DS-MLR: Exploiting Double Separability for Scaling up Distributed Multinomial Logistic Regression

Parameswaran Raman Sriram Srinivasan Shin Matsushima Xinhua Zhang Hyokun Yun S.V.N. Vishwanathan

Abstract

Multinomial logistic regression is a popular tool in the arsenal of machine learning algorithms, yet scaling it to datasets with very large number of data points and classes has not been trivial. This is primarily because one needs to compute the log-partition function on every data point. This makes distributing the computation hard. In this paper, we present a distributed stochastic gradient descent based optimization method (DS-MLR) for scaling up multinomial logistic regression problems to very large data. Our algorithm exploits double-separability, an attractive property we observe in the objective functions of several models in machine learning, that allows us to achieve both data as well as model parallelism simultaneously. In addition to being parallelizable, our algorithm can also easily be made asynchronous. In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, we solve a very large multiclass classification problem on the reddit dataset with data and parameter sizes of 200 GB and 300 GB respectively. Such a scale of data calls for simultaneous data and model parallelism which is where DS-MLR fits in.

1. Introduction

The holy grail in machine learning is to train complex models on massive amounts of data. As some recent studies (e.g. Mikolov et al., 2013; Chilimbi et al., 2014) have shown, it is not only important to use massive amounts of data but it is also important to increase the number of model parameters in order to improve predictive performance. PARAMS@UCSC.EDU SSRINIV9@UCSC.EDU SHIN_MATSUSHIMA@MIST.I.U-TOKYO.AC.JP ZHANGX@UIC.EDU YUNHYOKU@AMAZON.COM VISHY@UCSC.EDU

In this paper, we are concerned with multinomial logistic regression on large datasets, in the presence of large number of classes. Clearly, this is an important problem and has received significant research attention. The classic paradigm in distributed machine learning is to perform data partitioning, using, for instance, a map reduce style architecture. In other words, the data is distributed across multiple slaves. At the beginning of each iteration, the master distributes a parameter vector to all the slaves, who in turn use this to compute the objective function and gradient values on their part of the data and transmit it back to the master. The master aggregates the results from the slaves and updates the parameters, and transmits the updates back to the slaves, and the iteration proceeds. The L-BFGS optimization algorithm is used in the master to update the parameters after every iteration (Nocedal and Wright, 2006). The main drawback of this strategy is that the model parameters need to be replicated on every machine. This is problematic when the number of classes, and consequently the number of parameters is very large, and hence cannot fit in a single machine.

Alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) (Boyd et al., 2011) is another popular technique used to parallelize convex optimization problems. The key idea in ADMM is to reformulate the original optimization problem by introducing redundant linear constraints. This makes the new objective easily parallelizable. However, ADMM suffers from a similar drawback as L-BFGS especially when applied to a multinomial logistic regression model. This is because the number of redundant constraints that need to be introduced are N (# data points) $\times K$ (# classes) which is a major bottleneck to model parallelism.

An orthogonal approach is to use *model partitioning*. Here, again, we use a master slave architecture but now the data is replicated across each slave. However, the model parameters are now partitioned and distributed to each machine. During each iteration the model parameters on the individual machines are updated, and some auxiliary variables are



Table 1. Characterizing the applicability of the various methods. **DS-MLR** is our proposed method. LC is by (Gopal and Yang, 2013)

Parameters

computed and distributed to the other slaves, which use these variables in their parameter updates. See the Log-Concavity (LC) method (Gopal and Yang, 2013) for an example of such a strategy. The main drawback of this approach, however, is that the data needs to be replicated on each machine, and consequently it does not scale to massive datasets.

In contrast to the above approaches, we demonstrate that the objective function of multinomial logistic regression can be rewritten to exhibit *double separability* (Yun, 2014). This allows us to simultaneously perform both *data and model partitioning*, and hence opens the door for doing extreme classification at a massive scale with large number of data points and classes. Table 1 presents a categorization of the various methods we discussed. In Table 2, we compare their storage requirements in more detail. As it shows, DS-MLR occupies the least amount of storage per worker, since both data as well as parameters are partitioned across its P workers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 formally introduces Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR). Section 3 shows how the MLR objective function can be reformulated to exhibit double separability. In section 4, we discuss how our doubly separable objective function can be optimized in a distributed fashion and present synchronous and asynchronous algorithms for it. Section 6 discusses our contributions in the context of related work. Section 7 is devoted to experiments using our asynchronous algorithm; we present results in both the single-machine and multi-machine settings. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

2. Multinomial Logistic Regression

Suppose we are provided training data which consists of N data points $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_2), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N, y_N)$ where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d-dimensional feature vector and $y_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ is a label associated with it; K denotes the number of class labels. Let's also define an indicator variable $y_{ik} = I(y_i = k)$ denoting the membership of data point \mathbf{x}_i to class k. The probability that \mathbf{x}_i belongs to class k is given by:

$$\mathbb{P}(y=k|\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{w}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j)},$$
(1)

where $W = {\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_K}$ denotes the parameter vector for each of the K classes. Using the negative log-likelihood of (1) as a loss function, the objective function of MLR can be written as:

$$L_{1}(W) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\mathbf{w}_{k}\|^{2} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} y_{ik} \mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i})\right), \quad (2)$$

where $||\mathbf{w}_k||^2$ regularizes the objective, and λ is a tradeoff parameter. Optimizing the above objective function (2) when the number of classes K is large, is extremely challenging as computing the *log partition function* involves summing up over a large number of classes. In addition, it couples the class level parameters \mathbf{w}_k together, making it difficult to distribute computation.

In order to tackle this, (Gopal and Yang, 2013) analyzes a number of bounds, and proposes using the *Log-concavity bound* (Bouchard, 2007) to decompose the objective function in order to make it easy to parallelize.

