arXiv:1911.03992v1 [math.OC] 10 Nov 2019

Stochastic DCA for minimizing a large sum of DC functions with application to Multi-class Logistic Regression

Hoai An Le Thi[a,*], Hoai Minh Le[a], Duy Nhat Phan[a], Bach Tran[a]

[a] *Department of Computer Science and Applications, LGIPM, University of Lorraine, France*

Abstract

We consider the large sum of DC (Difference of Convex) functions minimization problem which appear in several different areas, especially in stochastic optimization and machine learning. Two DCA (DC Algorithm) based algorithms are proposed: stochastic DCA and inexact stochastic DCA. We prove that the convergence of both algorithms to a critical point is guaranteed with probability one. Furthermore, we develop our stochastic DCA for solving an important problem in multi-task learning, namely group variables selection in multi class logistic regression. The corresponding stochastic DCA is very inexpensive, all computations are explicit. Numerical experiments on several benchmark datasets and synthetic datasets illustrate the efficiency of our algorithms and their superiority over existing methods, with respect to classification accuracy, sparsity of solution as well as running time.

Keywords: Large sum of DC functions, DC Programming, DCA, Stochastic DCA, Inexact Stochastic DCA, Multi-class Logistic Regression

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: hoai-an.le-thi@univ-lorraine.fr (Hoai An Le Thi), minh.le@univ-lorraine.fr (Hoai Minh Le), nhatsp@gmail.com (Duy Nhat Phan), bach.tran@univ-lorraine.fr (Bach Tran)

1. Introduction

We address the so called *large sum of DC functions minimization* problem which takes the form

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left\{F(x) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} F_i(x)\right\}, \tag{1}$$

where F_i are DC functions, i.e., $F_i(x) = g_i(x) - h_i(x)$ with g_i being lower semi-continuous proper convex and h_i being convex, and n is a very large integer number. The problem of minimizing F under a convex set Ω is also of the type (1), as the convex constraint $x \in \Omega$ can be incorporated into the objective function F via the indicator function χ_Ω on Ω defined by $\chi_\Omega(x) = 0$ if $x \in \Omega$, $+\infty$ otherwise. Our study is motivated by the fact that the problem (1) appears in several different contexts, especially in stochastic optimization and machine learning. For instance, let us consider the minimization of expected loss in stochastic programming

$$\min_{x\in\Omega} \mathbb{E}[f(x,\xi)], \tag{2}$$

where f is a loss function of variables x and ξ, and ξ is a random variable. A standard approach for solving (3) is the sample average method (Healy & Schruben, 1991) which approximates the problem (2) by

$$\min_{x\in\Omega} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(x,\xi_i), \tag{3}$$

where $\xi_1, ..., \xi_n$ are independent variables, identically distributed realizations of ξ. When the loss function f is DC, the problem (3) takes the form of (1) with $F_i(x) = f(x,\xi_i) + \chi_\Omega(x)$. Obviously, the larger n is, the better approximation will be. Hence, a good approximate model of the form (3) in average sample methods requires an extremely large number n.

Furthermore, let us consider an important problem in machine learning, the multi-task learning. Let T be the number of tasks. For the j-th task, the training set $\mathcal{D}_j$ consists of n_j labeled data points in the form of ordered pairs $(x_i^j, y_i^j), i = 1, ..., n_j$, with $x_i^j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and its corresponding output $y_i^j \in \mathbb{R}$. Multi-task learning aims to estimate T predictive functions $f_\theta^j(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^m, j = 1, ..., T$, which fit well the

data. The multi-task learning can be formulated as

$$\min_{\theta} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{L}(y_i^j, f_\theta^j(x_i^j)) + \lambda p(\theta) \right\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ denotes the loss function, p is a regularization term and $\lambda > 0$ is a trade-off parameter. For a good learning process, $\sum_{j=1}^{T} n_j$ is, in general, a very large number. Clearly, this problem takes the form of (1) when $\mathcal{L}$ and p are DC functions. We observe that numerous loss functions in machine learning (e.g. least square loss, squared hing loss, ramp loss, logistic loss, sigmoidal loss, etc) are DC. On another hand, most of existing regularizations can be expressed as DC functions. For instance, in learning with sparsity problems involving the zero norm (which include, among of others, variable / group variable selection in classification, sparse regression, compressed sensing) all standard nonconvex regularizations studied in the literature are DC functions (Le Thi et al., 2015). Moreover, in many applications dealing with big data, the number of both variables and samples are very large.

The problem (1) has a double difficulties due to the nonconvexity of F_i and the large value of n. Meanwhile, the sum structure of F enjoys an advantage: one can work on F_i instead of the whole function F. Since all F_i are DC functions, F is DC too, and therefore (1) is a standard DC program, i.e., minimizing a DC function under a convex set and/or the whole space.

To the best of our knowledge, although several methods have been developed for solving different special cases of (1), there is no existing work that considers the general problem (1) as well. The stochastic gradient (SG) method was first introduced in Robbins & Monro (1951) and then developed in Bottou (1998); LeCun et al. (1998) for solving (3) in the unconstrained case ($\Omega = R^d$) with $f(\cdot, \xi_i)$ being smooth functions. The SG method chooses $i_l \in \{1, ..., n\}$ randomly and takes the update

$$x^{l+1} = x^l - \alpha_l \nabla f(x^l, \xi_{i_l}), \tag{5}$$

where α_l is the step size and $\nabla f(x^l, \xi_{i_l})$ is a stochastic gradient. Later, Bertsekas (2011, 2010) proposed the proximal stochastic subgradient methods (also referred as incremental proximal methods) for solving (3) in convex case, i.e., Ω is a closed convex set and $f(\cdot, \xi_i)$ are convex functions. The computational cost per iteration of

these basic SG methods is very cheap, however, due to the variance introduced by random sampling, their convergence rate are slower than the "full" gradient methods. Hence, some SG methods for solving (3) in unconstrained differentiable convex case use either the average of the stored past gradients or a multi-stage scheme to progressively reduce the variance of the stochastic gradient (see e.g Schmidt et al. (2017); Shalev-Schwartz & Zhang (2013); Defazio et al. (2014a,b); Johnson & Zhang (2013)). With the variance reduction techniques, other variants of the SG method have been proposed for nonconvex problem (3) where the L-smooth property is required (see e.g. Mairal (2015); Reddi et al. (2016); Allen-Zhu & Yuan (2016)).

As (1) is a DC program, a natural way to tackle it is using DCA (DC Algorithm) (see (Le Thi & Pham Dinh, 2005, 2018; Pham Dinh & Le Thi, 1998, 1997, 2014) and references therein), an efficient approach in nonconvex programming framework. DCA addresses the problem of minimizing a DC function on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$ or on a closed convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Generally speaking, a standard DC program takes the form:

$$\alpha = \inf\{F(x) := G(x) - H(x) \,|\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \quad (P_{dc}),$$

where G, H are lower semi-continuous proper convex functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Such a function F is called a DC function, and $G - H$ is a DC decomposition of F while G and H are the DC components of F. DCA has been introduced in 1985 Pham Dinh & Souad (1986) and extensively developed since 1993 ((Le Thi & Pham Dinh, 2005, 2018; Pham Dinh & Le Thi, 1998, 1997, 2014) and references therein) to become now classic and increasingly popular. Most of existing methods in convex/nonconvex programming are special versions of DCA via appropriate DC decompositions (see (Le Thi & Pham Dinh, 2018)). In recent years, numerous DCA based algorithms have been developed for successfully solving large-scale nonsmooth/nonconvex programs appearing in several application areas, especially in machine learning, communication system, biology, finance, etc. (see e.g. the list of references in Le Thi (Home Page); Le Thi & Pham Dinh (2018)). DCA has been proved to be a fast and scalable approach which is, thanks to the effect of DC decompositions, more efficient than related methods. For a comprehensible survey on thirty years of development of DCA, the reader is referred to the recent paper

(Le Thi & Pham Dinh, 2018). New trends in the development of DCA concern novel versions of DCA based algorithms (e.g. online/stochastic/approximate/like DCA) to accelerate the convergence and to deal with large-scale setting and big data. Our present work follows this direction.

The original key idea of DCA relies on the DC structure of the objective function F. DCA consists in iteratively approximating the considered DC program by a sequence of convex ones. More precisely, at each iteration l, DCA approximates the second DC component $H(x)$ by its affine minorization $H_l(x) := H(x^l) + \langle x - x^l, y^l \rangle$, with $y^l \in \partial H(x^l)$, and minimizes the resulting convex function.

Basic DCA scheme

Initialization: Let $x^0 \in \text{dom } \partial H$, $l = 0$.

For $l = 0, 1, \ldots$ **until convergence of** $\{x^l\}$**:**

k1: Calculate $y^l \in \partial H(x^l)$;

k2: Calculate $x^{l+1} \in \text{argmin}\{G(x) - H_l(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ (P_l).

