

Worst-case Complexity of Cyclic Coordinate Descent: $O(n^2)$ Gap with Randomized Version

Ruoyu Sun ^{*} Yinyu Ye[†]

Abstract

This paper concerns the worst-case complexity of cyclic coordinate descent (C-CD) for minimizing a convex quadratic function, which is equivalent to Gauss-Seidel method and can be transformed to Kaczmarz method and projection onto convex sets (POCS). We observe that the known provable complexity of C-CD can be $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than randomized coordinate descent (R-CD), but no example was rigorously proven to exhibit such a large gap. In this paper we show that the gap indeed exists. We prove that there exists an example for which C-CD takes at least $\mathcal{O}(n^4 \kappa_{\text{CD}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ operations, where κ_{CD} is related to Demmel's condition number and it determines the convergence rate of R-CD. It implies that in the worst case C-CD can indeed be $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than R-CD, which has complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \kappa_{\text{CD}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. Note that for this example, the gap exists for any fixed update order, not just a particular order. Based on the example, we establish several almost tight complexity bounds of C-CD for quadratic problems. One difficulty with the analysis is that the spectral radius of a non-symmetric iteration matrix does not necessarily constitute a *lower bound* for the convergence rate.

An immediate consequence is that for Gauss-Seidel method, Kaczmarz method and POCS, there is also an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between the cyclic versions and randomized versions (for solving linear systems). We also show that the classical convergence rate of POCS by Smith, Solmon and Wager [1] is always worse and sometimes can be infinitely times worse than our bound.

1 Introduction

Coordinate descent (CD) algorithms have been very popular recently due to their efficiency for solving large-scale optimization problems (see, e.g., [1] for a recent survey). In the most basic form, cyclic CD (C-CD) optimizes over one variable at a time with other variables fixed, and the variables are chosen according to a fixed order. Due to the simplicity, CD methods are one of the most widely used class of optimization methods in science and engineering. Its applications include tensor decomposition [2], libsvm package for SVM in machine learning [3, 4], glmnet package for Lasso in statistics [5–7], resource allocation in wireless communications [8–11], to name a few; see some other applications in [12–16].

For the theoretical analysis, most early works focused on the exact conditions for the convergence (e.g., Powell [17], Bertsekas [18], Tseng [19], Grippio and Sciandrone [20]) and the quality of convergence (e.g. Luo and Tseng [21]). A landmark in the history of CD algorithms is the establishment of the explicit convergence rate of randomized CD (R-CD) [22, 23], a variant which updates variables randomly. In particular, R-CD was shown to be $\mathcal{O}(1)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times faster than GD, where n is the number of variables. Note that the introduction of randomized update order is crucial since it makes the analysis of CD methods quite

^{*}Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, Univeristy of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL. ruoyus@illinois.edu.

[†]Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. yeye@stanford.edu.

simple. Ever since then, randomized update rule has been a new standard for theoretical analysis of CD-type methods [1, 24–33]. Furthermore, accelerated R-CD was shown to have better complexity than conjugate gradient method (in some parameters) when solving symmetric PD (positive definite) linear systems [34], and can improve the complexity of solving packing and covering LP (Linear Programming) [35].

With all these nice theoretical results on R-CD, one may wonder whether the same results can be achieved for C-CD. There are several reasons for studying cyclic methods. (1) The complexity of deterministic algorithms is theoretically important (partly because generating random bits is highly non-trivial). For example, the first polynomial-time deterministic algorithm for PRIME was regarded as a great achievement [36]. Another example is the interesting open question whether there exists a version of deterministic simplex method that can solve LP in polynomial time. (2) The study of the cyclic order may help us understand other update orders. For instance, the random permutation order was observed to perform very well in practice for CD, SGD and ADMM [29, 37, 38], but the best known convergence rate bounds of randomly permuted CD are almost the same as that of cyclic versions [39] (except for some special cases [40]). (3) In practice, it is not always easy or desirable to randomly pick coordinates. The typical computer architecture consists of multiple layers including caches, memory and hard disk, and fully randomized coordinate selection might be time-consuming when the communication between components of the system is not very fast. For example, it was pointed out in [37] that the sampling time of randomized order is not negligible. In certain distributed optimization algorithm [41], independently randomized order was deliberately avoided due to specific design requirement. (4) Many practitioners are still using cyclic versions of CD; one example is that statisticians are still using cyclic CD to solve Lasso [42]. If cyclic CD performs well in practice and already implemented in software packages, why would one change to randomized versions? A more comprehensive understanding of different update orders may help practitioners choose an appropriate update order.

There have been some recent efforts to understand the convergence speed of C-CD¹ [39, 43–46]. For simplicity, we will discuss these bounds for applying C-CD to strongly convex quadratic functions $x^T Ax - 2b^T x$, which is equivalent to Gauss-Seidel method, Kaczmarz method and POCS in this special setting (see discussions later). We further assume the coefficient matrix A has equal diagonal entries. Suppose the maximum eigenvalue, minimum eigenvalue and average eigenvalue of A are $\lambda_{\max}, \lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\text{avg}}$ respectively, the condition number $\kappa \triangleq \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\min}$, and $\kappa_{CD} \triangleq \lambda_{\text{avg}}/\lambda_{\min}$. It is well-known that the complexity of GD is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\kappa)$, and the complexity of R-CD is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\kappa_{CD})$, in which we ignore an $\mathcal{O}(\log 1/\epsilon)$ factor. This implies that R-CD is $\tau \triangleq \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}} \in [1, n]$ times better than GD; here, note that the gap τ can be as large as n . The best known complexity of C-CD for quadratic problems is approximately $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\tau\kappa\log^2 n)$ which is at least τ -times worse than GD and τ^2 times worse than R-CD. This theoretical bound does not match the numerical experiments which almost always show that C-CD converges much faster than GD. The existing results seem so weak that they even make a wrong prediction on whether C-CD is faster than GD. The potential $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between C-CD and R-CD also seems quite strange, as such a huge gap has not been reported by practitioners.

It is very tempting to think that we might be able to prove C-CD is faster than GD, or even comparable to R-CD. The discrepancy between the theory and the practice might just be because of the weakness of the proof techniques. This impression may be enhanced when we reflect on the existing proofs of upper bounds. The proof idea of [39, 43] is to view C-CD as an inexact version of GD, and the major effort is spent on bounding the difference between C-CD and GD. One obvious drawback of such a proof framework is that it cannot show a better convergence rate than GD; even if the difference is zero, only the same rate would be established. It seems possible that there exists a different proof framework for C-CD that leads to better

¹ In fact, the analysis applies to cyclic BCGD (Block Coordinate Gradient Descent) for solving convex problems. For minimizing convex quadratic functions, cyclic CGD with a special stepsize is the same as cyclic CD (i.e. exactly minimizing each subproblem).

convergence rates. To understand this issue is the main purpose of this paper.

1.1 CD, Gauss-Seidel Method, POCS, Kaczmarz method

In this subsection, we review several closely related methods: Gauss-Seidel method, Kaczmarz method and POCS (Projection Onto Convex Sets, a.k.a., alternating projection method). We will see that they are equivalent in the simple yet important setting of solving linear systems, thus understanding convergence speed is a common issue for all these methods.

Gauss-Seidel (G-S) method, first proposed by Gauss and Seidel in 19th century, is one of the oldest iterative algorithms. It can be used to solve any system of linear equations, though the convergence is only guaranteed when the coefficient matrix satisfies some diagonally dominant properties or is symmetric PSD (Positive SemiDefinite). Regarding the convergence speed, it is well-known that for some special matrices, asymptotically G-S method converges twice as fast as Jacobi method (see, e.g., [48]).

POCS is a method to solve the convex feasibility problem, i.e., find a point in the intersection of closed convex sets. POCS has found many applications in applied mathematics and engineering; see, e.g., a survey of ten applications of POCS by Deutsch [49]. The convergence of POCS was proved by Von Neumann for two sets in 1933 [50] and Halperin for more than two sets [51]. The convergence rate of POCS was given by Smith, Solmon and Wagner [52], and improved by a few works (e.g. [53, 54]). For a detailed review of numerous works in this field, we refer the readers to Bauschke, Borwein and Lewis [55], Escalante and Raydan [56] and Galantai [57].

Kaczmarz method is an old method for solving linear systems of equations proposed in 1937 [58]. A recent work [59] proved explicit convergence rate of randomized Kaczmarz method, which motivated works on R-CD. Note that Kaczmarz method is a special case of POCS when the sets are hyperplanes.

The basic versions of G-S method, POCS, Kaczmarz method and CD are equivalent. As mentioned above, Kaczmarz method is a special case of POCS. Under a basis transformation, Kaczmarz method is equivalent to G-S method for solving a symmetric PSD linear system, which is equivalent to cyclic CD (C-CD) for minimizing convex quadratic functions (see Appendix A). Note that G-S, POCS and CD are not equivalent in more general settings; in fact, G-S can be used to solve non-symmetric linear systems, POCS can be used to find intersection of any closed convex sets, and CD can be used to solve non-quadratic non-smooth problems. It seems not easy to obtain a unified convergence analysis for all of them. Nevertheless, to understand the worst-case complexity, we need to first study the simplest setting, in which these methods are equivalent and thus can be analyzed altogether. In particular, the major question we want to answer is:

For coordinate descent, G-S method, POCS and Kaczmarz method, is there an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between the worst-case convergence rate of their cyclic versions and randomized versions?

1.2 Summary of Contributions

We will focus on the worst-case complexity of C-CD for minimizing convex quadratic functions $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x$. As discussed in Section 1.1, in this simple setting, C-CD is equivalent to G-S method, Kaczmarz method and POCS. In the following, we will say an algorithm has complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(g(n, \theta))$, if it takes $\mathcal{O}(g(n, \theta) \log(1/\epsilon))$ unit operations to achieve relative error $\frac{f(x) - f^*}{f(x^0) - f^*} \leq \epsilon$. It is well-known that GD has complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2 \kappa)$ and R-CD has complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2 \kappa_{CD})$, where $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\min}$ is the condition number, $\kappa_{CD} = \lambda_{\text{avg}}/\lambda_{\min}$. Denote $\tau \triangleq \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}} \in [1, n]$.

We summarize our results, when specialized to the equal-diagonal case (i.e. all diagonal entries are the

same) in the following table, ignoring a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log 1/\epsilon)$. The non-equal-diagonal case is quite subtle and related to conjectures on Jacobi-preconditioning; see Section 4.3. Our main contribution is to establish several lower bounds by analyzing the convergence rate of a simple class of examples. Our discovery is that the upper bounds are “almost” tight (up to $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ factor) in the equal-diagonal case. More specifically, the table shows the following results:

| Parameters | κ | κ and τ | $\kappa_{CD}(=\kappa/\tau)$ |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| C-CD Upper bound (Proposition 3.1) | $n^3\kappa$ | $\frac{1}{10}n^2\kappa\tau\log^2 n$ | $n^4\kappa_{CD}$ |
| C-CD Lower bound (Theorem 3.1) | $\frac{1}{40}n^3\kappa$ | $\frac{1}{40}n^2\kappa\tau$ | $\frac{1}{40}n^4\kappa_{CD}$ |

- In terms of κ or κ_{CD} , the worst-case complexity of C-CD is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3\kappa) \text{ or } \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\kappa_{CD}). \quad (1)$$

Both bounds are tight up to constant factors. This implies that C-CD can be $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times slower than GD and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than R-CD.

- It is more precise to characterize the complexity using an extra parameter τ together with κ or κ_{CD} . The lower bound for the complexity of C-CD is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\kappa\tau) \text{ or } \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\kappa_{CD}\tau^2), \quad (2)$$

which is τ times worse than GD or τ^2 times worse than R-CD. The range of the gap τ is $[1, n]$ and can be large in most cases. These two bounds are “almost” tight as they are only $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ -times smaller than the upper bounds.

To prove the lower bounds, we only need to estimate the convergence rate of our specific examples, and there are at least two difficulties. Firstly, there is no closed form expression of the spectral radius of the iteration matrix and we need to consider the limiting behavior of a class of examples (still with fixed n). Secondly, the spectral radius does not directly lead to a lower bound of the convergence rate when the iteration matrix is *non-symmetric*, and we need to explore some special structure of the examples.

Simulation shows that our worst-case bound is *partially* consistent with the numerical experiments. We perform numerical experiments for dozens of random distributions of matrix A , and the relation between the numerical findings and the theory are summarized below.

- Our theoretical bound of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2\kappa\tau)$ indicates that C-CD converges slowly when $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$ is large. Interestingly, we do observe that when the off-diagonal entries are large and thus $\lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$ is large, C-CD is indeed slow. This shows that the theory is partially consistent with the simulations.
- In almost all scenarios (except random perturbations of our example) C-CD converges much *faster* than GD, which is *opposite* to the theory. The gap between C-CD and R-CD in the experiments is far from the theoretical gap $\mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$. This discrepancy reveals the weakness of the worst-case analysis.

1.3 Discussions

We further discuss a few interesting issues related to this work.

Gap Between Cyclic and Randomized Algorithms. We prove for the first time that C-CD, Gauss-Seidel method, Kaczmarz method and POCS can be $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than their randomized counterparts.

Despite the long history of these algorithms, this $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap was not rigorously established before. This is one of the few examples in continuous optimization that a large gap between a certain deterministic algorithm and its randomized counterpart is established.

Robustness of Worst-case Examples. Our worst-case example appears to be quite robust. A common belief is that C-CD can be slow because one particular order can be very bad, and randomly pick an order and fix it will be good. Indeed, this is the case for Example 2 in Section 4.2. However, for our example, *any fixed order* out of all $n!$ possible orders is equally slow. Another possible way to fix the worst-case example is to perturb the problem input. In a different scenario, a small perturbation of the problem input makes the complexity of the simplex method much better [60]. However, under a small perturbation of our example, C-CD is still $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than R-CD.

Role of Examples in Convergence Analysis. Our contribution is not just to provide an example that C-CD is much slower than R-CD. A single example itself says little, because there might exist another example that C-CD is much faster than R-CD. What is more interesting is how the example interacts with the theoretical bounds. There is an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between existing bounds of C-CD and R-CD, and our contribution is to prove that our example matches both bounds of C-CD and R-CD, thus validating the $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap. Not all examples can make the same “achievement”. See more discussions in Section 4.2.

Fundamental Gap Between Deterministic and Randomized CD? Our results only establish a large gap between a single deterministic version of CD and R-CD. A natural question arises: is there a fundamental gap between deterministic CD and randomized CD? There has to be an answer: either we can prove a large lower bound for *all* deterministic CD methods, or we can find one deterministic CD that performs close to R-CD. Both possibilities are very interesting. For the latter possibility, there are a few candidates such as CGD with stepsize other than $1/L_i$ (equivalent to SOR, i.e. successive over relaxation) and double sweep method (a.k.a. symmetric SOR), but they are far worse than R-CD for our example.

Deterministic Complexity. Recent progress on the complexity of some important classes of problems (e.g. PD linear systems, positive LP) is based on randomized versions of CD methods. As we have established a large gap between C-CD and R-CD, it is unclear whether the same complexity can be achieved for deterministic algorithms. For example, CG (conjugate gradient) is still the fastest *deterministic* iterative algorithm for solving PSD linear systems, even though accelerated R-CD is faster in a probabilistic sense.

Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice. It is an interesting question how to explain the large discrepancy between the theory and the practical performance of C-CD. This kind of discrepancy may lead to novel theoretical advances. One famous example is the smoothed analysis developed by Spielman and Teng [60] that aims to explain such a gap for the simplex method. What type of analysis is suitable for explaining the practical performance of C-CD (e.g. why is it usually much faster than GD)? Smoothed analysis is not enough as a small perturbation of our example still exhibits the large gap. This seems to be a difficult question that is currently beyond our reach. We think one possibility is to introduce a new metric that measures the convergence speed.

How to Compare Algorithms? It is widely accepted that Lanczos method is faster than power method, and conjugate gradient method is faster than GD, both theoretically and empirically. In particular, one theoretical justification is that in both cases the former achieves a rate dependent on $\sqrt{\kappa}$ while the latter achieves a rate dependent on κ . When it comes to the comparison of cyclic algorithms and randomized algorithms, the conclusion is far less clear. One issue is that there is no longer a proper metric like κ to quantify the convergence rate of both algorithms. While κ_{CD} is a natural choice for R-CD, the choices for C-CD are more abundant. In POCS literature, the rate is quantified by complicated functions of the angles between subspaces; in optimization literature, the rate is quantified by both κ and κ_{CD} , and sometimes complicated functions of the Hessian [39]. We also argue in Section 4.3 that for non-equal-diagonal case, a

natural metric should depend on eigenvalues of a Jacobi-preconditioned matrix, not the original matrix. It is for the comparison purpose that we express the convergence rate of C-CD in terms of the metric for R-CD. Therefore, our work cannot provide a complete answer to the worst-case complexity of C-CD and Kaczmarz method, and the investigation on other quantities and the influence on the comparison is left as future work.

Related Algorithms. We hope this research will shed light on the study of related algorithms, such as POCS, SGD (Stochastic Gradient Descent) and ADMM (Alternating Direction of Multiplier Method). For ADMM, it was recently found that the cyclic version with at least 3 blocks can be divergent [61], while randomly permuted version converges in expectation for solving linear systems [38], so a fundamental gap between cyclic versions and randomly permuted versions exists. Nevertheless, it was also known that for certain problems (e.g. strongly convex) the small-stepsize versions of cyclic ADMM can be convergent [62–64]. Based on the results of the current work, it is reasonable to conjecture that in these cases cyclic ADMM still achieve worse convergence rate than randomized versions of ADMM.

1.4 Notations and Organization

Most notations in this paper are standard. Throughout the paper, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric positive semi-definite matrix. Let $L = \lambda_{\max}(A)$, $\lambda_{\min}(A)$, $\lambda_{\text{avg}}(A)$ denote the maximum eigenvalue, minimum *non-zero* eigenvalue and average eigenvalue of A respectively; sometimes we omit the argument A and just use λ_{\max} , λ_{\min} and λ_{avg} . The condition number of A is defined as $\kappa = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(A)}{\lambda_{\min}(A)}$. Denote A_{ij} as the (i, j) -th entry of A and $L_i = A_{ii}$ as the i -th diagonal entry of A . We use redundant notations L and L_i to be consistent with the optimization literature: L represents the global Lipschitz constant and L_i represents the i -th coordinate Lipschitz constant of the gradient of the function $\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax$. We denote $\mathcal{R}(A) = \{Ax \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ as the range space of A . Denote A^\dagger as the pseudo-inverse of A , which can be defined as $V \text{diag}\{1/\lambda_1, \dots, 1/\lambda_r, 0, \dots, 0\}V^{-1}$ when the eigen-decomposition of A is $V \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r, 0, \dots, 0\}V^{-1}$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ are all the non-zero eigenvalues of A .

