Abstract

We conduct a local non-asymptotic analysis of the logistic fictitious play (LFP) algorithm, and show that with high probability, this algorithm converges locally at rate $O(1/t)$. To achieve this, we first develop a global non-asymptotic analysis of the deterministic variant of LFP, which we call DLFP, and derive a class of convergence rates based on different step-sizes. We then incorporate a particular form of stochastic noise to the analysis of DLFP, and obtain the local convergence rate of LFP. As a result of independent interest, we extend DLFP to solve a class of strongly convex composite optimization problems. We show that although the resulting algorithm is a simple variant of the generalized Frank-Wolfe method in Nesterov [1, Section 5], somewhat surprisingly, it enjoys significantly improved convergence rate.

1 Introduction

The logistic fictitious play (LFP) algorithm (a.k.a. stochastic fictitious play with best logit response), first introduced by Fudenberg and Kreps [2], is a classical algorithm in game theory (see [3] and references therein). In this work we focus on the two-player zero-sum version, which is shown in Algorithm 1. Specifically, players I and II are given finite action spaces $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $[m]$, respectively, and a payoff matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. At the beginning, players I and II choose their initial actions $i_0 \in [n]$ and $j_0 \in [m]$, respectively, and their initial “history of actions” are denoted by $x_0 := e_{i_0}$ and $y_0 := e_{j_0}$, respectively (where $e_i$ denotes the $i$-th standard coordinate vector). At any time $t \geq 0$, in order for player I to choose the next action $i_{t+1}$, she first computes the best-logit-response distribution $v_t$ based on player II’s history of actions $y^t$:

$$v_t := P_{x}(y^t) := \arg \min_{x \in \Delta_n} \langle A^\top y^t, x \rangle + \eta h_x(x),$$

(1.1)

where $h_x(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \ln(x_i)$ is the (negative) entropic function with domain $\text{dom } h := \mathbb{R}^n_+$ (where $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$), $\Delta_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1\}$ denotes the $(n-1)$-dimensional probability simplex, and $\eta > 0$ is the regularization parameter. Then, based on $v^t$, she randomly chooses $i_{t+1}$ by sampling from the distribution $v^t$, such that $\Pr(i_{t+1} = i) = v_i^t$ for $i \in [n]$. After obtaining $i_{t+1}$, she updates her history of actions from $x^t$ to $x^{t+1}$ by a convex combination of $x^t$ and $e_{i_{t+1}}$:

$$x^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t)x^t + \alpha_t e_{i_{t+1}},$$

(1.2)
Then in Algorithm LFP (and stochastic approximation in general; see e.g., [pseudo-trajectory approach serves as a powerful tool to analyze the asymptotic convergence of non-asymptotic convergence analysis seems lacking in the literature. Indeed, while the asymptotic convergence rate of LFP, by utilizing the techniques in analyzing Algorithm 6.1(ii)] proves the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1** (Hofbauer and Sandholm [4, Theorem 6.1(ii)]). Consider the fixed-point equation

\[ P_x(y) = x, \quad P_y(x) = y, \tag{1.6} \]

and its unique solution \((x^*, y^*) \in \text{ri} \, \Delta_n \times \text{ri} \, \Delta_m\) (where \(\text{ri} \, \Delta_p\) denotes the relative interior of \(\Delta_p\)). Then in Algorithm 1, for any initialization \(i_0 \in [n]\) and \(j_0 \in [m]\), and any step-sizes \(\{\alpha_t\}_{t \geq 0}\) satisfying (1.3), we have

\[ \Pr(\lim_{t \to +\infty} x_t = x^* \text{ and } \lim_{t \to +\infty} y_t = y^*) = 1. \tag{1.7} \]

The proof of this result (and similar ones, e.g., [5, Theorem 4.7]) typically follows two steps. First, we consider the deterministic variant of LFP, which is denoted by DLFP and shown in Algorithm 2, and its associated continuous-time dynamic system

\[ \frac{dx(s)}{ds} = P_x(y) - x, \quad \frac{dy(s)}{ds} = P_y(x) - y, \tag{1.8} \]

where \(s \geq 0\) denotes the continuous time index. Then we show that (1.8) admits a unique rest point \((x^*, y^*) \in \text{ri} \, \Delta_n \times \text{ri} \, \Delta_m\) (which is the same as the unique fixed point of (1.6)), and starting from any \((x(0), y(0)) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m\), the differential equations in (1.8) always admit a unique solution \(\{(x(s), y(s)) : s \geq 0\}\) such that \((x(s), y(s)) \to (x^*, y^*)\) as \(s \to +\infty\). Second, we show that with probability one, the continuous-time linear interpolation of the iterates \((x_t^*, y_t^*)\) for all \(t \geq 0\) in Algorithm 1 is an asymptotic pseudo-trajectory to the (unique) solution \(\{(x(s), y(s)) : s \geq 0\}\) of (1.8) (see Benaïm [6, Section 4] for details), and hence \((x_t^*, y_t^*) \to (x^*, y^*)\) as \(t \to +\infty\).

