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Abstract

Minimax optimization has recently gained a lot of attention as adversarial architectures and algorithms proliferate. Often, smooth minimax games proceed by simultaneous or alternating gradient updates. Although algorithms with alternating updates are commonly used in practice for many applications (e.g., GAN training), the majority of existing theoretical analyses focus on simultaneous algorithms. In this paper, we study alternating gradient descent-ascent (Alt-GDA) in minimax games and show that Alt-GDA is superior to its simultaneous counterpart (Sim-GDA) in many settings. In particular, we prove that Alt-GDA achieves a near-optimal local convergence rate for strongly-convex strongly-concave problems while Sim-GDA converges with a much slower rate. Moreover, we show that the acceleration effect of alternating updates remains when the minimax problem has only strong concavity in the dual variables. Numerical experiments on quadratic minimax games validate our claims. Additionally, we demonstrate that alternating updates speed up GAN training significantly and the use of optimism only helps for simultaneous algorithms.

1. Introduction

Since the seminal work of Neumann (1928), minimax optimization in the form of \( \min_x \max_y f(x, y) \) has been a major focus of research in mathematics, economics and computer science (Başar & Olsder, 1998; Roughgarden, 2010; Von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944). Recently, minimax optimization has gained tremendous attention in machine learning as it offers a flexible paradigm that goes beyond ordinary loss function minimization. In particular, there is a growing set of models that can be formulated as minimax problems, including generative adversarial networks (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Arjovsky et al., 2017), adversarial training (Madry et al., 2018), primal-dual reinforcement learning (Du et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020c) and robust optimization (Ben-Tal et al., 2009).

The most natural and frequently used method for solving minimax problems is the generalization of gradient descent known as gradient descent-ascent (GDA), with either simultaneous or alternating updates of the two players, referred to as Sim-GDA and Alt-GDA, respectively, throughout the sequel. Different from gradient descent which converges to a local minimum for minimization problems under a broad range of conditions (Lee et al., 2016; 2017), it is known that GDA with constant step-sizes could fail to converge for general smooth functions (Mescheder et al., 2017), even for the bilinear games (Gidel et al., 2019b; Bailey & Piliouras, 2018); even when it does converge, GDA may...
exhibit rotational behaviors (Mescheder et al., 2017; Letcher et al., 2019; Schaefer & Anandkumar, 2019) and hence converge slowly. To combat this problem, several algorithms have been introduced specifically for smooth games, including consensus optimization (Mescheder et al., 2017), negative momentum (NM) (Gidel et al., 2019b; Zhang & Wang, 2021), optimistic gradient-descent-ascent (OGDA) (Popov, 1980; Rakhlin & Sridharan, 2013; Daskalakis et al., 2018; Mertikopoulos et al., 2019) and extra-gradient (EG) (Korpelevich, 1976; Nemirovski, 2004).

The overwhelming majority of existing theoretical analyses focus on simultaneous algorithms where players update their strategies at the same time, as simultaneous updates are easier to analyze and can often be formulated as solving a variational inequality problem (Harker & Pang, 1990; Gidel et al., 2019a; Zhang et al., 2020). However, algorithms with alternating updates are commonly used in practice for many applications (e.g., GAN optimization) and sometimes enjoy better theoretical convergence properties than their simultaneous counterparts. In particular, the celebrated Stein–Rosenberg theorem (Stein & Rosenberg, 1948) formally proves that in solving certain linear systems, alternating updates converge strictly faster than their simultaneous counterparts, and often with a larger set of convergent instances. In bilinear games with the form of \( f(x, y) = x^T B y \), it has been shown that the iterates of Alt-GDA with properly chosen step-sizes stay bounded while Sim-GDA with any constant step-sizes diverges away from Nash equilibrium geometrically (Gidel et al., 2019b; Zhang & Yu, 2020; Bailey et al., 2020).

Yet, our understanding of alternating algorithms in minimax optimization is limited to simple bilinear games. For instance, the convergence rate of Alt-GDA for strongly-convex-strongly-concave functions is unknown while there are many papers showing that Sim-GDA converges linearly to the global Nash equilibrium (Ryu & Boyd, 2016; Azizian et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). The key difficulty of convergence analysis of alternating algorithms is that every iteration is a composition of two half updates, which adds another layer of complication.

**Our contributions.** In this paper, we first revisit the convergence properties of Alt-GDA in bilinear games for completeness. We then consider the strongly-convex strongly-concave quadratic games where Sim-GDA does converge and prove that Alt-GDA enjoys better convergence guarantees. Lastly, we show that both Sim-GDA and Alt-GDA attain linear convergence when the minimax problem has only strong concavity in the dual variables but no strong convexity in the primal variables, but Alt-GDA again gives a better convergence rate. In more detail:

1. We show that the iterates of Alt-GDA remain bounded while Sim-GDA diverges away from the equilibrium for any positive step-size in bilinear games, matching the known results in the literature.

2. We prove that, for strongly-convex strongly-concave quadratic games, Alt-GDA achieves an iteration complexity of \( O(\kappa) \), which is better than the \( O(\kappa^2) \) bound for Sim-GDA and even matches EG/OGDA. Notably, the complexity bound for Alt-GDA in this setting is near-optimal as it matches the coarse lower bound in Azizian et al. (2020, Corollary 1). We stress that convergence results for the quadratic case imply local convergence rates for smooth non-quadratic functions.

3. We further prove that both Sim-GDA and Alt-GDA attain linear convergence when the minimax problem has only strong concavity in \( y \) but no strong convexity in \( x \) by assuming non-singularity of the coupling matrix. Moreover, we show that the iterates of Alt-GDA converges to the equilibrium with an iteration complexity of \( O(\max\{\kappa^2_{xy}, \kappa_y\}) \) while Sim-GDA has a complexity bound of \( O(\max\{\kappa^2_{xy} \kappa_y, \kappa_y^2\}) \).

4. Finally, we validate our theory in quadratic minimax games. In addition, we demonstrate empirically that alternating updates could speed up GAN training though GAN objective is generally nonconvex-nonconcave.

