Abstract.
We survey sub-sampled inexact Newton methods and consider their application in non-convex settings. Under mild assumptions we derive convergence rates in expected value for sub-sampled low rank Newton methods, and sub-sampled inexact Newton Krylov methods. These convergence rates quantify the errors incurred in sub-sampling the Hessian and gradient, as well as in approximating the Newton linear solve, and in choosing regularization and step length parameters. We deploy these methods in training convolutional autoencoders for the MNIST, CIFAR10 and LFW data sets. These numerical results demonstrate that these sub-sampled inexact Newton methods are competitive with first order methods in computational cost, and can outperform first order methods with respect to generalization errors.
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1. Introduction. We consider the following stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{w \in W} F(w) = \int \ell(w; x, y) d\nu(x, y),$$

where $\ell$ is a smooth (loss) function, the data pairs $(x, y)$ are distributed with joint probability distribution $\nu(x, y)$, and $F : \mathbb{R}^d \supset W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is referred to as the expected risk. This problem arises in machine learning, where the goal is to reconstruct a mapping $x \mapsto y$ with a deep neural network or other model parametrized by $w$. See for example [15]. In practice, complete information about $\nu$ is unavailable. Rather one can generate samples $x_i, y_i \sim \nu$, then approximate the (1.1) via Monte Carlo integration, as follows

$$\min_{w \in W} F_X(w) = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{i \in X} F_i(w),$$

where $F_i(w) = \ell(w; x_i, y_i)$, and $X = \{(x_i, y_i) | x, y \sim \nu\}$. The function $F_X : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is referred to as the empirical risk. Because of the stochasticity in $\nu$, solutions to (1.2) may be poor approximations of the solution to (1.1). Iterative methods for solving (1.2) are therefore judged not only by how efficiently they solve (1.2), but also how well the approximate solutions they find generalize to unseen data. Optimization problem (1.2) is typically solved via a gradient based iteration of the form

$$w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha_k p_k,$$
where $p_k$ is a search direction and $\alpha_k$ is the step length or learning rate. If $p_k = -\nabla F(w_k)$, then the iteration is gradient descent. If $p_k = -\nabla^2 F(w)^{-1}\nabla F(w)$, then the iteration is full Newton’s method.

Several issues make optimization problem (1.2) difficult:

1. Large parameter dimension, $d$
2. Large data dimension, $|X|$  
3. Non-convexity of $F_X$
4. Ill conditioning of $F_X$

Issues 1 and 2 make deterministic optimization techniques for solving (1.2) prohibitively costly. To ease the computational burden, at a given iteration $k$, one typically sub-samples data $X_k$ from $X$, then substitutes $X_k$ for $X$ in (1.2). Because of issue 3, finding global minimizers is computationally intractible (NP-hard), and instead one has to settle for mere local minima [4, 26]. However, in deep learning, it is conjectured that local minima are almost as good as global minima [7]. However, finding local minima is still difficult because the energy landscape is riddled with saddle points [9]. Saddle points typically correspond to suboptimal solutions in non-convex optimization problems such as matrix factorization and phase retrieval [18, 37].

How best to deal with saddle points is an open area of research. Some work has been done to classify when non-convex problems are tractable [36]. Gill et al argue for modified Newton type methods [14], introduced by Dauphin et al in machine learning as saddle free Newton (SFN) [9]. Reddi et al argue for using first order methods while the gradient is large and switching to second order methods when near stationary points [29]. Jin et al argue for adding noise uniformly sampled from a ball with radius large enough to dominate saddle regions where optimizers get stuck [19].

Gradient based methods converge slowly for ill-conditioned problems [3, 23, 33]. In contrast the convergence of full Newton’s method is independent of the conditioning of the problem. Full Newton’s method is computationally impractical since inverting a full Hessian requires $O(d^3)$ operations. Inexact Newton methods require $O(kd^2)$ operations where $k$ is a constant that depends on the spectral properties of the Hessian. As the problem becomes more ill conditioned, $k$ typically grows. This shifts the computational burden due to ill conditioning from the nonlinear optimizer to the linear solver that is used to solve the Newton linear system. Experimental observations of the Hessian spectrum suggest that $k \ll d$ [2, 13, 34].

In this work we analyze and numerically test the following methods:

- Stochastic low rank saddle free Newton
- Stochastic inexact Newton CG
- Stochastic inexact Newton GMRES.

We show that these methods are comparable to first order methods such as Adam and gradient descent in terms of computational cost. We show that these methods can have better generalization properties than first order methods.

1.1. Related Work. Martens et al explore matrix free inexact Newton methods for deep learning; argue for the use of the Gauss-Newton Hessian [24, 25]. Bollapragada et al analyze stochastic inexact Newton methods including inexact Newton CG in the convex setting [5]. Roosta et al explore stochastic inexact Newton methods, and derive probabilistic bounds for spectral convergence of the sub-sampled Hessian to the true Hessian [31, 30, 40, 39]. Roosta et al experimentally demonstrate that Gauss Newton methods are likely to get stuck at saddle points. In order to escape saddle points, Dauphin et al propose a modified version of the Hessian in which the negative eigenvalues have been flipped [8]. Byrd et al discuss the use of stochastic
Hessian information in machine learning [6]. Several papers have investigated the spectral properties of the Hessian, showing that it is low rank and its eigenvalues are clustered [2, 13, 34].

1.2. Overview. We survey stochastic matrix free inexact Newton methods based on low rank approximation of the Hessian, as well as inexact solution of the Newton system with Krylov methods. We present a new adaption of the saddle free Newton method that uses randomized SVD and the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula to invert the modified Hessian. We present new convergence analysis for stochastic inexact Newton methods in which the linear solve is terminated using an Eisenstat-Walker condition, as well as stochastic low rank inexact Newton methods, and stochastic inexact Newton GMRES. These convergence rates demonstrate the computational trade-offs between sub-sampling the gradient and sub-sampling the Hessian. They also provide insight into how the spectral properties of the Hessian will effect convergence.

We compare these Newton methods to gradient descent and Adam on autoencoder problems in computer vision (MNIST, CIFAR10 and LFW), as well as a problem from forward uncertainty quantification involving partial differential equations (PDEs). Numerical results confirm the low rank and clustering properties of the Hessian spectrum predicted by theory. Our results demonstrate these Newton methods are competitive with gradient based methods in terms of computational cost. The solutions found by these Newton methods perform better on unseen data (better generalization) in all but one case.

1.3. Notation. $A \succeq B$ means that $A - B$ is semi positive definite. We work in finite dimensional Hilbert spaces with $x \cdot y = x^T y = (x, y)$ inner product and corresponding norm $\| \cdot \| = \| \cdot \|_2$, or the Euclidean $\ell_2$ distance on vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$. By $E$ we mean the expectation taken against the measure $\nu$. When we say $E_k$ we mean the conditional expectation at an iteration $k$ taken over all possible sample batches $X_k$.