To tackle the difficulty due to the large value of n, we first propose the so called *stochastic DCA* by exploiting the sum structure of F. The basic idea of stochastic DCA is to update, at each iteration, the minorant of only some randomly chosen h_i while keeping the minorant of the other h_i. Hence the main advantage of the stochastic DCA versus standard DCA is the computational reduction in the step of computing a subgradient of H. Meanwhile, the convex subproblem is the same in both standard DCA and stochastic DCA. The first work in this direction was published in the conference paper Le Thi et al. (2017) where we only considered a machine learning problem which is a special case of (1), namely

$$\min_x \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) + \lambda \|x\|_{2,0},$$

where f_i are L-Lipschitz functions. We rigorously studied the convergence properties of this stochastic DCA and proved that its convergence is guaranteed with probability one. In the present work, the same convergence properties of stochastic DCA for the general model (1) is proved. Furthermore, to deal with the large-scale setting, we propose an *inexact stochastic DCA* version in which both subgradient of H and optimal

solution of the resulting convex program are approximately computed. We show that the convergence properties of stochastic DCA are still valid for the inexact stochastic DCA.

Finally, we show how to develop the proposed stochastic DCA for the group variables selection in multi-class logistic regression, a very important problem in machine learning which takes the form (1). Numerical experiments on very large synthetic and real-world datasets show that our approach is more efficient, in both quality and rapidity, than related methods.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Solution methods based on stochastic DCA for solving (1) is developed in Section 2 while the stochastic DCA for the group variables selection in multi-class logistic regression is presented in Section 3. Numerical experiments are reported in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Stochastic DCA for minimizing a large sum of DC functions

Before presenting the stochastic DCA, let us recall some basic notations that will be used in the sequel.

The modulus of a convex function $\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ on Ω, denoted by $\rho(\theta, \Omega)$ or $\rho(\theta)$ if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, is given by

$$\rho(\theta, \Omega) = \sup\{\rho \geq 0 : \theta - (\rho/2)\|.\|^2 \text{ is convex on } \Omega\}.$$

One says that θ is ρ-convex (resp. *strongly convex*) on Ω if $\rho(\theta, \Omega) \geq 0$ (resp. $\rho(\theta, \Omega) > 0$).

For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x^0 \in \text{ dom } \theta$, the ε-subdifferential of θ at x^0, denoted $\partial\theta_\varepsilon(x^0)$, is defined by

$$\partial\theta_\varepsilon(x^0) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \theta(x) \geq \theta(x^0) + \langle x - x^0, y\rangle - \varepsilon : \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}, \qquad (6)$$

while $\partial\theta(x^0)$ stands for the usual (or exact) subdifferential of θ at x^0 (i.e. $\varepsilon = 0$ in (6)).

For $\epsilon \geq 0$, a point x_ϵ is called an ϵ-solution of the problem $\inf\{f(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ if

$$f(x_\epsilon) \leq f(x) + \epsilon \; \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

2.1. Stochastic DCA

Now, let us introduce a stochastic version of DCA, named SDCA, for solving (1). A natural DC formulation of the problem (1) is

$$\min \left\{ F(x) = G(x) - H(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}, \tag{7}$$

where

$$G(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(x) \text{ and } H(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i(x).$$

According to the generic DCA scheme, DCA for solving the problem (7) consists of computing, at each iteration l, a subgradient $v^l \in \partial H(x^l)$ and solving the convex subproblem of the form

$$\min \left\{ G(x) - \langle v^l, x \rangle : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}. \tag{8}$$

As $H = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i$, the computation of subgradients of H requires the one of all functions h_i. This may be expensive when n is very large. The main idea of SDCA is to update, at each iteration, the minorant of only some randomly chosen h_i while keeping the minorant of the other h_i. Hence, only the computation of such randomly chosen h_i is required.

SDCA for solving the problem (7) is described in Algorithm 1 below.

Algorithm 1 SDCA for solving the problem (1)

Initialization: Choose $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s_0 = \{1, ..., n\}$, and $l \leftarrow 0$.

Repeat

1. Compute $v_i^l \in \partial h_i(x^l)$ if $i \in s_l$ and keep $v_i^l = v_i^{l-1}$ if $i \notin s_l$, $l > 0$. Set $v^l = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^l$.

2. Compute x^{l+1} by solving the convex problem (8).

3. Set $l \leftarrow l + 1$ and randomly choose a small subset $s_l \subset \{1, ..., n\}$.

Until Stopping criterion.

The following theorem shows that the convergence properties of SDCA are guaranteed with probability one.

Theorem 1. *Assume that* $\alpha^* = \inf F(x) > -\infty$*, and* $|s_l| = b$ *for all* $l > 0$*. Let* $\{x^l\}$ *be a sequence generated by SDCA , the following statements are hold.*

a) $\{F(x^l)\}$ *is the almost sure convergent sequence.*

b) If $\min_i \rho(h_i) > 0$*, then* $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \|x^l - x^{l-1}\|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|x^l - x^{l-1}\| = 0$*, almost surely.*

c) If $\min_i \rho(h_i) > 0$*, then every limit point of* $\{x^l\}$ *is a critical point of* F *with probability one.*

Proof. a) Let x_i^0 be the copies of x^0. We set $x_i^{l+1} = x^{l+1}$ for all $i \in s_{l+1}$ and $x_j^{l+1} = x_j^l$ for $j \notin s_{l+1}$. We then have $v_i^l \in \partial h_i(x_i^l)$ for $i = 1, ..., n$. Let T_i^l be the function given by

$$T_i^l(x) = g_i(x) - h_i(x_i^l) - \left\langle x - x_i^l, v_i^l \right\rangle.$$

It follows from $v_i^l \in \partial h_i(x_i^l)$ that

$$h_i(x) \geq h_i(x_i^l) + \left\langle x - x_i^l, v_i^l \right\rangle.$$

That implies $T_i^l(x) \geq F_i(x) \geq F_i(x)$ for all $l \geq 0$, $i = 1, ..., n$. We also observe that x^{l+1} is a solution to the following convex problem

$$\min_x T^l(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^l(x), \tag{9}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T^l(x^{l+1}) \leq T^l(x^l) &= T^{l-1}(x^l) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in s_l} [T_i^l(x^l) - T_i^{l-1}(x^l)] \\ &= T^{l-1}(x^l) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in s_l} [F_i(x^l) + 2\epsilon^l - T_i^{l-1}(x^l)], \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the second equality follows from $T_i^l(x^l) = F_i(x^l)$ for all $i \in s_l$. Let $\mathcal{F}_l$ denote the σ-algebra generated by the entire history of SDCA up to the iteration l, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(x^0)$ and $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma(x^0, ..., x^l, s_0, ..., s_{l-1})$ for all $l \geq 1$. By taking the expectation of the inequality (A.2) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1}) | \mathcal{F}_l\right] \leq T^{l-1}(x^l) - \frac{b}{n}\left[T^{l-1}(x^l) - F(x^l)\right].$$

By applying the supermartingale convergence theorem (Neveu, 1975; Bertsekas et al., 2003) to the nonnegative sequences $\{T^{l-1}(x^l)-\alpha^*\}$, $\{\frac{b}{n}[T^{l-1}(x^l)-F(x^l)]\}$ and $\{0\}$, we conclude that the sequence $\{T^{l-1}(x^l,y^l)-\alpha^*\}$ converges to $T^*-\alpha^*$ and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\left[T^{l-1}(x^l)-F(x^l)\right]<\infty, \tag{11}$$

with probability 1. Therefore $\{F(x^l)\}$ converges almost surely to T^*.

b) By $v_i^{l-1}\in\partial h_i(x_i^{l-1})$, we have

$$h_i(x)\geq h_i(x_i^{l-1})+\langle x-x_i^{l-1},v_i^{l-1}\rangle+\frac{\rho(h_i)}{2}\|x-x_i^{l-1}\|^2,\ \forall x\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

This implies

$$F_i(x)\leq T_i^{l-1}(x)-\frac{\rho(h_i)}{2}\|x-x_i^{l-1}\|^2. \tag{12}$$

From (A.2) and (A.4) with $x=x^l$, we have

$$T^l(x^{l+1})\leq T^{l-1}(x^l)-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in s_l}\frac{\rho(h_i)}{2}\|x-x_i^{l-1}\|^2. \tag{13}$$

Taking the expectation of the inequality (A.5) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1})|\mathcal{F}_l\right]\leq T^{l-1}(x^l)-\frac{b}{4n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho(h_i)\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|^2+\left(\frac{2b}{n}+1\right)\epsilon^l.$$

Combining this and $\rho=\min_{i=1,\ldots,n}\rho(h_i)>0$ gives us

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1})|\mathcal{F}_l\right]\leq T^{l-1}(x^l)-\frac{b\rho}{2n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|^2.$$

Applying the supermartingale convergence theorem to the nonnegative sequences $\{T^{l-1}(x^l)-\alpha^*\}$, $\{\frac{b\rho}{2n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|^2\}$ and $\{0\}$, we get

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|^2<\infty,$$

with probability 1. In particular, for $i=1,...,n$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|^2<\infty, \tag{14}$$

and hence $\lim_{l\to\infty}\|x^l-x_i^{l-1}\|=0$ almost surely.

