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Abstract

SGD with Momentum (SGDM) is widely used for large scale optimization of machine learning problems. Yet, the theoretical understanding of this algorithm is not complete. In fact, even the most recent results require changes to the algorithm like an averaging scheme and a projection onto a bounded domain, which are never used in practice. Also, no lower bound is known for SGDM. In this paper, we prove for the first time that for any constant momentum factor, there exists a Lipschitz and convex function for which the last iterate of SGDM suffers from an error $\Omega\left(\frac{\log T}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$ after $T$ steps. Based on this fact, we study a new class of (both adaptive and non-adaptive) Follow-The-Regularized-Leader-based SGDM algorithms with increasing momentum and shrinking updates. For these algorithms, we show that the last iterate has optimal convergence $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$ for unconstrained convex optimization problems. Further, we show that in the interpolation setting with convex and smooth functions, our new SGDM algorithm automatically converges at a rate of $O\left(\frac{\log T}{T}\right)$. Empirical results are shown as well.

1 Introduction

Stochastic Gradient Descent with Momentum (SGDM) is one of the most used stochastic first-order optimization algorithms in machine learning applications. Part of its success is due to its simplicity and its low per-update computational complexity, but the primary reason is its good empirical performance on a different range of problems. Yet, from a theoretical point of view, there still some gaps in our knowledge.

The main gap is in the distance between the idealized version of SGDM used in the theoretical analysis and the actual SGDM used in practice. For example, theoretical analyses often assume projections onto bounded domains at each step and averaging of the iterates (e.g., Alacaoglu et al., 2020) that are rarely used in practice. Moreover, although recent works have proved that a variant of SGD with momentum improves the non-dominant terms in the convergence rate on convex stochastic least square problems (Dieuleveut et al., 2017; Jain et al., 2018), it is still unclear if the actual convergence rate can be improved and if the analysis extends to a more general class of problems. Overall, recent analyses seem unable to pinpoint the exact role of the momentum term in the optimization of general convex functions.

In this paper, we look at SGDM for unconstrained optimization of convex functions and without any averaging of the iterates. Our first result is a negative one: Surprisingly, we show that the last iterate of SGDM can have a suboptimal convergence rate for any constant momentum setting. This result alone kills the possibility of any advantage of SGDM with constant momentum, unless stronger assumptions are used.

Hence, motivated by the above result, we propose to modify SGDM to achieve the optimal convergence rate. We start from the very recent observation (Defazio, 2020) that SGDM can be seen as a primal averaging procedure (Nesterov and Shikhman, 2015; Tao et al., 2018; Cutkosky, 2019) applied to the iterates of Online Mirror Descent (OMD) (Nemirovsky and Yudin, 1983; Warmuth and Jagota, 1997). Based on this fact, we propose a new class of SGDM algorithms based on the Follow-the-Regularized-Leader (FTRL) framework\(^1\) (Shalev-Shwartz, 2007; Abernethy et al., 2008) and the primal averaging. The use of FTRL instead of OMD removes the necessity of projections onto bounded domains, while the primal averaging acts as a momentum term and guarantees the convergence of the last iterate. Moreover, the resulting algorithm has increasing momentum and shrinking updates that precisely allow to avoid our lower bound.

\(1\)FTRL is known in the offline optimization literature as Dual Averaging (DA) (Nesterov, 2009), but in reality, DA is a special case of FTRL when the functions are linearized.
In particular, we prove that the last iterate of FTRL-based SGDM converges at the optimal rate on convex functions. Moreover, we show that our construction is general enough to allow for an entire family of FTRL-based SGDM methods, both adaptive and non-adaptive. For example, we show that “adaptive” learning rates give rise to convergence rates that are adaptive to gradients, noise, and to the interpolation regime.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: We discuss the related work in Section 2 and the setting and assumptions in Section 3. We then present our main results: the lower bound (Section 4) and the new FTRL-based SGDM (Section 5). Finally, in Section 6 we present an empirical evaluation of our algorithms.

2 Related Work

Stochastic Momentum Methods SGDM has become a popular tool in deep learning and its importance has been discussed by recent studies (Sutskever et al., 2013). Polyak (1964) first proposed the use of momentum in gradient descent, calling it Heavy-Ball method. In the stochastic setting, there is multiple work analyzing the use of momentum in SGD. In particular, Yang et al. (2016) prove a convergence rate of \(O(1/\sqrt{T})\) for the averaged iterate in the convex setting and for an iterate taken uniformly at random in the nonconvex setting. Also, adaptive variants of momentum methods (Kingma and Ba, 2015; Reddi et al., 2018; Luo et al., 2018) are very popular in the deep learning literature, even if their guarantees are only for the online convex optimization setting, and their analyses require a decreasing momentum factor and a projection onto bounded domains. Alacaoglu et al. (2020) recently remove the assumption of a vanishing momentum factor, but they still require projections over a bounded domain. In the non-convex and smooth case, Cutkosky and Orabona (2019) introduce a variant of SGDM with a variance-reduction effect and a faster convergence rate than SGD on non-convex functions, but it requires two stochastic gradients per step. As far as we know, no convergence rate is known for the last iterate of SGDM.