2. Background. In solving (1.2) one seeks to find a candidate solution $w^*$ that satisfies optimality conditions.

**Definition 2.1 (Stationary points).** A point $w^*$ is a first order stationary point if $\| \nabla F(w^*) \| = 0$. A point $w^*$ is an $\epsilon$-first order stationary point if $\| \nabla F(w^*) \| < \epsilon$. A point $w^*$ is a second order stationary point if

$$\| \nabla F(w^*) \| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \preceq \nabla^2 F(w^*).$$

(2.1)

A point $w^*$ is an $(\epsilon_g, \epsilon_H)$-second order stationary point if

$$\| \nabla F(w^*) \| \leq \epsilon_g \quad \text{and} \quad -\epsilon_H I \preceq \nabla^2 F(w^*),$$

(2.2)

for some $\epsilon_g, \epsilon_H > 0$. A point $w^*$ is a stochastic $(\epsilon_g, \epsilon_H)$-second order stationary point if

$$E[\| \nabla F(w^*) \|] \leq \epsilon_g \quad \text{and} \quad -\epsilon_H I \preceq E[\nabla^2 F(w^*)].$$

(2.3)

We seek to solve the empirical risk minimization (1.2) via the gradient based iteration (1.3), approximately solving the Newton system

$$H(w)p_k = -g(w),$$

(2.4)
where $H(w)$ is the Hessian and $g(w)$ is the gradient. The Hessian and gradient are approximated using different data sets $X_k, S_k$ such that $|X_k| > |S_k|$. That is,

$$H(w) = \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w) = \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{i \in S_k} \nabla^2 F_i(w) \quad (2.5a)$$

$$g(w) = \nabla F_{X_k}(w) = \frac{1}{|X_k|} \sum_{i \in X_k} \nabla F_i(w). \quad (2.5b)$$

Due to ill conditioning and non-convexity we consider the Tikhonov regularized experimental risk minimization problem

$$\min_w F_{X_k}(w) = \frac{1}{|X_k|} \sum_{i \in X_k} F_i(w), + \gamma \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2, \quad (2.6)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ [38].

We now state some assumptions that will be used later in the paper. Assumptions A1-A4 are adapted from [5].

A1 (Dominant positive eigenvalues) The function $F$ is twice continuously differentiable and any sub-sampled Hessian is spectrally bounded above with constant $L$. That is, for any integer $\beta$ and set $S$ with $|S| = \beta$, there exists a positive constant $L_\beta < L$ such that

$$\nabla^2 F_S(w) \preceq L_\beta I. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover the first $r$ eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 F_S(w)$ along a path of iterates starting at $w_0$ are positive.

A2 (Bounded variance of sample gradients) There exists a constant $v$ such that

$$\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\nabla F_i(w))) \leq v^2 \ \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.8)$$

A3 (Lipschitz Continuity of Hessian) The Hessian of the objective function $F$ is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there is a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla^2 F(w) - \nabla^2 F(z)\| \leq M \|w - z\|^2 \ \forall w, z \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.9)$$

A4 (Bounded Variance of Hessian components) There exists $\sigma$ such that, for all component Hessians, we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}[(\nabla^2 F_i(w) - \nabla^2 F(w))^2]\| \leq \sigma^2, \ \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.10)$$

A5 ($\epsilon_g$-first order stationary point). For a given candidate stationary point $w^*$ and gradient batch size $|X_k| = \xi$, there exists $\epsilon_g > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\|\nabla F_{X_k}(w^*)\|] \leq \epsilon_g \quad (2.11)$$

3. Inexact Newton Methods. An inexact Newton method as described in [10] is a method for which the Newton system, $(2.4)$, is solved inexactely, and the linear solve is terminated when the following condition is satisfied:

$$\|Hp + g\| \leq \eta \|g\|. \quad (3.1)$$
When the gradient is large, the tolerance for inexactness is high. The tolerance tightens as one nears the solution. This avoids unnecessary work in the linear solves far from the solution, but still retains quadratic convergence near the solution. Optimal choices of $\eta$ are discussed in papers of Eisenstat and Walker [10, 11]. We establish the following local convergence rate for a sub-sampled inexact Newton method in the case that $\eta \leq \|g\|$.

**Theorem 3.1 (Local convergence for sub-sampled inexact Newton methods with gradient norm forcing).** Suppose that assumptions A1-A4 hold, let

$$
\mu = \min \left\{ \|\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I\|^{-1}, \|\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I\|^{-1} \right\},
$$

and assume that

(a) $w_k \in B_\delta(w^*)$ with $\delta < \frac{2\mu}{\epsilon_H}$,

(b) $-\epsilon_H I \preceq \nabla^2 F_{S_k}$ for all $S_k$ and for all $w \in B_\delta(w^*)$,

(c) The Tikhonov regularization parameter is chosen such that $\gamma > \epsilon_H$,

(d) $\|\nabla^2 F(w_k) p_k - \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \eta_k \|\nabla F(w_k)\|$ with $\eta_k \leq \|\nabla F(w_k)\|$.

Then for the iteration $w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha_k p_k$, we have the following bound:

$$
E_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq c_0 + c_1 \|w_k - w^*\| + c_2 \|w_k - w^*\|^2,
$$

where

$$
c_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left[ \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right) + |1 - \alpha_k| \|\nabla F(w_k)\| \right]
$$

$$
c_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} + \frac{2\alpha_k v\mu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right)
$$

$$
c_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{M}{2} + \alpha_k \mu^2 \right).
$$

See Appendix (A.1) for proof of Theorem 3.1. Assumption (a) states that $w_k$ is sufficiently close to an optimum. Assumption (b) states that eigenvalues of the Hessian are not too negative, and assumption (c) guarantees the Hessian is invertible. Assumption (d) is the Eisenstat-Walker forcing condition. Ideally the constants $c_0, c_1$ and $c_2$ will be as small as possible. The constant $c_0$ will be small when the Monte Carlo approximation of the gradient is good, and the full Newton step $\alpha_k = 1$ is taken. The constant $c_1$ will be small when the Monte Carlo approximation of the gradient and Hessian are both good. The constant $c_2$ will be small when the Hessian is well conditioned.

This theorem says nothing about how expensive the per iteration cost the method may be. The per iteration cost of the method will depend on the spectral properties of the Hessian and the batch sizes. In the next subsections, we will analyze how solving the Newton system approximately, rather than exactly, affects the convergence rate.

**3.1. Low Rank Newton Methods.** Let the eigenvalue decomposition of the Hessian be as follows:

$$
H = U\Lambda U^T = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i u_i u_i^T,
$$

(3.5)
where the eigenvalues $\lambda_i$ are sorted such that $|\lambda_i| \geq |\lambda_j|$ for all $i > j$, and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the corresponding eigenvectors. We consider the rank $r$ low rank approximation of $H$,

$$H_r = U_r \Lambda_r U_r^T = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i u_i u_i^T.$$  

(3.6)

The objective function is sensitive to perturbations to $w$ in directions corresponding to eigenvalues of large magnitude, because the energy landscape is sharply peaked in these directions. The objective function is insensitive to perturbations of $w$ in directions corresponding to eigenvalues of small magnitude, because the energy landscape is approximately flat in these directions. The magnitude of the eigenvalue $\lambda_i$ is related to how informative the data are to the component of $w$ in the $u_i$ direction; the larger the eigenvalue, the more information one can learn about the parameter in the associated eigenvector direction [3]. It is therefore important to resolve the subspace spanned by the dominant eigenvectors, while resolving the complementary subspace spanned by non-dominant eigenvectors is less important. We therefore consider low rank approximations to the Newton system.

