y_i) \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ are computed in Algorithm 2. These $\tilde{\zeta}_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$\tilde{\zeta}_t = -\nabla \phi_i^*(-\tilde{\alpha}) \text{ and } \phi_i^*(-\tilde{\alpha}) \leq \phi_i^*(-\alpha_i^{(t-1)}). \quad (15)$$

The following lemma is used to prove the linear convergence of this approximation approach.

Algorithm 2: Determine \tilde{F}_t .

```
1 begin
2   Let  $\alpha_i^\diamond := -\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(0; y_i)$ ;
3   if  $\alpha_i^\diamond < \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$  then
4     Find  $\tilde{\zeta}_t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that
5      $\tilde{\zeta}_t \leq 0$  and  $-\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(\tilde{\zeta}_t; y_i) \leq \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$ 
6   else
7     Find  $\tilde{\zeta}_t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that
8      $\tilde{\zeta}_t \geq 0$  and  $-\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(\tilde{\zeta}_t; y_i) \geq \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$ 
9   end
10  Let  $\tilde{\alpha} := -\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(\tilde{\zeta}_t; y_i)$ ; Use (14) to compute  $\tilde{F}_t$ ;
11 end
```

Lemma 2: Algorithm 2 ensures the inequality: $\tilde{F}_t \leq F_i^{(t-1)}$.

Our implementation of Line 4 and Line 6 that determine the value of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ is described as follows. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_i &:= \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R} \mid \phi_{\text{mup}}(\zeta; y_i) \leq n\phi_0(0)\}, \\ b_{u,i} &:= \inf \mathcal{L}_i \text{ and } b_{\ell,i} := \sup \mathcal{L}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Let $\alpha_i^\diamond := -\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(0; y_i)$ as defined in Algorithm 2. There are two cases: (i) $\alpha_i^{(t-1)} < \alpha_i^\diamond$ and (ii) $\alpha_i^\diamond \leq \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$. For the first case, the value of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ is determined by

$$\tilde{\zeta}_t := \min \left\{ \zeta \in \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_{p,i} \mid \alpha_i^{(t-1)} \leq -\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(\zeta; y_i) \right\} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_{p,i} := \left\{ \exp\left(\frac{k}{n}(4 + \log b_{\ell,i}) - 4\right) \mid k \in \{0\} \cup [n] \right\}. \quad (18)$$

For the second case (i.e. (ii) $\alpha_i^\diamond \leq \alpha_i^{(t-1)}$), the value of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ is set to

$$\tilde{\zeta}_t := \max \left\{ \zeta \in \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_{n,i} \mid -\nabla\phi_{\text{mup}}(\zeta; y_i) \leq \alpha_i^{(t-1)} \right\} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_{n,i} := \left\{ -\exp\left(\frac{k}{n}(4 + \log(-b_{u,i})) - 4\right) \mid k \in \{0\} \cup [n] \right\}. \quad (20)$$

The step size for this approximation approach is determined by

$$\eta_{\text{approx},t} := \min \left\{ 1, \bar{s}_t \cdot \max \left\{ 1, \frac{\tilde{F}_t + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\text{sm}}q_{i,t}^2}{\gamma_{\text{sm}}q_{i,t}^2} \right\} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

With this implementation for Line 4 and Line 6, Algorithm 2 ensures that the time taken for each iteration is proportional to the size of the dataset, maintaining linear scalability.

The approximation approach also guarantees that the number of iterations scales in a linear fashion with respect to the dataset size.

Algorithm 3: MIXUPSDCA_{approx} for maximizing $D_0(\alpha)$.

```
1 begin
2   Choose  $\alpha^{(0)} \in \text{dom}(-D_0)$ ;
3    $f^{(0)} := \frac{1}{\lambda n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^{(0)} \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \cdot)$ ;
4   for  $t := 1$  to  $T$  do
5     Select  $i$  at random from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ;
6      $z_i^{(t-1)} := f^{(t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ;
7     Compute  $\bar{s}_t$  by (12);
8     Run Algorithm 2 to compute  $\tilde{F}_t$ ;
9     Use (13) to compute  $\eta_{\text{van},t}$ ;
10     $\alpha^{(t)} := \alpha^{(t-1)} + q_{i,t}\eta_{\text{van},t}e_i$ ;
11     $f^{(t)} := f^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{\lambda n} \kappa(\mathbf{x}_i, \cdot) q_{i,t}\eta_{\text{van},t}$ ;
12  end
13 end
```