**2. Preliminaries**

**Notation.** In this paper, scalars are denoted by lower-case letters (e.g., \( \lambda \)), vectors by lower-case bold letters (e.g., \( \mathbf{x} \)), matrices by upper-case bold letters (e.g., \( \mathbf{J} \)). The spectrum of a square matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) is denoted by \( \text{Sp}(\mathbf{A}) \), and its eigenvalue by \( \lambda \). We respectively note \( \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \) and \( \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \) the smallest and the largest positive singular values of \( \mathbf{A} \). For matrix inequality \( \mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B} \), we mean \( \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B} \) is positive semi-definite. We use \( \mathbb{R} \) and \( \mathbb{C} \) to denote the real part and imaginary part of a complex scalar respectively. We use \( \mathbb{R} \) and \( \mathbb{C} \) to denote the set of real numbers and complex numbers, respectively. We use \( \rho(\mathbf{A}) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \|\mathbf{A}^t\|^{1/t} \) to denote the spectral radius of matrix \( \mathbf{A} \). \( \mathcal{O} \), \( \Omega \) and \( \Theta \) are standard asymptotic notations.

**2.1. Two-player Minimax Games**

We begin by presenting the fundamental two-player zero-sum game that we will consider throughout the paper. To that end, our problem of interest is the following unconstrained minimax optimization problem:

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} f(x, y). \tag{1}
\]

We are usually interested in finding a **Nash equilibrium** (Von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944): a set of parameters from which no player can (locally and unilaterally) improve its objective function.
In this work, we in particular focus on the case of $f$ being a convex-concave and smooth function. Here we state the assumption formally.

**Assumption 1.** The function $f$ is continuously differentiable and $L$-smooth in $x$ and $y$. Further, we assume $f$ is convex in $x$ and concave in $y$.

For completeness, we state the definition of smooth function. We note that the smoothness assumption is quite standard for convergence analysis in the literature.

**Definition 1.** A function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is $L$-smooth if it has $L$-Lipschitz gradient on $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $\|\nabla \phi(x_1) - \nabla \phi(x_2)\| \leq L\|x_1 - x_2\|$.

One of the nice properties of working with convex-concave problem is that there often exists at least one global Nash equilibrium $(x^*, y^*)$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$f(x^*, y) \leq f(x^*, y^*) \leq f(x, y^*).$$

Throughout the paper, we consider the following a specific case of convex-concave minimax games – quadratic minimax games with the following form:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{2} x^\top A x + x^\top B y - \frac{1}{2} y^\top C y,$$

where $A$ and $C$ are symmetric and positive semi-definite. For this minimax game, we have its gradient vector field:

$$V(x, y) = [A x + B y; C y - B^\top x],$$

and its associated Jacobian matrix

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ -B^\top & C \end{bmatrix}.$$  

We stress that quadratic minimax games are by no means trivial and have been widely discussed in the literature (see e.g., Gidel et al. (2019b); Azizian et al. (2020); Zhang & Wang (2021); Liang & Stokes (2019); Fiez & Ratliff (2021)). In particular, the convergence in quadratic games implies local convergence for smooth non-quadratic minimax games around the equilibrium.

**Theorem 1 (Bertsekas (1997, Proposition 4.4.1)).** For a continuously differentiable non-linear operator $F$ with the fixed point $z^* = F(z^*)$. If the spectral radius $\rho_F := \rho(\nabla F(z^*)) < 1$, then for any $z_0$ in a neighborhood of $z^*$, the iterates of $z_0$ converge to $z^*$ with a linear rate of $O((\rho + \epsilon)^t)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

In this work, we will discuss three instances of (2):

1. Bilinear games where $A$ and $C$ are both zero matrices;
2. Strongly-convex strongly-concave games where both $A$ and $C$ are positive definite;
3. Only one of $A$ and $C$ is positive definite.

### 2.2. Gradient Descent-Ascent Family

With the problem set up, we are ready to present the two algorithms we will discuss throughout the paper – simultaneous gradient descent-ascent (Sim-GDA) and alternating gradient descent-ascent (Alt-GDA).

The de-facto standard algorithm for finding Nash-equilibria of general smooth two-player minimax games is simultaneous gradient descent-ascent (Sim-GDA) which is a direct generalization of gradient descent to minimax games. In particular, it updates both players $x$ and $y$ simultaneously:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + \eta \nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)$$

where $\eta$ is the step sizes. For the quadratic game (2), the update can be succinctly written as the repeated application of a linear operator:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{t+1} \\ y_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ \eta B^\top & I - \eta C \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ y_t \end{bmatrix}$$

$$:= F^\eta_{sim}(x_t, y_t)$$

By contrast, Alt-GDA takes advantage of the fact that the iterates $x_{t+1}$ and $y_{t+1}$ are computed sequentially:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + \eta \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)$$

Similarly, it leads to a linear operator in the quadratic case with the operator:

$$F^\eta_{alt}(x_t, y_t) := \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ \eta B^\top (I - \eta A) & I - \eta C - \eta^2 B^\top B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ y_t \end{bmatrix}$$

For Sim-GDA (or Alt-GDA), if it converges, and its limit point $(x^*, y^*)$ is a fixed point of $F^\eta$, then $(x^*, y^*)$ is a Nash equilibrium of problem (2).

### 2.3. Convergence Rates

We’ve shown that finding an equilibrium boils down to solving a linear system defined by the specific algorithm for the quadratic case. Here we introduce how to characterize the convergence speed of the algorithm in solving the problem.

Given the fact that the operator $F^\eta$ is linear, one could derive the asymptotic convergence rate by just computing the spectral radius of $\nabla F^\eta$, which is a constant matrix depending on $\eta$ in our simple setting. In the paper, we focus on the worst-case convergence rate which is defined as follows:

$$\min_{\eta} \max_{A, B, C, M} \rho(\nabla F^\eta)$$

^1Using separate step sizes for two players won’t improve the worst-case convergence rate.
where the inner maximization is over all possible instances within the whole problem class $\mathcal{M}$. To take an example, the problem class for the general convex-concave setting is $\mathcal{M} = \{ A, B, C | 0 \leq A, C \preceq L, \| B \|_2 \leq L \}$.

3. Revisiting Alt-GDA for Bilinear Games

In this section, we first revisit the unconstrained bilinear games (Gidel et al., 2019b; Daskalakis & Panageas, 2018; Liang & Stokes, 2019; Mokhtari et al., 2020a) for which Sim-GDA diverges for any finite step size. Formally, the bilinear game is given by

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} x^T B y,$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where we ignore the linear terms without loss of generality.

In this setting, the Nash equilibrium is $(x^*, y^*)$ satisfying $B^* x^* = 0$ and $B y^* = 0$. To measure convergence, one could monitor the distance to the equilibrium:

$$\Delta_t = \| x_t - x^* \|^2 + \| y_t - y^* \|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

We aim to understand the difference between the dynamics of simultaneous methods and alternating methods. Practitioners have been widely using the latter instead of the former when optimizing GANs despite the rich optimization literature on simultaneous methods.

