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Abstract

Various gradient compression schemes have been proposed to mitigate the communication cost in distributed training of large scale machine learning models. Sign-based methods, such as signSGD [3], have recently been gaining popularity because of their simple compression rule and connection to adaptive gradient methods, like ADAM. In this paper, we perform a general analysis of sign-based methods for non-convex optimization. Our analysis is built on intuitive bounds on success probabilities and does not rely on special noise distributions nor on the boundedness of the variance of stochastic gradients. Extending the theory to distributed setting within a parameter server framework, we assure variance reduction with respect to number of nodes, maintaining 1-bit compression in both directions and using small mini-batch sizes. We validate our theoretical findings experimentally.

1 Introduction

One of the key factors behind the success of modern machine learning models is the availability of large amounts of training data [5, 12, 21]. However, the state-of-the-art deep learning models deployed in industry typically rely on datasets too large to fit the memory of a single computer, and hence the training data is typically split and stored across a number of compute nodes capable of working in parallel. Training such models then amounts to solving optimization problems of the form

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} f_m(x),$$

(1)

where $f_m : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents the non-convex loss of a deep learning model parameterized by $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ associated with data stored on node $m$.

Arguably, stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [20] in of its many variants [11, 7, 22, 31, 9] is the most popular algorithm for solving (1). In its basic implementation, all workers $m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$ in parallel compute a random approximation $\hat{g}^m(x_k)$ of $\nabla f_m(x_k)$, known as the stochastic gradient. These approximations are then sent to a master node which performs the aggregation

$$\hat{g}(x_k) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \hat{g}^m(x_k).$$

The aggregated vector is subsequently broadcast back to the nodes, each of which performs an update of the form

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \gamma_k \hat{g}(x_k),$$

thus updating their local copies of the parameters of the model.

1.1 Gradient compression

Typically, communication of the local gradient estimators $\hat{g}^m(x_k)$ to the master forms the bottleneck of such a system [23, 32, 13]. In an attempt to alleviate this communication bottleneck, a number
The simplest among these sign-based methods is signSGD (see also Algorithm 1; Option 1). We now summarize the main contributions of this work. Our key results are summarized in Table 1.

### 1.2 Contributions

The key novelty of our methods is in a substantial relaxation of the requirements that need to be imposed on the gradient estimator \( \hat{g}(x_k) \) of the true gradient \( \nabla f(x_k) \). In sharp contrast...
with existing approaches, we allow \( \hat{g}(x_k) \) to be biased. Remarkably, we only need one additional and rather weak assumption on \( \hat{g}(x_k) \) for the methods to provably converge: we require the signs of the entries of \( \hat{g}(x_k) \) to be equal to the signs of the entries of \( \nabla f(x^k) \) with a probability strictly larger than \( \frac{1}{2} \) (see Section 2, Assumption 1). We show through a counterexample (see Section 2.2) that this assumption is necessary.

- **Geometry.** As a byproduct of our analysis, we uncover a mixed \( l^1-l^2 \) geometry of sign descent methods (see Section 4).
- **Convergence theory.** We perform a complexity analysis of methods (2) and (3) (see Section 3.1, Theorem 1). While our complexity bounds have the same \( \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\pi}) \) dependence on the number of iterations, they have a better dependence on the smoothness parameters associated with \( f \). Theorem 1 is the first result on signSGD for non-convex functions which does not rely on mini-batching, and which allows for step sizes independent of the total number of iterations \( K \). Finally, Theorem 1 in [4] can be recovered from our general Theorem 1. Our bounds are cast in terms of a novel norm-like function, which we call the \( \rho \)-norm, which is a weighted \( l^1 \) norm with positive variable weights.
- **Distributed setup.** We extend our results to the distributed setting with arbitrary \( M \) (Section 4.2), where we also consider sign-based compression of the aggregated gradients.

# 2 Success Probabilities and Gradient Noise

In this section we describe our key (and weak) assumption on the gradient estimator \( \hat{g}(x) \) of the true gradient \( \nabla f(x) \), and give an example which shows that without this assumption, method (2) can fail.

## 2.1 Success Probability Bounds

**Assumption 1 (SPB: Success Probability Bounds).** For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we have access to an independent (and not necessarily unbiased) estimator \( \hat{g}(x) \) of the true gradient \( g(x) := \nabla f(x) \) that satisfies

\[
\rho_i := \text{Prob}(\text{sign } \hat{g}_i(x) = \text{sign } g_i(x)) > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{if } g_i \neq 0
\]

for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and all \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\} \).

We will refer to the probabilities \( \rho_i \) as success probabilities. As we will see, they play a central role in the convergence of sign based methods. We stress that Assumption 1 is the only assumption on gradient noise in this paper. Moreover, we argue that it is reasonable to require from the sign of stochastic gradient to show true gradient direction more likely than the opposite one. Extreme cases of this assumption are the absence of gradient noise, in which case \( \rho_i = 1 \), and an overly noisy stochastic gradient, in which case \( \rho_i \approx \frac{1}{2} \).

**Remark 1.** Assumption 1 can be relaxed by replacing bounds (4) with

\[
\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\hat{g}_i(x) \cdot g_i(x))] > 0, \quad \text{if } g_i(x) \neq 0.
\]

However, if \( \text{Prob}(\text{sign } \hat{g}_i(x) = 0) = 0 \) (e.g. in the case of \( \hat{g}_i(x) \) has continuous distributions), then these two bounds are identical.

**Extension to stochastic sign oracle.** Notice that we do not require \( \hat{g} \) to be unbiased. Moreover, we do not assume uniform boundedness of the variance, or of the second moment. This observation allows to extend existing theory to more general sign-based methods with a stochastic sign oracle.

By a stochastic sign oracle we mean an oracle that takes \( x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d \) as an input, and outputs a random vector \( \hat{s}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d \) with entries in \( \pm 1 \). However, for the sake of simplicity, in the rest of the paper we will work with the signSGD formulation, i.e., we let \( \hat{s}_k = \text{sign } \hat{g}(x_k) \).

