

Dualize, Split, Randomize: Fast Nonsmooth Optimization Algorithms

Adil Salim^{*1}, Laurent Condat¹, Konstantin Mishchenko¹, and Peter Richtárik¹

¹King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST),
Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

February 20, 2020

Abstract

We introduce a new primal-dual algorithm for minimizing the sum of three convex functions, each of which has its own oracle. Namely, the first one is differentiable, smooth and possibly stochastic, the second is proximable, and the last one is a composition of a proximable function with a linear map. Our theory covers several settings that are not tackled by any existing algorithm; we illustrate their importance with real-world applications. By leveraging variance reduction, we obtain convergence with linear rates under strong convexity and fast sublinear convergence under convexity assumptions. The proposed theory is simple and unified by the umbrella of stochastic Davis–Yin splitting, which we design in this work. Finally, we illustrate the efficiency of our method through numerical experiments.

1 Introduction

Many problems in statistics, machine learning, signal and image processing, or control can be formulated as convex optimization problems [1–6]. In the age of ‘big data’, with the explosion in size and complexity of the data to process, it is increasingly challenging to solve these optimization problems, whose solutions live in very high dimensional spaces [7–10]. To that aim, *proximal splitting algorithms* are well suited. They consist of simple, easy to compute, steps that can deal with the terms in the objective function separately; see a recent tutorial paper [11] and references therein.

In this paper, we focus on the optimization problem

$$\mathbf{Problem (1)} : \quad \underset{x \in \mathcal{X}}{\text{minimize}} \quad F(x) + R(x) + H(Lx), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{X} is a real Hilbert space, F is a smooth convex function, R, H are convex, possibly nonsmooth, functions and L is a linear operator. A solution is supposed to exist. We recast Problem (1) as finding a zero of the sum of three monotone operators in a primal–dual product space and we solve it by Davis–Yin splitting [12], a generic method for this type of monotone inclusions. The application of splitting methods for monotone inclusions in particular product spaces is a powerful framework to analyze and derive primal–dual optimization algorithms [11, 13–16]. The Condat–Vũ algorithm [13, 14] was designed as a primal–dual instance of forward–backward splitting, for instance. The derivation of primal–dual instances of the more general Davis–Yin splitting technique is new, to our knowledge.

Contributions. Our contribution is twofold. First, we propose a new proximal splitting algorithm, called the Primal–Dual Davis–Yin (PDDY) algorithm. We also show a new interpretation of

^{*}Corresponding author. Contact: see <https://adil-salim.github.io/>

the Condat–Vũ algorithm as an instance of Davis–Yin splitting, as is the case with the PD3O [17] and PDDY algorithms. Second, we introduce stochastic versions of the the PD3O and PDDY algorithms, where the gradients are replaced by stochastic gradient oracles. These algorithms are unified under the umbrella of a new stochastic generalization of Davis–Yin splitting. We perform a non-asymptotic analysis of these stochastic algorithms, when a constant stepsize is used. Within this general framework, that we present, we discover new results on stochastic algorithms and on proximal splitting algorithms. We also recover some of the best results known to date, for instance on primal–dual algorithms or on variance-reduced methods, in both the strongly convex and the general convex cases.

Related work. Primal–dual methods rely on reformulating a minimization problem as a saddle-point problem and then solving the latter. These methods are particularly well suited to solve large-scale nonsmooth problems, which involve, for instance, structured regularization. Several deterministic primal–dual algorithms exist to solve the Problem (1) in whole generality [13, 14, 17, 18], see also [11] for an overview.

When the gradient of F is intractable, Problem (1) can be solved by means of a stochastic algorithm, involving a stochastic gradient oracle. If $H \equiv 0$ and $L \equiv 0$, many stochastic algorithms have been proposed, see [19] for an overview and an unified analysis in the strongly convex case. When $H \neq 0$, stochastic primal–dual algorithms are usually used. For instance, [20] consider the case where L is the identity and the stochastic gradient is the SAGA or SVRG estimator [21–23]. The case of generic stochastic gradients has been tackled in [24–26].

The resolution of general saddle-point problems with stochastic algorithms has also been considered. For instance, [27, 28] obtain fast convergence results by leveraging variance reduction, when the saddle-point problem is strongly convex-concave.

In this work, we allow for a broad class of stochastic gradient oracles, satisfying mild conditions, in combination with large constant stepsizes, while ensuring convergence.

1.1 Mathematical Background

We introduce some notions of convex analysis and operator theory, see the textbooks [29, 30] for more details. In the paper, all Hilbert spaces are supposed of finite dimension.

1.1.1 Convex functions

Let \mathcal{Z} be a real Hilbert space, with its inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and norm $\| \cdot \| = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^{1/2}$. Let $G : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a convex function. The domain of G is the convex set $\text{dom } G = \{z \in \mathcal{Z} : G(z) \neq +\infty\}$. G is proper if its domain is nonempty and lower semicontinuous if the convex set $\{z \in \mathcal{Z} : G(z) \leq \ell\}$ is closed, for every $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{Z})$ the set of convex, proper, lower semicontinuous functions from \mathcal{Z} to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. We define the subdifferential of G as the set-valued operator $\partial G : z \in \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \{y \in \mathcal{Z} : (\forall z' \in \mathcal{Z}) G(z) + \langle z' - z, y \rangle \leq G(z')\}$. If G is differentiable at $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\partial G(z) = \{\nabla G(z)\}$, where $\nabla G(z)$ denotes the gradient of G at z . In this case, the Bregman divergence of G is defined by

$$D_G(x, x') := G(x) - G(x') - \langle \nabla G(x'), x - x' \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, G is ν -smooth if it is differentiable on \mathcal{Z} and ∇G is ν -Lipschitz continuous, for some $\nu > 0$. We denote by G^* the conjugate of G , defined by $G^* : z \mapsto \sup_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} \{\langle z, z' \rangle - G(z')\}$, which belongs to $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{Z})$. We define the proximity operator of G as the single-valued operator $\text{prox}_G : z \in \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \arg \min_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} \{G(z') + \frac{1}{2}\|z - z'\|^2\}$. Finally, given any $b \in \mathcal{Z}$, we define the indicator function $\iota_b : z \mapsto \{0 \text{ if } z = b, +\infty \text{ else}\}$, which belongs to $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{Z})$.

1.1.2 Monotone operators

Consider a set-valued operator $M : \mathcal{Z} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{Z}$. The inverse M^{-1} of M is defined by the relation $z' \in M(z) \Leftrightarrow z \in M^{-1}(z')$. The set of zeros of M is $\text{zer}(M) = M^{-1}(0) = \{z \in \mathcal{Z}, 0 \in M(z)\}$. The

Davis–Yin Algorithm DYS($\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}$) [12]

- 1: **Input:** $v^0 \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\gamma > 0$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: $z^k = J_{\gamma\tilde{B}}(v^k)$
 - 4: $u^{k+1} = J_{\gamma\tilde{A}}(2z^k - v^k - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k))$
 - 5: $v^{k+1} = v^k + u^{k+1} - z^k$
 - 6: **end for**
-

operator M is monotone if $\langle w - w', z - z' \rangle \geq 0$, whenever $u \in A(z)$ and $u' \in A(z')$, and strongly monotone if there exists $\mu > 0$, such that $\langle w - w', z - z' \rangle \geq \mu \|z - z'\|^2$. The resolvent operator of M is defined by $J_M = (I + M)^{-1}$, where I denotes the identity. If M is monotone, then $J_M(z)$ is either empty or single-valued. M is maximal monotone if $J_M(z)$ is single-valued, for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. We identify single-valued operators as operators from \mathcal{Z} to \mathcal{Z} . If $G \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{Z})$, then ∂G is maximal monotone, $J_{\partial G} = \text{prox}_G$, $\text{zer}(\partial G) = \arg \min G$ and $(\partial G)^{-1} = \partial G^*$.

A single-valued operator M on \mathcal{Z} is ξ -cocoercive if $\xi \|M(z) - M(z')\|^2 \leq \langle M(z) - M(z'), z - z' \rangle$. The resolvent of a maximal monotone operator is 1-cocoercive and ∇G is $1/\nu$ -cocoercive, for any ν -smooth function G .

Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be real Hilbert spaces and let $L : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a linear operator. The adjoint of L is denoted by $L^* : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and the operator norm of L is $\|L\| = \sup\{\|Lx\|, x \in \mathcal{X}, \|x\| \leq 1\}$. The largest eigenvalue of LL^* is $\|LL^*\| = \|L\|^2 = \|L^*\|^2$. Let $P : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be a linear and symmetric operator ($P^* = P$). P is positive semidefinite if $\langle Pz, z \rangle \geq 0$, for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, and positive definite if, additionally, $\langle Pz, z \rangle = 0$ implies $z = 0$. In this latter case, the inner product induced by P is defined by $\langle z, z' \rangle_P = \langle Pz, z' \rangle$ and the norm induced by P is defined by $\|z\|_P^2 = \langle z, z \rangle_P$. We denote by \mathcal{Z}_P the space \mathcal{Z} endowed with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_P$.

2 Primal–dual formulations and optimality conditions

Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be real Hilbert spaces, $L : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a linear operator, $F, R \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{X})$, and $H \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{Y})$. We assume that F is ν -smooth, for some $\nu > 0$. Let x^* be a minimizer of Problem (1). Assuming a standard qualification condition, for instance that 0 belongs to the relative interior of $\text{dom}(H) - L \text{dom}(R)$ [18], there exists $y^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{zer}(M)$, where M is the set-valued operator defined by

$$M(x, y) := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x) + \partial R(x) & + L^*y \\ -Lx & + \partial H^*(y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

In other words, there exist $r^* \in \partial R(x^*)$ and $h^* \in \partial H^*(y^*)$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x^*) + r^* & + L^*y^* \\ -Lx^* & + h^* \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Conversely, for every solution $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{zer}(M)$, x^* is a solution to (1). In the sequel, we fix $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{zer}(M)$ and r^*, h^* such that Equation (4) holds.