c) Assume that there exists a sub-sequence $\{x^{l_k}\}$ of $\{x^l\}$ such that $x^{l_k} \to x^*$ almost surely. From (A.6), we have $\|x^{l_k+1} - x_i^{l_k}\| \to 0$ almost surely. Therefore, by the finite convexity of h_i, without loss of generality, we can suppose that the sub-sequence $v_i^{l_k}$ tends to v_i^* almost surely. Since $v_i^{l_k} \in \partial h_i(x_i^{l_k})$ and by the closed property of the subdifferential mapping ∂h_i, we have $v_i^* \in \partial h_i(x^*)$. As x^{l_k+1} is a solution of the problem $\min_x T^{l_k}(x)$, we obtain

$$0 \in \partial T^{l_k}(x^{l_k+1}). \tag{15}$$

This is equivalent to

$$0 \in \partial \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(x^{l_k+1}) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^{l_k} = \partial G(x^{l_k+1}) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^{l_k}. \tag{16}$$

Hence, $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^{l_k} \in \partial G(x^{l_k+1})$. By the closed property of the subdifferential mapping ∂G, we obtain $v^* = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^* \in \partial G(x^*)$ with probability one. Therefore,

$$v^* \in \partial G(x^*) \cap \partial H(x^*), \tag{17}$$

with probability 1. This implies that x^* is a critical point of F with probability 1 and the proof is then complete. □

2.2. Inexact stochastic DCA

The SDCA scheme requires the exact computations of v_i^l and x^{l+1}. Observing that, for standard DCA these computations are not necessarily exact Le Thi & Pham Dinh (2018), we are suggested to introduce an inexact version of SDCA. This could be useful when the exact computations of v_i^l and x^{l+1} are expensive. The inexact version of SDCA computes ϵ-subgradients $v_i^l \in \partial_{\epsilon^l} h_i(x^l)$ and an ϵ^l-solution x^{l+1} of the convex problem (8) instead of the exactly computing. The inexact version of SDCA, named ISDCA, is described as follows.

Algorithm 2 Inexact SDCA for solving the problem (1)

Initialization: Choose $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s_0 = \{1, ..., n\}$, $\epsilon^0 \geq 0$ and $l \leftarrow 0$.

Repeat

1. Compute $v_i^l \in \partial_{\epsilon^l} h_i(x^l)$ if $i \in s_l$ and keep $v_i^l = v_i^{l-1}$ if $i \notin s_l$, $l > 0$. Set $v^l = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n v_i^l$.

2. Compute an ϵ^l-solution x^{l+1} of the convex problem (8).

3. Set $l \leftarrow l + 1$, randomly choose a small subset $s_l \subset \{1, ..., n\}$, and update $\epsilon^l \geq 0$.

Until Stopping criterion.

Under an assumption that $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^l < +\infty$, the ISDCA has the same convergence properties as SDCA, which are stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Assume that $\alpha^* = \inf F(x) > -\infty$, and $|s_l| = b$ for all $l > 0$. Let $\{x^l\}$ be a sequence generated by ISDCA with respect to a nonnegative sequence $\{\epsilon^l\}$ such that $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^l < +\infty$ almost surely. The following statements are hold.*

a) $\{F(x^l)\}$ is the almost sure convergent sequence.

b) If $\min_i \rho(h_i) > 0$, then $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \|x^l - x^{l-1}\|^2 < +\infty$ and $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|x^l - x^{l-1}\| = 0$, almost surely.

c) If $\min_i \rho(h_i) > 0$, then every limit point of $\{x^l\}$ is a critical point of F with probability one.

This theorem is analogously proved as Theorem 1 and its proof is provided in Appendix Appendix A.

3. Application to Group Variables Selection in multi-class Logistic Regression

Logistic regression, introduced by D. Cox in 1958 Cox (1958), is undoubtedly one of the most popular supervised learning methods. Logistic regression has been successfully applied in various real-life problems such as cancer detection Kim et al. (2008), medical Boyd et al. (1987); Bagley et al. (2001); Subasi & Erçelebi (2005), social science King & Zeng (2001), etc. Especially, logistic regression combined with feature

selection has been proved to be suitable for high dimensional problems, for instance, document classification Genkin et al. (2007) and microarray classification Liao & Chin (2007); Kim et al. (2008).

The multi-class logistic regression problem can be described as follows. Let $\{(x_i, y_i) : i = 1, ..., n\}$ be a training set with observation vectors $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and labels $y_i \in \{1, ..., Q\}$ where Q is the number of classes. Let W be the $d \times Q$ matrix whose columns are $W_{:,1}, ..., W_{:,Q}$ and $b = (b_1, ..., b_Q) \in \mathbb{R}^Q$. The couple $(W_{:,i}, b_i)$ forms the hyperplane $f_i := W_{:,i}^T x + b_i$+ that separates the class i from the other classes.

In the multi-class logistic regression problem, the conditional probability $p(Y = y|X = x)$ that an instance x belongs to a class y is defined as

$$p(Y = y|X = x) = \frac{\exp(b_y + W_{:,y}^T x)}{\sum_{k=1}^{Q} \exp(b_k + W_{:,k}^T x)}. \tag{18}$$

We aim to find (W, b) for which the total probability of the training observations x_i belonging to its correct classes y_i is maximized. A natural way to estimate (W, b) is to minimize the negative log-likelihood function which is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(W, b) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) \tag{19}$$

where $\ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) = -\log p(Y = y_i|X = x_i)$. Moreover, in high-dimensional settings, there are many irrelevant and/or redundant features. Hence, we need to select important features in order to reduce overfitting of the training data. A feature j is to be removed if and only if all components in the row j of W are zero. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider rows of W as groups. Denote by $W_{j,:}$ the j-th row of the matrix W. The $\ell_{q,0}$-norm of W, i.e., the number of non-zero rows of W, is defined by

$$\|W\|_{q,0} = |\{j \in \{1, ..., d\} : \|W_{j,:}\|_q \neq 0\}|.$$

Hence, the $\ell_{q,0}$ regularized multi-class logistic regression problem is formulated as follows

$$\min_{W,b} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) + \lambda \|W\|_{q,0} \right\}. \tag{20}$$

In this application, we use a non-convex approximation of the $\ell_{q,0}$-norm based on the following two penalty functions $\eta_\alpha(s)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Exponential:} \quad \eta_\alpha^{\text{exp}}(s) &= 1 - \exp(-\alpha s), \\ \text{Capped-}\ell_1\text{:} \quad \eta_\alpha^{\text{cap-}\ell_1}(s) &= \min\{1, \alpha s\}. \end{aligned}$$

These penalty functions have shown their efficiency in several problems, for instance, individual variables selection in SVM Bradley & Mangasarian (1998); Le Thi et al. (2008), sparse optimal scoring problem Le Thi & Phan (2016), sparse covariance matrix estimation problem Phan et al. (2017), and bi-level/group variables selection Le Thi et al. (2019); Phan & Thi (2019). The corresponding approximate problem of (20) takes the form:

$$\min_{W,b} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{d} \eta_\alpha(\|W_{j,:}\|_q) \right\}. \tag{21}$$

Since η_α is increasing on $[0, +\infty)$, the problem (21) can be equivalently reformulated as follows

$$\min_{(W,b,t)} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) + \chi_\Omega(W, b, t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{d} \eta_\alpha(t_j) \right] \right\}, \tag{22}$$

where $\Omega = \{(W, b, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times Q} \times \mathbb{R}^Q \times \mathbb{R}^d : \|W_{j,:}\|_q \leq t_j, j = 1, ..., d\}$. Moreover, as $\ell(x_i, y_i, W, b)$ is differentiable with L-Lipschitz continuous gradient and η_α is concave, the problem (22) takes the form of (1) where the function $F_i(W, b, t)$ is given by

$$F_i(W, b, t) = \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) + \chi_\Omega(W, b, t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{d} \eta_\alpha(t_j) := g_i(W, b, t) - h_i(W, b, t),$$

where the DC components g_ia and h_i are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(W, b, t) &= \frac{\rho}{2}\|(W, b)\|^2 + \chi_\Omega(W, b, t), \\ h_i(W, b, t) &= \frac{\rho}{2}\|(W, b)\|^2 - \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{d} \eta_\alpha(t_j), \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho > L$.

Before presenting SDCA for solving the problem (22), let us show how to apply standard DCA on this problem.