The less widely used notations are summarized below. We denote $L_{\max} = \max_i L_i$ and $L_{\min} = \min_i L_i$ as the maximum/minimum per-coordinate Lipschitz constant (i.e. maximum/minimum diagonal entry of A), and $L_{\text{avg}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n L_i)/n$ as the average of the diagonal entries of A (which is also the average of the eigenvalues of A). Denote $\kappa_{CD} = \frac{L_{\text{avg}}}{\lambda_{\min}} = \frac{\lambda_{\text{avg}}}{\lambda_{\min}}$ which is a well-studied quantity that characterizes the convergence rate of R-CD. We usually use Γ to denote the lower triangular part of matrix A with diagonal entries, i.e. $\Gamma_{ij} = A_{ij}$ iff $i \leq j$. We also use D_A to denote the diagonal matrix consisting of diagonal entries of A . Finally, an important quantity $\tau \triangleq \frac{L}{L_{\min}} = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\text{avg}}}$, a crucial ratio that characterizes the difference between GD, C-CD and R-CD.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the algorithms discussed in the paper. In Section 3, we present our theoretical results on the complexity of C-CD as well as the comparison of C-CD with other algorithms. In Section 5, we provide an overview of the proof techniques and main steps. Section 6 is devoted to the proof of the main result Theorem 3.1. In Section 7, we present some numerical experiments. In Section 8, we summarize our findings and discuss some future directions. The proofs of results other than Theorem 3.1 are provided in the appendix.

2 Preliminaries: Several Algorithms

In this section we will review several variants of CD, G-S method, Kaczmarz method and POCS. We mainly consider the quadratic minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} x^T A x - b^T x,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric PSD (positive semi-definite) matrix, $b \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $A_{ii} \neq 0, \forall i$. All the optimal solutions of the problem satisfy the system of linear equations

$$Ax = b.$$

When A is non-singular (thus positive definite), the unique minimizer $x = A^{-1}b$ is the unique solution to the linear system. When A is singular, there are infinitely many optimal solutions.

Gradient descent. GD (gradient descent) is one of the most basic iterative algorithms. Starting at $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, GD proceeds as follows:

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(x) = x^k - \frac{1}{L} (Ax - b).$$

There are many other choices of stepsizes, but we use a constant stepsize $1/L$ in the paper because it is simple and already leads to the standard complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \kappa \log 1/\epsilon)$ for quadratic problems.

Cyclic Coordinate Descent and Gauss-Seidel Method. The C-CD algorithm updates the variables cyclically by minimizing the objective function over one variable with other variables fixed. Each cycle of C-CD consists of the update of all variables:

$$x_i \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{x_i} f(x_i; x_{-i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where x_{-i} denotes the collection of all variables except x_i . The update order in each cycle is fixed, such as $(1, 2, \dots, n)$. For the quadratic problem, the subproblems are single-variable quadratic problems with closed-form solutions. Thus it can be written in the following way, assuming the initial point is $x^0 = x^{0,0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k,j} &= x^{k,j-1} - \frac{A(j,:)x^{k,j-1} - b_j}{A_{jj}} e_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n; \\ x^{k+1} &= x^{k,n}, \quad x^{k+1,0} = x^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where e_j is the j -th standard unit vector with only one nonzero entry 1 in the j -th position, $A(j,:)$ denotes the j -th row of A , and A_{jj} denotes the j -th diagonal entry of A .

The algorithm (3) is also the Gauss-Seidel method for solving the linear system $Ax = b$. Note that even if A is not symmetric, one can still apply G-S method (the update equations are exactly the same as above), but it only converges under certain assumptions on A .

We can write the above update equation as a simple matrix recursion

$$x^{k+1} - x^* = (I - \Gamma^{-1}A)(x^k - x^*),$$

where x^* is one optimal solution, and Γ is the lower triangular part of A with diagonal entries, i.e., $\Gamma_{ij} = A_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$. We denote the iteration matrix as

$$M = I - \Gamma^{-1}A.$$

Randomized Coordinate Descent. R-CD (randomized coordinate descent) algorithm starts at z^0 and proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{FOR } j = 1, 2, \dots \\ & \quad \text{Randomly pick } t \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ uniformly at random,} \\ & \quad z^{j+1} = z^j - \frac{A(t, :)z^j - b_j}{A(t, t)}e_t. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The output of R-CD is a sequence (z^1, z^2, \dots) . We further define $x^k = z^{kn}$, $\forall k$, to be comparable with GD and C-CD. Here k can be viewed as the index of “epoch”, where each epoch consists of n iterations.

Randomly Permuted Coordinate Descent. We also consider RP-CD (randomly permuted coordinate descent). Starting from $x^0 = x^{0,0}$, the algorithm proceeds as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{At epoch } k, \text{ pick a permutation } \sigma_k \text{ uniformly at random from the set of all permutations.} \\ & \text{FOR } j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ & \quad t = \sigma_k(j); \\ & \quad x^{k,j} = x^{k,j-1} - \frac{A(t, :)x^{k,j-1} - b_j}{A_{tt}}e_t; \\ & \quad x^{k+1} = x^{k,n}, \quad x^{k+1,0} = x^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

According to [38, Section II.A], the recursion formula of RP-CD is

$$x^k = (I - \Gamma_{\sigma_k}^{-1}A)x^{k-1}, \tag{6}$$

where σ_k is the permutation used in the k -th iteration, and $\Gamma_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined by

$$\Gamma_\sigma(\sigma(i), \sigma(j)) \triangleq \begin{cases} A_{\sigma(i), \sigma(j)} & j \leq i. \\ 0 & j > i, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

For example, when $n = 3$ and $\sigma = (\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \sigma(3)) = (231)$,

$$\Gamma_{(231)} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ 0 & A_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

POCS [51, 55–57, 65]. POCS is a general method to find a common point of m closed convex sets $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_m$. Starting from any point x^0 , the algorithm proceeds by performing projection onto these sets one by one:

$$x^{k+1} = P_m P_{m-1} \dots P_1 x^k,$$

where $P_j z = \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{M}_j}(z)$ is the projection of z onto the set \mathcal{M}_j .

Kaczmarz Method [58]. Consider a linear system of equations $Uy = b$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ and $n \geq m$. Suppose $U^T = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ and $b^T = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$, then a solution of $Uy = b$ is a point in the intersection of n hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}_k = \{y \mid \langle u_k, y \rangle = b_k\}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. Kaczmarz method is a special case of POCS for finding the intersection of hyperplanes. More specifically, starting from an arbitrary initial point $y^{0,0}$, the algorithm proceeds as

$$\begin{aligned} y^{k,j} &= \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}_j}(y^{k,j-1}) = y^{k,j-1} + \frac{b_j - \langle u_j, y^{k,j-1} \rangle}{\|u_j\|^2} u_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n; \\ y^{k+1} &= y^{k,n}, \quad y^{k+1,0} = y^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Connections between Different Methods. As mentioned above, G-S method for solving a symmetric PSD linear system of equations is a special case of C-CD. Kaczmarz method is a special case of POCS. The following claim shows that G-S method for solving a symmetric PD linear system $UU^T x = b$ is equivalent to Kaczmarz method for a full-rank square system $Uy = b$.

Claim 2.1. *Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, $A = UU^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is full rank. Then Gauss-Seidel method for solving $Ax = b$ is equivalent to Kaczmarz method for solving $Uy = b$; here, the equivalence means that there is a one-to-one mapping between the iterates of the two algorithms.*

The proof is given in Appendix A. Intuitively, under a coordinate transformation Kaczmarz method is equivalent to G-S method. More specifically, any vector y can be expressed as $y = x_1 u_1 + \dots + x_n u_n = U^T x$, i.e., x_j 's are the coordinates of y under the basis u_1, \dots, u_n , where u_j 's are columns of U^T . Thus, updating one coordinate x_j is equivalent to updating y according to one equation $\langle u_j, y \rangle = b_j$.

When U is not square and/or not full rank, as long as the initial point of Kaczmarz method lies in the row space of U , we can still show the almost “equivalence” of Kaczmarz method and G-S method, though there is no one-to-one mapping but a one-to-many mapping; see Appendix A. Therefore, in the basic setting, all four methods C-CD, G-S, Kaczmarz and POCS are equivalent.

3 Main Results

Consider the quadratic minimization problem

$$\min_x f(x) \triangleq x^T A x - 2b^T x,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive semi-definite, $b \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $A_{ii} \neq 0, \forall i$. We can assume $b \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ since otherwise the minimum value of $\min_x x^T A x - 2b^T x$ will be $-\infty$. We can assume $A_{ii} \neq 0, \forall i$, since when some $A_{ii} = 0$ all entries in the i -th row and the i -th column of A should be zero, which means that the i -th variable does not affect the objective and thus can be deleted. Recall that the maximum eigenvalue, minimum eigenvalue and average eigenvalue of A are $\lambda_{\max}, \lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\text{avg}}$ respectively, the condition number $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\min}$, and $\kappa_{CD} = \lambda_{\text{avg}}/\lambda_{\min}$.

To help the readers understand our main results, we first summarize the main results in the following Table 1 for the equal-diagonal case (i.e. all diagonal entries of A are equal). The upper bounds will be given in Proposition 3.1, and the lower bounds will be given in Theorem 3.1. In this table, we ignore the $\log 1/\epsilon$ factor, which is always necessary for an iterative algorithm to achieve error ϵ .

Table 1: Complexity of C-CD, GD and R-CD for equal-diagonal case (ignoring a $\log 1/\epsilon$ factor)

| Parameters | κ | κ and τ | $\kappa_{CD}(= \kappa/\tau)$ |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| C-CD Upper bound | $n^3 \kappa$ | $\frac{1}{10} n^2 \kappa \tau \log^2 n$ | $n^4 \kappa_{CD}$ |
| C-CD Lower bound (Theorem 3.1) | $\frac{1}{40} n^3 \kappa$ | $\frac{1}{40} n^2 \kappa \tau$ | $\frac{1}{40} n^4 \kappa_{CD}$ |
| GD | | $n^2 \kappa$ | — |
| R-CD | — | $n^2 \kappa / \tau$ | $n^2 \kappa_{CD}$ |

This table shows that the lower bounds match the upper bounds, up to constant and $\log^2 n$ factors. In addition, the table reveals the relations between the worst-case complexity of C-CD, GD and R-CD. To make the relationships easy to read, we extract the results on parameters κ and τ (i.e. the middle column) and normalize them by the complexity of GD to create Table 2.

Table 2: Complexity for equal-diagonal case (divided by $n^2\kappa \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ and ignoring constants. $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}} \in [1, n]$)

| | C-CD | GD | R-CD |
|-------------|----------------------------|----|------------------|
| Lower bound | τ | 1 | — |
| Upper bound | $\min\{\tau \log^2 n, n\}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{\tau}$ |

According to the tables, the main implications of our results are the following:

- C-CD is roughly $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ times slower than GD, and R-CD is $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ times faster than GD.
- When τ achieves the maximum $\mathcal{O}(n)$, C-CD is $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times slower than GD and R-CD is $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times faster than GD. This implies C-CD can be $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than R-CD.

Note that in the above statement “method 1 is X-times slower than method 2” does not mean that method 1 is always slower than method 2 (of course rarely can one make such a strong statement), but that “the worst-case complexity of method 1 is X-times worse than that of method 2, and both complexity bounds can be simultaneously achieved”.

Now we formally state the upper bounds and lower bounds on the convergence rate of C-CD.

Proposition 3.1. (*Upper bound of C-CD*) Consider the quadratic minimization problem $\min_x f(x) \triangleq x^T A x - 2b^T x$ where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive semi-definite, $b \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $A_{ii} \neq 0, \forall i$. For any $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let x^k denotes the output of C-CD after k cycles, then

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f^* \leq \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n\kappa} \frac{L_{\min}}{L_{\text{avg}}}, 1 - \frac{L_{\min}}{L(2 + \log n/\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\kappa} \right\} (f(x^k) - f^*). \quad (9a)$$

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f^* \leq \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n^2\kappa_{CD}} \frac{L_{\min}}{L_{\text{avg}}}, 1 - \frac{L_{\min}L_{\text{avg}}}{L^2(2 + \log n/\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\kappa_{CD}} \right\} (f(x^k) - f^*). \quad (9b)$$

Here, f^* is the minimum value of the function f ,

Theorem 3.1. (*Lower bound of C-CD*) For any initial point $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, there exists a quadratic function $f(x) = x^T A x - 2b^T x$ such that

$$f(x^k) - f^* \geq (1 - \delta) \left(1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa} \right)^{2k+2} (f(x^0) - f^*), \forall k, \quad (10a)$$

$$f(x^k) - f^* \geq (1 - \delta) \left(1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n^2\kappa_{CD}} \right)^{2k+2} (f(x^0) - f^*), \forall k, \quad (10b)$$

where x^k denotes the output of C-CD after k cycles, f^* is the minimum of the objective function f .

The overview of the proofs will be given in Section 5. The formal proof of Proposition 3.1 will be given in Appendix B.1, and the formal proof of Theorem 3.1 will be given in Section 6.

Remark 1: The example we construct is simple: all diagonal entries of A are 1 and all off-diagonal entries are c , where c is a constant close to 1. It is known that the SDD (symmetric diagonally dominant) system can be solved in almost linear time (see, e.g., [66–68] and the references therein). While for SDD system the off-diagonal entries have very small magnitude, the hard instance we construct can be viewed as the opposite of the SDD system: the off-diagonal entries are chosen as large as possible so that the matrix remains positive definite.

Remark 2: Throughout the paper, our discussion focuses the comparison of the *total time complexity*, instead of the *iteration complexity*. For quadratic problems, the two are closely related because each epoch of C-CD, GD and R-CD (under the proper definition of “epoch”) takes approximately the same time. For general convex problems, our lower bound result Theorem 3.1 should be viewed as a lower bound on the iteration complexity of C-CD.

We then describe how to obtain Table 1 from the two results. As mentioned in the introduction, we will say an algorithm has complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(g(n, \theta))$, if it takes $\mathcal{O}(g(n, \theta) \log(1/\epsilon))$ unit operations to achieve relative error ϵ . Each iteration of GD, each epoch (i.e. n iterations) of C-CD and R-CD all take $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ operations². Using the fact $-\ln(1-z) \geq -z, z \in (0, 1)$ one can immediately show that to achieve $(1 - 1/u)^k \leq \epsilon$ one only needs $k \geq u \log(1/\epsilon)$ epochs. Thus we can transform the convergence rate to the number of epochs, then the complexity³

Consider the equal-diagonal case (i.e. $L_i = L_1, \forall i$) for now and we will discuss the general case later in Section 4.3. In this case, $L_{\text{avg}} = L_{\min}$, thus greatly simplifying the bounds; further, $\frac{L}{L_{\min}}$ is just the quantity $\tau = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\text{avg}}}$. The upper bounds on convergence rate (9a) can be transformed to the following upper bound of complexity

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3 \kappa), \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2 \kappa \tau \log^2 n) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

These two quantities are those in the first two entries of C-CD upper bound in Table 1. Similarly, the other bounds on convergence rate in Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.1 can be transformed to corresponding bounds on the complexity, and they form the rest of Table 1.

4 Extensions and Discussions

4.1 Comparison with Known Convergence Rate of POCS

The convergence rate of POCS for finding the intersection of closed subspaces of a real Hilbert space has been studied since 1970s. One of the first convergence rate results is given by Smith, Solmon and Wagner [52], and cited as a major convergence rate result of POCS in [56, 57]. Further results are given in Kayalar and Weinert [53] and Deutsch and Hundal [54], but these rates are very complicated.

Due to the complication of the bounds of [53] and [54], we will only consider the classical convergence rate in [52]. The original result characterizes the rate by the angles between subspaces; interestingly, for the simple case of solving a linear system of equations $Uy = b$, the convergence rate can be characterized by the determinant of the matrix UU^T . For simplicity, we present the result for a full-rank square linear system.

Proposition 4.1. [52, 69] *Consider the linear system of equations $Uy = b$, where $U^T = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix with full rank and $\|u_j\| = 1, \forall j$. Suppose the sequence generated by Kaczmarz method is $\{y^k\}$, then*

$$\|y^k - y^*\| \leq (1 - \det(UU^T))^{k/2} \|y^0 - y^*\|.$$

This rate can be transformed to a rate dependent on the eigenvalues by using the fact $\det(UU^T) = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n$, where $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of $A = UU^T$. The number of epochs to achieve a relative

²When the matrix is sparse, the time is actually $\mathcal{O}(n \text{nnz}(A))$, but to simplify the discussions, we do not consider the sparsity in this work.

³To be precise, the upper bounds on the convergence rate can be transformed to upper bounds of the complexity, but the lower bounds require a bit of more work. We can make it precise, but let us ignore this minor issue, and just assume both upper bounds and lower bounds of convergence rate can be transformed to corresponding complexity bounds.

error ϵ predicted by the above result is

$$2 \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_n} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}.$$

The number of epochs predicted by our result is approximately

$$\frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{\lambda_{\min}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} = \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_n} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon},$$

in which we ignore the constant factor and $\log n$ factor. To simplify the comparison, let us denote

$$T_{\text{POCS}} \triangleq \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_n}, \quad T_{\text{C-CD}} \triangleq \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_n}.$$

For the example that achieves the lower bound (see Example 2 of Section 4.2), the eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_1 = 1 - c + cn, \quad \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \dots = \lambda_n = 1 - c,$$

where $0 < c < 1$. Then $T_{\text{POCS}} = \frac{1}{(1-c+cn)(1-c)^{n-1}}$, and $T_{\text{C-CD}} = \frac{(1-c+cn)^2}{1-c}$. The ratio of the two quantities are

$$\frac{T_{\text{C-CD}}}{T_{\text{POCS}}} = (1-c)^{n-2} (1-c+cn)^3 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 1.$$

Thus the POCS bound, as given by Proposition 4.1, is very loose for our example, and can be infinitely times worse than our bound. It is easy to show that as long as $c > 1 - K^{1/(n-2)} n^{-3/(n-2)} \approx 0$, the above ratio is less than $1/K$, meaning that the POCS bound is K times worse than our bound (up to a $\log(n)$ factor).

