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Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new SVRG-style accelerated stochastic algorithm for solving a family of non-convex optimization problems whose objective consists of a sum of \( n \) smooth functions and a non-smooth convex function. Our major goal is to improve the convergence of SVRG-style stochastic algorithms to stationary points under a setting with a large condition number \( c \) - the ratio between the smoothness constant and the negative curvature constant. The proposed algorithm achieves the best known gradient complexity when \( c \geq \Omega(n) \), which was achieved previously by a SAGA-style accelerated stochastic algorithm. Compared with the SAGA-style accelerated stochastic algorithm, the proposed algorithm is more practical due to its low memory cost that is inherited from previous SVRG-style algorithms. Compared with previous studies on SVRG-style stochastic algorithms, our theory provides much stronger results in terms of (i) reduced gradient complexity under a large condition number; and (ii) that the convergence is proved for a sampled stagewise averaged solution that is selected from all stagewise averaged solutions with increasing sampling probabilities instead of for a uniformly sampled solutions across all iterations.

1. Introduction

The target of interest in this paper is to solve the following non-convex optimization problem:

\[
\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(\mathbf{x}) + \psi(\mathbf{x})
\]  

(1)

where each \( f_i \) is a \( L \)-smooth and \( \mu \)-weakly convex function, and \( \psi(\mathbf{x}) \) is a "simple" closed convex function. The above problem covers constrained smooth optimization as a special case when \( \psi(\mathbf{x}) \) is the indicator function of a convex set. A function \( f(\cdot) \) is said to be \( \mu \)-weakly convex if \( f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \| \mathbf{x} \|^2 \) is a convex function for \( \mu > 0 \), where \( \| \cdot \| \) denotes the Euclidean norm. By "simple", we mean that the proximal mapping for \( \psi(\mathbf{x}) \) is easy to compute. This problem has broad applications in machine learning, and has been studied by a number of papers (Reddi et al., 2016b,a; Lan and Yang, 2018; Allen-Zhu, 2018; Allen-Zhu and Hazan, 2016). Several stochastic algorithms were proposed by utilizing the finite-sum structure of the problem to derive faster convergence than stochastic gradient methods. These algorithms are based on two well-known variance-reduction techniques, namely the SVRG-style variance reduction (Johnson and Zhang, 2013) and the SAGA-style variance reduction (Defazio et al.,}
Table 1: Comparison of gradient complexities of variance reduction based algorithms for finding \( \epsilon \)-stationary point of (1). The best complexity result for each setting is marked in red color. The top two algorithms, namely SAGA and RapGrad use the SAGA-style variance reduction technique, while others use the SVRG-style variance reduction technique. \( \tilde{O}(\cdot) \) hides some logarithmic factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithms</th>
<th>( L/\mu \geq \Omega(n) )</th>
<th>( L/\mu \leq O(n) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAGA (Reddi et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}(n^{2/3}/\epsilon^2) )</td>
<td>( O(n^{2/3}L/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RapGrad (Lan and Yang, 2018)</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}(\sqrt{nL\mu}/\epsilon^2) )</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}((\mu n + \sqrt{nL\mu})/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRG (Reddi et al., 2016a)</td>
<td>( O(n^{2/3}L/\epsilon^2) )</td>
<td>( O(n^{2/3}L/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha1 (Allen-Zhu, 2017a)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>( O(n \log((L/\epsilon \mu)) + n^{2/3}L^{1/3}\mu^{2/3}/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepeatSVRG (Allen-Zhu, 2017a)</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}(n^{3/4}\sqrt{L\mu}/\epsilon^2) )</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}((\mu n + n^{3/4}\sqrt{L\mu})/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagewise-Katyusha (this work)</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}(\sqrt{nL\mu}/\epsilon^2) )</td>
<td>( \tilde{O}((\mu n + L)/\epsilon^2) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014; Roux et al., 2012). The key difference between these two variance reduction techniques is that SVRG uses a full gradient that is computed periodically and SAGA uses a full gradient that is computed from its maintained historical gradients for each component \( f_i \). Due to this difference, SAGA might require much higher memory than SVRG for many problems (e.g., learning deep neural networks), which renders algorithms of SVRG-style more favorable than algorithms of SAGA-style.