In contrast to the well-understanding of the asymptotic convergence properties of LFP, the non-asymptotic convergence analysis seems lacking in the literature. Indeed, while the asymptotic pseudo-trajectory approach serves as a powerful tool to analyze the asymptotic convergence of LFP (and stochastic approximation in general; see e.g., [6,7]), it does not easily yield any (local or global) non-asymptotic convergence rate. Therefore, the purpose of this work is to provide a complementary perspective on LFP from the theory of modern convex optimization. Leveraging this perspective, we first conduct a global non-asymptotic analysis of DLFP (namely Algorithm 2). Then, by viewing LFP (i.e., Algorithm 1) as the stochastic version of DLFP, we then obtain a local convergence rate of LFP, by utilizing the techniques in analyzing Algorithm 2 (and the asymptotic almost sure convergence result in Theorem 1.1). Our contributions are summarized as follows.
Algorithm 1 Logistic fictitious play (LFP)

**Input:** Initial actions \( i_0 \in [n] \) and \( j_0 \in [m] \), and payoff matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \)

**Initialize:** \( x^0 := e_{i_0} \) and \( y^0 := e_{j_0} \)

At iteration \( t \in \{0, 1, \ldots\} \):

\[
x^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t) x^t + \alpha_t e_{i^{t+1}} ,
\]

where \( i^{t+1} \sim v^t \) and \( v^t := \mathbb{P}_x (y^t) := \arg \min_{x \in \Delta_n} \langle A^\top y^t, x \rangle + \eta h(x) \), \hspace{1cm} (1.10)

\[
y^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t) y^t + \alpha_t e_{j^{t+1}} ,
\]

where \( j^{t+1} \sim s^t \) and \( s^t := \mathbb{P}_y (x^t) := \arg \max_{y \in \Delta_m} \langle A x^t, y \rangle - \eta h(y) \). \hspace{1cm} (1.11)

Algorithm 2 Deterministic version of LFP (DLFP)

**Input:** Starting point \( x^0 \in \Delta_n \) and \( y^0 \in \Delta_m \), and payoff matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \)

At iteration \( t \in \{0, 1, \ldots\} \):

\[
x^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t) x^t + \alpha_t v^t = (1 - \alpha_t) x^t + \alpha_t \mathbb{P}_x (y^t),
\]

\[
y^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t) y^t + \alpha_t s^t = (1 - \alpha_t) y^t + \alpha_t \mathbb{P}_y (x^t) ,
\]\hspace{1cm} (1.12) (1.13)

1. We provide a global non-asymptotic analysis of Algorithm 2. Specifically, we derive a class of global convergence rates of this algorithm based on different choices of the step-size \( \alpha_t \). In particular, we show that Algorithm 2 convergences linearly with constant step-sizes \( \{\alpha_t\}_{t \geq 0} \).

2. Leveraging the techniques for analyzing Algorithm 2, we obtain a local convergence rate of the LFP algorithm (i.e., Algorithm 1). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first (local) non-asymptotic convergence result of LFP. Our result indicates that although some step-sizes are “asymptotically equivalent” (i.e., they all satisfy the conditions in (1.3)), they may yield different local convergence rates (cf. Remark 4.1).

3. As a result of independent interest, we extend DLFP (i.e., Algorithm 2) to solve a class of strongly convex composite problems. The resulting algorithm can be regarded as a simple variant of the generalized Frank-Wolfe method in Nesterov [1, Section 5], in the sense that it has an additional (dual) averaging step. We show that with this additional step, somewhat surprisingly, DLFP converges significantly faster than the original method in [1] (see Section 3.1 for details). We believe that this result may provide new insight in designing Frank-Wolfe-type methods.

**Notations.** For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we define \( \|x\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \) and \( \|x\|_\infty := \max_{i=1}^n |x_i| \). We define \( e := (1, 1, \ldots, 1) \) and \( e_i \) as the \( i \)-th standard coordinate vector. We denote the relative interior of a nonempty set \( \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) by \( \text{ri} \mathcal{X} \) and the indicator function of \( \mathcal{X} \) by \( \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}} \), which is defined as

\[
\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \mathcal{X} \\ +\infty, & x \notin \mathcal{X} \end{cases}
\] (1.9)
2 Preliminaries

First, note that we can view DLFP (i.e., Algorithm 2) as an algorithm solving a class of saddle-point problems, which reads

$$(SPP) : \min_{x \in \Delta_n} \max_{y \in \Delta_m} [S(x, y) := \eta h_x(x) + \langle Ax, y \rangle - \eta h_y(y)]. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that (SPP) has a unique saddle point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in ri \Delta_n \times ri \Delta_m$ that satisfies

$$S(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq S(\bar{x}, y) \leq S(\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \quad \forall (x, y) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m. \quad (2.2)$$

