

Distributed Nonconvex Optimization: Gradient-free Iterations and ϵ -Globally Optimal Solution [★]

Zhiyu He ^a, Jianping He ^a, Cailian Chen ^a, Xinping Guan ^a

^a*Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and Key Laboratory of System Control and Information Processing, Ministry of Education of China, Shanghai 200240, China*

Abstract

Distributed optimization utilizes local computation and communication to realize a global aim of optimizing the sum of local objective functions. It has gained wide attention for a variety of applications in networked systems. This paper addresses a class of constrained distributed nonconvex optimization problems involving univariate objectives, aiming to achieve global optimization without requiring local evaluations of gradients at every iteration. We propose a novel algorithm named CPCA, exploiting the notion of combining Chebyshev polynomial approximation, average consensus, and polynomial optimization. The proposed algorithm is i) able to obtain ϵ -globally optimal solutions for any arbitrarily small given accuracy ϵ , ii) efficient in terms of both zeroth-order queries (i.e., evaluations of function values) and inter-agent communication, and iii) distributed terminable when the specified precision requirement is met. The key insight is to use polynomial approximations to substitute for general objective functions, distribute these approximations via average consensus, and turn to solve an easier approximate version of the original problem. Due to the nice analytic properties owned by polynomials, this approximation not only facilitates efficient global optimization, but also allows the design of gradient-free iterations to reduce cumulative costs of queries and achieve geometric convergence when nonconvex problems are solved. We provide comprehensive analysis of the accuracy and complexities of the proposed algorithm.

Key words: Distributed optimization, nonconvex optimization, consensus, Chebyshev polynomial approximation.

1 Introduction

The developments of distributed optimization algorithms are motivated by wide application scenarios, including distributed learning, statistics, estimation and coordination in various large-scale networked systems, e.g., wireless sensor networks, smart grids, and robot swarms. These algorithms enable agents in a network to collaboratively optimize a global objective function, which is generally the sum or the average of local objective functions, by only using local computation and communication. Owing to their features of exploiting network-wide resources and not requiring central coordinators, these algorithms enjoy higher efficiency, scalability, and robustness compared with their centralized counterparts [2].

To solve coupled optimization problems by leveraging local interactions, the investigations into distributed optimization benefits a lot from the extensive research on optimization algorithms and consensus theory. Conversely, they also provides new insights to these fields, including the dependence of convergence rates on network topology [2] and the acceleration technique based on gradient tracking [3–6]. In summary, there is a close relationship between the study of distributed optimization and that of optimization and consensus.

Motivations: A large number of efficient distributed optimization algorithms have been proposed, e.g., [3, 7–9]. Nonetheless, there remain two notable unresolved issues. First, for problems with nonconvex objectives, only the convergence to stationary solutions is guaranteed. The limit point to which the sequence produced by descent methods converges is generally where the gradient of the global objective vanishes. It is hard to determine if this point is globally optimal, locally optimal, or a saddle point. Second, for most existing algorithms, the load of oracle queries (i.e., calls for gradients or values of objective functions) grows with the number of iterations. This increasing load stems from the iterative algorithmic

[★] This paper was presented in part at the 2020 American Control Conference [1].

Email addresses: hzy970920@sjtu.edu.cn (Zhiyu He), jphe@sjtu.edu.cn (Jianping He), cailianchen@sjtu.edu.cn (Cailian Chen), xpguan@sjtu.edu.cn (Xinping Guan).

structure, where local evaluations of gradients or function values are constantly performed at every iteration. When the numbers of iterations are large (e.g., optimization over large-scale networks) and such evaluations are costly (e.g., in hyperparameter optimization [10]), the cumulative cost of queries can be a critical bottleneck. To resolve these issues, we need to find suitable strategies to tackle general nonconvex problems and consider following a new path different from those of existing distributed first-order or zeroth-order algorithms.

We are inspired by the close link between function approximation and optimization. Indeed, there have been a variety of studies that introduce approximation to improve the performance of optimization algorithms, including speeding up convergence (e.g., Newton’s method [11]) and reducing computational costs (e.g., successive convex approximation techniques [4, 12]). These algorithms share a common feature of setting new estimates as minimizers of certain local approximations of the objective function. Such approximations are properly constructed based on local information at current estimates, ranging from function values, gradients, to Hessians. The minimizers of these approximations are readily available in general, and they can often be expressed in closed form. This unique feature contributes to the high efficiency of these algorithms. The closely related distributed implementations of these algorithms can be found in [4, 12–14].

When it comes to exploiting global approximations, there has been recent work in the numerical analysis field that uses Chebyshev polynomial approximations to substitute for univariate objective functions defined on intervals [15–18]. The approximations are polynomial interpolations in Chebyshev points within the intervals. This substitution makes the study of properties of objective functions much easier, including optimization, root-finding, and integration. Even for a general nonconvex objective, as long as it is Lipschitz continuous, we can construct its arbitrarily precise approximation (i.e., proxy) on the entire interval. Therefore, we can turn to solve an easier problem of optimizing the proxy for the global objective instead. Moreover, the vector of coefficients of a local proxy serves as its compact representation. We can then distribute these vectors via average consensus to let agents obtain a proxy for the global objective, thus facilitating locally performed optimization. In the aforementioned procedures, first-order queries (i.e., evaluations of gradients) are not required, whereas zeroth-order queries are performed in advance to construct local approximations, but are not needed within iterations to calculate gradient estimates as in [19, 20].

The above observations motivate the new algorithm presented in this work. We aim to pursue efficient optimization of global nonconvex objective functions, without requiring local first-order or zeroth-order queries at every

iteration. This aim will be achieved by introducing polynomial approximation into distributed optimization.

Contributions: In this paper, we propose a Chebyshev-Proxy-and-Consensus-based Algorithm (CPCA) to solve a class of constrained distributed nonconvex optimization problems. This class of problems involves Lipschitz continuous univariate objective functions and convex local constraint sets. The key idea is to use polynomial approximations with well-studied properties to substitute for general objectives, distribute these approximations through average consensus, and solve instead an approximate version of the original problem. This substitution owns two merits. First, it facilitates the efficient acquisition of the ϵ -globally optimal solution of nonconvex problems, where ϵ is any arbitrarily small given solution accuracy. This aim is achieved via semidefinite programming or the method based on finding stationary points. Second, it allows the design of gradient-free consensus-based iterations, where the vectors of coefficients of local approximations are exchanged and updated. This design helps to reduce cumulative costs of queries and achieve geometric convergence (i.e., lower the cost of communication) when nonconvex problems are solved. The main contributions are summarized as follows.

- We develop a novel algorithm, CPCA, based on Chebyshev polynomial approximation, consensus, and polynomial optimization via semidefinite programming. The Chebyshev-proxy-aided idea differentiates it from existing distributed gradient-based methods and offers a new view to addressing distributed optimization problems.
- We prove that CPCA obtains the ϵ -globally optimal solution of nonconvex problems and show that it achieves distributed termination once the precision requirement is met. We provide explicit expressions for the complexities of zeroth-order queries, floating-point operations (i.e., *flops*¹) and inter-agent communication of the proposed algorithm. Compared with existing algorithms, CPCA is more efficient in terms of both communication and queries (see Table 1).
- Our notion of combining function approximation and consensus to deal with problems related to networked systems is of independent interest. Local approximations serve as good representations of local features. Their vectors of coefficients can be exchanged and updated according to various consensus algorithms. This scheme enables agents to acquire an adequate representation of the once elusive global feature, which can be the average, product, or other functions of local features, thus facilitating subsequent operations.

¹ A flop is defined as one addition, subtraction, multiplication or division of two floating-point numbers. It is common to evaluate the complexity of a numerical algorithm by expressing the order of flops that it requires as a function of various parameters related to problem dimensions [11].

Table 1
Comparisons of Different Distributed Nonconvex Optimization Algorithms

Algorithms	Networks	Queries		Flops	Comm. ¹
		0 th -order	1 st -order		
Alg. 2 in [20]	I ²	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{\text{dim}}{\epsilon})^3$	/	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{\text{dim} \cdot F_0}{\epsilon})^4$	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$
SONATA [12]	II ²	/	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{\max(F_1, F_p)}{\epsilon})^4$	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$
CPCA	I ²	$\mathcal{O}(m)^5$	/	$\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m^{3.5} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, F_0))^6$	$\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$

¹ Comm. stands for inter-agent communication.

² I and II refer to static undirected and time-varying directed graphs, respectively. The extension of CPCA to handle type II networks is discussed in Sec. 5.2. ³ $\text{dim}(\in \mathbb{N})$ is the dimension of the problem and equals 1 when univariate objective functions are considered, and ϵ is the given solution accuracy.

⁴ F_0 , F_1 , and F_p are the costs of evaluating function values, evaluating gradients, and solving local optimization problems in [12], respectively. These costs depend on the forms of objective functions [11] and hence are not explicitly specified.

⁵ m is the maximum degree of local approximations, and its dependence on ϵ is examined in Lemma 2, Sec. 5.1.

⁶ The order of required flops decreases to $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, \log \frac{m}{\epsilon}, F_0))$ if the alternative approach discussed in Sec. 5.3 is used.

While the proposed algorithm relies on some well-established theories, there are major contributions in the algorithmic idea, design, and performance analysis. To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first to adopt a new perspective of introducing approximation into distributed optimization and to quantitatively demonstrate that this idea brings the improved performance, e.g., the acquisition of the ϵ -globally optimal solution of nonconvex problems and the reduced costs of communication and queries. Furthermore, we i) provide a general rule, which tightly connects the error bounds for the three stages of the proposed algorithm, to guarantee the accuracy of the obtained solution, and ii) investigate the issues of properly terminating these stages when the given solution accuracy is reached.

