

# Approximate Frank-Wolfe Algorithms over Graph-structured Support Sets

Baojian Zhou

Department of Computer Science  
Stony Brook University, NY  
baojian.zhou@cs.stonybrook.edu

Yifan Sun

Department of Computer Science  
Stony Brook University, NY  
ysun@cs.stonybrook.edu

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose approximate Frank-Wolfe (FW) algorithms to solve convex optimization problems over graph-structured support sets where the *linear minimization oracle* (LMO) cannot be efficiently obtained in general. We first demonstrate that two popular approximation assumptions (*additive* and *multiplicative gap errors*), are not valid for our problem, in that no cheap gap-approximate LMO oracle exists in general. Instead, a new *approximate dual maximization oracle* (DMO) is proposed, which approximates the inner product rather than the gap. When the objective is  $L$ -smooth, we prove that the standard FW method using a  $\delta$ -approximate DMO converges as  $O(L/\delta t + (1 - \delta)(\delta^{-1} + \delta^{-2}))$  in general, and as  $O(L/(\delta^2(t + 2)))$  over a  $\delta$ -relaxation of the constraint set. Additionally, when the objective is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and the solution is unique, a variant of FW converges to  $O(L^2 \log(t)/(\mu\delta^6 t^2))$  with the same per-iteration complexity. Our empirical results suggest that even these improved bounds are pessimistic, with significant improvement in recovering real-world images with graph-structured sparsity.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider convex optimization (CO) problems over graph-structured (GS) support sets, which is defined as the following:

$$\text{GSCO} : \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x), \quad \mathcal{D} := \text{conv} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 \leq C, \text{supp}(x) \in \mathbb{M}\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a convex differentiable function,  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is a GS support set (the convex hull of structured points described by  $\mathbb{M}$ ) and  $\mathbb{M}$  captures a collection of allowed structures of the problem. The support of  $x$  is defined as  $\text{supp}(x) := \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$  and encodes interesting structural information such as a tree, cluster, or path when it is defined on an underlying graph. For example,  $\mathcal{D}$  can be seen as a generalization of the  $k$ -support norm ball [Argyriou et al., 2012], where  $\mathbb{M}$  is a  $k$ -clique in a graph. The GSCO is a convex relaxation of fundamental problems in machine learning and signal processing, with many applications including  $k$ -sparsity and its generalization [Lim and Wright, 2017], structured sparsity [Bach et al., 2012a,b], cluster sparsity [McDonald et al., 2016b], weighted graph models (WGM) [Hegde et al., 2015b], graph LASSO [Sharpnack et al., 2012, Hallac et al., 2015], marginal polytope [Krishnan et al., 2015] and many others [Baraniuk et al., 2010, Hegde et al., 2016].

To solve the GSCO problem (1), a natural idea is to use projected gradient descent (PGD) where, at each iteration, a *projection oracle* finds a point in  $\mathcal{D}$  that is closest to a given vector. However, the efficiency of the projection oracle highly depends on the complexity of  $\mathbb{M}$  and thus may not be polynomial.

Instead, the Frank-Wolfe (FW) algorithm [Frank et al., 1956] (a.k.a conditional gradient method) and its variants [Jaggi, 2013, Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi, 2015, Garber and Meshi, 2016, Bashiri and Zhang, 2017, Balasubramanian and Ghadimi, 2018, Lei et al., 2019, Luise et al., 2019, Locatello et al., 2019, Thekumparampil et al., 2020, Garber, 2020, Kerdreux et al., 2018, Combettes and Pokutta, 2020, Pedregosa et al., 2020] have been receiving increasing attention in recent years for constrained convex optimization. Unlike PGD-based methods, FW-type algorithms, at each iteration, find a point using the *linear minimization oracle* (LMO), which for many constraints, may enjoy much cheaper per-iteration cost than the projection oracle [Combettes and Pokutta, 2021]. Therefore, they are attractive for solving problems in many applications [Krishnan et al., 2015, Briol et al., 2015, Ping et al., 2016, Berthet and Perchet, 2017, Allen-Zhu et al., 2017, Abernethy and Wang, 2017].

We focus on FW-type methods for GSCO problems. Here, the main difficulty is that solving the LMO efficiently, even with  $\mathcal{D}$  convex, is in general NP-hard for many structured models  $\mathbb{M}$ . A typical motivational example is a popular weighted graph model (WGM), where  $\mathbb{M}$  contains all sets of  $g$  connected components of a specified weighted graph [Hegde et al., 2015b]; here, both the projection oracle and LMO are NP-hard to compute. While convergence rates exist for FW with approximate LMOs, they tend to be limited to two kinds of approximations: *additive gap-approximate LMO* [Jaggi, 2013] and *multiplicative gap-approximate LMO* [Locatello et al., 2017, Pedregosa et al., 2020]. As such, we ask the following crucial question

*Do there exist an additive or multiplication gap-approximate LMO for solving GSCO problems?*

In particular, by answering this question negatively, we open and explore the space for inexact FW methods that are more appropriate for this class of problems.

### Our contributions.

- We first demonstrate that, for a WGM  $\mathbb{M}$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ , one can always find adversarial examples to show that gap-additive and gap-multiplicative LMO are as hard to resolve as exact LMOs and thus also NP-hard. Therefore, the existing approximate-LMO FW convergence rates are not applicable to GSCOs in general.<sup>1</sup>
- Instead, we propose to use an approximate *dual maximization oracle* (DMO), which for several important GS problems can be easy to find in practice. This assumption is equivalent to multiplicatively approximating a key inner product, rather than the gap.
- When  $f$  is  $L$ -smooth, we show standard FW using a  $\delta$ -approximate DMO converges as  $O(L/(\delta t) + (1 - \delta)(\delta^{-1} + \delta^{-2}))$  over  $\mathcal{D}$ , and as  $O(L/(\delta^2(t + 2)))$  over  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$ . The convergence rate of the later case is consistent with recent advances of generalized matching pursuit (MP) [Locatello et al., 2018].
- Additionally, when  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex, we propose a new variant of FW, using the nearest extreme point (NEP) oracle described in Garber and Wolf [2021]. The main ingredient is to use  $(-x_t + \nabla f(x_t)/(L\eta_t))$  as the input to the DMO rather than  $\nabla f(x_t)$ . Thus, the iteration complexity is the same as of standard FW, but the convergence rate is much faster. We show that this method converges to a small ball at a linear rate  $O((1 - \mu/L)^t)$  in the general case, and  $O(L^2 \log(t)/(\mu\delta^6 t^2))$  to the optimum over  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$ .

We numerically apply these methods over a WGM  $\mathbb{M}$  on the task of sparse image recovery. Our results suggest that even these improved bounds are most likely pessimistic.

### 1.1 Related work

**FW method and its variants.** The FW method [Frank et al., 1956] for convex constrained problems has recently received popularity mainly due to two advantages. First, it is projection free—the LMO is often much cheaper to compute than the projection oracle. Second, in applications with desired structured sparsity, early FW iterates tend to be naturally sparse.

<sup>1</sup>Although this paper focuses on a specific model  $\mathbb{M}$ , our proposed methods are applicable for any  $\mathbb{M}$  whenever a corresponding approximate DMO is available.

The tradeoff is that standard FW has a slow convergence rate in general  $O(1/t)$ , even when  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex [Jaggi, 2013].

Recent works put effort into accelerating FW with modifications. More specifically, Lacoste-Julien and Jaggi [2015] and Garber and Meshi [2016] propose away-step variants to reduce the computation overheads. Garber and Hazan [2015] show that if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a strongly convex set, then the FW rate can be improved to  $O(1/t^2)$ . However, our graph-structured set  $\mathcal{D}$  is not strongly convex in general. A stochastic variant [Mokhtari et al., 2020] and many more have also been studied [Balasubramanian and Ghadimi, 2018, Garber and Hazan, 2016, Pena and Rodriguez, 2019, Yu et al., 2017, Liu et al., 2016, Harchaoui et al., 2015, Hazan and Luo, 2016, Sun and Bach, 2020], with accompanying rates.

**Connections with other methods.** One of reasons that FW is so heavily studied is its connections with other important greedy methods. For example, Bach [2015] shows that FW is closely related with mirror decent through duality; and Locatello et al. [2017] and Combettes and Pokutta [2019] explore the close connection between FW and MP.

**Approximation of LMO.** The study of inexact FW methods tend to center on two types of LMO approximates: gap-additive [Jaggi, 2013] and gap-multiplicative [Pedregosa et al., 2020]. Under these two assumptions, the convergence rate are  $O(\delta/t)$  and  $O(1/(\delta^2 t))$  respectively. However, as shown in Section 3, these two regimes do not adequately describe efficient methods for GS problems. Instead, we explore approximates that are multiplicative with respect to an inner product; this is inspired by Locatello et al. [2018] who did a similar analysis for MP, and is related to the works of Hazan et al. [2018], Garber [2017]. Kerdreux et al. [2018] propose a subsampling oracle where a subset of atoms is randomly selected per-iteration. However, in our case the number of atoms in  $\mathcal{D}$  is exponential large, and even subsampling is inefficient.

**Graph-structured support sets.** Bach [2010] considers FW methods for submodular optimization for combinatorial problems, which often involve large (but convex) constraint sets. El Halabi et al. [2018] considers homogeneous and non-homogeneous convex relaxations for combinatorial penalty functions (see also [Bach et al., 2012b,a]). Most related to our work is that of Hegde et al. [2015b], which proposes a general weighted graph model and provides two approximate projection oracles, a similar work Hegde et al. [2014a] which discusses *head projections* (we propose to use as an approximate oracle) and [Lim and Wright, 2017] which discusses projections on such sets over tree structures.

## 2 Preliminaries and Notations

**Notations.** Throughout of this paper, we consider the Euclidean space equipped with an inner product  $(\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ , where  $\langle x, y \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$ . The norm induced by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is  $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$ . Under this setting, the dual space  $\mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H}$  and corresponding dual norm  $\|x\|_* = \|x\| = \|x\|_2$  are both the same. However, results of this paper can be extended to other norms. The ground index set is denoted as  $[d] := \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and uppercase letters (e.g.,  $I, S$ ) stand for subsets of  $[d]$ . The collection of support sets  $\mathbb{M}$  is then a subset of the power set of  $[d]$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{M} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([d])$ .  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  denotes a matrix and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are column vectors. The support of  $x$  is  $\text{supp}(x) := \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$ . We use  $x_S$  to denote a masked vector such that  $x_S(i) = x(i)$  if  $i \in S$ , and 0 otherwise. An  $\alpha$ -scaling of  $\mathcal{D}$  is denoted as  $\alpha\mathcal{D} := \{\alpha x : x \in \mathcal{D}\}$ . **All proofs are postponed to the supplementary material.**

**Definition 1** (FW-type algorithms). *Given an initial  $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ , the method iterates as*

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + \eta_t(\rho v_t - x_t), \quad \text{LMO} : v_t \in \arg \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle c_t, s \rangle, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $c_t := ax_t + b\nabla f(x_t)$  and  $\eta_t \in [0, 1]$  is a learning rate for step  $t$ .

Setting  $a = 0, b = 1, \rho = 1$  with  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$  recovers standard FW. Later, we will also consider  $\rho = 1/\delta$ , which efficiently solves a relaxation of (1), as a FW-type. Before introducing GS support sets, we first recall the  $k$ -support norm [Argyriou et al., 2012], defined as

$$\|x\|_k^{\text{sp}} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{I \in \mathbb{M}_k} \|v_I\| : \text{supp}(v_I) \subseteq I, \sum_{I \in \mathbb{M}_k} v_I = x \right\},$$

where  $\mathbb{M}_k := \{S \subseteq [d] : |S| \leq k\}$ . An extended matrix form is defined in Richard et al. [2014]; note also this is a special instance of the group norm of Jacob et al. [2009]. The unit ball of the  $k$ -support norm ( $\{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x}\|_k^{\text{sp}} \leq 1\}$ ) is exactly a convex hull of normalized  $k$ -sparse vectors. When  $k = 1$  and  $k = d$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_k^{\text{sp}}$  recovers  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  respectively. We now show that calculating the dual norm corresponds to solving LMO.

