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Abstract

Due to the size of data and the limited data storage space in a single local computer, data can often be stored in a distributed manner. In order to use the distributed big data in machine learning, performing large-scale machine learning from the distributed data through communication networks is inevitable. In this paper, we investigate the impact of network communication constraints on the convergence speed of distributed machine learning optimization algorithms. Firstly, we study the convergence rate of the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a general tree structured network, since every connected communication network can have a spanning tree, and a tree network can be understood as the generalization of a star network. Secondly, by considering network communication delays, we optimize the network-constrained dual coordinate ascent to maximize its convergence speed in terms of operation time. Through numerical experiments, we demonstrate that under different network communication delays, the delay-dependent number of local and global iterations in distributed dual coordinated ascent can play a significant role in the achievement of maximum convergence speed.

1 Introduction

In the past decade, machine learning has been a hot topic leveraged by the huge amount of data, simply called big data. By using those accumulated data in various fields including education, finance, transportation, healthcare, engineering, and management, etc., the big data is changing our lives and societies better than before [1], e.g., recommendation services and the prediction of flu outbreaks [2]. However, due to limited storage volumes and limited communication bandwidth, we face a challenge to deal with big data. Especially, big data are very often collected and stored from different locations at different times. Also, it is very expensive and inefficient to aggregate distributed big data in one central place. Therefore, it is quite natural to consider to solve large-scale machine learning problems with distributed data in order to obtain actionable and valuable information from the distributed data.
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Solving large-scale optimization problems dealing with distributed data is a challenging problem, due to the limited resources and obstacles including limited communication bandwidth, limited storage volume, limited energy consumption or even privacy and security issues. In order to handle the challenge of distributed data with limited resources, researchers have studied various optimization methods and different approaches in [3–11] and the references therein. More specially, synchronous Stochastic Gradient Decent (SGD) [3–4], synchronous Stochastic Dual Coordinate Ascent (SDCA) [5–7], asynchronous SGD [8–9], and asynchronous SDCA [10–11] for distributed data have been intensively investigated in the literature. Among various interesting works on SDCA and SGD, [12] shows that even though the convergence of SGD does not depend on the size of data, SDCA can outperform SGD when we need relatively high solution accuracy. Moreover, asynchronous updating scheme can suffer from the conflicts between intermediate results.

Motivated by these facts, [5–7] considers the problem of using synchronous SDCA to solve regularized loss minimization problems in a star network. In the scenario considered in [5–7], data are distributed over a few local workers in the star network and each local worker communicates with a central station. [5–7] analyze the convergence rate of the distributed SDCA in terms of communication rounds. Especially, the strong aspects of the proposed distributed optimization framework in [6–7] include free of tuning parameters or learning rates compared with SGD-based methods, and the readily computable duality gap for fair stopping criterion and efficient accuracy certificates.

In practice, in addition to a star network, the local workers may be organized in various types of network topologies such as a tree, and a ring, etc. Taking advantage of the network topologies may play a significant role in finding efficient solutions to large-scale distributed machine learning problems. Therefore, it is natural to ask how to design and analyze dual coordinate ascent algorithms for a network with general topologies. Additionally, communication delays of edges in a network can be different from each other due to the physical distance of each edge and the load difference of communication line. A natural question related to this is how network communication delays will affect the design and convergence rate of distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithms [5–7] in terms of time instead of the number of communication rounds. We remark that the authors in [13] analyze the convergence bound in terms of time for consensus based distributed optimization by considering communication delays in a network.

The contribution of this paper is two-fold. Firstly, we design and analyze the distributed dual coordinate ascent for regularized loss minimization in a general tree structured network, and provide the convergence rate analysis of the distributed dual coordinate ascent for the general tree network. Since a star network is a special case of a general tree network, our distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithm for a general tree network can be thought of as a generalized version of the distributed dual coordinate ascent for a star network. Also, our convergence analysis for general tree networks can be applicable to the star network case. Secondly, we study the influence of the network communication constraints in the distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithms. By considering network communication delays, we optimize the network-constrained dual coordinate ascent to maximize its convergence speed in terms of time, and provide the approximate closed-form solution for the optimal number of local iterations. The closed-form solution, which is a function of the severity rate between the communication delay in a network and the local execution time, can be used for the reference of the optimal number of local iterations to achieve the fastest convergence speed of the distributed dual coordinate ascent. For numerical experiments, we consider practical machine learning problems including a regression problem and a classification problem, and demonstrate that when the heavy communication delays exist between the central node and its direct child nodes, the distributed dual coordinate ascent for a tree network can achieve the much faster convergence speed than that for a star network. In additional numerical experiments for the optimal local iterations,
we demonstrate that under different network communication delays, delay-dependent number of local iterations in the distributed dual coordinate ascent is required to achieve maximum convergence speed in time, and provide the comparison results between the number of local iterations from the closed-form solution and actual number of local iterations for the fastest convergence speed.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the regularized loss minimization problem for machine learning with distributed data. Section 3 provides a review of existing work on the synchronous distributed dual coordinate ascent in a star network. In Section 4, we propose the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in tree-structured networks. Section 5 describes the convergence analysis of the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent. In Section 6, we study the communication delay factor in the convergence speed of the distributed dual coordinate ascent. In Section 7, we demonstrate the performance of the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent and the optimal iteration numbers for the fast convergence speed.

Notations: We denote the set of real numbers as \( \mathbb{R} \). We use \([k]\) to denote the index set of the coordinates in the \( k \)-th coordinate block. For an index set \( Q \), we use \( \overline{Q} \) and \(|Q|\) to represent the complement and the cardinality of \( Q \) respectively. We use bold letters to represent vectors and matrices. If we use an index set as a subscript of a vector (resp. matrix), we refer to the partial vector (resp. partial matrix) over the index set (resp. with columns over the index set). The superscript \((t)\) is used to denote the \( t \)-th iteration. For example, \( \alpha_{[i]}^{(t)} \) represents a partial vector \( \alpha \) over the \( k \)-th block coordinate at the \( t \)-th iteration. We reserve the superscript \(*\) to denote an optimal solution to an optimization problem.

## 2 Problem formulation

We consider the following regularized loss minimization problem for machine learning applications \([5–7, 10, 11, 14]\):

\[
\text{minimize } P(w) \triangleq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i(w^T x_i),
\]

where \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, i = 1, 2, ..., m, \) are data points, \( \ell_i(\cdot) \), \( i = 1, 2, ..., m, \) are loss functions, and \( \lambda \) is a tuning parameter for a regularization term. By considering different loss functions, \((1)\) can be interpreted as various machine learning problems including regression and classification. For instance, for linear classification, by choosing the loss function \( \ell_i(\cdot) \) to the hinge loss, i.e., \( \ell_i(w^T x_i) = \max(0, 1 - y_i(w^T x_i)) \), \((1)\) with labeled dataset \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{m} \), where \( y_i \in \mathbb{R} \) is label information, can be understood as the linear Support Vector Machine (SVM). For regression, we can set \( \ell_i(w^T x_i) = (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 \) with some measurement data \( y_i \), \( i = 1, 2, ..., m \). In machine learning applications \([15]\), the data point \( x_i \) can be an image, sound, or sensor datum. Throughout the paper, we assume that the data \( x_i, i = 1, 2, ..., m, \) are normalized in \( \ell_2 \) norm, i.e., \( \|x_i\| \leq 1, i = 1, 2, ..., m, \) and the dataset \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{m} \) is divided and distributed over a network.

