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Abstract

In this paper, we analyze the recently proposed stochastic primal-dual hybrid gradient (SPDHG) algorithm and provide new theoretical results. In particular, we prove almost sure convergence of the iterates to a solution and linear convergence with standard step sizes, independent of strong convexity constants. Our assumption for linear convergence is metric subregularity, which is satisfied for smooth and strongly convex problems in addition to many nonsmooth and/or nonstrongly convex problems, such as linear programs, Lasso, and support vector machines. In the general convex case, we prove optimal sublinear rates for the ergodic sequence and for randomly selected iterate, without bounded domain assumptions. We also provide numerical evidence showing that SPDHG with standard step sizes shows favorable and robust practical performance against its specialized strongly convex variant SPDHG-µ and other state-of-the-art algorithms including variance reduction methods and stochastic dual coordinate ascent.

1 Introduction

Chambolle et al. proposed stochastic primal-dual hybrid gradient (SPDHG) algorithm in [6], for solving the optimization problem

\[
\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(A_i x) + g(x),
\]

where \( f_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) and \( g : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) are proper, lower semicontinuous, convex functions and \( f \) is defined as the separable function such that \( f(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(y_i) \). \( A_i : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}_i \) is a linear mapping and \( A \) is defined such that \( (Ax)_i = A_i x \).

The classical approaches provide numerical solutions to (1.1) via primal-dual methods. In particular, a common strategy is to have coordinate-based updates for the separable dual variable [6, 46]. These methods show competitive practical performance and are proven to converge linearly under the assumption that \( f^*_i, \forall i \) and \( g \) are \( \mu_i \) and \( \mu_g \)-strongly convex functions, respectively. Step sizes of these methods in turn depend on \( \mu_i, \mu_g \) to obtain linear convergence. SPDHG belongs to this class.

Chambolle et al. provide convergence analysis for SPDHG under various assumptions on the problem template [6]. Indeed, SPDHG is a variant of celebrated primal-dual hybrid gradient (PDHG) method [7, 8] where the novelty is stochastic block updates for dual variables at each iteration. In the general convex case, [6] proved that the Bregman distance between the iterates of SPDHG and any primal-dual solution converges almost surely to 0. Note however that this result does not imply the almost sure convergence of the sequence to a solution, in general. If \( f_i^* \) and \( g \) are strongly convex functions, SPDHG-µ, which is a variant of SPDHG with step sizes depending on strong convexity constants, is proven to converge linearly [6, Theorem
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When we assume that $X$ we prove the following results for SPDHG which are not known in the current literature.

1. which are selected randomly every iteration. Let $E$ with respect to $P = \text{diag}(\tau)\times\delta$ using the convex indicator function $D$. The probability of selecting an index $i \in \mathbb{E}$.

2.1 Notation

General convex case We prove that the iterates of SPDHG converge almost surely to a solution. For the ergodic sequence, we show that SPDHG has $O(1/k)$ rate for objective residual for unconstrained problems; and objective residual and feasibility for linearly constrained problems, without requiring bounded primal and dual domains. We prove that a randomly selected iterate of SPDHG also features a metrically subregular case When the problem satisfies the assumption of metric subregularity (defined in the sequel), we prove that SPDHG has linear convergence with standard step sizes. Our result shows that without any modification, basic SPDHG adapts to problem structure and attains linear rate for strongly convex-strongly concave problems, linear programs, Lasso, and support vector machines.

Practical performance We show that SPDHG shows a robust and competitive practical performance compared to SPDHG-$\mu$ of [6] and other state-of-the-art methods such as variance reduction methods and stochastic dual coordinate ascent.

We summarize our results and compare with those of [6] in Table 2 (Page 22).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

We assume that $X$ and $Y$ are Euclidean spaces such that $Y = \prod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$ and $X = \prod_{i=1}^{n} X_i$. We also define $Z = X \times Y$ and $z = (x, y) \in Z$. For a positive definite matrix $Q$, we use $\langle x, y \rangle_Q = \langle Qx, y \rangle$ to denote weighted inner product and $\|x\|_Q^2 = \langle Qx, x \rangle$ to denote weighted Euclidean norm. For a given set $C$, and positive definite matrix $Q$, distance of a point $x$ to the set $C$ in weighted norm is defined as $\text{dist}_Q^2(x, C) = \min_{y \in C} \|x - y\|_Q^2$.

When $Q = I$, we drop the subscript and write $\text{dist}(x, C)$. We define for $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the diagonal matrix such that $D(\sigma) = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$. Domain of a function $f$ is denoted as $\text{dom} f$. We encode equality constraints using the convex indicator function $\delta_b$ such that $\delta_b(b) = 0$ and $\delta_b(x) = +\infty$ if $x \neq b$.

We define $e(i) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $e(i)_j = 1$, if $j = i$ and $e(i)_j = 0$, if $j \neq i$. Moreover, we use $E(i) = e(i)e(i)^T$. Unless used with a subscript, 1 in Kronecker products denotes $1_n$, vector of size $n$ with all elements equal to 1.

The probability of selecting an index $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is denoted as $p_i > 0$, where $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$. We define $P = \text{diag}(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $p = \min_i p_i$. The notation $\mathcal{F}_k$ defines the filtration generated by indices $\{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ which are selected randomly every iteration. Let $E_k := E[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$ denote the conditional expectation with respect to $\mathcal{F}_k$.

The proximal operator of a function $f$ is defined as

$$\text{prox}_{r, f}(x) = \text{arg} \min_{u \in \text{dom} f} f(u) + \frac{1}{2}\|u - x\|_{r^{-1}}^2.$$  \hfill (2.1)

We say that a function $f$ is $\mu$-strongly convex if it satisfies $\forall x, y \in \text{dom} f, \forall g \in \partial f(y)$

$$f(x) \geq f(y) + \langle g, x - y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y\|^2.$$
A related notion is quadratic growth which is satisfied for function \( f \) if it holds \( \forall x \in \text{dom} f \) that
\[
 f(x) - \min f \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \text{dist}(x, \text{arg} \min f)^2.
\]
It is straightforward to see that quadratic growth is implied by strong convexity, therefore it is a weaker assumption. The relation between these conditions and examples satisfying quadratic growth are discussed in detail in [5, 29].

The Fenchel conjugate of a proper, lower semicontinuous, convex function \( f \) is defined as
\[
 f^*(y) = \sup_{z \in \text{dom} f} \langle z, y \rangle - f(z).
\]
Using the Fenchel conjugate, Problem (1.1) can also be cast as the saddle point problem
\[
 \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle A_i(x, y_i) - f_i^*(y_i) + g(x) \rangle.
\]

For a set valued mapping \( F : \mathcal{X} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{Y} \), we denote the graph of \( F \) by \( \text{gra} F = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} : y \in Fx \} \). We say that \( F \) is metrically subregular at \( \bar{x} \) for \( \bar{y} \), with \( (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gra} F \), if there exists \( \eta_0 > 0 \) with a neighborhood of subregularity \( \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}) \) such that:
\[
 \text{dist}(x, F^{-1}(\bar{y})) \leq \eta_0 \text{dist}(\bar{y}, Fx), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}).
\]
If \( \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}) = \mathcal{X} \), then \( F \) is globally metrically subregular [14]. Absence of metric subregularity is signaled by \( \eta_0 = +\infty \). This assumption is used in the context of deterministic and stochastic primal-dual algorithms in [15, 24, 26].

In the paper we shall study how the metric subregularity of the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker operator \( F \) in (2.5) implies linear convergence of SPDHG.

Metric subregularity holds globally if \( f_i^* \) and \( g \) are strongly convex functions, or (1.1) is a linear program [15, 22]. In the former case, one can also relax strong convexity assumptions to quadratic growth/local strong convexity for \( f_i^* \) and local strong convexity/quadratic growth for \( g \) [25, Lemma 4.3]. In addition, as proven in [24], problems consisting of convex piecewise linear-quadratic (PLQ) functions satisfy metric subregularity, though not globally, but restricted to any compact set [47]. Problems with PLQ functions encompass a large body, including quadratic programs, Lasso, SVM, and linearly constrained problems with PLQ loss functions [24]. Lack of global metric subregularity for PLQs will require a special care in the sequel. Please see Remark 4.5.
2.3 Smoothed gap

In order to prove sublinear convergence rates of the algorithm in the general convex case, we are going to utilize the smoothed gap framework introduced in [41]. For Problem (1.1), the smoothed gap function is defined as

\[ G_{\alpha,\beta}(x,y;\bar{x},\bar{y}) = \sup_{u,v} g(x) + \langle Ax,v \rangle - f^*(v) - \langle Au,y \rangle + f^*(y) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|u - \bar{x}\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|v - \bar{y}\|^2. \]

Convergence of the smoothed gap function, and the parameters \( \alpha, \beta \) to 0, can be used to obtain convergence guarantees for objective residual for unconstrained problems and objective residual and feasibility for linearly constrained problems, without requiring bounded primal and dual domains [41, Lemma 1].