This paper focuses on the case when the condition number \( L/\mu \) is very large (e.g., \( L/\mu > n \)), and aims to provide faster convergence for a SVRG-style stochastic algorithm. We summarize below the key features of the proposed algorithm and its convergence guarantee in comparison with previous results.

The proposed algorithm is following a stagewise framework, which has been commonly adopted for solving problems with weakly convex functions. At each stage, an accelerated SVRG-style algorithm is called to minimize \( \phi(x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x\|^2 \) to a certain degree. We propose a variant based on Katyusha for convex problems (Allen-Zhu, 2017b). We refer to the proposed algorithm as Stagewise-Katyusha. The novelty of the proposed algorithm lies on a tailored setting of the involved parameters in Katyusha to adapt to the \( \mu \)-weakly convexity of the problem. By a refined analysis of the gradient complexity of the proposed variant of Katyusha, we establish that for finding an \( \epsilon \)-level stationary point (i.e., the magnitude of the proximal gradient is less than \( \epsilon \) in expectation) the proposed algorithm has a gradient complexity of \( O(\sqrt{n\mu L \log(L/\mu)}/\epsilon^2) \) when \( L/\mu \geq \Omega(n) \), and a gradient complexity of \( O((n\mu + L) \log(L/\mu)/\epsilon^2) \) when \( L/\mu \leq \Omega(n) \).

We compare our results with previous works on SVRG-style and SAGA-style stochastic algorithms for (1) in Table 1 1. It is notable that for the setting of large condition number, the complexity of Stagewise-Katyusha matches that of RapGrad (Lan and Yang, 2018). However, RapGrad is a SAGA-style stochastic algorithm, hence requiring a large memory cost. Moreover, the complexity of Stagewise-Katyusha is better than SVRG and SAGA when \( L/\mu \geq \log(L/\mu)n^{1/3} \). Natasha1 has a better complexity for a small condition number, but it is not applicable for problems with a large condition number. Finally, we note that

1. After our first manuscript was posted online, it was brought to our attention that the updated arXiv manuscript (Allen-Zhu, 2018, V5) reported a new result for RepeatSVRG for our considered problem, which is in the same order as the result achieved in this work.
our algorithm is more practical than Natasha1/SVRG/SAGA/RepeatSVRG/RapGrad in that we do not use randomly selected intermediate solutions to proceed as in Natasha1, do not return a uniformly sampled solution across all iterations as in SVRG/SAGA, do not require setting $\epsilon$ aprior as in RepeatSVRG, and do not require a large memory cost as in SAGA/RapGrad. For our algorithm, the returned solution is a stagewise average solution that is sampled from all stagewise average solutions with increasing sampling probabilities, which also provides a better justification of using the last averaged solution in practice.

2. Stagewise-Katyusha

In this section we present the Stagewise-Katyusha algorithm and its analysis. We first present some notations, which is almost duplicate of that from (Chen et al., 2018). For problem (1), a point $x \in \text{dom}(\psi)$ is a first-order stationary point if $0 \in \partial \phi(x)$, where $\partial \phi$ denotes the partial gradient of $\phi$. Moreover, a point $x$ is said to be $\epsilon$-stationary if

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial \phi(x)) \leq \epsilon.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\text{dist}$ denotes the Euclidean distance from a point to a set. For any function $f$ and $\lambda > 0$, the following function is called a Moreau envelope of $f$

$$f_{\lambda}(x) = \min_{z} f(z) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|z - x\|^2.$$

Further, the optimal solution to the above problem denoted by

$$\text{prox}_{\lambda f}(x) = \arg \min_{z} f(z) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|z - x\|^2$$

is called a proximal mapping of $f$.

A small norm of $\nabla f_{\lambda}(x)$ has an interpretation that $x$ is close to a point that is nearly stationary. In particular for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\hat{x} = \text{prox}_{\lambda f}(x)$, then we have

$$f(\hat{x}) \leq f(x), \quad \|x - \hat{x}\| = \lambda \|\nabla f_{\lambda}(x)\|, \quad \text{dist}(0, \partial f(\hat{x})) \leq \|\nabla f_{\lambda}(x)\|. \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

This means that a point $x$ satisfying $\|\nabla f_{\lambda}(x)\| \leq \epsilon$ is close to a point in distance of $O(\epsilon)$ that is $\epsilon$-stationary. Below, we will prove the convergence in terms of $\|\nabla \phi_{\gamma}(x)\|$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and discuss its implication for solving smooth problems with $\psi = 0$. To connect with the convergence measures in (Lan and Yang, 2018), we will also measure the convergence in terms of $\|x - \hat{x}\|$.