From the primal problem \((1)\), we have the following dual problem by considering the conjugate function, i.e., \( \ell_i(a) = \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} ab - \ell_i^*(b) \), where \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \ell_i(\cdot) \) is convex:

\[
\text{maximize } D(\alpha) \triangleq -\frac{\lambda}{2} \|A\alpha\|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i^*(-\alpha_i),
\]

where \( \alpha_i \) is the \( i \)-th element of the dual vector \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m \), and the data matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \) whose \( i \)-th column is \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} x_i \), i.e., \( A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} x_i \), is introduced for notation convenience. By defining \( w(\alpha) = A\alpha \) shown in \([14]\), we have the duality gap as \( P(w(\alpha)) - D(\alpha) \) for a useful and readily computable
stopping criteria. It is noteworthy that due to the duality, we have \( P(w) \geq D(\alpha) \) for all \( w \) and \( \alpha \), and thus, \( P(w(\alpha)) \geq D(\alpha) \) for all \( \alpha \). If \( \alpha = \alpha^* \), which is the optimal solution to the dual problem (2), and the loss function \( \ell(\cdot) \) is convex, we have \( P(w(\alpha^*)) = D(\alpha^*) \) from strong duality. Thus, \( w(\alpha^*) \) becomes \( w^* \), which is the optimal solution to the primal problem (1).

In the following sections, we consider a distributed dual coordinate ascent for the regularized loss minimization problem over distributed data in a network of computers. We firstly review the previous research on the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a star network.

3 Review of the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a star network

The distributed dual coordinate ascent for the regularized loss minimization problem over distributed data in a network has been studied in \([5–7, 10]\), where a star network topology for the network is considered as shown in Figure 1. In particular, the authors in \([6]\) introduced a distributed dual coordinate ascent framework, called the Communication-Efficient Distributed Dual Coordinate Ascent (CoCoA), and later proposed CoCoA+ \([7]\), which is an enhanced version of CoCoA by adjusting the parameter value in the accumulation of intermediate results for a faster convergence speed than CoCoA. Since we are interested in the distributed dual coordinate ascent for various structural network topologies and their influences to the performance of the distributed algorithm, we provide a high level review of CoCoA proposed in \([6]\).

Suppose a star network has \( K \) local workers and each local worker has disjoint parts of dataset \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m \). Specifically, the \( k \)-th local worker has training data \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}, i \in [k] \), where \([k]\) represents the index set for the training data of the \( k \)-th local worker. Hence, we have \( \cup_{k=1}^K [k] = m \).

With this problem setting, the authors in \([6]\) introduced the distributed dual coordinate ascent for a star network. Due to the nature of the distributed algorithm, the algorithm updates the global variable in the outer iteration, and locally each worker has inner iterations. Particularly, at the \( t \)-th outer iteration of the algorithm, each worker solves a local dual problem for given dataset via LocalDualMethod(\( \cdot \)), which represents any dual method to solve (2), e.g. Stochastic Dual Coordinate Ascent (SDCA), simply denoted by LocalSDCA(\( \cdot \)), through inner iterations. And then, each local worker sends the intermediate solution to the center node. The center node collects and accumulates all the results from the local workers, and then updates and shares the global solution \( w(t) \) at the \( t \)-th outer iteration back to the workers. Algorithm 1 describes the detail steps of the distributed coordinate ascent in a star network. The following theorem characterizes the convergence rate of the algorithm in \([6]\).

**Theorem 1** (\([6, \text{Theorem 2}]\) ). **Suppose that Algorithm 1 is run for** \( T \) **outer iterations of** \( K \) **local
Algorithm 1: Distributed Dual Coordinate Ascent [6]

Input: $T \geq 1$
Output: $w, \alpha$
Data: $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{m}$ distributed over $K$ local workers
Initialization: $\alpha^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$ for all local workers, and $w^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$

for $t = 1$ to $T$ do
  for all local workers $k = 1, 2, ..., K$ in parallel do
    $(\Delta \alpha^{[k]}, \Delta w_k) \leftarrow \text{LocalDualMethod}(\alpha^{(t-1)}_{[k]}, w^{(t-1)})$
    $\alpha^{(t)}_{[k]} \leftarrow \alpha^{(t-1)}_{[k]} + \frac{1}{K} \Delta \alpha^{[k]}$
  end
  send $\Delta w_k$, $k = 1, ..., K$, to the central station
  $w^{(t)} \leftarrow w^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta w_k$
  distribute $w^{(t)}$ to local workers
end

computers with the procedure LocalSDCA(·) having local geometric improvement $\Theta$. Further, assume that the loss functions $\ell_i(·)$ are $\frac{1}{\gamma}$-smooth. Then, the following geometric convergence rate holds for the global (dual) objective:

$$
\mathbb{E}[D(\alpha^*) - D(\alpha^{(T)})] \leq \left(1 - (1 - \Theta) \frac{1}{K} \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\rho + \lambda m \gamma}\right)^T (D(\alpha^*) - D(\alpha^{(0)})),
$$

where $m$ is the size of the whole dataset and $\rho$ is any real number satisfying

$$
\rho \geq \rho_{\text{min}} \triangleq \max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m} \lambda^2 m^2 \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \|A^{[k]}_{[k]}\alpha\|_2^2 - \|A\alpha\|_2^2}{\|\alpha\|_2^2} \geq 0.
$$

With LocalSDCA(·), which uses the SDCA to solve the dual problem for given dataset at each worker, the local geometric improvement $\Theta$ can be set to:

$$
\Theta = \left(1 - \frac{s}{\tilde{m}}\right)^H,
$$

where $\tilde{m} \triangleq \max_{k=1, ..., K} m_k$ is the size of the largest block of coordinates among $K$ local workers, $H$ is the number of local (or inner) iterations in LocalSDCA(·), and $s \in [0, 1]$ is a step size of the gradient ascent which determines how far the next solution will be taken from the current solution at each iteration. Additionally, by choosing different parameter values instead of $\frac{1}{K}$ in the summation of $\Delta w_k$’s, the authors in [7] proposed CoCoA+, which has the same framework as CoCoA introduced in Algorithm [1] for faster convergence speed than CoCoA.

CoCoA has been shown to work well for distributed machine learning problems with distributed data in a star network, which is a simple network model. However, the topology of a network may not necessarily be a star network. In the next section, we study the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a general network, which is a tree structured network model.
4 Generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in tree-structured networks

One may think of a connected communication network, e.g., a spanning tree network, as a virtual star network by considering the long relays of links from a central node to each leaf node as a direct virtual-link to the central node from a leaf node. Since communication delays are normally exist in a network and the communication is a big burden of distributed algorithms, the distributed algorithms in the virtual star network can easily suffer from the long delays in communications by significantly slowing down the convergence of the distributed algorithms. Therefore, in a connected communication network, it is efficient to perform distributed optimization among local workers close to each other, and then, communicate the intermediate results to a central or sub-central stations. Based on this idea, we investigate how to design of the distributed dual coordinate ascent over a general tree structured network instead of a simple star network, and provide its convergence analysis.

Since every connected communication network has a spanning tree, we choose to investigate the distributed algorithm over a tree structured network, which is also a generalization of a star network.

