

Stochastic Newton and Cubic Newton Methods with Simple Local Linear-Quadratic Rates

Dmitry Kovalev
KAUST*

Konstantin Mishchenko
KAUST

Peter Richtárik
KAUST

Abstract

We present two new remarkably simple stochastic second-order methods for minimizing the average of a very large number of sufficiently smooth and strongly convex functions. The first is a stochastic variant of Newton’s method (SN), and the second is a stochastic variant of cubically regularized Newton’s method (SCN). We establish local linear-quadratic convergence results. Unlike existing stochastic variants of second order methods, which require the evaluation of a large number of gradients and/or Hessians in each iteration to guarantee convergence, our methods do not have this shortcoming. For instance, the simplest variants of our methods in each iteration need to compute the gradient and Hessian of a *single* randomly selected function only. In contrast to most existing stochastic Newton and quasi-Newton methods, our approach guarantees local convergence faster than with first-order oracle and adapts to the problem’s curvature. Interestingly, our method is not unbiased, so our theory provides new intuition for designing new stochastic methods.

1 Introduction

The problem of empirical risk minimization (ERM) is ubiquitous in machine learning and data science. Advances of the last few years [39, 6, 15, 42] have shown that availability of finite-sum structure and ability to use extra memory allow for methods that solve a wide range of ERM problems [33, 34, 40, 1, 26, 19]. In particular, Majorization-Minimization [20] (MM) approach, also known as successive upper-bound minimization [36], gained a lot of attention in first-order [24, 7, 4, 28, 35], second-order [27], proximal [21, 40] and other settings [16, 25].

The aforementioned finite-sum structure is given by the minimization formulation

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) \right], \quad (1)$$

where each function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to have Lipschitz Hessian.

Since in practical applications n is often very large, this problem is typically solved using stochastic first order methods, such as Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) [37], which have cheap iterations independent of n . However, constant-stepsize SGD provides fast convergence to a neighborhood of the solution only [32, 13], whose radius is proportional to the variance of the stochastic gradient at the optimum. So-called variance-reduced methods resolve this issue [39, 15, 10, 14], but their iteration complexity relies significantly on the *condition number* of the problem, which is equal to the ratio of the smoothness and strong convexity parameters.

Second-order methods, in contrast, adapt to the curvature of the problem and thereby decrease their dependence on the condition number [30]. Among the most well-known second-order methods

*King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

are Newton’s method (see e.g. [30, 17, 12]), a variant thereof with cubic regularization [31] and BFGS [22, 2]. The vanilla deterministic Newton method uses simple gradient update preconditioned via the inverse Hessian evaluated at the same iterate, i.e.,

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - (\nabla^2 f(x^k))^{-1} \nabla f(x^k).$$

This can be seen as approximating function f locally around x^k as²

$$f(x) \approx f(x^k) + \langle \nabla f(x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|_{\nabla^2 f(x^k)}^2, \quad (2)$$

and subsequently minimizing this approximation in x . However, this approximation is not necessarily an upper bound on f , which makes it hard to establish global rates for the method. Indeed, unless extra assumptions [17, 12] or regularizations [31, 9, 8] are employed, the method can diverge. However, second order methods are famous for their fast (superlinear or quadratic) local convergence rates.

Unfortunately, the fast convergence rate of Newton and cubically regularized Newton methods does not directly translate to the stochastic case. For instance, the quasi-Newton methods in [23, 29, 11] have complexity proportional to $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^M)$ with some $M \gg 1$ instead of $\mathcal{O}(\kappa)$ in [15], thus giving a worse theoretical guarantee. Other theoretical gaps include inconsistent assumptions such as bounded gradients together with strong convexity [3].

Surprisingly, a lot of effort [18, 5, 46, 44, 43, 45] has been put into developing methods with massive (albeit sometimes still independent of n) batch sizes, typically proportional to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$, where ϵ is the target accuracy. This essentially removes all randomness from the analysis by making the variance infinitesimal. In fact, these batch sizes are likely to exceed n , so one ends up using mere deterministic algorithms. Furthermore, to make all estimates unbiased, large batch sizes are combined with preconditioning sampled gradients using the Hessians of *some other* functions. We naturally expect that these techniques would not work in practice when only a single sample is used since the Hessian of a randomly sampled function might be significantly different from the Hessians of other samples.