For Sim-GDA, the eigenvalues of $I - \nabla F^\text{sim}_\eta$ are all pure imaginary. Hence, we have the spectral radius of the operator as $\rho(\nabla F^\text{sim}_\eta) = 1 + \eta^2 \sigma^2_{\max}(B)$. Therefore, we have

**Theorem 2 (Gidel et al. (2019b)).** For any $\eta > 0$, the iterates of Sim-GDA diverges as

$$\Delta_t \in O(\Delta_0 (1 + \eta^2 \sigma^2_{\max}(B)) t^4)$$

This theorem states that the iterates of Sim-GDA diverge linearly for any positive constant step-size $\eta$. By contrast, the iterates of Alt-GDA stay bounded due to the sequential update rule which significantly shifts the eigenvalues of the Jacobian. In particular, the eigenvalues of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$ are roots of the following polynomial

$$(x - 1)^2 + \eta^2 \lambda x, \quad \lambda \in \text{Sp}(B^T B).$$

As a consequence, the spectral radius of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$ is upper bounded by 1 with properly chosen step size $\eta$ and hence the iterates of Alt-GDA stays bounded.

**Theorem 3.** For any $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\max}(B)}$, the iterates of Alt-GDA stay bounded

$$\Delta_t \in O(\Delta_0)$$

Similar results can be found in the literature (see e.g., Gidel et al. (2019b); Zhang & Yu (2020)). In addition, one can show that for bilinear games, Alt-GDA is perhaps a symplectic integrator applied on the continuous dynamics (Bailey et al., 2020), which preserves energy and volume.

4. Alt-GDA Achieves Acceleration for Quadratic Minimax Games

In the last section, we revisited the dynamics of Sim-GDA and Alt-GDA in bilinear games. In this section, we move on to discuss the general setting (2) which adds attractive forces to both players (other than the rotational forces in bilinear games). In particular, we assume $f(x, y)$ is strongly-convex strongly-concave and smooth, which implies

$$\mu_x I \preceq A \preceq L_x I, \quad \mu_y I \preceq C \preceq L_y I, \quad \| B \|_2 \leq L_{xy}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

We let $L := \max\{L_x, L_y, L_{xy}\}$ and $\mu := \min\{\mu_x, \mu_y\}$ and define the condition number $\kappa := L/\mu$. Accordingly, one can define $\bar{\kappa}_x := L/\mu_x$ and $\bar{\kappa}_y := L/\mu_y$. In this setting, the worst-case convergence rate (9) of Sim-GDA is equivalent to

$$\min_{\eta, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}} | 1 - \eta \lambda |$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $\mathbb{C} = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : | \lambda | \leq \sqrt{2} L, \Re \lambda \geq \mu > 0 \}$ (see Appendix B). This set is the intersection between a circle and a halfplane (Azizian et al., 2020). It is known that Sim-GDA converges slowly to the equilibrium in this setting due to the large imaginary part of its eigenvalues (Mescheder et al., 2017), we summarize the result here.

**Theorem 4.** With the step size $\eta = \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}}}{\sqrt{2} \bar{\kappa}}$, the asymptotic convergence rate of Sim-GDA is $\rho(\nabla F^\text{sim}_\eta) = 1 - \frac{1}{2 \kappa^2}$, hence we have

$$\Delta_t \in O(\Delta_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2 \kappa^2}\right)^t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

We remark that this rate implies local convergence with a linear rate of $O((1 - \frac{1}{2 \kappa^2} + \epsilon)^t)$ by Theorem 1. Further, this theorem suggests that Sim-GDA converges to the equilibrium linearly with an iteration complexity of $O(\kappa^2)$, which is much slower than the $O(\kappa)$ iteration complexity of extra-gradient (EG) or optimistic gradient-descent-ascent (OGDA) (Gidel et al., 2019a; Mokhtari et al., 2020a).

To understand why, we note the maximization over $\lambda$ in (13) is attained in the case of $\lambda = \mu + \sqrt{2 L^2 - \mu^2} i$, which has a large imaginary component. As shown in Mescheder et al. (2017, Lemma 4), the largest feasible step size is inversely proportional to $(\frac{\mu}{\kappa})^2$. Hence, the step size has to be extremely small in the presence of eigenvalues with large imaginary parts, which in turn, leads to slow convergence.

In a nutshell, the culprits of slow convergence in Sim-GDA are eigenvalues of the Jacobian of the associated gradient vector field with large imaginary parts. We stress that eigenvalues with large imaginary components contribute to a strong “rotational force”. To improve convergence, some
With the step size η, the real eigenvalues of ∇^Sim F satisfy

|λ| ≤ \max\{1 - \eta \mu_x, 1 - \eta \mu_y\},

and its complex eigenvalues satisfy

|λ| ≤ \sqrt{(1 - \eta \mu_x)(1 - \eta \mu_y)}.

In stark contrast to Sim-GDA, the complex eigenvalues with large imaginary parts are not the laggard any more for Alt-GDA. Hence, we are allowed to use a larger step size, which gives an improved convergence rate (see Figure 2 for details).

Remark 1. In stark contrast to Sim-GDA, the complex eigenvalues with large imaginary parts are not the laggard any more for Alt-GDA. Hence, we are allowed to use a larger step size, which gives an improved convergence rate (see Figure 2 for details).

Following immediately from Theorem 5, we have the following Corollary with a proper chosen step-size.

Corollary 1. With η = \frac{1}{2\kappa}, the asymptotic convergence rate of Alt-GDA is ρ(∇^Alt F_η) = 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa}, hence we have

\[ Δ_t \in \mathcal{O}\left(Δ_0\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa}\right)^t\right) \]  

Again, this bound implies a local convergence rate of \( \mathcal{O}\left((1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} + \epsilon)^t\right) \) for smooth non-quadratic functions. In addition, this corollary suggests that the iteration complexity of Alt-GDA matches the coarse lower iteration complexity bound\(^3\) \( \Omega(\kappa) \) (Azizian et al., 2020, Corollary 1) up to a constant. More surprisingly, it implies that the convergence rate of Alt-GDA is no worse than its rate for pure cooperative games with B = 0. Put it differently, the adversarial component (the existence of coupling matrix B) does not make the optimization any harder for Alt-GDA. We remark that this is not true for Sim-GDA because the coupling matrix B introduces complex eigenvalues with large imaginary parts for Sim-GDA, which slows down convergence.