In Figure 2, we show a 2-layer tree network as an example of a general tree structured network. The root node of the tree network, represents the central station of the network. Any other tree nodes correspond to local workers. Each tree node may have several direct child nodes. For example, the root node has three direct child nodes $S_1$, $S_2$, and $S_3$ in Figure 2. Without loss of generality, we assume that only the local workers corresponding to the leaf nodes have the distributed data, which is the disjoint segmented blocks of the data matrix $A$ in column-wise. Note that $A_i = \frac{1}{m} x_i$, where $A_i$ is the $i$-th column of $A$ and $x_i$ is the $i$-th datum vector. This is because if a non-leaf node $Q$ stores data, we can always create a virtual leaf node $L$ attached to $Q$, and “stores” the data in $L$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that the dataset $\{x_i, y\}_{i=1}^m$ are distributed only to leaf nodes.

For a tree node $Q$, $Q$ is also denoted as the set of indices of data points stored in the subtree with $Q$, where $Q$ is considered as the root node of the subtree. Hence, the subtree includes $Q$ and its indirect and direct child nodes. We denote the set of indices of data points stored in the subtree whose root node is the $k$-th direct child node of $Q$ as $[Q,k]$. If $Q$ is a leaf node, we denote the number of data points stored in $Q$ as $m_Q$. In a tree network, we additionally assume that a node
Algorithm 2: TreeDualMethod: General Distributed Dual Coordinate Ascent for the Root Node $Q$

**Input:** $R \geq 1$

**Initialization:**
- $\alpha^{(0)}_{[Q,k]} \leftarrow 0$ for all direct child nodes $k$ of node $Q$, $w^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$

for $t = 1$ to $R$

for all direct child nodes $k = 1, 2, ..., K$ in parallel do

- $(\Delta\alpha^{(t)}_{[Q,k]}, \Delta w_k) \leftarrow$ TreeDualMethod($\alpha^{(t-1)}_{[Q,k]}, w^{(t-1)}$)
- $\alpha^{(t)}_{[Q,k]} \leftarrow \alpha^{(t-1)}_{[Q,k]} + \frac{1}{K} \Delta\alpha_{[Q,k]}$

end

$w^{(t)} \leftarrow w^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta w_k$

**Output:** $\alpha^{(R)}$ and $w^{(R)}$

Algorithm 3: TreeDualMethod: General Distributed Dual Coordinate Ascent for a General Tree Node $Q$ (not root or leaf)

**Input:** $T \geq 1$, $\alpha_Q$, $w$

**Initialization:**
- $\alpha^{(0)}_{[Q,k]} \leftarrow \alpha_{[Q,k]}$ for all direct child nodes $k$ of node $Q$, $w^{(0)} \leftarrow w$

for $t = 1$ to $T$

for all direct child nodes $k = 1, 2, ..., K$ of $Q$ in parallel do

- $(\Delta\alpha^{(t)}_{[Q,k]}, \Delta w_k) \leftarrow$ TreeDualMethod($\alpha^{(t-1)}_{[Q,k]}, w^{(t-1)}$)
- $\alpha^{(t)}_{[Q,k]} \leftarrow \alpha^{(t-1)}_{[Q,k]} + \frac{1}{K} \Delta\alpha_{[Q,k]}$

end

$w^{(t)} \leftarrow w^{(t-1)} + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta w_k$

**Output:** $\Delta\alpha_Q \triangleq \alpha^{(T)}_Q - \alpha^{(0)}_Q$, and $\Delta w_Q \triangleq w^{(T)} - w^{(0)} = A_Q \Delta\alpha_Q$

can only communicate with its direct child nodes or its direct parent nodes. We then introduce the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent, which we call TreeDualMethod, to solve the dual problem (2) with distributed data stored in a general tree structural network. Algorithm 3, Algorithm 2, and Procedure P describe respectively the computational steps of TreeDualMethod for a general tree node (not root or leaf), the root node, and a leaf node. It is noteworthy that like the star network case, in distributed networks, $\Delta w_Q$ or $w$ are transmitted between nodes, while $\alpha$ or $\Delta\alpha_Q$ are not. Each node provides $\alpha$ or $\delta\alpha_Q$ as an output of each node, but those are only used in each node at the next iteration without transmission to other nodes. Therefore, even though we have a large dataset, the communication cost is not affected by the size of dataset. Also, when the dimension of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is large, transmitting $\Delta w_Q$ or $w$ whose dimension is much smaller than $m$, is beneficial to have communication efficiency.

In the following section, we provide the convergence analysis of the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in a tree structured network model.
Procedure P. TreeDualMethod: General Distributed Dual Coordinate Ascent for a Leaf Node $Q$

Input: $H \geq 1$, $\alpha_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m_Q}$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ consistent with other coordinate blocks of $\alpha$ s.t. $w = A\alpha$

Data: $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in Q}$, where $|Q| = m_Q$

Initialization: $\Delta \alpha_Q \leftarrow 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_Q}$, and $w^{(0)} \leftarrow w$

for $h = 1$ to $H$ do
  choose $i \in Q$ uniformly at random
  find $\Delta \alpha$ maximizing $-\frac{\lambda}{2}||w^{(h-1)} + \frac{1}{\lambda m} \Delta \alpha x_i||^2 - \ell_i^*(-\alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha))$
  $\alpha_i^{(h)} \leftarrow \alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha$
  $\left(\Delta \alpha_Q\right)_i \leftarrow \left(\Delta \alpha_Q\right)_i + \Delta \alpha$
  $w^{(h)} \leftarrow w^{(h-1)} + \frac{1}{\lambda m} \Delta \alpha x_i$

end

Output: $\Delta \alpha_Q$ and $\Delta w_Q \doteq A_Q \Delta \alpha_Q$

5 Convergence analysis of TreeDualMethod for a tree network

We analyze the convergence analysis of the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a general tree structured network model in this section. In order to do that, in a nutshell, we show a recursive relation between the convergence rate of the algorithm at a tree node $Q$ and at the node $Q$’s direct child nodes. Hence, the overall convergence analysis of the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a general tree network structure can be expressed in a recursive way, where the number of recursions is dependent on the number of layers of the tree network.

Suppose that $Q$ has $K$ direct child nodes. We use the notation $\alpha_{[Q,k]}$ to represent the dual variable vector corresponding to its $k$-th direct child node, where $1 \leq k \leq K$. Then, let us define the local suboptimality gap for the $k$-th direct child node of $Q$ as:

$$\epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha) \doteq \max_{\alpha_{[Q,k]}} D(\alpha_{[Q,1]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}, \alpha_{[Q,k]} - D(\alpha_{[Q,1]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}, \alpha_{[Q,k]}). \quad (5)$$

Remark that the suboptimality gap for the $k$-th child node is defined with fixing $\alpha_{[Q]}$ and $\alpha_{[Q,i]}$'s, where $i \neq k$, and only updating $\alpha_{[Q,k]}$. Then, we introduce the following assumption about the local geometric improvement of TreeDualMethod at the $k$-th direct child node of $Q$.

Assumption 1 (Geometric improvement of TreeDualMethod at a direct child node). For a tree node $Q$, we assume that there exists $\Theta \in [0, 1)$ such that for any given $\alpha$, TreeDualMethod at the $k$-th direct child node of $Q$ returns an update $\Delta \alpha_{[Q,k]}$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[Q,1]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,k-1]}, \alpha_{[Q,k]} + \Delta \alpha_{[Q,k]} \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}, \alpha_{[Q,k]}]] \leq \Theta \cdot \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha). \quad (6)$$

For a leaf node, we use LocalSDCA for TreeDualMethod described in Procedure P as in [6]. We remark that this geometric improvement condition holds true with LocalSDCA if the $k$-th direct child node of $Q$ is a leaf child node. We provide the following proposition about the bound on the convergence for a leaf node $B$ even with the input $w$ also determined by $\alpha_{[Q]}$ and $\alpha_{Q,B}$ in Procedure P.