2.1. Reformulating the Objective Function

The Log-concavity bound uses the first order concavity property of the log-partition function:

$$\log(\gamma) \le a\gamma - \log(a) - 1, \quad \forall \gamma, a > 0, \tag{3}$$

where *a* is a variational parameter. This bound is tight when $a = \frac{1}{\gamma}$. Using this bound, the log partition function can be linearized as follows:

$$\log\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i})\right) \leq a_{i} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i}) - \log(a_{i}) - 1$$
(4)

where for each instance i, a variational parameter a_i is introduced. Plugging (4) into (2), the overall objective for MLR can be written as:

$$L_2(W, A) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(-\sum_{k=1}^{K} y_{ik} \mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i + a_i \sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \log(a_i) - 1 \right), \quad (5)$$

where a_i can be computed in closed form as:

$$a_i = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i)}.$$
 (6)

	Storage Requirement		Total Storage	Communication
	Data	Parameters		
L-BFGS	$O(\frac{ND}{P})$	O(KD)	$O(\frac{ND}{P}) + O(KD)$	O(KD)
ADMM	$O(\frac{ND}{P})$	$O(KD) + O(\frac{NK}{P})$	$O(\frac{ND}{P}) + O(KD) + O(\frac{NK}{P})$	
LC	O(ND)	$O(\frac{KD}{P}) + O(N)$	$O(ND) + O(\frac{KD}{P}) + O(N)$	O(N)
DS-MLR	$O(\frac{ND}{P})$	$O(\frac{KD}{P}) + O(\frac{N}{P})$	$O(\frac{ND}{P}) + O(\frac{KD}{P}) + O(\frac{N}{P})$	$O(\frac{KD}{P})$

Table 2. Space requirement **per worker** of the various algorithms when applied to multinomial logistic regression. (N : # of data points, D : # of features, K : # of classes, P : # of workers).

The above objective although not convex, is differentiable. (Gopal and Yang, 2013) proposes a block coordinate descent procedure that converges to a stationary point of $L_2(W, A)$, and show that the resulting W is also an optimal solution. Given a fixed value of the variational parameters $A = \{a_i\}_{i=1,...,N}$, the objective function $L_2(W, A)$ splits into K sub-problems, each of which can be optimized independently as follows:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}_{k}} \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_{k}\|^{2} - \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} y_{ik} \mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{i} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i}) \right)$$
(7)

(Gopal and Yang, 2013) solves these sub-problems in (7) in a distributed fashion using the Map-Reduce framework. In each iteration, the class level parameters \mathbf{w}_k are optimized in parallel in the *map* phase using a L-BFGS solver and the variational parameters a_i are updated in the *reduce* phase.

Although this is one way of reformulating (2) to distribute the computation, it has several fundamental drawbacks:

- Observe that solving each sub-problem (7) involves summing over all the data points. This means that even though the sub-problems can be handled in parallel, the entire data needs to be replicated in each machine. Clearly, this is not feasible when the training data is large and it prevents data parallelism.
- The above reformulation is well-suited only for situations where the number of data points N are small while the number of classes K are large. However, this is not realistic since in most large scale applications, as data grows, these numbers go hand in hand and increase simultaneously. We show in our empirical results that the LC method developed by (Gopal and Yang, 2013) cannot be run on datasets which do not satisfy this criteria.
- The variational parameters a_i are updated in a bulk synchronization step after all the K sub-problems are solved. This is expensive since, as the number of processors increases, the synchronization time increases

as well, because of the problem commonly known as curse of the last reducer.

Our new formulation (DS-MLR) aims to tackle these issues.

3. Doubly-Separable Multinomial Logistic Regression (DS-MLR)

• The concept of Separability (Zhong et al., 2004) of functions is well-known in the optimization community (Tseng and Mangasarian, 2001). Extending this idea, Double-Separability is formally defined as below:

Definition 1 Double Separability

Let $\{\mathbb{S}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\mathbb{S}'_j\}_{j=1}^{m'}$ be two families of sets of parameters. A function $f: \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{S}_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{m'} \mathbb{S}'_j \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be doubly separable if there exists $f_{ij}: \mathbb{S}_i \times \mathbb{S}'_j \to \mathbb{R}$ for each i = 1, 2, ..., m and j = 1, 2, ..., m' such that:

$$f(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_m, \theta'_1, \theta'_2, \dots, \theta'_{m'}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m'} f_{ij}(\theta_i, \theta'_j).$$
(8)

3.1. Formulation of DS-MLR

By rearranging the objective function of $L_2(W, A)$ represented as in (5), we can obtain a *doubly-separable* form of the objective function as following:

$$L_2(W,B) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\lambda}{2N} \| \mathbf{w}_k \|^2 - \frac{y_{ik} \mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i}{N} + \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i + b_i)}{N} - \frac{b_i}{KN} - \frac{1}{KN} \right), \quad (9)$$

where we denote $b_i = \log(a_i)$ for convenience and $B = \{b_i\}_{i=1,\dots,N}$. Observe that (9) takes the same form as (8).

This can be seen easily since,

$$L_2(w_1, \dots, w_K, b_1, \dots, b_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K f_{ki}(\mathbf{w}_k, b_i),$$
(10)

where

$$f_{ki}(\mathbf{w}_k, b_i) = \frac{\lambda}{2N} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 - \frac{y_{ik}\mathbf{w}_k^T\mathbf{x}_i}{N} + \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T\mathbf{x}_i + b_i)}{N} - \frac{b_i}{KN} - \frac{1}{KN}.$$
(11)

3.2. Stochastic Optimization

Minimizing $L_2(W, B)$ involves computing the gradients of (9) with respect to the class-level weight parameters \mathbf{w}_k and log of the instance-level variational parameters a_i which is often computationally expensive. Instead, one can compute *stochastic gradients* (Robbins and Monro, 1951) which are computationally cheaper than the exact gradient, and perform stochastic updates as follows:

$$\mathbf{w}_{k} \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_{k} - \eta_{1} K \left(\lambda \mathbf{w}_{k} - y_{ik} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} + b_{i}) \mathbf{x}_{i} \right)$$
(12)

$$b_i \leftarrow b_i - \eta_2 K \left(\exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i + b_i) - \frac{1}{K} \right)$$
 (13)

where η_1 and η_2 are learning rates for \mathbf{w}_k and b_i respectively. Being an unbiased stochastic gradient estimator, the standard convergence guarantees of SGD apply here. For proof of convergence we refer the reader to (Kushner and Yin, 2003). Our formulation of DS-MLR (9) offers several key advantages:

- *First*, observe that the objective function $L_2(W, B)$, now splits as summations over N data points and K classes making it possible to derive stochastic gradient updates as shown in (12) and (13),
- Second, each term in the stochastic updates (12) and (13) only depends one data point *i* and one class *k*. We exploit this to distribute computation efficiently,
- *Third*, we are able to update the variational parameters b_i simultaneously while updating the weights w_k . This saves us the additional cost of using a synchronization step and having to wait until all w_k 's are updated.
- *Fourth*, Our formulation lends itself nicely to an asynchronous implementation.

4. Distributing the Computation of DS-MLR

4.1. DS-MLR Sync

We first describe the distributed DS-MLR Synchronous algorithm in Algorithm 1. The data and parameters are distributed among the P processors as illustrated in Figure 1 where the row-blocks and column-blocks represent data $X^{(p)}$ and weights $W^{(p)}$ on each local machine respectively. The algorithm proceeds by running T iterations in parallel on each of the P workers arranged in a ring network topology. Each iteration consist of P inner-epochs. During the inner-epoch, each worker first exchanges its parameters $W^{(p)}$ with the adjacent machines. Next, it stochastically updates the block of weight parameters $W^{(p)}$ and variational parameters $b^{(p)}$ that it owns. Observe that these updates depend only on $X^{(p)}$ and $W^{(p)}$.

Algorithm 1 DS-MLR Synchronous

- 1: *K*: # classes, *P*: # workers, *T*: total outer iterations, *t*: outer iteration index, *s*: inner epoch index
- 2: $W^{(p)}$: weights per worker, $b^{(p)}$: variational parameters per worker
- 3: Initialize $W^{(p)} = 0, b^{(p)} = \frac{1}{K}$
- 4: for all $p = 1, 2, \ldots, P$ in parallel do for all t = 1, 2, ..., T do 5: for all s = 1, 2, ..., P do 6: Send $W^{(p)}$ to worker on the right 7: Receive $W^{(p)}$ from worker on the left 8: Update $W^{(p)}$ stochastically using (12) 9: Update $b^{(p)}$ stochastically using (13) 10: end for 11: 12: end for
- 13: end for



Figure 1. P = 4 inner-epochs of distributed SGD updates where each worker performs local SGD updates on mutually-exclusive blocks of data and parameters as shown by the dark colored diagonal blocks.

At this point, it is worth noting that this is an instantiation of the DSGD (Distributed Stochastic Gradient Descent) scheme in (Gemulla et al., 2011b) which proves the scheme's asymptotic convergence properties. This was actively extended by (Yun et al., 2013) and (Zhuang et al., 2013). To our knowledge, however, DSGD and its extensions have only been used for matrix factorization problems where double separability can be immediately seen, and we are the first to apply the scheme beyond matrix factorization. **Exact Updates for** b_i : Although the DS-MLR formulation presented above allows both \mathbf{w}_k and b_i to be updated stochastically, one can make use of the closed-form updates of b_i to improve convergence. Based on this idea, we introduce a variant of DS-MLR Sync which we call the 1-delay algorithm. This is outlined in Algorithm 2. Here, each iteration consist of 2P inner-epochs. During the first P inner-epochs, each worker sends/receives its parameters $W^{(p)}$ to/from the adjacent machine and performs stochastic $W^{(p)}$ updates using the block of data $X^{(p)}$ and parameters $W^{(p)}$ that it owns. The second P inner-epochs are used to pass around the $W^{(p)}$ to compute the $b^{(\hat{p})}$ exactly using (6). We call this approach 1-delay because it uses versions of \mathbf{w}_k 's which are stale by one round of inner-epochs, to update b_i . Notice that our 1-delay algorithm is reminiscent of (Gopal and Yang, 2013). Instead of using L-BFGS to solve the inner sub-problems we use SGD to do the same.

Al	gorith	m 2	DS-ML	.R Sy	nchro	nous 1	-del	ay
----	--------	-----	-------	-------	-------	--------	------	----

1:	K: # classes, P: # workers, T: total outer iterations, t:
	outer iteration index, s: inner epoch index
2:	$W^{(p)}$: weights per worker, $b^{(p)}$: variational parameters
	per worker
3:	Initialize $W^{(p)} = 0, b^{(p)} = \frac{1}{K}$
4:	for all $p = 1, 2, \dots, P$ in parallel do
5:	for all $t=1,2,\ldots,T$ do
6:	for all $s = 1, 2,, P$ do
7:	Send $W^{(p)}$ to worker on the right
8:	Receive $W^{(p)}$ from worker on the left
9:	Update $W^{(p)}$ stochastically using (12)
10:	end for
11:	for all $s = 1, 2,, P$ do
12:	Send $W^{(p)}$ to worker on the right
13:	Receive $W^{(p)}$ from worker on the left
14:	Compute partial sums
15:	end for
16:	Update $b^{(p)}$ exactly (6) using the partial sums
17:	end for
18:	end for

Avoiding Bulk Synchronization: The 1-delay algorithm uses a synchronization step after the first P inner-epochs where the machines stop, exchange the parameters and update b_i exactly which is expensive. In order to get the best of both worlds - i.e., make use of closed form updates as well as avoid the additional synchronization step, we devise another variant of our method which we term as 0delay algorithm. The main idea in 0-delay is to update b_i in the background using their closed form (6) simultaneously while updating the \mathbf{w}_k 's. Since this approach uses the freshest copy of \mathbf{w}_k , we term it 0-delay. Computing b_i requires computing the partial sums $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i)$, so we compute these partial sums in the inner-epochs and then use them at the end to make the final update. This completely avoids any bulk synchronization in the outerepochs. This algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 4 in the Appendix.