3 Algorithm

Chambolle et al. proposed SPDHG [6], which fits into the primal-dual coordinate descent class of algorithms, proposed before in [13, 18, 46]. A comprehensive literature review is given in Section 5. Several variants of SPDHG are analyzed in [6]. Depending on the strong convexity assumptions, different step sizes have to be used in [6] to attain fast convergence rates. In this paper, we focus on the standard SPDHG which we include as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Stochastic PDHG (SPDHG) [6]

Input: Pick step sizes \( \sigma_i, \tau \) by (3.1) and \( x^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 = y^1 = \bar{y}^1 \in \mathcal{Y} \). Given \( P = \text{diag}(p_1, \ldots, p_n) \).

for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \) do

\[ x^k = \text{prox}_{\tau,g}(x^{k-1} - \tau A^Ty^k) \]

Draw \( i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( P(i_k = i) = p_i \).

\[ y^k_{i_k} = \text{prox}_{\sigma_{i_k}f^*_{i_k}}(y^k_{i_k} + \sigma_{i_k} A_i x^k) \]

\[ y^{k+1}_i = y^k_i, \quad \forall i \neq i_k \]

\[ \bar{y}^{k+1} = y^{k+1} + P^{-1}(y^{k+1} - y^k), \]

end for

We focus on following standard step size rules for primal and dual step sizes \( \tau, \sigma_i \), which only depend on \( \|A_i\| \) and not any other structural constants about the problem

\[ p_i^{-1} \tau \sigma_i \|A_i\|^2 \leq \gamma^2 < 1. \quad (3.1) \]

Next section will illustrate our novel theoretical results for SPDHG along with comparisons to the results of [6].

4 Convergence

We start with a lemma analyzing one iteration behavior of the algorithm. This lemma is essentially the same as Lemma 4.4 in [6] up to minor modifications and is included for completeness, with its proof in the appendix.

Lemma 4.1. Let Assumption 1 hold. Let us denote \( z = (x,y) \) and define the functions

\[ V(z) = \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}} + \langle Ax, P^{-1}y \rangle, \]

and

\[ V_k(z, y) = \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} - \langle Ax, P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}. \]
We also define the full dimensional dual update
\[ y_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\sigma_i f_i}(y_k + \sigma_i A_i x^k), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}. \]

It holds for SPDHG, \(\forall x \in X, \forall y \in Y\),
\[ D_g(x^k; z) + D_f((\tilde{y}^{k+1}; z) \leq V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y) - E_k [V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y)] - V(z^k - z^{k-1}). \tag{4.1} \]

Moreover, under the step size rules in (3.1), we have
\[ V(z^k - z^{k-1}) \geq C_1 \left( \frac{1}{2} \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_r^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2 \right), \tag{4.2} \]

and
\[ V_k(x, y) \geq C_1 \left( \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_r^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|y\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2, \tag{4.3} \]

with \(C_1 = 1 - \gamma\).

### 4.1 Almost sure convergence

In this section, we present the almost sure convergence of the iterates of SPDHG to a solution of (1.1). Currently known result in [6] states that almost surely, \(D_h(z^k; z^*) \rightarrow 0\), for any \(z^*\), with \(h(z) = f^*(y) + g(x)\), which, in general, does not imply almost sure convergence of \(z^k\) to a solution.

We start with an equivalent representation of SPDHG, inspired by [21], that is instrumental in our proofs. This representation shifts the update of the primal update so that the algorithm can be written as a fixed point operator. Since the definition of \(\tilde{y}^{k+1}\) depends on the selected index \(i_k\) at iteration \(k\), the operator \(T\) is defined such that all the possible values of \(\tilde{y}^{k+1}\) and consequently, of \(x^{k+1}\) are captured.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let us define \(T : \mathbb{R}^{pn+n^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{pn+n^2}\) that to \((x, y)\) associates \((\hat{x}, \hat{y})\) such that \(\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\},\)
\[ \hat{y}(i) = \text{prox}_{D(\sigma), f_i}(y(i) + D(\sigma)Ax(i)) \]
\[ \hat{y}(i) = y(i) + (1 + p_i^{-1})(\hat{y}(i) - y(i))e(i) \]
\[ \hat{x}(i) = \text{prox}_{\tau, g}(x(i) - \tau A^T \hat{y}(i)) \]
where \(x(i) = (x(i)_1, \ldots, x(i)_p)^T, y(i) = (y(i)_1, \ldots, y(i)_n)^T\) and \(x = (x(1); x(2); \ldots; x(n)), y = (y(1); y(2); \ldots; y(n))\).

The fixed points of \(T\) are of the form \((x(i), y(i))_{i=1}^{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^\ast, \forall i\). Moreover, \((x^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^{k+1}) = (T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k), T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k))\). We denote \(\hat{S} = \text{blkdiag}(\tau^{-1} I_{p \times p}, I_{n \times n} \otimes D(\sigma)^{-1}), \)
and \(\hat{P} = \text{blkdiag}(p_1, \ldots, p_n) I_{p \times p}, p_1 I_{n \times n}, \ldots, p_n I_{n \times n}\).

We then have,
\[ \|T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) - (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)\|_{S^\ast}^2 = E_k \left[ \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{r^{-1}}^2 + \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2 \right]. \]

**Proof.** Let \((x, y)\) be a fixed point of \(T\). Then it follows that \(y(i) = \text{prox}_{D(\sigma), f_i}(y(i) + D(\sigma)Ax(i)), \forall i, \hat{y}(i) = y(i), \forall i\) and \(x(i) = \text{prox}_{\tau, g}(x(i) - \tau A^T y(i)), \forall i\). Hence, optimality conditions for each \(i\) are clearly the same as (2.5). Therefore fixed points of \(T\) are such that \((x(i), y(i)) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ast, \forall i\).

The equality \((x^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^{k+1}) = (T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k), T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k))_{y(1)}\) is just another way to write the algorithm. Since when inputted \((1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)\), \(T\) outputs \((1 \otimes \tilde{y}^{k+1})\) for the dual variable, we can simply take first copy for \(\tilde{y}^{k+1}\).
For the equality of norms, we have, using the fact that \( \| \hat{y}^{k+1} - y^k \|_D^{(\sigma)-1}_p \leq \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \| \hat{y}^{k+1} - y^k \|_D^{(\sigma)-1}_p \right] \) as in (7.14),
\[
\| T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) - (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) \|_{SP}^2 \\
= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \| T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) y(i) - x^k \|_{T^{-1}} p_i + \| T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) y(i) - y^k \|_{D^{(\sigma)-1}} p_i \right) \\
= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \| T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) x(i) - x^k \|_{T^{-1}} p_i + \| \hat{y}^{k+1} - y^k \|_{D^{(\sigma)-1}} (\sum_{i=1}^n p_i) \right) \\
= \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \| x^k - x^k \|_{T^{-1}} + \| \hat{y}^{k+1} - y^k \|_{D^{(\sigma)-1}} p_i \right],
\]
where we also used that \( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \).

**Theorem 4.3.** Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, almost surely, there exists \((x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^*\), such that the iterates of SPDHG satisfy \(x^k \to x^*\) and \(y^k \to y^*\).

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.1, we have
\[
D_\sigma(x^k; z) + D_{f^*}(\hat{y}^{k+1}; z) \leq -\mathbb{E}_k \left[ V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y) \right] + V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y) - V(z^k - z^{k-1}).
\]
We pick \(x = x^*\) and \(y = y^*\) and by convexity we get \(D_\sigma(x^k; z) \geq 0\), \(D_{f^*}(\hat{y}^{k+1}; z^*) \geq 0\). In addition, we define
\[
\Delta^{k-1} = V_k(x^{k-1} - x^*, y^k - y^*) \\
\Delta^k = V_{k+1}(x^k - x^*, y^{k+1} - y^*).
\]
We use these definitions in (4.4) to write
\[
\mathbb{E}_k [\Delta^k] \leq \Delta^{k-1} - V(z^k - z^{k-1}).
\]
We now use the fact that \(\mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\mathbb{E}_k [\Delta^k]] = \mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\Delta^k]\) to write
\[
\mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\Delta^k] \leq \mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}_{k-1} [V(z^k - z^{k-1})] \\
\leq \mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] - C_1 \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \| T(1 \otimes x^{k-1}, 1 \otimes y^{k-1}) - (1 \otimes x^{k-1}, 1 \otimes y^{k-1}) \|_{SP}^2 \right],
\]
where the last inequality is by (4.2) and Lemma 4.2.

We take full expectation of both sides and get from this inequality that \(\mathbb{E} [\Delta^k] \leq \Delta^0 \) and \(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \| T(1 \otimes x^{k-1}, 1 \otimes y^{k-1}) - (1 \otimes x^{k-1}, 1 \otimes y^{k-1}) \|_{SP}^2 \right] < +\infty\).

First, let \(\mathbb{E} [\Delta^k] \leq \Delta^0 \) and (4.3), we get that \(z^\omega(t) = (x^k(\omega), y^k(\omega))\) is a bounded sequence where \(\omega\) is picked from a set of probability 1. Therefore \((z_k(\omega))_k \) is a converging subsequence and we denote by \(\tilde{z} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\) one of its cluster points. Then, denote \(q^k = (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)\) and \(\tilde{q} = (1 \otimes \tilde{x}, 1 \otimes \tilde{y})\). It follows that \(\tilde{q}\) is a cluster point of \((q^k(\omega))_k\).