The differences between this paper and its conference version [1] include i) the incorporation of the distributed stopping mechanism for consensus iterations, ii) the new SDP reformulation to optimize the polynomial proxy, iii) rigorous treatments of the accuracy and complexities of the algorithm, and iv) results and discussions on the multivariate extension.

Organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formally describes the problem of interest and provides some preliminaries. Section 3 develops the algorithm CPCA. Section 4 analyzes the accuracy and complexities of the proposed algorithm. Further discussions on application scenarios and issues related to the algorithmic structure are provided in Section 5. Section 6 presents the simulation results. Related work is reviewed in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper and discusses some future directions.

Notations: Throughout the paper, let $\|a\|$ and $\|a\|_\infty$ be the ℓ_2 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm of a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. The superscript t denotes the number of iterations, and the subscripts i, j denote the indexes of agents.

The script in parentheses k denotes the index of elements in a vector. The given solution accuracy is denoted by ϵ .

2 Problem Description and Preliminaries

2.1 Problem Description

Consider a network with N agents, each of which owns a local objective function $f_i(x) : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a local constraint set $X_i \subset \mathbb{R}$. The goal is to solve the following constrained optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_x \quad & f(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in X = \bigcap_{i=1}^N X_i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

in a distributed manner. The network is described by an undirected connected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{V} is the set of agents and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges. Agent j can receive information from agent i if and only if (iff) $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Two basic assumptions are given as follows.

Assumption 1 *The local objective $f_i(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous on X_i .*

Assumption 2 *The local constraint set X_i is a closed, bounded, and convex set.*

Assumptions 1 and 2 are general and commonly seen among the literature and are satisfied by typical problems of practical interests (see [9, 12, 21–23] and the references therein).

Problem (1) has nonconvex objectives and convex constraint sets, and it is therefore a constrained nonconvex optimization problem. Under Assumption 2, for all

$i \in \mathcal{V}$, X_i is a closed interval. Thus, let $X_i = [a_i, b_i]$, where $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $X = [a, b]$, where $a = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} a_i$, $b = \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}} b_i$.

General distributed optimization algorithms with gradient tracking [3–6] can be abstracted by

$$x_i^{t+1} = \mathcal{F}_t \left(\sum_j w_{ij} x_j^t, s_i^t \right), \quad (2a)$$

$$s_i^{t+1} = \sum_j w'_{ij} s_j^t + \nabla f_i(x_i^{t+1}) - \nabla f_i(x_i^t), \quad (2b)$$

where \mathcal{F}_t is the update rule, and w_{ij} and w'_{ij} are the weights [24]. Note that for every agent i , the evaluation of the local gradient ∇f_i is performed at every iteration. As discussed in Sec. 1, even for univariate problems, the cumulative cost of such evaluations can be high when certain problems (e.g., hyperparameter optimization) are solved over large-scale networks. Additionally, for nonconvex univariate problems, general algorithms as (2) can only ensure the convergence to stationary points [12, 20]. In contrast, in this paper we aim to overcome the aforementioned restrictions by taking a new path of introducing polynomial approximation rather than following the existing framework (2).

2.2 Preliminaries

• Consensus Algorithms

Consensus algorithms enable agents in networked systems to reach global agreement via local information exchange only. Let $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j | (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ be the set of neighbors of agent i and $\deg(i) = |\mathcal{N}_i|$ be its degree, where $|\mathcal{N}_i|$ denotes the cardinality of \mathcal{N}_i . Suppose that every agent i maintains a local variable $x_i^t \in \mathbb{R}$. The maximum consensus algorithm [25] is

$$x_i^{t+1} = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} x_j^t. \quad (3)$$

It has been proven that with (3), all x_i^t converge exactly to $\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} x_i^0$ in T ($T \leq D$) iterations, where D is the diameter (i.e., the greatest distance between any pair of agents) of \mathcal{G} . The average consensus algorithm based on lazy Metropolis weights [2] is

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{x_j^t - x_i^t}{\max(\deg(i), \deg(j))}. \quad (4)$$

This algorithm requires agents to exchange their local variables x_i^t and degrees $\deg(i)$ with their neighbors. With (4), all x_i^t converge geometrically to the average $\bar{x} = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^0$ of the initial values [2]. Let $x^t = [x_1^t, \dots, x_N^t]^\top$, and let $t(\epsilon)$ denote the first t when $\frac{\|x^t - \bar{x} \mathbf{1}\|}{\|x^0 - \bar{x} \mathbf{1}\|} \leq \epsilon$. Then, by referring to [2, Proposition 5], we have

$$t(\epsilon) \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right). \quad (5)$$

• Chebyshev Polynomial Approximation

Chebyshev polynomial approximation aims at using truncated Chebyshev series to approximate general functions, thus facilitating numerical analysis. For a Lipschitz continuous function $g(x)$ on $[a, b]$, its degree m Chebyshev approximation $p^{(m)}(x)$ is

$$p^{(m)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m c_j T_j \left(\frac{2x - (a+b)}{b-a} \right), \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (6)$$

where c_j is the Chebyshev coefficient, and $T_j(\cdot)$ is the j -th Chebyshev polynomial defined on $[-1, 1]$ satisfying $|T_j(u)| \leq 1$, $\forall u \in [-1, 1]$, $\forall j$. As m increases, $p^{(m)}(x)$ converges to $g(x)$ uniformly on the given interval [15]. The convergence rates depend on the smoothness of $g(x)$ and are characterized in Sec. 5.1. The above observation makes computing $p^{(m)}(x)$ a practical way to construct an arbitrarily close polynomial approximation of $g(x)$, as theoretically guaranteed by the *Weierstrass Approximation Theorem* [15, Theorem 6.1].

• Sum of Squares Polynomials

Let $v(x)$, $[T_0(x), \dots, T_d(x)]^\top$ be the vector of Chebyshev polynomials of degrees $0, \dots, d$. The elements of $v(x)$ constitute an orthogonal basis for all polynomials of degree d or less. For any univariate polynomial $p(x)$ of degree $2d$, it is non-negative (or equivalently, a sum of squares (SOS)) on \mathbb{R} iff there exists a positive semidefinite matrix Q of order $d+1$ (i.e., $Q \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d+1}$) s.t.

$$p(x) = v(x)^\top Q v(x) = \sum_{i,j=0}^d Q_{ij} T_i(x) T_j(x), \quad (7)$$

where the rows and columns of Q are indexed by $0, 1, \dots, d$. The proof relies on the following relationship

$$p(x) = v(x)^\top Q v(x) = [Mv(x)]^\top [Mv(x)] = \sum_k q_k^2(x),$$

where $Q = M^\top M$ is a square root factorization of Q , and $Mv(x) = [\dots, q_k(x), \dots]^\top$ is the vector of polynomials whose squares add up to $p(x)$. We refer readers to [26, Lemma 3.33] for details.

3 CPCA: Design and Analysis

We present CPCA to solve problem (1) in a distributed manner. Figure 1 illustrates the main architecture and information flow of the proposed algorithm.




Fig. 1. An overview of CPCA and its algorithmic flow.

3.1 Construction of Local Chebyshev Proxies

In this stage, every agent i constructs a polynomial approximation $p_i(x)$ of $f_i(x)$ on $X = [a, b]$ to achieve

$$\mathbf{G}_1: |f_i(x) - p_i(x)| \leq \epsilon_1, \quad \forall x \in [a, b], \quad (8)$$

where ϵ_1 is a specified error bound. Specifically, Chebyshev polynomial approximation is chosen because i) it is in the global sense, which contrasts with the Taylor expansion that characterizes the local landscape, ii) it allows compact representations of complex functions via vectors of coefficients, and iii) the ranges of basis polynomials are identical and bounded, which contributes to establishing the accuracy guarantee of the proposed algorithm. The key insight is to systematically increase the degree of the Chebyshev approximation until a certain stopping criterion is satisfied [17]. To illustrate, agent i initializes $m_i = 2$ and starts to calculate a Chebyshev interpolant of degree m_i . It first evaluates $f_i(x)$ at the set S_{m_i} , $\{x_0, \dots, x_{m_i}\}$ of $(m_i + 1)$ points by

$$x_k = \frac{b-a}{2} \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{m_i}\right) + \frac{a+b}{2}, \quad f_k = f_i(x_k), \quad (9)$$

where $k = 0, 1, \dots, m_i$. Then, it computes the Chebyshev coefficients of the interpolant of degree m_i by

$$c_j = \frac{1}{m_i} (f_0 + f_{m_i} \cos(j\pi)) + \frac{2}{m_i} \sum_{k=1}^{m_i-1} f_k \cos\left(\frac{jk\pi}{m_i}\right), \quad (10)$$

where $j = 0, 1, \dots, m_i$. The degree m_i is doubled at every iteration until the stopping criterion

$$\max_{x_k \in (S_{2m_i} - S_{m_i})} |f_i(x_k) - p_i(x_k)| \leq \epsilon_1 \quad (11)$$

is met, where $p_i(x)$ is in the form of (6) with $\{c_j\}$ being the coefficients. Since $S_{m_i} \subset S_{2m_i}$, the evaluations of $f_i(x)$ are continuously reused. Note that agents know the intersection set $X = [a, b]$ by running a finite number of max/min consensus iterations as (3) in advance. According to [17], except for very few well-designed counterexamples, the aforementioned procedures return $p_i(x)$ satisfying (8) for almost all Lipschitz continuous $f_i(x)$ encountered in practice.