The matrix $H_r$ has at most rank $r$, so the system $H_r p = -g$ is degenerate. For any $\gamma \neq -\lambda_i$, the matrix $H_r + \gamma I$ is invertible. This matrix arises in the case of Levenberg-Marquardt damping/trust region methods [27], or Tikhonov regularization.

$$[H_r + \gamma I]p_k = \hat{g}_k = \begin{cases} g_k & \text{Levenberg-Marquardt} \\ g_k + \gamma w_k & \text{Tikhonov regularization} \end{cases}$$  

(3.7)

Equation (3.7) can be efficiently solved using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$p_k = - \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma} I_d - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} U_r \left( \Lambda_r^{-1} + \frac{1}{\gamma} I_r \right)^{-1} U_r^T \right] \hat{g}_k.$$  

(3.8)

The method therefore interpolates between gradient descent and Newton’s method. In $\text{span}\{U_r\}$, the Newton direction is used. In $\text{span}\{U_r\}^\perp$, the preconditioned gradient direction is used.

### 3.1.1. Local convergence for the sub-sampled low rank Newton method.

Suppose that for each $w_k$ and $S_k$, we have the truncated eigenvalue decomposition for the experimental risk function $H^k_r = U_r \Lambda_r U_r^T$, and the iterates

$$w_{k+1} = w_k - \alpha_k [H_r^T + \gamma I]^{-1} \nabla F_{X_k}(w).$$  

(3.9)

**Theorem 3.2 (Local convergence of sub-sampled low rank Newton).** Let $\{w_k\}$ be the iterates generated by (3.9), and suppose that assumptions A1-A4 hold, then for each $k$

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq c_0 + c_1 \|w_k - w^*\| + c_2 \|w_k - w^*\|^2,$$  

(3.10)
where

\[ c_0 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma|} \left[ \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{X_k}} + |1 - \alpha_k||\nabla F(w_k)|| \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11a)

\[ c_1 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma|} \left[ |\lambda_{r+1,S_k}| + \gamma + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11b)

\[ c_2 = \frac{M}{2|\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma|}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11c)

Proof. This result follows immediately from Lemma (A.2) and Lemma (A.3) in Appendix A.2.

For fast convergence, we want the constants \( c_0, c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) to be as small as possible. The constant \( c_0 \) is small when the Monte Carlo approximation error for the gradient is small, and the full Newton step \( \alpha_k = 1 \) is taken. The constant \( c_1 \) has errors from both the Hessian Monte Carlo approximation, and the low rank Hessian approximation. When the Hessian is low rank, the low rank approximation error will be small. The Hessian is often low rank in machine learning applications [2, 13, 34]. We also observe that the Hessian is low rank in our numerical experiments. The constant \( c_2 \) will be small when the Hessian is well conditioned.

3.1.2. Randomized Low Rank Newton. In practice randomized algorithms can be used to determine the numerical rank of the Hessian and compute low rank factorizations of the Hessian efficiently [16]. Lanczos procedures are used in other machine learning applications, but we prefer randomized algorithms because they are robust to repeated eigenvalues [2, 9]. We present the randomized low rank Newton algorithm and then state a local convergence rate.

**Algorithm 1: Randomized Low Rank Newton**

1. Given \( w_0 \) and an oracle with functions \( g(w), H(w)v \)
2. while not converged do
   3. if \( \|g_k\| \leq \epsilon_g \) and \( \lambda_{\min}(H) \geq -\epsilon_H \) then
      4. break
   end
   6. Calculate \( U_r, \Lambda_r, U_r^T \approx H_r \) via randomized SVD [16]
   7. Calculate \( p_k = -\left[ \frac{1}{d} I_d - \frac{1}{d} U_r \left( \Lambda_r^{-1} + \frac{1}{d} I_r \right)^{-1} U_r^T \right] g_k \)
   8. \( \alpha_k \) given or computed via line search
   9. \( w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha_k p_k \)
3. end

**Theorem 3.3 (Local convergence of randomized low rank Newton).** Let \( \{w_k\} \) be the iterates generated by Algorithm (1), and suppose that assumptions A1-A4 hold, then for each \( k \)

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq c_0 + c_1 \|w_k - w^*\| + c_2 \|w_k - w^*\|^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)
where
\[ c_0 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_r,S_k + \gamma|} \left[ \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} + |1 - \alpha_k| \| \nabla F(w_k) \| \right] \] \hfill (3.13a)
\[ c_1 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_r,S_k + \gamma|} \left[ \left( 2 + 4 \sqrt{\frac{2d}{r-1}} \right) |\lambda_{r+1,S_k} + \gamma| + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} \right] \] \hfill (3.13b)
\[ c_2 = \frac{M}{2|\lambda_r,S_k + \gamma|} \] \hfill (3.13c)

\textbf{Proof.} This result follows immediately from Lemma (A.4) in Appendix A.2 and an argument similar to Theorem (3.2). \qed

The constant \( c_0 \) will be small when the gradient Monte Carlo error is small, and the full Newton step \( \alpha_k = 1 \) is taken. The constant \( c_1 \) will be small when the Hessian Monte Carlo error is small and the approximation of the Hessian by the randomized SVD is accurate. The constant \( c_2 \) will be small when the Hessian is well conditioned.

\subsection{3.1.3. Low Rank Saddle Free Newton.} Exact Newton rescales the negative gradient, component-wise in the Hessian eigen-basis by the corresponding eigenvalue,
\[ p = -H^{-1}g = -\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{\lambda_i}(g, u_i)u_i. \] \hfill (3.14)

When an eigenvalue is negative, the components of the gradient in this direction will change sign and point towards the saddle point, instead of away. Therefore exact Newton iterates may converge to saddle points. One remedy to this is the saddle free Newton algorithm, in which negative eigenvalues of the Hessian are flipped to be positive \[9, 14\]. In the saddle free Newton method, one solves \(|H|p = -g\), where \(|H| = U|\Lambda|U^T\). We propose a low rank version of this, using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula,
\[ p_k = -\left[ \frac{1}{\gamma} I_d - \frac{1}{\gamma r} U_r \left( |\Lambda_r|^{-1} + \frac{1}{\gamma} I_r \right)^{-1} U_r^T \right] g_k. \] \hfill (3.15)

When the Hessian is positive definite in \( \text{span}(U_r) \), this method is identical to Algorithm 1. In this case convergence will be similar to that of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3. The low rank saddle free Newton method will escape indefinite regions that low rank Newton will get stuck in.

\subsection{3.2. Inexact Newton-Krylov Methods.} Krylov methods are historically the method of choice for inexact Newton methods. In this section we discuss their extension to sub-sampled non-convex problems.

\textbf{Definition 3.4 (Krylov Subspace).} Given \( H : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( v \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we define the \( m \)th Krylov subspace is the linear subspace \( \mathcal{K}_m(H, v) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \)
\[ \mathcal{K}_m(H, v) = \text{span}\{v, Hv, \ldots, H^{m-1}v\}. \] \hfill (3.16)

Newton-Krylov methods approximate
\[ p = -H^{-1}g \approx p_m \in \mathcal{K}_m(H, -g) \] \hfill (3.17)
via a Galerkin projection. Similar to randomized low rank methods, Krylov methods only require the action of a matrix on vectors; access to the entries of the matrix is not required. For the sake of this work we will consider only conjugate gradients (CG) and the generalized minimal residual method (GMRES). The latter applies to indefinite matrices and the former can be adapted to indefinite matrices by a simple modification. A generic sub-sampled inexact Newton-Krylov method is described below.