Lower Bound Harvey et al. (2019) prove the tight convergence bound \(O(\ln T/\sqrt{T})\) of the last iterate of SGD for convex and Lipschitz functions. To the best of our knowledge, there is no lower bound for the last iterate of SGDM.

Last Iterate Convergence of SGDM Nesterov and Shikhman (2015) introduces a quasi monotone subgradient method, which uses double averaging (both in Primal and Dual) based on Dual Averaging, to achieve the optimal convergence of the last iterate for the convex and Lipschitz function. This approach is then rediscovered and extended by Cutkosky (2019). Tao et al. (2018) extends Nesterov and Shikhman (2015)’s method to Mirror Descent, calling it stochastic primal averaging. They recover the same bound for convex functions, again with a bounded domain assumption. Defazio (2020) points out that the sequence generated by the stochastic primal averaging (Tao et al., 2018) can be identical to that of stochastic gradient descent with momentum for specific choices of the hyper-parameters. Accordingly, they give a Lyapunov analysis in the nonconvex and smooth case. Based on this work, Jelassi and Defazio (2020) introduce “Modernized dual averaging method”, which is actually equal to the one by Nesterov and Shikhman (2015). They also give a similar Lyapunov analysis as in Defazio (2020) with specific choices of hyper-parameters in the non-convex and smooth optimization setting, where they assume a bounded domain and get a convergence bound \(O(\ln T/\sqrt{T})\). Recently, Tao et al. (2021) propose the very same algorithm as in Tao et al. (2018) and analyze it as a modified Polyak’s Heavy-ball method (already pointed out by Defazio (2020)). They give an analysis in the convex cases and extend it to an adaptive version, obtaining in both cases an optimal convergence of the last iterate. However, they still assume the use of projection onto a bounded domain.

3 Problem Set-up

Notation We denote vectors by bold letters, e.g. \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\). All standard operations on the vectors, e.g., \(xy, x/y, \sqrt{x}\) and \(x < y\), are to be considered element-wise. We denote by \(E[\cdot]\) the expectation with respect to the underlying probability space and by \(E_t[\cdot]\) the conditional expectation with respect to the past. Any norm without particular notation in this work is the \(\ell_2\) norm.

Setting We consider the unconstrained optimization problem \(\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)\), where \(f(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}\) is a convex function and we denote its infimum by \(f^*\). We also assume to have access to a first-order black-box
optimization oracle that returns a stochastic subgradient in any point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \). In particular, we assume that we receive a vector \( g(x, \xi) \) such that \( E_{\xi} [g(x, \xi)] = \nabla f(x) \) for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \). To make the notation concise, we let \( g_t \triangleq g(x_t, \xi_t) \) and \( E_t [g_t] = \nabla f(x_t), \forall t \).

We will make different assumptions on the objective function \( f \). Sometimes, we will assume that

- (H1) \( f \) is \( L \)-smooth, that is, \( f \) is differentiable and its gradient is \( L \)-Lipschitz, i.e., \( \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\| \).

We also use one or more of the following assumptions on the stochastic gradients \( g_t \).

- (H2) bounded variance: \( E_t \|g_t - \nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \sigma^2 \).
- (H3) bounded in expectation: \( E \|g_t\|^2 \leq G^2 \).
- (H3') \( \ell_2 \) bounded: \( \|g_t\| \leq G \).
- (H3'') \( \ell_\infty \) bounded: \( \|g_t\|_\infty \leq G_\infty \).

### 4 Lower bound of SGDM

First of all, as we discussed in the related work, most of the analyses of SGDM assume a vanishing momentum or a constant one. However, is a constant momentum the best setting for stochastic optimization of convex functions, especially for the convergence of the last iterate? For this question, it is worth remembering that the use of a constant momentum term is mainly motivated by the empirical evidence in the deep learning literature. However, deep learning objective functions are non-convex and the convex setting might be different. Also, the deep learning literature offers no theoretical explanations.

In this section, we show the surprising result that for SGD with any constant momentum, there exists a function for which the lower bound of the last iterate is \( \Omega \left( \log T / \sqrt{T} \right) \). Our proof extends the one in Harvey et al. (2019) to SGD with momentum.