4.2. DS-MLR Async

Although the techniques mentioned in section 4.1 speed up DS-MLR quite a bit, the algorithm is still fundamentally synchronous. This prevents performing computation and communication in parallel, which could drastically improve its performance. Based on this observation, we present an asynchronous version of DS-MLR. Due to the double-separable nature of our objective function (9), we can readily apply the NOMAD algorithm proposed in (Yun et al., 2013). The entire DS-MLR Async algorithm is described in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 DS-MLR Asynchronous
1: K: total # classes, P: total # workers
2: T: total outer iterations
3: $W^{(p)}$: weights per worker
4: $b^{(p)}$: variational parameters per worker
5: queue[P]: array of P worker queues
6: //Initialize parameters
7: Initialize $W^{(p)} = 0, b^{(p)} = \frac{1}{K}$
8: //Initialize worker queues
9: for $k \in W^{(p)}$ do
10: Pick q uniformly at random
11: queue[q].push((k, \mathbf{w}_k))
12: end for
13: //Start P workers
14: for all $p = 1, 2, \ldots, P$ in parallel do
15: for all $t = 1, 2,, T$ do
16: repeat
17: $(k, \mathbf{w}_k) \leftarrow \text{queue}[p].\text{pop}()$
18: Update \mathbf{w}_k stochastically using (12)
19: Compute partial sums
20: Compute index of next queue to push to: \hat{q}
21: queue[\hat{q}].push((k, \mathbf{w}_k))
22: until # of updates is equal to <i>K</i>
23: Update $b^{(p)}$ exactly (6) using the partial sums
24: end for
25: end for

The algorithm begins by distributing the data and parameters among P workers in the same fashion as in the synchronous version. However, here we also maintain Pworker queues. Initially the parameters $W^{(p)}$ are distributed uniformly at random across the queues. The workers subsequently can run their updates in parallel as follows: each one pops a parameter \mathbf{w}_k out the queue, updates it stochastically and pushes it into the queue of the next worker. Simultaneously, each worker also records the partial sum that is required for updating the variational parameters. This process repeats until K updates have been made which is equivalent to saying that each worker has updated every parameter \mathbf{w}_k . Following this, the worker updates all its variational parameters $b^{(p)}$ exactly using the partial sums (6).

For simplicity of explanation, we restricted Algorithm 3 to P workers on a single-machine. However, in our actual implementation, we follow a Hybrid Architecture. This means that there are multiple threads running on a single machine in addition to multiple machines sharing the load across the network. Therefore, in this setting, each worker (thread) first passes around the parameter \mathbf{w}_k across all the threads on its machine. Once this is completed, the parameter is tossed onto the queue of the first thread on the next machine.





(a) Initial assignment of W and X. Each worker works only on the diagonal active area in the beginning.



(b) After a worker finishes processing column k, it sends the corresponding item parameter \mathbf{w}_k to another worker. Here, \mathbf{w}_2 is sent from worker 1 to 4.



(d) During the execution of

the algorithm, the owner-

ship of the global parameters

(weight vectors) \mathbf{w}_k changes.

(c) Upon receipt, the column is processed by the new worker. Here, worker 4 can now process column 2 since it owns the column.

Figure 2. Illustration of the communication pattern in DS-MLR Async algorithm

5. Convergence

Although the semi-stochastic nature of DS-MLR makes it hard to directly apply the existing convergence results, under standard assumptions, it can be shown that it finds ϵ accurate solutions to the original objective L_1 in $T = O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations.

Theorem 1 Suppose all $||\mathbf{x}_i|| \leq r$ for a constant r > 0. Let the step size η_1 in (12) decay at the rate of $1/\sqrt{t}$. Then for both DS-MLR with 1-delay and 0-delay, \exists constant C independent of N, K, D and P, such that

$$\min_{t=1,\dots,T} L_1(W^t) - L_1(W) \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \forall W, \qquad (14)$$

where W^t is value of W at the end of the iteration t and \mathbf{x}_i denotes the data point. N, K, D, and P denote the number of data points, classes, dimensions and workers respectively.

It is worth noting that this rate of convergence is independent of the size of the problem. In particular, it is invariant to P, the number of workers. Therefore, as more workers become available, the computational cost per iteration can be effectively distributed without sacrificing the overall convergence rate, up to the point where communication cost becomes dominant. Detailed proof is relegated to the Appendix A. Our key idea in casting both algorithms as stochastic gradient descent methods is to demonstrate that although the update of W is based on a stale value of b arising from the delayed updates, such a delay still allows the error of the gradient of L_1 w.r.t W to be bounded by $O(\eta_1)$, in Euclidean norm.

6. Related Work

In this section, we outline some factors that are important to characterize parallel algorithms for machine learning and discuss related work on each of these aspects, thereby putting our DS-MLR method in perspective.

Online: Batch gradient descent methods Batch vs. compute the gradients over all instances in the dataset and have several advantages. Firstly, the gradient is less noisier than stochastic updates as it is averaged over a large number of samples; Secondly, it can use optimized matrix operations in the gradient computations. On the downside, it does not scale very well to large number of data points (Bottou and Bousquet, 2011). Stochastic gradient descent method (SGD) on the other hand, converges much more rapidly as it computes the gradient of one randomly chosen instance per iteration and makes frequent parameter updates (Bottou, 2010). A bigger challenge here is tuning the learning rate and there exist several methods to help with this (Zeiler, 2012). A nice tradeoff between these two approaches is to use Mini-batch stochastic gradient where the gradient is computed over manageable batches of the data. DS-MLR is a stochastic approach.

Exact vs. Inexact: Our work is not the first paper making use of delayed updates for stochastic gradient descent. Zinkevich et al. (2009) explored using delayed updates for SGD in the online setting and provide theoretical proofs for their convergence.