Unlike all these methods, ours will work even with batch size equal one. Thus, it is a major contribution of our work that we give up on taking unbiased estimates and show convergence despite the biased nature of our methods. This is achieved by developing new Lyapunov functions that are specific to second-order methods.

We are aware of two methods [38, 27] that do not suffer from the issues above. Nevertheless, their update is cyclic rather than stochastic, which is known to be slower with the first-order oracle due to possibly bad choice of the iteration order [41].

1.1 Basic definitions and notation

Convergence of our algorithms will be established under certain regularity assumptions on the functions in (1). In particular, we will assume that all functions f_i are twice differentiable, have a Lipschitz Hessian, and are strongly convex. These concepts are defined next. Let $\langle x, y \rangle$ and $\|x\| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x, x \rangle^{1/2}$ be the standard Euclidean inner product and norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$, respectively.

Definition 1 (Strong convexity). *A differentiable function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ -strongly convex, where $\mu > 0$ is the strong convexity parameter, if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\phi(x) \geq \phi(y) + \langle \nabla \phi(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y\|^2. \quad (3)$$

For twice differentiable functions, strong convexity is equivalent to requiring the smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian to be uniformly bonded above 0, i.e., $\nabla^2 \phi(x) \succeq \mu I$, where $I \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the identity matrix, or equivalently $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \phi(x)) \geq \mu$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Given a twice differentiable strongly convex function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we let $\|x\|_{\nabla^2 \phi(w)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(w)x, x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ be the norm induced by the matrix $\nabla^2 \phi(w) \succ 0$.

²For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and an $n \times n$ positive definite matrix M , we let $\|x\|_M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x^\top M x)^{1/2}$.

Algorithm 1 Stochastic Newton (SN)

Initialize: Choose starting iterates $w_1^0, w_2^0, \dots, w_n^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and minibatch size $\tau \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

$$x^{k+1} = \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) \right]^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) w_i^k - \nabla f_i(w_i^k) \right]$$

Choose a subset $S^k \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ of size τ uniformly at random

$$w_i^{k+1} = \begin{cases} x^{k+1}, & i \in S^k \\ w_i^k, & i \notin S^k \end{cases}$$

end for

Definition 2 (Lipschitz Hessian). *Function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has H -Lipschitz Hessian if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\|\nabla^2 \phi(x) - \nabla^2 \phi(y)\| \leq H \|x - y\|.$$

Recall (e.g., see Lemma 1 in [31]) that a function ϕ with H -Lipschitz Hessian admits for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the following estimates,

$$\|\nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(y) - \nabla^2 \phi(y)(x - y)\| \leq \frac{H}{2} \|x - y\|^2, \quad (4)$$

and

$$|\phi(x) - \phi(y) - \langle \nabla \phi(y), x - y \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(y)(x - y), x - y \rangle| \leq \frac{H}{6} \|x - y\|^3. \quad (5)$$

Note that in the context of second order methods it is natural to work with functions with a Lipschitz Hessian. Indeed, this assumption is standard even for deterministic Newton [30] and cubically regularized Newton methods [31].

2 Stochastic Newton method

In the big data case, i.e., when n is very large, it is not efficient to evaluate the gradient, let alone the Hessian, of f at each iteration. Instead, there is a desire to develop an incremental method which in each step resorts to computing the gradient and Hessian of a single function f_i only. The challenge here is to design a scheme capable to use this stochastic first and second order information to progressively throughout the iterations build more accurate approximations of the Newton step, so as to ensure a global convergence rate. While establishing *any* meaningful global rate is challenging enough, a fast linear rate would be desirable.

In this paper we propose to approximate the gradient and the Hessian using the latest information available, i.e.,

$$\nabla^2 f(x^k) \approx H^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k), \quad \nabla f(x^k) \approx g^k = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(w_i^k),$$

where w_i^k is the last vector for which the gradient ∇f_i and Hessian $\nabla^2 f_i$ was computed. We then use these approximations to take a Newton-type step. Note, however, that H^k and g^k serve as good approximations only when used together, so that we precondition gradients with the Hessians at the same iterates. Although the true gradient, $\nabla f(x^k)$, gives precise information about the linear approximation of f at x^k , preconditioning it with approximation H^k would not make much sense. Our method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

2.1 Local convergence analysis

We now state a simple local linear convergence rate for Algorithm 1. By $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid x^k, w_1^k, \dots, w_n^k]$ we denote the expectation conditioned on all information prior to iteration $k + 1$.