Theorem 1: Let $R_{\text{mx}} := \max_{i \in [n]} \sqrt{K_{i,i}}$. Using the approximation algorithm, $\mathbb{E} \left[h_p^{(t)} \right] \leq \epsilon_p$ holds for iteration t such that (9) is satisfied by

$$\beta^{-1} = n + \frac{R_{\text{mx}}^2}{\lambda\gamma_{\text{sm}}}. \quad (22)$$

VI. DECOMPOSITION APPROACH

This section provides a second approach to tackle the issues caused by the mixup loss in the dual problem. The dual function in (4), denoted as D_0 , is not unique in general: for a given primal objective function, there can be an infinite number of corresponding dual functions. Choosing which dual function to use impacts the ease of optimization. This section introduces a new dual function \tilde{D} that is an alternative choice to D_0 . The new dual function \tilde{D} is obtained by rearranging the regularized empirical risk:

$$R[f] = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_\kappa}^2 + \frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\phi}_i(\sigma_i f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i \in [n], \quad \sigma_i &:= 1, \quad \sigma_{i+n} := -1, \quad y_{i+n} := -y_i, \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+n} &:= \mathbf{x}_i, \quad \mathcal{I} := \{i \in [2n] \mid 1 + y_i > 0\}, \quad \tilde{n} := |\mathcal{I}|, \\ \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_i &:= (1 + y_i)\phi_0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Equation (23) is derived by substituting the definition of the loss function into the regularized empirical risk. In (23), the losses are decomposed into at most two per example. Notice that this reformulation retains a form of a typical regularized empirical risk minimization problem, where the loss for \tilde{n} training examples $(\mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \{\pm 1\}$ is evaluated with $\tilde{\phi}_i$, and no intermediate labels are involved. The dual function to (23) is given by

$$\tilde{D}(\alpha) := -\frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| \tilde{f}_\alpha \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_\kappa}^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\phi}_j^*(-\alpha_j). \quad (25)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_\alpha := \frac{1}{\lambda \tilde{n}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_j \sigma_j \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{j(\text{mod } n)}, \cdot) \quad (26)$$

The smoothness of $\tilde{\phi}_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ affects the convergence speed of this decomposition approach.

Lemma 3: Function $\tilde{\phi}_i$ is $2/\gamma_{\text{sm}}$ -smooth, and its convex conjugate can be computed in constant time.

This property ensures the efficiency of direct application of the vanilla SDCA to maximizing the alternative dual function \tilde{D} without the approximation approach described in the previous section.

Theorem 2: Let $R_{\text{mx}} := \max_{i \in [n]} \sqrt{K_{i,i}}$. If we apply the vanilla SDCA to maximizing $\tilde{D}(\alpha)$, then the inequality $\mathbb{E} [h_{\text{p}}^{(t)}] \leq \epsilon_{\text{p}}$ holds for iteration t such that (9) is satisfied by

$$\beta^{-1} = 2n + \frac{2R_{\text{mx}}^2}{\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}}}. \quad (27)$$

TABLE I
AUROC FOR TOXITY PREDICTION.

	Neurotoxicity		Cardiotoxicity	
	Classical	Mixup	Classical	Mixup
Smoothed hinge loss	0.881	0.909	0.818	0.857
BCE loss	0.888	0.923	0.832	0.902
Quadratic hinge loss	0.685	0.797	0.643	0.862

TABLE II
RUNTIMES UNTIL THE PRIMAL OBJECTIVE ERROR REACHES BELOW A THRESHOLD OF 10^{-5} . THE UNIT IS SECONDS.