**Algorithm 2: Inexact Newton-Krylov Methods**

1. Given \( w_0 \) and an oracle with functions \( g(w), H(w)v \)
2. while not converged do
3.   if \( \|g_k\| \leq \epsilon_g \) and \( \lambda_{\min}(H) \geq -\epsilon_H \) then
4.     break
5.   end
6.   Given \( \|g_k\| \) compute \( \eta_k \) via Eisenstat-Walker
7.   Solve \( \|H(w_k)p_k + g(w_k)\| \leq \eta_k\|g_k\| \) via a Krylov method (CG, GMRES)
8.   \( \alpha_k \) given or computed via line search
9.   \( w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha_k p_k \)
10. end

### 3.2.1. Local convergence rates.

In the case that CG is used for the linear solve, Bollapragada *et al* have derived the following convergence rate for the semi-stochastic case, in which the gradient is not sub-sampled [5].

**Theorem 3.5** (Local convergence of semi-stochastic inexact Newton CG, Lemma 3.1 Bollapragada *et al*). Suppose assumptions A1, A3 and A4 hold and the iterates \( \{w_k\} \) are generated by the Hessian sub-sampled inexact Newton CG method, the direction \( p_k \) is found in \( r \ll d \) steps, and \( \alpha_k = 1 \). Then,

\[
E_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq \frac{M}{2(\gamma - \epsilon_H)} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma}{(\gamma - \epsilon_H)\sqrt{|S_k|}} + 2\kappa_2^2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_2^2} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_2^2} + 1} \right)^r \right) \|w_k - w^*\| \tag{3.18}
\]

The reason this bound does not contain a constant error term is that Bollapragada *et al* only consider the semi-stochastic case. If the gradient were sub-sampled, as in the fully stochastic case, a constant error is incurred from the Monte Carlo approximation. If \( \alpha_k < 1 \) then a constant error term involving \( \|\nabla F(w_k)\| \) would be incurred, as in previous bounds. The term \( \uparrow \) involves the convergence rate of the CG algorithm with respect to the Krylov iteration \( r \). Convergence rates will often depend on the condition number of the matrix, which can be reduced via preconditioning. Beyond preconditioning, Krylov methods achieve enhanced convergence if the Hessian spectrum is clustered, as we will see in the next section. If the spectrum of \( H \) resides in an interval that does not include the origin, GMRES achieves superior convergence. We present the following result about the convergence rate of sub-sampled inexact Newton GMRES algorithm.

**Theorem 3.6** (Local convergence of sub-sampled inexact Newton GMRES). Suppose that assumptions A1 - A5 hold and we have that additionally for some \( \delta > 0, -\epsilon_H I \succeq \nabla^2 F_{S_k} \) for all \( S_k \) for all \( w \in B_\delta(w^*) \) and \( \gamma - \epsilon_H > 0 \). The iterates \( \{w_k\} \)
Let \( x_k \) be the \( k \)th CG iterate for solving \( Ax = b \). The following relationship holds:

\[
\|x_* - x_m\|_A^2 = \min_{q \in Q_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k q(\lambda_k)^2 (u_k^T e_0)^2
\]  

where \( e_0 = x_* - x_0 \).

**Theorem 3.8.** Let \( x_m \) be the \( m \)th GMRES iterate for solving \( Ax = b \). Then the following relationship holds:

\[
\|b - Ax_m\|^2 = \min_{q \in Q_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} q(\lambda_k)^2 (u_k^T b)^2
\]
These results are canonical (see for example [35]), we give short proofs in (B). When eigenvalues are clustered, a lower degree polynomial is better able to minimize either (3.24) or (3.25). This means that CG and GMRES will perform better than low rank approximations when the eigenvalues are clustered. Due to the extra $\lambda_k$ in equation (3.24) CG will more aggressively resolve the subspaces corresponding to large eigenvalues than the subspaces corresponding to eigenvalues (GMRES does not have this property).

3.2.3. Newton-Krylov methods and saddle points. Inexact Newton-Krylov methods can be made robust to saddle points. At a given Krylov iteration, an unnormalized Rayleigh quotient $v_m^T H v_m$ can be calculated for minimal extra cost (since $H v_m$ is already computed). If this quantity is negative, then the vector $v_m$ is concentrated in negative definite subspaces of $H$. Since the Newton update in these directions will point towards a saddle point, one can at this point break before updating in these directions. This yields a search direction consisting of the Newton direction in a dominant positive subspace, and the gradient direction in the complementary space. The drawback relative to saddle free Newton is that one can not accelerate the escaping of the saddle point as in saddle free Newton without extra line searching in the indefinite direction.

3.3. Affine Invariance and Globalization. A well known property of exact Newton methods is the affine invariance (scaling invariance property). Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a nonsingular matrix and $\hat{F}(w) = F(Aw)$. Then the Newton update is invariant under scaling transformations:

$$w_{k+1} = w_k - [\nabla^2 \hat{F}(w_k)]^{-1} \nabla \hat{F}(w_k)$$

$$= w_k - [A^T \nabla^2 F(Aw_k) A]^{-1} A^T \nabla F(Aw_k)$$

$$= w_k - A^{-1} [\nabla^2 F(Aw_k)]^{-1} \nabla F(Aw_k)$$ (3.26a)

$$Aw_{k+1} = Aw_k - [\nabla^2 F(Aw_k)]^{-1} \nabla F(Aw_k)$$ (3.26b)

In contrast, the gradient descent step is not scale invariant:

$$w_{k+1} = w_k - \alpha \nabla \hat{F}(w_k)$$ (3.27a)

$$Aw_{k+1} = Aw_k - \alpha A A^T \nabla F(Aw_k)$$. (3.27b)

In exact Newton the natural step length is $\alpha = 1$ and the method should generally be convergent for $\alpha \leq 1$ if the problem is sufficiently regular. In the case of gradient descent, the method is convergent for $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{L}$ where $L$ is the Lipschitz number for the Hessian. This number is generally not known a priori.

In inexact Newton methods, the Newton scaling will only be applied in subspaces of the Hessian. In other subspaces the gradient will not be rescaled by the eigenvalues and the scale invariance property will not hold. The full step $\alpha = 1$ may be taken when the problem at hand is sufficiently regular, and the dominant modes of the Hessian can be resolved in a lower dimensional subspace, and the Hessian is not changing too rapidly in parameter space. This is however not often the case when the problem is highly non-convex, or stochastic.

Moreover, in the stochastic setting globalization is not a practical constraint when there is significant variance in the underlying data. A candidate step may have sufficient descent over one batch of data, while being an ascent direction over another. Globalization via trust region or line search will only be meaningful to within the incurred Monte Carlo approximation error of the cost at the new location in parameter
space. Additionally, in the non-convex setting, guaranteeing strict monotonic descent of the cost may be overly restrictive, and force one to settle for suboptimal basins.

When not using globalization it is often useful to conceive of the problem as a discretization of the following dynamics,

\[
\frac{dw}{dt} = p(w). \tag{3.28}
\]

For \( p(w) = -\nabla F(w) \), (3.28) represents the local dynamics of gradient flow, for \( p(w) = -[\nabla^2 F(w)]^{-1} \nabla F(w) \) the dynamics are Newton flow. Local minima are stable points for these dynamics. If they are encountered, the gradient will be zero, thus making \( p(w) \) zero. Discretizing equation (3.28) in time via Explicit Euler we have

\[
w_{k+1} = w_k + \Delta t p(w_k). \tag{3.29}
\]

The problem is then finding \( \alpha_k = \Delta t \) such that the underlying dynamics are properly resolved. In what follows we use globalization for the inexact Newton methods and compare against gradient descent while employing line search. In the case of low rank saddle free Newton, line search leads to worse performance. We believe that the Krylov methods are able to approximately invert in a much larger subspace of the Hessian than the low rank saddle free Newton method due to their superiority in approximating matrices with clustered spectra (see Section 3.2.2). Low rank saddle free Newton may best be interpreted as a local approximation of saddle point dynamics, meant to point away from saddle points only in dominant subspaces. For this reason taking the full Newton step \( \alpha_k = 1 \) may not make sense as in the other inexact Newton methods.