3.2 Consensus-based Information Dissemination

In this stage, agents go through consensus-based iterations to update their local variables p_i^t , whose initial value $p_i^0 = [c_0, \dots, c_{m_i}]^T$ stores the coefficients of the local approximation $p_i(x)$. The goal is to enable p_i^t to converge to the average of all the initial values $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^0$. Specifically, let K be the total number of iterations and p_i^K be the local variable of agent i at time K . We aim to ensure that

$$\mathbf{G}_2: \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|p_i^K - \bar{p}\|_\infty \leq \delta, \quad \frac{\epsilon_2}{m+1}, \quad m, \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} m_i$$

holds, where ϵ_2 is an error bound and m is the highest of the degrees of local approximations. Then, a sufficiently precise proxy (recovered from p_i^K) for the global objective function is acquired. The challenge is fulfilling in-time termination when the accuracy requirement is met. The details are as follows.

Every agent updates its local variable p_i^t according to

$$p_i^{t+1} = p_i^t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{p_j^t - p_i^t}{\max(\deg(i), \deg(j))}. \quad (12)$$

To achieve distributed stopping once the consensus has reached the specified precision, we incorporate the max/min-consensus-based stopping mechanism in [27]. The main idea is to exploit i) the monotonicity of the sequences of maximum and minimum of local variables across the network, and ii) the finite-time convergence of max/min consensus algorithms. This mechanism requires some knowledge of the diameter D of \mathcal{G} .

Assumption 3 Every agent knows an upper bound U on D .

The distributed estimation of D can be realized via the Extrema Propagation technique [28]. If Assumption 3 holds, agents will know how long to wait to ensure that max/min consensus algorithms converge.

To realize distributed stopping, there are two auxiliary variables r_i^t and s_i^t , which are vectors initialized as p_i^0 . These variables are updated in parallel with p_i^t by

$$r_i^{t+1}(k) = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} r_j^t(k), \quad s_i^{t+1}(k) = \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} s_j^t(k), \quad (13)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, m+1$, and they are reinitialized as p_i^t every U iterations to facilitate the constant dissemination of recent information on p_i^t . At time $t_l = lU$ ($l \in \mathbb{N}$), every agent i periodically check the following criterion

$$\|r_i^{t_l} - s_i^{t_l}\|_\infty \leq \delta. \quad (14)$$

If (14) is met at time K , agents terminate the iterations. As a result, p_i^K is sufficiently close to \bar{p} . This observation is supported by the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *When (14) is satisfied, we have*

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|p_i^K - \bar{p}\|_\infty \leq \delta, \quad (15)$$

where $\delta = \epsilon_2/(m+1)$.

Proof. Please see Appendix A.1. \square

Remark 1 *After the initialization, different agents own p_i^0 of different lengths $m_i + 1$. While going on the consensus updates by (4) and (13), agents ensure agreements in dimension by aligning and padding zeros to those local variables of shorter lengths. After a finite number of iterations (less than D , hence less than U), all these local variables will be of the same length $\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} m_i (= m) + 1$.*

Remark 2 *Through the above distributed stopping mechanism, agents can simultaneously detect the meets of (14) and then terminate the iterations. The reason is that at time t_l , agents share equal auxiliary variables and actually check the same inequality. It follows from the design of re-initialization and the finite-time convergence of maximum and minimum consensus algorithms that*

$$r_i^{t_l}(k) = \max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^{t_l-1}(k), \quad s_i^{t_l}(k) = \min_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^{t_l-1}(k),$$

where $k = 1, \dots, m$ and $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Hence, at time $t_l = lU$ ($l \in \mathbb{N}$), every agent i locally check the same inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_i^{t_l} - s_i^{t_l}\|_\infty &= \max_{k=1, \dots, m} (r_i^{t_l}(k) - s_i^{t_l}(k)) \\ &= \max_{k=1, \dots, m} (\max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^{t_l-1}(k) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^{t_l-1}(k)) \leq \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

3.3 Polynomial Optimization by Solving SDPs

In this stage, agents optimize the polynomial proxy $p_i^K(x)$ recovered from p_i^K independently, thus obtaining ϵ -optimal solutions of problem (1). The optimization of $p_i^K(x)$ on $X = [a, b]$ is reformulated as a semidefinite program (SDP). It can then be readily solved via the interior-point method [11]. Based on the theory of SOS polynomials, we offer such a reformulation, considering the coefficients of $p_i^K(x)$ with respect to the Chebyshev polynomial basis, rather than the monomial basis [26].

Note that $p_i^K(x)$ is a polynomial of degree m in the form of (6), with the elements of $p_i^K = [c'_0, \dots, c'_m]^\top$ being its Chebyshev coefficients. To simplify the notation, we utilize the translation and scaling of $p_i^K(x)$ defined on

$[a, b]$ to obtain

$$g_i^K(u), p_i^K\left(\frac{b-a}{2}u + \frac{a+b}{2}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^m c'_j T_j(u), \quad u \in [-1, 1].$$

Then, the optimal value of $p_i^K(x)$ on $[a, b]$ and that of $g_i^K(u)$ on $[-1, 1]$ are equal, and the optimal points x_p^* and u_g^* satisfy

$$x_p^* = \frac{b-a}{2}u_g^* + \frac{a+b}{2}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, once we have solved the following problem

$$\min_u g_i^K(u) \quad \text{s.t. } u \in [-1, 1], \quad (18)$$

we can use (17) to obtain the optimal value and optimal points of $p_i^K(x)$ on $[a, b]$. We now discuss how to transform problem (18) to a convex optimization problem.

We first transform problem (18) to its equivalent form

$$\max_t t \quad \text{s.t. } g_i^K(x) - t \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [-1, 1]. \quad (19)$$

The equivalence follows from the fact that (x^*, t^*) is optimal for problem (19) iff x^* is optimal for problem (18) and $t^* = g_i^K(x^*)$. To further transform the inequality constraint, we utilize the non-negativity of $g_i^K(x) - t$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$, where t is viewed as a specified parameter. It follows from the *Markov-Lukács theorem* [26, Theorem 3.72] that $g_i^K(x) - t$ is non-negative for $x \in [-1, 1]$ iff it can be expressed as

$$g_i^K(x) - t = \begin{cases} (x+1)h_1^2(x) + (1-x)h_2^2(x), & \text{if } m \text{ is odd,} \\ h_1^2(x) + (x+1)(1-x)h_2^2(x), & \text{if } m \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where $h_1(x), h_2(x)$ are polynomials of degree $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \rfloor$, respectively. It should be pointed out that some coefficients of $h_1(x)$ and $h_2(x)$ depend on t . Based on (7), there exist $Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}_+$ such that

$$h_1^2(x) = v_1(x)^\top Q v_1(x), \quad h_2^2(x) = v_2(x)^\top Q' v_2(x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x) &= [T_0(x), \dots, T_{d_1}(x)]^\top, \quad d_1 = \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor, \\ v_2(x) &= [T_0(x), \dots, T_{d_2}(x)]^\top, \quad d_2 = \lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above transformations, by making sure that the Chebyshev coefficients of $g_i^K(x) - t$ are consistent whatever its forms are, we transform the inequality constraint in problem (19) to a set of equality constraints

related to the elements of Q and Q' . When m is odd, we reformulate problem (19) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{t, Q, Q'} t \\
& \text{s.t. } c'_0 = t + Q_{00} + Q'_{00} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u=1}^{d_1+1} Q_{uu} + \sum_{u=1}^{d_2+1} Q'_{uu} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{|u-v|=1} (Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv}), \\
& \quad c'_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} (Q_{uv} + Q'_{uv}) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{B}} (Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv}), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \\
& \quad Q \in S_+^{d_1+1}, \quad Q' \in S_+^{d_2+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the rows and columns of Q and Q' are indexed by $0, 1, \dots$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A} &= \{(u, v) | u + v = i \vee |u - v| = i\}, \\
\mathcal{B} &= \{(u, v) | u + v = i - 1 \vee |u - v| = i - 1 \vee \\
& \quad |u + v - 1| = i \vee ||u - v| - 1| = i\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

When m is even, we reformulate problem (19) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{t, Q, Q'} t \\
& \text{s.t. } c'_0 = t + Q_{00} + \frac{1}{2} Q'_{00} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u=1}^{d_1+1} Q_{uu} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{u=1}^{d_2+1} Q'_{uu} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{|u-v|=2} Q'_{uv}, \\
& \quad c'_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} \left(Q_{uv} + \frac{1}{2} Q'_{uv} \right) + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{C}} Q'_{uv}, \\
& \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \\
& \quad Q \in S_+^{d_1+1}, \quad Q' \in S_+^{d_2+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are given by (21) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} &= \{(u, v) | u + v = i - 2 \vee |u - v| = i - 2 \\
& \quad \vee |u + v - 2| = i \vee ||u - v| - 2| = i\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following theorem guarantees the equivalence of these reformulations and problem (18).

Theorem 2 *When m is odd (resp., even), problem (20) (resp., problem (22)) is the equivalent transformation of problem (18).*

Proof. Please see Appendix A.2. \square

Note that both of these reformulated problems are SDPs, and can therefore be efficiently solved via primal-dual

interior-point methods [11]. The solving process is terminated when

$$\mathbf{G}_3: \quad 0 \leq f_e^* - p^* \leq \epsilon_3$$

is achieved, where f_e^* is the returned estimate of the optimal value p^* of $p_i^K(x)$ on $X = [a, b]$, and $\epsilon_3 > 0$ is some specified tolerance. The optimal points of $g_i^K(x)$ can be obtained from the complementary slackness condition [26]. We can then calculate the optimal points of $p_i^K(x)$ on X by (17).

