

- 2) Next, we propose a distributed ADMM algorithm, FD-ADMM-FTDT, that solves *exactly* the multi-node convex optimization problem in digraphs. At every iteration of the algorithm, each node solves a local convex optimization problem for one of the primal variables by utilizing the proposed fully distributed finite-time consensus protocol to compute the *exact* optimal of the other primal variable.
- 3) FD-ADMM-FTDT performance is evaluated via extensive simulations and compared with the only other known distributed ADMM approach suitable for directed graphs [16], and it is shown that our approach apart from computing the exact solution (unlike the one in [16]), it requires fewer iterations per optimization step and therefore the optimization speed is accelerated.

D. Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we provide necessary notation and background knowledge for the development of our results. In Section III, the problem to be solved is formulated, and in Section IV our proposed algorithms are explained. Illustrative examples are presented in Section VI. Finally, Section VII presents concluding remarks and future directions.

II. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation

The set of real (integer) numbers is denoted by \mathbb{R} (\mathbb{Z}) and the set of positive numbers (integers) is denoted by \mathbb{R}_+ (\mathbb{Z}_+). \mathbb{R}_+^n denotes the non-negative orthant of the n -dimensional real space \mathbb{R}^n . Vectors are denoted by small letters whereas matrices are denoted by capital letters. A^\top denotes the transpose of matrix A . The i^{th} component of a vector x is denoted by x_i , and the notation $x \geq y$ implies that $x_i \geq y_i$ for all components i . For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a_{ij} denotes the entry in row i and column j . By $\mathbf{1}$ we denote the all-ones vector and by I we denote the identity matrix (of appropriate dimensions). We also denote by $e_j^\top = [0, \dots, 0, 1_{j^{\text{th}}}, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, where the single “1” entry is at the j^{th} position. $|A|$ is the element-wise absolute value of matrix A (i.e., $|A| \triangleq [|A_{ij}|]$), $A \leq B$ ($A < B$) is the (strict) element-wise inequality between matrices A and B . A matrix whose elements are nonnegative, called nonnegative matrix, is denoted by $A \geq 0$ and a matrix whose elements are positive, called positive matrix, is denoted by $A > 0$. $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of x . $\langle a, b \rangle$ denotes the usual Euclidean inner product $a^\top b$. Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* . The sequence is said to converge Q-linearly to x^* if there exists a number $\mu \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|x^{k+1} - x^*\| / \|x^k - x^*\| \leq \mu$. The sequence is said to converge R-linearly to x^* if there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ such that $\|x^k - x^*\| \leq \varepsilon_k$ and $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ converges Q-linearly to zero.

In multi-component systems with fixed communication links (edges), the exchange of information between components (nodes) can be conveniently captured by a directed graph (digraph) $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ of order n ($n \geq 2$), where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ is the set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges. A directed edge from node v_i to node v_j is denoted by $\varepsilon_{ji} = (v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and represents a communication link

that allows node v_j to receive information from node v_i . A graph is said to be undirected if and only if $\varepsilon_{ji} \in \mathcal{E}$ implies $\varepsilon_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$. A digraph is called *strongly* connected if there exists a path from each vertex v_i of the graph to each vertex v_j ($v_j \neq v_i$). In other words, for any $v_j, v_i \in \mathcal{V}$, $v_j \neq v_i$, one can find a sequence of nodes $v_i = v_{l_1}, v_{l_2}, v_{l_3}, \dots, v_{l_m} = v_j$ such that link $(v_{l_{s+1}}, v_{l_s}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $s = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. The diameter D of a graph is the longest shortest path between any two nodes in the network.

All nodes that can transmit information to node v_j directly are said to be in-neighbors of node v_j and belong to the set $\mathcal{N}_j^- = \{v_i \in \mathcal{V} \mid \varepsilon_{ji} \in \mathcal{E}\}$. The cardinality of \mathcal{N}_j^- , is called the *in-degree* of v_j and is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_j^- = |\mathcal{N}_j^-|$. The nodes that receive information from node v_j belong to the set of out-neighbors of node v_j , denoted by $\mathcal{N}_j^+ = \{v_l \in \mathcal{V} \mid \varepsilon_{lj} \in \mathcal{E}\}$. The cardinality of \mathcal{N}_j^+ , is called the *out-degree* of v_j and is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_j^+ = |\mathcal{N}_j^+|$.

B. Average Consensus

In the type of algorithms we consider, we associate a positive weight p_{ji} for each edge $\varepsilon_{ji} \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{(v_j, v_j) \mid v_j \in \mathcal{V}\}$. The nonnegative matrix $P = [p_{ji}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ (with p_{ji} as the entry at its j^{th} row, i^{th} column position) is a weighted adjacency matrix (also referred to as weight matrix) that has zero entries at locations that do not correspond to directed edges (or self-edges) in the graph. In other words, apart from the main diagonal, the zero-nonzero structure of the adjacency matrix P matches exactly the given set of links in the graph. In a synchronous setting, each node v_j updates and sends its information to its neighbors at discrete times T_0, T_1, T_2, \dots . We index nodes’ information states and any other information at time T_t by t . Hence, we use $w_j^t \equiv w_j[t] \in \mathbb{R}$ to denote the information state of node j at time T_t . Note that $w_j^{t^\top}$ denotes (is equivalent to) $w_j[t]^\top$.

Each node updates its information state w_j^t by combining the available information received by its neighbors w_i^t ($v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j^-$) using the positive weights p_{ji}^t , that capture the weight of the information inflow from node v_i to node v_j at time t . In this work, we assume that each node v_j can choose its self-weight and the weights on its out-going links \mathcal{N}_j^+ only. Hence, in its general form, each node updates its information state according to the following relation:

$$w_j^{t+1} = p_{jj} w_j^t + \sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j^-} p_{ji} w_i^t, \quad k \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $w_j^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is the initial state of node v_j . If we let $w^t = (w_1^t \ w_2^t \ \dots \ w_n^t)^\top$ and $P = [p_{ji}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, then (1) can be written in matrix form as

$$w^{t+1} = P w^t, \quad (2)$$

where $w^0 = (w_1^0 \ w_2^0 \ \dots \ w_n^0)^\top \triangleq w_0$. We say that the nodes asymptotically reach average consensus if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w_j^t = \frac{\sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}} w_i^0}{n}, \quad \forall v_j \in \mathcal{V}.$$

The necessary and sufficient conditions for (2) to reach average consensus are the following: (a) P has a simple eigenvalue at

one with left eigenvector $\mathbb{1}^\top$ and right eigenvector $\mathbb{1}$, and (b) all other eigenvalues of P have magnitude less than 1. If $P \geq 0$ (as in our case), the necessary and sufficient condition is that P is a primitive doubly stochastic matrix. In an undirected graph, assuming each node knows n (or an upper bound n') and the graph is connected, each node v_j can distributively choose the weights on its outgoing links to be $\frac{1}{n'}$ and set its diagonal to be $1 - \frac{\mathcal{D}_j^+}{n'}$ (where $\mathcal{D}_j^+ = \mathcal{D}_j^- \triangleq \mathcal{D}_j$), so that the resulting P is primitive doubly stochastic. However, this weight selection does not necessarily yield a doubly stochastic weight matrix in a digraph.

C. Ratio Consensus

In [20], an algorithm is suggested, called ratio consensus, that solves the average consensus problem in a directed graph in which each node v_j distributively sets the weights on its self-link and outgoing-links to be $\frac{1}{1+\mathcal{D}_j^+}$, so that the resulting weight matrix P is column stochastic, but not necessarily row stochastic. Average consensus is reached by using this weight matrix to run two iterations with appropriately chosen initial conditions. The algorithm is stated below for a specific choice of weights on each link that assumes that each node knows its out-degree; note, however, that the algorithm works for any set of weights that adhere to the graph structure and form a primitive column stochastic weight matrix.