3.1. Standard DCA for solving the problem (22)

We consider three norms corresponding to $q \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$. DCA applied to (22) consists of computing, at each iteration l, $(U^l, v^l, z^l) \in \partial H(W^l, b^l, t^l)$, and solving the convex sub-problem

$$\min_{(W,b,t)} \left\{ \frac{\rho}{2}\|(W,b)\|^2 + \chi_\Omega(W,b,t) - \langle U^l, W\rangle - \langle v^l, b\rangle - \langle z^l, t\rangle \right\}. \tag{23}$$

The computation of (U^l, v^l, z^l) is explicitly defined as follows.

$$(U^l, v^l, z^l) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l), (U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l) \in \partial h_i(W^l, b^l, t^l).$$

More precisely

$$\begin{aligned}
(U_i^l)_{:,k} &= \rho W_{:,k}^l - \left(p_k^l(x_i) - \delta_{ky_i}\right) x_i, k = 1, ...Q,\\
(v_i^l)_k &= \rho b_k^l - \left(p_k^l(x_i) - \delta_{ky_i}\right), k = 1, ...Q,\\
(z_i^l)_j &= \begin{cases} -\lambda\alpha\exp(-\alpha t_j^l), & j = 1, \ldots, d \quad \text{if } \eta_\alpha = \eta_\alpha^{\exp},\\ -\lambda\alpha \text{ if } \alpha t_j^l \le 1, \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise}, & j = 1, \ldots, d, \quad \text{if } \eta_\alpha = \eta_\alpha^{\text{cap}-\ell_1}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with $p_k^l(x_i) = \exp(b_k^l + (W_{:,k}^l)^T x_i)/(\sum_{h=1}^{Q} b_h^l + (W_{:,h}^l)^T x_i))$, $\delta_{ky_i} = 1$ if $k = y_i$ and 0 otherwise.

The convex sub-problem (23) can be solved as follows (note that $z_j^l \le 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, d$)

$$W^{l+1} = \arg\min_W \left\{ \frac{\rho}{2}\|W\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d}(-z_j^l)\|W_{j,:}\|_q - \langle U^l, W\rangle \right\}, \tag{25}$$

$$b^{l+1} = \arg\min_b \left\{ \frac{\rho}{2}\|b\|^2 - \langle v^l, b\rangle \right\} = \frac{1}{\rho}v^l, \tag{26}$$

$$t_j^{l+1} = \|W_{j,:}^{l+1}\|_q, j = 1, ..., d. \tag{27}$$

Since the problem (25) is separable in rows of W, solving it amounts to solving d independent sub-problems

$$W_{j,:}^{l+1} = \arg\min_{W_{j,:}} \left\{ \frac{\rho}{2}\|W_{j,:}\|^2 + (-z_j^l)\|W_{j,:}\|_q - \langle U_{j,:}^l, W_{j,:}\rangle \right\}.$$

Moreover, $W_{j,:}^{l+1}$ is computed via the following proximal operator

$$W_{j,:}^{l+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{(-z_j^l)/\rho\|\cdot\|_q}\left(U_{j,:}^l/\rho\right),$$

Table 1: Computation of $W_{j,:}^{l+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{(-z_j^l)/\rho\|\cdot\|_q}\left(U_{j,:}^l/\rho\right)$ corresponding to $q \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$.

q	$\mathbf{prox}_{(-z_j^l)/\rho\|\cdot\|_q}\left(U_{j,:}^l/\rho\right)$
1	$\left(\lvert U_{j,:}^l\rvert/\rho - (-z_j^l)/\rho\right)_+ \circ \text{sign}(U_{j,:}^l)$
2	$\begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{-z_j^l}{\|U_{j,:}^l\|_2}\right) U_{j,:}^l/\rho & \text{if } \|U_{j,:}^l\|_2 > -z_j^l \\ 0 & \text{if } \|U_{j,:}^l\|_2 \le -z_j^l. \end{cases}$
∞	$\begin{cases} U_{j,:}^l/\rho - \left(\frac{1}{-z_j^l}\lvert U_{j,:}^l\rvert - \delta\right)_+ \circ \text{sign}(U_{j,:}^l) & \text{if } \|U_{j,:}^l\|_1 > -z_j^l \\ 0 & \text{if } \|U_{j,:}^l\|_1 \le -z_j^l, \end{cases}$ where δ satisfies $\sum_{k=1}^Q \left(\frac{1}{-z_j^l}\lvert U_{j,k}^l\rvert - \delta\right)_+ = 1$.

where the proximal operator $\mathbf{prox}_f(\nu)$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{prox}_f(\nu) = \arg\min_t \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\|t - \nu\|^2 + f(t) \right\}.$$

The proximal operator of $(-z_j^l)/\rho\|\cdot\|_q$ can be efficiently computed (Parikh & Boyd, 2014). The computation of $\mathbf{prox}_{(-z_j^l)/\rho\|\cdot\|_q}(\nu/\rho)$ can be summarized in Table 1. DCA based algorithms for solving (22) with $q \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$ are described as follows.

DCA-$\ell_{q,0}$: DCA for solving (22) with $q \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$

Initialization: Choose $(W^0, b^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times Q} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$, $\rho > L$ and $l \leftarrow 0$.

Repeat

1. Compute $(U^l, v^l, z^l) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l)$, where (U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l), $i = 1, ..., n$ are defined in (24).

2. Compute $(W^{l+1}, b^{l+1}, t^{l+1})$ according to Table 1, (26) and (27), respectively.

3. $l \leftarrow l + 1$.

Until Stopping criterion.

3.2. SDCA for solving the problem (22)

In SDCA, at each iteration l, we have to compute $(U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l) \in \partial h_i(W^l, b^l, t^l)$ for $i \in s_l$ and keep $(U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l) = (U_i^{l-1}, v_i^{l-1}, z_i^{l-1})$ for $i \notin s_l$, where s_l is a randomly chosen subset of the indexes, and solve the convex sub-problem taking the form of (23). Hence, SDCA for solving (22) is described below.

SDCA-$\ell_{q,0}$: SDCA for solving (22) with $q \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$

Initialization: Choose $(W^0, b^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times Q} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$, $t_j^0 = \|W_{j,:}^0\|_q$, $\rho > L$, $s_0 = \{1, ..., n\}$ and $l \leftarrow 0$.

Repeat

1. Compute (U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l) by (24) if $i \in s_l$ and keep $(U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l) = (U_i^{l-1}, v_i^{l-1}, z_i^{l-1})$ if $i \notin s_l$. Set $(U^l, v^l, z^l) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (U_i^l, v_i^l, z_i^l)$.

2. Compute $(W^{l+1}, b^{l+1}, t^{l+1})$ according to Table 1, (26) and (27), respectively.

3. $l \leftarrow l + 1$ and randomly choose a small subset $s_l \subset \{1, ..., n\}$.

Until Stopping criterion.

---

4. Numerical Experiment

4.1. Datasets

To evaluate the performances of algorithms, we performed numerical experiments on two types of data: real datasets (*covertype*, *madelon*, *miniboone*, *protein*, *sensit* and *sensorless*) and simulated datasets (*sim_1*, *sim_2* and *sim_3*). All real-world datasets are taken from the well-known UCI and LibSVM data repositories. We give below a brief description of real datasets:

- *covertype* belongs to the Forest Cover Type Prediction from strictly cartographic variables challenge[1]. It is a very large dataset containing $581,012$ points described by 54 variables.

- *madelon* is one of five datasets used in the NIPS 2003 feature selection challenge[2]. The dataset contains 2600 points, each point is represented by 500 variables. Among 500 variables, there are only 5 informative variables and 15 redundant variables (which are created by linear combinations of 5 informative variables). The 480 others variables were added and have no predictive power. Notice that *madelon* is a highly non-linear dataset.

- *miniboone* is taken form the MiniBooNE experiment to observe neutrino oscillations[3], containing $130,065$ data points.

- *protein* [4] is a dataset for classifying protein second structure state (α, β, and coil) of each residue in amino acid sequences, including $24,387$ data points.

- *sensit* [4] dataset obtained from distributed sensor network for vehicle classification. It consists of $98,528$ data points categorized into 3 classes: Assault Amphibian Vehicle (AAV), Dragon Wagon (DW) and noise.

- *sensorless* measures electric current drive signals from different operating conditions, which is classified into 11 different classes [5]. It is a huge dataset, which contains $58,509$ data points, described by 48 variables.

We generate three synthetic datasets (*sim_1*, *sim_2* and *sim_3*) by the same process proposed in Witten & Tibshirani (2011). In the first dataset (*sim_1*), variables are independent and have different means in each class. In dataset (*sim_2*), variables also have different means in each class, but they are dependent. The last synthetic dataset (*sim_3*)

[1] https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Covertype

[2] https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Madelon

[3] https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/MiniBooNE+particle+identification

[4] https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/multiclass.html

[5] https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Dataset+for+Sensorless+Drive+Diagnosis

has different one-dimensional means in each class with independent variables. Detail produces to generate three simulated datasets are described as follows:

- For *sim_1*: we generate a four-classes classification problem. Each class is assumed to have a multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_k, I)$, $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with dimension of $d = 50$. The first 10 components of μ_1 are 0.5, $\mu_{2j} = 0.5$ if $11 \leq j \leq 20$, $\mu_{3j} = 0.5$ if $21 \leq j \leq 30$, $\mu_{4j} = 0.5$ if $31 \leq j \leq 40$ and 0 otherwise. We generate $250,000$ instances with equal probabilities.