**Lemma 1** ([McDonald et al., 2016a, Jacob et al., 2009]). Denote  $\|\cdot\|_k^{\text{sp}*}$  as the dual norm of  $\|\cdot\|_k^{\text{sp}}$ . The dual norm is given by

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_k^{\text{sp}*} := \sup_{\{\mathbf{v} : \|\mathbf{v}\|_k^{\text{sp}} \leq 1\}} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|,$$

where  $I_k$  is the set of  $k$  indices in  $[d]$  corresponding to the largest magnitude elements of  $\mathbf{u}$ .

Lemma 1 indicates that, for any  $\mathbf{u} := \mathbf{c}_t$ , calculating the dual norm  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_k^{\text{sp}*}$  is equivalent to solving the LMO for  $\mathbf{c}_t$ . In particular, any  $\mathbf{s}$  such that  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{s} \rangle = \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$  will be an LMO solution, with  $s_i = -u_i / \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$  for  $i \in I_k$  and  $s_i = 0$  otherwise.

**Definition 2** (Structured support sets). Define  $\mathbb{M}$  as a collection of subsets of  $[d]$ . A structured support set  $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}(C, \mathbb{M})$  is the convex hull of an intersection of two sets: the convex ball  $\mathcal{B}(C) = \{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C\}$  and the non-convex structural set  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}) = \{\mathbf{x} : \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{M}\}$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{D}(C, \mathbb{M}) := \text{conv}\{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C, \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{M}\}.$$

We consider  $C = 1$  in the rest of this paper for simplicity and denote the norm for which  $\mathcal{D}(C, \mathbb{M})$  is the unit norm ball as  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{M}}^{\text{sp}}$ .

In this work we explore  $\mathbb{M}$  as a collection of subset nodes in a graph. To associate a graph with variable structures, we associate nodes  $v_i$  with a variable  $x_i$ . These models can now describe many interesting scenarios where graph structures serve as a powerful prior. For example, Garber and Meshi [2016] model structured polytopes via connected paths in a graph, and McDonald et al. [2016b] use connected cliques to model multi-task learning. An important instantiation in our work is the (unweighted) graph model  $\mathbb{M}$  proposed in Hegde et al. [2015b], stated below.

**Definition 3** (Graph Model [Hegde et al., 2015b]). Given an underlying graph  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ , define the graph model  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$ -WGM as

$$\mathbb{M} = \{F = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_g : S_i \text{ are connected components of } \mathbb{G}, |F| \leq k\}. \quad (3)$$

For the remainder of the paper, we focus on the structured support set  $\mathcal{D}(C, \mathbb{M})$  corresponding to  $\mathbb{M}$  the graph model, which we call the graph support set.

**Hardness of computing graph support norm.** In the simplest case, computing the  $k$ -support norm can be done in  $O(d)$  time.<sup>2</sup> However, graph support sets (3) are NP-hard to compute in general [Hegde et al., 2015a, Lim and Wright, 2017].

**Definition 4** ( $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth, [Rockafellar, 2015]). We say a convex differentiable  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth if there exist positives  $\mu$  and  $L$  such that

$$\mu\text{-strongly convex: } \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq B_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad L\text{-smooth: } B_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad (4)$$

for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $B_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle$  is the Bregman divergence of  $f$ .

### 3 FW-type methods for graph-structured support sets

We first discuss how the more popular gap-based approximation assumptions are not appropriate for an inexact FW applied to the graph support set, in that there exists cases where any ‘‘approximation’’ is necessarily exact. We then present dual maximization oracle, which approximates inner product and is easier to obtain. Finally, we analyze the convergence rate of FW-type methods with  $\delta$ -approximate DMOs.

<sup>2</sup>While previous works [Argyriou et al., 2012, McDonald et al., 2016b] claim that the run time of computing  $k$ -support norm is  $O(d \log d)$ , on average, it can be finished in  $O(d)$  by using Floyd-Rivest selection algorithm [Floyd and Rivest, 1975].



### 3.1 Gap-approximated LMOs and adversarial examples

**Additive approximate LMO.** As presented in Jaggi [2013], the gap-additive approximate LMO finds  $v_t$  such that

$$\langle \nabla f(x_t), v_t \rangle \leq \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(x_t), s \rangle + \epsilon_t, \quad (5)$$

where  $\epsilon_t \geq 0$  is the approximate tolerance.  $\epsilon_t$  must necessarily decay at  $\epsilon_t \sim O(\delta/t)$  to obtain a  $O(\delta/t)$  convergence rate [Dunn and Harshbarger, 1978, Jaggi, 2013]. When  $\epsilon_t = \epsilon$  a small constant, then FW obtains an accuracy of  $\epsilon + O(1/t)$  [Freund and Grigas, 2016].

**Multiplicative approximate LMO.** Another common approximation regime is the gap-multiplicative approximate LMO [Pedregosa et al., 2020, Locatello et al., 2017] which returns  $v_t$  such that

$$\langle \nabla f(x_t), v_t - x_t \rangle \leq \delta \cdot \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(x_t), s - x_t \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  is the approximation factor.

These two approximations essentially ensure the *approximate duality gap*<sup>3</sup> is “close to” the *true duality gap*. That is, in the additive case, (5) ensures that  $g(v_t^*) - g(v_t) \leq O(\delta/t)$  and thus achieves  $O((1 + \delta)/t)$  convergence rate [Jaggi, 2013]; in the multiplicative case, (6) ensure  $g(v_t) \geq \delta g(v_t^*)$  and achieves  $O(1/(\delta^2 t))$  convergence rate [Pedregosa et al., 2020].




Figure 1: A toy example of  $I^*$  with  $k = 4$  and  $d = 30$  where  $\mathbb{G}[I^*]$  is the connected subgraph with up to 4 nodes (red region). This subgraph provides an optimal solution  $-\sqrt{4}$ . The blue region is the best approximate solution with value  $-\sqrt{3 + \tau^2}$ .

**Adversarial example.** However, to find these oracles can be NP-hard for GSCOs. Consider the graph  $\mathbb{G}$  illustrated in Figure 1. Suppose  $f(x) = x^\top x / 2 - x^\top b$ . Clearly,  $f(x)$  is 1-strongly convex and 1-smooth. Let  $b$  and  $x_t$  be such that  $\nabla f(x_t)^\top = [1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, \tau, \tau, \dots, \tau]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$  where the first  $k$  entries are 1 and rest  $d - k$  entries are  $\tau$  with  $0 < \tau < 1$ . Assume further that  $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, 1)$  the set of connected components of  $\mathbb{G}$  each with at most  $k$  nodes, and assume that nodes are numbered such that  $I^* = \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \in \mathbb{M}$ . Then, the optimal solution

$$v_t^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in \mathcal{D}(1, \mathbb{M})} v^\top \nabla f(x_t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \underbrace{(-1, -1, \dots, -1, 0, \dots, 0)}_{k \text{ entries}},$$

where  $v_t^{*\top} \nabla f(x_t) = -\sqrt{k}$ . However, the best non-optimal-support LMO will select  $\tilde{v}$  with at least one  $\tau$  entry, and thus  $\tilde{v}^\top \nabla f(x_t) \leq \sqrt{k - 1 + \tau^2}$ .

**Gap-additive adversarial example.** The key problem with the gap-additive assumption is the requirement for the gap error to decay. In particular,  $g(v_t^*) - g(\tilde{v}_t) = \nabla f(x_t)^\top (v_t^* - \tilde{v}_t) = \sqrt{k} - \sqrt{k - 1 + \tau^2}$  which is strictly positive and constant in  $t$ . Thus any additive gap assumption with decaying tolerance will eventually require exact LMO-support recovery. Since the NP-hardness of finding graph support LMOs lies exactly in identifying the correct support, this assumption will be too weak for the inexact LMO oracles needed to tractably perform this task.

**Gap-multiplicative adversarial example.** We further consider adversarial examples for satisfying (6), continuing the above example. In this scenario, (6) requires

$$\underbrace{(-\sqrt{k - 1 + \tau^2} - \langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle)}_A \leq \underbrace{\delta (-\sqrt{k} - \langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle)}_B.$$

<sup>3</sup>Recall the duality gap  $g(v_t^*) := \langle x_t - v_t^*, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle$  where  $v_t^* \in \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle x_t - s, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle$  and an approximate of it at  $v_t$  is  $g(v_t) := \langle x_t - v_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle$ .

But for any  $0 < \tau < 1$ , suppose that

$$\mathbf{x}_t = [\underbrace{-1, -1, \dots, -1}_{k-1 \text{ entries}}, (k-1) - \sqrt{k-1+\tau}, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top \Rightarrow \sqrt{k-1-\tau^2} < -\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle < \sqrt{k}.$$

Then  $A > 0$  but  $B < 0$ , and *no positive value* of  $\delta$  can possibly satisfy (6); that is, the assumption is only satisfied if  $\delta = 1$  and the LMO is exact, which is NP-hard.

### 3.2 Dual maximization oracle for approximate inner product

The above adversarial examples show, in practice, both (5) and (6) can be impossible to find unless we solve the LMO with exact support. Instead, rather than approximating the gap, we turn to approximate  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{s} \rangle$  by using DMO; here, efficient inexact methods exist.

**Definition 5.** Given any  $\mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D}$ , and approximation factor  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , the approximated inner product operator, i.e.  $(\delta, \mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D})$ -IPO returns  $\mathbf{v}$  such that

$$(\text{Approximate IPO}) \quad \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \leq \delta \cdot \min_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{s} \rangle. \quad (7)$$

We call this operator the approximated IPO and denoted it as  $\mathbf{v} = (\delta, \mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D})$ -IPO.

The approximated IPO is not new. Outside of Frank-Wolfe methods, Mokhtari et al. [2018] use it to design approximate algorithms for MP (see also [Locatello et al., 2017]), and Garber [2017] uses it for online linear optimization (see also [Garber, 2021]). An important recent work [Garber and Wolf, 2021] shows that for certain norm balls, the LMO is equivalent to the projection on a nearest extreme point. From this observation, we realize that the approximate IPO is equivalent to an approximate dual norm calculation.

**Definition 6** (Dual Maximization Oracle  $(\delta, \mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D})$ -DMO). Given the graph support set  $\mathbb{M}$ , we define a dual approximation oracle as one which finds an  $S \in \mathbb{M}$  where

$$(\text{Dual maximization oracle}) \quad \|\mathbf{z}_S\|_* \geq \delta \cdot \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|\mathbf{z}_{S'}\|_*, \quad (8)$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  is the approximation factor.

Notice that in the example from Fig. 1,  $\delta = \frac{\sqrt{k-1+\tau^2}}{\sqrt{k}}$  satisfies (8). Here, we use  $\|\cdot\|_*$  to represent the dual norm for full generality; in our current scenario,  $\|\cdot\|_* = \|\cdot\|_2$ . Typical examples of the above oracle are the head approximations studied in the area of sparse recovery and compressive sensing [Hegde et al., 2016, 2015b, Golbabaee and Davies, 2018].

**Lemma 2.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is the graph support set defined in Def. 2. Suppose further that  $S$  is a support return by  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO. Then  $\mathbf{v}_t := -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_S / \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_S\|$  satisfies the  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -IPO.

Lemma 2 indicates that any solution  $S$  of the DMO provides a corresponding vector  $\mathbf{v}_t$  of the IPO (see Lines 3 and 4 of our proposed two algorithms).

**Efficient examples of  $\delta$ -DMOs.** For our graph model problems, at least two polynomial-time examples exist of inexact  $\delta$ -DMOs. The first DMO goes as follows: **Step 1)** Let  $I_g$  be the indices of  $g$  largest magnitude  $|z_i|$ . Initialize a node set as  $S = I_g$ . **Step 2)** Next, iterate through the edges  $(u, v) \in \mathbb{E}$ , in any order. If  $u \in S$ , merge  $v$  into  $S$ ; similarly, if  $v \in S$ , merge  $u$  into  $S$ . If at any point  $|S| = k$ , terminate. **Step 3)** Repeat Step 2 until either no new edges are added, or  $|S| = k$ . This procedure finds a  $\delta$ -DMO for  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  with  $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil$ , with runtime linear to the number of edges  $O(m)$ .