	magic04	bank	spambase
MIXUPSDCA _{naive}	$7.25 \cdot 10^2$	$2.36 \cdot 10^2$	$4.36 \cdot 10^2$
MIXUPSDCA _{approx}	$2.52 \cdot 10^2$	$1.02 \cdot 10^2$	$1.24 \cdot 10^2$
MIXUPSDCA _{decomp}	$5.98 \cdot 10^2$	$2.32 \cdot 10^2$	$2.57 \cdot 10^2$
SGD with $\eta = 10^{-1}$	N/A	N/A	N/A
SGD with $\eta = 10^{-2}$	N/A	$1.35 \cdot 10^3$	$3.53 \cdot 10^2$
SGD with $\eta = 10^{-3}$	$2.69 \cdot 10^2$	$4.51 \cdot 10^2$	N/A
SGD with $\eta = 10^{-4}$	N/A	N/A	N/A

VII. EXPERIMENTS

A. Prediction performance

We examined the predictive performance for mixup learning on toxicity prediction from gene expressions [25], [26]. The experimental conditions followed the methodology outlined in [3]. Specifically, we used gene expression data obtained by exposing stem cells to 24 different chemicals, as used by Yamane et al. [26]. The neurotoxicity and cardiotoxicity statuses of these 24 chemicals are already known. Based on this, we prepared two benchmark datasets for binary classification.

For neurotoxicity, there were 13 positive chemicals and 11 negative chemicals, while for cardiotoxicity, there were 15 positive chemicals and nine negative chemicals.

Prediction performance was evaluated using leave-one-out cross-validation, where one of the 24 chemical substances was used as the test set, and the remaining 23 were used for training. The 23 training examples were augmented using the mixup data augmentation, increasing the number of examples by 50. Three types of loss functions were employed: smoothed hinge loss, BCE loss, and squared hinge loss. The RBF kernel was used for the kernel function. The regularization parameter λ and the kernel width of the RBF kernel were optimized by performing another leave-one-out cross-validation on the 23 training examples.

The prediction performance was assessed using the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) curve. Since the data augmentation using mixup involves randomization, the results vary across trials. Therefore, the average AUROC from five trials was used for evaluation. The prediction performance for neurotoxicity and cardiotoxicity is presented in Table I. For both types of toxicity, and for all loss functions used, mixup was found to improve the prediction performance. For both neurotoxicity and cardiotoxicity, BCE loss achieved higher AUROC values than smoothed hinge loss. These results suggest that mixup enhances generalization across various machine learning models.

B. Runtime

To evaluate the convergence speed of the new algorithms to the optimal solution, we conducted numerical experiments. We here denote by MIXUPSDCA_{naive}, MIXUPSDCA_{approx} and MIXUPSDCA_{decomp} the algorithms presented in Sections IV, V and VI, respectively. We compared the two new algorithms with the stochastic gradient descent (SGD). Four step sizes for SGD were tested: $\eta = 10^{-4}$, 10^{-3} , 10^{-2} , 10^{-1} . We employed BCE as the loss function. The datasets used in these experiments include magic04, bank, and spambase. Each dataset contains 10,000, 4,532, and 4,601 examples, respectively. For each dataset, 5,000 examples were added using the mixup data augmentation. Four values of the regularization parameter were explored ($\lambda = 10^0/n$, $10^{-1}/n$, $10^{-2}/n$) and the total runtime was measured. If the primal objective error did not converge to 10^{-5} within 5,000 epochs, the optimization algorithm was terminated.

Table II displays the runtimes. Therein, N/A indicates that the primal objective error did not reach 10^{-5} for any setting of the regularization parameter within 5,000 epochs. The approximation approach converged the most rapidly across all datasets. For the three datasets, the decomposition approach took 2.37, 2.22, 2.07 times longer than the approximation approach. As proven in Theorem 2, the increase in the required number of iterations led to this result. Solving the naïve dual problem was slower than the approximation approach due to its dependence on numerical search for computing the convex conjugate. For SGD, the step size that completed convergence within 5,000 epochs varied depending on the dataset. For the

bank dataset, learning converged within 5,000 epochs when $\eta = 10^{-2}$ and $\eta = 10^{-3}$, but for other step sizes, the primal objective error failed to reach 10^{-5} within the 5,000 epochs. For the magic04 and spambase datasets, learning was completed within 5,000 epochs only when $\eta = 10^{-3}$ and $\eta = 10^{-2}$, respectively. For any step size of SGD, the runtime was slower than that of the approximation approach.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