Recall that $(x^*, y^*) \in ri \Delta_n \times ri \Delta_m$ is the unique solution of the fixed-point equation (1.6). From the definitions of $P_x$ and $P_y$, we easily see that $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = (x^*, y^*)$. Thus existing results (e.g., [5, Theorem 4.4]) already show that in DLFP, $(x^t, y^t) \to (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ as $t \to +\infty$. To measure the rate of such a convergence, however, we will use the duality gap $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ of (SPP), which is defined as

$$G(x, y) = \max_{y' \in \Delta_m} S(x, y') - \min_{x' \in \Delta_n} S(x', y) = \eta h_x(x) + g_x^a(Ax) + g_y^a(-A^\top y) + \eta h_y(y), \quad (2.3)$$

where
g_x^a(w) := \max_{x \in \Delta_n} \langle w, x \rangle - \eta h_x(x) \quad \text{and} \quad g_y^a(u) := \max_{y \in \Delta_m} \langle u, y \rangle - \eta h_y(y)
denote the Fenchel conjugate functions of $\eta h_x + \iota_{\Delta_n}$ and $\eta h_y + \iota_{\Delta_m}$, respectively. Note that the duality gap in (2.3) is also commonly used as the Lyapunov function for analyzing the asymptotic convergence of LFP in previous works (e.g., [5, 8]). Also, by the definitions of $P_x$ and $P_y$, we have

$$g_x^a(-A^\top y) = -\langle AP_x(y), y \rangle - \eta h_x(P_x(y)) \quad \text{and} \quad g_y^a(Ax) = \langle Ax, P_y(x) \rangle - \eta h_y(P_y(x)), \quad (2.4)$$

and consequently,

$$G(x, y) = \eta h_x(x) - \eta h_x(P_x(y)) + \langle Ax, P_y(x) \rangle - \langle AP_x(y), y \rangle + \eta h_y(y) - \eta h_y(P_y(x)) \quad (2.5)$$

$$= S(x, P_y(x)) - S(P_x(y), y). \quad (2.6)$$

In the following, let us introduce some well-known properties of the functions $h_x, h_y, g_x^a$ and $g_y^a$ that will be useful in our analyses in Sections 3 and 4.

**Lemma 2.1.** The functions $\eta h_x$ and $\eta h_y$ are $\eta$-strongly convex with respect to $\| \cdot \|_1$ on $\Delta_n$ and $\Delta_m$, respectively, namely

$$\eta h_x(x') \geq \eta h_x(x) + \eta (\nabla h_x(x), x' - x) + \eta/2 \|x' - x\|_1^2, \quad \forall x \in ri \Delta_n, \quad \forall x' \in \Delta_n, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\eta h_y(y') \geq \eta h_y(y) + \eta (\nabla h_y(y), y' - y) + \eta/2 \|y' - y\|_2^2, \quad \forall y \in ri \Delta_n, \quad \forall y' \in \Delta_m. \quad (2.8)$$

Consequently, the functions $g_x^a$ and $g_y^a$ are differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^m$, respectively, with $\eta^{-1}$-Lipschitz gradients with respect to $\| \cdot \|_\infty$. Namely,

$$\| \nabla g_x^a(w) - \nabla g_x^a(w') \|_1 \leq \eta^{-1} \| w - w' \|_\infty, \quad \forall w, w' \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (2.9)$$

$$\| \nabla g_y^a(u) - \nabla g_y^a(u') \|_1 \leq \eta^{-1} \| u - u' \|_\infty, \quad \forall u, u' \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (2.10)$$

In other words, the functions $g_x^a$ and $g_y^a$ are $\eta^{-1}$-smooth with respect to $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^m$, respectively.
Lemma 2.3. The functions $g^y_x$ and $g^y_y$ are $\eta^{-1}$-smooth with respect to $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^m$, respectively, if and only if
\begin{align}
g^y_x(w') &\leq g^y_x(w) + \langle \nabla g^y_x(w), w' - w \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|w' - w\|_\infty^2, \quad \forall w, w' \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.11} 
g^y_y(u') &\leq g^y_y(u) + \langle \nabla g^y_y(u), u' - u \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|u' - u\|_\infty^2, \quad \forall u, u' \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{2.12}
\end{align}
In addition, by Danskin’s theorem [12] and the strict convexity of $h_x$ and $h_y$, the following holds.

Lemma 2.3. For any $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we can compute $\nabla g^y_x(w)$ and $\nabla g^y_y(u)$ as follows:
\[
\nabla g^y_x(w) := \arg \max_{x \in \Delta_n} \langle w, x \rangle - \eta h_x(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla g^y_y(u) := \arg \max_{y \in \Delta_m} \langle u, y \rangle - \eta h_y(y). \tag{2.13}
\]

3 Global convergence rate of DLFP

Let the sequence $\{(x^t, y^t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be produced in DLFP (i.e., Algorithm 2), with any starting point $(x^0, y^0) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m$. For convenience, for all $t \geq 0$, define $V_t := G(x^t, y^t)$, namely the duality gap of (SPP) at $(x^t, y^t)$. A crucial step to obtain the global convergence rate of DLFP is to show the following two important recursions about $\{V_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.

Proposition 3.1. In Algorithm 2, for any starting point $(x^0, y^0) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m$, we have
\begin{align}
V_{t+1} &\leq (1 - \alpha_t + \kappa^2 \alpha^2_t) V_t, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{3.1} 
V_{t+1} &\leq (1 - \alpha_t) V_t + 4\alpha^2_t \eta \kappa^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{3.2}
\end{align}
where $\kappa := \|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}/\eta$ and $\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty} := \max_{i \leq [m], j \in [n]} |A_{i,j}|$.

