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Abstract

In this note we propose a new variant of the hybrid variance-reduced proximal gradient method in [7] to solve a common stochastic composite nonconvex optimization problem under standard assumptions. We simply replace the independent unbiased estimator in our hybrid-SARAH estimator introduced in [7] by the stochastic gradient evaluated at the same sample, leading to the identical momentum-SARAH estimator introduced in [2]. This allows us to save one stochastic gradient per iteration compared to [7], and only requires two samples per iteration. Our algorithm is very simple and achieves optimal stochastic oracle complexity bound in terms of stochastic gradient evaluations (up to a constant factor). Our analysis is essentially inspired by [7], but we do not use two different step-sizes.

1 Problem Statement and Standard Assumptions

We consider the following stochastic composite and possibly nonconvex optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_\xi(x)] + \psi(x) \right\},$$

where $f_\xi(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a stochastic function defined, such that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $f_\xi(x)$ is a random variable in a given probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, while for each realization $\xi \in \Omega$, $f_\xi(\cdot)$ is differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^p$; and $f(x) := \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_\xi(x)]$ is the expectation of the random function $f_\xi(x)$ over $\xi$ on $\Omega$; $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a proper, closed, and convex function.

Our algorithm developed in this note relies on the following fundamental assumptions:

**Assumption 1.1.** The objective functions $f$ and $\psi$ of (1) satisfies the following conditions:

(a) **(Convexity of $\psi$)** $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is proper, closed, and convex. In addition, $\text{dom}(F) := \text{dom}(f) \cap \text{dom}(\psi) \neq \emptyset$.

(b) **(Boundedness from below)** There exists a finite lower bound

$$F^* := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + \psi(x) \right\} > -\infty.$$  

(2)

(c) **(L-average smoothness)** The expectation function $f(\cdot)$ is $L$-smooth on $\text{dom}(F)$, i.e., there exists $L \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ \| \nabla f_\xi(x) - \nabla f_\xi(y) \|^2 \right] \leq L^2 \|x - y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \text{dom}(F).$$  

(3)

(d) **(Bounded variance)** There exists $\sigma \in [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ \| \nabla f_\xi(x) - \nabla f(x) \|^2 \right] \leq \sigma^2, \quad \forall x \in \text{dom}(F).$$  

(4)

These assumptions are very standard in stochastic optimization and required for various gradient-based methods. Unlike [2], we do not impose a bounded gradient assumption, i.e., $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq G$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Algorithm I below has a single loop and achieves optimal oracle complexity bound since it matches the lower bound complexity in [1] up to a constant factor.
2 Hybrid Variance-Reduced Proximal Gradient Algorithm

We first propose a new variant of [7] Algorithm 1 for solving (1) and then analyze its convergence and oracle complexity.

2.1 Main result: Algorithm and its convergence

We propose a novel hybrid variance-reduced proximal gradient method to solve (1) under standard assumptions (i.e., Assumption 1) as described in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 (Hybrid Variance-Reduced Proximal Gradient Algorithm)

1: Initialization: An arbitrarily initial point \( x_0 \in \text{dom}(F) \).
2: Choose an initial batch size \( \bar{b} \geq 1 \), \( \beta \in (0, 1) \), and \( \eta > 0 \) as in Theorem 2.1 below.
3: Generate an unbiased estimator \( v_0 := \frac{1}{\bar{b}} \sum_{\xi \in \tilde{B}} \nabla f_{\xi}(x_0) \) at \( x_0 \) using a mini-batch \( \tilde{B} \).
4: Update \( x_1 := \text{prox}_{\eta v_0}(x_0 - \eta v_0) \).
5: For \( t := 1, \ldots, T \) do
6: Generate a proper sample \( \xi_t \) (single sample or mini-batch).
7: Evaluate \( v_t \) and update
\[
\begin{cases}
    v_t := \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) + (1 - \beta) [v_{t-1} - \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1})] \\
    x_{t+1} := \text{prox}_{\eta v_t}(x_t - \eta v_t).
\end{cases}
\]
8: EndFor
9: Choose \( F_T \) uniformly from \( \{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_T\} \).

Compared to [7] Algorithm 1, the new algorithm, Algorithm 1, has two major differences. First, it uses a new estimator \( v_t \) adopted from [2]. This estimator can also be viewed as a variant of the hybrid SARAH estimator in [7] by using the same sample \( \xi_t \) for \( \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) \). That is

- Hybrid SARAH [7]: \( v_t^h := (1 - \beta) [v_{t-1} + \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) - \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1})] + \beta \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t), \ \xi_t \neq \xi_t \)
- Momentum SARAH [2]: \( v_t := (1 - \beta) [v_{t-1} + \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) - \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1})] + \beta \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t), \ \xi_t = \xi_t \)

Second, it does not require an extra damped step-size \( \gamma \) as in [7], making Algorithm 1 simpler than the one in [7].

