

RLC Circuits based Distributed Mirror Descent Method

Yue Yu and Behçet Açıkmeşe

Abstract—We consider distributed optimization with smooth convex objective functions defined on an undirected connected graph. Inspired by mirror descent method and RLC circuits, we propose a novel distributed mirror descent method. Compared with mirror-prox method, our algorithm achieves the same $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ iteration complexity with only half the computation cost per iteration. We further extend our results to cases where a) gradients are corrupted by stochastic noise, and b) objective function is composed of both smooth and non-smooth terms. We demonstrate our theoretical results via numerical experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Distributed optimization over a graph aim to optimize sum of nodal convex objective functions via local computation on nodes and efficient communication on edges, which arises in a variety of engineering applications [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. Among the most popular distributed optimization algorithms are distributed mirror descent methods [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18]. These methods not only include distributed (projected) subgradient method [19], [20] as special cases, but also achieve faster convergence using Bregman divergence to measure distance, which exploits the underlying geometry of the constraint set better than quadratic function [4], [5].

Although they all revolve around mirror descent method [21], [22], different distributed mirror descent methods use different assumptions on objective functions, consensus dynamics, and discretization schemes. See Tab. I for a detailed comparison. For example, methods in [6], [7], [8], [9], [10] add a heat equation dynamics to mirror descent step. Although using an efficient Euler-forward scheme and suitable for non-smooth objective functions, these methods converge slowly with iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$, which can be improved to $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ by additionally assuming strong convexity [12]. On the other hand, the mirror-prox method [13], [14], [15] solves distributed optimization as a saddle point problem, leading to a wave equation dynamics, and achieves a $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ iteration complexity for smooth objective functions. However, mirror-prox method uses a predictor-corrector scheme, whose per-iteration computation cost is twice as much as Euler-forward scheme. Recently, inspired by distributed alternating directional method of multipliers [23], [24], [25], there are few attempts of adding damping to the wave equation dynamics used by mirror-prox method [16], [17], [18]. The resulting methods can achieve $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ iteration complexity for non-smooth objective functions, but

strictly rely on computationally prohibitive Euler-backward scheme that requires optimizing penalized objective function at each iteration.

Based on the above comparison, this work is motivated by the following question:

For smooth distributed optimization, is it possible to upgrade the predictor-corrector scheme used by mirror-prox method to the more efficient Euler-forward scheme?

In this letter, we answer this question affirmatively and make the following contributions.

- 1) We propose a novel distributed mirror descent method for smooth convex objective function using Euler-forward discretization of RLC circuits dynamics. Compared with mirror-prox method [13], our algorithm achieves the same $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ iteration complexity using only half the computation cost per iteration.
- 2) We prove that our algorithm also converges in expectation when the gradients are corrupted by stochastic noise with zero mean and bounded variance.
- 3) We further extend our results to cases where the objective function is composed of both smooth and non-smooth terms.

We demonstrate our theoretical findings via numerical experiments. Our results extend the previous work [17] to noisy gradients and composite objective scenarios.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. After introducing necessary preliminaries in §II, we discuss our algorithm and its convergence in §III and, respectively, §IV, which are further extended to composite objective optimization in §V. We demonstrate our results via numerical experiments in §VI before concluding in §VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Let \mathbb{R} denote the real numbers, \mathbb{R}^n the n -dimensional real numbers. We use \cdot^\top to denote matrix (and vector) transpose. Let $\langle x, y \rangle = x^\top y$ and $\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$ denote the inner product and, respectively, ℓ_2 norm. Let $\mathbf{diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are given by vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let I_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the vector of all 1's. Let \otimes denotes Kronecker product. Let $\mathbb{E}[\eta]$ denote the expectation of a random variable η .

A. Graph theory

An undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of a node set \mathcal{V} and an edge set \mathcal{E} , where an edge is a pair of distinct nodes in \mathcal{V} . For an arbitrary orientation on \mathcal{G} , *i.e.*, each edge has a head and a tail, the $|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{E}|$ incidence matrix is denoted by $E(\mathcal{G})$. The columns of $E(\mathcal{G})$ are indexed by the edges

The authors are with the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 USA (emails: yueyu@uw.edu, behcet@uw.edu).

TABLE I: Comparison of different distributed mirror descent methods.