In general, we can show that $T_{\text{C-CD}} \leq 10T_{\text{POCS}}$. We need the condition $\|u_j\|^2 = 1$, which means $A_{jj} = 1$ and thus $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = \text{Tr}(A) = n$. By algebraic-mean-geometric-mean inequality, we have

$$\frac{T_{\text{C-CD}}}{T_{\text{POCS}}} = \lambda_1^3 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{n-1} = 27 \left(\frac{1}{3} \lambda_1 \right)^3 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{n-1} \leq 27 \left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_{n-1}}{n-1} \right)^{n-1} \leq 27 \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^{n-1} \leq 27/e \leq 10,$$

This relation means that our bound is at least as good as the POCS bound (up to constant and $\log(n)$ factors).

This comparison has a few implications. First, an interesting question is whether the bound in this paper can be improved by using other metrics like the angles between subspaces. From the comparison we know that at least the classical bound of POCS does not provide the improvement. Second, as the classical bound of POCS can be infinitely times worse than our bound, there is large room of improvement for general POCS.

In this subsection we only consider the deterministic cyclic version of POCS. Randomized versions of POCS (see, e.g., [59, 70]) can have much faster convergence rates. In fact, since randomized POCS has the same rate as R-CD for solving linear systems [59], we infer that the bound of randomized POCS can be infinitely times better than the classical rate of cyclic POCS in [52]⁴. By using our bound, cyclic POCS is up to $O(n^2)$ times worse than randomized POCS.

4.2 Role of Examples in Convergence Rate Analysis

We propose the following example to show the lower bound of the convergence rate of C-CD. The rigorous analysis of this example is long and technical, and will be provided in a later section.

⁴As a historical remark, the paper [59] could have used the comparison of their rate with the bound of cyclic POCS in [59] to justify their proposal of randomized Kaczmarz method.

Example 1: For any constant $c \in (0, 1)$, consider minimizing the following quadratic function

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \triangleq x^T A_c x, \quad (12)$$

where $A_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as

$$A_c = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & c & \dots & c \\ c & 1 & \dots & c \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c & c & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

Simple calculation shows that A_c is a positive definite matrix.

After posting the first version of the paper in April 2016, Steven Wright pointed out to us that he proposed the matrix that we analyzed in this paper in a talk in Paris in July 2015 and in a talk at NYU in December 2015. He also noticed the large gap between C-CD and randomized CD for this example, although no theoretical analysis was available on public.

Another example was brought to our attention independently by Strohmer and Richtarik after posting the first version of this paper. This example shows that cyclic Kaczmarz method can be much slower than the randomized version.

Example 2: Consider solving a linear system of equations $Uy = 0$ where $U^T = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times n}$, and $u_j = (\cos(\theta_k), \sin(\theta_k))$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, where $\theta_k = 2k\pi/n$. The hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}_j = \{y \mid \langle u_j, y \rangle = 0\}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ are n lines crossing the origin with angles $2\pi/n$ between two adjacent lines. Cyclic projection to the lines H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n one by one can be very slow, and randomized projection is much faster.

We have checked this example by simulations. Since Kaczmarz method can be transformed to Gauss-Seidel method or equivalently C-CD, instead of solving $Uy = 0$ by Kaczmarz method, we consider solving $UU^T x = 0$ by C-CD, GD and R-CD. We have some interesting findings:

1) C-CD is slow if we update the coordinates in the order $(12 \dots n)$. If we pick a random order and use this order throughout, C-CD is actually very fast. In contrast, for Example 1, any fixed order is slow (similarly, for the divergent examples of cyclic ADMM in [61] and [38], any fixed order is divergent). In this sense, Example 2 is a “weak” bad example for C-CD, and Example 1 is a “strong” bad example.

2) In Example 2, the condition number $\kappa = 1$, and the spectral radius of the update matrix of C-CD is approximately $1 - 20/n$ (we check it numerically for n from 10 to 1000). The gap between C-CD and GD for Example 2 is at least $n/20$, similar to Example 1. Even the constant 20 is the same. The difference with Example 1 is that for Example 1 there is an $\tilde{O}(n)$ gap between GD and R-CD, leading to $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ gap between C-CD and R-CD; for Example 2, GD and R-CD converge at the same speed, thus Example 2 does not show the $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ gap between C-CD and R-CD.

In short, this example does *not* provide numerical evidence that the complexity of C-CD is at least $\mathcal{O}(n^4 \kappa_{CD})$, but only that the complexity of C-CD is at least $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \kappa)$.

3) The actual gap between GD/R-CD and C-CD in this example is larger than $n/20$ because the rates of the former do not depend on $\log(1/\epsilon)$. In fact, GD/R-CD both take 2 epochs to converge while C-CD takes $\log(1/\epsilon)n/20$ epochs to converge, thus the “true” gap between R-CD and C-CD is $\frac{n}{40} \log(1/\epsilon)$. For instance, when $n = 100$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$, GD/R-CD both take 2 epochs and C-CD takes about 80 epochs, and the true gap $40 = 80/2$ is close to $\log(1/\epsilon)n/40 = 15 \times 2.5 = 37.5$. Note that in this computation, $\log(1/\epsilon) = 15$ has a much larger contribution than $n/40 = 2.5$, hence by looking at the 37.5-times gap itself, it is not easy to tell where this number 37.5 comes from. To see the effect of $\tilde{O}(n)$, one may need to choose $n > 600$ or even larger. If the gap were completely due to the contribution of $\log(1/\epsilon)$, this large gap between GD/R-CD and

C-CD should be considered a constant gap, since it is impossible to get a theoretical bound of GD/R-CD independent of $\log(1/\epsilon)$ in general. In this sense, the gap of $\log(1/\epsilon)$ is very special to the example, and should not be considered an evidence of GD/R-CD being faster than C-CD.

We emphasize that our contribution is not only the proposal of an example (independent of Steven Wright), but also the theoretical analysis related to the example. Just one example empirically showing algorithm A being much faster than algorithm B is not very meaningful for a theoretical understanding, for at least two reasons. First, it is possible that someone comes up with another example showing that algorithm B is much faster than algorithm A. In fact, there are many numerical examples to show C-CD is faster than R-CD; even though the gap is not as large as $\tilde{O}(n)$, one could not claim that such an example does not exist. Second, the gap may be a “fake” gap that cannot be explained by any existing theoretical bounds, just like the $\log(1/\epsilon)$ -factor gap analyzed above. Therefore, in addition to proposing an example, it is important to prove that the example exhibits the behavior of the theoretical bounds, thus validating the tightness of the established bounds as well as the gap between the bounds.

4.3 Non-equal-diagonal Case, Jacobi Preconditioning and Open Questions

We will discuss the complexity bounds when the diagonal entries L_i ’s are not equal. It turns out the “true” complexity in this general case is more subtle than the equal-diagonal case (i.e. the case where all L_i ’s are equal) and related to an old problem in numerical linear algebra.

In the previous discussions we often assume $L_i = L_1, \forall i$ since one can always scale the coefficient matrix A to get a new matrix $D_A^{-1/2} A D_A^{-1/2}$ and modify the algorithm correspondingly. Such a preprocessing procedure is called Jacobi preconditioning in numerical linear algebra, and is a common data preprocessing trick in machine learning. It is very simple to implement and only slightly increases the total complexity of the algorithm.

Nevertheless, one may still wonder what the complexity in the non-equal-diagonal case is. Our Proposition (3.1) implies an upper bound which is more general than (11):

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{O} \left(n^3 \kappa \frac{L_{\text{avg}}}{L_{\min}} \right), \tilde{O} \left(n^2 \kappa \log^2 n \frac{L}{L_{\min}} \right) \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Notice that L_{\min} appears in the denominator of both bounds, thus as $L_{\min} \rightarrow 0$ both bounds approach infinity. Intuitively, this implies that when one coordinate has very little contribution to the whole function C-CD will converge very slowly. However, this phenomenon will not happen in practice and the dependency in $1/L_{\min}$ is somewhat artificial. In fact, theoretically we can prove a stronger upper bound of C-CD that does not depend on $1/L_{\min}$, but instead depends on a new condition number.

Proposition 4.2. (Stronger Upper Bounds) Consider the same setting as Proposition 3.1. We have

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f^* \leq \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n\hat{\kappa}}, 1 - \frac{1}{\hat{L}(2 + \log n/\pi)^2 \hat{\kappa}} \right\} (f(x^k) - f^*). \quad (15a)$$

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f^* \leq \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n^2 \hat{\kappa}_{CD}}, 1 - \frac{1}{\hat{L}^2 (2 + \log n/\pi)^2 \hat{\kappa}_{CD}} \right\} (f(x^k) - f^*). \quad (15b)$$

Here, the parameters $\hat{L} = \lambda_{\max}(\hat{A})$, $\hat{\kappa} = \lambda_{\max}(\hat{A})/\lambda_{\min}(\hat{A})$, and $\hat{\kappa}_{CD} = 1/\lambda_{\min}(\hat{A})$, where $\hat{A} = D_A^{-1/2} A D_A^{-1/2}$ is the Jacobi-preconditioned matrix, and D_A is a diagonal matrix consisting of all diagonal entries of A .

The proof of Proposition 4.2 will be given in Appendix B.2. The proof is almost the same as the proof of Proposition 3.1 except that we should replace matrix A and its lower triangular part Γ by the Jacobi-preconditioned versions. By taking a closer look into the proof, we find that Jacobi-preconditioning is naturally “embedded” in C-CD ⁵. This is not surprising since in the update rule (3) we need to scale the diagonals A_{ii} at each step, which is similar to Jacobi-preconditioning (but not the same). Therefore, we can think of $\hat{\kappa}$ as a more appropriate parameter to characterize the complexity of C-CD than the original condition number κ .

Proposition 4.2 implies the following upper bound

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{O}(n^3 \hat{\kappa}), \tilde{O} \left(n^2 \hat{\kappa} \log^2 n \frac{\hat{L}}{\hat{L}_{\text{avg}}} \right) \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where \hat{L}_{avg} is the average of the diagonal entries of A , and it equals 1 since all diagonal entries of matrix \hat{A} are 1. For the equal-diagonal case, this upper bound reduces to the upper bound (11) since \hat{A} is just a scaled version of A . Comparing this bound with (14) which also holds for the non-equal-diagonal case, we find that the $L_{\text{avg}}/L_{\text{min}}$ factor disappears here (since this ratio equals 1 for the Jacobi-preconditioned matrix). This can be explained as that the factor $L_{\text{avg}}/L_{\text{min}}$ is absorbed into the new condition number $\hat{\kappa}$; in fact, it is straightforward to prove

$$\hat{\kappa} \leq \kappa \frac{L_{\text{max}}}{L_{\text{min}}},$$

thus the upper bound $\tilde{O}(n^3 \hat{\kappa})$ immediately implies an upper bound $\tilde{O} \left(n^3 \kappa \frac{L_{\text{max}}}{L_{\text{min}}} \right)$ that is slightly weaker than the first bound in (14). It is not easy to explicitly compare the second bound of (16) and the second bound of (14).

The reason we still present the bound dependent on κ , instead of only presenting the bound dependent on $\hat{\kappa}$, is because the former bound allows us to compare C-CD with GD. With the new bound (16), a natural question is how to transform it to a bound that only depends on the parameters of the original matrix, such as κ . This is related to the following classical question on Jacobi-preconditioning:

What is the relation between the condition number of A and that of the Jacobi-preconditioned matrix?

Intuitively, larger discrepancy in the diagonal entries leads to a larger condition number, thus Jacobi-preconditioning which makes the diagonals equal should reduce the condition number. In other words, one may expect that $\hat{\kappa} \leq \kappa$ holds for most of the time, if not always. Unfortunately, it is only known that the relation $\hat{\kappa} \leq \kappa$ holds for some special A (more precisely, when A satisfies Young’s property (A)⁶), according to Forsythe and Straus [72]. For our purpose, the exact relation $\hat{\kappa} \leq \kappa$ is not necessary as we are more interested in the upper bound of $\hat{\kappa}/\kappa$. There are some simple bounds (see, e.g., [73, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3]):

$$\hat{\kappa} \leq \kappa \cdot \min \left\{ n, \frac{L_{\text{max}}}{L_{\text{min}}} \right\}.$$

As a direct corollary, the first bound of (16) implies two upper bounds

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{O}(n^4 \kappa), \tilde{O} \left(n^3 \kappa \frac{L_{\text{max}}}{L_{\text{min}}} \right) \right\}. \quad (17)$$

⁵The Jacobi-preconditioning is also embedded in R-CD, but if we pick the coordinates with probability proportional to A_{ii} , the preconditioning effect disappears.

⁶If the rows and columns of a $(p+q)$ -dim matrix can be rearranged so that the upper $p \times p$ and lower $q \times q$ submatrices are diagonal, then the matrix is said to have Property (A) [71]. For example, the tridiagonal matrix satisfies Property (A). Also note that the question in [72] appears in a different form: when is \hat{A} the best conditioned matrix out of all possible diagonally scaled matrix of A ?

We have already seen a variant of the above second bound in (14).

What is more interesting is the first bound in (17) $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\kappa)$, which is n^2 times worse than GD, and n times worse than the equal-diagonal case! If we want to express the complexity of cyclic CD purely in terms of κ for the non-equal-diagonal case, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\kappa)$ is the best upper bound we have right now. There is an $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -factor gap between this upper bound and the lower bound $\mathcal{O}(n^3\kappa)$. We believe this gap is artificial and there should be a stronger proof that establishes an upper bound of $\mathcal{O}(n^3\kappa)$. Such a stronger upper bound might be achieved by proving a constant upper bound of $\kappa/\hat{\kappa}$. We pose two open questions:

Open Question 1: Is there a non-equal-diagonal example that cyclic CD has complexity worse than $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3\kappa)$? If yes, what about $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\kappa)$?

Open Question 2: Is there a constant upper bound on $\hat{\kappa}/\kappa$, where κ and $\hat{\kappa}$ are the condition numbers of A and the Jacobi-preconditioned \hat{A} respectively? If not, what is the best upper bound of $\hat{\kappa}/\kappa$? Is there an example that the ratio $\hat{\kappa}/\kappa$ achieves $\mathcal{O}(n)$?

We stress again that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3\hat{\kappa})$ is a tight bound in general, and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3\kappa)$ is a tight bound when A has equal diagonal entries. Thus the above Question 1 is only valid when we consider non-equal-diagonal matrix A and insist on expressing the complexity in terms of the condition number of the original matrix. In some sense, it is not as essential as the question whether there is an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between C-CD and R-CD studied in this paper. Nevertheless, it is still a valid question, and becomes more interesting due to its relation to Jacobi-preconditioning.

4.4 Necessity of Two Types of Bounds

Consider the equal-diagonal case (i.e. $L_i = L_1, \forall i$) in this subsection. We will explain the relation between the two types of bounds, one does not involve $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\min} = L/L_1$ and another does. We argue that it is not easy, if not impossible, to obtain one single tight bound. We will also suggest slightly stronger bounds that might be the tightest based on the current parameters (again, for the equal-diagonal case).

We denote two bounds related to κ as $B_1 = \mathcal{O}(n^3\kappa)$ and $B_2 = \mathcal{O}(n^2\kappa\tau\log^2 n)$; the comparison between the bounds related to κ_{CD} will be similar and thus omitted. Since we assume $L_1 = \dots = L_n$, we have $L \leq \sum_i L_i = nL_1$, and $1 \leq \tau = L/L_1 \leq n$. Therefore, in most cases (more precisely, as long as $\tau \in [1, n/\log^2 n]$ while the full range of τ is $[1, n]$) the bound B_2 is better than B_1 . However, B_2 does not dominate B_1 since for our example B_1 is tight while B_2 is $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ times worse. One natural guess is that maybe the best bound is $B_3 = \mathcal{O}(n^2\kappa\tau)$, which is better than both B_1 and B_2 and also consistent with our example. Unfortunately, B_3 is probably not the right bound since there exists an example such that the $\log^2 n$ factor is unavoidable [47].

Now we discuss the result by Oswald [47]. The paper [47] establishes an upper bound similar to the second bound in 11. Then the paper constructs an example that “matches” the upper bound; more specifically, in the example both κ and τ are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ while the spectral radius of the iteration matrix of C-CD is $1 - 1/\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$. Thus the complexity for this example is at least $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n) = \mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n \kappa \tau)$ which is $\log^2 n$ times larger than B_3 ⁷. However, this example only “matches” the upper bound in a weak sense as the key parameters κ and τ are constants in the example. In particular, this example has nothing to do with the question whether the extra factor τ is necessary or not. It does not exclude the possibility that the worst-case complexity of C-CD were $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n \kappa)$ or even $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n \kappa_{CD})$ which are very close to the complexity of GD and R-CD respectively. We think the extra τ factor is very important for at least two reasons. First,

⁷This statement is not rigorous. It is tricky: the spectral radius of a non-symmetric iteration matrix may not provide the lower bound of the convergence rate; extra effort is needed to rigorously build the connection. We will discuss this issue in more details later.

for most randomly generated matrices the ratio $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$ is much larger than $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. This can be tested by numerical experiments, and also validated by theoretical results: for example, for the Wishart random ensemble $A = U^T U$ where the entries of U are standard Gaussian variables, the ratio $\tau = L/L_1$ is approximately $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ ⁸. Second, τ exactly characterizes the theoretical improvement of R-CD over GD. When τ is small, the gain of using R-CD is very limited: either the problem is too easy and GD already performs well, or the problem is so difficult that even R-CD does not help. Thus the interesting problems for CD-type methods are those with large τ .

Now we know that the $\log^2 n$ factor is necessary for one extreme case $\tau = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and the $\log^2 n$ factor can be removed for the other extreme case $\tau = n$. The transition has to happen somewhere in between, and we guess it happens near $\tau \approx \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$. In other words, we guess the “best” bound is

$$B_{\text{conj}} = \mathcal{O}(n^2 \kappa \max\{\tau, C \log^2 n\}).$$

Although the operator norm of the triangular operator is $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, we conjecture that when restricted to a certain class of PD matrices (τ is not too small) the operator norm becomes $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Conjecture 4.1. *If A is symmetric PSD with equal diagonal entries and $\tau = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\text{avg}}} \geq C_1 \log^2 n$ for some constant C_1 , then the lower triangular part (with diagonals) Γ , defined as $\Gamma_{ij} = A_{ij}, i \leq j$ and $\Gamma_{ij} = 0, i > j$, satisfies $\|\Gamma\| \leq C_2 \|A\|$.*

4.5 Precise Comparison of Time Complexity

In our previous comparison between C-CD and GD/R-CD we have ignored the constants, and we do not state the comparison in a formal result. Next we will formally compare them and quantify the exact gap in terms of the time complexity. In the first result the error is measured in the objective values. In the second result the error is measured in iterates, which allows us to add RP-CD into the comparison and get a better bound for R-CD.