\subsection*{3.4. Comparing costs: gradient vs Hessian.}

For a given iteration of a low rank Newton method with rank \( r \) and oversampling parameter \( p \), the number of neural sweeps used to construct the low rank Hessian approximation can be expressed as follows:

\[
\#(\text{Low Rank Hessian sweeps}) = 2C(r+p)|S_k|. \tag{3.30}
\]

Here \( C = 1, 2 \) depending on if single pass or double pass algorithms are used for randomized SVD. We use the double pass algorithm. The total neural network sweeps for this algorithm, including the cost of computing the gradient, is then

\[
\#(\text{Low Rank Newton sweeps}) = \left(|X_k| + 2C(r+p)|S_k|\right). \tag{3.31}
\]

The cost of the associated linear algebra will yield an additional \( O(dr^2+r^3) \) operations. For the inexact Newton-Krylov method with \( r \) Krylov iterations

\[
\#(\text{Inexact Newton-Krylov sweeps}) = \left(|X_k| + 2r|S_k|\right). \tag{3.32}
\]

Previous analysis (Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2, and Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.6) suggests that taking \( |X_k| \) large is important if one desires fast convergence. As for \( |S_k| \), Bollapragada et al use convergence rates similar to the ones presented in previous analysis to derive conditions on how to increase \( |S_k| \) to maintain super-linear convergence rates [5]. Since the computational cost will grow with this increase in
batch size, we take $|S_k| \ll |X_k|$ fixed. How large then, should $|S_k|$ be, so that the sub-sampled Hessian is representative of the true Hessian? Xu et al use Operator-Bernstein / Chernoff inequalities to derive probabilistic spectral convergence of the uniformly sub-sampled Hessian, that can be used to guide the choice of $|S_k|$.

**Theorem 3.9 (Complexity of Uniform Sampling, Lemma 4 Xu et al [40]).** Given $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$, and assume assumption A1 holds, let

$$|S_k| \geq \frac{16L^2}{\epsilon^2} \log \frac{2d}{\delta}$$

(3.33)

at any $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, suppose that the elements of $S_k$ are chosen uniformly at random, with or without replacement from $X$. Then the sub-sampled Hessian obeys the following probabilistic bound

$$\Pr\left(\|\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w) - \nabla^2 F(w)\| \leq \epsilon\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$  

(3.34)

In the next section, we will numerically show that the sub-sampled Hessian still provides a good approximation of the true Hessian, even when $|S_k|$ is small relative to $|X_k|$. This empirical observation in combination with (3.31) and (3.32) suggests that the per iteration cost of sub-sampled Newton is not substantially more than the per iteration cost of gradient descent. But sub-sampled Newton methods may reduce the cost function more per iteration.

4. **Numerical Experiments.** In various computer vision problems such as image classification, autoencoders are used to learn a low dimensional compressed representation of an image. We consider three data sets: MNIST, CIFAR10 and labeled faces in the wild (LFW) [17, 21, 22]. We study the convergence and generalization properties of low rank saddle free Newton (LRSFN), inexact Newton CG with early termination (INCG), and inexact Newton GMRES (INGMRES). We compare these Newton methods with standard deep learning methods such as gradient descent (GD), stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and Adam [20]. We investigate how well these optimizers are able to discover regions of parameter space associated with good generalization properties, and how much computational work these optimizers require. In each case the underlying problem is fixed and Tikhonov regularization is used. In addition to studying the convergence and generalization properties of these algorithms, we also study the dominant spectrum of the Hessian along the sequence of iterates generated by INCG. For each problem, we run the optimizers for a fixed number of neural network sweeps, and compare the testing and training errors.

For the Newton methods and gradient descent, we fix $X_k$ for each iteration. For the Newton methods $S_k$ is sub-sampled from $X_k$. In the case of Adam and SGD, mini batches of size $0.1|X_k|$ are sub-sampled from $X_k$. For the Newton Krylov methods and GD, a line search is performed at each iteration, and the associated neural network evaluations are counted. LRSFN does not perform as well with line search, as we will see in the MNIST example, so for the more difficult problems (CIFAR10 and LFW) $\alpha_k < 1$ is fixed, and we compare the method directly against SGD and Adam using the same step lengths.

When computationally feasible, we run many simulations for each problem starting from different initial guesses. At each iteration empirical risk is calculated against the training data and unseen testing data. When ensembling the runs we report sample averages and standard deviations for the minimum training and testing empirical
risks for each method. For a given run, we denote this quantity as $\hat{F}_k$. All neural
networks use softmax activation functions. Since we desire that the Hessian be Lipschitz (Assumption A3), we do not use non-smooth activation functions like ReLU. For each problem we train convolutional autoencoders with initial guesses $w_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. We take regularization parameter $\gamma = 0.1$. Run specifications for each data set are summarized in Table 4.1. Each convolutional kernel (filter) is square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MNIST</th>
<th>CIFAR10</th>
<th>LFW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>X_k</td>
<td>_{\text{train}}$</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>S_k</td>
<td>_{\text{test}}$</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>X_k</td>
<td>_{\text{test}}$</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_filters</td>
<td>[4,4,4,4]</td>
<td>[4,4,4,8,8,4,4,4]</td>
<td>[4,4,4,8,8,4,4,4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filter_sizes</td>
<td>[8,4,4,8]</td>
<td>[16,8,4,4,8,8,16]</td>
<td>[16,8,4,4,8,8,16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>12,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>_{\text{train}}$</td>
<td>(28)$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max sweeps</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Summary of run specifications for convolutional autoencoders

### 4.1. MNIST

In Table 4.2, using a line search at each iteration we see that INGMRES performed the best by a significant margin, followed by INCG, followed by GD, and followed by LRSFN. INCG had the least variance in the testing and training error. LRSFN had very high variance in the training and testing errors; in some cases most of the neural network sweeps were wasted on the line search and the method made little progress. This can be seen by the discrepancy between the means and medians for the LRSFN empirical risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>6.031e-02</td>
<td>1.333e-02</td>
<td>6.108e-02</td>
<td>1.344e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCG</td>
<td>5.837e-02</td>
<td>1.176e-02</td>
<td>5.856e-02</td>
<td>1.176e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGMRES</td>
<td><strong>5.183e-02</strong></td>
<td>1.791e-02</td>
<td><strong>5.202e-02</strong></td>
<td>1.799e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSFN $r = 20$</td>
<td>7.971e-02</td>
<td>5.102e-02</td>
<td>8.041e-02</td>
<td>5.123e-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>min($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>median($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>min($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th>median($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>3.048e-02</td>
<td>6.081e-02</td>
<td>3.079e-02</td>
<td>6.160e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCG</td>
<td>3.325e-02</td>
<td>6.074e-02</td>
<td>3.349e-02</td>
<td>6.092e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGMRES</td>
<td><strong>1.791e-02</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.970e-02</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.799e-02</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.025e-02</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSFN $r = 20$</td>
<td>3.182e-02</td>
<td>6.793e-02</td>
<td>3.189e-02</td>
<td>6.843e-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Summary for MNIST with line search over 50 different initial guesses

In Figure 4.1 we see that both INGMRES and INCG converge quickly to basins that they stay in. GD converges relatively quickly as well, and LRSFN found a basin similar to that of GD. The best parameters found by both LRSFN and GD were better than all regions in parameter space visited by INCG.
For the MNIST training problem the Hessian spectra cluster throughout training. As seen in Figure 4.2, the Hessian spectra calculated using training data match Hessian spectra calculated using testing data. This suggests that the dominant modes of the Hessian did not have too much variance, and that the Hessian training batch size was sufficiently large.