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Cubic Newton (SCN)

Initialize: Choose starting iterates $w_1^0, w_2^0, \dots, w_n^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and minibatch size $\tau \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

$$x^{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x) + \frac{M}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right]$$

Choose a subset $S^k \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ of size τ uniformly at random

$$w_i^{k+1} = \begin{cases} x^{k+1}, & i \in S^k \\ w_i^k, & i \notin S^k \end{cases}$$

end for

Theorem 1. Assume that every f_i is μ -strongly convex and has H -Lipschitz Hessian and consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$\mathcal{W}^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|w_i^k - x^*\|^2. \quad (6)$$

Then for the random iterates of Algorithm 1 we have the recursion

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{W}^{k+1}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n} + \frac{\tau}{n} \left(\frac{H}{2\mu} \right)^2 \mathcal{W}^k \right) \mathcal{W}^k. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, if $\|w_i^0 - x^*\| \leq \frac{\mu}{H}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{W}^{k+1}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{3\tau}{4n} \right) \mathcal{W}^k.$$

Clearly, when $\tau = n$, we achieve the standard superlinear (quadratic) rate of Newton method. When $\tau = 1$, we obtain linear convergence rate that is independent of the conditioning, thus, the method provably adapts to the curvature.

3 Stochastic Newton method with cubic regularization

Motivated by the desire to develop a new principled variant of Newton's method that could enjoy global convergence guarantees, Nesterov and Polyak [31] proposed the following “cubically regularized” second-order approximation of f :

$$f(x) \approx f(x^k) + \langle \nabla f(x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x^k\|_{\nabla^2 f(x^k)}^2 + \frac{M}{6} \|x - x^k\|^3.$$

In contrast to (2), the above is a global upper bound on f provided that $M \geq H$. This fact is then used to establish local rates.

3.1 New method

In this section we combine cubic regularization with the stochastic Newton technique developed in previous section. Let us define the following second-order Taylor approximation of f_i :

$$\phi_i^k(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_i(w_i^k) + \langle \nabla f_i(w_i^k), x - w_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - w_i^k\|_{\nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k)}^2.$$

Having introduced ϕ_i^k , we are now ready to present our Stochastic Cubic Newton method (Algorithm 2).

3.2 Local convergence analysis

Our main theorem gives a bound on the expected improvement of a new Lyapunov function $\mathcal{V}^k$.

Theorem 2. Let f be μ -strongly convex and assume every f_i has H -Lipschitz Hessian and consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$\mathcal{V}^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(w_i^k) - f(x^*))^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (8)$$

Then for the random iterates of Algorithm 2 we have the recursion

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{V}^{k+1}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n} + \frac{\tau}{n} \left(\frac{(M+H) \sqrt{2}}{3\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right)^{3/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{V}^k} \right) \mathcal{V}^k.$$

Furthermore, if $f(w_i^0) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{2\mu^3}{(M+H)^2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{V}^{k+1}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2n} \right) \mathcal{V}^k.$$

Again, with $\tau = n$ we recover local superlinear convergence of cubic Newton. In addition, this rate is locally independent of the problem conditioning, showing that we indeed benefit from second-order information.