The inclusion (4) characterizes the first-order optimality conditions associated with the convex–concave Lagrangian function defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y) := (F + R)(x) - H^*(y) + \langle Lx, y \rangle. \quad (5)$$

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we define the *duality gap* at (x, y) as $\mathcal{L}(x, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y)$. Then

Lemma 1 (Duality gap). For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y) = D_F(x, x^*) + D_R(x, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y, y^*), \quad (6)$$

where $D_F(x, x^*)$ is defined by (2) and

$$\begin{aligned} D_R(x, x^*) &:= R(x) - R(x^*) - \langle r^*, x - x^* \rangle \\ D_{H^*}(y, y^*) &:= H^*(y) - H^*(y^*) - \langle h^*, y - y^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, Lemma 1 and the convexity of F, R, H^* imply that the duality gap is nonnegative, that

$$\mathcal{L}(x^*, y) \leq \mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*) \leq \mathcal{L}(x, y^*). \quad (7)$$

and that

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(x, y) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}(x, y). \quad (8)$$

Besides, the duality gap is zero

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y) = 0 \quad (9)$$

if and only if x is a solution to Problem (1) and y is a solution to the dual problem $\min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (F + R)^*(-L^*y) + H^*(y)$, see Section 15.3 of [30].

Finally, one can check that the operator M defined by (3) is monotone. Moreover, one can split M as

$$M(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} L^*y^* \\ -Lx^* + \partial H^*(y) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

or,

$$M(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \partial H^*(y) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x) + L^*y^* \\ -Lx^* \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and each term at the right hand side of (10) or (11) is maximal monotone, see Corollary 25.5 in [30].

3 Davis-Yin Splitting

Solving the optimization problem (1) boils down to finding a zero (x^*, y^*) of the monotone operator M defined in (3), which can be written as the sum of three monotone operators, as we have seen in (10) or (11). The Davis-Yin splitting (DYS) algorithm [12], is dedicated to this problem; that is, find a zero of the sum of three monotone operators, one of which is cocoercive.

Let \mathcal{Z} be a real Hilbert space. Let $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}$ be maximal monotone operators on \mathcal{Z} . We assume that \tilde{C} is ξ -cocoercive, for some $\xi > 0$. The DYS algorithm, denoted by $\text{DYS}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ and shown above, aims at finding an element in $\text{zer}(\tilde{A} + \tilde{B} + \tilde{C})$, which is supposed nonempty. The fixed points of $\text{DYS}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ are the triplets $(v^*, z^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^3$, such that

$$\begin{cases} z^* &= J_{\gamma \tilde{B}}(v^*) \\ u^* &= J_{\gamma \tilde{A}}(2z^* - v^* - \gamma \tilde{C}(z^*)) \\ u^* &= z^*. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

These fixed points are related to the zeros of $\tilde{A} + \tilde{B} + \tilde{C}$ as follows, see Lemma 3.2 in [12]: for every $(v^*, z^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^3$ satisfying (12), $z^* \in \text{zer}(\tilde{A} + \tilde{B} + \tilde{C})$. Conversely, for every $z^* \in \text{zer}(\tilde{A} + \tilde{B} + \tilde{C})$, there exists $(v^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^2$, such that (v^*, z^*, u^*) satisfies (12).

The DYS algorithm is proved to converge as follows [12]:

Lemma 2 (Convergence of the DYS Algorithm). Suppose that $\gamma \in (0, 2\xi)$. Then the sequences $(v^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(z^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(u^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by $\text{DYS}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ converge to some elements v^* , z^* , u^* in \mathcal{Z} , respectively. Moreover, (v^*, z^*, u^*) satisfies (12) and $u^* = z^* \in \text{zer}(\tilde{A} + \tilde{B} + \tilde{C})$.

The proof of this result relies on the following important equality, proven in the Appendix for the sake of completeness.

Primal–dual Davis–Yin (PDDY) algorithm (proposed)

- 1: **Input:** $p^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 \in \mathcal{Y}, \gamma > 0, \tau > 0$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: $y^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \tau\gamma LL^*)y^k + \tau Lp^k)$
 - 4: $x^k = p^k - \gamma L^*y^{k+1}$
 - 5: $s^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(2x^k - p^k - \gamma \nabla F(x^k))$
 - 6: $p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k$
 - 7: **end for**
-

Lemma 3 (Fundamental equality of the DYS Algorithm). Let $(v^k, z^k, u^k) \in \mathcal{Z}$ be the iterates of the DYS algorithm, and $(v^*, z^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{Z}$ be such that (12) holds. Then, for every $k \geq 0$, there exist $b^k \in \tilde{B}(z^k), b^* \in \tilde{B}(z^*), a^{k+1} \in \tilde{A}(u^{k+1})$ and $a^* \in \tilde{A}(u^*)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^{k+1} - v^*\|^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle b^k - b^*, z^k - z^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \tilde{C}(z^k) - \tilde{C}(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle a^{k+1} - a^*, u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle \\
&\quad - \gamma^2 \|a^{k+1} + b^k - (a^* + b^*)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 \|\tilde{C}(z^k) - \tilde{C}(z^*)\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

4 Primal-Dual Optimization Algorithms

We now set $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the spaces defined in Sect. 2. To solve the primal–dual problem (10) or (11), which consists in finding a zero of the sum $A + B + C$ of 3 operators in \mathcal{Z} , of which C is cocoercive, a natural idea is to apply the Davis–Yin algorithm $\text{DYS}(A, B, C)$. But the resolvent of \tilde{A} or \tilde{B} is often intractable. In this section, we show that preconditioning is the solution; that is, we exhibit a positive definite linear operator P , such that $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$ is tractable. Since $P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C$ are monotone operators in \mathcal{Z}_P , the algorithm will converge to a zero of $P^{-1}A + P^{-1}B + P^{-1}C$, or, equivalently, of $A + B + C$.

Let us apply this idea in four different ways.

4.1 A New Primal–Dual Algorithm

Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ be real parameters. We introduce the four operators, with matrix–vector notations,

$$\begin{aligned}
A : (x, y) &\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} L^*y \\ -Lx + \partial H^*(y) \end{bmatrix}, \quad B : (x, y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C : (x, y) &\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma I - \gamma^2 LL^* \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

P is positive definite if and only if $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$. Since A, B, C are maximal monotone in \mathcal{Z} , $P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C$ are maximal monotone in \mathcal{Z}_P . Moreover, $P^{-1}C$ is $1/\nu$ -cocoercive in \mathcal{Z}_P . Importantly, we have:

$$P^{-1}C : (x, y) \mapsto (\nabla F(x), 0), \tag{15}$$

$$J_{\gamma P^{-1}B} : (x, y) \mapsto (\text{prox}_{\gamma R}(x), y), \tag{16}$$

$$J_{\gamma P^{-1}A} : (x, y) \mapsto (x', y'), \text{ where} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{cases} y' = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}(y + \tau L(x - \gamma L^*y)) \\ x' = x - \gamma L^*y'. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

PD3O Algorithm [17]

```

1: Input:  $p^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 \in \mathcal{Y}, \gamma > 0, \tau > 0$ 
2: for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
3:    $x^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^k)$ 
4:    $w^k = 2x^k - p^k - \gamma \nabla F(x^k)$ 
5:    $y^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \gamma \tau L L^*)y^k + \tau L w^k)$ 
6:    $p^{k+1} = x^k - \gamma \nabla F(x^k) - \gamma L^* y^{k+1}$ 
7: end for

```

We plug these explicit steps into the Davis–Yin algorithm $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}B, P^{-1}A, P^{-1}C)$ and we identify the variables as $v^k = (p^k, q^k)$, $z^k = (x^k, y^k)$, $u^k = (s^k, d^k)$. After straightforward simplifications, we obtain the new Primal–dual Davis–Yin (PDDY) algorithm, shown above, for Problem (1). Note that it can be written with only one call to L and L^* per iteration. Also, the PDDY Algorithm could be overrelaxed [11]. We have:

Theorem 4 (Convergence of the PDDY Algorithm). Suppose that $\gamma \in (0, 2/\nu)$ and that $\tau\gamma\|L\|^2 < 1$. Then the sequences $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(s^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. the sequence $(q^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$) generated by the PDDY Algorithm converge to some solution x^* to Problem (1) (resp. some $y^* \in \arg \min(F + R)^* \circ (-L^*) + H^*$).

Proof. Under the assumptions of Theorem 4, P is positive definite. Then the result follows from Lemma 2 applied in \mathcal{Z}_P and from the analysis in Sect. 2. \square

4.2 The PD3O Algorithm

We consider the same notations as in the previous section. We switch the roles of A and B and consider $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$. Then we recover exactly the PD3O algorithm proposed in [17], shown above. Although it is not derived this way, its interpretation as a primal–dual Davis–Yin algorithm is mentioned by its author. Its convergence properties are the same as for the PDDY Algorithm, as stated in Theorem 4.