The first proposition shows that to achieve any given relative error in objective values, C-CD takes at least $n/20$ times more operations than GD, and $n^2/40$ times more operations than R-CD. The proof of Proposition 4.3 will be given in Appendix D.1.

Proposition 4.3. *(Compare C-CD with GD, R-CD; objective error) Let $k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)$, $k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)$ and $k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)$ be the minimum number of epochs⁹ for C-CD, GD, R-CD to achieve (expected) relative error*

$$\frac{E(f(x^k) - f^*)}{f(x^0) - f^*} \leq \epsilon$$

for all initial points in \mathbb{R}^n (for C-CD and GD the expectation operator can be ignored). There exists a quadratic problem such that

$$\frac{k_{\text{CD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \frac{n}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n}{20}, \quad (18a)$$

$$\frac{k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \frac{n^2}{4\pi^2} \approx \frac{n^2}{40}. \quad (18b)$$

⁸ According to [74, Proposition 6.1] the maximum eigenvalue is about $4n$ and the diagonal entries are the lengths of n -dimensional random vectors which are $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$, thus after scaling the diagonal entries $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$.

⁹For a fair comparison, here one epoch of CD or RP-CD means one cycle of all coordinates, and for R-CD one iteration means randomly selecting coordinates for n times.

Remark: It seems that the comparison of C-CD and R-CD is not fair since for R-CD we record the *expected* number of iterations. Nevertheless, it is easy to prove that to guarantee the same error with probability $1 - \delta$, we only need $\log(1/\delta)$ times more iterations. For simplicity, we just consider the expected number of iterations of R-CD.

In the above Proposition 4.3, the relative error is defined for the function values; next, we prove a result in which the relative error is defined for the (expected) iterates. The proof of Proposition 4.4 is given in Appendix D.2.

Proposition 4.4. *(Compare C-CD with GD, R-CD and RP-CD; iterates error) Let $K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)$, $K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)$, $K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)$ and $K_{\text{RPCD}}(\epsilon)$ be the minimum number of iterations¹⁰ for C-CD, GD, R-CD and RP-CD to achieve (expected) relative error*

$$\frac{\|E(x^k) - x^*\|^2}{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2} \leq \epsilon$$

for all initial points in \mathbb{R}^n (for C-CD and GD the expectation operator can be ignored). There exists a quadratic problem such that

$$\frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \frac{n}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n}{20}, \quad (19a)$$

$$\frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \frac{n^2}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n^2}{20}, \quad (19b)$$

$$\frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RPCD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \frac{n(n+1)}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n(n+2)}{20}. \quad (19c)$$

We present the result for two reasons. First, the convergence of iterates is of interest in some scenarios. Second, we can obtain stronger bounds. In particular, the ratio we obtained for the squared iterates of R-CD is twice as large as that for the function values of R-CD ($n^2/20$ v.s. $n^2/40$). Moreover, we are able to add RP-CD into comparison for the iterates error. We do not include RP-CD in Proposition 4.4 since it seems difficult to compute the convergence rate of the objective error for RP-CD. Despite the advantages, we need to emphasize that the convergence of expected iterate error is a weaker notion of convergence than the convergence of objective error, because the former does not lead to a high probability convergence rate while the latter does (which is because $f(x^k) - f^* \geq 0$). If we could bound $E(\|x^k - x^*\|^2)$ instead of $\|E(x^k - x^*)\|^2$, then high probability convergence rate could also be automatically established; but we are unable to bound $E(\|x^k - x^*\|^2)$ for RP-CD either.

Our theory shows that there exists one example $A = A_c$ such that C-CD takes at least $\frac{n}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n}{20}$ times more iterations than GD and $\frac{n^2}{2\pi^2} \approx \frac{n^2}{20}$ times more iterations than R-CD to achieve any accuracy ϵ . While the theory is only established for the case c is very close to 1 (recall c is the off-diagonal entry), we will show in simulations that the predicted gaps do really exist for a wide range of c . Note that “the number of required iterations” is defined for “all initial points” (in other words, “worst-case” initial points). We will show in simulations that even for random initialization the gaps observed in practice match those predicted by Proposition 4.4.

¹⁰Again, for a fair comparison, here one iteration of CD or RP-CD means one cycle of all coordinates, and for R-CD one iteration means randomly selecting coordinates for n times.

5 Overview of the Proofs

5.1 Overview of Proof of Proposition 3.1

We present two types of bounds: in the equal-diagonal case, the first type only depends on κ or κ_{CD} , and the second type depends on κ and τ . In the non-equal diagonal case, both bounds depend on L_{\min} . The first type of bounds can be established by the same techniques as in [39], though [39] only considers non-strongly convex case. We give a unified proof framework that leads to both types of bounds. Our proof can be divided into two stages. The first stage is to relate the convergence rate with the spectral norm of a matrix $\Gamma^{-1}A\Gamma^{-T}$, which can be proved by two different approaches (from different perspectives): one is from optimization which views C-CD as inexact GD; the other is from linear algebra which studies the spectral radius of the iteration matrix $I - \Gamma^{-1}A$. Note that $\Gamma^{-1}A$ is non-symmetric, thus the latter method requires an extra symmetrization technique which relaxes the spectral radius by the spectral norm. As we will see later, such a technique cannot be used in the proof of the lower bound, and other techniques are needed for that proof. In the second stage, we estimate $\|\Gamma^{-1}A\Gamma^{-T}\|$ via two different methods, leading to the two types of bounds. As discussed in Section 4.4, each bound is tight in one scenario, thus the two bounds cannot be combined into one single bound.

5.2 Overview of Proof of Theorem 3.1

5.2.1 Difficulties

In general, to prove a lower complexity bound, one only needs to construct an example and compute the convergence rate of the example. However, in our case, computing the convergence rate of the example is not easy due to (at least) two reasons.

First, Gauss-Seidel method can be written as a matrix recursion and its convergence rate is related to the spectral radius of the update matrix. It turns out that the spectral radius of our example does not have a closed form expression; in fact, the spectral radius depends on the roots of an n -th order equation. To resolve this issue, we notice that as the constructed matrix tends to singular (i.e. the off-diagonal entries tend to 1) the n -th order equation will become simple; based on this fact, we are able to bound the spectral radius asymptotically (as off-diagonal entries tend to 1, but still for fixed n).

Second, the update matrix of Gauss-Seidel method is a non-symmetric matrix. A simple, though usually ignored, fact is that for non-symmetric matrix recursion, the spectral radius of the iteration matrix is not the lower bound of the convergence factor in the *real* domain. Note that if we were allowed to pick initial points in the complex domain, then the spectral radius did provide a lower bound of the convergence rate; but here we are only interested in the real initial points. We have not seen a general method to deal with this issue; fortunately, the example we constructed happens to exhibit some special structure so that we can provide a lower bound of the convergence rate. We will discuss this difficulty in more details in Section 5.2.2. There is actually one more difficulty caused by the non-symmetry of the iteration matrix: it is even harder to bound the function error. Fortunately again, we are able to resolve this difficulty due to another special property of the problem. See more details in Step 3 of the outline in Section 5.2.3.

The issue of non-symmetry does not appear in the proof of the upper bound in Proposition 3.1 because a symmetrization technique is used. Assuming $x^* = 0$, we need to compute the convergence rate of $f(x^k) = (x^k)^T A(x^k) = \|y^k\|^2$, where $y^k = Ux^k$ in which U satisfies $A = U^T U$. It is easy to get the matrix recursion $y^{k+1} = (I - U\Gamma^{-1}U)y^k$, thus one needs to bound the spectral radius of $M_f = I - U\Gamma^{-1}U$. The spectral radius of a non-symmetric matrix is not easy to directly bound, thus in that proof we instead upper bound

the spectral norm $\|M_f\| = \sqrt{\|M_f^T M_f\|}$, which gives an upper bound of $\rho(M_f)$. However, the relaxation from $\rho(M_f)$ to $\|M_f\|$ is not reversible; in other words, even if we prove that for our example $\|M_f\|$ is large, this does not mean $\rho(M_f)$ is large (or C-CD is slow). Thus we have to consider the original non-symmetric form $U\Gamma^{-1}U$ or $\Gamma^{-1}A$ for the lower bound.

5.2.2 Why Non-symmetric Iteration Matrix Causes Difficulty

We discuss why the spectral radius of a non-symmetric iteration matrix does not necessarily lead to a lower bound of the convergence rate (for real initial points). Consider the following matrix recursion

$$y^{k+1} = My^k. \quad (20)$$

We say a sequence $\{y^k\}$ converges with convergence rate τ if $\|y^k\| \leq C\tau^k$, where C is a constant.

A basic result is that if M is symmetric the convergence rate of $\|y^k\|$ is exactly $\rho(M)$. How to prove this result? For the lower bound (i.e. the convergence rate is at least $\rho(M)$), we need to pick the initial point to be the eigenvector of M corresponding to $\rho(M)$. This proof no longer works for non-symmetric M since its eigenvectors may be complex vectors. One way to resolve this issue is to pick the real part of the complex eigenvector; however, this approach requires additional assumptions to work. More specifically, suppose $Mv = \lambda v$, where $\lambda = \rho(M) = |\lambda|e^{i\theta}$, and pick the initial point $y^0 = \text{Re}(v) = \frac{1}{2}(v + \bar{v})$. The update (20) leads to

$$y^k = M^k y^0 = \frac{1}{2} M^k (v + \bar{v}) = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda^k v + \bar{\lambda}^k \bar{v}) = \text{Re}(\lambda^k v) = |\lambda|^k \text{Re}(e^{ik\theta} v).$$

Suppose $v = (r_1 e^{i\phi_1}, \dots, r_n e^{i\phi_n})$, then

$$\|y^k\| = \rho(M)^k \sqrt{r_1^2 \cos^2(k\theta + \phi_1) + \dots + r_n^2 \cos^2(k\theta + \phi_n)}. \quad (21)$$

For the lower bound, we want to prove

$$\|y^k\| \geq C\rho(M)^k, \quad \forall k, \quad (22)$$

where C is a constant. Without any additional assumption, this is impossible: if $\phi_j = 0, r_j = 1, \forall j$ and $k\theta = \frac{\pi}{2} + 2m\pi$ for some integer m , then $\|y^k\| = 0$. Intuitively, when all ϕ_j 's are close to each other, it is hard to lower bound $\|y^k\|$; but if all ϕ_j 's are evenly spread out, then $\|y^k\|$ can be lower bounded. For our problem, it turns out the phase ϕ_j goes to $2j\pi/n$ as c goes to 1, which is the the nicest case we can expect (the phases are equally spaced). In such a nice case, we are able to give a simple lower bound of $\|y^k\|$.

One might wonder whether it is easy to obtain a lower bound in the general case under mild assumptions. We consider the simplest case $n = 2$. If $r_1 = r_2 > 0$ and $0 < |\phi_1 - \phi_2| < \pi/2$, then $\|y^k\| \geq \rho(M)^k r_1 |\sin((\phi_1 - \phi_2)/2)|$. However, if $r_1 \neq r_2$, then even for $n = 2$ we need more assumptions to find a lower bound. Such assumptions can be a relation between r_1/r_2 and $\phi_1 - \phi_2$, which look non-intuitive and seem to be constructed merely for theory. Moreover, it is hard to express the corresponding bound (e.g. $r_1 |\sin((\phi_1 - \phi_2)/2)|$) as a function of simple parameters of the original problem. From a practical point of view, the ‘‘constant’’ $r_1 |\sin((\phi_1 - \phi_2)/2)|$ can be so small that it already meets the practical need. These issues will become even more complicated when $n > 2$. As a conclusion, when the iteration matrix is non-symmetric, it seems difficult to lower bound the convergence rate in general.

5.2.3 Proof Outline for Theorem 3.1

The detailed proof is divided into three steps. We will construct an example $\min_x x^T A_c x$ where the coefficient matrix has diagonal entries 1 and off-diagonal entries $c \in (0, 1)$. Obviously $x^* = 0$ is the unique minimum

and $f^* = 0$.

In Step 1, we compute the spectral radius of the iteration matrix asymptotically. More specifically, we show that the eigenvalues of the iteration matrix are given by $\lambda_j = 1 - q_j^n$, where q_j 's are the roots of the equation $q^n(1 - c + q) = 1$. While the closed form expression of λ_j is difficult to compute (in fact, for a special case, a very complicated closed form of an infinite series is given in [75]), we observe that as $c \rightarrow 1$, q_j 's tend to the n -th unit roots. We then prove that as $c \rightarrow 1$ the spectral radius of the iteration matrix tends to roughly $1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}$.

In Step 2, we prove that for a certain real initial point x^0 , the relative error $\frac{\|x^k - x^*\|^2}{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}$ is lower bounded by $O\left(\left(1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}\right)^{2k}\right)$. In other words, the sequence $\{\|x^k - x^*\|^2\}$ converges at a rate lower bounded by the spectral radius $1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}$. The initial point we choose is the real part of the eigenvector corresponding to the spectral radius of the iteration matrix $I - \Gamma^{-1}A$. A crucial property is that the eigenvector has an expression $(1, q, \dots, q^n)$ where q is a complex eigenvalue of $\Gamma^{-1}A$, thus the phases of the initial elements are roughly $2j/\pi, j = 1, \dots, n$. This property makes the calculation of the relative error $\frac{\|x^k - x^*\|^2}{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}$ possible.

In Step 3, we prove that the relative error $\frac{f(x^k) - f^*}{f(x^0) - f^*} = \frac{f(x^k)}{f(x^0)}$ is also lower bounded by $O\left(\left(1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}\right)^{2k}\right)$. Again, the special structure of the example is crucial for this step. Unlike GD method where the iteration matrix $I - \frac{1}{\beta}A$ has the same eigenvectors as A , the iteration matrix of CD method $I - \Gamma^{-1}A$ has different eigenvectors from A . As we pick x^0 to be the real part of an eigenvector of $\Gamma^{-1}A$, it is not clear a priori how to bound $f(x^k) = (x^k)^T A x^k$ and $f(x^0) = (x^0)^T A x^0$. Of course one can lower bound $f(x^k)$ by $\lambda_{\min}(A)\|x^k\|^2$ and upper bound $f(x^0)$ by $\lambda_{\max}(A)\|x^0\|^2$ to get a lower bound of $\frac{f(x^k)}{f(x^0)}$, but this will introduce an extra factor $\frac{\lambda_{\min}(A)}{\lambda_{\max}(A)} = \frac{1-c}{1-c+cn} \approx \frac{1-c}{n}$ which tends to 0 as $c \rightarrow 1$. Thus we need to give a tighter bound of either $f(x^k)$ or $f(x^0)$. We choose to bound $f(x^0)$ differently: it turns out $f(x^0) = (x^0)^T A x^0$ can be upper bounded by $\lambda_{\min}(A)\|x^0\|^2$ plus some negligible term (as $c \rightarrow 1$), which makes $\frac{f(x^k)}{f(x^0)}$ very close to $\frac{\|x^k\|^2}{\|x^0\|^2}$. The crucial property here is that for our example, the eigenvector corresponding to the spectral radius of the iteration matrix $I - \Gamma^{-1}A$ is very close to the eigenvector corresponding to the minimum eigenvalue of A . Needless to say, this property does not hold for general matrix A .

6 Formal Proof of Theorem 3.1

This section contains a full proof of Theorem 3.1 except the proof for some technical lemmas.

Assume the initial point is up to our choice for now. We will show in the end of the proof how to deal with an arbitrary initial point.

For any constant $c \in (0, 1)$, consider minimizing the following quadratic function

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \triangleq x^T A_c x, \quad (23)$$

where $A_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as

$$A_c = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & c & \dots & c \\ c & 1 & \dots & c \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c & c & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

Simple calculation shows that A_c is a positive definite matrix, with one eigenvalue $1 - c$ with multiplicity

$n - 1$ and one eigenvalue $1 - c + cn$ with multiplicity 1. Thus the condition number of the matrix is

$$\kappa = \frac{1 - c + cn}{1 - c}. \quad (25)$$

The optimum of the problem is $x = (0; 0; \dots; 0)$. Solving this problem is also equivalent to solving a linear system of equations $Ax = 0$.

Step 1: Computing the spectral radius of the iteration matrix, asymptotically. The following lemma shows that the eigenvalues of the matrix A_c are the roots of a polynomial equation. The proof of Lemma 6.1 is given in Appendix C.1.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $A = A_c$ is defined by (24) and Γ is the lower triangular part of A_c (with diagonals), and denote $\hat{c} = 1 - c$. Suppose the $n + 1$ roots of*

$$q^n(q - 1 + c) = cq \quad (26)$$

are $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}, q_n$ among which $q_0 = 0, q_n = 1$, then

$$\lambda_k = \frac{(1 - c)(1 - q_k)}{1 - c - q_k} = 1 - q_k^n, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1 \quad (27)$$

are all n eigenvalues of $Z = \Gamma^{-1}A$.

Note that $\lambda_n = 1 - q_n^n = 0$ is not an eigenvalue of Z . Eliminating a factor of q in (26), we have that $q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}, q_n = 1$ are the n roots of the equation $q^{n-1}(q - 1 + c) = c$. Intuitively, as c goes to 1, the equation becomes $q^n = 1$, thus the roots q_k will converge to an n -th root of unity. The formal statement is given below and the proof is given in Appendix C.2.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists some $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that when $c \in (c_0, 1)$ the following holds: the equation $q^{n-1}(q - 1 + c) = c$ has exactly one solution $q_k(c)$ such that $|q_k(c) - e^{i2\pi k/n}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{\pi}{n}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$; moreover,*

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} q_k(c) = e^{i2\pi k/n}, \quad \forall k.$$

Suppose $c \in (c_0, 1)$ from now on. Note that $\min_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} |e^{i2\pi j/n} - e^{i2\pi k/n}| = |1 - e^{i2\pi/n}| = 2 \sin(\pi/n)$, thus by Lemma 6.2 $q_k(c), k = 1, \dots, n$ are distinct roots of the equation $q^{n-1}(q - 1 + c) = c$. For simplicity of notations, we denote $q_k(c)$ as q_k , which satisfies

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} q_k = e^{i2\pi k/n}. \quad (28)$$

Obviously $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \lambda_k = 0, \forall k$.