5. Acceleration without Strong Convexity

In the last section, we analyzed quadratic strongly-convex strongly concave minimax games where both players receive attractive forces. Here, we further discuss the case that has only strong concavity in the player y but no strong convexity in the player x. In particular, it is equivalent to assume

\[ 0 ≤ A ≤ L_x I, \quad μ_y I ≤ C ≤ L_y I, \quad \|B\|_2 ≤ L_{xy} \]  

This setting was investigated in empirical policy evaluation where no strong convex regularization is applied on the primal variables (Du et al., 2017). They showed that the

\(^3\)The fine-grained bound (Zhang et al., 2019) is \( \Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_x \kappa_y}) \). One could achieve this bound by using a accelerated proximal point framework (Yang et al., 2020b) with Alt-GDA in the inner-loop.
non-singularity of the coupling matrix $B$ can help achieve linear convergence for Sim-GDA. Technically, the coupling matrix $B$ has to be full-row rank (i.e., $\lambda_{\min}(BB^\top) > 0$) and we simply assume $\mu_{xy} := \sigma_{\min}(B) > 0$. Then for Sim-GDA, we have the eigenvalues of its Jacobian in the following theorem:

**Theorem 6.** Let $\eta \leq \frac{1}{T}$, any eigenvalue of $\nabla F^\text{Sim}_\eta$, if it is real, satisfies the following bound

$$|\lambda| \leq \max\{1 - \frac{2}{T} \mu_x^2, 1 - \eta \mu_y\}.$$ 

Otherwise (if it is complex), it is upper bounded as follows

$$|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{1 - \eta \mu_y + 2\eta^2 L^2}.$$

To be noted, our eigenvalue bounds in Theorem 6 are slightly different from that in Du et al. (2017) as they allow step size separation for player $x$ and $y$. As a result, we get the following bound on the distance to the equilibrium by optimizing over the step-size $\eta$.

**Corollary 2.** Choosing $\eta = \frac{\mu_y}{\eta \mu_x}$, the asymptotic rate of Sim-GDA is $\rho(\nabla F^\text{Sim}_\eta) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{16 \max\{\kappa_y \kappa_x^2, \kappa_y^2\}}$. Hence, the iterates of Sim-GDA converge as

$$\Delta_t \in O\left(\Delta_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{16 \max\{\kappa_y \kappa_x^2, \kappa_y^2\}}\right)^t\right).$$

This corollary suggests that the convergence rate of Sim-GDA could match the rate in Theorem 4 if the coupling matrix is well-conditioned (i.e., $\kappa_{xy} \approx 1$), albeit the absence of strong convexity in $x$. Naturally, this begs the question: whether we can derive similar results for Alt-GDA that improves upon the rate bound of Sim-GDA. We answer this question in the affirmative. In particular, we have the following bounds for the eigenvalues of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$:

**Theorem 7.** Let $\eta \leq \frac{1}{T}$, any eigenvalue of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$, if it is real, satisfies the following bound

$$|\lambda| \leq \max\{1 - \eta^2 \mu_x^2, 1 - \eta \mu_y\}.$$ 

Otherwise (if it is complex), it is upper bounded as follows

$$|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{1 - \eta \mu_y}.$$

Compare the eigenvalue bound of Alt-GDA to Sim-GDA, one may notice that the main difference is the complex eigenvalues. Similar to the strongly-convex strongly-concave setting, the complex eigenvalues of Alt-GDA are much smaller in magnitude, thus allowing us to use large step sizes. Consequently, we have a better convergence rate for Alt-GDA (see Figure 1 for detailed comparisons).

**Corollary 3.** Choosing $\eta = \frac{1}{T}$, the iterates of Alt-GDA converges to the equilibrium as

$$\Delta_t \in O\left(\Delta_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{4 \max\{\kappa_{xy}^2, \kappa_y\}}\right)^t\right).$$

Compared with the bound of Sim-GDA in Theorem 2, one can see that Alt-GDA converges much faster than Sim-GDA, especially when $\kappa_y$ is large.

### 6. Related Work

The discussion of simultaneous and alternating updates in iterative algorithms dates back to the Jacobi and Gauss–Seidel methods in numerical linear algebra (see Saad (2003) for details). The Jacobi method makes simultaneous updates and is therefore naturally amenable to parallelization. On the other hand, the Gauss-Seidel method updates sequentially, so that each update leverages fresh information, and therefore is typically more stable and converges in fewer iterations. In minimax optimization, there is an analogous trade-off between simultaneous and alternating updates.

The discussion of alternating algorithms is lacking and is largely limited to simple bilinear games. Gidel et al. (2019b) showed that Alt-GDA stays bounded and negative momentum with alternating updates converges linearly in bilinear games. Later, Bailey et al. (2020) extended the analysis of Alt-GDA to no-regret online learning, albeit just for simple bilinear games. Zhang & Yu (2020) provided some evidence that alternating version of many popular algorithms outperform their simultaneous counterpart in bilinear games. Very recently, Yang et al. (2020a) established the global convergence of Alt-GDA in a subclass of nonconvex-nonconcave objectives satisfying a so-called two-sided Polyak-Łojasiewicz inequality. As a result, we get the following bound on the distance to the equilibrium by optimizing over the step-size $\eta$.

**Corollary 2.** Choosing $\eta = \mu_y$, the asymptotic rate of Sim-GDA is $\rho(\nabla F^\text{Sim}_\eta) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{16 \max\{\kappa_y \kappa_x^2, \kappa_y^2\}}$. Hence, the iterates of Sim-GDA converge as

$$\Delta_t \in O\left(\Delta_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{16 \max\{\kappa_y \kappa_x^2, \kappa_y^2\}}\right)^t\right)$$

This corollary suggests that the convergence rate of Sim-GDA could match the rate in Theorem 4 if the coupling matrix is well-conditioned (i.e., $\kappa_{xy} \approx 1$), albeit the absence of strong convexity in $x$. Naturally, this begs the question: whether we can derive similar results for Alt-GDA that improves upon the rate bound of Sim-GDA. We answer this question in the affirmative. In particular, we have the following bounds for the eigenvalues of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$:

**Theorem 7.** Let $\eta \leq \frac{1}{T}$, any eigenvalue of $\nabla F^\text{Alt}_\eta$, if it is real, satisfies the following bound

$$|\lambda| \leq \max\{1 - \eta^2 \mu_x^2, 1 - \eta \mu_y\}.$$ 

Otherwise (if it is complex), it is upper bounded as follows

$$|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{1 - \eta \mu_y}.$$
and this rate is achieved by both the EG and OGDA algorithms (Nemirovski, 2004; Tseng, 2008; Hsieh et al., 2019; Mokhtari et al., 2020b) for the averaged (ergodic) iterates. Later, (Golowich et al., 2020a) derived a $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ bound for the last iterate of EG and OGDA.

