Distributed Forgetting-factor Regret-based Online Optimization over Undirected Connected Networks

Lipo Mo, Jianjun Li, Min Zuo, Member, IEEE, Lei Wang.

arXiv:2503.21498v1 [eess.SY] 27 Mar 2025

Abstract—The evaluation of final-iteration tracking performance is a formidable obstacle in distributed online optimization algorithms. To address this issue, this paper proposes a novel evaluation metric named distributed forgetting-factor regret (DFFR). It incorporates a weight into the loss function at each iteration, which progressively reduces the weights of historical loss functions while enabling dynamic weights allocation across optimization horizon. Furthermore, we develop two distributed online optimization algorithms based on DFFR over undirected connected networks: the Distributed Online Gradientfree Algorithm for bandit-feedback problems and the Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm for high-dimensional problems. Through theoretical analysis, we derive the upper bounds of DFFR for both algorithms and further prove that under mild conditions, DFFR either converges to zero or maintains a tight upper bound as iterations approach infinity. Experimental simulation demonstrates the effectiveness of the algorithms and the superior performance of DFFR.

Index Terms—Distributed forgetting-factor regret (DFFR); Distributed online optimization; Multi-agent systems (MAS)

I. INTRODUCTION

NLINE optimization is a versatile technique with widespread applications across various domains, such as communication network [1], [2], grid systems [3]-[5], energy management [6], where dynamic decision-making is crucial. The online optimization problem involves finding a series of decisions to minimize cumulative objective functions, which are dynamic and uncertain compared to offline optimization problems. Recently, many centralized online algorithms have been proposed to address this challenge [7]-[16]. For unconstrained online optimization, several online convex optimization algorithms have been developed based on gradient descent method, prediction-correction method and randomization technique [7]-[10]. For constrained situation, some robust algorithms, such as online gradient algorithm and online mirror descent algorithm, have been introduced to find the optimal decision sequence [11], [12], [14]–[16]. The common performance metric for online optimization algorithms is regret, first introduced by [17]. The algorithm is called to have good performance if its regret is sublinear, which means that the average loss of the algorithm, in hindsight, approaches the average loss of the best solution. Although the regret of the algorithms mentioned above can reach sublinearity, it cannot always guarantee that the decision generated at the final iteration is close to the optimal solution. In order to solve this problem, the concept of forgetting-factor regret (FFR) was introduced, which incorporated a forgetting-factor (FF) to reduce the weight of past loss functions and analyzed the tracking performance at the final iteration [18]. However, when the objective function is very complex, such as the sum of some local objective functions, the computing amount becomes very large and the centralized online optimization algorithms mentioned above are ineffective.

Distributed optimization algorithms offer significant advantages in handling large-scale, high-computation online optimization problems when compared to centralized online optimization methods. These algorithms typically involve multiagent systems (MAS), which consist of multiple autonomous agents that interact and collaborate to achieve shared goals. In a MAS, each agent usually operates based on its own local information and decision-making rules. However, in many practical scenarios, such as smart grids [3]-[5] or drone swarms [19], agents need to coordinate with others to optimize collective performance, often through communication networks. The need for online optimization in such systems arises from the dynamic and real-time nature of these applications. For example, in the smart grid, the agent must constantly adjust its operation according to the changing energy demand and supply, while considering the current state of the grid. Similarly, in drone swarms, agents must make real-time decisions to achieve coordinated behaviors, such as path planning or task allocation, while adapting to environmental changes or mission requirements. In these dynamic and unpredictable environments, online optimization allows agents to adjust their strategies continuously, ensuring optimal system performance even in the face of evolving network topologies or incomplete information. Thus, online optimization provides a flexible and adaptive framework to handle the complexities of MAS in real-world applications.

Recently, several distributed online optimization algorithms have been proposed within MAS [20]–[27]. For example, the full information feedback algorithms were proposed with static and dynamic regrets, where each agent can access the gradient information of the local objective function . In other works, distributed online algorithms have been designed with eventtriggered mechanisms to reduce communication overhead in scenarios with time-varying constraints and time-delaying [26], [27]. It is worth noting that most of the algorithms for constrained online optimization problems rely on projection operators, which tend to have high computational complexity. To reduce the gradient computing, some algorithms, such as mirror descent method, stochastic gradient method and Frank-

The authors are with the Institute of Systems Science, Beijing Wuzi University, Beijing 101126, P. R. China, also with School of Mathematics and Statistics, Beijing Technology and Business University, Beijing 100048, P. R. China, also with School of Automation Science and Electrical Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, P. R. China (e-mail: lwang@buaa.edu.cn; beihangmlp@126.com; jianjun2021@sina.cn; zuominbtbu@126.com)

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62473009.

Wolfe method, have been proposed [28]-[30]. Although these distributed online optimization algorithms achieve sublinear regret, their tracking performance at final iteration has not been analyzed. This presents a challenge in ensuring that the decisions made at the final iteration are sufficiently close to the optimal solution. To address this issue, we proposed DFFR by incorporating a weight into the loss function at each iteration. For the full information feedback, we designed Distributed Online Gradient Decent Algorithm based on projection operator in [31], assuming that the gradient of the local objective function is accessible. In fact, the computation of gradients and projection operators might bring high load to the algorithm, which would limit the application of the distributed algorithms to real-world problems, such as resource allocation.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no work on DFFR for distributed algorithms when the gradient can not be accessed or the projection operator can not be utilized. For this problem, this paper mainly propose two algorithms for distinct distributed online optimization problems over undirected connected networks, where the gradient of local objective function can not be accessed or the projection operator can not be utilized. The primary contributions of this paper are as follows.

(1) We propose gradient-free and projection-free algorithms for bandit-feedback and high-dimensional problems. Compared to [31], which uses gradients and projection operators, our first algorithm eliminates gradient information, reducing communication overhead, while our second algorithm simplifies optimization progress and improves computational efficiency. Unlike [32], [33], where the gradient-free and projection-free algorithms were designed but loss function was assumed to be strongly convex, we consider general convex functions. This broader conditions makes our algorithms more widely applicable in practical scenarios.

(2) We design DFFR by introducing the FF to regret, which can guarantee satisfactory tracking performance. Based on the proposed theoretical framework, we establish the upper bounds of DFFR for the proposed algorithms and derive mild conditions that guarantee the DFFR either converges to zero or remains within a tight upper bound as the number of iterations approaches infinity. Compared with works [20], [22], where the proposed algorithms were sublinear, our method achieves tracking performance at final iteration with tight bounds, which is not satisfied by sublinear.