Algorithm	Objective function	Dynamics	Discretization	Convergence
[6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11]	non-smooth, convex	heat eqn.	Euler-forward	$\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$
[12]	non-smooth, strongly convex	heat eqn.	Euler-forward	$\mathcal{O}(1/k)$
[13], [14], [15]	smooth, convex	wave eqn.	predictor-corrector	$\mathcal{O}(1/k)$
[16], [17], [18]	non-smooth, convex	damped wave eqn.	Euler-backward	$\mathcal{O}(1/k)$
This work	smooth, convex	damped wave eqn.	Euler-forward	$\mathcal{O}(1/k)$

in \mathcal{E} , and the entry on their i -th row takes the value “1” if node i is the head of the edge, “-1” if it is its tail, and 0 otherwise. When graph \mathcal{G} is connected, the nullspace of $E(\mathcal{G})^\top$ is spanned by $\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{V}|}$ [26].

B. Convex Analysis

We will use the following results from convex analysis (see, e.g., [27]). Given a convex set X , define the normal cone $N_X(x)$ at $x \in X$ as follows

$$N_X(x) = \{u \mid \langle u, x' - x \rangle \leq 0, \forall x' \in X\}. \quad (1)$$

We say X is the domain of function f , i.e., $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $X = \{x \mid f(x) < \infty\}$. A function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex over its convex domain X if and only if $f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)x') \leq \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(x')$ for all $x, x' \in X$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. The subdifferential of function f at $x \in X$ is defined as

$$\partial f(x) = \{u \mid f(x') - f(x) \geq \langle u, x' - x \rangle, \forall x' \in X\}. \quad (2)$$

If function f is continuously differentiable over X , then its subdifferential reduces to a singleton, i.e., $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$, and f is convex if and only if, for all $x, x' \in X$,

$$f(x') \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), x' - x \rangle. \quad (3)$$

In addition, we say f is β -smooth if $\frac{\beta}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2 - f$ is also convex, which implies that, for all $x, x' \in X$,

$$f(x') \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), x' - x \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x' - x\|_2^2, \quad (4)$$

The Bregman divergence associated with differentiable convex function $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as [28]

$$B_\psi(x', x) = \psi(x') - \psi(x) - \langle \nabla \psi(x), x' - x \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Applying (5) to three points $x, x', x^+ \in X$, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} & B_\psi(x', x) - B_\psi(x', x^+) - B_\psi(x^+, x) \\ &= \langle \nabla \psi(x^+) - \nabla \psi(x), x' - x^+ \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We will also use the following results.

Lemma 1 (Thm. 27.4, [27]). *If f is a proper convex function, X is a closed convex set, then $x' = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} f(x)$ if and only if $0 \in \partial f(x') + N_X(x')$, i.e., there exists $v \in \partial f(x')$ such that $\langle v, x - x' \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$.*

III. METHOD

In this section, we introduce our algorithm (RLC), which is inspired by RLC circuits dynamics given by (KCL). Throughout the section we are interested in distributed optimization problem of the following form [4], [5],

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x}{\operatorname{minimize}} \quad & f(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(x_i) \\ & E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x = 0, \quad x \in X := X_0^{|\mathcal{V}|}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P})$$




Fig. 1: An illustration of RLC circuits.

where $x = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{V}|}^\top]^\top$; $X_0^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ is the Cartesian product of $|\mathcal{V}|$ copies of closed convex set $X_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which describes potentially non-Euclidean domain of decision variable, e.g., probability simplex [4], [5]; $f_i : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the convex differentiable functions available to node i only; $E_l(\mathcal{G}) = (E(\mathcal{G}) \operatorname{diag}(\sqrt{l}) \otimes I_n)$ where \sqrt{l} is the element-wise square root of $l \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}$. The idea of (P) is to create local variable x_i on node i , then use constraint $E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x = 0$ and the connectivity of \mathcal{G} to ensure all copies agree with each other.