This paper investigates the optimization problem of learning from a mixup-augmented dataset in RKHS and presents two novel algorithms: the approximation method and the decomposition method. Both algorithms are guaranteed to converge linearly to the minimum value. We empirically showed that mixup improves generalization performance in learning binary classification problems on RKHS. Furthermore, numerical experiments demonstrated that the approximation method converges more rapidly than gradient descent-based approaches and the naïve algorithm.

While this paper primarily addresses binary classification, future work remains to analyze the optimization of mixup data augmentation in other machine learning tasks. Moreover, the application of mixup learning to federated learning, especially extensions that strengthen privacy and security, is an intriguing direction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants 22K04372 and 23K28245 and JST ASTEP JPMJTR234E.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Lu, D. Quo, A. B. Garakani, K. Liu, A. May, A. Bellet, L. Fan, M. Collins, B. Kingsbury, M. Picheny, and F. Sha, "A comparison between deep neural nets and kernel acoustic models for speech recognition," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, Mar. 2016, pp. 5070–5074, doi: 10.1109/ICASSP.2016.7472643.
- [2] H. Zhang, M. Cisse, Y. N. Dauphin, and D. Lopez-Paz, "mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [3] R. Mochida, M. Nakajima, H. Ono, T. Ando, and T. Kato, "Mixup svm learning for compound toxicity prediction using human pluripotent stem cells," *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. E107.D, no. 12, pp. 1542–1545, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1587/transinf.2024edl8040.
- [4] S. Shalev-Shwartz and T. Zhang, "Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 567–599, Feb. 2013.
- [5] S. Yun, D. Han, S. J. Oh, S. Chun, J. Choe, and Y. Yoo, "Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features," *arXiv: 1905.04899*, 2019.
- [6] Y. Sun, K. Qi, Y. Zhou, and Y. Qi, "Strip-cutmix for person re-identification," in *2023 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [7] D. Hendrycks, N. Mu, E. D. Cubuk, B. Zoph, J. Gilmer, and B. Lakshminarayanan, "Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- [8] A. Psaroudakis and D. Kollias, "Mixaugment & mixup: Augmentation methods for facial expression recognition," in *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*. IEEE, Jun. 2022, pp. 2366–2374, doi: 10.1109/cvprw56347.2022.00264.
- [9] L. Sun, C. Xia, W. Yin, T. Liang, P. Yu, and L. He, "Mixup-transformer: Dynamic data augmentation for nlp tasks," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, 2020, doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.305.
- [10] Y. Zhou, L. You, W. Zhu, and P. Xu, "Improving time series forecasting with mixup data augmentation," in *2nd International Workshop on Machine Learning for Irregular Time Series (MLITS2023)*, ser. -, vol. -. -, Sept 2023, pp. -, <https://www.amazon.science/publications/improving-time-series-forecasting-with-mixup-data-augmentation>.
- [11] L. Carratino, M. Cissé, R. Jenatton, and J.-P. Vert, "On mixup regularization," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 325, pp. 1–31, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/20-1385.html>
- [12] Y. Zou, V. Verma, S. Mittal, W. H. Tang, H. Pham, J. Kannala, Y. Bengio, A. Solin, and K. Kawaguchi, "MixupE: Understanding and improving mixup from directional derivative perspective," in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, R. J. Evans and I. Shpitser, Eds., vol. 216. PMLR, 31 Jul–04 Aug 2023, pp. 2597–2607.
- [13] L. Zhang, Z. Deng, K. Kawaguchi, A. Ghorbani, and J. Zou, "How does mixup help with robustness and generalization?" *arXiv: 2010.04819*, 2021.
- [14] S. Thulasidasan, G. Chennupati, J. A. Bilmes, T. Bhattacharya, and S. Michalak, "On mixup training: Improved calibration and predictive uncertainty for deep neural networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, Eds. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019, pp. –.
- [15] Z. Shao and A. Devarakonda, "Scalable dual coordinate descent for kernel methods," *arXiv: 2406.18001*, 2024.
- [16] Q. Lei, I. E.-H. Yen, C. Yuan Wu, I. S. Dhillon, and P. Ravikumar, "Doubly greedy primal-dual coordinate descent for sparse empirical risk minimization," in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, Eds., vol. 70. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017, pp. 2034–2042.
- [17] D. Chu, R. Lu, J. Li, X. Yu, C. Zhang, and Q. Tao, "Optimizing top- k multiclass SVM via semismooth newton algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 29, no. 12, pp. 6264–6275, Dec. 2018.
- [18] K. Tran, S. Hosseini, L. Xiao, T. Finley, and M. Bilenko, "Scaling up stochastic dual coordinate ascent," in *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ser. KDD' 15. ACM, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1145/2783258.2783412.
- [19] Y. Takada, R. Mochida, M. Nakajima, S. suke Kadoya, D. Sano, and T. Kato, "Stochastic dual coordinate ascent for learning sign constrained linear predictors," *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. E107.D, no. 12, pp. 1493–1503, Dec. 2024, doi:10.1587/transinf.2023edp7139.
- [20] K. Tajima, K. Tsuchida, E. R. R. Zara, N. Ohta, and T. Kato, "Learning sign-constrained support vector machines," in *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, Jan. 2021, doi:10.1109/icpr48806.2021.9412786.
- [21] K. Tajima, Y. Hirohashi, E. R. R. Zara, and T. Kato, "Frank-wolfe algorithm for learning svm-type multi-category classifiers," in *Proceedings of SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM21)*. Virginia, USA: SIAM, April 2021, pp. –.
- [22] T. Kato and Y. Hirohashi, "Learning weighted top- k support vector machine," in *Proceedings of The Eleventh Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, W. S. Lee and T. Suzuki, Eds., vol. 101. Nagoya, Japan: PMLR, 17–19 Nov 2019, pp. 774–789.
- [23] J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty, *Fundamentals of Convex Analysis*. Springer, 2001.
- [24] S. Thomas, *The operation of infimal convolution*. Instytut Matematyczny Polskiej Akademi Nauk, 1996.
- [25] J. Yamane, S. Aburatani, S. Imanishi, H. Akanuma, R. Nagano, T. Kato, H. Sone, S. Ohsako, and W. Fujibuchi, "Prediction of developmental chemical toxicity based on gene networks of human embryonic stem cells," *Nucleic Acids Research*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 5515–5528, July 2016.
- [26] J. Yamane, T. Wada, H. Otsuki, K. Inomata, M. Suzuki, T. Hisaki, S. Sekine, H. Kouzuki, K. Kobayashi, H. Sone, J. K. Yamashita,