We now use the facts that \(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \| T(q^k - q_k - q^{k-1}) \|_{SP}^2 \right] < +\infty\) and (4.2) to conclude that \(T(q^k(\omega)) - q^k(\omega) \to 0\), by continuity of \(T\), we have that \(T(\tilde{q}) - \tilde{q} \to 0\), therefore \(\tilde{q}\) is a fixed point of \(T\). We now use Lemma 4.2 to argue that fixed points of \(T\) which we denote as \((x_f(i), y_f(i)) \in \{1, ..., n\}\) are such that \((x_f(i), y_f(i)) \in \mathcal{Z}^*, \forall i\). Since \(\tilde{q}\) is a fixed point of \(T\), we conclude that \(\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^*\).

To sum up, we have shown that at least on some subsequence \(z_k(\omega)\) converges to \(\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^*\). Using Robbins-Siegmund lemma [37] and the same arguments as in [18], we can then show that, almost surely, there exists \((x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^*\) such that \(x^k \to x^*\) and \(y^k \to y^*\).

We remark that almost sure convergence result in [6], given in the Bregman distance generated by \(h(x, y) = f^*(y) + g(x)\), does not guarantee that \((x^k, y^k)\) will converge to a point in the solution set \(\mathcal{Z}^*\), unless \(h\) is strictly convex as also mentioned in [6, Remark 4]. In contrast, our result shows almost sure convergence to a point in the solution set for general convex case.
4.2 Linear convergence

The standard approach for showing linear convergence with metric subregularity is to obtain a Fejer-type inequality of the form [24]

\[
\mathbb{E}_k [d(z^{k+1} - z^*)] \leq d(z^k - z^*) - V(T(z^k) - z^k),
\]

(4.6)

for suitably defined norms \(d\) and \(V\) and operator \(T\). However, as evident from (4.1) and the definition of \(V_{k+1}\), one iteration result of SPDHG does not fit into this form. When \(x = x^*, y = y^*, V_{k+1}(x^* - x, y^{k+1} - y^*)\) does not only measure distance to solution, but also the distance of subsequent iterates \(y^{k+1}\) and \(y^k\). In addition, \(V_{k+1}\) includes \(x^* - x^*\) and \(y^{k+1} - y^*\) rather than \(x^* - x^*\) and \(y^{k+1} - y^*\), which further presents a challenge due to asymmetry, for using metric subregularity. Therefore, an intricate analysis is needed to control the additional terms and handle the asymmetry in \(V_{k+1}\). In addition, Lemma 4.2 is a necessary tool to identify \(T\).

We need the following notation which builds on Lemma 4.2 for easier computations with metric subregularity.

Lemma 4.4. Under the notations of Lemma 4.2, to write compactly the operation of \(T\), let us define the operators

\[
C : (x, y) \mapsto (\partial g(x), \partial f^*(y)),
\]

\[
M : (x, y) \mapsto (A^T y, -Ax),
\]

\[
B : (x, y) \mapsto (\partial g(x(1)), \ldots, \partial g(x(n)), \partial f^*(y(1)), \ldots, \partial f^*(y(n))),
\]

\[
N : (x, y) \mapsto (A^T y(1), \ldots, A^T y(n), -Ax(1), \ldots, -Ax(n)),
\]

\[
F = C + M,
\]

and

\[
H : (x, y) \mapsto (\tau^{-1} x(1) + A^T (1 + p_1^{-1})E(1)y(1), \ldots,
\]

\[
\tau^{-1} x(n) + A^T (1 + p_n^{-1})E(n)y(n), D(\sigma)^{-1}y(1), \ldots, D(\sigma)^{-1}y(n)) .
\]

Let \(q^k = (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)\), \(\hat{q}^{k+1} = T(q^k)\) and \(\hat{z}^{k+1} = (x^{k+1}, \hat{y}^{k+1}) = (\hat{q}^{k+1}_{x(1)}, \hat{q}^{k+1}_{y(1)})\). Then, we have

\[
(H - N)q^k \in (B + H)q^{k+1} \text{ and } (N - H)(q^{k+1} - q^k) \in (B + N)q^{k+1} \text{ and }
\]

\[
\mathbb{E}_k [\text{dist}^2(0, Fz^{k+1})] = \mathbb{E}_k [\text{dist}^2(0, (C + M)z^{k+1})] = \text{dist}_p^2(0, (B + N)\hat{q}^{k+1}).
\]

Proof. We start by the representation in Lemma 4.2 by incorporating the update of \(\hat{y}^{k+1}\), and recalling the definition of \(E(i) = e(i)e(i)^T\), \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}

\[
y(i) = \text{prox}_{D(\sigma)f^*}(y(i) + D(\sigma)Ax(i))
\]

\[
\hat{x}(i) = \text{prox}_{\tau g}(x(i) - \tau A^T \left[ y(i) + (1 + p_i^{-1})E(i)(\hat{y}(i) - y(i)) \right])
\]

\[
= \text{prox}_{\tau g}(x(i) - \tau A^T (1 + p_i^{-1})E(i)\hat{y}(i) + \tau A^T (-I_n \times n + (1 + p_i^{-1})E(i))y(i)).
\]

We now use the definition of proximal operator to obtain

\[
D(\sigma)^{-1}y(i) + Ax(i) \in \partial f^* (\hat{y}(i)) + D(\sigma)^{-1}\hat{y}(i)
\]

\[
\tau^{-1} x(i) - A^T y(i) + A^T (1 + p_i^{-1})E(i)y(i) \in \partial g(\hat{x}(i)) + \tau^{-1} \hat{x}(i) + A^T (1 + p_i^{-1})E(i)\hat{y}(i).
\]

We identify

\[
Hq = \begin{bmatrix}
\tau^{-1} x(1) + A^T (1 + p_1^{-1})E(1)y(1) \\
\vdots \\
\tau^{-1} x(n) + A^T (1 + p_n^{-1})E(n)y(n) \\
D(\sigma)^{-1}y(1) \\
\vdots \\
D(\sigma)^{-1}y(n)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
Nq = \begin{bmatrix}
A^T y(1) \\
\vdots \\
-Ax(1) \\
\vdots \\
-Ax(n)
\end{bmatrix}
\]
and \( V \) which exists since Assumption 2.

Recall the definition of \( \hat{q} \) in (2.5). We assume that metric subregularity holds for all \( z^* \in Z^* \), where the first equality follows by \( \hat{q} \) and assign \( q = q^k \) and \( \hat{q} = \hat{q}^{k+1} \), by definition of \( T \) in Lemma 4.2 to obtain the first inclusion.

The second inclusion follows by adding to both sides \( Nq^{k+1} \) and rearranging.

For the equality, we write

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}_k \left[ \text{dist}^2 \left( 0, (C + M)z^{k+1} \right) \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{dist}^2 \left( 0, (C + M)\hat{q}^{k+1}(i) \right) p_i \\
&= \text{dist}^2 \left( 0, (B + N)\hat{q}^{k+1} \right),
\end{align*}
\]

where the first equality follows by \( z^{k+1} = (x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) = (\hat{q}^{k+1}, \hat{q}^{k+1}_y) \) and the second equality is by the definitions of \( C, M, B, \) and \( N \) and the fact that \( \hat{q}_y^{k+1} = \hat{q}_y^{k+1}(i), \forall i. \)

We continue by presenting the metric subregularity assumption we use for proving the linear convergence of SPDHG. We also include important example problems satisfying the assumption.

**Assumption 2.** Recall the definition of \( F \) in (2.5). We assume that metric subregularity holds for \( F \) at all \( z^* \in Z^* \) for 0 with constant \( \eta > 0 \) using the norm \( \| \cdot \|_S \) with \( S = \text{diag}(\tau^{-1} I_p, \sigma_1^{-1}, \ldots, \sigma_n^{-1}) \), and the neighborhood of regularity \( N(z^*) \) contains \( \hat{z}^k, \forall k, \) almost surely.

We note that this holds in following cases:

1. \( f^*_i \) and \( g \) are strongly convex functions, since \( N(z^*) = Z \).
2. The problem (1.1) is a linear program, since \( N(z^*) = Z \).
3. The problem (1.1) is defined with PLQ functions and \( \text{dom } g \) and \( \text{dom } f^* \) are compact sets, in which case \( N(z^*) = \text{dom } g \times \text{dom } f^* \).

**Remark 4.5.** In the first two cases of Assumption 2, compact domains are not needed since metric subregularity holds globally for these problems. One can also relax strong convexity in the first case, to local strong convexity and quadratic growth as in [25]. We remark that compact domain assumption is only needed in the third case in Assumption 2 in this paper, for PLQs. The reason, as we will see in Theorem 4.6 is the lack of control on the low probability event that the trajectory may make an excursion far away. The same assumption for proving linear convergence of a primal-dual coordinate descent method, in the case of PLQs is also needed in [24].

We present our main theoretical development in the next theorem, where we show that SPDHG with step sizes in (3.1) attains linear convergence when the problem satisfies metric subregularity.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. We denote by

\[
(x_k^*, y_k^*) = \arg \min_{(x,y) \in Z^*} V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y),
\]

which exists since \( V_k \) is a nonnegative quadratic function. We also define

\[
\Delta^k = V_{k+1}(x^k - x_k^*, y^{k+1} - y_k^*),
\]

and

\[
q^k = \Delta^k \frac{C_1}{4\zeta} \| y^k - y_k^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \geq 0.
\]
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Then,

$$E \left[ \frac{C_1}{2} \|x^k - x_\star^k\|_{\tau}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2 \right] \leq (1 - \rho)^k 2\Phi^0,$$

where $\rho = \frac{C_1 p}{2\zeta}$, $\zeta = 2 + 2\eta^2\|H - N\|^2$, $C_1 = 1 - \gamma$, and $\eta$ is picked large enough so that $\zeta \geq (1 + \gamma)p$. We note that the assumption on $\eta$ is not restrictive, since when $F$ is metrically subregular for some $\eta_0$, then it is also metrically subregular for all $\eta > \eta_0$, in view of (2.6).