In order to solve (P), consider a conceptual RLC circuits on graph \mathcal{G} as follows.¹ Let each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ denote a pin connected to a grounded parallel RC circuit, and each edge $\{ij\} \in \mathcal{E}$ denote a parallel RL circuit. See Fig. 1 for an illustration and Tab. II for characteristics of each unit, where ψ_0 is a continuously differentiable function. If we let $x_i(t)$ denote the voltage on node i at time t , then the Kirchoff's current law applied to such RLC circuits is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \nabla \psi(x(t)) &= -L_r(\mathcal{G})x(t) - E_l(\mathcal{G})u(t) - \nabla f(x(t)), \\ \frac{d}{dt} u(t) &= E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{KCL})$$

where we let $L_r(\mathcal{G}) = (E(\mathcal{G}) \operatorname{diag}(r) E(\mathcal{G})^\top) \otimes I_n$, $x(t) = [x_1(t)^\top, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{V}|}(t)^\top]^\top$, and $\psi(x) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \psi_0(x_i)$ with $\psi_0 : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being a closed, convex, proper, continuously differentiable function; vector u denotes the (scaled) electrical current flowing through the inductors. Notice that (KCL) describes nonlinear capacitor and resistors that reduce to linear ones when $\psi_0 = f_i = \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

Applying Euler-forward scheme to (KCL) gives

$$\nabla \psi(x^{k+1}) = \nabla \psi(x^k) - \alpha^k w^k, \quad (7a)$$

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \alpha^k E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x^{k+1} \quad (7b)$$

where $w^k = L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k + E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k)$ and $\alpha^k > 0$ is the step size. Since $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is closed, convex and proper,

¹An equivalent mechanical network model was used in [17].

we know $x^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} -\langle x, \nabla \psi(x^{k+1}) \rangle + \psi(x)$ [27, Thm. 23.5]. Hence update (7a) is equivalent to the following

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \alpha^k \langle w^k, x \rangle - \langle \nabla \psi(x^k), x \rangle + \psi(x) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \alpha^k \langle w^k, x \rangle + B_\psi(x, x^k). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we further assume that $\nabla f(x^k)$ is corrupted by an additive noise vector $\eta^k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|n}$, then (7) gives the following algorithm,

$$\begin{aligned} w^k &= L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k + E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k) + \eta^k, \\ x^{k+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \alpha^k \langle w^k, x \rangle + B_\psi(x, x^k), \\ u^{k+1} &= u^k + \alpha^k E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{RLC})$$

Notice that (RLC) can be implemented in a fully distributed fashion. This is because the Kirchoff current law (KCL) is fully separable with respect to different pins (nodes in \mathcal{G}), and no coupling is introduced during discretization.

Remark 1. *Alternatively, applying the predictor-corrector scheme to the undamped version of (KCL), i.e., $r = 0$, gives the following mirror-prox method [13]*

$$\begin{aligned} y^k &= \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in X} \alpha^k \langle E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k), y \rangle + B_\psi(y, x^k), \\ v^k &= u^k + \alpha^k E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x^k, \\ x^{k+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \alpha^k \langle E_l(\mathcal{G})v^k + \nabla f(y^k), x \rangle + B_\psi(x, x^k), \\ u^{k+1} &= u^k + \alpha^k E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top y^k. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{mirror-prox})$$

Compared with (mirror-prox), iterations in (RLC) compute $\nabla f(x)$ (gradient evaluating) and $E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x$ (information exchange among neighboring nodes) only half as often by adding an $L_r(\mathcal{G})x$ term at virtually no additional cost.

IV. CONVERGENCE

In this section, we establish the convergence of (RLC). Key to our analysis is Lemma 2, an energy dissipation property of (RLC).

We first make the following assumptions.

- Assumption 1.** 1) $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is undirected and connected. Edge weights $l, r \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}$ are element-wise positive. Let $\frac{1}{\gamma} = \max\{\alpha \mid \alpha l \leq r\}$ and λ be the largest eigenvalue of matrix $L_r(\mathcal{G})$.
2) $X_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex set,² $\psi_0 : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is proper, closed, continuously differentiable and 1-strongly convex, i.e., $\psi_0 - \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2$ is convex over X_0 .

²In general, X_0 can be a closed convex subset of any Hilbert spaces. Here we assume this space is \mathbb{R}^n for simplicity.