Single vs. Multi Machine: Distributed memory approaches offer the potential for much greater improve-

Dataset	# instances	# features	#classes	
CLEF	10,000	80	63	
NEWS20	11,260	53,975	20	
LSHTC1-small	4,463	51,033	1,139	
LSHTC1-large	93,805	347,256	12,294	
WikipediaLarge	2,365,436	20,000	325,056	
Reddit-20M	20,000,000	1,348,192	33,000	
Reddit-Full	302,097,708	1,348,192	33,000	

Table 3. Dataset Characteristics

ments than single-machine approaches as they can scale to datasets which struggle to fit on one machine, but they suffer from bandwidth issues arising as a result of communication across machines. Our approach DS-MLR can work in shared, distributed and hybrid settings. Several algorithms for parallelizing SGD have been proposed in the past such as Hogwild (Recht et al., 2011), Parallel SGD (Zinkevich et al., 2010), DSGD (Gemulla et al., 2011a), FPSGD (Zhuang et al., 2013) and more recently, Parameter Server (Li et al., 2013) and Petuum (Xing et al., 2015). Although the importance of data and model parallelism has been recognized in Parameter Server and the Petuum framework (Xing et al., 2015), to the best of our knowledge this has not been exploited in their specific instantiations such as applications to multinomial logistic regression (Xie et al., 2015). We believe this is because (Xie et al., 2015) does not reformulate the problem like the way DS-MLR does. Several problems in machine learning are not naturally wellsuited for data and model parallelism, and therefore such reformulations are essential in identifying a suitable structure. Other doubly-separable methods also exist such as NOMAD (Yun et al., 2013) for matrix completion and Ro-BiRank (Yun et al., 2014) for latent collaborative retrieval.

Synchronous vs. Asynchronous: Synchronous approaches suffer from non-uniform performance distributions of machines where some machines might happen to be very slow at a given time, thus bringing down the performance of the entire algorithm. Implementations based on Spark and Hadoop MapReduce for instance, are known to exhibit this problem. Asynchronous methods overcome these drawbacks. Parameter Server, HogWild Recht et al. (2011), NOMAD are all asynchronous approaches, although they differ in other aspects. DS-MLR has both synchronous and asynchronous variants and the latter is in the spirit of NOMAD.

7. Experiments

In our empirical study, we will focus on DS-MLR Async.

Datasets: We use a wide scale of real-world datasets as listed in Table 3. For single-machine single-core experiments, we consider: CLEF (Kocev), NEWS20 (Jason), and LSHTC1-small (Partalas et al., 2015). For single-machine

multi-core experiments, we use LSHTC1-large. For the multi-machine multi-core experiments, we use: WikipediaLarge (Partalas et al., 2015) and Reddit (Reddit).

Hardware: All single-machine experiments were run on a cluster with the configuration of two 8-core Intel Xeon-E5 processors and 32 GB memory per node. For multimachine multi-core, we used Intel vLab Knights Landing (KNL) cluster with node configuration of Intel Xeon Phi 7250 CPU (272 cores, 200GB memory), connected through Intel Omni-Path (OPA) Fabric. The asynchronous, nonblocking property of DS-MLR makes it ideal to be run on KNL, which is a many-core (68 core, 272 threads) architecture with massive FPLOPs, memory bandwidth, and large memory space (MCDRAM + DDR). GPUs cannot handle this case.

Implementation Details: We implemented our DS-MLR method in C++ using MPI for communication across nodes and Intel TBB for concurrent queues and multi-threading. To make the comparison fair, we re-implemented the LC (Gopal and Yang, 2013) method in C++ using MPI. For inner optimization in LC, we used ALGLIB. LC adaptively decreases the inner tolerance for the L-BFGS solver until a particular limit. We set the inner L-BFGS tolerance to 1e-9. Finally, for the L-BFGS implementation, we used the TAO package (from PETSc) with the tolerance set to 1e-9.

7.1. Single-machine Single-Core

We compare the following optimization methods: (i) *L-BFGS*, (ii) *LC*: and (iii) our proposed method *DS-MLR*. We make the following observations based on the results:

DS-MLR vs L-BFGS: L-BFGS is a highly efficient second-order method that has a rapid convergence rate. Even when pitched against such a powerful second order method, DS-MLR performs considerably well in comparison. In fact, on some datasets such as NEWS20, DS-MLR is almost on par with L-BFGS in terms of decreasing the objective and also achieves a better f-score much more quickly. Figure 3 shows the progress of objective function as a function of time for DS-MLR, L-BFGS and LC on NEWS20, CLEF, LSHTC1-small datasets. The corresponding plots showing f-score vs time are available in Appendix D. However, L-BFGS loses its applicability when the number of parameters increases beyond what can fit on a single-machine.

DS-MLR vs LC: DS-MLR consistently shows a faster decrease in objective compared to LC on all three datasets: NEWS20, LSHTC1-small and CLEF. In fact, LC has a tendency to stall towards the end and progresses very slowly to the optimal objective value. In CLEF dataset, to reach an optimal value of 0.398, DS-MLR takes 1,262 secs while



Figure 3. Single-machine Single-core experiments. λ and η are the regularizer and step-size respectively.



Figure 4. Single-Machine Multi-Core and Multi-Machine Multi-Core experiments. In each plot, $P=N \times M \times T$ denotes that there are N nodes each running M mpi tasks, with T threads each. λ and η are the regularizer and step-size respectively.

LC takes 21,003 secs. Similarly, in LSHTC1-small, to reach an optimal value of 0.065, DS-MLR takes 1,191 secs while LC takes 32,624 secs.

7.2. Single-machine Multi-Core

Here we compare DS-MLR only with LC. L-BFGS requires all its parameters to fit on one machine and is therefore not suited for model parallelism. For instance, even on modestly large datasets such as LSHTC1-large, there are \approx 4.2 billion parameters that need to be stored which would consume \approx 34GB of memory. Thus, parallelizing L-BFGS would involve duplicating 34 GB of parameters across all its processors. We ran DS-MLR using the configuration of 4 nodes \times 1 mpi task \times 12 threads for this experiment. In order to provide a reasonable amount of parallelism to LC, we ran it with 4 nodes \times 12 mpi tasks each. Figure 4 (left) shows how the objective function changes vs time for DS-MLR and LC on the LSHTC1-large dataset. As can be seen, DS-MLR out performs LC by a wide-margin despite the advantage LC has by duplicating data across all its processors.