Alternatively, we can use the *head projection* presented in Hegde et al. [2014a], which provides a  $\delta$ -DMO with  $\delta = \sqrt{1/14}$ . It runs in polynomial time  $O(m \log^3 d)$  where  $m$  is the number of edges in  $\mathbb{G}$ .

### 3.3 Approximate FW methods via DMO

#### Algorithm 1 FW-DMO

1: **Input:**  $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ , step size  $\{\eta_t\}$ ,  $\delta$   
2: **for**  $t = 0, 1, \dots$ , **do**  
3:    $S_t = (\delta, \nabla f(x_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO  
4:    $\tilde{v}_t = -\nabla f(x_t)_{S_t} / \|\nabla f(x_t)_{S_t}\|_*$   
5:   (I):  $x_{t+1} = x_t + \eta_t(\tilde{v}_t - x_t)$   
6:   (II):  $x_{t+1} = x_t + \eta_t(\tilde{v}_t/\delta - x_t)$

#### Algorithm 2 AccFW-DMO

1: **Input:**  $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ , step size  $\{\eta_t\}$ ,  $\delta$   
2: **for**  $t = 0, 1, \dots$ , **do**  
3:    $S_t = (\delta, -x_t + \nabla f(x_t)/\beta\eta_t, \mathcal{D})$ -DMO  
4:    $\tilde{v}_t = (x_t - \nabla f(x_t)/\beta\eta_t)_{S_t} / \|(x_t - \nabla f(x_t)/\beta\eta_t)_{S_t}\|_*$   
5:   (I):  $x_{t+1} = x_t + \eta_t(\tilde{v}_t - x_t)$   
6:   (II):  $x_{t+1} = x_t + \eta_t(\tilde{v}_t/\delta - x_t)$

We present the inexact-DMO FW method (FW-DMO) in Algorithm 1 and explore two options for updating  $x_{t+1}$ : (I) is FW, which ensures  $x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}$ ; and (II) is a relaxed version, i.e.  $x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}/\delta$ . We also provide Algorithm 2, which is inspired from the NEP oracle [Garber and Wolf, 2021], and achieves an accelerated rate when  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex.

### 3.4 Convergence analysis

We first discuss the convergence of FW-DMO (I). Let  $h(x_{t+1})$  be the primal error, i.e.  $h(x_{t+1}) := f(x_{t+1}) - f(x^*)$  and  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . Then

$$h(x_{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{t+2}\right) h(x_t) + \underbrace{\frac{2(1-\delta)}{t+2} \langle -x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{2L\|\tilde{v}_t - x_t\|^2}{(t+2)^2}}_{Q_t}, t \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Clearly, if  $\delta = 1$ , then  $Q_t = O(1/t^2)$  and thus we can show recursively that  $h(x_{t+1}) = O(1/t)$ . The decay rate of  $Q_t$  in (9) is dominated by  $|\langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle|$ . When  $\delta = 1$ , it is well known that dual gap  $g_t(x_t) := \max_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle x_t - s, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle \geq \langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle$  attains to  $O(1/t)$  at a certain iteration (Theorem 2 in [Jaggi, 2013]). However, main difficulties to directly use dual gap are: 1) the decay of the gap to  $O(1/t)$  is not for all  $t$  in general; and 2) the magnitude of  $|\langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle|$  is not bounded directly. In general  $\langle x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle$  is not easy to directly bound, and thus when  $\delta < 1$  this proof technique fails. Instead, we prove  $h(x_{t+1})$  converges to an approximate solution (bounded by a small constant) at rate  $O(1/t)$  in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** (Convergence rate of FW-DMO (I)). *Let  $f$  be  $L$ -smooth and its gradient is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.  $\|\nabla f(x)\|_* \leq B, \forall x \in \mathcal{D}$ . Let  $x^* := \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f$  be the minimizer of (1). For  $t \geq 1$ , the primal error  $h(x_t) = f(x_t) - f(x^*)$  of FW-DMO (I) with the learning rate  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$  satisfies*

$$h(x_t) \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta(t+2)} + \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right), \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad (10)$$

where  $D := \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{D}} \|x - y\|$  the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Remark 1.** When  $\delta = 1$ , (10) recovers the standard convergence rate of the Frank-Wolfe method as given in [Jaggi, 2013]. The last term indicates that the approximation quality of  $h(x_t)$  highly depends on the DMO approximation factor  $\delta$  and the constants  $B$  and  $D$ . Table 1 compares this rate with several others. The left of Fig. 2 illustrates  $h(x_t)$  indeed converge with respect to different  $\delta$ .

**Expanding  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$ .** The above analysis shows that even after infinite iterations, the approximation error could be large when  $\delta$  is small. Alternatively, we now show that we can achieve an *exact* solution to a *relaxed* problem, by allowing  $x^* \in \mathcal{D}/\delta$ , an expanded set. To see this, notice that  $x_{t+1}$  is a convex combination of approximate vectors  $\tilde{v}_i$ . For each vector  $\tilde{v}_i$ , we enlarge its length to  $\|\tilde{v}_i\|/\delta$  so that  $\langle \nabla f(x_t), \tilde{v}_t - x_t \rangle$  is a lower bound of  $\min_{s \in \mathcal{D}/\delta} \langle \nabla f(x_t), s - x_t \rangle$ . The convergence rate of FW-DMO (II) is stated as the following




Figure 2: **Left:** The primal error  $h(x_t)$  as a function of  $t$  for FW-DMO (I) with different  $\delta$ . **Right:** The primal error as a function of  $t$  for FW-DMO (II) with different  $\delta$  on the Lasso problem. Details can be found in the supplementary.

Table 1: The comparison of convergence rates of FW methods with ours when  $\mathcal{D}$  is a GS support set. In all cases, we assume  $\mathcal{D}$  is bounded by  $D := \max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$  and  $f$  is convex differentiable. The  $\square$  column checks whether an approximate LMO/DMO-operator is efficiently obtainable for GSCOs.  $H_{\max}$  is given in Thm. 3.

| Algorithm                                  | $\square$ | Solution                                      | Condition   | Convergence rate   |
|--|-----------|---|---|--|
| Inexact gap-additive [Jaggi, 2013]         | ✗         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}$                | $L$ -smooth   | $O(2LD^2(1+\delta)/(t+2))$   |
| Inexact gap-mult. [Pedregosa et al., 2020] | ✗         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}$                | $L$ -smooth   | $O(2(LD^2 + BD\delta)/(\delta^2 t + 2\delta))$   |
| FW-DMO (I)                                 | ✓         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}$                | $L$ -smooth, $\ \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\ _* \leq B$                | $O\left(\frac{2LD^2}{\delta(t+2)} + \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left(B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta}\right)\right)$ |
| FW-DMO (II)                                | ✓         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \frac{\mathcal{D}}{\delta}$ | $L$ -smooth   | $O(2LD^2/\delta^2(t+2))$   |
| AccFW-DMO (I)                              | ✓         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}$                | $L$ -smooth, $\mu$ -strong, $\ \nabla f(\mathbf{x})\ _* \leq B$ | $O\left(\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^t h(\mathbf{x}_0) + H_{\max}\right)$                                      |
| AccFW-DMO (II)                             | ✓         | $\mathbf{x}_t \in \frac{\mathcal{D}}{\delta}$ | $L$ -smooth, $\mu$ -strong                                      | $O\left(\frac{8L^2 D^2 \log(t+1)}{\mu \delta^6 (t+1)^2}\right)$  |

**Theorem 2** (Convergence of FW-DMO (II)). *Let the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by FW-DMO (II). Assume that  $f$  is convex and  $L$ -smooth and consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 1$ , the primal error  $h(\mathbf{x}_t) = f(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies*

$$h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}/\delta$  and  $D := \max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Comparison it with Matching Pursuit.** The convergence rate of FW-DMO (II) in (11) is consistent with that of two variants of MP studied in Locatello et al. [2018], which converge at  $O(2LD^2/(\delta^2(t+2)))$ . To be clear, our analysis is on FW-type methods, which, unlike matching pursuit, update  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  via repeated convex combinations with the extreme points at a prespecified learning rate. In contrast, the MP updates involve mixing constants that may be difficult to estimate in practice. In any case, although the two methods are similar, their proof techniques cannot be interchanged.

**Faster convergence rate.** As is consistent with previous works, our FW-DMO methods still have sublinear convergence rates, even when  $f$  is strongly convex. To achieve linear rates, we explore an accelerated version AccFW-DMO.

**Theorem 3** (Convergence of AccFW-DMO (I)). *Let the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by of Algorithm 2 (I). Assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth. Consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 0$ , AccFW-DMO (I) has the following convergence*

$$h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L}{2} \sum_{i=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^i H_{t-i}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$H_{t-i} \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ \eta_{t-i} D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta \eta_{t-i}}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil}\right) \eta_{t-i}^2,$$

with  $H_{\max} \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil}\right)$ . Again,  $D$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$  and the gradient  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_* \leq B$ .

**Remark 2.** Theorem 3 shows that AccFW-DMO (I) converges to a local ball. The leading term of (12) critically depends on the condition number. In our experiments, the convergence rate appears linear when  $\mu/L$  is not too small.

**Theorem 4** (Convergence of AccFW-DMO (II)). *Let the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by of Algorithm 2 (II). Assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth. Consider the step size*

$\eta_t = 2/(t + 2)$ . For any  $t \geq 1$ , the prime error  $h(x_t) := f(x_t) - \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f$  of AccFW-DMO (II) has the following convergence

$$h(x_t) \leq \frac{8L^2D^2 \log(t + 1)}{\mu\delta^6(t + 1)^2}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \quad (13)$$

**Remark 3.** The proof technique mainly follows from Garber and Wolf [2021] where a critical step is showing that  $\sum_{i=0}^t \text{dist}(x_i, x^*)$  can be bound by  $\log(t + 1)$ . Additionally, there are two key observations: 1) the solution is unique since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex; and 2) all extreme points in  $\mathcal{D}$  have same norm.

## 4 Empirical Results

**Graph-structured sparse recovery.** We evaluate proposed methods on the model-based sparse recovery problem. The goal is to recovery a sparse image  $x^*$  with  $\|x^*\| = 1$  (Fig.3) where the underlying sparsity pattern has  $g = 11$  connected components and the loss  $f(x) := \|Ax - y\|^2/2$ . Measurements  $y$  are generated by  $y = \langle A, x^* \rangle + e$  where  $e = 0$  for noiseless case and  $e \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  for noise case.<sup>4</sup>  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  is a Gaussian sensing matrix where each entry  $a_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\sqrt{n})$  independently. The training data contains  $n = 3 \cdot |\text{supp}(x^*)|$  samples. We run each experiment for 20 trials. The GENMP method is the generalized MP discussed in Locatello et al. [2018] where each constant curvature is estimated by the maximal eigenvalue of  $A^\top A$ . The DMO we used is the head projection of Hegde et al. [2014a]. Our code and datasets are provided in supplementary materials.

**Results.** The convergence comparison is illustrated in Fig.3. GENMP converges faster than our methods. This empirical observation is consistent with the theoretical guarantee when  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth, which indeed are true for our case. However, in terms of comparing the recovered images, AccFW-DMO (I) is the best. This indicates a better tradeoff between the convergence rate and estimation error quality of AccFW-DMO (I). On the other hand, AccFW-DMO (II) converges much slower, which is consistent with our results since  $\delta^6$  dominates the rate shown in Thm. 4. In practice,  $\delta$  could be much larger than  $\sqrt{1/14}$ .

## 5 Conclusions

We study FW type methods for GSCO problems over the GS norm sets. We first demonstrate that there exist adversarial examples such that two popular inexact LMOs are at least as hard to compute as the exact LMO. Instead, we consider an inexact DMO which is equivalent to an approximation on the inner product oracle rather than the gap, and prove that the inexact DMO is equivalent to the inexact IPO. The standard FW admits  $\mathcal{O}(L/\delta t + (1 - \delta)(\delta^{-1} + \delta^{-2}))$ . We also prove that a simple relaxed version of FW which admits  $\mathcal{O}(LD^2/(\delta^2 t))$  for general convex functions to a relaxed graph support norm ball.