TABLE II: Voltage-current relation of RLC units

type	symbol	voltage	current
resistor		x_i	$\nabla f_i(x_i)$
capacitor		x_i	$\frac{d}{dt} \nabla \psi_0(x_i)$
resistor		$x_i - x_j$	$r_{\{ij\}}(x_i - x_j)$
inductor		$x_i - x_j$	$\int l_{\{ij\}}(x_i - x_j) dt$

- 3) For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $f_i : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable, convex and β -smooth, i.e., both f_i and $\frac{\beta}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2 - f_i$ are convex over X_0 . There exists x^*, u^* such that

$$E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x^* = 0, \quad x^* \in X, \quad (\text{KKT-a})$$

$$-E_l(\mathcal{G})u^* - \nabla f(x^*) \in N_X(x^*). \quad (\text{KKT-b})$$

We define the Lagrangian of (P) as follows

$$\ell(x, u) = f(x) + \langle E_l(\mathcal{G})u, x \rangle. \quad (9)$$

Using Lemma 1 one can show that (KKT-a) and (KKT-b) imply $u^* = \operatorname{argmax}_u \ell(x, u)$ and $x^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \ell(x, u)$ for any x and u . Further, (KKT-a) also implies that $\ell(x^*, u^*) = \ell(x^*, u)$ for any u , hence,

$$0 \leq \ell(x, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*) = \max_u \ell(x, u) - \min_{x \in X} \ell(x, u).$$

for all $x \in X$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|n}$. Non-negative function $\ell(x, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)$ is also known as the *running duality gap function*, which measures the quality of solution x [13], [25].

We will use the following energy function, which represents the sum of electrical and magnetic energy of the RLC circuits used in (KCL).

$$V(x, u) = B_\psi(x^*, x) + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u^*\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

The following lemma shows that, along trajectories generated by (RLC), the variation of $V(x, u)$ is controlled by $\ell(x, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)$ up to a discretization error.

Lemma 2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. If $0 < \alpha^k \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}$, then along the trajectories generated by (RLC), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &V(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1}) - V(x^k, u^k) \\ &\leq -\alpha^k (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)) \\ &\quad - \alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle - \frac{1 - \alpha^k(\lambda + \beta)}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\ell(x, u)$ and $V(x, u)$ are given by (9) and (10).

Proof. We will show that (11) is the sum of (B-1)–(B-5). In particular, the sum of (B-1) and (B-2) gives the difference of $V(x, u)$ between two consecutive iterations, which can be further simplified by (B-3)–(B-5).

First, using Lemma 1 we can show that the x -update in (RLC) implies the following

$$0 \leq \langle \alpha^k w^k + \nabla \psi(x^{k+1}) - \nabla \psi(x^k), x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle.$$

Substituting the w -update in (RLC) and (6) (with $x = x^k, x' = x^*, x^+ = x^{k+1}$) into the above inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} &B_\psi(x^*, x^{k+1}) - B_\psi(x^*, x^k) + B_\psi(x^{k+1}, x^k) \\ &\leq -\alpha^k \langle L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k + E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k) + \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-1})$$

where we also use (KKT-a). Second, let $L_l(\mathcal{G}) = E_l(\mathcal{G})E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top$, then using (6) with $\psi = \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2$ we can show

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|u^{k+1} - u^*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u^k - u^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \langle u^k - u^*, u^{k+1} - u^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|u^{k+1} - u^k\|_2^2 \\ &= \alpha^k \langle E_l(\mathcal{G})(u^k - u^*), x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha^k}{2} \langle \alpha^k L_l(\mathcal{G})x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-2})$$

where the last step uses the u -update in (RLC) and (KKT-a).

Further, we can show the following inequalities (B-3)–(B-5), each uses one part of Assumption 1 as follows.

Part 1): Since $0 < \alpha^k \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} = \max\{\alpha \mid \alpha l \leq r\}$, vector $r - \alpha^k l$ is element-wise non-negative and matrix $L_r(\mathcal{G}) - \alpha^k L_l(\mathcal{G}) = (E(\mathcal{G}) \text{diag}(r - \alpha^k l) E(\mathcal{G})^\top) \otimes I_n$ is positive semi-definite, which implies

$$0 \leq \frac{\alpha^k}{2} \langle (L_r(\mathcal{G}) - \alpha^k L_l(\mathcal{G})) x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} \rangle. \quad (\text{B-3})$$

Part 2): Since ψ_0 is 1-strongly convex, we can apply (3) to convex function $\psi - \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_2^2$, which gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 \leq B_\psi(x^{k+1}, x^k). \quad (\text{B-4})$$