To analyze Algorithm 1 as usual, we define the following gradient mapping of (1):
\[
G_\eta(x) := \frac{1}{\bar{b}} \left( x - \text{prox}_{\eta v_0}(x - \eta \nabla f(x)) \right),
\]
where \( \eta > 0 \) is any given step-size. It is obvious to show that \( x^* \in \text{dom}(F) \) is a stationary point of (1), i.e., \( 0 \in \nabla f(x^*) + \partial \psi(x^*) \) if and only if \( G_\eta(x^*) = 0 \). We will show that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), Algorithm 1 can find \( F_T \) such that \( E \left[ \|G_\eta(F_T)\| \right] \leq \varepsilon^2 \), which means that \( F_T \) is an \( \varepsilon \)-approximate stationary point of (1), where the expectation is taken over all the present randomness.

The following theorem establishes convergence of Algorithm 1 and provides oracle complexity.

Theorem 2.1. Under Assumption 1, suppose that \( \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2L}) \) is a given step-size and \( 0 < \frac{2\ell^2}{1 - L_0} \leq \beta < 1 \). Let \( \{x_t\}_{t=0}^T \) be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, we have
\[
\frac{1}{T+1} \sum_{t=0}^T E \left[ \|G_\eta(x_t)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{2E[|F(x_0) - F^*|]}{\eta(T + 1)} + \frac{E[\|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2]}{\beta(T + 1)} + 2\beta\sigma^2.
\]
In particular, if we choose \( \eta := \frac{1}{2L(T+1/2)}, \beta := \frac{1}{(T+1/2)^2}, \) and \( \bar{b} := \left( \frac{T + 1/3}{2} \right) \geq 1 \), then the output \( F_T \) of Algorithm 1 satisfies
\[
E \left[ \|G_\eta(F_T)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{4L|F(x_0) - F^*| + 4\sigma^2}{(T + 1)^{2/3}}.
\]
Consequently, for any tolerance \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the total number of stochastic gradient evaluations in Algorithm 2 achieves \( \tau_T \) such that \( E \|G_\theta(\tau_T)\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \) is at most \( \tau_{\xi,f} := \left\lceil \frac{\Delta_0^{1/2}}{2\varepsilon} + \frac{\Delta_0^{3/2}}{3\varepsilon^3} \right\rceil \), where \( \Delta_0 := 4 \left[ L F(x_0) - F^* \right] + \sigma^2 \).

Theorem 2.1 shows that the oracle complexity of Algorithm 1 is \( O \left( \frac{\Delta_0^{1/2}}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\Delta_0^{3/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \right) \) as in [7], where \( \Delta_0 := 4 \left( L F(x_0) - F^* \right) + \sigma^2 \). This complexity bound in fact matches the lower bound one in [1] up to a constant factor under the same assumptions as in Assumption 1.1. Hence, we conclude that Algorithm 1 is optimal.

### 2.2 Convergence Analysis

Let us denote by \( F_t := \sigma(\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_t) \) the \( \sigma \)-filed generated by \( \{\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_t\} \). We also denote by \( E[\cdot] \) the full expectation over the history \( F_t \). The following lemma establishes a key estimate for our convergence analysis. We emphasize that Lemma 2.1 is self-contained and can be applied to other types of estimators, e.g., Hessian, and other problems.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \( v_t \) be computed by (5) for \( \beta \in (0, 1) \). Then, under Assumption 1.1, we have

\[
E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right] \leq (1 - \beta^2)\|v_{t-1} - \nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 + 2(1 - \beta)^2 L^2 \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 + 2\beta^2 \sigma^2.
\]

(9)

Therefore, by induction, we have

\[
E \left[ \|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right] \leq (1 - \beta)^2 E \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] + 2\beta \sigma^2 + 2L^2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - \beta)^{2(i-t)} E \left[ \|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 \right].
\]

(10)

**Proof.** Let us denote

\[
a_t := (1 - \beta) \left( \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) - \nabla f(x_t) - \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1}) + \nabla f(x_{t-1}) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad b_t := \beta \left( \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) - \nabla f(x_t) \right).
\]