**4.2. CIFAR10.** Since LRSFN did not perform well with line search for the MNIST problem (Table 4.2), we do not perform line search using LRSFN for CIFAR10 and LFW. We perform two sets of tests for CIFAR10: methods with line search (GD, INCG), and methods with fixed step sizes (Adam, LRSFN, SGD). As seen in Table 4.3 INCG was able to find the best regions of parameter space with respect to both training and testing data on average, and it did so with the least variability.

| $|X_k| = 10000$, $|S_k| = 1000$, $d = 12315$, $|x| = 3(32)^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| mean($F_k$) train | std($F_k$) train | mean($F_k$) test | std($F_k$) test |
| GD | 4.345e+03 | 109.2 | 4.397e+03 | 106.0 |
| INCG | **4.230e+03** | **62.34** | **4.285e+03** | **59.77** |

Table 4.3: (Line search) Summary for CIFAR10 over 50 different initial guesses

As Table 4.4 shows, LRSFN was able to find better regions of parameter space on average, and also with significantly less variance. Both Adam and SGD did a
significant amount of overfitting. None of the three methods performed as well as the line search methods.

<p>| $X_k = 10000$, $S_k = 500$, $d = 12315$, $|x| = 3(32)^2$ |
|-----------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimizer</th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th># runs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>1.372e+03</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>5.202e+03</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSFN</td>
<td>3.293e+03</td>
<td><strong>29.55</strong></td>
<td>4.548e+03</td>
<td><strong>30.78</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGD</td>
<td><strong>8.264e+02</strong></td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>4.580e+03</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: (Fixed step length) Summary for CIFAR10 over 20 different initial guesses ($\alpha_k = 0.01$)

The variance in the Hessian spectra is evident in Figure 4.3. The training and testing Hessian spectra do not coincide, however they still do cluster, and the dominant eigenvalues got smaller as training proceeded.

4.3. LFW. Table 4.5 shows that INCG had the best generalization error, and with the least variance. GD found the best minima for the training empirical risk; however this led to over-fitting. LRSFN with fixed step length performed worse than INCG, but better than GD.

<p>| $X_k = 10000$, $S_k = 1000$, $d = 12315$, $|x| = 3(32)^2$ |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimizer</th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) train</th>
<th>mean($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th>std($\hat{F}_k$) test</th>
<th># runs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td><strong>1.184e+03</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.218</strong></td>
<td>5.215e+03</td>
<td>395.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCG</td>
<td>1.191e+03</td>
<td><strong>9.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.507e+03</strong></td>
<td><strong>192.8</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSFN $\alpha = 0.01$</td>
<td>1.193e+03</td>
<td><strong>9.49</strong></td>
<td>4.758e+03</td>
<td>481.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Summary for LFW over various different initial guesses
Figure 4.4 shows that the Hessian spectra are initially not low rank as in CIFAR10. Both of these problems are overdetermined, and cannot reduce the magnitude of the loss as in the case of MNIST. LFW remains high rank throughout the first 30 Newton iterations, in contrast to MNIST and CIFAR10.

4.4. Software. All of the code used for this paper can be found at https://github.com/tomoleary/hessianlearn, a python library for second order optimizers in tensorflow [1].

5. Conclusion. Sub-sampled inexact Newton methods have desirable convergence properties for stochastic non-convex optimization problems. In addition, they can be made computationally comparable to first order methods, and can attain superior generalization error. We presented analysis on sub-sampled low rank Newton methods, and sub-sampled inexact Newton Krylov methods. We derived convergence rates that characterize the errors incurred in sub-sampling the gradient and Hessian, in approximately solving the Newton linear system, and in choosing step length and regularization hyperparameters. Theory suggests that the Krylov methods would better approximate the Newton linear system for a given number of Hessian vector products, when clustering is prevalent in the Hessian spectrum. In the case of neural network training, we observed clustering of the Hessian spectrum in our numerical experiments, in agreement with other numerical experiments [2, 13, 34].

We performed numerical experiments on a set of three increasingly difficult convolutional autoencoder training problems (MNIST, CIFAR10 and LFW). In these experiments we found that inexact Newton Krylov methods performed the best. Inexact Newton CG and inexact Newton GMRES with line search performed the best for the MNIST autoencoder problem. Low rank saddle free Newton did not perform well with line search, however when fixed step lengths were taken it performed better than Adam and stochastic gradient descent. We observed Hessian spectral clustering for the MNIST and CIFAR10 problems, for the LFW problem which was severely overdetermined we did not observe clustering. In these problems, the inexact Newton Krylov methods outperformed low rank saddle free Newton, we believe this is due to the superior approximation of the spectral properties of the Hessian inherent in Krylov methods.
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Appendix A. Local Convergence Rate Estimates.

Lemma A.1. Suppose that assumption A1 holds, and choose $\alpha_k > 0$
\[
\|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \frac{M}{2} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + |1 - \alpha_k\|\|\nabla F(w_k)\| \tag{A.1}
\]

Proof.
\[
\|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k)\| = \|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \nabla F(w_k) + (1 - \alpha_k)\nabla F(w_k)\| \\
\leq \|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \nabla F(w_k)\| + |1 - \alpha_k|\|\nabla F(w_k)\| \tag{A.2}
\]

By a derivation in Lemma 2.2 in [5] that uses the Lipschitz continuity of the Hessian
we can bound term 1 by
\[
\|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \frac{M}{2} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 \tag{A.3}
\]
which yields
\[
\|\nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \frac{M}{2} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + |1 - \alpha_k|\|\nabla F(w_k)\| \tag{A.4}
\]

A.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.1 (Local convergence for sub-sampled inexact Newton methods with
gradient norm forcing). Suppose that assumptions A1-A4 hold, let
\[
\mu = \min \left\{ \|\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I\|^{-1}, \|\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I\|^{-1} \right\}, \tag{3.2}
\]
and assume that
(a) $w_k \in B_\delta(w^*)$ with $\delta < \frac{2\mu}{\epsilon_H}$,
(b) $-\epsilon_H I \preceq \nabla^2 F_{S_k}$ for all $S_k$ and for all $w \in B_\delta(w^*)$,
(c) The Tikhonov regularization parameter is chosen such that $\gamma > \epsilon_H$,
(d) $\|\nabla^2 F(w_k)p_k - \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \eta_k \|\nabla F(w_k)\|$ with $\eta_k \leq \|\nabla F(w_k)\|$.
Then for the iteration $w_{k+1} = w_k + \alpha_k p_k$, we have the following bound:
\[
E_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq c_0 + c_1 \|w_k - w^*\| + c_2 \|w_k - w^*\|^2, \tag{3.3}
\]
where
\[
c_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left[ \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right) + |1 - \alpha_k\|\|\nabla F(w_k)\| \right] \tag{3.4a}
\]
\[
c_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} + \frac{2\alpha_k v \mu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right) \tag{3.4b}
\]
\[
c_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{M}{2} + \alpha_k \mu^2 \right) \tag{3.4c}
\]
Proof.