7.3. Multi-machine Multi-Core

Wiki-large: We ran DS-MLR on wikilarge using 5 nodes \times 5 mpi tasks \times 20 threads. The progress in decreasing the objective function value is shown in Figure 4. We ran LC method using a similar configuration with MPI, however after nearly 20 hours it did not complete even a single iteration. In the same amount of time, DS-MLR was able to complete 9 iterations with the objective value changing

in second decimals. We also noticed consistently, that the LC method takes at least 4-5 times longer than DS-MLR to complete its first iteration.

Reddit datasets: In this sub-section, we demonstrate the capability of DS-MLR to solve a multi-class classification problem of massive scale, using a bag-of-words dataset *RedditFull* created out of 1.7 billion reddit user comments spanning the period 2007-2015. Details are in Table 3. Our aim is to classify a particular reddit comment (data point) into a suitable sub-reddit (class). The data in all occupies 200 GB and the model parameters total 300 GB. Therefore, LC cannot be applied here. DS-MLR is able to run on this successfully and produce results. The result of running DS-MLR on *Reddit-Full* for the first 40 iterations is shown in Figure 4.

To obtain a smaller dataset, we sub-sampled 20 million data points and created *Reddit20M*, reducing the data size to 20 GB, keeping the parameters size the same (300 GB). However, this data size is still quite large for LC method to run. The result of running DS-MLR on *Reddit20M* for the first few iterations is shown in Figure 4.

Appendix C presents DS-MLR's scaling behavior as the number of workers are varied and Appendix D has additional plots showing progress of f-score vs time.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we present a new stochastic optimization algorithm (DS-MLR) to solve multinomial logistic regression problems having large number of examples and classes, by exploiting both data and model parallelism simultaneously. Our algorithm is distributed, asynchronous and avoids any kind of bulk-synchronization overheads. As a result, DS-MLR can scale to arbitrarily large datasets where many of the existing methods do not seem to apply. To demonstrate this, we run DS-MLR on a massive dataset with 200 GB data and 300 GB parameters respectively to perform multi-class classification. Our work promises several interesting future directions in areas such as extreme multi-label classification and large-scale bayesian inference.

References

Dimitri P Bertsekas. Nonlinear programming. 1999.

- Leon Bottou. Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In *Proceedings of COMPSTAT'2010*. Springer, 2010.
- Leon Bottou and Olivier Bousquet. The tradeoffs of largescale learning. *Optimization for Machine Learning*, page 351, 2011.
- Guillaume Bouchard. Efficient bounds for the softmax function, applications to inference in hybrid models. 2007.
- Stephen Boyd, Neal Parikh, Eric Chu, Borja Peleato, and Jonathan Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends (R) in Machine Learning*, 3(1):1–122, 2011.
- Trishul Chilimbi, Yutaka Suzue, Johnson Apacible, and Karthik Kalyanaraman. Project adam: Building an efficient and scalable deep learning training system. In *OSDI*, 2014.
- Rainer Gemulla, Erik Nijkamp, Peter J Haas, and Yannis Sismanis. Large-scale matrix factorization with distributed stochastic gradient descent. ACM, 2011a.
- Rainer Gemulla, Erik Nijkamp, Peter J Haas, and Yannis Sismanis. Large-scale matrix factorization with distributed stochastic gradient descent. ACM, 2011b.
- Siddharth Gopal and Yiming Yang. Distributed training of large-scale logistic models. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 289–297, 2013.

Jason. http://qwone.com/~jason/ 20Newsgroups/.

Dragi Kocev. http://kt.ijs.si/DragiKocev/ PhD/resources/doku.php.

- Harold Kushner and G George Yin. *Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications*, volume 35. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- Mu Li, Li Zhou, Zichao Yang, Aaron Li, Fei Xia, David G Andersen, and AJ Smola. Parameter server for distributed machine learning. In *Big Learning NIPS Workshop*, 2013.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In Chris Burges, Leon Bottou, Max Welling, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Kilian Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, 2013.
- Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer, 2nd edition, 2006.
- Ioannis Partalas, Aris Kosmopoulos, Nicolas Baskiotis, Thierry Artieres, George Paliouras, Eric Gaussier, Ion Androutsopoulos, Massih-Reza Amini, and Patrick Galinari. Lshtc: A benchmark for large-scale text classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.08581, 2015.
- Benjamin Recht, Christopher Re, Stephen Wright, and Feng Niu. Hogwild: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 693–701, 2011.
- Reddit. https://www.reddit.com/r/ datasets/comments/3bxlg7/i_have_ every_publicly_available_reddit_ comment/.
- Herbert E. Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:400–407, 1951.
- P. Tseng and Communicated O. L. Mangasarian. Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization. *J. Optim Theory Appl*, pages 475–494, 2001.
- Pengtao Xie, Jin Kyu Kim, Yi Zhou, Qirong Ho, Abhimanu Kumar, Yaoliang Yu, and Eric P. Xing. Distributed machine learning via sufficient factor broadcasting. *CoRR*, 2015.
- Eric P Xing, Qirong Ho, Wei Dai, Jin Kyu Kim, Jinliang Wei, Seunghak Lee, Xun Zheng, Pengtao Xie, Abhimanu Kumar, and Yaoliang Yu. Petuum: a new platform for distributed machine learning on big data. *Big Data, IEEE Transactions on*, 2015.
- Hyokun Yun. *Doubly Separable Models*. PhD thesis, Purdue University West Lafayette, 2014.