There are several remaining important directions that are not explored in this work. For example, will incorporating away-steps further improve this method? It remains of interest to compare the methods with projected gradient descent. Additionally, the empirical evidence suggest that the provided convergence rates are pessimistic, and it remains interesting to see whether a better convergence rate is obtainable.

<sup>4</sup>Results for the noise case can be found in the supplementary material.




Figure 3: **Left:** The comparison of logarithmic primal error  $\log h(x_t)$  as a function of  $t$ . **Right:** The recovered sparse image  $x_t$  where  $t = 500$ .



## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

### References

- Jacob Abernethy and Jun-Kun Wang. On frank-wolfe and equilibrium computation. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6587–6596, 2017.
- Cem Aksoylar, Lorenzo Orecchia, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Connected subgraph detection with mirror descent on sdps. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 51–59. PMLR, 2017.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Elad Hazan, Wei Hu, and Yuanzhi Li. Linear convergence of a frank-wolfe type algorithm over trace-norm balls. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6192–6201, 2017.
- Andreas Argyriou, Rina Foygel, and Nathan Srebro. Sparse prediction with the  $k$ -support norm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1457–1465, 2012.
- Ery Arias-Castro, Emmanuel J Candes, and Arnaud Durand. Detection of an anomalous cluster in a network. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 278–304, 2011.
- Francis Bach. Structured sparsity-inducing norms through submodular functions. In *NIPS 2010: Twenty-Fourth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, page NIPS, 2010.
- Francis Bach. Duality between subgradient and conditional gradient methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(1):115–129, 2015.
- Francis Bach, Rodolphe Jenatton, Julien Mairal, and Guillaume Obozinski. Optimization with sparsity-inducing penalties. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 4(1):1–106, 2012a.
- Francis Bach, Rodolphe Jenatton, Julien Mairal, Guillaume Obozinski, et al. Structured sparsity through convex optimization. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):450–468, 2012b.
- Krishnakumar Balasubramanian and Saeed Ghadimi. Zeroth-order (non)-convex stochastic optimization via conditional gradient and gradient updates. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3455–3464, 2018.
- Richard G Baraniuk, Volkan Cevher, Marco F Duarte, and Chinmay Hegde. Model-based compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 56(4):1982–2001, 2010.
- Mohammad Ali Bashiri and Xinhua Zhang. Decomposition-invariant conditional gradient for general polytopes with line search. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2687–2697, 2017.
- Quentin Berthet and Vianney Perchet. Fast rates for bandit optimization with upper-confidence frank-wolfe. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2222–2231, 2017.
- François-Xavier Briol, Chris J Oates, Mark Girolami, and Michael A Osborne. Frank-wolfe bayesian quadrature: probabilistic integration with theoretical guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems-Volume 1*, pages 1162–1170, 2015.
- Cyrille Combettes and Sebastian Pokutta. Boosting frank-wolfe by chasing gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2111–2121. PMLR, 2020.
- Cyrille W Combettes and Sebastian Pokutta. Blended matching pursuit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12335*, 2019.
- Cyrille W Combettes and Sebastian Pokutta. Complexity of linear minimization and projection on some sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.10040*, 2021.

- Phuong Dao, Kendric Wang, Colin Collins, Martin Ester, Anna Lapuk, and S Cenk Sahinalp. Optimally discriminative subnetwork markers predict response to chemotherapy. *Bioinformatics*, 27(13):i205–i213, 2011.
- Joseph C Dunn and S Harshbarger. Conditional gradient algorithms with open loop step size rules. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 62(2):432–444, 1978.
- Marwa El Halabi, Francis Bach, and Volkan Cevher. Combinatorial penalties: Which structures are preserved by convex relaxations? In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1551–1560. PMLR, 2018.
- Robert W. Floyd and Ronald L. Rivest. Algorithm 489: The algorithm select—for finding the  $i$ th smallest of  $n$  elements [m1]. *Commun. ACM*, 18(3):173, March 1975.
- Marguerite Frank, Philip Wolfe, et al. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
- Robert M Freund and Paul Grigas. New analysis and results for the frank-wolfe method. *Mathematical Programming*, 155(1-2):199–230, 2016.
- Dan Garber. Efficient online linear optimization with approximation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 627–635, 2017.
- Dan Garber. Revisiting frank-wolfe for polytopes: Strict complementarity and sparsity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Dan Garber. Efficient online linear optimization with approximation algorithms. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(1):204–220, 2021.
- Dan Garber and Elad Hazan. Faster rates for the frank-wolfe method over strongly-convex sets. In *32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2015*, 2015.
- Dan Garber and Elad Hazan. A linearly convergent variant of the conditional gradient algorithm under strong convexity, with applications to online and stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(3):1493–1528, 2016.
- Dan Garber and Ofer Meshi. Linear-memory and decomposition-invariant linearly convergent conditional gradient algorithm for structured polytopes. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1009–1017, 2016.
- Dan Garber and Noam Wolf. Frank-wolfe with a nearest extreme point oracle, 2021.
- Mohammad Golbabaee and Mike E Davies. Inexact gradient projection and fast data driven compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(10):6707–6721, 2018.
- David Hallac, Jure Leskovec, and Stephen Boyd. Network lasso: Clustering and optimization in large graphs. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 387–396, 2015.
- Zaid Harchaoui, Anatoli Juditsky, and Arkadi Nemirovski. Conditional gradient algorithms for norm-regularized smooth convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 152(1):75–112, 2015.
- Elad Hazan and Haipeng Luo. Variance-reduced and projection-free stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1263–1271. PMLR, 2016.
- Elad Hazan, Wei Hu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhiyuan Li. Online improper learning with an approximation oracle. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5657–5665, 2018.
- Chinmay Hegde, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. Approximation-tolerant model-based compressive sensing. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium On Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1544–1561. SIAM, 2014a.

- Chinmay Hegde, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. A fast, adaptive variant of the goemans-williamson scheme for the prize-collecting steiner tree problem. In *Workshop of the 11th DIMACS Implementation Challenge*, volume 2, page 3. Workshop of the 11th DIMACS Implementation Challenge, 2014b.
- Chinmay Hegde, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. Approximation algorithms for model-based compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5129–5147, 2015a.
- Chinmay Hegde, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. A nearly-linear time framework for graph-structured sparsity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 928–937, 2015b.
- Chinmay Hegde, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. Fast recovery from a union of subspaces. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4394–4402, 2016.
- Dorit S Hochbaum and Anu Pathria. Node-optimal connected k-subgraphs. *University of California, Berkeley*, 1994.
- Laurent Jacob, Guillaume Obozinski, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 433–440, 2009.
- Martin Jaggi. Revisiting Frank-Wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 30th international conference on machine learning*, pages 427–435, 2013.
- Thomas Kerdreux, Fabian Pedregosa, and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Frank-wolfe with subsampling oracle. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2591–2600. PMLR, 2018.
- Rahul G Krishnan, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and David Sontag. Barrier frank-wolfe for marginal inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015:532–540, 2015.
- Simon Lacoste-Julien and Martin Jaggi. On the global linear convergence of frank-wolfe optimization variants. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 496–504, 2015.
- Qi Lei, Jiacheng Zhuo, Constantine Caramanis, Inderjit S Dhillon, and Alexandros G Dimakis. Primal-dual block generalized frank-wolfe. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:13866–13875, 2019.
- Cong Han Lim and Stephen Wright. k-support and ordered weighted sparsity for overlapping groups: Hardness and algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 284–292, 2017.
- Bo Liu, Xiao-Tong Yuan, Shaoting Zhang, Qingshan Liu, and Dimitris N Metaxas. Efficient k-support-norm regularized minimization via fully corrective frank-wolfe method. In *IJCAI*, 2016.
- Francesco Locatello, Rajiv Khanna, Michael Tschannen, and Martin Jaggi. A unified optimization view on generalized matching pursuit and frank-wolfe. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 860–868, 2017.
- Francesco Locatello, Anant Raj, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Gunnar Rätsch, Bernhard Schölkopf, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. On matching pursuit and coordinate descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3198–3207. PMLR, 2018.
- Francesco Locatello, Alp Yurtsever, Olivier Fercoq, and Volkan Cevher. Stochastic frank-wolfe for composite convex minimization. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- Giulia Luise, Saverio Salzo, Massimiliano Pontil, and Carlo Ciliberto. Sinkhorn barycenters with free support via frank-wolfe algorithm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.

- Andrew McDonald, Massimiliano Pontil, and Dimitris Stamos. Fitting spectral decay with the k-support norm. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1061–1069. PMLR, 2016a.
- Andrew M McDonald, Massimiliano Pontil, and Dimitris Stamos. New perspectives on k-support and cluster norms. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):5376–5413, 2016b.
- Aryan Mokhtari, Hamed Hassani, and Amin Karbasi. Conditional gradient method for stochastic submodular maximization: Closing the gap. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1886–1895. PMLR, 2018.
- Aryan Mokhtari, Hamed Hassani, and Amin Karbasi. Stochastic conditional gradient methods: From convex minimization to submodular maximization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(105):1–49, 2020.
- Deanna Needell and Joel A Tropp. Cosamp: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples. *Applied and computational harmonic analysis*, 26(3):301–321, 2009.
- Fabian Pedregosa, Geoffrey Negiar, Armin Askari, and Martin Jaggi. Linearly convergent frank-wolfe with backtracking line-search. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1–10. PMLR, 2020.
- Javier Pena and Daniel Rodriguez. Polytope conditioning and linear convergence of the frank-wolfe algorithm. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(1):1–18, 2019.
- Wei Ping, Qiang Liu, and Alexander T Ihler. Learning infinite rbms with frank-wolfe. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29:3063–3071, 2016.
- Jing Qian, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Yuting Chen. Connected sub-graph detection. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 796–804. PMLR, 2014.
- Anton Riabov and Zhen Liu. Scalable planning for distributed stream processing systems. In *ICAPS*, pages 31–41, 2006.
- Emile Richard, Guillaume R Obozinski, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Tight convex relaxations for sparse matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27:3284–3292, 2014.
- Ralph Tyrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton university press, 2015.
- James Sharpnack, Aarti Singh, and Alessandro Rinaldo. Sparsistency of the edge lasso over graphs. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1028–1036. PMLR, 2012.
- Yifan Sun and Francis Bach. Safe screening for the generalized conditional gradient method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09718*, 2020.
- Kiran K Thekumparampil, Prateek Jain, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Sewoong Oh. Projection efficient subgradient method and optimal nonsmooth frank-wolfe method. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 12211–12224, 2020.
- Yaoliang Yu, Xinhua Zhang, and Dale Schuurmans. Generalized conditional gradient for sparse estimation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):5279–5324, 2017.
- Hui Zhang. The restricted strong convexity revisited: analysis of equivalence to error bound and quadratic growth. *Optimization Letters*, 11(4):817–833, 2017.

## Checklist

The checklist follows the references. Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question, change the default **[TODO]** to **[Yes]**, **[No]**, or **[N/A]**. You are strongly encouraged to include a **justification to your answer**, either by referencing the appropriate section of your paper or providing a brief inline description. For example:

- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? [Yes] See Section 2.
- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? [No] The code and the data are proprietary.
- Did you include the license to the code and datasets? [N/A]

Please do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers. Note that the Checklist section does not count towards the page limit. In your paper, please delete this instructions block and only keep the Checklist section heading above along with the questions/answers below.

1. For all authors...
  - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? [Yes] See Abstract and the introduction section 1.
  - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] See section 5.
  - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [N/A] As this is theoretical research in nature, it is hard to predict any foreseeable societal consequence.
  - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes] We read the ethics review guidelines.
2. If you are including theoretical results...
  - (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [Yes] See section 3.
  - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [Yes] See supplementary material.
3. If you ran experiments...
  - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] In the supplemental material.
  - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes] See Section 4.
  - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [Yes] See Section 3 and Section 4.
  - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [N/A]
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
  - (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes]
  - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes]
  - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes]
  - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [Yes]
  - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [No] No offensive content.
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
  - (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [No] No human subjects involved.
  - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [No] No IRB involved.
  - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [No] No particular participants involved.