4.3 The Condat–Vũ Algorithm

Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ be real parameters. In this section only, we define the operators A and B differently than for the PDDY and PD3O algorithms, as well as the linear operator Q on \mathcal{Z} , as:

$$\begin{aligned}
A : (x, y) &\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x) + L^*y \\ -Lx \end{bmatrix}, \quad B : (x, y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \partial H^*(y) \end{bmatrix}, \\
C : (x, y) &\mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $K := \frac{\tau}{\tau}I - \gamma^2 L^* L$. Indeed, we want to study the decomposition (11) instead of (10). If $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$, Q and K are positive definite. In that case, since A, B, C are maximal monotone in $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $Q^{-1}A, Q^{-1}B, Q^{-1}C$ are maximal monotone in \mathcal{Z}_Q . Moreover, we have:

$$Q^{-1}C : (x, y) \mapsto (K^{-1}\nabla F(x), 0) \tag{20}$$

$$J_{\gamma Q^{-1}B} : (x, y) \mapsto (x, \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(y)) \tag{21}$$

$$J_{\gamma Q^{-1}A} : (x, y) \mapsto (x', y'), \text{ where} \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{cases} x' = \text{prox}_{\tau R}((I - \tau\gamma L^* L)x - \tau L^* y) \\ y' = y + \gamma L x'. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

As proved in the Appendix, if we plug these explicit steps into the Davis–Yin algorithm $\text{DYS}(Q^{-1}A, Q^{-1}B, Q^{-1}C)$ or $\text{DYS}(Q^{-1}B, Q^{-1}A, Q^{-1}C)$, we recover Algorithm 3.1 and Algorithm 3.2 of [13], respectively. Therefore, the convergence of these algorithms follows from Lemma 2. A technical point is to compute the value of ξ , the cocoercivity constant of $Q^{-1}C$ in \mathcal{Z}_Q . We prove in the Appendix that we recover the same conditions on τ and γ as in Theorem 3.1 of [13].

5 Stochastic Primal–Dual Algorithms: Non-Asymptotic Analysis

In this section, we introduce stochastic versions of the PD3O and PDDY Algorithms.

5.1 Gradient Estimators

In these stochastic versions, all gradients $\nabla F(x^k)$ can be replaced by stochastic gradients g^{k+1} . More precisely, we consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_k)_k, \mathbb{P})$, an (\mathcal{F}_k) -adapted stochastic process $(g^k)_k$, we denote by \mathbb{E} the mathematical expectation and by \mathbb{E}_k the conditional expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_k . The following assumption is made on the process $(g^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Assumption 1. There exist $\alpha, \beta, \delta \geq 0$, $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and a $(\mathcal{F}_k)_k$ -adapted stochastic process denoted by $(\sigma_k)_k$, such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_k(g^{k+1}) = \nabla F(x^k), \quad (24)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_k(\|g^{k+1} - \nabla F(x^k)\|^2) \leq 2\alpha D_F(x^k, x^*) + \beta\sigma_k^2, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_k(\sigma_{k+1}^2) \leq (1 - \rho)\sigma_k^2 + 2\delta D_F(x^k, x^*). \quad (26)$$

Assumption 1 is satisfied by several stochastic gradient estimators used in machine learning, including stochastic gradients used for coordinate descent [31], variance reduction [22, 32–34] and stochastic gradients used in Federated learning [35], see Table 1 in [19]. Also, the full gradient estimator defined by $g^{k+1} = \nabla F(x^k)$ satisfies Assumption 1 with $\alpha = \nu$, the smoothness constant of F , $\sigma_k \equiv 0$, $\rho = 1$, and $\delta = \beta = 0$, see Th. 2.1.5 in [36]. The loopless SVRG estimator [32, 34] also satisfies Assumption 1.

Proposition 5 (Loopless SVRG estimator). Assume that F is written as a finite sum $F = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i$, where for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $f_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a ν_i -smooth convex function. Let $p \in (0, 1)$, and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. On $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, consider:

- a sequence of i.i.d random variables $(\theta^k)_k$ with Bernoulli distribution of parameter p ,
- a sequence of i.i.d random variables $(\zeta^k)_k$ with uniform distribution over $\{1, \dots, n\}$,
- the sigma-field \mathcal{F}_k generated by $(\theta^j, \zeta^j)_{0 \leq j \leq k}$ and a (\mathcal{F}_k) -adapted stochastic process (x^k) ,
- a stochastic process (\tilde{x}^k) defined by

$$\tilde{x}^{k+1} = \theta^{k+1}x^k + (1 - \theta^{k+1})\tilde{x}^k, \quad (27)$$

- a stochastic process (g^k) defined by

$$g^{k+1} = \nabla f_{\zeta^{k+1}}(x^k) - \nabla f_{\zeta^{k+1}}(\tilde{x}^k) + \nabla F(\tilde{x}^k). \quad (28)$$

Then, the process (g^k) satisfies Assumption 1 with $\alpha = 2 \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \nu_i$, $\beta = 2$, $\rho = p$, $\delta = \alpha p/2$, and

$$\sigma_k^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_k \|\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^k) - \nabla f_i(x^*)\|^2.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma A.11 of [19]. Although this Lemma is only stated for (x^k) generated by a specific algorithm, it remains true for any (\mathcal{F}_k) -adapted stochastic process (x^k) . \square

Stochastic PD3O Algorithm

1: **Input:** $p^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 \in \mathcal{Y}$
 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 3: $x^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^k)$
 4: $w^k = 2x^k - p^k - \gamma g^{k+1}$
 5: $y^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \gamma\tau LL^*)y^k + \tau Lw^k)$
 6: $p^{k+1} = x^k - \gamma g^{k+1} - \gamma L^* y^{k+1}$
 7: **end for**

5.2 The Stochastic PD3O Algorithm

In this section, we consider the iterates defined by the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm, shown above.

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_P$ the norm induced by P on \mathcal{Z} and by $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma, \tau}$ the norm induced by $\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2 LL^*$ on \mathcal{Y} .

Theorem 6 (M strongly monotone and R smooth). Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Also, suppose that H is $1/\mu_{H^*}$ -smooth, F is μ_F -strongly convex, and G is μ_R -strongly convex and λ -smooth, where $\mu := \mu_F + 2\mu_R > 0$ and $\mu_{H^*} > 0$. For every $\kappa > \beta/\rho$ and every $\gamma, \tau > 0$ such that $\gamma \leq 1/(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$ and $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$, define

$$V^k := \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*})\|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\sigma_k^2, \quad (29)$$

and

$$r := \max\left(1 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2}, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right), \frac{1}{1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}}\right). \quad (30)$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}V^k \leq r^k V^0. \quad (31)$$

Under smoothness and strong convexity assumptions, Theorem 6 implies the linear convergence of the dual variable y^k to y^* , with convergence rate given by r . Since $\|x^k - x^*\| \leq \|p^k - p^*\|$, Theorem 6 also implies the linear convergence of the primal variable x^k to x^* with the same convergence rate.

Remark 1 (Particular case). In the case where $G \equiv H \equiv 0$ and $L \equiv 0$, then the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm boils down to Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), where the stochastic gradient oracle satisfies Assumption 1. Moreover, the value of r boils down to $r = \max\left(1 - \gamma\mu, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right)\right)$. Consider the applications of SGD covered by Assumption 1, and mentioned in Sect. 5.1. Then, as proven in [19], the value $r = \max\left(1 - \gamma\mu, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right)\right)$ matches the best known convergence rates for these applications, with an exception for some coordinate descent algorithms. However, if $H \equiv 0$ and $L \equiv 0$ but $G \neq 0$, then the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm boils down to Proximal SGD, and r boils down to $r = \max\left(1 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2}, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right)\right)$, whereas the best known rates for Proximal SGD under Assumption 1 is $\max\left(1 - \gamma\mu, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right)\right)$. Finally, if $g^{k+1} = \nabla F(x^k)$, the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm boils down to the PD3O Algorithm and Theorem 6 provides a convergence rate similar to Theorem 3 in [17]. In this case, by taking $\kappa = 1$, we obtain

$$r = \max\left(1 - \gamma\frac{\mu_F + 2\mu_R}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2}, \frac{1}{1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}}\right), \quad (32)$$

whereas Theorem 3 in [17] provides the rate

$$\max\left(1 - \gamma\frac{2(\mu_F + \mu_R) - \gamma\alpha\mu_F}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2}, \frac{1}{1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}}\right)^1.$$

¹The reader might not recognize the rate given in Theorem 3 of [17] because of some typos in eq. 39 of the same paper.

Without the smoothness assumption on R , we still guarantee linear convergence for the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm:

Theorem 7 (M strongly monotone). Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Also, suppose that H is $1/\mu_{H^*}$ -smooth, F is μ_F -strongly convex and R is μ_R -strongly convex, where $\mu := \mu_F + 2\mu_R > 0$ and $\mu_{H^*} > 0$. For every $\kappa > \beta/\rho$ and every $\gamma, \tau > 0$ such that $\gamma \leq 1/(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$, $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$ and $\gamma^2 \leq \frac{2\mu_{H^*}}{\|L\|^2\mu}$, define $\eta := 2\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2\|L\|^2\mu \geq 0$,

$$V^k := \left(1 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{2}\right) \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\eta) \|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\sigma_k^2, \quad (33)$$

and

$$r := \max\left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{2}}, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right), \frac{1}{1 + \tau\eta}\right). \quad (34)$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}V^k \leq r^k V^0. \quad (35)$$

To our knowledge, Theorem 7 is the first linear convergence result without assuming that R is smooth, even in the deterministic case $g^{k+1} = \nabla F(x^k)$.

Theorem 8 (M monotone). Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\kappa := \beta/\rho$, $\gamma, \tau > 0$ be such that $\gamma \leq 1/2(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$ and $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$. Define $V^0 := \|v^0 - v^*\|_P^2 + \gamma^2\kappa\sigma_0^2$, where $v^0 = (p^0, y^0)$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\mathcal{L}(\overline{x^k}, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, \overline{y^{k+1}})\right) \leq \frac{V^0}{k\gamma},$$

where $\overline{x^k} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} x^j$ and $\overline{y^{k+1}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k y^j$.