References

- [1] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):8194–8244, 2017.
- [2] Mordecai Avriel. *Nonlinear programming: analysis and methods*. Courier Corporation, 2003.
- [3] Albert S. Berahas, Jorge Nocedal, and Martin Takáč. A multi-batch L-BFGS method for machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1055–1063, 2016.
- [4] Alberto Bietti and Julien Mairal. Stochastic optimization with variance reduction for infinite datasets with finite sum structure. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1623–1633, 2017.
- [5] Raghu Bollapragada, Richard H. Byrd, and Jorge Nocedal. Exact and inexact subsampled Newton methods for optimization. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 39(2):545–578, 2018.
- [6] Aaron Defazio, Francis Bach, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, 2014.
- [7] Aaron Defazio, Tiberio Caetano, and Justin Domke. Finito: A faster, permutable incremental gradient method for big data problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1125–1133, 2014.
- [8] Nikita Doikov and Yurii Nesterov. Minimizing uniformly convex functions by cubic regularization of newton method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.02671*, 2019.
- [9] Nikita Doikov and Peter Richtárik. Randomized block cubic Newton method. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [10] Eduard Gorbunov, Filip Hanzely, and Peter Richtárik. A unified theory of SGD: Variance reduction, sampling, quantization and coordinate descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11261*, 2019.
- [11] Robert Gower, Donald Goldfarb, and Peter Richtárik. Stochastic block BFGS: Squeezing more curvature out of data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1869–1878, 2016.
- [12] Robert M. Gower, Dmitry Kovalev, Felix Lieder, and Peter Richtárik. RSN: Randomized subspace Newton. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [13] Robert Mansel Gower, Nicolas Loizou, Xun Qian, Alibek Sailanbayev, Egor Shulgin, and Peter Richtárik. SGD: General analysis and improved rates. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5200–5209, Long Beach, California, USA, 09–15 Jun 2019. PMLR.
- [14] Filip Hanzely and Peter Richtárik. One method to rule them all: variance reduction for data, parameters and many new methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11266*, 2019.
- [15] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 315–323, 2013.
- [16] Belhal Karimi and Eric Moulines. MISSO: Minimization by incremental stochastic surrogate for large-scale nonconvex optimization. 2018.
- [17] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Sebastian U. Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Global linear convergence of Newton’s method without strong-convexity or Lipschitz gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00413*, 2018.
- [18] Jonas Moritz Kohler and Aurelien Lucchi. Sub-sampled cubic regularization for non-convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1895–1904. JMLR. org, 2017.
- [19] Dmitry Kovalev, Samuel Horváth, and Peter Richtárik. Don’t jump through hoops and remove those loops: SVRG and Katyusha are better without the outer loop. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08689*, 2019.
- [20] Kenneth Lange, David R. Hunter, and Ilsoon Yang. Optimization transfer using surrogate objective functions. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 9(1):1–20, 2000.

- [21] Hongzhou Lin, Julien Mairal, and Zaid Harchaoui. A universal catalyst for first-order optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3384–3392, 2015.
- [22] Dong C. Liu and Jorge Nocedal. On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 45(1-3):503–528, 1989.
- [23] Luo Luo, Zihao Chen, Zhihua Zhang, and Wu-Jun Li. A proximal stochastic quasi-Newton algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.00223*, 2016.
- [24] Julien Mairal. Optimization with first-order surrogate functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 783–791, 2013.
- [25] Konstantin Mishchenko, Franck Iutzeler, Jérôme Malick, and Massih-Reza Amini. A delay-tolerant proximal-gradient algorithm for distributed learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3584–3592, 2018.
- [26] Konstantin Mishchenko and Peter Richtárik. A stochastic decoupling method for minimizing the sum of smooth and non-smooth functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11535*, 2019.
- [27] Aryan Mokhtari, Mark Eisen, and Alejandro Ribeiro. IQN: An incremental quasi-Newton method with local superlinear convergence rate. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1670–1698, 2018.
- [28] Aryan Mokhtari, Mert Gürbüzbalaban, and Alejandro Ribeiro. Surpassing gradient descent provably: A cyclic incremental method with linear convergence rate. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1420–1447, 2018.
- [29] Philipp Moritz, Robert Nishihara, and Michael Jordan. A linearly-convergent stochastic L-BFGS algorithm. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 249–258, 2016.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: a basic course (Applied Optimization)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [31] Yurii Nesterov and Boris T. Polyak. Cubic regularization of Newton method and its global performance. *Mathematical Programming*, 108(1):177–205, 2006.
- [32] Lam Nguyen, Phuong Ha Nguyen, Marten van Dijk, Peter Richtárik, Katya Scheinberg, and Martin Takáč. SGD and Hogwild! Convergence without the bounded gradients assumption. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3750–3758, Stockholmssan, Stockholm Sweden, 10–15 Jul 2018. PMLR.
- [33] Lam M. Nguyen, Jie Liu, Katya Scheinberg, and Martin Takáč. SARAH: A novel method for machine learning problems using stochastic recursive gradient. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 2613–2621. JMLR. org, 2017.
- [34] Lam M. Nguyen, Jie Liu, Katya Scheinberg, and Martin Takáč. Stochastic recursive gradient algorithm for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07261*, 2017.
- [35] Xun Qian, Alibek Sailanbayev, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtárik. MISO is making a comeback with better proofs and rates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01474*, 2019.
- [36] Meisam Razaviyayn, Maziar Sanjabi, and Zhi-Quan Luo. A stochastic successive minimization method for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization with applications to transceiver design in wireless communication networks. *Mathematical Programming*, 157(2):515–545, 2016.
- [37] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:400–407, 1951.
- [38] Anton Rodomanov and Dmitry Kropotov. A superlinearly-convergent proximal Newton-type method for the optimization of finite sums. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2597–2605, 2016.
- [39] Nicolas L. Roux, Mark Schmidt, and Francis R. Bach. A stochastic gradient method with an exponential convergence rate for finite training sets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2663–2671, 2012.
- [40] Ernest K. Ryu and Wotao Yin. Proximal-proximal-gradient method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06908*, 2017.
- [41] Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. How good is SGD with random shuffling? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.00045*, 2019.