Proposition 1 ([6, Proposition 1]). Let us consider a tree node $Q$ whose direct child node $B$ is a leaf node. Assume that loss functions $\ell_i(\cdot)$ are $\frac{1}{\gamma}$-smooth. Then for the leaf node $B$, Assumption 7
holds with \[
\Theta = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{1 + \lambda m \gamma} \frac{1}{m_B}\right)^H.
\] (7)

where \(m_B\) is the size of data stored at node \(B\), \(H\) is the number of iterations in Procedure \(P\)

Additionally, Theorem 2, which is our main result, shows that if the geometric improvement condition holds true for direct child nodes of \(Q\), then the geometric improvement condition also holds true for \(Q\); thus it leads to a recursive calculation of the convergence rate for the whole tree network.

**Theorem 2.** Let us consider a tree node \(Q\) which has \(K\) direct child nodes satisfying the local geometric improvement requirement introduced in Assumption 7 with parameters \(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \ldots, \Theta_K\). We assume that Algorithm 2 (or Algorithm 3) has an input \(w\), and Algorithm 2 (or Algorithm 3) is run for \(T\) iterations. We further assume that loss functions \(f_i(\cdot)\) are \(1/\gamma\)-smooth.

Then, for any input \(w\) to Algorithm 2 (or Algorithm 3), the following geometric convergence rate holds for \(Q\):

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[D(\alpha_Q^*, \alpha_Q) - D(\alpha_Q^{(T)}, \alpha_Q^*)\right] \leq \left(1 - (1 - \Theta)\frac{1}{K \rho + \lambda m \gamma}\right)^T \left[D(\alpha_Q^*, \alpha_Q) - D(\alpha_Q^{(0)}, \alpha_Q^*)\right].
\] (8)

where \(\Theta = \max_k \Theta_k\), and \(\rho\) is any real number satisfying

\[
\rho \geq \rho_{\text{min}} \triangleq \maximize_{\alpha_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\left|Q\right|}} \lambda^2 m^2 \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|A_{[Q,k]}\alpha_{[Q,k]}\|^2 - \|A_Q \alpha_Q\|^2 \|\alpha_Q\|^2 \geq 0.
\]

Proposition 1 is for the geometric improvement of TreeDualMethod at a leaf node. Theorem 2 is for the improvement of TreeDualMethod at any non-leaf tree node. Note that \(\left(1 - (1 - \Theta)\frac{1}{K \rho + \lambda m \gamma}\right)^T\) in (8) becomes the “\(\Theta^\prime\)” for a tree node \(Q\), and (8) is interpreted as the geometric improvement of TreeDualMethod at the direct child node by the direct parent node of \(Q\). Therefore, by combining Theorem 2 with Proposition 1, we can recursively obtain the convergence rate of the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithm for the whole tree network.

Remark that Theorem 2 is different from Theorem 2 of [6] in three aspects. Firstly, Theorem 2 is applicable to any tree node in a general tree network, beyond a star network discussed in [6]. Secondly, even when the input \(w\) of Algorithm 3 is determined by not only \(\alpha_Q\) but also \(\alpha_Q^\prime\). Theorem 2 holds. Note that \(w = A(\alpha_Q, \alpha_Q^\prime) = A_Q \alpha_Q + A_Q^\prime \alpha_Q^\prime\). Unlike our case, in Theorem 2 of [6], due to the star network topology, a local worker has \(w\) as an input from the root node which is updated with intermediate results obtained from all the local workers. Hence, \(\alpha_Q^\prime\) is not considered in Theorem 2 of [6] and its proof. Our proof of Theorem 2 addresses this challenge that the input \(w\) is also affected by \(\alpha_Q^\prime\). For the readability, we place the proof of Theorem 2 in Appendix 10.1. In the proof, we follow the steps in the proof of Theorem 2 of [6]. The big difference is that in our proof, we have both updating coordinates \(\alpha_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\left|Q\right|}\) and un-updating coordinates \(\alpha_Q^\prime \in \mathbb{R}^{\overline{Q}}\) to deal with, where \(\left|Q\right| + \overline{Q} = m\), while in the proof of Theorem 2 of [6], all the coordinates are updating coordinates, i.e., \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m\). Finally, unlike [6], we do not consider different local-dual problem introduced in Eqn. (8) of [6] for local workers, but deal with the original dual problem introduced in [2] with fixed \(w = A_Q \alpha_Q^\prime\) for all workers including local workers, sub-centers and center computer. Therefore, our theorem works for any tree node in a general tree network rather than just for one center node.
We have discussed how the network topology can affect the convergence rate of the distributed dual coordinate ascent, which is expressed in terms of the number of iterations. However, for distributed algorithms, communications in a network can be a bottleneck of the convergence of distributed algorithms. Therefore, it is required to consider communication delays, which is expressed normally in time, in predicting or estimating the convergence speed of distributed algorithms. In the next section, we study how the communication delays, which is another major network constraint, impact the convergence of distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithms. By taking communication delays into account, we optimize the number of local iterations $H$ for maximum convergence speed.

6 Impacts of communication delays on the convergence rate of distributed dual coordinate ascent

Earlier works [5–7] bounded the convergence of distributed dual coordinate ascent algorithms with respect to the number of inner and outer iterations. However, in distributed algorithms, there may be significant communication delays between computers. Thus, the convergence speed of distributed algorithms depends on not only how many iterations of these algorithm have been run, but also the communication delays in performing these iterations. Also, intuitively, if the communication delay is close to zero, local workers might want to perform a small number of local iterations, and communicate with the central station at a higher frequency; on the other hand, if the communication delay is large, namely, there is a large communication cost, then local workers may want to perform more local iterations before communicating with the central station in order to speed up convergence. Therefore, our goal here is to investigate the convergence speed of distributed dual coordinate ascent with respect to total time used by including computational time and communication delays, and to optimize the number of local iterations by considering communication delays to achieve the maximum convergence speed of distributed dual coordinate ascent.

For simplicity, let us consider a star network as shown in Figure 1 and the corresponding Algorithm 1. Since the communication delay is normally given in time, we need to consider both time and the number of iterations in the convergence analysis in order to obtain the optimal number of iteration in practical applications having delay in communication and computation. We assume that the round-trip communication delay between a local worker and the central station is $t_{\text{delay}}$. We use $t_{\text{lp}}$ to denote the computational time for one local iteration at a worker, and use $t_{\text{cp}}$ to denote the computational time for one parameter update at the central station. Figure 3 illustrates the communication delay, and the processing time of each local and center computer.