Proof. First, note that the convexity of $g$ and $h$ implies that
\begin{align}
h_x(x^{t+1}) - h_x(x^t) &\leq (1 - \alpha_t) h_x(x^t) + \alpha_t h_x(x^t) - h_x(x^t) = \alpha_t (h_x(x^t) - h_x(x^t)), \tag{3.3} 
h_y(y^{t+1}) - h_y(y^t) &\leq (1 - \alpha_t) h_y(y^t) + \alpha_t h_y(y^t) - h_y(y^t) = \alpha_t (h_y(y^t) - h_y(y^t)). \tag{3.4}
\end{align}

Also, using (2.11) and (2.12) in Lemma 2.2, together with Lemma 2.3, we have
\begin{align}
g^y_x(A_{t+1}) &\leq g^y_x(A_x^t) + \langle \nabla g^y_x(A_x^t), A(x^{t+1} - x^t) \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A(x^{t+1} - x^t)\|_\infty^2, 
g^y_x(A_{t+1}) &\leq g^y_x(A_x^t) + \langle s^t, A(x^{t+1} - x^t) \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|_2^2, 
ge^y_x(A_{t+1}) &\leq g^y_x(A_x^t) + \alpha_t \langle s^t, A(v^t - x^t) \rangle + \alpha^2_t (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|v^t - x^t\|_2^2, \tag{3.5}
g^y_y(y^{t+1}) &\leq g^y_y(-A^t y^t) + \langle \nabla g^y_y(-A^t y^t), A^t (y^{t+1} - y^t) \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A^t (y^{t+1} - y^t)\|_\infty^2, 
g^y_y(y^{t+1}) &\leq g^y_y(-A^t y^t) + \langle v^t, A^t (y^{t+1} - y^t) \rangle + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|y^{t+1} - y^t\|_2^2, 
ge^y_y(y^{t+1}) &\leq g^y_y(-A^t y^t) - \alpha_t \langle v^t, A^t (s^t - y^t) \rangle + \alpha^2_t (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|s^t - y^t\|_2^2. \tag{3.6}
\end{align}
Now, combining (3.3) to (3.6), and by the definition of \( V_t = G(x^t, y^t) \) in (2.3), we have
\[
V_{t+1} - V_t = (\eta h_x(x^{t+1}) - \eta h_x(x^t)) + (\eta h_y(y^{t+1}) - \eta h_y(y^t)) + (g_x^2(Ax^{t+1}) - g_x^2(Ax^t)) + (g_y^2(-Ay^{t+1}) - g_y^2(-Ay^t)) \leq \alpha_t \{ \eta h_x(v^t) - \eta h_x(x^t) + \eta h_y(s^t) - \eta h_y(y^t) + \langle s^t, A(v^t - x^t) \rangle - \langle v^t, A^\top(s^t - y^t) \rangle \} + \alpha_t^2 \{(\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|^2_{1\rightarrow\infty}\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I + (\eta^{-1}/2)\|A\|^2_{1\rightarrow\infty}\|s^t - y^t\|^2_I \} \]
\[
= -\alpha_t V_t + \alpha_t^2 \kappa^2 \{(\eta/2)\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I + (\eta/2)\|s^t - y^t\|^2_I \},
\]
where the last step uses the definition of \( G(\cdot, \cdot) \) in (2.5) and the definition of \( \kappa \).

Now, we have two ways to upper bound \( C_t := (\eta/2)\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I + (\eta/2)\|s^t - y^t\|^2_I \). The first way is rather simple. Indeed, we note that
\[
\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I \leq D_1(\Delta_n) := \max_{x, x' \in \Delta_n} \|x - x'\|_I = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|s^t - y^t\|^2_I \leq D_1(\Delta_m) = 2,
\]
so that \( C_t \leq 4\eta_t \) and this leads to the recursion in (3.2). For the second way, we note that due to the \( \eta \)-strong convexity of \( \eta h_x \) and \( \eta h_y \) (with respect to \( \|\cdot\|_I \)), both \( S(\cdot, y^t) \) and \( -S(x^t, \cdot) \) are \( \eta \)-strongly convex on \( \Delta_n \) and \( \Delta_m \), respectively. Since \( v^t = \arg\min_{x \in \Delta_n} S(x, y^t) \) and \( s^t = \arg\max_{y \in \Delta_m} S(x^t, y) \), we have
\[
S(x^t, y^t) \geq S(v^t, y^t) + (\eta/2)\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I, \\
-S(x^t, y^t) \geq -S(s^t, y^t) + (\eta/2)\|s^t - y^t\|^2_I,
\]
and consequently,
\[
C_t = (\eta/2)\|v^t - x^t\|^2_I + (\eta/2)\|s^t - y^t\|^2_I \leq S(x^t, s^t) - S(v^t, y^t) \overset{(a)}{=} G(x^t, y^t) = V_t,
\]
where in (a) we use the definition of \( G(\cdot, \cdot) \) in (2.6). This leads to (3.1).

Equipped with Proposition 3.1, we now present the global convergence rates of Algorithm 2 for different step-sizes \( \{\alpha_t\}_{t \geq 0} \).