- [42] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang. Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):567–599, 2013.
- [43] Nilesh Tripuraneni, Mitchell Stern, Chi Jin, Jeffrey Regier, and Michael I. Jordan. Stochastic cubic regularization for fast nonconvex optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2899–2908, 2018.
- [44] Junyu Zhang, Lin Xiao, and Shuzhong Zhang. Adaptive stochastic variance reduction for sub-sampled Newton method with cubic regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.11637*, 2018.
- [45] Dongruo Zhou and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic recursive variance-reduced cubic regularization methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11518*, 2019.
- [46] Dongruo Zhou, Pan Xu, and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic variance-reduced cubic regularized Newton method. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5985–5994, 2018.

Supplementary Material

A Proofs for Algorithm 1

A.1 Three lemmas

Lemma 1. *Let f_i be μ -strongly convex and have H -Lipschitz Hessian for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the iterates of Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \frac{H}{2\mu} \cdot \mathcal{W}^k. \quad (9)$$

Proof. Letting $H^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k)$, one step of the method can be written in the form

$$x^{k+1} = (H^k)^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) w_i^k - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(w_i^k) \right].$$

Subtracting $x^* = (H^k)^{-1} H^k x^*$ from both sides, and using the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(x^*) = 0$, this further leads to

$$x^{k+1} - x^* = (H^k)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) (w_i^k - x^*) - (\nabla f_i(w_i^k) - \nabla f_i(x^*))]. \quad (10)$$

Next, note that since f_i is μ strongly convex, we have $\nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) \succeq \mu I$ for all i . It implies that $H^k \succeq \mu I$, which in turns gives

$$\|(H^k)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu}. \quad (11)$$

The rest of the proof follows similar reasoning as in the standard convergence proof of Newton's method, with only small modifications:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\| &\stackrel{(10)}{\leq} \left\| (H^k)^{-1} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) (w_i^k - x^*) - (\nabla f_i(w_i^k) - \nabla f_i(x^*))] \right\| \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\mu} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla f_i(x^*) - \nabla f_i(w_i^k) - \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) (x^* - w_i^k)] \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla f_i(x^*) - \nabla f_i(w_i^k) - \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k) (x^* - w_i^k)\| \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\mu n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{H}{2} \|w_i^k - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2. *Assume that each f_i is μ -strongly convex and has H -Lipschitz Hessian. If $\|w_i^0 - x^*\| \leq \frac{\mu}{H}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then for all k ,*

$$\mathcal{W}^k \leq \frac{\mu^2}{H^2}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. We claim that

$$\|w_i^k - x^*\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu^2}{H^2}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (13)$$

The upper bound on $\mathcal{W}^k$ then follows immediately.

We will now prove the claim by induction in k . The statement (13) holds for $k = 0$ by our assumption. Assume it holds for k and let us show that it holds for $k + 1$. If $i \notin S^k$, w_i^k is not updated and

inequality (13) holds for $w_i^{k+1} = w_i^k$ by induction assumption. On the other hand, for every $i \in S^k$, we have

$$\|w_i^{k+1} - x^*\| = \|x^k - x^*\| \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \frac{H}{2\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|w_j^k - x^*\|^2 \leq \frac{H}{2\mu} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mu^2}{H^2} < \frac{\mu}{H}.$$

Thus, again, inequality (13) holds for w_i^{k+1} . □

Lemma 3. *The random iterates of Algorithms 1 and 2 satisfy the identity*

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{W}^{k+1}] = \frac{\tau}{n} \mathbb{E}_k [\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2] + \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{W}^k. \quad (14)$$