Suppose that each local worker performs $H$ local iterations before communicating with the
central station, and, in total, there are $T$ outer iterations. The total experienced time is stated as

$$t_{\text{total}} = (t_{lp} H + t_{\text{delay}} + t_{cp}) \cdot T. \quad (9)$$

Hence, the number $T$ of outer iterations is given by

$$T = \frac{t_{\text{total}}}{(t_{lp} H + t_{\text{delay}} + t_{cp})}. \quad (10)$$

From (8), for $T$ outer iterations, the expected gap between the optimal objective value and the current objective value for Algorithm 1 is expressed as

$$F_t \bullet \text{gap in objective value (11) under a given total time} \quad (11)$$

where $\delta = \frac{s}{m}$, $C = \lambda m \gamma (\rho + \lambda m)$, and $K$ is the number of local workers. In order to minimize the gap in objective value (11) under a given total time $t_{\text{total}}$, we introduce the following optimization problem over the number of local iterations $H$ by plugging (10) into (11):

$$\min_{H \geq 0} \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \right) \right) \frac{t_{\text{total}}}{t_{lp}} \frac{t_{\text{delay}} + t_{cp}}{t_{lp}} \approx F(H). \quad (12)$$

In order to figure out the optimal number of local iteration, let us find the critical point of the objective function $F(H)$. By applying logarithm, which is a monotonic function, to the objective function $F(H)$, we have

$$\ln F(H) = \frac{t_{\text{total}}}{t_{lp}} \ln \left( \frac{K - C}{K} + \frac{C}{K} \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \right). \quad (A)$$

which can be seen as the multiplication of two parts: the fraction part (A) and the logarithm part (B). Note that the fraction part (A) is a decreasing function over $H$. And for the logarithm part (B), as $H$ increases, (B) goes from 0 to $\ln((K - C)/K)$, which is less than zero, due to $0 \leq 1 - \delta < 1$. At $H = 0$, $\ln F(H)$ is 0 due to (B) = 0. And as $H$ goes to infinity, $\ln F(H)$ will go to 0 due to (A) = 0. Therefore, we can expect at least a critical point at some $H$. In order to figure out the critical point of (13), which is the same critical point of $F(H)$, we calculate the first order condition as follows:

$$\frac{d\ln F(H)}{dH} = \frac{(K - C)}{K} \frac{t_{\text{total}}}{t_{lp}} (1 - \delta)^H \ln(1 - \delta) \left( \frac{t_{\text{total}}}{t_{lp}} \ln \left( \frac{K - C}{K} + \frac{C}{K} \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \right) \right) = 0 \quad (14)$$

By simplifying (14) and denoting $\frac{t_{\text{delay}} + t_{cp}}{t_{lp}}$ to $r$, we have the following first order condition over $H$:

$$\frac{K - C}{K} (H + r) \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \ln(1 - \delta) - \left( \frac{K - C}{K} + \frac{C}{K} \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \right) \ln \left( \frac{K - C}{K} + \frac{C}{K} \left[ 1 - \delta \right]^H \right) = 0. \quad (15)$$
Note that \((15)\) has Lambert W-function \(16\), which is defined as when \(xe^x = a\), the solution is \(x = W(a)\), where \(W(\cdot)\) is the Lambert W-function. When \(H\) is large enough, \((D)\) is approximated to \(\left(\frac{K-C}{K}\right)\ln\left(\frac{K-C}{K}\right)\). And then, we have the following equation:

\[
\frac{K-C}{K}(H+r)\left[1 - \delta\right]^H \ln(1 - \delta) = \left(\frac{K-C}{K}\right)\ln\left(\frac{K-C}{K}\right).
\]  

(16)

By using the definition of the Lambert W-function, we have the following optimal local iteration \(H\) from \((16)\):

\[
H = \frac{1}{\ln(1 - \delta)} W\left(\left[1 - \delta\right]^\gamma \ln\left(\frac{K-C}{K}\right)\right) - r.
\]  

(17)

It is noteworthy that from the recursive nature of the convergence analysis for the tree networks introduced in Section 5, the optimal number of iterations \(T\) in Algorithm 3 for a node \(Q\) can also be obtained by using aforementioned equation \((12)\) with little different interpretation. Here, the the number of local iterations \(H\) in \((12)\) is understood as the number of local iteration \(T\) in Algorithm 3 for the node \(Q\). The computational time for the local iteration at a worker, denoted by \(t_{wp}\), is interpreted as the computational time for one-time receiving the updating intermediate results from \(Q\)'s child nodes. And \(t_{delay}\) and \(t_{cp}\) represent the communication delay time and the processing time at \(Q\)'s parent node respectively. Therefore, with the same equation as \((12)\) with different interpretation and notation, the optimal number of local iterations for a general tree node \(Q\) can be obtained. We will further show the impact of the ratio \(r\), which is communication delay, to the optimal number of local iteration \(H\) in the simulation section.

7 Numerical experiments

We demonstrate the convergence of the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in a tree network model. Since the authors in [6,7] compared the distributed dual coordinate ascent in a star network, so-called CoCoA, with other known methods including mini-batch SDCA [17], local SGD and mini-batch-SGD [18], we focus to compare our generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in a tree network with the CoCoA [6] by considering network constraint, especially, communication delay. Additionally, since we are interested in the distributed dual coordinate ascent considering different network topologies, we do not consider the CoCoA+ [7], which is the updated version of the CoCoA in the numerical experiments.

7.1 Comparison in realistic machine learning problems

In the previous subsection, we numerically checked that the optimal number of local iterations and demonstrated the impact of communication delay to the convergence speed of the distributed dual coordinate ascent with synthetic data by varying the communication delay in distributed networks. In this subsection, we consider more practical machine learning problems including regression and classification with the well known machine learning dataset - wine quality dataset [19] and covertype dataset [20].

7.1.1 Wine quality regression problem

In the numerical experiment, we assume that lots of communication delays exist between the center node and local workers for the CoCoA. For the generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent in a
We test our algorithm for a ridge regression problem with the wine quality dataset having 12 attributes including a label and 4898 instances. We consider the following specific optimization problem by setting \( \ell_i(w^T x_i) = (\frac{1}{\lambda m} w^T x_i - y_i)^2 \):

\[
\minimize_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\lambda}{2} ||w||^2 + \frac{1}{m} ||A^T w - y||^2,
\]

where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \) is the feature matrix whose \( i \)-th column is \( \frac{1}{\lambda m} x_i \) and \( y \in \mathbb{R}^m \) is a label vector. Then, the following dual problem is considered:

\[
\maximize_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m} -\frac{\lambda}{2} ||A\alpha||^2 - \lambda^2 m \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\alpha_i^2}{4} - \frac{y_i \alpha_i}{\lambda m} \right).
\]

Hence, in a local worker, \( \Delta \alpha \) in Procedure [P] is simply calculated as follows:

\[
\Delta \alpha = -\left( \frac{||x_i||^2}{\lambda m} + \frac{\lambda^2 m^2}{2} \right)^{-1} \left( w^{(h-1)T} x_i + \frac{\lambda^2 m^2}{2} \alpha_i^{(h-1)} - \lambda m y_i \right),
\]

where \((x_i, y_i)\) is a randomly chosen datum and \( \alpha_i^{(h-1)} \) is \( \alpha_i \) value at \((h-1)\)-th iteration.

For the dataset, we normalize each attribution with \( \ell_2 \) norm of it for the performance of regression operation, and then normalize each instance with \( \ell_2 \) norm of each instance in order to make each instance \( x_i \) hold the condition \( ||x_i|| \leq 1 \). And we take first 4000 instances for our numerical experiments. Therefore, the dimension of each variable is \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{11 \times 4000}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{4000}, \) and \( w \in \mathbb{R}^{11} \). We set the tuning parameter \( \lambda \) to 1. For the distributed networks, we consider a tree network model having four local workers, two sub-center nodes (each having two local workers), and one center node. The simulated star network has four local workers and one center node. In both cases, we evenly split the data to four local workers; namely, 1000 instances without overlap are assigned to each local worker. For the tree network, we set the number of local iterations in local workers and the number of communications between the local workers and the sub-center to 100 and 10 respectively.