**Proof.** Starting from the result of Lemma 4.1, we have

$$D_g(x^k; z) + D_f(y^{k+1}; z) \leq -E_k[V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y)] + V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y) - V(z^k - z^{k-1}). \quad (4.7)$$

We pick $x = x_\star^{k-1}$, $y = y^k$, with $z_k = (x_\star^{k-1}, y^k)$ and use convexity to get $D_g(x^k; z_k) \geq 0$ and $D_f(y^{k+1}; z_k) \geq 0$. In addition, we define

$$\Delta^{k-1} = V_k(x^{k-1} - x_\star^{k-1}, y^k - y_\star^k)$$

$$\Delta^k = V_{k+1}(x^k - x_\star^{k-1}, y^{k+1} - y_\star^k).$$

We use these definitions in (4.7) to write

$$E_k[\Delta^k] \leq \Delta^{k-1} - V(z^k - z^{k-1}).$$

By definition of $(x_\star^k, y_\star^{k+1})$, we have $\Delta^k \leq \Delta^k$, which implies that

$$E_k[\Delta^k] \leq \Delta^{k-1} - V(z^k - z^{k-1}). \quad (4.8)$$

We recall $S = \text{diag}(\tau^{-1}P, \sigma_1^{-1}, \ldots, \sigma_n^{-1})$, $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{P}$ are as defined in Lemma 4.2, and $\text{dist}_{\bar{S}}^2(z_k, Z^*) = \|z_k - \bar{P}z_k, (z_k)\|_S^2 = \|x^k - \bar{x}_k\|_{\tau}^2 + \|y^k - y_\star^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2$ where $\bar{x}_k$ is the projection of $x^k$ onto the set of solutions with respect to norm $\|\cdot\|_{\tau}$ and $\bar{P}$ is the projection of $y^k$ onto the set of solutions with respect to norm $\|\cdot\|_{\tau}$.

We now use Assumption 2 stating that $F = C + M$ is metrically subregular at $\hat{z}^{k+1} = (x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ for $0$. We recall, $q^k = (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)$ and $\hat{q}^{k+1} = T(q^k)$ and estimate as

$$\|x^k - \hat{x}_k\|_{\tau}^2 + \|y^k - y_\star^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2 = \text{dist}_{\bar{S}}^2(z_k, Z^*)$$

$$\leq E_k[\|z^k - \bar{P}z^k, (z^k)\|_S^2]$$

$$\leq 2E_k[\|z^k - \hat{z}^{k+1}\|_S^2] + 2E_k[\|\hat{z}^{k+1} - \bar{P}z^{k+1}\|_S^2]$$

$$\leq 2E_k[\|z^k - \hat{z}^{k+1}\|_S^2] + 2\eta^2E_k[\text{dist}_{\bar{S}}^2(0, (C + M)\hat{z}^{k+1})]$$

$$= 2E_k[\|z^k - \hat{z}^{k+1}\|_S^2] + 2\eta^2\text{dist}_{\bar{S}}^2(0, (B + N)\hat{q}^{k+1})$$

$$\leq 2E_k[\|z^k - \hat{z}^{k+1}\|_S^2] + 2\eta^2\|N - H\|^2\|q^{k+1} - q^k\|_{\bar{S}}^2,$$  

where the first inequality is due to the definition of $\text{dist}_{\bar{S}}^2(z_k, Z^*)$, third inequality is due to metric subregularity, second equality and fourth inequality are by Lemma 4.4 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

First, we use $\|\hat{q}^{k+1} - q^k\|_{\bar{S}}^2 = E_k[\|q^{k+1} - q^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2]$ as in (7.14) to estimate

$$E_k[\|z^k - \hat{z}^{k+1}\|_S^2] = E_k[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{\tau}^2] + \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2,$$

$$= E_k[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{\tau}^2 + \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2]. \quad (4.10)$$

Second, we use Lemma 4.2 to obtain

$$\|\hat{q}^{k+1} - q^k\|_{\bar{S}}^2 \leq \|T(1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k) - (1 \otimes x^k, 1 \otimes y^k)\|_{\bar{S}}^2$$

$$= E_k[\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_{\tau}^2 + \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_{D(\sigma^{-1} p^{-1})}^2]. \quad (4.11)$$

9
We combine (4.10) and (4.11) in (4.9) to get
\[
\frac{1}{2} \| x_k - \bar{x}_k \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_k - y_k^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \\
\leq (2 + 2\eta^2 \|N - H\|^2) E_k \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| x_{k+1} - x_k \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_{k+1} - y_k^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right].
\] (4.12)

Herein, we denote \( \zeta = 2 + 2\eta^2 \| H - N \|^2 \).

By using (4.2), we have that, for all \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \)
\[
E_{k-1} \left[ V(z^k - z^{k-1}) \right] \geq C_1 E_{k-1} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| x_k - x_{k-1} \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_k - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right] \\
\geq C_1 \left( \frac{1}{2} \| x_{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1} \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_{k-1} - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right) \\
\geq C_1 \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} \| x_{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1} \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_{k-1} - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right),
\] (4.13)

where the second inequality is due to (4.12).

We have, by definition of \( x_{k-1}^* \) that
\[
\Delta^{k-1} \leq V_k(x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^*, y^k - y_k^*) \\
= \frac{1}{2} \| x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^* \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y^{k-1} - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \\
- \langle P^{-1} A(x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^*), y^k - y_k^* \rangle \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \| x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^* \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y^{k-1} - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} + \frac{1}{2} \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \\
+ \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} \| y^k - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \| x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^* \|^2_{r-1} \\
= \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} \| x^{k-1} - \bar{x}_{k-1}^* \|^2_{r-1} + \frac{1 + \gamma}{2\alpha} \| y^{k-1} - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \\
+ \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} \| y^k - y_{k-1} \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} - \frac{1 + \gamma}{2\alpha} \| y_{k-1} - y^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1},
\]

where the second inequality is due to (3.1).

We now take conditional expectation of both sides and use (4.13) to get
\[
E_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] \leq \frac{(1 + \gamma)\zeta}{C_1 \alpha} E_{k-1} \left[ V(z^k - z^{k-1}) \right] + \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} E_{k-1} \left[ \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} E_{k-1} \left[ \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right] - \frac{1 + \gamma}{2\alpha} \| y_{k-1} - y^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1}.
\]

By using (4.2) and requiring that \( \frac{(1 + \gamma)\zeta}{C_1} \leq \frac{(1 + \gamma)\zeta}{C_1 \alpha} \), or equivalently \( \zeta \geq \alpha \), which is not restrictive since \( \alpha \) is finite, and one can increase \( \eta \) as in (2.6) to satisfy the requirement, we can combine the first two terms in the right hand side to get
\[
E_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] \leq \frac{2(1 + \gamma)\zeta}{C_1 \alpha} E_{k-1} \left[ V(z^k - z^{k-1}) \right] + \frac{1}{2} E_{k-1} \left[ \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right] \\
- \frac{1 + \gamma}{2\alpha} \| y_{k-1} - y^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1}.
\]

We now insert this inequality into (4.8) and use that \( E_{k-1} \left[ E_k [\Delta^k] \right] = E_{k-1} [\Delta^k] \)
\[
E_{k-1} [\Delta^k] \leq E_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] + \left( -\frac{C_1 \alpha}{2(1 + \gamma)\zeta} E_{k-1} [\Delta^{k-1}] \right) \\
+ \frac{C_1 \alpha}{4(1 + \gamma)\zeta} E_{k-1} \left[ \| y_k^* - y_k \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}, p-1} \right] - \frac{C_1}{4\alpha} \| y_{k-1} - y^* \|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}},
\]
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We take full expectation and rearrange to get
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \Delta^k - \frac{C_1 \alpha}{4(1 + \gamma) \zeta} \|y^k - y^*_k\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1} P^{-1}} \right] \\
\leq \left( 1 - \frac{C_1 \alpha}{2(1 + \gamma) \zeta} \right) \mathbb{E}\left[ \Delta^{k-1} - \frac{C_1}{4 \zeta(1 - \frac{C_1 \alpha}{4(1 + \gamma) \zeta})} \|y^{k-1} - y^*_{k-1}\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right].
\]
(4.14)

We require
\[
C_2 = \frac{C_1 \alpha}{4p(1 + \gamma) \zeta} \leq \frac{C_1}{4 \zeta(1 - \frac{C_1 \alpha}{4(1 + \gamma) \zeta})} \iff \alpha \leq (1 + \gamma) \frac{4 \zeta}{C_1}.
\]
(4.15)

Let us pick \( \alpha = (1 + \gamma) \frac{4 \zeta}{C_1} \) so that \( C_2 = \frac{C_1}{4 \zeta} \) and define
\[
\Phi^k = \Delta^k - C_2 \|y^k - y^*_k\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}}.
\]

We note (4.13) and (4.8) to have
\[
\|y^k - y^*_k\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \leq \frac{2 \zeta}{C_1} \mathbb{E}_k \left[ V(z^{k+1} - z^*) \right] \leq \frac{2 \zeta}{C_1} \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \Delta^k \right].
\]

Then, we can lower bound \( \Phi^k \) as
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \Phi^k \right] \geq \left( 1 - C_2 \frac{2 \zeta}{C_1} \right) \mathbb{E}\left[ \Delta^k \right] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[ \Delta^k \right].
\]
(4.16)

Therefore, it follows that \( \mathbb{E}\left[ \Phi^k \right] \) is nonnegative, by the definition of \( \Delta^k \) and (4.3).