The remaining parts are as follows. In section 2, we provide a detailed description of the problem, assumptions and some necessary lemmas. In section 3, 4, we introduce Distributed Online Gradient-free Algorithm and Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm respectively, then establish the upper bounds of their DFFR. In section 5, we provide some numerical simulations to demonstrate our results.

Notion: \mathbb{R}^d represents the set of *d*-dimensional vectors. \mathbb{N}_+ denotes the positive integer set. Define $P_X(y)$ $\arg \min_{x \in X} ||x - y||^2$ as the projection of y onto the set X. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represents the inner product of the vector. $\|\cdot\|$ represents the norm of some vector.

II. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND LEMMAS

Consider a MAS with n agents, where each agent can communicate with its neighbors over a graph G. The adjacency matrix composed of the graph is W. Among them, the weight associated between agent i and j is ω_{ij} . Let $[n] = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$. The purpose of this paper is to design a series of distributed algorithms to find a decision sequence $\{x_i^t, t = 1, \dots, T, i = 1, \dots n\}$ $\{x_i^t \text{ means the decision gener-}$ ated by agent i at iteration time t) for each agent minimizing the following entire objective functions over a finite duration $T \geq 1$:

$$\min \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x) \tag{1}$$
$$s.t.x \in X,$$

where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $f_t(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^t(x)$, and $f_i^t : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is the local objective function. Here, once the agent *i* makes the decision, the local objective function f_i^t is revealed. Then the agent incurs an objective function value $f_i^t(x_i^t)$. Subsequently, a decision sequence $\{x_i^t\}$ of the local objective $\{f_i^t\}$ is obtained. Given the FF $\rho \in (0,1)$, the DFFR of the corresponding algorithm is

$$R_T^F \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[f_t \left(x_i^t \right) - f_t \left(x_*^t \right) \right] \right], \qquad (2)$$

where $x_*^t \in \arg\min_{x \in X} f_t(x), t = 1, 2, ...T$. Due to $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_T(x_i^T) - f_T(x_*^T) \right] \leq R_T^F$, the tracking performance at T can be given when the upper bound of R_T^F is known. Clearly, if $\lim_{T\to\infty} R_T^F = 0$ or a non-zero small bounded quantity, the decisions generated by the algorithm are close enough as the optimal solution at T.

Remark 1. For a distributed algorithm with sublinear dynamic regret, it cannot always guarantee good tracking performance at the final iteration. For example, we set $m_t =$ Then $\lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{t=1}^{T} m_t/T \le \lim_{T \to \infty} (\log_3 T)/T = 0$, while there's no way to guarantee $m_T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_T \left(x_i^T \right) - f_T \left(x_*^T \right) \right] = 0.$ Now, we make some assumptions:

Assumption 1. ([18]) Suppose f_i^t (·) is differentiable and convex in X. For all t > 0, there exists L > 0 such that $\|\nabla f_i^t(x)\| \leq L$ and $\{f_i^t(\cdot), t = 1, ..., T\}$ is L_s - smooth in X, where $L_s > 0$ is a constant, i.t. for any $x, y \in X$, $f_i^t\left(y\right) - f_i^t\left(x\right) \le \langle \nabla f_i^t\left(x\right), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_s}{2} \|y - x\|^2.$

Assumption 2. The feasible set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is convex and compact. Define $M = \sup\{|| x || : x \in X\} < \infty$.

Assumption 3. ([34]) The undirected topology graph meets the following three conditions for any $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

(a) There exists $\omega \in (0,1)$ such that $\omega_{ij} \geq \omega$ whenever $\omega_{ij} > 0.$

(b) The adjacency matrix W is doubly stochastic, i.e.,

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_{ij} = 1, \forall i, j \in [n].$ (c) The topology graph is connected at any time.

Remark 2. The above assumptions are important for the study of distributed algorithms. Assumption 1 can ensure the stability and convergence of the algorithm. The boundedness of decision in Assumption 2 is very important to ensure the feasibility of the optimization process and preventing the divergence of solutions. Assumption 3 has many benefits, such as simplifying the structure, ensuring algorithm convergence, balancing weights.

Below, we give some lemmas, which would be used in the following analysis.

Lemma 1. ([35], [36]) If the adjacent matrix $W = [w_{ij}]$ satisfies Assumption 3. Then

$$\left| \left[W^{t-s} \right]_{ij} - \frac{1}{n} \right| \le \gamma \lambda^{t-s}, \forall i, j \in [n], \forall t \ge s \ge 1, \quad (3)$$

where $\gamma = (1 - \omega/4n^2)^{-2} > 1$, and $\lambda = (1 - \omega/4n^2)^{1/B} \in (0, 1)$. Under Assumption 3, B can take any integer between [1, T].

Lemma 2. ([37]) Let K be a non-empty, closed, and convex subset within \mathbb{R}^d and m, n be two vectors in \mathbb{R}^d . If $x = P_K(n-m)$, then

$$2\langle x - z, m \rangle \le ||z - n||^2 - ||z - x||^2 - ||x - n||^2, \forall z \in K.$$
(4)

Lemma 3. ([34]) Suppose Assumption 3 holds. For all $i \in [n]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, denote $\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x = x_i^t - z_i^t$, and $\overline{x^t} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^t$, where x_i^t is the iteration sequence of agent *i*, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \right\| &\leq \gamma \lambda^{t-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| x_{j}^{1} \right\| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{j,t-1}^{x} \right\| + \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x} \right\| \\ &+ \gamma \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$
(5)

Lemma 4. ([38]) Let $\{\gamma_k\}$ be a scalar sequence, if $\lim_{k\to\infty}\gamma_k = \gamma$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, then

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k} \beta^{k-l} \gamma_l = \frac{\gamma}{1-\beta}.$$
 (6)

III. DFFR of Distributed Online Gradient-free Algorithm

Let \mathbb{B} represent the unit ball and \mathbb{S} denote the unit sphere (They are all *d*-dimensional). In the bandit-feedback problem, due to the absence of specific gradients $\nabla f_i^t(x_i^t)$, we propose the following method to estimate it. At time *t*, the local cost function $f_i^t(x_i^t)$ is estimated by the δ -smoothing function

$$\stackrel{\wedge}{f_{i,\delta}^t} \left(x_i^t \right) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[f_i^t \left(x_i^t + \delta v_i^t \right) \right],$$
 (7)

where $\delta > 0$ represents a constant, and v_i^t is a random vector that is evenly distributed within the unit ball \mathbb{B} . Before introducing the algorithm, we propose a necessary assumption as follows.