2.1. Algorithm

The Stagewise-Katyusha algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1, which falls into the same framework presented in (Chen et al., 2018) with a modified Katyusha employed at each stage for solving the regularized subproblem $f_{s}(x)$, which is assumed to be $\sigma$-strongly convex and have $\hat{L}$-Lipschitz continuous gradients for the smooth components. The modified Katyusha is presented in Algorithm 2. Given the way that $f_{s}$ is constructed, we can write it as

$$f_{s}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_{i}(x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - x_{s-1}\|^2 \right) + \frac{\gamma - \mu}{2} \|x - x_{s-1}\|^2 + \psi(x).$$
Algorithm 1 Stagewise-Katyusha

1: Initialize: non-decreasing positive weights \( \{w_s\}, x_0 \in \text{dom}(\psi), \gamma = (2\mu)^{-1} \)
2: for \( s = 1, \ldots, S + 1 \) do
3: \( f_s(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \| -x_{s-1}\|^2 \)
4: \( x_s = \text{Katyusha}(f_s, x_{s-1}, K_s, \mu, L + \mu) \)
5: end for
6: Return: \( x_{\tau+1}, \tau \) is randomly chosen from \( \{0, \ldots, S\} \) according to probabilities \( p_\tau = \frac{w_{\tau+1}}{\sum_{k=0}^S w_{k+1}}, \tau = 0, \ldots, S \).

Algorithm 2 Katyusha\((f, x_0, K, \sigma, \hat{L})\)

1: Initialize: \( \tau_2 = \frac{1}{2}, \tau_1 = \min\{\sqrt{\frac{1}{L^2}}, \frac{1}{2}\}, \eta = \frac{1}{3\gamma L}, \theta = 1 + \eta \sigma, m = \lceil \frac{\log(2\tau_1 + 2/\theta - 1)}{\log \theta} \rceil + 1 \)
2: \( y_0 = \zeta_0 = \bar{x}^0 \leftarrow x_0 \)
3: for \( k = 0, \ldots, K - 1 \) do
4: \( u^k = \nabla f(\bar{x}^k) \)
5: for \( t = 0, \ldots, m - 1 \) do
6: \( j = km + t \)
7: \( x_j = \tau_1 \zeta_j + \tau_2 \bar{x}^k + (1 - \tau_1 - \tau_2) y_j \)
8: \( \nabla j+1 = u^k + \nabla \hat{f}(x_{j+1}) - \nabla \hat{f}(\bar{x}^k) \)
9: \( \zeta_{j+1} = \arg\min_{\zeta} \frac{1}{2\eta} \| \zeta - \zeta_j \|^2 + \langle \nabla j+1, \zeta \rangle + \psi(\zeta) \)
10: \( y_{j+1} = \arg\min_y \frac{3}{2} \| y - x_{j+1} \|^2 + \langle \nabla j+1, y \rangle \)
11: end for
12: compute \( \bar{x}^{k+1} = \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t y_{km+t+1}}{\sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t} \)
13: end for
14: Output \( \bar{x}^K \)

It is easy to see that \( \hat{f}_i(x) \) is convex and \( \hat{L} = (L + \mu) \)-smooth, and \( \hat{\psi}(x) \) is \( \sigma = (\gamma^{-1} - \mu) \)-strongly convex, which satisfy the conditions made in (Allen-Zhu, 2017b). In each call of the modified Katyusha, \( \hat{f}_i \) is considered as the smooth component, and \( \hat{\psi} \) is considered as the non-smooth regularizer. The key difference between our modified Katyusha and the original Katyusha algorithm for solving smooth and strongly convex problems in (Allen-Zhu, 2017b) lies at the setting of \( \tau_1, m \) and \( K \). For example in (Allen-Zhu, 2017b), the value of \( \tau_1 \) is set to \( \tau_1 = \min(\sqrt{m \sigma / 3\hat{L}}, 1/2) \). However, in our modified Katyusha the value of \( \tau_1 \) is independent of \( m \). The value of \( m \) is also different from that suggested in (Allen-Zhu, 2017b), which is suggested to \( 2n \). The value of \( K \) (the number of epochs) in the original Katyusha is chosen such that the objective gap is less than \( \epsilon \). In our modified Katyusha, it is set to make sure that the objective function \( f_s(x) \) is decreased by a sufficient amount. Actually, we do not solve \( \min_x f_s(x) \) to an \( \epsilon \)-accuracy level in terms of the objective value. Below, we present the gradient complexity of Stagewise-Katyusha (i.e., the order of number of evaluations of \( \nabla \phi_i(x) \)).
Assumption 1 For problem (1), we assume that (i) \( f_i(\cdot) \) is \( L \)-smooth and \( \mu \)-weakly convex, (ii) \( \psi \) is a non-smooth convex function, and (iii) there exists \( \Delta_\phi > 0 \) such that \( \phi(x_0) - \min_x \phi(x) \leq \Delta_\phi \).