Theorem 8 provides a $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ ergodic convergence for the general convex case.

Remark 2 (Particular case). In the case where $H \equiv 0$ and $L \equiv 0$, the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm boils down to proximal SGD and Theorem 8 implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left(F + R(\overline{x^k}) - (F + R)(x^*)\right) \leq \frac{V^0}{k\gamma}. \quad (36)$$

The $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ ergodic convergence (36) unifies known results on the non strongly convex proximal stochastic gradient algorithm where the stochastic gradient satisfies Assumption 1. This covers non strongly convex coordinate descent and variance reduction methods, see Section 5.1. If $g^{k+1} = \nabla F(x^k)$, then the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm boils down to the PD3O Algorithm and Theorem 8 boils down to Theorem 2 in [17], up to a factor of 2.

We now consider the particular case of Problem (1) where $R \equiv 0$ and $H \equiv \iota_b$, for some $b \in \mathcal{X}$. In this case, Problem (1) boils down to linearly constrained minimization:

$$\min_{\{x \in \mathcal{X} : Lx=b\}} F(x), \quad (37)$$

and the PD3O Algorithm boils down to a stochastic version of the Proximal Alternating Predictor–Corrector (PAPC) algorithm, a.k.a. Loris–Verhoven algorithm, see [11], shown above.

Theorem 9 (Linear constraints). Suppose that 1 holds. Also, suppose that F is μ_F -strongly convex, $H = \iota_b$ and $R \equiv 0$. In addition, suppose that $y^0 \in \text{ran}(L)$. Then, there exists $y^* \in \text{ran}(L)$ and $\omega(L) > 0$ such that, for every $\kappa > \beta/\rho$ and every $\gamma, \tau > 0$ such that $\gamma \leq 1/\alpha + \kappa\delta$ and $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$,

$$V^k := \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\gamma\omega(L)) \|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\mathbb{E}\sigma_k^2, \quad (38)$$

and

$$r := \max\left(1 - \gamma\mu, 1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{1 + \tau\gamma\omega(L)}\right), \quad (39)$$

Stochastic PAPC Algorithm (proposed)

1: **Input:** $x^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 \in \mathcal{Y}$
2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
3: $y^{k+1} = y^k + \tau L(x^k - \gamma g^{k+1} - \gamma L^* y^k) - \tau b$
4: $x^{k+1} = x^k - \gamma g^{k+1} - \gamma L^* y^{k+1}$
5: **end for**

Stochastic PDDY algorithm (proposed)

1: **Input:** $p^0 \in \mathcal{X}, y^0 \in \mathcal{Y}$
2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
3: $y^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \tau \gamma L L^*)y^k + \tau L p^k)$
4: $x^k = p^k - \gamma L^* y^{k+1}$
5: $s^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(2x^k - p^k - \gamma g^{k+1})$
6: $p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k$
7: **end for**

satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}V^k \leq r^k V^0. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, y^* is the unique element of $\text{ran}(L)$ such that $\nabla F(x^*) + L^* y^* = 0$. Finally, if L is injective, then $\omega(L) = \frac{1}{\|L^{-1}\|^2}$.

Under a strong convexity assumption on F , Theorem 9 implies the linear convergence of the iterates x^k of the Stochastic PAPC Algorithm to x^* . Note that this algorithm does not require the ability to project onto the affine space $\{x \in \mathcal{X}, Lx = b\}$. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 9 was not known even in the deterministic case where $g^{k+1} = \nabla F(x^k)$. However, the value of the convergence rate r in Theorem 9 is typically higher than the value of the convergence rate obtained in Theorem 6. To illustrate this point, assume that L is injective. In this case, $\omega(L) = 1/\|L^{-1}\|^2$. Moreover,

$$r \geq \frac{1}{1 + \tau \gamma \omega(L)} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\omega(L)}{\|L\|^2}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\|L\|^2 \|L^{-1}\|^2}. \quad (41)$$

The number $\|L\|^2 \|L^{-1}\|^2$ is the *squared* condition number of L .

5.3 The Stochastic PDDY Algorithm

We now analyze the proposed Stochastic PDDY Algorithm, shown above.

Theorem 10 (M strongly monotone). Suppose that 1 holds. Also, suppose that H is $1/\mu_{H^*}$ -smooth, F is μ_F -strongly convex and R is μ_R -strongly convex, where $\mu := \mu_F + 2\mu_R > 0$ and $\mu_{H^*} > 0$. For every $\kappa > \beta/\rho$ and every $\gamma, \tau > 0$ such that $\gamma \leq 1/(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$, $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$ and $\gamma^2 \leq \frac{\mu_{H^*}}{\|L\|^2 \mu_R}$, define $\eta := 2(\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2\|L\|^2 \mu_R) \geq 0$,

$$V^k := (1 + \gamma\mu_R)\|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\eta)\|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\sigma_k^2, \quad (42)$$

and

$$r := \max\left(\frac{1}{1 + \gamma\mu_R}, 1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{1 + \tau\eta}\right). \quad (43)$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}V^k \leq r^k V^0. \quad (44)$$

Theorem 10 provides a linear convergence result for the stochastic PDDY Algorithm, similar to Theorem 7.




Figure 1: Results for the PCA-Lasso experiment. Left: convergence in the objective, middle: convergence in norm, right: the effect of the stepsizes.

Theorem 11 (*M* monotone). Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\kappa := \beta/\rho$, $\gamma, \tau > 0$ be such that $\gamma \leq 1/2(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$ and $\gamma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$. Define $V^0 := \|v^0 - v^*\|_P^2 + \gamma^2\kappa\sigma_0^2$, where $v^0 = (p^0, y^0)$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(D_F(\bar{x}^k, x^*) + D_{H^*}(\bar{y}^{k+1}, y^*) + D_R(\bar{s}^{k+1}, s^*) \right) \leq \frac{V^0}{k\gamma},$$

where $\bar{x}^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} x^j$, $\bar{y}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k y^j$ and $\bar{s}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k s^j$.

Theorem 11 provides a $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ ergodic convergence result for the general convex case, similar to Theorem 8.

Remark 3 (Proofs). The proofs of Theorems 6–11 are provided in the Appendix. They rely on instantiating Lemma 3 with the monotone operators $P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C$ defined in (14), in \mathcal{Z}_P . The vector $P^{-1}C(z^k)$ is replaced by the stochastic realization $P^{-1}(g^{k+1}, 0)^T$ and the last term of Equation (13) is handled using Assumption 1. Note that this term is the only nonnegative term at the right hand side of Equation (13).

Remark 4 (Stochastic Condat–Vũ Algorithm). We omit the analysis of the stochastic version of Algorithm 3.1 (resp. Algorithm 3.2) of [13], which is essentially the same as for the Stochastic PD30 (resp. Stochastic PDDY) Algorithm, with added technicalities due to the cocoercivity with respect to metric induced by Q in (19).




Figure 2: Results for the MNIST experiment. Left: convergence in the objective, middle: convergence in norm, right: the effect of the stepsizes.

6 Experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments for the discussed algorithms. We use PDDY, PD3O and Algorithm 3.1 of [13], which we denote as CV (Condat–Vũ), see the Appendix for the detailed formulation. SGD was always used with a small γ , such as $\frac{0.01}{L}$. For stochastic methods, we used a batch size of 16 for better parallelism. For stochastic methods, the sampling type is specified in the figures. The stepsizes were tuned with log-grid-search for all methods.

We observed that the performances of these algorithms are nearly identical, when the same stepsizes are used, so we do not provide their direct comparison in the plots. Instead, we 1) compare different stochastic oracles, 2) illustrate how convergence differs in functional suboptimality and distances, and 3) show how the stepsizes affect the performance.

6.1 PCA-Lasso

In a recent work [37] the following difficult PCA-based Lasso problem was introduced: $\min_x \frac{1}{2} \|Wx - a\| + \lambda \|x\|_1 + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^m \|L_i x\|$, where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda, \lambda_1 > 0$ are given. We generate 10 matrices L_i randomly with standard normal i.i.d. entries, each with 20 rows. W and y are taken from the mushrooms datasets from the libSVM package [38]. After normalizing the data, we chose λ and λ_1 of order $\frac{1}{n}$.




Figure 3: Results for the Fused Lasso experiment. Left: convergence with respect to the objective function, middle: convergence in norm, right: illustration of the effect of the stepsizes.

6.2 MNIST with Overlapping Group Lasso

Now we consider the problem where F is the ℓ_2 -regularized logistic loss and a group Lasso penalty. Given the data matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and vector of labels $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $F(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|^2$ is a finite sum,

$$f_i(x) = -\left(a_i \log(h(w_i^\top x)) + (1 - a_i) \log(1 - (w_i^\top x))\right),$$

where, $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the i -th row of W and $h : t \rightarrow 1/(1 + e^{-t})$ is the sigmoid function. The nonsmooth regularizer, in turn, is given by $\sum_{j=1}^m \|x\|_{G_j}$, where $G_j \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ is a given subset of coordinates and $\|x\|_{G_j}$ is the ℓ_2 -norm of the corresponding block of x . To apply splitting methods, we use $L = (I_{G_1}^\top, \dots, I_{G_m}^\top)^\top$, where I_{G_j} is the operator that takes $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and returns only the entries from block G_j . Then, we can use $H(y) = \sum_{j=1}^m \|y\|_{G_j}$, which is separable in y and, thus, proximal. We use the MNIST dataset [39] of 70000 black and white 28×28 images. For each pixel, we add a group of pixels G_j adjacent to it, including the pixel itself. Since there are some border pixels, groups consist of 3, 4 or 5 coordinates, and there are 784 penalty terms in total.