Since \( E_{\xi_t} [a_t] = E_{\xi_t} [b_t] = 0 \), and (5), we can derive (9) as follows:

\[
E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right] = E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|\nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t) + (1 - \beta)(v_{t-1} - \nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1})) - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right]
\]

\[= E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|\nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_t)\|^2 + \|\nabla f_{\xi_t}(x_{t-1})\|^2 + \|v_{t-1} - \nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 \right] + 2E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|a_t + b_t\|^2 \right]
\]

\[=(1 - \beta)^2 \|v_{t-1} - \nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - \beta)^{2(i-t)} E_{\xi_t} \left[ \|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 \right].
\]

Taking the full expectation over the full history \( F_t \) of (9), and noticing that for \( \beta \in (0, 1) \),

\[
\frac{1 - (1 - \beta)^2}{1 - (1 - \beta)^2} \leq \frac{1}{\beta},
\]

by induction, we can show that

\[
E \left[ \|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right] \leq (1 - \beta)^2 E \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] + 2\beta \sigma^2 \frac{1 - (1 - \beta)^2}{1 - (1 - \beta)^2} + 2L^2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - \beta)^{2(i-t)} E \left[ \|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 \right]
\]

\[\leq (1 - \beta)^2 E \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] + 2\beta \sigma^2 + 2L^2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - \beta)^{2(i-t)} E \left[ \|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 \right].
\]

This proves (10). \( \square \)

Next, we prove another property of our composite function \( F \) in (1).
Lemma 2.2. Let \( \{x_t\} \) be generated by Algorithm 1 for solving (11) and \( G_\eta \) be defined by (6). Then, under Assumption 1.1, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}[F(x_{t+1}) - F^*] \leq \mathbb{E}[F(x_t) - F^*] - \left(\frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{L}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}[\|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2] - \frac{\eta}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|G_\eta(x_t)\|^2] + \frac{\eta}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t) - v_t\|^2].
\]

Proof. Let us denote by \( \bar{x}_t := \text{prox}_{\eta v_t}(x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t)) \). From the optimality condition of this proximal operator, we have
\[
\langle \nabla f(x_t), x_t - \bar{x}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_t - \bar{x}_t\|^2 + \psi(x_t) \leq \psi(x_t) - \frac{1}{\eta} \|x_t - \bar{x}_t\|^2.
\]
Similarly, from \( x_{t+1} = \text{prox}_{\eta v_t}(x_t - \eta v_t) \), we also have
\[
\langle v_t, x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 + \psi(x_{t+1}) \leq \langle v_t, x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_t - x_{t+1}\|^2 + \psi(x_t) - \frac{1}{\eta} \|x_t - x_{t+1}\|^2.
\]
Combining the last two inequalities, we can show that
\[
\psi(x_{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \leq \psi(x_t) - \frac{\eta}{2} \|G_\eta(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_t - x_{t+1}\|^2 + \langle v_t, x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \langle \nabla f(x_t), \bar{x}_t - x_t \rangle.
\]
By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any \( \eta > 0 \), we easily get
\[
\langle \nabla f(x_t) - v_t, x_{t+1} - \bar{x}_t \rangle \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \|\nabla f(x_t) - v_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|x_{t+1} - \bar{x}_t\|^2.
\]
Finally, using the \( L \)-average smoothness of \( f \), we can derive
\[
f(x_{t+1}) + \psi(x_{t+1}) \leq f(x_t) + \langle \nabla f(x_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 + \psi(x_{t+1})
\]
\[
= f(x_t) - \left(\frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{L}{2}\right) \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 + \langle \nabla f(x_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \psi(x_{t+1}) + \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2
\]
\[
\leq f(x_t) - \left(\frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{L}{2}\right) \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 + \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\nabla f(x_t) - v_t, x_{t+1} - x_t\| + \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2
\]
\[
\leq f(x_t) + \|x_t - \bar{x}_t\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{2} \|\nabla f(x_t) - v_t\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{2} \|x_t - x_{t+1}\|^2.
\]
Taking the full expectation of both sides of the last inequality and noting that \( F = f + \psi \), we obtain (11).

Now, we are ready to prove our main result, Theorem 2.4 above.