Theorem 1 Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let \( w_s = s^\alpha, \alpha > 0, \gamma = \frac{1}{2\mu}, \hat{L} = L + \mu, \sigma = \mu, \) and in each call of Katyusha let \( \tau_1 = \min\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{4n\sigma}{3\hat{L}^2}}, \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \) step size \( \eta = \frac{1}{3\tau_1 \hat{L}}, \tau_2 = 1/2, \theta = 1 + 4\sigma, \) and

\[
K_s = \left\lceil \frac{\log(D_s)}{m \log(\theta)} \right\rceil, \quad m = \left\lceil \frac{\log(2\tau_1 + 2/\theta - 1)}{\log \theta} \right\rceil + 1,
\]

where \( D_s = \max\{12\hat{L}/\mu, \hat{L}^3/\mu^3, 4L^2s/\mu^2\} \). Then we have that

\[
\max\{\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\gamma}(x_{\tau+1})\|^2], \mathbb{E}[L^2\|x_{\tau+1} - z_{\tau+1}\|^2]\} \leq \frac{34\mu\Delta_\phi(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1} + \frac{49\mu\Delta_\phi(\alpha + 1)}{(S + 1)^{\alpha<1}},
\]

where \( z = \text{prox}_{\gamma \phi}(x) \), \( \tau \) is randomly chosen from \( \{0, \ldots, S\} \) according to probabilities \( p_\tau = \frac{w_\tau + 1}{\sum_{k=0}^{\tau} w_k + 1}, \tau = 0, \ldots, S \). Furthermore, the total gradient complexity for finding \( x_{\tau+1} \) such that

\[
\max(\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi_{\gamma}(x_{\tau+1})\|^2], L^2\mathbb{E}[\|x_{\tau+1} - z_{\tau+1}\|^2]) \leq \epsilon^2
\]

is

\[
N(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 
O\left( (\mu n + \sqrt{n\mu L}) \log \left( \frac{L}{\mu \epsilon^2} \right) \right), & n \geq \frac{3L}{4\mu}, \\
O\left( \sqrt{nL\mu \log \left( \frac{L}{\mu \epsilon^2} \right)} \right), & n \leq \frac{3L}{4\mu}.
\end{cases}
\]

Indeed, when \( \psi = 0 \) we can derive a slightly stronger result stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 Suppose Assumption 1 holds and \( \psi = 0 \). With the same parameter values as in Theorem 1 except that \( K = \left\lceil \frac{\log(D)}{m \log(\theta)} \right\rceil, \) where \( D = \max(8\hat{L}/\mu, \hat{L}^3/\mu^3) \). The total gradient complexity for finding \( x_{\tau+1} \) such that \( \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \phi(x_{\tau+1})\|^2] \leq \epsilon^2 \) is

\[
N(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 
O\left( (\mu n + \sqrt{n\mu L}) \log \left( \frac{L}{\mu \epsilon^2} \right) \right), & n \geq \frac{3L}{4\mu}, \\
O\left( \sqrt{nL\mu \log \left( \frac{L}{\mu \epsilon^2} \right)} \right), & n \leq \frac{3L}{4\mu}.
\end{cases}
\]

Remark: Our results in the above two theorems match that in (Lan and Yang, 2018). Indeed, our result in Theorem 1 is slightly more general than that in (Lan and Yang, 2018), which only considers the constrained smooth optimization with \( \psi \) being the indicator function of a convex set.