Assumption 4 ([18]) Let $r\mathbb{B}$ be a subset of X, which in turn is contained within $R\mathbb{B}$, where R > r > 0. Furthermore, there is a constant $L_1 > 0$ for which $\sup_{1 \le t \le T, x_i^t \in X} |f_i^t(x_i^t)| \le L_1$.

Remark 3. X is a set that is contained between an R-fold extension and an r-fold reduction of the unit ball \mathbb{B} . In other words, the norm of each point of X is between r and R, ensuring that X is a set limited within this range.

Lemma 5. ([39]) Let $\delta \in (0, r)$, and set $X_{\delta} \triangleq (1 - \frac{\delta}{r}) X$. The following conditions holds

$$X_{\delta} + \delta \mathbb{B} \subset X \tag{8}$$

and

$$\nabla f_{i,\delta}^{\dagger}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) = \frac{d}{\delta} \mathbb{E}\left[f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t} + \delta u_{i}^{t}\right)u_{i}^{t}\right],\tag{9}$$

where u_i^t is a random vector that is homogeneously spread across the d-dimensional unit sphere S.

Remark 4. Due to the new loss function $f_{i,\delta}^t$, its perturbations may move points outside the feasible set. To deal with this situation, we limit its feasible set to X_{δ} , which can satisfy the ball of radius δ around each point in the subset is contained in X.

Now, we propose the algorithm as follows.

Algorithm 1: Distributed Online Gradient-free Algorithm

Input: positive and non-increasing step size sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$, the final moment T of iteration, a smoothing parameter δ . **Initialize**: $x_i^1 \in X_{\delta}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

For t = 1, ..., T

choose a random vector $u_i^t,$ which is evenly distributed over unit sphere $\mathbb S$ and independent of $\left\{u_i^1,...,u_i^{T-1}\right\}$

for i = 1, ..., n

update the decision as

$$g_i^t = \frac{a}{\delta} \left(f_i^t(x_i^t + \delta u_i^t) - f_i^t(x_i^t) \right) u_i^t, \tag{10}$$

$$z_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j=1} w_{ij} x_j^t, \tag{11}$$

$$\hat{x}_{i}^{t+1} = z_{i}^{t+1} - \alpha_{t} g_{i}^{t}, \tag{12}$$

$$x_i^{t+1} = P_{X_\delta}(\hat{x}_i^{t+1}), \tag{13}$$

end for

Output:
$$\{x_i^t\}$$
.

Theorem 1. Suppose Assumptions 1-4 hold. Let $\{x_i^t\}_{t=1}^T$ be the decision sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $\{\alpha_t\}_{t=1}^T$, which is a positive decreasing sequence. Denote $\widetilde{x}_{*}^t = \arg\min_{x_i^t \in X_{\delta}} f_t(x), \ F_i^t \triangleq |||\varepsilon_{i,t}^x|| - ||\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x|||, \ \widetilde{\theta}_t \triangleq ||\widetilde{x}_{*}^t - \widetilde{x}_{*}^{t+1}||, \ \sigma \triangleq (4+5d)L + \frac{2L(1+d)\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}}, \ then for any 1 > \rho > \lambda > 0,$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[R_T^F\right] \le 2L(1+d)\gamma \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \parallel x_j^1 \parallel \sum_{t=1}^I \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2}$$

$$+ \frac{4L(1+d)}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}(F_{i}^{t}) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\alpha_{t}n}{2} \sigma^{2} \rho^{T-t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\delta}{r} L_{1} \rho^{T-t} + 2M \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\theta_{t}})}{\alpha_{t}} + \frac{2M^{2}}{\alpha_{T}}.$$
 (14)

Proof. By the definition of R_T^F , we start with $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_t(x_i^t)$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}f_{j}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) + \frac{1}{n^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(f_{j}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) - f_{j}^{t}(x_{j}^{t})\right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) + \frac{1}{n^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}L\left\|x_{i}^{t} - x_{j}^{t}\right\|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) + \frac{2L}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\right\|.$$
(15)

Thus, we can get an upper bound of the latter part of the regret as defined earlier in (2).

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_t\left(x_i^t\right) - f_t\left(x_*^t\right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i^t\left(x_i^t\right) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i^t\left(x_*^t\right) \\
+ \frac{2L}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_i^t - \overline{x^t} \right\| \\
= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_i^t\left(x_i^t\right) - f_i^t\left(x_*^t\right) \right] + \frac{2L}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_i^t - \overline{x^t} \right\|.$$
(16)

Notice $\widetilde{x_*^t} = \arg \min_{x_i^t \in X_\delta} f_t(x)$ and we know that $0 \in X$. Then by the convexity of $f_i^t(\cdot)$, we have

$$f_t(\widetilde{x_*^t}) = \min_{x_i^t \in X_{\delta}} f_t(x_i^t) = \min_{x_i^t \in X} f_t[(1 - \frac{\delta}{r})x_i^t]$$

$$= \min_{x_i^t \in X} f_t[0 \cdot \frac{\delta}{r} + (1 - \frac{\delta}{r})x_i^t]$$

$$\leq \min_{x_i^t \in X} \left\{ \frac{\delta}{r} f_t(0) + (1 - \frac{\delta}{r}) f_t(x_i^t) \right\}.$$
(17)

Due to Assumption 4 and $\sup_{1 \le t \le T, x_i^t \in X} |f_i^t(x_i^t)| \le L_1$, we get

$$f_t(\widetilde{x_*^t}) \le \frac{\delta}{r} L_1 + f_t(x_*^t).$$
(18)

Therefore, we can get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_i^t \left(\widetilde{x_*^t} \right) - f_i^t \left(x_*^t \right) \right] \le \frac{n\delta}{r} L_1.$$
(19)

By Assumption 1, for any $x_i^t \in X_\delta$, we have the following estimate

$$\begin{vmatrix} f_{i,\delta}^{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) - f_{i}^{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) \end{vmatrix} = \left| \mathbb{E} \left[f_{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} + \delta v_{i}^{t} \right) \right] - f_{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) \right| \\ \leq \mathbb{E} \left| f_{i}^{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} + \delta v_{i}^{t} \right) - f_{i}^{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) \right|.$$
(20)

Based on the convexity of f_i^t , we obtain

$$\left| f_{i,\delta}^{\wedge} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) - f_{i}^{t} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right) \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[L\delta \left\| v_{i}^{t} \right\| \right] \leq L\delta.$$
 (21)