M. Osawa, M. K. Saito, and W. Fujibuchi, "StemPanTox: A fast and wide-target drug assessment system for tailor-made safety evaluations using personalized iPS cells," *iScience*, vol. 25, no. 7, p. 104538, Jul. 2022, doi:10.1016/j.isci.2022.104538.

[27] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970.

APPENDIX A SMOOTH LOSS FUNCTIONS

This section gives some examples of the loss functions ϕ_0 . The binary cross-entropy (BCE) loss

$$\phi_{\text{bce}}(s) := \log(1 + \exp(-s)), \quad (28)$$

is an example of the function ϕ_0 . This loss function is calculated based on the log of the sigmoid function. The smooth hinge loss function

$$\phi_{\text{smh}}(s) := \begin{cases} -s + 1 - \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}}}{2} & \text{if } s < 1 - \gamma_{\text{sm}}, \\ \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{sm}}}(s - 1)^2 & \text{if } 1 - \gamma_{\text{sm}} \leq s < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \leq s, \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where $\gamma_{\text{sm}} \in (0, 1)$ is a constant, is a variant of the hinge loss function, which smooths the region where the margin is violated. It is commonly used in SVM. The quadratic hinge loss

$$\phi_{\text{qh}}(s) := \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{sm}}} \max(0, 1 - s)^2 \quad (30)$$

is another variant of the hinge loss function that penalizes margin violations more gradually. The next section introduces the dual function, which includes the convex conjugate of the loss function. The convex conjugate of a function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as:

$$\phi^*(a) := \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}} a\zeta - \phi(\zeta). \quad (31)$$