Next we prove

$$J_k \triangleq \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1/\kappa}{1 - |1 - \lambda_k|} = \frac{1}{2n \sin^2(k\pi/n)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n - 1. \quad (29)$$

For notational convenience, let $\hat{c} \triangleq 1 - c, \hat{\lambda}_k = 1 - \lambda_k$. Then we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_k \stackrel{(27)}{=} 1 - \frac{\hat{c}(1 - q_k)}{\hat{c} - q_k} = \frac{(\hat{c} - 1)q_k}{\hat{c} - q_k} = \frac{cq_k}{q_k - \hat{c}} = \frac{c}{1 - \hat{c}/q_k}. \quad (30)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} J_k &\stackrel{(25)}{=} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{\hat{c} + cn} \frac{1}{1 - |\hat{\lambda}_k|} = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{1 - |\hat{\lambda}_k|} \stackrel{(30)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{1 - \left| \frac{c}{1 - \hat{c}/q_k} \right|} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c} |1 - \hat{c}/q_k|}{|1 - \hat{c}/q_k| - c}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since $\lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} |1 - \hat{c}/q_k| = 1$, from the above relation we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_k &= \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{|1 - \hat{c}/q_k| - c} = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}(|1 - \hat{c}/q_k| + c)}{|1 - \hat{c}/q_k|^2 - c^2} = \frac{2}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{|1 - \hat{c}/q_k|^2 - c^2} \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{1 + \hat{c}^2/|q_k|^2 - 2\hat{c}\text{Re}(1/q_k) - c^2} \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{c}}{\hat{c}(1 + c) + \hat{c}^2/|q_k|^2 - 2\hat{c}\text{Re}(1/q_k)} \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{1 + c + \hat{c}/|q_k|^2 - 2\text{Re}(1/q_k)}
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Since $\lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} |q_k| = 1$, $\lim_{\hat{c} \rightarrow 0} \text{Re}(1/q_k) = \cos(-2k\pi/n)$, the above relation can be further simplified to

$$J_k = \frac{2}{n} \frac{1}{1 + 1 + 0 - 2\cos(-2k\pi/n)} = \frac{1}{2n \sin^2(k\pi/n)},$$

which proves (29).

Step 2: Bound the relative iterates error.

To simplify the notations, let $q = q_1$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \frac{\hat{c} - \hat{c}q_1}{\hat{c} - q_1}$ from now on.

According to the proof of Lemma 6.1, $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{v}_1; \dots; \tilde{v}_n)$ is an eigenvector of $Z = \Gamma^{-1}A$ corresponding to λ , where

$$\tilde{v}_j = \frac{c}{\lambda - \hat{c}} q^{j-1}, j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{33}$$

We scale each entry of \tilde{v}_j by a constant $\frac{\lambda - \hat{c}}{c} q$ to get a new vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, where

$$v_j = q^j, j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{34}$$

Obviously v is also an eigenvector of Z corresponding to λ , i.e. $Zv = \lambda v$.

Now pick the initial point $x^0 = \text{Re}(v)$. Suppose

$$q = re^{i\theta}, \tag{35}$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $r > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, then

$$x_j^0 = \text{Re}(r^j e^{\sqrt{-1}j\theta}) = r^j \cos(j\theta), j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{36}$$

Since $x^0 = \frac{1}{2}(v + \bar{v})$, and v and \bar{v} are eigenvectors of $M = I - \Gamma^{-1}A$ with eigenvalues $1 - \lambda$ and $1 - \bar{\lambda}$ respectively, we have

$$x^k = M^k x^0 = \frac{1}{2} M^k (v + \bar{v}) = \frac{1}{2} ((1 - \lambda)^k v + (1 - \bar{\lambda})^k \bar{v}) = \text{Re}((1 - \lambda)^k v) \stackrel{(77)}{=} \text{Re}(q^{kn} v).$$

According to (34), the j -th entry of x^k is

$$x_j^k = \text{Re}(q^{kn+j}) = r^{kn+j} \cos(kn + j)\theta, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Note that $r = |q| \leq 1$ (otherwise C-CD will diverge, but we know from classical results that C-CD always converges for solving our problem), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^k\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n r^{2kn+2j} \cos^2[(kn + j)\theta] \geq r^{2kn+2n} \sum_j \cos^2[(kn + j)\theta] \\
&= r^{(2k+2)n} \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j \cos(2kn\theta + 2j\theta) + n \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

To calculate the sum in the above expression, we will need the following standard equality; for completeness, the proof of this claim is given in Appendix C.3.

Claim 6.1. *For any $z, \phi \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \cos(z + j\phi) = \frac{\sin(n\phi/2) \cos(z + (n+1)\phi/2)}{\sin(\phi/2)}. \quad (38)$$

Applying (38) to the expression in (37), we have

$$\|x^k\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} r^{(2k+2)n} \left(\frac{\sin(n\theta) \cos(2kn\theta + (n+1)\theta)}{\sin \theta} + n \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} r^{(2k+2)n} \left(n - \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin \theta} \right| \right). \quad (39)$$

Similar to (37) (but bound r^{2j} from above by 1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^0\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n r^{2j} \cos^2(j\theta) \leq \sum_j \cos^2(j\theta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j \cos(2j\theta) + n \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sin(n\theta) \cos((n+1)\theta)}{\sin \theta} + n \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(n + \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin \theta} \right| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Combining the above two relations, we have

$$\frac{\|x^k\|^2}{\|x^0\|^2} \geq r^{2kn+2n} \frac{n - |\sin(n\theta)/\sin \theta|}{n + |\sin(n\theta)/\sin \theta|} = r^{2kn+2n} \omega_c, \quad (41)$$

where

$$\omega_c \triangleq \frac{n - |\sin(n\theta)/\sin \theta|}{n + |\sin(n\theta)/\sin \theta|}.$$

According to (28), $q_1 = r e^{i\theta}$ converges to $e^{i2\pi/n}$ as $c \rightarrow 1$, thus $\theta \rightarrow 2\pi/n$ and $|\sin(n\theta)/\sin \theta| \rightarrow 0$ as $c \rightarrow 1$, which further implies $\omega_c \rightarrow 1$ as $c \rightarrow 1$.

Step 3: Bound the relative objective error.

Suppose $A = U^T U$, and denote $y^k = U x^k$, then

$$\|y^k\|^2 = (x^k)^T U^T U x^k = (x^k)^T A x^k = f(x^k).$$

Note that the minimum eigenvalue of A is $\hat{c} = 1 - c$, thus

$$\|y^k\|^2 = \|U x^k\|^2 = (x^k)^T A x^k \geq \hat{c} \|x^k\|^2 \stackrel{(39)}{\geq} \frac{\hat{c}}{2} r^{(2k+2)n} \left(n - \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \right). \quad (42)$$

We need to give an upper bound of $\|y^0\|^2$. Denote

$$\gamma_j = \operatorname{Re}(q^j) = r^j \cos(j\theta), \quad S = \sum_{l=1}^n \gamma_l. \quad (43)$$

Then the expression of x^0 given in (36) becomes

$$x^0 = (\gamma_1; \dots; \gamma_n). \quad (44)$$

Since the j -th row of A is $(c, \dots, c, 1, c, \dots, c)$ where 1 is in the j -th position, we can compute the j -th entry of Ax^0 as

$$(Ax^0)_j = c \sum_{l=1}^n \gamma_l + (1-c)\gamma_j \stackrel{(43)}{=} cS + \hat{c}\gamma_j. \quad (45)$$

Then we have

$$\|y^0\|^2 = (x^0)^T Ax^0 = \sum_j \gamma_j (cS + \hat{c}\gamma_j) = cS \sum_j \gamma_j + \hat{c} \sum_j \gamma_j^2 = cS^2 + \hat{c}\|x^0\|^2. \quad (46)$$

We will show that the second term $\hat{c}\|x^0\|^2$ is the dominant term, which will imply that $\frac{\|y^k\|^2}{\|y^0\|^2} \approx \frac{\hat{c}\|x^k\|^2}{\hat{c}\|x^0\|^2}$. To this end, we need to bound S^2 . By the definition of S in (43), we have

$$S = \sum_j \gamma_j = \operatorname{Re}(\sum_j q^j) = \operatorname{Re}(q \frac{1-q^n}{1-q}),$$

thus

$$S^2 \leq \left| q \frac{1-q^n}{1-q} \right|^2 = r^2 \left| \frac{1-q^n}{1-q} \right|^2 = r^2 \left| \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \right|^2 = r^2 \left| \frac{\hat{c}}{\hat{c}-q} \right|^2 = \hat{c}^2 \left| \frac{q}{\hat{c}-q} \right|^2.$$

Substituting the above relation and (40) into (46), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^0\|^2 &\leq c\hat{c}^2 \left| \frac{q}{\hat{c}-q} \right|^2 + \hat{c} \frac{1}{2} \left(n + \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \right) \\ &= \hat{c}\alpha_c, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where in the last equality we introduce the definition

$$\alpha_c \triangleq c\hat{c} \left| \frac{q}{\hat{c}-q} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(n + \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \right).$$

As $c \rightarrow 1$, we have $\hat{c} = 1-c \rightarrow 0$, $\left| \frac{q}{\hat{c}-q} \right| \rightarrow 1$ and $\left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \rightarrow 0$, thus

$$\alpha_c \rightarrow 0 + \frac{n}{2} = \frac{n}{2}, \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 1. \quad (48)$$

Combining (42) and (47), we get

$$\frac{\|y^k\|^2}{\|y^0\|^2} \geq \frac{\hat{c}}{2} r^{(2k+2)n} \left(n - \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \right) \frac{1}{\hat{c}\alpha_c} = \beta_c r^{(2k+2)n}, \quad (49)$$

where in the last equality we introduce the definition

$$\beta_c \triangleq \frac{1}{2\alpha_c} \left(n - \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \right).$$

According to (48) and the fact that $\left| \frac{\sin(n\theta)}{\sin(\theta)} \right| \rightarrow 0$ as $c \rightarrow 1$, we have

$$\beta_c \rightarrow \frac{1}{n}(n-0) = 1, \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 1, \quad (50)$$

which implies that for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $c_{u,1} < 1$ such that

$$\beta_c > 1 - \delta, \quad \forall c \in (c_{u,1}, 1). \quad (51)$$

By the relation between λ_1 and q_1 and the definition of r , we have

$$|1 - \lambda_1| \stackrel{(27)}{=} |q_1|^n \stackrel{(35)}{=} r^n.$$

According to (29), we have $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1/\kappa}{1-r^n} = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1/\kappa}{1-|1-\lambda_1|} = \frac{1}{2n \sin^2(\pi/n)} > \frac{n}{2\pi^2}$. Therefore, there exists $c_{u,2} < 1$ such that $\frac{1/\kappa}{1-r^n} > \frac{n}{2\pi^2}$, $\forall c \in (c_{u,2}, 1)$, i.e.

$$r^n > 1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}, \quad \forall c \in (c_{u,2}, 1). \quad (52)$$

For any $\delta > 0$, pick $c \in (\max\{c_{u,1}, c_{u,2}\}, 1)$ and substituting (51) and (52) into (49), we obtain

$$\frac{f(x^k) - f^*}{f(x^0) - f^*} = \frac{\|y^k\|^2}{\|y^0\|^2} \geq (1 - \delta) \left(1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n\kappa}\right)^{2k+2}. \quad (53)$$

This proves (10a). To prove the bound (10b), notice that for our example

$$\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_{CD}} = \frac{L}{L_{\text{avg}}} = \frac{1 - c + cn}{1} \rightarrow n, \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 1. \quad (54)$$

According to (52) and (54), for c close enough to 1, we have $r^n > 1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{n^2\kappa_{CD}}$. Substituting this relation and (51) into (49), we obtain the desired bound (10b) (similar to the calculation done in (53)).

At last, for an arbitrary initial point x^0 our results still hold since C-CD is invariant with respect to the simultaneous shift of the initial point and the space of variables. More specifically, pick $c \in (0, 1)$ such that (10) holds and let v be the eigenvector of A_c given in (34). Consider using C-CD to solve the problem

$$\min_z (z - x^0 + v)^T A_c (z - x^0 + v)$$

starting from x^0 . Applying a linear transformation $z = x - x^0 + v$, this algorithm becomes C-CD for solving $\min_x x^T A_c x$ starting from v (the optimal solution x^* and optimal value f^* will change accordingly). Applying the result we have proved for this case, we get the desired result for the case with initial point x^0 . **Q.E.D.**

7 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments of C-CD, R-CD, RP-CD (randomly permuted CD, i.e., use random orders in each cycle) and GD for minimizing quadratic functions. In the literature, some papers present examples that C-CD performs better than R-CD (e.g., [76]), and others present opposite examples (e.g. [24]). Nevertheless, instead of simply stating “sometimes C-CD converges faster, sometimes R-CD converges faster”, we will demonstrate that the size of off-diagonal entries (relative to diagonal entries) affect the performance of C-CD. We summarize our numerical findings below:

1. C-CD is very slow for solving our example (24), as predicted by our theory, even for random initial points and non-asymptotic c (e.g. $c > 0.5$). In addition, the gap between C-CD and GD/R-CD/RP-CD in our simulation matches the theoretical prediction very well.
2. In the equal-diagonal case, the ratio $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}} = L/L_{\text{avg}}$ is an important indicator of the performance of C-CD. For randomly generated A , when A has large τ , C-CD converges much slower than R-CD/RP-CD; when A has small τ , C-CD usually converges as fast as (sometimes faster than) R-CD/RP-CD. In these random examples, τ is closely related to “off-diagonals-over-diagonals-ratio” (the ratio of the average magnitude of the off-diagonal entries over that of the diagonal entries), thus the size of the off-diagonal entries can be a simple indicator of the performance of C-CD.

- Similar to many experiments in earlier works, we also find that C-CD converges much faster than GD in all cases we test. This is opposite to the theory based on worst-case analysis. The bizarre discrepancy between theory and practice has motivated our work, but our work cannot explain but rather validate this discrepancy, and new types of analysis might be needed.

7.1 Experiments for the Bad Example

We first present simulation results for our example (24).

Our theoretical results are established for the asymptotic case $c \rightarrow 1$, and we want to test whether the same holds for fixed c . Although the value $\rho(M)$ does not necessarily represent the convergence rate when M is non-symmetric for C-CD (we have only proved $c \rightarrow 1$ case, not for general $c < 1$), we will still use $\rho(M)$ as a plausible indicator. We have computed $1 - \rho(M)$ where M is the (expected) iteration matrix of C-CD, R-CD, RP-CD and GD for various values of $c \in (0, 1)$. In the last three columns, we divide the values $1 - \rho(M)$ of R-CD, RP-CD and GD by the value of C-CD, and the resulting ratio represents how many times faster they are than C-CD. In the rows indicated by “1(theory)”, we use the theoretical values $n^2/2\pi^2 \approx n^2/20, n(n+1)/2\pi^2 \approx n(n+1)/20, n/2\pi^2 \approx n/20$ according to Proposition 4.4.

Table 3: Comparison of C-CD, R-CD, RP-CD and GD for our example $A = A_c$

| c | $1 - \rho(M)$, where M is iteration matrix | | | | Ratio over C-CD | | |
|------------|---|---------|--------|---------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| | C-CD | GD | R-CD | RP-CD | GD | R-CD | RP-CD |
| n = 20 | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 7.6e-1 | 4.8e-1 | 4.0e-1 | 5.2e-1 | 0.63 | 0.53 | 0.68 |
| 0.8 | 1.4e-2 | 1.2e-1 | 1.8e-2 | 2.0e-1 | 0.85 | 12.6 | 14.3 |
| 0.99 | 4.98e-4 | 5.05e-4 | 1e-2 | 1.03e-2 | 1.01 | 20.0 | 20.7 |
| 1 (theory) | – | – | – | – | 1.01 | 20.2 | 21.2 |
| n = 100 | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 3.8e-3 | 9.9e-3 | 0.39 | 0.50 | 2.6 | 103 | 132 |
| 0.8 | 6.1e-4 | 2.5e-3 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 4.08 | 297 | 328 |
| 0.99 | 2.0e-5 | 1.01e-4 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 5.02 | 494 | 497 |
| 1 (theory) | – | – | – | – | 5.07 | 506 | 512 |
| n = 1000 | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 3.9e-5 | 9.99e-4 | 0.39 | 0.50 | 25.4 | 9999 | 12717 |
| 0.8 | 6.2e-6 | 2.5e-4 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 40.5 | 29411 | 32480 |
| 0.99 | 2.01e-7 | 1.01e-5 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 50.2 | 49407 | 49704 |
| 1 (theory) | – | – | – | – | 50.7 | 50600 | 50760 |

Table 3 clearly shows that for $c = 0.8$ the gap between C-CD and other methods is already large, and rather close to the theory value for $c = 1$. In fact, the gap between GD and C-CD for $c = 0.8$ is around 80% of the theoretical gap for $c = 1$. When $c = 0.99$, the gap is about 99% of the predicted gap. These findings indicate that the gap between GD and C-CD can be uniformly expressed as c times the theoretical gap for $c = 1$; similarly the gap between R-CD/RP-CD and C-CD can be expressed as c^2 times the theoretical gap for $c = 1$. This phenomenon suggests that the lower bound (2) is not only true for $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}} = n$, but also for many other values of τ (at least for $\tau \geq 0.5n$). Nevertheless, a rigorous validation requires a non-asymptotic analysis for a given c , not for $c \rightarrow 1$, which seems not easy.

Table 3 only shows the convergence rate of various methods for the *worst* initial points. Now we present

some simulation results for *random* initialization. Figure 1 compares the performance of five methods C-CD, cycCGD-small (cyclic CGD with small stepsize $1/\lambda_{\max}$), RP-CD, R-CD and GD, for minimizing $f(x) = x^T A x$, where $n = 100$, $A = A_c$ with $c = 0.8$. The left figure shows the first 100 iterations, and the right figure shows 10^4 iterations. In the right figure, the large gap predicted by theory clearly exists: C-CD is about 4 times slower than GD, and GD is about 80 times slower than R-CD/RP-CD (which means C-CD is about 320 times slower than R-CD/RP-CD, matching Table 3). Figure 1 shows that RP-CD is slightly faster than R-CD, which also matches Table 3.




Figure 1: Relative error $\frac{f(x^k) - f^*}{f(x^0) - f^*}$ v.s. iterations, for 5 methods C-CD, cyclic CGD with small stepsize $1/\lambda_{\max}(A)$, randomly permuted CD, randomized CD and GD. Minimize $f(x) = x^T A x$, $n = 100$, $A = A_c$ with $c = 0.8$.

7.2 Experiments for Random Data

Next, we discuss numerical experiments for randomly generated A ; for simplicity, we will normalize the diagonal entries of A to be 1. Since different random distributions of A will lead to different results, we test many distributions and try to understand for which C-CD performs well/poorly. To guarantee that A is positive semidefinite, we generate a random matrix U and let $A = U^T U$. We generate the entries of U i.i.d. from a certain random distribution, such as $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (standard Gaussian distribution), $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ (uniform $[0, 1]$ distribution), log-normal distribution, etc. It turns out for most distributions C-CD is slower than R-CD, but for standard Gaussian distribution C-CD is better than R-CD.