Now we can convert the previous part $f_i^t(\boldsymbol{x}_i^t) - f_i^t(\boldsymbol{x}_*^t)$ as follows

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_i^t(x_i^t) - f_i^t(x_*^t) \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(x_i^t) + L\delta \right)$$
$$- \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(\widetilde{x_*}) + L\delta \right) + \frac{n\delta}{r} L_1$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(x_i^t) - f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(\widetilde{x_*}) \right) + \frac{n\delta}{r} L_1.$$
(22)

Then, let's analyze of the upper bound of $f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(x_i^t) - f_{i,\delta}^{\uparrow}(\widetilde{x_*^t})$. Note that

$$\bigwedge_{i,\delta}^{\wedge} (x_i^t) - f_{i,\delta}^t(\widetilde{x_*^t}) \le \left\langle \nabla f_{i,\delta}^t(x_i^t), x_i^t - \widetilde{x_*^t} \right\rangle$$
(23)

and the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[g_i^t(x_i^t)|x_i^t] = \nabla f_{i,\delta}^{\wedge}\left(x_i^t\right)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle = \left\langle \nabla f_{i,\delta}^{\wedge} \left(x_{i}^{t} \right), x_{i}^{t} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle, \qquad (24)$$

from which and by taking the mathematical expectation to both sides of (23), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(f_{i,\delta}^{\wedge}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right) - f_{i,\delta}^{\dagger}(\widetilde{x_{*}^{t}})\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}}\right\rangle.$$
(25)

We introduce x_i^{t+1} in the follow equation:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle = \mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\rangle + \mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t+1} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle.$$
(26)

By Assumption 1, $||g_i^t|| \leq \frac{d}{\delta}L ||\delta u_i^t|| = dL$, we can get

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle \leq dL \mathbb{E}\left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\| + \mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t+1} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle.$$
(27)

By Lemma 2, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle g_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t+1} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} \right\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha_{t}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - z_{i}^{t+1} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - z_{i}^{t+2} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|^{2} \right].$$
(28)

Here,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[R_{T}^{F}\right] \leq \frac{dL}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left\|x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\| \\
+ \frac{2L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left\|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\right\| \\
+ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{\alpha_{t}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - z_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2} - \left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - z_{i}^{t+2}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
+ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{\alpha_{t}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2} - \left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
- \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{\alpha_{t}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left\|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\right\|^{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{\delta L_{1}}{r}.$$
(29)

Now, let's analyze the upper bound of the first part in (29)

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| x_i^t - x_i^{t+1} \right\| = \mathbb{E} \left\| x_i^t - z_i^{t+1} + z_i^{t+1} - x_i^{t+1} \right\| \\
\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| x_i^t - z_i^{t+1} \right\| + \mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^x \right\| \\
\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| x_i^t - \overline{x^t} \right\| + \mathbb{E} \left\| \overline{x^t} - z_i^{t+1} \right\| + \mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^x \right\|.$$
(30)

Then, through (11), we can obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \|$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \overline{x^{t}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} x_{j}^{t} \| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \|.$$
(31)

Note that $\|\cdot\|$ is convex and Assumption 3 (b), we can get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \|$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} \mathbb{E} \| \overline{x^{t}} - x_{j}^{t} \| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \|$$
$$= 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \|.$$
(32)

Then, by Lemma 3, we can obtain

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma \lambda^{t-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \|x_j^1\|$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \|x_j^1\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2}.$$
(33)

For the second term of $x_i^t - \overline{x^t}$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{j,t-1}^{x} \| = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{j,t-1}^{x} \|$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x} \|.$$
(34)

Note that $F_i^t \triangleq |||\varepsilon_{i,t}^x|| - ||\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^x|||$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x} \| \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \big(\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \| + F_{i}^{t} \big)$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \| + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \big(F_{i}^{t} \big).$$
(35)

Now, for the last term of (5),

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \big\| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \big\| \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \sum_{t=s+2}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \big\| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \big\| \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-t-2} \sum_{t=s+2}^{T} \rho^{-(t-s-2)} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \big\| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \big\| \end{split}$$

$$=\sum_{s=1}^{T-2}\rho^{T-t-2}\sum_{v=0}^{T-s-2}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\rho}\right)^{v}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left\|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\right\|.$$
 (36)

Owing to $\lambda < \rho$, we get

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{j,s}^{x} \|$$

$$= \frac{\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{j,t}^{x} \|$$

$$\leq \frac{\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \|.$$
(37)

Therefore, through (33) - (37), we can analyze that the DFFR in the first two parts of (29) is as follows

$$\begin{split} &\frac{dL}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \| \\ &+ \frac{2L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \| \\ &\leq 2L(1+d) \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| x_{j}^{1} \| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2} \\ &+ \frac{4L(1+d)}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} (F_{i}^{t}) \\ &+ (\frac{(4+5d)L}{n} + \frac{\frac{(2L(1+d))}{n} \rho^{-2}}{1 - \lambda/\rho}) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \|. \end{split}$$
(38)

Next, we will analyze the upper bound of the DFFR in third part of (29)

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{2na_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \widetilde{x_*^{t}} - z_i^{t+1} \right\|^2 - \left\| \widetilde{x_*^{t+1}} - z_i^{t+2} \right\|^2 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\rho^{T-1}}{2a_1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_*^{1}} - z_i^2 \right\|^2 - \frac{\rho^0}{2a_T} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_*^{T+1}} - z_i^{T+2} \right\|^2$$

$$+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} \left(\frac{\rho^t}{2a_{T-t}} - \frac{\rho^{t+1}}{2a_{T-t-1}} \right) 4M^2 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\rho^{T-1}}{2a_1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_*^{1}} - z_i^2 \right\|^2 + \left(\frac{\rho^0}{2a_T} - \frac{\rho^{T-1}}{2a_1} \right) 4M^2 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{2M^2}{a_T}.$$
(39)

Next, we will analyze the DFFR in the fourth part of (29). Noting that $\tilde{\theta_t} \triangleq \left\| \widetilde{x_*^t} - \widetilde{x_*^{t+1}} \right\|$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2} - \mathbb{E}\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}}\right\| \cdot \mathbb{E}\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - x_{i}^{t+1} + \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\| \\ & \leq 4M\mathbb{E}\left(\widetilde{\theta_{t}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Therefore, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{2\alpha_t n} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(\left\|\widetilde{x_*^{t+1}} - x_i^{t+1}\right\|^2 - \left\|\widetilde{x_*^{t}} - x_i^{t+1}\right\|^2) \\
\leq 2M \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\widetilde{\theta_t}\right)}{\alpha_t}.$$
(41)

Now, let's analyze the DFFR in the fifth part of (29). Denote $\sigma \triangleq (4+5d)L + \frac{2L(1+d)\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{2}}$, we have

$$\sigma \mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\| \le \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\|^{2}}{2\alpha_{t}n} + \frac{\alpha_{t}n}{2}\sigma^{2}.$$
 (42)

Therefore, we can obtain

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma \mathbb{E} \parallel \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \parallel -\frac{1}{2\alpha_{t}n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \parallel \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \parallel^{2}$$
$$\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\alpha_{t}n}{2} \sigma^{2} \rho^{T-t}.$$
(43)

From (38), (39), (41) and (43), we can get (14). This proof is completed.