We assume that

$$\phi_0(0) > 0, \quad \forall s \leq 0, \quad \nabla \phi_0(s) < 0. \quad (32)$$

Furthermore, assume that the conjugate ϕ_0^* is twice differentiable, and there exists $\gamma_{\text{sm}} > 0$ such that

$$\forall a \in \text{dom}(\phi_0^*), \quad \nabla^2 \phi_0^*(a) \geq \gamma_{\text{sm}} \quad (33)$$

where $\text{dom}(f)$ is the effective domain of a function f [27]. The original function ϕ_0 is said to be a $1/\gamma_{\text{sm}}$ -smooth function [23]. Then, it is a well-known fact that $\forall \eta \in [0, 1]$, $\forall u, \alpha \in -\text{dom}(\phi_0^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \phi_0^*(-u) + (1 - \eta) \phi_0^*(-\alpha) \\ & \geq \phi_0^*(-\eta u - (1 - \eta)\alpha) + \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}}}{2} (u - \alpha)^2 (1 - \eta). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

APPENDIX B PROOF FOR LEMMA 1

The assumption (8) leads to the bound of the expected primal objective error with respect to randomness at previous iterations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_{\text{p}}^{(t)}] & \leq \beta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[h_{\text{D}}^{(t)} - h_{\text{D}}^{(t+1)} \right] \leq \beta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[h_{\text{D}}^{(t)} \right] \\ & \leq \beta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[h_{\text{D}}^{(t-1)} \right] (1 - \beta) \\ & \leq \beta^{-1} h_{\text{D}}^{(0)} \cdot (1 - \beta)^t \leq \beta^{-1} h_{\text{D}}^{(0)} \exp(-\beta t). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Hence, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[h_{\text{p}}^{(t)}] \leq \epsilon_{\text{p}}$ conditioned on $\beta^{-1} h_{\text{D}}^{(0)} \exp(-\beta t) \leq \epsilon_{\text{p}}$. This condition can be rearranged as

$$t \geq \frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(\frac{h_{\text{D}}^{(0)}}{\epsilon_{\text{p}} \beta} \right). \quad (36)$$

□

APPENDIX C PROOF FOR THEOREM 1

We shall first show that

$$J_t^{\text{van}}(\bar{s}_t) \leq J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta_{\text{approx},t}). \quad (37)$$

Let

$$\hat{\eta}_{\text{II}} := \bar{s}_t \cdot \frac{F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2}{\gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2} \quad (38)$$

and

$$\tilde{\eta}_0 := \bar{s}_t \cdot \frac{\tilde{F}_t + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2}{\gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2}. \quad (39)$$

From Lemma 2,

$$\tilde{\eta}_0 \leq \hat{\eta}_{\text{II}}. \quad (40)$$

Function $J_t^{\text{van}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is increasing in the interval $(-\infty, \hat{\eta}_{\text{II}})$ and decreasing in the interval $(\hat{\eta}_{\text{II}}, +\infty)$, since the derivative of J_t^{van} is given by

$$\nabla J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta) = \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}} q_{i,t}^2}{n \bar{s}_t} (\hat{\eta}_{\text{II}} - \eta). \quad (41)$$

There are two cases: i) $\tilde{\eta}_0 \leq \bar{s}_t$, ii) $\bar{s}_t < \tilde{\eta}_0$.

- In case of $\tilde{\eta}_0 \leq \bar{s}_t$, we have $\eta_{\text{approx},t} = \bar{s}_t$, thereby

$$J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta_{\text{approx},t}) = J_t^{\text{van}}(\bar{s}_t). \quad (42)$$

- In case of $\bar{s}_t < \tilde{\eta}_0$, we have

$$\bar{s}_t < \eta_{\text{approx},t} = \min \{1, \tilde{\eta}_0\} \leq \hat{\eta}_{\text{II}}. \quad (43)$$

Recall that the function $J_t^2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is increasing in the interval $(-\infty, \hat{\eta}_{\text{II}})$. Therefore, we get

$$J_t^{\text{van}}(\bar{s}_t) \leq J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta_{\text{approx},t}). \quad (44)$$

Thus, the inequality (37) has been established.