Figures [I] show the duality gap at a center node as the operation time goes. We set a scenario where communication delay, \( t_{delay} \) exists between the center node and its direct child node. Therefore, in a star network, the communication delay exists between the central node and local workers, while a tree network has the delay between the central node and the sub-central node. We set the communication delay \( t_{delay} = r \times t_{lp} \), where \( t_{lp} \) is the computational time for one local iteration at a worker and \( r \) is varied from 1 to \( 10^3 \). The simulation results in Figure [I] demonstrate that when the communication delay is small, the star network can have fast speed in convergence. However, as the communication delay increases, the distributed algorithm based on a tree network can achieve much faster convergence speed than the distributed algorithm in a star network. Therefore, the operation time of the distributed dual coordinate ascent can be further reduced by sharing local results via sub-center nodes when communication delays between the center node and local workers are large.

### 7.1.2 Covertype dataset classification problem

We further conduct the comparison between the distributed dual coordinate ascent in the star network and the tree network in a standard hinge loss \( \ell_2 \) regularized SVM. In this experiment, we use the preprocessed Covertype dataset [21], which is a binary classification dataset having 581,012 instances.
and 12 attributions including label information. The 12 attributions are expressed as 54 columns of data with 10 quantitative variables, 4 binary wilderness areas and 40 binary soil type variables.

In order to satisfy the condition $\|x_i\| \leq 1$, we normalize the dataset and $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. In this simulation, we organize a tree network having one center computer, two sub-center computers, and eight local workers. Each sub-center has four local workers. Each local worker has evenly divided instances for dataset without overlap. For the tree network, the number of communications between the local workers and the sub-center is set to 10. The number of local iterations in For the star network, the number of local iterations is set to 300.

For SVM, we consider the soft-margin SVM classification having hinge loss function, i.e., $\ell_i(w^T x_i) \leq \max(0, 1 - y_i(\frac{1}{\lambda m} w^T x_i - b))$ as follows:

$$\minimize_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \max(0, 1 - A^T w), \quad (21)$$

where the $A_i$, the $i$-th column of the matrix $A$, is $\frac{1}{\lambda m} y_i x_i$, $\max(\cdot)$ is element-wise operator, and $0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the all 0 and all 1 vectors respectively.

---

[1] The binary Covertype dataset is available at the following link: https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/binary.html#covtype.binary.
The dual problem of (21) is stated as follows:

$$\max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|A\alpha\|^2$$
subject to $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{m}, \forall i.$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Note here that while deriving the dual problem (22), we have $w = \frac{1}{\lambda} A\alpha$ as the dual-primal variable relation. Then, the local problem for a local worker $Q$ is stated as follows:

$$\max_{\alpha_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|Q|}} -\frac{1}{2\lambda} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \|A_Q \alpha_Q\|^2 + \sum_{i \in Q} \alpha_i$$
subject to $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{m}, \forall i \in Q,$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $w = \frac{1}{\lambda} A_Q \alpha_Q = w - \frac{1}{\lambda} A_Q \alpha_Q.$ Then, in Procedure $P$ for updating $\Delta \alpha$, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\Delta \alpha = \arg\max_{\Delta \alpha} -\frac{1}{2\lambda} \|w^{(h-1)}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2m} \Delta \alpha y_i x_i \| + (\alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha)$$
subject to $0 \leq \alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}.$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

Notice here we update the $i$-th coordinate of $\alpha$, where $i \in Q$. It is also possible to update the variable $\alpha_Q$ with a block coordinate method. In order to solve (24), we calculate the optimal solution of (24) without the box constraint, i.e., $0 \leq \alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha < \frac{1}{m}$, and then project the optimal solution onto the box constraint as follows:

$$\Delta \alpha = \begin{cases} 
1/m - \alpha_i^{(h-1)} & \text{if } \alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha > 1/m \\
-\alpha_i^{(h-1)} & \text{if } \alpha_i^{(h-1)} + \Delta \alpha < 0
\end{cases}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

Figure 5 shows the duality gap as the operation time of the algorithms goes.

7.2 Impact of communication delay in the convergence speed

In order to see the impact of the ratio $r$, which is communication delay, to the optimal number of local iteration $H$, we provide Figure 6 to show the optimal number of local iterations $H$ by finding the critical point of (14). In the simulation, we set $(C, K, \delta, t_{total}, t_{lp}, t_{cp}) = (0.5, 3, 1/300, 1.4 \times 10^{-5}, 3 \times 10^{-5})$, which were measured in our numerical experiments for the star network model (unit of time is second). We set $t_{delay} = r \times t_{lp}$, where $r$ is a parameter indicating how severe the communication delays. Here, we ignore the computation time in a central station, i.e., $t_{cp} = 0$. Figure 6 (a) shows the objective values of (12) when $H$ is varied from 1 to 2000. The red line represents the optimal convergence bound at the optimal number of local iterations. Figure 6 (b) shows the optimal number of local iterations to achieve the fastest convergence rate for different communication delays, where $r$ is varied from 1 to $10^5$. The red dotted line is obtained by calculating (17) with aforementioned parameters, while the blue solid line is obtained by numerically calculating (12) and finding the optimal $H$ which minimizes the objective value. From this experiment, we demonstrate that the delay in communication becomes bigger with fixed local computational ability, the more local iteration is desired for the fast convergence speed of the overall algorithm.
Figure 5: Duality gap at center node in a classification problem as the operation time of algorithms goes. The distributed dual coordinate ascent in a tree network (red solid line) and a star network (blue dotted line), i.e., CoCoA, are considered when the communication delay, $\tau_{\text{delay}}$, exists between the center node and its direct child nodes. $\tau_{\text{delay}} = r \times t_{\text{lp}}$, where $t_{\text{lp}}$ represents the computational time for one local iteration at a worker.

In order to see the impact of the optimal local iterations, we similarly set up a situation and conducted a regression task with wine quality dataset as introduced in Section 7.1.1 with a star network. For the number of iterations in local workers, i.e., $H$, we varied $H$ from 1000 to 100000 and checked the convergence speed in time. Figures 7 (a) and (b) show the duality gap as the operation time goes when the delay severity levels $r$ are set to 1 and $10^5$ respectively. As we expected in Section 6, when the communication delay is huge, it is better to compute the more local iterations before sharing the intermediate results to the central node. Also, if the communication delay is small, frequently sharing the intermediate results with the central node is helpful to improve the convergence speed. Also, we calculated the optimal number of iterations in local workers from (17) to see whether the introduced equation (17) for the optimal number of iterations in local workers fits to the simulation results. The parameters $\delta$, $K$, and $C$ are set to $\delta = 1/1000$, $K = 4$, and $C = 0.9$ by reflecting the network and simulation settings. With those parameter values, we obtained $2.1167e3$ for $r = 1$ and $6.0281e3$ for $r = 10^5$, while in the simulation, $H = 2000$ for $r = 1$ and $H = 100000$ for $r = 10^5$ provided the best convergence speed among six cases varying $H$. We think that the error is caused by various factors such as the approximation of the equation (17), the variation of the computer performance during operation and the randomness of the algorithm. However, even though there is a little difference between the simulation results and the numerical calculation for the optimal local number of iterations, (17) can still be used as a reference for the number of local iterations in local workers.
Figure 6: (a) The objective value of (12) when the number of iterations $H$ is varied from 1 to 2000, where $(C, K, δ, t_{total}, t_{lp}, t_{cp}) = (0.5, 3, 1/300, 1, 4 \times 10^{-5}, 3 \times 10^{-5})$ and $t_{delay} = r \times t_{lp}$. The red line represents the optimal number of local iterations to achieve the fastest convergence rate. (b) Optimal number of iterations to achieve the fastest convergence rate, when the parameters are the same as (a) and $r$ is varied from 1 to $10^5$.