- Hyokun Yun, Hsiang-Fu Yu, Cho-Jui Hsieh, SVN Vishwanathan, and Inderjit Dhillon. Nomad: Non-locking, stochastic multi-machine algorithm for asynchronous and decentralized matrix completion. 2013.
- Hyokun Yun, Parameswaran Raman, and S Vishwanathan. Ranking via robust binary classification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- Matthew D. Zeiler. Adadelta: An adaptive learning rate method. CoRR, abs/1212.5701, 2012.
- Ruiliang Zhang and James T Kwok. Asynchronous distributed admm for consensus optimization. In *ICML*, pages 1701–1709, 2014.
- Weicai Zhong, Jing Liu, Mingzhi Xue, and Licheng Jiao. A multiagent genetic algorithm for global numerical optimization. Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B: Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on, 34(2):1128–1141, 2004.
- Yong Zhuang, Yu-Chin Juan, and Chih-Jen Lin. A fast parallel stochastic gradient method for matrix factorization in shared memory systems. 2013.
- Martin Zinkevich, John Langford, and Alex J. Smola. Slow learners are fast. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 22. 2009.
- Martin Zinkevich, Markus Weimer, Lihong Li, and Alex J Smola. Parallelized stochastic gradient descent. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 2595–2603, 2010.

In the following sections, we provide a more detailed proof of convergence for our algorithms, present outline of the other algorithms mentioned in our formulation and also include additional plots from our empirical study.

A. Rates of convergence

First the diameter of W space can be bounded by a universal constant (independent of N, D, K) because we can always enforce that $\frac{1}{2\lambda} ||W||^2 \le f(\mathbf{0}) = \log K$ (ignoring log term). We also assume all \mathbf{x}_i are bounded in L_2 norm by some constant r. We will write r as a constant everywhere. They are not necessarily equal; in fact we may write r^2 and 2r as r. It just stands for some constant that is independent of ϵ, D, N and K.

We index outer iteration by superscript t and inner-epochs within each outer iteration by subscript k. So $W_1^t = W_{N+1}^{t-1}$, which we also denote as W^t . We consider optimizing the objective

$$L_1(W) = F(W) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(W), \qquad (15)$$

where $f_i(W) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|W\|^2 - w_{y_i}^T \mathbf{x}_i + \log \sum_{k=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i)$. Clearly f_i has a variational representation

$$f_{i}(W) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|W\|^{2} - w_{y_{i}}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \min_{a_{i} \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -a_{i} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} + a_{i}) \right\} - 1,$$
(16)

where the optimal a_i is attained at $-\log \sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i)$. So given W, we can first compute the optimal a_i , and then use it to compute the gradient of f_i via the variational form (Danskin's theorem (Bertsekas, 1999)).

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{w}_k} f_i(W) = \lambda \mathbf{w}_k - [y_i = k] \mathbf{x}_i + \exp(\mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{x}_i + a_i) \mathbf{x}_i.$$
(17)

Here $[\cdot] = 1$ if \cdot is true, and 0 otherwise.

Due to the distributed setting, we are only able to update a_i to their optimal value at the end of each epoch (*i.e.* based on W^t):

$$a_i^t = a_i(W^t) = -\log \sum_{k=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T w_k^t).$$
 (18)

We are *not* able to compute the optimal a_i for the latest W when incremental gradient is performed through the whole dataset. Fortunately, since W is updated in an epoch by a

fixed (small) step size η_t , it is conceivable that the a_i computed from W^t will not be too bad as a solution in (16) for W_k^t , $k \in [m]$. In fact, if $||W_k^t - W^t||$ is order $O(\eta_t)$, then the following Lemma says the gradient computed from (17) using the out-of-date a_i is also $O(\eta_t)$ away from the true gradient at W_k^t .

Lemma 2 Denote the approximate gradient of f_i evaluated at W_k^t based on a_i^t as

$$\tilde{G}_k^t = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_K), \tag{19}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{c} = \lambda w_{k,c}^{t} - [y_{i} = c] \mathbf{x}_{i} + \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{k,c}^{t} + a_{i}^{t}) \mathbf{x}_{i}.$ Then $\left\| \tilde{G}_{k}^{t} - \nabla_{W} f_{i}(W_{k}^{t}) \right\| \leq \frac{r}{K} \| W_{k}^{t} - W^{t} \|.$

Proof Unfolding the term a_i^t from (18),

$$\begin{split} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{c} &- \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{c}} f_{i}(W_{k}^{t}) \\ &= \left(\frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{k,c}^{t})}{\sum_{c=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{c}^{t})} - \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{k,c}^{t})}{\sum_{c=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{k,c}^{t})} \right) \mathbf{x}_{i} \end{split}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{G} - \nabla_W f_i(W_k^t) \right\| \\ &\leq r\sqrt{K} \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{c=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T w_c^t)} - \frac{1}{\sum_{c=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T w_{k,c}^t)} \right. \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to upper bound the gradient of $1/\sum_{c=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T w_c)$. Since \mathbf{x}_i and w_c are bounded, $\exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T w_c)$ is lower bounded by a positive universal constant¹. Now,

$$\left\| \nabla_{W} \frac{1}{\sum_{c=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{c})} \right\|$$

= $\frac{1}{(\sum_{c=1}^{K} \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{c}))^{2}} \left\| (\exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{1}) \mathbf{x}_{i}, \dots, \exp(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} w_{K}) x_{i}) \right\|$
 $\leq \frac{\sqrt{K}}{K^{2}} r$

Using Lemma 2, we can now show that our algorithm achieves $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ epoch complexity, with no dependency on m, d, or K. In fact we just apply Nedic's algorithm and analysis on F(W). However we need to adapt their proof a little because they assume the gradients are *exact*.