## A Appendix

### Contents

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| A.1   | Proofs . . . . .                                  | 15 |
| A.1.1 | Proof of Theorem 1 . . . . .                      | 16 |
| A.1.2 | Proof of Theorem 2 . . . . .                      | 18 |
| A.1.3 | Proof of Theorem 3 . . . . .                      | 19 |
| A.1.4 | Proof of Theorem 4 . . . . .                      | 21 |
| A.2   | Experimental results . . . . .                    | 24 |
| A.2.1 | The explanation of Fig. 2 . . . . .               | 24 |
| A.2.2 | Graph-structured (GS) sparse recovery . . . . .   | 26 |
| A.3   | Dual maximization oracles . . . . .               | 27 |
| A.3.1 | DMOs for $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$ . . . . . | 27 |
| A.3.2 | Other GS models . . . . .                         | 30 |

Section A.1 provides all missing proofs. Section A.2 presents results shown in Fig. 2 and provides more experimental results on the Lasso and GS sparse recovery problem. Finally, we present two DMOs for  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  and briefly discuss other DMOs in Section A.3. Our code, datasets, and results are also provided in the supplementary material and will be made available on publish.

#### A.1 Proofs

**Lemma 1.** Denote  $\|\cdot\|_k^{\text{SP}*}$  as the dual norm of  $\|\cdot\|_k^{\text{SP}}$ . The dual norm is given by

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_k^{\text{SP}*} := \sup_{\{\mathbf{v}: \|\mathbf{v}\|_k^{\text{SP}} \leq 1\}} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|,$$

where  $I_k$  is the set of  $k$  indices in  $[d]$  corresponding to the largest magnitude elements of  $\mathbf{u}$ .

*Proof.* Notice that the unit ball of  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_k^{\text{SP}}$  is the convex hull of  $k$ -sparse vectors with norm no greater than 1, that is  $\{\mathbf{v} : \|\mathbf{v}\|_k^{\text{SP}} \leq 1\} = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{v} : |\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})| \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\| \leq 1\}$ . We calculate the dual norm as the following

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_k^{\text{SP}*} := \sup_{\{\mathbf{v}: \|\mathbf{v}\|_k^{\text{SP}} \leq 1\}} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \sup_{\text{conv}\{\mathbf{v}: |\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})| \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\| \leq 1\}} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle,$$

where sup is over a compact convex set, hence it is attainable. Let  $\mathbf{v}_I$  be the maximizer ( $\mathbf{v}_I$  is a vector to maximize  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ ). By using Hölder's inequality, we have  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_I \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_I, \mathbf{v}_I \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{u}_I\|_* \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_I\| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_I\|_* \leq \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$ . Notice that when  $\mathbf{v}_I = \mathbf{u}_{I_k} / \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$ , we always have  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_I \rangle = \|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$ . Therefore, we obtain the maximum value  $\|\mathbf{u}_{I_k}\|$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** The similar proofs of ours can be found in the Proposition 2 of [McDonald et al. \[2016a\]](#), Section 2.1 of [Argyriou et al. \[2012\]](#), and Lemma 2 of [Jacob et al. \[2009\]](#).

**Lemma 2.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}$  is the graph support set defined in Def. 2. Suppose further that  $S$  is a support return by  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO. Then  $\mathbf{v}_t := -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_S / \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_S\|$  satisfies the  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -IPO.

*Proof.* As defined in (7), i.e.  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{v}_t \rangle \leq \delta \cdot \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle$ .  $\mathbf{v}_t = (\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -IPO provides the following inequality  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{v}_t \rangle \leq \delta \cdot \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle$ . Recall  $\mathcal{D} = \text{conv}(\cup_{I \in \mathbb{M}} \{w \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{supp}(w) \subseteq I\})$ . Denote the unit ball induced by  $I$  as  $\mathcal{B}(I) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{supp}(x) \subseteq I, \|w\| \leq 1\}$ . Notice that  $s$  be must in the set of extreme points. We have

$$\min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle = \min_{s \in \text{conv}(\cup_{I \in \mathbb{M}} \mathcal{B}(I))} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle = \min_{s \in \cup_{I \in \mathbb{M}} \mathcal{B}(I)} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle = \min_{s \in \mathcal{B}(I^*)} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*}, s \rangle,$$

where we denote  $I^*$  as the support of  $s$ . By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we always have  $-\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*}\|_* \cdot \|s\| \leq \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*}, s \rangle$ . When  $s = -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*} / \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*}\|$ , it attains the minimal value  $-\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{I^*}\|_*$ .

On the other hand, let  $S$  be a support returned by  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO, that is,  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_S\|_* \geq \delta \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{S'}\|_*$ . Let  $S^*$  be the optimal support, i.e.  $S^* \in \arg \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{S'}\|_*$ . Clearly, we can rewrite  $\mathbf{v}_t$  and have the following inequality

$$\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{v}_t \rangle = -\sqrt{\sum_{i \in S} (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i)^2} \leq -\delta \sqrt{\sum_{i \in S^*} (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i)^2} \leq -\delta \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I^*} (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i)^2},$$

where the last inequality due to the fact that  $S^*$  is an optimal and  $I^* \in \mathbb{M}$ . The above inequality indicates that given  $S$  that satisfies DMO property, then  $\mathbf{v}_t$  is a solution of IPO operator. We prove the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** Lemma 2 gives us a way to find a vector of IPO vector. Lemma 2 also indicates IPO operator and DMO operator are equivalent. That is, for an existing  $\mathbf{v}_t \in (\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -IPO, one can find  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_t) \in (\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ .

### A.1.1 Proof of Theorem 1

**Theorem 1.** Let  $f$  be  $L$ -smooth and its gradient is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_* \leq B, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}^* := \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f$  be the minimizer of (1). For  $t \geq 1$ , the primal error  $h(\mathbf{x}_t) = f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)$  of FW-DMO (I) with the learning rate  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$  satisfies

$$h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta(t+2)} + \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right), \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad (14)$$

where  $D := \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$  the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof.* If DMO is exact ( $\delta = 1$ ), then  $h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})$  of FW-DMO (I) is recursively bounded as  $h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq (1 - 2/(t+2))h(\mathbf{x}_t) + 2LD^2/(t+2)^2, t \geq 0$ , which eventually leads to  $h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq 2LD^2/(t+2), \forall t \geq 1$ . In the rest of the proof, we assume  $0 < \delta < 1$ .

Notice that  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{t\mathbf{x}_t}{t+2} + \frac{2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{t+2}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0$  by Line 5 of Algorithm 1. We can rewrite  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  as a convex combination of  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t$  as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \frac{t\mathbf{x}_t}{t+2} + \frac{2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{t+2} = \sum_{i=0}^t \frac{2(i+1)\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i}{(t+1)(t+2)} = \sum_{i=0}^t \left\{ \frac{2(i+1)}{(t+1)(t+2)} \cdot \frac{-\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}}{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}\|} \right\},$$

where the last equality follows Line 4 of Algorithm 1. When  $t = 0$ , we assume the initial point is  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ . When  $t \geq 1$  the inner product  $\langle -\mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle$  can be bounded as the following

$$\begin{aligned} \langle -\mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle &= \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \frac{2(i+1)}{t(t+1)} \left\langle \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}}{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}\|}, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \frac{2(i+1)}{t(t+1)} \left\| \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}}{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i)_{S_i}\|} \right\| \cdot \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|_* \\ &= \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|_* \leq B \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by the Holder's inequality and the last inequality is the assumption of boundness of  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|$ . By  $L$ -smooth of  $f$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_t) &\leq \underbrace{\eta_t \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \eta_t \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top \mathbf{x}_t}_{\leq \delta \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t} + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \\ &\leq -\eta_t \delta (f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f^*) - (1 - \delta) \eta_t \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top \mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\eta_t^2 LD^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the following

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{t+2}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + Q_t, \text{ where } Q_t := \frac{2(1-\delta)}{t+2} \langle -\mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle + \frac{2L\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2}{(t+2)^2} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{t+2}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2(1-\delta)B}{t+2} + \frac{2LD^2}{(t+2)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In the rest of the proof, we show the convergence by induction. We wish to show

$$h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq \frac{2}{t+2} \frac{LD^2}{\delta} + \frac{1-\delta}{\delta} (B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta}).$$

For the initial case, notice that

$$h(\mathbf{x}_0) = f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq B\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq BD$$

Therefore after one round of recursion, with  $0 < \delta < 1$

$$h(\mathbf{x}_1) \leq (1-\delta)BD + (1-\delta)B + \frac{LD^2}{2} \leq \frac{LD^2}{\delta} + \frac{1-\delta}{\delta} (B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta}).$$

This proves the base case. In the rest, we assume it is true and prove it for  $h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})$ , by (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{t+2}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2(1-\delta)B}{t+2} + \frac{2LD^2}{(t+2)^2} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{t+2}\right) \left( \frac{2LD^2}{\delta(t+2)} + \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right) \right) + \frac{2(1-\delta)B}{t+2} + \frac{2LD^2}{(t+2)^2} \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{2LD^2}{\delta(t+3)} + \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right) - \frac{2\delta}{t+2} \left( \frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta} \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right) \right)}_{T_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \left( \frac{1}{t+2} - \frac{2\delta}{(t+2)^2} - \frac{1}{t+3} \right)}_{T_2} + \underbrace{\frac{2(1-\delta)B}{t+2} + \frac{2LD^2}{(t+2)^2}}_{T_3}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by the induction step. We finish the proof by showing that the sum of last three terms are nonpositive, i.e.  $T := (t+2)^2(t+3)(T_1 + T_2 + T_3) \leq 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (t+2)^2(t+3)(T_1 + T_2 + T_3) \\ &= (t^2 + 5t + 6) \left( -2(1-\delta) \left( B(1+D) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \right) \right) + ((1-2\delta)t + 2 - 6\delta) \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \\ &\quad + (t^2 + 5t + 6)(2(1-\delta)B) + 2LD^2(t+3) \\ &= \underbrace{-(t^2 + 5t + 6)2(1-\delta)BD}_{<0} \\ &\quad + ((t^2 + 5t + 6)(-2(1-\delta)) + (1-\delta)t + 2 - 3\delta) \frac{2LD^2}{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t^2 + 5t + 6 > t/2 + 1$  for all  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$T \cdot \frac{\delta}{2LD^2} < -t(1-\delta) - 2(1-\delta) + (1-\delta)t + 2 - 3\delta = -\delta \leq 0.$$

Hence  $T \leq 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.** The bound of (10) is tight in the sense that when  $\delta = 1$ , and it recovers the standard convergence of FW [Jaggi, 2013].

### A.1.2 Proof of Theorem 2

**Theorem 2.** Let the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by FW-DMO (II). Assume that  $f$  is convex and  $L$ -smooth and consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 1$ , the primal error  $h(\mathbf{x}_t) = f(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies

$$h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad (16)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}/\delta$  and  $D := \max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof.* By  $L$ -smooth of  $f$ , we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \eta_t \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t/\delta - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + L\eta_t^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t/\delta - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2/2.$$

Let  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$  and adding  $-f(\mathbf{x}^*)$  (where  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x})$ ) on both sides, we have

$$h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2}{t+2} \left\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\rangle + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2},$$

where the last term follows from the scaling diameter of  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$ , i.e.  $D^2/\delta^2$ . Notice that, by  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO, we have  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t \rangle \leq \delta \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s \rangle$ . Scaling by  $1/\delta$  and then adding  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), -\mathbf{x}_t \rangle$  both sides, we have  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t/\delta - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle \leq \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle$ . We continue to have the following

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2}{t+2} \min_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), s - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2} \\ &\leq h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2}{t+2} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2} \\ &\leq (1 - \frac{2}{t+2})h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the convexity of  $f$ , i.e.  $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)$  and  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{D}$ . In the rest proof, we show the bound of

$$h(\mathbf{x}_t) \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)}$$

by induction. Notice that  $t = 1$ , by the above inequality,

$$h(\mathbf{x}_1) \leq LD^2/2\delta^2 \leq 2LD^2/\delta^2(1+2).$$

Now we assume it is true for  $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$ , we consider  $h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})$

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \frac{t}{t+2}h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{t}{t+2} \cdot \left( \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)} \right) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2} \\ &= \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+3)} + \frac{t}{t+2} \cdot \left( \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)} \right) + \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2} - \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+3)} \\ &= \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+3)} - \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+2)^2(t+3)} \leq \frac{2LD^2}{\delta^2(t+3)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by the induction. Hence we prove the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 7.** The above proof follows a similar proof strategy as in Jaggi [2013]. Different from previous one, we show that when  $\mathbf{x}_t$  extended to  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$  with a  $\delta$ -approximation DMO, we can still have a convergence rate inverse proportional to  $\delta$ .