Part 3): Since f_i is convex and β -smooth for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and λ is the largest eigenvalue of $L_r(\mathcal{G})$, function $h(x) := f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \langle L_r(\mathcal{G})x, x \rangle$ is convex and $(\beta + \lambda)$ -smooth. Hence we can apply inequality (3) and, respectively, inequality (4) to function $h(x)$, which gives the following.

$$\alpha \langle \nabla h(x), x' - x \rangle \leq \alpha(h(x') - h(x)),$$

$$\alpha \langle \nabla h(x), x - x^+ \rangle \leq \alpha(h(x) - h(x^+) + \frac{\beta + \lambda}{2} \|x^+ - x\|_2^2),$$

for all $x, x^+, x' \in X$ and $\alpha > 0$. Summing up the above two inequalities with $x = x^k$, $x' = x^*$, $x^+ = x^{k+1}$, $\alpha = \alpha^k$, and recalling that $h(x) = f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \langle L_r(\mathcal{G})x, x \rangle$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\alpha^k \langle \nabla f(x^k) + L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle \\ & \leq -\alpha^k (f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*)) - \frac{\alpha^k}{2} \langle L_r(\mathcal{G})x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha^k(\beta + \lambda)}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-5})$$

where we also use the fact that $h(x^*) = f(x^*)$.

Finally, summing up (B-1)–(B-5) gives (11). \square

Based on Lemma 2, we will prove that $\ell(x, u^*)$ converges to $\ell(x^*, u^*)$ in expectation along trajectories generated by (RLC). The key idea is upper bounding the last two terms on the right hand side of (11).

We first start with the noiseless case where $\eta^k = 0$.

Theorem 1 (Noiseless gradient). *Suppose Assumption 1 hold. Along the trajectories generated by (RLC), if $0 < \alpha^k \equiv \alpha \leq \min\{\frac{1}{\beta + \lambda}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\}$ and $\eta^k = 0$ for all k , then*

$$\ell(\bar{x}^K, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*) \leq \frac{V(x^1, u^1)}{\alpha K},$$

where $\bar{x}^K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K x^{k+1}$, $\ell(x, u)$ and $V(x, u)$ are given by (9) and, respectively, (10).

Proof. If $\eta^k = 0$ and $\alpha^k \equiv \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\beta + \lambda}$, then (11) reduces to

$$\alpha(\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)) \leq V(x^k, u^k) - V(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1}).$$

Summing up the above inequality from $k = 1$ to $k = K$ we have $\alpha \sum_{k=1}^K (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)) \leq V(x^1, u^1)$, which, combined with Jensen's inequality $\ell(\bar{x}^K, u^*) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \ell(x^{k+1}, u^*)$, completes the proof. \square

Theorem 1 shows that the step sizes for algorithm (RLC) (noiseless case) are bounded by $\min\{\frac{1}{\beta + \lambda}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\}$. In comparison, one can show that, under Assumption 1, the

step sizes for algorithm (mirror-prox) are bounded by $\min\{\frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\gamma\lambda}}\}$ [29, Thm. 5.2].

The following theorem extends Theorem 1 to cases where η^k has zero mean and bounded variance.

Theorem 2 (Noisy gradient). *Suppose Assumption 1 hold. Along the trajectories generated by (RLC), if $0 < \alpha^k \leq \min\{\frac{1}{2(\beta + \lambda)}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\}$, η^k is an independent random variable with $\mathbb{E}[\eta^k] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\eta^k\|_2^2] \leq \sigma^2$ for all k , then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell(\bar{x}^K, u^*)] - \ell(x^*, u^*) \leq \frac{V(x^1, u^1) + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K (\alpha^k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha^k},$$

where $\bar{x}^K = (\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha^k)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha^k x^{k+1}$, $\ell(x, u)$ and $V(x, u)$ are given by (9) and, respectively, (10).