Inspired by the numerical experiments for the example (24), we suspect that the performance of C-CD depends on how large the off-diagonal entries of A are (with fixed diagonal entries). To quantify the “off-diagonals-over-diagonals-ratio”, we define

$$\chi_i = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}|}{A_{ii}} = \sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \chi_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \chi_i, \quad \tau = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\text{avg}}} = \frac{L}{L_{\text{avg}}} = L,$$

where we have used the assumption $A_{ii} = 1, \forall i$ and its consequence $L_{\text{avg}} = 1$. Obviously $L = \lambda_{\max} \leq 1 + \max_i \chi_i$. In many examples we find λ_{\max} to be close to $1 + \chi_{\text{avg}}$, especially when both of them are large.

We perform some kind of A/B testing for each distribution: compare the zero-mean case (leading to small off-diagonal entries) with the non-zero mean case (large off-diagonal entries). We report the simulation results for three distributions Gaussian, uniform and log-normal. The simulation results are given in Figure 2, and the findings from these figures are summarized below.

1. For all zero-mean cases, C-CD is the fastest; for all non-zero mean cases, C-CD is slower than R-CD/RP-CD. This shows that empirically large off-diagonal entries (or large τ) lead to bad performance of C-CD.
2. Different from the example (24), C-CD is always much faster than GD in these experiments.
3. Overall, RP-CD is the best algorithm out of the five.

There are many other ways of generating random A . For example, we can multiply U by the square root of a fixed correlation matrix C . When C has large off-diagonal entries, the results are similar to those shown on the right column of Figure 2. In statistics, this means that for solving linear regression problems, C-CD is slow when the data have large correlation ([42] has noticed a related phenomenon).

One interesting question is: Is randomness crucial in the sense that for any random problem C-CD is faster than GD? It turns out the answer is no. We randomly perturb our example, and found that when the perturbation is reasonably small, C-CD is still very slow. This also implies that our “worst-case” example is robust under small perturbation, which is different from the exponential time example for simplex methods. Maybe a new type of analysis is needed to explain this phenomenon.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we rigorously establish a $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between cyclic coordinate descent (C-CD) and randomized coordinate descent (R-CD), when solving quadratic minimization. More specifically, after presenting an upper bound of $\mathcal{O}(n^4\kappa_{\text{CD}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ for C-CD, we prove that this bound is tight in terms of the current parameters. This is achieved by showing that for a class of examples C-CD does take that many iterations to achieve accuracy ϵ . Compared with the complexity of R-CD $\mathcal{O}(n^2\kappa_{\text{CD}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, our result implies that C-CD can indeed be $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ times slower than R-CD. When using more parameters such as $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$ to characterize the complexity, the complexity of C-CD is approximately $\mathcal{O}(n^2\tau^2\kappa_{\text{CD}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ (up to $\log^2 n$ factor), which is $\mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$ times slower than R-CD.


Due to the equivalence of C-CD, Gauss-Seidel method, Kaczmarz method and POCS for solving symmetric PSD linear systems, our result also establishes an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ gap between the cyclic versions of these methods and their randomized counterparts. An interesting finding is that the classical bound of POCS in [52] is not better than our bound, and for the proposed example is infinitely times worse than our bound.

The simulation partially validates our worst-case analysis. For random coefficient matrices, our numerical experiments show that the ratio $\tau = \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\text{avg}}$ is closely related to the performance of C-CD. When the ratio τ is large (e.g., in a regression problem with large correlation between the variables), C-CD is much slower than R-CD. However, in all random data experiments the gap was never as large as $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. More strangely, C-CD is always much faster than GD for random data. Thus more theory is needed to explain the worst-case performance of C-CD and typical performance in numerical experiments.


We then discuss some subtle issues and some open questions on the worst-case complexity of C-CD. One subtly arises in the analysis of the non-equal diagonal case, for which we have argued that a more reasonable set of parameters should be based on the Jacobi-preconditioned version of the original coefficient matrix. To perform a comparison with GD and R-CD, we need to explore the relationships between the Jacobi-preconditioned matrix and the original matrix, which is not well understood yet. This lack of understanding leads to an open question whether an $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ gap can be established for the non-equal diagonal quadratic case. Yet another issue was mentioned in [39]: for general convex case (even with equal per-block Lipschitz constant), a few bounds for C-CD were established but it is still not known whether the gap between C-

CD and R-CD can be $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. It was conjectured in [39] that the current parameters are not enough for characterizing the convergence rate of C-CD for general convex problems.


A more important open question is whether there is a fundamental gap between deterministic versions of CD and randomized versions. We have not yet found a deterministic version of CD which can perform as well as R-CD for the proposed example. Either such an example or a proof of the lower bound for *all* deterministic versions of CD would be very interesting. This question is also related to the best complexity of deterministic iterative algorithms for solving symmetric PSD linear systems and positive LP. A more general version of this question is whether for other algorithms such as ADMM, there is a fundamental gap between all deterministic algorithms and randomized versions.




(a1) Gaussian zero mean. $L \approx 3.8$, $\chi_{\max} \approx 7.9$.




(a2) Gaussian with mean 2. $L \approx 80$, $\chi_{\text{avg}} \approx 79$




(b1) Uniform $[-0.5, 0.5]$. $L \approx 3.8$, $\chi_{\text{avg}} \approx 7.9$.



(b2) Uniform $[0,1]$. $L \approx 75$, $\chi_{\text{avg}} \approx 74$.



(c1) Log-normal, with zero mean. $L \approx 3.8$, $\chi_{\text{avg}} \approx 7.6$.



(c2) Log-normal. $L \approx 42$, $\chi_{\text{avg}} \approx 41$.

Figure 2: Comparison of various methods for solving $\min_x x^T A x$, where A is a 100×100 matrix. A is generated as follows: generate entries of U i.i.d. from a certain distribution and let $A = U^T U$; different figures represent different distributions of U . Figures (a1) and (a2): Gaussian distribution with variance 1; figures (b1) and (b2): uniform distribution; figure (c1) and (c2): log-normal distribution. On the left: zero-mean; on the right: non-zero mean.

Appendix

A Proof of Claim 2.1

We restate Claim 2.1 below for readers' convenience:

Claim A.1. *Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, $A = UU^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has no zero row. Then Gauss-Seidel method for solving $Ax = b$ is equivalent to Kaczmarz method for solving $Uy = b$; here, the equivalence means that there is a one-to-one mapping between the iterates of the two algorithms.*

Proof: Suppose $U^T = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$, then $u_j \neq 0, \forall j$.

To solve the linear system $Ax = b$, the update equation of Gauss-Seidel method can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k,j} &= x^{k,j-1} - \frac{A(j,:)x^{k,j-1} - b_j}{A_{jj}}e_j = x^{k,j-1} - \frac{u_j^T U^T x^{k,j-1} - b_j}{\|u_j\|^2}e_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n; \\ x^{k+1} &= x^{k,n}, \quad x^{k+1,0} = x^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Let $y^{k,j} = U^T x^{k,j}$ and $y^{k+1} = U^T x^{k+1}$, $y^{k+1,0} = U^T x^{k+1,0}$, and multiply U^T on both sides of the above equations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} y^{k,j} &= y^{k,j-1} - \frac{u_j^T y^{k,j-1} - b_j}{\|u_j\|^2}u_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n; \\ y^{k+1} &= y^{k,n}, \quad y^{k+1,0} = y^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

This is exactly the update equation of Kaczmarz method. Since U is invertible, define $x^{k,j} = U^{-T}y^{k,j}$, we can transform the Kaczmarz method to Gauss-Seidel method. **Q.E.D.**

Remark: The above proof shows that Gauss-Seidel method for any symmetric PSD linear system can be transformed to Kaczmarz method. The other direction is less clear if U^T does not have an inverse. Below we show that in the general case Kaczmarz method is “almost” equivalent to Gauss-Seidel method.

To simplify the discussion, we assume $b = 0$ and $\|u_j\|^2 = 1, \forall j$. The projection onto the hyperplane $\mathcal{H}_j = \{y \mid \langle u_j, y \rangle = b_j\}$ has a simple expression $I - u_j u_j^T$.

Case 1: U is square invertible. This means that u_1, \dots, u_n form a basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We rewrite the above proof in a more intuitive way. Any vector y can be represented under the basis u_1, \dots, u_n as

$$y = x_1 u_1 + \dots + x_n u_n.$$

Projecting y onto a hyperplane \mathcal{H}_1 is just left multiplying y by $I - u_1 u_1^T$:

$$\begin{aligned} (I - u_1 u_1^T)y &= (I - u_1 u_1^T)(x_1 u_1 + \dots + x_n u_n) = 0 + \sum_{j=2}^n (I - u_1 u_1^T)x_j u_j \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^n (u_j - u_1 u_1^T u_j)x_j = -(u_1^T u_2 x_2 + \dots + u_1^T u_n x_n)u_1 + x_2 u_2 + \dots + x_n u_n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the coordinates x_2, \dots, x_n are unchanged, and the first coordinate x_1 is updated to $-(u_1^T u_2 x_2 + \dots + u_1^T u_n x_n)$, which is exactly the optimal solution to $\min_{x_1} x^T U U^T x$ with other variables x_2, \dots, x_n fixed.

Under a basis transformation $y = U^T x$, one iterate of Kaczmarz method for updating y is exactly one iterate of Gauss-Seidel method for updating x . Therefore, Gauss-Seidel method is just Kaczmarz method under a different basis.

Case 2: Full row-rank linear system, i.e., $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with rank $n \leq m$, and the initial point $y^{0,0}$ lies in the span of u_1, \dots, u_n . Note that the row vectors u_1, \dots, u_n may not span the whole space \mathbb{R}^m . The equivalence of G-S method and Kaczmarz method still holds. In fact, $y^{0,0} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ can be expressed by n vectors u_1, \dots, u_n , and all the iterates stay in the span of u_1, \dots, u_n . Thus there is a one-to-one mapping between $y^{k,j}$ and $x^{k,j}$ which is formed by the coordinates of $y^{k,j}$ under the basis u_1, \dots, u_n .

Case 3: U is not full row-rank, and the initial point $y^{0,0}$ lies in the span of u_1, \dots, u_n . This includes the overdetermined case $n > m$, as well as the underdetermined case $n \leq m$ with linearly dependent rows. There is no one-to-one correspondance between the two methods; nevertheless, each sequence of Kaczmarz method corresponds to infinitely many sequences of G-S method. This is because y can be represented by u_1, \dots, u_n in multiple ways, i.e., the representation $y = x_1 u_1 + \dots + x_n u_n$ is not unique. Fix any representation of the initial point $y^{0,0}$, the coordinates of $y^{0,0}$ under the spanning set u_1, \dots, u_n can be updated according to the rule described in Case 1, which can be viewed as Gauss-Seidel method. Thus one representation of $y^{0,0}$ leads to one sequence of Gauss-Seidel iterates. Different representations of $y^{0,0}$ can lead to different sequences of Gauss-Seidel iterates.

B Proofs of Upper Bounds

B.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Without loss of generality, we can assume $b = 0$. In fact, minimizing $f(x) = x^T A x - 2b^T x$ is equivalent to minimizing $f(x) = (x - x^*)^T A (x - x^*)$ where $x^* = A^\dagger b$; here we use the fact that $Ax^* = AA^\dagger b = b$ when $b \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. By a linear transformation $z = x - x^*$, C-CD for minimizing $(x - x^*)^T A (x - x^*)$ starting from x^0 is equivalent to C-CD for minimizing $z^T A z$ starting from $z^0 = x^0 - x^*$. Thus we can assume $x^* = 0$, or equivalently, $b = 0$.

The update equation of C-CD now becomes

$$x^{k+1} = (I - \Gamma^{-1} A) x^k = x^k - d^k, \quad (57)$$

where Γ is the lower triangular part of A with diagonal entries, i.e., $\Gamma_{ij} = A_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$, and $d^k = \Gamma^{-1} A x^k$ is the moving direction. This implies

$$\Gamma d^k = A x^k. \quad (58)$$

We first assume A is positive definite and will show how to extend to the PSD case in the end.

The proof consists of two main claims. The first claim relates the convergence rate of C-CD with the spectral radius of a certain matrix.

Claim B.1. *Let $D_A = \text{diag}(A_{11}, \dots, A_{nn})$ be a diagonal matrix with entries A_{ii} 's. Then*

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}\|} \right) (f(x^k) - f(x^*)). \quad (59)$$

First Proof of Claim B.1 (Optimization Perspective): Following the proof framework of [39], we bound the descent amount and the cost yet to be minimized (cost-to-go) respectively. Suppose $w^0 = x^k, w^n = x^{k+1}$

and w^1, \dots, w^{n-1} are the $n-1$ intermediate iterates. Since w^i is obtained by minimizing f over the i -th coordinate with other variables fixed, it is easy to verify

$$d_i^k = \frac{1}{2A_{ii}} \nabla_i f(w^{i-1}). \quad (60)$$

In the above expression, $2A_{ii}$ can be viewed as the i -th coordinate-wise Lipschitz constant of ∇f from an optimization perspective. We have

$$w^1 = w^0 - d_1^k e_1 = w^0 - \frac{1}{2A_{11}} \nabla_1 f(w^0), \dots, w^n = w^{n-1} - d_n^k e_n = w^{n-1} - \frac{1}{2A_{nn}} \nabla_n f(w^{n-1}),$$

where e_i is the i -th unit vector. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(w^{i-1}) - f(w^i) &= (w^{i-1})^T A w^{i-1} - (w^{i-1} - d_i^k e_i)^T A (w^{i-1} - d_i^k e_i) = -d_i^k e_i^T A e_i d_i^k + 2(w^{i-1})^T A e_i d_i^k \\ &= -A_{ii}(d_i^k)^2 + \nabla_i f(w^{i-1}) d_i^k \stackrel{(60)}{=} -A_{ii}(d_i^k)^2 + 2A_{ii}(d_i^k)^2 = A_{ii}(d_i^k)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Therefore, the descent amount $f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1})$ can be bounded in terms of d^k as

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(w^{i-1}) - f(w^i) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_{ii}(d_i^k)^2 = (d^k)^T D_A d^k. \quad (62)$$

The cost-to-go estimate is simply

$$f(x^k) - f(x^*) = f(x^k) = (x^k)^T A x^k \stackrel{(58)}{=} (d^k)^T \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma d^k. \quad (63)$$

Combining with (62), we obtain

$$\frac{f(x^k) - f(x^*)}{f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1})} = \frac{(d^k)^T \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma d^k}{(d^k)^T D_A d^k} \leq \|D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}\|, \quad (64)$$

which implies (59).

Second Proof of Claim B.1 (Matrix Recursion Perspective): One natural idea is to prove $f(x^{k+1}) = M_f f(x^k)$ or $f(x^{k+1}) \leq \|M_f\| f(x^k)$ for a certain matrix M_f , based on the update equation of the iterates $x^{k+1} = (I - \Gamma^{-1} A) x^k$. We can write down the expression of $f(x^{k+1})$ in terms of x^k as $f(x^{k+1}) = (x^k)^T (I - \Gamma^{-1} A)^T A (I - \Gamma^{-1} A) x^k$. However, it is not clear how this expression is related to $f(x^k) = (x^k)^T A x^k$. A simple trick to resolve this issue is to express everything in terms of d^k . More specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) &= (x^k)^T A x^k - (x^k - d^k)^T A (x^k - d^k) = 2(d^k)^T A x^k - (d^k)^T A d^k \\ &= 2(d^k)^T \Gamma d^k - (d^k)^T A d^k = (d^k)^T (\Gamma + \Gamma^T) d^k - (d^k)^T A d^k = (d^k)^T D_A d^k, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the last step is because $\Gamma + \Gamma^T = A + D_A$. Equation (65) is equivalent to (62) derived earlier using another approach. The rest is the same as the first proof. **Q.E.D.**

Remark: Although the second proof seems simpler, for people who are familiar with optimization the first proof is probably easier to understand: equation (61) is just the classical descent lemma (applied to each coordinate), thus (62) is straightforward to derive. In the proof of [39], one crucial step is to bound the cost-to-go in terms of d^k ; here for the quadratic case the cost-to-go has a closed form expression given by (64). The second proof is cleaner to write, but it is specifically tailored for the quadratic problem; in contrast, the first proof can be extended to non-quadratic problems as done in [39] ((62) and (64) will become inequalities).

Claim B.2. Let $D_A = \text{diag}(A_{11}, \dots, A_{nn})$ be a diagonal matrix with entries A_{ii} 's. Then

$$\|\Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma\| \leq \kappa \cdot \min \left\{ \sum_i L_i, (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 L \right\}. \quad (66)$$

Proof of Claim B.2:

Denote

$$\Gamma_{\text{unit}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{unit}} \circ A$, where \circ denotes the Hadamard product. According to the classical result on the operator norm of the triangular truncation operator [77, Theorem 1], we have

$$\|\Gamma\| = \|\Gamma_{\text{unit}} \circ A\| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n) \|A\| \leq (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n) \|A\|.$$

Thus we have

$$\|\Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma\| \leq \|\Gamma^T \Gamma\| \|A^{-1}\| = \|\Gamma\|^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(A)} \leq (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 \frac{\|A\|^2}{\lambda_{\min}(A)} = (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 \kappa L,$$

which proves the second part of (66).

We can bound $\|\Gamma\|^2$ in another way (denote λ_i 's as the eigenvalues of A):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma\|^2 &\leq \|\Gamma\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{2} (\|A\|_F^2 + \sum_i A_{ii}^2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2 + \sum_i A_{ii}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left((\sum_i \lambda_i) \lambda_{\max} + L_{\max} \sum_i A_{ii} \right) \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{2} (L + L_{\max}) \sum_i L_i \leq L \sum_i L_i. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where (i) is because $\sum_i \lambda_i = \text{tr}(A) = \sum_i A_{ii}$ and $A_{ii} = L_i$. Thus

$$\|\Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma\| \leq \|\Gamma\|^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(A)} \stackrel{(67)}{\leq} \frac{L}{\lambda_{\min}} \sum_i L_i = \kappa \sum_i L_i.$$

which proves the first part of (66). **Q.E.D.**

Finally, according to the fact $\|D_A^{-1/2} B D_A^{-1/2}\| \leq \frac{1}{\min_i L_i} \|B\| = \frac{1}{L_{\min}} \|B\|$ for any positive definite matrix B , we have

$$\|D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}\| \leq \frac{1}{L_{\min}} \|\Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma\| \stackrel{(66)}{\leq} \frac{1}{L_{\min}} \kappa \cdot \min \left\{ \sum_i L_i, (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 L \right\}$$

Plugging this inequality into (59) and replacing $\sum_i L_i$ by $n L_{\text{avg}}$, we obtain (9a).