We consider SGDM with constant momentum factor \( \beta \):

\[
m_t = \beta m_{t-1} + (1 - \beta) g_t, \quad x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta_t m_t,
\]

where \( g_t \in \partial f(x_t) \) and \( \eta_t = c \cdot t^{-\alpha}, 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} \).

Let \( \mathcal{X} \) denote the Euclidean ball with radius \( \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \) in \( \mathbb{R}^T \). For any fixed \( \beta \) and \( \alpha \), we introduce the following function. Define \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( h_i \in \mathbb{R}^T \) for \( i \in \{T+1\} \) by

\[
f(x) = \max_{i \in \{T+1\}} h_i^T x, \quad h_i = \begin{cases} a_j, & 1 \leq j < i \\ -b_j, & i = j < T \\ 0, & i < j \leq T \end{cases}
\]

where \( b_j = \frac{2^\alpha}{c(1 - \beta)^j} \) and \( a_j = \frac{1 - \alpha}{c(T-j+1)} \). We have that \( \partial f(x_t) \) is the convex hull of \( h_i : i \in \mathcal{I}(x) \) where \( \mathcal{I}(x) = \{ i : h_i^T x = f(x) \} \).

Note that \( f \) is Lipschitz over \( \mathcal{X} \) since

\[
\|h_i\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^T a_i^2 + \frac{4}{c^2(1 - \beta)^2} \leq \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{c^2} \sum_{i=1}^T \frac{1}{i^2} + \frac{4}{c^2(1 - \beta)^2} \leq \frac{5}{c^2(1 - \beta)^2}.
\]

Also, \( \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \) is non-positive since \( f(0) = 0 \).

**Theorem 1 (Lower bound of SGDM).** For any \( \beta \in [0, 1] \), define \( f \) as in (1). Then, the sequence produced by SGDM with momentum \( \beta \) and polynomial stepsize \( \eta_t = c \cdot t^{-\alpha}, 0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} \) satisfies

\[
f(x_T) - f^* \geq \frac{(1 - \alpha) \log T}{cT^\alpha}.
\]
Proof of Theorem 1. Define a sequence $z_t$ for $t \in [T+1]$ as follows: $z_1 = 0$ and

$$z_{t+1} = z_t - (1 - \beta)\eta_t \sum_{i=1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_i.$$  

(2)

We will show that $z_t$ are exactly the updates of SGDM and $f(z_{T+1}) \geq \Omega \left( \frac{\log T}{T^\alpha} \right)$. First, we explore the upper bound and the lower bound of $z_{t,j}$.

**Lemma 1.** Let $b_j = \frac{2^\alpha}{c(1-\beta)T^\alpha}$, $a_j = \frac{1-\alpha}{c(T-j+1)}$ and $\eta_j = c \cdot j^{-\alpha}$. $z_t$ is defined as (2). Then, for $t \leq j$, $z_{t,j} = 0$, and for $t > j$, $z_{t,j} \geq \frac{1}{T^\alpha}$ and $z_{t,j} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\beta)T^\alpha}$.

**Proof of Lemma 1.** We first prove by induction that when $t \leq j$, $z_{t,j} = 0$. First, $z_1 = 0$. Also, suppose it holds for $t$. Then, in the case of $t + 1$, for any $j \geq t + 1$,

$$z_{t+1,j} = z_{t,j} - (1 - \beta)\eta_t \sum_{i=1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_{i,j} = 0 - 0 = 0,$$

which implies $t \leq j$, $z_{t,j} = 0$ holds. Next, we claim that $z_t$ satisfies

$$z_{t,j} \geq (1 - \beta) \left[ b_j \eta_j - a_j \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^{t-1} \eta_k + \beta \sum_{k=j+2}^{t-1} \eta_k + \cdots + \beta^{t-j-2} \sum_{k=t-1}^{t-1} \eta_k \right) \right], \quad j < t \leq T.$$  

(3)

We prove (3) by induction. For any $t$, $z_{t,t-1}$ satisfies (3) since that

$$z_{t+1,t} = z_{t,t} - (1 - \beta)\eta_t \sum_{i=1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_{i,t} = -(1 - \beta)\eta_t h_{t,t} = (1 - \beta)\eta_t b_t.$$