- For *sim_2*: this synthetic dataset contains three classes of multivariate normal distributions $\mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \Sigma)$, $k = 1, 2, 3$, each of dimension $d = 50$. The components of $\mu_1 = 0$, $\mu_{2j} = 0.4$ and $\mu_{3j} = 0.8$ if $j \leq 40$ and 0 otherwise. The covariance matrix Σ is the block diagonal matrix with five blocks of dimension 10×10 whose element (j, j') is $0.6^{|j-j'|}$. We generate $150,000$ instances.

- For *sim_3*: this synthetic dataset consists of four classes. For class $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $i \in C_k$ then $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for $j > 100$, and $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{k-1}{3}, 1)$ otherwise, where $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes the Gaussian distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2. We generate $62,500$ data points for each class.

The number of points, variables and classes of each dataset are summarized in the first column of Table 2.

4.2. Comparative algorithms

To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing method in the literature for solving the group variable selection in multi-class logistic regression using $\ell_{q,0}$ regularization. However, closely connected to the Lasso (ℓ_1-norm), Vincent & Hansen (2014) proposed to use the convex regularization $\ell_{2,1}$ instead of $\ell_{2,0}$. Thus, the resulting problem takes the form

$$\min_{W,b} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(x_i, y_i, W, b) + \lambda \|W\|_{2,1} \right\}. \tag{28}$$

A coordinate gradient descent, named `msgl`, was proposed in Vincent & Hansen (2014) to solve the problem (28). `msgl` is a comparative algorithm in our experiment.

On another hand, we are interested in a comparison between our algorithms and a stochastic based method. A stochastic gradient descent algorithm to solve (28), named SPGD$-\ell_{2,1}$, is developed for this purpose. SPGD$-\ell_{2,1}$ is described as follows.

SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$: Stochastic Proximal Gradient Descent for solving (28)

Initialization: Choose $(W^0, b^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times Q} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$, and $l \leftarrow 0$.

Repeat

1. Randomly choose a small subset $s_l \subset \{1, ..., n\}$. Set $\alpha_l = \frac{n}{10l}$. Compute $\bar{U}^l_{:,k} = W^l_{:,k} - \frac{\alpha_l}{|s_l|}\sum_{i\in s_l}\left(p^l_k(x_i) - \delta_{ky_i}\right)x_i, k = 1, ...Q$.

2. Compute (W^{l+1}, b^{l+1}) by

$$\begin{aligned} W^{l+1}_{j,:} &= \left(\|\bar{U}^l_{j,:}\|_2 - \alpha_l\lambda\right)_+ \frac{\bar{U}^l_{j,:}}{\|\bar{U}^l_{j,:}\|_2}, j = 1, ..., d \\ b^{l+1}_k &= b^l_k - \frac{\alpha_l}{|s_l|}\sum_{i\in s_l}\left(p^l_k(x_i) - \delta_{ky_i}\right), k = 1, ..., Q. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

3. $l \leftarrow l + 1$.

Until Stopping criterion.

4.3. Experiment setting

We randomly split each dataset into a training set and a test set. The training set contains 80% of the total number of points and the remaining 20% are used as test set.

In order to evaluate the performance of algorithms, we consider the following three criteria: the classification accuracy (percentage of well classified point on test set), the sparsity of obtained solution and the running time (measured in seconds). The sparsity is computed as the percentage of selected variables. Note that a variable $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ is considered to be removed if all components of the row j of W are smaller than a threshold, i.e., $|W_{j,i}| \leq 10^{-8}, \forall i \in 1, \ldots, Q$. We perform each algorithm 10 times and report the mean and standard deviation of each criterion.

We use the early-stopping condition for SDCA and SPGD$-\ell_{2,1}$. Early-stopping is a well-know technique in machine learning, especially in stochastic learning which

permits to avoid the over-fitting in learning. More precisely, after each epoch, we compute the classification accuracy on a validation set which contains 20% randomly chosen data points of training set. We stop SDCA and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$ if the classification accuracy is not improved after $n_{patience} = 5$ epochs. The batch size of stochastic algorithms (SDCA and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$) is set to 10%. DCA is stopped if the difference between two consecutive objective functions is smaller than a threshold $\epsilon_{stop} = 10^{-6}$. For *msgl*, we use its default stopping parameters as in (Vincent & Hansen, 2014). We also stop algorithms if they exceed 2 hours of running time in the training process.

The parameter α for controlling the tightness of zero-norm approximation is chosen in the set $\{0.5, 1, 2, 5\}$. We use the solution-path procedure for the trade-off parameter λ. Let $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > ... > \lambda_l$ be a decreasing sequence of λ. At step k, we solve the problem (20) with $\lambda = \lambda_k$ from the initial point chosen as the solution of the previous step $k - 1$. Starting with a large value of λ, we privilege the sparsity of solution (i.e. selecting very few variables) over the classification ability. Then by decreasing the value λ decreases, we select more variables in order to increase the classification accuracy. In our experiments, the sequence of λ is set to $\{10^4, 3 \times 10^3, 10^3, \ldots, 3 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-3}\}$.

All experiments are performed on a PC Intel (R) Xeon (R) E5-2630 v2 @2.60 GHz with 32GB RAM.

4.4. Experiment 1

In this experiments, we study the effectiveness of SDCA. For this purpose, we choose the $\ell_{2,0}$ regularization, and perform a comparison between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp. Furthermore, we will compare SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp with msgl and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$, two algorithms for solving the multi-class logistic regression using $\ell_{2,1}$ regularization (c.f Section 4.2).

The comparative results between are reported in Table 2 and Figure 1. Note that the running time is plotted in logarithmic scale.

Comparison between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp

In term of classification accuracy, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp produces fairly similar result comparing with DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp. DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is better than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp on 4




Figure 1: Comparative results between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp, DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp, SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$ and msgl (running time is plotted on a logarithmic scale).

datasets (*covertype*, *sensit*, *sensorless* and *sim_3*) while SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp gives better results on 2 datasets (*madelon* and *protein*). The two biggest gaps (3.49% and 1.17%)

occur on dataset *sensorless* and *sensit* respectively.

As for the sparsity of solution, DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp provide the same results on 4 datasets (*miniboon*, *sim_1*, *sim_2* and *sim_3*). DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp suppresses more variables than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp on 3 datasets (*protein*, *sensit* and *sensorless*), while SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp gives better sparsity on *covertype* and *madelon*. The gain of DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp on this criterion is quite high, up to 22.3% on dataset *protein*.

Concerning the running time, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp clearly outperforms DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp. Except for *miniboone* where DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is 1.11 second faster, the gain of SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is huge. SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is up to 19.58 times faster than DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp (dataset *covertype*).

Overall, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is able to achieve equivalent classification accuracy with a running time much smaller than DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp.

Comparison between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and msgl.

SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp provides better classification accuracy on 6 out of 9 datasets with a gain up to 1.85%. For the 3 remaining datasets, the gain of msgl in accuracy is smaller than 0.3%. As for the sparsity of solution, the two algorithms are comparable. SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is by far faster than msgl on all datasets, from 3.2 times to 470 time faster.

Comparison between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$.

In term of classification accuracy, SDCA is better on 6 datasets with a gain up to 4.65%, whereas SPGD only gives better result on *sensit*. Moreover, the number of selected variables by SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$ is considerably higher. SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$ chooses from 2% to 51.39% more variables than SDCA in 6 over 9 cases (*covertype*, *miniboone*, *protein*, *sensorless*, *sim_1*, and *sim_2*), and $> 27\%$ more in 3 over 9 cases (*covertype*, *protein* and *sensorless*). As for the running time, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is up to 15.68 times faster than SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$. Overall, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp clearly outperforms SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$ on all three criteria.

In conclusion, as expected, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp reduces considerably the running time of DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp while achieving equivalent classification accuracy. Moreover, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp outperforms the two related algorithms msgl and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$.

4.5. Experiment 2

In this experiment, in order to study the effectiveness of different non-convex regularizations $\ell_{q,0}$, we compare three algorithms SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp. The results are reported in Table 2 and plotted in Figure 2.

In term of classification accuracy, SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp are comparable and are slightly better than SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp. SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp produces similar results with SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp on 6 out of 9 datasets, where the gap is lower than 0.3% in classification accuracy. For *protein*, *sensorless* and *sensit*, SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp provides slightly better classification accuracy than SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp. This is due to the fact that SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp selects much more variables than the two others.

As for the sparsity of solution, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is the best on 8 out of 9 datasets (except for *protein*). SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp selects moderately more variables than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp, from 5.67% to 17.19%. In contrast to SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp, SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp suppresses less variables than SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp on all datasets, except *covertype*. Especially, on dataset *sensorless*, SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp selects 60.42% (resp. 43.23%) more variables than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp (resp. SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp).

In term of running time, SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp is the fastest and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is the slowest among the three algorithms. SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp is up to 3.4 time faster than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and 2.06 times faster than SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp.

Overall, SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp provide comparable results and realize a better trade-off between classification and sparsity of solution than SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp.