2.2. Analysis

We need the following lemma for our analysis.
Lemma 3 (Allen-Zhu, 2017b) Regarding the modified-Katyusha algorithm, suppose that \( \tau_1 \leq \frac{1}{3nL} \), \( \tau_2 = 1/2 \). Defining \( D_t := f(y_t) - f(x) \), \( \tilde{D}^k := f(x^k) - f(x) \) for any \( x \), conditioned on iterations \( \{0, \ldots, t-1\} \) in \( k \)-th epoch and all iterations before \( k \)-th epoch, we have that

\[
0 \leq \frac{(1 - \tau_1 - \tau_2)}{\tau_1} D_t - \frac{1}{\tau_1} D_{t+1} + \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} E[\tilde{D}^t] + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\zeta_t - x\|^2 - \frac{1 + \eta\sigma}{2\eta} E[\|\zeta_{t+1} - x\|^2]
\]

Proof [of Theorem 1] First, we verify \( K \) has a valid value. Overall, we need

\[
\theta^{-mK} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mu}{4L}, \frac{\mu^3}{L^2}, \frac{\mu^2}{L^2s} \right\}
\]

Define \( D_s = \max\{4\tilde{L}/\mu, \tilde{L}^3/\mu^3, L^2 s/\mu^2\} \geq 16 \). We can set \( K = \lceil \frac{\log(D_s)}{m \log \theta} \rceil \). Then,

\[
K \geq \frac{\log(D_s)}{m \log(1 + \eta\sigma)} \geq \frac{\log(4)}{\log(2\tau_1 + 2/\theta - 1) + \log \theta} \geq 1
\]

where the last inequality follows that \( 2/\theta \geq 2/\tau_1 + 2/\theta - 1 \geq 1 \) always according to the setting of \( \tau_1 = \min\{\frac{2\mu}{3\tilde{L}}, \frac{1}{2}\} \) and \( \eta = \frac{1}{3\tau_1 L} \).

One call of Katyusha Define \( \theta = 1 + \eta\sigma \) and multiply (4) by \( \theta^t \) on both side. By summing up the inequalities in (4) in the \( k \)-th epoch, we have that

\[
0 \leq E_k \left[ \frac{1 - \tau_1 - \tau_2}{\tau_1} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} D_{km+t} \theta^t - \frac{1}{\tau_1} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} D_{km+t+1} \theta^t \right] + \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} E_k[\tilde{D}^t] \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \theta^t + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\zeta_{km} - x_*\|^2
\]

where \( x_* = \arg \min_x f(x) \), \( E_k[\cdot] \) denotes expectation in \( k \)-th epoch conditional on \( 0, \ldots, k-1 \) epochs. Using the convexity of \( f(\cdot) \), we have that

\[
\frac{\tau_1 + \tau_2 - 1 + 1/\theta}{\tau_1} E_k[\tilde{D}^{k+1}] \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t + \frac{1 - \tau_1 - \tau_2}{\tau_1} \theta^m D_{(k+1)m} + \frac{\theta^m}{2\eta} E_k[\|\zeta_{(k+1)m} - x_*\|^2]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \tilde{L} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t + \frac{1 - \tau_1 - \tau_2}{\tau_1} D_{km} + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\zeta_{km} - x_*\|^2
\]

Substituting \( \tau_2 = 1/2 \) and \( m \leq \frac{\log(2\tau_1 + 2/\theta - 1)}{\log \theta} + 1 \), we have that

\[
\theta^m \frac{1}{2\tau_1} E_k[\tilde{D}^{k+1}] \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t + \frac{1/2 - \tau_1}{\tau_1} \theta^m D_{(k+1)m} + \frac{\theta^m}{2\eta} E_k[\|\zeta_{(k+1)m} - x_*\|^2]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2\tau_1} \tilde{L} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t + \frac{1/2 - \tau_1}{\tau_1} D_{km} + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\zeta_{km} - x_*\|^2
\]
Telescoping above inequality over all epochs \( k = 0, \ldots, K - 1 \) we have that
\[
E_k[\tilde{D}^K] \leq 2\tau_1 \theta^{-mK} \left( \frac{1}{2\tau_1} \tilde{D}^0 + \frac{1/2 - \tau_1}{\tau_1} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t D_0 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t \|\zeta_0 - x_0\|^2 \right)
\]

Since \( \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \theta^t \geq 1 \), and \( \tau_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \) we have
\[
E_k[\tilde{D}^K] \leq 2\tau_1 \theta^{-mK} \left( \frac{1 - \tau_1}{\tau_1} \tilde{D}^0 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\zeta_0 - x_0\|^2 \right)
\]

We can use the same analysis by plugging \( x = \zeta_0 \) in (4) to prove that \( E[f(\bar{x}^K) - f(\bar{x}^0)] \leq 0 \) - an objective value decreasing property that will be used later.