Then, suppose (3) holds for any $j < t$. We show that it holds for any $j < t + 1$. We already proved for $j = t$. For $j < t$,

$$z_{t+1,j} = z_{t,j} - (1 - \beta)\eta_t \sum_{i=1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_{i,j}$$

$$= z_{t,j} - (1 - \beta)\eta_j \sum_{i=j+1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_{i,j}$$

$$= z_{t,j} + (1 - \beta)\eta_j \beta^{t-j} b_j - \eta_j (1 - \beta) \sum_{i=j+1}^t \beta^{t-1} h_{i,j}$$

$$\geq z_{t,j} - \eta_j (1 - \beta) \sum_{i=j+1}^t \beta^{t-1} a_j$$

$$\geq (1 - \beta) \left[ b_j \eta_j - a_j \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^{t-1} \eta_k + \beta \sum_{k=j+2}^{t-1} \eta_k + \cdots + \beta^{t-j-2} \sum_{k=t-1}^{t-1} \eta_k \right) \right] - \eta_j (1 - \beta) \sum_{i=j+1}^t \beta^{t-1} a_j$$

$$= (1 - \beta) \left[ b_j \eta_j - a_j \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^t \eta_k + \beta \sum_{k=j+2}^t \eta_k + \cdots + \beta^{t-j-2} \sum_{k=t-1}^t \eta_k + \beta^{t-j-1} \eta_t \right) \right],$$  

(4)

where in the last inequality we used the induction.

Taking $b_j = \frac{2^\alpha}{c(1-\beta)T^\alpha}$, $a_j = \frac{1-\alpha}{c(T-j+1)}$ and $\eta_j = \frac{c}{j^\alpha}$, we have

$$\left(4\right) \geq \frac{2}{T^\alpha} - a_j \sum_{k=j+1}^t \eta_k = \frac{2}{T^\alpha} - \frac{1-\alpha}{(T-j+1)} \sum_{k=j+1}^t \frac{1}{k^\alpha}.$$  

(5)
By Lemma 7, we have that for $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$

$$\frac{2}{T^\alpha} - \frac{1}{T^{1-\alpha}} \geq \frac{1}{T^\alpha},$$

and for $\alpha = 0$, (5) $\geq 2 - \left(\frac{t-j-1}{(T-j+1)}\right) \geq 1$. Thus, we have $z_{t,j} \geq 0$. On the other hand, from the above analysis, we have

$$z_{t+1,j} \leq z_{t,j} + (1 - \beta)\eta_i b_j \leq (1 - \beta)\eta_i \beta^{t-j} \leq (1 - \beta)\eta_i \beta^{t-j}. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 2.** $f(z_t) = h_i^Tz_t$ for any $t \in [T+1]$. The subgradient oracle for $f$ at $z_t$ returns the vector $h_i$.

**Proof of Lemma 2.** We claim that $h_i^T z_t = h_i^T z_t$ for all $i < t$ and $h_i^T z_t > h_i^T z_t$ for all $1 \leq i < t$. When $i < t$, $z_t$ is supported on the first $t-1$ coordinates, while $h_t$ and $h_i$ agree on the first $t-1$ coordinates.

In the case of $i > t$, by the definition of $z_t$ and $h_t$, we have

$$z_t^T(h_t - h_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} z_{t,j}(h_{t,j} - h_{i,j}) = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} z_{t,j}(h_{t,j} - h_{i,j}) = z_{t,j}(a_i + b_i) + \sum_{j=i+1}^{t-1} z_{t,j}a_j > 0.$$

Thus, we have proved $f(z_t) = h_i^T z_t$ by the definition. Moreover, $I(z_t) = \{i : h_i^T z_t = f(z_t)\} = \{t, \ldots, T+1\}$. So the subgradient evaluated at $z_t$ is $h_t$.

Hence, we proved that $z_t$ is the updates of SGDM. Finally, we have

$$f(z_{T+1}) = h_i^T z_{T+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{T} h_{T+1,j} z_{T+1,j} \geq \frac{1}{T^\alpha} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1 - \alpha}{c(T-j+1)} = \frac{\log T(1-\alpha)}{cT^\alpha}. \quad \square$$

## 5 FTRL-based SGDM

The lower bound for the last iterate in the previous Section motivates us to study a different variant of SGDM. In particular, we aim to find a way to remove the $\ln T$ term from the convergence rate.

Defazio (2020) points out that the stochastic primal averaging method Tao et al. (2018) (which is actually an instance of Algorithm 1 Cutkosky (2019) with OMD):

$$z_{t+1} = z_t - \gamma_t \nabla f(x_t)$$
$$x_{t+1} = s_t x_t + (1-s_t)z_t$$

could be one-to-one mapped to the momentum method

$$m_{t+1} = \beta_t m_t + \nabla f(x_t)$$
$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha_t m_t$$

by setting $\gamma_t = \frac{1}{\beta_t}$. While this is true, the convergence rate depends on the convergence rate of OMD, that in turn requires to assume that $\|x_t - x^*\|^2 \leq D^2$. This is possible only using a projection onto a bounded domain in each step, but it is rarely used in practice.