## 2.2 A counterexample to SIGNSGD

Here we analyze a counterexample to signSGD discussed in [15]. Consider the following least-squares problem with unique minimizer \( x^* = (0, 0) \):

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \langle a_1, x \rangle^2 + \langle a_2, x \rangle^2 \right], \quad a_1 = \left[ \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right], \quad a_2 = \left[ \frac{-1 + \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right],
\]
Theorem 1 implies that no assumption on the noise distribution is required beyond unbiasedness.

We now investigate the cause of the divergence. In this counterexample, Assumption 1 is violated. Indeed, note that

\[
\text{sign} \, \hat{g}(x) = (-1)^i \text{sign}(a_i, x) \left\lfloor \frac{-1}{2} \right\rfloor \quad \text{with probabilities} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

By \( S := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \langle a_1, x \rangle \cdot \langle a_2, x \rangle > 0 \} \neq \emptyset \) denote the open cone of points having either an acute or an obtuse angle with both \( a_i \)'s. Then for any \( x \in S \), the sign of the stochastic gradient is \((1, -1)\) with probabilities \(1/2\). Hence for any \( x \in S \), we have low success probabilities:

\[
\rho_i(x) = \text{Prob} (\text{sign} \, \hat{g}_i(x) = \text{sign} \, g_i(x)) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

So, in this case we have an entire conic region with low success probabilities, which clearly violates (4). Furthermore, if we take a point from the complement open cone \( S^c \), then the sign of stochastic gradient equals to the sign of gradient, which is perpendicular to the axis of \( S \) (thus in the next step of the iteration we get closer to \( S \)). For example, if \( \langle a_1, x \rangle < 0 \) and \( \langle a_2, x \rangle > 0 \), then \( \text{sign} \, \hat{g}(x) = (1, -1) \) with probability 1, in which case \( x - \gamma \text{sign} \, \hat{g}(x) \) gets closer to low success probability region \( S \).

In summary, in this counterexample there is a conic region where the sign of the stochastic gradient is useless (or behaves adversarially), and for any point outside that region, moving direction (which is the opposite of the sign of gradient) leads toward that conic region.

2.3 Sufficient conditions for SPB

To justify our SPB assumption, we show that it holds under general assumptions on gradient noise.

**Lemma 1 (see [3.4].)** Assume that for any point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we have access to an independent and unbiased estimator \( \hat{g}(x) \) of the true gradient \( g(x) \). Assume further that each coordinate \( \hat{g}_i \) has a unimodal and symmetric distribution with variance \( \sigma_i^2 = \sigma_i^2(x) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq d \). Then \( \rho_i \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{|g_i|}{|g_i| + \sqrt{3} \sigma_i} \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{if} \quad g_i \neq 0. \)

Next, we remove the distribution condition and add a condition on the variance bounds.

**Lemma 2 (see [3.4]).** Assume that for any point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we have access to an independent, unbiased estimator \( \hat{g}(x) \) of the true gradient \( g(x) \), with coordinate-wise bounded variances \( \sigma_i(x) \leq c_i |g_i(x)| \) for some constants \( 0 \leq c_i < 1/\sqrt{2} \). Then \( \rho_i \geq 1 - c_i^2 > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{if} \quad g_i \neq 0. \)

**Remark 2.** The strict condition of a variance bound is not supported very well, since vanishing the variance at stationary points could trap the algorithm at saddle points. Indeed, saddle points are not stable and randomness in stochastic gradient helps the algorithm to escape from the saddle points [8]. However, considering convergence to just stationary points, this lemma together with Theorem 1 implies that no assumption on the noise distribution is required beyond unbiasedness and a variance bound (neither unimodality nor symmetricity of the noise distribution is required). Moreover, one can still ensure convergence with only unbiasedness and standard variance bound, \( \sigma_i(x) \leq c_i |g_i(x)| + \tilde{c}_i \), by increasing the mini-batch size and decreasing the step-sizes enough (see Theorem 1 in [3.3]).

3 A New “Norm” for Measuring the Size of the Gradients

In this section we introduce the concept of a norm-like function, which call \( \rho \)-norm, induced from success probabilities. Used to measure gradients in our convergence rates, \( \rho \)-norm is a technical tool enabling the analysis.

**Definition 1 (\( \rho \)-norm).** Let \( \rho := \{ \rho_i(x) \}_{i=1}^d \) be the collection of probability functions from the SPB assumption. We define the \( \rho \)-norm of gradient \( g(x) \) via \( \| g(x) \|_\rho := \sum_{i=1}^d (2\rho_i(x) - 1) |g_i(x)| \).

Note that \( \rho \)-norm is not a norm as it may not be positively homogeneous, and may not satisfy the triangle inequality. However, \( \rho \)-norm is always positive definite as it is a weighted \( l^1 \) norm with
(Algorithm 1 with Option 1) with step sizes $\gamma$.

We now state our convergence result for Algorithm 1 under the general SPB assumption.

Algorithm 1

1. **Input:** step size $\gamma_k$, current point $x_k$
2. $\hat{g}_k \leftarrow$ StochasticGradient($x_k$)
3. **Option 1:** $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k - \gamma_k \text{ sign } \hat{g}_k$
4. **Option 2:** $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg \min \{ f(x_k), f(x_k - \gamma_k \text{ sign } \hat{g}_k) \}$

**Theorem 1** (Non-convex convergence of signSGD, see [3, 4]). Under the SPB assumption, signSGD (Algorithm 1 with Option 1) with step sizes $\gamma_k = \gamma_0/\sqrt{k} + 1$ converges as follows

$$
\min_{0 \leq k < K} \mathbb{E} \| \nabla f(x_k) \|_\rho \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{\|f(x_0) - f^*\|_\rho}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 d \bar{L} \right] + \frac{\gamma_0 d \bar{L} \log K}{\sqrt{K}}.
$$

4 Convergence Theory

Now we turn to our theoretical results of sign based methods. First we give our general convergence results under the SPB assumption. Afterwards, we present convergence result in the distributed setting under the unimodal and symmetric noise assumptions.

Throughout the paper we assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower bounded, i.e., $f(x) \geq f^*$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and is $L$-smooth with some non-negative constants $L = [L_1, \ldots, L_d]$. That is, we assume that $f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{L_i}{2} (y_i - x_i)^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We allow $f$ to be nonconvex. Let $L := \frac{1}{d} \sum L_i$ and $L_{\max} = \max_i L_i$.