8 Discussion

In this paper, we considered the distributed dual coordinate ascent in the synchronous updating scheme. However, due to the possible difference in performance between local workers, it is quite natural to consider asynchronous scheme. Thus, the design and analysis of asynchronous dual coordinate ascent algorithm for generalized network topology, e.g., tree structured networks, can also be the next direction of this research. We leave it for future research.

The communication networks can have a variety of network constraints including communication delay, limited communication bandwidth, and limited transmission energy, etc.. Motivated by these network constraints, we studied the impact of communication delays on the convergence speed of distributed dual coordinate ascent in this paper. It is also interesting to study the other constraints including the impact of limited bandwidth in distributed algorithms.

Additionally, finding the close-form solution for the optimal number of local iterations is conducted by approximating some parts of the first order condition (15), which causes error as demonstrated in Figure 6 (b) and Figures 7 (a) and (b). For more accurate results, finding the exact solution to (15) is desired.

9 Conclusion

We considered the communication efficient distributed coordinate ascent in the tree structured network system, which has a center computer, sub-center computers and local computers are connected in tree structured network. Our network setting is more suitable to the practical situations ranging from international-wide network systems to management systems having branches and headquarter in hierarchy than a simple star network which has a server at center and all local computers are connected to the server. Furthermore, Since the communication becomes bottleneck in distributed network systems, we considered the communication delay in time for the convergence analysis of the communication efficient distributed coordinate ascent and obtained the optimal number of iterations to achieve the best convergence rate. Numerical experiments with wine quality dataset and
Figure 7: (a) Duality gap when the delay severity $r$ is 1. (b) Duality gap when the delay severity $r$ is $10^5$.

Covtype dataset demonstrated our generalized distributed dual coordinate ascent for tree networks can converge faster than that for star networks, when communication delays exist between the central node and its direct child nodes. We further studied the optimal number of iterations in local workers when the communication delay in time is given through wine quality regression problem.
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10 Appendix

10.1 Proof of Theorem

Proof. Suppose the tree node \( Q \) has \( K \) direct child nodes, and we simply represent the child nodes from 1 to \( K \). The convergence rate of the algorithm at a tree node \( Q \) is obtained by considering the updating scheme at the node \( Q \) as follows. For simplicity, we omit \( Q \) in the subscript of \( \alpha \).

\[
\alpha^{(t+1)} = (\alpha_{[1:K]^+}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) = (\alpha_{[1:K]} + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q}),
\]

(26)

where \( \alpha_{\cdot[k]} \) is the zero-padding version of \( \alpha_{[k]} \) and \( Q = [1 : K] = \cup_{k=1}^{K} [k] \) is the index set corresponding to workers connected to the node \( Q \). The optimal value at the node \( Q \) is stated as

\[
D(\alpha_Q, \alpha_\overline{Q}) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \| A_Q \alpha_Q + A_\overline{Q} \alpha_\overline{Q} \|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in Q} \ell_i^*(\alpha_i) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in \overline{Q}} \ell_i^*(-\alpha_i)
\]

\[
= \frac{\lambda}{2} \| A_{[1:K]} \alpha_{[1:K]} + \overline{\mathbf{w}} \|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \ell_i^*(\alpha_i) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in \overline{Q}} \ell_i^*(-\alpha_i),
\]

(27)

where \( A_Q \) is the partial matrix of \( A \) by choosing the columns of \( A \) over the index set \( Q \), and \( A_{\overline{Q}} \alpha_{\overline{Q}} \) is denoted as \( \overline{\mathbf{w}} \). From (26), we have

\[
D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) = D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q})
\]

\[
= D\left( \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}), \alpha_\overline{Q} \right)
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q}),
\]

where the inequality is obtained from the Jensen’s inequality. Then, we have

\[
D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \geq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \right]
\]

\[
+ D((\alpha_{[q,1]}^{(t)}), ..., \alpha_{[q,k]}^{(t)}), ..., \alpha_{[q,K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q})) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \right],
\]

where \( \epsilon_{Q,k}(\cdot) \) is defined in (5) and the super-script * represents the optimal solution. Then, the expectation of \( D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \) is lower-bounded as follows:

\[
\mathbb{E}[D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q})] \geq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q})] - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \Delta \alpha_{\cdot[k]}, \alpha_\overline{Q})] \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{K} (1 - \Theta) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}),
\]

where the last inequality is obtained from Assumption (4) and \( \sum_{k=1}^{K} \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_\overline{Q}) \) can be bounded as follows.
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{K} \ell_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_{Q}^{(t)})
\]
\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{K} \maximize_{\alpha_{[Q,k]}^{(t)}} \left[ D((\alpha_{[Q,1]}^{(t)}, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}^{(t)}), \alpha_{Q}^{(t)}) - D((\alpha_{[Q,1]}^{(t)}, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_{Q}^{(t)}) \right]
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ D((\alpha_{[Q,1]}^{(t)}, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}^{(t)}), \alpha_{Q}^{(t)}) - D((\alpha_{[Q,1]}^{(t)}, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}^{(t)}), \alpha_{Q}^{(t)}) \right]
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ \frac{-\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}(\alpha_{[Q,1]}^{(t)}, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_{[Q,k]}, \ldots, \alpha_{[Q,K]}^{(t)}) + \bar{w}\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} + \bar{w})\|^2 \right]
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \left( -\ell_{i}^{t}(\hat{\alpha}_{i}) + \ell_{i}^{t}(\alpha_{i}^{(t)}) \right)
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \left( -\ell_{i}^{t}(\hat{\alpha}_{i}) - \ell_{i}^{t}(\alpha_{i}^{(t)}) \right)
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w})\|^2 - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
\[
= \maximize_{\alpha^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) - D(\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{Q}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A_{[1:K]}\alpha^{(t)}_{[1:K]} + \bar{w}\|^2
\]
We can lower-bound (28) by upper-bounding (A). For the upper-bound of (A), we have

\[
(A) = \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \|A_k(\alpha_k^t - \hat{\alpha}_k[k])\|^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} - \alpha_k^t)\|^2 \right] \\
\leq \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \|A_i(\alpha_i^t - \hat{\alpha}_i)\|^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} - \alpha_i^t)\|^2 \\
\leq \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2m^2}\|x_i\|^2(\alpha_i^t - \hat{\alpha}_i)^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} - \alpha_i^t)\|^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2m^2} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} (\alpha_i^t - \hat{\alpha}_i)^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} - \alpha_i^t)\|^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2m^2} \|\alpha_i^t - \hat{\alpha}_i\|^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]} - \alpha_i^t)\|^2 \\
\leq \frac{\rho}{\lambda^2m^2} \|\alpha_i^t - \hat{\alpha}_i\|^2,
\]
where we assume the scaled input data, i.e., \(\|x_i\| \leq 1\), and \(\rho \leq 1\) is introduced for the last inequality.