3.4 Description of CPCA

CPCA consists of the three aforementioned stages and is formulated as Algorithm 1, where lines 1-6 perform the initialization; lines 7-9 construct the local proxy; lines 10-23 are consensus iterations with distributed stopping; and line 24 is the step of polynomial optimization. With CPCA, we sequentially achieve goals \mathbf{G}_1 , \mathbf{G}_2 , and \mathbf{G}_3 , thus solving problem (1). Furthermore, the algorithm takes the given error tolerance ϵ as one of the inputs. The tolerance ϵ is used to set the error bounds (i.e., ϵ_1, ϵ_2 , and ϵ_3) utilized in the corresponding stages. To guarantee the reach of ϵ -optimality of CPCA, these bounds must satisfy

$$\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 = \epsilon, \quad \epsilon_i > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{23}$$

We set these three error bounds to be $\epsilon/3$ in Algorithm 1.

The rule (23) allows the balance between computations and communication by adjusting the error bounds for the three stages. For example, if the costs of inter-agent communication and intra-agent computations are high and low, respectively, we can decrease the accuracy of iterations (i.e., increase ϵ_2) and increase the precision of calculating approximations and approximate solutions (i.e., decrease ϵ_1 and ϵ_3). Consequently, less burden will be placed upon communication and more computational resources will be utilized, thus improving the overall efficiency and adaptability.

The proposed algorithm differs from most distributed optimization algorithms (e.g., [12, 20]) in both the shared information and the structure of iterations. First, existing algorithms generally require the exchange of local estimates of optimal solutions, while CPCA involves the exchange of vectors of coefficients of local approximations (i.e., local proxies). Second, most existing algorithms call for local evaluations of gradients or function values at every iteration to update local estimates, whereas CPCA is free from such evaluations and only performs consensus-based updates concerning those vectors of coefficients. These updates naturally lead to the acquisition of the global proxy and hence help to efficiently obtain approximate globally optimal solutions.

Algorithm 1 CPCA

Input: $f_i(x), X_i = [a_i, b_i], U$, and ϵ .
Output: f_e^* for every agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$.
1: **Initialize:** $a_i^0 = a_i, b_i^0 = b_i, m_i = 2$.
2: **for each** agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ **do**
3: **for** $t = 0, \dots, U - 1$ **do**
4: $a_i^{t+1} = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_j^t, b_i^{t+1} = \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} b_j^t$.
5: **end for**
6: Set $a = a_i^t, b = b_i^t$.
.....
7: Calculate $\{x_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ by (9).
8: Calculate $\{c_k\}$ by (10).
9: If (11) is satisfied (where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon/3$), go to step 10. Or
 set $m_i \leftarrow 2m_i$ and go to step 7.
.....
10: Set $p_i^0 = r_i^0 = s_i^0 = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{m_i}]^\top, l = 1$.
11: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
12: **if** $t = lU$ **then**
13: **if** $l = 1$ **then**
14: $\delta = \epsilon_2/(m + 1) = \epsilon/3(m + 1)$.
15: **end if**
16: **if** $\|r_i^t - s_i^t\|_\infty \leq \delta$ **then**
17: $p_i^K = p_i^t$. **break**
18: **end if**
19: $r_i^t = s_i^t = p_i^t, l \leftarrow l + 1$.
20: **end if**
21: Update $p_i^{t+1}, r_i^{t+1}, s_i^{t+1}$ by (12) and (13).
22: Set $t \leftarrow t + 1$.
23: **end for**
.....
24: Solve problem (20) or (22) with $\epsilon_3 = \epsilon/3$ and return
 f_e^* .
25: **end for**

Remark 3 The authors of [18] proposed a related centralized algorithm by using the SDP approach to optimize Lagrange or Hermite interpolations of objective functions. Due to the following notable differences, the proposed algorithm is not a trivial distributed extension of [18]. First, the SDP reformulations depend on different information on functions. The reformulations in [18] are built upon the values of objective functions at interpolation points (i.e., the values of approximations), whereas those obtained in this paper rely on the coefficients of approximations. Second, the guarantees on solution accuracy are different. In [18], the errors with respect to the degrees of interpolations are studied mainly through numerical experiments. In contrast, we provide careful designs and rigorous analysis, where the specified solution accuracy ϵ is used to regulate the three separate stages for obtaining ϵ -optimal solutions. Moreover, we discuss an alternative stationary-point-based method to locally optimize the polynomial proxy (see Sec. 5.3).

4 Performance Analysis

4.1 Accuracy

We first provide a lemma stating that if two functions $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are sufficiently close on the entire in-

terval, their minimum values $f(x_f^*)$ and $g(x_g^*)$ are also sufficiently close.

Lemma 1 Suppose that f, g satisfy $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \epsilon, \forall x \in [a, b]$. Then,

$$|f(x_f^*) - g(x_g^*)| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let $x = x_f^*$. Then, $|f(x_f^*) - g(x_f^*)| \leq \epsilon$. Since g is minimized at x_g^* , we have $g(x_g^*) \leq g(x_f^*)$. Hence,

$$g(x_g^*) \leq g(x_f^*) \leq f(x_f^*) + \epsilon,$$

which implies that $f(x_f^*) - g(x_g^*) \geq -\epsilon$. Similarly, we have

$$f(x_f^*) \leq f(x_g^*) \leq g(x_g^*) + \epsilon,$$

which leads to $f(x_f^*) - g(x_g^*) \leq \epsilon$. It follows that

$$|f(x_f^*) - g(x_g^*)| \leq \epsilon. \quad \square$$

The accuracy of CPCA is established as follows. We use ϵ and f^* to denote the given solution accuracy and the optimal value of problem (1), respectively.

Theorem 3 Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold. If ϵ is specified, CPCA ensures that every agent obtains ϵ -optimal solutions f_e^* for problem (1), i.e.,

$$|f_e^* - f^*| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix A.3. \square

We provide an explicit bound for the distance between the optimal point x_p^* of $p_i^K(x)$ and that x_f^* of $f(x)$ when $f(x)$ defined on $[a, b]$ is bi-Lipschitz.

Definition 1 A function $f(x)$ defined on X is bi-Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $L (L \geq 1)$ iff

$$\frac{1}{L}|x_1 - x_2| \leq |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq L|x_1 - x_2|, \forall x_1, x_2 \in X.$$

Theorem 4 Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold and $f(x)$ is bi-Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant L . Then,

$$|x_p^* - x_f^*| \leq \frac{4}{3}L\epsilon.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix A.4. \square

4.2 Complexity

We analyze the computational and communication complexities of the proposed algorithm. The following theorem establishes the orders of the numbers of

Table 2
Complexities of CPCA

Stages	Queries	Flops	Comm. ¹
init	$\mathcal{O}(m)^2$	$\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, F_0))$	/
iteration	/	$\mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$	$\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$
solve	/	$\mathcal{O}(m^{4.5} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$	/
whole	$\mathcal{O}(m)$	$\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m^{3.5} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, F_0))$	$\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$

¹ Comm. stands for inter-agent communication.

² The dependence of m on ϵ is discussed in Lemma 2, Sec. 5.1.

zeroth-order queries (i.e., evaluations of values of local objective functions), inter-agent communication, and floating-point operations (i.e., flops) required for one agent. We suppose that one evaluation of the function value costs F_0 flops. In practice, this cost depends on the specific forms of objective functions [11].

Theorem 5 *With CPCA, every agent obtains ϵ -optimal solutions for problem (1), with $\mathcal{O}(m)$ zeroth-order queries, $\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$ rounds of inter-agent communication, and $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m^{3.5} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, F_0))$ flops.*

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A.5. We summarize the costs of zeroth-order queries, flops, and communication of the proposed algorithm in Table 2. \square

In CPCA, the evaluations of function values are not required in the stage of iterations and are only performed in the stage of constructing approximations. This design implies that the number of needed evaluations will not increase with the number of iterations. Hence, the cumulative costs of queries can be significantly reduced especially when large-scale networks are considered.

5 Further Discussions and Applications

We present further discussions on relevant issues concerning the performance and design of the proposed algorithm. We also point out some closely related application scenarios.

5.1 Degrees of Polynomial Approximations

In the initialization stage, every agent i constructs polynomial approximation $p_i(x)$ for $f_i(x)$, such that (8) holds. The degree m_i of $p_i(x)$ depends on the specified precision ϵ_1 and also the smoothness of $f_i(x)$. This dependence is characterized by the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *If $f_i(x)$ and its derivatives through $f_i^{(v-1)}(x)$ are absolutely continuous and $f_i^{(v)}(x)$ is of bounded variation on X_i , then $m_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_1^{-1/v})$. If $f_i(x)$ is analytic on X_i , then $m_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon_1})$.*

Proof. This lemma can be derived from Theorem 7.2 and 8.2 in [15]. It has been proven that if $f_i(x)$ satisfies the differentiability condition stated in the former part of the lemma, then its degree m Chebyshev interpolant $p_i(x)$ satisfies

$$\max_{x \in X_i} |f_i(x) - p_i(x)| \leq \frac{4V}{\pi v(m-v)^v}.$$

If $f_i(x)$ analytic on X_i is analytically continuable to the open Bernstein ellipse E_ρ , where it satisfies $|f_i(x)| \leq M$, then,

$$\max_{x \in X_i} |f_i(x) - p_i(x)| \leq \frac{4M\rho^{-m}}{\rho - 1}.$$

By setting these bounds of errors to be less than ϵ_1 , we obtain the orders of m_i . \square

Lemma 2 implies that extremely high precision (e.g., machine epsilon) can be attained with moderate m (of the order of $10^1 \sim 10^2$) as long as the objective functions have certain degrees of smoothness.