Beyond the convex-concave setting, nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems have recently gained more attention due to their generality. However, there might be no Nash (or even local Nash) equilibria in that setting due to the loss of strong duality. To overcome that, different notions of equilibrium were introduced by taking into account the sequential structure of games (Jin et al., 2020; Fiez et al., 2019; Farnia et al., 2019) and this rate is achieved by both the EG and OGDA algorithms (Nemirovski, 2004; Tseng, 2008; Hsieh et al., 2019; Mokhtari et al., 2020b) for the averaged (ergodic) iterates. Later, (Golowich et al., 2020a) derived a $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ bound for the last iterate of EG and OGDA.

In that setting, the main challenge is to find the right equilibrium and some algorithms (Wang et al., 2019; Adolphs et al., 2019; Mazumdar et al., 2019) have been proposed to achieve that. By comparison, nonconvex-concave problems appear to be a class of tractable problems. For this line of research, double-loop algorithms (or even triple-loop) (Rafique et al., 2018; Nouiehed et al., 2019) and two-time-scale algorithms (Lin et al., 2020a) are typically used for convergence.

7. Experiments

7.1. Quadratic Minimax Games

In this section, we compare the performance of Alt-GDA with Sim-GDA along with other three popular algorithms (EG, OGDA and NM) so as to verify our theoretical result on the convergence rate of Alt-GDA. In particular, we focus on the following quadratic minimax problem:

$$
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} x^T A x + x^T B y - \frac{1}{2} y^T C y \tag{17}
$$

where we set the dimension $d = 100$. We note both linear regression (Du & Hu, 2019) and robust least square (Yang et al., 2020a) problem admit this minimax formulation. The matrices $A$ and $C$ have eigenvalues $\{\frac{1}{\kappa_i}\}_{i=1}^d$, giving a condition number of 100. For matrix $B$, we set it to be a random matrix with entries sampling from a Gaussian distribution $N(0, 0.01)$. For all algorithms, the iterates start with $x_0 = 1$ and $y_0 = 1$. Figure 3 shows that the distance to the optimum of Sim-GDA, Alt-GDA, OGDA, EG and NM versus the number of iterations for this minimax problem. For all methods, we tune their hyperparameters by grid-search. We can observe that all three methods converge linearly to the optimum. As expected, Alt-GDA performs significantly better than Sim-GDA and yields a convergence rate that is better than its worst-case rate (black dashed line). Moreover, we find that Alt-GDA outperforms OGDA and EG by a visible margin. This is surprising, in that OGDA and EG take another memory buffer for accelerating the convergence.

Further, we study how the convergence rates (or iteration complexities) scale with the condition numbers. To this end, we randomly sample matrices $A$, $B$, $C$ and compute the condition number by $\kappa = \max_{i} |\lambda_i| / \min_{i} |\lambda_i|$ where $\lambda_i$ are eigenvalues of the Jacobian $J$ in (4). Once we have all these three matrices, we can compute the spectral radius $\rho$ of all algorithms with tuned step-sizes and momentum value. We plot $-1/\log(\rho)$ versus the condition number $\kappa$ in Figure 3 (right) to get a sense of how the relative iteration complexity scales as a function of condition number. We find that the iteration complexity of Alt-GDA scales linearly with the condition number, matching our prediction in Corollary 1. On the other hand, Sim-GDA takes roughly $\kappa^2$ iterations to convergence, as predicted in Theorem 4. In addition, Alt-GDA is slightly better than OGDA and EG as its curve
Figure 4. Comparisons between simultaneous algorithms and alternating algorithms on GAN training. (a) We train the DCGAN model on CIFAR-10 with simultaneous SGD. The samples are saved at iteration 30000. (b) We train the DCGAN model on CIFAR-10 with alternating SGD. Again, the samples are saved at iteration 30000. (c) The curves of FID scores on CIFAR-10 with SGD. The dash lines are computed at exponential moving averaged models. (d) The curves of FID scores on CIFAR-10 with AMSGrad. In all settings, alternating version of the algorithms converges much faster than their simultaneous counterparts and achieve better FID scores in the end.

Figure 5. (a) ResNet model trained with SGD on CIFAR-10. (b) ResNet model trained with AMSGrad on CIFAR-10. Alternating algorithms dominate simultaneous ones. More interestingly, the use of optimism does not help for alternating algorithms.

suggesting that alternating updates and optimistic updates have similar roles in improving GAN training. This could be explained by our theoretical results that Alt-GDA enjoys similar convergence rate as OGDA.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we take an important step towards understanding alternating algorithms in minimax optimization by analyzing alternating GDA in three distinct settings. In particular, we show theoretically that Alt-GDA outperforms its simultaneous counterpart by a big margin in all three settings. Unexpectedly, Alt-GDA achieves near-optimal convergence rate locally for strongly-convex strongly-concave smooth minimax games, matching the known coarse lower bound. Moreover, we show that the acceleration effect of alternating updates remains when the minimax problem has only strong concavity in the dual variables.

Our numerical simulations on toy quadratic games verified our claims. Further, we demonstrate empirically that alternating updates could significantly speed up GAN training though GAN objective is generally nonconvex-nonconcave. More interestingly, we show that the use of optimism only helps for simultaneous algorithms. We believe that the default use of alternating update rule in GAN training was an important reason for its success.
Acknowledgments

We thank Chris J. Maddison, Ioannis Mitliagkas and Guojun Zhang for many helpful discussions. We also thank Chaoqi Wang, Jenny Bao and Jonathan Lorraine for detailed comments on early drafts. GZ would like to thank for the supports from Borealis AI fellowship. RG acknowledges support from the CIFAR Canadian AI Chairs program.