6.3 Fused Lasso Experiment

In the Fused Lasso problem, we are given a feature matrix W and an output vector a , which define the least-squares penalty $F(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|Wx - a\|^2$. This function is regularized with $\|Dx\|_1$, where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-1) \times d}$ has entries $D_{i,i} = 1$, $D_{i,i+1} = -1$, for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, and $D_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. We use the mushrooms datasets from the libSVM package. Our numerical findings for this problem

are very similar to the ones for PCA-Lasso. In particular, larger values of γ seem to perform significantly better and the value of the objective function does not oscillate, unlike in the MNIST experiment. The results are shown in Figure 3. The proposed Stochastic PDDY algorithm with the SAGA estimator performs best in this setting.

6.4 Summary

We can see from the plots that stochastic updates make the convergence extremely faster, sometimes even without variance reduction. The stepsize plots suggest that it is best to keep $\gamma\tau$ close to $\frac{1}{\|L\|^2}$, while the optimal value of γ might sometimes be smaller than $\frac{1}{\nu}$. This is especially clearly seen from the fact that SGD works sufficiently fast even despite using γ inversely proportional to the number of iterations. All methods experienced oscillatory behavior, in particular at the beginning of the optimization process.

References

- [1] D. P. Palomar and Y. C. Eldar, Eds., *Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [2] J.-L. Starck, F. Murtagh, and J. Fadili, *Sparse Image and Signal Processing: Wavelets, Curvelets, Morphological Diversity*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [3] F. Bach, R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, and G. Obozinski, “Optimization with sparsity-inducing penalties,” *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–106, 2012.
- [4] N. G. Polson, J. G. Scott, and B. T. Willard, “Proximal algorithms in statistics and machine learning,” *Statist. Sci.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 559–581, 2015.
- [5] A. Chambolle and T. Pock, “An introduction to continuous optimization for imaging,” *Acta Numerica*, vol. 25, pp. 161–319, 2016.
- [6] G. Stathopoulos, H. Shukla, A. Szucs, Y. Pu, and C. N. Jones, “Operator splitting methods in control,” *Foundations and Trends in Systems and Control*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 249–362, 2016.
- [7] M. Elad, *Sparse and redundant representations: From theory to applications in signal and image processing*. Springer, 2010.
- [8] S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. J. Wright, *Optimization for Machine Learning*. The MIT Press, 2011.
- [9] S. Bubeck, “Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity,” *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 8, no. 3–4, pp. 231–357, 2015.
- [10] A. Emrouznejad, Ed., *Big Data Optimization: Recent Developments and Challenges*. Springer, 2016.
- [11] L. Condat, D. Kitahara, A. Contreras, and A. Hirabayashi, “Proximal splitting algorithms: Relax them all!” 2019, preprint arXiv:1912.00137.
- [12] D. Davis and W. Yin, “A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications,” *Set-Val. Var. Anal.*, vol. 25, pp. 829–858, 2017.
- [13] L. Condat, “A primal-dual splitting method for convex optimization involving Lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms,” *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 158, no. 2, pp. 460–479, 2013.
- [14] B. C. Vũ, “A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators,” *Adv. Comput. Math.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 667–681, Apr. 2013.

- [15] P. L. Combettes, L. Condat, J.-C. Pesquet, and B. C. Vũ, “A forward–backward view of some primal–dual optimization methods in image recovery,” in *Proc. of IEEE ICIP*, Paris, France, Oct. 2014.
- [16] N. Komodakis and J.-C. Pesquet, “Playing with duality: An overview of recent primal–dual approaches for solving large-scale optimization problems,” *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 31–54, Nov. 2015.
- [17] M. Yan, “A new Primal–Dual algorithm for minimizing the sum of three functions with a linear operator,” *J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 1698–1717, Sep. 2018.
- [18] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, “Primal–dual splitting algorithm for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite, Lipschitzian, and parallel-sum type monotone operators,” *Set-Val. Var. Anal.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 307–330, 2012.
- [19] E. Gorbunov, F. Hanzely, and P. Richtárik, “A unified theory of SGD: Variance reduction, sampling, quantization and coordinate descent,” in *Proc. of Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Stat. (AISTATS)*, Palermo, Sicily, Italy, Jun. 2020, to appear.
- [20] F. Pedregosa, K. Fatras, and M. Casotto, “Proximal splitting meets variance reduction,” in *Proc. of Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Stat. (AISTATS)*, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [21] R. Johnson and T. Zhang, “Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2013, pp. 315–323.
- [22] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien, “Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2014, pp. 1646–1654.
- [23] A. Defazio, “A simple practical accelerated method for finite sums,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2016, pp. 676–684.
- [24] A. Yurtsever, B. C. Vũ, and V. Cevher, “Stochastic three-composite convex minimization,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2016, pp. 4329–4337.
- [25] R. Zhao and V. Cevher, “Stochastic three-composite convex minimization with a linear operator,” in *Proc. of Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Stat. (AISTATS)*, 2018.
- [26] P. Bianchi, W. Hachem, and A. Salim, “A fully stochastic primal-dual algorithm,” 2019, preprint arXiv:1901.08170.
- [27] B. Palaniappan and F. Bach, “Stochastic variance reduction methods for saddle-point problems,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2016, pp. 1416–1424.
- [28] L. Luo, C. Chen, Y. Li, G. Xie, and Z. Zhang, “A stochastic proximal point algorithm for saddle-point problems,” 2019, preprint arXiv:1909.06946.
- [29] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [30] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2017.
- [31] F. Hanzely, K. Mishchenko, and P. Richtárik, “Sega: Variance reduction via gradient sketching,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2018, pp. 2082–2093.
- [32] T. Hofmann, A. Lucchi, S. Lacoste-Julien, and B. McWilliams, “Variance reduced stochastic gradient descent with neighbors,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2015, pp. 2305–2313.

- [33] R. M. Gower, P. Richtárik, and F. Bach, “Stochastic quasi-gradient methods: Variance reduction via jacobian sketching,” 2018, preprint arXiv:1805.02632.
- [34] D. Kovalev, S. Horváth, and P. Richtárik, “Don’t jump through hoops and remove those loops: SVRG and Katyusha are better without the outer loop,” in *Proc. of Int. Conf. Algo. Learn. Theory (ALT)*, 2020, to appear.
- [35] S. Horváth, D. Kovalev, K. Mishchenko, S. Stich, and P. Richtárik, “Stochastic distributed learning with gradient quantization and variance reduction,” 2019, preprint arXiv:1904.05115.
- [36] Y. Nesterov, *Lectures on convex optimization*. Springer, 2018, vol. 137.
- [37] J. K. Tay, J. Friedman, and R. Tibshirani, “Principal component-guided sparse regression,” 2018, preprint arXiv:1810.04651.
- [38] C.-C. Chang and C.-J. Lin, “LibSVM: A library for support vector machines,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 27, 2011.
- [39] Y. LeCun and C. Cortes, “MNIST handwritten digit database,” 2010.

Appendix

A Proof of Lemma 3	18
B Proofs related to primal–dual optimality	18
B.1 Optimality conditions	18
B.2 Proof of Lemma 1	19
C Proofs related to the Condat–Vũ Algorithm	19
C.1 Proof of Lemma 12	19
C.2 Algorithm 3.1 of [13] as an instance of the Davis–Yin Splitting Algorithm	20
C.3 Algorithm 3.2 of [13] as an instance of the Davis–Yin Splitting Algorithm	20
C.4 Cocoercivity parameter of $Q^{-1}C$	21
D Proofs related to the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm	21
D.1 Proof of Theorem 6	24
D.2 Proof of Theorem 7	25
D.3 Proof of Theorem 8	25
D.4 Proof of Theorem 9	26
E Proofs related to the Stochastic PDDY Algorithm	27
E.1 Proof of Theorem 10	29
E.2 Proof of Theorem 11	30

A Proof of Lemma 3

Since $z^k = J_{\gamma\tilde{B}}(v^k)$, $z^k \in v^k - \gamma\tilde{B}(z^k)$ by definition of the resolvent operator. Therefore, there exists $b^k \in \tilde{B}(z^k)$ such that $z^k = v^k - \gamma b^k$. Similarly,

$$u^{k+1} \in 2z^k - v^k - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k) - \gamma\tilde{A}(u^{k+1}) = v^k - 2\gamma b^k - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k) - \gamma\tilde{A}(u^{k+1}). \quad (45)$$

Therefore, there exists $a^{k+1} \in \tilde{A}(u^{k+1})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} z^k = v^k - \gamma b^k \\ u^{k+1} = v^k - 2\gamma b^k - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k) - \gamma a^{k+1} \\ v^{k+1} = v^k + u^{k+1} - z^k. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

Moreover,

$$v^{k+1} = v^k - \gamma b^k - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k) - \gamma a^{k+1}. \quad (47)$$

Similarly, there exist $a^* \in \tilde{A}(u^*)$, $b^* \in \tilde{B}(z^*)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} z^* = v^* - \gamma b^* \\ u^* = v^* - 2\gamma b^* - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^*) - \gamma a^* \\ v^* = v^* + u^* - z^*, \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

and

$$v^* = v^* - \gamma b^* - \gamma\tilde{C}(z^*) - \gamma a^*. \quad (49)$$

Therefore, using (47) and (49),

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle a^{k+1} + b^k + \tilde{C}(z^k) - (a^* + b^* + \tilde{C}(z^*)), v^k - v^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|a^{k+1} + b^k + \tilde{C}(z^k) - (a^* + b^* + \tilde{C}(z^*))\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

By expanding the last square at the right hand side, and by using (46) and (48) in the inner product we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle b^k + \tilde{C}(z^k) - (b^* + \tilde{C}(z^*)), z^k - z^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle a^{k+1} - a^*, u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle b^k + \tilde{C}(z^k) - (b^* + \tilde{C}(z^*)), \gamma b^k - \gamma b^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle a^{k+1} - a^*, 2\gamma b^k + \gamma\tilde{C}(z^k) + \gamma a^{k+1} - (2\gamma b^* + \gamma\tilde{C}(z^*) + \gamma a^*) \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|a^{k+1} + b^k - (a^* + b^*)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|\tilde{C}(z^k) - \tilde{C}(z^*)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma^2 \langle a^{k+1} + b^k - (a^* + b^*), \tilde{C}(z^k) - \tilde{C}(z^*) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Then, the last five terms at the right hand side simplify to

$$\gamma^2 \|\tilde{C}(z^k) - \tilde{C}(z^*)\|^2 - \gamma^2 \|a^{k+1} + b^k - (a^* + b^*)\|^2, \quad (52)$$

and we get the result.