**Convergence of \( \|\nabla \phi_s(\cdot)\|\):** Let \( z_s = \arg \min_x f_s(x) \) and \( x_s \) denote the global minimum of \( \min_x \phi(x) \). It is notable that \( |x_{s-1} - z_s|/\gamma = \nabla \phi_s(x_{s-1}) \). Below, we will use \( K \) to denote \( K_s \). Applying the above analysis to the \( s \)-th call of Katyusha, we have
\[
E_s[f_s(x_{s-1}) - f_s(z_s)] \leq 2\theta^{-mK} \left( f_s(x_{s-1}) - f_s(z_s) \right) + \frac{\theta^{-mK}}{2\eta} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2
\]

It is easy to see that
\[
f_s(x_{s-1}) - f_s(z_s) = \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(z_s) - \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2 \\
\leq \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(z_s) - \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2
\]

Thus, we have
\[
E_s[f_s(x_s) - f_s(z_s)] \leq 2\theta^{-mK} \left( \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s) \right) + \theta^{-mK} \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2 \\
\leq 2\theta^{-mK} \left( \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s) \right) + \theta^{-mK} \frac{1}{\gamma \sigma} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2
\]

By the strong convexity of \( f_s \), we have
\[
E[\|x_s - z_s\|^2] \leq \frac{2}{\sigma} \mathcal{E}_s
\]