Remark 4 *For those Lipschitz continuous objectives that are not “smooth” enough (e.g., $|x|$ on $[-1, 1]$, which is not differentiable at $x = 0$), the degrees of satisfactory approximations may be somewhat large. Hence, the literature suggests dividing the interval and calculating piecewise Chebyshev approximations for these objectives [15, 17]. The degrees of approximations can then be efficiently brought down.*

5.2 Choices of Average Consensus

In the previous section, we describe the use of average consensus based on lazy Metropolis weights to enable agents’ local variables to converge to the average of all the initial values. We employ this kind of protocol for its simplicity, fast convergence, and certain property that facilitates the design of effective distributed stopping rules. Since there are various efficient average consensus algorithms tailored to different application ranges, our algorithm can be readily adjusted and enhanced by substituting them for the one that is already used.

For example, under the condition that individual agents own strong storing and computing capabilities, finite-time consensus [29] can be used in the stage of iterations. This kind of protocol enables agents to calculate the exact consensus value in a finite number of iterations. This benefit is accompanied by a cost of locally storing a square Hankel matrix possibly of order $\mathcal{O}(N)$ constructed from history information, and constantly analyzing its ranks and kernels at every iteration. When it comes to time-varying directed graphs, push-sum average consensus [2] can be utilized, and similar corresponding distributed stopping mechanisms can be introduced.

5.3 An Alternative Method of Polynomial Optimization

In Sec. 3.3, we transform the optimization of $p_i^K(x)$ to semidefinite programs, thus enabling agents to obtain ϵ -globally optimal solutions for problem (1). This scheme ensures that all the errors are theoretically controllable, but its implementation is relatively involved. For practical numerical computations, an alternative approach implemented in the Chebfun toolbox [16] is more preferable. In this approach, all the stationary points of $p_i^K(x)$ are first obtained by calculating the eigenvalues of a colleague matrix constructed from its Chebyshev coefficients [15]. Then, by comparing the values of $p_i^K(x)$ at all these critical points, we decide the optimal value and set of optimal points of $p_i^K(x)$. The details are as follows.

Suppose that $p_i^K(x)$ is in the form of (6), with $\{c_j | j = 0, \dots, m\}$ being the coefficients. Then,

$$\frac{dp_i^K(x)}{dx} = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \tilde{c}_j T_j \left(\frac{2x - (a+b)}{b-a} \right), \quad x \in (a, b),$$

where the coefficients $\{\tilde{c}_j | j = 0, \dots, m-1\}$ are obtained from the following recurrence formula

$$\tilde{c}_j = \begin{cases} \tilde{c}_{j+2} + 2(j+1)S\tilde{c}'_{j+1}, & j = m-1, \dots, 1, \\ \frac{1}{2}\tilde{c}_2 + S\tilde{c}'_1, & j = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $S = 2/(b-a)$, $\tilde{c}_m = \tilde{c}_{m+1} = 0$. The above formula requires $\mathcal{O}(m)$ flops. By [15], the roots of $dp_i^K(x)/dx$ (i.e., the stationary points of $p_i^K(x)$) are the eigenvalues of the following square colleague matrix M_C

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2\tilde{c}_{m-1}} & -\frac{\tilde{c}_1}{2\tilde{c}_{m-1}} & \dots & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\tilde{c}_{m-3}}{2\tilde{c}_{m-1}} & -\frac{\tilde{c}_{m-2}}{2\tilde{c}_{m-1}} \end{bmatrix},$$

which is of order $m-1$. These eigenvalues are computed via QR algorithm with a cost of $\mathcal{O}(m^3)$ flops. The order of cost is brought down to $\mathcal{O}(m^2)$ in Chebfun by recursion and exploitation of the special structure of M_C [15]. Let E be the set of all the real eigenvalues of M_C that lie in $X = [a, b]$. Then, the optimal value f_e^* and set of optimal points X_e^* of $p_i^K(x)$ are

$$f_e^* = \min_{x \in X_K} p_i^K(x), \quad X_e^* = \arg \min_{x \in X_K} p_i^K(x), \quad (24)$$

where $X_K = E \cup \{a, b\}$ is the set of all the critical points. The evaluation of $p_i^K(x)$ at one point requires $\mathcal{O}(m)$ flops by using the Clenshaw algorithm [17], and thus the cost

of (24) is $\mathcal{O}(m^2)$ flops. Hence, the aforementioned approach needs $\mathcal{O}(m^2)$ flops in total. By referring to Table 2, we obtain that if this approach is incorporated into the proposed algorithm, the overall order of the required flops decreases to $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, \log \frac{m}{\epsilon}, F_0))$.

It should be pointed out that the calculations of eigenvalues of M_C in practice may be accompanied by certain numerical errors. Therefore, the easy-to-implement stationary-point-based method for optimizing $p_i^K(x)$ is more suitable for numerical computations than for theoretical analysis.

5.4 Application Scenarios

• Distributed Optimization with Decoupling

In some cases, the distributed optimization problems with high-dimensional variables are naturally decoupled, or can be converted to be decoupled via change of coordinates or variables. Then, we can separately optimize over the single variable to solve the whole problem. For example, consider one version of the linear facility location problems [11]. Every agent i keeps its own location $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and wants to agree on a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that minimizes the weighted sum of the taxicab distances to all the locations u_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, i.e.,

$$\min_x \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \|x - u_i\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^n w_i |x(k) - u_i(k)|, \quad (25)$$

where w_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) are nonnegative weights. Problem (25) are decoupled and can be solved by considering a set of subproblems with univariate objectives

$$\min_{x(k)} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i |x(k) - u_i(k)|, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

The same holds for decomposable problems with separable nonconvex regularization penalties, e.g., smooth approximated ℓ_q penalty [30]

$$\|x\|_{q,\epsilon}^q = \sum_{k=1}^n (x^2(k) + \epsilon^2)^{\frac{q}{2}},$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a smoothing parameter. We can then focus on each subproblem with a univariate regularization term $(x^2(k) + \epsilon^2)^{q/2}$, where $k = 1, \dots, n$.

• Hyperparameter optimization in distributed learning

In distributed learning, sometimes we want to find a continuous hyperparameter (e.g., learning rate or regularization parameter) that leads to an optimal model with

the minimum generalization error [10,31]. This problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\lambda} F(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N R_i(w(\lambda), \lambda) \\ \text{s.t. } w(\lambda) &= \arg \min_w \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i(w, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where λ is the hyperparameter, $w(\lambda)$ are the model parameters, $L_i(w, \lambda)$ is the loss function of agent i in the learning problem (e.g., regularized empirical risk on the local training dataset), and $R_i(w(\lambda), \lambda)$ is the generalization error of the learned model given λ (e.g., empirical risk on the local validation dataset). In practice, we usually obtain approximate model parameters $\tilde{w}(\lambda)$ via some descent-based algorithms \mathcal{A} , i.e.,

$$w(\lambda) \approx \tilde{w}(\lambda) = \mathcal{A}(\lambda).$$

According to [31, Theorem 1], if λ is a continuous variable and $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ and $R(w(\lambda), \lambda)$ are continuous functions, then $F(\lambda)$ is a univariate continuous function of λ . In this case, the coupling in $w(\lambda)$ may pose additional challenges. The proposed algorithm needs further adjustment to fit this interesting problem, which is of independent interest in the learning community.

The main focus of the above application scenarios lies in solving distributed optimization problems with univariate objective functions. Hence, the proposed algorithm can be applied. The main differences in performance between it and existing algorithms when employed to these scenarios include the acquisition of ϵ -globally optimal solutions of nonconvex problems and reduced costs of queries and communication.

• Distributed Data Statistics

In networked system, agents hold a portion of the whole data. The goal is to estimate certain global data statistics in a distributed manner. Typical examples include i) estimating a global probability density function (PDF) [32], which is a univariate function while considering a specific random variable, and ii) estimating a separable functional $T(P)$ (e.g., entropy) of an unknown discrete distribution $P = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ [33], where $T(P) = \sum_j f(p_j)$ for some univariate function f . Instead of transmitting plenty of local data directly, agents can solve problems with a low communication cost by exploiting approximations of local PDFs or functions f and utilizing consensus-based fusion of local information, as explored in [32, 33].

5.5 The Multivariate Extension

We discuss the design and open issues of the multivariate extension of the proposed algorithm. The differences

mainly consist in the stages of initialization and local optimization of approximations. Specifically, any smooth local objective function $f_i(x)$ in the n -dimensional hypercube $[-1, 1]^n$ can be approximated by the following multivariate Chebyshev polynomial approximation

$$\hat{f}_i(x) = \sum_{k_1=0}^{m_1} \cdots \sum_{k_n=0}^{m_n} a_{k_1, \dots, k_n} T_{k_1}(x(1)) \cdots T_{k_n}(x(n)),$$

where $x(n)$ denotes the n -th element in a vector x , and $T_{k_n}(\cdot)$ denotes the k_n -th Chebyshev polynomial defined on $[-1, 1]$ [34]. After local approximations $\hat{f}_i(x)$ are constructed, agents exchange and update their local variables storing those coefficients (as discussed in Sec. III-B) and obtain an approximation of the global objective function. Finally, they locally optimize this approximation by solving a hierarchy of SDPs (of increasing size, which is related to degrees of polynomials used in the SOS representation) to obtain a monotone non-decreasing sequence of lower bounds that asymptotically approach the globally optimal value.

There are two technical issues in the multivariate algorithmic design. First, to find a systematic way of constructing $\hat{f}_i(x)$ of an appropriate degree that strictly meets the specified precision requirement (8). For either the constructive proof involving Bernstein polynomials or the method that uses the upper bound of approximation errors, the calculated degrees can be unnecessarily large, thus leading to challenges in implementations. Second, to reduce the costs of flops in local optimization due to the hierarchy of SDPs. Because of the fundamental restrictions in transforming the non-negativity constraint related to a multivariate polynomial (which is known as Hilbert's seventeenth problem [26]), we cannot equivalently rewrite the constraint in problem (19) as in the univariate case. Alternatively, we solve a hierarchy of SDPs to reach the globally optimal solution of the approximate problem (18), with a relatively large burden in terms of flops. Nonetheless, we will benefit from the advances in extensive research on polynomial approximation and polynomial optimization and design a promising extension of the proposed algorithm.