The proof of Theorem 2.4. First, summing up (10) from \( t := 0 \) to \( t := T \), we get
\[
\sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}[\|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2] \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T} (1 - \beta)^{2t} \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 + 2(T + 1)\beta \sigma^2
\]
\[
+ 2L^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T} \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (1 - \beta)^{2(t-i)} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\beta}{\eta} \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 + 2(T + 1)\beta \sigma^2
\]
\[
+ 2L^2 \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \sum_{t=i+1}^{T} (1 - \beta)^{2(t-i)} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\beta}{\eta} \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 + 2(T + 1)\beta \sigma^2.
\]
\[
+ 2L^2 \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2].
\]
Next, summing up (11) from \( t := 0 \) to \( t := T \), we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E}[F(x_{T+1}) - F^*] \leq [F(x_0) - F^*] - \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_t)\|^2 \right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T} \left( \frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{\beta}{4} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \right] \\
+ \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \right]
\]
\[
\leq [F(x_0) - F^*] - \frac{2\eta}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_t)\|^2 \right] - \sum_{t=0}^{T} \left( \frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{\beta}{4} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \right] \\
+ \frac{\eta}{2T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\beta \eta}{2T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \right] + (T+1) \eta \beta \sigma^2.
\]
Since \( \eta \in \left( 0, \frac{1}{2L}\right) \), we have \( 0 < \frac{2L^2 \eta^2}{1 - L \eta} < 1 \). Suppose \( \frac{1}{2\eta} - \frac{\beta}{2} \geq \frac{L^2 \eta^2}{2 - L \eta} \), i.e., \( \beta \geq \frac{2L^2 \eta^2}{1 - L \eta} \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E}[F(x_{T+1}) - F^*] \leq [F(x_0) - F^*] - \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_t)\|^2 \right] + \frac{\eta}{2T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] + (T+1) \eta \beta \sigma^2,
\]
which leads to (7).

Now, if we choose \( \eta := \frac{1}{2L(T+1)^{1/3}} \) and \( \beta := \frac{1}{(T+1)^{2/3}} \), then we can verify that \( \beta \geq \frac{2L^2 \eta^2}{1 - L \eta} \).

Moreover, (7) becomes
\[
\frac{1}{T+1} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_t)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{4L}{(T+1)^{2/3}} [F(x_0) - F^*] + \frac{2\sigma^2}{(T+1)^{2/3}} + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right].
\]

By Step 3 of Algorithm 1 and the choice \( \tilde{b} := \left[ \frac{(T+1)^{1/3}}{2} \right] \), we have \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_0 - \nabla f(x_0)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T+1} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_t)\|^2 \right] \). Substituting this bound into the previous one and using \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_T)\|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{T+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_0)\|^2 \right] \), we obtain (8).

Finally, from (8), to guarantee \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|G_{\eta}(x_T)\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon^2 \), we have \( T + 1 \geq \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2\sigma^2} \), where \( \Delta_0 := 4L[F(x_0) - F^*] + 4\sigma^2 \). We can take \( T := \left[ \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \). Therefore, the number of stochastic gradient evaluation is \( \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}} = \tilde{b} + 2T = \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{2\Delta_0^3}{\varepsilon^2} \). Rounding it, we obtain \( \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}} = \left[ \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{2\Delta_0^3}{\varepsilon^2} \right] \).

## 3 Concluding Remarks and Outlook

Theorem 2.4 only analyzes a simple variant of Algorithm 1 with constant step-size \( \eta = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{T^{1/3}} \right) \) and constant weight \( \beta = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{T^{2/3}} \right) \). It also uses a large initial mini-batch of size \( \tilde{b} = \mathcal{O} \left( T^{1/3} \right) \).

Compared to SARAH-based methods, e.g., in [3] [4] [5], Algorithm 3 is simpler since it is single-loop. At each iteration, it uses only two samples compared to three ones in [7]. We remark that the convergence of Algorithm 1 can be established by means of Lyapunov function as in [2].

The result of this note can be extended into different directions:

- We can also adapt our analysis to mini-batch, adaptive step-size \( \eta_t \), and adaptive weight \( \beta_t \) variants as in [6]. If we use adaptive weight \( \beta_t \) as in [6], then we can remove the initial batch \( \tilde{b} \) at Step 3 of Algorithm 1. However, the convergence rate in Theorem 2.4 will be \( \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\log(T)}{T^{1/3}} \right) \) instead of \( \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{T^{1/3}} \right) \). The rate \( \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\log(T)}{T^{1/3}} \right) \) matches the result of [2] without bounded gradient assumption.

- Our results, especially, Lemma 2.3 here can be applied to develop stochastic algorithms for solving other optimization problems such as compositional nonconvex optimization, minimax problems, and reinforcement learning.

- The idea here can also be extended to develop second-order methods such as sub-sampled and sketching Newton or cubic regularization-based methods.

It is also interesting to incorporate this idea with adaptive schemes as done in [2] by developing different strategies such as curvature aid or quasi-Newton methods.
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