Then, we define \(\rho_{\text{min}}\), which is the minimum value of \(\rho\) that can hold the inequality, as follows:

\[
\rho \geq \rho_{\text{min}} \triangleq \max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{[1:K]}} \lambda^2m^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\|A_k\|_2^2 \|\alpha_k\|_2^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}\|_2^2 \|\alpha\|_2^2}{\|\alpha\|_2^2} \geq 0.
\]

The condition \(\rho_{\text{min}} \geq 0\) can be shown by considering a feasible solution making \(\sum_{k=1}^K \|A_k\|_2^2 \|\alpha_k\|_2^2 - \|A_{[1:K]}\|_2^2 = 0\), e.g., \(\alpha = e_i\), where \(e_i\) is a standard unit vector having 1 in the \(i\)-th entry and 0 elsewhere.

Then, (28), which is \(\sum_{k=1}^K \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma)\), is lower-bounded as follows:

\[
\sum_{k=1}^K \epsilon_{Q,k}(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) \\
\geq \max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{[1:K]}} D(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - \frac{\rho}{2\lambda m^2} \|\alpha_{[1:K]} - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 \\
\geq \max_{\eta \in [0, 1]} D(\eta \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma + (1 - \eta)\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - \frac{\rho}{2\lambda m^2} \|\eta \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma + (1 - \eta)\alpha_{[1:K]}^t - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 \\
\geq \max_{\eta \in [0, 1]} \eta D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) + (1 - \eta)D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) + \frac{\gamma(1 - \eta)}{2m} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 \\
- \frac{\rho \eta^2}{2\lambda m^2} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 \\
\geq \max_{\eta \in [0, 1]} \eta D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - \eta D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) + \frac{\gamma(1 - \eta)}{2m} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 - \frac{\rho \eta^2}{2\lambda m^2} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 \\
= \max_{\eta \in [0, 1]} \eta D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) - \eta D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma) + \frac{\eta(1 - \eta)}{2m} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2 - \frac{\rho \eta^2}{2\lambda m^2} \|\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma - \alpha_{[1:K]}^t\|^2,
\]
where \(\eta\) is the second inequality is introduced for line search between the optimal solution \(\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma\) and \(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t\), and the equality holds when \(\hat{\alpha}_{[1:K]}\) is in the line between \(\alpha_{[1:K]}^\gamma\) and \(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t\). And the third inequality is obtained from the strong concavity of \(D(\alpha)\). More specifically, we use the well-known fact that if a function \(\ell_i(a) = \frac{1}{\gamma}\) smooth, then, the conjugate function \(\ell_i^*\) is \(\gamma\) strongly convex: for all \(u, v \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(\eta \in [0, 1]\):

\[
-\ell_i^*(\eta u + (1 - \eta)v) \geq -\eta \ell_i^*(u) - (1 - \eta)\ell_i^*(v) + \frac{\gamma(1 - \eta)}{2}(u - v)^2.
\]
From (31), we have the following inequality for \(D(\eta \alpha^*_{[1:K]} + (1 - \eta)\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q)\):

\[
D\left(\eta \alpha^*_{[1:K]} + (1 - \eta)\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q\right) \\
= -\frac{1}{2}\left\| A(\eta \alpha^*_{[1:K]} + (1 - \eta)\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha^*_i - (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)}) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in Q} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha_i - (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)})
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2}\left\| \eta A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) + (1 - \eta)A(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha^*_i + (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)}) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in Q} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha_i + (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)})
\]

(Note that \(\eta \in [0,1]\))

\[
\geq -\frac{\eta}{2}\left\| A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) \right\|^2 - \frac{(1 - \eta)}{2}\left\| A(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha^*_i + (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)}) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in Q} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha_i + (1 - \eta)\alpha_i^{(t)})
\]

\[
= -\frac{\eta}{2}\left\| A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) \right\|^2 - \frac{(1 - \eta)}{2m} \left[ \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha^*_i) + \sum_{i \in Q} \ell^*_{i}(-\eta \alpha_i) \right] - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in Q} \left( \alpha^*_i - \alpha_i^{(t)} \right)^2
\]

\[
= \eta D(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) + (1 - \eta)D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) + \frac{\gamma(1 - \eta)}{2m} \sum_{i \in [1:K]} \left( \alpha^*_i - \alpha_i^{(t)} \right)^2.
\]

Note that here, we derive the equations by using \(A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q)\); however, at each node, we do not know \(\alpha_Q\), but \(\overline{w}\). Therefore, for the term \(A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q)\), \((A_Q \alpha^*_{[1:K]} + \overline{w})\) is the correct notation; however in order to clearly show the dual objective function, we use the term \(A(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q)\) instead of \((A_Q \alpha^*_{[1:K]} + \overline{w})\) with which the derivation can also go through.

(31) can be lower-bounded by choosing \(\eta = \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\lambda m \gamma + \rho} \geq 0\) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(31) \geq \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\lambda m \gamma + \rho} \left(D(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q)\right)
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}[D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \alpha_Q) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) \mid \overline{w}, \alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}] & \geq \frac{1}{K} (1 - \Theta) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \epsilon_{Q,k} (\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{K} (1 - \Theta) \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\lambda m \gamma + \rho} \left(D(\alpha^*_{[1:K]}, \alpha_Q) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)}, \alpha_Q)\right)
\end{align*}
\]

(32)
From \( \mathbb{E}[D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) + D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) | \bar{w}, \alpha_{[1:K]}^t] \)
\[
\geq \frac{1}{K} (1 - \Theta) \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\lambda m \gamma + \rho} (D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}))
\]
By moving the term \( D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) \) in LHS to RHS and multiplying -1 in both sides, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}[D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t+1)}, \bar{Q}) | \alpha_{[1:K]}^{(t)} | \bar{w}]
\leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{K} (1 - \Theta) \frac{\lambda m \gamma}{\lambda m \gamma + \rho} \right) (D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}) - D(\alpha_{[1:K]}^t, \bar{Q}))
\]

\[\square\]

### 10.2 Derivation of the optimal local iteration \( H \)

For the sake of simplicity of \( \mathbb{E}[ ] \), by denoting \( 1 - \delta, \frac{K - C}{K}, \frac{C}{K} \), and \( (t_{\text{delay}} + t_{\text{cp}})/t_{\text{lp}} \) to \( a, b, c, \) and \( r \) respectively, we have the following first order condition over \( H \) for given \( a, b, c, \) and \( r \):
\[
b(H + r)a^H \ln(a) - (b + ca^H) \ln(b + ca^H) = 0,
\]
where \( a, b, c \in [0, 1) \) and \( b + c = 1 \). When \( H \) is large enough, \( b(H + r)a^H \ln(a) \) is the dominant term of \( (33) \) and notice that \( 0 < a < 1 \). Therefore, by approximating the term \( (b + ca^H) \ln(b + ca^H) \) to \( b \ln(b) \), we have the following simplified equation:
\[
b(H + r)a^H \ln(a) = b \ln(b).
\]

Then, we can re-state \( \mathbb{E}[ ] \) as follows:
\[
(H + r) \ln(a) e^{H \ln(a)} = \ln(b)
\Rightarrow (H + r) \ln(a) e^{(H + r) \ln(a) - r \ln(a)} = \ln(b)
\Rightarrow (H + r) \ln(a) e^{(H + r) \ln(a)} = \ln(b) e^{r \ln(a)}
\]
From the definition of the Lambert W-function, which is when \( x e^x = a \), the solution \( x \) is \( W(a) \), where \( W(\cdot) \) is the Lambert W-function, we have
\[
(H + r) \ln(a) = W \left( \ln(b) e^{r \ln(a)} \right).
\]
Therefore, for the optimal number of local iterations \( H \), we have
\[
H = \frac{1}{\ln(a)} W \left( \ln(b) e^{r \ln(a)} \right) - r.
\]