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[||w_{k+1} - w^*||] \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}_k[||w_k - w^* - \alpha_k p_k||] \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)^{-1}(\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)p_k + \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k))||] \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] \]
\[ + \frac{\alpha_k}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)p||] \]
\[ \text{(A.5)} \]

Term 1 can be bounded as
\[ \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left[ \frac{M}{2} ||w_k - w^*||^2 + |1 - \alpha_k||\nabla F(w_k)|| + \frac{\sigma}{|S_k|}||w_k - w^*|| + \frac{\alpha_k \nu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right] \]
\[ \text{(A.6)} \]

by a combination of Lemma A.1 and Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 in [5]. For term 2 we have that by assumption

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)p||] \leq \eta_k \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] \]
\[ \text{(A.7)} \]

and then by the choice of \( \eta \)
\[ \eta_k \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] \leq \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||^2] \]
\[ \text{(A.8)} \]

by Jensen’s inequality. By a bound given in Theorem 2.1 in [5] we have the Monte Carlo approximation error

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla F(w_k)||^2] \leq \frac{\nu^2}{|X_k|} \]
\[ \text{(A.9)} \]

by the reverse triangle inequality we have

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||^2] \leq \left( ||\nabla F(w_k)|| + \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right)^2 \]
\[ \text{(A.10)} \]

by Lemma 1.2 in [11] we have that there exists \( \mu \) such that

\[ \mu = \min \left\{ ||\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I||^{-1}, ||[\nabla^2 F(w^*) + \gamma I]^{-1}|| \right\} \]
\[ \text{(A.11a)} \]

\[ ||\nabla F(w_k)|| \leq \mu ||w_k - w^*||. \]
\[ \text{(A.11b)} \]

So combining these we get

\[ \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||^2] \leq \mu^2 ||w_k - w^*||^2 + \frac{2\nu \mu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} ||w_k - w^*|| + \frac{\nu}{|X_k|} \]
\[ \text{(A.12)} \]
bringing it all together we have
\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_M} \left[ \left( \frac{M}{2} + \alpha_k \mu^2 \right) \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} + \frac{2\alpha_k \nu \mu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right) \|w_k - w^*\| + \frac{\alpha_k \nu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right] + 1 - \alpha_k \|\nabla F(w_k)\|
\] (A.13)

\hfill \Box

A.2. Convergence lemmas for low rank Newton.

**Lemma A.2.** Let \( \{w_k\} \) be the iterates generated by (3.9), with \( \alpha_k = 1 \), and suppose that assumptions A1-A3 hold, then for each \( k \)

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \left[ \left( \frac{M}{2} \right) \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + \|\nabla F(w_k)\| + \mathbb{E}_k[\|H_k^* + \gamma I\| (w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*)\| + \frac{\alpha_k \nu}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right) \right]
\] (A.14)

**Proof.**

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] = \mathbb{E}_k[\|w_k - w^* - \alpha_k [H_k^* + \gamma I]^{-1} (w_k) \nabla F_X (w_k)\|]
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_k[\|([H_k^* + \gamma I]^{-1} (H_k^* + \gamma I) (w_k) - \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k) - \alpha_k \nabla F_X (w_k) + \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k))\|]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \mathbb{E}_k[\|([H_k^* + \gamma I]^{-1} (H_k^* + \gamma I) (w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*) + \nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*) - \nabla F(w_k))\|]
\]

\[
+ \frac{\alpha_k}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\nabla F_X (w_k) - \nabla F(w_k)\|]
\] (A.15)

Therefore

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \left[ \|\nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F(w_k)\| \right.
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \mathbb{E}_k[\|H_k^* + \gamma I\| (w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*)\|]
\]

\[
+ \frac{\alpha_k}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\nabla F_X (w_k) - \nabla F(w_k)\|]
\] (A.16)

for term 1, a bound is given by Lemma A.1

\[
\frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \|\nabla^2 F(w_k) (w_k - w^*) - \nabla F(w_k)\| \leq \frac{M}{2\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_r, s_k + \gamma} \|\nabla F(w_k)\|
\] (A.17)

Term 3 can be bounded by Jensen’s inequality and a bound given in equation 2.11 in [3].

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\|\nabla F(w_k) - \nabla F_X (w_k)\|] \leq \frac{v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}}
\] (A.18)
so indeed
\[ E_k[\|w_{k+1} - w^*\|] \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma|} \left[ \frac{M}{2} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 + |1 - \alpha_k\|\nabla F(w_k)\| + \frac{\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} \right. \]
(A.19)

Lemma A.3. Bounds for exact truncated Hessian approx. Suppose that Assumptions A1 and A4 hold, then
\[ E_k[\|H_k + \gamma I\](w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*)\| \leq (\lambda_{r+1,S_k} + \gamma + \sum \sqrt{|S_k|}) \|w_k - w^*\| \]  
(A.20)

Proof. 
\[ E_k[\|H_k + \gamma I\](w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*)\| \leq \frac{\lambda_{r,S_k} + \gamma + \sum}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} \|w_k - w^*\| \]
(A.21)

The first term is bounded as
\[ E_k[\|H_k(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)\| (w_k - w^*)\| \leq (\lambda_{r+1,S_k} + \gamma) \|w_k - w^*\|^2 \]
(A.23)

since the largest eigenvalue of the matrix \((H_k - \nabla^2 F_{S_k})(w_k)\) is bounded by \(\lambda_{r+1,S_k}\). The second term is bounded by
\[ \sum \sqrt{|S_k|} \|w_k - w^*\|^2 \]
(A.24)

via Lemma 2.3 in [5] \[\square\]

Lemma A.4. Bounds for randomized truncated Hessian approx. Suppose that Assumptions A1 and A4 hold, and \(2 \leq r < \frac{d}{2}\), and \(\hat{H}_k \approx H_k\) is calculated via randomized SVD, with random matrices drawn from a Gaussian probability measure \(\mu\).
\[ E_k[\|\hat{H}_k + \gamma I\](w_k) - \nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*)\| \leq \left( 2 + \frac{d}{r - 1} \right) |\lambda_{r+1,S_k} + \gamma | \|w_k - w^*\| \]
(A.26)
The first term is bounded as
\[
\mathbb{E}_k \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mu \| (\tilde{H}_k(w_k) + \gamma I) - \nabla^2 F(w_k)(w_k - w^*) \| \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \mathbb{E}_\mu \| (\tilde{H}_k(w_k) + \gamma I) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) \| \right] \\
+ \mathbb{E}_k \| (\nabla^2 F(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k))(w_k - w^*) \| \tag{A.27}
\]

By 1.11 in [16]. The second term is bounded by
\[
\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} \| w_k - w^* \|, \tag{A.31}
\]
via Lemma 2.3 in [5] \(\Box\)

**A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.6.**

**Theorem 3.6** (Local convergence of sub-sampled inexact Newton GMRES). Suppose that assumptions A1 - A5 hold and we have that additionally for some \(\delta > 0\), 
\[-\epsilon_H I \preceq \nabla^2 F_{S_k} \text{ for all } S_k \text{ for all } w \in B_k(w^*) \text{ and } \gamma - \epsilon_H > 0. \]
The iterates \(\{w_k\}\) generated by the sub-sampled inexact Newton GMRES method, and the direction \(p_k^*\) is found in \(r \ll d\) steps. Then,
\[
\mathbb{E}_k[\| w_{k+1} - w^* \|] \leq c_0 + c_1 \| w_k - w^* \| + c_2 \| k - w^* \|^2 \tag{3.19}
\]

where
\[
c_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{\alpha_k v}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} + \frac{\alpha_k \epsilon g L_\beta}{(\gamma - \epsilon_H)^2 |C_{m}(\frac{3}{2})|} + |1 - \alpha_k|\| \nabla F(w_k) \| \right) \tag{3.20a}
\]
\[
c_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left( \frac{\alpha_k^2}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} + \frac{\alpha_k^2 L_\beta^2}{(\gamma - \epsilon)^2 |C_{m}(\frac{3}{2})|} \right) \tag{3.20b}
\]
\[
c_2 = \frac{M}{2(\gamma - \epsilon_H)} \tag{3.20c}
\]

where
\[
a = (L_\beta - \gamma + \epsilon_H) + 2\epsilon, \quad e = \frac{1}{2}(L_\beta + \gamma - \epsilon_H), \quad d = \frac{1}{2}(L_\beta - \gamma + \epsilon_H) \tag{3.21}
\]
and $C_m$ is the $m^{th}$ order Chebyshev polynomial.