References


Near-optimal Local Convergence of Alternating Gradient Descent-Ascent for Minimax Optimization


A. Proof of Theorem 3 and 5

For the quadratic minimax game, Alt-GDA iterates as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
X_{t+1} \\
Y_{t+1}
\end{bmatrix} = \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}} \begin{bmatrix}
X_t \\
Y_t
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where the Jacobian matrix \( \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}} \) has the following form:

\[
\nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ \eta B^T & I - \eta C \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ \eta B^T(I - \eta A) & I - \eta C - \eta^2 B^T B \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}
\]

Without loss of generality, we assume matrices \( A \) and \( C \) to be diagonal with eigenvalues \( [\alpha]_i \) and \( [\beta]_j \). We have the characteristic polynomial:

\[
\det(\lambda I - \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}}) = \det(\lambda I - (I - \eta A)) \det(\lambda I - (I - \eta C - \eta^2 B^T B - \eta^2 B^T (I - \eta A)(\lambda I - I + \eta A)^{-1} B)), \tag{20}
\]

where we used properties of the Schur complement. For \( \det(\lambda I - \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}}) \) to be zero, \( \lambda \) has to one of the eigenvalues of the following matrix:

\[
M := I - \eta C - \eta^2 B^T \text{Diag} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1 + \eta \alpha} \right) B. \tag{21}
\]

**In the case of \( \lambda \) being real,** it is easy to show that for any \( \eta \leq \frac{1}{2L} \), we have

\[
|\lambda| \leq \max \{1 - \eta \alpha_{\min}, 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \}. \tag{22}
\]

We prove that by contradiction. Suppose \( \lambda > \max \{1 - \eta \alpha_{\min}, 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \} \geq 0 \), then we have

\[
\lambda_{\max}(M) \leq 1 - \eta \lambda_{\min}(C) = 1 - \eta \beta_{\min}. \tag{23}
\]

That is because the term \( \eta^2 B^T \text{Diag} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1 + \eta \alpha} \right) B \) is positive semi-definite when \( \lambda > \max \{1 - \eta \alpha_{\min}, 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \} \geq 0 \).

Since we know \( \lambda \) is one of the eigenvalue of \( M \) and hence it has to be smaller than \( 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \), contradiction.

Suppose \( \lambda < - \max \{1 - \eta \alpha_{\min}, 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \} \leq 0 \), we have

\[
M \succeq I - \eta C - \eta^2 B^T B. \tag{24}
\]

For bilinear games where \( C = 0 \), we have \( M \succeq 0 \) and hence \( \lambda \) is impossible to be smaller than \( -1 \). On the other hand, since we have \( \eta \leq \frac{1}{2L} \), we know \( M \succeq 0 \), contradiction again. Therefore, we proved that \( |\lambda| \leq \max \{1 - \eta \alpha_{\min}, 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \} \).

**In the case of \( \lambda \) being complex,** we let \( \lambda = a + bi \) with \( b \neq 0 \) and \( v \) be the eigenvector associated with \( \lambda \) such that \( Mv = \lambda v \). Then we have the following identities:

\[
v^*(M + M^*)v = 2\Re(\lambda) = 2a,
\]

\[
v^*(M - M^*)v = 2\Im(\lambda)i = 2bi. \tag{25}
\]

Plugging the value of \( M \), we have

\[
a = \frac{1}{2} v^*(M + M^*)v = \sum_j (1 - \eta \beta_j) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 \sum_j |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{a^2 - a(1 - \eta \alpha_j) + b^2}{(a - 1 + \eta \alpha_j)^2 + b^2} \tag{26}
\]

and

\[
bi = \frac{1}{2} v^*(M - M^*)v = \eta^2 \sum_j |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{(1 - \eta \alpha_j)bi}{(a - 1 + \eta \alpha_j)^2 + b^2}. \tag{27}
\]

From (27), one can get

\[
\eta^2 \sum_j |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{(1 - \eta \alpha_j)}{(a - 1 + \eta \alpha_j)^2 + b^2} = 1. \tag{28}
\]
Next, combining (26) and (28), we have
\[ \sum_j (1 - \eta \beta_j) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{a^2 + b^2}{\Delta_j} = 0, \] (29)
where \( \Delta_j = (a - 1 + \eta \alpha_j)^2 + b^2 \). It follows from (29) and (28) that
\[ 1 = \eta^2 \sum_j |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{(1 - \eta \alpha_j)}{\Delta_j} \leq \eta^2 \sum_j |(Bv)_j|^2 \frac{(1 - \eta \alpha_{\min})}{\Delta_j} \]

As a result,
\[ |\lambda|^2 = a^2 + b^2 \leq (1 - \eta \alpha_{\min})(1 - \eta \beta_{\min}). \] (31)

For bilinear games, the Jacobian matrix \( \nabla F_{\eta}^A \) is diagonalizable (since real skew-symmetric matrix is diagonalizable in \( \mathbb{C} \)); by Lemma 3 in Gidel et al. (2019b), we conclude that \( \Delta_t \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta_0) \).

\section*{B. Proof of Theorem 4}

To prove Theorem 4, we first claim that all eigenvalues of \( J \) in (4) fall within the following set:
\[ \mathcal{K} = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| \leq \sqrt{2}L, \Re \lambda \geq \mu > 0 \right\}. \] (32)

We first prove \( \Re \lambda \geq \mu \). Let \( \lambda := a + bi \) is a complex eigenvalue of \( J \) such that \( Jv = \lambda v \). In general, the eigenvector \( v \) is a complex vector and we let \( v = u + wi \). Then, one can show
\[ \Re(\lambda) = \frac{u^T Ju + w^T Jw}{u^T u + w^T w} = \frac{u_1^T A u_1 + u_2^T C u_2 + w_1^T A w_1 + w_2^T C w_2}{u^T u + w^T w} \] (33)
where \( u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is the first half of the vector \( u \) and \( u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is the second half (the same for \( w_1, w_2 \)). As we know that \( A \succeq \mu_x I \succeq \mu I \) and \( C \succeq \mu_y I \succeq \mu I \), we have
\[ \Re(\lambda) \geq \frac{\mu u_1^T u_1 + \mu u_2^T u_2 + \mu w_1^T w_1 + \mu w_2^T w_2}{u^T u + w^T w} = \mu. \] (34)

We next prove \( |\lambda| \leq \sqrt{2L} \). To this end, it suffices to show \( \lambda_{\max}(J^T J) \leq 2L^2 \). Recall the definition of \( J \) in (4), we have
\[ J^T J = \begin{bmatrix} A & -B \ A^T & B \\ B^T & C \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ -B^T & C \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^2 + BB^T & AB - BC \\ B^T A - CB^T & B^T B + C^2 \end{bmatrix}. \] (35)