We can now rewrite (4.14) as
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \Phi^k \right] \leq (1 - \rho) \mathbb{E}\left[ \Phi^{k-1} \right],
\]
where \( \rho = \frac{C_1 \alpha}{2 C_1} \). We have shown that \( \Phi^k \) converges linearly to 0 in expectation.

By (4.16), it immediately follows that \( \Delta^k \) converges linearly to 0.

To conclude, we note \( \Delta^k = V_{k+1}(x^k - x^*_k, y^k+1 - y^*_{k+1}) \), and (4.3), from which we conclude linear convergence of \( \|x^k - x^*_k\|^2_{P^{-1}} \) and \( \|y^{k+1} - y^*_{k+1}\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1} P^{-1}} \).

It is obvious to see that \( 0 < \rho \) follows by the fact that \( \eta \) is finite by metric subregularity and \( \rho < 1 \) follows since, if needed one can take \( \eta \) large enough to satisfy \( \rho < 1 \).

One important remark about Theorem 4.6 is that the knowledge of the metric subregularity constant \( \eta \) is not needed for running the algorithm. Step sizes are chosen as (3.1) and linear convergence follows directly when metric subregularity holds in the sense of (2.6). Important examples where metric subregularity holds are given in Assumption 2 and Section 2.2.

**Remark 4.7.** Strictly speaking, metric subregularity is used in Theorem 4.6 in the weighted norm
\[
dist_z(z, Z^*) \leq \eta \dist_z(0, F z),
\]
where \( S = \text{diag}(\tau^{-1} p, \sigma_1^{-1}, \ldots, \sigma_n^{-1}) \). In terms of the definition in (2.6) if \( \eta_0 \) is the constant using the standard Euclidean norm, it is obvious that \( \eta \leq \|S\| \|S^{-1}\| \eta_0 \), but we use \( \eta \) in Theorem 4.6 since it can be smaller, resulting in a better rate.

For obtaining linear convergence in Theorem 6.1 of [6], the authors modify step sizes with strong convexity constants \( \mu_x \) and \( \mu_y \) and their result does not apply when step sizes in (3.1) are used. On the other hand, Theorem 4.6 shows that SPDHG with step sizes in (3.1) adapts to strong convexity in the problem (see Assumption 2) to get global linear convergence rate, explaining the favorable performance of SPDHG with standard step sizes. In addition, since Assumption 2 also covers nonstrongly convex problems, Theorem 4.6 implies linear convergence for a broader class of problems.

The guarantees in Theorem 4.6 for PLQs (see Assumption 2) apply to SVM, Lasso and quadratic programs. This result explains the linear convergence behaviour observed in practice for SPDHG while solving these nonsmooth and/or nonstrongly convex problems, albeit, strictly speaking, not completely. Specifically for PLQs, as given in Assumption 2, we have to assume compact domains for \( f^* \) and \( g \) which might not hold in general and the technical reason for the assumption is detailed in Remark 4.5. The same assumption is also needed in previous work [24].
4.3 Sublinear convergence

In this section, we show convergence rates for ergodic sequence as in [6] and a randomly selected iterate in the spirit of [18, 38].

4.3.1 Ergodic sequence

It is known that SPDHG obtains the optimal $O(1/k)$ with ergodic averaging [6]. The guarantee for primal-dual gap in [6] requires bounded primal and dual domains. Without bounded domains, [6] obtains rates in Bregman distance generated by $h(z) = f^*(y) + g(x)$ which is weaker than convergence in objective value and/or feasibility. In this section, we show that convergence in terms of objective values and/or feasibility can indeed be shown with possibly unbounded primal and dual domains. We remark that the specific case of $f(\cdot) = \delta_b(\cdot)$ is studied in [28] and a similar result was derived.

**Theorem 4.8.** Let Assumption 1 hold. We define $x^k_{av} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i$.

- If $f$ is $L(f)$-Lipschitz continuous, and $y_i \in \text{dom } f^*$,
  \[
  \mathbb{E} [f(Ax^k_{av}) + g(x^k_{av}) - f(Ax^*) - g(x^*)] \leq \frac{C_6}{k}.
  \]

- If $f(\cdot) = \delta_b(\cdot)$ with $b \in \mathcal{Y}$,
  \[
  \mathbb{E} [g(x^k_{av}) - g(x^*)] \leq \frac{C_7}{k},
  \]
  \[
  \mathbb{E} \|Ax^k_{av} - b\|_{D(\sigma)P} \leq \frac{C_8}{k},
  \]

where $C_6 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) (f^*(y_i) - \mathbb{E} [f^*(y_i^{k+1})]) + (1/p - 1) \mathbb{E} \|y^{k+1} - y^1\|^2 + \frac{1+\gamma}{2} \|y^1 - y^0\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}P^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1/p_i - 1) \|A_i\|^2 \|x^0\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} < +\infty,}$

$A_f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) |A_i|^2 \tau + 1 + \gamma,$

$C_6 = C_e + \frac{2}{L(f)^2} + \frac{A_f}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2_{\tau^{-1}},$

$C_7 = C_e + \frac{1}{2} \|y^* - y^1\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}P^{-1}} + \left( \|y^* - y^1\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}P^{-1}} + 4C_e + 2A_f \|x^* - x^0\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} \right)^{1/2},$

$C_8 = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \|y^* - y^1\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}P^{-1}} + \left( \|y^* - y^1\|^2_{D(\sigma)^{-1}P^{-1}} + 4C_e + 2A_f \|x^* - x^0\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} \right)^{1/2} \right\},$

**Proof.** Recall that $f^*$ is separable, and as in (2.4), we have

\[
D_{f^*}(y; \bar{z}) = f^*_1(y_1) - f^*_1(\bar{y}_1) - \langle A_i \bar{x}, y_i - \bar{y}_i \rangle.
\]

Moreover, we define

\[
D_{f^*}(y; \bar{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) D_{f^*_i}(y_i; \bar{z}).
\]

Then, we note that for $F_k$ measurable $Z = (X,Y)$, we have

\[
D_{f^*}(y^{k+1}; Z) = \mathbb{E}_k \left[ D_{f^*}(y^{k+1}; Z) - D_{f^*}(y^k; Z) + \mathbb{E}_k \left[ D_{f^*}(y^{k+1}; Z) \right] \right].
\]

Then, as in Lemma 4.1, we get

\[
D_f(x^k; z) + \mathbb{E}_k \left[ D_{f^*}(y^{k+1}; z) \right] \leq D_{f^*}(y^k; z) - \mathbb{E}_k \left[ D_{f^*}(y^{k+1}; z) \right] - \mathbb{E}_k \left[ V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y) \right] + V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y).
\]
We take total expectation and sum this inequality to get

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_{f^*}(y^{i+1}; z) \right] \leq D_f^j(y^1; z) - \mathbb{E} \left[ D_f^j(y^{k+1}; z) \right] \\
- \mathbb{E} \left[ V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y) \right] + V_1(x^0 - x, y^1 - y) \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) \left( f_i^*(y^1) - \mathbb{E} \left[ f_i^*(y^{k+1}) \right] \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[ (A_i x, y_i^{k+1} - y_i^1) \right] \\
+ V_1(x^0 - x, y^1 - y). \tag{4.18}
\]

We estimate

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) \left( f_i^*(y_i^1) - \mathbb{E} \left[ f_i^*(y_i^{k+1}) \right] \right) \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) \left( f_i^*(y_i^1) - \mathbb{E} \left[ f_i^*(y_i^{k+1}) \right] \right) + \frac{|A_i|^2}{2} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \| x - x^0 \|_2^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y_i^1 \|^2 \right] \right] \\
+ \frac{|A_i|^2}{2} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \| x_0 \|_2^2 \right] \right).
\]

Moreover, we have, similar to (4.3)

\[
V_1(x^0 - x, y^1 - y) \leq (1 + \gamma) \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| x^0 - x \|_{\tau^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| y^1 - y_0 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \| y^1 - y_0 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}^2. \tag{4.19}
\]

We combine the last two estimates into (4.18) to obtain

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_{f^*}(y^{i+1}; z) \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) \left( f_i^*(y_i^1) - \mathbb{E} \left[ f_i^*(y_i^{k+1}) \right] \right) \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( 1/p_i - 1 \right) |A_i|_2^2 \left[ \| x - x^0 \|_{\tau^{-1}}^2 + (1/2 - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y_i^1 \|^2 \right] \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \| y^1 - y_0 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}^2.
\]

We define

\[
A_f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) |A_i|_2^2 \tau + 1 + \gamma,
\]

rearrange the last inequality and multiply both sides by $1/k$ to get

\[
\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_{f^*}(y^{i+1}; z) \right] - \frac{A_f}{2k} \| x^0 - x \|_{\tau^{-1}}^2 - \frac{1}{2k} \| y^1 - y_0 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{k} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} - 1 \right) \left( f_i^*(y_i^1) - \mathbb{E} \left[ f_i^*(y_i^{k+1}) \right] \right) + (1/2 - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y_i^1 \|^2 \right] \right\} \\
+ \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} \| y^1 - y_0 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}p^{-1}}^2 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1/p_i - 1)|A_i|_2^2 \| x_0 \|_{\tau^{-1}}^2}{2} \\
= \frac{1}{k} C_e. \tag{4.20}
\]

Due to (4.8), $\mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y_i^1 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right] \leq 2\Delta^0$, and by Jensen’s inequality and concavity of square root, $\mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y_i^1 \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right] \leq \sqrt{2\Delta^0}$, thus $\mathbb{E} \left[ \| y^{k+1} \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} \right] \leq \sqrt{2\Delta^0} + \| y \|_{D(\sigma)^{-1}} =: C_d < +\infty$. 