**Theorem 3.1.** In Algorithm 2, for any starting point \( (x^0, y^0) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m \):

(a) If \( \alpha_t = 1/(2\kappa^2) \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), then
\[
V_t \leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4\kappa^2} \right)^t V_0, \quad \forall t \geq 1.
\]

(b) If \( \alpha_t = 1/(t+1) \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), then
\[
V_t \leq \frac{4\eta\kappa^2(1 + \ln t)}{t}, \quad \forall t \geq 1.
\]

(c) If \( \alpha_t = 2/(t+2) \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), then
\[
V_t \leq \frac{16\eta\kappa^2}{t+1}, \quad \forall t \geq 1.
\]
Proof. Part (a) is immediate from (3.1). Parts (b) and (c) can be derived from (3.2), which is a typical recursion appearing in the analysis of the Frank-Wolfe method [13]. Indeed, the proof of parts (b) and (c) from (3.2) follows from the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( \{V_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) be a nonnegative sequence that satisfies the following recursion:

\[
V_{t+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_t)V_t + \alpha_t^2 C, \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]

(3.13)

where \( C \geq 0 \) and \( \alpha_t \in [0, 1] \) for \( t \geq 0 \). Then

\[
V_t \leq \frac{C(1 + \ln t)}{t}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{1}{t + 1}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]

(3.14)

\[
V_t \leq \frac{4C}{t + 1}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad \text{if } \alpha_t = \frac{2}{t + 2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

(3.15)

Unsurprisingly, the proof of this lemma already appears in the literature on the FW method, e.g., [14, Section 3]. However, for completeness, we provide the proof in Appendix A. □

**Remark 3.1.** From Theorem 3.1, we see that the constant step-size \( \alpha_t = 1/(2\kappa^2) \) yields a linear convergence rate of Algorithm 2, which is better than the sub-linear convergence rates resulted from the two decreasing step-sizes \( \alpha_t = 1/(t + 1) \) and \( \alpha_t = 2/(t + 2) \). However, in the stochastic case (i.e., LFP in Algorithm 1), the constant step-size does not work. To see this, note that it does not satisfy the conditions in (1.7), and hence cannot guarantee the asymptotic almost sure convergence of Algorithm 1. In fact, this can also be seen from our local non-asymptotic analysis of LFP in Theorem 4.1 below.

### 3.1 Extension of DLFP for solving strongly convex composite problems

Let us first observe that DLFP (i.e., Algorithm 2) can be extended to solve the following class of saddle-point problems (that subsumes the problem in (2.1) as a special case):

\[
\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} [S(x, y) := f_x(x) + \langle Ax, y \rangle - f_y(y)],
\]

(3.16)

where \( \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \) are non-empty, closed and convex sets, \( f_x \) is \( \mu_x \)-strongly convex on \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( f_y \) is \( \mu_y \)-strongly convex on \( \mathcal{Y} \) (\( \mu_x, \mu_y > 0 \)). (However, note that neither \( f_x \) nor \( f_y \) is necessarily differentiable.) The resulting algorithm is identical to Algorithm 2, except that one replaces \( \Delta_n \), \( \Delta_m \), \( \eta h_x \) and \( \eta h_y \) in Algorithm 2 with \( \mathcal{X} \), \( \mathcal{Y} \), \( f_x \) and \( f_y \), respectively.

Indeed, let us observe that the proof of Proposition 3.1 only uses the strong convexity of the functions \( h_x \) and \( h_y \), and the convexity and closedness of the constraint sets \( \Delta_n \) and \( \Delta_m \). As a result, the extension of Algorithm 2 enjoys similar recursions to those in (3.1) and (3.2). In particular, defining \( \bar{\kappa}^2 := \|A\|_1^2 \to \infty / \mu_x \mu_y \), we have

\[
V_{t+1} \leq (1 - \alpha_t + \bar{\kappa}^2 \alpha_t^2)V_t, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

(3.17)

Consequently, if \( \alpha_t = 1/(2\bar{\kappa}^2) \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), we have

\[
V_t \leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4\bar{\kappa}^2} \right)^t V_0, \quad \forall t \geq 1.
\]

(3.18)
Next, let us define the Fenchel conjugate of \( f_y + \iota_Y \) as
\[
\ell(u) := \max_{y \in Y} \langle u, y \rangle - f_y(y), \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{3.19}
\]
With this definition, we can write down primal problem associated with (3.16):
\[
F^* := \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [F(x) := \ell(Ax) + f_x(x)]. \tag{3.20}
\]
Note that by [10, Theorem 1], \( \ell \) is \( \mu^\ast \)-smooth on \( \mathbb{R}^m \) as \( f_y \) is \( \mu \)-strongly convex on \( Y \). Therefore, (3.20) is the strongly convex composite problem that has received considerable attention in the past 15 years (see e.g., [1, 15]). In particular, in [1, Section 5], Nesterov proposed a generalized Frank-Wolfe method for solving (3.20) that reads:
\[
x^{t+1} := (1 - \alpha_t)x^t + \alpha_t \bar{v}^t, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{v}^t := P_x(s^t) = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \langle A^\top s^t, x \rangle + f_x(x) \tag{3.21}
\]
and \( s^t = P_y(x^t) \) (cf. (1.11)). Nesterov showed that for any starting point \( x^0 \in \mathcal{X} \), this method converges at the sub-linear rate \( O(1/t^2) \) in terms of the primal sub-optimality gap \( F(x^t) - F^* \), with step-sizes \( \alpha_t = 6(t + 1)/(t + 2)(2t + 3) \) for \( t \geq 0 \). Note that DLFP is almost the same as (3.21), except only one difference: in DLFP, \( \bar{v}^t \) is defined to be \( P_x(s^t) \), rather than \( P_x(s^t) \). Since \( \{s^t\}_{t \geq 0} \) is nothing but an averaged sequence of \( \{s^t\}_{t \geq 0} \), we can interpret DLFP as a variant of the generalized Frank-Wolfe method for solving (3.20) with an additional (dual) averaging step. However, the benefit of this simple averaging step is rather significant: DLFP achieves linear convergence in terms of the duality gap of (3.16) (see (3.18)). Since \( V_t \geq F(x^t) - F^* \), DLFP also converges linearly in terms of the primal sub-optimality gap \( F(x^t) - F^* \). We believe that this result may provide new insight in designing Frank-Wolfe-type methods for solving problems similar to (3.20).