Hence,
\[ \lambda_{\max}(J^T J) = \max_{||v||=1} v^T J^T Jv = \max_{||v||=1} v_1^T (A^2 + BB^T)v_1 + v_2^T (C^2 + B^T B)v_2 \] (36)

Because we assume \( A \preceq L_x I \preceq LI, C \preceq L_y I \preceq LI \) and \( ||B||_2 \leq L_{xy} \leq L \), we have
\[ \lambda_{\max}(J^T J) \leq \max_{||v||=1} 2L^2(v_1^T v_1 + v_2^T v_2) = 2L^2. \] (37)

Therefore, we get \( |\lambda| \leq \sqrt{2L} \). Now the convergence rate bound of Sim-GDA reduces to the following problem:
\[ \min_{\eta} \max_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}} |1 - \eta \lambda| = \min_{\eta} \max_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(1 - \eta \Re(\lambda))^2 + \eta^2 \Im(\lambda)^2} \] (38)
where the maximum modulus is achieved on the point \( \lambda = \mu + \sqrt{2L^2 - \mu^2} \). Hence, we have
\[
\rho(\nabla F_{Sim}^\sim) \leq \min \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} |1 - \eta \lambda| = \min_\eta 1 - 2\eta \mu + 2\eta^2 L^2 = 1 - \frac{\mu}{2L^2}.
\]
As a consequence, we have
\[
\Delta_t = ||x_t - x^*||_2^2 + ||y_t - y^*|| \leq ||\nabla F_{Sim}^\sim||_2^2 \Delta_{t-1}.
\]
By the property of spectral radius, we know that there exists a norm \( \| \cdot \| \) such that \( \| \nabla F_{Sim}^\sim \| \leq \rho(\nabla F_{Sim}^\sim) + \epsilon = 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} + \epsilon \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). It follows immediately that \( \| \nabla F_{Sim}^\sim \|_2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \). Finally, by the equivalence of matrix norm, we get
\[
\Delta_t \in \mathcal{O} \left( \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\right)^t \Delta_0 \right).
\]

**C. Proof of Corollary 1**

All the corollaries in the main paper can be proved in the same way, therefore we only give the proof for Corollary 1.

Choosing the step size \( \eta = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \), we have \( \rho(\nabla F_{Alt}^\sim) = 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \) (by Theorem 5). As a consequence, we have
\[
\Delta_t = ||x_t - x^*||_2^2 + ||y_t - y^*|| \leq ||\nabla F_{Alt}^\sim||_2^2 \Delta_{t-1}.
\]
By the property of spectral radius (see e.g. Greenbaum (1997, Theorem 1.3.3)), we know that there exists a norm \( \| \cdot \| \) such that \( \| \nabla F_{Alt}^\sim \| \leq \rho(\nabla F_{Alt}^\sim) + \epsilon = 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} + \epsilon \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). It follows immediately that \( \| \nabla F_{Alt}^\sim \|_2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \). Finally, we use the fact that any two matrix norms are equivalent asymptotically. In particular, for any two matrix norms \( \| \cdot \|_\alpha \) and \( \| \cdot \|_\beta \), we know
\[
r\|M\|_\alpha \leq \|M\|_\beta \leq s\|M\|_\alpha
\]
for some positive numbers \( r, s \) and for all matrix \( M \). Hence, we conclude
\[
\Delta_t \in \mathcal{O} \left( \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\right)^t \Delta_0 \right).
\]

**D. Proof of Theorem 6**

Recall that the Jacobian matrix \( \nabla F_{Sim}^\sim \) of Sim-GDA:
\[
\nabla F_{Sim}^\sim = \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ \eta B^T & I - \eta C \end{bmatrix}.
\]
To bound its spectral radius, we first compute its characteristic polynomial and simplify it with the Schur complement.
\[
\det(\lambda I - \nabla F_{Sim}^\sim) = \det(\lambda I - (I - \eta C)) \det(\lambda I - (I - \eta A - \eta^2 B(I - (I - \eta C)^{-1} B^T)))
\]
In the case of \( \lambda \) being real, for \( \eta \leq \frac{1}{2} \), one can prove that \( \lambda \) is within the range \((0, 1)\) by contradiction argument. Without loss of generality, we assume matrices \( A \) and \( C \) to be diagonal with eigenvalues \([\alpha]_i\) and \([\beta]_j\). Let assume \( \lambda > 1 - \eta \beta_{\min} \), then we claim that \( \lambda \leq 1 - \frac{\eta}{L} \lambda_{\min}(BB^T) \). The key is (by \( \lambda < 1 \))
\[
(\lambda I - (I - \eta C))^{-1} \geq (\eta C)^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{\eta Ly} I \geq \frac{1}{\eta L} I
\]
Therefore, we have a upper bound for \( M := I - \eta A - \eta^2 B(I - (I - \eta C)^{-1} B^T) \)
\[
M \leq I - \frac{\eta}{L} BB^T \leq \left( 1 - \frac{\eta}{L} \lambda_{\min}(BB^T) \right) I.
\]
Hence, $\lambda$, as one of the eigenvalues of $M$, has to be smaller than $1 - \frac{n}{L} \lambda_{\text{min}}(BB^T)$. In summary, we proved that
\[
0 < \lambda \leq \max \left\{ 1 - \eta \beta_{\text{min}}, 1 - \frac{\eta}{L} \lambda_{\text{min}}(BB^T) \right\}
\] (49)

**In the case of $\lambda$ being complex**, we claim that $\Re(\lambda) \leq 1 - \frac{2}{\eta} \mu_\eta$. Let $\lambda = a + bi$ with $b \neq 0$ and $v$ be the eigenvector associated with $\lambda$ such that $Mv = \lambda v$. Then we have the following identities:
\[
v^H(M + M^H)v = 2\Re(\lambda) = 2a \quad (50)
\]
\[
v^H(M - M^H)v = 2\Im(\lambda)i = 2bi
\]
Plugging the value of $M$, we have
\[
a = \frac{1}{2} v^H(M + M^H)v = \sum_j (1 - \eta \alpha_j) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{a - (1 - \eta \beta_j)}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2}
\] (51)
and
\[
b = \frac{1}{2} v^H(M - M^H)v = \eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{bi}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2}
\] (52)
From (52), we get
\[
\eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{1}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2} = 1
\] (53)
Next, combining (52) and (51), we have
\[
2a - 1 = \sum_j (1 - \eta \alpha_j) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{\eta \beta_j}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2}
\leq \sum_j (1 - \eta \alpha_{\text{min}}) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{\eta \beta_{\text{min}}}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2}
\] (54)
\[
\leq \sum_j (1 - \eta \beta_{\text{min}}) |v_j|^2 - \eta^2 \sum_j |(B^T v_j)|^2 \frac{\eta \beta_{\text{min}}}{(a - 1 + \eta \beta_j)^2 + b^2}
\]
\[
= 1 - \eta \beta_{\text{min}}
\]
Therefore, we proved our claim that $\Re(\lambda) = a \leq 1 - \frac{2}{\eta} \beta_{\text{min}}$.