Since \( f_i \) is proper, lower semicontinuous, convex, by Corollary 13.38 and Corollary 9.21 from [4], we have that \( \forall y_i \) such that \( \| y_i \| \leq C_d < +\infty \), \( f_i^*(y_i) \geq -C_i^* > -\infty \).

By Jensen’s inequality, \( \| E [y_i^{k+1}] \|_{\sigma_i^{-1}} \leq E \left[ \| y_i^{k+1} \|_{\sigma_i^{1}} \right] \leq C_d \) and \( -C_i^* \sigma_i \leq f_i^*(E [y_i^{k+1}]) \leq E [f_i^*(y_i^{k+1})] \), which concludes that \( E [f_i^*(y_i^{k+1})] \) is bounded from below.

With similar reasoning, \( E \left[ \| y^{k+1} - y^1 \|_2^2 \right] \) is bounded from above. Combining these shows that \( C_e \) is bounded from above.

We now take the supremum of both sides of (4.20) with respect to \( x \) and \( y \) and note the definition of smoothed gap as before and define \( x_{av}^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^k, y_{av}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k y_i^{k+1} \) and use Jensen’s inequality in (4.20) to obtain

\[
E \left[ G_{\frac{\delta_f}{\| z \|}, \frac{1}{k}} (x_{av}^k, y_{av}^{k+1}; x^0, y^1) \right] = E \left[ D_g(x_{av}^k; z) + D_f(y_{av}^{k+1}; z) \right] - \frac{A_f}{2k} \| x^0 - x \|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2k} \| y^1 - y \|_2^2 p - 1 \\
\leq \frac{1}{k} C_e. \tag{4.22}
\]

- When \( f \) is Lipschitz continuous in the norm \( \| \cdot \|_{D(\sigma)} \), we will argue as in [18]. First, on (4.21), we make the following observations. By Corollary 17.19 in [4], when \( f \) is \( L(f) \)-Lipschitz continuous in the norm \( \| \cdot \|_{D(\sigma)} \), it follows that \( \| y^1 - y \|_{D(\sigma)} \leq L(f)^2. \) Moreover, we can pick \( y \in \partial f(Ax^k) \neq \emptyset \) such that \( \langle Ax^k, y \rangle - f^*(y) = f(Ax^k) \) and \( x = x^* \) such that \( f^*(y^{k+1}) - \langle A^T y^{k+1}, x^* \rangle \geq -f(Ax^*) \) by Fenchel-Young inequality. We also use \( p = \min \{p_i \} \) to obtain

\[
E \left[ G_{\frac{\delta_f}{\| z \|}, \frac{1}{k}} (x_{av}^k, y_{av}^{k+1}; x^0, y^1) \right] \geq E \left[ f(Ax_{av}^k) + g(x_{av}^k) - f(Ax^*) - g(x^*) \right] \\
- \frac{2}{p} L(f)^2 - \frac{A_f}{2k} \| x^0 - x^* \|_2^2 - 1,
\]

where the result directly follows.

- When \( f(\cdot) = \delta_\delta(\cdot) \), we use Lemma 1 from [41], to obtain the bounds

\[
E \left[ g(x_{av}^k) - g(x^*) \right] \leq E \left[ G_{\frac{\delta_f}{\| z \|}, \frac{1}{k}} (x_{av}^k, y_{av}^{k+1}; x^0, y^1) \right] \\
+ \frac{A_f}{2k} \| x^0 - x^* \|_2^2 - 1 - E \left[ \| y^* - Ax_{av}^k - b \|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \| y^* - y^1 \|_2^2 D(\sigma) - 1 p - 1, \right. \\
E \left[ \| Ax_{av}^k - b \|_{D(\sigma)} p \right] \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left\{ \| y^* - y^1 \|_{D(\sigma) - 1 p - 1} + \left( \| y^* - y^1 \|_{D(\sigma) - 1 p - 1} \right)^2 \\
+ 4kE \left[ G_{\frac{\delta_f}{\| z \|}, \frac{1}{k}} (x_{av}^k, y_{av}^{k+1}; x^0, y^1) \right] + 2A_f \| x^0 - x^* \|_2^2 - 1 \right\}^{1/2}, \]

- \]

4.3.2 Randomly selected iterate

We characterize the convergence rate for a randomly selected iterate in the spirit of [18, Theorem 11] where the authors showed \( O(1/\sqrt{k}) \) rate for a different primal-dual coordinate descent algorithm. Our next corollary states that it is also possible to obtain the optimal \( O(1/k) \) rate for this iterate for SPDHG.

**Corollary 4.9.** Let Assumption 1 hold. Define \( K \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \) which is selected uniformly at random, independent of \( F_k \).

- If \( f \) is \( L(f) \)-Lipschitz continuous, and \( y^1 \in \text{dom} f^* \),

\[
E \left[ f(Ax^k) + g(x^k) - f(Ax^*) - g(x^*) \right] \leq \frac{C_0}{k}.
\]
If \( f(\cdot) = \delta_b(\cdot) \) with \( b \in \mathcal{Y} \),
\[
E \left[ g(x^K) - g(x^*) \right] \leq \frac{C_7}{k}, \quad E \left[ \|Ax^K - b\|_{D(\sigma)} \right] \leq \frac{C_8}{k},
\]
where \( C_6, C_7, C_7, \) and \( C_8 \) are as defined in Theorem 4.8.

**Proof.** We proceed the same as the proof of Theorem 4.8, until (4.20) which is
\[
\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} E \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_f^*(y^{i+1}; z) \right] - \frac{A_f}{2k} \|x^0 - x\|_{\tau^{-1}}^2 - \frac{1}{2k} \|y^1 - y\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} C_e. \tag{4.23}
\]
Here, we note that
\[
E \left[ D_g(x^K; z) + D_f^*(y^{K+1}; z) \right] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} E \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_f^*(y^{i+1}; z) \right].
\]
Then, we have for the left hand side of (4.23) that
\[
E \left[ G_{A_f} \left( x^K, y^{K+1}, x^0, y^1 \right) \right] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E \left[ D_g(x^i; z) + D_f^*(y^{i+1}; z) \right] - \frac{A_f}{2k} \|x^0 - x\|_{\tau^{-1}}^2 - \frac{1}{2k} \|y^1 - y\|_{D(\sigma)^{-1} p^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} C_e. \tag{4.24}
\]
The rest follows the same steps as in the proof Theorem 4.8.

\[\square\]

5 Related works

5.1 Primal camp

Stochastic gradient based methods (SGD) can be applied to solve (1.1) [31, 36]. SGD cannot get linear convergence except special cases [30]. It is known that variance reduction based methods obtain linear convergence under the assumption that functions \( f_i \) are smooth and \( g \) is strongly convex or \( f_i \) are smooth and strongly convex [2, 23, 42]. Smoothness of \( f_i \) is equivalent to strong convexity of \( f_i^* \). Therefore, the linear convergence results of these methods require the similar assumptions as [6]. Moreover, as in [6], variance reduction based methods require knowing the constants \( \mu_i \) and \( \mu_g \) to set the algorithmic parameters accordingly, to obtain linear convergence.

For the specific case of \( f_i(\cdot) = \delta_{b_i}(\cdot) \), SGD type methods are proposed in [17, 33, 43]. However, these methods can only obtain \( O(1/k) \) rate with strong convexity of \( g \) since they focus on the general problem where the objective can be given in expectation form. Even though this rate is optimal for their template, it is suboptimal for (1.1).

5.2 Primal-dual camp

Another line of research utilizes coordinate descent type of schemes for solving (1.1). Coordinate descent with random sampling for unconstrained optimization is proposed in [32] and later generalized and improved in [19, 35]. These methods apply coordinate descent in the primal and obtain linear convergence rates with smooth and strongly convex \( f_i \) and smooth \( f_i^* \) and strongly convex \( g \).