B Proofs related to primal–dual optimality

B.1 Optimality conditions

Let x^* be a minimizer of Problem (1). Assuming a standard qualification condition, for instance that 0 belongs to the relative interior of $\text{dom}(H) - L \text{dom}(R)$, then for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\partial(F + R + H \circ L)(x) = \nabla F(x) + \partial R(x) + L^* \partial H(Lx), \quad (53)$$

see for instance Theorem 16.47 of [30]. Then,

$$x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{F(x) + R(x) + H(Lx)\} \quad (54)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow 0 \in \nabla F(x^*) + \partial R(x^*) + L^* \partial H(Lx^*) \quad (55)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists y^* \in \partial H(Lx^*) \text{ such that } 0 \in \nabla F(x^*) + \partial R(x^*) + L^* y^* \quad (56)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists y^* \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ such that } 0 \in \nabla F(x^*) + \partial R(x^*) + L^* y^* \text{ and } 0 \in -Lx^* + \partial H^*(y^*), \quad (57)$$

where we used $\partial H^* = (\partial H)^{-1}$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 1

Using the optimality conditions (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_F(x, x^*) + D_R(x, x^*) &= (F + R)(x) - (F + R)(x^*) - \langle \nabla F(x^*) + r^*, x - x^* \rangle \\ &= (F + R)(x) - (F + R)(x^*) + \langle L^T y^*, x - x^* \rangle \\ &= (F + R)(x) - (F + R)(x^*) + \langle y^*, Lx \rangle - \langle y^*, Lx^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{H^*}(y, y^*) &= H^*(y) - H^*(y^*) - \langle h^*, y - y^* \rangle \\ &= H^*(y) - H^*(y^*) - \langle Lx^*, y - y^* \rangle \\ &= H^*(y) - H^*(y^*) - \langle Lx^*, y \rangle + \langle y^*, Lx^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Summing the two last equations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_F(x, x^*) + D_R(x, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y, y^*) &= (F + R)(x) - (F + R)(x^*) + H^*(y) - H^*(y^*) - \langle Lx^*, y \rangle + \langle y^*, Lx \rangle \\ &= \mathcal{L}(x, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

C Proofs related to the Condat–Vũ Algorithm

In the notations of Section 4.3, let us state the lemma:

Lemma 12. $J_{\gamma Q^{-1}A}$ maps (x, y) to (x', y') , such that

$$\begin{cases} x' = \text{prox}_{\tau R}((I - \tau\gamma L^*L)x - \tau L^*y), \\ y' = y + \gamma Lx'. \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

C.1 Proof of Lemma 12

Let (x, y) and $(x', y') \in \mathcal{Z}$, such that

$$Q \begin{bmatrix} x' - x \\ y' - y \end{bmatrix} \in -\gamma \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x') + L^*y' \\ -Lx' \end{bmatrix}, \quad (62)$$

where

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2 L^*L & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (63)$$

We shall express (x', y') as a function of (x, y) . First,

$$y' = y + \gamma Lx'.$$

Moreover, x' is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2L^*L\right)(x') &\in \left(\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2L^*L\right)(x) - \gamma\partial R(x') - \gamma L^*y' \\ &\in \left(\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2L^*L\right)(x) - \gamma\partial R(x') - \gamma L^*y - \gamma^2L^*Lx'. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the term γ^2L^*Lx' disappears from both sides and

$$x' \in x - \gamma\tau L^*Lx - \tau\partial R(x') - \tau L^*y. \quad (64)$$

Finally,

$$x - \gamma\tau L^*Lx - \tau L^*y \in x' + \tau\partial R(x'), \quad (65)$$

and

$$x' = \text{prox}_{\tau R}(x - \gamma\tau L^*Lx - \tau L^*y). \quad (66)$$

C.2 Algorithm 3.1 of [13] as an instance of the Davis–Yin Splitting Algorithm

We apply $\text{DYS}(Q^{-1}A, Q^{-1}B, Q^{-1}C)$, which yields:

$$\begin{cases} x^k = \text{prox}_{\tau R}((I - \gamma\tau L^*L)p^k - \tau L^*q^k) \\ y^k = q^k + \gamma Lx^k \\ s^{k+1} = 2x^k - p^k - \gamma\left(\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2L^*L\right)^{-1}\nabla F(x^k) \\ d^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(2y^k - q^k) \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (67)$$

Note that $p^{k+1} = x^k - \left(\frac{1}{\tau}I - \gamma L^*L\right)^{-1}\nabla F(x^k)$ and $q^{k+1} = d^{k+1} - \gamma Lx^k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} x^k &= \text{prox}_{\tau R}(x^{k-1} - \gamma\tau L^*Lx^{k-1} - \tau\nabla F(x^{k-1}) - \tau L^*(d^k - \gamma Lx^{k-1})) \\ &= \text{prox}_{\tau R}(x^{k-1} - \tau\nabla F(x^{k-1}) - \tau L^*d^k), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d^{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(2y^k - q^k) \\ &= \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(q^k + 2\gamma Lx^k) \\ &= \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(d^k + \gamma L(2x^k - x^{k-1})). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

The sequence (x^k, d^{k+1}) follows the updates of Algorithm 3.1 of [13].

C.3 Algorithm 3.2 of [13] as an instance of the Davis–Yin Splitting Algorithm

We apply $\text{DYS}(Q^{-1}B, Q^{-1}A, Q^{-1}C)$:

$$\begin{cases} x^k = p^k \\ y^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(q^k) \\ s^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau R}\left((I - \gamma\tau L^*L)(2x^k - p^k - \gamma\left(\frac{\gamma}{\tau}I - \gamma^2L^*L\right)^{-1}\nabla F(x^k)) - \tau L^*(2y^k - q^k)\right) \\ d^{k+1} = 2y^k - q^k + \gamma Ls^{k+1} \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

Note that $p^k = s^k = x^k$ and $q^{k+1} = y^k + \gamma Lx^{k+1}$. So,

$$x^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau R}(x^k - \tau \nabla F(x^k) - \tau L^*(2y^k - q^k + \gamma Lx^k)), \quad (71)$$

$$= \text{prox}_{\tau R}(x^k - \tau \nabla F(x^k) - \tau L^*(2y^k - y^{k-1})), \quad (72)$$

and

$$y^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma H^*}(y^{k-1} + \gamma Lx^k). \quad (73)$$

The sequence (y^k, x^{k+1}) follows the updates of Algorithm 3.2 in [13].

C.4 Cocoercivity parameter of $Q^{-1}C$

Since K is positive definite, $\|K^{-1/2}\|^2 = \|K^{-1}\|$. Let $z = (x, y)$, $z' = (x', y') \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^{-1}C(z) - Q^{-1}C(z')\|_Q^2 &= \|K^{-1}\nabla F(x) - K^{-1}\nabla F(x')\|_K^2 \\ &= \|K^{-1/2}\nabla F(x) - K^{-1/2}\nabla F(x')\|^2 \\ &\leq \|K^{-1/2}\|^2 \|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x')\|^2 \\ &= \|K^{-1}\| \|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x')\|^2 \\ &\leq \|K^{-1}\| \nu \langle \nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x'), x - x' \rangle \\ &= \|K^{-1}\| \nu \langle K^{-1}\nabla F(x) - K^{-1}\nabla F(x'), x - x' \rangle_K \\ &= \|K^{-1}\| \nu \langle Q^{-1}C(z) - Q^{-1}C(z'), z - z' \rangle_Q. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|K^{-1}\|$ is the inverse of the smallest eigenvalue of K ,

$$\|K^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\frac{\gamma}{\tau} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2}.$$

Therefore, $Q^{-1}C$ is $\xi = \frac{\frac{\gamma}{\tau} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2}{\gamma}$ cocoercive. Moreover, the condition $\gamma < 2\xi$ of Lemma 2 is equivalent to $\nu/2 < \frac{1}{\tau} - \gamma \|L\|^2$ which is exactly the condition (i) of Theorem 3.1 in [13].

D Proofs related to the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm

In this section and in the next section, we shall use the following notation abuse to make the derivations clearer: when the operators are set-values, we shall confuse the element and the set containing the element. For instance, $a^{k+1} \in \tilde{A}(u^{k+1})$ will be denoted $\tilde{A}(u^{k+1})$ directly, $r^* \in \partial R(x^*)$ will be denoted $R(x^*)$ and $h^* \in \partial H^*(y^*)$ will be denoted $\partial H^*(y^*)$. Indeed, the important property is in which set the variables live, more than the variables themselves, and we think that this notation simplification makes it easier for the reader to follow the derivations.