4 Local convergence rate of LFP

To begin with, let us note that from Theorem 1.1, since \( (x^*, y^*) \in \text{ri} \Delta_n \times \text{ri} \Delta_m \), there exists \( r_x, r_y > 0 \) such that \( B_1(x^*, r_x) \times B_1(y^*, r_y) \subseteq \text{ri} \Delta_n \times \text{ri} \Delta_m \), where
\[
B_1(x^*, r_x) := \{ x \in \Delta_n : \| x - x^* \|_1 \leq r_x \} \tag{4.1}
\]
and \( B_1(y^*, r_y) \) is defined similarly. With simple algebra, one can easily show that there exist \( 0 \leq L_x, L_y < +\infty \) such that \( h_x \) and \( h_y \) are \( L_x \)- and \( L_y \)-smooth (with respect to \( \| \cdot \|_1 \)) on \( B_1(x^*, r_x) \) and \( B_1(x^*, r_y) \), respectively. Therefore, by [11, Lemma 1.30], we have
\[
h_x(x') \leq h_x(x) + \langle \nabla h_x(x), x' - x \rangle + (L_x/2)\| x' - x \|_1^2, \quad \forall x, x' \in B_1(x^*, r_x), \tag{4.2}
\]
\[
h_y(y') \leq h_y(y) + \langle \nabla h_y(y), y' - y \rangle + (L_y/2)\| y' - y \|_1^2, \quad \forall y, y' \in B_1(y^*, r_y). \tag{4.3}
\]
Let \( \{(x^t, y^t)\}_{t \geq 0} \) be produced in LFP (i.e., Algorithm 1), for any initial actions \( i_0 \in [n] \) and \( j_0 \in [m] \), and any step-sizes \( \{\alpha_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) satisfying the conditions in (1.3). Our analysis starts with a simple corollary of Theorem 1.1, which states that with high probability, after a sufficiently long time \( T \), \( \{(x^t, y^t)\}_{t \geq T} \) will lie inside the neighborhood \( B_1(x^*, r_x) \times B_1(y^*, r_y) \) of \( (x^*, y^*) \).

\textbf{Corollary 1.} For any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), there exists \( T(\delta) < +\infty \) such that \( \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{T(\delta)}) \geq 1 - \delta \), where
\[
\mathcal{A}_T := \{ \forall \ t \geq T, \ (x^t, y^t) \in B_1(x^*, r_x) \times B_1(y^*, r_y) \}, \quad \forall T \geq 0. \tag{4.4}
\]
Proof. Indeed, from standard results (e.g., [16, Theorem 3.3]), we know that the almost sure convergence result in (1.7) is equivalent to \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \Pr(A_T) = 1 \). Therefore, for any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), there exists \( T(\delta) < +\infty \) such that for all \( T \geq T(\delta) \), \( \Pr(A_T) \geq 1 - \delta \). This completes the proof. \( \square \)

For convenience of our analysis, we rewrite the iterations (1.10) and (1.11) in Algorithm 1 as

\[
\begin{align*}
x^{t+1} &:= (1 - \alpha_t)x^t + \alpha_t(v^t + \zeta^t_x) = x^t + \alpha_t(v^t + \zeta^t_x - x^t), \quad \text{where} \quad \zeta^t_x := e_{i_{t+1}} - v^t, \tag{4.5} \\
y^{t+1} &:= (1 - \alpha_t)y^t + \alpha_t(s^t + \zeta^t_y) = y^t + \alpha_t(s^t + \zeta^t_y - y^t), \quad \text{where} \quad \zeta^t_y := e_{j_{t+1}} - s^t. \tag{4.6}
\end{align*}
\]

In addition, let us define a filtration \( \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) such that for all \( t \geq 0 \), \( \mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^t) \), namely the \( \sigma \)-field generated by the set of random variables \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^t \). Since \( i_{t+1} \sim v^t \) and \( j_{t+1} \sim s^t \), we easily see that \( \{\zeta^t_x\}_{t \geq 0} \) and \( \{\zeta^t_y\}_{t \geq 0} \) are martingale difference sequences (MDS) with uniformly bounded (conditional) variances. Namely,

\[
\mathbb{E}_t[\zeta^t_x] := \mathbb{E}[\zeta^t_x | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_t[\zeta^t_y] := \mathbb{E}[\zeta^t_y | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{4.7}
\]

and there exist \( 0 \leq \sigma_x, \sigma_y < +\infty \) such that

\[
\mathbb{E}_t[\|\zeta^t_x\|^2_1] \leq \sigma_x^2, \quad \mathbb{E}_t[\|\zeta^t_y\|^2_1] \leq \sigma_y^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{4.8}
\]

Let us now present the local convergence rate of Algorithm 1.