Now we show how to modify the above proof to the case that A is PSD. From (58) we have

$$x^k = A^\dagger \Gamma d^k.$$

Then (63) is slightly modified to $(x^k)^T A x^k = (d^k)^T \Gamma^T A^\dagger \Gamma d^k$. We still have (62) since its proof does not require A to be positive definite. Now we modify (64) to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(x^k) - f(x^*)}{f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1})} &= \frac{(d^k)^T \Gamma^T A^\dagger \Gamma d^k}{(d^k)^T D_A d^k} \leq \frac{(d^k)^T \Gamma^T \Gamma d^k \|A^\dagger\|}{(d^k)^T D_A d^k} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \frac{(d^k)^T \Gamma^T \Gamma d^k}{(d^k)^T D_A d^k} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \|D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma^T \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min} L_{\min}} \|\Gamma^T \Gamma\|. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where (i) is because $\|A^\dagger\| = 1/\lambda_{\min}$ where λ_{\min} is the minimum non-zero eigenvalue of A . The rest is almost the same as the proof for the PD case: obtaining the bounds of $\Gamma^T \Gamma$ as in Claim B.2 and plugging them into (68) immediately leads to (9a).

The first bound of result (9b) is a direct corollary of (9a) because $\kappa \leq n\kappa_{CD}$ (which is because $\lambda_{\max}(A) \leq \text{tr}(A) = nL_{\text{avg}}$). The second bound of (9b) is the same as the second bound of (9a) because

$$\frac{\kappa L}{L_{\min}} = \frac{L^2}{\lambda_{\min} L_{\min}} = \frac{L^2}{L_{\text{avg}} L_{\min}} \frac{L_{\text{avg}}}{\lambda_{\min}} = \frac{L^2}{L_{\text{avg}} L_{\min}} \kappa_{CD}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.1.

B.2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

This proof is a slight modification of the proof of Proposition 3.1.

We first consider the case that A is positive definite. The insight is to rewrite the relation proved in Claim B.1

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma^T A^{-1} \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}\|}\right) (f(x^k) - f(x^*)) \quad (69)$$

as

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|\hat{\Gamma}^T \hat{A}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}\|}\right) (f(x^k) - f(x^*)), \quad (70)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma} = D_A^{-1/2} \Gamma D_A^{-1/2}$ and $\hat{A} = D_A^{-1/2} A D_A^{-1/2}$. Note that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is still the lower-triangular part (with diagonal entries) of the Jacobi-preconditioned matrix \hat{A} . The diagonal entries of $\hat{\Gamma}$ and \hat{A} are all 1, so $\hat{L}_i = 1, \forall i$.

Applying Claim B.2 we have

$$\|\hat{\Gamma}^T \hat{A}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}\| \leq \hat{\kappa} \cdot \min \left\{ \sum_i \hat{L}_i, (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 \hat{L} \right\} = \hat{\kappa} \cdot \min \left\{ n, (2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log n)^2 \hat{L} \right\}.$$

Plugging the above relation into (70) we obtain (15a). Similar to Proposition 3.1, the second bound (15b) follows directly from (15a).

The case that A is PSD is can be handled in a similar way to the proof of Proposition 3.1.

C Supplemental Proofs for Theorem 3.1

C.1 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Suppose λ is an eigenvalue of $Z = \Gamma^{-1}A$ and $v = (v_1; v_2; \dots; v_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times 1}$ is the corresponding eigenvector. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma^{-1}Av = \lambda v \\ \implies & Av = \lambda Lv \\ \implies & \begin{cases} v_1 + c \sum_{j \neq 1} v_j = \lambda v_1 \\ v_2 + c \sum_{j \neq 2} v_j = \lambda(cv_1 + v_2) \\ \dots \\ v_k + c \sum_{j \neq k} v_j = \lambda(cv_1 + \dots + cv_{k-1} + v_k), \\ \dots \\ v_n + c \sum_{j \neq n} v_j = \lambda(cv_1 + \dots + cv_{n-1} + v_n). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume

$$\sum_{j=1}^n v_j = 1. \quad (72)$$

Let $\hat{c} = 1 - c$. Then (71) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \hat{c}v_1 + c = \lambda v_1 \\ \hat{c}v_2 + c = \lambda(cv_1 + v_2) \\ \dots \\ \hat{c}v_k + c = \lambda(cv_1 + \dots + cv_{k-1} + v_k), \\ \dots \\ \hat{c}v_n + c = \lambda(cv_1 + \dots + cv_{n-1} + v_n). \end{cases} \quad (73)$$

The first equation implies $v_1 = \frac{c}{\lambda - \hat{c}}$. Plugging into the second equation, we get

$$v_2 = \frac{c(1 - \lambda v_1)}{\lambda - \hat{c}} = \frac{c(\lambda - \hat{c} - \lambda c)}{(\lambda - \hat{c})^2} = \frac{c\hat{c}(\lambda - 1)}{(\lambda - \hat{c})^2}.$$

Plugging the expression of v_1, v_2 into the third equation, we get

$$v_3 = \frac{c(1 - \lambda v_1 - \lambda v_2)}{\lambda - \hat{c}} = \frac{c(\hat{c})^2(\lambda - 1)^2}{(\lambda - \hat{c})^3}.$$

In general, we can prove by induction that

$$v_k = \frac{c(\hat{c})^{k-1}(\lambda - 1)^{k-1}}{(\lambda - \hat{c})^k} = \frac{c}{\lambda - \hat{c}} q^{k-1}, \quad (74)$$

where

$$q = \frac{\hat{c}(\lambda - 1)}{\lambda - \hat{c}}. \quad (75)$$

We can also express λ in terms of q as

$$\lambda = \frac{\hat{c} - \hat{c}q}{\hat{c} - q}. \quad (76)$$

Note that the expression of v_k given by (74) satisfies (73) for any λ , but our goal is to compute λ . To do this, we need to utilize the normalization assumption (72). In particular, we have (when $q \neq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_k v_k = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n q^{k-1} \right) \frac{c}{\lambda - \hat{c}} = \frac{1 - q^n}{1 - q} \frac{c}{\lambda - \hat{c}} \\ \implies (1 - q)(\lambda - \hat{c}) &= c(1 - q^n) \\ \stackrel{(75)}{\implies} c\lambda &= c(1 - q^n) \\ \implies q^n &= 1 - \lambda \stackrel{(76)}{=} 1 - \frac{\hat{c} - \hat{c}q}{\hat{c} - q} \\ \implies q^n &= \frac{qc}{q - \hat{c}} \\ \implies q^n(q - \hat{c}) &= cq. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

The above procedure is reversible, i.e. suppose $q \neq 1$ is a root of $q^n(q - \hat{c}) = cq$, then $\lambda = \frac{\hat{c} - \hat{c}q}{\hat{c} - q}$ is an eigenvalue of Z . Suppose the $n + 1$ roots of $q^n(q - \hat{c}) = cq$ are $q_0 = 0, q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}, q_n = 1$ ($q = 0$ and $q = 1$ are always roots), then $\lambda_k = \frac{\hat{c} - \hat{c}q_k}{\hat{c} - q_k} \stackrel{(77)}{=} 1 - q_k^n, k = 0, \dots, n - 1$ are the n eigenvalues of Z .

C.2 Proof of Lemma 6.2

The roots of a polynomial continuously depend on the coefficients of the polynomial, and thus the roots of a series of polynomials will converge to the roots of the limiting polynomial of this family; see [78, Theorem 4A]. To make our proof self-consistent, we will prove Lemma 6.2 by Rouché's theorem in complex analysis.

When $n = 1$, the only solution of $q^{n-1}(q - 1 + c) = c$ is $q = 1$, thus the conclusion holds. From now on, we assume $n \geq 2$.

Let $p = 1/q$, then the equation $q^{n-1}(q - 1 + c) = c$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} p^{-1} - 1 + c &= cp^{n-1} \iff 1 - (1 - c)p = cp^n \iff 1/c - (1/c - 1)p = p^n \\ &\iff p^n - 1 + (1/c - 1)(p - 1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This equation can be written as $F(p) + G_c(p) = 0$, where F and G_c are defined as

$$F(p) = p^n - 1, \quad G_c(p) = (1/c - 1)(p - 1).$$

Lemma C.1. *Suppose $n \geq 2$. For any $0 < \epsilon < \sin(\pi/n)$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for any $c \in (1 - \delta, 1)$, $F(p) + G_c(p)$ has exactly one root p_k in the ball $B(e^{-i2k\pi/n}, \epsilon) \triangleq \{z \mid |z - e^{-i2k\pi/n}| \leq \epsilon\}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$.*

Clearly, the function F has n roots $\eta_k \triangleq e^{-i2k\pi/n}, k = 1, \dots, n$. The distance between two adjacent roots are

$$|1 - e^{-2i\pi/n}| = 2\sin(\pi/n).$$

For any $0 < \epsilon < \sin(\pi/n)$, consider n balls

$$B(\eta_k, \epsilon) = \{z \mid |z - \eta_k| \leq \epsilon\}, k = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1.$$

Any two such balls have no intersection since $\epsilon < |\sin(\pi/n)| = \min_{0 \leq j, k \leq n-1} |\eta_j - \eta_k|$.

The boundary of the ball $B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$ is

$$\partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon) = \{z \mid |z - \eta_k| = \epsilon\}.$$

Define

$$v_k(\epsilon) \triangleq \inf_{z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon)} F(z) = \min_{z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon)} |z^n - 1| > 0.$$

This minimum can be achieved because $v_k(\epsilon)$ is the minimal value of a continuous function on a compact set. It is positive since otherwise there exists some $z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$ such that $z^n = 1$ which means $z \in \{\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1}\}$. This contradicts the fact that any two balls $B(\eta_j, \epsilon), B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$ have no intersection.

Define

$$v(\epsilon) = \min_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} v_k(\epsilon) > 0.$$

For any $z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$, we have

$$|F(z)| = |z^n - 1| \geq v(\epsilon). \quad (78)$$

For any $z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$ and any $c > \frac{3}{3+v(\epsilon)}$, we have

$$|G_c(z)| = |(1/c - 1)(z - 1)| \leq |1/c - 1|(|\eta_k| + \epsilon + 1) \leq 3|1/c - 1| < v(\epsilon), \quad (79)$$

where the second inequality is due to $|\eta_k| = 1$ and $\epsilon < \sin(\pi/n) \leq 1$.

Combining the two bounds (78) and (79), we obtain that

$$|F(z)| > |G_c(z)|, \forall z \in \partial B(\eta_k, \epsilon).$$

According to Rouché's theorem, F and $F + G_c$ have the same number of zeros inside $B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$. Since F has exactly one root inside $B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$ which is η_k , we obtain that $F + G_c$ has exactly one root p_k inside $B(\eta_k, \epsilon)$.

□

We first let $\epsilon_0 = \sin(\pi/n)/4$, which implies $B(\eta_k, \epsilon_0), k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ are n disjoint balls. For any $c \in (3/(3+v(\epsilon_0)), 1)$, Lemma C.1 implies that $F(p) + G_c(p)$ has exactly one root inside each ball. We denote $p_0(c), p_1(c), \dots, p_{n-1}(c)$ to be the roots of $F(p) + G_c(p)$ such that $p_k(c) \in B(\eta_k, \epsilon_0), \forall k$. Since $F + G_c$ has exactly n complex roots, thus $p_k(c)$'s are all the roots of $F + G_c$. Lemma C.1 implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some δ such that whenever $c > 1 - \delta$, we have

$$|p_k(c) - \eta_k| < \epsilon, \forall k.$$

This means

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} p_k(c) = \eta_k, \forall k.$$

Since there is a one-to-one mapping between the roots of $q^{n-1}(q-1+c)-c$ and the roots of $F(p) + G_c(p) = p^n - 1 + (1/c - 1)(p - 1)$ by the inverse transformation $p = 1/q$, we obtain the following result: for any $c \in (3/(3+v(\epsilon_0)), 1)$, the equation $q^{n-1}(q-1+c)-c$ has exactly one root $q_k(c)$ such that $|1/q_k(c) - e^{-i2\pi k/n}| < \sin(\pi/n)/2$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$; moreover,

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} q_k(c) = e^{i2\pi k/n}, \forall k.$$

Since $|1/q_k(c) - e^{-i2\pi k/n}| < \sin(\pi/n)/4$ implies $|q_k(c) - e^{i2\pi k/n}| < \sin(\pi/n)/2$, we obtain the following conclusion: for any $c \in (3/(3+v(\epsilon_0)), 1)$, the equation $q^{n-1}(q-1+c)-c$ has exactly one root $q_k(c)$ such that $|q_k(c) - e^{i2\pi k/n}| < \sin(\pi/n)/2$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$; moreover,

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} q_k(c) = e^{i2\pi k/n}, \forall k.$$

C.3 Proof of Claim 6.1

Since $2\sin(n\phi/2)\cos(x + (n+1)\phi/2) = \sin(z + (n+1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2)$, the desired equation (38) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \cos(z + j\phi) = \frac{\sin(z + (n+1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2)}{2\sin(\phi/2)}. \quad (80)$$

We prove (80) by induction. When $n = 1$, it holds because $\sin(z + 1.5\phi) - \sin(z + 0.5\phi) = 2\sin(\phi/2)\cos(z + \phi)$. Suppose (80) holds for $n - 1$, i.e.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \cos(z + j\phi) = \frac{\sin(z + (n-1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2)}{2\sin(\phi/2)}.$$

Note that $2\cos(z + n\phi)\sin(\phi/2) = \sin(z + (n+1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + (n-1/2)\phi)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \cos(z + j\phi) &= \frac{\sin(z + (n-1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2)}{2\sin(\phi/2)} + \cos(z + n\phi) \\ &= \frac{\sin(z + (n-1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2) + \sin(z + (n+1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + (n-1/2)\phi)}{2\sin(\phi/2)} \\ &= \frac{\sin(z + (n+1/2)\phi) - \sin(z + \phi/2)}{2\sin(\phi/2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

This completes the induction step, and thus (80) holds. **Q.E.D.**

D Proofs of Propositions on Exact Comparison

D.1 Proof of Proposition 4.3

Same as the proof of Theorem 3.1, we pick $A = A_c$ and consider minimizing $f(x) = x^T A_c x$. Obviously the minimizer $x^* = 0$ and the optimal value $f^* = f(x^*) = 0$.

We first compute $k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)$. The update equation of GD is $x^k = (I - \frac{1}{\beta}A)x^{k-1}$, where $\beta = \lambda_{\max}(A)$. Since A is a symmetric positive definite matrix, we can assume $A = U^T U$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is non-singular. Then

$$Ux^k = U(I - \frac{1}{\beta}A)x^{k-1} = (I - \frac{1}{\beta}UU^T)Ux^{k-1}, \quad (82)$$

The spectral norm of the iteration matrix

$$\|I - \frac{1}{\beta}UU^T\| = \|I - \frac{1}{\beta}A\| = 1 - \frac{1}{\beta}\lambda_{\min}(A) = 1 - 1/\kappa, \quad (83)$$

where κ is the condition number of A given by

$$\kappa = \frac{1 - c + cn}{1 - c}. \quad (84)$$

The relation (82) implies

$$f(x^k) = \|Ux^k\|^2 \leq \|I - \frac{1}{\beta}UU^T\|^2 \|Ux^{k-1}\|^2.$$

Therefore we have

$$f(x^k) \leq \|I - \frac{1}{\beta} U U^T\|^{2k} f(x^0) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right)^{2k} f(x^0). \quad (85)$$

The minimum number of iterations to achieve $\frac{(x^k)^H A x^k}{(x^0)^H A x^0} \leq \epsilon$ for all initial points $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ can be upper bounded as

$$k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon) \leq \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\|I - A/\beta\|} \right\rceil \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa)} + 1 \triangleq \tilde{k}_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon). \quad (86)$$

Let $y^k = U x^k$. We will use the same definitions of q, r, λ_i as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. According to (49), to obtain a relative error $\frac{f(x^k)}{f(x^0)} = \frac{\|y^k\|^2}{\|y^0\|^2} \leq \epsilon$, the number of iterations $k = k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)$ should satisfy

$$\epsilon \geq \beta_c r^{(2k+2)n} \stackrel{(35)}{=} \beta_c |q|^{(2k+2)n} \stackrel{(27)}{=} \beta_c |1 - \lambda_1|^{2k+2},$$

i.e.

$$k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln(1/\epsilon) + \ln(\beta_c)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)} - 1. \quad (87)$$

Since $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|) = 0$ and by (50) $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \beta_c = 1$, we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\frac{\ln(1/\epsilon) + \ln(\beta_c)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)} - 1}{\frac{\ln(1/\epsilon)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)}} = 1.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)} &\geq \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{\tilde{k}_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln(1/\epsilon) + \ln(\beta_c)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa)} + 1 \right)^{-1} \\ &= \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln(1/\epsilon)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa)} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa)}{\ln|1 - \lambda_1|} = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa)}{-1/\kappa} \cdot \frac{-(1 - |1 - \lambda_1|)}{\ln|1 - \lambda_1|} \cdot \frac{1/\kappa}{1 - |1 - \lambda_1|} \\ &= \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1/\kappa}{1 - |1 - \lambda_1|} \stackrel{(29)}{=} \frac{1}{2n \sin^2(\pi/n)} > \frac{n}{2\pi^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

The convergence rate of the objective values for R-CD has been given in [23, Theorem 2] and [22, Theorem 3.6]. We present the convergence rate of both the iterates and the objective values for R-CD, when solving quadratic problems (23). The proof is quite straightforward and omitted here. Note that the proposition implies $\|E(x^k)\|^2$ converges twice as fast as $E(f(x^k))$, which explains why in Proposition 4.4 the gap between C-CD and R-CD is twice as large as that in Proposition 4.3.

Proposition D.1. *Consider solving a quadratic minimization problem (23) where A is a positive definite matrix with all diagonal entries being 1. Suppose R-CD generates a sequence z^k according to (4) and define $x^k = z^{kn}$. Then*

$$\|E(x^k)\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\min}\right)^{2kn} \|x^0\|^2, \quad (89)$$

and

$$E(f(x^k)) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\min}\right)^{kn} f(x^0), \quad (90)$$

where λ_{\min} is the minimum eigenvalue of A .