Proposition 1 ([20]): Consider a strongly connected digraph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Let y_j^t and x_j^t (for all $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) be the result of the iterations

$$y_j^{t+1} = p_{jj}y_j^t + \sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j^-} p_{ji}y_i^t, \quad (3a)$$

$$x_j^{t+1} = p_{jj}x_j^t + \sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j^-} p_{ji}x_i^t, \quad (3b)$$

where $p_{lj} = \frac{1}{1+\mathcal{D}_j^+}$ for $v_l \in \mathcal{N}_j^+ \cup \{v_j\}$ (zeros otherwise), and the initial conditions are $y^0 = y_0$ and $x^0 = \mathbb{1}$. Then, the solution to the average consensus problem can be asymptotically obtained as $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j^t = \frac{\sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}} y_i^0}{|\mathcal{V}|}$, $\forall v_j \in \mathcal{V}$, where

$$\mu_j^t = \frac{y_j^t}{x_j^t}.$$

Remark 1: Proposition 1 proposes a decentralised algorithm with which the exact average is *asymptotically* reached, even if the directed graph is not balanced.

D. Finite-Time Exact Ratio Consensus (FTEC)

In what follows, we present a distributed protocol proposed in [17], [18] with which each node can compute, based on its own local observations and after a minimal number of steps, the exact average. This protocol is based on the algorithm in Proposition 1, with which every node can compute $\mu_j \triangleq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j^t$ in a *minimum* number of steps.

Definition 1: (Minimal polynomial of a matrix pair) The minimal polynomial associated with the matrix pair $[P, e_j^\top]$ denoted by $q_j(s) = s^{M_j+1} + \sum_{i=0}^{M_j} \alpha_i^{(j)} s^i$ is the monic polynomial of minimum degree $M_j + 1$ that satisfies $e_j^\top q_j(P) = 0$.

Considering the iteration in (2) with weight matrix P , it is easy to show (e.g., using the techniques in [21]) that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{M_j+1} \alpha_i^{(j)} w_j^{t+i} = 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_{M_j+1}^{(j)} = 1$. Let us now denote the z -transform of w_j^t as $W_j(z) \triangleq \mathbb{Z}(w_j^t)$. From (4) and the time-shift property of the z -transform, it is easy to show (see [21], [22])

$$W_j(z) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{M_j+1} \alpha_i^{(j)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} w_j^\ell z^{i-\ell}}{q_j(z)}, \quad (5)$$

where $q_j(z)$ is the minimal polynomial of $[P, e_j^\top]$. If the network is strongly connected, $q_j(z)$ does not have any unstable poles apart from one at 1; we can then define the following polynomial:

$$p_j(z) \triangleq \frac{q_j(z)}{z-1} \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^{M_j} \beta_i^{(j)} z^i. \quad (6)$$

The application of the final value theorem [21], [22] yields:

$$\phi_y(j) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_j^t = \lim_{z \rightarrow 1} (z-1)Y_j(z) = \frac{y_{M_j}^\top \beta_j}{\mathbb{1}^\top \beta_j}, \quad (7a)$$

$$\phi_x(j) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j^t = \lim_{z \rightarrow 1} (z-1)X_j(z) = \frac{x_{M_j}^\top \beta_j}{\mathbb{1}^\top \beta_j}, \quad (7b)$$

where $y_{M_j}^\top = (y_j^0, y_j^1, \dots, y_j^{M_j})$, $x_{M_j}^\top = (x_j^0, x_j^1, \dots, x_j^{M_j})$ and β_j is the vector of coefficients of the polynomial $p_j(z)$.

Consider the vectors of $2t + 1$ successive discrete-time values at node v_j , given by

$$y_{2t}^\top = (y_j^0, y_j^1, \dots, y_j^{2t}),$$

$$x_{2t}^\top = (x_j^0, x_j^1, \dots, x_j^{2t}),$$

for the two iterations y_j^t and x_j^t at node v_j (as given in iterations (3a) and (3b)), respectively. Let us define their associated Hankel matrices:

$$\Gamma\{y_{2t}^\top\} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y_j^0 & y_j^1 & \dots & y_j^t \\ y_j^1 & y_j^2 & \dots & y_j^{t+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ y_j^t & y_j^{t+1} & \dots & y_j^{2t} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Gamma\{x_{2t}^\top\} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x_j^0 & x_j^1 & \dots & x_j^t \\ x_j^1 & x_j^2 & \dots & x_j^{t+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_j^t & x_j^{t+1} & \dots & x_j^{2t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We also consider the vector of differences between successive values of y_j^t and x_j^t :

$$\bar{y}_{2t}^\top = (y_j^1 - y_j^0, \dots, y_j^{2t+1} - y_j^{2t}),$$

$$\bar{x}_{2t}^\top = (x_j^1 - x_j^0, \dots, x_j^{2t+1} - x_j^{2t}).$$

It has been shown in [22] that β_j can be computed as the kernel of the first defective Hankel matrices $\Gamma\{\bar{y}_{2t}^\top\}$ and $\Gamma\{\bar{x}_{2t}^\top\}$ for arbitrary initial conditions y_0 and x_0 (i.e.,

β_j can be calculated as the normalized kernel $\beta_j = \left[\beta_j^0 \ \beta_j^1 \ \dots \ \beta_j^{x_{M_j}-1} \ 1 \right]^T$ of the first defective Hankel matrix $\Gamma\{\bar{y}_{2t}^T\}$, except a set of initial conditions with Lebesgue measure zero.

Next, we provide Theorem 1 from [17], in which it is stated that the exact average μ among the nodes in a strongly connected digraph can be distributively obtained in a finite number of steps.

Theorem 1 ([17]): Consider a strongly connected graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Let y_j^t and x_j^t (for all $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) be the result of the iterations (3a) and (3b), where $P = [p_{ji}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ is any set of weights that adhere to the graph structure and form a primitive column stochastic weight matrix. Then, the solution to the average consensus can be distributively obtained in finite-time at each node v_j , by computing

$$\mu_j \triangleq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_j^t}{x_j^t} = \frac{\phi_y(j)}{\phi_x(j)} = \frac{y_{M_j}^T \beta_j}{x_{M_j}^T \beta_j}, \quad (8)$$

where $\phi_y(j)$ and $\phi_x(j)$ are given by equations (7a) and (7b), respectively and β_j is the vector of coefficients, as defined in (6).

Theorem 1 states that the average consensus in a strongly connected digraph can be computed by the ratio of the final values computed for each of the iterations (3a) with initial condition $y^0 = y_0$ and iteration (3b) with initial condition $x^0 = \mathbf{1}$. Note that $x^0 = \mathbf{1}$ does not belong into the Lebesgue measure zero set of matrix P as defined in Proposition 1.

E. max-consensus algorithm

The max-consensus algorithm is a simple algorithm for computing the maximum value in a distributed fashion [23]. For any node $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$, the update rule is as follows:

$$x_j^{t+1} = \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j^- \cup \{v_j\}} \{x_i^t\}. \quad (9)$$

It has been shown (see, e.g., [24], [25]) that this algorithm converges to the maximum value among all nodes in a finite number of steps s , $s \leq D$.