Similar to the analysis in (Chen et al., 2018), we have
\[
\frac{(1 - \alpha_s)}{2\gamma} E_s \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2 \leq E_s[\Delta_s] + \frac{(\alpha_s^{-1} - 1)}{2\gamma} E_s[\|x_s - z_s\|^2] + \mathcal{E}_s \\
\leq E_s[\Delta_s] + \frac{(\alpha_s^{-1} - 1)}{\gamma \sigma} \mathcal{E}_s \\
\leq E_s[\Delta_s] + \frac{(\alpha_s^{-1} - 1)}{\gamma \sigma} \left[ 2\theta^{-mK} \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s) + \theta^{-mK} \frac{1}{\gamma \sigma} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2 \right]
\]
where \( \Delta_s = \phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s) \). Substituting \( \alpha_s = 1/2 \), \( \gamma = 1/(2\mu) \), and \( \sigma = \mu, \hat{L} \leq 2L \) and \( \theta^{-mK} \leq \mu/(12\hat{L}) \), we have that
\[
\frac{1}{8\gamma} \|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2 \leq E_s[\Delta_s] + 6\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)),
\]  
(i.e.,
\[
\|\nabla \phi_{s}(x_{s-1})\|^2 \leq E_s[8\Delta_s/\gamma] + 48\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s))/\gamma;
\]  
Multiplying both sides by \( w_s \), we have that
\[
w_s E_s[\|\nabla \phi_{s}(x_{s-1})\|^2] \leq E_s \left[ 8w_s\Delta_s/\gamma + 48\theta^{-mK}w_s(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s))/\gamma \right]
\]  
By summing over \( s = 1, \ldots, S + 1 \), we have
\[
E\left[ \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\|\nabla \phi_{s}(x_{s-1})\|^2 \right] \leq E \left[ \frac{8}{\gamma} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\Delta_s + \frac{48}{\gamma} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) \right]
\]  
Taking the expectation w.r.t. \( \tau \in \{0, \ldots, S\} \), we have that
\[
E[\|\nabla \phi_{s}(x_{s})\|^2] \leq E \left[ \frac{8}{\gamma} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\Delta_s + \frac{48}{\gamma} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) \right]
\]  
Next, we bound the numerators of the two terms in the above bound. For the first term in the above bound, we have
\[
\sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\Delta_s = \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) = \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_{s-1}\phi(x_{s-1}) - w_s\phi(x_s)) + \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_s - w_{s-1})\phi(x_{s-1})
\]  
\[
= w_0\phi(x_0) - w_{S+1}\phi(x_{S+1}) + \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_s - w_{s-1})\phi(x_{s-1})
\]  
\[
= \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_s - w_{s-1})(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_{S+1}))
\]  
Taking expectation on both sides, we have
\[
E \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\Delta_s \right] = \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_s - w_{s-1})E[(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_{S+1}))] \leq \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} (w_s - w_{s-1})[\phi(x_0) - \phi(x_s)]
\]  
\[
\leq \Delta_\phi w_{S+1}
\]  
where we use the fact that \( E[f_s(x_s) - f_s(x_{s-1})] \leq 0 \) (this is the objective value decreasing property of Katyusha) implying \( E[\phi(x_s) - \phi(x_{s-1})] \leq 0 \) and hence \( E[\phi(x_s)] \leq \phi(x_0) \) for \( s \geq 0 \). For the second term, we can do similar analysis having
\[
E \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) \right] \leq \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\theta^{-mK}E[(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s))] \leq \Delta_\phi \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s\theta^{-mK}
\]
As a result,
\[
E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau})\|^2] \leq \left[ \frac{8\Delta_{\phi}w_{S+1}}{\gamma \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s} + \frac{48\Delta_{\phi} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s \theta^{-mK}}{\gamma \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \left[ \frac{8\Delta_{\phi}w_{S+1}}{\gamma \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s} + \frac{12\Delta_{\phi} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s s^{-1}}{\gamma \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s} \right]
\]
where we use the fact $\theta^{-mK} \leq 1/(4s)$. Then by simple algebra (cf. (Chen et al., 2018)), we have
\[
E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau})\|^2] \leq \frac{16\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1} + \frac{24\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{(S + 1)\alpha^{\delta_0 < 1}}
\]
Due to the objective decreasing property, we have
\[
E[\phi(x_s) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x_s - x_{s-1}\|^2 - \phi(x_{s-1})] \leq 0,
\]
which implies by a similar analysis
\[
\frac{1}{2\gamma} E[\|x_{\tau+1} - x_{\tau}\|^2] \leq \frac{\Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1}
\]
Since $\phi_{\gamma}(x)$ has $(\gamma^{-1} - \mu)$-Lipschitz continuous gradient (cf. Lemma 2.1 in (Drusvyatskiy and Paquette, 2018)), then we have
\[
E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau+1})\|^2] \leq 2E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau})\|^2] + 2(\gamma^{-1} - \mu)^2 E[\|x_{\tau+1} - x_{\tau}\|^2]
\]
\[
\leq 2E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau})\|^2] + \frac{2\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{34\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1} + \frac{48\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{(S + 1)\alpha^{\delta_0 < 1}}
\]
To proceed, from (10) we have
\[
L^2 \|x_s - z_s\|^2 \leq \frac{2L^2}{\sigma}(2\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) + \theta^{-mK}4\tilde{L}\|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{4L^2 \theta^{-mK}}{\sigma}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) + \frac{2L^3 \theta^{-mK}}{\mu^3} \|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{s-1})\|^2
\]
\[
\leq \frac{4L^2 \theta^{-mK}}{\sigma}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(x_s)) + 2\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{s-1})\|^2
\]
where we use the fact $\|x_{s-1} - z_s\|/\gamma = \|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{s-1})\|$ and $\theta^{-mK} \leq \mu^3/\tilde{L}^3$. Then following the same analysis as above,
\[
E[L^2 \|x_{\tau+1} - z_{\tau+1}\|^2] \leq \frac{4L^2 \Delta_{\phi} \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s \theta^{-mK}}{\sigma \sum_{s=1}^{S+1} w_s} + 2E[\|\nabla_{\gamma}(x_{\tau})\|^2]
\]
Since $\theta^{-mK} \leq \mu^2/(4L^2s)$, then
\[
E[L^2 \|x_{\tau+1} - z_{\tau+1}\|^2] \leq \frac{16\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{S + 1} + \frac{49\mu \Delta_{\phi}(\alpha + 1)}{(S + 1)\alpha^{\delta_0 < 1}}
\]
When $\psi(\cdot) = 0$ and considering $\alpha$ as a constant, we have

$$E[\|\nabla \phi(x_{r+1})\|^2] \leq E[\|\nabla \phi(x_{r+1}) - \nabla \phi(z_{r+1}) + \nabla \phi(z_{r+1})\|^2] \leq E[2L^2\|x_{r+1} - z_{r+1}\|^2 + 2\|\nabla \phi(x_r)\|^2]$$