For multivariate problems, the central idea of introducing polynomial approximation still i) offers a new perspective of representing possibly complicated objective functions by simple vectors of coefficients of approximations, which allows the distribution of the global optimization objective in networked systems, and ii) fulfills the acquisition of approximate globally optimal solutions in a distributed and asymptotic manner.

6 Numerical Evaluations

We present simulation results to illustrate the performance of CPCA and compare it with other algorithms.

We generate a network with $N = 30$ agents using Erdős-Rényi model with connectivity probability 0.4. In other words, the probability that every pair of agents can communicate with each other is 0.4. Suppose that all the local constraint sets are the same interval $X = [-1, 1]$. We consider two instances of problem (1) with different types of local objective functions. In the first instance, the local objective of agent i is

$$f_i(x) = a_i e^{b_i x} + c_i e^{-d_i x}, \quad (26)$$

where $a_i, b_i \sim U(1, 2), c_i, d_i \sim U(2, 4)$ are uniformly distributed. Note that $f_i(x)$ is convex and Lipschitz continuous on X . In the second instance, the local objective of agent i is

$$f_i(x) = \frac{a_i}{1 + e^{-x}} + b_i \log(1 + x^2), \quad (27)$$

where $a_i \sim \mathcal{N}(10, 2), b_i \sim \mathcal{N}(5, 1)$ are Gaussian random variables. Note that $f_i(x)$ is nonconvex and Lipschitz continuous on X . We use the Chebfun toolbox [16] to help construct Chebyshev polynomial approximations.

For comparison, we implement SONATA-L [12], Alg. 2 in [20], projected distributed sub-gradient descent method (Proj-DGD, for convex objectives) [21], and projected stochastic gradient descent method (Proj-SGD, for non-convex objectives) [35]. The step-size rules of SONATA-L, Alg. 2 in [20], Proj-DGD and Proj-SGD are set as $\alpha^t = \alpha^{t-1}(1 - 0.01\alpha^{t-1})$ with $\alpha^0 = 0.5$, $\alpha^t = 0.05$, $\alpha^t = 1/t^{0.5}$, and $\alpha^t = 0.1/t^{0.9}$, respectively, based on the guidelines therein. For Alg. 2 in [20], the number involved in calculations of gradient estimators is given by $u^t = 1/t^{3/4}$. For Proj-SGD, we consider 50 Monte-Carlo runs and plot the curves of average objective errors.

Fig. 2a and 3a show the relationships between the objective error ϵ and the number of inter-agent communication for all the algorithms. For CPCA and the remaining algorithms, ϵ denote $|f_e^* - f^*|$ and $|f(\bar{x}^t) - f^*|$, respectively, where \bar{x}^t is the average of all agents' local estimates at time t . Specifically, the blue line shows the relationship between the specified accuracy and the resulting number of communication executed by CPCA, whereas the orange line indicates the relationship between the number of performed communication and the actual objective error when the algorithm ends. We observe that to reach the given precision, CPCA requires fewer numbers of communication thanks to its linearly convergent inner iterations. Also, the orange line is below the blue line (i.e., the actual error is less than the specified error). This phenomenon stems from the careful design of the proposed algorithm to ensure the reach of the specified accuracy.

Fig. 2b and 3b show the relationships between the objective error ϵ and the number of oracle queries for all the algorithms. For CPCA that requires zeroth-order




Fig. 2. Comparison of CPCA, SONATA-L, Alg. 2 in [20] and Proj-DGD for solving problem (1) with (26) as local objectives.




Fig. 3. Comparison of CPCA, SONATA-L, Alg. 2 in [20] and Proj-SGD for solving problem (1) with (27) as local objectives.

queries, the horizontal axes represent the average number of queries needed for one agent (i.e., the average degree of local proxies plus one). The presented results correspond to the discussions in Sec. 5.1 that m depends on ϵ , and that extremely small ϵ is generally associated with moderate m . Note that in this case, Alg. 2 in [20] and the remaining algorithms require two zeroth-order queries and one first-order query at every iteration, respectively. Hence, the curves corresponding to the latter are identical to those in Fig. 2a and 3a. We observe that CPCA calls for fewer oracle queries in both examples. This difference results from the design of gradient-free iterations which effectively reduce the cumulative costs of queries.

7 Related Work

There has been extensive research on the design and analysis of distributed optimization algorithms. Most of the proposed algorithms are consensus-based iterative first-order or zeroth-order methods. A brief overview of some representative work is as follows.

Distributed Convex Optimization: A variety of efficient distributed convex optimization algorithms have been proposed. Most of them can be divided into two categories, i.e., primal and dual-based methods. Primal methods generally combine (sub)gradient descent with consensus, so as to drive local estimates to converge consensually to the globally optimal point in the primal domain. Early methods exhibit sub-linear convergence

for nonsmooth convex objectives [7, 36]. By exploiting history information of local gradients to track the global gradient, recent works achieve linear convergence rates for strongly convex and smooth objectives [3, 5, 6, 8]. Current focuses mainly include stochastic gradients, asynchronous computations [37] and second-order methods. Dual-based methods transform the problem by introducing consensus equality constraints, and then solve the dual problem [38] or carry on primal-dual updates to reach a saddle point of the Lagrangian function [9, 39, 40]. These methods are preferable if the computations of dual (sub)gradients or sub-optimizations relating to the alternating direction method of multipliers are easy to execute. However, they are rather hard to be extended to deal with time-varying or directed graphs, since how to formulate consensus as equality constraints in those cases is still an open question.

Distributed Nonconvex Optimization: Though being much more challenging, distributed nonconvex optimization has recently received increasing attention due to its promising values in various applications, e.g., resource allocation, learning, and compressed sensing. Several noticeable algorithms have appeared in the literatures, e.g., [4, 12, 35, 41, 42]. The overall algorithmic frameworks designed share similarities with those for convex problems. Nevertheless, the use of various techniques, including stochastic gradient descent [35], utilization of perturbations [41], proximal methods [42] and successive convex approximation [4, 12] managed to enable agents to iteratively converge to the stationary or locally optimal points of nonconvex problems.

Zeroth-order Distributed Optimization: The literature is also focusing on developing zeroth-order algorithms for both convex and nonconvex distributed optimization [19, 20]. This trend arises from the concern that issues like black-box procedures or resource limitations may inhibit the direct access to the gradients of objective functions. The key lies in constructing randomized gradient estimators [43] based on finitely many function evaluations. [20] shows that the convergence rates of distributed zeroth-order algorithms can match those of their first-order counterparts.

Distributed Constrained Optimization: When there are convex local constraint sets, the most common means of ensuring feasibility is to project the newly generated estimates onto the local set after usual updates. This means is first adopted by [21] to solve distributed constrained optimization problems with convex objectives. Further issues have also been studied, including step size selections, random projections, asynchronous updates [22], directed graphs [23, 44], and nonconvex objectives [35]. In other algorithms, the feasibility of new local estimates is satisfied by minimizing local surrogate functions [4, 12] or solving proximal minimization problems [45] right over the constraint sets. For general problems with inequality and equality constraints, the common practice

is to introduce multipliers and then use consensus-based primal-dual sub-gradient methods to reach the saddle points of the Lagrangians [46, 47]. In the aforementioned works, all the local estimates converge consensually to the optimal solutions.

Our work is closely related to the extensive literature on consensus-based distributed optimization, but it also provides a new perspective. Instead of using first-order or zeroth-order information consecutively at every iteration, we utilize function evaluations (i.e., zeroth-order information) to construct polynomial approximations for local objectives in advance, thus facilitating subsequent information dissemination and optimization. This new algorithmic design enables us to obtain sufficiently precise estimates of the globally optimal solution of nonconvex problems, with lower costs in zeroth-order queries and inter-agent communication.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose CPCA to solve distributed optimization problems with nonconvex Lipschitz continuous univariate objective functions and different convex local constraint sets. The proposed algorithm relies on Chebyshev polynomial approximation, consensus, and polynomial optimization. It consists of three stages, i.e., i) constructing approximations of local objectives, ii) performing average consensus to facilitate information dissemination, and iii) locally optimizing the obtained approximation of the global objective via polynomial optimization methods. We provide comprehensive theoretical analysis and numerical results to illustrate its effectiveness, including i) obtaining ϵ -globally optimal solutions, ii) being efficient in oracle and communication complexities, and iii) achieving distributed termination. Future directions include but are not limited to i) designing efficient multivariate extensions by leveraging the idea of introducing approximations, and ii) considering cases where evaluations of function values are perturbed by noises.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We rewrite the average-consensus-based update of p_i^t in (12) as $p_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} p_j^t$, where

$$w_{ij} = \begin{cases} (2\max(d_i, d_j))^{-1}, & j \in \mathcal{N}_i, j \neq i, \\ 0, & j \notin \mathcal{N}_i, j \neq i, \\ 1 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij}, & j = i. \end{cases}$$