Remark 5. Theorem 1 gives the upper bound of the DFFR of Distributed Online Gradient-free Algorithm. Note that the upper bound of R_T^F is related to δ , because we use (9) as an estimate for $abla f_{i,\delta}^t (x_i^t)$, instead of the gradient of the local optimization function $\nabla f_i^t(x_i^t)$ itself.

Corollary 1. Setting the step size α is a positive constant, we will further draw the following conclusion.

$$\mathbb{E}\left[R_{T}^{F}\right] \leq 2L(1+d)\gamma\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E} \|x_{j}^{1}\|\sum_{t=1}^{T}\rho^{T-t}\lambda^{t-2} + \frac{4L(1+d)}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\rho^{T-t}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}(F_{i}^{t}) + \frac{\sigma^{2}\alpha n}{2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\rho^{T-t} + \frac{\delta}{r}L_{1}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\rho^{T-t} + \frac{2M}{\alpha}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\rho^{T-t}\mathbb{E}\left(\widetilde{\theta_{t}}\right) + \frac{2M^{2}}{\alpha}.$$
(44)

Proof. Consider the upper bound of the DFFR in third part of (29),

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{2n\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - z_{i}^{t+1} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - z_{i}^{t+2} \right\|^{2} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\rho^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{1}} - z_{i}^{2} \right\|^{2} - \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{T+1}} - z_{i}^{T+2} \right\|^{2} + \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} \left(\rho^{t} - \rho^{t+1} \right) 4M^{2} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\rho^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widetilde{x_{*}^{1}} - z_{i}^{2} \right\|^{2} + \left(\rho^{0} - \rho^{T-1} \right) 4M^{2} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{2M^{2}}{\alpha}.$$
(45)

For the DFFR in the fourth part of (29), we have

$$\frac{1}{2\alpha n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}(\left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t+1}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2} - \left\|\widetilde{x_{*}^{t}} - x_{i}^{t+1}\right\|^{2})$$

$$\leq \frac{2M}{\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \mathbb{E}\left(\widetilde{\theta_{t}}\right).$$
(46)

For the last part of DFFR, we use the following inequality:

$$\sigma \mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\| \le \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\|^{2}}{2\alpha n} + \frac{\alpha n}{2} \sigma^{2}.$$
 (47)

Then, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma \mathbb{E} \parallel \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \parallel -\frac{1}{2\alpha n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \parallel \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \parallel^{2}$$
$$\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\alpha n}{2} \sigma^{2} \rho^{T-t}.$$
(48)

The rest proof is the same as Theorem 1. Through (38),(45), (46) and (48), we can obtain (44).

Remark 6. If $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}(F_i^t) = o(1)$ and $\mathbb{E}\left(\widetilde{\theta_t}\right) = o(1)$ as $t \to \infty$, then we have $\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[R_T^F\right] \leq \frac{\alpha\sigma^2 n}{2(1-\rho)} + \frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{\delta L_1}{r(1-\rho)} + \frac{2M^2}{\alpha}$, which leads to $\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[R_T^F\right]$ is a bounded quantity. Comparing with the Algorithm proposed in [31], we obtain that under the bandit feedback, the upper bound of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_T \left(x_i^T \right) - f_T \left(x_*^T \right) \right] \text{ as } T \to \infty \text{ will be larger, and the}$ larger part is related to the introduction of δ due to unknown gradient information.

IV. DFFR of Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm

Projection-based algorithms simplify data and reduce noise, but they can also lead to information loss, particularly with high-dimensional parameters and large datasets. In contrast, projection-free algorithms avoid this complexity, simplifying updates and reducing storage and communication costs, making them more efficient for high-dimensional problems. The Frank-Wolfe algorithm is a prominent example [40]–[43]. Inspired by them, we propose a distributed online projectionfree algorithm and analyze its DFFR in this section. Below is the specific algorithm:

Algorithm 2: Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm

Initialize: $x_i^1 \in X_\delta$ for any $i \in [n]$. For t = 1, ..., Tfor i = 1, ..., nupdate the estimate as $v_i^t = \arg\min_{v^t \in X} \left\langle \nabla f_i^t(x_i^t), v^t \right\rangle,$

$$z_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} x_j^t,$$
(50)

(49)

$$\alpha_i^t = \arg\min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} f_i^t (z_i^{t+1} + \alpha(v_i^t - x_i^t)),$$
(51)
$$x_i^{t+1} = z_i^{t+1} + \alpha_i^t (v_i^t - x_i^t),$$
(52)

$$z_{i}^{t+1} = z_{i}^{t+1} + \alpha_{i}^{t}(v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t}),$$
 (52)

end for	
end for	
Output: $\{x_i^t\}$.	

Theorem 2. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. Let $v^t =$ $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i^t - x_*^t\|$ to measure the average distance between the decisions of agents and the best decision. Then for any 1 > 1 $\rho > \lambda > 0$,

$$R_{T}^{F} \leq L \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \nu_{t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} (2L\alpha_{0}M + 2L_{s}\alpha_{0}^{2}M^{2}) + 8L \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t}F_{i}^{t} + 4L\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_{j}^{1}|| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t}\lambda^{t-2} + (\frac{9L}{n} + \frac{4L}{1-\lambda/\rho}) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}||.$$
(53)

If $\nu^{t} = o(1)$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{i}^{t} = o(1)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}|| = o(1)$ as $t \to \infty$, then $\lim_{T\to\infty} R_{T}^{F} = 0$. This achieves $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_{T}(x_{i}^{T}) - f_{T}(x_{*}^{T})) = 0$ as $T \to \infty$.