Recall that the PD3O algorithm is equivalent to $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$. We denote by $v^k = (p^k, q^k)$, $z^k = (x^k, y^k)$, $u^k = (s^k, d^k)$ the variables in $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$, with $p^k, x^k, s^k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $q^k, y^k, d^k \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Then, the step

$$z^k = J_{\gamma P^{-1}B}(v^k),$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} x^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^k) \\ y^k = q^k. \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

Using (18), the step

$$u^{k+1} = J_{\gamma P^{-1}A}(2z^k - v^k - \gamma P^{-1}C(z^k)),$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} s^{k+1} = (2x^k - p^k - \gamma \nabla F(x^k)) - \gamma L^* d^{k+1} \\ d^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \gamma \tau LL^*)(2y^k - q^k) + \tau L(2x^k - p^k - \nabla F(x^k))). \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

Finally, the step

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + u^{k+1} - z^k,$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (76)$$

Similarly, the fixed points $v^* = (p^*, q^*)$, $z^* = (x^*, y^*)$, $u^* = (s^*, d^*)$ of $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} x^* = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^*) \\ y^* = q^* \\ s^* = (2x^* - p^* - \gamma \nabla F(x^*)) - \gamma L^* d^* \\ d^* = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \gamma \tau LL^*)(2y^* - q^*) + \tau L(2x^* - p^* - \nabla F(x^*))) \\ p^* = p^* + s^* - x^* \\ q^* = q^* + d^* - y^*. \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

and the iterates of the stochastic PD3O algorithm satisfy

$$\begin{cases} x^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^k) \\ y^k = q^k \\ s^{k+1} = (2x^k - p^k - \gamma g^{k+1}) - \gamma L^* d^{k+1} \\ d^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \gamma \tau LL^*)(2y^k - q^k) + \tau L(2x^k - p^k - g^{k+1})) \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

Lemma 13. Assume that F is μ_F -strongly convex, for some $\mu_F \geq 0$, and that (g^k) satisfies Assumption 1. Then, the iterates of the Stochastic PD3O Algorithm satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) D_F(x^k, x^*) - \gamma \mu_F \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(x^k) - \partial R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) - \partial H^*(d^*), d^{k+1} - d^* \rangle \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 3 for $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}A, P^{-1}B, P^{-1}C)$ using the norm induced by P we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}B(z^k) - P^{-1}B(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle_P \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle_P \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) - P^{-1}A(u^*), u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle_P \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*)\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2 \\ &= \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle B(z^k) - B(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle C(z^k) - C(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle A(u^{k+1}) - A(u^*), u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*)\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using

$$A(u^{k+1}) = \begin{bmatrix} L^* s^{k+1} \\ -Ls^{k+1} + \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (79)$$

$$B(z^k) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x^k) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (80)$$

$$C(z^k) = \begin{bmatrix} g^{k+1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (81)$$

and

$$A(u^*) = \begin{bmatrix} L^* s^* \\ -Ls^* + \partial H^*(d^*) \end{bmatrix} \quad (82)$$

$$B(z^*) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(x^*) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (83)$$

$$C(z^*) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x^*) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (84)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(x^k) - \partial R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle g^{k+1} - \nabla F(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) - \partial H^*(d^*), d^{k+1} - d^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 \|g^{k+1} - \nabla F(x^*)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Taking conditional expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_k and using Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(x^k) - \partial R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \nabla F(x^k) - \nabla F(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) - \partial H^*(d^*), d^{k+1} - d^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 (2\alpha D_F(x^k, x^*) + \beta \sigma_k^2) \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Using strong convexity of F ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma \mu_F \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma D_F(x^k, x^*) \\ &\quad + \gamma^2 (2\alpha D_F(x^k, x^*) + \beta \sigma_k^2) \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(x^k) - \partial R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) - \partial H^*(d^*), d^{k+1} - d^* \rangle \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Using Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\
&\quad - \gamma\mu_F \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) D_F(x^k, x^*) \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(x^k) - \partial R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial H^*(d^{k+1}) - \partial H^*(d^*), d^{k+1} - d^* \rangle \\
&\quad - \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}B(z^k) - (P^{-1}A(u^*) + P^{-1}B(z^*))\|_P^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

□

D.1 Proof of Theorem 6

We first use Lemma 13 along with the strong convexity of R, H^* . Note that $y^k = q^k$ and therefore $q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - q^k = d^{k+1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + 2\gamma\mu_{H^*} \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \\
&\leq \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 - \gamma\mu \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\
&\quad + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) D_F(x^k, x^*)
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that for every $q \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\|q\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 = \frac{\gamma}{\tau} \|q\|^2 - \gamma^2 \|L^*q\|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{\tau} \|q\|^2$, and taking $\gamma \leq 1/(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + (1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \\
&\leq \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 - \gamma\mu \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since R is λ -smooth, $\|p^k - p^*\|^2 \leq (1 + 2\gamma\lambda + \gamma^2\lambda^2) \|x^k - x^*\|^2$. Indeed, in this case, applying Lemma 3 with $\tilde{A} \equiv 0$, $\tilde{C} \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{B} = \nabla R$, we obtain that if $x^k = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^k)$ and $x^* = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(p^*)$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^k - x^*\|^2 &= \|p^k - p^*\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \nabla R(x^k) - \nabla R(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle - \gamma^2 \|\nabla R(x^k) - \nabla R(x^*)\|^2 \\
&\geq \|p^k - p^*\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma\lambda \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \gamma^2\lambda^2 \|x^k - x^*\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + (1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \\
&\leq \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2} \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Thus, set

$$V^k = \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}) \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \sigma_k^2, \tag{91}$$

and

$$r = \max \left(1 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{(1 + \gamma\lambda)^2}, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right), \frac{1}{1 + 2\tau\mu_{H^*}} \right). \tag{92}$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq r V^k. \tag{93}$$

D.2 Proof of Theorem 7

We first use Lemma 13 along with the strong convexity of R and H^* . Note that $y^k = q^k$, so that $q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - q^k = d^{k+1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma\mu_{H^*} \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2 - \gamma\mu \|x^k - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Note that $p^{k+1} = x^k - \gamma L^* q^{k+1}$. Using Young's inequality, $- \|a + b\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2$. Therefore,

$$- \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2. \quad (95)$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \quad (96)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\quad - \gamma(2\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{2} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \quad (97) \\ &\quad - \tau(2\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 - \frac{\gamma\mu}{2} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|q\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{\tau} \|q\|^2$. Set $\eta = 2\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu \geq 0$. Then

$$\left(1 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\eta) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \quad (98)$$

$$\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2. \quad (99)$$

Thus, set

$$V^k = \left(1 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{2}\right) \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\eta) \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \sigma_k^2, \quad (100)$$

and

$$r = \max\left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\gamma\mu}{2}}, \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right), \frac{1}{1 + \tau\eta}\right). \quad (101)$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq r V^k. \quad (102)$$

D.3 Proof of Theorem 8

Using Lemma 13, convexity of F, R, H^* , and Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) \mathbb{E}_k (\mathcal{L}(x^k, d^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, d^{k+1})). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Recall that $1 - \rho + \beta/\kappa = 1$, $\gamma \leq 1/2(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$. Set

$$V^k = \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \sigma_k^2. \quad (104)$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq V^k - \gamma \mathbb{E}_k (\mathcal{L}(x^k, d^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, d^{k+1})). \quad (105)$$

Taking the expectation,

$$\gamma \mathbb{E} (\mathcal{L}(x^k, d^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, d^{k+1})) \leq \mathbb{E} V^k - \mathbb{E} V^{k+1}. \quad (106)$$

Iterating and using the nonnegativity of V^k ,

$$\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} (\mathcal{L}(x^j, d^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, d^{j+1})) \leq \mathbb{E} V^0. \quad (107)$$

We conclude using the convex-concavity of L .

Lemma 14. Let $x \in \text{ran}(L^*)$, the range space of L^* . There exists a unique $y \in \text{ran}(L)$ such that $L^*y = x$. Moreover, there exists $\omega(L) > 0$ such that, for every $y \in \text{ran}(L)$,

$$\omega(L)\|y\|^2 \leq \|L^*y\|^2. \quad (108)$$

If L is injective,

$$\omega(L) = \frac{1}{\|L^{-1}\|^2}. \quad (109)$$

Proof. We denote by $\tilde{L} : \text{ran}(L) \rightarrow \text{ran}(L^*)$ the linear map defined by $\tilde{L}(y) = L^*y$, for every $y \in \text{ran}(L)$. Since $\text{ran}(L)$ is the orthogonal space to $\ker(L^*)$, the null space of L^* , $\tilde{L} : \text{ran}(L) \rightarrow \text{ran}(L^*)$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, for every $x \in \text{ran}(L^*)$, there exists a unique $y = \tilde{L}^{-1}x \in \text{ran}(L)$, such that $L^*y = x$. Moreover,

$$\|y\|^2 \leq \|\tilde{L}^{-1}\|^2 \|x\|^2. \quad (110)$$

Setting

$$\omega(L) = \frac{1}{\|\tilde{L}^{-1}\|^2}, \quad (111)$$

we have $\omega(L)\|y\|^2 \leq \|L^*y\|^2$. Finally, if L is injective, then $\tilde{L} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{ran}(L^*)$. Since $(L^*)^{-1} = (L^{-1})^*$, we have

$$\omega(L) = \frac{1}{\|\tilde{L}^{-1}\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|(L^{-1})^*\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|L^{-1}\|^2}. \quad (112)$$