We next observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{0,\alpha^{(t-1)}}\|^2 &= \left\langle f_{0,\alpha^{(t-1)}}, \frac{1}{\lambda n} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^{(t-1)} \kappa(\mathbf{x}_j, \cdot) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda n} \sum_{j=1}^n z_j^{(t-1)} \alpha_j^{(t-1)} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t-1)} + h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} &= R[f_{0,\alpha^{(t-1)}}] - D_0(\alpha^{(t-1)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \phi_{\text{mup}}(z_j^{(t-1)}; y_j) + \phi_{\text{mup}}^*(-\alpha_j^{(t-1)}; y_j) \\ &\quad + \lambda \|f_{0,\alpha^{(t-1)}}\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{(t-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We now use the inequality (37) to have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} - h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t)} &= J_t^0(q_{i,t}, \eta_{\text{approx},t}) \geq J_t^{\text{van}}(\eta_{\text{approx},t}) \\ &\geq J_t^{\text{van}}(\bar{s}_t) = \frac{\bar{s}_t}{n} F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Taking the expectation with respect to the randomness for selection of $i \in [n]$ at t th iteration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} - \mathbb{E}[h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t)}] &\geq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\lambda n \gamma_{\text{sm}}}{R_{\text{mx}}^2 + \lambda n \gamma_{\text{sm}}} \sum_{i=1}^n F_{\text{van},i}^{(t-1)} \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}}}{R_{\text{mx}}^2 + \lambda n \gamma_{\text{sm}}} \cdot \left(h_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t-1)} + h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n + R_{\text{mx}}^2 / (\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}})} \cdot \max \left\{ h_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t-1)}, h_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

This implies that (8) is satisfied with

$$\beta^{-1} = n + \frac{R_{\text{mx}}^2}{\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}}}. \quad (49)$$

which allows us to apply Lemma 1. Hence, Theorem 1 is established. \square

APPENDIX D PROOF FOR LEMMA 3

The convex conjugate of $\tilde{\phi}_i$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_i^*(a) &= \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left(sa - \tilde{\phi}_i(s) \right) \\ &= \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left(sa - (1 + y_i) \phi_0(s) \right) \\ &= (1 + y_i) \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{sa}{1 + y_i} - \phi_0(s) \right) \\ &= (1 + y_i) \phi_0^* \left(\frac{a}{1 + y_i} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Recall the assumption that the value of ϕ_0^* can be computed with $O(1)$ cost, and so is that of $\tilde{\phi}_i^*$.

The second order derivative is:

$$\nabla^2 \tilde{\phi}_i^*(a) = \frac{1}{1 + y_i} \nabla^2 \phi_0^* \left(\frac{a}{1 + y_i} \right) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}}}{1 + y_i} \geq \frac{\gamma_{\text{sm}}}{2} \quad (51)$$

which implies that $\tilde{\phi}_i$ is a $2/\gamma_{\text{sm}}$ -smooth function. \square

APPENDIX E PROOF FOR THEOREM 2

Let

$$\tilde{h}_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t)} := \tilde{D}(\alpha_*) - \tilde{D}(\alpha^{(t)}). \quad (52)$$

Using the similar proof technique used in Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t)}] &\geq \frac{\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}} / 2}{R_{\text{mx}}^2 + \lambda \tilde{n} \gamma_{\text{sm}} / 2} \cdot \left(h_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{h}_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2n + 2R_{\text{mx}}^2 / (\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}})} \cdot \max \left\{ h_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t-1)}, \tilde{h}_{\mathbf{D}}^{(t-1)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

implying the assumption in (8) is satisfied with

$$\beta^{-1} = 2n + \frac{2R_{\text{mx}}^2}{\lambda \gamma_{\text{sm}}}. \quad (54)$$

Applying Lemma 1 concludes the proof. \square