**Theorem 4.1.** In Algorithm 1, choose any initial actions \( i_0 \in [n] \) and \( j_0 \in [m] \). For any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), there exists \( T(\delta) < +\infty \) such that \( \Pr(A_{T(\delta)}) \geq 1 - \delta \) and we have that

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t}|A_{T(\delta)}] &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}(1 + \ln t)}{t}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_t = \frac{1}{t + 1}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{4.9} \\
\mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t}|A_{T(\delta)}] &\leq \frac{4C}{t + 1}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_t = \frac{2}{t + 2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{4.10}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\tilde{C} := (\kappa^2 + \kappa_x)\eta(4 + \sigma^2_x) + (\kappa^2 + \kappa_y)\eta(4 + \sigma^2_y), \quad \kappa_x := L_x/\eta \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_y := L_y/\eta. \tag{4.11}
\]

**Proof.** Using the smoothness conditions of \( h_x \) and \( h_y \) in (4.2) and (4.3), respectively, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
h_x(x^{t+1}) - h_x(x^t) &\leq \langle \nabla h_x(x^t), x^{t+1} - x^t \rangle + (L_x/2)\|x^{t+1} - x^t\|^2_1 \\
&= \alpha_t(\nabla h_x(x^t), v^t + \zeta^t_x - x^t) + \alpha_t^2(L_x/2)\|v^t + \zeta^t_x - x^t\|^2_1 \\
&\leq \alpha_t(h(v^t) - h(x^t)) + \alpha_t(\nabla h_x(x^t), \zeta^t_x) + \alpha_t^2L_x(\|v^t - x^t\|^2_1 + \|\zeta^t_x\|^2_1), \tag{4.12} \\
h_y(y^{t+1}) - h_y(y^t) &\leq \langle \nabla h_y(y^t), y^{t+1} - y^t \rangle + (L_y/2)\|y^{t+1} - y^t\|^2_1 \\
&= \alpha_t(\nabla h_y(y^t), s^t + \zeta^t_y - y^t) + \alpha_t^2(L_y/2)\|s^t + \zeta^t_y - y^t\|^2_1 \\
&\leq \alpha_t(h(s^t) - h(y^t)) + \alpha_t(\nabla h(y^t), \zeta^t_y) + \alpha_t^2L_y(\|s^t - y^t\|^2_1 + \|\zeta^t_y\|^2_1), \tag{4.13}
\end{align*}
\]
where in (4.12) and (4.13) we use the convexity of \( h_x \) and \( h_y \), and the inequality \( \|a - b\|_1^2 \leq 2(\|a\|_1^2 + \|b\|_1^2) \). In addition, similar to (3.5) and (3.6), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
g_y^0(Ax^{t+1}) &\leq g_y^0(Ax^t) + \alpha_t \langle s^t, A(v^t - x^t) \rangle + \alpha_t^2 (\eta^{-1}/2) \|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|v^t - x^t\|_1^2, \\
&\leq g_y^0(Ax^t) + \alpha_t \langle (s^t, A(v^t - x^t)) + (s^t, A\zeta_y^t) \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_t^2 \eta^{-1} \|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|v^t - x^t\|_1^2 + \|\zeta_y^t\|_1^2, \\
g_x^0(-A^T y^{t+1}) &\leq g_x^0(-A^T y^t) - \alpha_t \langle v^t, A^T(s^t + \zeta_y^t - y^t) \rangle + \alpha_t^2 (\eta^{-1}/2) \|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|s^t + \zeta_y^t - y^t\|_1^2, \\
&\leq g_x^0(-A^T y^t) - \alpha_t \langle (v^t, A^T(s^t - y^t)) + (v^t, A\zeta_y^t) \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_t^2 \eta^{-1} \|A\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \|s^t - y^t\|_1^2 + \|\zeta_y^t\|_1^2, \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.14)

(4.15)

Therefore, by combining (4.12) to (4.15), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{t+1} - V_t &\leq \alpha_t \{h_y(v^t) - h_y(x^t) + \alpha_t \langle \nabla h_y(x^t), \zeta_y^t \rangle + h_y(s^t) - h_y(y^t) + \alpha_t \langle \nabla h_y(y^t), \zeta_y^t \rangle \}
\quad + \alpha_t \{\langle s^t, A(v^t - x^t) \rangle + \langle s^t, A\zeta_y^t \rangle - \langle Av^t, (s^t - y^t) \rangle - \langle Av^t, \zeta_y^t \rangle \}
\quad + \alpha_t^2 \{((\kappa^2 + \kappa_x)\eta(\|v^t - x^t\|_1^2 + \|\zeta_y^t\|_1^2)) + (\kappa^2 + \kappa_y)\eta(\|s^t - y^t\|_1^2 + \|\zeta_y^t\|_1^2)\}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Consequently, taking expectation (by conditioning on \( \mathcal{F}_t \)) and using both (4.7) and (4.8), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}_t[V_{t+1}] &\leq (1 - \alpha_t) V_t + \alpha_t^2 \{(\kappa^2 + \kappa_x)\eta(\|v^t - x^t\|_1^2 + \sigma_x^2) + (\kappa^2 + \kappa_y)\eta(\|s^t - y^t\|_1^2 + \sigma_y^2)\}, \\
&\leq (1 - \alpha_t) V_t + \alpha_t^2 \bar{C},
\end{align*}
\]