4.1 Convergence Analysis for $M = 1$

We now state our convergence result for Algorithm 1 under the general SPB assumption.

Figure 1: Contour plots of the $l^{1,2}$ norm [5] at 4 different scales with fixed noise $\sigma = 1$. positive (and variable) weights $2 \rho_i(x) - 1 > 0$. That is, $\|g\|_\rho \geq 0$, and $\|g\|_\rho = 0$ if and only if $g = 0$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 2, $\rho$-norm can be lower bounded by a weighted $l^1$ norm with positive constant weights $1 - 2c_i^2 > 0$: $\|g\|_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^d (2 \rho_i - 1) |g_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - 2c_i^2) |g_i|$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, $\rho$-norm can be lower bounded by a mixture of the $l^1$ and squared $l^2$ norms:

$$
\|g\|_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^d (2 \rho_i - 1) |g_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{g_i^2}{|g_i| + \sqrt{3}c_i} := \|g\|_{1,2}.
$$

Note that $l^{1,2}$-norm is again not a norm. However, it is positive definite, continuous and order preserving, i.e., for any $g^k, g, \tilde{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have: i) $\|g\|_{1,2} \geq 0$ and $\|g\|_{1,2} = 0$ if and only if $g = 0$; ii) $g^k \to g$ (in $l^2$ sense) implies $\|g^k\|_{1,2} \to \|g\|_{1,2}$, and iii) $0 \leq g_i \leq \tilde{g}_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d$ implies $\|g\|_{1,2} \leq \|g\|_{1,2}$. From these three properties it follows that $\|g^k\|_{1,2} \to 0$ implies $g^k \to 0$. These properties are important as we will measure convergence rate in terms of the $l^{1,2}$ norm in the case of unimodal and symmetric noise assumption. To understand the nature of the $l^{1,2}$ norm, consider the following two cases when $\sigma_i(x) \leq c_1 |g_i(x)| + c_2$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$. If the iterations are in $\varepsilon$-neighbourhood of a minimizer $x^*$ with respect to the $l^\infty$ norm (i.e., $\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |g_i| \leq \varepsilon$), then the $l^{1,2}$ norm is equivalent to scaled $l^2$ norm squared:

$$
\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{3}c_1}} \|g\|_2^2 \leq \|g\|_{1,2} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{3}c_2}} \|g\|_2.
$$

On the other hand, if iterations are away from a minimizer (i.e., $\min_{1 \leq i \leq d} |g_i| \geq L$), then the $l^{1,2}$-norm is equivalent to scaled $l^1$ norm:

$$
\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{3}c_1}} \|g\|_1 \leq \|g\|_{1,2} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{3}c_2}} \|g\|_1.
$$

These equivalences are visible in Figure 1, where we plot the layer sets of $g \mapsto \|g\|_{1,2}$ at various distances from the origin.
If $\gamma_k \equiv \gamma > 0$, we get $\frac{1}{K}$ convergence to a neighbourhood of the solution:

$$
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_k)\|_\rho \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma K} + \frac{4L}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}\mathbb{1}.
$$

We now comment on the above result:

- **Generalization.** Theorem 1 is the first general result on signSGD for non-convex functions without mini-batching, and with step sizes independent of the total number of iterations $K$. Known convergence results [3, 4] on signSGD use mini-batches and/or step sizes dependent on $K$. Moreover, they also use unbiasedness and unimodal symmetric noise assumptions, which are stronger assumptions than our SPB assumption (see Lemma 1). Finally, Theorem 1 in [4] can be recovered from Theorem 1 (see Section C for the details).

- **Convergence rate.** Rates (6) and (7) can be arbitrarily slow, depending on the probabilities $\rho_i$. This is to be expected. At one extreme, if the gradient noise was completely random, i.e., if $\rho_i \equiv 1/2$, then the $\rho$-norm would become identical zero for any gradient vector and rates would be trivial inequalities, leading to divergence as in the counterexample. At other extreme, if there was no gradient noise, i.e., if $\rho_i \equiv 1$, then the $\rho$-norm would be just the $l^1$ norm and from (6) we get the rate $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{K})$ with respect to the $l^1$ norm. However, if we know that $\rho_i > 1/2$, then we can ensure that the method will eventually converge.

- **Geometry.** The presence of the $\rho$-norm in these rates suggests that there is no particular geometry (e.g., $l^1$ or $l^2$) associated with signSGD. Instead, the geometry is induced from the success probabilities. For example, in the case of unbiased and unimodal symmetric noise, the geometry is described by the mixture norm $l^{1/2}$.

- **Practicality.** The rate (7) (as well as (37)) supports the common learning schedule practice of using a constant step size for a period of time, and then halving the step-size and repeating this process.

For a reader interested in comparing Theorem 1 with a standard result for SGD, we state the standard result in the Section C. We now state a general convergence rate for Algorithm 1 with Option 2.

**Theorem 2** (see B.4). Under the SPB assumption, Algorithm 1 (Option 2) with step sizes $\gamma_k = \gamma_0 / \sqrt{K + 1}$ and mini-batch size $b = 1$ converges as follows:

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0 \bar{L}} + \gamma_0 n \tilde{L} \right].
$$

In the case of constant step size $\gamma_k = \gamma > 0$, the same rate as (7) is achieved.

Comparing Theorem 2 with Theorem 1, notice that a small modification in Algorithm 1 can remove the log-dependent factor from (6); we then bound the average of past gradient norms instead of the minimum. On the other hand, in a big data regime, function evaluations in Algorithm 1 (Option 2, line 4) are infeasible.

### 4.2 Convergence Analysis in Distributed Setting

**Algorithm 2** DISTRIBUTED SIGNSGD WITH MAJORITY VOTE

```plaintext
1: Input: step sizes $\{\gamma_k\}$, current point $x_k$, # of nodes $M$
2: on each node
3: $\hat{g}^m(x_k) \leftarrow$ StochasticGradient($x_k$)
4: on server
5: pull sign $\hat{g}^m(x_k)$ from each node
6: push sign $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \text{sign} \: \hat{g}^m(x_k)$ to each node
7: on each node
8: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k - \gamma_k \text{sign} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{M} \text{sign} \: \hat{g}^m(x_k) \right]
```

In this part we present the convergence result of distributed signSGD (Algorithm 2) with majority vote introduced in [3]. Majority vote is considered within a parameter server framework, where for each coordinate parameter server receives one sign from each node and sends back the sign sent by the
majority of nodes. Known convergence results [3, 4] use $O(K)$ mini-batch size as well as $O(1/K)$ constant step size. In the sequel we remove this limitations extending Theorem 1 to distributed training.