### A.1.3 Proof of Theorem 3

**Theorem 3.** Let the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by of Algorithm 2 (I). Assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth. Consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 0$ , AccFW-DMO (I) has the following convergence

$$h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L}{2} \sum_{i=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^i H_{t-i}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$H_{t-i} \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ \eta_{t-i} D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta \eta_{t-i}}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil}\right) \eta_{t-i}^2,$$

with  $H_{\max} \geq H_t := \frac{L}{2} \sum_{i=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^i \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ \eta_{t-i} D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta \eta_{t-i}}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil}\right) \eta_{t-i}^2 \right)$  and  $H_{\max} \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil}\right)$ . Again,  $D$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$  and the gradient  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_* \leq B$ .

*Proof.* By the  $L$ -smooth of  $f$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t = \eta_t(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \eta_t \langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{x}_t) + L\eta_t^2 \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle - \eta_t \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{x}_t) + L\eta_t^2 \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle + L\eta_t^2 \langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, \mathbf{x}_t \rangle - \eta_t \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \\ &= f(\mathbf{x}_t) + L\eta_t^2 \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right) - \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2}{2L} \\ &\leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) - \frac{\mu}{L} (f(\mathbf{x}^t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + L\eta_t^2 \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the restricted strongly convex property, i.e.,  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2/2 \geq \mu(f(\mathbf{x}^t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*))$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ . Add  $-f(\mathbf{x}^*)$  on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + L\eta_t^2 \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + L\eta_t^2 \delta \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}} \left\langle \mathbf{v}, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$



Notice that  $\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}} \left\langle \mathbf{v}, -\mathbf{x}_t + \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\rangle = -\left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\|$  where  $S_t^* := \arg \min_{S \in \mathbb{M}} -\left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_S \right\|$ . We proceed to have the following

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) - L\eta_t^2 \delta \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\| + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right) h(\mathbf{x}_t) + \underbrace{\frac{L}{2} \eta_t^2 \cdot \left( \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 - 2\delta \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right)}_{H_t}. \end{aligned}$$

We recursively use the above inequality and reach at the following

$$h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L}{2} \sum_{i=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^i H_{t-i}. \quad (18)$$

Notice that  $\left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\|^2$  where each  $|S_t^*| \leq k$ . Clearly,  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\| = 1$  and we can loosely bound  $H_t$  by the following

$$\begin{aligned} H_t &\leq \eta_t^2 \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\|^2 - 2\delta \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2 \right) \\ &= \eta_t^2 \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \left( \left\| \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\| - \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right)^2 + 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \\ &= \lceil d/k \rceil \left( \left\| \left( \eta_t \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\| - \frac{\delta \eta_t}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right)^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \eta_t^2 \\ &\leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ \left\| \left( \eta_t \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L} \right)_{S_t^*} \right\|, \frac{\delta \eta_t}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \eta_t^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that  $|a - b| \leq \max\{a, b\}, \forall a > 0, b > 0$ . Given the assumption of bounded gradient  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\| \leq B$  and bounded solution  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\| \leq D$ , we have

$$H_t \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ \eta_t D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta \eta_t}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \eta_t^2.$$

The above indicates that  $H_0 \leq \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right)$  when  $\eta_0 = 1$ . We continue to bound (12) as the following

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L}{2} \sum_{i=0}^t \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^i \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L^2(1 - (1 - \mu/L)^{t+1})}{2\mu} \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t+1} h(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{L^2}{2\mu} \left( \lceil d/k \rceil \max \left\{ D + \frac{B}{L}, \frac{\delta}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right\}^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\lceil d/k \rceil} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 8.** The above theorem indicates that the convergence of  $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$  to a small ball is dominated by  $D + B/L$  when  $\delta/\lceil d/k \rceil$  is small. In practice, the linear convergence may not be able to observed. For example, Fig. 8 indicates that AccFW-DMO (I) is dominated by  $H_t$ .

#### A.1.4 Proof of Theorem 4

**Theorem 4.** Let the sequence  $\{x_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by of Algorithm 2 (II). Assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth. Consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 1$ , the prime error  $h(x_t) := f(x_t) - \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f$  of AccFW-DMO (II) has the following convergence

$$h(x_t) \leq \frac{8L^2 D^2 \log(t+1)}{\mu \delta^6 (t+1)^2}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \quad (19)$$

**Notations.** Let  $\mathcal{V} := \{x : \text{supp}(x) \in \mathbb{M}, \|x\| = 1\}$ . Following notations of Garber and Wolf [2021], we denote the set of optimal points  $\mathcal{X}^* := \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x)$  where  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined in our problem (1) with  $C = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}} \{\max_{u,v \in \mathcal{S}} \|u - v\| : \mathcal{X}^* \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{S})\}$ . That is,  $\mathcal{S}$  is a set of extreme points and its convex hull contains  $\mathcal{X}^*$ ;  $\mathcal{S}^*$  is such an  $\mathcal{S}$  whose diameter is minimal. The diameter of  $\mathcal{S}^*$  is then  $D^* = \max_{u,v \in \mathcal{S}^*} \|u - v\|$ . Again, the primal error of the original problem is  $h(x_t) = f(x_t) - \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x)$ .

Since AccFW-DMO (II) solves a relax problem over  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$  and corresponding vertices of  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$  is  $\mathcal{V}/\delta$ . We redefine the notations for this relaxed problem as follows: Denote  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^*$  as the set of optimal solutions of the extended problem, i.e.  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{D}/\delta} f(x)$ . Similar to  $\mathcal{S}^*$ , we define  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^*$  over  $\mathcal{V}/\delta$ , i.e.,  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}/\delta} \{\max_{u,v \in \mathcal{S}} \|u - v\| : \bar{\mathcal{X}}^* \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{S})\}$ . The associated diameter is then  $\bar{D}^* = \max_{u,v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*} \|u - v\|$ . The extended primal error is then  $\bar{h}(x_{t+1}) := f(x_{t+1}) - f(\bar{x}^*)$ , where  $\bar{x}^*$  is an optimal solution of  $\min_{\mathcal{D}/\delta} f(x)$ .

**Sketch proof of Theorem 4.** Since we assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex ( $\mu > 0$ ) and the constraint set is convex compact set, the minimizer of  $f$  over both  $\mathcal{D}/\delta$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is unique. Notice that we always have  $h(x_t) \leq \bar{h}(x_t)$ . Theorem 4 is directly from Theorem 5 with  $D^* = 0$  and  $h(x_t) \leq \bar{h}(x_t)$ . In the rest, we aim to prove the following main Theorem.

**Theorem 5.** Let the sequence  $\{x_{t+1}, t \geq 0\}$  be generated by AccFW-DMO (II). Assume that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth. Consider the step size  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2)$ . For any  $t \geq 1$ , the primal error  $\bar{h}(x_t) := f(x_t) - f(\bar{x}^*)$  has the following inequality

$$\bar{h}(x_t) \leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{8L^2(D^{*2} + D^2/\delta^2) \log(t+1)}{\mu \delta^4(t+1)^2}, \quad \forall t \geq 1, \quad (20)$$

where  $x_t \in \mathcal{D}/\delta$  and the diameter of  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $D := \max_{x,y \in \mathcal{D}} \|x - y\|$ .

Before we prove the above theorem. We introduce the following technique lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $\tilde{v}_t$  be the corresponding to the output of  $(\delta, \nabla f(x_t), \mathcal{D})$ -IPO operator of Algorithm 2 (Line 4). For any  $t$ -th iteration with the sequence of step sizes  $\{\eta_t\}$ , we have the following

$$\eta_t \left\langle \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta} - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta} - x_t \right\|^2 \leq \min_{v \in \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\delta}} \left\{ \eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|v - x_t\|^2 \right\}, \quad (21)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of all extreme points with unit norm, i.e.  $\mathcal{V} := \{w : \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \mathbb{M}, \|w\| = 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{V}/\delta$  is the set of extreme points expanding each  $w$  to  $w/\delta$ , i.e.  $\|w/\delta\| = 1/\delta$ .

**Proof of Lemma 3.** Notice that the LHS of (21) can be written as the following

$$\eta_t \left\langle \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta} - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta} - x_t \right\|^2 = \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta} - x_t + \frac{\nabla f(x_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 - \frac{\|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2}{2L}. \quad (22)$$

The rest of the proof is to construct the RHS of Equ. (22). Notice that, at  $t$ -th iteration, by the property of  $(\delta, x, \mathcal{D})$ -DMO operator, we have the following

$$2 \cdot \left\langle \frac{\tilde{v}_t}{\delta}, - \left( x_t - \frac{\nabla f(x_t)}{L\eta_t} \right) \right\rangle \leq 2 \cdot \min_{v \in \mathcal{D}/\delta} \left\langle v, - \left( x_t - \frac{\nabla f(x_t)}{L\eta_t} \right) \right\rangle \leq 2 \cdot \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \left\langle v, - \left( x_t - \frac{\nabla f(x_t)}{L\eta_t} \right) \right\rangle,$$

where the first inequality is due to  $(\delta, -\mathbf{x}_t + \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)/(L\eta_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO oracle in Line 3 of Algorithm 2 and last inequality follows by  $\mathcal{V}/\delta \subseteq \mathcal{D}/\delta$ . Adding  $1/\delta^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)/(L\eta_t)\|^2$  on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\delta^2} + 2 \cdot \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta}, -\left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\rangle + \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} + 2 \cdot \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\delta}} \left\langle \mathbf{v}, -\left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t\|^2/\delta^2 = 1/\delta^2$  and  $\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 = 1/\delta^2, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta$ . The above inequality can be reformulated as the following

$$\left\| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\|^2 \leq \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \left\| \mathbf{v} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\|^2. \quad (23)$$

We first multiply a positive value  $L\eta_t^2/2$  and then add  $-\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2/(2L)$  on both sides of Equ. (23), it reaches at the following

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\|^2 - \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2}{2L} &\leq \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{v} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\|^2 - \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2}{2L} \\ \eta_t \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\|^2 &\leq \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{v} - \left(\mathbf{x}_t - \frac{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)}{L\eta_t}\right) \right\|^2 - \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2}{2L} \\ \eta_t \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\|^2 &\leq \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \left\{ \eta_t \left\langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by (22). Hence, we prove the lemma.  $\square$

Follow a similar argument made in Garber and Wolf [2021], we will establish the error reduction of Algorithm 2 by using Lemma 3 and state this error reduction in the following.

**Lemma 4.** Let  $\mathcal{V} := \{\mathbf{w} : \text{supp}(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{M}, \|\mathbf{w}\| = 1\}$ . Denote the set of optimal points  $\bar{X}^* := \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{D}/\delta} f(\mathbf{w})$  and denote  $\bar{S}^* \in \arg \min_{S \subseteq \mathcal{V}/\delta} \{\max_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in S} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| : \bar{X}^* \subseteq \text{conv}(S)\}$ . That is,  $S$  is a set of extreme points and its convex hull contains  $\bar{X}^*$ ;  $\bar{S}^*$  is such an  $S$  whose diameter is minimal. Define the extended primal error as  $\bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_t) := f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*), \forall t \geq 1$ , where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*$  is an optimal solution of  $\min_{\mathcal{D}/\delta} f(\mathbf{x})$ .  $\forall t \geq 0$ , we have the following error reduction

$$\bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_t) \bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2\delta^2} \left( \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_t, \bar{X}^*)^2 + D^{*2} \right), \quad (24)$$

where  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_t, \bar{X}^*) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \bar{X}^*} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|$ .