(4.16)

where in (4.16) we use (3.8). Therefore, using Lemma 3.1, we complete the proof.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 4.1.** From Theorem 4.1, we see that between the two decreasing step-sizes \( \alpha_t = 1/(t + 1) \) and \( \alpha_t = 2/(t + 2) \), the latter yields a faster convergence rate than the former, although the former is more commonly used in the literature on LFP (see e.g., [4]). Therefore, our analysis suggests that in terms of local convergence rate, \( \alpha_t = 2/(t + 2) \) is preferred over \( \alpha_t = 1/(t + 1) \), although both step-sizes are “asymptotically equivalent”, meaning that both of them satisfy the conditions in (1.3) and hence guarantee the asymptotic almost sure convergence of LFP (cf. Theorem 1.1). In addition, one can easily check (from the proof of Lemma 3.1 in Appendix A) that the \( O(1/t) \) convergence rate resulted from \( \alpha_t = 2/(t + 2) \) cannot be improved by choosing \( \alpha_t = q/(t + q) \) for some integer \( q > 2 \) (see also [1, Section 2]).

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we provide a local convergence rate analysis of LFP (namely Algorithm 1). Note that our local convergence rate easily yields an estimation of the total number of iterations of LFP to achieve an expected \( \epsilon \)-duality gap. To see this, first note that the duality gap \( G(\cdot, \cdot) \) is uniformly bounded on \( \Delta_n \times \Delta_m \), namely

\[
\max_{(x, y) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m} G(x, y) := \bar{V} < +\infty.
\]

(5.1)

For any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), let \( T(\delta) < +\infty \) satisfy that \( \Pr(A_{T(\delta)} \geq 1 - \delta) \), and let the accuracy \( \epsilon < \mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)}] \).

By law of total expectation, we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t}] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t} | A_{T(\delta)}] + \delta \mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t} | A_{T(\delta)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_{T(\delta)+t} | A_{T(\delta)}] + \delta \bar{V}.
\]

(5.2)
If we choose \( \alpha_t = 2/(t+2) \) and \( \delta = \varepsilon/(2\bar{V}) \), then by (4.10) in Theorem 4.1, we have

\[
E[V_{\varepsilon/(2\bar{V})+t}] \leq \frac{4\bar{C}}{t+1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{5.3}
\]

Thus if \( t \geq \lceil 8\bar{C}/\varepsilon \rceil - 1 \), then \( E[V_{\varepsilon/(2\bar{V})+t}] \leq \varepsilon \). In other words, LFP finds a stochastic primal-dual pair \((x, y) \in \Delta_n \times \Delta_m\) with \( E[G(x, y)] \leq \varepsilon \) in no more than

\[
T(\varepsilon/(2\bar{V})) + \lceil 8\bar{C}/\varepsilon \rceil - 1 \tag{5.4}
\]

iterations. As such, an important future research topic would be upper bounding \( T(\delta) \) in terms of \( \delta, r_x, r_y \) and other problem parameters. Such an upper bound, together with (5.4), would provide a global iteration complexity of LFP.

### A Proof of Lemma 3.1

Let \( \{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) be a nonnegative auxiliary sequence such that

\[
\beta_t \geq \beta_{t+1}(1 - \alpha_{t+1}), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{A.1}
\]

As a result, we have

\[
\beta_{t+1}(1 - \alpha_{t+1})V_{t+1} \leq \beta_t(1 - \alpha_t)V_t + \beta_t \alpha_t^2 C, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

After telescoping, by choosing \( \alpha_0 = 1 \), we have

\[
\beta_t(1 - \alpha_t)V_t \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \alpha_i^2 \quad \implies \quad V_t \leq \frac{C \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \beta_i \alpha_i^2}{\beta_t(1 - \alpha_t)}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \tag{A.2}
\]

If we choose \( \alpha_t = q/(t+q) \) for some positive integer \( q \), then we can choose \( \beta_t = (t+q) \cdots (t+1)/q! = (t+q)_q \), and we have

\[
V_t \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \frac{q(i+q-1)}{(i+q-1)_q}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \tag{A.3}
\]

In particular, if \( q = 1 \), then

\[
V_t \leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{1}{t}}{t} \leq \frac{C(1 + \ln t)}{t}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \tag{A.4}
\]

and if \( q = 2 \), then

\[
V_t \leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{2i}{(t+1)i}}{2} \leq \frac{4C}{t+1}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \tag{A.5}
\]

This completes the proof.
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