Instead of general SPB assumption, here we assume the sufficient assumption from Lemma 1 that is unbiasedness and unimodal symmetric gradient noise assumptions. As we have seen, under this assumptions, the geometry describing the convergence is mixed $l_{1,2}^d$ norm. In distributed setting the number of nodes $M$ get involved in geometry introducing new $l_{1,2}^d$ norm.

**Definition 2.** Let $M \geq 1$ be the number of nodes. Define $l_{1,2}^d$ norm of gradient $g(x)$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$
\|g\|_{l_{1,2}^d}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\sigma_i^2}{|g_i + \phi(M)\sigma_i|},
$$

where $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma_i^2(x)$ is the variance of $i$-th component of stochastic gradient and

$$
\phi(2l - 1) = \phi(2l) = \sqrt{3} 4^{l-1} B(l, l) \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{l}, \quad l = 1, 2, \ldots.
$$

Now we can state the convergence rate of distributed signSGD with majority vote.

**Theorem 3** (Non-convex convergence of distributed signSGD, see [5, 6]). Assume that each component of gradient noise is unimodal and symmetric, denote by $\sigma_i^2(x)$ the variance of $i$-th component at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then Algorithm 2 with step sizes $\gamma_k = \gamma_0/\sqrt{K + 1}$ converges as follows

$$
\min_{0 \leq k < K} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_k)\|_{l_{1,2}^d}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\lambda} + \gamma_0 nL \right] + \frac{\gamma_0 \log K}{\gamma_0}.
$$

For constant step sizes $\gamma_k \equiv \gamma > 0$, we have convergence up to a level proportional to step size $\gamma$: 

$$
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_k)\|_{l_{1,2}^d}^2 \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma K} + \frac{L \gamma}{2}.
$$

**Variance Reduction.** As expected, increasing the number of nodes reduces variance by a factor of roughly $1/\sqrt{M}$. Function $\phi$ describing the variance reduction involves a special function $B$ (called beta function). Approximation in (9) is quite tight and is obtained from Stirling’s approximation. The proof and plot of tightness are in the supplements (see [8, 9]).

**Number of nodes.** It can be seen from (9) that theoretically there is no difference between $2l - 1$ and $2l$ nodes, and this in not a limitation of the analysis. Indeed, as it is shown in the proof, expected sign vector at the master with $M = 2l - 1$ nodes is the same as with $M = 2l$ nodes:

$$
\mathbb{E}\text{sign}(\hat{g}_i^{(2l-1)} \cdot g_i) = \mathbb{E}\text{sign}(\hat{g}_i^{(2l)} \cdot g_i),
$$

where $\hat{g}^{(M)}$ is the sum of stochastic sign vectors aggregated from nodes. The intuition behind this phenomenon is that majority vote with even number of nodes, e.g. $M = 2l$, fails to provide any sign with little probability (it is the probability of half nodes voting for $+1$, and half nodes voting for $-1$). However, if we remove one node, e.g. $M = 2l - 1$, then master receives one sign-vote less but gets rid of that little probability of failing the vote (sum of odd number of $\pm 1$ cannot vanish). So, somehow this two things cancel each other and we gain no improvement in expectation adding one more node to parameter server framework with odd number of nodes.

5 Experiments

We verify our theoretical results experimentally using the well known Rosenbrock (non-convex) function with $d = 10$ variables:

$$
f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} 100(x_{i+1} - x_i^2)^2 + (1 - x_i)^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.
$$

Stochastic formulation of the corresponding minimization problem is as follows: at any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have access to **biased** stochastic gradient $\hat{g}(x) = \nabla f_i(x) + \xi$, where index $i$ is chosen uniformly at random from $\{1, 2, \ldots, d - 1\}$ and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \nu^2 I)$ with $\nu > 0$.

Figure 3 shows the robustness of SPB assumption in the convergence rate (7) with constant step size. We exploited four levels of noise in each column to demonstrate the correlation between success probabilities and convergence rate. In the first experiment (first column) SPB assumption is violated.
Figure 2: Experiments on distributed signSGD with majority vote. Plots show function values with respect to iterations averaged over 10 repetitions. Left plot used constant step size $\gamma = 0.02$, right plot used variable step size with $\gamma_0 = 0.02$. We set mini-batch size 1 and used the same initial point. Dashed blue lines show the minimum value.

Figure 3: Performance of signSGD with constant step size ($\gamma = 0.25$) under four different noise levels (mini-batch size 1, 2, 5, 8). Each column represent a separate experiment with function values, evolution of minimum success probabilities and the histogram of success probabilities throughout the iteration process. Dashed blue line in the first row is the minimum value. Dashed red lines in second and third rows are thresholds $1/2$ of success probabilities. The shaded area in first and second rows shows standard deviation obtained from ten repetitions.

Figure 2 illustrates the effect of multiple nodes in distributed training with majority vote. As we see increasing the number of nodes improves the convergence rate. It also supports the claim that in expectation there is no improvement from $2l - 1$ nodes to $2l$ nodes.
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Appendix: “On Stochastic Sign Descent Methods”

A Extra Experiments

In this section we perform several additional experiments for further insights.

Figure 4: Performance of signSGD with variable step size ($\gamma_0 = 0.25$) under four different noise levels (mini-batch size 1, 2, 5, 7). As in the experiments of Figure 3 with constant step size, these plots show the relationship between success probabilities and the convergence rate (6). In low success probability regime (first and second columns) we observe oscillations, while in high success probability regime (third and forth columns) oscillations are mitigated substantially.
Figure 5: In this part of experiments we investigated convergence rate (7) to a neighborhood of the solution. We fixed gradient noise level by setting mini-batch size 2 and altered the constant step size. For the first column we set bigger step size \( \gamma = 0.25 \) to detect the divergence (as we slightly violated SPB assumption). Then for the second and third columns we set \( \gamma = 0.1 \) and \( \gamma = 0.05 \) to expose the convergence to a neighborhood of the minimizer. For the forth column we set even smaller step size \( \gamma = 0.01 \) to observe a slower convergence.