Thus, we propose to study a new variant of SGDM, which has the following form (details in Algorithm 1),

$$m_{t+1} = \beta_t m_t + (1-\beta_t)\nabla f(x_t)$$
$$x_{t+1} = s_t x_t - \alpha_t m_{t,1}.$$

Note the presence of a shrinking factor $s_t$ in the iterates in each step. This variant comes naturally when using the primal averaging scheme with Follow-the-Regularized-Leader (FTRL) rather than to OMD. Hence, we just denote it by FTRL-based SGDM. Now, this momentum variant inherits all the good properties of FTRL. In particular, we no longer need the bounded domain assumption. Moreover, we will show that it guarantees the optimal convergence $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$ (Agarwal et al., 2012) of the last iterate for convex and Lipschitz functions.
Algorithm 1 FTRL-based SGDM
1: **Input:** A sequence $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_T$, with $\alpha_1 > 0$. Non-increasing sequence $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{T-1}$. $m_0 = 0$. $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2: **for** $t = 1, \ldots, T$ **do**
3:  Get $g_t$ at $x_t$ such that $E_t[g_t] = \nabla f(x_t)$
4:  $\beta_t = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i}$ (Define $\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i = 0$)
5:  $m_t = \beta_t m_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_t) g_t$
6:  $\eta_t = \frac{\alpha_{t+1} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i} \gamma_t$
7:  $x_{t+1} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i x_t}{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i} + \frac{\alpha_{t+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i} x_1 - \eta_t m_t$
8: **end for**

### 5.1 Convergence Rates for FTRL-based SGDM
We first present a very general theorem for FTRL-based SGDM.

**Theorem 2.** Under the assumption in Section 3, Algorithm 1 guarantees

$$
\mathbb{E} [f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \alpha_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\sqrt{T}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\gamma_{t-1} \alpha_t g_t^2) \right].
$$

The above theorem is very general and it gives rise to a number of different variations of the FTRL-based SGDM. In particular, we can instantiate it with the following choices.

First, we consider the most used polynomial stepsize $\frac{c}{\sqrt{t}}$ for convex and Lipschitz function, and the constant stepsize $\frac{c}{\sqrt{T}}$ if $T$ is given in advance.

**Corollary 1.** Assume (H4) and set $\alpha_t = 1$ for all $t$. Algorithm 1 with either $\gamma_{t-1} = \frac{c}{\sqrt{t}} \cdot 1$ or $\gamma_{t-1} = \frac{c}{\sqrt{T}} \cdot 1$ guarantees

$$
\mathbb{E} [f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{c\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2cG^2}{\sqrt{T}}.
$$

The above corollary tells that both of these two stepsize give the optimal bound $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$ for the last iterate. Next, we will show that if we use an adaptive stepsize, Algorithm 1 gives a data-dependent convergence rate for the last iterate. We first consider a global version of AdaGrad stepsize as in Li and Orabona (2019); Ward et al. (2019).

**Corollary 2.** Assume (H4') and take $\gamma_t = \frac{\alpha_t}{\sqrt{G^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i g_i^2}}$, $1 \leq t \leq T$ and $\alpha_t = 1$. Then, Algorithm 1 guarantees

$$
\mathbb{E} [f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{2}{T} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|g_t\|^2 + G^2}.
$$

We also state a result for the coordinate-wise AdaGrad stepsize (McMahm and Streeter, 2010; Duchi et al., 2010).

**Corollary 3.** Assume (H4") and set $\gamma_t = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{G_{\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i g_i^2}}$, $1 \leq t \leq T$ and $\alpha_t = 1$. Then, Algorithm 1 guarantees

$$
\mathbb{E} [f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{2}{T} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} g_{i,j}^2 + G_{\infty}^2}.
$$

\(^2\)Even if widely used in the literature, it is a misnomer to call these stepsize “adaptive”: an algorithm can be adaptive to some unknown quantities (if proved so), not the stepsizes.
The above two corollaries show that the convergence bound are adaptive to the stochastic gradients. In words, in the worst case (i.e., \( \sum_{t=1}^{T} \|g_t\|^2 = O(T) \) and \( \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} g^2_{t,j} = O(T) \)), the convergence rate is \( O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}) \). However, when stochastic gradients are small or sparse, the rate could be much faster than \( O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}) \).

Also, we now show that if in addition \( f \) is smooth, the last iterate of FTRL-based momentum with the global adaptive stepsize gives adaptive rates of convergence that interpolate between \( O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}) \) and \( O(\frac{\ln T}{T}) \).

**Corollary 4.** Assume (H1). Then, under the same assumption and parameter setting of Corollary 2, Algorithm 1 guarantees

\[
\mathbb{E}[f(x_T) - f^*] \leq \frac{2C}{T} \sqrt{16L^2C^2 \ln^2 T + 8LGC \ln T + G^2} + \frac{2\sqrt{2C} \sigma}{\sqrt{T}},
\]

where \( C \triangleq \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \).