4.6. Experiment 3

In this experiment, to study the effect of the approximation functions (capped-ℓ_1 and exponential approximation), we compare two algorithms: SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1. It is worth to note that capped-ℓ_1 function is nonsmooth, hence the resulting approximate problem is a nonsmooth (and nonconvex) problem. The results are reported in Figure 3 and Table 2.

For *sensit*, *madelon*, *sim_1*, *sim_2* dataset, both algorithms have similar performance in all three criteria. The differences in terms of accuracy are negligible ($< 0.1\%$), while the gaps of sparsity and running time are mostly the same.

For *sim_3* and *miniboone* dataset, both algorithms choose the same number of features. However, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1 is faster than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp (by 41% and 67% respectively), while SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp gives better (or similar) result in terms of classification accuracy.

For *covertype*, *sensorless* and *protein* dataset, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp provides better results than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1. SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp furnishes results with higher classification accuracy in 2 out of 3 cases (*covertype* and *sensorless*) while having lower lower sparsity in 2 out of 3 cases (*protein* and *sensorless*). In terms of running time, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp is faster than SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1 by at least 1.5 times.

Overall, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp clearly shows better results SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1 in three criteria.

Table 2: Comparative results on both synthetic and real datasets. Bold values correspond to best results for each dataset. n, d and Q is the number of instances, the number of variables and the number of classes respectively.

Dataset	Algorithm	Accuracy (%)		Time (s)		Sparsity (%)	
		Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
covertype	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	71.62	0.05	**4.74**	**0.07**	61.11	3.21
$n = 581,012$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	71.34	0.07	10.27	1.25	69.91	1.77
$d = 54$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	69.92	0.38	11.93	0.88	60.49	1.51
$Q = 7$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	70.40	0.03	7.47	5.69	57.41	1.85
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	68.60	0.29	8.98	2.03	**25.93**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	70.16	0.03	14.80	3.63	56.79	3.85
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	72.15	0.08	92.73	0.51	64.81	1.51
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	**72.28**	**0.07**	57.93	2.87	73.61	0.93
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	69.39	0.10	57.22	5.36	42.13	0.93

	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	70.40	0.03	61.15	3.34	57.41	1.85
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	69.41	0.39	37.20	1.23	69.14	1.07
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	72.09	0.13	19.99	0.10	49.38	5.35
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	66.97	0.51	60.59	7.09	100.00	0.00
	msgl	71.22	0.02	525.49	1.10	68.52	0.00
madelon	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	**62.12**	**1.00**	0.16	0.02	**0.40**	**0.12**
$n = 2,600$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	61.92	0.80	**0.14**	**0.03**	0.65	0.10
$d = 500$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	61.68	1.05	0.16	0.01	0.70	1.47
$Q = 2$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	62.18	1.35	0.15	0.09	0.40	0.00
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	61.73	1.26	0.16	0.02	1.53	0.12
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	61.99	1.06	0.16	0.31	10.60	0.20
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	61.54	0.79	0.29	0.27	0.85	0.19
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	61.83	1.12	0.32	0.02	0.55	0.10
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	61.88	1.03	2.17	0.01	4.65	0.25
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	61.28	2.23	0.21	0.00	0.93	0.12
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	61.54	1.57	0.41	0.00	1.07	0.31
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	60.58	1.07	0.35	0.01	2.73	0.23
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	61.79	0.80	1.07	0.03	1.00	0.20
	msgl	60.48	2.37	23.92	0.12	0.67	0.00
miniboone	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	83.84	0.08	3.60	0.04	6.00	0.00
$n = 130,065$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	83.90	0.10	1.57	0.06	8.00	0.00
$d = 50$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	83.10	0.22	1.62	0.04	8.00	0.00
$Q = 2$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	83.31	0.15	**1.18**	**0.01**	6.00	0.00
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	82.50	0.06	2.96	0.19	8.00	0.00
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	83.77	0.10	4.22	0.28	16.00	4.00
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	83.93	0.12	2.49	0.31	6.00	0.00
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	**84.19**	**0.15**	9.42	0.09	8.00	0.00
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	81.54	0.12	9.81	3.45	8.00	0.00

	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	83.74	0.07	7.04	0.01	6.00	0.00
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	83.11	0.05	7.54	0.00	**4.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	82.81	0.09	7.14	0.00	15.33	1.15
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	83.86	0.13	8.77	0.41	11.00	1.15
	msgl	81.99	0.21	121.17	4.30	10.00	0.00
protein	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	67.84	1.11	1.28	0.06	64.89	1.95
$n = 24,387$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	67.23	0.90	1.47	0.02	63.67	2.39
$d = 357$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	68.13	0.57	1.36	0.06	92.79	0.86
$Q = 3$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	66.41	1.12	**1.13**	**0.12**	**22.64**	**0.47**
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	67.25	1.24	1.33	0.14	65.73	1.09
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	**68.19**	**1.06**	**1.13**	**0.10**	77.47	0.42
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	67.23	0.75	2.59	0.02	42.56	1.66
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	66.19	0.96	3.77	0.41	33.36	1.87
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	66.93	0.75	13.53	2.12	54.21	0.61
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	67.04	0.72	3.35	0.00	50.47	1.27
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	67.89	0.60	3.43	0.00	79.68	0.58
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	66.90	0.84	3.66	1.04	58.43	1.46
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	66.59	1.82	11.73	2.80	92.70	2.50
	msgl	67.34	0.48	5.59	0.36	47.15	1.32
sensit	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	78.67	0.11	3.48	0.21	28.33	8.50
$n = 98,528$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	79.64	0.22	3.11	0.96	34.00	17.35
$d = 100$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	79.73	0.28	**1.61**	**0.07**	53.67	6.81
$Q = 3$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	78.59	0.08	2.94	0.17	33.80	5.31
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	79.71	0.23	2.94	2.12	100.00	0.00
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	78.83	0.24	2.91	0.20	35.00	2.74
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	**79.84**	**0.11**	27.97	0.80	19.25	0.50
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	79.65	0.21	18.31	4.90	**17.50**	**0.58**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	79.16	0.17	42.91	5.24	91.50	2.38

	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	78.92	0.15	26.36	2.22	56.67	1.53
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	78.91	0.38	27.05	2.80	57.33	0.58
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	79.20	0.17	35.78	2.69	91.67	7.23
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	79.52	0.27	22.44	2.41	27.00	1.00
	msgl	79.02	0.13	11.16	0.53	23.00	0.00
sensorless	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	86.52	0.78	1.47	0.16	37.50	5.10
$n = 58,509$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	87.33	0.27	1.40	0.09	54.69	10.67
$d = 48$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	86.91	0.19	1.41	0.38	97.92	2.08
$Q = 11$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	84.77	0.08	2.45	0.13	68.06	1.20
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	82.89	0.30	2.69	0.62	72.92	2.08
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	87.12	0.72	**1.36**	**0.09**	**25.69**	**1.20**
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	90.00	0.31	15.96	0.65	32.81	1.04
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	89.11	0.18	16.28	0.97	31.25	0.00
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	**90.76**	**0.14**	18.99	0.81	100.00	0.00
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	89.60	1.15	24.75	1.39	53.47	1.20
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	88.87	1.04	16.28	0.44	47.92	0.80
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	81.06	3.9	14.99	3.22	41.67	0.70
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	86.07	1.39	8.16	1.05	88.89	2.41
	msgl	85.06	0.31	199.00	41.75	50.00	0.00
sim_1	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	72.22	0.46	0.46	0.02	**80.00**	**0.00**
$n = 100,000$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	72.24	0.43	0.46	0.03	**80.00**	**0.00**
$d = 50$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	72.24	0.47	0.56	0.06	**80.00**	**0.00**
$Q = 4$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	72.24	0.52	0.50	0.04	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	72.24	0.58	0.42	0.06	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	72.21	0.58	0.51	0.07	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	72.22	0.40	2.34	0.05	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	72.25	0.38	0.26	0.01	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	72.22	0.40	9.79	0.10	**80.00**	**0.00**

	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	72.25	0.52	0.32	0.00	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	72.24	0.52	**0.30**	**0.00**	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	72.24	0.51	3.00	0.00	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	71.48	0.81	7.16	0.91	83.50	2.52
	msgl	**72.33**	0.18	214.83	25.40	82.00	0.00
sim_2	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	68.53	0.29	0.79	0.00	**80.00**	**0.00**
$n = 150,000$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	68.48	0.34	0.73	0.16	**80.00**	**0.00**
$d = 50$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	**68.71**	**0.23**	0.97	0.12	**80.00**	**0.00**
$Q = 3$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	68.50	0.29	1.02	0.14	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	67.42	0.40	**0.71**	**0.23**	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	68.38	0.28	1.40	0.18	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	68.55	0.22	1.14	0.26	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	68.31	0.23	13.51	1.93	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	**68.71**	**0.18**	2.75	2.80	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	67.70	0.31	4.29	0.03	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	68.43	0.24	0.93	0.16	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	67.49	0.35	0.69	0.10	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	67.62	0.48	7.77	0.28	82.00	0.00
	msgl	68.42	0.03	367.29	53.52	82.00	0.00
sim_3	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	99.69	0.04	36.61	1.48	**80.00**	**0.00**
$n = 250,000$	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	**99.93**	**0.01**	**10.74**	**0.42**	**80.00**	**0.00**
$d = 500$	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	99.56	0.07	22.11	3.43	80.73	0.64
$Q = 4$	SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	99.69	0.01	21.45	0.93	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	99.00	0.01	23.10	0.12	**80.00**	**0.00**
	SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	99.67	0.01	21.05	1.06	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp	99.88	0.02	249.74	10.73	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp	99.88	0.02	202.67	33.27	**80.00**	**0.00**
	DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp	97.74	2.05	431.13	26.47	**80.00**	**0.00**

DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1	99.92	0.01	178.89	7.83	**80.00**	**0.00**
DCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-capℓ_1	99.87	0.01	270.69	17.64	**80.00**	**0.00**
DCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-capℓ_1	99.85	0.03	24.40	4.29	80.40	0.40
SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$	99.70	0.12	212.71	21.79	**80.00**	**0.00**
msgl	**99.93**	**0.01**	1581.44	14.76	80.20	0.00

5. Conclusion

We have proposed two novel DCA based algorithms, stochastic DCA and inexact stochastic DCA for minimizing a large sum of DC functions, with the aim of reducing the computation cost of DCA in large-scale setting. The sum structure of the objective function F permits us to work separately on the component functions F_i. The stochastic DCA is then proposed to tackle problems with huge numbers of F_i while the inexact stochastic DCA aims to address large-scale setting and big data. We have carefully studied the convergence properties of the proposed algorithms. It turns out that the convergence to a critical point of both stochastic DCA and inexact stochastic DCA is guaranteed with probability 1. Furthermore, we have developed DCA and SDCA to group variables selection in multi-class logistic regression, an important problem in machine learning. By using a suitable DC decomposition of the objective function we have designed a DCA scheme in which all computations are explicit and inexpensive. Consequently SDCA is very inexpensive. Numerical results showed that, as expected, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp reduces considerably the running time of DCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp while achieving equivalent classification accuracy. Moreover, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp outperforms the two related algorithms msgl and SPGD-$\ell_{2,1}$. We are convinced that SDCA is an efficient variant of DCA, especially for large-scale setting.

Continuing this research direction, in future works we will develop novel versions of DCA based algorithms (e.g. online/stochastic/approximate/like DCA) for other problems in order to accelerate the convergence of DCA and to deal with large-scale setting and big data.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 2

To prove Theorem 2, we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \cap \{+\infty\}$ be a ρ-convex function. For any $\epsilon \geq 0$ and any $v \in \partial_\epsilon f(x)$ with $x \in$ dom f, we have*

$$2\epsilon + f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle v, y - x\rangle + \frac{\rho}{4}\|y - x\|^2, \ \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. Since $v \in \partial_\epsilon f(x)$, we have

$$\epsilon + f(z) \geq f(x) + \langle v, z - x\rangle, \ \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Replacing z with $x + t(y - x)$ in this inequality gives that

$$\epsilon + f(x + t(y - x)) \geq f(x) + t\langle v, y - x\rangle, \ \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

It follows from the ρ-convexity of f that for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$tf(y) + (1 - t)f(x) \geq f(x + t(y - x)) + \frac{\rho t(1 - t)}{2}\|y - x\|^2.$$

Summing the two above inequalities gives us

$$\epsilon + tf(y) \geq tf(x) + t\langle v, y - x\rangle + \frac{\rho t(1 - t)}{2}\|y - x\|^2.$$

Thus, the conclusion follows from this inequality with $t = 1/2$. □

Proof. (of Theorem 2) a) Let x_i^0 be the copies of x^0. We set $x_i^{l+1} = x^{l+1}$ for all $i \in s_{l+1}$ and $x_j^{l+1} = x_j^l$ for $j \notin s_{l+1}$. Set $\epsilon_i^0 = \epsilon^0$ and $\epsilon_i^{l+1} = \epsilon^{l+1}$ if $i \in s_{l+1}$, ϵ_i^l otherwise. We then have $v_i^l \in \partial_{\epsilon_i^l} h_i(x_i^l)$ for $i = 1, ..., n$. Let T_i^l be the function given by

$$T_i^l(x) = g_i(x) - h_i(x_i^l) - \left\langle x - x_i^l, v_i^l \right\rangle + 2\epsilon_i^l.$$

It follows from $v_i^l \in \partial_{\epsilon_i^l} h_i(x_i^l)$ that

$$\epsilon_i^l + h_i(x) \geq h_i(x_i^l) + \left\langle x - x_i^l, v_i^l \right\rangle.$$

This implies $T_i^l(x) \geq F_i(x) + \epsilon_i^l \geq F_i(x)$ for all $l \geq 0$, $i = 1, ..., n$. We also observe that x^{l+1} is an ϵ^l-solution of the following convex problem

$$\min_x T^l(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i^l(x) \tag{A.1}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T^l(x^{l+1}) \leq T^l(x^l) + \epsilon^l &= T^{l-1}(x^l) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in s_l} [T_i^l(x^l) - T_i^{l-1}(x^l)] + \epsilon^l \\ &= T^{l-1}(x^l) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in s_l} [F_i(x^l) + 2\epsilon^l - T_i^{l-1}(x^l)] + \epsilon^l, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where the second equality follows from $T_i^l(x^l) = F_i(x^l) + 2\epsilon^l$ for all $i \in s_l$. Let $\mathcal{F}_l$ denote the σ-algebra generated by the entire history of ISDCA up to the iteration l, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(x^0, \epsilon^0)$ and $\mathcal{F}_l = \sigma(x^0, ..., x^l, \epsilon^0, ..., \epsilon^l, s_0, ..., s_{l-1})$ for all $l \geq 1$. By taking the expectation of the inequality (A.2) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1}) | \mathcal{F}_l\right] \leq T^{l-1}(x^l) - \frac{b}{n}\left[T^{l-1}(x^l) - F(x^l)\right] + \left(\frac{2b}{n} + 1\right)\epsilon^l.$$

Since $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_i^l < +\infty$ with probability 1, by applying the supermartingale convergence theorem (Neveu, 1975; Bertsekas et al., 2003) to the nonnegative sequences $\{T^{l-1}(x^l) - \alpha^*\}, \{\frac{b}{n}[T^{l-1}(x^l) - F(x^l)]\}$ and $\{(\frac{2b}{n} + 1)\epsilon^l\}$, we conclude that the sequence $\{T^{l-1}(x^l, y^l) - \alpha^*\}$ converges to $T^* - \alpha^*$ and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[T^{l-1}(x^l) - F(x^l)\right] < \infty, \tag{A.3}$$

with probability 1. Therefore $\{F(x^l)\}$ converges almost surely to T^*.

b) By $v_i^{l-1} \in \partial_{\epsilon_i^{l-1}} h_i(x_i^{l-1})$ and Lemma 1, we have

$$2\epsilon_i^{l-1} + h_i(x) \geq h_i(x_i^{l-1}) + \langle x - x_i^{l-1}, v_i^{l-1} \rangle + \frac{\rho(h_i)}{4}\|x - x_i^{l-1}\|^2, \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This implies

$$F_i(x) \leq T_i^{l-1}(x) - \frac{\rho(h_i)}{4}\|x - x_i^{l-1}\|^2. \tag{A.4}$$

From (A.2) and (A.4) with $x = x^l$, we have

$$T^l(x^{l+1}) \leq T^{l-1}(x^l) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in s_l} \frac{\rho(h_i)}{4}\|x - x_i^{l-1}\|^2 + \left(\frac{2b}{n} + 1\right)\epsilon^l. \tag{A.5}$$

Taking the expectation of the inequality (A.5) conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1})|\mathcal{F}_l\right] \leq T^{l-1}(x^l) - \frac{b}{4n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho(h_i)\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\|^2 + \left(\frac{2b}{n}+1\right)\epsilon^l.$$

Combining this and $\rho = \min_{i=1,\ldots,n}\rho(h_i) > 0$ gives us

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T^l(x^{l+1})|\mathcal{F}_l\right] \leq T^{l-1}(x^l) - \frac{b\rho}{4n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\|^2 + \left(\frac{2b}{n}+1\right)\epsilon^l.$$

Applying the supermartingale convergence theorem to the nonnegative sequences $\{T^{l-1}(x^l) - \alpha^*\}$, $\{\frac{b}{4\rho n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\|^2\}$ and $\{(\frac{2b}{n}+1)\epsilon^l\}$, we get

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\|^2 < \infty,$$

with probability 1. In particular, for $i = 1, ..., n$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\|^2 < \infty, \tag{A.6}$$

and hence $\lim_{l\to\infty}\|x^l - x_i^{l-1}\| = 0$ almost surely.