Figure 6: Unit balls in \( l^{1,2} \) norm (5) with different noise levels.
B  Proofs

B.1 Sufficient conditions for SPB: Proof of Lemma 1

First we apply Gauss inequality\(^3\) on unimodal distributions to symmetric distributions, then by direct algebraic manipulations we find a simple lower bound\(^3\):

\[
\text{Prob}(|X - \mu| \leq r) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1 - \frac{4}{9} \left( \frac{r}{\sigma} \right)^2}{\sqrt{3}}, & \text{if } \frac{r}{\sigma} \geq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3} \sigma}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

where \(\mu\) and \(\sigma^2\) are the mean and variance of unimodal, symmetric random variable \(X\), and \(r \geq 0\).

Then, using the assumption that each \(\hat{g}_i(x)\) has unimodal and symmetric distribution, we apply this bound for \(X = \hat{g}_i(x)\), \(\mu = g_i(x)\), \(\sigma^2 = \sigma^2_i(x)\) and get a bound for success probabilities

\[
\text{Prob}(\text{sign } \hat{g}_i = \text{sign } g_i) = \begin{cases} \text{Prob}(\hat{g}_i \geq 0), & \text{if } g_i > 0 \\
\text{Prob}(\hat{g}_i \leq 0), & \text{if } g_i < 0 \end{cases}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Prob}(0 \leq \hat{g}_i \leq g_i), \quad \text{if } g_i > 0 \\
= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Prob}(g_i \leq \hat{g}_i \leq 0), \quad \text{if } g_i < 0
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Prob}(|\hat{g}_i - g_i| \leq |g_i|)
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{|g_i|}{|g_i|/\sigma_i + \sqrt{3}}
\]

B.2 Sufficient conditions for SPB: Proof of Lemma 2

Here we estimate the failure probabilities of sign \(\hat{g}(x)\) when \(g_i(x) \neq 0\):

\[
\text{Prob}(\text{sign } \hat{g}_i \neq \text{sign } g_i) = \text{Prob}(|\hat{g}_i - g_i| = |\hat{g}_i| + |g_i|)
\]

\[
\leq \text{Prob}(|\hat{g}_i - g_i| \geq |g_i|)
\]

\[
= \text{Prob}((\hat{g}_i - g_i)^2 \geq g_i^2)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\text{E}((\hat{g}_i - g_i)^2)}{g_i^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{\sigma^2_i}{g_i^2}
\]

Hence

\[
\text{Prob}(\text{sign } \hat{g}_i = \text{sign } g_i) \geq 1 - \sigma^2_i g_i^2 \geq 1 - c_i^2.
\]

B.3 Convergence Analysis: Proof of Theorem

First, from \(L\)-smoothness assumption we have

\[
f(x_{k+1}) = f(x_k - \gamma_k \text{ sign } \hat{g}_k)
\]

\[
\leq f(x_k) - \langle g_k, \gamma_k \text{ sign } \hat{g}_k \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{L_i}{2} (\gamma_k \text{ sign } \hat{g}_{k,i})^2
\]

\[
= f(x_k) - \gamma_k \langle g_k, \text{ sign } \hat{g}_k \rangle + \frac{dL}{2} \gamma_k^2,
\]

\(^3\)see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gauss%27s_inequality

notice that this simple bound is tight when \(r/\sigma\) tends to 0 or \(\infty\)
where \( g_k = g(x_k) \), \( \hat{g}_k = \hat{g}(x_k) \), \( \hat{g}_{k,i} \) is the \( i \)-th component of \( \hat{g}_k \) and \( \bar{L} \) is the average value of \( L_i \)'s. Taking conditional expectation given current iteration \( x_k \) gives

\[
\mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) | x_k] \leq f(x_k) - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[(g_k, \text{sign} \hat{g}_k)] + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma_k^2. \tag{13}
\]

Using the definition of success probabilities \( \rho_i \) we get

\[
\mathbb{E}[(g_k, \text{sign} \hat{g}_k)] = \langle g_k, \mathbb{E}[\text{sign} \hat{g}_k] \rangle \tag{14}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} g_{k,i} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{sign} \hat{g}_{k,i}] = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d, g_{k,i} \neq 0} g_{k,i} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{sign} \hat{g}_{k,i}] \tag{15}
\]

\[
= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d, g_{k,i} \neq 0} g_{k,i} (\rho_i(x_k) \text{sign} g_{k,i} + (1 - \rho_i(x_k))(- \text{sign} g_{k,i})) \tag{16}
\]

\[
= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d, g_{k,i} \neq 0} (2\rho_i(x_k) - 1)|g_{k,i}| = \sum_{i=1}^{d} (2\rho_i(x_k) - 1)|g_{k,i}| = \|g_k\|_\rho. \tag{17}
\]

Plugging this into (13) and taking full expectation, we get

\[
\mathbb{E}\|g_k\|_\rho \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(x_k)] - \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1})]}{\gamma_k} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma_k. \tag{18}
\]

Therefore

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k \mathbb{E}\|g_k\|_\rho \leq (f(x_0) - f^*) + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k^2. \tag{19}
\]

Now, in case of decreasing step sizes \( \gamma_k = \gamma_0 / \sqrt{k + 1} \)

\[
\min_{0 \leq k < K} \mathbb{E}\|g_k\|_\rho \leq \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k + 1}} \right] \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\gamma_0}{\sqrt{k + 1}} \right] \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k + 1} \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k + 1} \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 d\bar{L} + \frac{\gamma_0 d\bar{L}}{2} \log K \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 d\bar{L} \right] + \frac{\gamma_0 d\bar{L}}{2} \frac{\log K}{\sqrt{K}}.
\]

where we have used the following standard inequalities

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \geq \sqrt{K}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{k} \leq 2 + \log K. \tag{20}
\]