Another approach is to apply coordinate ascent in the dual to exploit separability of the dual in (1.1). Stochastic dual coordinate ascent (SDCA) is proposed in [38, 39]. These methods require smoothness of \( f_i \) and strong convexity of \( g \) for guaranteeing linear convergence and the strong convexity constants are used in the algorithms for setting the parameters.
The algorithm we analyzed in this paper is SPDHG, which is proposed in [6]. The authors proved linear convergence of the modified method SPDHG-µ [6, Theorem 6.1] by assuming strong convexity of $f^*$, $g$ and special step sizes depending on strong convexity constants. The convergence and ergodic $O(1/k)$ results in [6] are given in terms of Bregman distances which is not interpretable in general. For obtaining $O(1/k)$ rate for the primal-dual gap, the result requires bounded primal and dual domains which prohibits the use of this guarantee for linearly constrained problems where primal and dual domains are unbounded. In contrast, our analysis for SPDHG, shows linear convergence with standard step sizes in (3.1) and with weaker metric subregularity assumption, detailed in Section 2. Moreover, in the general convex case, we prove almost sure convergence of the iterates to a solution, which is stronger than Bregman distance based almost sure convergence in [6], as discussed in Section 4.1. Lastly, we prove $O(1/k)$ for the ergodic sequence and randomly selected iterate, with possibly unbounded domains. The comparison of the results is also summarized in Table 2.

Primal dual coordinate descent schemes similar to SPDHG are proposed in [13, 18, 46]. All these variants assume strong convexity of $f^*$, $g$ to guarantee linear convergence. Only [18] proved linear convergence with step sizes independent of strong convexity constants which provided a partial answer for adaptivity of SPDHG-type methods to strong convexity. However, as detailed in Table 1 on Page 22, with dense $A$ matrix, and uniform sampling, this method requires step sizes $n$ times smaller than (3.1) which is problematic in practice as will be shown in Section 6.1. For sublinear convergence, [18] proved $O(1/\sqrt{k})$ rate on a randomly selected iterate, under similar assumption to ours whereas [46] requires boundedness of dual domain and setting a horizon.

Coordinate descent variants of primal-dual algorithms are also studied in [11, 12, 34]. As mentioned in [6, 18], operator theory-based proofs of these methods require using small step sizes depending on $\|A\|$ instead of $\|A_i\|$, which causes slow performance in practice.

Coordinate descent methods for linearly constrained problems are studied in [1, 13, 28]. These methods are shown to obtain sublinear convergence rates.

Latafat et al. [24] proposed a method called TriPD-BC and proved linear convergence for their method under metric subregularity. There exist two drawbacks of TriPD-BC for our setting. First, when $A$ is not of special structure, such as block diagonal, one needs to use duplication for an efficient implementation. Second issue is that as in [18], this method needs to use $n$ times smaller step sizes with dense $A$. For the details of duplication and small step sizes, we refer the reader to [18]. The need to use small step sizes seriously affects the practical performance of the algorithm as illustrated in Section 6.1.

We compiled the comparison of primal-dual coordinate descent methods in Table 1.

Some classical references for deterministic primal-dual algorithms are in [7, 8, 16, 21, 40, 41]. As observed in [6], coordinate descent-based variants significantly increase the practical performance of these deterministic methods.

Our results imply global linear convergence for deterministic PDHG when $n=1$, answering the question posed in [7] which stated that “It would be interesting to understand whether the steps can be estimated in Algorithm 1 without the a priori knowledge of $\mu_i, \mu_g$. ” We note that in the third part of Assumption 2, compact domains are not needed for this case, for PDHG. We would like to highlight that such behavior of deterministic primal-dual methods is investigated before in [24, 26].

5.3 Linear programming

A related notion to metric subregularity for linear programming is Hoffman’s lemma due to classical result in [22], which is used by many researchers to show linear convergence of ADMM-type methods for LPs [27, 44, 45]. The drawback of these approaches is that one needs to know the constant $\eta$ to run the algorithm which is difficult to estimate in general. Our analysis recovers these results specific to LPs with a much simpler algorithm that does not need the knowledge of $\eta$.

6 Numerical evidence

In this section, we are going to verify our theoretical findings showing that SPDHG with step sizes in (3.1) indeed obtains linear convergence for problems satisfying metric subregularity. The problems we will solve,
namely, basis pursuit, Lasso, ridge regression and SVM with hinge loss, all satisfy metric subregularity (see Assumption 2). On the other hand, only ridge regression is strongly convex-strongly concave, thus this is the only problem where existing linear convergence results from [6] apply by using the algorithm SPDHG-µ [6, Theorem 6.1]. We will show that even in this case, when strong convexity constants are small, applying SPDHG is more beneficial than applying SPDHG-µ. SPDHG-µ is not applicable for other problems due to lack of strong convexity either in the primal or dual problems. We also illustrate favorable behavior of SPDHG against state-of-the-art methods SVRG [23], accelerated SVRG [48] and SDCA [38].

For space limitations, we include results with one or two datasets for each problem whereas we observed similar behavior with other datasets as well. For SPDHG, as suggested in [6], we use the step sizes \( \tau = \frac{\gamma}{\max_i \| A_i \|} \) and \( \sigma_i = \frac{\gamma}{\| A_i \|} \), with \( \gamma = 0.99 \) for all problems. For the other methods, we use uniform sampling for coordinates and the suggested step sizes in the respective papers.

6.1 Sparse recovery with basis pursuit

We first solve the basis pursuit problem which is a fundamental problem in signal processing [10] and also finds applications in machine learning [3, 20]:

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \| x \|_1 : Ax = b. \tag{6.1}
\]

Since basis pursuit is a linear program [10], metric subregularity holds globally [22]. The aim in this section is to illustrate the difference on the step sizes mentioned in Section 5.2 and Table 1 and verify the proven linear convergence of SPDHG. We are going to compare SPDHG with coordinate descent version of Vu-Condat algorithm, developed in [18], which we refer to as FB-VC-CD. Note that [24] requires duplication for an efficient implementation for this problem and it uses the same step sizes as [18]. For this reason, we only compare with FB-VC-CD and note that the practical performance of [24] is bound to be similar to FB-VC-CD with same step sizes. We generate the data matrix \( A \) synthetically where \( n = 500 \) and \( p = 1000 \) and entries of data matrix follow a normal distribution. We generate a covariance matrix \( \Sigma_{i,j} = \rho^{|i-j|} \) with \( \rho = 0.5 \) and a sparse solution \( x^\star \) with 100 nonzero entries. We then compute \( b = Ax^\star \).

The analysis of SPDHG by [6] shows \( O(1/k) \) rate on the Bregman distance to solution on the ergodic sequence whereas our new analysis proves linear convergence on the last iterate. On the other hand, FB-VC-CD is proven to have \( O\left(1/\sqrt{k}\right) \) rate for this problem [18]. We note that FB-VC-CD is tailored specially to exploit sparsity in the data. However, in this problem, the data is dense, which causes FB-VC-CD to use \( n \) times smaller step sizes as shown in Figure 1. Because of this reason, FB-VC-CD exhibits a slow rate whereas SPDHG gets fast rate as predicted by our theoretical results.

![Figure 1: Linear convergence of SPDHG for basis pursuit problem.](image)

6.2 Lasso and ridge regression

In this section we solve ridge regression and Lasso problems, formulated as

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{2} \| Ax - b \|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \| x \|^2, \tag{6.2}
\]
and
\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda \|x\|_1,
\]
respectively.

In terms of structure, (6.2) is smooth and strongly convex, or equivalently, its Lagrangian function is strongly convex-strongly concave. For this problem class, [6] showed linear convergence for the method SPDHG-\(\mu\), which is a modified version of SPDHG using strong convexity and strong concavity constants for step sizes. In addition, SVRG and accelerated SVRG obtain linear convergence for this problem [2, 42, 48].

Different from [6], our results show linear convergence for SPDHG with step sizes in (3.1) only depending on \(\|A_i\|\).

We use regression datasets from libsvm [9] and use three different regularization parameters for each case and compile the results in Figures 2 and 3 along with information on datasets and regularization parameters.

Figure 2: Ridge regression, YearPredictionMSD, \(n = 463,715, p = 90\).

Figure 3: Ridge regression, w8a, \(n = 49,749, p = 300\).

We observe that, for large regularization parameters, or equivalently, large strong convexity constants, SPDHG-\(\mu\) is faster than SPDHG, which is expected since SPDHG-\(\mu\) is designed to use strong convexity as good as possible, whereas our result holds generically without any modifications on the algorithm. On the other hand, we observe that especially in the ill-conditioned regime where strong convexity constant is small, SPDHG gets a faster linear rate than SPDHG-\(\mu\), which suggests robustness of SPDHG over SPDHG-\(\mu\). SPDHG also shows a robust and favorable performance against SVRG and accelerated SVRG. We would like to remark that the aim in this experiment is not to argue that SPDHG gets the best performance in all cases since this instance is a very specific instance where most algorithms can get linear convergence. Our goal is rather to illustrate that even though our linear convergence results apply to a broad class of problems, SPDHG is still competitive when compared to methods which are designed to exploit the structure of this specific setting.

We then solve Lasso (6.3), for which SPDHG-\(\mu\) does not apply and accelerated SVRG cannot get linear rates. We compare with SVRG for varying regularization parameters and compile the results in Figure 4. We observe that SPDHG converges linearly for this problem and exhibits a better practical performance than SVRG, especially with small regularization parameters, similar to previous problem.
6.3 SVM

Lastly, we focus on an SVM instance where the problem is

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max(0, 1 - b_i \langle a_i, x \rangle) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2,$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, for $i = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ are the feature vectors and $b_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ are the labels. We used a classification dataset from libsvm [9], and compiled the results in Figure 5.