Observe that when \( \sigma = 0 \), namely there is no noise on the gradients, the rate of \( O(\frac{\ln T}{T}) \) is obtained. As far as we know, the above theorems are the first convergence guarantees for the last iterate of adaptive method in unconstrained convex optimization.

### 5.2 Convergence Rate in Interpolation Regime

Now we assume that \( F(x) = \mathbb{E}_\xi[f(x, \xi)] \) and that the stochastic gradient is calculated drawing one function in each time step and calculating its gradient: \( g_t = \nabla f(x_t, \xi_t) \). In this scenario, it makes sense to consider the interpolation condition (Needell et al., 2015; Ma et al., 2018)

\[
x^* \in \mathop{\text{argmin}}_{x} F(x) \Rightarrow x^* \in \mathop{\text{argmin}}_{x} f(x, \xi), \forall \xi.
\]

This condition says that the problem is “easy”, in the sense that all the functions in the expectation share the same minimizer. This case morally corresponds to the case in which there is no noise on the stochastic gradients. However, this condition seems weaker because it says that only in the optimum the gradient is exact and noisy everywhere else. We will also assume that each function \( f(x, \xi) \) is \( L \)-smooth in the first argument.

**Theorem 3.** Assume (H1) (H3'). Then, under the interpolation setting, Algorithm 1 with \( \gamma_t = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{G^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \alpha_i \|g_i\|^2}} \) guarantees

\[
\mathbb{E}F(x_T) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{2C}{T} \sqrt{16L^2C^2 \ln^2 T + 8L^2C \ln T + G^2},
\]

where \( C \triangleq \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first rate for the last iterate of momentum methods in the interpolation setting.

### 5.3 Proofs

Before presenting the proofs of our convergence rates, we revisit an Online-to-Batch algorithm (Algorithm 2) by Cutkosky (2019), which introduce a modification to any online learning algorithm to obtain a guarantee on the last iterate in the stochastic convex setting.

**Lemma 3.** (Cutkosky, 2019, Theorem 1) Assume (H2). Then, for all \( x^* \in D \), Algorithm 2 guarantees

\[
\mathbb{E}[f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{R_T(x^*)}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \alpha_t} \right].
\]


Algorithm 2 Anytime Online-to-Batch (Cutkosky, 2019)

1: **Input:** Online learning algorithm \( A \) with convex domain \( D \), \( \alpha_1, ..., \alpha_T \), with \( \alpha_1 > 0 \).
2: Get Initial point \( w_1 \) from \( A \)
3: for \( t = 1, ..., T \) do
4: \( x_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\alpha_i w_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{i} \alpha_j} \)
5: Play \( x_t \), receive subgradient \( g_t \)
6: Send \( \ell_t(x) = \langle \alpha_t g_t, x \rangle \) to \( A \) as the \( t \)th loss
7: Get \( w_{t+1} \) from \( A \)
8: end for

Algorithm 3 Follow-the-Regularized-Leader on Linearized Losses

1: **Input:** Regularizers \( \psi_1, ..., \psi_T : \mathbb{R}^d \to (\mathbb{R}, + \infty] \).
2: for \( t = 1, ..., T \) do
3: \( w_t \in \text{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \psi_t(w) + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \langle g_i, w \rangle \)
4: Receive \( \ell_t : \mathbb{R}^d \to (\mathbb{R}, + \infty] \) and pay \( \ell_t(w_t) \)
5: Set \( g_t \in \partial \ell_t(w_t) \)
6: end for

Set \( \psi_t(x) = \| \frac{x_1 - x}{\sqrt{\gamma_{t-1}}} \|^2 \), where \( \gamma_{t+1} \leq \gamma_t \) and \( \gamma_0 > 0 \). Then, we write FTRL with \( \ell_t(w) = \langle \alpha_t g_t, w \rangle \) as

\[
 w_{t+1} = w_1 - \gamma_t \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i g_i .
\]

We then plug FTRL (Algorithm 3) into Algorithm 2 and it gives Algorithm 4. Hence, using the Regret bound of FTRL in Lemma 5, we get the following Lemma.

**Lemma 4.** Under the same setting with Lemma 3, Algorithm 4 guarantees

\[
 E[f(x_T) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \alpha_t} \left[ \left\| u - x_1 \right\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma_{T-1}}} \right]^2 + \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\gamma_{t-1}, \alpha_t^2 g_i^2) .
\]

Now we start to prove the theorems by showing the connection between the modified SGDM and Algorithm 4.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** We prove that the updates of \( x_t \) in Algorithm 1 can be one-to-one mapped to the updates of \( x_t \), Algorithm 4 when \( w_1 = x_1 \).