Proof. Following the previous approach, let's start analyzing from $f_i^t(x_i^t) - f_i^t(x_*^t)$, where

$$f_i^t(x_i^t) - f_i^t(x_*^t) = f_i^t(x_i^{t+1}) - f_i^t(x_*^t) + f_i^t(x_i^t) - f_i^t(x_i^{t+1}).$$
(54)

According to (52) and the convexity of function $f_i^t(\cdot)$, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \leq f_{i}^{t}(z_{i}^{t+1} + \alpha_{i}^{t}(v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t})) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \\ &+ \left\langle \nabla f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right), x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$
(55)

For any fix $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \leq f_{i}^{t}(z_{i}^{t+1} + \alpha_{0}(v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t})) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \\ &+ \left\langle \nabla f_{i}^{t}\left(x_{i}^{t}\right), x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$
(56)

By Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) &- f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \leq f_{i}^{t}(z_{i}^{t+1}) + \left\langle \nabla f_{i}^{t}\left(z_{i}^{t+1}\right), \alpha_{0}(v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t}) \right\rangle \\ &+ \frac{L_{s}}{2} \alpha_{0}^{2} \left\| v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t} \right\|^{2} - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) + L \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\| \\ &\leq f_{i}^{t}(z_{i}^{t+1}) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) + L \alpha_{0} \left\| v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t} \right\| + \frac{L_{s}}{2} \alpha_{0}^{2} \left\| v_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t} \right\|^{2} \\ &+ L \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$
(57)

By Assumption 1, 2 and (50), we can further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) &\leq \left\langle \nabla f_{i}^{t}\left(z_{i}^{t+1}\right), z_{i}^{t+1} - x_{*}^{t} \right\rangle + 2L\alpha_{0}M \\ &+ 2L_{s}M^{2}\alpha_{0}^{2} + L \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\| \\ &\leq L \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij}x_{j}^{t} - x_{*}^{t} \right\| + 2L\alpha_{0}M + 2L_{s}M^{2}\alpha_{0}^{2} \\ &+ L \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$
(58)

Note that the adjacent matrix W is doubly stochastic, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} \left\| x_j^t - x_*^t \right\| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_i^t - x_*^t \right\|.$$
(59)

Through equations (54) - (59), we can obtain that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) - f_{i}^{t}(x_{*}^{t}) \right] \leq \frac{L}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{*}^{t} \right\| + 2L\alpha_{0}M$$
$$+ 2L_{s}\alpha_{0}^{2}M^{2} + \frac{L}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|.$$
(60)

Therefore,

$$R_T^F \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[f_i^t(x_i^t) - f_i^t(x_*^t) \right] + \frac{2L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| x_i^t - \overline{x^t} \right\| \leq L \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \nu_t + \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} (2L\alpha_0 M + 2L_s \alpha_0^2 M^2) + \frac{L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| x_i^t - x_i^{t+1} \right\| + \frac{2L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| x_i^t - \overline{x^t} \right\|.$$
(61)

Now, let's analyze the upper bound of the last two items in (61),

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1}\| &= \|x_{i}^{t} - z_{i}^{t+1} + z_{i}^{t+1} - x_{i}^{t+1}\| \\ &\leq \|x_{i}^{t} - z_{i}^{t+1}\| + \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\| \\ &\leq \|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\| + \|\overline{x^{t}} - z_{i}^{t+1}\| + \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\|. \end{aligned}$$
(62)

Then, for all agents,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\|\overline{x^{t}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij}x_{j}^{t}\right\| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\|.$$
(63)

Noting that $\|\cdot\|$ is convex, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} \|\overline{x^{t}} - x_{j}^{t}\| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\| = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}}\| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\|.$$
(64)

Then, by Lemma 3, we can obtain

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma \lambda^{t-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|x_{j}^{1}\|$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|x_{j}^{1}\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2}.$$
 (65)

...

For the second term of (5),

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{j,t-1}^{x} \right\| = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{j,t-1}^{x} \right\|$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x} \right\|.$$
(66)

Noting that $F^{t} \triangleq |||\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}|| - ||\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x}|||$, we can get

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{x} \right\| \le \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\| + F_{i}^{t} \right)$$
$$= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\| + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{i}^{t}.$$
(67)

Now, for the last term of (5),

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|$$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \sum_{t=s+2}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|$$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-t-2} \sum_{t=s+2}^{T} \rho^{-(t-s-2)} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|$$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-t-2} \sum_{v=0}^{T-s-2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\rho}\right)^{v} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|.$$
(68)

Owing to $\lambda < \rho$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{s=1}^{t-2} \lambda^{t-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{s=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-s-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,s}^{x}\|$$

$$= \frac{\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{j,t}^{x}\|$$

$$\leq \frac{\rho^{-2}}{1-\frac{\lambda}{\rho}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^{x}\|.$$
(69)

Therefore, through (65) - (69), we obtain

$$\frac{L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - x_{i}^{t+1} \right\|
+ \frac{2L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - \overline{x^{t}} \right\|
\leq 4L \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| x_{j}^{1} \right\| \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2} + \frac{8L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{i}^{t}
+ \left(\frac{9L}{n} + \frac{4L}{1 - \lambda/\rho} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} \right\|.$$
(70)

Finally, combining the results of equations (61) and (70), we can obtain the upper bound of R_T^F as follows

$$R_{T}^{F} \leq L \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \nu_{t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} (2L\alpha_{0}M + 2L_{s}\alpha_{0}^{2}M^{2}) + \frac{8L}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{i}^{t} + 4L\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} || x_{j}^{1} || \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \lambda^{t-2} + (\frac{9L}{n} + \frac{4L}{n} \rho^{-2}) \sum_{t=1}^{T} \rho^{T-t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} || \varepsilon_{i,t}^{x} ||.$$
(71)

At this point, the proof of Theorem 2 has been finished. \Box

Remark 7. Theorem 2 gives the upper bound for DFFR for the Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm. If $\sum_{i=1}^{n} F_i^t = o(1)$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\varepsilon_{i,t}^x\| = o(1)$ and $\nu_t = o(1)$ as $t \to \infty$, then $\lim_{T\to\infty} R_T^F \leq \frac{(2L\alpha_0 M + 2L_s\alpha_0^2 M^2)}{1-\rho}$. We note that the upper bound of R_T^F is a constant about α_0 . Since α_0 is arbitrary between 0 and 1, we can obtain that $\lim_{T\to\infty} R_T^F = 0$. So we can analyze that the algorithm has good tracking performance, that is, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_T(x_i^T) - f_T(x_*^T)) = 0$ as $T \to \infty$.