F. Finite-Time Distributed Termination (FTDT)

Charalambous and Hadjicostis [19] proposed a distributed termination mechanism in order to enhance an existing finite-time distributed algorithm to allow the nodes to agree when to terminate their iterations, provided they have all computed their exact average. More specifically, the proposed method is based on the fact that the finite-time consensus algorithm proposed in [17], [18] allows nodes in the network running iterations (3a) and (3b) to compute an upper bound of their eccentricity and use this information for deciding when to terminate the process. The procedure is as follows:

- Once iterations (3a) and (3b) are initiated, each node v_j also initiates two counters c_j , $c_j[0] = 0$, and r_j , $r_j[0] = 0$. Counter c_j increments by one at every time step, i.e., $c_j[k+1] = c_j[k] + 1$. The way counter r_j updates is described next.

- Alongside iterations (3a) and (3b) a max-consensus algorithm is initiated as well, given by

$$\theta_j[k+1] = \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}_j \cup \{v_j\}} \{ \max\{\theta_i[k], c_i[k]\} \}, \quad (10)$$

with $\theta_j[0] = 0$. Every time step k for which $\theta_j[k+1] = \theta_j[k]$, counter r_j increments by one, but if, however, at any step k' , $\theta_j[k'+1] \neq \theta_j[k']$, then r_j is set to zero, i.e.,

$$r_j[k+1] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta_j[k+1] \neq \theta_j[k], \\ r_j[k] + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

- Once the square Hankel matrices $\Gamma\{\bar{y}_{M_j}^T\}$ and $\Gamma\{\bar{x}_{M_j}^T\}$ for node v_j lose rank, node v_j saves the count of the counter c_j at that time step, denoted by k_j^o , as c_j^o , i.e., $c_j^o \triangleq c_j[k_j^o]$, and it stops incrementing the counter, i.e., $\forall k' \geq k_j^o, c[k'] = c_j[k_j^o] = c_j^o$. Note that $c_j^o = 2(M_j + 1)$.
- Node v_j can terminate iterations (3a) and (3b) when r_j reaches c_j^o .

The main idea of this approach is that $2(M_j + 1)$ serves as an upper bound on the maximum distance of any other node to node v_j . This quantity is not known initially, but becomes known to node v_j through the finite-time consensus algorithm [18], and it is used to decide whether all nodes have computed the average and, hence, the node can terminate the iterations.

G. Standard ADMM Algorithm

The Standard ADMM algorithm solves the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(x) + g(z) \\ \text{s.t. } Ax + Bz = c \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for variables $x \in \mathbb{R}^p, z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times m}$ and vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Note that $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ represent the dimensions of prime variables. The augmented Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} L_\rho(x, z, \lambda) = f(x) + g(z) + \lambda^T (Ax + Bz - c) \\ + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax + Bz - c\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier and $\rho > 0$ is a penalty parameter. In ADMM, the primary variables x, z and the Lagrange multiplier λ are updated as follows: starting from some initial vector $[x^0 \ z^0 \ \lambda^0]^T$, at each optimization iteration k ,

$$x^{k+1} = \underset{x}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_\rho(x, z^k, \lambda^k), \quad (14)$$

$$z^{k+1} = \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_\rho(x^{k+1}, z, \lambda^k), \quad (15)$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \rho(Ax^{k+1} + Bz^{k+1} - c). \quad (16)$$

The step-size in the Lagrange multiplier update is the same as the augmented Lagrangian function parameter ρ .

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this work, we consider a strongly connected digraph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ in which each node $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ is endowed with a scalar cost function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ assumed to be known to the node only. We assume that each node v_j has knowledge of the number of its out-going links, D_j^+ , and has access to

local information only via its communication with the neighboring nodes, \mathcal{N}_j^- . The only global information available to all the nodes in the network is given in Assumption 1.

Assumption 1: Each node $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$ knows an upper bound on the number of nodes in the network n' (i.e., $n' \geq n$).

While Assumption 1 is limiting, there exist distributed methods for computing the size of the network; see, for example, [26].

The problem is to design a discrete-time coordination algorithm that allows every node v_j in a *digraph* to distributively solve the following optimization problem:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x), \quad (17)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a global optimization variable (or a common decision variable). In order to distributively solve the previous problem and to enjoy the structure ADMM scheme at the same time, a separate decision variable x_i for node v_i is introduced and the constraint $x_i = x_j$ is imposed to guarantee that the node decision variables are equal¹. In other words, problem (17) is reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i), \\ \text{s.t. } x_i = x_j, \forall v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{V}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Define a closed nonempty convex set \mathcal{C} as

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ [x_1^\top \ x_2^\top \ \dots \ x_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{np} : x_i = x_j \right\}. \quad (19)$$

By denoting $X := [x_1^\top \ x_2^\top \ \dots \ x_n^\top]^\top$ and making variable $z \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$ as a copy of vector X , problem (18) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i), \\ \text{s.t. } X = z, z \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Then, take g as the indicator function of set \mathcal{C} , and define $g(z)$ as

$$g(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Finally, problem (20) is transformed to

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) + g(z), \\ \text{s.t. } X - z = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

For notational convenience, denote $F(X) := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$. Thus, denote the Lagrangian function as

$$L(X, z, \lambda) = F(X) + g(z) + \lambda^\top (X - z), \quad (23)$$

where λ in \mathbb{R}^{np} is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the constraint $X - z = 0$. Then, the following standard assumptions are required for the optimization problem.

Assumption 2: Each cost function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is closed, proper and convex.

Assumption 3: The Lagrangian $L(X, z, \lambda)$ has a saddle point, i.e., there exists a solution (X^*, z^*, λ^*) , for which

$$L(X^*, z^*, \lambda) \leq L(X^*, z^*, \lambda^*) \leq L(X, z, \lambda^*) \quad (24)$$

holds for all X in \mathbb{R}^{np} , z in \mathbb{R}^{np} and λ in \mathbb{R}^{np} .

Assumption 2 allows f_i to be non-differentiable [3]. By Assumptions 2-3 and based on the definition of $g(z)$ in (21), $L(X, z, \lambda^*)$ is convex in (X, z) and (X^*, z^*) is a solution to problem (22) [3], [13].

IV. MAIN RESULTS

At iteration k , the corresponding augmented Lagrangian of optimization problem (22) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_\rho(X^k, z^k, \lambda^k) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i^k) + g(z^k) + \lambda^{k\top} (X^k - z^k) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X^k - z^k\|^2 \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(f_i(x_i^k) + \lambda_i^{k\top} (x_i^k - z_i^k) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_i^k - z_i^k\|^2 \right) + g(z^k), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the i -th element of vector z . By ignoring terms which are independent of the minimization variables (i.e., x_i, z), for each node v_i , the standard ADMM updates (14)-(16) change to the following format:

$$x_i^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x_i} f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i^{k\top} x_i + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_i - z_i^k\|^2, \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} z^{k+1} &= \operatorname{argmin}_z g(z) + \lambda^{k\top} (X^{k+1} - z) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X^{k+1} - z\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_z g(z) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X^{k+1} - z + \frac{1}{\rho} \lambda^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\lambda_i^{k+1} = \lambda_i^k + \rho(x_i^{k+1} - z_i^{k+1}), \quad (28)$$

where the last term in (27) comes from the identity $2a^\top b + b^2 = (a+b)^2 - a^2$ with $a = \lambda^k/\rho$ and $b = X^{k+1} - z$.