*Proof.* By the  $L$ -smooth of  $f$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t = \eta_t(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t/\delta - \mathbf{x}_t)$ , we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \eta_t \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t}{\delta} - \mathbf{x}_t \right\|^2.$$

Adding  $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*)$  on both sides of the above and using Equ. (21) of Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_t) + \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}/\delta} \left\{ \eta_t \left\langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_t) + \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \bar{S}^*} \left\{ \eta_t \left\langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the last inequality is due to  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^* \subseteq \mathcal{V}/\delta$ . We proceed to bound  $\eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + L\eta_t^2 \|v - x_t\|^2 / 2$  over  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^*$  as the following

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*} \left\{ \eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \|v - x_t\|^2 \right\} \\
&= \min_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*} \left\{ \eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \|v - \bar{x}^*\|^2 + \|\bar{x}^* - x_t\|^2 + 2 \langle v - \bar{x}^*, \bar{x}^* - x_t \rangle \right) \right\} \\
&\leq \min_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*} \left\{ \eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{\delta^2} + \text{dist}(x_t, \bar{\mathcal{X}}^*)^2 + 2 \langle v - \bar{x}^*, \bar{x}^* - x_t \rangle \right) \right\} \\
&\leq \min_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*} \left\{ \eta_t \langle v - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{\delta^2} + \frac{\text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2} + 2 \langle v - \bar{x}^*, \bar{x}^* - x_t \rangle \right) \right\} \\
&\leq \eta_t \langle \bar{x}^* - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{\delta^2} + \frac{\text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2} \right) \\
&\leq -\eta_t \bar{h}(x_t) + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{\delta^2} + \frac{\text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2} \right), \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{x}^*$  in the first equality be such that closest to  $x_t$ , i.e.  $\|\bar{x}^* - x_t\| = \text{dist}(x_t, \bar{\mathcal{X}}^*)$  and first inequality follows by  $\|\bar{x}^* - x_t\| \leq D^*/\delta, \forall v \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}^*$  and the second inequality follows from the fact that  $\langle \bar{x}^* - x_t, \nabla f(x_t) \rangle \leq f(\bar{x}^*) - f(x_t)$ . Combine Equ. (26) and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{h}(x_{t+1}) &\leq \bar{h}(x_t) - \eta_t \bar{h}(x_t) + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{\delta^2} + \frac{\text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2} \right) \\
&= (1 - \eta_t) \bar{h}(x_t) + \frac{L\eta_t^2}{2\delta^2} \left( D^{*2} + \text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We prove the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 9.** Unlike the proof of Lemma 1 in Garber and Wolf [2021], the above proof is critically based on Lemma 3 where all extreme points have norm  $1/\delta^2$ . We are ready to prove the main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* By using Lemma 4 and setting the step size as  $\eta_t = 2/(t+2), t \geq 0$ , we have

$$\bar{h}(x_{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{t+2}\right) \bar{h}(x_t) + \frac{2L}{\delta^2} \left( \frac{D^{*2}}{(t+2)^2} + \frac{\text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{(t+2)^2} \right). \tag{27}$$

By Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{h}(x_{t+1}) &\leq \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \frac{2L}{\delta^2} \left( D^{*2} + \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}^*)^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \frac{2L \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2}, \\
&\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{\frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} 2L \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}^*)^2}{\delta^2(t+2)},
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where the second inequality follows by the fact  $ct/(t+1)^2 \leq c/(t+2)$  where  $c = 2LD^{*2}/\delta^2$  and the last inequality is due to  $1/(t+1)^2 \leq 1/(t(t+2))$ . Clearly, from the last of above inequality,  $\forall t \geq 1$ , we have

$$\bar{h}(x_t) \leq \frac{2L(D^{*2} + D^2/\delta^2)}{\delta^2(t+2)}$$

where  $D/\delta = \max_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}/\delta} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|$ . Notice that, by  $\mu$ -strongly convex, we have  $\mu \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2/2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)$  (Theorem 3.2 of Zhang [2017]). We proceed to use Equ. (28) as the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{2L}{\delta^2(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{X}^*)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{4L}{\mu\delta^2(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_k) \\
&\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{4L}{\mu\delta^2(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \left( \frac{2L(D^{*2} + D^2\delta^2)}{\delta^2(k+2)} \right) \\
&= \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{8L^2(D^{*2} + D^2/\delta^2)}{\mu\delta^4(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{k+2} \\
&\leq \frac{2LD^{*2}}{\delta^2(t+2)} + \frac{8L^2(D^{*2} + D^2/\delta^2) \log(t+1)}{\mu\delta^4(t+1)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is from the  $\mu$ -strongly convexity, i.e.  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathcal{X}^*)^2 \leq 2(f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*))/\mu = 2\bar{h}(\mathbf{x}_t)/\mu$  and the last inequality follows the fact that  $\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} 1/(k+2) \leq \log(t+1)$   $\square$

**Remark 10.** The above proof mainly follows from Garber and Wolf [2021]. In the original proof, authors assume that  $f$  satisfies quadratic growth property. Interestingly, according to Theorem 2 of Zhang [2017], the condition of quadratic growth and restricted strongly convex are equivalent.

**Lemma 5** ([Garber and Wolf, 2021]). Given two nonnegative sequence  $\{a_t\}$  and  $\{b_t\}$  such that

$$a_{t+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{t+2}\right) a_t + \frac{b_t}{(t+2)^2}, \forall t \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Then for any  $t \geq 1$ , we have

$$a_{t+1} \leq \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} b_k. \quad (30)$$

## A.2 Experimental results

### A.2.1 The explanation of Fig. 2

---

**Algorithm 3**  $(\delta, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathcal{D})$ -DMO for  $\ell_1$ -norm ball,  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq 1\}$

---

```

1: Input: approximation factor  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , input vector  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)$ 
2:  $i = \arg \max_{t \in [d]} |\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_t|$ 
3: if  $\delta = 1$  then
4:   return  $\{i\}$ 
5: for  $j \in \text{permutation}([d])$  do
6:   if  $|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_j| \geq \delta |\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i|$  then
7:     return  $\{j\}$ 

```

---

In Fig. 2, we consider the following Lasso problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x}) := \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|^2, \quad (31)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the  $\ell_1$ -ball is written as  $\mathcal{D} := \{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq 1\} = \text{conv}\{\pm \mathbf{e}_1, \pm \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \pm \mathbf{e}_d\} = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1, \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{M}\}$  with  $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{d\}\}$ .  $\forall i \in [d]$ ,  $\mathbf{e}_i$  are standard bases of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The LMO operator for  $\ell_1$ -norm can be calculated as the following

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq 1} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x} \rangle = -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_{\{i\}}, \quad i \in \arg \max_{i \in [d]} |\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i|. \quad (32)$$




Figure 4: **Left:** The primal error  $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$  as a function of  $t$  for AccFW-DMO (I) with different  $\delta$ . **Right:** The primal error as a function of  $t$  for AccFW-DMO (II) with different  $\delta$  on the Lasso problem. The number of measurements  $n = 300$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{300 \times d}$ .

**Approximate DMO for  $\ell_1$ -ball.** Instead of using the above exact operator, we obtain an approximate DMO operator for problem (31) and present the  $\delta$ -approximate DMO for  $\ell_1$ -ball in Algorithm 3. It returns an  $S$  such that is at least  $\delta$ -approximation DMO operator oracle. The key step to control the quality of  $S$  is Line 6 where  $S = \{j\}$  is returned whenever  $|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_j| \geq \delta |\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)_i|$  and  $i$  is the index of maximal magnitude of  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t)$ .

We also present the results of this setting on AccFW-DMO (I) and (II) in Fig. 4. We also conduct experiments where we set  $n = 1000$  and consider smaller  $\delta \in \{1, .9, \dots, .3\}$ . The convergences of  $\log h(\mathbf{x}_t)$  with respect to  $\log(t)$  have been illustrated in Fig. 5. For small  $\delta$ , results indicate FW-DMO methods can successfully converge. Similarly, we compare AccFW-DMO with AccFW-DMO on relaxed version, i.e. (II) in Fig. 6. Both of them can successfully converge.




Figure 5: The comparison of FW-DMO (I) with AccFW-DMO (I) for different  $\delta$  from  $\{0.3, 0.4, \dots, 1.0\}$ .






Figure 6: The comparison of FW-DMO (II) with AccFW-DMO (II) for different  $\delta$  from  $\{0.3, 0.4, \dots, 1.0\}$ .

### A.2.2 Graph-structured (GS) sparse recovery

The goal of GS sparse recovery is to recovery a sparse image  $\mathbf{x}^*$  with several small connected components as a prior. We consider an  $d = 100 \times 100$  sparse image shown in Fig. 7 (a) (A true image  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is shown at center of the top.). The underlying sparsity pattern has  $g = 11$  connected components (CC),  $k = 687$  nonzeros pixels, and each nonzero  $x_i^*$  is randomly generated from a uniform distribution  $\mathcal{U}[0.95, 1]$ . We then normalize  $\mathbf{x}^*$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| = 1$ . Measurements  $\mathbf{y}$  are generated by  $\mathbf{y} = \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \mathbf{e}$  where  $\mathbf{e} \sim \epsilon \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$  and  $\epsilon$  controls the magnitude of noise  $\mathbf{e}$ . To summarize, the objective in our experiment is as the following

**GS Sparse recovery**

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2, \text{ where}$$

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{conv} \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1, \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{M} \}, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbb{M} = \{ F = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{11} : S_i \text{ are CCs of } \mathbb{G}, |F| \leq 687 \}.$$

$\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  is a Gaussian sensing matrix where each entry  $a_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\sqrt{n})$  independently. The training data contains  $n = 3 \cdot |\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}^*)| = 2061$  samples which is challenging for methods to recovery the true signal  $\mathbf{x}^*$ .<sup>5</sup> We run each experiment for 20 trials.

**Estimation error  $\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}^*\|$ .** We present estimation errors of all methods when  $\epsilon = 0$  (noiseless case) and  $\epsilon = 0.05$  (noise case) in Fig. 7. Clearly, AccFW-DMO (I) has the fastest convergence rate of the estimation error compared with other methods. A reasonable explanation of this is that, at each iteration, DMO operator captures most of important entries  $-\mathbf{x}_t + \nabla f(\mathbf{x})/(L\eta_t)$  while AccFW-DMO (II) underestimate ( $\delta = \sqrt{1/14}$ ) the quality of DMO operator. In this specific application,  $\delta$  could be much larger than  $\sqrt{1/14}$ .

<sup>5</sup>Indeed, to successfully recover  $\mathbf{x}^*$ , a lower bound of  $n$  should be  $C \cdot k \log(d/k)$  where  $C$  is a constant [Needell and Tropp, 2009]. Notice that when  $d = 10,000$  and  $k = 687$ , we have  $\log(d/k) \approx 2.678$ . Therefore,  $3 \cdot k$  is an upper close to the lower bound and hence it is hard for methods to recover  $\mathbf{x}^*$ .




Figure 7: The logarithmic estimation error  $\log \|x_t - x^*\|$  as a function of  $t$ . The sparse image  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d = 10,000$ . There are  $k = 687$  nonzero pixels making  $g = 11$  connected components. (a) illustrates the error without noise while (b) with noise parameter  $\epsilon = 0.05$ .




Figure 8: The logarithmic loss  $\log f(x_t)$  as a function of  $t$ . The sparse image  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d = 10,000$ . There are  $k = 687$  nonzero pixels making  $g = 11$  connected components. (a) illustrates the error without noise while (b) with noise parameter  $\epsilon = 0.05$ .

### A.3 Dual maximization oracles

#### A.3.1 DMOs for $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$

**A heuristic method with  $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil$ .** In Section 3.2, we present a heuristic procedure that is for  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$ . Algorithm 4 presents this heuristic method, which has three main steps: **Step 1)** Let  $I_g$  be the indices of  $g$  largest magnitude  $|z_i|$ . Initialize a node set as  $S = I_g$  (Line 2 and Line 3); **Step 2)** Next, iterate through the edges  $(u, v) \in \mathbb{E}$ , in any order. If  $u \in S$ , merge  $v$  into  $S$ ; similarly, if  $v \in S$ , merge  $u$  into  $S$ . If at any point  $|S| = k$ , terminate; **Step 3)** Repeat Step 2 until either no new edges are added, or  $|S| = k$  (Line 10 to Line 24). This procedure finds a  $\delta$ -DMO for  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  with  $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil$ , with runtime linear to the number of edges  $O(m)$ .