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

For a tracking system where n agents track n targets, let $z_i(s)$ and $\widetilde{z_i}(s)$ represent the position of target i and agent i at times $s \in (t, t+1)$, respectively.

$$z_{i}(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{d_{i}} x_{i}^{t}[k]c_{k}^{t}(s), \qquad (72)$$

$$\widetilde{z}_{i}\left(s\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{d_{i}} \xi_{i}^{t}\left[k\right] c_{k}^{t}\left(s\right),\tag{73}$$

where $x_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the coordinate vectors of the target *i* and $\xi_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the coordinate vectors of the tracker *i* at time *t*, respectively. $c_k^t(s)$ are vector functions that characterize the space of potential paths as they evolve over time [t, t+1] and satisfy

$$\int_{t}^{t+1} \left\langle c_{k}^{t}(s), c_{l}^{t}(s) \right\rangle \, ds = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = l \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(74)

At each time t, agent exchanges information with its neighbors to choose their location. In order to be closer to the target, reducing the selection cost $\langle \pi_i^t, x_i^t \rangle$ ($\pi_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ is the price vector.) and minimizing global losses. The cost function faced by each agent is as follows

$$f_{i}^{t}(x_{i}^{t}) = \xi_{i}^{1} \langle \pi_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} \rangle + \xi_{i}^{2} \int_{t}^{t+1} \left\| z_{i}(s) - \widetilde{z_{i}}(s) \right\|^{2} ds$$
$$= \xi_{i}^{1} \langle \pi_{i}^{t}, x_{i}^{t} \rangle + \xi_{i}^{2} \left\| x_{i}^{t} - \xi_{i}^{t} \right\|^{2},$$
(75)

where ξ_i^1 and ξ_i^2 represent nonnegative constants that balance the two sub-objectives. Specific model descriptions can be found in [44]. In this section, we are examining a one-dimensional system, where the dimension is d = 1, and the constraint region is defined as X being the interval [-10, 10]. Set $\xi_i^1 = 0$ and $\xi_i^2 = 1$. We set $\xi_i^t = \frac{60}{t^2}$, but in order to adapt to more complex situations, we set different position functions for different agents. Ultimately, the objective functions faced by each agent are $f_1^t(x_1^t) = \|x_1^t - \frac{60}{t^2}\|^2$, $f_2^t(x_2^t) = \|2x_2^t - \frac{60}{t^2}\|^2$, $f_3^t(x_3^t) = \|3x_3^t - \frac{60}{t^2}\|^2$ and $f_4^t(x_4^t) = \|6x_4^t - \frac{60}{t^2}\|^2$. We set up four agents and built a undirected connected network, in which the non-zero element with the smallest adjacency matrix is 0.22, as shown in Figure 1. So the λ as defined in (3) is



Fig. 1: The topological structure of undirected graphs.

0.98625, we chose $\rho = 0.9875$ and B = 1. At the same time, we set the $\alpha_t = \frac{2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Under Algorithm 1, we choose $\delta = 0.01$. Under Algorithm 2, we set a fixed step size between 0 and 1 in advance as 0.002. Therefore, the conditions of Theorem 1-2 are satisfied. We consider the condition for the consistency of agent decision is that the difference between the maximum decision and the minimum decision is less than 0.001. Although facing different time-varying objective functions, the decisions generated by the proposed algorithms reached agreement at t=21 and t=15 respectively at a very fast speed, as shown in Figure 2 and 3.



Fig. 2: The decisions of Algorithm 1.

Assuming that the difference between the agent's decision and the target is less than 0.001, we determine that the



Fig. 3: The decisions of Algorithm 2.

target tracking is successful. Through comparison, it can be found that Algorithm 2 is faster than Algorithm 1 in tracking the target. Algorithm 1 needs at least 348 iterations, while Algorithm 2 only needs 73 iterations.

The DFFR of Algorithm 1-2 show good convergence, as shown in Figure 4. Compared with Distributed Online Gradient Decent Algorithm, Algorithm 2 has similar convergence and tracking performance, while Algorithm 1 has a slower convergence speed due to the lack of the information of gradient, as shown in Figure 4 and 5.



Fig. 4: DFFR of Algorithms.

Meanwhile, for Distributed Online Gradient Decent Algorithm, we also compared its convergence under classical regret and DFFR conditions, as shown in Figure 6. Through DFFR, we can know the minimum time for the agent decisions to converge to the optimal decision. If the tracking error is less than 0.01, the minimum time required to meet this tracking condition increases as ρ increases, and it is the largest when ρ is not present. By comparison, we can obtain that DFFR has better tracking performance.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose a new metric for measuring distributed online optimization algorithms, namely the dis-



Fig. 5:
$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i^t - x_*^t||$$
.



Fig. 6: DFFR of Distributed Online Gradient Decent Algorithm with $\rho = 0.98, \rho = 0.97, \rho = 0.96$ and without ρ .

tributed forgetting-factor regret (DFFR). Firstly, we propose Distributed Online Gradient-free Algorithm and Distributed Online Projection-free Algorithm. Then, we derive the upper bounds of the DFFR and provide mild conditions for the regret to approach zero or to have a tight bound as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, we validate the effectiveness of the algorithms and the superior performance of DFFR through experimental simulation. In the future, we will extend our results to both direct and switching topology scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62473009.

REFERENCES

- Gao J, Zhong C, Li GY, Zhang Z. Online deep neural network for optimization in wireless communications. IEEE Wireless Commun Lett 2022;11(5):933-7.
- [2] Liu Z, Almhana J, Choulakian V, McGorman R. Online optimization of data transmission policies for wireless networks. IEEE Trans Autom Control 2008;53(11):2633-8.