Proof. For each i , w_i^{k+1} is equal to x^{k+1} with probability $\frac{\tau}{n}$ and to w_i^k with probability $1 - \frac{\tau}{n}$, hence the result. □

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{W}^{k+1}] &\stackrel{(14)}{=} \frac{\tau}{n} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{W}^k \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \frac{\tau}{n} \left(\frac{H}{2\mu}\right)^2 (\mathcal{W}^k)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{W}^k \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n} + \frac{\tau}{n} \left(\frac{H}{2\mu}\right)^2 \mathcal{W}^k\right) \mathcal{W}^k \\ &\stackrel{(12)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{3\tau}{4n}\right) \mathcal{W}^k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have also used the assumption on $\|w_i^0 - x^*\|$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. □

B Proofs for Algorithm 2

B.1 Four lemmas

Lemma 4. *Let each f_i have H -Lipschitz Hessian and choose $M \geq H$. Then,*

$$f(x^{k+1}) \leq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(x) + \frac{M+H}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right]. \quad (15)$$

Proof. We begin by establishing an upper bound for f :

$$f(x) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) \stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x) + \frac{H}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x) + \frac{M}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right].$$

Evaluating both sides at x^{k+1} readily gives

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^{k+1}) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x^{k+1}) + \frac{M}{6} \|x^{k+1} - w_i^k\|^3 \right] \\ &= \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x) + \frac{M}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the last equation follows from the definition of x^{k+1} . We can further upper bound every ϕ_i^k using (5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\phi_i^k(x) + \frac{M}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right] &\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[f_i(x) + \frac{M+H}{6} \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right] \\ &= f(x) + \frac{M+H}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i^k\|^3. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Finally, by combining (16) and (17), we get

$$f(x^{k+1}) \leq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(x) + \frac{M+H}{6} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right].$$

□

Lemma 5. *Let f be μ -strongly convex, f_i have H -Lipschitz Hessian for every i and choose $M \geq H$. Then*

$$f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(M+H)}{3\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \mathcal{V}^k. \quad (18)$$

Proof. The result readily follows from combining Lemma 4 and strong convexity of f . Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^{k+1}) &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(x) + \frac{M+H}{6n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i^k\|^3 \right] \\ &\leq f(x^*) + \frac{M+H}{6n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x^* - w_i^k\|^3 \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} f(x^*) + \frac{M+H}{6n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{2}{\mu} (f(w_i^k) - f(x^*)) \right]^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= f(x^*) + \frac{(M+H)\sqrt{2}}{3\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(w_i^k) - f(x^*))^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6. *Let f be μ -strongly convex, f_i have H -Lipschitz Hessian for every i . If $M \geq H$ and $f(w_i^0) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{2\mu^3}{(M+H)^2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then*

$$\mathcal{V}^k \leq \frac{27\mu^{\frac{9}{2}}}{8\sqrt{2}(M+H)^3} \quad (19)$$

holds with probability 1.

Proof. Denote for convenience $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sqrt{2}(M+H)}{3\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}}$. The lemma's claim follows as a corollary of a stronger statement, that for any i and k we have with probability 1

$$(f(w_i^k) - f(x^*))^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{4C^3}.$$

Let us show it by induction in k , where for $k = 0$ it is satisfied by our assumptions. If $i \notin S^k$, $w_i^{k+1} = w_i^k$ and the induction assumption gives the step. Let $i \in S^k$ and, then

$$\begin{aligned} f(w_i^{k+1}) - f(x^*) &= f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*) \stackrel{(18)}{\leq} \frac{C}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (f(w_i^k) - f(x^*))^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{4C^3} \\ &= \frac{1}{4C^2} < \frac{1}{4^{2/3}C^2}, \end{aligned}$$

so $(f(w_i^{k+1}) - f(x^*))^{3/2} \leq \frac{1}{4C^3}$. $\square$

Lemma 7. *The following equality holds for all k*

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{V}^{k+1}] = \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}^k + \frac{\tau}{n} \mathbb{E}_k \left[(f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*))^{\frac{3}{2}} \right]. \quad (20)$$