The update of \( x_t \) in Algorithm 4 can be written as following:

\[
 x_{t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\alpha_i x_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_j} + \frac{\alpha_{t+1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_j} w_{t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\alpha_i x_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_j} + \frac{\alpha_{t+1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_j} \left( w_1 - \gamma_t \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i g_i \right) .
\]

It is enough to prove that for any \( t \), \( \eta_t m_t = \frac{\alpha_{t+1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_j} \gamma_t \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i g_i \). We claim it is true and prove it by induction.

When \( t = 1 \), it holds that \( \eta_1 m_1 = \frac{\alpha_2 \alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \gamma_1 g_1 \). Suppose it holds for \( t = k - 1, k \geq 2 \). Then in the case of...
Algorithm 4: Anytime Online-to-Batch with FTRL

1: Input: Online learning algorithm $A$ with convex domain $D$, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_T$, with $\alpha_t > 0$. $0 < \gamma_{t+1} \leq \gamma_t$.
2: Initialize $w_1$
3: for $t = 1, \ldots, T$ do
4: $x_t = \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i w_i$
5: Play $x_t$, receive subgradient $g_t$
6: $w_{t+1} = w_t - \gamma_t \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i g_i$
7: end for

$t = k$, we have

$$
\eta_k m_k = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i} m_{k-1} + \frac{\alpha_k}{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i} g_k \right) \cdot \frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i} \gamma_k
$$

$$
= \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i g_i + \frac{\alpha_k}{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i} g_k \right) \cdot \frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i} \gamma_k
$$

$$
= \frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i} \gamma_k \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i g_i.
$$

where in the first equation we used the definitions of $\eta_k$ and $m_k$ and in the second equality we used the induction step. So we proved the above claim. Thus, we can directly use Lemma 4.

Proof of Corollary 2 and Corollary 3. For the adaptive $\gamma_t = \frac{\alpha_1}{G^2 + \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \|g_i\|^2}$, we have

$$
\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_{t-1} \|g_t\|^2 \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\|g_t\|^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\|g_t\|^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2 \right),
$$

where in the first inequality we used Lemma 8. Similarly, for $\gamma_t = \frac{\alpha}{G_{\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i g_i}$, we have

$$
\sum_{t=1}^T \langle \gamma_{t-1} g_t \rangle \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\|g_t\|^2}{\sqrt{G_{\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\|g_t\|^2}{\sqrt{G_{\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|g_i\|^2 \right).
$$

Proof of Corollary 4. By Theorem 2 and Jensen’s inequality, we have

$$
E \left[ f(x_T) - f(x^*) \right] \leq \frac{2}{T} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|g_t\|^2 + G^2}
$$

$$
\leq \frac{2}{T} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|g_t\|^2 + G^2}.
$$

From the unbiasedness of the gradients, we have

$$
E \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|g_t\|^2 \right] \leq E \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + T\sigma^2,
$$

9
We have presented a family of FTRL-based SGDM algorithms, that exhibit optimal convergence of the last
where in the second inequality we used Lemma 6 and Holder’s and Jensen’s inequalities in the third inequality.

Then, we solve for 

\[ E \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|g_t\|^2 \leq 16L^2 \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right)^2 \ln^2 T + 8L \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \ln TG + 2T\sigma^2. \]

Putting it back to (6), we get the stated bound.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** By Theorem 2, we have

\[ \mathbb{E} [F(x_T) - F(x^*)] \leq \frac{2}{T} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t, \xi_t)\|^2 + G^2}. \]  

(7)

Under the interpolation condition and \( L \)-smoothness of the functions \( f \), it satisfies that

\[ \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t, \xi_t)\|^2 \leq 2L \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} f(x_t, \xi_t) - f(x^*, \xi_t) \right] \]

\[ \leq 2L \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} F(x_t) - F(x^*) \right]. \]

Use (7) on each \( t \) to get

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} F(x_t) - F(x^*) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{2}{t} \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_i, \xi_i)\|^2 + G^2} \]

\[ \leq 2 \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \ln T \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_i, \xi_i)\|^2 + G^2}. \]

Then, we solve for \( \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_i, \xi_i)\|^2 \) and get

\[ \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla f(x_i, \xi_i)\|^2 \leq 16L^2 \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right)^2 \ln^2 T + 8L \left( \frac{\|x_1 - x^*\|^2}{\alpha} + \alpha \right) \ln TG. \]

Using this expression in (7), we have the stated bound.

**6 Empirical Results**

We have presented a family of FTRL-based SGDM algorithms, that exhibit optimal convergence of the last
iteration. These algorithms are motivated by a new lower bound that shows that constant momentum SGDM
is provably suboptimal to minimize convex Lipschitz functions. However, the theory guarantees only an improvement of $\ln T$, so it is unlikely to make a difference in practical applications. Yet, we also perform some experiments to show that FTRL-based momentum methods have also interesting empirical properties.