Proof.

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[||w_{k+1} - w^*||] \\
= \mathbb{E}_k[||w_k - w^* - \alpha_k p_k^*||] \\
= \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)^{-1}(\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k) + \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k))||] \\
\leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] + \frac{\alpha_k}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)p_k^*||] \\
\text{term 1} \quad \text{term 2} \quad (A.32)
\]

Term 1 can be bounded as

\[
\frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)(w_k - w^*) - \alpha_k \nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)||] \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left[ \frac{M}{2} ||w_k - w^*||^2 + |1 - \alpha_k||\nabla F(w_k)|| + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} ||w_k - w^*|| + \frac{\alpha_k \epsilon g}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} \right] \\
\text{(A.33)}
\]

by a combination of Lemma A.1, and Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 in [5]. For term 2 we have due to proposition 6.33 in [32]

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(w_k)p_k^*||] \leq \frac{L_{\beta}}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \frac{C_m(\frac{2}{\gamma})}{C_m(\frac{2}{\gamma})} ||\nabla F_{X_k}|| \\
\text{(A.34)}
\]

The last bound is given by the mean value theorem and Hessian spectral bound for $\beta = |X_k|$ from assumption A1, and the property for the sample $X_k$ gradient at the minimum

\[
||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k)|| = ||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla F_{X_k}(w^*) + \nabla F_{X_k}(w^*)|| \\
\leq ||\nabla F_{X_k}(w_k) - \nabla F_{X_k}(w^*)|| + ||\nabla F_{X_k}(w^*)|| \\
\leq L_{\beta} ||w_k - w^*|| + \epsilon g. \\
\text{(A.35)}
\]

Putting it all together we have

\[
\mathbb{E}_k[||w_{k+1} - w^*||] \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \epsilon_H} \left[ \frac{M}{2} ||w_k - w^*||^2 + |1 - \alpha_k||\nabla F(w_k)|| \\
+ \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{|S_k|}} + \frac{\alpha_k L_{\beta}^2}{(\gamma - \epsilon_H)^2 |C_m(\frac{2}{\gamma})|} \right) ||w_k - w^*|| \\
+ \left( \frac{\alpha_k \epsilon g L_{\beta}}{\sqrt{|X_k|}} + \frac{\alpha_k \epsilon g L_{\beta}}{(\gamma - \epsilon_H)^2 |C_m(\frac{2}{\gamma})|} \right) \right] \\
\text{(A.36)}
\]

\[\square\]

Appendix B. Polynomials and Krylov Spaces.

Note that generally for $x \in K_m(A, v)$, we can express it as

\[
x = c_0 v + c_1 A v + \ldots + c_{m-1} A^{m-1} v \\
= (c_0 I + c_1 A + \ldots + c_{m-1} A^{m-1}) v = p(A) v \\
\text{(B.1)}
\]
for some $p \in \mathbb{P}_{m-1}$. When $A$ is positive definite, the quadratic form $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax - b^T x$ is bounded below. The minimizer of this quadratic form satisfies $Ax = b$. CG builds the approximation $x_m$ in $K_m(A, r_0)$ where $r_0 = b - Ax_0$ with the the property that the iterates minimize $\phi$ in each sequential Krylov subspace [12]. This is equivalent to the condition

$$x_m = \arg \min_{x \in x_0 + K_m(A, r_0)} \|x_s - x\|_A^2$$

(B.2)

where $\|y\|_A^2 = y^T Ay$ is the $A$-norm or energy-norm.

Proof of Theorem (3.7) (similar to results in [32] and [35]):

Proof. Given $x \in x_0 + K_m(A, r_0)$ by (B.1) we may represent it as

$$x = x_0 + p(A)r_0$$

(B.3)

for some $p \in \mathbb{P}_{m-1}$. Note that $r_0 = b - Ax_0 = Ax_s - Ax_0 = Ae_0$, we may then express $x_s - x$ as

$$x_s - x = e_0 - p(A)Ae_0 = \underbrace{(I - p(A)A)}_{q(A)} e_0 = q(A)e_0,$$

(B.4)

where $q \in \mathbb{P}_m$ is defined as

$$q(s) = 1 - sp(s) \quad \text{and} \quad q(0) = 1$$

(B.5)

so $q \in Q_m$. This establishes bijections between $K_m(A, r_0), \mathbb{P}_{m-1}$ and $Q_m$. From (B.2) we have

$$\|e_m\|_A^2 = \min_{x \in x_0 + K_m(A, r_0)} \|x_s - x\|_A^2 = \min_{q \in Q_m} \|q(A)e_0\|_A^2.$$  

(B.6)

Representing $e_0$ on the eigenbasis for $A$ ($A = U\Lambda U^T$) diagonalizes $q(A)$. We have then that

$$e_m = q(A)e_0$$

(B.7a)

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n} q(\lambda_k)(u_k^T e_0)u_k$$

(B.7b)

$$Ae_m = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k q(\lambda_k)(u_k^T e_0)u_k$$

(B.7c)

$$e_m^T Ae_m = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k q(\lambda_k)^2(u_k^T e_0)^2$$

(B.7d)

The $m^{th}$ iterate of MINRES is characterized as the unique point $x_m \in K_m(A, b)$ such that $\ell^2$ norm of the residual is minimal [28]:

$$x_m = \arg \min_{x \in K_m(A, b)} \|b - Ax\|^2.$$

(B.8)

Proof of Theorem (3.8) (adapted from [3]):
Proof. Given $x \in K_m(A,b)$, and employing (B.1) we can express the residual as

$$b - Ax = b - Ap(A)b = (I - Ap(A)) b = q(A)b.$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.9)

$q \in P_m$ is defined as

$$q(s) = 1 - sp(s) \text{ and } q(0) = 1 \hspace{1cm} \text{(B.10)}$$

so $q \in Q_m$. This establishes bijections between $K_m(A,b), P_{m-1}$ and $Q_m$. Applying (B.8) we have

$$\|b - Ax_m\|^2 = \min_{x \in K_m(A,b)} \|b - Ax\|^2 = \min_{q \in Q_m} \|q(A)b\|^2. \hspace{1cm} \text{(B.11)}$$

Expanding $x$ and $b$ on the eigenbasis for $A (A = U\Lambda U^T)$ diagonalizes $q(A)$. The matrix polynomial optimization problem is then equivalent to a scalar polynomial optimization problem over the eigenvalues of $A$. This gives

$$\min_{q \in Q_m} \|q(A)b\|^2 = \min_{q \in Q_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} q(\lambda_k)^2 (u_k^Tb)^2. \hspace{1cm} \text{(B.12)}$$

\hfill $\Box$