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle \\ & = -\alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle - \alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{\varepsilon \alpha^k}{2} \|\eta^k\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^k}{2\varepsilon} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 - \alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^k - x^* \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the last step is by completing the square, and we let $\varepsilon = \frac{\alpha^k}{1 - \alpha^k(\beta + \lambda)} > 0$. Since $\frac{\varepsilon \alpha^k}{2} \leq (\alpha^k)^2$ when $\alpha^k \leq \frac{1}{2(\beta + \lambda)}$, summing up (11) and (12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & V(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1}) - V(x^k, u^k) - (\alpha^k)^2 \|\eta^k\|_2^2 \\ & \leq -\alpha^k (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*)) - \alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^k - x^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

From (RLC) we know that, as random variables, x^k and η^k are independent of each other, hence

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \eta^k, x^k - x^* \rangle] = \langle \mathbb{E}[\eta^k], \mathbb{E}[x^k - x^*] \rangle = 0.$$

Therefore taking expectation on both sides of (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\alpha^k (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*))] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[V(x^k, u^k)] - \mathbb{E}[V(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1})] + (\alpha^k)^2 \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we also use the assumption that $\mathbb{E}[\|\eta^k\|_2^2] \leq \sigma^2$. Summing up the above inequality from $k = 1$ to $k = K$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[\alpha^k (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) - \ell(x^*, u^*))] \leq V(x^1, u^1) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\alpha^k)^2 \sigma^2$, which, combined with Jensen's inequality $\ell(\bar{x}^K, u^*) \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha^k} \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha^k \ell(x^{k+1}, u^*)$, completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. *Theorem 2 shows that if $\alpha^k \equiv \alpha$, algorithm RLC converges to a “noise floor” given by $\alpha\sigma^2$, i.e., $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\bar{x}^K, u^*)] - \ell(x^*, u^*) = \alpha\sigma^2$. If the maximum iteration number K is fixed in advance as a computation budget and we choose $\alpha^k \equiv 1/\sqrt{K}$, then such noise floor also decreases with K at the rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{K})$.*

V. DISTRIBUTED COMPOSITE OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION

An important paradigm in machine learning is composite objective optimization where the objective function include, in addition to a smooth cost function, a potentially non-smooth regularization function that typically promotes desired solution properties (e.g., sparsity). Examples of composite optimization include ridge regression, lasso, and logistic regression [30]. Combining such paradigm with problem

(P) gives the following distributed composite objective optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad & f(x) + g(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(x_i) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} g_i(x_i) \\ & E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x = 0, \quad x \in X := X_0^{|\mathcal{V}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{co-P})$$

where, in addition to the smooth cost function f_i , each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ also has a possibly non-smooth convex regularization function $g_i : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Motivated by composite objective mirror descent method [30], we propose the following variation of (RLC), which adds an additional regularization to the x -update,

$$\begin{aligned} w^k &= L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k + E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k) + \eta^k, \\ x^{k+1} &= \underset{x \in X}{\text{argmin}} \alpha^k \langle w^k, x \rangle + \alpha^k g(x) + B_\psi(x, x^k), \\ u^{k+1} &= u^k + \alpha^k E_l(\mathcal{G})^\top x^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{co-RLC})$$

Algorithm (co-RLC) can be viewed as a distributed extension to composite objective mirror descent method [30]; or, alternatively, a direct combination of (RLC) and the algorithm proposed in [17].

Remark 3. An important special case of (co-RLC) is when $X_0 = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g_i = \eta \| \cdot \|_1$ with $\theta > 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, which aims to induce sparse solution using ℓ_1 norm regularization. In this case, one can show that the x -update in (co-RLC) reduces to $x^{k+1} = S_{\alpha^k \theta}(x^k - \alpha^k w^k)$, where $S_\alpha(x)$ is the shrinkage operator defined element-wise as follows [30]

$$[S_\alpha(x)]_j = \text{sign}([x]_j) \max\{0, |[x]_j| - \alpha\},$$

where $[x]_j$ denote the j -th element of vector x .