In the case of constant step size \( \gamma_k = \gamma \)

\[
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|g_k\|_\rho \leq \frac{1}{\gamma K} \left[ (f(x_0) - f^*) + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma^2 K \right] = \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma K} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma.
\]
B.4 Convergence Analysis: Proof of Theorem 2

Clearly, the iterations \( \{x_k\}_{k \geq 0} \) of Algorithm 1 (Option 2) do not increase the function value in any iteration, i.e. \( E[f(x_{k+1}|x_k)] \leq f(x_k) \). Continuing the proof of Theorem 1 from (18), we get

\[
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} E[\|g_k\|] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{E[f(x_k)] - E[f(x_{k+1})]}{\gamma_k} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2} \gamma_k \\
= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{E[f(x_k)] - E[f(x_{k+1})]}{\gamma_k} \sqrt{k+1} + \frac{d\bar{L}}{2K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k \sqrt{k+1} \\
\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{E[f(x_k)] - E[f(x_{k+1})]}{\gamma_0} + \frac{\gamma_0 d\bar{L}}{\sqrt{K}} \\
= \frac{f(x_0) - E[f(x_K)]}{\gamma_0 \sqrt{K}} + \frac{\gamma_0 d\bar{L}}{\sqrt{K}} \\
\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 d\bar{L} \right],
\]

where we have used the following inequality

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \leq 2\sqrt{K}.
\]

The proof for constant step size is the same as in Theorem 1.

B.5 Convergence Analysis in Distributed Setting: Proof of Theorem 3

The proof goes with the same steps as in Theorem 1, except the derivation (14)–(17) is replaced by

\[
E[\langle g_k, \text{sign} \hat{g}_{k}^{(M)} \rangle] = \langle g_k, E[\text{sign} \hat{g}_{k}^{(M)}] \rangle \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} g_{k,i} \cdot E[\text{sign} \hat{g}_{k,i}^{(M)}] \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} |g_{k,i}| \cdot E \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_{k,i}^{(M)} \cdot g_{k,i} \right) \right] \\
\geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} |g_{k,i}| \cdot \frac{|g_{k,i}|}{|g_{k,i}| + \phi(M)\sigma_{k,i}} = \|g_k\|_{d,2},
\]

where we have used the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Assume that for some point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), master node receives \( M \) independent, unbiased estimators \( \hat{g}_{i}^{m}(x) \), \( m = 1, \ldots, M \) of true gradient \( g(x) \). Assume further that each coordinate \( \hat{g}_{i}^{m} \) has unimodal and symmetric distribution with variance \( \sigma_{i}^2 = \sigma_{i}^2(x) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq d \). Let \( \hat{g}_{k}^{(M)}(x) \) be the sum of stochastic sign vectors aggregated from nodes:

\[
\hat{g}_{k}^{(M)} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \text{sign} \hat{g}_{k}^{m}.
\]

Then

\[
E \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_{k,i}^{(M)} \cdot g_{i} \right) \right] \geq \frac{|g_{i}|}{|g_{i}| + \phi(M)\sigma_{i}},
\]

where

\[
\phi(2l - 1) = \phi(2l) = \sqrt{3} \cdot 4^{l-1} B(l,1), \quad l = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]
Proof. First of all, if \( q_i = 0 \) then (22) trivially holds. In the case of single node, i.e. \( M = 1 \), (22) follows from Lemma 1 as \( \phi(1) = \sqrt{3} \). Indeed, from Lemma 1 we have

\[
p_i := p_i^{(1)} := \text{Prob} \left( \text{sign} \; \hat{g}_i^{(1)} = \text{sign} \; g_i \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{|g_i|}{|g_i| + \sqrt{3}\sigma_i},
\]

from which

\[
E \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_i^{(1)} \cdot g_i \right) \right] = p_i \cdot 1 + (1 - p_i) \cdot (-1) = 2p_i - 1 \geq \frac{|g_i|}{|g_i| + \phi(1)\sigma_i}.
\]

Denote by \( S_m^i \) the Bernoulli trial of node \( m \) corresponding to \( i \)-th coordinate, where “success” is the sign match between stochastic gradient and gradient:

\[
S_m^i := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{sign} \left( g_i^m \cdot g_i \right) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if sign} \; \hat{g}_i^m = \text{sign} \; g_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i) \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Since nodes have their own independent stochastic gradients and the objective function (or data points) is shared, then master node receives i.i.d. trials \( S_m^i \), which sum up to a binomial random variable \( S_i \):

\[
S_i := \sum_{m=1}^{M} S_m^i \sim \text{Binomial}(M, p_i).
\]

First, let us consider the case when there are odd number of nodes, i.e. \( M = 2l - 1 \), \( l \geq 1 \). In this case, taking into account (25) and (26), we have

\[
\text{Prob} \left( \text{sign} \; \hat{g}_i^{(M)} = 0 \right) = 0,
\]

\[
p_i^{(M)} := \text{Prob} \left( \text{sign} \; \hat{g}_i^{(M)} = \text{sign} \; g_i \right) = \text{Prob}(S_i \geq l),
\]

\[
1 - p_i^{(M)} = \text{Prob} \left( \text{sign} \; \hat{g}_i^{(M)} = - \text{sign} \; g_i \right).
\]

Let us assume for a moment that we have the following lower bound for these probabilities:

\[
\text{Prob}(S_i \geq l) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\phi(M)}{\phi(1)} \left( \frac{1}{2p_i - 1} - 1 \right).
\]

From (24) it follows that

\[
\frac{1}{2p_i - 1} - 1 \leq \phi(1) \frac{\sigma_i}{|g_i|},
\]

therefore

\[
E \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_i^{(M)} \cdot g_i \right) \right] = p_i^{(M)} \cdot 1 + (1 - p_i^{(M)}) \cdot (-1)
\]

\[
= 2p_i^{(M)} - 1
\]

\[
= 2\text{Prob}(S_i \geq l) - 1
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\phi(M)}{\phi(1)} \frac{\phi(1)}{|g_i|} \sigma_i}
\]

\[
= \frac{|g_i|}{|g_i| + \phi(M)\sigma_i}.
\]

To complete the lemma for odd number of nodes, it remains to show (27). It is well known that cumulative distribution function of binomial random variable can be expressed with regularized incomplete beta function defined in (31):

\[
\text{Prob}(S_i \geq l) = I(p_i; l, M - l + 1) = I(p_i; l, l).
\]