Proof. The result follows immediately from the definition (8) of $\mathcal{V}^k$ and the fact that $w_i^{k+1} = x^{k+1}$ with probability $\frac{\tau}{n}$ and $w_i^{k+1} = w_i^k$ with probability $1 - \frac{\tau}{n}$. $\square$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Denote $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sqrt{2}(M+H)}{3\mu^{3/2}}$. By combining the results from our lemmas, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k [\mathcal{V}^{k+1}] &\stackrel{(20)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}^k + \frac{\tau}{n} (f(x^{k+1}) - f^*)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(18)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}^k + \frac{\tau}{n} (C\mathcal{V}^k)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \left[1 - \frac{\tau}{n} + \frac{\tau}{n} C^{3/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{V}^k}\right] \mathcal{V}^k \\ &\stackrel{(19)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2n}\right) \mathcal{V}^k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we also used the assumption on $f(w_i^0) - f(x^*)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. $\square$

C Efficient implementation for generalized linear models

Algorithm 3 Stochastic Newton (SN) for generalized linear models with $\tau = 1$

Initialize: Choose starting iterates $w_1^0, w_2^0, \dots, w_n^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, compute $\alpha_i^0 = \phi_i'(a_i^\top w_i^0)$, $\beta_i^0 = \phi_i''(a_i^\top w_i^0)$, $\gamma_i^0 = a_i^\top w_i^0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $B^0 = (\lambda I + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^0 a_i a_i^\top)^{-1}$, $g^0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^0 a_i$, $h^0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^0 \gamma_i^0 a_i$
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 $x^{k+1} = B^k(h^k - g^k)$
 Choose $i = i^k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ uniformly at random
 $\alpha_i^{k+1} = \phi_i'(a_i^\top x^{k+1})$
 $\beta_i^{k+1} = \phi_i''(a_i^\top x^{k+1})$
 $\gamma_i^{k+1} = a_i^\top x^{k+1}$
 $g^{k+1} = g^k + (\alpha_i^{k+1} - \alpha_i^k) a_i$
 $h^{k+1} = h^k + (\beta_i^{k+1} \gamma_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k \gamma_i^k) a_i$
 $B^{k+1} = B^k - \frac{\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k}{n + (\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k) a_i^\top B^k a_i} B^k a_i a_i^\top B^k$
end for

In this section, we consider fitting a generalized linear model (GLM) with ℓ_2 regularization, i.e. solving

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\left(\phi_i(a_i^\top x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2 \right)}_{f_i(x)},$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are given and $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$ are some convex and smooth function. For any x , we therefore have $f_i(x) = \phi_i(a_i^\top x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2$ and $\nabla^2 f_i(x) = \phi_i''(a_i^\top x) a_i a_i^\top + \lambda I$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Let us define for convenience

$$\begin{aligned} H^k &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda I + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i''(a_i^\top w_i^k) a_i a_i^\top, & B^k &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (H^k)^{-1}, \\ g^k &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i'(a_i^\top w_i^k) a_i, & h^k &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i''(a_i^\top w_i^k) a_i a_i^\top w_i^k. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can shorten the update rule for x^{k+1} to $x^{k+1} = B^k(h^k + \lambda x^k - (g^k + \lambda x^k)) = B^k(h^k - g^k)$. Our key observation is that updates of B^k , g^k and h^k are very cheap both in terms of memory and compute.

First, it is evident that to update g^k it is sufficient to maintain in memory only $\alpha_i^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_i'(a_i^\top w_i^k)$. Similarly, for h^k we do not need to store the Hessians explicitly and can use instead $\beta_i^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_i''(a_i^\top w_i^k)$ and $\gamma_i^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_i^\top w_i^k$. Then

$$H^{k+1} = H^k + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S^k} (\nabla^2 f_i(x^{k+1}) - \nabla^2 f_i(w_i^k)) = H^k + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S^k} (\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k) a_i a_i^\top.$$

The update above is low-rank and there exist efficient ways of computing the inverse of H^{k+1} using the inverse of H^k . For instance, the following proposition is at the core of efficient implementation of quasi-Newton methods and it turns out to be quite useful for Algorithm 1 too.