c) Assume that there exists a sub-sequence $\{x^{l_k}\}$ of $\{x^l\}$ such that $x^{l_k} \to x^*$ almost surely. From (A.6), we have $\|x^{l_k+1} - x_i^{l_k}\| \to 0$ almost surely. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that the sub-sequence $v_i^{l_k} \to v_i^*$ almost surely. From the proof of (a), we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\epsilon_i^l \leq T^l(x^{l+1}) - F(x^{l+1}).$$

From this and (A.3) it follows that ϵ_i^l converges to 0 as $l \to +\infty$ with probability 1. Since $v_i^{l_k} \in \partial_{\epsilon_i^{l_k}} h_i(x_i^{l_k})$, $\epsilon_i^{l_k} \to 0$ with probability 1, and by the closed property of the ϵ-subdifferential mapping $\partial_{\epsilon_i^{l_k}} h_i$, we have $v_i^* \in \partial h_i(x^*)$. Since x^{l_k+1} is a ϵ^{l_k}-solution of the problem $\min_x T^{l_k}(x)$, we obtain

$$T^{l_k}(x^{l_k+1}) \leq T^{l_k}(x) + \epsilon^{l_k}. \tag{A.7}$$

Taking $k \to \infty$ gives us

$$\limsup_{l_k\to+\infty} G(x^{l_k+1}) \leq G(x) - \langle x - x^*, v^*\rangle,\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with probability 1, where $v^* = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^* \in \partial H(x^*)$ almost surely. It follows from this with $x = x^*$ that

$$\limsup_{l_k \to +\infty} G(x^{l_k+1}) \leq G(x^*),$$

almost surely. Combining this with the lower semi-continuity of G gives us that

$$\lim_{l_k \to +\infty} G(x^{l_k+1}) = G(x^*),$$

almost surely. Thus, we have

$$G(x^*) \leq G(x) - \langle x - x^*, v^* \rangle, \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

almost surely. This implies

$$v^* \in \partial G(x^*), \tag{A.8}$$

with probability one. Therefore,

$$v^* \in \partial G(x^*) \cap \partial H(x^*), \tag{A.9}$$

with probability 1. This implies that x^* is a critical point of F with probability 1 and the proof is then complete. □

References

Allen-Zhu, Z., & Yuan, Y. (2016). Improved SVRG for non-strongly-convex or sum-of-non-convex objectives. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48* ICML'16 (pp. 1080–1089).

Bagley, S. C., White, H., & Golomb, B. A. (2001). Logistic regression in the medical literature: Standards for use and reporting, with particular attention to one medical domain. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *54*, 979–985.

Bertsekas, D., Nedic, A., & Ozdaglar, A. (2003). *Convex analysis and optimization*. Athena Scientific.

Bertsekas, D. P. (2010). *Incremental Gradient, Subgradient, and Proximal Methods for Convex Optimization: A Survey*. Technical Report Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Bertsekas, D. P. (2011). Incremental proximal methods for large scale convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, *129*, 163–195.

Bottou, L. (1998). On-line learning and stochastic approximations. In D. Saad (Ed.), *On-line Learning in Neural Networks* (pp. 9–42). New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, C. R., Tolson, M. A., & Copes, W. S. (1987). Evaluating trauma care: The TRISS method. Trauma Score and the Injury Severity Score. *The Journal of Trauma*, *27*, 370–378.

Bradley, P. S., & Mangasarian, O. L. (1998). Feature selection via concave minimization and support vector machines. In *Machine Learning Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference (ICML 98)* (pp. 82–90). Morgan Kaufmann.

Cox, D. (1958). The regression analysis of binary sequences (with discussion). *J Roy Stat Soc B*, *20*, 215–242.

Defazio, A., Bach, F., & Lacoste-Julien, S. (2014a). Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Defazio, A., Caetano, T., & Domke, J. (2014b). Finito: A faster, permutable incremental gradient method for big data problems. In *Proceedings of the* 31^{st} *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Genkin, A., Lewis, D. D., & Madigan, D. (2007). Large-scale Bayesian logistic regression for text categorization. *Technometrics*, *49*, 291–304.

Healy, K., & Schruben, L. W. (1991). Retrospective simulation response optimization. In *1991 Winter Simulation Conference Proceedings.* (pp. 901–906).

Johnson, R., & Zhang, T. (2013). Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26* (pp. 315–323). Curran Associates Inc.

Kim, J., Kim, Y., & Kim, Y. (2008). A Gradient-Based Optimization Algorithm for LASSO. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, *17*, 994–1009.

King, G., & Zeng, L. (2001). Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data. *Political Analysis*, *9*, 137–163.

Le Thi, H. A., Le, H. M., Nguyen, V. V., & Pham Dinh, T. (2008). A DC programming approach for feature selection in support vector machines learning. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, *2*, 259–278.

Le Thi, H. A., Le, H. M., Phan, D. N., & Tran, B. (2017). Stochastic DCA for the Large-sum of Non-convex Functions Problem and its Application to Group Variable Selection in Classification. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 3394–3403). volume 70.

Le Thi, H. A., & Pham Dinh, T. (2005). The DC (difference of convex functions) programming and DCA revisited with DC models of real world nonconvex optimization problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, *133*, 23–46.

Le Thi, H. A., & Pham Dinh, T. (2018). DC programming and DCA: thirty years of developments. *Mathematical Programming*, (pp. 1–64).

Le Thi, H. A., Pham Dinh, T., Le, H. M., & Vo, X. T. (2015). DC approximation approaches for sparse optimization. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, *244*, 26–46.

Le Thi, H. A., & Phan, D. N. (2016). DC Programming and DCA for Sparse Optimal Scoring Problem. *Neurocomput.*, *186*, 170–181.

Le Thi, H. A., Phan, D. N., & Pham, D. T. (2019). DCA based approaches for bi-level variable selection and application for estimating multiple sparse covariance matrices. *Revised version Neurocomputing*, .

Le Thi (Home Page), H. A. (2005). DC Programming and DCA - Website of Le Thi Hoai An. http://www.lita.univ-lorraine.fr/~lethi/index.php/en/research/dc-programming-and-dca.html.

LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Orr, G. B., & Müller, K. R. (1998). Efficient backprop. In *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade* (pp. 9–50). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Liao, J. G., & Chin, K.-V. (2007). Logistic regression for disease classification using microarray data: Model selection in a large p and small n case. *Bioinformatics*, *23*, 1945–1951.

Mairal, J. (2015). Incremental majorization-minimization optimization with application to large-scale machine learning. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, *25*, 829–855.

Neveu, J. (1975). *Discrete-Parameter Martingales* volume 10 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. Elsevier.

Parikh, N., & Boyd, S. (2014). Proximal algorithms. *Found. Trends Optim.*, *1*, 127–239.

Pham Dinh, T., & Le Thi, H. A. (1997). Convex analysis approach to dc programming: Theory, algorithms and applications. *Acta Mathematica Vietnamica*, *22*, 289–355.

Pham Dinh, T., & Le Thi, H. A. (1998). A D. C. Optimization Algorithm for Solving the Trust-Region Subproblem. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, *8*, 476–505.

Pham Dinh, T., & Le Thi, H. A. (2014). Recent advances in DC programming and DCA. *Transactions on Computational Collective Intelligence*, *8342*, 1–37.

Pham Dinh, T., & Souad, E. B. (1986). Algorithms for Solving a Class of Nonconvex Optimization Problems. Methods of Subgradients. In J. B. Hiriart-Urruty (Ed.), *North-Holland Mathematics Studies* (pp. 249–271). North-Holland volume 129 of *Fermat Days 85: Mathematics for Optimization*.

Phan, D. N., Le Thi, H. A., & Pham Dinh, T. (2017). Sparse covariance matrix estimation by DCA-Based Algorithms. *Neural Computation*, *29*, 3040–3077.

Phan, D. N., & Thi, H. A. L. (2019). Group variable selection via $\ell p, 0$ regularization and application to optimal scoring. *Neural Networks*, .

Reddi, S. J., Sra, S., Poczos, B., & Smola, A. J. (2016). Proximal stochastic methods for Nonsmooth Nonconvex Finite-Sum Optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (pp. 1145–1153).

Robbins, H., & Monro, S. (1951). A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, *22*, 400–407.

Schmidt, M., Le Roux, N., & Bach, F. (2017). Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. *Mathematical Programming*, *162*, 83–112.

Shalev-Schwartz, S., & Zhang, T. (2013). Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *14*, 567–599.

Subasi, A., & Erçelebi, E. (2005). Classification of EEG signals using neural network and logistic regression. *Comput. Methods Programs Biomed.*, *78*, 87–99.

Vincent, M., & Hansen, N. R. (2014). Sparse group lasso and high dimensional multinomial classification. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, *71*, 771–786.

Witten, D. M., & Tibshirani, R. (2011). Penalized classification using Fisher's linear discriminant. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, *73*, 753–772.




Figure 2: Comparative results between SDCA-$\ell_{1,0}$-exp, SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{\infty,0}$-exp (running time is plotted on a logarithmic scale).




Figure 3: Comparative results between SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-exp and SDCA-$\ell_{2,0}$-capℓ_1 (running time is plotted on a logarithmic scale).