□

D.4 Proof of Theorem 9

First, we define y^* . In the case $R \equiv 0$ and $H = \iota_b$, Equation (4) states that $\nabla F(x^*) \in \text{ran}(L^*)$. Using Lemma 14, there exists a unique $y^* \in \text{ran}(L)$ such that $\nabla F(x^*) + L^*y^* = 0$. Noting that $y^* = d^* = q^*$ and applying Lemma 13 with $\gamma \leq (\alpha + \kappa\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|p^k - p^*\|^2 + \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 - \gamma\mu_F \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) - P^{-1}A(u^*)\|_P^2. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Since the component of $P^{-1}A(u^{k+1}) - P^{-1}A(u^*)$ in \mathcal{X} is $L^*d^{k+1} - L^*d^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 - \gamma\mu_F \|p^k - p^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma^2 \|L^*d^{k+1} - L^*d^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

Inspecting the iterations of the algorithm, one can see that $d^0 \in \text{ran}(L)$ implies $d^{k+1} \in \text{ran}(L)$. Since $d^* \in \text{ran}(L)$, $d^{k+1} - d^* \in \text{ran}(L)$. Therefore, using Lemma 14, $\omega(L)\|d^{k+1} - d^*\|^2 \leq \|L^*d^{k+1} - L^*d^*\|^2$. Since $q^{k+1} = d^{k+1} = y^{k+1}$ and $x^k = p^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_k \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + (1 + \gamma\tau\omega(L))\mathbb{E}_k \|y^{k+1} - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma\mu_F)\|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Setting

$$V^k = \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\gamma\omega(L))\|y^k - y^*\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\sigma_k^2, \quad (116)$$

and

$$r = \max\left(1 - \gamma\mu, 1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{1 + \tau\gamma\omega(L)}\right), \quad (117)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq rV^k. \quad (118)$$

E Proofs related to the Stochastic PDDY Algorithm

Recall that the PDDY algorithm is equivalent to $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}B, P^{-1}A, P^{-1}C)$. We denote by $v^k = (p^k, q^k)$, $z^k = (x^k, y^k)$, $u^k = (s^k, d^k)$ the iterates of $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}B, P^{-1}A, P^{-1}C)$, where $p^k, x^k, s^k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $q^k, y^k, d^k \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Using (18), the step

$$z^k = J_{\gamma P^{-1}B}(v^k), \quad (119)$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} x^k &= p^k - \gamma L^* y^k \\ y^k &= \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \tau\gamma LL^*)q^k + \tau L p^k). \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

Then, the step

$$u^{k+1} = J_{\gamma P^{-1}A}(2z^k - v^k - \gamma P^{-1}C(z^k))$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} s^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(2x^k - p^k - \gamma \nabla F(x^k)) \\ d^{k+1} = 2y^k - q^k. \end{cases} \quad (121)$$

Finally, the step

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + u^{k+1} - z^k$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (122)$$

Similarly, the fixed points $v^* = (p^*, q^*)$, $z^* = (x^*, y^*)$, $u^* = (s^*, d^*)$ of $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}B, P^{-1}A, P^{-1}C)$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} x^* = p^* - \gamma L^* y^* \\ y^* = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \tau\gamma LL^*)q^* + \tau L p^*) \\ s^* = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(2x^* - p^* - \gamma \nabla F(x^*)) \\ d^* = 2y^* - q^* \\ p^* = p^* + s^* - x^* \\ q^* = q^* + d^* - y^*, \end{cases} \quad (123)$$

and the iterates of the stochastic PDDY algorithm satisfy

$$\begin{cases} x^k = p^k - \gamma L^* y^k \\ y^k = \text{prox}_{\tau H^*}((I - \tau\gamma LL^*)q^k + \tau L p^k) \\ s^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma R}(2x^k - p^k - \gamma g^{k+1}) \\ d^{k+1} = 2y^k - q^k \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + s^{k+1} - x^k \\ q^{k+1} = q^k + d^{k+1} - y^k. \end{cases} \quad (124)$$

Lemma 15. Suppose that (g^k) satisfies Assumption 1. Then, the iterates of the Stochastic PDDY Algorithm satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) D_F(x^k, x^*) \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(y^k) - \partial H^*(y^*), y^k - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial R(s^{k+1}) - \partial R(s^*), s^{k+1} - s^* \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 3 for $\text{DYS}(P^{-1}B, P^{-1}A, P^{-1}C)$ using the norm induced by P , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &= \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}A(z^k) - P^{-1}A(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle_P \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle_P \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle P^{-1}B(u^{k+1}) - P^{-1}B(u^*), u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle_P \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*)\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}B(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}A(z^k) - (P^{-1}B(u^*) + P^{-1}A(z^*))\|_P^2 \\
&= \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle A(z^k) - A(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle C(z^k) - C(z^*), z^k - z^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle B(u^{k+1}) - B(u^*), u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}C(z^k) - P^{-1}C(z^*)\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - \gamma^2 \|P^{-1}B(u^{k+1}) + P^{-1}A(z^k) - (P^{-1}B(u^*) + P^{-1}A(z^*))\|_P^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using

$$\begin{aligned}
A(z^k) &= \begin{bmatrix} L^* y^k \\ -Lx^k + \partial H^*(y^k) \end{bmatrix} \\
B(u^{k+1}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(s^{k+1}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
C(z^k) &= \begin{bmatrix} g^{k+1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
A(z^*) &= \begin{bmatrix} L^* y^* \\ -Lx^* + \partial H^*(y^*) \end{bmatrix} \\
B(u^*) &= \begin{bmatrix} \partial R(s^*) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
C(z^*) &= \begin{bmatrix} \nabla F(x^*) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(y^k) - \partial H^*(y^*), y^k - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle g^{k+1} - \nabla F(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial R(s^{k+1}) - \partial R(s^*), s^{k+1} - s^* \rangle \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 \|g^{k+1} - \nabla F(x^*)\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

Applying the conditional expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_k and using Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(y^k) - \partial H^*(y^*), y^k - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \nabla F(x^k) - \nabla F(x^*), x^k - x^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial R(s^{k+1}) - \partial R(s^*), s^{k+1} - s^* \rangle \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 (2\alpha D_F(x^k, x^*) + \beta \sigma_k^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

Using the convexity of F ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(y^k) - \partial H^*(y^*), y^k - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial R(s^{k+1}) - \partial R(s^*), s^{k+1} - s^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma D_F(x^k, x^*) \\
&\quad + \gamma^2 (2\alpha D_F(x^k, x^*) + \beta \sigma_k^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

Using Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) D_F(x^k, x^*) \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \langle \partial H^*(y^k) - \partial H^*(y^*), y^k - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mathbb{E}_k \langle \partial R(s^{k+1}) - \partial R(s^*), s^{k+1} - s^* \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

□

E.1 Proof of Theorem 10

We first use Lemma 15 along with the strong convexity of R, H^* . Note that $y^k = q^{k+1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\
&\quad - 2\gamma \mu_{H^*} \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2 - 2\gamma \mu_R \mathbb{E}_k \|s^{k+1} - s^*\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

Note that $s^{k+1} = p^{k+1} - \gamma L^T y^k$. Therefore, $s^{k+1} - s^* = (p^{k+1} - p^*) - \gamma L^T (y^k - y^*)$. Using Young's inequality $-\|a + b\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2$, we have

$$-\mathbb{E}_k \|s^{k+1} - s^*\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2. \tag{133}$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \tag{134}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\quad - 2\gamma (\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu_R) \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|^2 - \gamma \mu_R \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\
&\quad - 2\tau \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 (\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu_R) - \gamma \mu_R \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

Set $\eta = 2(\mu_{H^*} - \gamma^2 \|L\|^2 \mu_R) \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1 + \gamma \mu_R) \mathbb{E}_k \|p^{k+1} - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau \eta) \mathbb{E}_k \|q^{k+1} - q^*\|_{\gamma, \tau}^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 \\
&\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa \gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

Set

$$V^k = (1 + \gamma\mu_R)\|p^k - p^*\|^2 + (1 + \tau\eta)\|q^k - q^*\|_{\gamma,\tau}^2 + \kappa\gamma^2\sigma_k^2 \quad (137)$$

and

$$r = \max\left(\frac{1}{1 + \gamma\mu_R}, 1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{1 + \tau\eta}\right). \quad (138)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq rV^k. \quad (139)$$

E.2 Proof of Theorem 11

Using Lemma 15 and the convexity of F, R, H^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_k \sigma_{k+1}^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \left(1 - \rho + \frac{\beta}{\kappa}\right) \sigma_k^2 \\ &\quad - 2\gamma(1 - \gamma(\alpha + \kappa\delta)) (D_F(x^k, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y^k, y^*) + \mathbb{E}_k D_R(s^{k+1}, s^*)). \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

Since $1 - \rho + \beta/\kappa = 1$, $\gamma \leq 1/2(\alpha + \kappa\delta)$. Set

$$V^k = \|v^k - v^*\|_P^2 + \kappa\gamma^2 \sigma_k^2. \quad (141)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_k V^{k+1} \leq V^k - \gamma \mathbb{E}_k (D_F(x^k, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y^k, y^*) + D_R(s^{k+1}, s^*)). \quad (142)$$

Taking the expectation,

$$\gamma \mathbb{E} (D_F(x^k, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y^k, y^*) + D_R(s^{k+1}, s^*)) \leq \mathbb{E} V^k - \mathbb{E} V^{k+1}.$$

Iterating and using the nonnegativity of V^k ,

$$\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} (D_F(x^k, x^*) + D_{H^*}(y^k, y^*) + D_R(s^{k+1}, s^*)) \leq \mathbb{E} V^0. \quad (143)$$

We conclude using the convexity of the Bregman divergence in its first variable.