Update (26) for x_i^{k+1} can be solved by a classical method, e.g., the proximity operator [3, Section 4]. Update (28) for the dual variable λ_i^{k+1} can be implemented trivially by node v_i . Note that both updates can be done independently by node v_i . Since g is the indicator function of the closed nonempty convex set \mathcal{C} , update (27) for z^{k+1} becomes

$$z^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(X^{k+1} + \lambda^k/\rho),$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ denotes the projection (in the Euclidean norm) onto \mathcal{C} . Intuitively, from (27) and the definition of $g(z)$ in (21), one can see that the elements of z (i.e., z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) should go into \mathcal{C} in finite time. If not, one will have $g(z) = \infty$ and update (27) will never be finished. Then, from the definition of \mathcal{C} in (19), one can see that z going into \mathcal{C} means $z_1 = z_2 = \dots = z_n$, which is in the mathematical format of consensus. Therefore, if each node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ can have z_i reach $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i(0)$ in a finite number of steps, with $z_i(0) = x_i^{k+1} + \lambda_i^k/\rho$, then the update can be completed. Therefore, update (27) reduces to a finite time consensus problem. For this reason, we adopt the finite time exact ratio consensus (FTERC) algorithm for digraphs, as introduced in Section II-D.

¹This step is quite standard in distributed optimization.

A. FTERC given network size upper bound [1]

Herein, we describe the algorithm we proposed in [1]. For this algorithm, we assume that all nodes are aware of an upper bound of the size of the network n' (i.e., $n' \geq n$ and n' is known to all nodes), the augmented Lagrangian function parameter ρ , and the ADMM maximum optimization step k_{\max} . The optimization consists of the following steps:

- 1) At the first optimization step, node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ computes x_i^1 using (26), computes z_i^1 via FTERC which runs for $2n'$ iterations. By that time, it is guaranteed that each node has computed their final value z_i^1 , which requires computing β_i and as a consequence M_i is determined. Then, using x_i^1 and z_i^1 , it computes λ_i^1 using (28).
- 2) At the second optimization step, node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$, computes x_i^2 using (26), runs ratio consensus (3) for n' iterations and computes z_i^2 with the same β_i computed at the first optimization step (i.e., there is no need to compute the defective Hankel matrices again). At the same time it runs a max-consensus algorithm with initial condition $x_i^0 = M_i + 1$. Note that $M_i + 1 < n \leq n'$ and that the max-consensus algorithm converges in s iterations ($s \leq D \leq n-1 < n'$). Hence, at this step node v_i , not only computes z_i^2 , but also the maximum number of iterations needed $t_{\max} := M_{\max} + 1$ by each node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ for every optimization step k to compute their z_i^{k+1} . Again, using x_i^2 and z_i^2 , it computes λ_i^2 using (28).
- 3) At every optimization step thereafter, each node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ computes x_i^{k+1} using (26), computes z_i^{k+1} via ratio consensus (3) with the same β_i which runs for t_{\max} iterations.
- 4) The ADMM algorithm terminates once the stopping criterion² is satisfied or the maximum number of optimization steps, k_{\max} is reached.

The algorithm guarantees that the number of iterations needed at every optimization step k , $k \geq 2$ is the *minimum* (see properties of FTERC) and that the solution at every step is the *exact* optimal. Fig. 1 shows the number of iterations needed at every optimization step.




Fig. 1. The FTERC is terminated after $2n'$ iterations in the first step of the ADMM optimization (n' is an upper bound of n known to all nodes). During the first optimization step, each node v_j computes M_j . During the second step, they run a max-consensus algorithm (which converges in s ($s \leq D$) iterations) and they determine M_{\max} . The second optimization step is terminated after n' iterations. Thereafter, each optimization step is changed to $t_{\max} := M_{\max} + 1$ iterations.

Algorithm 1 provides D-ADMM-FTERC, the distributed ADMM algorithm proposed in [1] for solving optimization problem (22).

B. Fully distributed FTERC

In this subsection, we propose a *fully-distributed* FTERC algorithm using FTDT in Section II-F, in which no information

Algorithm 1 D-ADMM-FTERC.

- 1: **Input:** $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, $\rho > 0$, n' (upper bound on n), k_{\max} (ADMM maximum number of iterations)
 - 2: **Data:** Node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ sets $x_i^0, z_i^0, \lambda_i^0$ randomly, and $k = 0$
 - 3: Node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ does the following:
 - 4: **while** $k \leq k_{\max}$ **do**
 - 5: Compute x_i^{k+1} using Eq. (26)
 - 6: **if** $k = 0$ **then**
 - 7: Compute z_i^1 via FTERC which runs for $2n'$ steps, and determine M_i and β_i
 - 8: **else if** $k = 1$ **then**
 - 9: Run max-consensus and ratio consensus (3): determine M_{\max} (via max-consensus), compute z_i^2 with the same β_i and terminate iterations after n' steps
 - 10: **else**
 - 11: Compute z_i^{k+1} via ratio consensus (3) with the same β_i (runs for t_{\max})
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: Compute λ_i^{k+1} using Eq. (28)
 - 14: **if** ADMM stopping criterion is satisfied **then**
 - 15: Stop D-ADMM-FTERC
 - 16: **end if**
 - 17: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - 18: **end while**
-

about the network size is known. The changes with respect to D-ADMM-FTERC described in Section IV-A are steps 1) and 2). More specifically, step 2) is completely omitted, whereas step 1) is replaced by the following step: At the first optimization step, node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ computes

- x_i^1 using (26),
- z_i^1 via FTDT which runs for $t_1 := 4(M_{\max} + 1) - 1$ iterations for all nodes (as shown in Fig. 2). During the first t_1 iterations, node v_i will terminate at step $t_{0,i} \leq t_1$, given by

$$t_{0,i} := \max_{v_j \in \mathcal{N}} \{2(M_j + 1)\} + 2(M_i + 1) - 1, \quad (29)$$

as it is the case for FTERC in Section IV-A. We observe that, by $t_{0,i}$ node v_i (i) has computed their final value z_i^1 , which requires computing β_i , and as a consequence M_i is determined, and (ii) $M_{\max} := \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{N}} M_i$ can be determined by (29)

$$M_{\max} = \frac{t_{0,i} - 2M_i - 1}{2} - 1. \quad (30)$$

As a consequence, node will terminate its iteration at $t_{0,i}$ and it will know that by t_1 all the nodes have terminated their iterations.

- λ_i^1 using x_i^1 and z_i^1 in (28).

Note that this process is for synchronizing of all nodes to start the next ADMM iteration simultaneously. Thereafter, each ADMM optimization step is changed to t_{\max} . Note also that, as it is the case with Algorithm 1, since the nodes have computed M_{\max} already, they will be able to determine t_{\max} and this is what they do from the optimization step 1 onwards

²Primal and dual feasibility conditions in [3].

Algorithm 2 FD-ADMM-FTDT.

- 1: **Input:** $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, $\rho > 0$, k_{\max} (ADMM maximum number of iterations)
 - 2: **Initialization:** Node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ sets $x_i^0, z_i^0, \lambda_i^0$ randomly, and $k = 0$
 - 3: Node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ does the following:
 - 4: **while** $k \leq k_{\max}$ **do**
 - 5: Compute x_i^{k+1} using Eq. (26)
 - 6: **if** $k = 0$ **then**
 - 7: Compute z_i^1 via FTDT which runs for t_1 steps, and determine M_i, β_i and M_{\max} (or t_{\max}).
 - 8: **else**
 - 9: Compute z_i^{k+1} via ratio consensus (3) with the same β_i (runs for t_{\max})
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: Compute λ_i^{k+1} using Eq. (28)
 - 12: **if** ADMM stopping criterion is satisfied **then**
 - 13: Stop FD-ADMM-FTDT
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - 16: **end while**
-

(something that in Algorithm 1 it starts from optimization step 2 onwards; see Fig 2.