After plugging this into (27) and doing some algebraic manipulations, what we need to show is the following

\[
G(p_i) := \frac{1}{2I(p_i)} \frac{1}{2p_i - 1} - 1 \leq \frac{\phi(M)}{\phi(1)}.
\]
It follows from Lemma 3 that function $F(p)$, $p \in [1/2, 1]$ is non-increasing:

$$G'(p) = \frac{d}{dp} \left[ \frac{p - \frac{1}{2} - 1 - I(p)}{1 - p} \right] = \frac{1}{2(1-p)^2 I(p) - \frac{1}{2}} \left( 1 - I(p) \right) \frac{p - \frac{1}{2}}{1 - p} + \frac{1}{2(1-p)^2 I(p) - \frac{1}{2}} \left[ (1 - I(p)) \left( I(p) - \frac{1}{2} \right) - (1 - p) \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) I'(p) \right] \leq 0. $$

Hence, since $p_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$ from (24) and $I(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$, it follows

$$G(p_i) \leq \lim_{p \to \frac{1}{2}^+} G(p) = \lim_{p \to \frac{1}{2}^+} \frac{1 - I(p)}{1 - p} \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{I'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)} = 4^{l-1} B(l, l) = \frac{\phi(2l - 1)}{\phi(1)} = \frac{\phi(M)}{\phi(1)} $$

and we obtain (30). Now, let us consider the case when there are even number of nodes, i.e. $M = 2l$, $l \geq 1$. In this case $\text{Prob} \left( \text{sign} \hat{g}_i \left( 2 \right) = 0 \right) > 0$, however using (29) and properties of beta function we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_i \left( 2 \right) \cdot g_i \right) \right] = \text{Prob}(S_i \geq l + 1) - \text{Prob}(S_i \leq l - 1) = I(p_i; l + 1, l) + I(p_i; l, l + 1) - 1 = 2I(p_i; l, l) - 1 = 2\text{Prob}(S_i \geq l) - 1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{sign} \left( \hat{g}_i \left( 2l - 1 \right) \cdot g_i \right) \right].$$

This means that in expectation there no difference between having $2l - 1$ and $2l$ nodes. That is why $\phi(2l - 1) = \phi(2l)$ and there is no extra variance reduction from $2l - 1$ to $2l$ number of nodes.

To complete the proof of Theorem 3 in distributed setting, it remains to prove the following technical lemma on incomplete beta function, which we already used in the previous lemma.

**Lemma 4.** Denote by $I(p; a, b)$ the regularized incomplete beta function defined as follows

$$I(p; a, b) = \frac{B(p; a, b)}{B(a, b)} = \int_0^p \frac{t^{a-1} (1 - t)^{b - 1}}{a-1 (1 - t)^{b-1}} dt, \quad a, b > 0, \quad p \in [0, 1]. \quad (31)$$

Fix $a = b = m \geq 1$, then

$$\left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - p) I'(p) \geq \left( I(p) - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - I(p)), \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq p \leq 1. $$

**Proof.** First, if $m = 1$ then $I(p) = p$ and the inequality becomes equality. Let $m > 1$, consider the difference of two sides of the inequality

$$F(p) := \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - p) I'(p) - \left( I(p) - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - I(p))$$

and prove that $F(p) \geq 0$ for $p \in [1/2, 1]$. Direct computations (or properties of Beta function) show that $I(1/2) = 1/2, I(1) = 1$, which implies that $F(1/2) = F(1) = 0$. To prove that $F(p) \geq 0$ for any $1/2 \leq p \leq 1$, it is sufficient to show that $F'(p) \geq 0$ on $[1/2, c]$ and $F'(p) \leq 0$ on $[c, 1]$ for some

For this reason we have

\[ F'(p) = \left( \frac{3}{2} - 2p \right) I'(p) + \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - p) I''(p) - \left( \frac{3}{2} - 2I_p \right) I'(p) \]
\[ = 2 (I(p) - p) I'(p) + \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - p) I''(p) \]
\[ = \frac{(p(1 - p))^{m-1}}{B(m,m)} \left[ 2 (I(p) - p) - \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - p) \frac{(m - 1)(2p - 1)}{p(1 - p)} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{2(p(1 - p))^{m-1}}{B(m,m)} \left[ I(p) - p - \frac{m - 1}{p} \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right]. \]

Denote

\[ J(p) = p + \frac{m - 1}{p} \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2, \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq p \leq 1. \]

Notice that \( \text{sign} F'(p) = \text{sign}(I(p) - J(p)) \). Furthermore

\[ J \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = I \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (32) \]
\[ J(1) = \frac{m + 3}{4} > 1 = I(1), \quad (33) \]
\[ J''(p) = \frac{m - 1}{2p^3} > 0, \quad p \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right), \quad (34) \]
\[ I''(p) = -(m - 1)(2p - 1) \frac{(p(1 - p))^{m-2}}{B(m,m)} < 0, \quad p \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right). \quad (35) \]

(34) is strict convexity of \( J(p) \) and (35) is strict concavity of \( I(p) \) for \( p \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right) \). Using boundary relations (32) and (33), we conclude that either \( J(p) > I(p) \) for any \( p \in (1/2, 1) \) or there exists \( c \in (1/2, 1) \) such that \( J(p) < I(p), p \in [1/2, c] \) and \( J(p) > I(p), p \in [c, 1] \). First scenario is impossible as it implies \( \text{sign} F'(p) = -1 \) for any \( p \in (1/2, 1) \), which contradicts boundary values \( F(1/2) = F(1) = 0 \). In the second scenario, we have \( F'(p) \geq 0 \) for \( p \in [1/2, c] \) and \( F'(p) \leq 0 \) for \( p \in [c, 1] \), which together with boundary values yields \( F(p) \geq 0 \) for any \( p \in [1/2, 1] \).