- [3] Zhang W, Liu W, Wang X, Liu L, Ferrese F. Online optimal generation control based on constrained distributed gradient algorithm. IEEE Trans Power Syst 2014;30(1):35-45.
- [4] Wei B, Deconinck G. Distributed online optimization for voltage control in low voltage distribution networks. In: 2020 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Europe. ISGT-Europe, 2020, p. 1216-20.
- [5] Fan S, He G, Zhou X, Cui M. Online optimization for networked distributed energy resources with time-coupling constraints. IEEE Trans Smart Grid 2020;12(1):251-67.
- [6] Chang X, Xu Y, Sun H. Online distributed neurodynamic optimization for energy management of renewable energy grids. Int J Electr Power Energy Syst 2021;130:106996.
- [7] Cutkosky A, Boahen KA. Online convex optimization with unconstrained domains and losses. Adv Neural Inf Process Syst. 2016;29.
- [8] Simonetto A, Koppel A, Mokhtari A, Leus G, Ribeiro A. Predictioncorrection methods for time-varying convex optimization. In: 2015 49th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers. ACSSC, 2015, p. 666-70.
- [9] Simonetto A, Mokhtari A, Koppel A, Leus G, Ribeiro A. A class of prediction-correction methods for time-varying convex optimization. IEEE Trans Signal Process. 2016;64(17):4576-91.
- [10] Tatarenko T, Kamgarpour M. Minimizing regret in unconstrained online convex optimization. In: 2018 European Control Conference. ECC, 2018, p. 143-8.
- [11] Shalev-Shwartz S. Online learning and online convex optimization. Foundations and Trends[®] in Machine Learning. 2012;4(2):107-194.
- [12] Hazan E. Efficient algorithms for online convex optimization and their applications. Princeton University; 2006.
- [13] Boyd S. Convex Optimization. Cambridge University Press; 2004.
- [14] Shi M, Lin X, Fahmy S. Competitive online convex optimization with switching costs and ramp constraints. IEEE/ACM Trans Networking. 2021;29(2):876-89.
- [15] Bernasconi de Luca M, Vittori E, Trovò F, Restelli M. Conservative online convex optimization. In: Springer, 2021, p. 19-34.
- [16] Yu J, Li J, Chen G. Online bandit convex optimisation with stochastic constraints via two-point feedback. Int J Syst Sci. 2023;54(10):2089-2105.
- [17] Vapnik V. Estimation of Dependences Based on Empirical Data. New York: Springer Science & Business Media. 2006.
- [18] Liu Y, Zhao W, Yin G. Forgetting-Factor Regrets for Online Convex Optimization. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2023.
- [19] Hu Y, Chen M, Saad W, Poor HV, Cui S. Distributed multi-agent meta learning for trajectory design in wireless drone networks. IEEE J Sel Areas Commun. 2021;39(10):3177-92.
- [20] Zhang Y, Ravier RJ, Zavlanos MM, Tarokh V. A distributed online convex optimization algorithm with improved dynamic regret. In: 2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control. CDC, 2019, p. 2449-54.
- [21] Shen X, Li D, Fang R, Zhou Y, Wu X. Distributed adaptive online learning for convex optimization with weight decay. Asian J Control. 2022;24(2):562-75.
- [22] Zhang W, Shi Y, Zhang B, Yuan D. Improved dynamic regret of distributed online multiple Frank-Wolfe convex optimization. Sci China Inf Sci. 2024;67(11):212201.
- [23] Lu K, Jing G, Wang L. Online distributed optimization with strongly pseudoconvex-sum cost functions. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2019;65(1):426-33.
- [24] Yi X, Li X, Xie L, Johansson KH. Distributed online convex optimization with time-varying coupled inequality constraints. IEEE Trans Signal Process. 2020;68:731-46.
- [25] Yi X, Li X, Xie L, Johansson KH. A distributed algorithm for online convex optimization with time-varying coupled inequality constraints. In: 2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control. CDC, 2019, p. 555-60.
- [26] Xiong M, Zhang B, Yuan D, Zhang Y, Chen J. Event-triggered distributed online convex optimization with delayed bandit feedback. Appl Math Comput. 2023;445:127865.
- [27] Yamashita M, Hayashi N, Takai S. Dynamic regret analysis for eventtriggered distributed online optimization algorithm. IEICE Trans Fundam Electron Commun Comput Sci. 2021;104(2):430-7.
- [28] Yuan D, Hong Y, Ho DWC, Xu S. Distributed mirror descent for online composite optimization. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2020;66(2):714-29.
- [29] Bottou L. Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In: Springer, 2010, p. 177-186.
- [30] Wai HT, Lafond J, Scaglione A, Moulines E. Decentralized Frank-Wolfe algorithm for convex and nonconvex problems. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2017;62(11):5522-37.

- [31] Li J, Mo L, Shang J, Zuo M. Forgetting-Factor Regret for Distributed Online Optimization. In: 2024 43rd Chinese Control Conference. CCC, 2024, p. 6056-61.
- [32] Wang C, Xu S, Yuan D, Zhang B, Zhang Z. Push-sum distributed online optimization with bandit feedback. IEEE Trans Cybern. 2020;52(4):2263-73.
- [33] Kretzu B, Garber D. Revisiting projection-free online learning: the strongly convex case. In: International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics. AISTATS, 2021, p. 3592-3600.
- [34] Yi X, Li X, Yang T, Xie L, Johansson KH, Chai T. Regret and cumulative constraint violation analysis for distributed online constrained convex optimization. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2022;68(5):2875-90.
- [35] Nedič A, Ozdaglar A. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2009;54(1):48-61.
- [36] Nedič A, Olshevsky A. Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2014;60(3):601-15.
- [37] Li X, Yi X, Xie L. Distributed online optimization for multi-agent networks with coupled inequality constraints. IEEE Trans Autom Control. 2020;66(8):3575-91.
- [38] Sundhar Ram S, Nedić A, Veeravalli VV. Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization. J Optim Theory

Appl. 2010;147:516-45.

- [39] Flaxman AD, Kalai AT, McMahan HB. Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: gradient descent without a gradient. In: Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SODA, 2005, p. 385–94.
- [40] Zhang M, Zhou Y, Quan W, Zhu J, Zheng R, Wu Q. Online Learning for IoT Optimization: A Frank-Wolfe Adam-Based Algorithm. IEEE Internet of Things J. 2020;7(9):8228-37.
- [41] Reddi SJ, Sra S, Póczos B, Smola A. Stochastic Frank-Wolfe methods for nonconvex optimization. In: 54th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing. Allerton, 2016, p. 1244-51.
- [42] Joulin A, Tang K, Fei-Fei L. Efficient image and video co-localization with Frank-Wolfe algorithm. In: 13th European Conference; 2014, p. 253-68.
- [43] Garber D, Hazan E. Faster rates for the Frank-Wolfe method over strongly-convex sets. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2015, p. 541-49.
- [44] Yi X, Li X, Xie L, Johansson KH. Distributed Online Convex Optimization With Time-Varying Coupled Inequality Constraints. IEEE Trans Signal Process. 2020;68:731-46.