For this problem, SDCA [38] is observed to exhibit linear rate with partial explanations in theory. In [38], it is proven that with some restrictive assumptions on the data, one gets linear convergence for this problem. Due to the fact that hinge loss and ridge regularization terms are PLQ functions, our Theorem 4.6, Assumption 2, and Remark 4.5 provides an alternative explanation for good performance of SPDHG. We observe that both SDCA and SPDHG gets fast convergence for the problem. Similar to previous examples, when regularization parameter is large, SDCA and SPDHG gets similar performance. On the other hand, as regularization parameter gets smaller, the performance of SDCA deteriorates, whereas SPDHG maintains a favorable behavior.

7 Appendix

7.1 Proof for Lemma 4.1

Proof. As in [6], we first introduce the following representation for the algorithm with full dimensional updates

$$x^k = \text{prox}_{\tau,g}(x^{k-1} - \tau A^T \hat{y}^k), \tag{7.1}$$

$$\hat{y}^{k+1}_i = \text{prox}_{\sigma_i f_i}(y^{k}_i + \sigma_i A_i x^k). \tag{7.2}$$
By using the definition of the proximal operator (2.1) along with convexity of $f_*$ and $g$, we get, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\forall i = \{1, \ldots, n\}$

$$g(x) \geq g(x^k) + \langle x^k - x, A^\top \hat{y} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.3)

and

$$f_*(y_i) \geq f_*(\hat{y}_i^{k+1}) - \langle \hat{y}_i^{k+1} - y_i, A_i x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{y}_i^{k+1} - y_i\|^2_{\sigma_i^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{y}_i^{k+1} - y_i\|^2_{\sigma_i^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \|y_i - \hat{y}_i^k\|^2_{\sigma_i^{-1}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.4)

We sum the second inequality from $i = 1$ to $n$ and add to the first inequality to obtain

$$0 \geq g(x^k) - g(x) + \langle x^k - x, A^\top \hat{y} \rangle + f_*(\hat{y}^{k+1}) - f_*(y) - \langle \hat{y}^{k+1} - y, A x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{y} - y\rangle_{\sigma^{-1}} + \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - y\|^2_{\sigma^{-1}} + \|y^k - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2_{\sigma^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \|y_i - \hat{y}_i^k\|^2_{\sigma_i^{-1}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.5)

We recall

$$D_g(x^k; z) = g(x^k) - g(x) + \langle A^\top y, x^k - x \rangle,$$

$$D_{f_*}(\hat{y}^{k+1}; z) = f_*(\hat{y}^{k+1}) - f_*(y) - \langle Ax, \hat{y}^{k+1} - y \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.6) \hspace{1cm} (7.7)

We add and subtract $\langle A^\top y, x^k - x \rangle - \langle Ax, \hat{y}^{k+1} - y \rangle$ on the right hand side of (7.5) and use the definitions in (7.6) and (7.7) to get

$$0 \geq D_g(x^k; z) + D_{f_*}(\hat{y}^{k+1}; z) + \langle x^k - x, A^\top (\hat{y}^{k+1} - y) \rangle - \langle \hat{y}^{k+1} - y, A(x^k - x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \|x^k - x\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2_{\tau^{-1}}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{y} - y\rangle_{\sigma^{-1}} + \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - y\|^2_{\sigma^{-1}} + \|y^k - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2_{\sigma^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \|y_i - \hat{y}_i^k\|^2_{\sigma_i^{-1}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.8)

Note that at step $k$ of SPDHG in Algorithm 1, we select an index $i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ randomly with probability $p_{i_k}$ and perform the following step on the dual variable

$$y_{i_k}^{k+1} = \hat{y}_{i_k}^{k+1}, \text{ and } y_{i_k}^k = \hat{y}_{i_k}^k, \forall i \neq i_k.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.9)

For any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ that is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_k$, (7.9) immediately gives

$$\mathbb{E}_k [y^{k+1}] = Py^{k+1} + (I - P) y^k,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.10)

$$\mathbb{E}_k \left[ \|y^{k+1} - Y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} \right] = \|y^{k+1} - Y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} + \|y^k - Y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} - (I - P).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.11)

A simple manipulation of (7.10) and plugging in $Y = y$ and $Y = y_k$ in (7.11) respectively, gives

$$\hat{y}^{k+1} = P^{-1} \mathbb{E}_k [y^{k+1}] - (P^{-1} - I) y^k$$

$$\|\hat{y}^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} = \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \|y^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} - (P^{-1} - I) \right] - \|y^k - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}}$$

$$\|\hat{y}^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} = \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \|y^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} - (P^{-1} - I) \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.12) \hspace{1cm} (7.13) \hspace{1cm} (7.14)

We apply (7.13) and (7.14) to the last line of (7.8) to get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( - \|y^k - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} + \|y^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} + \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left( - \|y^k - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} + \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \|y^{k+1} - y\|^2_{D_{\sigma^{-1}}} - (P^{-1} - I) \right] \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.15)
In addition, we have for the bilinear term in (7.8) that

\[
\langle x^k - x, A^T(y^k - y) \rangle - \langle y^{k+1} - y, A(x^k - x) \rangle = \langle A(x^k - x), y^k - y^{k+1} \rangle \\
= \langle A(x^k - x), y^k - P^{-1}\mathbb{E}_k[y^{k+1}] + (P^{-1} - I)y^k \rangle \\
= -\mathbb{E}_k [\langle A(x^k - x), P^{-1}(y^{k+1} - y^k) \rangle] + \langle A(x^k - x), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle \\
= -\mathbb{E}_k [\langle A(x^k - x), P^{-1}(y^{k+1} - y^k) \rangle] + \langle A(x^{k-1} - x), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle \\
+ \langle A(x^k - x^{k-1}), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle.
\]  

(7.16)

where the second equality is due to (7.12), and third equality is due to the definition of \( \hat{y}^k \).

We now insert (7.15) and (7.16) into (7.8) and also add and subtract the term \( \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} \) to obtain

\[
0 \geq D_\phi(x^k; z) + D_f(\hat{y}^{k+1}; z) + \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} \\
- \mathbb{E}_k [\langle A(x^k - x), P^{-1}(y^{k+1} - y^k) \rangle] + \langle A(x^{k-1} - x), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle \\
+ \langle A(x^k - x^{k-1}), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\|x^{k-1} - x\|_D^{-1} + \|x^k - x\|_D^{-1} + \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_D^{-1} \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} + \mathbb{E}_k [\|y^{k+1} - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}}] \\
+ \mathbb{E}_k [\|y^k - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}}].
\]  

(7.17)

The result follows by using the definitions of \( V \) and \( V_k \):

\[
V(x^k - x^{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_D^{-1} + \langle A(x^k - x^{k-1}), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}},
\]

\[
V_{k+1}(x^k - x, y^{k+1} - y) = \frac{1}{2}\|x^k - x\|_D^{-1} - \langle A(x^k - x), P^{-1}(y^{k+1} - y^k) \rangle \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\|y^{k+1} - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2}\|y^{k+1} - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}},
\]

\[
V_k(x^{k-1} - x, y^k - y) = \frac{1}{2}\|x^{k-1} - x\|_D^{-1} - \langle A(x^{k-1} - x), P^{-1}(y^k - y^{k-1}) \rangle \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}} + \frac{1}{2}\|y^k - y\|_D^{2(\sigma^{-1})^{-1}P^{-1}}.
\]

\[
\square
\]
Table 1: Comparison of primal dual coordinate descent methods. s.c. denotes strongly convex, MS denotes metrically subregular. Please see Section 5 for a thorough comparison. Please see Section 2 for comparison of MS and s.c. assumptions. *Step sizes are for optimization with a potentially dense $A$ matrix and uniform sampling: $p_i = 1/n$. †This rate is for the primal-dual gap function.

| [6] | $f^*_i: \mu_i$-s.c. $g: \mu_g$-s.c. | Ergodic $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ with bounded domains† | $\|A_i\|, \mu_i, \mu_g$ |
| [46] | $f^*_i: \mu_i$-s.c. $g: \mu_g$-s.c. | Nonergodic $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ with bounded dual domain and fixed horizon | $\|A_i\|, \mu_i, \mu_g$ |
| [18] | $f^*_i: \mu_i$-s.c. $g: \mu_g$-s.c. | Randomly selected iterate $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ | $n^2 \tau \sigma_i \|A_i\|^2 < 1$ |
| This paper | $\partial f^*, \partial g$ are MS | Ergodic $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$, Randomly selected iterate $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ | $n \tau \sigma_i \|A_i\|^2 < 1$ |

Table 2: Comparison of our results and previous results on SPDHG. *Step size condition is for uniform sampling: $p_i = 1/n$. †In this case $P(x) := f(Ax) + g(x)$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.s. convergence</th>
<th>Linear convergence</th>
<th>Ergodic rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[6] $D_h(z^k; z^<em>) \rightarrow 0$, for any $z^</em>$ where $D_h$ is Bregman distance generated by $h(z) = f^*(y) + g(x)$</td>
<td>Assumption: $f^*, g$ s.c. step sizes depending on $\mu_i, \mu_g$</td>
<td>Primal-Dual Gap = $O(1/k)$ with bounded $X$, $Y$ $D_h(z^k_{av}; z^*) = O(1/k)$ with unbounded $X$ and $Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>$z^k \rightarrow z^<em>$, for some $z^</em>$</td>
<td>Assumption: $F$ in (2.5) is MS Step sizes: $n \tau \sigma_i |A_i|^2 &lt; 1$*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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