Proposition 1 (Sherman-Morrison formula). *Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be an invertible matrix and $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be arbitrary two vectors such that $1 + u^\top H^{-1} v \neq 0$, then we have*

$$(H + uv^\top)^{-1} = H^{-1} - \frac{1}{1 + u^\top H^{-1} v} H^{-1} u v^\top H^{-1}.$$

Consider for simplicity $\tau = |S^k| = 1$, then $H^{k+1} = H^k + \frac{\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k}{n} a_i a_i^\top$ and by Proposition 1

$$B^{k+1} = B^k - \frac{\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k}{n + (\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k) a_i^\top B^k a_i} B^k a_i a_i^\top B^k.$$

Thus, the complexity of each update of Algorithm 3 is $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$, which is much faster than solving linear system from the update of Newton method.

D Efficient implementations of Algorithm 2

The subproblem that we need to efficiently solve when running Algorithm 2 can be reduced to

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} g^\top x + \frac{1}{2} x^\top H x + \frac{M}{6n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i\|^3, \quad (21)$$

where $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are some given vectors. One way to solve it is to run gradient descent or a stochastic variance reduced algorithm. For instance, if $f_i(x) = \phi(a_i^\top x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2$, then H is the sum of n functions, whose individual gradients can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(d)$, while the gradient of $\frac{1}{2} x^\top H x$ requires $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ flops.

A special care is required for the sum of cubic terms. Despite its simplicity, every cubic function $\|x - w_i\|^3$ is not globally smooth, so we can not rely on gradients to minimize it. In addition, it might become the bottleneck of the solver since processing it requires accessing n vectors $w_1, \dots, w_n$, making solver's iterations too expensive. We propose two ways of resolving this issue.

First, one can use a stochastic method that is based on proximal operator. For instance, the method from [26] can combine gradient descent or SVRG [15] with variance-reduced stochastic proximal point. Note that for a single cubic term, the proximal operator of $\|x - w\|^3$ can be computed in closed-form.

Second, one can slightly change the assumption in equation (5) to use a different norm, $\|\cdot\|_3$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_2$. Due to norm equivalence, this does not actually change our assumptions, although it might affect the value of M . The advantage of using the new norm is that it allows us to simplify the sum of cubic terms as given below,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x - w_i\|_3^3 = \|x\|_3^3 - 3 \left\langle x^2, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \right\rangle + 3 \left\langle x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right\rangle - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|w_i\|_3^3,$$

where by x^2 and w_i^2 we denoted the vectors whose entries are coordinate-wise squares of x and w_i correspondingly. Thus, to compute gradients and functional values of the cubic penalty we only need to access $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2$ rather than every w_i individually. Furthermore, one can also compute proximal operator of this function in $\mathcal{O}(d)$ flops, making it possible to run proximal gradient descent or its stochastic variant on the objective in (21).

E Experiments

We run our experiments on ℓ_2 -regularized logistic regression problem with two datasets from the LIBSVM library: madelon and a8a. The objective is given by $f_i(x) = \log(1 + \exp(-b_i a_i^\top x)) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2$, where $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^d, b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$ are given and the value of λ is either of 0, $\frac{1}{10000n}$ and $\frac{1}{100n}$.

We compared to the standard (deterministic) Newton and incremental Newton from [38], all initialized at $x^0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. See Figure 1 for the results. Interestingly, we see that the incremental variant outperforms the full-batch Newton only by a slight margin and the stochastic method is even worse. All methods, however, solve the problem very fast even when it is ill-conditioned.




Figure 1: Comparison of Newton methods when applied to logistic regression with ℓ_2 -regularization (x -axis is the number of full passes over the dataset and y -axis is the functional suboptimality).

We also did a comparison of the full batch cubic Newton with our stochastic version. Since with initialization $x^0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ Newton algorithm itself is convergent, we chose an initialization much further from the optimum, namely $x^0 = (0.5, \dots, 0.5)^\top$. With this choice of x^0 , the value $M = 0$ leads to divergence. Therefore, we separately tuned the optimal value of M for both algorithms, deterministic and stochastic, and discovered that Algorithm 2 converges under much smaller values of M and its optimal value was typically close to the smallest under which it converges. This is similar to the behaviour of first-order approximations [35], where the quadratic penalty works under n times slower coefficient.




Figure 2: Comparison of Newton methods with cubic regularization when applied to logistic regression with ℓ_2 -regularization (x -axis is the number of full passes over the dataset and y -axis is the functional suboptimality). The stochastic algorithm uses $n = 10$.

To solve the cubic subproblem (21), we used the algorithm from [26]. To get a finite-sum problem, we partitioned the a8a dataset into $n = 10$ parts of approximately the same size. The results are presented in Figure 2.