We prove that  $S$  returned by Algorithm 4 satisfies  $\|z_S\|_* \geq 1/\lceil k/g \rceil \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|z_{S'}\|_*$ : First of all,  $S$  is in  $\mathbb{M}$  and notice that  $\|z_{S'}\|_*^2 = \sum_{i \in I_g} |z_i|^2 + \sum_{j \in S' \setminus I_g} |z_j|^2$ ,  $\forall S' \in \mathbb{M}$ . As  $S$  contains  $g$  largest magnitudes of  $z$ , we have  $(\lceil k/g \rceil - 1) \sum_{i \in S} |z_i|^2 \geq \sum_{j \in S' \setminus I_g} |z_j|^2$ . This inequality provides  $\lceil k/g \rceil \|z_S\|_*^2 \geq \sum_{i \in I_g} |z_i|^2 + \sum_{j \in S' \setminus I_g} |z_j|^2 = \|z_{S'}\|_*^2$ . Hence, we have  $\lceil k/g \rceil \|z_S\|_*^2 \geq \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|z_{S'}\|_*^2$ . Taking square root of both sides will provide a better approximation guarantee, i.e.  $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil \geq \delta' = \sqrt{1/\lceil k/g \rceil}$ . Clearly, the total run time is  $O(m)$  dominated by the for loop of Line 12.

---

**Algorithm 4** A HEURISTIC DMO WITH  $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil$  approximation guarantee

---

```

1: Input: underlying graph  $\mathbb{G}$ , sparsity  $k$ , number of CCs  $g$ , input vector  $\mathbf{z}$ 
2: Sort entries of  $\mathbf{z}$  by magnitudes such that  $|z_{\tau_1}| \geq |z_{\tau_2}| \geq \dots \geq |z_{\tau_g}| \geq |z_{\tau_{g+1}}|$  ▶ Notice that
   this step can be done in  $O(d)$  time by using Floyd-Rivest selection algorithm [Floyd and
   Rivest, 1975].
3:  $I_g = [\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_g]$ ,  $S = I_g$ 
4:  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$  ▶ Initially, all nodes have same connected component ID
5:  $i = 1$  ▶ Tracking the ID of connected component
6: for  $v \in S$  do
7:    $c_v = i$  ▶ Node  $v$  has a component ID  $i$ 
8:    $i = i + 1$ 
9:  $\mathbb{F} = \emptyset$  ▶ Keep edges that are in  $g$  components
10: if  $|S| = k$  then ▶ We assume  $g \leq k$ 
11:   Return  $S$ 
12: for  $(u, v) \in \mathbb{E}$  do
13:   if  $c_u == 0$  and  $c_v \neq 0$  then
14:      $S = S \cup \{u\}$ 
15:      $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F} \cup (u, v)$ 
16:      $c_u = c_v$  ▶  $u$  is added to  $c_v$ -th component
17:   if  $|S| = k$  then
18:     Return  $S$ 
19:   if  $c_u \neq 0$  and  $c_v == 0$  then
20:      $S = S \cup \{v\}$ 
21:      $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F} \cup (u, v)$ 
22:      $c_v = c_u$  ▶  $v$  is added to  $c_u$ -th component
23:   if  $|S| = k$  then
24:     Return  $S$ 

```

---

**DMO via Head projection.** [Hegde et al., 2015b] presents an algorithm for  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  that has  $\delta = \sqrt{1/14}$ . We state a simplified version of it as the following.

**Theorem 6** (DMO via Head projection [Hegde et al., 2015b]). *Consider  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$ -WGM and let  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then there is an algorithm that returns a support  $S \subseteq [d]$  in  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, 2k + g, g)$ -WGM satisfying that*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_S\|_* \geq \delta \cdot \max_{S' \in \mathbb{M}} \|\mathbf{b}_{S'}\|_*, \quad (33)$$

where  $\delta = \sqrt{1/14}$  and it runs in  $O(m \log^3(d))$  where  $m$  is the number of edges in  $\mathbb{G}$ .

The head projection algorithm is restated in Algorithm 5. We first set a large enough budget  $B = k - g$  as each edge cost in our experiments is set to 1. In this case, the cost budget will never be violated since total costs in a  $g$  forest is always not greater than  $k - g$ . It calls PCSF-HEAD in Line 4 where each node weight of the input graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is set to  $z_i^2$  and each edge cost is  $1 + B/k$ . A constant parameter  $\nu = 1/169$  is to control the quality returned by PCSF-HEAD. The essential idea of PCSF-HEAD is a binary search over the Price-Collecting Steiner Forest problem [Hegde et al., 2014b] where each instance is PCSF-GW( $\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g$ ) (Line 8 of Algorithm 6). Algorithm 7 and 8 are corresponding to pruning over the final forest  $F$  and each tree  $T$  respectively so that the returning  $\mathbb{G}[S]$  so that the final  $S$  is “dense”.

**The prize-collecting Steiner forest (PCSF) algorithm.** Given input tuple  $(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g)$  where  $c$  is edge cost function  $c(e) : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  and  $\pi$  is node price function  $\pi(v) : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  and  $g$  is the number of CCs in returned forest. In the following algorithms, we denote  $c(\mathbb{F}) := \sum_{e \in \mathbb{F}} c(e)$  where  $\mathbb{F}$  is the edge set of forest  $F$  and  $c(e)$  is the edge cost of  $e$ . Similarly,  $\pi(F) := \sum_{v \in F} \pi(v)$ . There exists an algorithm PCSF-GW( $\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g$ ) [Hegde et al., 2014b] returns an  $F$  such that

$$c(\mathbb{F}) + 2\pi(\overline{F}) \leq \min_{F' \subseteq \mathbb{G}, \text{CC}(F') \leq g} 2c(F') + 2\pi(\overline{F'}),$$

where  $\mathbb{F}$  is the set of edges in  $F$  and  $\text{CC}(F)$  returns the number of connected components in  $F$ . A C++ implementation of PCSF-GW is publicly available at [https://github.com/ludwigschmidt/cluster\\_approx](https://github.com/ludwigschmidt/cluster_approx). In our experiments, we implement a C-version, which is a little bit faster.

---

**Algorithm 5** HEAD-PROJ( $\mathbf{z}, \mathbb{G}, k, g$ ) [Hegde et al., 2015b]

---

```

1: Input: underlying graph  $\mathbb{G}$ , sparsity  $k$ , number of CCs  $g$ , input vector  $\mathbf{z}$ 
2:  $B = k - g$ 
3:  $\pi(i) = z_i^2, c(e) = 1 + B/k, C = 2B$ 
4:  $S = \text{PCSF-HEAD}(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g, C)$  ▷ Algorithm 6
5: Return  $S$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm 6** PCSF-HEAD( $\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g, C$ )

---

```

1: Input:  $\mathbb{G}, c, \pi, g, C$ 
2:  $\pi_{\min} = \min_{\pi(i)>0} \pi(i), \epsilon = C/(338\pi(\mathbb{G}))$ , and define  $\pi_\lambda(i) := \lambda \cdot \pi(i)$ 
3:  $\lambda_r = 2C/\pi_{\min}, \lambda_l = 1/(4\pi(\mathbb{G}))$ 
4:  $F = \text{PCSF-GW}(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi_{\lambda_r}, g)$  ▷ Available at https://github.com/ludwigschmidt/cluster\_approx
5: if  $c(F) \leq 2C$  then
6:   Return  $F$ 
7: while  $\lambda_r - \lambda_l > \epsilon$  do ▷ Binary search over PCSF-GW
8:    $\lambda_m = (\lambda_r + \lambda_l)/2$ 
9:    $F = \text{PCSF-GW}(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi_{\lambda_m}, g)$ 
10:  if  $c(F) > 2C$  then  $\lambda_r = \lambda_m$  else  $\lambda_l = \lambda_m$ 
11:  $F_l = \text{PCSF-GW}(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi_{\lambda_l}, g)$ 
12:  $F_r = \text{PCSF-GW}(\mathbb{G}, c, \pi_{\lambda_r}, g)$ 
13:  $F_r' = \text{PRUNEFOREST}(F_r, c, \pi, g)$  ▷ Algorithm 7
14: if  $\pi(F_l) \geq \pi(F_r')$  then
15:   Return  $F_l$ 
16: else
17:   Return  $F_l$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm 7** PRUNEFOREST( $F, c, \pi, C$ )

---

```

1: Input:  $F, c, \pi, C$ 
2: Let  $\{T_1, \dots, T_{|F|}\}$  be the trees in  $F$  sorted by  $\pi(T_i)/c(T_i)$  descendingly.
3:  $C_r = C$ 
4: for  $i \in \{1, \dots, |F|\}$  do
5:   if  $C_r \geq c(T_i)$  then
6:      $T_i' = T_i$ 
7:   else if  $C_r > 0$  then
8:      $T_i' = \text{PRUNETREE}(T_i, c, \pi, C_r)$  ▷ Algorithm 8
9:      $C_r = 0$ 
10:  else
11:     $T_i' = \arg \max_{j \in T_i} \pi(j)$ 
12: return  $\{T_1', \dots, T_{|F|}'\}$ 

```

---

---

**Algorithm 8** PRUNETREE( $T, c, \pi, C'$ )

---

```
1: Input:  $T, c, \pi, C'$ 
2: Let  $L = (v_1, \dots, v_{2|V_T|-1})$  be a tour through the nodes of  $T$ .
3:  $\pi'(j) = \pi(v_j)$  if position  $j$  is the first appearance of  $v_j$  in  $L$ ; 0 otherwise.
4: Let  $c'(P) = \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} c(P_i, P_{i+1})$  and let  $\phi = \pi(T)/c(T)$ 
5: if there is a  $v \in V_T$  with  $\pi(v) \geq C' \cdot \phi/6$  then
6:   Return  $F = \{v\}$ 
7:  $T'_i = T_i$ 
8: for  $i \in \{1, \dots, 2|V_T| - 1\}$  do
9:   Append  $i$  to  $P^l$ 
10:  if  $c'(P^l) > C'$  then
11:     $\ell = \ell + 1, P^l = ()$ 
12:  else if  $\pi'(P^l) \geq \frac{C' \cdot \phi}{6}$  then
13:    Return the subtree of  $T$  on the nodes in  $P^l$ 
14: Merge  $P^l$  and  $P^{l-1}$ 
```

---

### A.3.2 Other GS models

Table 2: DMOs of different  $\mathbb{M}$ . DP is for Dynamic Programming.

| $\mathbb{M}$  | DMO                                 | Complexity      | $\delta$ -approx.              |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| $\{H : H := \cup_{i=1}^k S_k\}$ where graph $\mathbb{G}$ is a tree and $S_k$ is a subtree                           | Tree decomp. [Lim and Wright, 2017] | $O(mk + d)$     | $\delta = 1$                   |
| $\{S : \mathbb{T}_S \text{ is a subtree. }  S  \leq k\}$ where $\mathbb{T}$ is a tree and $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{T}$ | DP Hochbaum and Pathria [1994]      | $O(k^2 d)$      | $\delta = 1$                   |
| $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  | Algorithm 4                         | $O(m)$          | $\delta = 1/\lceil k/g \rceil$ |
| $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{G}, k, g)$  | Head Proj. [Hegde et al., 2015b]    | $O(m \log^3 d)$ | $\delta = \sqrt{1/14}$         |

**Other operators and applications.** We list GS models in Table 2 with their time complexities and approximation guarantees. These operators consider connectivity constraints, a key property or requirement of subgraph detection. Connectivity and subgraph detection have been explored recently [Arias-Castro et al., 2011, Qian et al., 2014, Hegde et al., 2015a, Aksoylar et al., 2017]. For example, if we assume  $\mathbb{M} = \{S : |S| \leq k, \mathbb{G}[S] \text{ is connected.}\}$ , DMO operator can be reformulated as  $k$ -maximum-weight subgraph problem, which was considered in Hochbaum and Pathria [1994]. This algorithm has been applied to identify subnetwork markers in protein-protein interaction (PPI) network [Dao et al., 2011] and automatic planning [Riabov and Liu, 2006].