Fig. 2. The finite-time consensus algorithm is terminated after t_1 iterations in the first step of the ADMM optimization. During the first optimization step, each node v_i computes M_i . Note that inside this process, each node v_i can compute the value of M_i using FTDT in Section II-F at step $2(M_i + 1) - 1$; then, at step $t_{0,i}$, the value of M_{\max} can be calculated. After step $t_{0,i}$, each node v_i stops running the ratio consensus process until everybody terminates at step t_1 .

We stress that the algorithm guarantees that the number of iterations needed at every optimization step k , $k \geq 1$ is the *minimum* (see properties of FTDT) and that the solution at every step is the *exact* optimal.

We now formally describe our algorithm, herein called *Algorithm 2*, in which the nodes distributively solve optimization problem (22).

Remark 2: The main difference between Algorithm 1 and 2 is that Algorithm 2 does not require the information of the upper bound of the size of the network n' . This is especially helpful and significant when dealing with large-scale multi-node optimization problems.

Remark 3: For both algorithms (Algorithms 1 and 2), the exact finite-time iteration number t_{\max} is determined theoretically. On the contrary, for finite-time ϵ consensus in [16], the iteration number cannot be decided by theory and also varies depending on the value of ϵ .

V. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, the following well-know identity is used frequently:

$$(a_1 - a_2)^T(a_3 - a_4) = \frac{1}{2}(\|a_1 - a_4\|^2 - \|a_1 - a_3\|^2) \quad (31)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\|a_2 - a_3\|^2 - \|a_2 - a_4\|^2), \forall a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

A. $O(1/k)$ converge rate

In this section, the $O(1/k)$ convergence rate of our proposed D-ADMM-FTERC/FD-ADMM-FTDT algorithms will be presented. The analysis is inspired by the analyses in [13] and [16]. Authors in [13] analyzed the D-ADMM based on the assumption of an underlying undirected graph. A D-ADMM approach for directed graphs is proposed in [16] based on a finite-time ‘‘approximate’’ consensus method, which means the resulted solution to problem (22) will not be optimal, but close to the optimal solution (X^*, z^*) . By using the FTERC/FTDT methods presented in the previous section, we will prove our D-ADMM-FTERC/FD-ADMM-FTDT algorithms for the digraph being able to get the exact optimal solution (X^*, z^*) in the following theorem.

Theorem 2: Let $\{X^k, z^k, \lambda^k\}$ be the iterates from our Algorithms 1 and 2 for problem (22), where $X^k = [x_1^{kT}, x_2^{kT}, \dots, x_n^{kT}]^T$ and $\lambda^k = [\lambda_1^{kT}, \lambda_2^{kT}, \dots, \lambda_n^{kT}]^T$. Let $\bar{X}^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} X^{s+1}$, $\bar{z}^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} z^{s+1}$ be respectively the ergodic average of X^k . Considering a strongly connected communication graph, under Assumptions 1-3, the following relationship holds for any iteration k as

$$0 \leq L(\bar{X}^k, \bar{z}^k, \lambda^k) - L(X^*, z^*, \lambda^*)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda^* - \lambda^0\|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X^* - z^0\|^2 \right). \quad (32)$$

Proof: From the second inequality of the saddle point of Lagrangian function (24), the first inequality in (32) can be proved directly.

We now prove the second inequality in (32). For each node v_i , since x_i^{k+1} minimizes $L_\rho(x, z^k, \lambda^k)$ in (26), by the optimal condition, we have

$$(x - x_i^{k+1})^T [h_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \lambda_i^k + \rho(x_i^{k+1} - z_i^k)] \geq 0, \quad (33)$$

where $h_i(x_i^{k+1})$ is the sub-gradient of f_i at x_i^{k+1} . By integrating $x_i^{k+1} = (\lambda_i^{k+1} - \lambda_i^k)/\rho + z_i^{k+1}$ from (28) into the above inequality, we have

$$(x - x_i^{k+1})^T [h_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \lambda_i^{k+1} + \rho(z_i^{k+1} - z_i^k)] \geq 0. \quad (34)$$

The compact mathematical format of the above n inequalities can be written as

$$(X - X^{k+1})^T [\bar{h}(X^{k+1}) + \lambda^{k+1} + \rho(z^{k+1} - z^k)] \geq 0, \quad (35)$$

where $\bar{h}(X^{k+1}) = [h_1^T(x_1^{k+1}), \dots, h_n^T(x_n^{k+1})]^T$. Since z^{k+1} minimizes $L_\rho(x^{k+1}, z, \lambda^k)$ in (27), similarly, we have

$$(z - z^{k+1})^T [\bar{g}(z^{k+1}) - \lambda^k - \rho(X^{k+1} - z^{k+1})]$$

$$= (z - z^{k+1})^T (\bar{g}(z^{k+1}) - \lambda^{k+1}) \geq 0 \quad (36)$$

for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\bar{g}(z^{k+1})$ is the sub-gradient of g at z^{k+1} . As both F and g are convex, by utilizing the sub-gradient inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & F(X^{k+1}) - F(X) + g(z^{k+1}) - g(z) \\ & \leq -(X - X^{k+1})^\top \bar{h}(X^{k+1}) - (z - z^{k+1})^\top \bar{g}(z^{k+1}) \\ & \leq \lambda^{(k+1)T} [X - X^{k+1} - (z - z^{k+1})] \\ & \quad + \rho(X - X^{k+1})^\top (z^{k+1} - z^k), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the last inequality comes from (35) and (36). Due to feasibility of the optimal solution (X^*, z^*) , we obtain $X^* - z^* = 0$. By setting $X = X^*, z = z^*$, (37) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & F(X^{k+1}) - F(X^*) + g(z^{k+1}) - g(z^*) \\ & \leq \lambda^{(k+1)T} (z^{k+1} - X^{k+1}) + \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top (z^{k+1} - z^k). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Adding the term $\lambda^{*T}(X^{k+1} - z^{k+1})$ to both sides of (38),

$$\begin{aligned} & F(X^{k+1}) - F(X^*) + g(z^{k+1}) - g(z^*) + \lambda^{*T}(X^{k+1} - z^{k+1}) \\ & \leq (\lambda^* - \lambda^{k+1})^\top (X^{k+1} - z^{k+1}) + \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top (z^{k+1} - z^k) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\rho} (\lambda^* - \lambda^{k+1})^\top (\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k) + \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top (z^{k+1} - z^k), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the last equality is calculated from (28). Then, by using equality (31), (39) changes to

$$\begin{aligned} & F(X^{k+1}) - F(X^*) + g(z^{k+1}) - g(z^*) + \lambda^{*T}(X^{k+1} - z^{k+1}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|\lambda^* - \lambda^k\|^2 - \|\lambda^* - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \quad - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2) + \frac{\rho}{2} (\|X^* - z^k\|^2 - \|X^* - z^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \quad + \|X^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|^2 - \|X^{k+1} - z^k\|^2) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|\lambda^* - \lambda^k\|^2 - \|\lambda^* - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho}{2} (\|X^* - z^k\|^2 - \|X^* - z^{k+1}\|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where the last inequality comes from using (28) and dropping the negative term $-\frac{\rho}{2}\|X^{k+1} - z^k\|^2$. Now, by using $s := k$, we change (40) to another format as