The following theorem shows that the convergence of (co-RLC) can be established by following the same ideas used by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

Theorem 3 (Composite objective). *Suppose $g_i : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is closed, convex, proper for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Suppose Assumption 1 hold with (KKT-b) replaced by*

$$-E_l(\mathcal{G})u^* - \nabla f(x^*) \in N_X(x^*) + \partial g(x^*).$$

Then Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 hold if (RLC) is replaced by (co-RLC) and $\ell(x, u^)$ is replaced by $\ell(x, u^*) + g(x)$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 1 we can show that the x -update in (RLC) implies: there exists $v \in \partial g(x^{k+1})$ such that

$$0 \leq \langle \alpha^k(w^k + v) + \nabla \psi(x^{k+1}) - \nabla \psi(x^k), x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle,$$

Since $v \in \partial g(x^{k+1})$, we can use (2) to show

$$\alpha^k \langle v, x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle \leq \alpha^k (g(x^*) - g(x^{k+1})).$$

Summing up the above two inequalities, then use w -update in (co-RLC) and (6) we can show the following

$$\begin{aligned} & B_\psi(x^*, x^{k+1}) - B_\psi(x^*, x^k) - \alpha^k (g(x^*) - g(x^{k+1})) \\ & \leq -B_\psi(x^{k+1}, x^k) - \alpha^k \langle L_r(\mathcal{G})x^k, x^{k+1} \rangle \\ & \quad - \alpha^k \langle E_l(\mathcal{G})u^k + \nabla f(x^k) + \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-1.1})$$

Notice that (co-RLC) differs from (RLC) only in its x -update, which implies (B-2)–(B-5) in Lemma 2 still hold as the assumptions they used are unchanged. Therefore we can sum up (B-1.1) and (B-2)–(B-5), arriving at

$$\begin{aligned} & V(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1}) - V(x^k, u^k) \\ & \leq -\alpha^k \langle \eta^k, x^{k+1} - x^* \rangle - \frac{1 - \alpha^k(\lambda + \beta)}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 \\ & \quad - \alpha^k (\ell(x^{k+1}, u^*) + g(x^{k+1}) - \ell(x^*, u^*) - g(x^*)). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Finally, applying the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 to (14) instead of (11) completes the proof. \square

VI. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we compare our algorithms against the distributed mirror descent method in [8], [9], [11] and mirror-prox method (and its composite objective extensions) [13], [14], [15] via numerical examples. We first generate a random graph \mathcal{G} with $|\mathcal{V}| = 30$ and each pair of nodes are connected with probability 0.3. We let $f_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2} \|A_i x_i - b_i\|_2^2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, where entries of A_i, b_i are randomly generated. Using such choice on \mathcal{G} and f , we construct the following two examples (where $n = 30$).

- least squares over simplex: (P) with $X_0 = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n | v \geq 0, \langle v, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle = 1\}$, $\psi_0(v) = \langle v, \ln v \rangle$.³
- least squares with ℓ_1 regularization: (co-P) with $g_i(v) = \frac{1}{100} \|v\|_1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $X_0 = \mathbb{R}^n$, $\psi_0(v) = \frac{1}{2} \|v\|_2^2$.

For (RLC) and (co-RLC), we set $r = \frac{1}{10} \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{E}|}$, $l = (\beta + \lambda)r$ and $\alpha^k \equiv \frac{1}{\beta + \lambda}$; for distributed mirror descent, we use step size $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$ and doubly stochastic matrix $P = I - \frac{1}{1 + \Delta} L(\mathcal{G})$, where $L(\mathcal{G}) = E(\mathcal{G})E(\mathcal{G})^\top$ and Δ is the largest diagonal element of $L(\mathcal{G})$; for mirror-prox method, we use step size $\min\{\frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\gamma\lambda}}\}$ for problem (P) and (co-P), as we discussed after Theorem 1. In the noisy gradient case, we sample η^k from Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma I_{|\mathcal{V}|n})$ for all k .

The convergence of algorithms are shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. We can see that the convergence of (RLC) and (co-RLC) behaves no worse than mirror-prox method [13] and its composite objective extension [15] using only half of the computation cost per iteration; they all reach a ‘‘noise floor’’ when gradient are corrupted by noise. In the ℓ_1 regularized least squares case, both mirror-prox and RLC significantly outperform distributed mirror descent method since they use the shrinkage operator, as we discussed in Remark 3, rather than subgradients of ℓ_1 norm.

VII. CONCLUSION

Inspired by RLC circuits, we propose a novel distributed mirror descent for smooth distributed optimization. Compared with mirror-prox method, our algorithm achieve the same iteration complexity with half of the computational cost per iteration. We extend our results to noisy gradients and composite objective setting. Future directions include extensions to online distributed optimization, time-varying graph and improved convergence under strong convexity assumption.