We compare FTRL-M (Algorithm 1, $\gamma_t = c \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$), AdaFTRL-M (Algorithm 1, $\gamma_t = \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{G}} + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{c_2}{g_i^2}$) with classic SGDM ($\beta = 0.9$), SGDM-AVG (averaged iterates of SGDM, $\beta = 0.9$) and AdaGrad (Duchi et al., 2011). The initial stepsizes for all the algorithms were tuned with a fine grid-searching procedure.

**Synthetic Data** For the first experiment, we generate synthetic data and test the algorithms following the protocol in Vaswani et al. (2019). We generate a synthetic binary classification dataset with $n = 8000$ and the dimension $d = 100$. We make the data linearly separable with a margin, in which case the interpolation condition is satisfied. We train linear classifiers with the squared hinge loss: $f(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\max(0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i))^2$. Note that the loss function is smooth and $f(w^*) = 0$. In this case, the optimal convergence rate is at least as fast as $1/T$.

We plot the suboptimality gap versus the number of epochs with different margin value in Figure 1, in loglog plots. Also, we add a line to fit the curves, where the slopes represent the power of $t$. From Figure 1, we observe that two adaptive algorithms AdaGrad and AdaFTRL-M bring faster convergence and AdaFTRL-M has the biggest slope in all the cases. Also, the performance of FTRL-M is on par with SGDM and SGDM-AVG.

**Real Data** We also test the algorithms on real datasets. We use classification datasets from the LIBSVM website (Chang and Lin, 2001); real-sim, w8a, and phishing. The details of the datasets are in Appendix.

We trained linear classifiers with the hinge loss and no regularization: $f(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\max(0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i))$. The stochastic gradients are obtained evaluating the subgradient on one example at the time. We repeat the experiments for 5 times for each algorithm and report the average of 5 repetitions. We show the objective value versus the number of epochs in Figure 2.

The results show that the algorithms with non-adaptive stepsizes tend to perform worse than the ones with adaptive stepsizes. Moreover, the performance of AdaFTRL-M is close to the last iterate of AdaGrad.
and sometimes outperforms all the other algorithms, especially in the last iterations.
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Appendix

Lemmas for Proof

The following lemma is a well-known result for FTRL (see, e.g., Orabona, 2019).

**Lemma 5.** Let $\ell_t$ a sequence of convex loss functions. Set the sequence of regularizers as $\psi_t(x) = \|x - u\|_{\sqrt{\gamma_t}}^2$, where $\gamma_{t+1} \leq \gamma_t$, $t = 1, \ldots, T$. Then, FTRL (Algorithm 3) guarantees

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \ell_t(x_t) - \ell_t(u) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T} - 1} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\gamma_{t-1}, g^2_t).$$

**Lemma 6.** (Srebro et al., 2010, Lemma 4.1) Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be $M$-smooth and bounded from below, then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \leq 2M(f(x) - \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} f(y)).$$

**Lemma 7.** For any $1 \leq j \leq t \leq T$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\frac{1}{T-j+1} \sum_{k=j+1}^{t} \frac{1}{k^\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{T^\alpha}.$

**Proof of Lemma 7.** First, we observe that $\sum_{k=j+1}^{t} \frac{1}{k^\alpha} \leq \int_{j}^{t} \frac{1}{x^\alpha} dx = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{t-j}{t^\alpha j^\alpha}. $

Then, we claim $\frac{1}{T-j+1} \int_{j}^{t} \frac{1}{x^\alpha} dx \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{T-j}{T^\alpha}. $ Let $g(x) = \frac{x^\alpha - 1}{x^\alpha}$. The derivative $g'(x) = \frac{x^\alpha - 1}{x^\alpha}$ is positive for all $x > 0$ and $j \geq 0$. So it satisfies that $\frac{t-j}{T^\alpha} \leq \frac{t-j}{j^\alpha}$, which implies the claim. \qed

**Lemma 8.** Let $a_i \geq 0, \ldots, T$ and $f : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ nonincreasing function. Then

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_t f \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i \right) \leq \int_{a_0}^{\sum_{i=0}^{T} a_t} f(x) dx.$$

**Proof.** Denote by $s_i = \sum_{i=0}^{t} a_i$. Then

$$a_i f(s_i) = \int_{s_{i-1}}^{s_i} f(s_i) dx \leq \int_{s_{i-1}}^{s_i} f(x) dx.$$ Summing over $i = 1, \ldots, T$, we have the stated bound. \qed

Details of Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Real datasets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real-sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>