It follows that W , $(w_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$ is row stochastic, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} = 1, 0 \leq w_{ij} \leq 1, \forall i, j = 1, \dots, N$. Con-

sider the k -th element of the involved vectors, where $k = 0, \dots, m$. Using the row-stochasticity of W , we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_i^{t+1}(k) &= \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} p_j^t(k) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} \max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^t(k) \\ &= \max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^t(k), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^t(k)$, $M^t(k)$, $\min_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j^t(k)$, $m^t(k)$. Hence,

$$M^{t+1}(k) \leq M^t(k), \quad m^{t+1}(k) \geq m^t(k).$$

The convergence of (4) implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} p_i^t(k) = \bar{p}(k)$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} M^t(k) = \bar{p}(k)$. Combining the non-increasing property of $M^t(k)$ in terms of t , we have $\bar{p}(k) \leq M^t(k)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$m^t(k) \leq \bar{p}(k) \leq M^t(k), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Suppose that agents terminate at the K -th iteration. Since the max/min consensus is guaranteed to converge within U iterations, we have

$$r_i^K(k) - s_i^K(k) = M^{K'}(k) - m^{K'}(k),$$

where K' , $K - U$. The stopping criterion $\|r_i^K - s_i^K\|_\infty \leq \delta$ is equivalent to $r_i^K(k) - s_i^K(k) \leq \delta$, $\forall k$. When it is satisfied, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |p_i^K(k) - \bar{p}(k)| &\leq M^K(k) - m^K(k) \\ &\leq r_i^K(k) - s_i^K(k) \leq \delta, \quad \forall i, k. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The major fact we use is

$$T_u(x)T_v(x) = \frac{1}{2}T_{u+v}(x) + \frac{1}{2}T_{|u-v|}(x),$$

which implies that the product of two Chebyshev polynomials expands to a combination of polynomials with certain degrees [15]. Note that

$$g_i^K(x) - t = (c'_0 - t)T_0(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m c'_j T_j(x). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

• When m is odd, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_i^K(x) - t &= (x+1)h_1^2(x) + (1-x)h_2^2(x) \\ &= (T_1(x)+1)v_1(x)^T Q v_1(x) + (1-T_1(x))v_2(x)^T Q' v_2(x) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{u,v} Q_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{1}} + \underbrace{T_1(x) \sum_{u,v} Q_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{2}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{u,v} Q'_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{3}} - \underbrace{T_1(x) \sum_{u,v} Q'_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the coefficient of $T_0(x)$ in $g(x)$. From (A.1), this number is $c_0 - t$. For terms $\textcircled{1}$ and $\textcircled{3}$, the added coefficient of $T_0(x)$ is $Q_{00} + Q'_{00} + \sum_{u,u'} \frac{1}{2}(Q_{uu} + Q'_{u'u'})$. For terms $\textcircled{2}$ and $\textcircled{4}$, the added coefficient of $T_0(x)$ is $\sum_{|u-v|=1} \frac{1}{4}(Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} c'_0 - t &= Q_{00} + Q'_{00} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u=1}^{d_1+1} Q_{uu} + \sum_{u=1}^{d_2+1} Q'_{uu} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{|u-v|=1} (Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then, we consider the coefficient of $T_j(x)$ ($j = 1, \dots, m$) in $g(x)$. From (A.1), it equals c_j . For terms $\textcircled{1}$ and $\textcircled{3}$, when

$$u+v=j \text{ or } |u-v|=j,$$

the expansion of the product contains $T_j(x)$. Hence, the added coefficient of $T_j(x)$ is $\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{2}(Q_{uv} + Q'_{uv})$,

where $\mathcal{A} = \{(u,v) | u+v=j \vee |u-v|=j\}$. For terms $\textcircled{2}$ and $\textcircled{4}$, when

$$\begin{aligned} u+v &= j-1, \quad \text{or } |u-v|=j-1, \\ \text{or } |u+v-1| &= j-1, \quad \text{or } ||u-v|-1|=j, \end{aligned}$$

the expansion of the three-term product contains $T_j(x)$. Hence, the added coefficient of $T_j(x)$ is $\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{4}(Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv})$,

where $\mathcal{B} = \{(u,v) | u+v = i-1 \vee |u-v| = i-1 \vee |u+v-1| = i-1 \vee ||u-v|-1| = i\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} c'_j &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} (Q_{uv} + Q'_{uv}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{B}} (Q_{uv} - Q'_{uv}), \quad j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Equations (A.2) and (A.3), together with the requirements that

$$Q \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d_1+1}, \quad Q' \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d_2+1}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

constitute the constraints in (20). Therefore, when m is odd, problem (20) is equivalent with problem (18).

• When m is even, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g_i^K(x) - t &= h_1^2(x) + (x+1)(1-x)h_2^2(x) \\
&= v_1(x)^T Q v_1(x) + \frac{1-T_2(x)}{2} v_2(x)^T Q' v_2(x) \\
&= \underbrace{\sum_{u,v} Q_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{5}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u,v} Q'_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{6}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} T_2(x) \sum_{u,v} Q'_{uv} T_u(x) T_v(x)}_{\textcircled{7}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we first consider the coefficient of $T_0(x)$ in $g(x)$, which takes the value of $c_0 - t$. For terms $\textcircled{5}$ and $\textcircled{6}$, the added coefficient of $T_0(x)$ is $Q_{00} + \frac{1}{2} Q'_{00} + \sum_{u,u'} \left(\frac{1}{2} Q_{uu} + \frac{1}{4} Q'_{u'u'} \right)$. For term $\textcircled{7}$, the coefficient of $T_0(x)$ is $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{|u-v|=2} \frac{1}{4} Q'_{uv}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c'_0 - t &= Q_{00} + \frac{1}{2} Q'_{00} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u=1}^{d_1+1} Q_{uu} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{u=1}^{d_2+1} Q'_{uu} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{|u-v|=2} Q'_{uv}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

Then, we consider the coefficient of $T_j(x)$ ($j = 1, \dots, m$) in $g(x)$. From (A.1), this number is c_j . For terms $\textcircled{5}$ and $\textcircled{6}$, when

$$u + v = j \text{ or } |u - v| = j,$$

the expansion of the product contains $T_j(x)$. Hence, the added coefficient of $T_j(x)$ is $\sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{2} (Q_{uv} + Q'_{uv})$. For

term $\textcircled{7}$, when

$$\begin{aligned}
&u + v = j - 2, \text{ or } |u - v| = j - 2, \\
&\text{or } |u + v - 2| = j - 2, \text{ or } ||u - v| - 2| = j,
\end{aligned}$$

the expansion of the three-term product contains $T_j(x)$. Hence, the added coefficient of $T_j(x)$ is $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{4} Q'_{uv}$,

where $\mathcal{C} = \{(u, v) | u + v = i - 2 \vee |u - v| = i - 2 \vee |u + v - 2| = i \vee ||u - v| - 2| = i\}$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c'_j &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} \left(Q_{uv} + \frac{1}{2} Q'_{uv} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{C}} Q'_{uv}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Equations (A.5) and (A.6), as well as the requirements of positive semi-definiteness (A.4), constitute the constraints in (22). Therefore, when m is even, problem (22) is equivalent with problem (18).

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

We first establish the closeness between $p_i^K(x)$ and $\bar{p}(x)$. From Theorem 1, we have

$$\|p_i^K - \bar{p}\|_\infty \leq \delta, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Suppose that the sets of Chebyshev coefficients of $p_i^K(x)$ and $\bar{p}(x)$ are $\{c'_j\}$ and $\{\bar{c}'_j\}$, respectively. It follows that

$$|c'_j - \bar{c}'_j| \leq \delta, \quad \forall j = 0, \dots, m.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
|p_i^K(x) - \bar{p}(x)| &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^m (c'_j - \bar{c}'_j) T_j \left(\frac{2x - (a+b)}{b-a} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^m |c'_j - \bar{c}'_j| \cdot 1 \leq \delta(m+1) = \epsilon_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $|T_j(x)| \leq 1, \forall x \in [-1, 1]$.

Then, we establish the closeness between $\bar{p}(x)$ and $f(x)$. Since \bar{p} is the average of all p_i^0 , $\bar{p}(x)$ is also the average of all $p_i(x)$. Based on the results in Sec. 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{p}(x) - f(x)| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i(x) - f_i(x)) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |p_i(x) - f_i(x)| \leq \frac{1}{N} N \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|p_i^K(x) - f(x)| &\leq |p_i^K(x) - \bar{p}(x)| + |\bar{p}(x) - f(x)| \\
&\leq \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 = \frac{2}{3}\epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Let p^* denote the optimal value of $p_i^K(x)$ on $X = [a, b]$. It follows from Lemma 1 that

$$|p^* - f^*| \leq \frac{2}{3}\epsilon.$$

Since $p^* \leq f_e^* \leq p^* + \epsilon_3 = p^* + \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, we have

$$f^* - \frac{2}{3}\epsilon \leq p^* \leq f_e^* \leq p^* + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \leq f^* + \epsilon.$$

Therefore, $|f_e^* - f^*| \leq \epsilon$.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

From (A.7), we have $|p_i^K(x) - f(x)| \leq \frac{2}{3}\epsilon, \forall x \in [a, b]$. As in the proof of Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_i^K(x_p^*) &\leq p_i^K(x_f^*) \leq f(x_f^*) + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon, \\ f(x_f^*) &\leq f(x_p^*) \leq p_i^K(x_p^*) + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$f(x_f^*) \leq f(x_p^*) \leq f(x_f^*) + \frac{4}{3}\epsilon.$$

Since $f(x)$ is bi-Lipschitz, it follows that

$$|x_p^* - x_f^*| \leq L|f(x_p^*) - f(x_f^*)| \leq \frac{4}{3}L\epsilon. \quad \square$$

A.5 Proof of Theorem 5

In the stage of initialization, every agent i needs to evaluate $f_i(x)$ at $2m + 1$ points to construct an approximation $p_i(x)$ of degree m . Hence, the orders of zeroth-order queries and corresponding flops are $\mathcal{O}(m)$ and $\mathcal{O}(mF_0)$, respectively. The calculation of the points by (9) costs $\mathcal{O}(m)$ flops in total. For fixed m_i , through Fast Cosine Transform, we obtain the coefficients in (10) with $\mathcal{O}(m_i \log m_i)$ flops [15]. Since evaluating $p_i(x)$ at one point requires $\mathcal{O}(m_i)$ flops via the Clenshaw algorithm [17], the check for (11) costs $\mathcal{O}(m_i^2)$ flops. When m_i is gradually doubled from 2 to m , the order of the total flops required by (10) and (11) is of

$$\mathcal{O}(m^2) + \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{m}{2}\right)^2\right) + \dots + \mathcal{O}(2^2) = \mathcal{O}(m^2).$$

Therefore, the costs of this stage are $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, F_0))$ flops and $\mathcal{O}(m)$ zeroth-order queries.