$$\begin{aligned} & F(X^{s+1}) - F(X^*) + g(z^{s+1}) - g(z^*) + \lambda^{*T}(X^{s+1} - z^{s+1}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|\lambda^* - \lambda^s\|^2 - \|\lambda^* - \lambda^{s+1}\|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho}{2} (\|X^* - z^s\|^2 - \|X^* - z^{s+1}\|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

which holds true for all s . By summing (41) over $s = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ and after telescoping calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} F(X^{s+1}) - kF(X^*) + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} g(z^{s+1}) - kg(z^*) \\ & \quad + \lambda^{*T} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (X^{s+1} - z^{s+1}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|\lambda^* - \lambda^0\|^2 - \|\lambda^* - \lambda^k\|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho}{2} (\|X^* - z^0\|^2 - \|X^* - z^k\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Due to the convexity of both F and g , we get $kF(\bar{X}^k) \leq \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} F(X^{s+1})$ and $kg(\bar{z}^k) \leq \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} g(z^{s+1})$. Thus, utilizing

the definition of \bar{X}^k, \bar{z}^k and dropping the negative terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & kF(\bar{X}^k) - kF(X^*) + kg(\bar{z}^k) - kg(z^*) + \lambda^{*T}(k\bar{X}^k - k\bar{z}^k) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda^* - \lambda^0\|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|X^* - z^0\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Based on $X^* - z^* = 0$, (43) combined with the definition of Lagrangian function [cf. (23)] prove (32). \blacksquare

Remark 4: The convergence proof here is basically different from the ones in [13] and [16] as the investigated problems are different. Specifically, in [13], the proposed D-ADMM can be only applied to nodes with undirected graphs as the constraint $AX = 0$ is needed to minimize the objective function (18), where the matrix A is related to the communication graph structure which must be undirected. To apply D-ADMM for digraphs, authors in [16] proposed a different constraint which is $\|x_i - x_j\| \leq \varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0$ with the value of ε predefined. Note that the above constraint will inevitably lead to a sub-optimal solution, which is close to the optimal but not the exact optimal as we can see from the comparisons in Section VI. In this paper, we propose the constraint $x_i = x_j$ to guarantee the solution is optimal by using the FTERC/FTDT algorithms.

B. Linear convergence rate

Assumption 4: Function $f_i(\cdot)$ in (17) is continuously differentiable.

Assumption 5: $F(X) := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$ is a strongly convex with $\mu > 0$, i.e.,

$$\langle \nabla \bar{F}(X) - \nabla \bar{F}(Y), X - Y \rangle \geq \mu \|X - Y\|^2, \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (44)$$

where $\nabla \bar{F}(X) := [\nabla f_1^\top(x_1), \dots, \nabla f_n^\top(x_n)]^\top$.

Different from Assumption 2, assumption 4 requires $f_i(\cdot)$ to be differentiable. Assumption 5 does not require each $f_i(\cdot)$ to be strongly convex while the work of [10] does.

Theorem 3: Let $\{X^k, z^k, \lambda^k\}$ be the iterates from Algorithms 1 and 2 for problem (22), where $X^k = [x_1^{kT}, x_2^{kT}, \dots, x_n^{kT}]^\top$ and $\lambda^k = [\lambda_1^{kT}, \lambda_2^{kT}, \dots, \lambda_n^{kT}]^\top$. Considering a strongly connected communication graph, under Assumptions 1-5, X^k converges approximately R-linearly.

Proof: From Assumption 4, $f_i(x_i)$ is continuously differentiable for all $x_i \in \text{dom} f_i$. By the first order optimality condition, for the optimal solution (X^*, z^*, λ^*) , i.e., $x_i^* - z_i^* = 0$, from Eqs. (26), (27) and (28), we have

$$0 = \nabla f_i(x_i^*) + \lambda_i^*. \quad (45)$$

Similarly, for solution $(X^{k+1}, z^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & = \nabla f_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \lambda_i^k + \rho(x_i^{k+1} - z_i^k) \\ & = \nabla f_i(x_i^{k+1}) + \lambda_i^{k+1} + \rho(z_i^{k+1} - z_i^k), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

From (44), by assigning $X := X^{k+1}, Y := X^*$, we get

$$\langle \nabla \bar{F}(X^{k+1}) - \nabla \bar{F}(X^*), X^{k+1} - X^* \rangle \geq \mu \|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2. \quad (47)$$

Based on the optimal condition theory, we have

$\nabla \bar{F}(X^*)^\top(X - X^*) \geq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{C}$, i.e.,

$$\nabla \bar{F}(X^*)^\top(X^{k+1} - X^*) \geq 0. \quad (48)$$

Then, from (28), (46) (47) and (48), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2 &\leq \nabla \bar{F}(X^{k+1})^\top(X^{k+1} - X^*) \\ &\quad - \nabla \bar{F}(X^*)^\top(X^{k+1} - X^*) \\ &= (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top[\lambda^* - \lambda^k - \rho(X^{k+1} - z^k)] \\ &= \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top(X^{k+1} - X^k) + (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top \\ &\quad \times [\rho(X^{k+1} - X^k) + \lambda^* - \lambda^k - \rho(X^{k+1} - z^k)] \\ &= \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top(X^{k+1} - X^k) \\ &\quad + (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top[\lambda^* - \lambda^k - \rho(X^k - z^k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

From the equality law (31), (49) changes to

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2 &\leq \rho(X^* - X^{k+1})^\top(X^{k+1} - X^k) \\ &\quad - (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top[\lambda^k - \lambda^* + \rho(X^k - z^k)] \\ &\leq \frac{\rho}{2}(\|X^k - X^*\|^2 - \|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2) - \frac{\rho}{2}\|X^{k+1} - X^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top[\lambda^k - \lambda^* + \rho(X^k - z^k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Denote

$$\tau_k := \frac{\rho}{2}\|X^k - X^*\|^2. \quad (51)$$

One can see that if $\tau_k \rightarrow 0$, then $X^k \rightarrow X^*$, i.e., the optimal problem is solved. Based on (50), we get

$$(1 + \frac{2\mu}{\rho})\tau_{k+1} \leq \tau_k - \frac{\rho}{2}\Omega_k, \quad (52)$$

where $\Omega_k = \|X^{k+1} - X^k\|^2 + (X^{k+1} - X^*)^\top[\frac{2}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + 2(X^k - z^k)]$. In order to prove the linear convergence of our algorithm, we need to prove $\Omega_k \geq 0$. From (51), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_k &= \|(X^{k+1} - X^*) - (X^k - X^*)\|^2 + [(X^{k+1} - X^*) - (X^k \\ &\quad - X^*)]^\top[\frac{2}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + 2((X^k - X^*) - (z^k - X^*))] \\ &\quad + (X^k - X^*)^\top[\frac{2}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + 2((X^k - X^*) - (z^k - X^*))] \\ &= \|(X^{k+1} - X^*) - (X^k - X^*) + \frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) + ((X^k - X^*) \\ &\quad - (z^k - X^*))\|^2 + 2(X^k - X^*)^\top[\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) \\ &\quad + ((X^k - X^*) - (z^k - X^*))] - \|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) \\ &\quad + ((X^k - X^*) - (z^k - X^*))\|^2 \\ &= \|(X^{k+1} - X^*) + \frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \|X^k - X^*\|^2 - \|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

By applying the following basic inequality [27]:

$$\|u + v\|^2 \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\mu_1})\|u\|^2 + (1 - \mu_1)\|v\|^2, \forall \mu_1 > 0, \quad (54)$$

(53) changes to

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_k &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{\mu_1})\|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2 + (1 - \mu_1) \\ &\quad \times \|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2 + \|X^k - X^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - \|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2 \\ &= \|X^k - X^*\|^2 + (1 - \mu_1)\|X^{k+1} - X^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\mu_1}\|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{\rho}\tau_k + \frac{2(1 - \mu_1)}{\rho}\tau_{k+1} - \frac{1}{\mu_1}\|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) - (z^k - X^*)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Consequently, (52) changes to

$$\begin{aligned} \|X^{k+1} - X^*\| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\mu_1[(2 - \mu)\rho + 2\mu]}}\|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*) \\ &\quad - (z^k - z^*)\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\mu_1[(2 - \mu)\rho + 2\mu]}}(\|\frac{1}{\rho}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*)\| + \|(z^k - z^*)\|). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Based on Section 3.4 in [27], (z^k, λ^k) converges Q-linearly. Then, based on the definition of R-linear convergence, from (56), x^k converges approximately R-linearly. ■

Remark 5: Only the Q-linear convergence of (z^k, λ^k) is proved in [27]. In this paper, by (56), though x^k converges not exactly R-linearly, we prove it converges approximately R-linearly.