### B.6 Convergence Analysis in Distributed Setting: Proof of the approximation in (9)

Using the well known Stirling’s approximation \( n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n} \left( \frac{n}{e} \right)^n \), we get an approximation for \( B \) function

\[ B(l, l) = \frac{(l - 1)!^2}{(2l - 1)!} \approx \frac{\sqrt{2\pi(l - 1)} \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{l-1}^2}{\sqrt{2\pi(2l - 1)} \left( \frac{2l - 1}{e} \right)^{2l-1}} = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi e}}{\sqrt{2l - 1}} \left( \frac{l - 1}{2l - 1} \right)^{2l-1} \]
\[ = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi e}}{2^{2l-1} - T^{2l-1}} \left( \frac{l - 1}{2l - 1} \right)^{2l-1} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{1}{4^{l-1} \sqrt{l}}, \]

which implies the approximation in (9):

\[ \sqrt{3} 4^{l-1} B(l, l) \approx \frac{\sqrt{3\pi}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}}. \]

### C Convergence Result for Standard SGD

For comparison, here we state and prove non-convex convergence rates of standard SGD with the same step sizes.
Theorem 4 (Non-convex convergence of SGD). Let $\hat{g}$ be an unbiased estimator of the gradient $\nabla f$ and assume that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}\|^2 \leq C$ for some $C > 0$. Then SGD with step sizes $\gamma_k \equiv \gamma > 0$ converges as follows

$$\min_{0 \leq k < K} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 C L_{\max} \right] + \frac{\gamma_0 C L_{\max} \log K}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\gamma}} . \quad (36)$$

In the case of constant step size $\gamma_k \equiv \gamma > 0$

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma K} + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma. \quad (37)$$

Proof. From $L$-smoothness assumption we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1})|x_k] = \mathbb{E}[f(x_k - \gamma_k \hat{g}_k)|x_k]$$

$$\leq f(x_k) - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{g}_k, \gamma_k \hat{g}_k)] + \frac{L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2$$

$$= f(x_k) - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 + \frac{L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2.$$

Taking full expectation, using variance bound assumption, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1})] - \mathbb{E}[f(x_k)] \leq - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 + \frac{L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_k^2 C$$

Therefore

$$\gamma_k \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[f(x_k)] - \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1})] + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_k^2$$

Summing $k = 0, 1, \ldots, K - 1$ gives

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \leq (f(x_0) - f^*) + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \gamma_k^2.$$

Now, in case of decreasing step sizes $\gamma_k \equiv \gamma_0 / \sqrt{k + 1}$

$$\min_{0 \leq k < K} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k + 1}} \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k + 1}} \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 C L_{\max} + \frac{\gamma_0 C L_{\max} \log K}{2} \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left[ \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma_0} + \gamma_0 C L_{\max} \right] + \frac{\gamma_0 C L_{\max} \log K}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\gamma}}.$$
We define stochastic sign operator \( \tilde{\text{sign}} \) which compresses \( 32 \) with appropriate scaling factor.

\[
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|g_k\|^2_2] \leq \frac{1}{\gamma K} \left[ (f(x_0) - f^*) + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma^2 K \right] = \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\gamma K} + \frac{C L_{\max}}{2} \gamma.
\]

\[
D \quad \text{Recovering Theorem 1 in [4] from Theorem 1}
\]

To recover Theorem 1 in [4], first note that choosing a particular step size \( \gamma \) in (7) yields

\[
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|g_k\|_\rho] \leq \sqrt{2dL(f(x_0) - f^*)}, \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma = \sqrt{2(f(x_0) - f^*)/dLK}.
\]

Then, due to Lemma 1 under unbiasedness and unimodal symmetric noise assumption, we can lower bound general \( \rho \)-norm by mixed \( l^{1,2} \) norm. Finally we further lower bound our \( l^{1,2} \) norm to obtain the mixed norm used in Theorem 1 of [4], let \( H_k = \{ 1 \leq i \leq d: \sigma_i < (\sqrt{3}/2)|g_{k,i}| \} \)

\[
5\sqrt{dL(f(x_0) - f^*)} \geq \frac{5}{\sqrt{2}K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}[\|g_k\|_\rho] = \frac{5}{\sqrt{2}K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{g_i^2}{\|g_i\| + \sqrt{3}\sigma_i} \geq \frac{5}{\sqrt{2}K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{2}{5} |g_{k,i}| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{5} \sum_{i \in H_k} g_{k,i}^2 / \sigma_i \geq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in H_k} |g_{k,i}| + \sum_{i \notin H_k} g_{k,i}^2 / \sigma_i \right] = \sqrt{dK}.
\]

E Stochastic signSGD

Our experiments and the counterexample show that signSGD might fail to converge in general. What we proved is that SPB assumption is roughly a necessary and sufficient for general convergence. There are several ways to overcome SPB assumption and make signSGD to work in general, e.g. error feedback [13]. Here we want to present one simple way of fixing this issue, which is more natural to signSGD. The issue with signSGD is that sign of stochastic gradient is biased, which also complicates the analysis.

We define stochastic sign operator \( \widetilde{\text{sign}} \), which unlike the deterministic sign operator is unbiased with appropriate scaling factor.

**Definition 3 (Stochastic Sign).** Define the stochastic sign operator \( \widetilde{\text{sign}} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) as

\[
\left( \tilde{\text{sign}} g \right)_i = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{with prob } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} g_i / \|g\|_2, \\ -1, & \text{with prob } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} g_i / \|g\|_2, \end{cases}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d,
\]

and \( \tilde{\text{sign}} 0 = 0 \) with probability 1.

Furthermore, we define stochastic compression operator \( C : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) as \( C(x) = \|x\|_2 \cdot \tilde{\text{sign}} x \), which compresses \( 32d \) bits to \( d + 32 \) bits. Then for any unbiased estimator \( \hat{g} \) we get

\[
\mathbb{E} \|C(\hat{g})\| = \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}[\|C(\hat{g})\| | \hat{g} ] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{g}\|_2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{g}\|_2 / \|g\|_2 \right) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\|g\|] = g,
\]

\[
\mathbb{E} \|C(\hat{g}) - \hat{g}\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \|C(\hat{g})\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E} \|C(\hat{g})\|_2^2 \right] = (d-1)\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|_2^4] = (d-1)\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|_2^4].
\]

Using this relations, any analysis for SGD can be repeated for stochastic signSGD giving the same convergence rate with less communication and with \( (d-1) \) times worse coefficients.