First we need to bound some quantities. $\|\nabla f_i(W)\| \leq r$ because W is bounded, and for K numbers p_1, \ldots, p_K on

¹If one is really really meticulous and notes that $||W||^2 \le 2\lambda \log K$ which does involve K, one should be appeased that $\exp(\sqrt{\log K})$ is $o(K^{\alpha})$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

a simplex with $\sum_c p_c = 1$, we have $\sum_c p_c^2 \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, suppose f_k is used for update at step k. Then W_k^t is subtracted by $\frac{\eta_t}{m} (\lambda W_k^t - x_k \otimes \mathbf{e}'_{y_k} + \tilde{G}_k^t)$, where \otimes is Kroneker product and \mathbf{e}_c is a canonical vector. As long as $\eta_t \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$, we can recursively apply Lemma 2 and derive bounds

$$\left\| W_k^t - W^t \right\| \le \frac{k}{m} \eta_t r,\tag{20}$$

$$\left\|\nabla_W f_k(W_k^t) - \tilde{G}_k^t\right\| \le \eta_t r,\tag{21}$$

$$\left\|\tilde{G}_k^t\right\| \le r,\tag{22}$$

for all k. Now we run Nedic's proof. Then for any W

$$\begin{split} \left\| W_{k+1}^{t} - W \right\|^{2} \\ &= \left\| W_{k}^{t} - \frac{\eta_{t}}{m} \tilde{G}_{k}^{t} - W \right\|^{2} \\ &= \left\| W_{k}^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\frac{\eta_{t}}{m} \left\langle \tilde{G}_{k}^{t}, W_{k}^{t} - W \right\rangle + \frac{\eta_{t}^{2}}{m^{2}} \left\| \tilde{G}_{k}^{t} \right\|^{2} \\ &= \left\| W_{k}^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\frac{\eta_{t}}{m} \left(\left\langle \nabla_{W} f_{k}(W_{k}^{t}), W_{k}^{t} - W \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{G}_{k}^{t} - \nabla_{W} f_{k}(W_{k}^{t}), W_{k}^{t} - W \right\rangle \right) + \frac{\eta_{t}^{2}}{m^{2}} \left\| \tilde{G}_{k}^{t} \right\|^{2} \\ &\leq \left\| W_{k}^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\frac{\eta_{t}}{m} \left(f_{k}(W_{k}^{t}) - f_{k}(W) - \eta_{t}r \right) + \frac{\eta_{t}^{2}}{m^{2}} r^{2} \end{split}$$

Telescoping over k = 1, ..., m, we obtain that for all W and t:

$$\begin{split} \left\| W^{t+1} - W \right\|^{2} &\leq \left\| W^{t} - W \right\|^{2} \\ &- 2 \frac{\eta_{t}}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left(f_{k}(W_{k}^{t}) - f_{k}(W) \right) + \eta_{t}^{2} r \\ &\leq \left\| W^{t} - W \right\|^{2} \\ &- 2 \eta_{t} \left(F(W^{t}) - F(W) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left(f_{k}(W_{k}^{t}) - f_{k}(W^{t}) \right) \right) \\ &+ \eta_{t}^{2} r. \end{split}$$

Using the fact that ∇f_k is bounded by a universal constant, we further derive

$$\begin{split} \left\| W^{t+1} - W \right\|^{2} \\ &\leq \left\| W^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\eta_{t} \left(F(W^{t}) - F(W) \right) \\ &+ 2\frac{\eta_{t}}{m} r \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left\| W_{k}^{t} - W^{t} \right\| + \eta_{t}^{2} r \\ &\leq \left\| W^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\eta_{t} \left(F(W^{t}) - F(W) \right) \\ &+ 2\frac{\eta_{t}^{2}}{m} r \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{k}{m} + \eta_{t}^{2} r \quad (by (20)) \\ &= \left\| W^{t} - W \right\|^{2} - 2\eta_{t} \left(F(W^{t}) - F(W) \right) + \eta_{t}^{2} r \end{split}$$

Now use the standard step size of $O(1/\sqrt{t})$, we conclude

$$\min_{t=1...T} F(W^t) - F(W) \le \frac{r}{\sqrt{T}}.$$
(23)

Note the proof has not used the convexity of a_i in (16) at all. This is reasonable because it is "optimized out".

B. DS-MLR Sync (0-delay)

Below we describe the 0-delay approach.

|--|

1:	K: # classes, P : # workers, T : total outer iterations, t :
	outer iteration index, s: inner epoch index
2:	$W^{(p)}$: weights per worker, $b^{(p)}$: variational parameters
	per worker
3:	Initialize $W^{(p)} = 0, b^{(p)} = \frac{1}{K}$
4:	for all $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$ do
5:	for all $s = 1, 2, \ldots, P$ do
6:	Send $W^{(p)}$ to worker on the right
7:	Receive $W^{(p)}$ from worker on the left
8:	Compute partial sums
9:	Update $W^{(p)}$ stochastically using (12)
10:	end for
11.	Undate $b^{(p)}$ exactly (6) using the partial sums

11: Update $b^{(\nu)}$ exactly (6) using the partial sums 12: end for

C. Scaling behavior of DS-MLR as a function of the number of workers

In Figure 5, we plot how the objective function as well as the f-score varies when we change the the number of workers (# mpi tasks \times # threads) on the lshtc1-large dataset. We first increase the number of threads on a single machine (as a single mpi task) as 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 20. Next, we run two mpi tasks with 10 each and four mpi tasks with 5 threads each. In an ideal scenario with linear scaling, we would expect all the figures to overlap with each other. This is precisely what we observe, the scalability in terms of # of threads is very good, while scaling in terms of # of mpi tasks is affected a bit on increasing # of tasks.



Figure 5. Change in objective function and f1-scores as a function of computation time while the # of workers are varied

D. Additional Plots

Below we show how the macro and micro f-score changes as a function of time on the various datasets.



Figure 6. (Left): objective vs time, (Center): test micro F1 vs time, (Right): test macro F1 vs time



Figure 7. (Left): objective vs time, (Center): test micro F1 vs time, (Right): test macro F1 vs time



Figure 8. (Left): objective vs time, (Center): test micro F1 vs time, (Right): test macro F1 vs time



Figure 9. (Left): Objective vs time, (Center): test micro F1 vs time, (Right): test macro F1 vs time



Figure 10. (Left): Objective vs time, (Center): test micro F1 vs time, (Right): test macro F1 vs time