According to Proposition D.1,

$$E(f(x^k)) \leq (1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})^{kn} f(x^0),$$

where $\kappa_{\text{CD}} = \frac{\max_i A_{ii}}{\lambda_{\min}(A)}$. To achieve an error $\frac{E(f(x^k))}{f(x^0)} \leq \epsilon$, we only need

$$(1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})^{kn} \leq \epsilon \iff k \geq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})}.$$

Therefore we have

$$k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\ln \epsilon}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})} + 1. \quad (91)$$

Combining the above relation with (86), we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tilde{k}_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} \geq \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{n \ln(1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})}{2 \ln(1 - 1/\kappa)} = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{n/\kappa_{\text{CD}}}{2/\kappa} = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{n \lambda_{\max}(A)}{2 \sum_i \beta_i} = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{n(1 - c + cn)}{2n} = \frac{n}{2}. \quad (92)$$

Combining the above relation with (88), we obtain

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} > \frac{n}{2\pi^2} \frac{n}{2} = \frac{n^2}{4\pi^2}. \quad (93)$$

According to (88) and (93), there exists c such that (19a) and (19b) hold.

Q.E.D.

D.2 Proof of Proposition 4.4

Same as the proof of Theorem 3.1, we pick $A = A_c$ and consider minimizing $f(x) = x^T A_c x$. Obviously the minimizer $x^* = 0$ and the optimal value $f^* = f(x^*) = 0$.

First we consider $K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)$. Since A is a symmetric positive definite matrix, we can assume $A = U^T U$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is non-singular. The update formula of GD is $x^{k+1} = (I - \frac{1}{\beta} A) x^k$. The iteration matrix $I - \frac{1}{\beta} A$ has the same eigenvalues as $I - \frac{1}{\beta} U U^T$, the iteration matrix of $\{U x^k\}$ (see (82)). Since both $I - \frac{1}{\beta} A$ and $I - \frac{1}{\beta} U U^T$ are symmetric, we have the following relation (which means that for GD the squared iterates and the function values converge at the same speed)

$$k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon) = K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon). \quad (94)$$

We then consider $K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)$. Compare 49 with 41 in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we know that the bound we obtained for the function values is the same as the bound for the squared iterates. Similar to (87), we have

$$K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln(1/\epsilon) + \ln(\omega_c)}{\ln(1/|1 - \lambda_1|)} - 1.$$

Similar to (88) in the proof of Proposition 4.3, we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)} > \frac{n}{2\pi^2}. \quad (95)$$

Next, we consider $K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)$. According to Proposition D.1,

$$\|E(x^k)\| \leq (1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})^{kn} \|x^0\|,$$

which implies

$$K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2n} \frac{\ln(\epsilon)}{\ln(1 - 1/\kappa_{\text{CD}})} + 1.$$

Note that the RHS (right-hand side) of the above bound is asymptotically half the RHS of (91). Combining with (92) and (94), we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} \stackrel{(94)}{=} \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} = 2 \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)}{k_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} \stackrel{(92)}{>} n.$$

Multiplying this inequality with (95), we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RCD}}(\epsilon)} > \frac{n^2}{2\pi^2}. \quad (96)$$

Finally, we compute $K_{\text{RPCD}}(\epsilon)$.

Claim D.1. *Consider using RP-CD (randomly permuted coordinate descent) to solve the problem $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} x^T A_c x$ with A_c given in (24). Suppose the initial point is x^0 , then we have*

$$\|E(x^k)\|^2 \leq (1 - (1 - c)(1 - \gamma))^{2k} \|x^0\|^2, \quad (97)$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{-n + (1 - (1 - c)^n)/c}{n(n - 1)}. \quad (98)$$

The proof of this claim is given in Appendix D.2.1.

By the definition of γ in (98) we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \gamma = -1/n. \quad (99)$$

Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.3, from (97) and (85) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RPCD}}(\epsilon)} &= \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\kappa}{1/[(1 - c)(1 - \gamma)]} \stackrel{(84)}{=} \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{1 - c + cn}{1 - c} (1 - c)(1 - \gamma) \\ &\stackrel{(98)}{=} \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} (1 - c + cn)(1 - \gamma) \stackrel{(99)}{=} (n)(1 + 1/n) = n + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this relation with (95) and use the fact $K_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon) = k_{\text{GD}}(\epsilon)$ we get

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{K_{\text{CCD}}(\epsilon)}{K_{\text{RPCD}}(\epsilon)} > \frac{n(n + 1)}{2\pi^2}. \quad (100)$$

According to (95), (96) and (100), there exists c such that all three relations in (19) hold.

D.2.1 Proof of Claim D.1

For simplicity, we denote $L = L_{12\dots n}$. Since $A = A_c$, we have

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ c & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c & c & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

It is easy to get (recall that $\hat{c} \triangleq 1 - c$)

$$\Gamma^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -c & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -c\hat{c} & -c & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -c\hat{c}^2 & -c\hat{c} & -c & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -c\hat{c}^{n-2} & -c\hat{c}^{n-3} & -c\hat{c}^{n-4} & \dots & -c & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Since L_σ can be obtained by permuting the rows and columns of L , thus L_σ^{-1} can also be obtained by similar permutations based on L_σ^{-1} . As the matrix A_c has only two distinct values, we know that the expression of $E(L_\sigma^{-1})$ (the expectation is taken over the uniform distribution of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$) must have the following form

$$E(L_\sigma^{-1}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \gamma & \dots & \gamma \\ \gamma & 1 & \dots & \gamma \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \gamma & \gamma & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (101)$$

where γ only depends on c . Due to symmetry, γ must be the average of all off-diagonal entries of Γ^{-1} , i.e.

$$\gamma = \frac{(n-1)c + (n-2)c\hat{c} + \dots + \hat{c}^{n-2}}{n(n-1)} = \frac{-n + (1 - \hat{c}^n)/c}{n(n-1)}. \quad (102)$$

By the expressions (101) and (24), we have

$$E(L_\sigma^{-1})A = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \tau & \dots & \tau \\ \tau & \alpha & \dots & \tau \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tau & \tau & \dots & \alpha \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\alpha = 1 + (n-1)c\gamma$, $\tau = c + \gamma + (n-2)c\gamma$. The minimum eigenvalue of this matrix is

$$\lambda_{\min}(E(L_\sigma^{-1})A) = \alpha - \tau = 1 + (n-1)c\gamma - c - \gamma - (n-2)c\gamma = (1-c)(1-\gamma). \quad (103)$$

According to (5), we have (note that σ^k is independent of x^k)

$$E(x^k) = E(I - L_\sigma^{-1}A)E(x^{k-1}),$$

where the expectation is taken over the uniform distribution of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. This implies

$$\|E(x^k)\| \leq \|I - E(L_\sigma^{-1})A\| \|E(x^{k-1})\|,$$

which further implies

$$\|E(x^k)\|^2 \leq \|I - E(L_\sigma^{-1})A\|^{2k} \|x^0\|^2. \quad (104)$$

It is easy to verify that $I - E(L_\sigma^{-1})A$ is a positive semidefinite matrix, thus $\|I - E(L_\sigma^{-1})A\| = 1 - \lambda_{\min}(E(L_\sigma^{-1})A)$. Plugging this and (103) into (104), we obtain the desired inequality (97).

References

- [1] Stephen J Wright, “Coordinate descent algorithms,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 151, no. 1, pp. 3–34, 2015.
- [2] Tamara G Kolda and Brett W Bader, “Tensor decompositions and applications,” *SIAM review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 455–500, 2009.
- [3] Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin, “Libsvm: a library for support vector machines,” *ACM transactions on intelligent systems and technology (TIST)*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 27, 2011.
- [4] Cho-Jui Hsieh, Kai-Wei Chang, Chih-Jen Lin, S Sathya Keerthi, and Sellamanickam Sundararajan, “A dual coordinate descent method for large-scale linear SVM,” in *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on machine learning*. ACM, 2008, pp. 408–415.
- [5] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Rob Tibshirani, “Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent,” *Journal of statistical software*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1, 2010.
- [6] Joseph K Bradley, Aapo Kyrola, Danny Bickson, and Carlos Guestrin, “Parallel coordinate descent for l1-regularized loss minimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.5379*, 2011.
- [7] Rahul Mazumder, Jerome H Friedman, and Trevor Hastie, “Sparsenet: Coordinate descent with nonconvex penalties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2012.
- [8] Meisam Razaviyayn, Mingyi Hong, and Zhi-Quan Luo, “A unified convergence analysis of block successive minimization methods for nonsmooth optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1126–1153, 2013.
- [9] Hadi Baligh, Mingyi Hong, Wei-Cheng Liao, Zhi-Quan Luo, Meisam Razaviyayn, Maziar Sanjabi, and Ruoyu Sun, “Cross-layer provision of future cellular networks: A wmmse-based approach,” *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 56–68, 2014.
- [10] Ruoyu Sun, Hadi Baligh, and Zhi-Quan Luo, “Long-term transmit point association for coordinated multipoint transmission by stochastic optimization,” in *Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC), 2013 IEEE 14th Workshop on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 330–334.
- [11] Mingyi Hong, Ruoyu Sun, Hadi Baligh, and Zhi-Quan Luo, “Joint base station clustering and beamformer design for partial coordinated transmission in heterogeneous networks,” *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 226–240, 2013.
- [12] Adrian A Canutescu and Roland L Dunbrack, “Cyclic coordinate descent: A robotics algorithm for protein loop closure,” *Protein science*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 963–972, 2003.
- [13] Charles A Bouman and Ken Sauer, “A unified approach to statistical tomography using coordinate descent optimization,” *Image Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 480–492, 1996.
- [14] Anne Greenbaum, *Iterative methods for solving linear systems*, vol. 17, SIAM, 1997.
- [15] Zaiwen Wen, Donald Goldfarb, and Katya Scheinberg, “Block coordinate descent methods for semidefinite programming,” in *Handbook on Semidefinite, Conic and Polynomial Optimization*, pp. 533–564. Springer, 2012.
- [16] Ruoyu Sun and Zhi-Quan Luo, “Guaranteed matrix completion via nonconvex factorization,” in *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 270–289.
- [17] Michael JD Powell, “On search directions for minimization algorithms,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 193–201, 1973.
- [18] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear Programming, 2nd ed*, Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA, 1999.
- [19] P. Tseng, “Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 103, no. 9, pp. 475–494, 2001.
- [20] L. Grippo and M. Sciandrone, “On the convergence of the block nonlinear Gauss-Seidel method under convex constraints,” *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 26, pp. 127–136, 2000.
- [21] Z.-Q. Luo and P. Tseng, “On the convergence of the coordinate descent method for convex differentiable minimization,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Application*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 7–35, 1992.
- [22] Dennis Leventhal and Adrian S Lewis, “Randomized methods for linear constraints: convergence rates and conditioning,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 641–654, 2010.
- [23] Y. Nesterov, “Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 341–362, 2012.
- [24] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang, “Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 567–599, 2013.

- [25] P. Richtárik and M. Takáč, “Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 144, pp. 1–38, 2014.
- [26] Zhaosong Lu and Lin Xiao, “On the complexity analysis of randomized block-coordinate descent methods,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 152, no. 1-2, pp. 615–642, 2015.
- [27] Zheng Qu, Peter Richtárik, and Tong Zhang, “Randomized dual coordinate ascent with arbitrary sampling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.5873*, 2014.
- [28] Qihang Lin, Zhaosong Lu, and Lin Xiao, “An accelerated proximal coordinate gradient method and its application to regularized empirical risk minimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.1296*, 2014.
- [29] Yuchen Zhang and Lin Xiao, “Stochastic primal-dual coordinate method for regularized empirical risk minimization,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, 2015, pp. 353–361.
- [30] Olivier Fercoq and Peter Richtárik, “Accelerated, parallel, and proximal coordinate descent,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1997–2023, 2015.
- [31] Ji Liu, Stephen J Wright, Christopher Ré, Victor Bittorf, and Srikrishna Sridhar, “An asynchronous parallel stochastic coordinate descent algorithm,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 285–322, 2015.
- [32] Andrei Patrascu and Ion Necoara, “Efficient random coordinate descent algorithms for large-scale structured nonconvex optimization,” *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 19–46, 2015.
- [33] Cho-Jui Hsieh, Hsiang-Fu Yu, and Inderjit S Dhillon, “Passcode: Parallel asynchronous stochastic dual co-ordinate descent,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.01365*, 2015.
- [34] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford, “Efficient accelerated coordinate descent methods and faster algorithms for solving linear systems,” in *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 147–156.
- [35] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Lorenzo Orecchia, “Nearly-linear time positive lp solver with faster convergence rate,” in *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing*. ACM, 2015, pp. 229–236.
- [36] Manindra Agrawal, Neeraj Kayal, and Nitin Saxena, “PRIMES is in P,” *Annals of mathematics*, pp. 781–793, 2004.
- [37] B. Recht and C. Ré, “Parallel stochastic gradient algorithms for large-scale matrix completion,” *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 201–226, 2013.
- [38] Ruoyu Sun, Zhi-Quan Luo, and Yinyu Ye, “On the expected convergence of randomly permuted ADMM,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06387*, 2015.
- [39] Ruoyu Sun and Mingyi Hong, “Improved iteration complexity bounds of cyclic block coordinate descent for convex problems,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015, pp. 1306–1314.
- [40] Ching-Pei Lee and Stephen J Wright, “Random permutations fix a worst case for cyclic coordinate descent,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.08320*, 2016.
- [41] Lin Xiao, Adams Wei Yu, Qihang Lin, and Weizhu Chen, “Dscovr: Randomized primal-dual block coordinate algorithms for asynchronous distributed optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05080*, 2017.
- [42] Yi Yang and Hui Zou, “A coordinate majorization descent algorithm for ℓ_1 penalized learning,” *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 84–95, 2014.
- [43] A. Beck and L. Tetruashvili, “On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2037–2060, 2013.
- [44] A. Beck, “On the convergence of alternating minimization with applications to iteratively reweighted least squares and decomposition schemes,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 185–209, 2015.
- [45] A. Saha and A. Tewari, “On the nonasymptotic convergence of cyclic coordinate descent method,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 576–601, 2013.
- [46] M. Hong, X. Wang, M. Razaviyayn, and Z.-Q. Luo, “Iteration complexity analysis of block coordinate descent methods,” 2013, Preprint, available online arXiv:1310.6957.
- [47] Peteer Oswald, “On the convergence rate of sor: a worst case estimate,” *Computing*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 245–255, 1994.
- [48] Anne Greenbaum, *Iterative methods for solving linear systems*, vol. 17, Siam, 1997.
- [49] Frank Deutsch, “The method of alternating orthogonal projections,” in *Approximation theory, spline functions and applications*, pp. 105–121. Springer, 1992.
- [50] John Von Neumann, “Functional operators. volume II, the geometry of orthogonal spaces,” 1950. This is a reprint of mimeographed lecture notes first distributed in 1933.

- [51] Israel Halperin, “The product of projection operators,” *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, vol. 23, no. 1-2, pp. 96–99, 1962.
- [52] Kennan T Smith, Donald C Solmon, and Sheldon L Wagner, “Practical and mathematical aspects of the problem of reconstructing objects from radiographs,” *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 1227–1270, 1977.
- [53] Selahattin Kayalar and Howard L Weinert, “Error bounds for the method of alternating projections,” *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems (MCSS)*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 43–59, 1988.
- [54] Frank Deutsch and Hein Hundal, “The rate of convergence for the method of alternating projections, ii,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 205, no. 2, pp. 381–405, 1997.
- [55] Heinz H Bauschke, Jonathan M Borwein, and Adrian S Lewis, “The method of cyclic projections for closed convex sets in hilbert space,” *Contemporary Mathematics*, vol. 204, pp. 1–38, 1997.
- [56] René Escalante and Marcos Raydan, *Alternating projection methods*, SIAM, 2011.
- [57] Aurél Galántai, *Projectors and projection methods*, vol. 6, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [58] Stefan Kaczmarz, “Angenäherte auflösung von systemen linearer gleichungen,” *Bulletin International de l’Academie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres*, vol. 35, pp. 355–357, 1937.
- [59] Thomas Strohmer and Roman Vershynin, “A randomized kaczmarz algorithm with exponential convergence,” *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 262–278, 2009.
- [60] Daniel A Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng, “Smoothed analysis of algorithms: Why the simplex algorithm usually takes polynomial time,” *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 385–463, 2004.
- [61] Caihua Chen, Bingsheng He, Yinyu Ye, and Xiaoming Yuan, “The direct extension of admm for multi-block convex minimization problems is not necessarily convergent,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 155, no. 1-2, pp. 57–79, 2016.
- [62] Mingyi Hong and Zhi-Quan Luo, “On the linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1208.3922*, 2012.
- [63] T. Lin, S. Ma, and S. Zhang, “On the convergence rate of multi-block ADMM,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.4265*, 2014.
- [64] X. Cai, D. Han, and X. Yuan, “The direct extension of ADMM for three-block separable convex minimization models is convergent when one function is strongly convex,” *Optimization Online*, 2014.
- [65] John Von Neumann, “On rings of operators. reduction theory,” *Annals of Mathematics*, pp. 401–485, 1949.
- [66] Daniel A Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng, “Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems,” in *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM, 2004, pp. 81–90.
- [67] Daniel A Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng, “Nearly linear time algorithms for preconditioning and solving symmetric, diagonally dominant linear systems,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 835–885, 2014.
- [68] Ioannis Koutis, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng, “Approaching optimality for solving sdd linear systems,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 337–354, 2014.
- [69] A Galántai, “On the rate of convergence of the alternating projection method in finite dimensional spaces,” *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, vol. 310, no. 1, pp. 30–44, 2005.
- [70] Ion Necoara, Peter Richtarik, and Andrei Patrascu, “Randomized projection methods for convex feasibility problems: conditioning and convergence rates,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.04873*, 2018.
- [71] David Young, “Iterative methods for solving partial difference equations of elliptic type,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 92–111, 1954.
- [72] George E Forsythe and Ernst G Straus, “On best conditioned matrices,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 340–345, 1955.
- [73] Olof B Widlund, “On the effects of scaling of the peaceman-rachford method,” *Mathematics of computation*, vol. 25, no. 113, pp. 33–41, 1971.
- [74] Alan Edelman, “Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 543–560, 1988.
- [75] M Lawrence Glasser, “The quadratic formula made hard: A less radical approach to solving equations,” *arXiv preprint math/9411224*, 1994.
- [76] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, “A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems,” *SIAM Journal on Imaging Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 183–202, 2009.
- [77] James R Angelos, Carl C Cowen, and Sivaram K Narayan, “Triangular truncation and finding the norm of a hadamard multiplier,” *Linear algebra and its applications*, vol. 170, pp. 117–135, 1992.
- [78] Hassler Whitney, *Complex analytic varieties*, Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1972.