Then, we could prove $J = \frac{1}{\eta}(I - \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Sim}})$ has the operator norm $\|J\| \leq \sqrt{2L}$ by the same argument in (37). Consequently, we have $|\Im(\lambda)| \leq \eta \sqrt{2L^2 - \frac{\mu_\eta^2}{4}}$. Follows immediately, we have
\[
|\lambda| = \sqrt{\Re(\lambda)^2 + \Im(\lambda)^2} \leq (1 - \frac{\eta}{2} \mu_\eta)^2 + \eta^2(2L^2 - \frac{1}{4} \mu_\eta^2) = 1 - \eta \mu_\eta + 2\eta^2 L^2
\] (55)

**E. Proof of Theorem 7**

As in the proof of Theorem 5, we analyze the eigenvalues of $\nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}}$. Recall $\nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}}$ has the following form:
\[
\nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A & -\eta B \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ \eta B^T & I - \eta C \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \eta A - \eta^2 BB^T & -\eta B(I - \eta C) \\ \eta B^T & I - \eta C \end{bmatrix}
\] (56)
Notice that this matrix in (56) is slightly different from the one defined in (8), but they have the same eigen-spectrum. Without loss of generality, we assume matrices $A$ and $C$ to be diagonal with eigenvalues $[\alpha_i]$ and $[\beta_j]$. We then have the characteristic polynomial:
\[
\det(\lambda I - \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}}) = \det(\lambda I - (I - \eta C))\det((\lambda I - (I - \eta A - \eta^2 BB^T - \eta^2 B(I - \eta C)(\lambda I - I + \eta C)^{-1}B^T)))
\] (57)
where we used Schur complement. For $\det(\lambda I - \nabla F_{\eta}^{\text{Alt}})$ to be zero, $\lambda$ has to one of the eigenvalues of the following matrix:
\[
M := I - \eta A - \eta^2 BB^T - \eta^2 B(I - \eta C)(\lambda I - I + \eta C)^{-1}B^T
\] (58)
In the case of $\lambda$ being real, for any $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda}$, it is easy to show that $\lambda$, as one of the eigenvalues of $M$, is within $(0, 1)$. Let us first assume $\lambda > 1 - \eta \beta_{\text{min}}$, we have $B(I - \eta C)((\lambda I - I + \eta C)^{-1}B^T \geq 0$. Hence, we have

$$M \preceq I - \eta A - \eta^2 BB^T \preceq I - \eta^2 BB^T \preceq (1 - \eta^2 \mu_{xy})I \quad (59)$$

As a consequence, we know $|\lambda| \leq 1 - \eta^2 \mu_{xy}^2$.

In the case of $\lambda$ being complex, we could reuse the result of (31)

$$|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{(1 - \eta \alpha_{\text{min}})(1 - \eta \beta_{\text{min}})} \leq \sqrt{1 - \eta \mu_y} \quad (60)$$

F. Additional Results on SVHN

![FID score vs iterations for ResNet on SVHN](image)

Figure 6. (a) ResNet model trained with SGD on SVHN. (b) ResNet model trained with AMSGrad on SVHN. Alternating algorithms dominate simultaneous ones. Again, the use of optimism makes little difference for alternating algorithms.

G. Implementation Details for Generative Adversarial Networks

For our experiments, we used the PyTorch\(^9\) deep learning framework. For experiments, we compute the FID score using the provided implementation in Tensorflow\(^10\) for consistency with related works.

Optimistic update rule: the simultaneous version of optimistic gradient descent-ascent takes the following form:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - 2\eta \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) + \eta \nabla_x f(x_{t-1}, y_{t-1})$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + 2\eta \nabla_y f(x_t, y_t) - \eta \nabla_y f(x_{t-1}, y_{t-1}) \quad (61)$$

By comparison, the alternating version iterates as follows:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - 2\eta \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) + \eta \nabla_x f(x_{t-1}, y_{t-1})$$

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + 2\eta \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \eta \nabla_y f(x_t, y_{t-1}) \quad (62)$$

Loss functions: For DCGAN experiments, we used WGAN-GP objective (Gulrajani et al., 2017). For ResNet experiments, we used the hinge version of the adversarial non-saturating loss, see Miyato et al. (2018). As a reference, our ResNet architectures for CIFAR-10 and SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011) have approximately 85 layers in total for the generator and discriminator, including the non-linearity and the normalization layers. This ResNet architecture was also used in Chavdarova et al. (2021), see Appendix E 2.2 of Chavdarova et al. (2021).

Hyperparameters: We conduct grid search over the step size (and $\beta_2$ for AMSGrad) for each setting. For SGD, the search range of step-size is $\{5e^{-4}, 1e^{-3}, 2e^{-3}, 5e^{-3}, 1e^{-2}, 2e^{-2}\}$. For AMSGrad, the search range of step-size is $\{5e^{-5}, 1e^{-4}, 2e^{-4}, 5e^{-4}, 1e^{-3}, 2e^{-3}\}$ while the search range of $\beta_2$ is $\{0.9, 0.99, 0.999\}$. We report the optimal hyperparameters used in the following tables. All these hyperparameters are tuned with random seed 1. We have also tried other seeds (including seed 2 and 3) and the optimal hyperparameters could be different with different random seeds. However, the optimal curves across different random seeds look similar.

\(^9\)https://pytorch.org/

\(^10\)https://github.com/bioinf-jku/TTUR
Table 2. Hyperparameters for DCGAN experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Sim-SGD</th>
<th>Alt-SGD</th>
<th>Sim-AMSGrad</th>
<th>Alt-AMSGrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch-size</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (G)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (D)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momentum</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Hyperparameters for ResNet experiments on CIFAR-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Simultaneous</th>
<th>Alternating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGD</td>
<td>OSGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch-size</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (G)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (D)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momentum</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Hyperparameters for ResNet experiments on SVHN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Simultaneous</th>
<th>Alternating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGD</td>
<td>OSGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch-size</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (G)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step-size (D)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momentum</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>