VI. EXAMPLES

In this section, two examples are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness and performance of Algorithms 1 (in Sec. VI-A) and 2 (in Sec. VI-B).

A. Distributed least square problem

The distributed least square problem is considered as

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i x - b_i\|^2, \quad (57)$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$ is only known to node v_i , $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is the measured data and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the common decision variable that needs to be optimized. For the automatic generation of large number of different matrices A_i , we choose $q = p$ to have the square A_i . All elements of A_i and b_i are set from independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples of standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. To better demonstrate the difference between our proposed Algorithm 1 and the algorithm in [16], we set $p = 3$.

First, we choose $n = 6$ to have 6 nodes having a strongly connected digraph. Fig. 3 shows that the solution of D-ADMM-FTERC is always smaller than the one of D-DistADMM in [16] no matter whether we have ADMM stopping condition or not, which verifies Remark 4. Note the value of $\epsilon = 0.01$ is already very small and ϵ cannot be zero. If it is the case, the finite-time ϵ consensus technique in D-DistADMM will become normal ratio consensus technique in Section II-C, making the z^{k+1} update in (27) converges in infinite time as it asks $z_i = z_j$ (from $\|z_i - z_j\| \leq \epsilon$). Fig. 4 gives more details about the comparisons.




Fig. 3. Comparison of solutions to problem (57) between D-ADMM-FTERC in this paper and D-DistADMM in [16]: (a) with stopping condition (steps 14–16 in Algorithm 1 with absolute tolerance = $1 \exp -4$ and relative tolerance = $1 \exp -2$); (b) without stopping condition (herein $k_{\max} = 500$).




Fig. 4. Technique comparison of FTERC and finite-time ϵ consensus in [16]. z_{ij}^{k+1} update in (27): one can see clearly that $z_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, n$ in FTERC (black color) converge to the same value during each ADMM iteration while stay inside a bound ($\|z_i - z_j\| \leq \epsilon$) in finite-time ϵ consensus (red color).

Now, we choose $n = 70, 100$ and 700 , respectively, with a random strongly connected digraph. Here, we choose $n' = n + 1$ from the FERTC structure in Fig. 1 which is verified by Fig 5. In addition, Fig 5 demonstrates that after the first 2 ADMM iterations, FTERC iteration number in each ADMM iteration is much smaller than finite-time ϵ consensus in [16]. Note that during the first two ADMM optimization steps, finite-time ϵ consensus has less iteration numbers. This is related to the node number. Furthermore, Table I describes the running time comparison on an Intel Core i5 processor at 2.6 GHz with Matlab R2020b for $\epsilon = 0.01, k_{\max} = 200$ for this example. One can see D-ADMM-FTERC is time-efficient than D-DistADMM, and is much more time-efficient for large scale systems.

TABLE I
RUNNING TIME COMPARISON.

	n=70	n=100	n=700
D-ADMM-FTERC	1.4122s	2.1967s	52.0160s
D-DistADMM	22.5361s	78.7964s	30867.5860s




Fig. 5. Ratio consensus iteration number comparison: $n = 70, 100, 700$.

B. Distributed l_1 regularized logistic regression problem

The background of distributed l_1 regularized logistic regression is elaborated in Sec. 11.2 of [3]. The problem is

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p, v \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \exp(-b_i(a_i^T x + v))) + \mu \|x\|_1, \quad (58)$$

where the training set consists of m pairs (a_i, b_i) with $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ being a feature vector and $b_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ being the corresponding label. For problem (58), we generate $m = 2 \times 10^4$ training examples and $p = 200$ features. The m examples are distributed among $n = 100$ subsystems (processors or nodes) among which a strongly connected communication graph (topology) can be built.

The ‘true’ vector $x^{true} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ has 100 normally distributed nonzero entries. The true intercept $v^{true} \in \mathbb{R}$ is also sampled independently from a standard normal distribution. Labels b_i are generated by $b_i = \mathbf{sign}(a_i^T x^{true} + v^{true} + v_i), v_i \in \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$. The regularization parameters μ is set as $\mu = 0.1\mu_{\max}$, where μ_{\max} is the critical value above which the solution of the problem is $x^* = 0$. The Sec. 11.2 of [3] presents details how to calculate μ_{\max} .

Denote $f_i(x_i) := \log(1 + \exp(-b_i(a_i^T x_i + v))), r(x) := \mu \|x\|_1$. To solve problem (58), in Sec. 8.2 of [3], fitting the model involves solving the global consensus problem in the following with local variables $x_i = (v_i, w_i)$ and global consensus variable $z = (v, w)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) + r(z), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_i = z, i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

If r is fully separable, the generic global variable consensus ADMM algorithm described in Sec. 7.1 of [3] can be applied

with scaled dual variable as

$$x_i^{k+1} = \underset{x_i}{\operatorname{argmin}} (f_i(x_i) + (\rho/2)\|x_i - z^k + u_i^k\|_2^2), \quad (60)$$

$$z^{k+1} = \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} (r(z) + (n\rho/2)\|z - \bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{\lambda}^k\|_2^2), \quad (61)$$

$$\lambda_i^{k+1} = \lambda_i^k + x_i^{k+1} - z^{k+1}, \quad (62)$$

where \bar{x} is the average of x_1, \dots, x_n and $\bar{\lambda}$ is the average of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.

The z -update includes an averaging step (i.e., $\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}$) and a followed proximal step involving r which is a threshold operation:

$$z^{k+1} := S_{\mu/(n\rho)}(\bar{x}^{k+1} + \bar{\lambda}^k). \quad (63)$$

It is worth noting that the z -update needs a central collector to calculate \bar{x}^{k+1} and $\bar{\lambda}^k$ in each ADMM step k and it assumes each subsystem has the same global variable z . A central collector means an extra subsystem (node) is needed to collect data from all other subsystems, do the average (or even the whole z -update because z is global) calculation and broadcast the calculated results to those subsystems, which is one centralized step, not distributed.