Then, we focus on the stage of information dissemination. Based on the convergence time (5) of the average consensus algorithm (4), to ensure that (15) holds, the order of the required number of consensus iterations is of

$$U + \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon}\right).$$

In every iteration, agent i exchanges information with its neighbors only once and updates p_i^{t+1} by (12) in $\mathcal{O}(m)$ flops. Hence, the orders of needed communication and flops are of $\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$ and $\mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{m}{\epsilon})$, respectively.

Finally, we discuss the computational costs of solving SDPs in the stage of polynomial optimization. To solve these problems, the primal-dual interior-point method [48] can be used. The authors of [49] reported that this method solves SDPs in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{m} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ primal-dual iterations, with $\mathcal{O}(\max\{p, m\}^4)$ flops per iteration in the

worst-case scenario, where p , m and ϵ are the number of constraints, the problem size (i.e., the order of positive semidefinite matrices) and the solution accuracy, respectively. Hence, the order of the total flops required is of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\max\{p, m\}^4 \sqrt{m} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right).$$

It follows that the obtained SDP reformulations are solved in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{m} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ primal-dual iterations, with a total cost of $\mathcal{O}(m^{4.5} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ flops.

References

- [1] Zhiyu He, Jianping He, Cailian Chen, and Xinping Guan. CPCA: A chebyshev proxy and consensus based algorithm for general distributed optimization. In *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, pages 94–99, 2020.
- [2] Angelia Nedić, Alex Olshevsky, and Michael G Rabbat. Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization. *Proc. IEEE*, 106(5):953–976, 2018.
- [3] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. EXTRA: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.
- [4] Paolo Di Lorenzo and Gesualdo Scutari. NEXT: In-network nonconvex optimization. *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, 2(2):120–136, 2016.
- [5] Jinming Xu, Shanying Zhu, Yeng Chai Soh, and Lihua Xie. Convergence of asynchronous distributed gradient methods over stochastic networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 63(2):434–448, 2018.
- [6] Guannan Qu and Na Li. Accelerated distributed nesterov gradient descent. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 65(6):2566–2581, 2019.
- [7] Angelia Nedić and Asuman Ozdaglar. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 54(1):48–61, 2009.
- [8] Angelia Nedić, Alex Olshevsky, and Wei Shi. Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 27(4):2597–2633, 2017.
- [9] Kevin Scaman, Francis Bach, Sébastien Bubeck, Laurent Massoulié, and Yin Tat Lee. Optimal algorithms for non-smooth distributed optimization in networks. In *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, pages 2740–2749, 2018.
- [10] Marc Claesen and Bart De Moor. Hyperparameter search in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.02127*, 2015.
- [11] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2004.
- [12] Gesualdo Scutari and Ying Sun. Distributed nonconvex constrained optimization over time-varying digraphs. *Math. Program.*, 176(1-2):497–544, 2019.
- [13] Damiano Varagnolo, Filippo Zanella, Angelo Cenedese, Gianluigi Pillonetto, and Luca Schenato. Newton-Raphson consensus for distributed convex optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 61(4):994–1009, 2015.
- [14] Jiaqi Zhang, Keyou You, and Tamer Başar. Distributed adaptive newton methods with global superlinear convergence. *Automatica*, 138:110156, 2022.

- [15] Lloyd N Trefethen. *Approximation theory and approximation practice*, volume 128. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2013.
- [16] Tobin A Driscoll, Nicholas Hale, and Lloyd N Trefethen. *Chebfun guide*, 2014.
- [17] John P Boyd. *Solving Transcendental Equations: The Chebyshev Polynomial Proxy and Other Numerical Rootfinders, Perturbation Series, and Oracles*, volume 139. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2014.
- [18] Etienne de Klerk, Dick den Hertog, and G Elabwabi. Optimization of univariate functions on bounded intervals by interpolation and semidefinite programming. Technical Report Center Discussion paper 2006-26, Tilburg University, The Netherlands, April 2006.
- [19] Davood Hajinezhad, Mingyi Hong, and Alfredo Garcia. ZONE: Zeroth-order nonconvex multiagent optimization over networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 64(10):3995–4010, 2019.
- [20] Yujie Tang, Junshan Zhang, and Na Li. Distributed zero-order algorithms for nonconvex multiagent optimization. *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, 8(1):269–281, 2021.
- [21] Angelia Nedić, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Pablo A Parrilo. Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 55(4):922–938, 2010.
- [22] Soomin Lee and Angelia Nedić. Asynchronous gossip-based random projection algorithms over networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 61(4):953–968, 2016.
- [23] Chenguang Xi and Usman A Khan. Distributed subgradient projection algorithm over directed graphs. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 62(8):3986–3992, 2016.
- [24] Guannan Qu and Na Li. Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization. *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, 5(3):1245–1260, 2018.
- [25] Reza Olfati-Saber and Richard M Murray. Consensus protocols for networks of dynamic agents. In *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, pages 951–956, 2003.
- [26] Grigoriy Blekherman, Pablo A Parrilo, and Rekha R Thomas. *Semidefinite optimization and convex algebraic geometry*, volume 13. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2013.
- [27] Vikas Yadav and Murti V Salapaka. Distributed protocol for determining when averaging consensus is reached. In *Proc. 45th Annu. Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control and Computing*, pages 715–720, 2007.
- [28] Paulo Jesus, Carlos Baquero, and Paulo Sérgio Almeida. A survey of distributed data aggregation algorithms. *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts*, 17(1):381–404, 2014.
- [29] Shreyas Sundaram and Christoforos N Hadjicostis. Finite-time distributed consensus in graphs with time-invariant topologies. In *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, pages 711–716, 2007.
- [30] Ming-Jun Lai, Yangyang Xu, and Wotao Yin. Improved iteratively reweighted least squares for unconstrained smoothed ℓ_q minimization. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(2):927–957, 2013.
- [31] Bin Gu, Guodong Liu, Yanfu Zhang, Xiang Geng, and Heng Huang. Optimizing large-scale hyperparameters via automated learning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09026*, 2021.
- [32] Yushan Li, Qing Jiao, Han Wang, and Jianping He. Consensus and approximation-based distribution statistics in network systems. In *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, pages 3767–3772, 2021.
- [33] Yihong Wu and Pengkun Yang. Polynomial methods in statistical inference: theory and practice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07317*, 2021.
- [34] Lloyd Trefethen. Multivariate polynomial approximation in the hypercube. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(11):4837–4844, 2017.
- [35] Pascal Bianchi and Jérémie Jakubowicz. Convergence of a multi-agent projected stochastic gradient algorithm for non-convex optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 58(2):391–405, 2012.
- [36] Dušan Jakovetić, Joao Xavier, and José MF Moura. Fast distributed gradient methods. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 59(5):1131–1146, 2014.
- [37] Shi Pu, Wei Shi, Jinming Xu, and Angelia Nedic. Push-pull gradient methods for distributed optimization in networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 66(1):1–16, 2021.
- [38] Kevin Scaman, Francis Bach, Sébastien Bubeck, Yin Tat Lee, and Laurent Massoulié. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 3027–3036, 2017.
- [39] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Kun Yuan, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. On the linear convergence of the ADMM in decentralized consensus optimization. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 62(7):1750–1761, 2014.
- [40] Alessandro Falsone, Ivano Notarnicola, Giuseppe Notarstefano, and Maria Prandini. Tracking-admm for distributed constraint-coupled optimization. *Automatica*, 117:108962, 2020.
- [41] Tatiana Tatarenko and Behrouz Touri. Non-convex distributed optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 62(8):3744–3757, 2017.
- [42] Mingyi Hong, Davood Hajinezhad, and Ming-Min Zhao. Prox-PDA: The proximal primal-dual algorithm for fast distributed nonconvex optimization and learning over networks. In *Proc. 34th Int. Conf. Mach. Learning*, pages 1529–1538, 2017.
- [43] Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 17(2):527–566, 2017.
- [44] Van Sy Mai and Eyad H Abed. Distributed optimization over directed graphs with row stochasticity and constraint regularity. *Automatica*, 102:94–104, 2019.
- [45] Kostas Margellos, Alessandro Falsone, Simone Garatti, and Maria Prandini. Distributed constrained optimization and consensus in uncertain networks via proximal minimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 63(5):1372–1387, 2017.
- [46] Minghui Zhu and Sonia Martínez. On distributed convex optimization under inequality and equality constraints. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 57(1):151–164, 2011.
- [47] Tsunghui Chang, Angelia Nedić, and Anna Scaglione. Distributed constrained optimization by consensus-based primal-dual perturbation method. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 59(6):1524–1538, 2014.
- [48] Christoph Helmberg, Franz Rendl, Robert J Vanderbei, and Henry Wolkowicz. An interior-point method for semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 6(2):342–361, 1996.
- [49] Zhi-Quan Luo, Wing-Kin Ma, Anthony Man-Cho So, Yinyu Ye, and Shuzhong Zhang. Semidefinite relaxation of quadratic optimization problems. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 27(3):20–34, 2010.