³ $\ln v$ denotes the element-wise natural logarithm of v .




Fig. 2: Least squares over simplex.




Fig. 3: ℓ_1 regularized least squares.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Li, K. D. Wong, Y. H. Hu, and A. M. Sayeed, "Detection, classification, and tracking of targets," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 17–29, 2002.
- [2] B. Açıkmeşe, M. Mandić, and J. L. Speyer, "Decentralized observers with consensus filters for distributed discrete-time linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1037–1052, 2014.
- [3] V. Lesser, C. L. Ortiz Jr, and M. Tambe, *Distributed Sensor Networks: A Multiagent Perspective*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 9.
- [4] B. Gholami, S. Yoon, and V. Pavlovic, "Decentralized approximate bayesian inference for distributed sensor network." in *AAAI Conf. Artificial Intell.*, 2016, pp. 1582–1588.
- [5] A. Yahya, A. Li, M. Kalakrishnan, Y. Chebotar, and S. Levine, "Collective robot reinforcement learning with distributed asynchronous guided policy search," in *Int. Conf. Intell. Robots Syst.* IEEE, 2017, pp. 79–86.
- [6] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright, "Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 592–606, 2012.
- [7] C. Xi, Q. Wu, and U. Khan, "Distributed mirror descent over directed graphs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5526[math.OC]*, 2014.
- [8] J. Li, G. Chen, Z. Dong, and Z. Wu, "Distributed mirror descent method for multi-agent optimization with delay," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 177, pp. 643–650, 2016.
- [9] Y. Wang, H. Zhou, and Y. Hong, "Distributed stochastic mirror descent algorithm over time-varying network," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Control Automat.* IEEE, 2018, pp. 716–721.
- [10] J. Li, G. Li, Z. Wu, and C. Wu, "Stochastic mirror descent method for distributed multi-agent optimization," *Optim. Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1179–1197, 2018.
- [11] T. T. Doan, S. Bose, D. H. Nguyen, and C. L. Beck, "Convergence of the iterates in mirror descent methods," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 114–119, 2019.
- [12] D. Yuan, Y. Hong, D. W. Ho, and G. Jiang, "Optimal distributed stochastic mirror descent for strongly convex optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 90, pp. 196–203, 2018.

- [13] A. Nemirovski, "Prox-method with rate of convergence $O(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with Lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 229–251, 2004.
- [14] A. Juditsky, A. Nemirovski, and C. Tauvel, "Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm," *Stochastic Systems*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 17–58, 2011.
- [15] N. He, A. Juditsky, and A. Nemirovski, "Mirror prox algorithm for multi-term composite minimization and semi-separable problems," *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 275–319, 2015.
- [16] Y. Yu, B. Açıkmeşe, and M. Mesbahi, "Bregman parallel direction method of multipliers for distributed optimization via mirror averaging," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 302–306, 2018.
- [17] —, "Mass-spring-damper network for distributed averaging in non-Euclidean spaces," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01999*, 2018.
- [18] Y. Yu and B. Açıkmeşe, "Stochastic Bregman parallel direction method of multipliers for distributed optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09695[math.OC]*, 2019.
- [19] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [20] A. Nedic, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, 2010.
- [21] A. S. Nemirovsky and D. B. Yudin, *Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization*. John Wiley and Sons, 1983.
- [22] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, "Mirror descent and nonlinear projected subgradient methods for convex optimization," *Oper. Res. Lett.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 167–175, 2003.
- [23] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, J. Eckstein, et al., "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [24] E. Wei and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed alternating direction method of multipliers," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control.* IEEE, 2012, pp. 5445–5450.
- [25] D. Meng, M. Fazel, and M. Mesbahi, "Proximal alternating direction method of multipliers for distributed optimization on weighted graphs," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control.* IEEE, 2015, pp. 1396–1401.
- [26] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt, *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [27] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [28] Y. Censor and A. Lent, "An iterative row-action method for interval convex programming," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 321–353, 1981.
- [29] S. Bubeck et al., "Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 8, no. 3-4, pp. 231–357, 2015.
- [30] J. C. Duchi, S. Shalev-Shwartz, Y. Singer, and A. Tewari, "Composite objective mirror descent." in *Proc. Ann. Conf. Learn. Theory*, 2010, pp. 14–26.