$$\leq O\left(\frac{\mu \Delta \phi}{S + 1}\right)$$

Indeed, for $\psi(\cdot) = 0$, we can do slightly better by bounding $f_s(x_{s-1}) - f_s(z_s) \leq \frac{\mu}{S}\|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2$. Then $E_s$ becomes $2\theta^{-mK}\hat{L}\|x_{s-1} - z_s\|^2$ and $\theta^{-mK}(\phi(x_{s-1}) - \phi(z_s))$ in the proceeding analysis is gone, which removes the requirement $\theta^{-mK} \leq \mu^2/(4L^2s)$. As a result, we can set $K = \lceil \log(D)/(m \log \theta) \rceil$, where $D = \max(24L/\mu, \hat{L}^3/\mu^3)$.

**Gradient Complexity:** Finally, we analyze the gradient complexity. Let us consider the gradient complexity at the $s$-th stage, which is

$$(n + m)K \leq \frac{2 \log(D_s)}{\log(2\tau_1 + 2\tau_1\eta/1 - \eta/\mu)} n + \frac{2 \log(D_s)}{\log(1 + \eta/\mu)}$$

Let $\tau_1 = \frac{\eta}{\mu}$, where $0 \leq c = \frac{\mu}{3\hat{L}} \leq \frac{1}{3}$. We have that

$$(n + m)K = nK + mK = \frac{\log(D_s)}{\log(2\tau_1 + 2\tau_1\eta/1 - \eta/\mu)} n + \frac{\log(D_s)}{\log(1 + \eta/\mu)}$$

$$\leq \frac{\log(D_s)}{\log(2\tau_1 + 2c + 1 - \frac{c}{\tau_1})} n + \frac{\log(D_s)}{\log(1 + \frac{c}{\tau_1})}$$

We analyze two cases.

**Case 1:** If $n \geq \frac{3\hat{L}}{\mu}$, then $\tau_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, we have that

$$(n + m)K \leq O\left(\log(D_s)n + \frac{\log D_s}{\log(1 + 2c)}\right)$$

Since $c \leq 1/3$ so $\log(1 + 2c) \geq c$, then

$$(n + m)K \leq O\left((n + \frac{\hat{L}}{\mu})\log D_s\right).$$

Then the total gradient complexity for finding $E[\|\nabla \phi(x_r)\|^2] \leq c^2$ is $O((\mu n + L) \log(L/(\mu c))$.

**Case 2:** If $n \leq \frac{3\hat{L}}{\mu}$, then $\tau_1 = \sqrt{\frac{nu}{3\hat{L}}} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. We have that following inequalities hold

$$\frac{\tau_1}{c} = \sqrt{\frac{3n\hat{L}}{\mu}} \leq \frac{3\hat{L}}{2\mu}, \quad \log\left(\frac{\tau_1 + c}{\frac{c}{\tau_1}}\right) \leq \log\left(\frac{3\hat{L}}{\mu}\right), \quad \log\left(1 + c/\tau_1\right) \geq c/(2\tau_1)$$

and due to

if $2\tau_1 + 2c - \frac{c}{\tau_1} \leq 1/2$, then $\log(2\tau_1 + 2c + 1 - \frac{c}{\tau_1}) \geq \tau_1 + c - c/(2\tau_1)$

if $2\tau_1 + 2c - \frac{c}{\tau_1} \geq 1/2$, then $\log(2\tau_1 + 2c + 1 - \frac{c}{\tau_1}) \geq \log(1.5)$
we have
\[
\frac{1}{\log(2\pi_1 + 2c + 1 - \frac{c}{\pi})} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\log(1.5)}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{3\pi}{2L} + \frac{\mu}{3L} - \frac{\mu}{3nL}}} \right\} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{L}{n\mu}}\right).
\]

Thus we have
\[
(n + m)K \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{nL}{\mu} \log \frac{L}{\mu}}\right),
\]
and the total gradient complexity for finding $E\|\nabla \phi_\gamma(x_\tau)\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2$ is $O(\sqrt{\mu n L \log(L/(\mu \epsilon))})$.

### 3. Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed a SVRG-style accelerated stochastic algorithm for solving a family of non-convex optimization problems whose objective consists of a finite-sum of smooth functions and a non-smooth convex function. We proved that the gradient complexity can be improved when the condition number is very large compared to the number of smooth components, which matches an existing result based SAGA-style stochastic algorithm.
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