To make the z -update distributed, our proposed FTERC or FTDT can be applied here. Unlike (59), we formulate the local consensus problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) + r(z_i), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_i = z_i, i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

which is similar as (20). Denote the vector $Z := [z_1^T, z_2^T, \dots, z_n^T]^T, Z \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$. The z -update changes to

$$Z^{k+1} = \underset{Z}{\operatorname{argmin}} (r(Z) + g(Z) + (n\rho/2)\|Z - \bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{\lambda}^k\|_2^2), \quad (65)$$

where $g(Z)$ is defined in (21). The solution of (65) also takes two steps. First, by forcing Z to go into set \mathcal{C} defined in (19), we use FTERC or FTDT to distributively get the average $\bar{z}_i^k := \bar{x}^{k+1} + \bar{\lambda}^k$ for each subsystem i . Then, (65) changes to $z_i^{k+1} = \underset{z_i}{\operatorname{argmin}} (r(z_i) + (n\rho/2)\|z_i - \bar{z}_i^k\|_2^2)$, and the threshold operator is used to get the solution $z_i^{k+1} := S_{\mu/(n\rho)}(\bar{z}_i^k)$.

Same as in [3], we use L-BFGS-B to carry out x -updates (60) distributively (in parallel). The λ -updates are also the same as (62). The Matlab codes for the algorithm (60), (61) and (62) in [3] are the example 10 in <https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/admm/>.

Based on our proposed FTERC or FTDT, both x -update and z -update are distributed, while in the previous codes only x -update is distributed. This is useful either when there are so many training examples that it is inconvenient or impossible to process them on a single machine or when the data is naturally collected or stored in a distributed fashion. This includes, for example, on-line social network data, web server access logs, wireless sensor networks, and many cloud computing applications more generally.

Fig. 6 (a) shows that the above two algorithms and D-DistADMM in [16] can reach the minimization objective as we can see there is nearly no obvious difference in the

optimal value. However, it is worth noting that the above fully distributed advantage from FD-ADMM-FTDT and D-DistADMM also comes with one cost: running time. By running this example on an Intel Core i5 processor at 2.6 GHz with Matlab R2020b for $\epsilon = 0.05$, the running time for above three algorithms are respectively 3.691185s, 238.563915s, 1173.344407s. One can see even though FD-ADMM-FTDT running time is much larger than the algorithm in [3] in which the average calculation is done with a simple *mean* function in Matlab by the central collector, it is nearly 5 times less than D-DistADMM which is because the running ratio consensus steps is much less shown in Fig. 6 (b).




Fig. 6. Comparison of solutions to problem (58) among the algorithm in [3], FD-ADMM-FTDT in this paper and D-DistADMM in [16] with absolute tolerance $1 \exp^{-4}$ and relative tolerance $1 \exp^{-2}$: (a) minimized objective value; (b) ratio consensus running number.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A. Conclusions

A distributed alternating direction method of multipliers using finite-time exact ratio consensus (D-ADMM-FTERC) algorithm is proposed to solve the multi-node convex optimization problem under digraphs. Compared to other state of art distributed ADMM algorithms, D-ADMM-FTERC can not only apply to digraphs and reach the exact optimal solution, but also is very time-efficient, especially for large-scale systems.

B. Future Directions

This work assumes that the nodes are aware of an upper bound of the size of the network, which in most applications consisting of static networks (e.g., in data centers) this is readily available. However, in more dynamical networks (e.g., sensor networks) this can become a limitation. We plan to find ways to terminate the consensus process in a distributed fashion without any knowledge of the size or the structure of the network.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to study the asynchronous implementation of our proposed method.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Ji and T. Charalambous, "Distributed alternating direction method of multipliers using finite-time exact ratio consensus in digraphs," in *Proceedings of the European Control Conference (ECC)*, July 2021, accepted.
- [2] M. Rabbat and R. Nowak, "Distributed optimization in sensor networks," in *3rd Int. Symp. Information Proc. Sensor Netw.*, April 2004, pp. 20–27.
- [3] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, and E. Chu, *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*. Now Publishers Inc, 2011.
- [4] A. Nedic, "Distributed gradient methods for convex machine learning problems in networks: Distributed optimization," *IEEE Signal Proc. Mag.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 92–101, 2020.
- [5] J. Tsitsiklis, D. Bertsekas, and M. Athans, "Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 803–812, Sep. 1986.
- [6] D. Bertsekas and J. Tsitsiklis, *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods*. Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [7] B. Johansson, "On distributed optimization in networked systems," Ph.D. dissertation, School of Electrical Engineering (EES), Automatic Control, KTH, The address of the publisher, 2008.
- [8] B. Johansson, M. Rabi, and M. Johansson, "A randomized incremental subgradient method for distributed optimization in networked systems," *SIAM J. Optimiz.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1157–1170, Aug. 2009.
- [9] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [10] A. Makhdoumi and A. Ozdaglar, "Convergence rate of distributed ADMM over networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 5082–5095, 2017.
- [11] A. Nedic, A. Olshevsky, and M. G. Rabbat, "Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization," *P. IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 953–976, 2018.
- [12] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, "A survey of distributed optimization," *Ann. Rev. Control*, vol. 47, pp. 278–305, 2019.
- [13] E. Wei and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed alternating direction method of multipliers," in *Proc. 51st IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, 2012, pp. 5445–5450.
- [14] W. Shi, Q. Ling, K. Yuan, G. Wu, and W. Yin, "On the linear convergence of the ADMM in decentralized consensus optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Proc.*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1750–1761, 2014.
- [15] A. Falsone, I. Notarnicola, G. Notarstefano, and M. Prandini, "Tracking-admm for distributed constraint-coupled optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 117, p. 108962, 2020.
- [16] V. Khatana and M. V. Salapaka, "D-DistADMM: A $O(1/k)$ distributed ADMM for distributed optimization in directed graph topologies," in *Proc. 59th IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, Dec. 2020, pp. 2992–2997.
- [17] T. Charalambous, Y. Yuan, T. Yang, W. Pan, C. N. Hadjicostis, and M. Johansson, "Decentralised minimum-time average consensus in digraphs," in *Proc. 52nd IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, 2013, pp. 2617–2622.
- [18] —, "Distributed finite-time average consensus in digraphs in the presence of time delays," *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 370–381, 2015.
- [19] T. Charalambous and C. N. Hadjicostis, "When to stop iterating in digraphs of unknown size? an application to finite-time average consensus," in *2018 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [20] A. D. Domínguez-García and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Coordination and control of distributed energy resources for provision of ancillary services," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Grid Commun.*, Oct. 2010, pp. 537–542.
- [21] Y. Yuan, G.-B. Stan, L. Shi, and J. Gonçalves, "Decentralised final value theorem for discrete-time LTI systems with application to minimal-time distributed consensus," in *Proc. 48th IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, Dec. 2009, pp. 2664–2669.
- [22] Y. Yuan, G.-B. Stan, M. Barahona, L. Shi, and J. Gonçalves, "Decentralised minimal-time consensus," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1227–1235, May 2013.
- [23] J. Cortés, "Distributed algorithms for reaching consensus on general functions," *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 726–737, March 2008.
- [24] S. Giannini, D. Di Paola, A. Petitti, and A. Rizzo, "On the convergence of the max-consensus protocol with asynchronous updates," in *Proc. 52nd IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, 2013, pp. 2605–2610.
- [25] V. Khatana, G. Saraswat, S. Patel, and M. V. Salapaka, "Gradient-consensus method for distributed optimization in directed multi-agent networks," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf. (ACC)*, 2020, pp. 4689–4694.
- [26] I. Shames, T. Charalambous, C. Hadjicostis, and M. Johansson, "Distributed network size estimation and average degree estimation and control in networks isomorphic to directed graphs," in *50th Ann. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, and Computing*, Oct. 2012, pp. 1885–1892.
- [27] W. Deng and W. Yin, "On the global and linear convergence of the generalized alternating direction method of multipliers," *Journal of Scientific Computing*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 889–916, 2016.